Women and the City, Women in the City

A Gendered Perspective on Ottoman Urban History

Edited by

Nazan Maksudyan

berghahn
NEW YORK · OXFORD
www.berghahnbooks.com

Published in 2014 by

Berghahn Books

www.berghahnbooks.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Women and the city, women in the city : a gendered perspective on Ottoman urban history / edited by Nazan Maksudyan. – First Edition.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-78238-411-3 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-1-78238-412-0 (ebook)
1. Women–Turkey–Social conditions. 2. Women–Turkey–Economic conditions. 3. Sex role–Religious aspects. 4. Turkey–Social life and customs. 5. Turkey–History–Ottoman Empire, 1288–1918. 6. Turkey–History–20th century. 7. Turkey–History–21st century. I. Maksudyan, Nazan, 1977– editor of compilation.

HQ1726.7.W6296 2014
305.409561–dc23

2014000993

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Printed on acid-free paper

ISBN: 978-1-78238-411-3 hardback
ISBN: 978-1-78238-412-0 ebook

To my grandmother, Maryam Maksudyan, and to my city, Istanbul,
two inalienable parts of my life and work.

Contents

Figures

Preface

Kaffee und Kuchen

Nazan Maksudyan

1 December 2006, Krakow

Saturday afternoon. A very elegant old little café on Starowiślna Street. Small square tables, dark colored curtains on the windows, and the smell of burned sugar and cotton candy. Two very well dressed women in their seventies enter through the door proudly taking off their graceful little hats and leather gloves. They slowly approach one of the few empty tables, make a sign to the waiter without looking at the menu, and order immediately. Two coffees and two slices of cake arrive shortly afterward. The way they sit facing one another, the apparent harmony of their conversation, their togetherness—in other words every little detail of this presumably weekly or monthly ritual—is in some way warm, sincere, and flowing naturally.

15 January 2007, Madrid

Monday morning. A bakery/coffee shop close to the metro station La Latina. The mother and daughter calmly come toward the *comptoir,* sit on the high bar stools and order croissants. A tender-eyed waitress behind the *comptoir* serves warm milk to the mother, who really has a resemblance to Carmen Maura, the famous actress in many Almodovar movies, and *café con leche* to the daughter in her forties. There is a happy silence between them, while they eat their butter-smelling breakfast with good appetite. Then a third woman joins the troupe—maybe she is also family. As they finish eating, all of them light a cigarette and start a conversation that is frequently interrupted by high-pitched and cheerful laughter.

20 January 2007, Prague

Tuesday morning. A classy pastry shop on Karmelitska Street. Chairs covered in blue velvet, antique mirrors on the walls, jewel-like cakes in a glass case. Three old ladies step in while still in the middle of an excited conversation. In a short while the waiter brings three glasses of red wine. In fact, it is not even ten in the morning! Their body language and gestures imply that they all enjoy the heated debate, who knows on what.

26 February 2007, Paris

Monday afternoon. A sunny day in Place de la Bastille, one of the fanciest cafés: Café Français. A pretty, old woman at one of the miniscule tables, wearing a pale blue *deux-pièces,* maybe a designer's cut. She wears heavy makeup of rosy colors and her hair is pinkish blond. She has probably just been to the *coiffeure.* Neither reading a book nor writing in a diary, like most of the unaccompanied crowd, in her silence and loneliness she is just looking at the *place* and the monument of liberty in our sight. Yet, her attention is mostly focused on her *chocolat chaud,* the cup of which is warming her hands.

WOMEN AND THE CITY

While working on putting together this volume, my intent was to have a range of essays that covered a wide array of subjects, and the final product proudly bears witness to this initial hope. Yet, when trying to prepare the introductory section and reflecting on the two keywords in the title of the book, "women" and "city," I could not help but remember Edward Hopper's famous painting, *Chop Suey* from 1929. In most of his paintings, he observes people and places, especially the interiors of New York restaurants in the 1920s. But this painting is probably one of the best representatives of his focus on the ever growing affinity of the urban scene and *modern* women.

It goes without saying that urban women do much more than enjoy *kaffee und kuchen.* Especially when the background scenery is the Ottoman context, one has to broaden the scope to a variety of subjects and issues. Yet, the above described separate but linked images of women in cafés in different cities still played a role in the conception of an urban history book mainly from a gender perspective. Without doubt and with the utmost strength, I thought of my grandmother. Through all her life, she was for me the best guide in discovering my city, Istanbul, and a perfect example of a city woman. A city woman, a perfect example? What do I mean by

these phrases? If I were to define it in a rigorous way, I guess I might refer to such things as education, work experience, mobility, and travel, having a presence in public, a taste of fashion, and a notion of living well. But again I am haunted by *Chop Suey* and cannot detach myself from the theme of *kaffee und kuchen.* My grandmother was my heroine not only because she was a well-educated, intelligent, and incredibly elegant woman who spoke five languages, who had a career and who had seen many parts of the world, but also she was my first and regular companion at the famous and exceptional European styled café of Istanbul: Baylan. Until it was closed in 1992, Karaköy Baylan was the usual stop of our adventures in the European side of the city, as we were among the people of the "other side" (*karşı*). But we were also frequenters of the branch in Kadıköy, in our side of the city. There, we always had the specialty of Baylan, kup griye (*cup grillé*). To give an idea of the sin that we shared, it was made with ice cream, caramel sauce, toasted almonds, vanilla, pistachios, and *crème Chantilly* and was served with *langue de chat* biscuits. Even though I was a teenager at the time, I like to think that we were both women of sweets enjoying the dolce vita.

So I want to dedicate this book to my grandmother, Maryam Maksudyan, and to my city, Istanbul, two inalienable parts of my life and work.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the Europe in the Middle East—the Middle East in Europe (EUME) program of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, the Fritz Thyssen Foundation, and the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. As a postdoctoral fellow of the EUME program (2009–2010), directed by Georges Khalil, I became affiliated with my host institute in Berlin, Zentrum Moderner Orient (ZMO). Thanks to the productive research environment I was granted, I managed to put together both the necessary motivation and time to bring together the fields gender and urban studies in the Ottoman context. During that period, the ZMO was hosting an exquisite group of colleagues working on different aspects of urban history, and our regular discussions brought to my attention the rarity of publications on the Ottoman Empire. This collection is the product of those two intellectually vibrant years that I spent in Berlin, at the ZMO, during which I thought, wrote, and spoke frequently about women in Ottoman and post-Ottoman cities.

I am grateful for the combined efforts of Ulrike Freitag and Nora Lafi, who shared their invaluable ideas for editing this volume. I would like to thank all the contributors of this volume who kindly agreed to work on their chapters and diligently made the necessary changes so as to create a very solid contribution to the available literature.

Introduction

Nazan Maksudyan

It is well established that men and women have considerably varied experiences of the city in relation to housing, use of transport, relative mobility, and spheres of employment. Now a customary trope among urban theorists, the *flâneur*,[1] someone who finds delight and pleasure in ambling contentedly and unhurriedly through the city, is necessarily a male figure.[2] As Wilson succinctly puts it, "Men—white middle-class men at least, and in particular—own the street without thinking about it. Women must always make a conscious claim, must each time assert anew their right to be 'streetwalkers'."[3] Still, it took a while for urban and gender studies, as coconstitutive subjects, to stop being shy toward each other. In fact, parallel to patriarchal gendered participation and representation in the public sphere, urban history, like many other subfields of history, had traditionally tended to focus more on *his* story rather than *hers*. This was largely due to the spatial separation of home and work, which necessarily meant a highly gendered division of labor between masculine paid work and feminine unpaid work.[4] Men were associated with public, productive spheres, including paid work outside the home, while women were associated with private, reproductive spheres that confined them within the home. However, growing and expanding scholarship on the history of women from the last few decades demonstrated the necessity of incorporating women's roles into the larger picture.

Especially given the waves of structuralism and poststructuralism, there is more and more emphasis on both women's agency in history and the contextual fluidity and ongoing production of meaning (of gender and forms of power relations).[5] It was largely thanks to postmodern theory and method—which originally sought to recover excluded and marginalized urban subjects (space, culture, women, ethnic minorities)—that traditional urban

studies approached and developed within itself a markedly feminist scholarship. Therefore historical record has proved that despite the prevalence of dominant (patriarchal, traditional) gender relations encouraging women to "stay home," women have resisted confinement to the private sphere. Women's participation especially in voluntary organizations reshaped the city and its social relations, often by creating liminal spaces in the community where women had more power and authority than they did in either the home or the workplace.[6]

In that respect, a systematic treatment of urban and gender studies combined offers a feminist critique of mainstream urban policy and planning and a gendered reorientation of key urban social, environmental, and city-regional debates.[7] These studies that take into account previously neglected dimensions of gendered critical urban analysis shed light on transformations of gender roles and state and personal politics, across intersecting spheres of home, work, the family, urban settlements, and civil society. They acknowledge women as manipulating, if not shaping, urban space. Numerous research works attest that women did more than react to alterations in urban space. They actively participated in changing the *map* of the city and in redefining its essence.

Before going deeper into what is meant by "a gendered approach to urban history" and in what ways historians learn from the contributions of feminist geographers—and what this volume offers in general—there is need to assess the state of affairs in the field of Ottoman urban studies. It goes without saying that for a considerable time now there has been a growing body of literature in the form of city monographs. The cities around the Mediterranean, and especially port cities with multiple connections to the global system, were among the first to capture the attention of Ottoman historians—as they continue to do today.[8] Moreover, there have traditionally been more numerous and much deeper analyses of the provincial capitals and other important cities in the Balkan and Arab provinces—especially Salonika, Beirut, Aleppo, and Damascus.[9] One would actually be surprised to see that much less has been written even on the capital, Istanbul, leaving aside other core cities such as Bursa or Edirne.[10]

Recognizing more and more the multiple faces and realities of the Ottoman presence throughout its large geography, urban historians recently built up working groups and conglomerates in order to produce comparative studies, providing more nuanced accounts of the cities involved and the urban administration of the empire. One such significant working group has been established within the framework of the EUME (Europe in the Middle-East—the Middle-East in Europe) program at Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin (Institute of Advanced Study) in 2004 in collaboration with the Zentrum Moderner Orient. First formulated as "New Approaches to the History of Merchant Cities in the Ottoman Empire and Its Successor States," this group was later named "Cities Compared: Urban Change in the Mediterranean and Adjacent Regions." Zentrum Moderner Orient has also become the host of the now well-known Ottoman Urban Studies Seminar, organized by Ulrike Freitag and Nora Lafi since 2006. The intent of the Seminar has been to provide a floor to discuss several dimensions (urban government, cosmopolitanism, everyday life) of Ottoman urban history with the participation of both the fellows of the EUME program and international guests. Numerous projects were completed under this rubric and most of them deserve to be considered milestones in the growth of Ottoman urban studies.[11] One of the latest accomplishments of the group, *The City in the Ottoman Empire,* also needs to be mentioned as a significant contribution to the field with its comparative perspective, since, as previously underlined, Ottoman urban history has often been written in a fragmented manner by the prevalence of area studies.[12]

Despite the developmental trend in both urban and gender studies, their combined approach to Ottoman history remains scantier. On the one hand, new scholarly works that embrace a broader understanding of Ottoman women's participation in different facets of social life are usually economic and social histories of a particular urban area, yet fail to provide a truly urban historical perspective. On the other, serious urban histories of the empire still suffer from the abovementioned male bias and usually remain silent about the female members of urban communities. Still, there is reason to believe that this gap will soon become narrower as new contributions to the field, including the present volume, increasingly include gender in their analysis.[13]

GENDERED SPACE AND TIME: WOMEN AND URBAN SOCIAL CHANGE

Elizabeth Wilson characterizes the urban as a space of opportunity and abandon for women. Notwithstanding its difficulties, Wilson argues, the city emancipates women far more than rural life or suburban domesticity.[14] It goes without saying that the urban space is highly segregated by income, class, and race, yet it is rarely demarcated according to explicit sex separation. However, normalization of a patriarchal gender regime and hegemonic masculinity have profound impacts on urban experience, life chances, and

well-being. The resulting inequalities are wide ranging—from legal barriers to owning property, to real or perceived threats of violence or insidious labeling.[15] Having said this, the approach of this volume still follows Wilson in maintaining that women successfully make use of the urban space for mobility, transgression, and social change. Hence they *negotiate* with the urban milieu with their own strategies and flourish in the interstices of the city.[16]

Sevgi Adak's essay on women's dress provides an ideal setting for studying the gender regime in the urban public realm. Literature has highlighted women's historical contributions to urban norms and other such reconfigurations, despite all the dominant ideologies about women's place and women's space.[17] Adak's account clearly brings forth this dichotomy. The state ban on veiling is on the one hand a case of direct state intervention in deeply rooted gender codes and women's public presence in an attempt for reshaping the urban space. The chapter also presents a very strong case of assumed agency on the part of women against the actions of an authoritarian state. Women of the new Turkish republic contested the reform agenda of the Kemalist regime, as they become involved in the anti-veiling campaigns, both as facilitators and as actors who tried to adapt, shape, modify, and/or resist the change. These campaigns were primarily formulated and implemented at the local level. This way, women could benefit from a wide range of possibilities to manipulate the new dress codes in the public sphere, leaving room for agency. While women took part in the remaking of the city, they also reconstituted gender relations and gender identities.[18]

Women's negotiation capability was not only limited to the spatial axes, but also reached out to the temporal one. In a recent article, Gila Hadar noted that women were the timekeepers within the patriarchal family and society of Salonika. The life of the family, namely, women and children, was conducted not in accordance with official space and time—either "government time" or "Jewish time"— but in terms of more internal, restricted dimensions.[19] Also from within a parallel understanding, On Barak's chapter highlights the active participation of middle-class women in new timekeeping arrangements in colonial Egypt. In his analysis, Egyptian women appear not only as the rhetorical "other" of modern abstract masculine clock-time. Alongside this important capacity, women paradoxically reinforced masculine temporality in several important, if concealed ways. Notably, they were the ones who made it possible for their husbands and sons to lead a scheduled life while at the same time taking much of the blame for disruptions in these new modern routines. Undoubtedly, synchronization and the transmission of time between and inside each of the interconnected "private" and "public" spheres involved much social tension. Still, it is still relevant to talk

about the agency of women over the passage of time inside the house, which eventually influenced outside-the-house temporality.

Moreover, Barak's essay hints at how different female actors (i.e., effendi women vs. servants) based on their own history of spatial and social knowledge approach the city in varied ways. Postmodern (poststructural) feminist writing on the city brought about the recognition that gender identity functions through multiplicity and differences between (categories of) women.[20] Diverse groups of women, possessing multiple and fluid identities (and identifications) approached the city from different angles, with distinct intents, and with unequal pace. Heterogeneous everyday experiences and domestic spaces of women determined their relation to and presence in public arenas. What feminist geographers call *intersectionality* underlines that gender identity operates in complex relationships to other social identities such as race, ethnicity, class, nationality, First World–Third World, religion, sexuality, age, and health.[21]

Nazan Maksudyan's chapter on the political agency of women in the nineteenth century Ottoman society eloquently depicts the large role that intersectionality plays in how women associate themselves with the city. Philanthropy was a fairly different form of female engagement, granting women an exceptional freedom of mobility in the city and at unconventional times. They could easily bypass spatial urban boundaries, which were mostly drawn with reference to class, gender, and respectability. Philanthropic women's organizations breached various social hierarchies on a daily basis, as non-Muslims in Muslim households or as wealthy women in poor neighborhoods. Their direct involvement in current political, social, and religious issues was a significant source of empowerment. They assumed a significant amount of authority at the societal level and especially within larger female networks. In that respect, the analysis of women's organization and philanthropy as a new urban profession for women brings to light how women from different class, religious, ethnic, or immigrant backgrounds had manifold linkages within themselves and with the urban space.

Fluidity is not only meaningful on the identity level, but current research recognizes that the urban context is also a changing set of situated social relationships that are influenced by economic, social, political, and cultural changes operating at various spatial scales and interacting with each other. Change in urban places in return alters women's lives and the gender inequalities associated with them. The fluidity of urban environment may also create opportunities for women to make progressive changes through individual and collective action. The city represents a site of personal autonomy and political possibilities for women. It would not be an exaggeration to

claim that cities are the only place where women are able to negotiate social change. At least, in the urban environment this potential for empowerment becomes particularly visible and thus accessible to the historian through a range of material sources.

Maksudyan's chapter recounts various moments of opportunity in times of utmost change. Women's claims to rights as citizens is a relevant perspective with which to map out gender relations and gender identities in urban places. Ottoman women tried to find common ground for their experiences as urbanites of important cities, as members of non-Muslim communities, as educated and elite minority of women in their polities. Their interactions have been very similar to those previously observed by Sarah Deutsch. Women from diverse backgrounds came together for common purposes and through both rivalries and alliances, they formed new urban relations and spaces, which in the end challenged and negotiated the over-imbued sexual division of urban space.[22] Their philanthropic engagement with urban social life created chances for them to have a say in changing the urban structure and to take agency.[23] In this picture, the city becomes the site of modern citizen making. Women tested their chances of becoming full citizens by forcing free access to the streets, by demonstrating in front of public buildings, by establishing shelters for women and the needy. Different groups of Ottoman women living in distinct temporalities/spatialities have negotiated ethnic, religious, nationalist, and sexual urban tensions and so they were all engaged in the political questions of their time as significant actors of social change.

A FEMALE *FLÂNEUSE*?: BEING "OUT OF PLACE" AND FORMATIONS OF BELONGING

The city is more than its economic and ethnic geography. Urban sexual geography crosscuts them in both ideological and physical terms. Wolff suggests that there cannot be a female *flâneuse,* only the prostitute. I would add to them the lower classes, underscoring the idea that the freedom to roam is very much a male freedom.[24] Since power relationships intertwine with the field of vision, the cultural codes and politics of seeing and being seen are deeply gendered. In urban space women are more likely than men to be the ones who are looked at, the objects of the gaze.[25] Therefore, women alone in public space have been inevitably women "out of place," subject to sanctions and negative connotations. As proof of the internalization of the sexual geography and gendered spatiality, it has been demonstrated that "warnings about the potential for sexual victimization are a central feature of women's socialization."[26] Moreover, the presence of elite women in working-class neighborhoods would be a breach of proper sexual geography, since only working women and sex-workers were allowed there.[27] The controversy over a philanthropic maternity clinic mostly for single mothers and prostitutes is a typical example of such blurring of boundaries, where elite women disturbingly occupied the same space as "other women."

In discussing the gap between the sexual freedoms afforded to men and women on the streets, one needs to be careful not to reproduce the idea that the public realm is a solely male realm, nor the private realm exclusively female. Instead, as has been demonstrated by feminist geographers, it is to assert that men and women create their presences in the urban space on a profoundly gendered basis.[28] Ulrike Freitag's essay on the carnival of *al-Qays* in Jeddah is a perfect representation of how women both reproduced and played with the urban sexual geography. When men left Jeddah for Mecca and onward to Mount 'Arafāt, the women would dress up as men and for four consecutive nights, they would take to the streets with drums and perform dances. So during this carnival, women not only take over the streets, but also they do it at nighttime, overturning both spatial and temporal axes of urban belonging. To stress and sanction now the reversed "out of place" roles in the public sphere, they could even take an aggressive posture by attempting to beat up those men who did not let them celebrate unhindered. The urban environment is the context within which gender identities and gender relations are negotiated and this context is in turn altered by changing gender identities and relations. Freitag's chapter gives an actual and fairly exceptional account of this interactional relationship between gender and urban, between city and women.

The politics of seeing and being seen or from the reverse dimension, the "politics of looking" could also be discussed with reference to another typical urban public realm, that of the print culture. It was asserted that circulation of images was part of the construction of a new public sphere for producing and reproducing identities. As Nora Lafi elaborates in her essay on the visions of North African women in early Turkish Republican press, power relationships intertwine with the field of vision, including acts of seeing and being seen, as well as the cultural meanings of the visual and its representations. Lafi argues that the dichotomous visualities of a semi-naked "exotic" Algerian young woman in contrast with Turkish women dressed and made up as modern Parisians is indicative of a new stance of the state in imagining the new Turkish woman as a way to position the country in the mirror of Europe. Accordingly, the new Turkish

nationalist elite assumed the colonial gaze of European men and women toward Arab Muslim females.[29]

Hegemonic masculinity of city streets might make women unwelcome outsiders, even targets of sexual assaults. Spatial relations, including restricted access to public space and limited mobility because of fear of violence, can be seen as a test of equality—a parameter of empowerment.[30] Women negotiate space for themselves by conscious practices of boldness and through their very presence in the public sphere. The women who feel confident reclaim space for themselves and make it more available for other women through everyday practices and routinized uses. In that respect, they are both victimized and empowered by the same gendered urban environment. Vahé Tachjian's chapter brings forth a range of mechanisms, from nation-state formation to ethnic nationalism, from repressive patriarchal structures to local exclusionary mechanisms that put Armenian women in a highly precarious situation. Still, when their lives were at stake, they could have come up with survival strategies of conversion, mixed marriage, and prostitution—even if none of them seemed neither voluntary nor preferable. Moreover, in the discussions about reintegrating them into the Armenian society, Armenian elite women took initiatives to create women's groups that would work in the shelters in order to provide a female network of moral support and inspire them with courage.

What these activists tried to do was to re-adapt these women, who had been through entirely different experiences, to their communities. More importantly, the attempt was to re-create a sense of belonging that was lost *along the way,* as many of these women dreaded the idea of going back home after all that happened. Belonging does not simply denote being a member or a resident of a place, but it also has affective dimensions of longing or yearning.[31] Furthermore, belonging has an across-time quality: it brings together past memories, present experiences, and future ties connected to a place.[32] What Armenian women lacked was related to this rupture between past and present, and eventually between present and future.

Belonging as a sentiment is noted to build up and grow out of everyday life activities. For de Certeau, corporal everyday activities in the city are part of a process of appropriation and territorialization.[33] Once those activities are lacking or changing at an unprecedented pace, then people might develop a sentiment of dis-belonging. Christoph Herzog's essay on a young woman's memoirs during World War I touches upon her multilayered dimensions of dis-belonging on her migratory journey from Trabzon to Istanbul. Mediha recounts her suffering from being forced to be sheltered in non-Muslims' quarters in the cities they passed. In these Armenian or Greek quarters, the family not only had "headaches due to church bells," but they were also deprived of the sound of *ezan.* Judging from her account, intercommunal relations between Muslims and Christians in Trabzon were both distant and culturally demarcated. In addition to the loss of customary religious boundaries, Mediha also longs for the beauty of nature that she associates with her hometown. As her case clearly demonstrates, when everyday practices are interrupted, memory as well creates and consists of a sense of belonging.[34]

Although Herzog's chapter is the only one referring directly to the dimension of mobility in urban history, several other contributors touch upon the urban-rural dichotomy and criticism against and exclusion of rural practices and behavior in the urban environment. Adak discusses how women of Eskişehir were ordered to remove their *peştemal,* or at least choose simpler and more "dignified" colors, since too colorful ones were presenting "a rural image," instead of "a more civilized style." The negotiation of urban spaces through dress was a significant challenge for Muslim women across class. They would either "fit in" or face exclusion. In an entirely different context, Barak refers to the perceived difficulties ahead of the middle-class temporal reform—especially targeting night hours and sleeping patterns of children—in the face of jinn and *afarit* stories, which effendi men and women believed to be contracted from domestic servants, many of whom were of rural origins. The city offers more numerous and probable promises for the emancipation of women in comparison to rural life. However, the city also demanded a sense of urban belonging. Rural and migrant women were expected, if not forced, to "fit in" the urban norms.

CONCLUSION

The present volume aims to contribute to a growing scholarly sensibility by highlighting the role of women in the making of urban space. Embracing the significance of intersectionality in gender studies, the contributors of the volume also work with other relevant analytical categories such as class, culture, ethnicity, nationhood, and religion. In that respect, the collection is an attempt to reveal, recover, and reconsider the roles, positions, and actions of women in the midst of altered or redefined economic, social, political, and cultural contexts of the Ottoman and post-Ottoman cities. Separate chapters as a whole highlight how women could reimagine and reconceive the city, actually neither designed for nor controlled by them, and how in time they could create female-controlled public and semi-public spaces. The contributors reconsider the negotiations, alliances, and agency of women in asserting themselves in the public domain, a spatial challenge in which even today they face obstacles and resistance as legitimate actors.

NOTES

1. The *flâneur* first appears in Charles Baudelaire's Paris poems of the 1850s, resurfacing in the work of Walter Benjamin in the early twentieth century. Susan Buck-Morss, *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991).
2. Keith Tester, ed., *The Flâneur* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994, 2006).
3. Elizabeth Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 139.
4. Suzanne Mackenzie, "Restructuring the Relations of Work and Life: Women as Environmental Actors, Feminism as Geographic Analysis," *Gender, Place and Culture* 6, no. 4 (1999): 417–430.
5. Chris Beasley, *What is Feminism? An Introduction to Feminist Theory* (London: Sage, 1999), 91.
6. Beth Moore-Milroy and Susan Wisner, "Communities, Work and Public/private Sphere Models," *Gender, Place and Culture* 1, no. 1 (1994): 71–90.
7. Helen Jarvis, Paula Kantor, and Jonathan Cloke, eds., *Cities and Gender* (London; New York: Routledge, 2009).
8. Among the first such examples are Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, and Bruce Alan Masters, eds., *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir, and Istanbul* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Çağlar Keyder, Y. Eyüp Özveren, and Donald Quataert, eds., *Port-Cities of the Eastern Mediterranean, 1800-1914* (Binghamton: Fernand Braudel Center, 1993). So far the latest contribution is the study of Kolluoğlu and Toksöz. Biray Kolluoğlu and Meltem Toksöz, eds., *Cities of the Mediterranean: From the Ottomans to the Present Day* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010).
9. Some examples might be: Meropi Anastassiadou, *Salonique, 1830-1912: une ville ottomane à l'âge des Réformes* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Abraham Marcus, *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989); Margaret L. Meriwether, *The Kin Who Count: Family and Society in Ottoman Aleppo, 1770-1840* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999); Leila Tarazi Fawaz, *Merchants and Migrants in Nineteenth-Century Beirut* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983); Richard van Leeuwen, *Waqfs and Urban Structures: The Case of Ottoman Damascus* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Jens Hanssen, Thomas Philipp, and Stefan Weber, eds., *The Empire in the City: Arab Provincial Capitals in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Beirut: Orient Institut der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, 2002); Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts: Christians, Muslims, and Jews, 1430-1950* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005); Jens Hanssen, *Fin de siècle Beirut: The Making of an Ottoman Provincial Capital* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Stefan Weber, *Damascus: Ottoman Modernity and Urban Transformation 1808-1918* (Århus: Aarhus University Press, 2009).
10. It requires an analysis of its own, but one main reason behind this discrepancy is the better preservation of court records and other local archives in these areas, thanks to ironic clerical or colonial interest in history. Having said that, some major works on Ottoman Anatolia should definitely be underlined: Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts, and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Leslie Peirce, *Morality Tales: Law and Gender in the Ottoman Court of Aintab* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Hülya Canbakal, *Society and Politics in an Ottoman Town: 'Ayntāb in the 17th Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
11. A few examples from many: Nora Lafi, ed., *Municipalités méditerranéennes. Les réformes urbaines ottomanes au miroir d'une histoire comparée* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2005); Malte Fuhrmann, *Der Traum vom deutschen Orient. Zwei deutsche Kolonien im Osmanischen Reich 1851-1918* (Frankfurt: Campus 2006); Marc David Baer, *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2010); Florian Riedler, "Public People: Seasonal Work Migrants in Nineteenth Century Istanbul," in *Public Istanbul: Spaces and Spheres of the Urban,* eds. Frank Eckardt and Kathrin Wildner (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008), 233–253; Nazan Maksudyan "State 'Parenthood' and Industrial Orphanages (*Islâhhanes*): Transformation of Urbanity and Family Life," *The History of the Family* 16, no. 2 (2011): 172–181.
12. Ulrike Freitag, Malte Fuhrmann, Nora Lafi, Florian Riedler, eds., *The City in the Ottoman Empire: Migration and the Making of Urban Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2011). There are two other volumes written from a comparative perspective. The first mainly concentrates on "the Arab Middle East" and the second on the contemporary phenomena. Peter Sluglett, ed., *The Urban Social History of the Middle East, 1750-1950* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008); Martina Rieker and Kamran Asdar Ali, eds., *Gendering Urban Space in the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
13. Some exceptional works, so far mostly in the form of articles, need to be mentioned here. Amila Buturovic and Irvin Cemil Schick, eds., *Women in the Ottoman Balkans: Gender, Culture and History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007); Haris Exertzoglou, "The Cultural Uses of Consumption: Negotiating Class, Gender, and Nation in the Ottoman Urban Centers during the 19th Century," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 35, no. 1 (2003): 77–101; Eyal Ginio, "Living on the Margins of Charity," in *Poverty and Charity in the Middle Eastern Contexts,* ed. Mine Ener, Amy Singer, and Michael Bonner (New York: SUNY Press, 2003), 165–184; Eyal Ginio, "18. Yüzyıl Selanikinde Yoksul Kadınlar," *Toplum ve Bilim* 89 (2001): 190–204.
14. Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City,* 10.
15. Jarvis, Kantor, and Cloke, 16.
16. Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City,* 8.
17. Dolores Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream, The Future of Housing, Work and Family Life* (New York: WW Norton and Company, 2002); David Sibley, "Gender, Science, Politics and Geographies of the City," *Gender, Place and Culture* 2, no. 1 (1995): 37–49.
18. Valerie Preston and Ebru Üstündağ, "Feminist Geographies of the 'City': Multiple Voices, Multiple Meanings," in *A Companion to Feminist Geography,* ed. Lise Nelson and Joni Seager (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), 211–227.

19. Gila Hadar, "Jewish Tobacco Workers in Salonika: Gender and Family in the Context of Social and Ethnic Strife," in *Women in the Ottoman Balkans: Gender, Culture and History,* ed. Amila Buturovic and Irvin Cemil Schick (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 127–152.
20. Linda McDowell, *Gender, Identity, and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 22.
21. Gillian Rose, *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Patricia Martin, "Contextualizing Feminist Political Theory," in *Mapping Women, Making Politics: Feminist Perspectives on Political Geography,* ed. Lynn A. Staeheli, Eleonore Kofman, and Linda J. Peake (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 15–30.
22. Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
23. So, in principle, it would be very interesting to examine rural women as actors in social change, but this inquiry would definitely require different and also rare kinds of source material.
24. Janet Wolff, "The Invisible Flâneuse: Women and the Literature of Modernity," *Theory, Culture and Society* 2, no. 3 (1985): 37–47.
25. Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994).
26. Ross Macmillan, Annette Nierobisz, and Sandy Welsh, "Experiencing the Streets: Harassment and Perceptions of Safety among Women," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37, no. 3 (2000): 306–322.
27. Phil Hubbard, "Women Outdoors: Destabilizing the Public/Private Dichotomy," in *A Companion,* Nelson and Seager, 322–333.
28. Kim Namaste, "Genderbashing: Perceived Transgressions of Normative Sex-Gender Relations in Public Spaces," *Environment and Planning D–Society and Space* 14, no. 2 (1996): 221–240.
29. Julia Clancy-Smith, "The Colonial Gaze: Sex and Gender in the Discourses of French North Africa," in *Franco-Arab Encounters,* ed. Carl L. Brown and Gordon S. Matthew (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1996), 201–228.
30. Hille Koskela, "Bold Walk and Breakings: Women's Spatial Confidence versus Fear of Violence," *Gender, Place and Culture* 4, no. 3 (1997): 301–319.
31. Nira Yuval Davis, "Belongings: In Between the Indegene and the Diasporic," in *Nationalism in the 21st Century,* ed. Umut Özkırımlı (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2003), 127–144.
32. Mike Crang, *Cultural Geography* (London: Routledge, 1998).
33. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
34. Tovi Fenster, "Gender and the City: The Different Formations of Belonging," in *A Companion,* Nelson and Seager, 242–256.

Chapter 5

"This time women as well got involved in politics!"

Nineteenth Century Ottoman Women's Organizations and Political Agency

Nazan Maksudyan

In March 1892, Jewish ladies of Péra and Galata founded a new charitable society to relieve the pains of poor women and children who emigrated from Russia and Corfu and who were in distress in Istanbul. The misfortunes of many poor Jewish families of different quarters of the city also attracted their attention. By the same token, in 1904 Bulgarian women's organizations were applying to the Consulates of the Great Powers to secure the release of a few Bulgarian women who were arrested by the Ottoman authorities due to their participation in the *Ilinden* Uprising of 1903. Again with objectives of helping other women in need, the Greek Women's Society in Péra applied to the government in 1907, requesting authorization for their already functioning maternity clinic, opened to serve young, poor, and unwed women. Likewise, in 1909 Armenian intellectual and elite women of Istanbul reorganized the activities of their charitable societies in order to relieve the pains of massacre-stricken orphans and widows in the Adana district.

This selection of women's organizations and activities from the last decades of the Ottoman Empire points to the fact that women were remarkably active in numerous nineteenth-century social and political questions, from the expansion of female education to refugee crises, from prostitution to illegitimate births and child abandonment, from nationalist movements to relieving the pain of ethnic conflicts. Ottoman women were active agents

in the public sphere. They provided medical services to the poor, the refugees, destitute women and children. They were involved in different forms of social care, such as holding workshops, offering classes, and providing shelter. They also became prominent figures in the reformation of educational institutions and establishments of schools for girls. They were pioneers in initiating philanthropic organizations, particularly in establishing orphanages and poorhouses.[1] Given the wide-ranging nature of these outlets for the actual participation of women in the most significant issues of their times—apart from those being within the ideology of motherhood, nationalism, and militarism[2]—their presence and influence has not been presented in the historiography as a form of agency, especially not from the perspective of social change.

It is frequently argued that horizons of women's work in the nineteenth century were to a large extent enlarged thanks to the profession of philanthropy, or social work as a general category, which is defined as an essentially *apolitical* occupation. Kandiyoti, for instance, differentiates women's organizations into "primarily philanthropic organizations" and "those more explicitly committed to struggle for women's rights."[3] It is fairly common in the literature to pose a dichotomy of philanthropic versus feminist, or political, as if philanthropy can be conceived as an essentially unconcerned, uninterested, and purely apolitical field. Tucker, in a similar respect, separated the women's societies in Iran into two categories, those "organized for nationalist political purposes" and those working "for the support of girls' schools, women's clinics, orphanages, and so on."[4] The approach is again similar, tending to separate educational and health-related affairs from *real* politics. Although what is meant by the "nationalist political purposes" is obvious, applying the adjective "political" only to nationalist purposes tends to ignore the highly political nature of opening a maternity clinic or an orphanage that this essay intends to demonstrate.

As Beth Baron underlined, women's engagement in philanthropic initiatives has rarely been the main theme of the histories written.[5] The women's organizations and their charitable activities have typically been seen in analysis as subsumed under a number of larger agendas, such as "the feminists' concern for the poor and the reach of their movements, women nationalists' fervor and desire to uplift the nation, or women's search for an outlet for their energy and a path to wage-earning jobs and professions."[6] Ottoman women's political, feminist, religious, and philanthropic agendas in the late nineteenth century cannot be easily perceived as independent of one another. Women's organizations' activities were unavoidably located among and between these seemingly separate yet intricately interrelated fields. Charitable activities, fundraising campaigns, and various initiatives

undertaken by Ottoman women's organizations, such as helping the refugees or the victims of a failed insurrection, were organically coupled with discussions of women's rights and enlargement of the political and social sphere for women. Differing fields of work, be it feminist, charitable, nationalist, or social, should be regarded as both independent and interdependent.

A comparative analysis of women's movements in the late Ottoman Empire proves that defining philanthropy as *apolitical* or *afeminist* would be shortsighted. Charitable Ottoman women of different ethnoreligious origins were also engaged in the political questions of their time. The fact that they focused their attention toward the needy, especially women and children, does not weaken but only supports this argument, since the late Ottoman political sphere and discourse also included unattended children, orphans, refugees, and widows.

The *seriousness* of women's involvement in politics is also discernible from the way they were perceived by the state authorities. During the Hamidian era and in the Young Turk period alike, women's organizations were subject to an extremely high level of interference and surveillance. The activities of many women's societies caused disturbance and were approached with suspicion by the government. The abovementioned Jewish ladies were accused of transferring money to overseas banks. Bulgarian women, in a similar respect, were seen as harmful tools in the hands of the politicians, trying to arouse the attention of the Western powers. Greek women were presented as trying to disturb the customs and morality of the Ottoman society with their philanthropic concern for illegitimate pregnancies. The bureaucratic apparatus of the constitutional period strictly and critically observed and kept under control the activities of Armenian women's societies after the Adana massacres of 1909, with the *declared* objective of strengthening Ottomanism.

Based on thorough archival research in the Prime Ministry's Ottoman Archives (BOA) and French Foreign Ministry Archives (AMAE), together with an analysis of contemporary press and publications of women's organizations, this chapter aims to present in a comparative perspective the centrality of Ottoman women's involvement in nineteenth-century social issues and how they appear as protagonists of Ottoman social and political history.

THE OTTOMAN JEWISH WOMEN'S INITIATIVE FOR JEWISH REFUGEES FROM RUSSIA

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, Jews in Russia were leading a difficult and precarious life. Novelist and *New York Times* correspondent Harold

Fredric, who spent the year of 1891–92 covering the Russian famine, often referred to the Russian Jews as the "Pariah Community."[7] Especially the May edicts of 1882, prepared by Tsar Alexander III and his minister of the interior, Nicholas P. Ignatiev, enforced the Russian Jews' pariah status with harsh economic sanctions and repression. These laws required the majority of the Jews of Russia to live in the Pale of Settlement, twenty-five provinces of the Russian Empire that included fifteen western districts of Russia and ten districts of the former Kingdom of Poland. Jews were forbidden from venturing outside that restricted province for a visit or for purposes of settlement unless they had a special permission from various Russian authorities. The severity of this imposition took on graver meaning under the social impact of the Russian famine of 1891–92, the 1892 cholera pandemic, and the resulting desire among Russian Jews to migrate to safer regions.

Forcibly evacuated at the end of September 1891 by the provincial governor from famine-stricken Volhynia, within the Russian Pale, a large group of Jews traveled on foot to Podolia. They were as unwelcome there as they were in their home province and they continued their travel to Odessa, hoping to escape the famine, disease, and tyranny. On 4 October 1891, approximately five days after their arrival in Odessa, the provincial governor issued an order expelling the 1,168 Russian Jews. The edict gave them forty-eight hours to leave. The exiled Jews had few options. Quickly arranging their passage out of Odessa and packing the few belongings and clothing they owned, the group of laborers, petty artisans, butchers, dray-men, and their families left Russia with the hope of emigrating to Palestine.[8]

The exiled Jews boarded a steamer that would take them across the Black Sea to Istanbul. Some of them carried papers approved by the Odessa authorities giving them dual status as Russian and Ottoman subjects. These were the lucky ones. The Ottoman authorities differentiated between those who had Ottoman status and those who did not have such status.[9] In 1891, the government ordered that those Jews who held Ottoman citizenship be allowed to settle within its domain, whereas numerous others were denied travel papers. They were told to find a way to go to the United States or Argentina.[10]

Soon after the arrival of the Russian Jews, a new law was enacted by the Ottoman government expressly forbidding the passage of Russian Jews through the Ottoman Empire to any other country, based on "sanitary grounds."[11] The Ottoman authorities were especially alarmed due to cholera and typhus epidemics in Russia. In practical terms, their entry to the Ottoman lands was banned.[12] For the ones who were already settled in the city, the government searched for ways of ensuring sanitation and hygiene of their dwellings in order to prevent the introduction of diseases. The government assumed in mid 1892 that Jewish refugees from Russia could have been infected with cholera and it was requisite to send them elsewhere and to warn the Russian authorities not to send more refugees.[13]

Furthermore, in the wake of the constant influx of Jewish migrants arriving in the Empire, the Sublime Porte announced its intent to curb further settlement in Palestine and to generally safeguard public health by assuring that large numbers of these immigrants not settle in any single location.[14] Émigre Jews, therefore, instead of making the planned escape to Palestine, were forced to hide in the ghetto-like Jewish neighborhoods[15] and synagogues of Istanbul,[16] places described in the Yiddish American press as a den of "pestilence, sin and death."[17] There they remained, fugitives without a national identity, while the Ottoman authorities deliberated their fate.

When the capacity to offer them settlement in synagogues and private homes was almost exhausted, temporary barracks in the form of a refugee camp were built in Kuruçeşme and Ortaköy.[18] The original aim of the Ottoman authorities was to forbid their stay in Istanbul and eventually transfer the refugees who could prove Ottoman nationality to the provinces of Salonika and Aydın at the government's expense.[19] In December 1892, many Jewish refugees were given expulsion orders, and without many choices, they were deported to the pre-determined provinces.[20]

Apart from the efforts of the Ottoman Jewish religious authorities to help these refugees, Jewish philanthropies based abroad, including those of the Baron de Hirsch, helped relocate many of the immigrants to settlements in the Americas. Furthermore, a series of local charitable organizations, largely run by Ottoman Jewish women, emerged with the sole aim of aiding the refugees who remained in the Empire. These efforts coincided with a general explosion of Ottoman Jewish philanthropic societies during this period. It is claimed that philanthropy had never made such advances in Ottoman Jewish society as it did during those years.[21] In late 1891, the Ashkenazim of Istanbul formed a committee for the refugees from Russia.[22] Several fundraising campaigns were organized in Salonika for the benefit of immigrants.[23] One of the largest and better organized of such initiatives was a society founded in Beyoğlu, particularly for helping women and children of the refugee Jews. It was called Société de Bienfaisance des Dames Israélites de Péra (Philanthropic Society of the Jewish Ladies of Péra), Beyoğlu'nda Musevi Kadınlar Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi as it appears in official correspondence.

As announced in the Ladino press of Istanbul, this new charitable society was established by Jewish women of Péra and Galata, shortly after the arrival of the refugees, in March 1892.[24] The initiative was taken by Madame Emilia Fernandez, the wife of Isaac Fernandez, who was a member of the regional committee of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Istanbul.[25] Madame

Fernandez was also an active charity worker after the 1877–78 refugee crisis and as a result of her valuable work for the "migration of refugees," she was given an imperial decoration of charity (*şefkat nişanı*).[26] In order to respond to "the suffering of their poor co-religionists who emigrated from Russia and Corfu and who suffer in Istanbul," and, moreover, to take care of the misfortunes of many poor Jewish families of different quarters of the city, she called on the women of Galata. These women immediately proceeded to form the committee that would direct the project. Madame Esther Cohen, the wife of Dr. Elias Pasha, was elected president. Madame Isaac Molho, the director of the House of Camondo, became the treasurer and Madame Weismann, the director of the Galata Alliance Girls' School, was elected secretary. As apparent from the committee members of the society, the initiative was closely related to the Alliance Israélite organization in Istanbul.

According to the official statute of the organization, the main aim of the association was to help the unfortunate Jews exclusively with food, fuel, clothing, and in exceptional cases with money.[27] According to the society's annual financial statement, prepared at the end of its first year of establishment in 1893, the organization spent 22,747 *guruş* for the distribution of different sorts of materials, such as blankets, shoes, coal, milk, meat, coats, and allowances to the poor and needy.[28] On the whole, the working budget of the society reached a remarkable sum of 47,910 *guruş*–45,336 of which was coming from fees and donations (*cotisations et donations*). The minimum yearly amount that can be paid as membership fee was 60 *guruş*.[29] The voluntary contribution of certain members could go up to 240 *guruş*.[30]

Apart from fee-paying active members, who had to be women, the society also collected donations from nonmembers, who wanted to contribute to the organization, both from Istanbul and abroad. Their names were inscribed on a special board of honor in the central office of the society.[31] Among those contributors, there were familiar names who donated real large amounts. The Ladies of the Fernandez family and Madame Baronne de Hirsch contributed 4750 *guruş* each to the society. Madame Salomon Fernandez herself donated 1080 *guruş*. These numbers were very impressive compared to the common standard of donating a few hundred *guruş*. The contribution of Baronne de Hirsch implies that the society was considered to be part of the relief efforts for the Jewish refugees of Russia. The Jewish Colonization Association of Baron de Hirsch (1891) subsidized and assisted a large number of societies all over the world, when their work was connected with the relief and rehabilitation of Jewish refugees.[32]

During the 1890s, philanthropic activity and benevolent organizations became widespread and effective in their fundraising activities. The Ottoman state, for its part, was seriously alarmed, and so heightened the level

of its surveillance.[33] The Jewish benevolent women's societies that were involved in assisting the refugees became suspect. In October 1892, the Sublime Porte argued that several Jewish organizations, which were collecting donations supposedly for the education of orphans, and the support of widows and the unemployed, were actually transferring these sums to banks in Greece.[34] The Porte could not be sure of their "real" objective. Still, the Hamidian regime was insistent on controlling and containing the formation of charity organizations and raising of funds especially among non-Muslims of the Ottoman Empire.

The Ottoman government's restrictive or oversuspicious policy regarding voluntary initiatives among the non-Muslim communities was directly linked to concerns about separatist activities within these communities. From the government's point of view, any fundraising activity could turn into a source of separatist nationalism.[35] In line with this observation, in March 1893, the Ministry of Police prepared a report on the philanthropic associations of the non-Muslim communities (*milel-i gayr-ı müslime*).[36] It was argued that several of these organizations were opened all over and that they were collecting money under such pretexts as helping schools, helping places of worship, and helping the poor and needy.[37] However, the government was left clueless about their actual expenditures (*sarfiyat*) and their transactions (*muamelat*). In that respect, Ottoman authorities underlined the need to prepare new regulations ensuring access to detailed information on these societies' revenues, expenses, and affairs.

The Jewish communities in Salonika and Izmir also organized relief measures to help Jewish refugees from Russia. The extent of the Izmir community's activities had to remain much smaller, since the government strictly controlled the charitable works of the Jewish community in Izmir. The governor (*vali*) prohibited any form of fundraising for the refugees and he took the charities under his total control.[38] The authorities assumed that so-called charitable organizations were actually raising money for some secret societies with unpopular political agendas.[39]

The issue of Jewish refugees was discomforting for the Ottoman state largely due to the possibility of the emergence of a Jewish state in Palestine. The issue exerted itself through purchases of land by Jewish settlers in the area and through the strengthening of Zionism.[40] Under the circumstances, the Alliance Israélite was also suspected of working toward the creation of a Jewish state, especially because they were purchasing land in Syria and Beirut, together with the Rothschild company.[41] The organic and financial links of the Jewish women's organizations that were founded to help the refugees, including Société de Bienfaisance, with both the Alliance and Baron de Hirsch, made them usual suspects in the eyes of the government. All the

organizations and fundraising campaigns of the society were approached with caution and surveillance.[42]

Helping the poor and homeless refugees was not seen—either by the Jewish organizations or by the state—merely as a benevolent activity for the needy. Like every philanthropic activity, refugee relief had its larger spheres of influence and consequences.

THE GREEK SISTERHOOD SOCIETY OF *AGIOS ELEFTHERIOS* AND THEIR MATERNITY CLINIC

The medical history of birth and maternity is one of the new and growing fields of Ottoman history.[43] The first maternity clinic, the Vilâdethane, was founded in 1892 by Besim Ömer.[44] This famous pediatrician was educated in Paris. He had to have a long and fierce fight before managing to open this clinic.[45] In the end, he could only establish a very small department with three rooms in a two-story building, located in an obscure corner of the Military Medicine School (Askeri Tıbbiye). The hospital was opened in a quasi-official way, without any imperial recognition. The doctor was severely criticized and his house was attacked, since his institution was labeled as a *piçhane* (bastard home).[46] Besim Ömer thought that the Ottoman government's rejection of the hospital resulted from that biased and distorted image of the "bastard home." This label captured the attention of large segments of society, including the sultan Abdülhamid II himself.[47]

This critical interpretation is understandable, given the social realities of the time. Traditionally, and under normal circumstances, pregnant Ottoman women would give birth in their own beds, in their own homes. The ones who had to do it somewhere else were those who had to hide their pregnancies, namely, unwed mothers, those who had extramarital relations, and those who were working as prostitutes.[48] Moreover, it was not rare to see maternities and foundling asylums next to one another, as in the famous examples of Paris, Moscow, and St. Petersburg, so that children born out-of-wedlock could be easily and discretely abandoned by their mothers in those asylums.[49] Therefore, it may actually be true that the babies born in the Vilâdethane were most often "bastards."

For instance, in February 1908, a Jewish girl gave birth to a baby girl in the maternity hospital (Vilâdethane). Arguing that the father of the baby had died previously and that she was "sick and poor, and was not able to feed her baby" (*âlil ve fakir ve çocuğunu ırza'a gayr-ı muktedir*), she abandoned her at the maternity clinic. After the investigation of the records of the hospital, it turned out that her name was Fortüne bint-i Baruh and that she was a resident of Balat, from among the wealthy (*erbab-ı yesardan bulunduğu*). The only reason that she gave birth in the maternity hospital was that she was unmarried and the baby was the result of an illicit affair (*münasebet-i gayr-ı meşru' neticesinde*).[50]

In order to change the habit of giving birth with the help of the midwives at home and to improve the infamous reputation of the institution, Besim Ömer wrote a number of articles and pamphlets in which he tried to appeal to indigent women, who lived in miserable conditions that were extremely dangerous for the lives of their newborn babies. Doctor Spyridon Zavitziano of the Greek community initiated in 1889 a "Department for Foundlings" (Service des enfants trouvés de Notre-Dame de Péra) in order to reform the provisions for abandoned children of the Greek Orthodox community of Beyoğlu. Specifically, he introduced a monitoring mechanism for wet-nurses. He suggested the opening of a birth clinic as well, where desperate and unwed pregnant women (*filles mères*) would give birth in safety. However, with the annual budget at the disposal of the community, even the purchase of a *couveuse* seemed to be too ambitious and unrealistic an objective.[51]

Apparently, the aim was not abandoned by the community. A Greek women's society would manage to open such a clinic two decades later in January 1906. Women's Sisterhood Society for the Protection of the Poor (Beyn-el İnas Fukaraperver Uhuvveti) was founded in 1887 by some "virtuous Christian women" (*muhadderât-ı hıristiyane*).[52] In the society's petition to the sultan, dated 16 April 1887, the activities of the society were clustered in three areas. One was supplying the poor with food, clothing, and medication. The society, for instance, distributed 360 sets of clothes to the victims of the fire at Kasımpaşa in 1888.[53] The second was assigning and sending doctors to the poor households in cases of illness (*li-ecli tedavi ettıba tayin ve esrâ*). As a third facility, the society opened a tailoring workshop for unemployed and unsupported women so that they could gain a livelihood while maintaining their chastity and decency (*ırz ve namus*). It was argued that the society succeeded in helping hundreds of needy women (*yüzlerce havatin-i muhtace*) through their tailoring facility. The curious coupling of medical treatment and helping women protect their honor and decency was also the defining theme of the society's maternity clinic.

In Greek, the society was called "Sisterhood of Saint Eleftherios of the Ladies at the Parish of Saint Constantine and Saint Helen in Péra."[54] Both Ottoman and Greek documents usually referred to it as Agios Eleftherios.[55] In 1907, the society had around sixty female members[56] and was organized

Figure 5.1. The official seal of the "Sisterhood of Saint Eleftherios."

under the presidency of Madam Ekaterina P. Papakonstantinou, the wife of Panayot Papakonstantinis, who was a teacher at the Greek school of Fener. The aims of the society were enlarged to help poor and lonely pregnant women, without any religious discrimination, by providing them with shelter and medical care in the hospital, where they could stay during the last weeks of their pregnancy until the end of the puerperium.[57]

The clinic (*tedâvihâne*) was opened in Tarlabaşı, Beyoğlu, in a three-story stone building and consisted of six rooms, including a kitchen, a balcony, and a garden.[58] As the permanent staff of the institution, there was a midwife (*kabile*) and a servant. Two doctors were also called in in cases of complication and illness. The official petition of Papakonstantinou defines the targeted constituency of the hospital mainly as women living under real poverty (*fakr u zaruret*). Still, the maternity clinic would first and foremost house young and unwed pregnant women and mothers in order to offer a healthy solution to the issues of infanticide and child abandonment. The list of women who gave birth in the institution in its first year of activity attests that the hospital managed to meet a strongly felt need of desperate women among the Greek community. From January 1906 to January 1907,

thirty women living in Beyoğlu and Tatavla gave birth in the institution, staying between eight and thirty-five days in the clinic. Within its first year of functioning, the total expenses spent on meat, milk, soap, sugar, underwear, medication, and doctors reached 7,000 *guruş*.

The government learned about the venture of the Agios Eleftherios only when the society applied to the Municipality of Istanbul to secure permission to organize a theater performance, which would bring revenue for the administration of the maternity clinic opened for "poor and destitute pregnant and puerperal women."[59] When the police department of the district looked into the issue, it was discovered that the clinic did not have an official authorization from the Ottoman authorities.[60] The association could not collect donations for an initiative unrecognized by the government. Consequently, the society applied for official authorization with the petition of Madam Ekaterina P. Papankostantinou in December 1906. A broad investigation was undertaken by the concomitant efforts of the Ministry of the Interior, the police department, the Municipality, the Council of State (Şura-yı Devlet), and the Directorate of Imperial Military Schools (Umum Mekatib-i Askeriye-i Şahane Nezareti). The reports prepared by each of the abovementioned bodies looked for pretexts to hinder the functioning of the clinic.

Holding an obstructive attitude toward the existence of the maternity hospital, the Directorate of Imperial Military Schools argued that although "the initiative deserved admiration" (*teşebbüsat-ı vaki şayan-ı takdir olub*), both the initial and permanent costs of such an establishment could not possibly be met with the charitable donations of the members of the association.[61] The Directorate also claimed that there were already a number of hospitals for poor and destitute women, and that each municipality employed a gynecologist to help such women in need. Thus, a new clinic was not necessary.[62]

The first assertion of the Directorate regarding the insufficiency of the financial resources of the association seems to be unfounded. The income of the association was not coming solely from the benevolent contributions of its members. There is evidence, in the records of the police department, that the association organized a number of artistic performances for fundraising. As previously mentioned, the association had applied to organize a theater production in December 1906.[63] Although the application of the Agios Eleftherios was initially rejected by the police department due to the association's unrecognized status, other documents prove that the theater production was actually held around February 1907.[64] It was performed in the famous Odeon Theatre and generated a revenue of 13,955 *guruş*.[65] The association also asked for permission to organize another theater production in February 1908, again in the Odeon Theatre, with the participation

of Greek "Panadi and Rona Companies."[66] The police department approved the petition of the association, with the requirement that a detailed ledger be prepared and handed to the police providing information on the revenues and expenses of the association.[67]

The second claim of the Directorate, regarding the multiplicity of maternity hospitals, seems to have been an exaggeration, since there were only a few such institutions in the city to respond to the needs of needy and destitute women: Haseki Women's Hospital (Nisâ Hastanesi),[68] Besim Ömer's Vilâdethane, maternity clinic of Dâr'ül-aceze,[69] and the Midwifery School in Kadırga.[70] However, there is evidence for the last argument. At least the Municipality of Beyoğlu (Altıncı Daire-yi Belediye) tried to provide a service that sent doctors to the domiciles of needy and sick pregnant women.[71]

The police department, in its turn, argued that at least three of the neighbors of the maternity clinic of Agios Eleftherios were against the existence and functioning of the institution.[72] Although the actual testimonies of the persons involved were not attached to the report, concerns regarding immorality and unwed pregnancy were underlined. As in early discussion relating to the Besim Ömer's Vilâdethane, the authorities refrained from collaborating in an undertaking providing relief to *unchaste* women.

As a result of ongoing objections and criticisms of the authorities, the clinic was officially closed, but probably was still functioning in a clandestine manner. In correspondence between the association and the police department between 1907 and 1908, Agios Eleftherios defined its purpose as working "for the needs of pregnant women and little children"[73] or as "for pregnant women and for the children they will give birth to."[74] Yet, there was no mention of the clinic, as if the association was targeting the pregnant women of the neighborhood at large, without particularly leaning on those lying-in at their own maternity clinic. Thanks to this reformulation of the field of activities, the organization was granted permission to remain open and was allowed to collect contributions.

The maternity clinic of Agios Eleftherios, despite its purely charity-based mission of helping poor and destitute women, definitely passed beyond the borders of health care and philanthropy in its overall social contribution. As the issues of prostitution and extramarital births became significant subjects in the feminist agenda of the period, organizing forms of help to the poor and pregnant women was a path-breaking and highly political issue. Moreover, as the Ottoman bureaucratic apparatus was reorganizing and centralizing itself toward a more *modern* state structure, the communal efforts, even in the realms of education and health, that were traditionally denominational fields of activities free from state control were under challenge.

THE *ILINDEN* UPRISING OF 1903 AND WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS IN ITS AFTERMATH

Literature on the French Revolution, human rights, and the European social democratic movement came to Macedonia, in other words to the *vilâyet* of Monastir, via Salonika and greatly influenced both female intellectuals and the women's emancipation movement. Numerous women's societies and organizations were established in the mid nineteenth century, many of them led by female teachers—including Kostur [Kastoria] Women's Association, Secret Women's Association in Struga, Women's Association in Krushevo, Secret Women's Association in Monastir, and the Women's Biblical Association in Bansko (of the Protestant missionary Helen Stone).[75] Female teachers of Ohrid in 1885 established a women's society, Virgin Mary Assumption, better known as Sunday School. It aimed to provide material assistance and education to the poor, and especially women. It organized weekly literacy classes and lectures on *emancipation.* Kostadina Bojadjieva[76] led the association from 1901 until the end of 1903.

The agenda of the Ottoman Macedonian female intelligentsia was focused on women's and national emancipation at the same time. In the fall of 1900, Virgin Mary Assumption joined the revolutionary national movement, Clandestine Macedonian-Adrianople Revolutionary Organization (CMARO).[77] The organization was established in 1893 and it adopted Socialist ideas on the emancipation of women. This was the responsible body behind the organization of the *Ilinden* uprising (2 August 1903) for the liberation of "Macedonia" from the Ottoman Empire. At the congress of the CMARO in Salonika at the beginning of 1903, a decision was made to undertake a "nationwide and strategic" uprising. The chosen day was 2 August 1903, the feast day of St. Elias, also known as *Ilinden.*[78] The first three weeks of the insurrection was a period of triumph. The Ottoman army seemed incapable of carrying out a campaign. Except in Monastir, Ohrid, and Kastoria, the insurgents were supreme almost everywhere. Yet, from 25 August onward, Nasır Pasha took over the command and began to apply a systematic plan of campaign; the insurgents were acting purely on the defensive.[79]

As one of the most significant activities of the Virgin Mary Assumption, Kostadina Bojadjieva and other female teachers of the society from Ohrid opened a clandestine hospital during the uprising. The hospital was situated in an old archbishopric building in Ohrid's Varos district, in the house of Metodi Patchev. The Ottoman authorities soon uncovered the hospital and imprisoned the women for actions against the state. Yet, the authorities could not find supporting evidence against them and they were released after brief imprisonment, though they had to endure brutal beatings.[80] For

the next three months, until the British Relief Fund (or British Charity Mission),[81] headed by HN Brailsford, took over, the teachers continued to work at the hospital with the agreement of the *Kaymakam* of Ohrid, Mehdi Bey, who provided the hospital with a daily ration of milk.[82] This hospital, which primarily targeted wounded women and children, can be considered the first significant activity of Macedonian women's organizations in the aftermath of the uprising.

Later in early 1904, the hospital in Ohrid was directed by Jane Brailsford, wife of the mission's head.[83] Actually, the hindrances of the Ottoman authorities did not allow the British charity mission to develop wider medical service in the area of uprising.[84] They had to apply numerous times throughout November and December 1903 to local and central governmental offices to get permission to open hospitals.[85] In the end, three small hospitals were in service in Kostur, Ohrid, and Monastir.[86] Only the insistent protests of the British Embassy in Istanbul prevented the closing of the hospitals.

The second wave of activities organized by women after the *Ilinden* was related to efforts to make the events known to the international public. Additionally, Bulgarian women's societies in Sofia undertook significant amnesty campaigns for imprisoned women and vigorously appealed to both the Ottoman government and to foreign consular authorities. Ekaterina Peneva Karavelova led one such campaign.[87] She took charge of the "Ladies' Committee in Sofia" and agitated for the release of Macedonian women who had been imprisoned after the *Ilinden* Uprising. At international forums she protested against the indifference of the Great Powers to Bulgarian national interests and to the fate of the tens of thousands of refugees who could not easily be absorbed by a small and underdeveloped Bulgaria.

In its report to the government in November 1903, the Commissariat of Bulgaria (Bulgaristan Komiseri) noted that three women visited the consulates of Britain and Belgium in Sofia. They handed in a written declaration (*beyanname*) to the consuls requesting that they intervene to put an end to the massacres and atrocities targeting the Bulgarians of the Ottoman Empire.[88] The Commissariat noted the name of Karavelova as one of the three women representing the women of Sofia (*Sofya nisvanı namına*). In order to acquire a copy of the declaration, the commissary visited the Consul of Britain. Yet, the consul claimed that he immediately sent the document to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in London and neglected to keep a copy for the Consulate.[89] This was definitely a diplomatic maneuver, a tactful strategy for politely refusing the Ottoman official.

In addition, the consul also emphasized that "the document did not carry any importance whatsoever" (*mezkur varakanın bir gûna ehemmiyeti haiz olmadığı*). The consul laughed while saying that "this time women as well got involved in politics" (*bu defa kadınların da politikaya karıştıkları*). Actually their visit was directly related to strictly "political" issues from the rejection of state authority, to the struggle for independence and armed rebellion. These Bulgarian women were actually "involved with politics" in the orthodox sense of the word. However, the openly political nature of women's involvement made the British Consul laugh! In return, the Ottoman official wishfully believed that these women were nonactors, since the Consul declared their application insignificant.

The Ladies' Committee in Sofia, usually referred in the Ottoman documents as the Philanthropic Association of the Bulgarian Women (Bulgar nisvanından mürekkeb cemiyet-i hayriye), continued its efforts for the release of women prisoners in collaboration with a number of other women's organizations in Sofia. In December 1904, the Commissariat of Bulgaria informed the Sublime Porte that women's organizations in Sofia were preparing a petition addressed to the Consulates of the Great Powers in the city for the release of Selavfa Chakarova, who had been convicted by the court of Salonika after the uprising.[90] The number of those arrested during and after the insurrection is disputed. Brailsford gives the number of persons imprisoned as 1,500.[91] The *New York Times* reported for the *vilâyet* of Salonika 900 prisoners were imprisoned, for Üsküb 500, for Monastir 850, and for Adrianople 550, a total of 2,800.[92] Most of the arrested women were school teachers, as the Ottoman authorities often imprisoned Bulgarian priests and educators on charges of national insurgence and defiance of Ottoman authority. Apparently, both the Commissariat and the government were concerned about the activities of these women's organizations and were eager to inhibit their actions so that the matter would not become internationalized.

Another significant activity of the Ladies' Committee was to organize fundraising performances and other philanthropic initiatives for the victims of the uprising. In November 1904, one such special event (*müsamere*) was organized by the Committee to collect contributions.[93] The Ottoman officials were especially interested in the event, since the Bulgarian prince[94] and his mother participated in the evening and donated 100 francs to the society. Thanks to the sum gathered during the event, it was declared in the local press in May 1905 that a committee was formed from among the members of several women's organizations under the name of the Macedonia Philanthropic Association in Sofia (Sofya'daki Makedonya cemiyyet-i hayriyesi) with the aim of establishing a poorhouse (*dâr'ül-aceze*) in the *vilâyet* of Monastir.[95] Not long after that project, the Ladies' Committee in Sofia opened an orphanage in Monastir in 1908 in collaboration with other Macedonian women's organizations. The institution would take care of the orphaned

children who lost their parents during past years of unrest and turbulence in the area.[96]

The efforts of the Bulgarian and Macedonian women after the *Ilinden* uprising of 1903 were remarkable in terms of responding to the needs of the afflicted persons, but especially women and children in the aftermath of the Ottoman authorities' brutal suppression of the unrest. The initiation of a hospital right in the middle of the crisis, efforts to secure the release of arrested women, and projects for opening a poorhouse and an orphanage were all designed to address the physical and social wounds incurred during the uprising. In that respect, once again, their initiatives were not only humanitarian and philanthropic, but also social and political.

THE 1909 ADANA MASSACRES AND RELIEF EFFORTS FOR ARMENIAN ORPHANS

The day after the counter-revolutionary attempt against the newly established Ottoman constitutional government of the Young Turks on 13 April 1909 (termed the 31 March Incident in contemporaneous historical chronicles), bloody events in the form of massacres of Armenians occurred in southern Anatolia in Adana. The pogrom started on 14 April in the larger area of the Adana province, specifically in Hacın, Hamidiye, Tarsus, Misis, Erzin, and Dörtyol, and quickly spread to the whole district, lasting for three days. After the area became relatively calm, especially after the appearance of the European naval forces in the nearby port of Alexandretta, a second massacre broke out on 24 April (Sunday), this time in the Armenian quarter of Adana, right after the arrival of Ottoman troops sent to quell the unrest. In this second massacre, which lasted for three days, killings occurred within the city of Adana. This phase also included the burning of the Armenian section of the city, together with many foreign mission premises, including schools and orphanages.

Even though the actual number of those killed during the massacres was highly contested, it seems probable that it was between approximately twenty and thirty thousand. Most of them were Armenians, but some Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Greeks were also killed. Cemal Pasha, who was appointed by the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) as the governor of the province after the massacres, later wrote in his memoirs that seventeen thousand Armenians were massacred during the incident. Hagop Babikian, a member of the investigative commission sent by the Ottoman Parliament, estimated the total loss as twenty-one thousand.[97]

According to the report of the Government Inquiry Commission, the number of homeless and starving widows and orphans of all ages was thirty thousand in the province of Adana and 6,797 in Aleppo. Although an English newspaper reported the total number as 70,500, in his report to the Istanbul Patriarchate, the Catholicos, Archbishop of Cilicia, provided instead the figure of 89,825.[98] It is an impossible task to determine the actual numbers of orphans and widows when the death toll is a disputed matter. Yet, the number of orphans who were taken care of in the orphanages was close to 3,500. In certain sources the number of half-orphans taken care of by their own mothers was estimated to be around 3,000[99] and 4,000.[100]

After the massacres of 1909, the future of the orphans became a national priority for the Patriarchate, the Armenian Parliament, and intellectuals. The community thought that the relief for orphans was much more important than any other need.[101] In a speech delivered in the aftermath of Cilician massacres to raise funds for the education of orphaned children, the writer and social activist, Zabel Asadur, also known as Sibyl, called the community to concentrate on educating orphans rather than simply providing humanitarian aid.[102] In the realm of orphan relief, two ideals were pronounced. One was not to move the orphans away from their *patrie,* and the other was not to give any orphan to a foreign institution. The Armenian community feared that they were to lose two generations at once. Not only were the adults killed, but their children were also to be assimilated. In one of her interviews, an old Armenian lady told Zabel Esayan, the famous feminist novelist, the following:

> There remains nobody between me and my grandchildren... Two generations were destroyed, they were all killed. There is no one left except for old women and very small children. And now, they fixed their eyes on them."[103]

The Armenian relief workers and intellectuals were particularly concerned, since the governor, Cemal, was willing to directly assume responsibility for these orphans, claiming that they were Ottomans first and foremost. In line with that assumption, he planned to build an Ottoman Orphanage (Dârü'l-Eytâm-ı Osmânî) for the Adana orphans. The use of the term "Ottoman" to qualify the institution was a deliberate reference to the constitutional regime and the Ottomanist ideology. According to the French vice-consul, this was to be an "*essentially Turkish* establishment," in which the language of instruction would be Turkish and the question of religion would not be taken into consideration, which basically meant that orphans of all confessions would be accepted and no religious education would be provided.[104] Cemal frequently referred to the ideal of "Ottomanism," of uniting

all the peoples of the Empire. Yet, the opening of a "state orphanage" for Armenian orphans and the governor's educational approach in matters of language and religion increased fears of conversion and assimilation among the Armenian community.[105]

Zabel Esayan was among the most prominent Armenians who opposed the establishment of the Ottoman Orphanage and who got involved in disputes with the governor.[106] She was sent to Cilicia in June 1909 as a member of the Armenian Patriarchate Orphanage Committee (APOC), to relieve the suffering of the victims of the massacres in general, and the orphans in particular. The committee first went to Mersin, where a delegation from the prelacy had rounded the orphans up one by one and dispatched them to shelters set up in the Armenian school and church. Later in Adana, the APOC had invited all those who were sheltering orphans to apply for enrollment in the institution. Esayan and her counterparts, Satenik Ohancanyan[107] and Arşaguhi Teotig, were to register the orphans who had lost their parents. In her book, describing her observations of massacre-stricken Adana, Teotig specifically notes that they "open[ed] schools so that they [Armenian girls] will love their language and their race."[108]

The Governorship of Adana managed to open three orphanages, in Adana, Hacın, and Dörtyol, sometime in the fall of 1909. These institutions sheltered around 450 orphans.[109] In order to resist the influences of the missionary establishments and the orphanages of the Ottoman local administration, the Patriarchate and organizations founded under its umbrella worked to open orphanages and other educational institutions for the Armenian orphans of the area. From August to October 1909, the APOC opened six orphanages in Adana, Maraş, Hacın, Aintab, Hasanbeyli, and Dörtyol, housing approximately 1,500 orphans.[110] Armenian women's organizations also directed their attention to the issue, especially in order to help orphan girls.

One such association was the Tıbrotsaser Hayuhyats/Dignants Ingerutyun (School-loving Armenian/Women's Association, Ermeni Maarifperver Kadınlar Cemiyeti). Founded in 1879, the association aimed at training female teachers in its teacher training college in Istanbul to be sent to the girls' schools in the Anatolian and Balkan provinces. Although the activities of the association were interrupted by the order of the government after the 1894–96 massacres, it was reopened following the proclamation of the constitution. According to the testimony of one of its members, Hayganuş Mark, the association was chaired by Zabel Asadur (Sybil) after its reinitiation in 1908.[111] At a speech in Istanbul to raise money to finance schools in Cilicia, Sibyl argued that the association was dedicated to working for female education in the provinces. The training schools of the Tıbrotsaser were going to raise provincial Armenian girls so that they had a respectable position,

especially as future teachers. The schools would train future generations of women, who would in return serve their sisters, their younger generations.[112]

In their petition to the sultan to ask for permission to organize a fundraising event, the administrators of the Tıbrotsaser underlined that they opened almost twenty schools in various regions of Anatolia for the education and instruction of poor and orphan "Ottoman girls with no discrimination of religion and sect."[113] However, they argued, due to the "lamentable events in Adana," the number of orphans had multiplied and the resources of the association were insufficient to meet the demands of educating these girls. The association felt it necessary to refer to the Ottomanist ideals and the goal of mixed education for different communities of the Empire in order to be in tune with the Young Turk rule. Still, the mentioning of Adana massacres makes it clear that the primary target of the association was the orphaned Armenian girls.

Another association, which had also directed its attention to the orphans of Cilicia, was Hay Dignants Ingerutiun (Armenian Women's Association). The organization was chaired by Madame Nigoğosyan, and its members included Hayganuş Mark, Makruhi Gülbenk, Zaruhi Bahri, Madame Garmir, and Şuşan Boşnakyan.[114] One of the most important activities of the association was to assume the responsibility of a girls' orphanage, which was opened in Şişli specifically for Adana orphans. Hay Dignants Ingerutiun was also in coordination with Vorpakhınam Marmin (Committee for the Relief of Orphans [of Adana]).[115] The latter was founded in 1909 in order to collect dispersed Armenian orphans and put them into orphanages in the area, together with transferring some of them to Istanbul.[116] The women involved in the activities of this committee included Zaruhi Kalemkâryan, Zaruhi Bahri, and Hulyane Sarkisyan.

The information on the orphanage in Şişli is scarce and incomplete. However, Ottoman archival documentation verifies that in January 1910, the orphanage was already functioning and Hay Dignants Ingerutiun was in search for finances to cover the costs of operation.[117] The association applied to the Municipality of Istanbul in order to secure the necessary authorization for opening a charity sale in the Armenian Church in Balıkpazarı, Beyoğlu (Surp Asdvadzadin) and also for organizing a lottery, which would involve the printing of three thousand tickets.[118] Discussing the matter with the Police Department of Istanbul and the General Directorate of Police (Emniyet-i Umumiye Vekaleti), the municipality approved the requests of the association.

However, at the same time, the institution had to face many obstacles created by the local or central authorities when it attempted to transfer a number of Armenian orphans from Cilicia to the capital in late 1909.[119] At

first, the Ministry of Justice and Sects, with the order of the Ministry of the Interior, refused to give travel permits to the orphans, claiming that they would suffer a lot during the long journey and that the Patriarchate should work to take care of them in the region. When the obstructions were overcome and the orphans finally arrived in Istanbul in January 1910, the Ministry of the Interior argued that these "Ottoman orphans" should not be handed over to the Armenian institutions. Instead, they should be sheltered in state institutions. In other words, while one branch of the government gave permission for Armenian organizations to collect money for the benefit of an Armenian orphanage, another authority denied these organizations the right to educate and instruct Armenian orphans on their own premises.

The educational efforts of the provincial government and the Armenian organizations were similar. Soon, they found themselves in competition and clashed. While the Young Turk rule tended to define the orphans of Adana as Ottoman citizens, the Armenian women's organizations and intellectuals stressed the importance of preserving these children's Armenian identity for the future generations. For this reason, the groups regarded each other as adversaries and nationalists at the same time. Within this picture, Armenian women and their associations definitely assumed leading roles in determining the fates of orphans. They acted as significant historical agents in the aftermath of the massacres of 1909 primarily through the philanthropic work that they undertook.

CONCLUSION

Elizabeth B. Frierson rightly criticizes the fact that by the early 1980s, feminist scholars still saw 1908 and 1914–23 as pivotal years when women began to be more active in public life and politics in the Ottoman Empire. She, instead, argues that change in women's social status had already started in the 1890s, "in the middle of wars and refugee flows into the empire."[120] Although the criticism is directed to an older generation of literature, the prioritizing of the post-1908 and World War I years as the glorious periods of women's enlarged involvement in the public sphere seems to remain intact, as many researchers still focus on these periods.[121] Another serious problem relates to the invisibility of non-Muslim Ottoman women in the few existing studies on "Ottoman women."[122] Probably due both to the dimension of continuity, namely, transformation of the Ottoman Empire into the Republic of Turkey, and the language limitations of the researchers created by the multilingual structure of the Empire, the activities of non-Muslim Ottoman women remain significantly understudied. The concern here is definitely not limited to a simple quantitative representation. More significantly, lack of sound knowledge on the activities of different women's societies and agency jeopardizes the integrity of the historical accounts and distorts our understanding of the role of women in the late Ottoman society.

This essay has attempted to delineate a number of distinct ways through which Ottoman women from various ethnoreligious communities engaged in the social and political issues of their society and acted as agents of social change. The analysis of a selection of different women's organizations proves that taking into consideration the multiethnic and multilingual nature of the Empire, and thus that of the adjective "Ottoman," clearly manifests the *political* and *feminist* potential of philanthropic women's associations in the late Ottoman society.

Aiming to recover both the role of Ottoman women as a general category and the non-Muslim women as an underrepresented category within it, this chapter aims to suggest that women's organizations of the late nineteenth century played crucial roles in changing, challenging, negotiating, and redefining their society and they took active parts in various dimensions of Ottoman social, political, and cultural history. They were involved in the large and reciprocally connected realms of philanthropy, education, and health, which in return were closely entwined with communal, national, religious, and feminist politics of their times. In this seemingly *sanitary* and *hygienic* female environment of humanitarianism and charity-mindedness, everything was, in fact, complicated, dirty, and political. As the British consul noted, during these times, "women as well got involved in politics."

NOTES

1. For a detailed overview of Ottoman Turkish/Muslim women's organizations from 1908 to 1923, see Fatma Müge Göçek, "From Empire to Nation: Images of Women and War in Ottoman Political Cartoons, 1908-1923," in *Borderlines: Genders and Identities in War and Peace, 1870-1930,* ed. Billie Melman (New York: Routledge, 1998), 47–72.
2. For a significant criticism of militarized and nationalistic women's involvement in politics, see Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000). For a criticism of the late Ottoman and early Republican case, see Ayşe Gül Altınay, *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004).
3. Deniz Kandiyoti, "End of Empire: Islam, Nationalism, and Women in Turkey," in *Women, Islam and the State,* ed. Deniz Kandiyoti (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1991), 22–47, 29.

4. Guity Nashat and Judith E. Tucker, *Women in the Middle East and North Africa: Restoring Women to History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 92.
5. Beth Baron, "Women's Voluntary Social Welfare Organizations in Egypt," in *Gender, Religion and Change in the Middle East: Two Hundred Years of History,* ed. Inger Marie Okkenhaug and Ingvild Flaskerud (New York: Berg, 2005), 85–102.
6. Ibid., 85.
7. Howard Markel, *Quarantine!: East European Jewish Immigrants and the New York City Epidemics* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 16–22.
8. Ibid., 22.
9. Selim Deringil, "Jewish Immigration to the Ottoman Empire at the Time of the First Zionist Congresses: A Comment," in *The Last Ottoman Century and Beyond: The Jews of Turkey and the Balkans 1808-1945,* ed. Minna Rozen (Tel Aviv: Diaspora Research Institute, Tel Aviv University, 2002), vol. 2, 142–149. In July 1892, the Municipality of Istanbul collected the passports of the Jewish refugees to be investigated by the office of citizenship (*tabiiyyet kalemi*). BOA, DH. MKT., 1970/4, 15/Z/1309 (10.07.1892).
10. BOA. DH. MKT., 1878/121, 13/Ra/1309 (17.10.1891).
11. Herman J. Schulteis, *Report on European Immigration* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1893), 44.
12. In October 1891, it was openly declared by the Ministry of Interior that the entry of Jewish refugees was prohibited and the cruise lines were ordered to be cautious not to take them on board. BOA. DH. MKT., 1879/105, 15/Ra/1309 (19.10.1891). It was further ordered that their landing from the ships be hindered. BOA. DH. MKT., 1882/90, 22/Ra/1309 (26.10.1891).
13. BOA, DH. MKT., 1976/22, 27/Z /1309 (22.07.1892). For a similar discussion, see BOA, DH. MKT., 1980/31, 06/M /1310 (30.07.1892).
14. "General," *The Levant Herald and Eastern Express,* 17 July 1893, 357.
15. In 1891 the Ministry of Interior warned the government that although the asylum in Hasköy, where Jewish refugees from Russia and Romania had been settled, was incredibly crowded, and in an unsanitary condition. BOA. DH. MKT., 1894/90, 26/R /1309 (28.11.1891).
16. In mid 1892, the Chief Rabbinate of Istanbul was working for the settlement of the Jewish refugees to the synagogue in Kuruçuşme. BOA. DH. MKT., 1975/69, 29/Z /1309 (24.07.1892).
17. *Arbeiter Zeitung,* New York, 19 February 1892, 1–2. In June 1892, the Municipality of Istanbul was still reporting a series of arrivals and worsening of hygiene conditions. Deringil, "Jewish Immigration," 144; BOA, Y.MTV., 64/12, 03/Z/1309 (28.06.1892).
18. They were in such miserable condition that the Chief Rabbinite asked for some financial support from the government for the reparation and renovation of the barracks in mid 1892. BOA. DH. MKT., 1980/123, 07/M /1310 (31.07.1892).
19. In early 1892, the government decided to facilitate the transfer of Jewish refugees to these provinces. BOA, DH. MKT., 1927/59, 01/Ş /1309 (29.02.1892). However, until June, the government and the provinces could not complete the deliberations on the sources of the income needed to undertake this task. BOA, DH. MKT., 1959/65, 14/Zâ/1309 (09.06.1892). In the latter part of 1892, the government considered sending them also to Kosova, Monastir, and Janina, yet completely prohibiting the passage to Palestine. BOA, DH. MKT., 1985/10, 15/M/1310 (08.08.1892).
20. Markel, *Quarantine,* 22. In the first months of 1893, the provincial authorities of Salonika and Aydın asked for funds to cover the expenses of the transfer of refugees. BOA, DH. MKT., 2045/76, 06/B/1310 (24 .01.1893); BOA, İ.DH., 1301/1310-B-28, 25/B/1310 (12 February .02.1893); BOA, DH. MKT., 14/28, 10/L/1310 (27.04.1893).
21. "Rolo del rabino," *El Tiempo,* 23 March 1891, 4. I sincerely thank Julia Phillips Cohen for providing me references from the Ottoman Ladino press.
22. "Los Judios rusos en Konstantinopla [Russian Jews in Constantinople]," *El Tiempo,* 7 January 1892, 2.
23. "Una Fiesta en Salonika en favor de los emigrados rusos [A Fest in Salonika for the Benefit of Russian Immigrants]," *La Buena Esperansa,* 29 September 1892, 4.
24. "Una sosiedad interesante [An Interesting Society]," *El Tiempo,* 10 March 1892, 2–3.
25. Alliance Israélite Universelle was a French Jewish educational organization founded in 1860 in Paris with the purpose of "emancipating and protecting Eastern Jewry." Pamela Dorn Sezgin, "Jewish Women in the Ottoman Empire," in *Sephardic and Mizrahi Jewry: From the Golden Age of Spain to Modern Times,* ed. Zion Zohar (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 216–238.
26. BOA, HR.TO., 465/51, 25/9/1879; BOA, İ.HR., 280/17302, 07/Z /1296 (21.11.1879).
27. *Société de Bienfaisance des Dames Israélites de Péra, Statuts* (Constantinople: Imprimerie de Castro, 1893).
28. Ibid., 11.
29. Ibid., 3.
30. Ibid., 12.
31. Art. 2- Elle [la société] se compose:
    1. des Dames adhérents qui payent une cotisation minima de près 60 par an, et qui sont seules membres actifs.
    2. de tous ceux, Dames ou Messieurs, qui veulent bien lui accorder leur concours tant à Constantinople qu'à l'étranger, à titre de donateurs et dont les noms seront inscrits sur un registre d'honneur spécialement consacré à cet usage.
32. Kurt Grunwald, *Türkenhirsch: A Study of Baron Maurice de Hirsch, Entrepreneur and Philanthropist* (New York: Daniey Davey & Co., Inc., 1966).
33. For a detailed analysis of philanthropy and the Hamidian regime, see Nadir Özbek, "Philanthropic Activity, Ottoman Patriotism, and The Hamidian Regime, 1876–1909," *IJMES* 37, no. 1 (2005): 59–81.
34. BOA, Y.MTV., 68/86, 19/Ra/1310 (10.10.1892).
35. Özbek, "Philanthropic Activity," 66.

36. BOA, DH.MKT., 2061/34, 22/Ş /1310 (11.03.1893).
37. Ibid. "... Milel-i gayr-ı müslime tarafından mekteb ve kilise ve fukara namlarına para toplamak bahanesiyle ötede beride teşkil edib."
38. Narcisse Leven, *Cinquante ans d'histoire: L'Alliance israélite universelle 1860-1910* (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1920), vol. 2, 430. The Alliance, for its part, in addition to distributing aid to the families in Izmir, ordered the school directors to enroll all refugee children of the appropriate age in the schools of Alliance and to provide them with food and clothing throughout the wintertime. In Salonika, a workshop was opened to teach certain manual trades to a number of young boys.
39. BOA, Y.EE.KP., 8/785, 29/B/1316 (13.12.1898).
40. Deringil, "Jewish Immigration," 145.
41. BOA, DH.MKT., 1890/25, 14/R/1309 (16.11.1891).
42. When Madame Tedeschi, the director of the society, applied to the Municipality of Istanbul in order to organize a ball at the Pera Palas Hotel in January 1908, the request was investigated with scrutiny, but in the end the requested authorization was provided. BOA, ZB., 391/115, 10/Ke/1323 (23.12.1907); BOA, ZB., 321/102, 25/Ke/1323 (07.01.1908).
43. Gülhan Balsoy, *The Politics of Reproduction in Ottoman Society, 1838–1900* (London: Pickering & Chatto Publishers, 2013).
44. Yeşim Işıl Ülman, "Besim Ömer Akalin (1862-1940): Ange Gardien des Femmes et des Enfants;—L'acclimatation d'un Savoir Veni d'Ailleurs," in *Médecins et ingénieurs ottomans à l'âge des nationalismes,* ed. Méropi Anastassiadou (Paris-Istanbul: Maisonneuve & Larose et IFEA, 2003), 101–121.
45. Nuran Yıldırım, "Viladethane," *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1994), vol. 7, 388–389.
46. Nuran Yıldırım, "İstanbul'un İlk Doğumevi Viladethane," *Hastane Hospital News* 7 (2000): 26–27; Ayten Altınbaş and Oğuz Ceylan, "Vilâdethâne," *Tombak* 17 (1997): 26–32.
47. Altınbaş and Ceylan, "Vilâdethâne," 28: "O zaman nezd-i Şahane'de Viladethane'nin bir 'piçhane' gibi telakki edilmiş olmasıdır. Hep bu telakki tesiri altında menfi cevap gelmekte idi. Her şey burada düğümlenip kalıyordu."
48. All over Europe, maternity hospitals usually served women with illegitimate pregnancies. Rachel G. Fuchs, *Poor and Pregnant in Paris: Strategies for Survival in the Nineteenth Century* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 220.
49. David Ransel, *Mothers of Misery: Child Abandonment in Russia* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988), 37.
50. BOA, DH.MKT., 549/2, 4/Ca/1326 (04.06.1908).
51. Méropi Anastassiadou, "Médecine hygiéniste et pédagogie sociale à Istanbul à la fin du XIXe siècle: Le cas du docteur Spyridon Zavitziano," in *Médecins et ingénieurs ottomans à l'âge des nationalismes,* ed. Méropi Anastassiadou (Paris-Istanbul: Maisonneuve & Larose et IFEA, 2003), 63–99.
52. BOA, Y.MTV., 26/26, 22/B/1304 (16.04.1887). The official seal of the association bears this date (see Figure 5.1).
53. "Havadis-i Dahiliyye," *Mürüvvet,* no. 6, 3 April 1888 (21/B/1305), 115.

54. The original name of the association, as indicated in its official seal, is the following: Αδελφότης του Αγίου Ελευθερίου, των Κυριών του εν Πέρα Αγ. Κωνσταντίνου και Ελένης. I thank Vangelis Kechriotis for transcribing and translating the official seal of the society. (See Figure 5.1.)
55. *Elefhteria* means "freedom" in Greek. But also it is customary to say *kali lefteria* to pregnant women, which means "[wish you a] quick and easy freedom [from pregnancy]." The name *Agios Eleftherios* probably comes from this connotation.
56. BOA, DH.MKT., 1155/22, 5/Şb/1322 (18.02.1907). Although the police department mentioned this number in its report of February 1907, the Sublime Porte later gave the much larger number of 200 in April 1908. BOA, DH.MKT., 1155/22, 2/Ra/1326 (04.04.1908).
57. BOA, DH.MKT., 1155/22, 5/Şb/1322 (18.02.1907).
58. Ibid., "... kargir olarak üç kat ve altı oda bir mutfak ve bahçe ve taraçaya şamil ..."
59. BOA, ZB, 389/167, 18/Ke/1322 (31.12.1906).
60. Ibid. "... öyle bir tedavihanenin küşadına ve mezuniyet-i resmiye istihsal edilmiş olduğuna dair malumat-ı resmiyye olunmamakla ..."
61. BOA, DH.MKT., 1155/22, 2/Ra/1326 (04.04.1908): "... bu gibi ianat-ı hayriye ile mezkur tedavihane mesarif-i ibtidaiyye ve daimesinin temini mümkün olamamağla ..."
62. Ibid., "... bu gibi aceze-yi nisvan için müteaddid hastahaneler mevcud ve devair-i belediyede birer tabib-i müvellid mütehaddim bulunmasına binaen böyle bir tedavihaneye esasen ihtiyaç olmadığı..."
63. BOA, ZB, 389/167, 18/Ke/1322 (31.12.1906).
64. BOA, ZB, 321/94, 19/Ke/1322 (01.01.1907). This document from early 1907 gives information on the printing of the tickets of the theater organized by the Agios Eleftherios.
65. BOA, ZB, 634/88, 14/Ks/1323 (27.01.1908).
66. Ibid.
67. BOA, ZB, 322/8, 27/Ks/1323 (09.02.1908).
68. The hospital was founded in 1869 and provided services to pregnant women having difficulties with delivery. Nuran Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi* (İstanbul: Darülaceze Vakfı, 1997), 7.
69. The clinic was opened in April 1907, on the birthday of the prophet. BOA, DH.MKT., 1148/37, 07/M/1325 (20.02.1907). Still, in mid 1907 the clinic had neither a permanent midwife or a doctor and the administration warned the applicants to inform the institution at least ten days prior to lying in. BOA, DH.MKT., 1171/8, 2/R/1325 (04.06.1907).
70. This institution, officially named *Darulfünun-ı Osmani Tıp Fakültesi Serîriyyat-ı Nisaiye ve Viladiyesi* (Ottoman University, Faculty of Medicine, Clinic of Gynecology and Maternity), was opened in 1905. Osman Nuri Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi,* vol. 2 (İstanbul: Eser Kültür Yayınları, 1977), 543.
71. For example, in August 1910 the municipality sent a doctor to Dolapdere to examine a poor pregnant woman, Roza, who was in emergency condition. BOA, DH.EUM.MH., 241/45, 11/Ş /1328 (16.08.1910).

72. BOA, DH.MKT., 1155/22, 5/Şb/1322 (18.02.1907). These were Mavraki Efendi, Mösyö Lamirdi, and Mösyö Karavil.
73. BOA, ZB, 634/88, 14/Ks/1323 (27.01.1908): "... hamile kadınlar ile küçük çocuklar ihtiyacına..."
74. BOA, ZB, 322/8, 27/Ks/1323 (09.02.1908): "... hamile kadınlarla tevellüd edecekleri çocuklarına..."
75. Francisca de Haan, Krasimira Daskalova, Anna Loutfi, eds., *Biographical Dictionary of Women's Movements and Feminisms in Central, Eastern, and South Eastern Europe: 19th and 20th Centuries* (Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2006), 66.
76. Kostadina Bojadjieva Nasteva-Rusinska (1880–1932) completed her primary education in Ohrid and her secondary education in Bulgaria. She was teaching at a primary school for boys and girls in Ohrid from around the turn of the century. Haan, Daskalova, and Loutfi, *Biographical Dictionary,* 66–69.
77. Charles Jelavich and Barbara Jelavich, *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977), 211–212.
78. Dimitur Kosev, "The Ilinden-Preobrazenie Uprising 1903," *Bulgarian Historical Review* 64 (1978): 14–30; Nikolaj Todorov, "La lutte de libération des Bulgares en Macédoine et dans la région d'Andrinople 1903," *Bulgarian Historical Review* 64 (1978): 30–39.
79. Henry Brailsford, *Macedonia: Its Races and Their Future* (London: Methuen, 1906), 148–155.
80. Haan, Daskalova, and Loutfi, *Biographical Dictionary,* 67.
81. Two members of the British Relief Fund, Edith Durham and Henry Brailsford, published their memoirs in 1905 and 1906, when their field service was completed. Both books concentrated on the regions of Macedonia that had been active in the *Ilinden* Uprising, and that met with harsh reprisals from the Ottoman forces. Edith M. Durham, *The Burden of the Balkans* (London: E. Arnold, 1905); Brailsford, *Macedonia.*
82. Haan, Daskalova, and Loutfi, *Biographical Dictionary,* 67.
83. Angela V. John, *War, Journalism and the Shaping of the Twentieth Century the Life and Times of Henry W. Nevinson* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 100.
84. Oswald Ashton Wentworth Dilke and Margaret S. Dilke, *Recollections of the National Liberation Struggles in Macedonia: At the End of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Centuries* (New Delhi, India: Mosaic Publications, 1984), 70.
85. Detailed information was given to the Sublime Porte in December 1903 on the hospital that the British relief officials wanted to open in Kostur. BOA, Y.A..HUS., 462/115, 20/N /1321 (09.12.1903). A couple of weeks later, similar requests were made to open a hospital in Ohrid. BOA, Y.A..HUS., 463/70, 11/L/1321 (30.12.1903).
86. The hospital in Monastir had 21 beds, the hospital of Kostur, 35 beds and that of Ohrid, 25 beds. Dilke, 92.
87. Ekaterina Peneva Karavelova (1860–1947) established a women's cultural organization *Maika* (mother) in Sofia in 1899, serving as its chairwoman for thirty years. Believing that women's independence and equality required giving them opportunities to earn a living, she strongly supported women's professional and vocational education and led *Maika* campaigns to open a vocational girls' school, "Maria Louisa." She was also among the founders in 1901 of the Bulgarian Women's Union. Haan, Daskalova, and Loutfi, *Biographical Dictionary,* 230–232.

88. BOA, Y.PRK.MK., 16/85, 12/Ş/1321 (12.11.1903): "... memalik-i şahanedeki Bulgarlar hakkında reva görülen mezâlim ve taadiyâta bir nihayet verilmesi..."
89. Ibid., "... beyannamenin suretini hıfz etmediği..."
90. BOA, Y.PRK.MK., 20/77, 22/L/1322 (29.12.1904): "... Sofya'daki düvel-i muazzama konsolosluklarına hitaben bir istida tehiyye etmekte oldukları..."
91. Brailsford, *Macedonia,* 165.
92. "Memorandum from Bulgaria to Powers," *The New York Times,* 17 August 1903, 1.
93. BOA, Y.PRK.MK., 20/61, 21/N/1322 (29.11.1904).
94. Prince Ferdinand, or Ferdinand I (26 February 1861–10 September 1948), born Prince Ferdinand Maximilian Karl Leopold Maria of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, was the Prince Regnant and later Tsar of Bulgaria (1908). Ferdinand was proclaimed Prince Regnant of autonomous Bulgaria on 7 July 1887, replacing the first prince, Alexander of Battenberg.
95. BOA, TFR.I.MN., 65/6422, 02/R/1323 (06.06.1905). The news was published in *Mir,* a Bulgarian newspaper in Sofia.
96. BOA, Y.PRK.MK., 22/103, 18/Ca/1326 (17.06.1908).
97. *İttihad,* 6 July 1909; *Tasvir-i Efkâr,* 8 July 1909.
98. Duckett Z. Ferriman, *Turkish Atrocities: The Young Turks and the Truth About the Holocaust at Adana in Asia Minor, During April, 1909* (London: n.p., 1913), 91–92.
99. Ibid., 100. Ferriman claims that there were 3,036 orphans and 1,869 widows.
100. Raymond H. Kevorkian, "La Cilicie (1909-1921). Des massacres d'Adana au mandat Français," *Revue d'Histoire Arménienne Contemporaine: Annales de la Bibliothèque Nubar de l'Union Générale Arménienne de Bienfaisance* 3 (1999): 5-141, 103.
101. For a detailed discussion on the Armenian orphans of Adana in 1909, see Nazan Maksudyan, "New 'Rules of Conduct' for State, American Missionaries, and Armenians: 1909 Adana Massacres and the Ottoman Orphanage (*Dârü'l-Eytâm-ı Osmânî*)," in *L'ivresse de la Liberté: La Révolution de 1908 dans l'Empire Ottoman,* ed. François Georgeon (Paris: CNRS, 2012), 137–171; Nazan Maksudyan, "Cemal Bey'in Adana Valiliği ve Osmanlıcılık İdeali" [Cemal Bey's Adana Governorship and the Ideal of Ottomanism], *Toplumsal Tarih* 158 (2008): 22–28.
102. Victoria Rowe, *A History of Armenian Women's Writing, 1880-1922* (Amersham: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2003), 35.
103. Zabel Esayan, "GiligioVorpanotsneri" [Orphanages of Cilicia], *Arakadz* 13, 17 August 1911, 196–197.
104. "M. Ronflard, Gérant du Vice-Consulat, à Monsieur Pichon, Mersine, le 7 Mai 1910.," AMAE Quai d'Orsay, *Correspondance politique et commerciale/ Nouvelle Série, Turquie, 1897-1914,* vol. 83.

105. In his memoirs, Cemal verifies that he supported the use of Turkish as the official language, but he claims that has nothing to do with Turkification. Cemal Paşa, *Hatıralar,* ed. Behçet Cemal (Istanbul: Selek Yayınları, 1959), 344.
106. The role of Esayan during and in the aftermath of the events has been a substantially investigated issue, thanks particularly to her own writings. Some of the significant works on her involvement include: Marc Nichanian, *Writers of Disaster: Armenian Literature in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton; London: Gomidas Institute, 2002); Krikor Beledian, "L'expérience de la catastrophe dans la littérature arménienne," *Revue d'histoire arméienne contemporaine* 1 (1995): 127–197; Rowe, *Armenian Women's Writing*; Léon Ketcheyan, "Zabel Essayan (1878-1943): Sa Vie et Son Temps: Traduction Annotée de l'Autobiographie et de la Correspondance" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, 2002).
107. Ohancanyan was one of the founders of the Istanbul Women's Red Cross Society (Bolso Ganants Garmir Khach), which was probably founded shortly after the Young Turk Revolution, when Ohandjanian came from Tbilisi to Istanbul. After the Adana massacres, she joined the relief committee and went to the area with a group of women. Sona Zeitlian, *Hay Knoç Dere Hay Heghapokhakan Sharzman Meç* [Armenian Women's Role in the Armenian Revolutionary Movement] (Los Angeles: Hrazian Sarkis Zeitlian Publizations, 1992), 147–149.
108. Rowe, *Armenian Women's Writing,* 81; Arşaguhi Teotig, *Amis mı i Giligya* [A Month in Cilicia] (Istanbul: V[ahram] H[ıraçya] Der Nersesyan, 1910), 77.
109. Ferriman, *Turkish Atrocities,* 90–100. In 1911, all three were united under the roof of the Ottoman Orphanage, *Dârü'l-Eytâm-ı Osmânî.*
110. Raymond H. Kevorkian, "La Cilicie (1909-1921). Des massacres d'Adana au mandat Français," *Revue d'Histoire Arménienne Contemporaine* 3 (1999): 5–141, 103. Another Armenian orphanage was opened in Dörtyol in 1912 by the L'Union Général Arménienne de Bienfaisance of Nubar Pasha with 85 orphans. This was the first enterprise of the Union. It also supported the local schools and orphanages of the Patriarchate. For further information, see *Un siècle d'histoire de L'Union Général Arménienne de Bienfaisance* (Cairo; Paris; New York: CHIRAT, 2006), vol. 1: 1906-1940, 26–29; BOA, DH.MUİ., 99/41, 21/Ca/1328 (31.05.1910).
111. Hayganuş Mark, "Hayatımın Dalgaları," in *Bir Adalet Feryadı: Osmanlı'dan Türkiye'ye Beş Ermeni Feminist Yazar, 1862-1933,* ed. Lerna Ekmekçioğlu and Melissa Bilal (Istanbul: Aras Yayıncılık, 2006), 264–316, 298.
112. Rowe, *Armenian Women's Writing,* 83.
113. BOA, İ.MBH., 1/1328-M-026, 21/M /1328 (02.02.1910): "... bila-tefrik-i cins ve mezheb bilcümle fakir ve yetim osmanlı kız çocukları..."
114. Mark, "Hayatımın Dalgaları," 299.
115. Ibid., 300.
116. Ferriman argues that forty-three orphans were brought to Istanbul, p. 99.
117. BOA, DH.EUM.THR., 23/41, 19/M /1328 (31.01.1910). The document clearly notes the orphanage in Şişli, which was under the rule of Armenian Women's Association: "... Şişli'de Kadınlar Cemiyetinin taht-ı idaresinde bulunan eytamhane..."
118. Ibid.
119. BOA, DH.MUİ., 53/42, 13/M/1328 (25.01.1910).
120. Elizabeth B. Frierson, "Women in Late Ottoman Intellectual Society," in *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy,* ed. Elisabeth Özdalga (London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005), 135–161, 136.
121. For instance see, Nicole A.N.M. van Os, "Nurturing Soldiers and Girls: Osmanlı Kadınları Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi," in *Papers of VIIIth International Congress on the Economic and Social History of Turkey,* ed. Nurcan Abacı (Morrisville: Lulu Press, 2006), 213–218; Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, "Debating Progress in a 'Serious Newspaper for Muslim Women': The Periodical 'Kadın' of the Post-Revolutionary Salonica, 1908-1909," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 30, no. 2 (2003): 155–181; Pelin Başçı, "Love, Marriage, and Motherhood: Changing Expectations of Women in Late Ottoman Istanbul," *Turkish Studies* 4, no. 3 (2003): 145–177; Nicole A.N.M. van Os, "Taking Care of Soldiers' Families: The Ottoman State and the *Muinsiz Aile Maaşı,*" in *Arming the State: Military Conscription in the Middle East and Central Asia, 1775-1925,* ed. Erik J. Zürcher (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 1999), 95–110.
122. Lerna Ekmekçioğlu previously touched upon this grave problem in her article on historiography of Ottoman women's movements and print cultures. "Osmanlı ve Türkiye Kadın Hareketi Hakkındaki Tarihyazımında Türk ve/veya Müslüman Olmayan Kadınlar: Bir Yokluğun Anatomisi," in *Bir Adalet Feryadı,* Ekmekçioğlu and Bilal, 327–340.