Project
MUSE®
Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

NAZAN MAKSUDYAN

MODERNIZATION OF WELFARE OR FURTHER DEPRIVATION? STATE PROVISIONS FOR FOUNDLINGS IN THE LATE OTTOMAN EMPIRE[1]

Though this history has so far received little scholarly attention, child abandonment was practiced in late Ottoman society, and its frequency was related to such factors as illegitimacy, poverty, migration, and war. Relying on Ottoman archival sources, together with periodicals and contemporary literature, this paper discerns major patterns of child abandonment in the late Ottoman Empire and discusses the history of the institutionalization and *modernization* of state provisions for abandoned children from a critical perspective, taking into account the experiences of infants, abandoning mothers, and wet-nurses. Traditionally stipends were assigned directly to the foundlings from central or local resources as part of the religiously determined policy to care for the needy. In an effort to organize and centralize relief, the stipends were gradually transferred to the wet-nurses, who acted as intermediary agents between the foundlings and the state. With the opening of the *Dâr'ül-aceze* foundling unit, the abandoned babies were taken care of by institutional, bureaucratized mechanisms in which police departments, birth registry offices, and municipalities played a part. Although these changes have been evaluated and discursively presented as the expansion of welfare policies and the modernization of the Ottoman state, from the perspective of the foundlings, the picture exposes increased deprivation, heightened mortality rates, and further suffering.

A resident of Salonika (Thessaloníki), a certain Hacı Osman bin Islam, after discovering a foundling girl (*lâkita*) in the European quarter (*Frenk mahallesi*) of the city, took her, named her Kâmile, and then wrote a petition to the municipality on 27 August 1904, requesting a stipend for her suckling from the budget of the municipality, as was the custom (*alelusûl*). The municipality found the request relevant and passed the application to the governorship, which later rejected it since the records showed another wet-nursing allowance given as a result of a previous petition of the same person for a foundling with the same name, Kâmile. The municipality replied on 23 November 1904, that the previous stipend had never been paid, since the foundling had died shortly after she was taken. Therefore, this was the second abandoned baby that Hacı Osman

Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth (v.2.3) © 2009 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

had adopted and given the same name. With the settlement of the ambiguity, a monthly stipend of thirty *guruş* was granted.[2]

It must have been painful for Hacı Osman and his family to lose the first baby. Yet in a short while, the family was able to adopt a second one. Was early twentieth-century Salonika full of abandoned babies? We do not know in exact quantitative terms, yet it is certain that foundlings could be found in Salonika, especially by someone looking for them. Hacı Osman was the night guard of the European quarter of the city, strolling continuously in the empty streets throughout the night. Therefore, he had many opportunities to encounter foundlings in front of houses, religious places, or in the streets.

This case successfully summarizes certain points that will be made in this paper. First of all, though I am unable to provide detailed statistical information, I do argue that child abandonment was practiced in the late Ottoman society, and its frequency was related to such factors as illegitimacy, poverty, migration, and war. In the absence of quantitative data on foundling numbers, anecdotal evidence and social and official records still point to its common occurrence. Secondly, institutional care came only in the first decade of the twentieth century; most of the foundlings were looked after in private homes with wet-nurses. Whether in homes or in institutions, foundlings had an extremely high mortality rate. Thirdly, there were significant state provisions for abandoned babies in the form of stipends, granted as a result of formal application by the finder or caretaker. These allowances were meticulously registered and controlled by the relevant authorities, which points to the relatively organized nature of the support. Fourthly, ambiguity about ethno-religious identity of foundlings caused problems in a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society due to permanent concerns over conversion and the weakening of communities.

After discerning several patterns of Ottoman child abandonment, such as the religious affiliation of the infants, the milieu of abandonment, their distribution according to cities and gender differences, this paper analyzes the history of the *modernization* of state provisions for abandoned children in the late Ottoman Empire from a critical perspective, taking into account the experiences of infants, abandoning mothers, and wet-nurses. Different phases of foundling care suggest gradual institutionalization and depersonalization. The traditional practice, in line with religious teachings, was to assign stipends from the treasury to foundlings themselves, who were adopted into private households. Gradually, state stipends were transferred to the wet-nurses of foundlings, turning them into intermediaries between the state and infants and better solidifying the centralized nature of relief. These two phases actually coexisted during

the last half of the nineteenth century, though the latter gradually became more prominent. As a third stage in modernization, a foundling unit was opened in the famous poorhouse of Istanbul (*Dâr'ül-aceze*), in which abandoned children were now taken care of by institutional, bureaucratized systems. Moreover, new regulations regarding foundlings assigned novel and significant roles to police departments, birth registry offices, and municipalities.

Ironically, the modernized Ottoman state and its redefined welfare policies meant deprivation, suffering, and higher mortality rates for the foundlings. First, state-subsidized wet-nurses contributed to the poor health of the foundlings, since they were usually asked to breast-feed more than one nursling. Moreover, new undertakings of the modernizing Ottoman state, such as required birth registration or the opening of *Dâr'ül-aceze*, made foundlings suffer in filthy police departments or crowded wards. In other words, what was advertised as *progress* by Ottoman administrators was detrimental to the health of abandoned children. Modernized administrative and institutional apparatuses caused deprivation and had mortal impacts on Ottoman foundlings.

REASONS FOR CHILD ABANDONMENT IN THE LATE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The phenomenon of child abandonment, that is, leaving infants in the courtyards of places of worship; on streets; or outside houses, convents, and hospitals, is explained in European historiography largely by circumstances of extreme poverty or dishonor.[3] Although the investigation of the phenomenon in the Ottoman context is still an unaccomplished task, there is evidence of a similar course.[4] In Mouradgea d'Ohsson's famous *Tableau Général*, abandoned children (*lâkit*)[5] are defined as "unfortunate fruits of crime or of misery."[6] The "crime" in that context is having an illegitimate relationship and thus an extramarital child, while "misery" bespeaks conditions of destitution and poverty.

Poverty, desertion, and widowhood all contributed to abandonment. In fact, child abandonment was one of the primary means for regulating family size under conditions of poverty. Infants were frequently deserted in the hope that they would be found and adopted by a wealthier person and would thus enjoy a better life.[7] In her article on the Greek foundlings of Beyoğlu—a traditionally minority-populated neighborhood comprised of concentrations of Europeans as well as Christians and Jews, although with a Muslim population as well—Méropi Anastassiadou underlines the importance of financial difficulties in explaining the abandonment of children, based on an analysis of little notes pinned to the swaddling clothes of the babies. In one such note, there is direct

reference to the regulation of the family size: "My sweet mother . . . we are five brothers and sisters and we do not have the means for livelihood, so they have sent me to you . . . ."[8]

Abandonment was also frequently used as a device for disposing of illegitimate children. In fact, there are occasions when the contemporary terminology became confused, and the terms "foundling" and "bastard" became interchangeable. Being abandoned within a month or so of birth may point to unwed mothers' fear of dishonor and rejection, since if foundlings were abandoned because of poverty or widowhood, there should have been more variation in the ages of the foundlings.[9] In the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, most of the abandoned infants were only a few days old, abandoned right after their birth (*ba'de-t tevellüd sokaklara bırakılan*).[10] In certain documents, foundlings are defined openly as "illegitimates" (*gayr-ı meşru*).[11] Anastassiadou also underlines the role of illegitimacy with her analysis of notes: "Dear Sir, . . . he is a bastard and we ask you to baptize him immediately, because he has pain."[12] Ahmed Midhat, famous novelist of nineteenth century, depicted child abandonment as a practice of unwed mothers.[13] He regarded abandonment as an obvious sign of increased sexual contacts among unmarried women, who became mothers when they were still regarded as girls: *fille mères*.

PATTERNS OF CHILD ABANDONMENT

It is almost impossible to provide detailed statistics on birth and infant mortality rates in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the quantitative prevalence of child abandonment is difficult to attain. Yet this problem can be overcome as meaningful trends are discovered. After thorough research in various collections of the Prime Ministry's Ottoman Archives (BOA), I have gathered a sample of more than 140 foundlings.[14] Of these, eighty-one cases relate to Muslims and sixty-three to non-Muslims [table 1]. Although it would be unrealistic to present exact statistical conclusions with such a small sample, it is possible to construct a table of "general trends," patterns, and repetitious themes. I have used

Table 1. Religious Affiliation of the Foundlings[15]

Religious Affiliation	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Muslim	81	56.25
Non-Muslim	63	43.75
Total	144	100

this information from Ottoman archival documents together with nineteenth-century literary sources to discern certain aspects of the lives of the foundlings.

Child abandonment in the Ottoman Empire had a basically urban character. In Ottoman archival documents relatively big cities and towns stick out [table 2]. Expectedly, most of the documents pertain to Istanbul (59.72%). Then come other cities, such as Salonika (11.11%), Mosul (5.56%), Rize (3.47%), Beirut

Table 2. Frequency of Child Abandonment in Different Cities of the Ottoman Empire

City	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Istanbul	86	59.72
Salonika	16	11.11
Mosul	8	5.56
Rize	5	3.47
Beirut	4	2.78
Bursa	3	2.08
Ankara	2	1.39
Trabzon	2	1.39
Edirne	2	1.39
Bosna	1	0.69
Çanakkale	1	0.69
Diyarbekir	1	0.69
Eski Zağra	1	0.69
Heraklion	1	0.69
Kastamonu	1	0.69
Malatya	1	0.69
Monastir	1	0.69
Muş	1	0.69
Plovdiv	1	0.69
Mardin	1	0.69
Sana	1	0.69
Serres	1	0.69
Tekirdağ	1	0.69
Yozgat	1	0.69
Unknown	1	0.69
Total	144	100

(2.78%), and Bursa (2.08%). From the documentation at hand, foundlings were never a major problem in provincial cities in the way that they were in big cities, since informal but organized networks of child care existed at the parochial level.[16] This data may also suggest the reluctance of women to abandon their children in poorer provinces. Moreover, many unmarried mothers from the countryside came to the city to be delivered so that they could hide their condition.[17] However, all these conclusions could result from research bias, since rural areas are under-represented in the archives.[18]

Previous studies underline that there should not be a discernible pattern of gender distinction in the overall gender distribution of foundlings in cases of illegitimacy or poverty; the concern being either with social impact or economic damage the child would be forsaken regardless of gender.[19] The data gathered from Ottoman archives, however, seems to suggest that abandoned girls were slightly more numerous (fifty-five percent) than abandoned boys [table 3]. Among the Greek community of Beyoğlu, girls were also abandoned more frequently than boys.[20] The ratio was even more marked for Greeks of Izmir: in 1899 seven boys and twenty-four girls were abandoned to the foundling asylum; in 1901 there were only twenty-two boys, as opposed to thirty-four girls.[21] The gender ratio among the foundling population of the Greek island of Kephallenia was also uneven: fifty-six males as opposed to ninety-five females were abandoned in 1830s.[22] This gender imbalance suggests a slight preference for boys. Although the data at hand is too little to make meaningful interpretations, households placed great emphasis on producing male heirs for their lineage. Thus it might have been more acceptable to retain illegitimate boys than girls.

Table 3. Gender Distribution of the Foundlings

Gender	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Boys	41	28.47
Girls	49	34.03
Unspecified	54	37.50
Total	144	100
Gender	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Boys	41	45.56
Girls	49	54.44
Total	90	100

DETERMINATION OF THE ETHNO-RELIGIOUS IDENTITY OF FOUNDLINGS

According to Islamic law, the legitimacy of children is only conveyed through descent (*neseb*), which is only conferred through legitimate marriage or by an admission of paternity in a court of law.[23] Thus, all the abandoned babies in the Ottoman Empire were considered illegitimate and without attachment to a lineage or a genealogy. The determination of the religious status of the foundlings has always been undertaken according to the traditional *Hanefi* regulation;[24] foundlings were Muslim and free, since all orphans belonged to the state.[25] However, if the foundling was discovered in a quarter specifically inhabited by non-Muslims or in the courtyard of a church or a synagogue, the child was presumed to belong to one of the non-Muslim communities.[26]

The milieu of abandonment thus played a strong role in determining the religious status of foundlings. Moreover, differences between the situations and attitudes of Muslim and Non-Muslim women can be discerned through the differing choices they made about where to abandon their infants [table 4]. For Muslims, the mosques were the most relevant places for abandonment (48.15%). The prominence of the mosques is explained by the intent of those

Table 4. Frequency of Child Abandonment in Different Milieus

	Muslims		*Non-Muslims*		*Total*	
Milieu	*Frequency*	*Percentage*	*Frequency*	*Percentage*	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Brothel			1	1.59	1	0.71
Cellar	1	1.23	1	1.59	2	1.42
Coffee house			2	3.17	2	1.42
Cemetery	4	4.94			3	2.13
Church			7	11.11	7	4.96
Doors	1	1.23	31	49.21	32	22.70
Mosque	39	48.15			37	26.24
Public Bath	6	7.41			6	4.26
Street	21	25.93	13	20.63	34	24.11
Maternity			1	1.59	1	0.71
Empty Plot			1	1.59	1	0.71
Unspecified	9	11.11	6	9.52	15	10.64
Total	81	100	63	100	144	100

who were abandoning their babies to benefit from the duties expected from the believer by Islamic teachings. In principle, legal doctrine recommends (*mendûb*) taking care of an abandoned child .[27] After the mosques the most usual Muslim practice was of leaving infants on the streets (25.93%). The entrances of public baths were also used for the purpose of abandoning babies (7.41%). These locations were chosen when it was intended that the baby be rescued and adopted. Yet, in cases of latent infanticide, the babies were practically hidden from passersby (*suret-i hafiyede enzar-ı ammeden gizli bir yere*): they were left in invisible corners of streets, cemeteries, cellars, or abandoned buildings (*virâne*).[28]

For non-Muslims, the most relevant place of abandonment seems to have been the doors of houses (49.21%). In the majority of cases, this was the house of a relatively known and affluent person.[29] The second choice was to leave infants on the streets (20.63%). Interestingly, only a few of the children were abandoned to churches (11.11%). Most of the non-Muslim *millet*s had their own communal mechanisms, and an infant left to a church would generally be guaranteed some form of care, usually in the form of foster care: religious authorities made necessary arrangements to entrust foundlings with wet-nurses. Yet, these women were, for the most part, poor immigrants, living in quite poor districts and in unpleasant dwellings.[30] In other words, abandoning children to churches would not render these children opportunities to have better lives than their parents; yet if left to particular households, they would have chances to lead wealthier lives.

Traditionally the Ottoman administration followed a policy of non-intervention in the case of non-Muslim foundlings and let relevant religious authorities handle the matter. However, in the 1890s there was a change in the policy regarding the identity of the foundlings related to the concerns for proper registration of the newborn babies as one of the new preoccupations of the modernizing state (*devletçe mültezim olan tahrir-i nüfus*).[31] During this time an article on the foundlings was added to the Regulation on Population Registration of 1882.[32] According to the new regulation, the finder was obliged to report where, how, and when the foundling was discovered to the Council of Elders in the villages and to the police department in towns and cities. The responsible body would prepare a report, comprising the baby's sex, assigned name, possible age, and the relevant place where the infant would be delivered. This record would be used for the registration of the baby to the census and for the preparation of the child's identity card. In that respect, neither religious authorities nor individuals were allowed to directly take in the babies; they had to inform the municipality and the police beforehand.

Non-Muslim leaders had serious concerns on that matter, arguing that the authorities had a tendency to register all the foundlings as Muslims, despite contrary evidence. The highest religious officials appealed to the government

numerous times with the grievance that despite the traditional arrangements for marking the identity of foundlings, the policemen disregarded the indicators of the religious affiliation of these infants. Babies carrying notes or labels attached to their clothing with a written declaration or sign indicating the child's Christian origin (*yafta*) or those who were abandoned in front of churches, synagogues, and non-Muslim households were registered as Muslims.[33] By the same token, the municipality complained to the religious authorities since they resisted bringing foundlings to the headmen of their districts (*mahalle muhtarı*).

In other words, this was a realm of continuous rivalry, where the patriarchates resisted the change (*usul-ı kadimesinin muhafazası talebi*) while the municipality emphasized the new needs of the administration.[34] The controversy can be seen as a microcosm of the emergence of the modern state, the birth of the idea of modern citizenship, and the problems it created with non-Muslim communities, whose interaction with the state now took a different form than it had traditionally taken.[35]

SURVIVAL OF A FOUNDLING

Abandoned children, thrown into streets as if they were *waste* thrown in trash heaps, usually died in a very short while before or after they were discovered. Some others, however, managed to survive. Certain mechanisms created by the Ottoman society and the state helped them stay alive. These included child adoption by private families, state allowances for foundlings, state stipends for wet-nurses, and the opening of a foundling asylum. Although these provisions existed side by side for some time, it is still possible to talk about a trend towards modernization of foundling care, especially in terms of institutionalization, centralization, and depersonalization. Two traditional methods that harmoniously coexisted were adoption of foundlings by affluent families and giving stipends to the babies when they were taken into poorer households. As a new development around the mid-1850s, stipends were transferred to wet-nurses, which points to the emergence of an intermediary between foundlings and the state. As yet another development, with the opening of a foundling asylum in 1903, the abandoned children (at least some of them) were taken care of solely by institutional, bureaucratized mechanisms. Even though these developments were valued as the expansion and modernization of the welfare policies of the Ottoman state, from the perspective of the foundlings, *modern* meant deprivation, mortality, and suffering. With these changes in welfare policy it became less likely that abandoned children would live within a family environment, have access to sufficient nutrients, and be the object of real affection without having to compete with other infants waiting for the same sort of attention.

"Kindness of Strangers": Private Efforts to Provide for the Foundlings

John Boswell argues that in the absence of institutions for the foundlings, a child should require rescue by the "kindness of strangers" in order to survive.[36] In other words, society needed *virtuous people* who would take abandoned children into their houses. Most of the examples from the Ottoman Empire fit into this category: the majority of the foundlings were sheltered in private houses. It was common for affluent families to take orphans and destitute children into the household, usually in the form of domestic servants. The adoptive children (*evlatlık*, *ahiret evladı*, or *besleme*)[37] were adopted only in linguistic terms; in reality these children were basically servants.[38] The head of the household pledged to supply the child with his or her basic needs, while the child, in return, was expected to serve in the house in the future.[39] The hosting family was considered to perform a charity by taking into custody a destitute child; for that reason these children's labor was unpaid. Consequently, the motivation behind welcoming foundlings into a household was much more concrete than a vague "kindness"; it was a form of recruitment, through which cheap/free labor was secured.

According to the account of a British diplomat from 1853, many rich Turkish ladies carried on a practice of training orphans, foundlings, or the children of poor parents. They kept Nurseries of Wives and Mothers, where they educated young girls who were collected from the streets by their agents.[40] His description proves that taking foundlings from the street was not always related to mere *kindness,* but that it may have brought certain gains when these women acted as intermediaries for the employment or marriage of these prospective maids or wives.

Men of status also adopted orphans and foundlings to develop their households and courts. Koca Hüsrev Paşa, grand vizier of Abdülmecid from July 1839 to June 1840, did not have children of his own and was keen on fostering children in his household.[41] There were teachers in residence, employed for the tutoring of a rather large population of children.[42] Definitely many of these children were of slave origin, but there is reason to believe that some were not. We know, for instance that İbrahim Edhem Paşa (1818-1893) was brought in as an orphan when he was only one year old and was adopted by Hüsrev's second wife. According to his biographers, he was one of the orphans of the uprising of Chios in 1822.[43] Most of these children succeeded in rising to important administrative and military positions, even that of the grand vizier. Their lives took a different turn in Hüsrev's household.

It seems to be common that despairing parents tried to find the wealthiest households for their babies. According to a newspaper article, in February 1893

an infant was abandoned at the doorstep of Henry Felix Woods Pasha's house. It was a healthy female child, only a few weeks old. A paper attached to her clothes explained that the mother had five other children and had no means of providing for this one.[44] Although the article stresses Mrs. Woods Pasha's "well-known *kindness* of heart," she sends the foundling to the Catholic Sisters of St. Benoît. In the novels of Ahmet Midhat Efendi, there are several "kind people," who accept foundlings without any hesitation. In *Dürdane Hanım* (1882), Dürdane secretly gives birth to her illegitimate boy, thanks to the arrangements of Ulviye, the mistress of the mansion next door. Servants bring the infant to Ulviye's house and leave him on the quay. Pretending that this is a helpless boy anonymously abandoned, Ulviye accepts the boy as her "*ahiret evladı*."[45] In *Müşahedat* (1891), a widowed mother's illicit affair with a Tunisian sailor results in pregnancy and an illegitimate baby, Siranuş. Since the poor woman was all alone and afraid of the judgment of society both for herself as an unwed mother and for her baby, she abandons the girl at the door of an Assyrian church in Beyoğlu.[46] The sexton finds the swaddled baby and takes her to the house of a merchant from Aleppo, whose wife has recently given birth. The family welcomes the baby sincerely.[47]

State Provisions for Abandoned Children

Leaving affluent families aside, it was not easy to accept a new member into a household, especially for people of modest means. In order to facilitate the survival of foundlings in such cases, the Ottoman state assumed an active role and supported the babies with allowances. The father or mother of a foundling might leave the child with some money to be used for its benefit. In religious terms, this money must be used by the finder only for the foundling's maintenance. However, if a foundling had no money or property, the Public Treasury (*beytülmal*) was responsible for its maintenance and upbringing (*nafaka*).[48] Mouradgea d'Ohsson's famous account of the Ottoman Empire, *Tableau Général* (1787) states that "if nobody takes care of an abandoned child, it belongs to the state, and it is the state who has to nourish and upbring it."[49] The Ottoman authorities acknowledged that the state had a duty to provide for the abandoned children (*sokaklara bırakılan çocukların hıfz-ı sıhhatleri ile ırzâ ve infakı vazife-yi hükümet iktizasından olmasına*).[50] Thus, as Islamic legal teachings tell, Muslim households of moderate means took responsibility for foundlings in order to benefit from the financial support that the state offered to the infant. Within the period between 1811 and 1911, the stipends ranged from ten to fifty-five *guruş*.[51]

Parallel with certain regulations of the millet system, provisions for abandoned children differed between Muslims and non-Muslims. Only Muslim

foundlings sheltered in Muslim households were offered state benefits. In order to receive support from the state, adopting families had to prove that the child in question was Muslim.[52]

Although maintenance and upbringing of a foundling was specified as the duty of the Public Treasury in legal texts, the source of the allowance changed from case to case based on spatial and chronological circumstances. Despite the preeminence of the central treasury,[53] local administrative and municipal revenues were also used to provide for the foundlings. In 1811 a stipend for a foundling was assigned from Istanbul custom revenues (*gümrük*).[54] In a later period, in 1853, a stipend of twenty-five *guruş* given to a wet-nurse, hired for a foundling who was found in Silivrikapı, was paid from the log revenues (*tomruklar hasılatı*) collected by the nearby police station (*zabtiyye*) of the district.[55]

Changes in the provincial administration of the Empire redefined rights and responsibilities of the local governments and affected the fates of foundlings as well. The municipalities were established from the 1870s onward and spread to the provinces after the 1880s. Municipalities, as local institutions serving the local community, were delegated certain duties of the center, as the state was increasingly sharing authority with the provincial governments. Relief for the poor and the destitute, sometimes in the form of monthly stipends from the budget, was also part of the municipalities' mandate.[56] In June 1886 a girl was found in a mosque in Kuvaroz, a town in Trabzon. She was given to Çolakoğlu Osman Çavuş, and a stipend was granted to her from the budget of the municipality.[57] There are numerous examples from other provinces, such as Mardin, Rize, Salonika, and Beirut, from the late 1880s onward.[58] In the 1890s the foundlings who were not voluntarily adopted into families were taken care of with the assistance of the municipality by those who accepted the babies for material gain.[59]

The duration of the support was variable. In most of the cases, foundlings were granted "temporary" (*muvakkaten*) allowances,[60] applicable only for the breast-feeding period.[61] In 1852 the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances ruled that granting allowance after suckling was contrary to precedents (*müddet-i ırzâiyesi tekmil olmuş olmasına nazaran maaş tahsisi bazı emsaline tevafuk etmez*).[62] Yet even after the decision, it is possible to find examples of foundlings who were supported for longer periods of time. Some girls might receive a stipend until their marriage (*hin-i tezvic*, *izdivacında kat' olunmak üzere*).[63] Boys were entitled to an allowance until they became self-sufficient and could live without needing anyone (*istiğna hasıl edinceye kadar*).[64] In 1865 it was emphasized that there were precedents of granting allowances for longer periods, especially to those foundlings who were abandoned to mosques (*cevami-i şerif*). Those boys would be given a monthly stipend of thirty *guruş* until they could earn their

livelihood (*kâr u kesbe muktedir*) and the girls until they married.[65] In that sense, duration of the support was still an unsettled issue, and the authorities assumed changing positions in different contexts.

In order to limit the duration of support, sometimes only wet-nurses of the foundlings were supplied with a stipend. Given the financial burden of long-term allowances for foundlings, it was hard to take care of these infants as single individuals. Consequently, the intervention of wet-nurses helped the government economize. The state usually played a direct role in entrusting abandoned children to needy wet-nurses (*hükümet marifetiyle istekli olan kadınlara teslim edilerek*).[66] In 1888 to secure the breast-feeding of a foundling left at the door of the Cami-i Kebir (Friday mosque) of Mardin a wet-nurse was recruited with a stipend of twenty-five *guruş*.[67] In 1890 a boy was found near the mosque in the Halidüz neighborhood of Rize and was given to Hacula Hatun for suckling.[68]

Financial registers in the Ottoman archives provide evidence that wet-nurses of foundlings were employed directly by the state. The registers of the treasury contain long lists of stipend assignments to wet-nurses.[69] Evidently, the state, as their employer, was in a position to determine the wages of wet-nurses in a centralized manner. In 1864 a decision of the Council of State increased monthly stipends for the wet-nurses of Istanbul from twenty-five to fifty *guruş* after many of these women returned foundlings entrusted to them (*canib hükümete redd olunmakta*) since their income was insufficient to support themselves and the infant at the same time.[70] It was acknowledged by the council that women applying for the job were usually deprived and destitute (*bîkes ve bîvâye*), and that they hoped the allowances would serve as their own means of livelihood (*medâr-ı maişetleri*). The council also approved in 1888 the decision of the Governorship of Salonika to increase the stipends of foundlings' wet-nurses from twenty-five to fifty-five *guruş* since they were too little in comparison with the increased costs of living (*galâ-yı es'âra nazaran dûn*).[71]

In general, women applying to take in foundlings were very poor and/or widowed and needed the stipend for themselves and their families. There are a few examples of married women of precarious means taking in foundlings to contribute to the household income. In 1908 Fatma Hanım, İzzet Ağa's wife, was granted a stipend from the municipality's budget for breast-feeding a baby girl, Saniye.[72] The monthly allowances paid to wet-nurses were not high, yet taking in abandoned infants was an important form of female wage labor.[73] A wet-nurse could contribute to the family budget as much as approximately one quarter to one-third of the wage of her husband (if he was an unskilled worker).[74] The opening of *Dâr'ül-aceze*, the well-known poorhouse introduced as a novel and modern institutional structure during the Hamidian era in 1896,

would change the employment terms of wet-nurses greatly, especially when it came to monetary compensation. Based on concerns for infants' health and the prestige of the institution, these women were offered much higher stipends than a regular female worker. In 1908 they were given a raise, and in 1909 new wet-nurses were recruited with a monthly stipend of two hundred fifty *guruş*.[75] This was actually five to ten times more than the range within which they traditionally had been paid.

The passage of stipends from foundlings to wet-nurses can be interpreted as the gradual transformation of these women into quasi-institutional solutions for the issue of child abandonment. Parallel to the emergence of different sorts of bureaucratic structures and intermediary mechanisms to deal with the ever-increasing concerns of a modernizing state, wet-nurses also found themselves as state employees. In other words, the state, instead of taking care of each foundling as a single individual, relied on intermediary mechanisms, which decreased its burden and expanded its access to wider areas. Therefore, it is apparent that wet-nurses, previously invisible and non-political figures, acquired a new identity in their relations with the central state. Their political significance was elevated, and they were now subjects of direct state interference and discipline.[76]

Dâr'ül-aceze Irzâhanesi: Ottoman Foundling Asylum

As already mentioned, foundlings were frequently confused with bastards in everyday vocabulary. As a manifestation of this confusion, nineteenth-century Ottoman intellectuals used the term "bastard dwelling" (*piçhane*) when they come across foundling asylums in Europe. Hayrullah Efendi, in his *Avrupa Seyahatnamesi* (*Travels in Europe*) from the years 1863-64, refers to "bastard dwellings" while giving information on a number of educational institutions in Paris.[77] The same terminology was also employed by Ahmed Midhat. In one of his novels, *Acayib-i Alem* (*Wonders of the World*), from 1882, the foundling asylum of Moscow was defined as a bastard home for illegitimate children (*evlâd-ı zinâ*).[78] It has to be underlined that Ahmed Midhat and other Ottoman intellectuals were appalled, yet a little gleeful at the immense numbers of abandoned children in Europe. That is, they were glad to be able to cite the statistics as a way to refute Europeans' self-righteous criticisms of Ottoman society and the general European standpoint of moral superiority. Their callous use of terms like *piçhane* was cultural payback for Christians who harped on the immorality of harems. For Midhat, on the other hand, the absence of certain Islamic traditions and practices, such as concubinage and polygamy, and the rate of divorce among Christians increased adultery, prostitution, and illegitimacy, and

thus child abandonment in European society. In other words, the link between foundlings and morality can be considered part of the period's culture wars.[79]

The term "bastard home" was also used in a derogatory sense for the first birth clinic in Istanbul (*Vilâdethane*), initiated by Besim Ömer Paşa, the famous Paris-educated pediatrician of the late Ottoman Empire.[80] Such an interpretation becomes understandable when contemporary social norms are considered. Under normal circumstances pregnant women would give birth in their own beds, in their own homes. The ones who had to do it elsewhere were those who had to hide their pregnancies: unwed mothers, those who had illegitimate affairs, and prostitutes.[81] Labeling the institution a "bastard home" severely criticized Besim Ömer and his clinic.[82] Although the institution's primary aim was to secure healthy births, maternities and foundling asylums had traditionally been located next to one another, as in the well-known examples of Paris, Moscow, and St. Petersburg.[83] Therefore, it is likely that the babies born in *Vilâdethane* were mostly illegitimate. For instance, in February 1908 a Jewish girl gave birth to a baby girl in *Vilâdethane*. Arguing that the father of the baby had died and that she was very poor and did not have the resources to take care of the baby (*alil ve fakir ve çocuğunu ırzaa gayr-ı muktedir*), she abandoned her at the maternity, even before the issuing of her identity card. After the investigation of the records of the hospital, it turned out that her name was Fortüne bint-i Baruh and that she was from among the wealthy residents of Balat. The reason for abandonment, then, was not her poverty but her out-of-wedlock relationship (*münasebet-i gayr-ı meşru*).[84]

The first Ottoman institution accepting foundlings was Haseki Hospital for Women (*Haseki Nisâ Hastanesi*), which was founded in 1869. In 1892 there were forty orphans in the hospital.[85] In the 1890s the municipality of Istanbul started to send foundlings to this institution since the children were gathering in police departments and no one volunteered to adopt them. In 1893 municipality officials sent a boy, who was found in the courtyard of Şehzadebaşı Mosque, to the Haseki hospital after preparing his identity card (*tezkire-yi Osmaniyye*).[86] Around the same time, another boy, who was found in street in Pangaltı,[87] was taken to the hospital after birth registration.[88] The hospital did not have special facilities for foundlings, but the authorities counted on the positive effects of a medical staff and female patients.

The first genuine state foundling home, *Dâr'ül-aceze Irzâhanesi*,[89] was opened under the roof of the poorhouse (*Dâr'ül-aceze*). It was one of the prestigious institutions of the Hamidian era; like the children's hospital and *Dâr'ül-hâyr-ı Âlî*, it underlined the power and legitimacy of the sultan.[90] The article on admittance in the regulation of the poorhouse prescribed that abandoned children

(*lâkitler*) would be among the inmates of the institution.[91] The foundling department started to accept infants in 1899, although the official opening was in April 1903.[92] The department took care of infants younger than four years old, and as they grew up they were transferred to the orphanage of the poorhouse. The institution was specific to foundlings or orphaned infants who had lost at least one parent. Infants with both parents living were refused. In 1907 when a divorced man, Ramazan Ağa, applied to the institution for the suckling of his son, Hakkı, he was rejected.[93]

Although the regulation of the *Dâr'ül-aceze* claimed that neither religion nor nationality would be taken into consideration for admittance (*Dâr'ül-aceze'ye alınacaklarda mezhep ve milliyet gözetilmemesi*), the foundlings in the institution were predominantly Muslim. In March 1911 the foundling hospital housed thirty Muslims, as opposed to only one Greek, one Armenian Catholic, and two Jews.[94] This uneven distribution can be explained by both the privileging of Muslim foundlings by the Ottoman welfare system and the reluctance of non-Muslim communities to send their foundlings to the hospital.

The facility was quite small: in 1899 there were seventeen foundlings.[95] The number increased to thirty-eight in 1905, although the department was still minuscule compared to a total of 863 inmates in the institution as a whole. In 1907 the foundling population reached seventy-five.[96] The department became smaller in 1911 with thirty-four infants. In the new regulation of *Dâr'ül-aceze* of 1914, it was clarified that the foundling unit would have a quota of fifty infants. Challenging the new regulation, *ırzâhane* was sheltering fifty-seven foundlings in 1916 [table 5]. In fact, the foundling home usually admitted around two hundred infants each year. Yet the number decreased enormously due to the high mortality rate. As will be discussed, 180 foundlings were admitted in 1916, of which 111 died; in 1917 only fifty of 251 foundlings survived.

The foundling home of *Dâr'ül-aceze* was designed to follow the lines of institutional care. Several wet-nurses were recruited to stay in the establishment and care for the infants. In 1904 the Ministry of the Interior ordered that the number of dry-nurses be decreased and that more wet-nurses be employed so as to have a ratio of one wet-nurse to every two foundlings.[97] However, in the early 1920s, it was decided to foster out some of the foundlings due to the ever-increasing costs of the institution. After screening to ensure that they had no health problems, women who applied for this work were entrusted with infants one after the other.[98] Yet the system of foster care created problems based on concern for the infant's nutrition and health.[99] These women were usually living in remote districts of the city with very poor conditions of hygiene and cleanliness, and their economic resources were extremely limited. As a result, a

Table 5. Number of Children under the care of the *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum (1903–1920)[100]

Year	*Infant Population*
1903	17
1905	38
1907	75
1911	34
1914	50
1916	57
1917	37
1918	33
1919	32
1920	39

monitoring system was introduced in the early 1920s, under which the doctors of *Dâr'ül-aceze* would provide medical examination to the infants and control wet-nurses with regular visits to their houses.

MODERNIZATION AND THE CRISES OF INFANT MORTALITY

Infant mortality was a huge problem in Ottoman society, including in the royal family, only a third or fewer of whose children survived in the earlier nineteenth century. During the course of the nineteenth century, infant mortality and its causes became important research matters, and in that respect the foundling population and asylums were examples picked up for further analysis, due to enormous mortality rates. In fact, it has been demonstrated for many time periods and places that infants born out of wedlock had significantly higher mortality in the first year of life than their legitimate peers.[101] Therefore, it is necessary to consider the "foundling factor" within the general picture of infant mortality, though we lack necessary statistical documentation for the Ottoman society.

The foundling institutions in the Ottoman Empire, like their counterparts all over the world, had to face high mortality rates. In the asylum of Filles de la Charité in Jerusalem, the mortality rate of the years 1886-1890 was 42.5 percent.[102] In the report of 1901, it was stated that during the last fifteen years, 486 infants were received, and two-thirds of them died.[103] The mortality rate in the foundling asylum of the church of the Franciscan missionaries, Sainte-Marie Draperis of Beyoğlu, was around fifty percent for the thirteen years between

1860 and 1873.[104] For the period between 1840 and 1880, Anastassiadou calculates that the number of Greek children abandoned annually to the Panaghia church in Beyoğlu ranged between twenty and thirty-five, with a mortality rate of sixty percent. The overall picture was much better for the foundling asylum of the Greek community of Izmir. Every year, only one-third of the babies brought to the institution survived. For instance, in 1901 of the eighteen babies admitted, fourteen passed away.[105]

The main reason for higher mortality among the foundlings was undernourishment. Until the late 1920s, physicians attributed the vast majority of infant deaths to lack of mother's milk. Due to the high death rate among artificially fed infants, the medical community preferred wet-nurses to bottles well into the twentieth century.[106] Yet due to the permanent dearth of wet-nurses, foundling asylums established their own dairies, and in order to keep the animal milk fresh and use it in a healthy way, they purchased devices for sterilization and pasteurization. The foundling unit of *Dâr'ül-aceze* was remarkably well-equipped with modern technology and an educated staff. The head of the foundling unit was a French woman, and there were Austrian nurses under her.[107] Shortly after its opening, an incubator for premature infants, *couveuse*, was purchased for the foundling unit.[108] Moreover, from 1903 onwards the department had a dairy of its own,[109] and in 1906 the Ministry of the Interior also approved the purchase of a special device for sterilizing animal milk for the institution.[110] Also in 1906, classes were provided by an obstetrician, Kolağası Burhaneddin Bey, to the nurses so that the children were properly taken care of under rules of hygiene and sanitation (*hıfz-ı sıhhaya uygun olarak*).[111]

All these improvements were propagated as signs of a capable, modernizing state. The press advertised the institution as a solution to the problem of infant mortality since it was abiding by the rules of hygiene and sterility. On 13 February 1899, the daily newspaper *Sabah* (*Morning*) published the striking story of a young, unmarried mother who had to handed over her baby to the *Dâr'ül-aceze* foundling unit. It was argued that she wanted to retrieve her child after finding a job as a domestic servant, yet when she saw how well the child was being cared for, she decided that it was best for the baby to stay. The author of the article claimed that "the compassion of the sultan was even stronger than maternal instinct."[112] However, it is highly probable that this story was a fabrication, since a newly hired domestic servant had very little chances to bring her illegitimate baby in where she worked. In fact, due to their working conditions, domestic servants predominated among the mothers who abandoned their children.[113]

To laud Hamidian philanthropic institutions, a poem was hung in the lobby of *Dâr'ül-aceze* praising the sultan for what he had done for the foundlings

(*ırzâdâr*).[114] In line with the same exalting attitude, the journalist Ahmet Rasim visited the foundling home in 1907 and painted an extremely lovely picture.[115] After telling about the facilities of the institution (a device for the sterilization of milk, a scale, a bathing room, a quarantine room, a bedroom for the older ones, a play room, a variety of toys), Rasim praised the capabilities of the foreign nurse at the head of the department and the condition of the foundlings themselves ("all the children are beautiful and they are cleanly dressed").[116]

Despite modernized facilities and positive propaganda, foundlings in the institution had to face high mortality rates. In order to comprehend the contradiction of applauded technical superiority with high mortality rates, it is necessary to take into account the limits of public criticism and the unbridgeable gap between the state-centered presentation of the institution and the experiences of the infants. The same ironic situation was the shared fate of many foundling asylums.[117] Technological improvement proved insufficient in the face of maternal malnutrition, unassisted childbirth, childhood diseases and epidemics that circulated in the general population, and the dynamic of infection within the enclosed environment of the asylum.

From 1903 to 1915, 932 children were accepted into the institution and 572 of them died (sixty-one percent). In early 1915 the mortality rate of abandoned children in *Dâr'ül-aceze* was already a concern for the government, and the administration of the institution was asked to give an explanation [tables 6, 7, and 8]. The director complained that the procedure that followed from the moment an infant was found to the time he or she was taken to the foundling asylum was too long and painful, since infants were kept in police departments while their identities were investigated.[118] The accusations against the police departments were rather grave. The pediatrician of the *Dâr'ül-aceze* claimed that the infants were put into baskets (*zenbil*) and hung on the walls during the night. Moreover, in order to stop their crying, a piece of bread was put into a dirty cloth and stuck into their mouths.[119] As a result, infants were deprived of necessary care and nutrition, and consequently they arrived at the institution in a half-dead condition (*nîm-mûrde bir halde*), which rendered all efforts spent for their survival futile (*semeredâr olamadığı*). The police were ordered to deliver the foundlings directly and quickly (*doğrudan doğruya ve vesait-i seri ile*) to *Dâr'ül-aceze*, or to other relevant places if they were non-Muslims, and to undertake the investigation afterwards.[120]

Throughout the decade the infant mortality rate of the foundling home remained embarrassing: according to the detailed report of the pediatrician of the institution, a certain Ali Şükrü, it was eighty percent in 1917, eighty-six percent in 1918, eighty-four percent in 1919, and seventy-three percent in 1920 (see table 8).[121] In total, from 1903 to 1921, seventy percent of all children

Table 6. Yearly Distribution of Foundlings in *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum[122]

Years	*Admitted*	*Left*	*Died*	*Transferred to the Orphanage*	*Resulting Population*
1903–1915	932	300	572	18	42
1916	180	42	111	12	57
1917	251	48	201	22	37
1918	250	29	216	9	33
1919	218	32	184	3	32
1920	175	37	146	0	39
Total (1903-1920)	2016	488	1426	64	

Table 7. Number of Foundlings Admitted into the *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum (1903–1920)

	1903–1915	*1916*	*1917*	*1918*	*1919*	*1920*	*1903–1920*
1 month–6 months	672	153	180	221	166	143	1535
6 months–1 years-old	171	17	34	21	42	49	334
1–3 years old	89	11	37	8	10	28	183
Total	932	181	251	250	218	220	2052

The data in tables 7 and 8 comes from similar sources as that shown in table 6, except for the year 1920. BOA, DH.UMVM., 114/44, 13/Ra/1340 (14.11.1921).

Table 8. Number of Foundlings Who Died in the *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum (1903–1920)

	1903–1915	*1916*	*1917*	*1918*	*1919*	*1920*	*1903–1920*
1 month–6 months	500	100	171	200	155	110	1236
6 months–1 years-old	62	10	20	14	27	37	170
1–3 years old	10	1	10	2	2	14	39
Total	572	111	201	216	184	161	1445

accepted into the institution died. Most of them passed away when they were less than six months old; the risk for those above one year old was much smaller [tables 9 and 10]. The doctor argued that this wretched and miserable condition of the foundling home (*ırzâhanenin bugünkü acınacak hal-i perişaniyesi*) could be explained neither by the insufficiencies of its building nor by the negligence or weakness of its doctors. What these poor infants essentially lacked was a "mother-like compassion and affection" (*merhamet ve şefkat-i mâderâne*), which was not provided by their wet-nurses. These women, the doctor argued, were recruited without much scrutiny, and it was obvious that their interest in the job had little to do with the "love of raising children" (*çocuk büyütme zevki*), compared to their preoccupation with escaping from starvation and gaining their livelihood. In an interesting similarity, doctors investigating the mortality

Table 9. Mortality Rates of Infants between 1–6 Months in the *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum (1903–1920)[123]

Years	*Admitted*	*Died*	*Mortality Rate (Percentage)*
1903–1915	672	500	74
1916	153	100	65
1917	180	171	95
1918	220	200	90
1919	166	155	93
1920	143	110	77
Total (1903–1920)	1535	1236	80

Table 10. Mortality Rates of 1 to 3 Year-Olds in the *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum (1903–1920)

Years	*Admitted*	*Died*	*Mortality Rate (Percentage)*
1903–1915	89	10	11
1916	11	1	9
1917	37	10	27
1918	8	2	25
1919	10	2	20
1920	28	14	50
Total (1903–1920)	183	39	21

rate in Mexico City's foundling home in the early twentieth century noted that the most advanced hygienic and medical regimen did not make the babies any healthier, but that they recovered upon visits to their impoverished families. Accordingly, child psychologists argued that infants developed hospitalism when deprived of maternal attention during the first year of life.[124]

The Ministry of Health reported in September 1921 that the mortality rate was still disastrous.[125] The ministry argued, parallel to the pediatrician, that the problem resulted from poor conditions of care, since these infants were left to the hands of ignorant, superstitious (*itikâdât ve âdât-ı batıleye merbut*), lazy women. According to the male gaze of the administrators, infants were victims of wet-nurses.[126] After an eight-month-long governmental investigation, civil inspector (*mülkiye müfettis¸i*) Hikmet Bey argued in January 1922 that since wet-nurses were entrusted with more than two infants in addition to their own babies, the supply of milk for each was insufficient. He suggested keeping the ratio of wet-nurses to infants at one to two. Therefore, the rehabilitation of the foundling asylum was possible only with the recruitment of a full-time pediatrician and five more wet-nurses.[127] From 1903 to 1930, 4685 children were accepted into the institution and 2360 of them died.[128] The inability of the institution to lower the rate of mortality led to a discussion of relocating it into the center of the city in the early 1920s.[129] However, in 1925, the doctors managed to decrease the mortality rate to as low as thirty-seven percent. The above mentioned fostering-out mechanisms seem to have helped produce this result. The mortality rate for the decade between 1920 and 1930 was only thirty-five percent, namely half of the percentage for the previous two decades [table 11].

Table 11. Mortality Rates of 1 to 3 Year-Olds in the *Dâr-ül'aceze* Foundling Asylum (1903–1920)

Years	*Admitted*	*Died*	*Mortality Rate (Percentage)*
1903–1915	932	572	61
1916	181	111	61
1917	251	201	80
1918	250	216	86
1919	218	184	84
1920	220	161	73
1925	325	120	37
Total (1903–1920)	2052	1445	70
Total (1903–1930)	4685	2360	50
Total (1920–1930)	2633	915	35

It is interesting that the ministries, doctors, and state ignored the fatal results of institutionalization itself. Independent of the conditions of feeding and nourishment, the foundlings taken care of in homes had a much smaller mortality rate, both because they did not suffer hospitalism and because the danger of infection was much lower compared to institutions. It is not unusual that hospitals, nurseries, maternities, or foundling asylums were themselves "killing fields," since sometimes buildings as a whole got infected.[130] In other words, since administrators of the late Ottoman Empire were obsessed with a particular interpretation of modernization and centralization, they ignored the harmful effects of *modern* forms of care themselves: what was presented as progress meant disaster for the foundlings.

CONCLUSION

The history of childhood brings the historian in contact with many different disciplines, theoretical backgrounds, approaches, sources, and methods. For that matter, this research communicates with major fields of demographic studies and state welfare and health policies, including concern for hygiene and infant and child mortality. Although this paper is unable to provide detailed statistics and, therefore, discuss with accuracy the prevalence of child abandonment in the late Ottoman Empire, I have been able to discern several patterns of late Ottoman child abandonment, such as the religious affiliation of the infants, the milieu of abandonment, distribution according to cities, and gender differences. Moreover, I have analyzed survival mechanisms of foundlings with reference to the role of informal adoption by affluent families, state subsidies, wet-nurses, and foundling asylums. Thus, this paper takes heed of the completely silenced voices of the abandoned children with an attentive concern for their lives under circumstances that make it impossible for them to speak for themselves. My research attempts to think about abandonment from many perspectives, namely the narrative of the modernizing state, the calculus of mothers deciding to abandon their children, and of wet nurses trying to support their own families by suckling foundlings. Moreover, throughout the paper I try to understand the foundlings' perspective and expose their experiences into view, suggesting a nuanced version of Ottoman modernization.

The short history of provisions for the abandoned children can be considered from the perspective of attempts at institutionalization and depersonalization of relief. The oldest and most well-established practice was to give stipends directly to the foundlings from central or local resources as part of the religiously determined policy to care for the needy. As an attempt to organize and centralize relief measures, the stipends were gradually transferred to the

wet-nurses, who acted as intermediary agents between the foundlings and the state. Although these two support methods coexisted for a while, the preference for the latter seemed to gain momentum in time. With the opening of the *Dâr'ül-aceze* foundling unit, the abandoned babies, at least of Istanbul, were now taken care of by institutional, bureaucratized mechanisms in which police departments, birth registry offices, and municipalities played a considerable part. Although the process has been evaluated and discursively presented as the expansion of welfare policies and the modernization of the Ottoman state, from the perspective of the foundlings, the picture exposes increased deprivation, heightened mortality rates, and further suffering.

In the households of "kind people," the resources for foundlings were expectedly more generous, and concern for their survival was real. The publicly assisted wet-nursing service was detrimental to the standards of living of the foundlings since usually they shared the nurse's milk with other nurslings, and they were no longer targets of particular care. Elevated concern for birth registration and the opening of *Dâr'ül-aceze* made foundlings anonymous babies in dirty police stations or packed hospital wards, where there were permanent queues to receive attention. In other words, ironically, by adopting the latest European approaches and modernized administrative and institutional apparatuses to the care of foundlings, the Ottoman state actually worsened foundlings' chances for survival.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to the Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for supporting my PhD research by the "Integrated PhD Program" from 2005 to 2007.

The earlier drafts of this paper have been read at the 21st Middle East History and Theory Conference, University of Chicago, 12-13 May 2006, and at the Eighth Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, Florence, 21-25 March 2007. I am indebted to Selçuk Akşin Somel, Hakan Erdem, Beth Baron, Méropi Anastassiadou-Dumont, Malte Fuhrmann, Vangelis Kechriotis, and Eyal Ginio, who have previously read my paper and made invaluable comments for its improvement.

2. The overall research of this paper was undertaken in the Prime Ministry's Ottoman Archives, (*Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi*) in the collections of the Prime Ministry (*Sadaret*), the Ministry of the Interior (*Dahiliye*), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Hariciye*), the Municipality (*Belediye*), the Police Department (*Zabtiye*), and decrees (*irade*). A large part of the documents were salary grants to foundlings or wet-nurses, official reports of found children, and court records (*sicil*) of informal child adoption. I also consulted periodicals of the period together with literary data. Hacı Osman's negotiations are in *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* (BOA), *Dahiliye Nezareti Mektubi Kalemi* (DH. MKT), 919/29, 24/L/1322 (31.12.1904). All stipends indicated in the paper are on a monthly basis.

3. David Ransel, *Mothers of Misery: Child Abandonment in Russia* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988); Rachel Fuchs, *Abandoned Children: Foundlings and Child Welfare in Nineteenth Century France* (Albany: SUNY, 1984); David I. Kertzer, "Gender Ideology and Infant Abandonment in Nineteenth Century Italy," *Journal of*

Interdisciplinary History 22 (1991): 1-25; Richard Adair, *Courtship, Illegitimacy, and Marriage in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996); Mark Jackson, *New-born Child Murder: Women, Illegitimacy and the Courts in Eighteenth-century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

4. It is possible to find rich information in related areas. Avner Giladi, *Infants, Parents, and Wet Nurses: Medieval Islamic Views on Breast-Feeding and Their Social Implications* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Moutassem-Mimouni, Badra, *Naissances et abandons en Algérie* (Paris: Éd. Karthala, 2001); Jamila Bargach, *Orphans of Islam: Family, Abandonment, and Secret Adoption in Morocco* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002); Amira al-Azhary Sonbol, "Adoption in Islamic Society: A Historical Survey," and Andrea B. Rugh, "Orphanages in Egypt: Contradiction or Affirmation in a Family-Oriented Society," in *Children in the Muslim Middle East*, ed. Elizabeth Warnock Fernea (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), 24-41, 45-67; Mine Ener, *Managing Egypt's Poor and the Politics of Benevolence, 1800-1952* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

5. In Arabic, *lâkit* describes any object including a "human infant" found in a public place. In James W. Redhouse's famous English-Turkish dictionary, the word is translated as "foundling." In archival documents these children were usually defined as "abandoned" (*metruk*, *terk edilmiş*, *bırakılmış*, *bulunmuş*), but the term *lâkit* is also common.

6. Mouradgea d'Ohsson, *Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman: Divisé en Deux Parties, dont l'une Comprend la Législation Mahométane; l'Autre, l'Histoire de l'Empire Othoman*, vol. 5 (Istanbul: Les Editions ISIS, 2001), 119-20.

7. Avner Giladi, *Children of Islam: Concepts of Childhood in Medieval Muslim Society* (London: Macmillan/St. Antony's College Series, 1992), 71.

8. Méropi Anastassiadou, "La protection de l'enfance abandonnée dans l'Empire ottoman au XIXe siècle. Le cas de la communauté grecque orthodoxe de Beyoğlu (Istanbul)," *Südost-Forschungen* 59-60 (2000-2001): 272-322.

9. Adrian Wilson, "Illegitimacy and its Implications in mid-Eighteenth-Century London: The Evidence of the Foundling Hospital," *Continuity and Change* 4 (1989): 103-64.

10. BOA, DH.MKT., 1573/83, 07/R /1306 (11.12.1888); BOA, *Cevdet Belediye* (C.BLD.), 90/4467, 29/Za/1255 (03.02.1840); BOA, *Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası Amedi Kalemi* (A.AMD.), 48/37, 08/Za/1269 (13/08/1853); BOA, DH.MKT., 1440/10, 26/Za/1304 (16.08.1887). Tucker notes that the foundlings recovered alive in Cairo in the early 1900s were generally presumed to be illegitimate children born to prostitutes or women who had been raped or had illicit love affairs. Judith E. Tucker, *Women in Nineteenth-Century Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 156.

11. For instance, BOA, DH.MKT., 1007/53, 19/B/1323 (19.9.1905); BOA, DH.MKT., 2235/92, 12/R/1317, (19.8.1899); BOA, DH.MKT., 1553/12, 4/S/1306 (10.10.1888).

12. Anastassiadou, "La protection de l'enfance abandonnée," 294.

13. Ahmed Midhat Efendi, *Müşahedat* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2000), 196.

14. In fact, based on documents of *Dâr'ül-aceze*, we have access to more than two thousand foundlings between the years 1903-1920. Yet these records, prepared to account for infant mortality, do not contain specific information on the foundlings except for their age at the time of admittance. See tables.

15. The data for tables 1-4 is deduced from 144 documents gathered from the Ottoman archives; the dates range from 1811 to 1911.

16. The association of illegitimacy with urbanization in France has often been noted. Etienne van de Walle, "Illegitimacy in France during the Nineteenth Century," in *Bastardy and Its Comparative History: Studies in the History of Illegitimacy and Marital Nonconformism in Britain, France, Germany, Sweden, North America, Jamaica, and Japan*, eds. Peter Laslett, Karla Oosterveen, and Richard M. Smith (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 264-77.

17. An 18-year-old woman, Fadl Wasi, originally from Jirja in the south of Egypt, had an extramarital affair with a soldier, who then deserted her to join his battalion. When her pregnancy started to show, she was forced to leave the village for Cairo in fear of dishonor and death. Khaled Fahmy, "Modernizing Cairo: A Revisionist Narrative," in *Making Cairo Medieval*, eds. Nasser O. Rabbat, Irene A. Bierman, Nezar Alsayyad (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2005), 173-200.

18. *Sicil* records, for instance, may have brought about more reliable information on rural areas.

19. In France, Rachel Fuchs found that the sex of the baby was *not* a significant factor; from 1830 to 1869 roughly half of all babies abandoned were male (Fuchs, *Abandoned Children*, 65). The same held true in Spain; see Joan Sherwood, *Poverty in Eighteenth-Century Spain: The Women and Children of the Inclusa* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 138-9. Ransel also found that in Russia, as time passed, boys and girls were abandoned in equal numbers (Ransel, *Mothers of Misery*, 132-4).

20. Anastassiadou, "La protection de l'enfance abandonnée," 285.

21. Vangelis Kechriotis, "The Greek Community in İzmir, 1897-1914," (PhD dissertation, Leiden University, 2005).

22. Thomas W. Gallant, "Agency, Structure, and Explanation in Social History: The Case of the Foundling Home on Kephallenia, Greece, during the 1830s," *Social Science History* 15 (1991): 479-508.

23. Carolyn Flueh-Lobban, *Islamic Society in Practice* (Florida: University Press of Florida, 1994), 74.

24. This was a particular school of Islamic jurisprudence which the Sunni Muslim Ottomans followed in the interpretation and implementation of Islamic law.

25. D'Ohsson, *Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman*,119.

26. Sujimon, "The Treatment of the Foundling," 361-2.

27. M. S. Sujimon, "The Treatment of the Foundling (al-laqit) according to the Hanafis," *Islamic Law and Society* 9 (2002): 358-385.

28. There are a few examples where the infants were abandoned to cemeteries. In 1893 a baby girl was found in the cemetery of İshakpaşa mosque in Salonika (BOA, DH.MKT., 146/25, 27/Ra/1311 [7.10.1893]). In another example, in 1907, a foundling was discovered in the Muslim cemetery of Salonika, and he was delivered to the municipal guard (*belediye çavuşu*) (BOA, DH.MKT., 1146/88, 30/Z /1324 [13.2.1907]). In 1911 a six-month-old baby was found in Karacaahmet Cemetery in Istanbul (BOA, *Dahiliye Nezareti Kalem-i Adliye* (DH.EUM. KADL.), 7/3, 01/S /1329 [1.2.1911]). In 1905 a baby was found in the cellar of the bastion (Toprak Tabya) in Okmeydanı (BOA, *Zabtiye Nezareti* (ZB.), 372/111, 5/Ts/1321 [18.11.1905]).

29. In 1906 a baby was abandoned in front of a grocer's (*bakkal*) house in Tarlabaşı (BOA, ZB., 373/34, 20/Ni/1322 [3.5.1906]). In 1903 a girl was left at a moneychanger's door (BOA,

DH.MKT., 783/6, 15/Ş /1321 [5.1.1903]). In 1910 a boy was abandoned at a candymaker's door, in Kumkapı (BOA, DH.MKT., 95/89, 29/Ra/1328 [10.4.1910]).

30. Anastassiadou, "La protection de l'enfance abandonnée," 307. In Istanbul they were living in Hasköy, Balat, Fener, Tatavla, and Dolapdere.

31. BOA, DH.MKT., 549/2, 20/R /1320 (26.07.1902). This document is a huge dossier, comprising numerous complaints and correspondences regarding the dispute over the identity of the foundlings.

32. "Sicill-i Nüfûs Nizamnâmesi, 8/L/1298 (23.8.1882)," *Düstûr*, Tertib 1, Zeyl 2, (Istanbul: Mahmut Bey Matbaası, 1299-1882), 15-23.

33. BOA, DH.MKT., 549/2, 20/R /1320 (26.07.1902).

34. It should be noted that intercommunal battles over these babies were to a large extent related to the multireligious circumstances of certain cities of the Empire, such as Istanbul and Salonika. This would not be a problem in more homogeneously populated cities.

35. For further information, see Nazan Maksudyan, "Fight over 'Nobody's Children': Religion, Nationality, and Citizenship of Foundlings in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire," *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 41, Fall 2009 (forthcoming).

36. John Boswell, *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

37. According to the Ottoman dictionary *ahiretlik* means "an orphan that is adopted." In the expressions "Ahiret anne" (stepmother) and "ahiret evladı" (adopted child) there is no genealogy involved. Even if certain girls are called "adopted daughter," there is no Islamic legal restriction for marrying them (neither by the father nor by the son of the family).

38. Adoption in the legal sense was unknown in the Ottoman society. Formal adoption (*tebennî*), which existed in pre-Islamic Arabic societies, was prohibited after embracing Islam, with the sura of Ahzab (33), verses four and five. Yet court records verify the prevalence of child transfers, proving the legalized nature of fostering. For further information on adopted children in late Ottoman society, see Nazan Maksudyan, "Foster-Daughter or Servant, Charity or Abuse: *Beslemes* in the Late Ottoman Empire," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 21, no. 4 (December 2008): 488-512.

39. Eyal Ginio, "Living on the Margins of Charity," in *Poverty and Charity in the Middle Eastern Contexts*, eds. Mine Ener, Amy Singer, and Michael Bonner (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003), 165-184.

40. Bayle St. John, *The Turks in Europe: A Sketch of Manners & Politics in the Ottoman Empire* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1853), 64.

41. Ehud R. Toledano, *Slavery and Abolition in the Ottoman Middle East* (University of Washington Press, 1998), 26.

42. İnalcık thought that there were around fifty children, while Avigdor Levy suggested there were one hundred. Halil İnalcık, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5 (Istanbul, 1950), 613; Avigdor Levy, "The Officer Corps in Sultan Mahmud's New Army 1826-1839," *IJMES* 2 (1971): 21-39.

43. Mehmet Zeki Pakalın, *Son Sadrazamlar ve Başvekiller*, vol. 2 (Istanbul: Ahmet Sait Matbaası, 1942), 403-404.

44. *The Levant Herald and Eastern Express*, XIII: 6 (February 6, 1893), 65.

45. Ahmed Midhat Efendi, *Dürdane Hanım* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2000), 43, 47, 108.

46. Today, "Meryem Ana Süryani Kadim Kilisesi."

47. Ahmet Midhat Efendi, *Müşahedat*, 196-97.

48. Sujimon, "The Treatment of the Foundling," 362-63.

49. d'Ohsson, *Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman*, 120.

50. BOA, *İrade, Meclis-i Vâlâ* (İ.MVL.), 519/23345, 22/Ca/1281 (23.10.1864).

51. In 1811 an infant was found near Kovacılar (Fatih, Istanbul) and taken by a woman. The baby was granted a monthly allowance of ten *guruş* (BOA, C.BLD., 76/3746, 26/M /1226 [20.02.1811]). In 1888 wet-nurse stipends were increased to fifty-five *guruş* in Salonika (BOA, DH.MKT. 1573/83, 07/R /1306 [11.12.1888]).

52. In February 1817 an unknown woman came to the house of Sûlti bint Dimitri, a Christian woman, in Koca Mustafa Paşa with a forty-day-old baby. The woman told her that the baby was the daughter of her son, a recent convert to Islam, who was missing at the moment, and that his wife was incapable of providing the baby's subsistence. Sûlti applied to the Islamic court in order to get some allowance from the treasury, trying to prove that the baby was Muslim. The court concluded that the infant was a subject of Islam since the testimony of Sûlti was not enough to determine the genealogical line of the baby. The baby was considered a foundling (*lâkit*) with no descent: she was free and a subject of Islam. As a result, the court ruled that Sûlti, as a non-Muslim, did not have the right to take a Muslim foundling into her household. *İstanbul Mahkemesi 121 Numaralı Şer'iyye Sicili* (Istanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi, 2006), 35.

53. BOA, İ.MVL., 409/1779, 01/Ca/1275 (08.12.1858); BOA, İ.MVL., 397/17286, 23/Za/1274 (05.07. 1858); BOA, İ.MVL., 233/8108, 02/C /1268 (24.03.1852).

54. BOA, C.BLD., 76/3746, 26/M /1226 (20.02.1811).

55. BOA, İ.MVL., 290/11567, 18/S /1270 (20.11.1853).

56. Mahmoud Yazbak, "Muslim Orphans and the Sharia in Ottoman According to Palestine Sijil Records," *JESHO* 44 (2001): 123-140.

57. BOA, DH.MKT. 1353/36, 04/L /1303 (06.07.1886).

58. For Trabzon: BOA, DH.MKT., 1351/45, 16/N /1303 (18.06.1886). For Mardin: BOA, DH.MKT., 1514/45, 10/L /1305 (20.06.1888). For Rize: BOA, DH.MKT., 1772/33, 02/Ra/1308 (16.10.1890); BOA, DH.MKT., 422/67, 14/Ra/1313 (04.09.1895); BOA, DH.MKT., 111/40, 01/S /1311 (13.08.1893). For Beirut: BOA, DH.MKT., 2480/113, 17/M /1319 (6.5.1901). For Salonika: BOA, DH.MKT., 1573/83, 07/R /1306 (11.12.1888); BOA, DH.MKT., 2224/40, 14/Ra/1317 (22.07.1899).

59. BOA, DH.MKT., 1986/123, 20/M/1310 (14.8.1892).

60. A baby boy, found in 1858 in the street in Üsküdar, was granted a temporary stipend and given to Emine Hanım for nursing (BOA., İ.MVL. 397/17286, 23/Za/1274 [05.07. 1858]).

    An infant girl, found in Sultan Bayezid Camii, was granted a temporary stipend of fifty *guruş* (BOA, İ.MVL. 351/15313, 18/B/1272 [25.3.1856]).

    A girl was found in Ankara, Hatuniye district. She was given to a wet-nurse with temporary stipend of thirty *guruş* (BOA, İ.MVL. 342/14761, 04/S/1272 [16.10.1855]).

61. Suckling or wet-nursing is the primary and inalienable right of a newborn. When the biological mother was dead or incapable of feeding her child, or when the baby was abandoned, a wet-nurse was hired. Bargach, *Orphans of Islam*, 69, 139.

62. BOA., İ..MVL., 233/8108, 02/C /1268 (24.03.1852).

63. Some examples may be BOA, DH.MKT. 1573/83, 07/R /1306 (11.12.1888); BOA, İ..MVL. 290/11567, 18/S /1270 (20.11.1853); BOA, A.AMD., 48/37, 08/Za/1269 (13/08/1853). The state retains the guardianship of the child, and it may act as the marriage guardian (*veli*) of a female foundling, represented by the person of the *kadı*.

64. BOA, İ..MVL., 233/8108, 02/C /1268 (24.03.1852).

    In 1865 Mehmed was found in a mosque in Serez (Serres) and granted a monthly stipend of thirty *guruş* until he could take care of himself (*kendini idare edinceye kadar*) (BOA, C.BLD., 90/4485, 24/Ş /1281 [22.01.1865]).

    In 1865 a baby boy, İsmail Hakkı, was found in Çürüklük (Topkapı, İstanbul) and granted a monthly stipend of fifty *guruş* until his puberty (*hadd-ı buluğ*) (BOA, C.BLD., 18/854, 19/Za/1281 [15.04.1865]).

65. BOA, C.BLD., 8/396, 18/S /1282 (11.07.1865).

66. BOA, İ..MVL, 519/23345, 22/Ca/1281 (23.10.1864).

    There are earlier examples. In 1840 two-day-old Mehmed Nuri was found in Kumkapı (Istanbul) at the Atik Nişancı Mehmed Paşa mosque. He was given to a wet-nurse with a monthly stipend of thirty guruş (BOA, C.BLD., 90/4467, 29/Za/1255 [03.02.1840]).

67. BOA, DH.MKT. 1514/45, 10/L /1305 (20.06.1888).

68. BOA, DH.MKT., 1772/33, 02/Ra/1308 (16.10.1890).

69. BOA, *Maliyeden Müdevver Defterler* (MAD.d.) 1/13894; BOA, MAD. d. 1/13578; BOA, MAD. d. 1/14192.

70. BOA, İ..MVL, 519/23345, 22/Ca/1281 (23.10.1864).

71. BOA, DH.MKT. 1573/83, 07/R /1306 (11.12.1888).

72. BOA, DH.MKT., 1227/77, 25/Z /1325 (29.01.1908).

73. These women made their "work agreements" with the municipality as single individuals without relying on a male figure. In 1899 a baby was given to a black wet-nurse (Zenciye Fatıma bint-i Abdullah), and she was offered a stipend by the municipality as one of its employees. BOA, DH.MKT., 2235/92, 12/R/1317, (19.8.1899).

74. Gallant, "Agency, Structure, and Explanation," 494. In the Ottoman Empire, day laborers received sixty to one hundred fifty *guruş* a month. A wet-nurse stipend was one-third of this, ranging between thirty and fifty *guruş* a month. Charles Issawi, *The Fertile Crescent, 1800-1914: A Documentary Economic History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 400.

75. BOA, DH.MKT., 1249/74, 22/Ra/1326 (23.04.1908). BOA, DH.MKT., 816/40, 6/My/1325 (19.5.1909).

76. In the 1890s the government realized that losing track of foundlings (*tevdi edilenlerin arkası aranmamasıyla*) who were entrusted into households of needy wet-nurses had unhealthy and dangerous results for these infants. In that respect, all the governorships, the municipality of Istanbul, and the Ministry of Police were duly warned. BOA,

DH.MKT., 1986/123, 20/M/1310 (14.8.1892). For further information see Nazan Maksudyan, "Hearing the Voiceless – Seeing the Invisible: Orphans and Destitute Children as Actors of Social, Economic, and Political History in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire," PhD Dissertation, Sabanci University, 2008.

77. Hayrullah Efendi, *Avrupa Seyahatnamesi*, ed. Belkıs Altuniş-Gürsoy (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2002), 119-21.

78. Ahmed Midhat Efendi, *Acayib-i Alem* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2000), 155-57.

79. Dror Ze'evi, *Producing Desire: Changing Sexual Discourse in the Ottoman Middle East, 1500-1900* (California: University of California Press, 2006), 161-63.

80. For more information on him see Yeşim Işıl Ülman, "Besim Ömer Akalın (1862-1940): ange gardien des femmes et des enfants ; – L'acclimatation d'un savoir venu d'ailleurs," in *Médecins et ingénieurs ottomans à l'âge des nationalismes*, ed. Méropi Anastassiadou (Paris-Istanbul: Maisonneuve & Larose et IFEA, 2003), 101-21.

81. Rachel G. Fuchs, *Poor and Pregnant in Paris: Strategies for Survival in the Nineteenth Century* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 220.

82. Nuran Yıldırım, "Viladethane," *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* 7 (1994): 388-89; Ayten Altınbaş, Oğuz Ceylan, "Vilâdethâne," *Tombak*, no. 17 (1997): 26-32.

83. Ransel, *Mothers of Misery*, 37.

84. BOA, DH.MKT., 549/2, 4/Ca/1326 (04.06.1908).

85. Nuran Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi* (Istanbul: Darülaceze Vakfı, 1997), 7.

86. BOA, DH.MKT., 2051/40, 24/B /1310 (11.02.1893).

87. This was a multireligiously inhabited and relatively poor neighborhood close to Beyoğlu, the face of which started changing after the opening of the French Sisters in 1856, Notre Dame de Sion.

88. BOA, DH.MKT., 2060/93, 20/Ş /1310 (09.03.1893).

89. The proper English translation of the word *ırzâhane* would be "suckling house." The name of the department was changed to "crèche for nurslings" (*Darülaceze Süt Çocukları Yuvası*) after 1908.

90. For a coherent account on philanthropy and legitimacy see Nadir Özbek, "Philanthropic Activity, Ottoman Patriotism and the Hamidian Regime, 1876-1909," *IJMES* 37 (2005): 59-81.

91. In the 1916 Regulation of the institution, the Fourth Section specifying the conditions of entry clarifies in Article 12 that one group of inmates were the abandoned children. Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi*, 411.

92. Yıldırım notes that there were seventeen foundlings in 1899, yet archival sources underline 1903 as the opening date of the department. BOA, *Dahiliye Nezareti Umûr-ı Mahalliye-i Vilâyât Müdüriyeti* (DH.UMVM.), 114/44, 13/Ra/1340 (14.11.1921), "Darülaceze ırzâhanesi'nin tarih-i tesisi olan 9 Nisan 319. . . ."

93. BOA, DH.MKT., 1162/17, 08/Ra/1325 (21.04.1907).

94. Arsen Yarman, *Osmanlı Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Ermeniler ve Surp Pırgiç Ermeni Hastanesi Tarihi* (İstanbul: Ermeni Hastanesi Vakfı, 2001), 364.

95. Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi,* 145.

96. Yarman, *Surp Pırgiç Ermeni Hastanesi Tarihi*, 364.

97. BOA, DH.MKT., 816/40, 14/Za/1321 (1.2.1904).

98. BOA., *Dahiliye Nezareti Umûr-ı Mahalliye-i Vilâyât Müdüriyeti* (DH.UMVM.), 166/70, 27/B/1340 (26.3.1922).

99. BOA., DH.UMVM. 166/70, 26/N/1340, (24.05.1922).

100. BOA, DH.UMVM., 113/58, 01/Ra/1339 (12.11.1920); Yıldırım, 145; Özbek, *Sosyal Devlet*, 210; Yarman, 364.

101. European literature underlines that the mortality rate for foundlings is higher compared to general infant mortality. Alysa Levene, "The Mortality Penalty of Illegitimate Children: Foundlings and Poor Children in Eighteenth-Century England," in A. Levene, T. Nutt, and S. Williams, *Illegitimacy in Britain, 1700-1920* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); Fuchs, *Poor and Pregnant* 196-99; Ransel, *Mothers of Misery*, 259.

102. "Palestine, Lettre de soeur Sion, supérieure des Filles de la charité, à Jérusalem," *Bulletin des Oeuvres des Écoles d'Orient*, no. 180 (September 1890): 341-7. "In four years, we have received 40 infants . . . but we have to give 17 of them in our possession to the eternal happiness. 23 remained with us and they are in our house."

103. Soeur Sion, "Les Filles de la Charité en Terre Saint (Suite)," t. 33 (1901): 537-8.

104. BOA, HR. TO. 458/1, 7.7. 1874.

105. Vangelis Kechriotis, "The Greek Community in İzmir, 1897-1914," (PhD dissertation, Leiden Universtiy, 2005).

106. For instance, at the New York Infant Asylum, opened in 1865, employees fed babies artificial food with such "disastrous results" that the asylum's directors added a large maternity ward to the building to supply babies with a steady stream of wet-nurses. Jacqueline H. Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby: Public Health and the Decline of Breastfeeding in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Ohio State University Press, 2001), 136.

107. Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet 1876-1914* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 210.

108. BOA., DH. MKT., 727/40, 26/Ra/1321, (22.06.1903).

109. After the official opening of the department, some cows and donkeys were purchased for the institution (BOA. DH. MKT. 745/32, 05/Ca/1321, [30.07.1903]).

110. BOA, DH.MKT., 1079/59, 21/Ra/1324 (15.05.1906).

111. BOA, DH.MKT., 1061/6, 26/M /1324 (22.03.1906).

112. *Sabah*, no. 3315, 13 February 1899, in Özbek, 210-12.

113. Ransel, *Mothers of Misery*, 166; John R. Gillis, "Servants, Sexual Relations, and the Risks of Illegitimacy in London, 1801-1900," *Feminist Studies* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 142-173.

114. Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi*, 162.

115. The journalist and writer Ahmet Rasim (1865-1932) was a graduate of the famous high school for affluent orphan boys, Darüşşafaka. He worked as a public servant and teacher becoming a member of parliament in 1927.

116. http://www.beyan.com.tr/arsiv/1999/sayi9/kulturmedeniyet.htm "Irza'hane, yeni doğmuş çocuklarla dört yaşına kadar olan küçük çocukların yetimhanesidir. Süt sterilize etmeye mahsus bir cihazı, tartı aleti, banyo dairesi, hasta tecrid odası, büyüklere mahsus yatak odası ve teneffüs oyun odası var. Türlü türlü oyuncakları, hattâ fotoğrafları da var. Bu dairenin başında çocuk bakımı mütehassısı bir ecnebi hemşire bulunuyor; madâm, hakikâten takdire şayan şekilde çalışmaktadır. Çocukların hepsi de güzel, tertemiz giydirilmişler."

117. In the 1920s the doctor of the Nursery and Child Hospital in New York complained, "I have had the best hospital wards, roof gardens, convalescent homes especially for these cases, and yet it is the same thing; every baby under one year of age did badly if kept long." Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby*, 77.

118. BOA. *Dahiliye Nezareti Muhaberât Ve Tensîkât Müdüriyeti* (DH.EUM.MTK.) 79/43, 3/Ra/1333 (19.1.1915).

119. BOA. DH.UMVM. 114/44, 23/Ra/1340 (24.11.1921).

120. BOA. DH.EUM.MTK. 79/43, 3/Ra/1333 (19.1.1915).

121. BOA., DH.UMVM., 114/44, 9/Te/1336 (9.10.1920).

122. BOA, DH.UMVM., 113/58, 01/Ra/1339 (12.11.1920). The registers for 1903–1915 were not separated by year so tables 6–8 show the figures for children as a total covering the entire period.

123. The data for tables 9-11 comes from BOA, DH.UMVM., 114/44, 13/Ra/1340 (14.11.1921), and Yıldırım, 165. For all these tables the information for 1903-1915 cannot be separated out by year.

124. Ann S. Blum, "Dying of Sadness: Hospitalism and Child Welfare in Mexico City, 1920-1940," in *Disease in the History of Modern Latin America: From Malaria to AIDS*, ed. Diego Armus (Duke University Press, 2003), 209-36.

125. BOA., DH.UMVM., 114/44, 1/M/1340 (4.9.1921).

126. To reinforce women's motivation, the poorhouse administration asked the Ministry of the Interior to give rewards to wet- and dry-nurses. BOA., DH.UMVM., 115/46, 11/Ca/1340 (10.1.1922).

127. BOA., DH.UMVM., 119/23, 12/Ca/1340 (11.1.1922). The Administrative Council (*Meclis-i İdare*) approved the recruitment of only two wet-nurses (BOA., DH.UMVM., 115/53, 06/C/1340 [4.2.1922]).

128. Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi*, 165.

129. *Akşam* [The Evening], no. 575, 25.04.1920; no. 2470, 29.08.1925; no. 2573, 11.12.1925.

130. Julie Miller noted the same infection problem for asylums in New York: "Like all the city's foundling asylums, which collected many children together in their wards, the Infant Department created excellent conditions for the spread of infection, which it did not have any means to combat; no doubt this was one reason for its failure to lower the death rate substantially." Julie Miller, *Abandoned: Foundlings in Nineteenth-Century New York City* (New York: NYU Press, 2008), 164.