

RECONFIGURING THE OTTOMAN
POLITICAL IMAGINATION:
PETITIONING AND PRINT CULTURE
IN THE EARLY TANZIMAT

Evthymios PAPATAXIARCHIS*

Petitions in the Low Politics of the Early Tanzimat

IN HER CLASSIC PAPER ON ‘POLITICAL INITIATIVES ‘from the bottom up’’ in early modern Ottoman society,¹ Suraiya Faroqhi suggests a programme that gives close attention to historical actors and considers their moves and strategies as having effects on ‘higher’ levels of governance.² Petitions are the stuff of the low politics that she unravels in her analysis. Faroqhi treats them as privileged means at the hands of the ‘ordinary people’ for pursuing political initiatives such as lodging complaints against administrators, making

* University of the Aegean, Department of Social Anthropology and History.

I would like to thank Antonis Anastasopoulos, Elias Kolovos, and Marinos Sariyannis for the kind invitation to participate in the Halcyon Days in Crete Symposium. Also many thanks to Efi Avdela, Eleni Gara, Suraiya Faroqhi, Vangelis Kechriotis, Christos Lyrintzis, Socrates Petmezas, Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, Maria Stamatoyiannopoulou, and Yücel Terzibaşoğlu for their help and encouragement in my research. I am grateful to Marinos Sariyannis for the translation of materials from the Ottoman archives, to Antonis Anastasopoulos and the anonymous reader for their comments and editorial suggestions, and to the staffs of the Başbakanlık Ottoman Archive and the Ecumenical Patriarchate Archives and Library in Istanbul, and of the Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Benaki Library in Athens for providing me with generous access to their collections. The archival research on which this paper is based was financially supported by a grant from the Research Council of the University of the Aegean.

- 1 S. Faroqhi, ‘Political Initiatives ‘From the Bottom Up’ in the Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire: Some Evidence for their Existence’, in H. G. Majer (ed.), *Osmanistische Studien zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte. In Memoriam Vančo Boškov* (Wiesbaden 1986), 24-33.
- 2 In this regard Faroqhi’s approach is connected with the wider move to apply ‘bottom-up’ perspectives in the historical anthropology of social and political practices in early modern European society; for example, see N. Z. Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford 1987) and A. Farge, *Fragile Lives: Violence, Power and Solidarity in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, trans. C. Shelton (Cambridge, Mass. 1993).

demands for ‘just’ taxation, or redressing official malpractices.³ She further locates the flourishing of petitioning during the period of the weakening of the central state’s ability to control its provinces, which started in the late sixteenth century and ended at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

From my perspective, the perspective of a historically-minded anthropologist,⁴ Faroqhi’s innovative analysis is highly relevant to understanding the early Tanzimat realities as well. It provides in particular a very useful framework for systematically exploring the micro-history of political moves and practices by the marginal Greek-speaking Christian populations of the Ottoman Empire during the upheaval that followed the successful Greek Revolution. Here, therefore, I take Faroqhi’s lead to address the function of petitions at the very end of the period that she considers to be the golden era of petitioning. What I intend to show is that in the early phases of the Tanzimat there is evidence suggesting that political initiatives of this kind to some degree intensified. Yet they also diversified in form, particularly as they creatively merged with other genres of communicating grievances and expressing opinion, often dissenting, in the emerging spheres of publishing and journalism, such as letters in the press.

In the extensive historiographic literature on the subject, petitions have been defined as formalised written statements articulating interests⁵ – in particular, pressing “demands for a favor or for the redressing of an injustice”⁶ – and voicing opinion⁷ that may be heterodox in nature. In this capacity they have been analysed as more or less bureaucratic means of conferring agency on allegedly ‘silent’ subjects⁸ and contributing to changes in

-
- 3 For centuries, as Faroqhi has shown, petitions constituted the principal framework for the legitimate expression of popular protest in the form of grievances and complaints personally addressed to higher officials or the Sultan. On the use of petitions in Ottoman society, also see S. Faroqhi, ‘Political Activity among Ottoman Taxpayers and the Problem of Sultanic Legitimation (1570-1650)’, *JESHO*, 34 (1992), 1-39 and E. Gara, ‘Popular Protest and the Limitations of Sultanic Justice’, in Eadem, M. E. Kabadayı and C. K. Neumann (eds), *Popular Protest and Political Participation in the Ottoman Empire: Studies in Honor of Suraiya Faroqhi* (Istanbul 2011), 89-104. For a review of the literature on petitions in Ottoman historiography see M. E. Kabadayı, ‘Petitioning as Political Action: Petitioning Practices of Workers in Ottoman Factories’, in Gara, Kabadayı and Neumann (eds), *Popular Protest*, 57-74.
- 4 On the unpopularity of anthropological history and ‘micro’-approaches among historians of the Ottoman Empire, see S. Faroqhi, ‘The Fieldglass and the Magnifying Lens: Studies of Ottoman Crafts and Craftsmen’, in Eadem, *Making a Living in the Ottoman Lands, 1480 to 1820* (Istanbul 1995), 85.
- 5 A. Würgler, ‘Voices from Among the “Silent Masses”’: Humble Petitions and Social Conflicts in Early Modern Central Europe’, in L. H. van Voss (ed.), *Petitions in Social History* (Cambridge 2002), 14.
- 6 L. H. van Voss, ‘Introduction’, in Eadem (ed.), *Petitions in Social History*, 1.
- 7 G. Shapiro and J. Markoff, ‘Officially Solicited Petitions: The *Cahiers de Doléances* as a Historical Source’, in van Voss (ed.), *Petitions in Social History*, 79-106.
- 8 I borrow the term from the title of Würgler, ‘Voices from Among the “Silent Masses”’. In the Ottoman context, this perspective is adopted by L. T. Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne 1996), 283-299. The ideology of the ‘Circle of Justice’, which

local configurations of power. In early modern contexts especially, both inside and outside Europe, where there were limited means of politics available to the lower ranks of society, collective petitioning constituted a quasi-judicial and therefore legitimate form of popular politics.⁹ In many cases, petitions provided ways of allying with the political centre against intermediate power-holders.¹⁰ In others, they functioned as a means of exerting pressure on the central government and its institutions from the 'outside', a tendency that intensified in conditions of rapid change, unrest, and popular radicalism in the course of the nineteenth century.¹¹

Here I adopt a much broader approach that turns attention to the writing and use of petitions beyond the bureaucratic context. Petitions are treated as texts which have a shaping influence on the world and, more specifically, as interested textual practices with a powerful communicative potential.¹² Viewed from this angle, the drafting of petitions shares common characteristics with the writing of letters to the press, journalistic reports, and other textual practices that, in conditions of socio-political strife, may also pursue political goals and perform a political function. Petitions, therefore, should be analysed in conjunction with other printed materials.¹³ After all, together they constitute the very stuff of contentious politics.¹⁴ Furthermore, as I will try to show, petitioning, epistolography, and other forms of publishing are often mixed and mutually transformed, as they are engaged in the service of political mobilisation. I believe that an open-minded approach to these mixings may reveal the wider political effects that petitions often have.

informed the constitution of the Ottoman state, suggested the interdependency of rulers and ruled, and, therefore, provided room for the expression of both consent and resistance. According to Darling, petitions were devices for correcting eccentricities of the 'Circle of Justice'.

9 See R. W. Hoyle, 'Petitioning as Popular Politics in Early Sixteenth-Century England', *Historical Research*, 75 (2002), 365-389.

10 Van Voss, 'Introduction', 4.

11 C. Leys, 'Petitioning in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', *Political Studies*, 111 (1955), 47.

12 My approach is inspired by a theoretical tradition that treats text as discursive practice to be analysed in context and focuses on the constitutive function of the text in the world. Historians who adopt the practice perspective as well as followers of the 'linguistic turn' in historiography have contributed to this new way of dealing with the written sources. Here I would like to refer to Roger Chartier's intervention in the debate over the 'Great Cat Massacre'; R. Chartier, 'Text, Symbols and Frenchness: Historical Uses of Symbolic Anthropology', in Idem, *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge 1988), 95-111. Also see Idem, 'History between Narrative and Knowledge', in Idem, *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Baltimore 1997), 13-27. This analytical framework has been innovatively applied in the study of letters of pardon and remission by Natalie Davis; Davis, *Fiction in the Archives*.

13 See D. Zaret, 'Petitions and the "Invention" of Public Opinion in the English Revolution', *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (1996), 1508.

14 For example, see C. Tilly, *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758-1834* (Cambridge, Mass. 1995), 54-56.

This brings us to the key issue: how do petitions work? I am particularly interested in one important aspect: petitions constitute a legitimate, institutionally formalised way of referring to a higher order – the state bureaucracy, the Church, regional authorities (or even the press) – and involving it in an interested scheme of action that is initiated and partially executed ‘from below’. In this capacity, petitions work as stimulators: they transmit political messages to higher levels of governance – often, especially in the case of collective petitions, through the use of appointed delegates and structures of interpersonal mediation – and eventually produce responses.¹⁵ For example, they give greater visibility to a ‘cause’, thus making it adoptable by particular bureaucratic agents. I want to consider how, under special conditions, petitions may change their form and mould political messages in novel ways, and to assess the wider implications of such innovations.

The development and spread of the press and publishing were the catalysts in the transformation of petitioning as a traditional means of political communication.¹⁶ Print culture introduced new principles of communication which both transcended the norms governing petitioning and shifted its content in innovative directions. This is a process that, as David Zaret has shown,¹⁷ initially emerged in the course of the English Revolution, when petitions were extensively printed.¹⁸ Printing transformed the petition as a traditional instrument of communication and superseded norms of secrecy that dominated its practice. In the hands of radical groups, printed petitions were subjected to political uses that contributed to ‘democratic speculation’ and further facilitated the development of public opinion. This is a particularly useful insight in understanding the transformations that the Greek Revolution brought into effect in the Ottoman Empire when, during the early Tanzimat, petitioning became enmeshed in the developing print culture and was transposed from the bureaucratic to the journalistic mode of expressing opinion.

The above issues will be addressed through the lens of the micro-historical analysis of factional conflict in Ayvalık/Kydonies¹⁹ during the first years of the Tanzimat. Con-

15 In systemic terms, petitions could be seen as administrative means for restoring imbalances in the relations between the rulers and the ruled. See Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy*, 284.

16 On print culture and its effects, see, besides the classic texts of E. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge 2005 [2nd ed.]) and B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London 1991), R. Chartier, *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Princeton 1987).

17 See Zaret, ‘Petitions’ and Idem, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton 2000).

18 Revolutionary moments of mass political mobilisation, such as the English, the French, and the American Revolutions, have provided very productive frameworks for the study of petitions. Political ruptures in early modern contexts constitute interesting parallels with the case at hand. On the use of petitions in the context of the French Revolution, see A. Farge and M. Foucault, *Le désordre des familles. Lettres de cachet des Archives de la Bastille au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1982). On the ‘Cahiers de doléances’, also see Shapiro and Markoff, ‘Officially Solicited Petitions’ and R. Chartier, ‘From Words to Texts: The Cahiers de doléances of 1789’, in Idem, *The Cultural Uses of Print*, 110-144.

19 In relation to the Ottoman context I am using as descriptive geographical terms those of the Ot-

flict had been endemic in Ayvalık's social life since the early 1830s, when the so-called 'regime of dual governance'²⁰ was restored, and Christian properties, which had been confiscated after the 'destruction' of the town by the Ottoman army in the first year of the Greek Revolution, were returned in exchange for a huge monetary sum for which the 'community' became indebted to the Porte.²¹ Throughout the 1830s the two main factions, the Chatzedes and the Saltaioi, both mostly representing the commercial and landed elites of the town, were rotating in office, and, despite their antagonism, there was considerable stability in the local political scene. Yet the promulgation of the *hatt-ı şerif* in 1839 and the reform of local and provincial government in 1840 – which instituted new rules of the political game, including a new way of electing the members of the local

toman official taxonomies. Only when I refer to subjective perceptions of identity in relation to place-names do I use Greek terms.

- 20 I am using this term to refer to the sharing of power between Muslim officials and Christian notables, who functioned as intermediaries, particularly at the level of localities. On the networks of power that involved Christians at the multiple levels of Ottoman governance, see C. M. Philliou, *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution* (Berkeley 2011). The period that starts with the proclamation of the Tanzimat (1839) and concludes with the voting of the General Regulations of the *Rum milleti* (1861-1862) was described by an important nineteenth-century ecclesiastic figure, the Ecumenical Patriarch Ioakeim III, in his Memorandum (*Hypomnema*) as “an epoch of comfort” (*aneseos epoche*), characterised by the predominance of the “faithful *reaya* status” (*pisto ragialiki*) and “reasonable” (*lelogismene*) lay involvement in the administration of the Patriarchate. On Ioakeim's Memorandum, see S. Ziogou-Karastergiou, 'Eisagoge' [Introduction], in Eadem (ed.), *To Oikoumeniko Patriarcheio, he othomanike dioikese kai he ekpaideuse tou genous: keimena – pages, 1830-1914* [The Ecumenical Patriarchate, Ottoman administration, and the education of the race: texts – sources, 1830-1914] (Salonica and Athens 1998), 23-44. Another influential commentator, Manouel Gedeon, in his 'Kanonismon apopeirai' [Attempts to institute regulations], *Ekklesiastike Aletheia*, 43 (1919), 215, from a different perspective, speaks about an “era of abuses” (*epoche katachreseon*), and castigates the “pillage of the communal finances” (*lelasiakoinon*).
- 21 The 'communal debt' was arranged between the Christian notables (primarily big landowners and moneylenders) and holders of municipal power and the Porte, and equalled the monetary sum in exchange for which they were given repossession of their confiscated landed properties. On earlier instances of factional strife in Ayvalık between the major kinship groups on educational and ideological matters in the decades preceding the Greek Revolution, see I. N. Karablias, *Historia ton Kydonion* [History of Kydonies], Vol. A (Athens 1949), 140-146. Particularly on the 1817 and 1819 crises, see G. Sakkares, *Historia ton Kydonion* [History of Kydonies] (Athens 1920), 92-100 and K. Lappas and R. Stamoule (eds), *Konstantinos Oikonomos ho ex Oikonomon: allelographia* [Konstantinos Oikonomos of the Oikonomoi: correspondence], Vol. 2 (Athens 2002), 69-73, 275-280, 339-343, 458-463. Despite their interested nature and the often biased and distorted view of actual events, 'local histories' have been valuable historical sources in the reconstruction of the Ayvalık tax revolt, particularly after they have been correlated to archival materials and placed in the wider context of academic historiography. On an assessment of the local historiography of Ayvalık, see I. Petropoulou, 'Gyro apo ten historiographia ton Kydonion' [On the historiography of Kydonies], *Deltion Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon*, 3 (1982), 231-241.

council (*meclis*) – upset the structures of brokerage, and gave rise to successive breaks with the regime of dual governance.²²

The first move was made by the Saltaioi faction, whose political position was strengthened because its key figure, Bishop Anthimos Koutalianos,²³ was well connected with the upper echelons of the Tanzimat bureaucracy and belonged to the network of Stratford Canning, the British Ambassador in Istanbul. The Saltaioi, and particularly Panages Ioannides, a relative and local representative (*vekil*) of Anthimos, brought the administration of the huge communal debt to the centre of local politics by raising the issue of the ‘accounts’: they demanded the exact calculation of the tax burden by a special committee and ways of dealing with it. Their move was initially successful and on those grounds they took the control of the local council from the traditionalists, the Chatzedes. Yet this was a temporary victory. Their failure to pursue the checking of the ‘accounts’ and strong criticism from within brought a new player into the game, the ‘party of the poor or *laos* (people)’, an alliance of small *oikokyraioi* (householders) and merchants (some claiming Hellenic protection) who had strong links with the large community of exiled Kydonians in the Hellenic town of Hermoupolis on the island of Syros. The newcomers won control of the council both in 1841 and 1842 in conditions of bitter conflict against the alliance of the two historic factions, who used a wide range of means in order to remove them from power. The conflict eventually escalated into a revolt of the local population against the local authorities in April 1842,²⁴ and the eventual imprisonment of the leaders of the ‘party of the people’ in the infamous *baigne/bagno*, the prison of the imperial

22 On the reform of local government in 1840, see C. V. Findley, ‘The Evolution of the System of Provincial Administration as Viewed from the Center’, in D. Kushner (ed.), *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period: Political, Social and Economic Transformation* (Jerusalem 1986), 3-29; İ. Ortaylı, ‘From the Ottoman Experiment in Local Government to the First Constitutional Parliament of 1876-77’, in Idem, *Studies on Ottoman Transformation* (Istanbul 1994), 109-115; S. Shaw, ‘Local Administration in the Tanzimat’, in H. D. Yıldız (ed.), *150. Yılında Tanzimat* (Ankara 1992), 33-49.

23 Anthimos Koutalianos, who later became Patriarch Anthimos VI, was a key player in the central political scene of the Ottoman Empire for almost four decades. At the time of the crisis he was one of the powerful *gerontes*, holders of the Patriarchal seal, while his diocese was one of the biggest in size and richest in revenues. On the role of Anthimos VI in the complex scene of *millet* politics, see D. Stamatopoulos, *Metarrythmise kai ekkosmikeuse: pros mia historia tou Oikoumenikou Patriarcheiu ton 19o aiona* [Reform and secularisation: towards a history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the nineteenth century] (Athens 2003).

24 The revolt followed the initial arrest of members of the newly elected local council by the Ottoman authorities, and involved clashes between the Christian inhabitants of the town and military forces. Few casualties were reported. Although the local leaders were set free, the town officials, in co-ordination with Bishop Anthimos and his followers, asked for reinforcements from the capital, thus leading to the flight of hundreds of inhabitants to the islands, to the expulsion by the authorities – acting in co-ordination with the Greek vice-consul – of a few among the many Hellenic subjects who were involved in the clashes, and to the arrest of nine councillors who belonged to the ‘party of the people’ and were eventually sentenced to 5-7 years imprisonment.

arsenal in Istanbul. Anthimos thus eventually reaffirmed his authority and consolidated his control of local governance.

Collective or individual petitions together with letters to the press were extensively employed by the competing parties during the conflict over the ‘accounts’.²⁵ In fact, they were the most marked feature of this set of events. Of the many petitions employed in the Ayvalık conflict from 1840 to 1843, I have studied twenty, ten of which were addressed to the Sultan or the *Kapudan Paşa* (Admiral),²⁶ one to the Patriarch, and nine to the King of the Hellenes, the Hellenic Secretaries of Foreign or Domestic Affairs, or Hellenic consular authorities.²⁷ Most of these documents are to be found in the *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* and the Archives of the Patriarchate in Istanbul, and the Archive of the Hellenic Foreign Ministry in Athens, respectively (see Appendix – Table I). I also studied a large number of letters and reports by locals, which were published mostly in newspapers of Hermoupolis and Athens and secondarily Izmir.

In this paper I want to consider the reconfigurations brought about by these events and the role played by the petitions in facilitating these reconfigurations. The use primarily of petitions and letters will be analysed in three phases: before, during and after the crisis. I will also discuss how, as the conflict developed, the mode of politically conducting and communicating the conflict shifted from bureaucratic to journalistic and the main context of the confrontation moved from the Ottoman Empire to the Hellenic Kingdom.

I will consider these issues through giving greater attention to the middle and later phases of the crisis and focusing on a single example, a hybrid form of petition that was published as a book immediately after the revolt. Undoubtedly a highly idiosyncratic text, this document, which resists easy classification, provides the opportunity of understanding the multiple transformations that were taking place in the political practices of the Christian subjects of the Empire and their subsequent extrapolation in the Ottoman political imagination at this early phase of the Tanzimat.

*The Use of Petitions and Letters during the Ayvalık Crisis (1840-1843):
The Shift from the Bureaucratic to the Journalistic Mode of Petitioning*

Petitioning in the Ottoman and Hellenic societies of the 1830s exhibited contrasting characteristics that reflected the distinct jural orders of the two states and the differential development of print culture as well as the uneven spread of notions of the ‘public’ and ‘public culture’ in the two contexts. In the Ottoman context the dominance of a ‘commu-

25 In moments of conflict and crisis the use of petitions eventually intensified. This is definitely what happened during the Ayvalık conflict over the ‘accounts’.

26 For example, see BOA, HH 2270.

27 For example, see the two letters that Apostolos Giannares sent to the King on 2 January 1843 (AYE [= Archive of the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs], 1843, 39/12-I/4), and on 19 April 1843 (AYE, 1843, 39/12-II/6), or the letter against the vice-consul Spyridon Semeriotis sent by a number of Hellenic subjects to the Secretary of Domestic Affairs on 2 June 1842 (AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/1).

nitarian structure', built around religion and the state, left little room for intermediate institutions such as secular law, and severely limited the development of 'civil society'.²⁸ The Ottoman patrimonial state seemed not to be a suitable environment for the spread of print culture. The latter had not yet pervaded the social and political life of the Empire, with the exception of the commercial enclaves of major port towns, such as Izmir, where newspapers and professional associations provided the core of an emergent public.²⁹ Under such conditions, petitioning went on being a principal means of delivering eponymous political messages and doing politics 'from below', while its conduct was primarily a bureaucratic affair dominated, particularly in the case of individual petitions, by norms of secrecy.

On the other side of the Aegean during the same period, the Hellenic Kingdom was developing a public that drew much of its vitality from the spread of the ideas of the Enlightenment among the educated elites and the expansion of print culture from the end of the eighteenth century onwards. The young Hellenic state was modernist in form, and its institutions – jural, political, educational, etc. – were ideologically informed by liberal ideas that favoured the expression and dialogic confrontation of opinion in public, particularly through the press. The Hellenic 'public' (*koinon*) was structured around a multiplicity of newspapers which, despite occasional censorship, debated issues of local or national significance from different political angles.³⁰

This definitely affected petitioning in a number of ways. *Anaphores* (petitions) were not the only nor the principal way of articulating interests 'from below', but they were

28 Ş. Mardin, *Religion, Society, and Modernity in Turkey* (Syracuse, NY 2006). But see Anastopoulos's critical comments in this volume.

29 See R. Kasaba, 'Economic Foundations of a Civil Society: Greeks in the Trade of Western Anatolia, 1840-1876', in D. Gondicas and C. Issawi (eds), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy, and Society in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton 1999), 77-87. The influence of the press was small and varied according to ethno-religious group, context (urban/rural), and other factors. Newspapers in the Greek language, though very limited in number, constituted a dynamic ingredient of the Ottoman press in the major port towns, such as Izmir. They often applied a strategy of closing and re-appearing under a new name in order to overcome the obstacles of strict censorship and limited means. For a good example of journalistic strategies against censorship see the case of the 'Erigenia' (1840-1841) of Spyridon Avlonites. In July 1841 it merged with 'Ethnike', which was closed down by censorship a few months later, only to re-emerge as 'Elpis'; C. S. Solomonides, *He demosiographia ste Smyrne (1821-1922)* [Journalism in Smyrna (1821-1922)] (Athens 1959). On the turcophone Ottoman press, see O. Koloğlu, 'The Printing Press and Journalism in the Ottoman State', *Boğaziçi Journal*, 18 (2004) [special issue: *Media Issues for Turkey*], 27-33.

30 The Hellenic newspapers were hierarchically distinguished by place of publishing (capital/periphery), and then readership, type of information provided (political, commercial, literary, etc.), factional affiliation (particularly in relation to the three main 'parties': the 'English', the 'French', and the 'Russian'), and level of political significance. Among the Athenian newspapers, 'Athena' and 'Aion', as opinion leaders, analysed matters of central political significance, such as state policies, in their international relevance. On the Hellenic press of that era, see A. Koumariou, *Historia tou hellenikou typou, 18^{os}-19^{os} ai.* [A history of the Hellenic press: eighteenth-nineteenth centuries] (Athens 2010).

part of a wide range of more or less formal means – including letters to the press, lawsuits (*egkleseis*), etc. – for the pursuit of individual or collective concerns. Also, in the Hellenic context, the press provided an outlet for the public expression of petitioning. In the early 1840s there was already a tradition of publishing petitions – side by side with letters – in newspapers. The press turned petitions into an instrument for shaping the opinion of the public and more generally into a vehicle of high-order politics. Thus, through the publication of the petitions the better integration of lower and higher levels of the political process was achieved.

The Ottoman Context: Arzuhal and Dual Governance in the Early Tanzimat

The Christian Greek-speaking subjects of the Empire had long experience in collective petitioning. As a process, this involved a set of moves.³¹ A petition was usually drafted in the administrative context of the ‘community’ (*koinon*) by its educated officials or other literati and was validated by the seal of the *koinon*.³² Money was collected by the well-to-do in order to support the journey of the appointed delegates (*vekil*) to the capital to deliver the petition either to the Patriarchate, the officials of the Porte, or the Sultan himself. It was also used for bribes that were needed to secure a meeting with higher authorities and deliver by hand the important document.

Most significant, the drafting of a collective petition included the collection of a number of signatures: the greater the number of the signatories the wider the political impact of the move.³³ In ordinary conditions the collection of signatures was easy enough, since it relied on the efficient mobilisation of the local elite. Yet, in conditions of internal strife and competitive antagonism for communal influence, the mobilisation of human resources in favour of factional moves was much more complicated and its outcome was often contested by the adversaries.³⁴ On the other hand, the collection of signatures estab-

31 Documents registered in the Codex of the Diocese of Mytilene describe the main steps in the process of petitioning as this was conducted in the early 1840s.

32 In the case of Ayvalık, each faction had its literati who specialised in the drafting of petitions. Among the Saltaioi this role was played by Nikolaos Salteles and Demetrios Amanites; see Anonymous, *Ta Kydoniaka e hoi neoi ton Kydonion triakonta tyrannoi* [Kydonian affairs or the new thirty tyrants of Kydonies] (Malta 1842), ie-ith (= xv-xix). Stavrakas Anagnostou, secretary of the council of 1841, and Apostolos Giannares, one of the most active Hellenes of Ayvalık, were most probably responsible for the drafting of petitions on behalf of the ‘party of the people’.

33 In fact, as Van Voss rightly points out, “the meeting in which a petition was debated was an exercise in politics, as was the soliciting of signatures”; Van Voss, ‘Introduction’, 3.

34 See, for example, the public questioning of the authenticity of signatures and of the methods that were applied in their collection. In a report from Ayvalık published in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 68, 2 July 1842 (also see ‘Anexartetos’, No. 7, 9 August 1842), the anonymous author castigates the collection by Salteles of schoolchildren’s signatures (signing on behalf of their relatives) using “73 types of ink”. In another, signed, letter, published in ‘Anexartetos’, No. 39, 18 March 1843, Semeriotos was accused of forging signatures in a petition in his defence. The author of *Ta Kydoniaka*, 118-119, accuses Bishop Anthimos of collecting signatures

lished the factions on firmer ground, along kinship, economic, or ideological lines, since it amounted to the explicit and formal (because it was written) individual declaration of support.³⁵ Also it further added an ingredient of representation: those who drafted the document and collected the signatures as well as those who managed its delivery to the higher authorities in the capital emerged as representatives of the wider group of signatories.

Recourse to higher orders of the Ottoman bureaucracy required therefore access to interpersonal networks and top officials who mediated. In this sense, petitioning was an integral aspect of dual governance. In the Ayvalık case, the structures of the Patriarchate provided a valuable channel in the early stages of the conflict, yet this was quickly superseded, as the religious leadership became deeply involved in it. It seems that each faction preferred to address its petitions to officials with whom they had a certain affinity as part of the strategy to forge, consolidate, or exploit (existing) linkages (Appendix – Table I). The Saltaioi faction had a relative advantage because of its easy access to higher ranks of the Ottoman bureaucracy through the participation of its leader, Bishop Anthimos, in the network of the men of the Tanzimat. At the climax of its confrontation with the ‘people’, it preferentially addressed its petitions to the *Kapudan Paşa* (and secondarily to the Sultan). It further employed the services of the local governor, Mustafa Bey. The ‘party of the people’, on the other hand, had more limited options since it was alienated from the Tanzimat circles, yet it probably achieved some access during the re-arrangements in the Ottoman government in the summer of 1842.

To turn to the forms and structure of petitioning, in bureaucratic terms, petitions to officials of the Porte or the Sultan himself were classified in various categories: *arz* – a formal individual petition or application by an official to a higher authority; *arz-ı hall/ arzuhal* – a private petition by a *reaya* or an *askeri*; and *mahzar* – a collective *arzuhal*.³⁶ In the 1830s, the content of the Ayvalık petitions was highly formalised in a submissive style,³⁷ and structured around the concepts of *pisto ragialiki* (being loyal *reaya*) and *ragiadikos karakteras* (*reaya* character) through which the petition functioned as a statement of submission to sultanic rule. The petitions also employed standard linguistic motifs that acknowledged the absolute power of the Ottoman state (*krataion kai hypselon devleti*), or the personal qualities of the Sultan, such as his mercy and his interest in the

by the use of violence. On the other side, the Greek Ambassador in Istanbul, Alexandros Mavrogordatos, in a letter, dated 13 April 1843, to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Iakovos Rizos Neroulos, argues that the signatures on the basis of which Giannares acted as *epitropos* were forged; AYE, 1843, 39/12-II/4.

35 Zaret argues that the published petition provided a novel opportunity for the making of an association of private individuals, i.e., a ‘party’, as distinct from the natural community; Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture*, 15.

36 On the bureaucratic handling of petitions in the Ottoman context, see Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy*, 246-280, 281-306. Also Gara, ‘Popular Protest’. On the differences between the various Ottoman bureaucratic categories of petition, see M. S. Küttükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili (Diplomatik)* (Istanbul 1998), 217-220, 303-315, 315-321.

37 On the rhetorical devices employed by petitions as cultural forms that have constitutive function, see Davis, *Fiction in the Archives*.

well-being of his subjects (*Ho megaleiotatos kai eusplachnikotatos hemon Anax*). *Time* (honour) – regarded as ‘sacred’ – and *to dikaion* (just cause) were the main values that marked collective petitioning, particularly before 1839 (Appendix – Petition 1).

The Christians of Ayvalık had long experience in the use of petitions as a means of pursuing demands. Till the beginning of the Tanzimat the petitions that were drafted by inhabitants of Ayvalık had a somewhat standard content: they contained grievances against the local governor or asked for his replacement.³⁸ So, in a way, they worked across ethno-religious lines. Yet, when the issue of the ‘accounts’ became the focal point in local politics and, particularly, from the moment that the ‘party of the people’ took control of the local communal council in spring 1841, the content of the petitions changed. As they turned into major weapons of antagonism within the ‘community’, they became more grounded in local micro-politics.³⁹ The first petition asking for the inspection of the ‘accounts’ by the church authorities was sent by the Saltaioi to the Patriarchate in 1840.⁴⁰ The existing evidence suggests that, once in office, the ‘party of the people’ intensified the use of petitions in order to challenge the traditional structures of dual governance and the control that the local bishop and his allies had over local affairs. In a shift of strategy they abandoned the effort to settle the issue of the ‘accounts’ either locally, through the elected *logistes* (accountants), or at the level of the Patriarchate, and turned to the Porte. In the summer of 1841 they asked the Porte to appoint an external official to inspect the ‘accounts’, a move that a couple of months later was followed by two petitions, one, signed by 206 inhabitants, asking again for the local inspection of the ‘accounts’ by the central authorities (Appendix – Petition 2),⁴¹ and another, signed by 76 inhabitants, asking for the withdrawal of foreign consular protection from the old managers of communal finances.⁴² A few weeks later their opponents reacted by the same means: in a petition sent to the *Kapudan Paşa* and signed by eight representatives of the “other party” they explicitly described the election of the new council as a “rebellion” (*ihtilâl*) and asked the authorities to suppress it and appoint a new council (Appendix – Petition 3).

These bureaucratic moves were partially successful but in ways that were not anticipated by the petitioners. No doubt they definitely managed to turn the attention of the

38 See, for example, the collective petition of 30 Kydonians asking in Greek for the replacement of their *voyvoda*; BOA, HH 26196 (Appendix – Petition 1).

39 For the sequence of the petitions that were submitted in the course of the crisis over the ‘accounts’ see Appendix – Table I.

40 Ecumenical Patriarchate Archives, Patriarchal Correspondence, Codex K, 287, 8 June 1841.

41 The ‘inspection (*theoresis*) of the accounts’ was a widespread motif in the political scene of the Patriarchate during this period and was linked to moves against financial abuses and lay attempts to control the patriarchal structures of governance. For example, on 21 March 1843, the accounts of the Patriarchate were inspected by a ‘big assembly’ that consisted of both lay and clerical members; Gedeon, *Kanonismon apo peirai*, 216. Also see Idem, *Historia ton tou Christou peneton* [A history of Christ’s paupers] (Athens 1939), 166-167.

42 Also, sometime in 1841, another petition by 65 inhabitants asked for the administrative transfer of Ayvalık from the *sancak* of Biga to that of Balıkesir.

Porte to Ayvalık. As a matter of domestic significance, the crisis was discussed at the highest level in the *Meclis-i Muhasebe-i Maliye* and then in the *Meclis-i Has*, where the direct intervention of the central authorities was decided upon.⁴³ As a result, a special envoy, Hüseyin Bey, in charge of a military force, was sent to the town. His mission was to inspect the tax registers in consultation with the two parties. The intervention of the central authorities, the investigation that was carried out in Istanbul, and other bureaucratic moves did not manage to bring peace to Ayvalık.⁴⁴ Soon the re-election of the ‘party of the people’ to the local council led to confrontation with the opposing faction. The conflict reached its climax with the violent events in spring 1842.⁴⁵

The Hellenic Context: Petitioning and the Dynamic of Print Culture before the September Revolution

The violent suppression of the revolt brought the issue of the ‘accounts’ to a conclusion. This was a serious setback for the council of 1842 and its followers. The arrest of their *vekils*, which was ordered by a special meeting of the *Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliye* attended also by the Bishop and representatives from the two ‘parties’ in the summer of 1842, suggested the failure of their strategy of bringing the issue to the attention of the Porte.⁴⁶ The mission of Tevfik Bey, a higher official of the *Meclis-i Vâlâ* specialising in the management of crises, in Ayvalık was eventually successful. The restoration of the *ancien régime* and the recapturing of the structures of dual governance by Anthimos and his allies left no room for the continuation of the local debate on the communal debt. References to the issue faded away. A few months after the revolt, a large group of Kydonians stated in a *sened* (promissory note) that they humbly recognised their mistakes (*gnorisantes ede ta sphalmata mas, kai elthontes eis heautous*) and that thereafter they would refrain from “meaningless passions” (*anoeta pathe*) and lead a “peaceful life” (*zoen eireniken*).⁴⁷ The jailed Kydonians, in their turn, made a petition in which they “promised” to keep quiet, and asked for pardon.⁴⁸ In the autumn of 1842 they were eventually released from jail.

Yet, the conflict continued: it was reshaped around a new agenda on nationality. The new focus of factional conflict, nationality, was born out of the previous one through a debate concerning consular protection. This was a sensitive issue. Initially consular protection was a historical ingredient of economic strategies, particularly popular among

43 See the set of documents in BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2270, 2370, 3282.

44 *Ta Kydoniaka*, 75-76.

45 The first years of the Tanzimat were marked by numerous similar incidents of unrest in various regions of the Empire. On this issue, besides the classic paper of H. İnalcık, ‘Application of the Tanzimat and its Social Effects’, *ArchOtt*, 5 (1973), 97-128, see, for example, the documents quoted by A. Uzun, *Tanzimat ve Sosyal Direnişler: Niş İsyanı Üzerine Ayrıntılı Bir İnceleme (1841)* (Istanbul 2002).

46 BOA, İrade MV 806.

47 BOA, İrade MV 916/1.

48 BOA, İrade MV 916/3.

Christian merchants who exploited the regime of the Capitulations against their Muslim competitors in order to dominate international trade as intermediaries. *Berat*-holders, the so-called *beratofermanlides*, were to be found in both camps of the conflict, and some of them were particularly able in applying shifting strategies and moving between alternative state protections through buying *berats* in the market.⁴⁹ Yet, in the conjuncture of the 1830s, protection was invested with new meanings. For example, the Greek Revolution added a new category of local veterans (*agonistes*) who held Hellenic travel documents and on these grounds demanded exemption from taxation (particularly from the *charatzil/cizye*), while retaining their rights to landed property (and even political representation). Also, during this period, the competition between an emerging category of Ottoman merchants specialising in local markets (rather than exports) and *berat*-holders intensified.⁵⁰ As an effect of these changes, the issue started being sporadically mentioned in mutual accusations before the authorities by both parties to the conflict. It also took on political overtones because of the ferocity with which Bishop Anthimos applied state policy to discipline Christians of ambiguous nationality by subjecting them to the *cizye* and imposing upon them the *reaya* status. However, the accusations against the vice-consul for failing to protect the Hellenes in Kydonies made the difference: they upgraded the issue of economic protection, politicised it, and transformed it into an issue of political nationality.

The decisive factors for this re-orientation were both internal and external to the locality. The persecution against the *reaya* and Hellenic subjects – merchants, captains, professionals – that followed the suppression of the revolt took multiple forms and did not allow for tactical manoeuvres in the Ottoman context. Thus, people associated with the defeated party shifted the terrain of conflict outside the Ottoman and into the Hellenic context. The main protagonists in this re-orientation were Hellenic subjects residing in Ayvalık who, through the use of petitions and letters, for the first time drew public attention to the involvement of the vice-consul on the side of the *Saltaioi* faction and to serious failures in the exercise of his duties.⁵¹ Their move in this new context found important backing

49 In the region of Izmir “the granting of indiscriminate protection was prevalent among the representatives of lesser powers, such as Greece”. See R. Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century* (Albany 1988), 71. On the trade of *berats* and foreign passports, also see E. Frangakis-Syrett, ‘The Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on Izmir’s Trade: European and Minority Merchants’, *NPT*, 7 (1992), 91-112.

50 See D. Quataert, ‘The Age of Reforms, 1812-1914’, in H. İnalcık with D. Quataert (eds), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914* (Cambridge 1994), 837-841.

51 There is no evidence of criticism against the vice-consul Semeriotēs in the Archive of the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or the newspapers before the summer of 1842. The first published reference to his complicity in “the persecution of Hellenic subjects” was made in an important letter by ‘K.’ in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 67, 19 June 1842, a couple of weeks after the collective petition to King Otto raised the issue of protection. A letter by ‘X.’, written on 15 June, and published much later, on 30 August 1842, in ‘Anexartetos’, No. 10, had a similar emphasis. Most probably these moves were co-ordinated.

among the Kydonians of the diaspora and sections of the Hellenic public who sympathised with the 'French' and 'Russian' parties.⁵² Yet, it also set in motion a dynamic that took the Ayvalık crisis far beyond its local scope. This was the dynamic of print culture.

As we have seen, petitioning initially followed the traditional channels and was restricted to the Ottoman context. Only after the violent confrontation and the arrest of the leaders of the 'party of the people' in April 1842, did the persecuted Kydonians and other Hellenic subjects living in Ayvalık take the matter to the comparatively thriving public sphere of the young kingdom. There, despite censorship, the expression of grievances followed more the journalistic than the bureaucratic path.⁵³ Side by side with formal petitioning through bureaucratic channels, letters to the press were a very popular and more flexible means of pursuing demands vis-à-vis officials and the state. In this regard, journalistic epistolography fused the expression of grievance with the public articulation of opinion on matters of general interest.⁵⁴ Therefore, the shift in the state context of reference transposed petitioning from the bureaucratic to the journalistic mode and affected both its content and its function.

The forms that this change took are to a degree suggestive of the wider transformations that were underway and in this regard deserve close attention. The first petition related to the Ayvalık crisis was addressed to the Secretary of Domestic Affairs of the Hellenic Kingdom just one month after the revolt, in June 1842. It was a collective petition signed by 22 Hellenic subjects residing in Ayvalık and remained unpublished (Appendix – Petition 4). One month later, a 'petition' addressed to the Sultan in book form (entitled *Ta Kydoniaka*) was published allegedly outside the Empire. I will come back to this important document, which provided a broad overview of the issue of the 'accounts', while it targeted the Hellenic vice-consul. Finally, in November 1842, the first individual petition in connection with the events of Ayvalık was published in the Athenian press: it was addressed to the King of the Hellenes by Anastasios Andronikos, a Hellenic merchant who was arrested in Ayvalık and prosecuted in Syros by the Hellenic vice-consul. It is important to consider these shifts and their connection to letter-writing more closely and place them in the wider context of publishing on the Ayvalık crisis.

Throughout the period of the crisis in Ayvalık, from the late 1830s till the middle 1840s, the issue of the 'accounts' in Ayvalık was discussed among the Greek-speaking public across the Aegean, primarily in the press of Hermoupolis ('Ephemeris ton aggelion', 'Hermes') and Izmir ('Amaltheia', 'Aster tes Anatoles'), but also of Athens

52 They were called so because of their pro-French and pro-Russian leanings, respectively.

53 Also, as noted above, the juridical order of the Kingdom provided an alternative, more formal, outlet for the expression of discontent between individuals, an outlet regulated by a modern penal code. On the introduction of modern penal justice in the Hellenic Kingdom, see M. Mavres, 'To systema aponomes tes poinikes dikaiosynes sten Hellada ton 19° aiona' [The system of penal justice in Greece in the nineteenth century], *Ta Historika*, 26 (1997), 53-76.

54 It was also quite common to publish letters addressed to high officials including the King. Despite their formal structure, letters had a greater flexibility than petitions: they relied on ideological motifs that were fashionable at the time, and were often co-ordinated with the general ideological climate.

(‘Anexartetos’, ‘Athena’, ‘Hellenikos parateretes’, ‘Zephyros’, ‘Philos tou laou’, ‘Tachypteros pHEME’). Information concerning Ayvalık and particularly the issue of the ‘accounts’ was regularly published in various forms that seem to constitute a continuum: reports by journalists or by locals, editorial notes, individual or collective letters sent by people who were involved in the conflict and used either their surnames or pseudonyms, and, last but not least, individual and collective petitions. As the close study of the surviving materials shows,⁵⁵ the use of these alternative forms was ordered in time. Therefore, the temporal sequence of moves with letters and petitions, particularly during the summer of 1842, is rather suggestive of the dynamics that shifted the conduct of the conflict in the direction of the ‘public’. It unravels a chain of events that make a dense fabric of interactions steadily surface at the macro level in an open debate over matters of wider significance such as nationality and Hellenic-Ottoman relations.

Before April 1842, it was mainly journalistic reports – often in the form of anonymous letters by locals – and occasional editorial statements which were published almost exclusively in the press of the major peripheral port towns of Izmir and Hermoupolis. These journalistic materials not only publicised developments in Ayvalık, particularly in relation to the issue of the ‘accounts’, but also loosely integrated these events into a wider taxonomic order – an order produced by literati, such as the ‘doctor of the poor’ and journalist Panagiotes Zontanos in Hermoupolis, or the merchant and poet Nikolaos Salteles in Ayvalık.

The Hellenic newspapers which more energetically reported on Ayvalık, i.e., ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’⁵⁶ and ‘Anexartetos’, were part of a network of newspapers⁵⁷ which were sympathetic to the perspective of the *agonistes* (‘fighters’, i.e., veterans of the ‘Struggle for Independence’, the Greek Revolution), and often relied on an embracive (mostly French-born) liberalism and radicalism. ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ was close to the large community of exiled Kydonians in Hermoupolis and did not hide its sympathy for the ‘French’ party. ‘Anexartetos’, an Athenian newspaper directed by Panteles Panteles, owner of a printing house in Hermoupolis in the late 1830s, was published in 1841 and in the course of subsequent years played a key role in pursuing the ‘agonistic’ perspective against Alexandros Mavrogordatos, the Greek Ambassador in Istanbul, and the

55 We have continuous series of most of the Hellenic newspapers of this period. On the other hand, most issues of the newspapers of Izmir (and, most important, ‘Amaltheia’) are missing. The content of their reporting on Ayvalık or Hellenic-Ottoman affairs can be inferred indirectly through its reproduction in the Hellenic press.

56 The newspapers of Syros, particularly ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, were initially close to the *Saltaioi*, yet gradually shifted in favour of the ‘party of the people’. This change of perspective is probably related to disillusionment with the Ottoman reforms. For example, in an editorial note of ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 66, 6 June 1842, its editor interpreted the revolt in Ayvalık as an index of Tanzimat’s failure. This attitude contrasted with the earlier very positive stance of the newspaper towards the Tanzimat; ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 2, 17 July 1840.

57 This included ‘Radamanthys’, which explicitly supported the Cretan Revolution, and stressed its ideological affinity with ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ and ‘Zephyros’. See the attack against this network by ‘Aster tes Anatoles’, No. 11, 25 December 1841.

neo-Phanariot networks.⁵⁸ The experience of the ‘Struggle for Independence’ and particularly the notion of *agonistis* (singular of ‘agonistes’) was the thread that united the formation of the Hellenic Kingdom with the persecutions and sufferings of Christians in western Anatolia at the hands of the *kocabaşıs* (Gr. ‘kotsabasedes’) under Ottoman rule. These newspapers opposed the ‘system of European interests’, which demanded the submission of Anatolian Christians to Ottoman rule. In the name of ‘Hellenic rights’, they were critical of Ottoman reforms and battled against the network of newspapers which, in accordance with Mavrogordatos’s strategy, promoted the above ‘system of European interests’, and the policies of the ‘English’ party.

On the Ottoman side of the Aegean, Greek newspapers either sided with those who defended the project of dual governance, as in the case of ‘Amaltheia’, which was sympathetic to the Saltaioi, or were apologists for Ottoman policies and attacked the militant press of the Kingdom, as in the case of ‘Aster tes Anatoles’. As Ottoman censorship deprived them of any available space for views that were interpreted as pro-Hellenic, journalistic opinion became increasingly segregated across state contexts. However, it should be noted that before 1842 factional conflict was primarily conducted by bureaucratic means in the corridors of the Ottoman government.

During the next phase, from the days of the revolt till the publication of the first petition in the Hellenic press (in November 1842), journalistic coverage of the crisis expanded in size and changed in form. The violence of factional strife was followed by a war of letters. The number of letters, particularly in the local press of Izmir and Hermoupolis, increased and their tone became aggressive. Reporting was clearly overtaken by letters written by eponymous or anonymous individuals who explicitly argued across lines that drew upon but also re-invented the wider ideological currents that pervaded journalistic debate. Most probably a number of the protagonists, from both camps, in this journalistic warfare were among the petitioners to the Porte: when it is not explicitly clear, this is implicitly suggested by certain stylistic affinities between published materials and petitions, structure and content of argument, and secondary evidence.⁵⁹ Through this publishing activity the Ayvalık crisis and its protagonists achieved considerable visibility.

The single most important aspect of the Ayvalık crisis that emerged was the inadequate protection offered by the Hellenic consular authority in Ayvalık. The vice-consul, Spyridon Semeriotis, was attacked in a barrage of individual letters in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ (anonymously, using pseudonyms such as ‘K.’, or eponymously signed, for example, by S. Antoniadis), in ‘Anexartetos’ (by ‘X.’), or in ‘Zephyros’ (anonymously) for failing to defend the Hellenic subjects of Ayvalık and for selectively protecting his

58 ‘Hermes – Ephemeris tes Syrou’ was also printed at the printing-house of Panteles Panteles. In early 1843, Zontanos shifted his journalistic activity from ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ to ‘Hermes’. These connections probably explain its special interest in the affairs of Ayvalık. ‘Anexartetos’ was heavily involved in the factional strife against Mavrogordatos’s consular network in western Anatolia.

59 This identification of petitioners with letter-writers is explicitly acknowledged in a letter signed by “the Hellenes of Ayvalık” published in ‘Anexartetos’ on 23 August 1842.

friends and co-operating with the Ottoman authorities.⁶⁰ Greek merchants, such as Anastasios Andronikos and Apostolos Giannares, also eponymously accused Semeriotēs of conspiring with his allies in the Saltaiōi faction against them and harming their businesses.⁶¹ Letters in ‘Amaltheia’, on the other hand, defended Semeriotēs. Soon after, the first collective letter from “refugees” from Ayvalık, published in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’,⁶² and a second one by the “Hellenic subjects of Kydonies” in ‘Anexartetos’⁶³ added a strong grassroots component to the critique against Semeriotēs, while the ideological framework of the debate expanded to include powerful motifs such as the record of *agonistis*⁶⁴ that a number of those persecuted held, the practice of *charatzoma* (the forceful imposition of *ciẏye*), or the ‘commercial convention’ which was negotiated by the Ottoman and Hellenic governments.

During the summer of 1842, the journalistic discourse on the Ayvalık affair was clearly emerging primarily ‘from below’. This had a decisive effect on the Athenian newspapers: in their editorial statements both ‘Zephyros’⁶⁵ and ‘Anexartetos’⁶⁶ added their voices to the press of Syros and acknowledged that under the growing popular pressure they had to support the case of the persecuted inhabitants of Ayvalık.⁶⁷ The sufferings of the Kydonians, side by side with the sufferings of the Samians, the Cretans, and other Greek-speaking Christians under Ottoman rule, were adopted as an icon of current political sensibilities.

Most important, the Athenian press, particularly the network of newspapers which opposed the realist strategy of the Anglophiles, moved the debate over Ayvalık to the higher level of foreign policy, thus achieving the mutual accommodation of their political agenda with the agenda of the protesting Kydonians. The issue of the ‘accounts’ was upgraded, as it was directly and explicitly linked to the criteria of choosing consuls and

60 At the same time, most letters went on attacking Bishop Anthimos and the core figures of the Saltaiōi faction, primarily Nikolaos Salteles, Chatzemales Salteles, Panages Ioannides, and Demetrios Amanites.

61 These moves were coupled with legal warfare. The initial prosecution against Andronikos and Giannares by the vice-consul in the courts of Hermoupolis led to a legal vendetta since it was followed by a sequence of suits against Semeriotēs in the Hellenic courts. Legal suits, however, remained secluded in the bureaucratic channel rather than being exposed to the public through the press. See AYE, 1843, 39/12-I/8.

62 ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 72, 25 July 1842.

63 ‘Anexartetos’, No. 13, 20 September 1842.

64 For example, the ‘persecutor’ Semeriotēs was denigrated for failing the ‘national character’ and lacking any record as an ‘agonistis’ in juxtaposition to his ‘victim’, who was known for his contribution in the Struggle for Independence; ‘Anexartetos’, No. 13, 20 September 1842, and No. 21, 14 November 1842; ‘Zephyros’, No. 117, 19 October 1842.

65 ‘Zephyros’, No. 113, 20 August 1842.

66 ‘Anexartetos’, No. 22, 21 November 1842.

67 As was stated by the editor of ‘Anexartetos’: “A wise advisor of a monarch used to say to him in such instances: ‘The crowd is always right’ (*Sophos tis symvoulos henos Monarchou elege pros auton eis toiautas periptoseis* “*Opou to plethos kai to Dikaion*”); ‘Anexartetos’, No. 39, 18 March 1843.

the nature of consular representation, as well as to the Commercial Treaty which was currently being negotiated by Mavrogordatos in Istanbul.⁶⁸ The press refashioned the ‘Kydoniaka’ (the Kydonian affair) into a matter of wider significance for the Hellenic public and into a ‘national’ issue.

To turn to petitioning, none of the petitions which were addressed to the Ottoman authorities in relation to the ‘accounts’ was ever published in the press. More generally, there is no evidence of the publication of petitions by the Ottoman press during this period.⁶⁹ The Hellenic press, on the other hand, became involved in the management of petitions only when the Hellenic subjects who became implicated in the Ayvalık revolt by Semeriotēs’s accusations and after being brought to Hellenic justice were finally acquitted turned against the vice-consul by various means, including petitions and lawsuits.

As we have seen, the first petition to the Secretary of Domestic Affairs in defence of the accused Hellenic subjects and against Semeriotēs by 22 Hellenic subjects who resided in Ayvalık also remained unpublished (Appendix – Petition 4). However, a whole sequence of collective or individual *anaphores* on the same issue that followed and were managed by two Greek merchants, Giannares and Andronikos, were published in November 1842 and in the course of the subsequent months in ‘Anexartetos’. The timing of their publication, and particularly the delay of five months since the drafting of the first collective petition, could be attributed to fears that the upgrading of the conflict in the Hellenic context might damage the efforts to liberate the imprisoned Kydonians. Yet, the time sequence of journalistic moves suggests another factor. The temporal coincidence of the publication of the first petition in ‘Anexartetos’ with the open declaration of the newspaper’s editor that it adopted the cause of the persecuted Hellenes shows that, once the newspaper established a position on the issue, it moved into publishing the petitions. The petitions were mobilised in support of the editorial policies, thus investing them with the authority of public voice as well as firmly grounding them on a formal bureaucratic basis.

The structure of mediation in the handling of collective petitions was rather complex and formally sanctioned. For example, the collective petition which was published in ‘Anexartetos’ in January 1843 was managed by a two-member committee of Hellenes of Ayvalık who settled in Athens in order to make local arrangements for the promotion of the cause of Ayvalık’s Hellenic subjects. The authority of the two *plerexousioi/epitropoi* (plenipotentiaries/agents) to represent was verified by a formal letter (*epitropi-*

68 The upgrading of the Ayvalık crisis was realised at a juncture that was marked by public debate over a new governmental circular (*egkyklios*) which regulated the functioning of the consulates, and by widespread criticism of various consuls for “failing the Hellenic character”. For example, see ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 75, 19 September 1842. Throughout 1842, influential Athenian newspapers, such as ‘Aion’ (No. 373, 9 August 1842, No. 382, 23 September 1842, and No. 387, 11 October 1842), which was close to the ‘Russian’ party, demanded the exclusion of non-Hellenic subjects from the post of consul.

69 The lack of primary sources constitutes a major obstacle and calls for great caution on the part of the researcher into the Greek press of the Ottoman Empire in the 1830s and 1840s. For instance, only a few issues of ‘Amaltheia’ have survived for this period in the Theological School of Chalki (mod. Heybeliada).

kon).⁷⁰ The publicisation of these arrangements empowered those involved to challenge the moves of their opponents through accusations of exploiting norms of secrecy in order to forge their respective petitions.

In terms of content, the *anaphores* were organised around a common structure: they highlighted through various examples the failure of the vice-consul to represent adequately the financial and political “interests” of the Hellenic subjects and protect them from the “persecutions” (*diogmoi*) of the Christian notables, while they also castigated his “treacherous” behaviour in siding with the Ottoman authorities, insulting their “Hellenic character”, and contributing to their subjection to the “yoke of the Turks”.⁷¹ In contrast with the Ottoman petitions, they adopted not a submissive but a militant style: national pride and “respect” for the King and his Ministers, together with faith in the supreme authority, but not submissive loyalty, were the marks of these petitions. The texts were inspired by the nationalist rhetoric that was so prominent in journalistic circles: in the name of Hellenic “rights” (*dikaionomata*) and “interests” (*sympheronta*) and Hellenic “dignity” (*axioprepeia*) and in accordance with “Hellenic Law”, they asked the King to intervene and defend the Hellenic subjects. In this sense, they could be regarded as an early expression of what was later dubbed ‘the nationality issue’,⁷² an issue that haunted Hellenic-Ottoman relations for the rest of the nineteenth century.

Petitioning in the Hellenic context worked in two ways. In the bureaucratic context, it turned the Ayvalık crisis into a major headache for Mavrogordatos and the officials in charge of Hellenic foreign policy. The pressing demands of the Anatolian Greek-speaking Christians on property, taxation, and consular protection were in conflict with strategic considerations of the Hellenic government, and complicated its position on the Eastern Question.⁷³ In this respect, petitioning on the issue of the ‘accounts’ added Ayvalık to the wider set of ‘dissident’ localities,⁷⁴ and made it part of the topos on which

70 The whole process of mediation was described in a letter published in ‘Anexartetos’, No. 39, 18 March 1843. Also see the formal document assigning the role of *plerexousios* to G. Ch. Athenelles and Giannares (AYE, 1844, 39/12-1/9).

71 It is during this period that a new category of classification of archival materials entitled ‘Persecutions of Greeks’ (*Diogmoi Hellenon*) was instituted in the Archive of the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

72 On the nationality issue, see S. Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia, 19^{os} ai.-1919, hoi hellenorthodoxes koinotetes: apo to milleti ton Romion sto helleniko ethnos* [Asia Minor, nineteenth century-1919, the Greek Orthodox communities: from the *Rum milleti* to the Hellenic nation] (Athens 1997). Also see H. Exertzoglou, ‘Shifting Boundaries: Language, Community and the “Non-Greek-Speaking Greeks”’, *Historein*, 1 (1999), 75-92.

73 The Secretary of Foreign Affairs sent Emmanouel Valles, a special envoy from the Hellenic consulate of Izmir, to make a local investigation and check the accuracy of the accusations against the Hellenic vice-consul. Some of the formal moves of the Hellenic government to re-establish state control over Hellenic citizens in Ayvalık resembled the bureaucratic course of action taken by the Ottoman government.

74 Places such as Crete or Samos (not to mention Kalymnos and others) were regarded as dissident in the Ottoman context, essentially because of their heavy involvement in the Greek Revolution.

the Hellenic-Ottoman relations and particularly the Commercial Convention between the two states were being debated and decided.

For the wider Greek public, the publishing of the *anaphores* in the Athenian press marked a transformation in the representation of the Ayvalık crisis. In conjunction with the wave of letters in the Athenian press, the published petitions upgraded as well as segregated the factional conflict. The sufferings of the Kydonians, together with the troubles of other Greek-speaking Christians of the Empire, received wider attention as a matter of state policy and national significance. As journalistic opinion became increasingly divided across state contexts, public opinion in the Hellenic Kingdom turned decisively in favour of the “persecuted Hellenes”, while the more vocal defenders of the Saltaioi and their Hellenic allies were restricted to the Ottoman Empire.

Ta Kydoniaka: *Hybridity and Reconfigurations in Petitioning*

The Hybrid Petition

The story so far narrated exhibits a linear progression towards increased politicisation, greater state supervision, and national over-determination. This sort of national evolutionism risks the danger of oversimplifying a very complicated scene. The moves on the ground and ‘from below’ regarding the Ayvalık crisis – moves that contributed to the irredentist course that Hellenic foreign policy gradually adopted after 1844 – were complex, contradictory, often suspended between alternative courses. To grasp the polysemy that is so characteristic of these times, we will have to move a step backward in time.

In the middle of this process of shifts and transformations a rather unusual move took place. During the crucial first weeks and months of summer 1842 which followed the dramatic events in Ayvalık, while the decisive change of strategy by the victims of persecution and the clear turn to the Hellenic authorities for proper protection were underway, the first ‘petition’, addressed to the Sultan, on the issue of the ‘accounts’ appeared in print. This was a break with the norms governing the circulation of petitions in the Ottoman context. It is quite remarkable that the first petition related to the Ayvalık crisis which was published in Greek had the form of a book entitled *Ta Kydoniaka*⁷⁵ (1842). It is also important that this most complete and detailed analysis of the issue of the ‘accounts’ was published when the issue was being violently resolved and a new emphasis on protection emerged.

As it was produced in turbulent times, a lot of mystery surrounds its publication. This impressive document, consisting of 164 pages, was published anonymously a few months after the crisis, on 17 July 1842, when the ‘party of the people’ was under persecution and the future of those accused of revolting against the authorities was being debated in Istanbul. The place of publication is disputed. Probably it was printed in Her-moupolis, where there was an available infrastructure at the service of the sympathisers

75 ‘Ta Kydoniaka’ actually means ‘Kydonian affairs’, or ‘The events in Kydonies’. As an expression, it is the product of a genre blending categories of space and time.

of the cause of the ‘party of the people’. The mention of Malta, a neutral space outside the two states, on the cover, seems to have been an aspect of a rhetoric of political impartiality and a strategy to hide any Hellenic involvement that could jeopardise the prospects of the jailed Kydonians.

The book is clothed in the form of a petition. It starts with a dedication to Sultan Abdülmeçid. This is immediately followed by a one-and-a-half-page statement, written in the first person plural and addressed to the Sultan in typical petition style. “The inhabitants of Kydonies” (who sign this introductory statement) appear on their knees (*gonyklitos*) and in tears (*me therma kai kardiostalakta dakrya*) before the throne and make a plea to the Sultan, addressed as “His Most Serene Highness the King” (*galenotateanax*), to listen to their sufferings (*pathe*) through reading the “booklet” and learn things that he had not heard before, in particular, how the *kocabaşıs* (*prouchontes*) had destroyed his kingdom and his poor subjects. Then he may decide not to give faith easily to the words of some of his ministers. The “booklet” aims at the benefit and happiness of the throne and the various “Nations” (*Ethne*) who live in his realm.

As on a theatre stage, the Kydonians are followed by the author. In a separate, two-page prologue, addressed “to the Readers”, the anonymous author, who signs as “the editor”,⁷⁶ presents himself and the circumstances of the book’s publication, speaking in the first person and using the rhetoric of impartiality and justice. Allegedly, he is an outsider, yet also a first-hand observer, since, even for a short while, he had been in Kydonies, as *agnoristos* (incognito), and saw what the *kocabaşıs* did against “this suffering and innocent people”. He also learned about it through speaking to “reliable” people in Izmir and Istanbul. “I always kept notes of what I was learning”, the author confesses, and eventually, when the recent crisis broke out, “I lost patience”, and decided “to appear through the Press before the Public”. As is mentioned in the concluding sentence of the book, it was written quickly, in ten days and in great urgency, that is why it has spelling mistakes!

From the very beginning, therefore, it is stressed that the book is not written by the accused Kydonians nor does it express their view, but the view of a stranger. In a paradoxical twist of the logic of petitioning, the petitioner appears to mediate with the higher authority and ask him to listen to the testimony of the impartial outsider.

The rest of the book is divided in three parts, followed by 35 pages of detailed “comments” (*scholia*) in the form of endnotes. The first part provides a detailed description of the tax system (various categories of taxes which are presented in the context of formal and informal tax practices), as this had been negotiated and settled between the local *kocabaşıs* and the higher authorities from the early 1830s till the initiation of the Tanzimat and the abolition of the local monopoly on olive oil. It is also a systematic description of the tax structures and mechanisms ‘from within’. The second part, entitled ‘The Shameless Tyranny’, is a detailed chronicle of the sequence of events that led to the cri-

76 By signing as the editor, the anonymous author – on whose identity I will not speculate here – seems to imply that his views reflect those of the ‘poor’ Christians of Ayvalık, whom at the same time he explicitly absolves of any responsibility for the book.

sis. In a remarkable ethnographic history of the present, the move for the “inspection of the accounts” and the successive changes in the composition and initiatives of the local council are systematically discussed. The third part, entitled ‘The Passions⁷⁷ of the Kydonians, or the New Thirty Tyrants of Kydonies’, describes the actual revolt and its aftermath. Here a rather sketchy reference to the complicity of the Hellenic vice-consul in the doings of the Saltaioi faction is also included. Finally, in the extensive endnotes the author offers rich additional information.

It is very clear that *Ta Kydoniaka* is not a ‘local history’ in the sense of the distinct genre that emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century. The author is uninterested in Hellenic origins, and totally abstains from the familiar, mythologising references to the classical past.⁷⁸ On the other hand, the very detailed as well as historically-minded description of informal tax practices and mechanisms through the analysis of actual cases reflects a developed ethnographic sense of the present. It also shows an exceptionally high information capacity. *Ta Kydoniaka*, in this sense, is quite remarkable.

All in all, the outcome is astonishing, yet difficult to classify particularly because of the hybridity of the text. *Ta Kydoniaka* stands right in the middle of a continuum of written documents – petitions, letters signed eponymously or under a pseudonym, anonymous reports by locals – which were employed by the competing parties during the Ayvalık crisis. As a hybrid text, it has eclectic affinities with all of them: it is their incomplete synthesis into the form of a book, the text of which retains all the heterogeneity of its constituent elements.⁷⁹

Ta Kydoniaka is a sort of grand petition in published, book form.⁸⁰ As in the case of formal petitions, in stylistic and ideological terms the author employs the language of *pisto ragialiki*, both in the introductory statement and throughout the text, in order to articulate particular claims and demands. Further, the book is full of passages rhetorically re-affirming the benevolence of the Sultan and the loyalty that he deserved from

77 The Greek term *pathe* clearly relates to Christ’s Passion and the powerful religious imagery of suffering followed by Resurrection.

78 Check its contrast with *Kydoniates*, a local history in verse written by Nikolaos Salteles, poet, secretary of the council of 1840, and one of the leaders of the Saltaioi faction. This book, which was published the same year (1842) in Athens, placed Ayvalık on the mythical map of classical Greece, yet said very little about the recent past and did not mention the bitter conflict that was taking place at the very moment of its writing, not to mention the role played by its author in this conflict. *Kydoniates*, probably because of its silences, eventually established itself at the centre of local historiography.

79 In this respect, it is reminiscent of the sixteenth-century letters of remission that have been described by Natalie Davis as a “mixed genre: a judicial supplication to persuade the king and courts, a historical account of one’s past actions and a story”; Davis, *Fiction in the Archives*, 4.

80 It also incorporates the full text of another petition within the ‘petition’. In this long, four-page document, “all the inhabitants of Kydonies” ask the Ottoman officials Şerif Ağa and Tevfik Bey to “acquit” them as well as “save” them from the old *kotsabasedes*; *Ta Kydoniaka*, ig-ist (= xiii-xvi). Equally interesting is the concluding paragraph of the long section with notes at the end of the book: there Patriarch Germanos is asked to “restrain” Bishop Anthimos as responsible for a “big scandal”; *ibid.*, le (= xxxv).

his faithful Christian subjects.⁸¹ Yet, in contrast with the traditional *sened* which was signed in autumn 1842 by many Kydonians promising to keep quiet and asking for pardon – a document that by being silent on the issue of the ‘accounts’ implicitly conceded guilt – the book grounds the plea for mercy on a direct confrontation with the issue of the ‘accounts’ and a detailed analysis of this economic matter. It is on these grounds that the alleged innocence of the persecuted *reaya* of Ayvalık and their just cause are demonstrated.

Of course, the hiding of authorial responsibility behind a posture of anonymity undermined the political weight of the submission offered as much as it also turned the stated claims into inchoate ideological statements. As an informal petition, the book lacked the pragmatic focus on concrete demands that gave petitions their distinctive mark. Also, by being published, it escaped the need to rely on (and therefore reproduce) the mediating structures which were often used by petitioners.⁸²

The book also has important eclectic affinities both in content and style with the letters that were published in the course of the crisis in the Hellenic, ‘agonistic’ press. Besides relying on first-hand knowledge of the facts, it is the synthesis in a single narrative and further expansion (in greater detail) of journalistic materials and particularly information that had been published in letters or reports in newspapers such as ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ or ‘Hermes’. In ideological terms it borrows from the Hellenic press and reproduces the important motif of *antikotsabasismos*: it argues against the rule of the *kocabaşıs* as a relic of the authoritarian past that had to be abolished,⁸³ using the narrative conventions of the libel that were so common in the anonymous reports by locals from Ayvalık or in letters under a pseudonym that were published in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’. The author often directly addresses the reader, and is engaged in a polemic with his opponents, castigating them (sometimes dialogically⁸⁴) in the second person plural, while at the same time he uses the more distant and ‘objective’ third person of ethnographic realism in describing particular de-

81 The author, writing one year before the 1843 Constitutional Revolution in Greece, could not possibly envisage the transformation of the King of the Hellenes into a constitutional monarch. It is more likely that the author, together with many other Greek-speaking Ottoman subjects, still played the card of an Ottoman constitutional monarchy.

82 That is, in contrast with the various, mostly collective, petitions that were addressed via the bureaucratic channel to the *Kapudan Paşa* or the Sultan by the various opposing parties (or the petitions addressed to King Otto).

83 *Antikotsabasismos* is a motif that became increasingly common and was enhanced by the letters and the reports by locals which were published in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ in relation to the Ayvalık crisis. These letters, which were full of information about Ayvalık, provided the link between the town and the large community of exiled Kydonians living in Hermoupolis. This was the privileged readership of *Ta Kydoniaka*.

84 If, as Harold Mah argues, the public is “an imagined rational space of disagreeing social groups” and amounts to the emergence of dialogical order, then the narrative style of *Ta Kydoniaka* (and the letters) imitates the trans-state public that was ‘under construction’ in the Aegean border zone. See H. Mah, ‘Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 72 (2000), 155.

tails.⁸⁵ The tone of the text also turns to tropes which were common in libels: for example, Bishop Anthimos and other office-holders are depicted in a negative light, their personality being sketched with denigrating metaphors, such as “clerical janissaries” (*Giannitzarous tou klerou*). Anthimos in particular is described as a “monster” and the personification of greed, or called “Süleyman Bey” (*Souleeman bees*), suggesting loss of Greekness.⁸⁶ Therefore, *Ta Kydoniaka*, as an anonymous anticlerical libel that condemns the *kotsabasedes*, participates in the important genealogy of Ottoman radicalism.

Reconfigurations in Petitioning

Let me now turn to the reconfigurations brought about by *Ta Kydoniaka*. This hybrid text is an exercise in the reconfiguration of the Ottoman political imagination. It rethinks dual governance through the deconstruction of Christian mediation. It does so by locating the *reaya* status in the context of the *hatt-ı şerif* and interpreting it from the viewpoint of radicalism, an ideological current that informed the historical consciousness of Greek-speaking *reaya* who had participated in the Greek Revolution.⁸⁷

The topos of this reconfiguration is the issue of the ‘accounts’ itself. ‘Accounting’ the tax burden and debt of the community was from the very beginning at the centre of the conflict that led to the revolt. The word ‘accounts’ thus became a key metaphor of the 1842 crisis and the chief vehicle of communicating this crisis to the various levels at which it was conducted. *Ta Kydoniaka* does not avoid the ‘accounts’ issue (as the pardon petition does) but directly confronts it in a political manner. It is particularly through thinking on the financial dealings of the notables with the Ottoman state and the people of Ayvalık that the anonymous author reconfigures the Tanzimat imagination of the political and conceptually restructures the terms of dual governance.

85 There are major stylistic affinities with letters by ‘K.’ in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’ in the summer of 1842. It is likely that ‘K.’ and the author of *Ta Kydoniaka* are the same person.

86 Anthimos is described as “the most cruel and ferocious man on earth, he who is absolutely unscrupulous, the wolf in the guise of a sheep, the blood-thirsty beast, the rabid tiger, the scheming Devil, Lucifer, and Satan, in short, the one whose only human trait is his appearance, and who, had he their power and rank, he would have surpassed Nero and Phalaris in cruelty”; *Ta Kydoniaka*, 11. Also see similar characterisations in ‘Ephemeris ton aggelion’, No. 67, 19 June 1842. The Bishop, as Patriarch Anthimos VI, became one of the most popular targets of anticlerical libels (usually pamphlets) of the mid nineteenth century. See, for instance, the novel by S. I. Ps. and D. *Ho metamorphomenos diavolos: poiema dramatikon* [The devil in disguise: dramatic poem] (Athens 1842) which mocks Anthimos, and *Ho Anthimos St’ kai to Voulgariko Zetema* [Anthimos VI and the Bulgarian Question] (Odessa 1872) by an anonymous author who castigates his policies on the issue of the Bulgarian Exarchate.

87 On radical versions of liberalism and the reception of the French Revolution in the Hellenic context, see P. M. Kitromilides, *He Gallike Epanastase kai he notioanatolike Europe* [The French Revolution and south-eastern Europe] (Athens 2000 [2nd ed.]) and I. A. Tassopoulos, ‘Constitutionalism and the Ideological Conversion to National Unity under the Greek Constitution of 1864’, in A. Frangoudaki and C. Keyder (eds), *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey: Encounters with Europe, 1850-1950* (London 2007), 9-25.

This reconceptualisation is effected in steps.

First, as we saw, *Ta Kydoniaka* is built around the notion of *pisto ragialiki*. Its dependence on this traditional pillar of sultanic authority certainly derives from the text's programmatic function as a petition in the Ottoman legal order. In contrast with an earlier communal petition, it does not refer to the *devleti* (state) but directly to the Sultan. The author recognises the legitimacy of sultanic authority (including its 'right' to impose the *charatzi*) and uses the consistency with which the *reaya* fulfil their tax obligations as a criterion of their political credibility. Yet, as this traditional notion is put in the liberal (constitutional) perspective,⁸⁸ the language of faith, historically structured around the notion of *time* (honour), seems to be surpassed and over-determined by the language of rights. The *reaya* as loyal subjects of the Sultan also have rights (*dikaiomata*): the right to *isotimia*, equal treatment by the law, and the right to justice.⁸⁹ These rights have been generously given to all non-Muslim subjects by the Sultan himself, protector of justice and the "rights of the poor", and derived from the "laws of the sacred *hatt-ı şerif*".⁹⁰ Further, these rights have been conferred on the *reaya* not as individuals but in their capacity as a political body, *laos* (the people).

Laos is presented as a collective subject, which in an anthropomorphic fashion has feelings (as much as it has rights). For example, 'he' is the subject of 'sufferings' that are inflicted upon 'him' by the doings of the local Christian rulers in the context of dual governance. Yet also, and most important, in a contradictory mixing of passive with active, *laos* has agency. The political mobilisation that resulted in the upturn of traditional authority structures by the 'party of the people' demonstrates their energetic involvement in the emergent Tanzimat scene. In some instances *laos* is semantically associated with the 'poor', in others it is treated as being equivalent to *koinoteta* (community), suggesting

88 The blend of liberal ideas with 'agonistic' perspectives became particularly prominent among the followers of the 'French' party in the Greek political scene in the early 1840s. French-style constitutionalism was also popular among the exiled Kydonians of Hermoupolis, who were followers of Ioannis Kolettis, the leader of the 'French' party.

89 Again, the timing of this interpretation is important. In the early 1840s the *hatt-ı şerif* and the sincerity and viability of the Sultan's promulgations were critically assessed by different political forces. In the Hellenic press, among the newspapers which were pursuing the cause of a Hellenic constitution and eventually prepared the ground for the 1843 Constitutional Revolution, the *hatt-ı şerif* was favourably received as an index of progress. For example, see 'Ephemeris ton aggelion', No. 2, 17 July 1840; 'Hellenikos tachydromos', No. 2, 5 January 1840. This positive attitude soon gave way to scepticism, as evidence for the maltreatment of the Christian subjects emerged from different parts of the Empire. For example, see 'Athena', No. 882, 10 February 1842. Scepticism eventually turned into open hostility once the Hellenic Kingdom successfully obtained its own constitutional charter. See 'Hermes', No. 244, 20 November 1843.

90 The *reaya* are not entitled to these rights because of their deeds, as, for example, their participation in the *Agonas* (Struggle for Independence). 'Agonistic' constitutionalism, that was so prominent among the Hellenic subjects who demanded proper and full consular protection, was evidently impossible to sustain within the Ottoman order.

therefore the unity of the political body of the ‘people’,⁹¹ a unity achieved in conceptual distinction from and opposition to the elders or notables. ‘Community’ should not, however, be confused with a fully formed corporate entity (a status achieved after the General Regulations in 1860-1862).⁹²

Second, the elders, classified under the heading of Chatzedes, are also treated as a collective subject that comprises the leaders of the different factions who in various times in the past administered the ‘community’ finances. *Ta Kydoniaka* draws upon the tradition of radical liberalism and its secularism in order to apply the old and very popular – among the Hellenic newspapers – motif of *antikotsabasismos*. The local notables, the *kocabaşıs*, are presented as an oligarchy that exercises a tyrannical rule⁹³ over the poor subjects using all means – including brutal force, treachery, or bribery – in order to stay in power when the terms for getting into office have radically changed. *Kotsabasismos* is also modified into *genitsarismos* in order to adjust it to the Ottoman context: the officials of the Christian *millet*, such as Bishop Anthimos, are called, as we have already mentioned, “clerical janissaries”, suggesting their place in the *ancien régime* and their reactive role against the moderniser Sultan.

On these grounds, the story of the mobilisation that arose around the issue of the ‘accounts’ is depicted as a process of political emancipation of the ‘people’ from oligarchic rule, a process that culminates in the emergence of the ‘party of the people’, its confrontation with the ‘party of the Chatzedes’, its domination in the council of 1841, and its persecution in 1842.

91 This should be interpreted as a response to the shock produced by the lack of correspondence between the elected ‘single-faction’ council and the multifactional *laos*. It is also connected with the emerging concept of *ethniko* (national) that suggests unity under the banners of the ‘nation’ and ‘national interest’ over factional fragmentation. This was a central ideological motif of the ‘French’ party and of the cognate press in the early 1840s.

92 The uncritical and anachronistic use of the concept of a diachronic, homogeneous, Christian, Greek *koinoteta* in the analysis of the *Rum milleti* still haunts the Greek historiography of nineteenth-century Anatolian societies. For a careful assessment see S. Petmezas, ‘Christian Communities in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Greece: Their Fiscal Functions’, in M. Greene (ed.), *Minorities in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton 2005), 71-127. Cf. B. Braude and B. Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, 2 vols (New York 1982).

93 ‘Tyranny’, a term that figures in the sub-title of the book, as a core metaphor of *antikotsabasismos*, was not a novelty, but rather a standard feature of radical discourse since the time of *Hellenike Nomarchia* [Hellenic rule of law], a liberal polemical pamphlet published in 1806. In their turn, radical liberal uses of the term were also a reconfiguration of the traditional notions of *zulm/zouloumi* and *gadr* which were often employed by Ottoman subjects in castigating the unjust rule of the intermediary elites; Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy*. Also see A. Anastasopoulos and E. Gara, ‘Othomanikes antilepseis peri egklematos kai timorias’ [Ottoman perceptions of crime and punishment], *Mnemon*, 21 (1999), 51-52. It is interesting, however, that in the mid nineteenth century this metaphor was also employed in a broader context. For instance, Manouel Gedeon much later describes the post-revolutionary scene at the Patriarchate as being occupied in struggles against “the appalling patriarchal tyranny” (*ten phoveran patriarchiken tyrannida*); Gedeon, *Kanonismos apo peirai*, 215.

Third, the notables are identified en masse as a single social category, at the debtor side vis-à-vis the ‘people’. This reconceptualisation is achieved through the anachronistic application of the language of debt in a reconfigured, politicised sense, which goes far beyond the historically predominant (administrative) logic of economic calculation (used by the followers of the Saltaioi faction). The first part of *Ta Kydoniaka* is devoted to a *defter*-type calculation of what the Chatzedes owe to the ‘people’. The author interprets a wide range of monetary dealings as a sort of outstanding ‘loans’, which the notables allegedly received from the *koinon*. These include (normal) gifts and bribes to high-standing officials (which were common in the *ancien régime*), the taxes from which families friendly to the notables were exempted, the private earnings from the illicit trading of the olive oil which was supposed to be sent to Istanbul (the so-called *rosoumati* [Ott. *rüsumat*])⁹⁴ at much higher prices than those prescribed by the government, the portion of the tithe (*dekate*), the land tax, which was allegedly ‘stolen’ in co-operation with the *voyvoda*, and, even, the unauthorised regulation of the monetary compensation for the return of the confiscated olive trees to their Christian owners.⁹⁵

This quite imaginative application of political logistics⁹⁶ concludes with the depiction of the notables, on the one hand, as “thieves of royal revenues” and, on the other, as being in a state of debt to the *koinoteta*. Since this ‘debt’ was neither acknowledged nor paid by the historical holders of communal office, the latter are accused of being mere embezzlers, “usurpers” (*katachrastes*) of public finances,⁹⁷ and enemies of the “common interest” (*koinon sympheron*). On these grounds the case for the “just” treatment of the “loyal *reaya*” is built.

Fourth, this is also a matter of ‘justice’: ordinary people, “the true, obedient *reaya*”, who are consistent in the payment of their tax obligations, are under persecution and find themselves accused of mutiny by this “oligarchic” tyranny that uses force and slander in order to impose its “unjust” rule. *Ta Kydoniaka* therefore defends the case for the submission of the ‘accounts’ to external inspection by the central authorities, though not by the Patriarchate but by government officials appointed by the Sultan. Through this move, the ‘people’ refer to a superior authority, which is imagined as acting on behalf of the ‘people’ in circumscribing the power of the intermediaries. The Sultan is asked to follow the example of the great “Kings of Enlightened Europe” and “promote justice” and the “rights of the poor”.

94 *Ta Kydoniaka*, 39, 41, 44.

95 Or other illegal uses of the earnings of the *koinon*, such as the re-negotiation of the communal debt for personal gain on the pretext of a poor crop.

96 As has already been mentioned, the author also provides an extremely detailed, practically ethnographic, description of the actual workings of the tax system, or an insider’s perspective of how the community’s finances were handled.

97 “They cheat and rob the King and, at the same time, they cause damage to the community” (*apatosi de kai kleptousi kai ten vasileian kai sygchronos zemionousi kai to Koinon*), or “experienced arch-thieves of the public and royal revenues” (*kai ton demosion kai vasilikon prosodon protokleptas empeirous*); *Ta Kydoniaka*, 41, 14.

To sum up: *Ta Kydoniaka* is an exercise in the invention of political accountability. The anonymous author of 1842 through the use of a radical version of the language of constitutional rights subjected the ‘communal’ debt to a political logic of calculation (that logistically looked absurd and historically unfounded), thus transforming economic debt into political debt. The standard debt situation was thus reversed: those who had the undisputed authority to allocate to individuals their share of communal tax (*na logariazoun*, *na dekatizoun*) and put them into a debt situation were now being called upon to settle their own debt to the community. Through this reversal, those making the accounts were made accountable.

*Petitioning in between States:
Exploring the Limits of Early Ottoman Constitutionalism*

In this paper I have treated petitioning as a fundamental aspect of contentious politics. Petitions are not just a major ingredient of low-level politics; under specific conditions, such as factional strife in an era of expanding opportunities in communication, they become the engine of politicisation. The relevant material from Ayvalık in the early 1840s clearly shows how, through petitioning and letter-writing in the press, the political increased its grasp over traditional domains (e.g., the management of taxes),⁹⁸ thus turning them into contested terrain. Yet, in these extraordinary conditions and as it changed in its social configurations and its socio-political references, petitioning also transformed the content of the political.

What makes petitioning in the Ayvalık crisis particularly interesting is the wider framework in which it was conducted. I am referring to the Greek trans-state public that emerged on the contested, unregulated border zone during this period. This was a dialogic space that brought together arguments, ideas, metaphors and tropes from the formally and institutionally separate socio-political environments of Kingdom and Empire. In this respect, it reflected the flux of people and commodities in the wider region of the Aegean and western Anatolia.⁹⁹ Its basis was primarily linguistic – competence in Greek.

98 Taxation had been a locus of confrontation at the level of localities for a long time. However, the manner, rather than the object, of this politicisation was a novelty.

99 Mobility between these two regions was facilitated by a number of factors, including technological – such as the development of steam navigation and the gradual spread of print culture – and institutional ones – such as the inadequate policing of the (informal) border and the loose and highly contested legal framework governing inter-state relations because of the failure of the two states to agree on a Commercial Treaty that would fix the border and regulate their economic and political relations. In micro-social terms, mobility between the two territories was coupled with the great flexibility in low-level strategies of identification, particularly in the treatment of matters of nationality/national belonging, property, and taxation. In strictly macro-political terms, this state of flux was further intensified by constitutional pressures and moves towards the liberalisation of institutions (which eventually led to the promulgation of the *hatt-ı şerif* in 1839 and the Constitutional Revolution in September 1843). For an insightful description of some of these strategies see the report ‘Peri ton en Kydoniais hellenon hype-

Its principal agents were the Greek-speaking literati from both sides of the Aegean who employed all available means – particularly the press – to communicate their arguments with great zeal and in all directions beyond and across state contexts to their Greek-speaking audiences. Its form was dialogic and confrontational. The exchange of information and arguments between newspapers provided the dialogic component. The war of letters and editorials added the confrontational dimension, thus bringing the Greek public into line with the factional and contentious politics that informed it.¹⁰⁰

The main point of the paper is that petitioning was refashioned as it was performed in the context of the trans-state public. Interactions between petitioning and letter-writing in the press were particularly important in this refashioning. The mode of petitioning changed from strictly bureaucratic to journalistic, thus taking full advantage of the possibilities offered by the expanding print culture and the press in order to overcome bureaucratic fixity and mould messages to audiences far beyond the standard bureaucratic recipients. Its form adopted greater variation reaching hybridity. And its content moved in novel directions.

From the above angle, I gave special attention to *Ta Kydoniaka*. This hybrid text is an extraordinary example of the transformations occurring in petitioning during this period and, particularly, of the imprint of the Greek trans-state public upon it. It is particularly an index of the in-betweenness of the moves that informed petitioning and of the capacity of publishing to provide bridges and open synthetic possibilities. Its hybrid form and its subsequent polysemy allowed *Ta Kydoniaka* to address multiple audiences, across state boundaries and levels – both *reaya* and Hellenes, local and diaspora Kydonians – and implicate in the realisation of this political project people living in different states (Ottoman, Hellenic) and functioning at various levels of governance, from high up (probably officials of the Porte and the Patriarchate) to the lower strata. In this regard, it represents an excellent instance of the flux of ideas that circulated among the trans-state Greek-speaking public.

However, the hybrid petition went a step further than letters to the press in the direction of political syncretism. It brought together ideas and concepts from both state contexts in a single politico-ideological framework that was creatively applied to dealing with an issue of local significance, that of the ‘accounts’. *Ta Kydoniaka* properly mixed – rather than juxtaposed, as often happened in letters to the press – the two state con-

koon’ [On the Hellenic subjects in Kydonies] that was sent by E. Valles, the special envoy of the consulate, to Theodoros Xenos, the Greek Consul in Izmir, on 7 December 1842; AYE, 1842, 45/1.

100 The Greek trans-state public was particularly fed with events which were generated by the contested boundary. Minor incidents of unrest in Ottoman territory, such as the ‘Kalymniaka’ of 1842, revolts, such as the ‘Kydoniaka’ of 1842, or, most important, revolutions, such as the Cretan one of 1841, provided the cultural raw materials for the construction of the public that crossed the boundary in both directions. They also increased the volume in the antagonistic trade in ideas, as new players – for instance, newspapers such as ‘Radamanthys’ – entered the dialogic field on the Hellenic side because of these events, in order to support the case of the Anatolian ‘Christian brothers’.

texts. While it formally addressed the Ottoman context – by adopting the perspective of the persecuted Kydonians, employing the language of *pisto ragialiki* and giving priority to Ottoman forms – it applied a modern content to the traditional form, a content that was borrowed from the constitutional debates taking place in the Hellenic press. As we saw, it used the logic of a radical version of liberalism, which was popular in the Hellenic Kingdom, in order to address the Ottoman problem of taxation. From this angle, it reconstructed the intermediaries as being accountable to the ‘people’. On the same basis, it adapted the traditional concept of ‘justice’/‘just’ (*dikaion*) to the modern, liberal notion of ‘rights’ (*dikaïoma*) (which was implicit in the *hatt-ı şerif* and so prominent in the Hellenic jural order). In other words, it gave new meaning to the idea of ‘justice’ by politicising it through a particular, Hellenic interpretation of the *hatt-ı şerif*. In this sense, it is an imaginative exploration of the limits of the early Tanzimat regime.

Ta Kydoniaka eventually turned into an experiment in the direction of elaborating an ideological framework ‘from below’, providing a more solid identity for the trans-state public to which it belonged. This ideological project was partial, incomplete, somehow ‘strange’ (since it combined French-born constitutional expectations with culturally distant Ottoman realities) and, as eventually became clear, transient (since the project of enlightened constitutional monarchy materialised not in the Ottoman realm but elsewhere, in Greece) – as transient as the book itself. However, as an aspect of the interstitial space of the border zone, *Ta Kydoniaka* was an important step towards the consolidation and reproduction of the trans-state Greek-speaking public which made it possible.

The paradox is that once it achieved its purpose – the upgrading of hybridity to a new ideological framework – the hybrid petition became redundant. As a reminder of the bitter conflict between Christians, it did not have a place in the upcoming order of things. Thus, it became marginalised in the very narrative to the emergence of which it had so decisively contributed. In the Empire, these early experiments of the Tanzimat did not last. The restoration of the *ancien régime* of dual governance and the promotion of Anthimos to the supreme office in the Christian *millet*, that of the Patriarch, just five years after the crisis cancelled any real prospect for changes in local government. In the Kingdom, on the other hand, the language of *pisto ragialiki* sounded like an instance of hubris against the ideals of the *Agon*, the Struggle for Independence. This could not be tolerated, particularly by those who became committed to the promotion of national ideals. The Constitutional Revolution of 1843 and the official adoption of the irredentist project rendered these *reaya*’s early constitutional fantasies redundant.

Once the two states increased their hold over the Greek public, *Ta Kydoniaka* was forced into the shadows of history: only a few copies of the book survived in public libraries, while its traces were gradually lost, as it was very rarely mentioned in the growing late nineteenth and early twentieth-century historiography of Ayvalık. After all, the 1842 crisis, as much as the wider period that starts in the 1830s and ends with the voting of the General Regulations in the early 1860s, seems to be a black hole in local historiography. This is hardly a surprise. What was later described as ‘intra-communal’ conflict was not compatible with the victorious myth of the nationally homogeneous and internally harmonious whole that deserves (and eventually gets) redemption. The hybridity for

which “the filthy book”, as *Ta Kydoniaka* was called by Manouel Gedeon,¹⁰¹ stood was matter out of place in the purist world that the victorious new canon of nationalist essentialism was creating in the Balkans. The book eventually became the victim of the very project to the success of which it had contributed.

APPENDIX

Petition 1

Arzuhal in Greek, sent to the Sultan, asking for the replacement of Baki Efendi by Ömer Ağa in the position of Ayvalık’s *voyvoda* (1253/1837)

Αναφερόμεθα το νυν προς το κραταιόν και υψηλόν δεβλέτι οι υποσιμειούμενοι πιστοί ραγιάδες κάτοικοι του Αϊβαλιού παρακαλούντες θερμώς να ρίψη όμμα [---] εις τας δεήσεις μας. ο μεγαλειότατος και ευσπλαχνικότατος ημών Άναξ, ου το κράτος είοι διαιωνίζον δι’ αιώνας, έχων ανέκαθεν την απαραδειγμάτιστον ευεργετικήν βούλησιν εις τους πιστούς και ευπειθείς υπηκόους του αυτοκρατορικού θρόνου του, επαγρουπνεί ώστε οι κατά τόπον διοικηταί να είναι σύμφωνοι με το πνεύμα του κραταιού δεβλετίου, το να ζουν οι πιστοί υπήκοοί του εν ανέσει και με όλην την έκτασιν του ραγιαδικού χαρακτήρος των χωρίς ποτέ να παραβιάζεται ούτε το δίκαιον των, ούτε η ησυχία των, ούτε η τιμή των. ο εις την πατρίδα ημών διοικών Βοϊβόντας παραμελήσας τα υψηλά χρέη τα οποία επεφορτίσθη από το κραταιόν δεβλέτι το να μας διοική φρονίμως, να μας νουθετή εις τα χρέη μας και να μας περιθάλλη εις τας ανάγκας μας, το εναντίον μετεχειρίσθη χαρακίρα όχι διοικητού αλλά ανθρώπου φοριόζου, όστις [---] εις όλας τας πράξεις του χωρίς να παρατηρή ούτε το σφάλμα του πταιστού ούτε το δίκαιον του αθώου. πολλάκις τον επαρακαλέσαμεν και του επαραστήσαμεν ότι ο τοιούτος τρόπος της διοικήσεως του αντί να περιμαζεύει τους πιστούς ραγιάδες εις το κέντρον της πατρίδος μας και του ραγιαλικίου μας τους διασκορπίζει με τοιαύτας βίας και καταχρήσεις, αι οποίαι αφ’ ου γίνονται εκ μέρους του, παραχωρεί να γίνονται και από τους ανθρώπους του. εις το διάστημα της διατριβής του εις την πατρίδα μας, πράγμα ανήκουστον ανέκαθεν, ηκολούθησαν διάφοροι φόνοι αθών ραγιάδων εις τους αγρούς των, τον επαρακαλέσαμεν να κάμη το χρέος του και να προστρέξη εις τα μέσα να μην ακολουθονώ άδικοι φόνοι. εις την παράκλησίν μας την ήκουσε με αδιαφορίαν, με μεγάλην μας επιμονήν του αναφέραμεν ότι εις τας λαμπράς και ενδόξους ημέρας του μεγαλειοτάτου άνακτος και εις όλους τους αιώνας της θεοσηρίκτου Οθωμανικής Βασιλείας η τιμή εθεωρήθη και θεωρήται Ιερά. αλλά με όλην [---] απερίφθη η αίτησίς μας. ταύτα πάντα παρατηρούντες ότι τρέχουν εις το αδιόρθωτον,

101 According to Gedeon, *Ta Kydoniaka* “vexes not only the [Bishop of] Ephesus, but all the bishops, ministers, etc.” (*den peirazei monon ton Ephesou, all’holous tous hagiou, hypourgous klp*); M. Gedeon, *Patriarchikai ephemerides: eideseis ek tes hemeteras ekklesiastikes historias, 1500-1912* [Patriarchal journals: news from our ecclesiastical history, 1500-1912] (Athens 1936-1938), 422-423.

και βλέποντες ότι με τον τρόπον του αντί να περιμαζεύσι εις τους όσοι έμειναν εις την [---] πασχίζη εις τους εδώ να διασκορπίση, και φοβούμενοι μήπως εν καιρώ φανώμεν τουχμετλίδες διότι [ε--σαμεν], αναφερόμεθα εις την ευσπλαχνίαν του υψηλού δεβλετίου παρακαλούντες θερμώς να μας σταλθή διοικητής φρόνιμος, δίκαιος, σώφρων, άξιος να αντιπροσωπεύση το κραταιόν δεβλέτι και να περιθάλλη εις τους ραγιάδες, και τους [---]. θέλομεν δε είμεθα προς τον θεόν δια παντός [---] δια την πολυχρόνιον ζωήν του Μεγαλειοτάτου και ευσπλαχνικοτάτου ημών Άνακτος.

Οι πιστοί και ευπηθείς ραγιάδες κάτοικοι του Αίβαλιού

Followed by 30 signatures and the seal of the 'community'.

Source: BOA, HH 26196

Petition 2

Arzuhal sent to the *Kapudan-ı derya* on 10/22 October 1841,
written in Greek and translated into Ottoman Turkish

Ba-irade-i seniye-i şahane Ayvalık kazasına memuren gönderilmiş olan mir-i alay Mustafa Beğiñ avdetiyle hâkpay-ı hazret-i kapudan-ı deryaya takdim olunmak üzere işbu mah-ı Teşrin-i evvelin onuncı günü tarihiyle müverrah memleket-i mezkûrede mukim metropolit vekili porotosingelos rahibiñ ve ehaliden dahi iki yüz altı nefer kesaniñ taraflarından mûmza olarak memleket-i mezkûreniñ meclis âzası bulunan dokuz nefer kocabaşlarıñ imza ve mühürleriyle ve memleketiñ mühür-i resmisiyle musaddak rumü'î-ibare vürud eden bir kit'a arz ve mahzarıñ tercümesidir.

Devletlü inayetlü ibretlü efendimiz hazretleri [---]-i asdika ve reaya-yı hass-ı devlet-i âliyeden olan zirde muharrerü'l-esami kulları taraf-ı devletlerinden testir olınan buyruıldı-ı samileri ehali-i kaza muvacehesinde kıraat olındıkda cümlemiz müteessir ve müteallim olarak hâkpay-ı âliyelerine zirde beyan olınan hususı arz ve ifadeye müsaraa ederiz şöyle ki ahz ve i'ta-yı vakaamızın muhasebatından dolayı rüesa-yı memleket ile ehali beynlerinde ba'z-ı gûna ihtilâfat ve mübayenet zuhûra gelüb bundan üç mah mukaddem asitane-i âliyeye üç nefer vekiller irsal ederek ve yedlerine bir kit'a arz ve mahzar i'ta olınarak muhasebe-i mezkûreniñ bu tarafda rüyet olınmasıyçün taraf-ı devlet-i âliyeden bir memur da ve iki nefer kâtibiñ memleketimize irsal buyurulmasını hakpây-ı şahaneden istida etmiş idik. Merkurum vekillerimiz el-haletü hazihi der-i saadetde bulunub beher hafta vaki olan mekâtibimizde maslahat-ı mezkûr kariben istidamız vechle tesviye olınacağını iş'ar etmededirler. Binaenaleyh zat-ı devletleriniñ min el-kadim fukara haklarında aşikâr olan merhamet ve inayetleri ve alel-husus bu esnada memleketimiziñ esbab-ı asayişiniñ istihsali emrinde arzan buyurdıkları sa'y ve himmetlerine istinaden der-i saadetde bulunan Dimitri Macunî ve Anataş (*sic*) veled-i Manol ve Atanaş Betr benamun üç nefer vekillerimize ilâve olınmak üzere bu defa dahi kazamızın üç aded mahallesini ehalisinden olarak asitane-i âliyeye irsal olınan İstilyano veled-i İstrati ve Yani Bi-

sa ve Yorgi Karita ve Yani İstravozina ve Nikola Acı Pandazi ve İstilyano Acı Tamirya (?) ve Kostandi Acı Petro ve Evangeli Çivğuli ve Terzi Hristaki ve Paraşkeva Yakumoğlu ve Dimitri Burnazo ve Nikola Orfaneli ve Ananosti Papaz oğlu ve Acı Dimitri Kalopoda ve Kuzino veled-i Yorgi namun on beş nefer reaya kulları-ki cem'an on sekiz nefere baliğ olur bunlar ile beraber hâkpay-ı şahanedan niyaz ve istida olunan bir memur ve iki nefer kâtibin bu tarafa i'zamına da ve mademki muhasebe-i mezkûrenin edasında cümle ehali kullarının medhali olduğundan ehali-i merkume dahi birtakım rencid[e] ve müsün ve [---] ve öksüz-i biçare makulesinden ibaret olarak kendüleri bi'n-nefs der-i saadete azimet eylemeleri mümkün olamayacağı ecilden muhasebe-i mezkûrenin Ayvalık kazasında rüyet olunmasına müsaade ve inayet buyurılmak babında emr ve ferman hazret-i menlehü'l-emriñdir.

Source: BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/3

Petition 3

Arzuhal sent to the *Kapudan-ı derya* on 20 October/1 November 1841,
written in Greek and translated into Ottoman Turkish

Ayvalık kazasına memur mir-i alay Mustafa Beğün avdetiyle vürud etmiş olan diğer fırkanın vekilleri bulunan sekiz nefer kesan taraflarından mümza olarak işbu mah-ı Teşrin-i evvelin yiğirminci günü tarihiyle müverrah hâkpay-ı hazret-i kapudan-ı deryaya takdim olunan rumû'l-ibare bir kıt'a arzuhalın tercümesidir.

İşbu elli yedi senesinin Martına gelinceye değin nizam ve asayiş-i memleketin vikayesine hayli zahmete muvaffak olmuş ise de tarih-i mezkûreden berü ba'z-ı müfsid kimesneler bi'l-ittifak gûya bundan soñra her nev' vergüden muaf ve düyun-ı atfıktan halâs olacaksınız yollu eracif-i [---] ile ehaliyi bi't-tahrik şimdiye değin memleketi ihtilâl suretinde de tutmakta ve bunlar ise kırk neferden ibaret olub bir mikdarı halkın bu vechle nasihleri ve diğeri dahi vekilleri sırasına girüb ve ehaliden ücret ahz ederek memleketin mühür-i resmisiniñ parçalarını beynlerinde taksim ve ba'zen birbirlerinin yedlerinden cebren ahz etmekte ve bu suretle memleketin mu'teberleri bulunan kesanı gâh sebb ve tahfif (*sic*) ve gâh habs ve tazyik etmek olduklarından başka hanelerini dahi ikide bir basub canlarına varınca kasd olunmakta olduğu derkârdır. Bu fesadın sebep-i asliyesi muhasebelerinin rüyeti olub muhasebe-i mezkûrun rüyetini va'd ve taahhüd ederek bed'en olunmuş ise de müfsidat-ı merkumun bu keyfiyetden dahi peşiman olarak muhasebe rüyet olunan hane [---] ve temhir de etmişlerdir. Ve bundan soñra muhassıl Mustafa Rüşdî Efendinin vürudinde be-tekrar muhasebe-i mezkûrenin rüyetine bi'l-mübaşere her kimiñ zimmetine akçe geçmiş bulunur ise faiziyle beraber te'diye eylememizi deruhde etmiş deyü hususı Patrikhane tarafına arz ve inha eylemiş ise gene müfsidan-ı merkumun muhassıl-ı mumaileyhe derece-i itaatlarını izhar zımnında habs olunan çend nefer-i müttehem kimesneleri habishaneden cebren ahz ve anların yerlerine mu'teberan-ı ehaliden bir tüccar-ı ermenî habse vaz'edüb habishanenin [---] üç gün kendüleri tevkif eylemişler-

dir. Binaenaleyh Ayvalık kazasının ahval-i haziresi ne merkezde idüği balâda beyan olan hususatdan ma'lûm olanları oldıkda muhasebe-i mezkûreniñ dahi hüsn-i nizam [---] üzere rüyeti evvel be-evvel memleketiñ nizam ve asayişiniñ iadesine ve mu'teberan-ı ehaliniñ emlak ve canlarında te'min olınmalarına mütevakkıf idüği bedihî ve aşikâr bir keyfiyet olduğından Ayvalık kazasında bu defa kıraat olunan buyruldi-i âlileri iktizasınca zirde mesturü'l-esami sekiz nefer kulları-ı hâkpay olanlarından memleketimizniñ nizam ve istirahatiniñ iadesini istidaya memur ve izam olındığımız ecilden saye-i merhametvaye-i hazret-i şahanede Ayvalık kazasının dahi ve [---] olduğu ihtilâlden [---] memalik-i saire-i hazret-i mülûkâne misillü nizam ve asayiş tahtına idhal buyurulmak babında emr ve ferman hazret-i menlehü'l-emriñdir.

Source: BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/2

Petition 4

Anaphora, written in Greek, sent to the Secretary of Domestic Affairs on 2 June 1842

Αναφορά των ευρισκομαίνων υπηκόων Ελλήνων εις Κυδωνίας κατοικούντων κατά του ελληνικού υποπροξένου των Κυδωνιών Σπυριδών Σημηριώτου περί αμελείας, αρνήσεως υπηρεσίας, αυθαιρέτου φυλάκησις και αποφυλάκησις, προσβολής της τιμής του Ελληνικού Έθνους και των Ελληνικών δικαιωμάτων και καταπίεσης κ.τ.λ. (2/6/42)

Προς την επί των εσωτερικών Β' Γραμματεία της επικρατείας

Οι ευσεβάστως ταπεινώς υποφαινόμενοι υπήκοοι έλληνες, εις την αναφορά μας ταύτην αναφέρωμεν παράπονα εναντίον του ελληνικού υποπροξένου, προς την σεβαστήν Β. Γραμματεία της επικρατείας, την οποίαν παρακαλούμε θερμώς να ακούση τα δίκαια παράπονα των υποφαινομαίνων υπηκόων ελλήνων με πολύν προσοχήν, και να στρέψει εν βλέμμα των ομμάτων της εκτός της επικρατείας και θέλει ακούσει πλήρη παράπονα και αδικείαςπραχθησομένας παρά του ιδίου. εις την σημερινήν περιστασιν των Κυδωνιών ενώθη εις τα πολιτικά, και ότι έλαβε μέρος με τους λεγομένους χατζήδες των Κυδωνιών, δια να ρήψουν το κόμμα των πτωχών καθώς και το έρηψαν και υπερήσχησε το κόμμα των πλουσίων, όπου και αυτός είναι ενωμένος μετ'αυτών και πολλοί έλληνες εκατατρέχθησαν ένεκα της διαβολής των υπηκόων οθωμανών, άλλος δε εραπίσθη εις τα πόδια με 500 ξυλιαίς, και άλλοι έλληνες εκατατρέχθη και είναι εις παράνομον κράτησιν και δεν συγχωρείται εις αυτούς να απέλθωσιν εις την οικίαν των μήτε με φύλακα, ως άλλοι φονείς ο Κοσ υποπροξένος δεν εσυγχωρούσι την άδειαν εις αυτούς, αλλ'ούτε έδειχνε την διαταγήν δυνάμει της οποίας οι έλληνες αυτοι εκρατούνταν, και ότι προβλέπει τιμώρησιν εις τοιαύτην περίστασιν από τον Νόμον επί παρανόμου κρατήσεως, αρνούμενος το να δείξει την διαταγήν δυνάμει της οποίας υστερείται την προσωπικήν του ελευθερίαν ενώ ο Νόμος προβλέπει την ποινήν του, φαίνεται δεν θέλει να ηξεύρει τον ελληνικόν Νόμον, μμείται τας Τουρκικάς αρ-

χάς έχων πάντοτε το αυθαίρετον χωρίς να ακούσουν τον διαβαλόμενον άντε κάτ τα λ.π. και ότι ο Κοσ υποπρόξενός μας καμμίαν διαφοράν δεν έχει από οθωμανός, και ότι προσβάλλει την ελληνικήν αξιοπρέπεια, και όλον το ελληνικό έθνος, διότι καθ'ημέραν πηγαίνει και συμβουλευήται από τους προύχοντας των Κυδωνιών και από τας τουρκικάς αρχάς οδηγούμενος από αυτών πάντοτε και ότι είναι κόμμα των, ότι αυτοί Σας βεβαιώμεν πράττει αυτός ότι τον ειπώσιν, και όχι ότι ο Νόμος και τα καθήκοντά του τον προτρέπουν να κάμη, περίπου του ενός μηνός ευρίσκεται εις Μοσχονήσια με την σύζυγόν του προς αλλαγίν του αέρα, και ότι κάθε εσπέρας απερνά και παίρνει μαζί του άνθρωπον τον οποίον εξήτησε άλλος έμπορος την προσωπικήν του κράτησιν και προκατέβαλε εις δο. 90 εξάμηνον τροφής ως ο Νόμος ορίζει, και αυτός τον έκαμε ναύτην της Ελληνικής υποπροξενικής λέμβου και φέρει μεθ'εαυτού του εις Μοσχονήσια και γυρίζει ελεύθερος, ποιος το συγχωρεί, και πώς να σιωπήση τας παρανόμους πράξεις του, έχων αίσθημα ελληνικόν και χαρακτήρ. Τοιούτου, ευαίσθητος έλλην δεν δύναται να βλέπη πλήρη αδικείας γινομένης παρά του ιδίου και μάλιστα λέγει ότι δεν γίνονται καθώς εις την Ελλάδα, διότι εδώ είναι Τουρκία. ποίος έλλην μεταξύ έλληνος έχων υπόθεσιν και έδωκε πέρας καλόν εις αυτήν, αν έχης να λαμβάνης τριακοσίας δο. αυτός θα πάρει τας 150 και τέλος δεν δίδει ποτέ εις την υπόθεσιν τοιαύτας δίκας κάμει. αν έλλην μεταξύ οθωμανού έχων διαφοράν θα υπάγη αυτήν εις τον Μεχχεμί να κρινη ο έλλην την διαφοράν του και όχι εις την Ελληνικήν πρεσβείαν, ενώ ο ελληνικός Νόμος διατάττει άλλως πως, ότι οι Έλληνες δεν παραδίδονται εις τας τουρκικάς αρχάς ως το άρθρον 1 και υπό της Ποιν. Δικονομίας, αυτός δε έλληνα τινά επαράδωσε εις την τουρκικήν αρχήν τον Τριαντάφυλλον Χατζητροπούνα ο οποίος εραπίσθη από 500 εις τα πόδια, ποία υπεράσπισις έκαμε εις αυτόν, αυτός δε όλως διόλου χατζής ως λέγουν, εδώ, και ότι σύρεται πάντοτε από τους προύχοντας των Κυδωνιών και από τον Άγιο Εφέσου και προσβάλλει τα ελληνικά συμφέροντα και τα προδίδει εις τας ενταύθα αρχάς τουρκικάς, δια να πιστοποιήσουν την καλήν του διαγωγήν και ακριβή εκπλήρωσιν των χρεών του, να γράψουν οι Βέηδες εις τον αυτού πρόξενον Κον. Κ. Βογορίδην, να συστήση εις το ελληνικόν έθνος την ακριβή εκπλήρωσιν των χρεών του, την τιμότητά του και την καλήν του διαγωγήν, εις το διάστημα της ζωής του απέρασε ησύχως και τιμίως, επειδή και εβοήθησε αυτούς πρώτερον τας ενταύθα τουρκικάς αρχάς, αυτάς δε βοηθούν τώρα, ανταμοίβεται η χάρις εις αυτόν, ένεκα των πολλών καταχρήσεων του έφθασαν εις τα ότα της Σεβαστής Κυβερνήσεώς μας η οποία θέλει ταχίνει την παραίτησιν αυτού και θέλει διατάξει την παύσιν του, και να φροντίση την αποστολήν άλλου το οποίον οι ευρισκόμενοι ενταύθα έλληνες θα ευγνωμονούν δια βίου, και ότι διορισθησομένου άλλου ίσως δυνηθώσιν να απερατώσουν ταχέως τας υποθέσεις των και απέλθουν εις την ποθητήν τους Ελλάδα, από τους φέροντας Έλληνας εις Σύρον δια να κριθώσιν επί της ψευδούς Συκοφαντίας, καθώς και από άλλων ελλήνων και υπηκόων θέλετε ακούσει πράγματα τα οποία και αυτά τα βάρβαρα έθνοι δεν ήθελον πράξει τοιούτα ως ο υποπρόξενός μας έπραξε. φαίνεται εις το κρανίον του μέσα θα έχει όλους τους ελληνικούς Νόμους και δεν βασιζεται εις τον νόμον του ελληνικού έθνους, ή να είπω καλλύτερον ότι αυτός έχει την θέλησιν του νόμον, αν τώνοντι έλληνες και υπήκοοι οθωμανοί κινήσουν αγωγάς ένεκα τας παρανόμους πράξεις του επί ζωής του θέλει δικάζεται εις τα Δικαστήρια και ούτος

δεν θέλει ελευθερωθεί, ταύτα πάντα καθ' υποβάλωμεν υπ' όψιν της Σεβαστής Γραμματείας της επικρατείας και παρακαλώμεν θερμώς, οι ευσεβάστως ταπεινώς υποφαινόμενοι να ενεργήση ότι το δίκαιον απαιτείται ένεκα των καταχρήσεων του, και να μην δώσει πίστη εις όσα υπήκοοι οθωμανοί βεβαιώσουν περί της ακριβείας εκπληρώσεως, ενώ αυτός είχε μέρος εις τα πράγματα των Κυδωνιών εφόναζε έκαστον έλληνα να μην ήθελε λάβει μέρος, και ποίαν ανάγκη είχαν οι έλληνες εις τα πράγματα των Κυδωνιών, ενώ γνωρίζουν ότι ο Νόμος τους απαγορεύει, ο Κοσ υποπρόξενος έχων μέρος και κινούμενος από έχθραν, μίσος, πάθος, σκοπόν Ιδιοτελείας, και χαριζόμενος και συρόμενος πάντοτε από τας αρχάς των Κυδωνιών, των προυχόντων δια να υποστηρίξουν αυτόν εις εναντίαν περίσταση οσάκις ήθελε κλονιστή από την θέσιν του, επρόδωσε τα ελληνικά Δικαιώματα, και ψευδώς ανήγγελε ότι οι έλληνες ήθελον συκόσουν επανάσταση εναντίον των ενταύθα Τουρκικών αρχών και ένεκα της επαγρυπνήσεώς του έλαβε τα δραστήρια μέτρα και εφυλάκησε τρεις έλληνας και εμπόδισε το κακόν και τωόντι άξιος υποπρόξενος και δραστήριος εις τα χρέη του ο Θεός να δίδη μακροχρόνιον ζωήν και αλλίμονον εις τους ενταύθα κατοικούντες προσωρινώς έλληνες, οι οποίοι περιμένουν από τοιούτον υπεράσπησιν και αποπεράτωσιν των υποθέσεών τους, μένωμεν εύελπισ ότι μία εκ των πολλών Σας Σκέψεων θέλει είναι και αποκατάστασις των υποφαινομαίνων και υποσημειούμεθα με το ανήκον Σέβας. Εν Κυδωνίαις την 2^α Ιουνίου 1842

Followed by 22 signatures.

Source: AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/1

TABLE I
Petitions employed in the course of the Ayvalık crisis (1840-1843)

Source (archival or other)	Date – Type	Signed by	Addressed to H/L	Mediated by	Content	Published – Translation
- [Reference in Patriarchal Correspondence, Codex K, 287, 8 June 1841]	[1841]	A number of inhabitants	H (Patriarch)	–	A (To send the registers [<i>katasticha</i>] for inspection)	Unpublished
- [Reference in BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/3]	[Summer 1841]	A number of inhabitants (The ‘people’)	H (Porte)	Three <i>vekils</i> : D. Matzounis, Athanasios tou Manoli, Athanasios Petrou	A (To appoint an inspector of the accounts)	Unpublished
BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/3	1841 <i>Arz ve mahzar</i>	65 inhabitants, verified by nine <i>kocabaşıs</i> (The ‘people’)	L	–	R (To transfer the <i>kaza</i> of Ayvalık from the <i>sancak</i> of Biga to the <i>sancak</i> of Balıkesir)	Unpublished Translated from Greek into Ottoman Turkish
BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2270/4	9-21 September 1841 <i>Arzuhal</i>	A number of inhabitants (Saltaioi)	H (Porte)	–	A (To appoint ten temporary notables [<i>prokri-toi</i>] and send envoy)	Unpublished Translated from Greek into Ottoman Turkish
BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/3	10-22 October 1841 <i>Arz ve mahzar</i>	Monk <i>protosyngelos</i> and 206 inhabitants, verified by nine <i>kocabaşıs</i> (The ‘people’)	L (<i>Kapudan Paşa</i>)	Mustafa Bey	A (To add another 15 representatives of the three <i>mahalles</i> . Includes members of the 1841 council)	Unpublished Translated from Greek into Ottoman Turkish

BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/3	10-22 October 1841 <i>Arz ve mahzar</i>	76 inhabitants, verified by nine <i>kocabayış</i> (The ‘people’)	L (<i>Kapudan Paşa</i>)	Mustafa Bey	A, P (To prohibit foreign protection for those who administered community finances and are property-holders in Ayvalık so that they may be tried [?])	Unpublished Translated from Greek into Ottoman Turkish
BOA, İrade Dahiliye 2370/2	20 October-1 November 1841 <i>Arzuhal</i>	Eight representatives of the ‘other’ party (Saltaioi)	L (<i>Kapudan Paşa</i>)	Mustafa Bey	O, A (To suppress the rebellion)	Unpublished Translated from Greek into Ottoman Turkish
[Reproduced in <i>Ta Kydoniaka</i> , ig-ist (= xiii-xvi)]	April-May 1842	“All the inhabitants of Kydonies” (<i>Holoi hoi katoikoi ton Kydonion</i>)	L (Şerif Ağa, Tefvik Bey)	–	A, J (To “acquit” the accused Kydonians as well as “save” them from the old <i>kotsabasedes</i>)	Published in <i>Ta Kydoniaka</i>
AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/1	2-14 June 1842	22 Hellenic subjects	L (Secretary of Domestic Affairs)	(A. Giannares)	P (To replace the Hellenic vice-consul in Kydonies and not give faith to his false claims)	Unpublished
AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/5	8-20 July 1842	Wife of Eustratios Karpandaros	L (Secretary of Foreign Affairs)	–	J (To show “mercy”)	Unpublished
[Reference in AYE, 1843, 39/12-I/8]	13-25 July 1842	D. ChatzeAthanasiou and “other citizens”	L (Th. Xenos, Hellenic Consul in Izmir)	–	–	Unpublished
<i>Ta Kydoniaka</i>	18 July 1842 Book	Anonymous	H (Sultan)	–	A, J, R	Published

[Reference in AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/4, 21 August 1842]	July-August 1842	Nikolaos Pathos	L (Secretary of Foreign Affairs)	–	P (Against Sermeriotes)	Unpublished
BOA, İrade MV 916/3	October-November 1842 <i>Arzuhal</i>	19 jailed inhabitants	–	–	O (To pardon)	Unpublished Translated from Greek into Ottoman Turkish
BOA, İrade MV 916/1	10-22 November 1842 <i>Sened</i>	59 inhabitants	L (İsmet Paşa)	–	O (Declaring submission, asking for pardon)	Unpublished Written in Greek
AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/9	20 November-2 December 1842	A. Andronikos	L (Secretary of Foreign Affairs)	–	J (To apply justice against vice-consul Sermeriotes)	Published as a letter to the King (dated 8 November) in ‘Anexartetos’, No. 22, 21 November 1842
AYE, 1842, 39/12-II/8	30 November-12 December 1842	26 Hellenic subjects	H (King)	–	P, T (Protection from maltreatment by the Ottoman governor of Kydonies and replacement of the incompetent vice-consul)	Published as a letter to the King in ‘Anexartetos’, No. 32, 30 January 1843
AYE, 1843, 39/12-I/4	2-14 January 1843	A. Giannares	H (King)	–	P (To replace the vice-consul in Kydonies because of his treacherous behaviour)	Unpublished
AYE, 1843, 39/12-II/6	19 April-1 May 1843	A. Giannares	H (King)	–	P (To replace the consular authorities in both Smyrna and Kydonies)	Published as a letter to the King in ‘Anexartetos’, No. 45, 29 April 1843

AYE, 1844, 39/12-I/1	7-19 No- vember 1843	70 signa- tures	L (Secretary of Foreign Affairs)	–	P (To replace the vice-consul in Kydonies be- cause of his co-operation with the Otto- man authorities and his failure to protect the Hellenic sub- jects)	Unpublished
-------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	---	---	---	-------------

Source: []: not found in any archive.

Addressed to: H: highest (Sultan, or Patriarch, or King of the Hellenes), L: lower (e.g., *Kapudan Paşa*, or Secretary of Foreign or Domestic Affairs).

Content: A = accounts, J = justice, O = order, P = protection, R = other topics, T = against the Ottoman Empire.