

This article was downloaded by: [Bogazici University]

On: 25 September 2012, At: 11:08

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cbjm20>

The Greek Community of İzmir/Smyrna in an Age of Transition: The Relationship between Ottoman Centre-Local Governance and the İzmir/Smyrna Greeks, 1840-1866

Feryal Tansuğ

Version of record first published: 10 Jun 2011.

To cite this article: Feryal Tansuğ (2011): The Greek Community of İzmir/Smyrna in an Age of Transition: The Relationship between Ottoman Centre-Local Governance and the İzmir/Smyrna Greeks, 1840-1866, British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 38:01, 41-72

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2011.559002>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

The Greek Community of İzmir/Smyrna in an Age of Transition: The Relationship between Ottoman Centre-Local Governance and the İzmir/Smyrna Greeks, 1840–1866¹

FERYAL TANSUĞ*

ABSTRACT *In the process of the economic development of İzmir, and the give and take of centre-periphery negotiations, the central authority attempted to re-integrate İzmir into its administrative and political structure in the nineteenth century, in accordance with the centralising or modernising Tanzimat reforms. However, Tanzimat reforms did not disturb the social cohesion of İzmir, which the city reproduced, with its local character and some peculiar dynamics, over the centuries. This paper concerns the impact of modernising—and centralising—state regulations on the Greek community of İzmir and the relationship between local governance and İzmir Greeks. Some Ottoman-Turkish documents and Greek newspapers of the time are used as first hand sources. Within the given period on which this article is focused (1840–1866), İzmir was neither a province nor had a municipality. In the absence of modern urban administrative developments, İzmir Greeks constructed their own ways of communication with the central and local authorities.*

İzmir commenced the nineteenth century under the powerful rule of the *ayan* (local land notables) families following the turbulent events of 1770—as a result of the naval battle of Çeşme, between the Ottoman Empire and Russia²—and the instigation of an urban riot by the Janissaries in 1797—when large numbers of Greek casualties occurred.³ These were also accompanied by destructive earthquakes, fires,

*Assistant Professor, Bahçeşehir University, Department of General Education, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: feryaltansug@gmail.com

¹ I am grateful to my *Hoca*, Prof. Virginia H. Aksan, who read and commented on this paper various times, and to Angelos Dourlaris for his generous help in dealing with the language of the Greek newspapers of the period. This paper is derived from a chapter in my PhD dissertation, ‘Communal Relations in Smyrna/Izmir: As seen through the prism of Greek-Turkish relations’, University of Toronto, 2007.

² The destruction of the Ottoman fleet by the Russians in the battle of Çeşme and following this, the initial Greek riots in Morea, humiliated some Turks in İzmir and this led to severe tension in the city. The French consul noted that the customs official İbrahim Ağa murdered all the Greeks in the customs house. Following this event some Turks went out of control and massacred 1500 Ottoman Greeks in İzmir, two Europeans and the Dutch dragoman, while the Europeans took refuge in the ships of their respective countries. M. de Charles Peyssonnel, *An Appendix to the Memoirs of Baron de Tott; Being a Letter from Mr. De Peyssonnel to the Marquis of N* (London: printed for T. Hookham, 1786), pp. 96–97.

³ Richard Clogg, ‘The Smyrna “Rebellion” of 1797: Some Documents from the British Archives’, in Richard Clogg (ed.), *I Kath’imas Anatoli: Studies in Ottoman Greek History* (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2004), p. 63. Elena

and subsequent population losses as a result of repeated epidemics. In spite of all these negative events and the oppressive policies of the centre, during the initial years of the Greek revolt (1821) along the Aegean coastline and islands, the Greek community of İzmir achieved a prominent position in certain sectors of the local economy: it was transformed effectively into a middle class by the 1850s. The multi ethno-religious society of İzmir resisted many catastrophic events, from epidemics to abuses of local powers, at the turn of the eighteenth century, and kept its social balance through its consolidated 'locality' throughout the nineteenth century. Here 'locality' is used to refer to how people perceive their relationship with the place they inhabit. Multi-religious coexistence, urban wealth, and interactive communal relations constituted İzmir's basic local characteristics. This article examines the impact of both the central authority and local governance on the Greek community of İzmir and the relationship between the local governance and İzmir Greeks in the period of centralising Tanzimat reforms. The period chosen in this article is that between the years 1840 and 1866, which marked two significant developments respectively in the empire: The new penal code, issued in 1840,⁴ reaffirmed the equality of all the people of the empire regardless of religion and the principle of rule of law as stressed in the Gülhane Rescript in 1839,⁵ while the city gained the status of 'province' in 1866, as a result of the 1864 General Provincial Reform Law. That is to say, İzmir was neither a province (it became province in 1866) nor had a municipality (it was founded in 1868) within the given period of this study (1840–1864). One of the points that I wanted to underscore in this work was that the Greek Community of İzmir and the local governance formed their own ways of communication even before the city became a province, and so did not benefit from the Provincial Organizations of 1864 and 1871.⁶

The central authority of the Ottoman Empire, and the sultan's claim to political power, had previously been challenged by the growing power of the land notables (*ayans*) in the eighteenth century. By the nineteenth century, the deteriorated central authority was seen as the core problem of the empire, with both the sultans and the statesmen believing it was necessary to institute military, administrative, and economic reforms. A powerful central authority's primary need is for most of its subjects to accept its rule as legitimate, as such a condition—whether termed 'authority' or 'domination' or 'legitimacy'—means that the actions and demands of the state will be accepted by most of its subjects, or at least not be actively resisted.⁷

By the nineteenth century, the legitimacy and domination of Ottoman rule had been challenged internally by its Orthodox-Christian subjects in the Balkans, beginning with the Greek unrest in Morea in the 1790s and continuing into the early nineteenth century—which saw conflict with Serbs, Greeks, Bulgarians, and

Footnote 3 continued

Frangakis-Syrett, *The Commerce of Smyrna in the Eighteenth Century, 1700–1820* (Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1992), p. 62; Rauf Beyru, *19. Yüzyılda İzmir'de Yaşam* [Life in the 19th Century İzmir] (İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları, 2000), pp. 41–42; Tuncer Baykara, *İzmir Şehri Tarihi* [History of City of İzmir] (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Matbaası, 1974), p. 83.

⁴ Ekrem Buğra Ekinci, *Osmanlı Mahkemeleri, Tanzimat ve Sonrası* [Ottoman Courts, Tanzimat and After] (İstanbul: An, 2004), p. 126.

⁵ Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 44.

⁶ Another period began in İzmir in the 1870s, when the Public Debt Administration became effective, leading to the isolation of the local bourgeoisie class in western Anatolia. The change in İzmir society continued with the Young Turk policies in the 1910s.

⁷ Christopher Pierson, *The Modern State* (London: New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 22.

Albanians, as well as with the governor of Egypt, Mehmed Ali Paşa. The empire had been also challenged externally, by the Western European powers and by Russia, over the Eastern question. The non-Muslim subjects of the empire in the Balkans refused to obey the orders of the Ottoman government. Their uprisings over not wanting to be ruled by a Muslim dynasty demonstrated that Ottoman legitimacy was at stake. The impact of the Western states on the Ottoman reform measures, especially after 1856, showed that Ottoman legitimacy was also questioned externally. Mahmud II responded to the Balkan uprisings with a reform program—declared as ‘the 1839 Gülhane edict’, following his death—to restore Ottoman domination and legitimacy against the non-Muslims and the Western states, not only in the military sphere, but also in administrative, social, and economic terms.

The 1839 reform edict, without contradicting the Shari‘a,⁸ stressed the need for sovereignty of the law, for the well-being of the subjects and therefore of the empire. The Ottoman government struggled to apply the principle of the rule of law for two main purposes: first, to regain its legitimacy in its internal and external affairs, and second, to end the uprisings by non-Muslims and prevent interference by foreign states. Regarding the intention of the Ottoman centre toward modernising reforms, neither the sultans nor the Tanzimat bureaucrats aimed to construct a modern state in the sense of a Western parliamentary regime, but instead wanted to build a well-running bureaucracy with a strong central authority. As will be shown in the following discussion, the attempt of the imperial government to restore central authority in İzmir was implemented by local governance; the centre regularly communicated with the local authorities to restrict the influence of foreign consuls in the city administration, and to control the social and cultural activities of the İzmir Greeks in order to maintain social order and peaceful multi-ethno-religious coexistence in the face of the new Kingdom of Greece. The correspondences of the *Meclis-i Vala* with the local governance of İzmir—*muhassıl*,⁹ *mutasarrıf*,¹⁰ and large provincial council—actually suggest a close relationship between centre and İzmir.

The most important change in the judicial system in the Tanzimat era was its replacement with the *Meclis-i Vala-yı Ahkam-ı Adliye* or ‘Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances’ (also known the *Meclis-i Vala* or ‘council of justice’), which was set up in 1838.¹¹ The establishment of this *Meclis-i Vala* was a

⁸ Butrus Abu-Manneh, ‘The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript’, in Butrus Abu-Manneh (ed.), *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century, 1826–1876* (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2001), pp. 74–75. Before Abu-Manneh, Roderic Davison also mentioned the Islamic features of the Gülhane Rescript. Roderic Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774–1923* (Austin, TX: University of Texas, 1990), p. 114.

⁹ *Muhassıl*: Salaried tax collectors hired to replace tax farmers in collecting state revenues.

¹⁰ *Mutasarrıf*: governor (sometimes deputy governor) of district (*sancak*); tax collector.

¹¹ Halil İnalçık, ‘Decision Making in the Ottoman State’, in Caesar E. Farah (ed.), *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire* (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993), p. 12. In the pre-modern Ottoman Empire, *meşveret*, ‘the consultation councils of the Porte’ was crucial by tradition in the decision making process. According to the Islamic sources, *meşveret*, was even an obligation for the sultan. In the extra-ordinary or emergency cases to share the responsibility viziers, dignitaries, commanders, ulama gathered in meetings. İnalçık, ‘Decision Making in the Ottoman State’: It was set up in 1838, but could not work properly until 1841—because of the organisation problems during the early years of the Tanzimat. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, p. 28.

compromise between the Ottoman *meşveret* tradition and the Western form of legislature.¹² The *Meclis-i Vala* served for 15 years as the main legislative organ responsible for preparing and executing the Tanzimat regulations.¹³ In addition to the preparation of Tanzimat laws and regulations, the *Meclis-i Vala* also had a judicial function: It worked as a special administrative court to adjudicate the administrative staff when they acted contrary to the Tanzimat regulations.¹⁴ It also became a unit charged with executing the new penal code of 1840,¹⁵ which reaffirmed the equality of all the people of the empire as stressed in the Gülhane Edict.¹⁶

Some significant changes concerned the provincial government: calling the delegates from the provinces to the capital to discuss administrative conditions and possible improvements; sending inspectors from the capital to the provinces; and forming 'a large provincial council' (*büyük meclis*) and a small provincial council (*küçük meclis*), constituted of both Muslim and non-Muslim members under the provincial governor to represent the local population.¹⁷ The large provincial council and small provincial council were founded in the districts (*kaza*) in 1840. The former served both as a unit to implement Tanzimat regulations and a court to enforce the 1840 penal code with the authority of making decisions, except on the crimes of murder and theft, which had to be referred to the capital, to the *Meclis-i Vala*.¹⁸ The representation of non-Muslims was made on an equal basis in each district, regardless of the proportion of the total population, so the non-Muslims

¹² İnalçık, 'Decision Making in the Ottoman State', p. 13.

¹³ *Meclis-i Vala-yı Ahkam-ı Adliye* was founded by the support of Mustafa Reşid Paşa in 1838 as a part of the Tanzimat reforms with the idea that a special unit was needed to organise and apply reforms. It had experienced some organisational changes, it had been reorganised as *Şura-yı Devlet* in 1868. Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, *Tanzimat Devrinde Meclis-i Vala 1838–1868* [Meclis-i Vala During the Tanzimat] (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurum Yayinevi, TTK, 1994), pp. 35–37; Musa Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları* [The Social and Economic Structure of Anatolian Cities during the Tanzimat Period] (Ankara: TTK, 1991), pp. 185–190.

¹⁴ Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları*, p. 190; Stanford Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, 1808–1975* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 78.

¹⁵ Ekrem Buğra Ekinci, *Osmanlı Mahkemeleri, Tanzimat ve Sonrası* [Ottoman Courts, Tanzimat and After] (Istanbul: Ari, 2004), p. 126.

¹⁶ Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History*, p. 44; For example, unfair collection of taxes, which was a major problem, was punished according to the new penal code of 1840. According to İnalçık, the Ottoman archives are full of registers from 1840 and 184 unfair tax collection by local administrators and orders for their punishment. Halil İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', *Belleten* XXVIII:112 (1964), p. 630. An example *kaima* concerning this issue in western Anatolia goes as follows: Müşir of Aydın was asked by the centre to re-interrogate the petition about the beating of Christians and taking of extra taxes from them in the Ayasluğ district of Aydın Sancağı. A.MKT 65/86, 1846.

¹⁷ Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History*, pp. 48–49; İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', p. 626. It was not unusual for the Ottoman state to have meetings with the notables in the time of need until the middle of the nineteenth century. This kind of general assembly was a custom and worked in the Empire in the pre-Tanzimat period, although it was not a representative body with selected delegates from each province, as created in the Tanzimat period, Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History*, p. 47.

¹⁸ İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', pp. 626–627; *Büyük Meclis* worked until 1868, when *Şura-yı Devlet* was formed. Ekinci, *Osmanlı Mahkemeleri, Tanzimat ve Sonrası*, p. 130; However, common people could not get involved in the large provincial councils and Muslim officials dominated them. Moreover, the old *ayans* dominated both councils, under the name of *ağa*, as well as the low-level administration in many cities and towns. Furthermore, the *ulema*, who were the opponents of the Tanzimat, sided with conservative *ağas* in these councils. İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', pp. 635–636. Large councils,

became under-represented in regions where they constituted a majority. On the other hand, they were over-represented in the districts where they were outnumbered by Muslims.¹⁹

Muhassıls and *mutasarrıfs* had influential position in the city administration during the Tanzimat period. The 1839 imperial edict abolished the tax farming system that had been controlled by semi-independent tax collectors (*mültezıms*), in order to provide direct taxation and effective central control.²⁰ *Muhassıls* were designed as salaried tax officials, and replaced semi-independent *mültezıms* by providing direct tax collection. They were appointed by the centre with great authority in order to stamp out abuses and the influence of district governors and local notables.²¹

The Tanzimat reforms could not be smoothly and successfully applied throughout the empire and it is difficult to say that sultans Abdülmecid and Abdülaziz sincerely supported and encouraged the reformist statesmen of their eras. There was constant opposition from anti-reformists in the government circles. But, despite the continuous opposition of conservative statesmen in the administrative cadres, the reform regulations were applied under the leadership of Mustafa Reşid Paşa as foreign minister and grand vizier, and of Fuat Paşa as foreign minister and grand vizier when the two men were in charge as successors of Mustafa Reşid Paşa. The instability in the office of grand vizier alone indicates the ambivalent and unpredictable attitude the sultans took toward the Tanzimat

Footnote 18 continued

generally, constituted by thirteen members, of whom seven were state officials (*muhasıslı*), his subordinate, two *katıbs* (scribes), a *kadı*, a *mufıı*, a *zaptıye memuru* (the police chief), four trustable Muslims, and two *kocabaş* and a metropol of the given non-Muslim community in that province. İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', p. 626; Stanford Shaw, 'Local Administration in the Tanzimat', in Hakkı Dursun Yıldız (ed.), *150. Yılında Tanzimat* [Tanzimat in its 150th Year] (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, TTK, 1992), p. 34; Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, pp. 48–49; Sometimes, unequal treatment of the non-Muslim council members by the Muslims was seen. We learn from a petition of the Rum Patriarchate in 1841 that the suggestions of the non-Muslim members of the council met with humiliation. As result of this petition, the *Meclis-i Vala* sent out a notice warning the Muslim members of these councils to act respectfully toward their non-Muslim members. İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devri'nde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri, (1840–1880)* [The Ottoman Local Administration in the Tanzimat Period], (Ankara: TTK, 2000), p. 40.

¹⁹ Shaw and Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, 1808–1975*, p. 34; İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', p. 633.

²⁰ 'Tax assessment is also one of the most important matters to regulate. A state, for the defense of its territory, manifestly needs to maintain an army and provide other services, the costs of which can be defrayed only by taxes levied on its subjects. Although thank God, our Empire had already been relieved of the affliction of monopolies, he harmful practice of tax farming (*iltizam*), which never yielded any fruitful results, still prevails. This amounts to handing over the financial and political affairs of a country to the whims of an ordinary man and perhaps to the grasp of force and oppression, for if the tax farmer is not of good character he will be interested only his own profit and will behave oppressively. It is therefore necessary that from now on every subject of the Empire should be taxed according to his fortune and his means, and that he should be saved from and further exaction. It is also necessary that special laws should fix and limit the expenses of our land and sea forces'. J.C. Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, 2nd edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), Vol. I, p. 270.

²¹ İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', pp. 625–628; Stanford J. Shaw, 'Local Administration in the Tanzimat', p. 33; Standford J. Shaw, 'The nineteenth Century Ottoman Tax Reforms and Revenue System', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 6(1–4) (1975), p. 422; Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devri'nde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri*, p. 32; But implementation of this system was a problem in the countryside, since both there were not enough educated bureaucrats to be appointed as *muhasıslı* and the available ones were not willing to do the job, because it was not very profitable. The state treasury revenues decreased already sharply between 1839 and 1840 due both the inability to collect sufficient taxes and the destructive war with Mehmed Ali Paşa of Egypt. İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', 637; Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde*

reforms.²² There were always opponents of the reforms, and sultans in the Tanzimat period were often caught between two opposing groups. Anti-reformist statesmen sometimes managed to manipulate sultans Abdülmecid and Abdülaziz to interrupt the enacting of reform regulations in certain periods. The *damads*, Damad Mehmed Seyyid,²³ Rıza Paşa, and Mehmet Ali Paşa, were opposed to Mustafa Reşid Paşa's rule and managed to dismiss him from his position on 31 March 1841. After Mustafa Reşid Paşa, the anti-reformist Rıza Paşa was put in charge of applying the Tanzimat regulations,²⁴ which he and his supporters instead immediately abolished. The office of *muhassıl* was eliminated and governors of the provinces became responsible for dealing with economic matters in addition to their duties of providing security and social order in the *vilayets* and *sancaks*, as in the pre-Tanzimat period. Moreover, they also sent an imperial order to every province to convince the conservative people that Islamic principles still had a strong presence in the new organisation.²⁵

In sum, this anti-reformist group eliminated the most radical reforms that Mustafa Reşid Paşa attempted to implement. Regarding the sultan's approach to reforms, although Abdülaziz had an inclination to restore the strong political power of the Ottoman sultan, Ali Paşa managed to control him.²⁶ Similarly, under the rule of Abdüzzaziz, Fuad Paşa tried to get the same kind of autonomy that Sultan Abdülmecid granted Ali Paşa.²⁷ Mahmud Nedim Paşa, who had secretly opposed the reforms in the administrative circles since the 1840s, managed twice to become grand vizier (first from September 1871 to the end of July 1872, and then again between 1875 and 1876). He entered the service at the Porte in 1842 and worked closely with Mustafa Reşid Paşa and his group on the recommendation of Ali and Fuat Paşa until 1854.

Footnote 21 continued

Anadolu Kentleri'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları, p. 210. *Muhassıls* appointed by the Ottoman centre who were supposed to return all the collected taxes to the state treasury. Shaw, 'Local Administration in the Tanzimat', p. 33. İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', pp. 625–626; Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devri'nde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri*, p. 32. Since the *muhassıls* were worked independently of each other, it took a very long time to return the taxes to the treasury. Moreover, the *muhassıls* were selected from among the people who were close to the old *mültezims*. Hence, the old *mültezims*, the land owners and the *muhassıls* all acted in cooperation to favour their own interests and did not obeyed to the rule of law in the collection of the taxes. Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları*, pp. 210–211; İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', p. 630. Hence, the *muhassıllık* system, which was set out in the Gülhane Rescript as a way to find a solution to the problems of the *iltizam* system, had to be disbanded. Shaw, 'The nineteenth Century Ottoman Tax Reforms and Revenue System', pp. 422–423; Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları*, p. 211; Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devri'nde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri*, pp. 32–33. Since the central government could not succeed in eliminating the old tax-farming system, it had to re-stress its abolition of it and direct taxation methods in 1856 edict, like the abolition of bribery and other abuses: '... The taxes are to be levied under the same denomination from all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of class or of religion. The most prompt and energetic means for remedying the abuses in collecting the taxes, and especially the tithes, shall be considered. The system of direct collections shall, gradually, and as soon as possible, be substituted for the plan of farming, in all the branches of the revenues of the state. As long as the present system remains in force all agents of the government and all members of the *meclis* shall be forbidden under the severest penalties...', 'İslahat Fermanı, 18 February 1856', in Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, p. 318.

²² Mustafa Reşid Paşa served multiple times as foreign minister (1837–1841, 1845–1846, and 1853–1854) and grand vizier (1846–1848, 1848–1852, 1852, 1854–1855, 1856–1857, and 1857–1858); Ali Paşa as grand vizier (1852–1853, 1855–1856, 1858–1859, and 1867–1871); and Fuat Paşa as foreign minister (1852–1853, 1855–1856, 1858–1860, and 1867–1871) and grand vizier, (1861–1863 and 1863–1866).

²³ Butrus Abu-Manneh, 'The Sultan and the Bureaucracy: The Anti-Tanzimat Concepts of Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 22 (1990), p. 260.

²⁴ İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', pp. 637–638.

²⁵ İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', p. 638.

²⁶ Abu-Manneh, 'The Sultan and the Bureaucracy: The Anti-Tanzimat Concepts of Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha', pp. 260–265.

²⁷ Shaw and Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, 1808–1975*, p. 64.

Suppressing his own tendencies, he fit in very well with the group of Mustafa Reşid Paşa without becoming influenced by him. He wrote a treatise in which he explained his ideas about the reasons for the Ottoman decline and, the Tanzimat and presented suggestions for the revival of the empire.²⁸ He believed that the absolute power of the Ottoman sultan must be restored to return the Ottoman Empire to the way, as it had been during the reign of Mahmud II. According to Mahmud Nedim Paşa, the main reason for the decline of the empire was the renouncing of Sharia principles in favour of the rise of the bureaucratic class.²⁹ Supported by Sunni Orthodox Islam, such anti-reformist tendencies regarding the political power of the sultans constituted a base for the pan-Islamist policy of Abdülhamid II subsequent years.

It is known that Mahmud Nedim Pasha served in İzmir for 6 months between September 1856 and March 1857.³⁰ As a result of my inquiry into the Ottoman-Turkish archival material and Greek newspapers of the time in İzmir, there is no evidence of the possible impact of his anti-reformist rule in İzmir. This does not mean that anti-reformists were absent in İzmir. However, even if they existed and attempted to disrupt the implementation of the reform regulations, they did not become influential; or, if some conservative groups existed in public and were annoyed by the reform regulations, they remained silent within the cosmopolitan commercial society of the city. The people of İzmir were accustomed to conducting their economic activities in the multi-ethno-religious environment of the city for almost two and a half centuries. The intricate local relations mingled people of different ethno-religious backgrounds during the process of economic expansion of İzmir. Furthermore, the level of economic expansion İzmir achieved required close interaction of people of İzmir with different ethno-religious affiliations.³¹ The three basic studies on the city³² emphasised that the cosmopolitan population of İzmir served the city well. İzmir grew as a major commercial centre and managed to resist or recover from the external assaults and natural disasters that beset the city persistently and regularly. They argued that economic wealth and the strength of local commercial networks played a key role in allowing the people of the city to become the agents of a long period of growth.

²⁸ Abu-Manneh, 'The Sultan and the Bureaucracy: The Anti-Tanzimat Concepts of Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha', pp. 258, 260–261.

²⁹ His background helps explain the origin of his opposition to the Tanzimat regulations: Mahmud Nedim Paşa, whose father belonged to the Naqshbandi-Khalidi order, had a Sunni Orthodox Islam education. During his grand vizierate, he dismissed all the followers of Ali and Fuat Paşa from their offices and replaced them with his own. But, despite his attempts to nullify the Tanzimat regulations, the bureaucracy, established and strengthened by Ali and Fuat Paşa, resisted his policies. Abu-Manneh, 'The Sultan and the Bureaucracy', pp. 263–267.

³⁰ Abu-Manneh, 'The Sultan and the Bureaucracy: The Anti-Tanzimat Concepts of Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha', p. 259.

³¹ Reşat Kasaba, 'İzmir 1922: A Port City Unravels', in Leila Tarazi Fawaz, Christopher Alan Bayly (eds.), *Culture and Modernity from Mediterranean and to Indian Ocean* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), pp. 211, 216.

³² Reşat Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century* (New York: State University of New York, 1988), 'Was There a Compradore Bourgeoisie in Mid-Nineteenth Century Western Anatolia?', *Review*, XL, 2 (Spring 1988), pp. 215–228, 'İzmir', *Review*, XVI, 4 (Fall 1993), pp. 387–410; Elena Frangakis Syrett, *The Commerce of İzmir in The Eighteenth Century 1700–1820* (Athens: The Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1992); Elena Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second half of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries', in Charles Issawi and Dimitri Gondicas (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1999), 'Western and Local Entrepreneurs in İzmir in the 19th and early 20th Centuries', in Tuncer Baykara (ed.), *Son Yüzyıllarda İzmir ve Batı Anadolu Uluslararası Sempozyumu Tebliğleri* (İzmir: Akademi Kitapevi, 1993); Daniel Goffman, *İzmir and the Levantine World, 1550–1650* (Seattle, WA: Washington University Press, 1990), 'İzmir from Village to Colonial Port City', in Ethem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, and Bruce Masters (eds.), *The Ottoman City between East and West, Aleppo, İzmir, and İstanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1st edition, 1999, 2nd edition, 2000).

In their analyses, the political and economic seats of power worked at cross purposes, with the latter trying to contain the former. All agreed that the collaboration of the people of İzmir, especially the city's Ottoman Greek and Turkish residents was indispensable for its long-term prosperity. However, none specifically addressed the nature of the communal relations among the people of the city, and the relationship between the central/local governance and the Greek community of the city.

In trying to fill this lacuna, this article has examined the latter. In doing so, it re-interprets Ottoman reforms. Rather than seeing them as a set of western imposed policies that led to a radical break with the pre-Tanzimat regulations and favoured the empire's non-Muslim populations, it argues that the reforms actually opened up new ways of co-existing and reinforcing each other to the different ethno-religious communities in İzmir. Instead of approaching the history of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire monolithically as a disintegration process, the nineteenth-century Ottoman reforms can be seen as an integration endeavour. The interactive relationship between local governance and the Greek community of İzmir demonstrates this well. It was not only the struggle of the Ottoman Empire to integrate itself to the West, but also to meld and integrate its multi-ethno-religious society in order to accommodate the social changes of the nineteenth century.

The people of İzmir paved their own way in forming economic and social relations that resulted in economic progress and social cohesion, and maintained them until the beginning of the twentieth century. This cannot be attributed to the weak bonds between the city of İzmir and the central administration. On the contrary, the residents of İzmir began to form their wide international network with the supporting policies of the centre in the middle of the seventeenth century that was the way the port of İzmir was made a unique venue for the conduct of international trade in the Aegean region at the expense of the ports of Kuşadası, Çeşme, and Chios.³³ The vital economic activity that resulted affected the nature of the both communal relations in the city's multi-ethno-religious society and the relationship of the non-Muslim communities with the local governance. İzmir's relations with the centre were not weak in economic terms, but in social and cultural terms; that is, while the Ottoman government played role in forming its economic relations, it left, even if unintentionally, relatively free in its societal organisation and cultural development. Nevertheless, during the Tanzimat period, it was interested in maintaining the city's social order and integrating it

³³ In the 1650s and 1660s, the internal commercial growth of İzmir increased due to an influx of merchants from the Atlantic, including Armenian Christians, Orthodox Greeks, and Jews, who came to the region in order to share in the wealth of the city. A change in imperial policy affected the economic development of the city, which in turn influenced its social and cultural development. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Ottoman state ceased to discourage the development of an international commercial network in İzmir, as it had done in the sixteenth century. Instead, it started to view the city as an additional source of income for the treasury and army. Therefore, after the 1660s, the central authority began to encourage international commerce in the city and to re-integrate it into the empire's economic and administrative structure so as benefit from its wealth. Goffman, 'İzmir from Village to Colonial Port City', pp. 90, 105. Even it implemented policies making İzmir the only influential port in western Anatolia able to conduct trade with the international market. Trade in the smaller ports of other coastal Aegean towns was forbidden by an imperial decree so that the ports of Kuşadası and Çeşme had to conduct their trade activities via the port of İzmir. (This meant that their grains, fruits, wines, raisins, and figs were exported to Europe exclusively through the İzmir port.) Moreover, the central authority restricted Chios' trade in favour of İzmir, in spite of the abundance of local products in Chios. Thus, İzmir began to flourish economically by encouraging such imperial policy in the middle of the seventeenth century. Frangakis Syrett, *The Commerce of İzmir in The Eighteenth Century 1700–1820*, pp. 26–27.

in to the centre through its control mechanisms. Since the central authorities were not interested in the social-cultural development of İzmir, but only in its economy, the people of İzmir were relatively free to construct their own kinds of social relations. This also provided the Greek community of the city to construct their own ways of communication with the local governance of the city, which tried to integrate the non-Muslim communities in to the Tanzimat ideology of Ottomanism.

Regarding the impact of the Ottoman reforms on the non-Muslims of the Empire, conventional Ottoman historiography has argued that the Tanzimat strengthened the economic and social positions of the non-Muslims at the expense of the Muslims and principle of equality in the Gülhane Edict (1839) and the abolition of the *millet* system³⁴ in the 1856 Hatt-ı Hümayun provided them more freedom.³⁵ This, in turn, led to the collapse of the Empire.³⁶ Accordingly, the focus of conventional Ottoman historiography on the ethnic homogeneity of Turks and its history, and of the Modern Greek historiography on the suppression of the Ottoman Greeks under the Ottoman rule, engendered the notion of two ‘conflicting communities’, Greek versus Turk or non-Muslim versus non-Muslim.

More recent work has generated a renewed interest in urban histories of the Ottoman cities in the age of the Ottoman reforms that challenges this prevailing view and examines the influence of the Ottoman reforms at society level. These studies focused on social relations and communal interactions, and interactive centre-periphery relations within the context of Ottoman modernity.³⁷ They demonstrated the existence of intercommunal interaction and interactive centre-periphery relations, and the strengthening local and urban character of the cities

³⁴ In social terms, Ottoman community was made up of Muslim and non-Muslim divisions, in which Muslims were privileged and non-Muslims were protected subjects of the Empire as people of the book in accordance with *zimmi* (*dhimmi*) pact of Islamic law. In the Islamic doctrine, which was made up of according to the Constitution of Medina, *dhimma* means ‘compact guaranteeing security’. In other words, in Islam *dhimma* was a kind of contract promising protection of non-Muslims in return for acceptance of subordinate status and automatically repealed if the *dhimmis* did not obey the contract. C.E. Bosworth, ‘The Concept of *dhimma* in Early Islam’, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc. 1982), Vol. I, pp. 40–41. Before the Tanzimat—Reorganization (1839–1876)—the social structure of the Ottoman Empire depended on the *millet* (community) system in which non-Muslims or *zimmis* (*dhimmis*) were considered as religiously defined members of a community, but not as individuals. Benjamin Braude, ‘Foundation Myths of the Millet System’, in Bernard Lewis and Benjamin Braude (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1982), Vol. I, p. 73. In the pre-Tanzimat the term *millet* did not occur to mean non-Muslims. It began to be used for non-Muslims in the official language of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century after the Tanzimat. Braude, ‘Foundation Myths of the Millet System’, p. 73.

³⁵ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford UP, 1961); Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964); Stanford J. Shaw, *Between Old and New* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 1st edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), Vols. I and II; for the economic prevalence of the non-Muslims over Muslims, Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of Turkey 1800–1914* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980); Donald Quataert, *Social Disintegration and Popular Resistance in the Ottoman Empire, 1881–1908*, Reactions to European Economic Penetration (New York: NYU Press, 1983).

³⁶ Salahi Ramadan Sonyel, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society Printing House, 1993).

³⁷ Fikret Adanir, ‘Semi-autonomous Provincial Forces in the Balkans and Anatolia’, *ibid*, pp. 157–185; Carter Findley, ‘Political Culture and the Great Households’, in S.N. Faroqi (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 65–80; Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts, Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430–1950* (London, New York, Toronto and Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2005); Bülent Özdemir, *Ottoman Reforms and Social Life: Reflections from Salonica, 1830–1850* (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2003); Nora Lafi, *Municipalités Méditerranéennes: les réformes urbaines Ottomanes au miroir d’une histoire comparée* (Berlin: K. Schwarz, 2005), *Une ville du Maghreb entre ancien régime et réformes ottomanes*:

during the age of the reforms. The recent urban histories of İzmir, too—an architectural history³⁸ and a social and cultural history of the city,³⁹ challenging the assumption that İzmir was a physically and socially segregated society—showed the existence of inter-communal relations, but have not dealt specifically with the question of the relationship between the central/local authority and the flourishing Greek community of İzmir in the Tanzimat period. The effect of the centralising Ottoman reforms on the people of multi ethno-religious İzmir and the relationship of the local authority with the non-Muslim residents of the city has not previously been examined in detail.

In analyzing this issue, in the present article, Greek newspapers of the period as well as some Ottoman-Turkish documents have been used. Newspapers and official documents allow us to see into society but still they are imperfect sources as they do not necessarily get as much beyond the ways in which the community wanted itself represented. Nevertheless, they provide us information to understand social relations and relationship of communities with the local governance. Below, I discuss the questions of how did the centralising Ottoman reforms affect Greeks of İzmir? What kind of policies did the imperial centre inaugurate towards the Greek community of İzmir in the face of the new Greek State and the growing Balkan separatist movements? And, how did the local officials treat the non-Muslim communities of the city? Examining such questions through analyzing both Greek and Ottoman-Turkish sources may offer an alternative view, a more integrative one, concerning the relations between the Ottoman Muslim central/local authorities and Greek Orthodox Christians of the Empire. That is to say, discussing these questions by freeing ourselves from biased conventional approaches may contribute towards a better understanding of the dynamics of coexistence in the multi ethno-religious Ottoman cities that were brought to an abrupt end as a result of the nation building formations.

An Overview of the Greek Community of the City

The migrant Greek national merchants and guildsmen together with the Ottoman Greek subjects and protected Greeks in İzmir pioneered the formation of the middle class.⁴⁰ However, the Greek community of İzmir was in disorder in terms of administration and organisation of the community during the Tanzimat years. The religious clergy of the Orthodox Church, the affluent Ottoman Greeks and the Greek nationals who migrated to İzmir from the Greek Kingdom were in

Footnote 37 continued

genèse des institutions municipales à Tripoli de Barbarie, 1795–1911 (Paris: L'Harmattan; Tunis: IRMC. Institut de recherche sur le Maghreb contemporain, 2002); Bruce Masters, 'Semi-autonomous Forces in the Arab Provinces', in S.N. Faroqi (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 186–206; Ussama Makdisi, *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History, and Violence in Nineteenth Century Ottoman Lebanon* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000); Beshara Doumani, *Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus 1700–1900* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995); (Harper Collins Publishers, 2004); Meropi Anastassadou, *Salonique 1830–1912* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Nikolai Todorov, *The Balkan City, 1400–1900* (London: University of Washington Press, 1983).

³⁸ Sibel Zandi Sayek, *Public Space and Urban Citizens: Ottoman İzmir in the Remaking, 1840–1890*, unpublished PhD dissertation (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2001).

³⁹ Marie-Carmen Smyrnelis, *Une société hors de soi: identités et relations sociales à Smyrne au XVIIIe et XIXe siècles* (Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005).

⁴⁰ Sia Anagnostopoulou, Μικρά Ασία, 19ος αι.-1919. Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες. Από το Μιλλέτ των Ρωμιών στο Ελληνικό Έθνος [Asia Minor, 19th c.–1919. The Greek Orthodox Communities. From Millet-irum to the Greek Nation] (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 1998), p. 307.

competition to dominate the organisation and educational facilities of the community. Moreover, Tanzimat regulations disturbed the political and economic power of the religious clergy in the Orthodox Church, and this led to confusion and disorder within the community. However, this disorder within the Greek community did not occur only because of the Tanzimat regulations, its origins trace back to earlier years when they were in contest in terms of economic matters.⁴¹ As a result, in spite of their internal conflicts and disorder, İzmir Greeks dominated the sectors of shipping, mining, commercial agriculture, tax farming, banking and finance, light industry and the wine, cloth, and liquor trade in the local economy of İzmir by the second decade of the twentieth century.⁴² Ottoman Greek and protected Greek merchants made up between 40 and 50 per cent of the city's merchants at the end of the nineteenth and into the early twentieth centuries.⁴³

The Greeks of İzmir occupied the highest number of households compared to other non-Muslim and European communities. The proportion of the non-Muslim population according to their citizenship in İzmir in 1841 was listed in descending order as: Greek, British, Austrian, French, Russian, Tuscan, Genovese, Napolitan, and Sardinian.⁴⁴ Among these, the Greeks were the greatest in number but not the richest community in İzmir.⁴⁵ Their diverse economic activities and demographic advantage over the other communities in the nineteenth century aided the Greek community into becoming pioneers in the economic predominance of İzmir. The Greek community of İzmir had already become prominent in certain sectors of the economy, ever since the age of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.⁴⁶ We already know of their active economic involvement and considerable contribution to the city's economic development in the nineteenth century.⁴⁷ They always successfully competed with other Ottoman intermediaries⁴⁸ and merchants, Muslims and Non-Muslims, inside and outside the Empire, such as

⁴¹ A crisis broke out between Ottoman Greek guildsmen and merchants, and affluent Ottoman Greek merchants and the church in 1819. As they strengthened economically, the tradesmen and merchants wanted to participate in the internal affairs of the community—its administration, education, and organisation. But, affluent Ottoman Greek merchants did not want to share their political and cultural power over the community with this class of merchants and guildsmen. Although they could not fully penetrate into community organisations until 1905, merchants and tradesmen gained more active role in community organisation in the second half of the nineteenth century. Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία, 19ος αι-1919. Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες. Από το Μιλλέτ των Ρωμιών στο Ελληνικό Έθνος*, p. 339.

⁴² Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir', pp. 19–34.

⁴³ Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir', p. 19.

⁴⁴ Mübahat Küttükoğlu, 'İzmir Temettü Sayımları ve Yabancı Tebaa', in Mübahat Küttükoğlu (ed.), *İzmir Tarihinden Kestiler* (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, Kent Kitaplığı Dizisi, 2000), p. 40.

⁴⁵ For example, their properties amounted to only 19 per cent of the British properties, because the Greeks were mostly shopkeepers (*esnaf*), which was not a very profitable occupation. The citizens of four big states—Britain, France, Russia and Austria—were employed in brokerage and trade, which involved high profits. Küttükoğlu, *İzmir Tarihinden Kestiler*, p. 45.

⁴⁶ Kasaba, 'İzmir', p. 395; Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second half of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries', p. 18.

⁴⁷ Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century*; Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second half of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries'; Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of Turkey: 1800–1914* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 'The Transformation of the Economic Position of the Millets in the Nineteenth Century', in Bernard Lewis & Benjamin Braude (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), Vol. I, pp. 261–285, 'Introduction', in Charles Issawi and Dimitri Gondicas (eds.), *Greeks in the Age of Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1999); Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία, 19ος αι-1919. Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες. Από το Μιλλέτ των Ρωμιών στο Ελληνικό Έθνος*.

⁴⁸ Local merchants or an individual merchant, whether non-Muslim or Muslim, either engaging in trade, tax farming, and money landing, is named by Kasaba 'intermediaries'. Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century*, pp. 75–85.

Armenians, Turks, and Jews, as well as the British.⁴⁹ The reason for the economic rise of the Ottoman Greeks was not their cooperation with foreign capitalists and the continuing good relations between them and foreigners as a 'comprador business class'. On the contrary, non-Muslim intermediaries were not 'a comprador business class', but were an economically active group that developed through obtaining power from controlling the sources outside of the control of the Ottoman bureaucracy.⁵⁰

The intermediaries were not favouring European (especially Britain) plans to install foreign financial institutions and set up new production and trading systems in western Anatolia. Their efforts for resistance against British penetration were more successful than their contest with Ottoman policies of reorganisation.⁵¹ Thereby, the acts of the local authorities—local governor, *mütesellim*,⁵² and customs officials—delayed effective implication of the 1838 British-Ottoman Trade Convention for a long time⁵³ and could not prevent the flourish of the Ottoman Greek bourgeoisie. The section below deals with the less addressed question of how the centralising Ottoman reforms affected the Greek community of İzmir that constituted a milestone of the middle class bourgeoisie when the city was in its urban transformation along with the attempts of the imperial government to integrate the city into the centre.

Imperial Reform Decrees and the Attempts of the Imperial Centre to Control İzmir's Greek Community

The principle of the rule of law was stressed in the reform edicts of both 1839 and 1856, when Ottoman sultans accepted the rule of law, as superior to their political power. However, this was not done in the Western sense, in which the idea of a state is generally associated with an impersonal and privileged constitutional order capable of administering and controlling a given territory.⁵⁴ The meaning of sovereignty had altered in Western Europe by the nineteenth century. After the experiences of the Renaissance, the Reformation, religious wars, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution, sovereignty meant something new in Europe: in the modern state, it was now believed, the final and absolute political authority is entrusted to the political community made up of people and within its jurisdiction no other actor may dispute the will of the sovereign state.⁵⁵

In the case of the Ottoman Empire, the sovereignty was entrusted to the Ottoman sultan himself, as was re-emphasised in the 1856 reform edict. While the Ottoman state reconfirmed the principle of the equality of non-Muslims established with the *Gülhane* Edict (1839) in the 1856 imperial edict, it also announced the complete abolishment of the *millet* system and described the reforms. While the reforms expanded and guaranteed the rights and freedoms of all people of the empire,

⁴⁹ Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second half of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries', p. 18.

⁵⁰ Reşat Kasaba, 'Was There a Comprador Bourgeoisie in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Western Anatolia', *Review*, XL, 2 (Spring 1988), pp. 215–228.

⁵¹ Kasaba, 'İzmir', p. 403.

⁵² *Mütesellim*: local official; deputy governor; tax collector.

⁵³ Elena Frangakis Syrett, 'Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on İzmir's Trade: European and Minority Merchants', *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 7 (Spring, 1992), pp. 99, 91–112.

⁵⁴ David Held, *Political Theory and the Modern State* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1989), p. 12.

⁵⁵ Pierson, *The Modern State*, p. 14.

regardless of religion, these rights and freedoms were in fact entrusted to them by central government; the 1856 edict ‘recognized implicitly that the government was the source of their rights and freedoms’.⁵⁶ In the pre-Tanzimat Ottoman era, the rights and freedoms of the non-Muslim communities were inherent in the *millet* system itself and could not be restricted or changed at will. Given in perpetuity, they therefore ‘became inherent in the millet itself without being subject to renewal, abolition or limitation’, a situation that had been since the time of the Mehmed II.⁵⁷ However, in the 1856 imperial edict, the sultan underscored that the *millet* would proceed with his high approval and the supervision of his high Porte.⁵⁸ The sovereignty was entrusted to the Ottoman sultan himself, as was re-stressed in the 1856 reform edict.⁵⁹ In the 1856 reform edict, the Ottoman sultanate presented itself as the only source of power in delegating—and also in ‘inspecting’—freedoms and rights within the Ottoman lands. Hence, the reform edicts of 1839 and 1856 brought non-Muslim communities under closer scrutiny by the central authority. Their employment in the public service or administration was contingent on the ‘sovereign will’ of the Ottoman sultan. The same was true for all teachers or others working in the field of education. The 1856 imperial edict stressed this fact saying that the employment of the non-Muslim subjects was determined only by his ‘sovereign command’.⁶⁰ This closer control was clearly expressed in the 1856 imperial edict. In fact, archival correspondence suggests that this closer control of the Greek community had already begun in İzmir after the 1839 edict. In 1840, a letter from the grand vizierate warned the *muhassıl* of İzmir (‘collector of funds’) that the activities of Greek and Austrian merchants and the staging of Greek theatrical plays might lead to hostility and unrest in İzmir’s society.⁶¹ The grand

⁵⁶ Kemal Karpat, ‘Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era’, in Braude and Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc. 1982), p. 164.

⁵⁷ Karpat, ‘Millets and Nationality’, p. 145.

⁵⁸ Karpat, ‘Millets and Nationality’, p. 164. ‘... The guarantees promised on our part by the Hatt-ı Hümayun of Gülhane, and in conformity with the Tanzimat, to all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of classes or of religion, for the security of their persons and property, and the preservation of their honor, are to-day confirmed and consolidated, and efficacious measures shall be taken in order that they may have their full entire effect. All the privileges and spiritual immunities granted by my ancestors, ab antiquo, and at subsequent dates, to all Christian communities or other non-Mussulman persuasions established in my empire, under my protection, shall be confirmed and maintained. Every Christian or other non-Mussulman community shall be bound within a fixed period, and with concurrence of a commission composed ad hoc of members of its own body, to proceed, with my high approbation and under the inspection of my Sublime Porte, to examine into its actual immunities and privileges, and to discuss and submit to my Sublime Porte the reforms required by the progress of civilization and of the age...’ ‘Islahat Fermanı (18 February 1856)’, in Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, pp. 316–317.

⁵⁹ ‘... As all forms of religion are and shall be freely professed in my dominions... The nomination and choice of all functionaries and other employees of my empire being wholly dependent upon my sovereign will, all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments, and qualified to fill them according to their capacity and merit, and conformably with rules to be generally applied... The nomination and choice of all functionaries and other employees of my empire being wholly dependent upon my sovereign will, all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments...’ ‘Islahat Fermanı’ (18 February 1856), Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, p. 316.

⁶⁰ The sovereignty was entrusted with the Ottoman sultan himself, as the 1856 reform edict re-emphasised: ‘... As all forms of religion are and shall be freely professed in my dominions... The nomination and choice of all functionaries and other employees of my empire being wholly dependent upon my sovereign will, all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments, and qualified to fill them according to their capacity and merit, and conformably with rules to be generally applied... The nomination and choice of all functionaries and other employees of my empire being wholly dependent upon my sovereign will, all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments...’, Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, pp. 269–271.

⁶¹ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA), Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası, Sadaret Evrakı Mektubi Kalemi (A.MKT), 10/10, 1260.2.24, (1844).

vizierate ordered the *muhassıl* to check the licenses of these merchants and the Greek schools and theatres. If they were unlicensed, they had to be closed down and such improper activities had to be forbidden in the districts of İzmir. The grand vizierate warned the *muhassıl*, that performances of Greek tragedies might instigate hatred and other unfavourable feelings among the populace citing as an example the Greek tragedy play about Marko Boçari who was one of the leaders in the Greek revolt of 1821.⁶² This indicates that the Ottoman state was sensitive to potential social unrest in the city, and concerned with the preservation of its multi ethno-religious society. We should also take into account the centre's concerns about the impact of the nascent Greek state on the native Greeks of İzmir.

Another document that shows the control of the centre is a 'memorial' (*tezkire*) written by the grand vizierate to the 'district chief' (*kaymakam*) of İzmir in 1844⁶³ concerning permission to re-publish the Greek newspaper *Amaltheia*. In earlier times, the paper had been shut down because some of its articles were clearly against the Ottoman government. In 1844, the state allowed *Amaltheia* to begin publishing again, on the condition that it would not run articles or material unfavourable to the imperial government. In regards to the centre control over the activities of the Greek community in İzmir, the archival evidence also shows that an imperial decree was sent to the *muhassıl* of İzmir (Şakir Bey) in 1847 ordering the close monitoring by disguised observers of Greeks in their churches and places where they came together (...*lisana aşına iki nefer kullarını tebdil-i came ile...*).⁶⁴ The *muhassıl* looked into the matter and reported that the Greeks expressed their blessings to the sultan in their prayers in the churches. He also mentioned that the Greeks, including those under the protection of Western states, submitted their *cizye* (non-Muslim poll tax) papers without being pressured, and that they were very happy with the government's stamp for the registration of their boats which was free of charge. Foreign consulates charged 40 *kuruş* to stamp or validate a passport (a practice known as passport debit).⁶⁵ In this document, we also see that although the old control practice of spying on people by the use of 'disguise' (*tebdil-i kıyafet* or *tebdil-i came*) was abolished by an imperial edict in 1829,⁶⁶ it remained in use during the Tanzimat era in İzmir. Other documents indicate that the imperial government attempted to prevent the formation of anti-government public opinion, and to maintain loyalty to the Ottoman state through the use of such control mechanisms over the socio-cultural activities of İzmir Greeks.

While the above-mentioned documents illustrate the attempts of the Ottoman state to make the freedom of non-Muslims solely dependent on the sultan's personal sovereign will, such efforts also assured these groups' rights by both depending on the Tanzimat regulations and applying pre-Tanzimat principles. In the nineteenth century, while İzmir played a crucial role in transmitting Western ideas and modernising elements to the Ottoman Empire, the central authority attempted to re-integrate the city into its administrative and political structure through reform regulations. Such typical archival documents for the case of İzmir

⁶² BOA, A.MKT, 10/10, 1260.2.24 (1844).

⁶³ BOA, A.MKT, 12/67, 1260.5.5 (1844).

⁶⁴ BOA, A.MKT, 96/37, 1263.10.15 (1846).

⁶⁵ BOA, A.MKT, 96/37, 1263.10.15 (1846).

⁶⁶ BOA, Cevdet Dahiliye, 14243, 7 March 1829 quoted in Cengiz Kırılı, *The Struggle Over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman İstanbul, 1780–1845*, unpublished dissertation (Binghamton: Binghamton University, 2000), p. 272, FN. 50.

suggest that the Ottoman Empire struggled to integrate its western periphery to the centre not only implementing control mechanisms, but also by applying Tanzimat regulations. In other words, the centre pushed İzmir to re-adjust to its own principles,⁶⁷ an argument supported by the archival examples cited. While the state used both the pre-Tanzimat and Tanzimat premises in order to entrench the notion of Ottomanism for social unity and cohesion,⁶⁸ it also increased its control mechanisms over its provinces. As far as İzmir is concerned, it attempted to do this through local governance. The centre regularly communicated with the local authorities and asked them to check the social and cultural activities of the İzmir Greeks, to restrict influence of the consuls, and continuously sent warning letters from ‘Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances’ (*Meclis-i Vala-yi Divan-ı Adliye*) to the local authorities in İzmir and—in general in western Anatolia—stressing the importance of the implementation of the new regulations.⁶⁹

İzmir integrated with the centre but also kept its local character. As the central authority applied its reform regulations, the locality and middle class of İzmir did not weaken, instead strengthened. İzmir Greeks had good relations with the local governance; interactive communal relations and urban locality of the city were consolidated during the centralising reforms. Tanzimat Reforms did not disturb social cohesion of İzmir, which the city produced with its local character and some peculiar dynamics over the centuries. The reason for this social cohesion and tolerance was the presence and strength of the middle class and social cultural and economic dynamics that the city reproduced over the centuries. The city’s background as regards the nature of the relationship between the central authority and its western periphery is an important factor in understanding the relationship between İzmir’s local governance and centre: The Ottoman government did not turn İzmir into the centre of a separate province until 1841, when it became the centre of the Aydın province.⁷⁰ In earlier centuries the city had been reserved as *hass-ı padişahi*.⁷¹ Therefore, the *kadı* was the city’s highest administrator, not a high-ranking paşa.⁷² This gave inhabitants of the city with more flexibility in conducting business.⁷³ Unlike in other towns and cities of the empire, there was little restriction in İzmir on the power of the *kadı*, who had the privilege of intervening in the affairs of foreign

⁶⁷ Sia Anagnostopoulou, “‘İzmir’s ‘National Historical Mission’”, in *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nation States. A Long and Difficult Process: The Greek Case* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2004), p. 76.

⁶⁸ For the implementation of the pre-Tanzimat and Tanzimat principles from the years 1839 to 1864, Feryal Tansuğ, *Communal Relations in İzmir/Smyrna, 1826–1864: As seen through the Prism of Greek-Turkish Relations*, unpublished PhD dissertation (Toronto: University of Toronto, Department of Near & Middle Eastern Civilizations, 2007).

⁶⁹ Many vizierial letters or notes from the *Meclis-i Vala*, which were addressed to the governor of provinces or *mutasarrıf*s in Western Anatolia are available in the Ottoman archives. They ordered prevention of any contrary actions against the Tanzimat regulations and attentive application of them. BOA, A.MKT, 213/2 1265.8.21 (12 June 1848), A.MKT, 235/93. *Meclis-i Vala* issued the regulations of the Tanzimat to the distant districts of the Empire (*taşra*). In these correspondences, *Meclis-i Vala* warned the local officials in *taşra* that the new rules and regulations of the Tanzimat should be obeyed and necessary inspections should be made to see if the new regulations were obeyed. BOA, Cevdet Adliye (C.ADL), n. 843, 2 Zi’l-kaide 1261 (2 November 1845); C.ADL, n. 842, n.d.

⁷⁰ Baykara, *İzmir Şehri Tarihi*, p. 54. Between 1843 and 1850, the centre of the Aydın province was changed, first moving to Aydın itself, then, in 1850, İzmir again became the centre of the Province. Baykara, *İzmir Şehri Tarihi*. İzmir became a separate province in 1866. Özer Ergenç, *Osmanlı Klasik Dönemi Kent Tarihçiliğine Katkı, 16.yy’da Ankara ve Konya* [A Contribution to the Urban History, Ankara and Konya in the 16th Century] (Ankara: Ankara Enstitüsü Vakfı Yayınları, 1995), p. 142.

⁷¹ Baykara, *İzmir Şehri Tarihi*, p. 53.

⁷² Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, p. 389.

⁷³ Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, p. 390.

nations.⁷⁴ Moreover, there was a *voyvoda*⁷⁵ who was responsible for the collection of taxes from the land called *hassa-ı padişahi* for the imperial household.⁷⁶ In the sixteenth century, the land in and around İzmir was assigned as *hassa-ı padişahi*, referring to a *dirlik* whose tax revenues and administration belonged directly to the sultan. In the Ottoman *tumar* system there was principle of ‘*mefruzü’l-kalem ve makt’u’ul-kadem*’.⁷⁷ According to this rule, the governor of a province, or the *sancakbeyi*, could not interfere in the administration of the *dirliks* that were allocated to the sultan and high official authorities. These *dirliks* were administrated by their owners and called ‘*serbest tumar*’.⁷⁸ Thus, inhabitants of İzmir belonging to this system could keep their own cultivation types since they were not subject to the classic centrally controlled *tumar* system. This gave residents the relative freedom to earn their substance and to conduct trade, and also contributed to the preservation of the special character of the city, not only as a secure natural port, but also as a safe place for refugees of different ethnic or religious backgrounds.⁷⁹ Hence, the weak administrative ties between İzmir and the centre gave the city’s communities relative freedom in developing their connections with the Mediterranean.⁸⁰ However, not only the weak administrative relations with the centre, but also the imperial policy encouraging the development of İzmir in the seventeenth century⁸¹ should be considered as a factor in the port city’s increasing ties with Europe and the Mediterranean. In order to understand İzmir’s peculiar condition *vis-à-vis* the Ottoman central authority, I suggest that we should consider the social-cultural and economic dynamics produced by the city’s multi-ethno-religious society.

Local Authority’s Attempts to Stimulate Political Loyalty among the İzmir/Smyrna Greeks

From the newspapers of the time, we know that the coronations of the Ottoman sultans, their visits to the city, the births of their sons, and sometimes the sultans’ birthdays themselves, were all celebrated in İzmir at events organised by the local governance and announced in the local papers. In 1836, the birth of one of the sons

⁷⁴ Goffman, ‘İzmir from Village to Colonial Port City’, p. 85; Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, p. 389; Baykara, *İzmir Şehri Tarihi*, p. 53.

⁷⁵ The *voyvoda* was the governmental officer responsible for collecting *has* and treasury revenues in the districts. Çadırıcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları*, pp. 29–30.

⁷⁶ Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, p. 390.

⁷⁷ *Mefruzü’l-kalem ve makt’u’l-kadem*: A phrase used to recognise autonomous status to a property or to guarantee freedom from outside interference to the possessor of a treasury stipend or allowance. Freely translated it means ‘separated from the treasury accounts’. [Kalem: an item in a financial register, and ‘off limits to all trespass’ (literally ‘cut off (from the entry of) the foot’], Rhoads Murphy, *The functioning of the Ottoman Army under Murad IV (1623–1639/1032–1042)*, *Understanding of the Relationship between Centre and Periphery in 17th Century Turkey*, unpublished dissertation (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1979), p. 316; *Mefruzü’l-kalem ve makt’u’l-kadem*: Separated from the pen and cut off from the foot (and) given. Dariuse Kolodziejczyk, *The Ottoman Survey Register of Podolia (ca. 1681)*, *Defter-i Mufassal-ı Eyalet-i Kamaniçe, Copies of Privileges Concerning Kara Mustafa’s Vakıf in Studenecja*, Part I, Appendix Vol. III (Harvard: Distributed by Harvard University press for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, n.a), p. 279.

⁷⁸ *Mefruzü’l-kalem ve makt’u’l-kadem*, BOA. MAD. 7589, p. 118–119. Also see Bayram Kodaman, *Sultan II. Abdülhamit Devri Doğu Anadolu Politikası* [Eastern Anotlia Politics in the period of Sultan Abdülhamid II] (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1987), pp. 5–20; and Mehmet Öz, ‘IV. Murad Devrine Ait Gelenekçi Bir Islahat Teklifi’ [A Traditionalist Reform suggestion in the period of Murad IV] *Türkiye Günlüğü*, 24 (1993), pp. 80–85.

⁷⁹ Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, p. 389.

⁸⁰ Kasaba, ‘İzmir’.

⁸¹ Goffman, ‘İzmir from Village to Colonial Port City’, pp. 90, 105; Frangakis-Syrett, *The Commerce of İzmir in The Eighteenth Century 1700–1820*, pp. 26–27.

of Sultan Mahmud II was celebrated in İzmir for seven days and nights. The bazaars and shops, the Turkish quarters and the public buildings were lit up for all seven nights. The illumination of the courthouse was apparently especially remarkable. Cannon-shots were fired five times a day, as was customary at all imperial celebrations.⁸² At the end of the same year, the birthday of Sultan Mahmud II was celebrated in İzmir as well.⁸³ A visit to the city by Sultan Abdülmecit in 1844 was greeted not only by the usual greeting protocols and receptions, but was also celebrated with joy by İzmir's European tradesmen. Horse races were organised in the sultan's honour.⁸⁴ The participation of foreigners in the ceremonies surrounding Abdülmecit's visit may be taken as a sign of the effects of the Tanzimat reforms. After these regulations were announced, not only non-Muslim Ottomans, but also European residents of İzmir felt more at ease. The local authority of İzmir took advantage of every opportunity to organise a celebration related to the city, which was always open to the public. On 22 September 1857, the governor of İzmir, Mustafa Pasha, organised a ceremony for the opening of the İzmir–Aydın railway.⁸⁵ Local governors in İzmir welcomed non-Muslim Ottomans and Europeans onto the organising committees for such celebrations. The 1865 celebration ceremony for Sultan Abdülaziz's coronation, for example, was organised by governor of İzmir, Raşid Paşa, who was beloved by all the people of the city regardless of their religion, and who invited the leaders of every ethno-religious group, leading community members, consuls, and their translators to a decorated and illuminated Ottoman ship called Sadiye, to discuss how the celebration would be organised. Raşid Paşa asked D. Amiran, H. Moraitinin, P. M. Klodon, Baron Varonon Testan, Dr. Rafineski and Ananian Alverti to organise the protocol matters and dancing activity at the ceremony, singling out Madam I.O. Dorsarment to handle the ladies' protocols. Everyone who took part in the entertainment, appreciated Raşid Pasha's kind hospitality.⁸⁶

Such imperially inspired celebrations can be seen both as symbols of central authority and also as attempts to integrate non-Muslims residents into the changing political climate of the Tanzimat through imposing the notion of Ottomanism, and gain their political allegiance, especially in the face of the existence of an independent Greek Kingdom and Balkan separatist movements. Moreover, governors of İzmir did not hesitate to join in the entertainments, celebrations, and ceremonies of the city's non-Muslim residents. The newspaper *Courier de Smyrne* noted that 'The Müsellim Ömer Lütfi Efendi had invited İzmir Levantines to his son's wedding ceremony'.⁸⁷ From other papers of the time, we learn that 'Anastasios Fotiadis, the patriarch of Alexandria, visited the town of Seydiköy in İzmir, where an evening's entertainment of dinner and dancing was organised before he left for Egypt. Raşid Pasha was in attendance along with the accountant Eyüp Efendi, the customs director Şevket Bey, and some other local officials'.⁸⁸ In later years, local

⁸² *Journal de Smyrne* (23 January 1836), quoted in Beyru, *19. yy'da İzmir'de Yaşam*, p. 328, FN. 1083.

⁸³ *Journal de Smyrne* (24 December 1836), quoted in Beyru, *19. yy'da İzmir'de Yaşam*, FN. 1084.

⁸⁴ Beyru, *19. yy'da İzmir'de Yaşam*, p. 357.

⁸⁵ Sibel Zandi Sayek, *Public Space and Urban Citizens*, p. 42, rephrased from the newspaper *Impartial* (25 September 1857).

⁸⁶ *Amaltheia* (18 June 1865), p. 4.

⁸⁷ *Courier de Smyrne* (21 November.1830), quoted in Orhan Koloğlu, 'İlk İzmirli Gazeteciden İzmir Haberleri' [News from the First Smyrnean Journalist of Smyrna] in Tuncer Baykara (ed.), *Son Yüzyılda İzmir ve Batı Anadolu* [İzmir and Western Anatolia in the last century] (İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1993), p. 141.

⁸⁸ *Amaltheia* (28 August 1865), p. 3.

governors of the city participated in the İzmir Greeks' celebration of events related to the Kingdom of Greece. They celebrated Georgios I's 'name day' (the feast day of the saint after which a person is named) 'with freedom and joy'. The consulate director of Greece in İzmir, the Russian consul, and all the Greek officials and citizens alike participated in the celebration. At the ceremony, the name of the Greek king was read along with those of Alexander the Great and Sultan Abdülaziz.⁸⁹ Regular soldiers were present in the front yard of the crowd. From the courtyard of Saint George Church, the voices of the crowd and celebratory gun shots could be heard. After the ceremony in the church, the director of the Greek consulate accepted congratulations from the other consuls. During the celebration that followed, Greeks passed around an icon while playing music. The name day of the Greek king was also celebrated in Aydın at the Metropolitan church, and celebrations of the name days of the Greek kings continued in later years.⁹⁰

In 1873, the Greek consul general and other consuls to İzmir visited the Ottoman ship Ertuğrul to express their thanks to its captain of the ship for the respect he showed during the name day of the Greek king.⁹¹ That same year, the name day was also celebrated in the Bornova district of İzmir. After a morning celebration in the church, the event continued in the centre of town where live İzmir music was performed at a coffee house.⁹² Such celebrations were mostly organised by Greeks of the Greek Kingdom in the city. The interaction between them and the Ottoman Greeks disturbed local authorities and foreign, especially British, diplomats, who feared an uprising of the native İzmir Greeks. Some of the British officials perceived such celebrations of the Kingdom of Greece as a sign of Greek nationalism.⁹³ The British consul reported some activities of the Greek nationals in İzmir, for example, describing them as provocative acts. In 1867, they decided to celebrate the independence day of Greece by raising the Greek flag over İzmir's Agia Fotini church an activity that was organised by an official of the Greek consulate, although the consul himself tried to prevent it. The same British consul also reported the founding of the Greek Literature Association in İzmir in 1863 stating that it was created by 'Hellenes and Ionians' and was less a cultural society than a group trying to cause trouble.⁹⁴ This suggests that the local authorities of İzmir attempted to curb the influence of the Greeks from Greece on the native İzmir Greeks by encouraging mutual interaction through participation in celebrations of urban matters and incorporating them into the imperial celebrations of the sultanate.

Participation of the local authorities in the social activities and events of the Greek community can also be seen as attempts to impose Ottomanism, and to promote unity and cohesion within the city's multi ethno-religious society, in the face of the growing influence from the Greek Kingdom. The local authority in İzmir worked to create a unified political allegiance among the various communities of the city, in accordance with the Tanzimat policy. In addition to the

⁸⁹ *Amaltheia* (28 April 1867), p. 3; Also noted in Gerasimos Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları, 19.yy'da İnanç, Cemaat ve Etnisite* [The Greeks of Asia Minor, Confession, Community, and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century] (İstanbul: Ayraç Yayınları, 1997), p. 329, FN. 23.

⁹⁰ *Amaltheia* (28 April 1867), p. 3.

⁹¹ *Smyrni* (24 April 1873), p. 3.

⁹² *Smyrni* (24 April 1873), p. 3.

⁹³ Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları*, p. 329.

⁹⁴ Embassy and Consular Archives, Foreign Office (FO), 78/176 (14 March 1863), noted in Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları*, p. 329, FN. 23.

local authorities' contact with the non-Muslims of the city, Ottoman sultans also did not hesitate to visit and stay with non-Muslim households during their trips to İzmir. When Sultan Abdülaziz visited İzmir on 23 April 1865, he stayed in the Bornova district at the villa of M. Whithall, one of the oldest English merchants of İzmir. The sultan was greeted by Turkish and Christian crowds, including both *imams* and bishops, in the courtyard of the villa. He also visited the Bornova villa of the Armenian Yusuf Efendi and in the Buca home of M. Baltazzi, who owned two remarkable villas with sizeable gardens.⁹⁵ During his stay, Abdülaziz made considerable donations to all the communities of İzmir.⁹⁶

In another example, dating back to 1865, the Greeks of Çeşme wrote an open letter to the Ottoman sultan and the governor of their town in the newspaper *Amaltheia*, thanking him for uniting Çeşme, Alaçatı, and Karaburun under a single governor, but also expressing their concerns about the physical condition of their town. They mentioned that their new governor, Seyid Bey, had begun to apply 'the new regulations of the empire' so that the roads were cleaned and the physical condition of their town better organised in general. Seyid Bey also negotiated with the Alaçatı Greeks, who were divided among themselves over their discussions on political divisions and conflicts in the kingdom. In their letter, the Greeks of Çeşme expressed their sincere thanks to Seyid Bey for resolving this conflict with his enthusiastic and favourable attitudes.⁹⁷ As this example indicates, the Greeks of Alaçatı were highly concerned with political issues and events in the Greek kingdom, but this did not trigger a reaction from local authorities, neither in İzmir nor in the distant districts of the city. Even on the eve of the formation of the new Greek kingdom in 1831, before the start of the Tanzimat era, the Greek community of Bornova celebrated its religious holiday with big festivities and large crowds, and without any problem with the local officials.⁹⁸

Such examples show that the Greeks of İzmir developed a new political loyalty to the Greek kingdom that coexisted with their loyalty to the Ottoman state. By maintaining their social contact with the non-Muslim residents, Ottoman local authorities in İzmir attempted to keep the Ottoman Greeks socially and politically tied to the Ottoman state. However, the presence of another political loyalty—this one to the Greek state—contributed to the Greek exodus in the 1910s when the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) ruled the Ottoman domains by favouring national economic policies. Moreover, the Greeks' return after the Balkan Wars indicates that their ties with the Greek kingdom were not as strong as their apparent desire to return to their hometown within Ottoman territory.

The participation of local authorities and community members in publicly held religious celebrations was not just seen in the case of the Greeks of İzmir. The public celebration of a Catholic religious holiday in May 1842 with the Corpus Christi Parade exemplified the new Tanzimat spirit of coexistence and tolerance, which publicly cut across the ethno-religious communal lines in İzmir.⁹⁹ The head

⁹⁵ Beyru, 19. yy. 'da İzmir'de Yaşam, pp. 357–359, FN. 1187.

⁹⁶ He donated 345.000 *kuruş* to the Muslims, 120.000 *kuruş* to the Catholics, 80.000 *kuruş* to the Greeks, 65.000 *kuruş* to the Armenians, 40.000 *kuruş* to the Jews, and 15.000 *kuruş* to the Protestants. Beyru, 19. yy. 'da İzmir'de Yaşam.

⁹⁷ *Amaltheia*, (9 July 1865), n. 1377, p.4.

⁹⁸ Beyru, 19.Yüzyılda İzmir'de Yaşam, p. 149, FN. 406.

⁹⁹ Sibel Zandi-Sayek, 'Orchestrating Difference, Performing Identity: Urban Space and Public Rituals in Nineteenth Century İzmir', in Nezar Al Sayyad (ed.), *Hybrid Urbanism, on the Identity Discourse and the Built Environment* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001), pp. 42–43.

of the city's Catholic community, Bishop Moussabini, led the parade, and both leaders and members of other communities, as well as local authorities, participated in the event. The newspaper *L'Echo de l'Orient* reported on this public religious celebration, emphasising 'the presence of many people from different communities in the parade: members of all the area Catholic churches; students of the Propaganda College, which was run by French Catholic Lazarist priests; 200 girls from the Sisters of Charity; the dragomans (translators) of the Catholic, French, and other consuls; and Ottoman soldiers'. The Greek shops along Frank Street, the main route of the parade, were decorated with flowers and banners. The governor of İzmir himself, Salih Pasha, several times checked the parade route to ensure peaceful social order.¹⁰⁰ Alexis de Valon also took note of this religious celebration, mentioning the supportive presence of Turkish guards in the parade, the enthusiastic Catholic influence over the Muslim population in İzmir, and the decoration of windows, even in the non-Catholic homes along Frank Street. Quoting a letter from the French consul to the minister of French Foreign Relations, de Valon also noted that the presence of the Turkish guards was not due to any uneasiness on the part of local authorities about potential rowdiness among the non-Muslims, but in order to participate in the event on peaceful terms as representatives of the Turks of the city.¹⁰¹ Such public celebrations were both a significant tool for the Ottoman state and the local communities to renew their relations with each other and a sign of religious freedom and civility and an indication of increased tolerance in İzmir in accordance with the intentions of the Tanzimat.¹⁰² The Corpus Christi Parade became a custom in İzmir in the years that followed.¹⁰³ In September of the same year, the opening celebration of a church in the Buca district was also held with the participation of various community members.

The Perception of the Local Authorities—Sense of Belonging to the City

The Greek newspapers in İzmir at the time openly expressed their thanks and gratitude to the local authorities for their positive efforts in certain regards, but also did not hesitate to criticise them on matters related to the physical conditions of their cities or towns. From the newspapers of the period, we learn about the high cost of living in İzmir in the 1840s and 1850s and the local authorities' attempts to solve the problem. On February 1845, the newspaper *Melisiyenis* thanked officials who had attempted to bring down the cost of food and begin to control prices in the city, writing:

Our majestic leader [referring to the İzmir governor] is struggling to reduce the food prices. This was something very important since butchers, bakers, [and] especially fishmongers were acting disrespectfully and selling to the public at very costly prices. His majesty [so] gained [the] admiration and love of [the] people, because of his efforts

¹⁰⁰ Beyru, *19.Yüzyılda İzmir'de Yaşam*, p. 161, FN. 446, quoted from *L'echo de l'Orient*, 27 May 1842; Sibel Zandi-Sayek, 'Orchestrating Difference, Performing Identity: Urban Space and Public Rituals in Nineteenth Century İzmir', pp. 42–43, FN. 3, quoted from *L'echo de l'Orient*, pp. 53–54, 27 May 1842.

¹⁰¹ Olaf Yaranga, *19. Yüzyılın ilk Yarısında Fransız Gezginlerin Anlatımlarına İzmir* [İzmir in the First Half of the 19th Century in the Accounts of the French Travelers] (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yay, 2nd edition, 2002), pp. 45–46, FN. 111.

¹⁰² Zandi-Sayek, 'Orchestrating Difference, Performing Identity: Urban Space and Public Rituals in Nineteenth Century İzmir', pp. 42–44, 53.

¹⁰³ Quoted from *L'Echo de l'Orient*, 8 June 1844 in Beyru, *19.Yüzyılda İzmir'de Yaşam*, p. 161, FN. 447.

to prevent this situation, that [they] began to see him like a father more than a governor.¹⁰⁴

When Reşid Bey was appointed as the local governor of İzmir in 1845, *Melisiyenis* thanked the sultan and his ministry on behalf of all people of the city for appointing such a governor and expressed its respects to Reşit Bey himself.¹⁰⁵ In 1852, the newspaper *Amaltheia* also published an article thanking Kamil Pasha and his staff for establishing order and price controls in İzmir.¹⁰⁶ The newspapers' comments about the local governor and authorities of İzmir are also enlightening. In November 1856, *Amaltheia* praised the governor of İzmir for his tender attitude towards prisoners, saying, 'we are grateful to him for his efforts', which included providing prisoners with food and blankets and working to improve the general condition of prisons in the city.¹⁰⁷ In the case of disasters, such as epidemics and fires, the local authority of İzmir treated its Muslim and non-Muslim subjects equally, so much so that the non-Muslim Ottomans expressed their thanks to the local authorities for their efforts to improve the well-being of the city with open letters in the newspapers.

One published in the newspaper *Amaltheia* on 9 July 1865 described the cholera epidemics and praised the efforts of Raşid Bey, the governor of İzmir, who assembled consuls and doctors to discuss precautions that could be taken to prevent the further spread of the epidemic, including helping poor families, cleaning roads, and providing aid to distant districts.¹⁰⁸ Raşid Pasha went to the Jewish quarter with the French consul, Ventivoglio, to observe the situation in person and organise issues related to the transferring of people to other regions, cleanliness, taking care of patients, and burying the deceased. Raşid Pasha, who forbade the transfer of bodies from the Jewish quarter to the centre of the city, asked the capital to send sufficient tents, specifically for the Jewish families. The newspaper praised both the affluent families of the city and the peasants for their help and also pointed out the necessary intervention of the İzmir police during such a period of crisis. In the city's garrison, the garrison commander and other military leaders and doctors, including Halit Bey and Dr. Mustafa Bey, distributed necessary medicines among the poorer patients. Raşid Pasha asked the religious leaders and other influential members of the communities to stay in their places with their people. When Raşid Pasha became interested in the homeopathic cures suggested by Dr. Krikas and published in *Amaltheia*, and met Dr. Krikas, to thank him for his efforts to cure the disease and to order a sufficient amount of the homeopathic medicines the doctor had recommended, the newspaper praised Raşid Pasha for his efforts in dealing with the cholera epidemic.¹⁰⁹

Addressing the local authorities in *Amaltheia*, the Armenian community also expressed its gratification by publishing an open letter of thanks, sending, in addition, a letter to the Armenian patriarchate in the capital that mentioned the humanitarian and fatherly characteristics of Raşid Pasha of İzmir.¹¹⁰ In August of the same year, *Amaltheia* reproachfully wrote, 'after other communities, finally,

¹⁰⁴ *Melisiyenis*, (3 February 1845), p. 1.

¹⁰⁵ *Melisiyenis* (3 February 1845), p. 1.

¹⁰⁶ *Amaltheia*, (7 March 1852), p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ *Amaltheia*, (22 November 1856), n. 927, p. 4.

¹⁰⁸ *Amaltheia* (9 July 1865), p. 4.

¹⁰⁹ *Amaltheia*, (9 July 1865), p. 4.

¹¹⁰ *Amaltheia*, (28 August 1865), p. 4.

the Ottoman community also expressed its gratitude to Raşid Pasha with a thanking letter for his help and cooperation during the difficult days of the epidemic'.¹¹¹ Many residents of Bornova expressed their gratitude in a public notice to Captain Hüseyin Ağa from the police organisation for carefully providing people with sanitation and security during the cholera epidemic.¹¹² In 1845, *Amaltheia* wrote about a fire that broke out in a bakery around 2 a.m. As help arrived on time, only the one bakery and two nearby butchers' shop were burned down. The newspaper stated that thanks to the efforts of general governor Raşid Pasha and the head of the police organisation, Yasin Ağa, and the timely arrival of the soldiers and seamen, the flame was put out quickly. *Amaltheia* added that 'We would like to thank to the new soldiers and police because of [the] positive and favourable attitudes they showed toward people. This new organisation deserves to be praised'.¹¹³ Within two months, a large fire broke out and became very dangerous because of the wind, destroying 36 shops in the *Kestane Pazarı*. Raşid Pasha, Yasin Ağa, the garrison commander, soldiers, captains, firemen (Greek, Armenian and Turkish ones, as well as those from the insurance companies), and seamen from the imperial ships all came to extinguish the blaze. Once again, *Amaltheia* praised the efforts of the local authorities during such a crisis.¹¹⁴

The letters from the non-Muslim communities praising the struggle of the local authorities and their enthusiastic attitudes towards people during such disasters show a sense of belonging to the city and political allegiance to the local governance. When the Greek newspapers of İzmir mentioned the governor of the city, they used the words 'our governor' and 'our city'. The rhetoric of these newspaper articles shows that they did not differentiate themselves from their Muslim neighbours or see the Muslim Turkish community as the 'real owners' of the city. Greeks, Armenians, and Jews all perceived themselves as the natural inhabitants of İzmir. The presence of a Greek state and their interest in the political events in Greece did not preclude them from having a sense of belonging to the city and its Muslim local rulers. *Amaltheia* even announced with great sorrow the departure of Raşid Pasha (to return to his previous position in Syria) and his staff, along with the head of the police organisation, Yasin Ağa, on 15 July 1866. The newspaper noted that Raşid Pasha and his team struggled for justice during their rule of the city and the communities of İzmir gave him a letter full of signatures in which they asked why he was leaving and expressed their sadness about it.¹¹⁵ Their emphasis on justice of Raşid Paşa's rule and praise of the newly founded Tanzimat organisations, like the police organisation, suggests that the İzmir society allows for this apparent societal tolerance.

The efforts of local rulers to deal with disasters and provide a good social order in İzmir continued into the early 1870s. In 1871, a fire that lasted for almost a week was eventually put out with the help of all official units and a Habsburg ship in the city. The newspaper *Smyrni* wrote, 'The commander of [the] gendarme, Salih Bey; İbrahim Ağa and Nuri Efendi from the police organization; [and the] Greek priest Arhimandrid K. Nikodimos, as usual, helped to extinguish the fire with great

¹¹¹ *Amaltheia*, (24 September 1865), p. 3.

¹¹² *Amaltheia*, (28 August 1865), p. 3.

¹¹³ *Amaltheia*, (28 May 1865), p. 3.

¹¹⁴ *Amaltheia*, (30 July 1865), p. 4.

¹¹⁵ *Amaltheia*, (15 July 1866), p. 3. The newspaper also informed people that the new ruler was Süreyya Paşa and that he would come from the capital.

struggles from the beginning to the end'.¹¹⁶ The interest of the local authority in the Greek community of İzmir in the 1870s also indicated continuing attempts to maintain integration and social cohesion: The governor of İzmir, Sadık Pasha, along with his political deputy, Grigoris Aristarhi Bey, visited the metropolitan's house and later the Evengeliki Greek school with the priest Filatatos Mireon, where he asked the students questions about history, geography, French, Turkish, and arithmetic. They also visited the school's library and the hospital. According to the newspaper, these actions motivated the students and hospital patients and honoured their community, which wished for the continuation of such positive attitudes on the part of the local governor. The interest of the İzmir governor in the city's Greek community was also appreciated by a local Greek newspaper in 1871.¹¹⁷

The Concerns for the Urban Development and Social Order of the City

Newspapers of the time often expressed their interest in the urban development and social order of the city. They imposed controlled urban development of their city, which also indicated their sense of belonging to the city. In 1857, for example, *Amaltheia* expressed its concern for the physical conditions of the streets while mentioning the effective work of the police and *zabita*:

The police and *zabita* force [that] was established by Raşid Pasha is very beneficial and [a] very good thing for our city. However, we wish this organization to be extended to all regions of the city, not to remain only in the urban centre. These new officials are controlling everything in the city with great care and do everything they can for the benefit of the people. They [get] people to take care of the front yards of their houses and workshops, to keep them clean, to get rid of [things] like *tabelas* which disturbed traffic. They especially control the scales with great care to prevent injustices. They only [issue] legal fines to those who do not obey the regulations, not [for anything] else. Our prices, especially for bread and meat, are reasonable. Therefore, our people must be happy. But, unfortunately, the physical conditions of our streets [has] not yet [improved], only in few streets [have] sidewalks [been] built; construction of sidewalks all over the city [has been] left to some [future] time.¹¹⁸

During the early years of the Tanzimat, in 1845, *Melisiyenis* showed its sensitivity to the well-being of the urban development of the city, criticising expenditures made for the balls held in clubs and the card games played there. As an example, it noted that a ball had been conducted a week before in the European Club and that another would take place in the Greek club the following week. In criticising the owners of such clubs and the negative results of gambling activities, including robbery, hopelessness, and suicide, the newspaper asked, 'wouldn't it be much better if this money was spent [on] philanthropic and educational institutions, and to beautify and light the streets of our city?'¹¹⁹ The gasworks and lights of İzmir were operated for the first time in February 1865,¹²⁰ twenty years after *Melisiyenis* published this criticism and demand. As these examples suggest, even in the early

¹¹⁶ *Smyrni*, (16 July 1871), p. 4.

¹¹⁷ *Smyrni*, (29 June 1871), p. 4.

¹¹⁸ *Amaltheia*, (14 May 1865), p. 3.

¹¹⁹ *Melisiyenis*, (6 January 1845), p. 1.

¹²⁰ Zandi-Sayek, 'Orchestrating Difference, Performing Identity: Urban Space and Public Rituals in Nineteenth Century İzmir', p. 101.

years of the Tanzimat in the 1840s—before the foundation of the İzmir municipality in 1868 or the establishment of the Provincial Law of 1864—the Greek newspapers were concerned with the modernisation of their cities.

The Greek newspapers not only reflected positive ideas about urban development, but urged the maintenance of good social order in İzmir. The newspaper *Smyrni* criticised an article by K. Çiligiryan that had been published in the Armenian journal *Mamul*. According to the newspaper, Çiligiryan's article attempted to instigate Armenians to disturb the good social relations between the Greek and Armenian communities of Anatolia:

He [K. Çiligiryan] says Greek doctors in the Empire should be replaced by Armenian ones. Such an approach [is] both against the religious rules and this period in which the Sultan [has] desired the co-existence of different ethno-religious communities in good social relations and harmony in Anatolia.¹²¹

Smyrni also emphasised that by writing such articles, Çiligiryan and his group were trying to undermine the affection and ties that existed between the two communities, saying: '... since we wish these two communities to live together in peaceful terms, we condemn this journal. Moreover, fortunately, the Armenian youth named such articles in this journal as reactionary and blamed them for their approach'.¹²² This example indicates that not only the local administration, but also the Greek newspapers of the city, desired social tranquillity and harmony among its multi-cultural residents.

The newspapers of the period were also concerned about the maintenance of social order during the celebration of feasts, with *Melisiyenis* announcing in January 1845 that the religious feasts had been celebrated in a peaceful and orderly manner, since the presence of the Ottoman soldiers kept the criminals cautious.¹²³ When the ruler of İzmir changed, *Melisiyenis* expressed its wishes for the tranquillity and social order in the city to continue: 'The customs director, Reşit Efendi, has become the new governor of İzmir, and Hacı Bey, who is known by everyone in İzmir, has become *Kahya Bey*. The appointment of these two experienced rulers is a hopeful event for the continuation of the calm and tranquil life in İzmir'.¹²⁴ The celebration of Orthodox Greek Easter in loud fashion with the use of pistols, which led to injuries and deaths, used to disturb the social order seriously in İzmir in the nineteenth century, and was a subject of complaint even before the 1800s. A Swedish natural scientist travelling through the region wrote about such a celebration in İzmir in 1749:

İzmir Greeks were giving some amount of money (500 *Para*) to *müsellim* of İzmir to celebrate their Easter freely. They freely celebrated their Easter by eating, dancing and even fighting in the streets ... in the second and third days of the Easter the [sounds] of songs were heard in the streets from the houses of the Greeks. In the Frank quarter Greeks danced and shot [gun] as a tradition. However, this year their metropolitan forbade the use of guns during the Easter celebrations, and told them that if they use guns, he would excommunicate them so that they did not shoot this year.¹²⁵

¹²¹ *Smyrni*, (13 July 1871), p. 3.

¹²² *Smyrni*, (13 July 1871), p. 3.

¹²³ *Melisiyenis*, 6 January 1845, p. 1.

¹²⁴ *Melisiyenis*, 6 January 1845, p. 1.

¹²⁵ Hristos Sokratos Solomonidis, Σμυρναϊκό Τρίπτυχο: η Σμύρνη στην εθνεγερσία, Πάσχα αλύτρωτων, η Σμύρνη Ελεύτερη [İzmir Trilogy: İzmir During the Awakening, The Easter of the unredeemed Greeks, Independent İzmir] (Athens: n.p., 1970), p. 57.

Nevertheless, the Greek habit of shooting off guns at celebrations continued into the 1850s, so much so that the governor of İzmir forbade the gunshots for the sake of security and good social order. The church and other official authorities tried to implement this decision as well. In announcing this ban, *Amaltheia* stated that although shooting in the air and using explosive materials were a custom of the Greeks, the metropolitan of İzmir, Anthimos, had sent letters to all the churches in the city asking his people to abandon this dangerous habit. The church elders helped by hanging a similar note on all of the churches in İzmir.¹²⁶ Still the İzmir Greeks did not give up this dangerous practice. Even in the 1870s, the governor of İzmir and Greek newspapers were struggling to explain its harmful and detrimental consequences. In 1871, the governor of İzmir went even further, publishing an advertisement in the Greek newspaper to announce that the use of guns would be banned during the Easter celebrations, and that those who did not obey this rule would be punished.¹²⁷ The newspaper *Smyrni* supported the decision of the governor and criticised the practice by stating that:

... such a custom belongs to barbarians. Go and see the situation in the hospitals after the Easter period, people [have] not only become injured but also handicapped because of this custom. The occurrence of such events in a metropolis like İzmir indicates uncivilized character. Last week it was [the] religious feast of the Muslims, who obeyed this prohibition and did not use any guns. As the Muslims obeyed the ban of our administration and behaved respectfully, why can we not do this? We hope that the Christians of İzmir [will] not give the opportunity to people to think that we are more backward and barbarian than our fellow Ottoman townsmen (συμπολίτες μας Οθωμανούς).¹²⁸

The way in which the newspaper emphasised the good attitude of the Muslims, and used this as an example to warn the Greeks, suggests that the Greeks had come to see themselves as of a higher status than the Muslims in terms of culture and civilisation. In other words, by this time, the Greeks of İzmir did not consider themselves subordinate to the Muslims although these shared a common religion with the ruling Ottoman dynasty. The control of the central control in İzmir through local authorities continued in 1870 as well, and the authorities were even more sensitive than they had been in the early 1840s about the possibility of a sense of Greek nationalism originating from the Greek state. Irredentist policies of the Greek state manifested itself in the Ottoman Empire, especially during the crises of 1839 to 1840, 1854, and 1878, and culminated in the 1897 Greek–Turkish War.¹²⁹ When the Greek king Otho was replaced by Georgios I in 1862, Hellenisation propaganda from the Greek state increased among the Ottoman Greeks, especially in those regions where they comprised the majority of the population.¹³⁰ Although King Otho absorbed the ideal of *megali idea*, his ineffective policies and insufficient attempts to implement it so disappointed the Greek statesmen that he was replaced by Georgios I.¹³¹ The Ottoman central government, in turn, sought to take all necessary precautions to prevent the spread of irredentist Greek ideals and negative ideas about the Ottoman Empire among

¹²⁶ *Amaltheia*, (21 March 1852), p. 2.

¹²⁷ *Smyrni*, (26 March 1871), p. 3.

¹²⁸ *Smyrni*, (26 March 1871), p. 3.

¹²⁹ Richard Clogg, 'The Greek Millet the Ottoman Empire', in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc., 1982), pp. 197–198.

¹³⁰ Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları*, p. 332.

¹³¹ Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları*, pp. 331–332.

the İzmir Greeks, forbidding, for example, the circulation of a Greek newspaper that came with an Austrian ship that had travelled from Greece in 1873.¹³²

As these examples indicate, the governors of İzmir struggled during the Tanzimat era to ensure a strong social order, both in times of disaster and of celebration, and to rule the people with justice. Meanwhile, the central government increased its control mechanisms over Greek educational, social, and cultural activities, banning teaching by Greek nationals anywhere in the empire in 1849, because of disturbances in İstanbul at the Great School of the Nation (*Megali tou Genous Scholi*) in Kuruçeşme.¹³³ In later years, a similar prohibition was again applied, following disturbances in Bursa—the state temporarily forbade the coming of Greek teachers from Greece to teach in the empire.¹³⁴ However, there is no evidence that signals the presence of any widespread tension between local officials and İzmir Greeks.

Conclusion

The Greek newspapers, which were the only public media of the era, played a crucial role not only in imposing urban values and sense of belonging to the city, but also reinforcing loyalty to the Ottoman local governance. During the first short-lived first constitutional period (1876–1878), and later, during the second one (1908–1918), Ottoman non-Muslims were promised political rights and representation in the Ottoman Parliament. Although these attempts did not accomplish their original intentions or expressed aims, the idea behind them gave Ottoman Greeks hope of gaining a more officially recognised political voice. However, during the Tanzimat period, when political rights and representation were not fully extended to non-Muslims beyond their weak presence on provincial councils, both large and small, we see that the İzmir Greeks were well-entrenched in the city's social and cultural fabric, not to mention in its economic life. As one of the integral components of the city, they cared about urban development, and about the characters and policies of İzmir's local rulers; their referring to the governor of İzmir as 'our governor' and their use of the terms 'our administration' and 'our city' show a middle class consciousness.

In other words, even in the absence of the modern political rights in the empire's parliamentary regimes the İzmir Greeks had full interactions and good relations with the Muslim local administration. All the above-mentioned public events and imperial celebrations, and the mutual struggles with urban disasters such as disease and fires, provide important indications of the nature of the ethno-religious coexistence and interactive communication with the local authority. The centre's attempts of the centre to control the activities of the İzmir Greeks aimed at maintaining social order of the city against possible instigations related to the issue of Kingdom of Greece. Accordingly, the centre's control mechanisms did not disturb the İzmir Greeks' relations with the local authorities. Local governance was concerned with maintaining the dynamics of peaceful co-existence in the multi ethno-religious city, which they achieved through applying the Tanzimat principles and actively involving İzmir's non-Muslims in city events and imperial government.

¹³² *Smyrni*, (27 July 1873), p. 3.

¹³³ Clogg, 'The Greek Millet the Ottoman Empire', 1982, p. 198.

¹³⁴ Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları*, p. 333.

Moreover, such actions by the local officials also aimed to integrate the city's non-Muslims inhabitants of the city into the political spirit of the age, Ottomanism. These attempts in turn contributed to the İzmir Greeks developing a strong sense of belonging to the city and a trust in the Ottoman reforms. That is to say, local authorities, as the representatives of the central authority, did not attempt to mould the social and cultural habits of the İzmir Greeks for the sake of centralising policies. Instead, they initiated policies to maintain the city's age-old peaceful ethno-religious coexistence. In addition to the reform regulations, other factors, including wealth, entrenchment in the city's socio-cultural and economic structure, societies, social groupings, educational institutions, and printed media led an Orthodox Greek to strengthen his political affiliation with the Ottoman State. Surely, the Tanzimat reforms accelerated the urban transformation of İzmir. However, the city had begun to form its local character in earlier centuries and it crystallised during the centralising reforms of the Tanzimat through the presence of a middle class and vital economic activity. That is to say, the strengthening of the localisation and middle class of İzmir did not occur independently of the Ottoman centre.¹³⁵

Moreover, neither the centralising policies of the Porte nor the British impact could curb the power of the local officials in İzmir and its hinterland. Their effective role in maintaining the status quo in the economic network of western Anatolia after the 1838 trade treaty between Britain and the Ottoman Empire demonstrated this well. Local authorities exerted very powerful control over the region's local economic network, to the extent that even the 1838 British-Ottoman Trade Convention could not eliminate the role of the Ottoman non-Muslims as intermediaries in İzmir and in the interior.¹³⁶ Instead, they continued to exist and even blossomed with the British firms continuing to use them as their agents, both in İzmir and in its hinterland, throughout the nineteenth century.¹³⁷

The Ottoman government began to formulate policies to isolate non-Muslims from various economic sectors during the reign of Abdülhamid II. Expanding Western capitalism, especially after the 1870s, with the beginning of the Hamidian period, thus had a negative impact on the natural social fabric of the multi-cultural cities of the Empire. In other words, after the 1870s, the commercial and political conditions of the empire had begun to be transformed into a phase that affected the non-Muslims' situation negatively. Despite the negative aspects of the Ottoman Empire, economic integration of western Anatolia into the growing capitalist economy would have ensured the empire's integration into the world economy. This could not be achieved, however, since the Ottoman government began to exclude non-Muslims after the 1870s, especially Greeks, from their economic and social positions, who had them for over a century.¹³⁸ The peripheral networks of western Anatolia, which were developed basically by the Greeks in the early nineteenth century, were taken over by the Ottoman bureaucracy, and this led to the gradual and subsequently political isolation of the non-Muslim Ottomans after 1870s.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ Jens Hanssen, 'Practices of Integration—Centre-Periphery-Relations in the Ottoman Empire', in Jens Hanssen, Philipp Thomas, and Stefan Weber (eds.), *The Empire in the City, Arab Provincial Capitals in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Beirut: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2002), p. 52.

¹³⁶ Elena Frangakis Syrett, 'Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on İzmir's Trade: European and Minority Merchants', *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 7 (Spring 1992), pp. 99, 107–111.

¹³⁷ Syrett, 'Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on İzmir's Trade', p. 107.

¹³⁸ Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century*, pp. 114–115.

¹³⁹ Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century*.

Therefore, following this argument, when the Ottoman bureaucracy began to dominate the commercial networks in the 1870s in western Anatolia, the gradual isolation of the non-Muslims prevented the further expansion of that social space within which the influence of the non-Muslims were rooted.¹⁴⁰ Muslim dominance was encouraged by the state all over the Empire through various mechanisms especially after 1876.¹⁴¹ Moreover, the interference of the Public Debt Administration (PDA) in the entrenchment of finance capital and agriculture in Anatolia disturbed local economic network run by the local merchants and intermediaries.¹⁴² However, this isolation process, which began in the 1880s, did not immediately cause the economic or social isolation of the Ottoman Greeks in urban İzmir and its surrounding environs. This isolation process began effectively during the rule of the CUP in 1908 and reached its peak when the military and Turkish wing of the CUP monopolised political power in 1912 and attempted to replace non-Muslim business with the Muslim ones in the name of the formation of the national bourgeoisie.¹⁴³ In spite of the negative interference of the PDA and the repressive Young Turk policies in western Anatolia, İzmir Greeks struggled against these policies and managed to maintain their workshops and business in urban İzmir until they had to leave in 1922–1923, as a result of the forced exchange agreement resulting from the Lausanne Treaty. In other words, İzmir Greeks were able to resist such discouraging policies and continued to exist as the most important agents of İzmir society in economic and socio-cultural life; they also continuously struggled for their political rights as one of the natural elements of the city. It is my contention that it was this local crystallisation that prevented the isolation of the non-Muslims from economic and social-cultural activity of the city throughout the nineteenth century, especially during the Hamidian rule until 1908. The CUP, however, attempted to break this ‘multi-ethno-religious locality’ and replace it with a ‘homogeneous locality’, and succeeded.

Demonstrating that the local authorities and the Greek community members worked together to maintain the long-standing peaceful inter-communal coexistence in İzmir, by exploring and analyzing Ottoman Turkish material and Greek newspapers of the period, this article aims to make a contribution to the recent growth of written Ottoman urban social histories. Zandi-Sayek has demonstrated peaceful co-existence in the unified spatial organisation of the city and how the different community members cooperated and cut across religious lines;¹⁴⁴ Smyrnelis has also revealed the existence of interactive communal relations, using largely Ottoman historiography from French sources.¹⁴⁵ Concentrating on the relationship between the central/local governance and the Greek community of İzmir, this article has tried to demonstrate peaceful coexistence within the framework of Ottoman state and society relations, in the years from 1840 to 1864.

¹⁴⁰ Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century*, p. 115.

¹⁴¹ For the increasing impact of the religion as an official ideology and pressure of the state on the population see Serim Deringil, *The Well Protected Domains, Ideology and the Legitimate of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876–1909* (London, New York: I.B. Taurus, 1998).

¹⁴² Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, pp. 407–408.

¹⁴³ Kasaba, ‘İzmir’, p. 407.

¹⁴⁴ Zandi Sayek, ‘Orchestrating Difference, Performing Identity: Urban Space and Public Rituals in Nineteenth Century İzmir’.

¹⁴⁵ Smyrnelis, *Une société hors de soi: identités et relations sociales à Smyrne au XVIIIe et XIXe siècles*.

References

Primary Sources (Ottoman Turkish)

- Meclis-i Vala'dan, Ayniyat Defterleri, 1841–1848*, Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi [Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives] İstanbul, Turkey.
- Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası, Sadaret Evrakı Mektubi Kalemî* (A.MKT), 1844–1850 [Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives] İstanbul, Turkey.
- Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası, Sadaret Evrakı, 1844–1850*, (A.DVN), Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, [Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives] İstanbul, Turkey.
- Cevdet Adliye Evrakı*, 1845, Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi [Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives] İstanbul, Turkey.

Newspapers (Greek)

Amaltheia
Melisiyenis
Smyrni

Published Sources

- Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία, 19ος αι-1919. Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες. Από το Μιλλέτ των Ρωμιών στο Ελληνικό Έθνος* [Asia Minor, 19th c. – 1919. The Greek Orthodox Communities. From Millet-i rum to the Greek Nation] (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 1998).
- Sia Anagnostopoulou ‘İzmir’s “National Historical Mission”’, in *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nation States, A Long and Difficult Process: The Greek Case* (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2004), pp. 75–101.
- Gerasimos Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları, 19.yy'da İnanç, Cemaat ve Etnisite* [The Greeks of Asia Minor, Confession, Community, and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century] (İstanbul: Ayraç Yayınları, 1997).
- Tuncer Baykara, *İzmir Şehri Tarihi* [History of City of İzmir] (İzmir: EÜ Matbaası, 1974).
- Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964).
- Rauf Beyru, *19. Yüzyılda İzmir'de Yaşam* [The Life in İzmir in the 19th Century] (İstanbul: Güzel Sanatlar Eğitim Vakfı, 2000).
- C. E. Bosworth, ‘The Concept of *dhimma* in Early Islam’, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc., 1982), Vol. I, pp. 37–51.
- Benjamin Braude, ‘Foundation Myths of the Millet System’, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc., 1982), pp. 69–83.
- Richard Clogg, ‘The Greek Millet the Ottoman Empire’, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1982), Vol. I, pp. 185–207.
- Richard Clogg, ‘The Smyrna “Rebellion” of 1797: Some Documents from the British Archives’, *I Kath’imas Anatoli: studies in Ottoman Greek History* (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2004).
- Cohen, Amnon, ‘On the Realities of the Millet System’, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, Vol. II (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc, 1982), pp. 7–19.
- Musa Çadırcı, *Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları* [The Social and Economic Structure of Anatolian Cities during the Tanzimat Period], (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991).
- Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963).

- Roderic Davison, 'Nationalism in a non-National State', in W. Haddad and W. Ochsenwald (eds.), *Nationalism in a Non-National State* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1977), pp. 25–56.
- Roderic Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774–1923* (Austin, TX: University of Texas, 1990).
- Besher Doumani, *Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700–1900* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995).
- Ekrem Buğra Ekinci, *Osmanlı Mahkemeleri, Tanzimat ve Sonrası* [Ottoman Courts, Tanzimat and After] (İstanbul: Arı, 2004).
- Elena Frangakis-Syrett, *The Commerce of İzmir in The Eighteenth Century 1700–1820* (Athens: The Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1992).
- Elena Frangakis-Syrett, 'Implementation of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention on İzmir's Trade: European and Minority Merchants', *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 7 (1992), pp. 91–112.
- Elena Frangakis-Syrett, 'Western and Local Entrepreneurs in İzmir in the 19th and early 20th Centuries', in Tuncer Baykara (ed.), *Son Yüzyıllarda İzmir ve Batı Anadolu Uluslararası Sempozyumu Tebliğleri* (İzmir: Akademi, 1993).
- Elena Frangakis-Syrett, 'The Economic Activities of the Greek Community of İzmir in the Second half of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries', in Charles Issawi and Dimitri Gondicas (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1999), pp. 17–44.
- Daniel Goffman, 'İzmir from Village to Colonial Port City', in Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Masters (eds.), *The Ottoman City Between East and West, Aleppo, İzmir, and İstanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Daniel Goffman, *İzmir and the Levantine World, 1550–1650* (Seattle, WA: Washington University Press, 1990).
- Jens Hanssen, 'Practices of Integration—Centre-Periphery—Relations in the Ottoman Empire', in Jens Hanssen, Thomas Philipp and Stefan Weber (eds.), *The Empire in the City, Arab Provincial Capitals in the Late Ottoman Empire*, (Beirut: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2002), pp. 49–74.
- Jens Hanssen, *Fin de Siècle Beirut: The Making of an Ottoman Provincial Capital* (Oxford: Clarendon: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Jacob Coleman Hurewitz, *The Middle East and North Africa in World Politics*, 2nd edition (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975), Vol. I.
- Halil İnalçık, 'Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkileri', *Belleten*, XXVIII 112 (1964), pp. 623–690.
- Halil İnalçık, 'Decision Making in the Ottoman State', in Caesar E. Farah (ed.), *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire* (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993).
- Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of Turkey 1800–1914* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980).
- Kemal Karpat, *An Inquiry into the Social Foundations of Nationalism in Ottoman State* (Princeton, NJ: The Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, 1973).
- Karpat Kemal, 'Millet and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era', in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society* (New York, London: Holmes & Miller Publishers Inc, 1982), Vol. I, pp. 141–169.
- Reşat Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and The World Economy, The Nineteenth Century* (New York: State University of New York, 1988).
- Reşat Kasaba, 'Was There a Compradore Bourgeoisie in Mid-Nineteenth Century Western Anatolia?', *Review*, Vol. XL, 2 (1988), pp. 215–228.
- Reşat Kasaba, 'İzmir', *Review*, XVI, 4 (Fall, 1993), pp. 387–410.
- Cengiz Kırılı, *The Struggle Over Space: coffeehouses of Ottoman İstanbul, 1780–1845*, unpublished dissertation (Binghamton: Binghamton University, 2000).
- Bayram Sultan Kodaman, *II.Abdülhamit Devri Doğu Anadolu Politikası* [Eastern Anatolia Politics in the period of Sultan Abdülhamid II] (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1987).

- Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *The Ottoman Survey Register of Podolia (ca. 1681), Defter-i Mufasssal-ı Eyalet-i Kamaniçe, Copies of Privileges Concerning Kara Mustafa's Vakıf in Studenecja*, Part I, Appendix Vol. III, (Harvard: Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, n.a.).
- Orhan Koloğlu, 'İlk İzmirli Gazeteciden İzmir Haberleri' [News from the First Smyranean Journalist of Smyrna] in Tuncer Baykara (ed.), *Son Yüzyılda İzmir ve Batı Anadolu* [İzmir and western Anatolia in the last century] (İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1993).
- Paraskevas Konartas, 'From Taife to Millet: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Greek Community', in Charles Issawi and Dimitri Gondicas (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1999), pp. 169–179.
- Mübahat Küttükoğlu, 'İzmir Temettü Sayımları ve Yabancı Tebaa', in Mübahat Küttükoğlu (ed.), *İzmir Tarihinden Kestiler* (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, Kent Kitaplığı Dizisi, 2000), pp. 36–59.
- Nora Lafi, *Une ville du Maghreb entre ancien régime et réformes ottomanes: genèse des institutions municipales à Tripoli de Barbarie, 1795–1911* (Paris, L'Harmattan Tunis: Institut de recherche sur le Maghreb contemporain, 2002).
- Nora Lafi, *Municipalités méditerranéennes: les réformes urbaines Ottomanes au miroir d'une histoire comparée* (Berlin: K. Schwarz, 2005).
- Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1961).
- Ussama Makdisi, *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History, and Violence in Nineteenth Century Ottoman Lebanon* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000).
- Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts, Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430–1950* (London, New York, Toronto and Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2005).
- Mefruzü'l-kalem ve maktu'u'l-kadem*, BOA. MAD. 7589, pp. 118–119.
- Rhoads Murphy, *The Functioning of the Ottoman Army under Murad IV (1623–1639/1032–1042), Understanding of the Relationship between Centre and Periphery in 17th Century Turkey*, unpublished dissertation (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1979).
- İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devri'nde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri (1840–1880)* [The Ottoman Local Administration in the Tanzimat Period], (Ankara: TTK, 2000).
- Mehmet Öz 'IV. Murad Devrine Ait Gelenekçi Bir Islahat Teklifi' [A Traditionalist Reform suggestion in the period of Murad IV], *Türkiye Günlüğü*, 24 (1993), pp. 80–85.
- M. de Charles Peyssonnel, *An Appendix to the Memoirs of Baron de Tott; Being a Letter from Mr. De Peyssonnel to the Marquis of N* (London: printed for T. Hookham, 1786).
- Christopher Pierson, *The Modern State* (London, New York: Routledge, 1996).
- Redhouse Büyük El Sözlüğü, [Big Redhouse Hand Dictionary] (İstanbul: Redhouse Yayınevi, 1994).
- Oliver J. Schmitt Levantiner, *Lebenswelten und Identitäten einer ethnokonfessionellen Gruppe im osmanischen Reich in 'langen 19. Jahrhundert'* [Levanitnes: Life Worlds and Identities of an Ethno-Denominational Group in the Ottoman Empire during the 'Long 19th Century'] (München: r. Oldenbourg, 2005).
- Donald Quataert, *Social Disintegration and Popular Resistance in the Ottoman Empire, 1881–1908, Reactions to European Economic Penetration* (New York: NYU Press, 1983).
- Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, *Tanzimat Devrinde Meclis-i Vala 1838–1868* [Meclis-i Vala During the Tanzimat] (Ankara: TTK, 1994).
- Marie-Carmen Smyrnalis, *Une société hors de soi: identités et relations sociales à Smyrne au XVIIIe et XIXe siècles* (Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005).
- Hristos Sokratous Solomnidis, *Σμυρναϊκό Τρίπτυχο: η Σμύρνη στην εθνεγερσία, Πάσχα αλύτρωτων, η Σμύρνη Ελεύθερη* [İzmir Trilogy: İzmir During the Awakening, The Easter of the Enredeemed Greeks, Independent İzmir] (Athens: n.p., 1970).
- Salahi Ramadan Sonyel, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society Printing House, 1993).
- Stanford J. Shaw, *Between Old and New* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971).

- Stanford J. Shaw, 'The Nineteenth Century Ottoman Tax Reforms and Revenue System', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, VI (1975), pp. 421–459.
- Stanford J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey* Vols. I, II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- Emilia Themopoulou, 'The Urbanization of an Asia Minor City, the example of Smyrna, Smyrna', *Smyrna, Metropolis of the Asia Minor Greeks* (Alimos: Ephesus Publishing, n.d.).
- Olaf Yaranga, *19. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Fransız Gezginlerin Anlatımında İzmir* [İzmir in the Accounts of the French Travelers in the second half of the 19th century], 2nd edition (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, Kent Kitaplığı Dizisi, 2002).
- Sibel Zandi-Sayek, *Public Space and Urban Citizens: Ottoman İzmir in the Remaking, 1840–1890*, unpublished dissertation (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2001).
- Sibel Zandi-Sayek, 'Orchestrating Difference, Performing Identity: Urban Space and Public Rituals in Nineteenth Century İzmir', in Nezar Al Sayyad (ed.), *Hybrid Urbanism: On the Identity Discourse and the Built Environment* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001).