

THE DEVELOPMENT OF OTTOMAN GOVERNMENTS' POLICIES
TOWARDS GREEK ASSOCIATIONS, 1861-1912

YUSUF ZİYA KARABIÇAK

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2012

THE DEVELOPMENT OF OTTOMAN GOVERNMENTS' POLICIES
TOWARDS GREEK ASSOCIATIONS, 1861-1912

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Yusuf Ziya Karabıçak

Boğaziçi University

2012

Thesis Abstract

Yusuf Ziya Karabıçak, “The Development of Ottoman Governments’ Policies
towards Greek Associations, 1861-1912”

This thesis aims to investigate the policies developed by Ottoman bureaucrats in their relations to Greek associations in the years between 1861 and 1912. These policies were constructed through the various documents the Ottoman bureaucrats produced while they were dealing with Greek associations. This study analyses these Ottoman correspondences focusing on the issues of Ottoman identity and the incorporation of Greek-speaking populations into the Ottoman political system. The focus of the thesis is on educational and philanthropic associations and their relations to the Ottoman bureaucrats. In this thesis Ottoman documents are presented in a way to link them with general developments among the Greek-speaking populations of the Empire and the perception of the Ottoman bureaucracy concerning an Ottoman identity. By focusing on the Ottoman bureaucrats’ perceptions and plans in these two fields, this thesis plans to contribute to the challenging of the standard historiography concerning Greek associations which deals with the issue in seclusion without paying attention to Ottoman governments’ plans and desires.

The main body of sources used for this thesis consists of correspondences prepared by various Ottoman ministries and state departments in their relations to the Greek associations. Also, some legal texts prepared by Ottoman lawyers who lived in the years this thesis is concerned with and compilations of legal codes like *Düstur* and *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye* were consulted.

Tez Özeti

Yusuf Ziya Karabıçak, “Osmanlı Hükümetlerinin Rum Cemiyetlerine İlişkin Politikalarının Gelişimi, 1861-1912”

Bu tez, Osmanlı bürokratlarının 1861 ve 1912 yılları arasında Rum cemiyetleri ile olan ilişkileri sürecinde geliştirdikleri politikaları araştırmayı amaç ediniyor. Bu politikalar, Osmanlı bürokratlarının Rum cemiyetleri ile meşgul oldukları sırada meydana getirdikleri değişik belgeler üzerinden geliştirilmiştir. Bu çalışma bahsedilen belgeleri Osmanlı kimliği ve Yunanca konuşan toplulukların Osmanlı politik sistemine katılımlarının sağlanması meselelerine yoğunlaşarak inceliyor.

Maarifperver ve Fukaraperver cemiyetler ve bunların Osmanlı bürokratları ile ilişkisi bu tezin odağını oluşturuyor. Bu tezde Osmanlıca belgeler, imparatorluğun Yunanca konuşan tebaası arasındaki gelişmeler ve Osmanlı bürokratlarının Osmanlı kimliği üzerindeki düşüncelerinin değişimiyle bağlantılandırılarak sunuluyor. Osmanlı bürokratlarının bu iki alan hakkındaki düşünceleri ve planları üzerinde yoğunlaşan bu tez, Rum cemiyetlerini Osmanlı hükümetlerinin etkisinden bağımsız gören hakim tarih yazımına getirilen eleştirilere katkıda bulunmayı amaç ediniyor.

Bu tezin yazımında kullanılan temel belgeler, değişik Osmanlı nezaretlerinin ve devlet kurumlarının Rum cemiyetleri ile olan ilişkileri sırasında ürettikleri belgelerdir. Bunun dışında tezin ilgilendiği zaman diliminde yaşamış bazı Osmanlı hukukçularının yazdığı eserler ve *Düstur* ve *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye* gibi Osmanlı kanun derlemelerinden yararlanılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to start by expressing my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Vangelis Kechriotis. His comments on my drafts provided me with invaluable insight and no doubt helped me give my thesis its final form. He was helpful not only during my thesis writing process, but throughout my adventure as an undergraduate and MA student in the history department of Boğaziçi University. I also owe sincere thanks to Molly Greene together with Vangelis Kechriotis for the courses they offered in my last year as an MA student, which proved very helpful for me to shape my thesis. I would also like to thank Yücel Terzibaşoğlu, who helped me out and who provided me with valuable advice whenever I asked for it throughout my six years of studentship in the History department of our university.

To be able to write this MA thesis, I had to learn Greek and no doubt I got help from very different persons in the last three years. I would especially like to thank my first Greek teacher Chryssi Sideropoulou, and my friends Maria Arvaniti and Vasiliki Amorati for the help they offered me in learning Greek.

I would also like to thank my friend M. Nureddin Özel, who had been reading my thesis from the start and providing me with very useful comments and who also had been a real moral support for me throughout the process. I would also like to thank Aylin Ciyitoğlu who helped me with the format of this thesis.

Last, but not the least, I would like to thank my family and especially my brother who supported me in my decision to pursue an academic career in History, rather than becoming a Management graduate.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Tanzimat	1
<i>Millet</i> System	8
Education	25
Philanthropy	31
The Plan of the Study	33
CHAPTER II: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEGAL ENVIRONMENT	35
Ottoman State and Collective Activity	35
The Development of Ottoman Regulations Concerning Associations.....	59
Conclusion	93
CHAPTER III: AREAS OF ACTIVITY: EDUCATION AND PHILANTHROPY	97
Education	98
Philanthropy	120
Conclusion	136
CHAPTER IV: WAYS TO LEGALITY: PATRIARCHAL LINKS AND SECULAR POSSIBILITIES	139
The Place of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Correspondences Concerning Greek Associations	140
Secular Possibilities for Greek Associations in Ottoman Legality	160
Conclusion	175
CHAPTER V: EPILOGUE	178
APPENDIX: Law of Associations of 1909	182
BIBLIOGRAPHY	187

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The sources and names in Ottoman Turkish are rendered in modern Turkish usage without transliteration, as is mainly done in modern Turkish writing. Only Ottomanized Greek words were transliterated, for the reader to see how these words were Ottomanized in the original documents.

As for Greek words, archaic Greek words and names were transliterated as their common forms in Latin, as in Mnemosyne, rather than Mnimosini. I transliterated the Greek letters in other words as follows:

B,β	as	V,v
Γ,γ	as	G,g
Θ,θ	as	Th,th
H,η	as	I,i
Υ,υ	as	I,i
X,χ	as	H,h
Ψ,ψ	as	Ps,ps
Ευ,ευ	as	Ef,ef
Ου,ου	as	Ou,ou
A (with diacritical)	as	A (hence Agios, not Hagios)

PREFACE

I remember reading Haris Exertzoglou's book "National Identity in Constantinople in the nineteenth century" (*Εθνική ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19^ο αιώνα*) in its Turkish translation (*Osmanlı'da Cemiyetler ve Rum Cemaati: Dersaadet Rum Cemiyet-i Edebiyesi*) while I was still an undergraduate history student. For me, this book on the endeavors of the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople was a very informing analysis of the perception of education by the Greek Ottoman elite of the capital. However, I remember being disturbed by something: What really struck me in Exertzoglou's work, and later in other works as well, was the general absence of Ottoman bureaucrats in the analyses provided by historians. This was the starting point of not only my thesis adventure, but also of my adventure as an MA student in the history department of Boğaziçi University. As I became more and more familiar with the literature, I was more and more convinced that the endeavors of the Ottoman bureaucracy deserved to be researched for historians to be able to understand the phenomena of Greek urban activities, Greek education and philanthropy locating these into a broader Ottoman reality. This was what I set out to do with a naïve belief that I could write a history around the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople from the documents produced by the Ottoman bureaucrats.

As a result of this "naivety," I set out to search for documents relating to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople when I first entered the Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives. I would sit down at one of the computers; enter the electronic system of the Ottoman archive and search for phrases like *Dersaadet Rum Cemiyeti*, *sillogos*, *silloğos* and all other Turkified variations of *syllogos*, the Greek word for an association, I could imagine. Luckily, it did not take me long to figure out that this

was not an advisable way to go on with my research. There was very few items directly related to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople and I came to realize that the phrases I used for searching the database were used by Ottoman bureaucrats occasionally to describe other associations as well. As a result, I started searching for *Rum Cemiyeti* (Greek Association) as I thought any Greek association founded in the Empire would be named as such. But as I started reading the documents I could find, I came to realize that most associations were never called a *Rum Cemiyeti*. I had to make a broader research using the keyword *cemiyet* (association).

This last keyword allowed me not only to go through various documents about associations that were founded in various parts of the Empire, but also made me aware of how Ottoman bureaucrats used the expression *cemiyet*. It turned out that this word was not always used for describing an association; in fact it was used dominantly for other reasons. This allowed me to speculate on the nature of Ottoman bureaucrats' perceptions of association in the time frame I was interested with, as I did in my first chapter.

In a parallel inquiry, I was after some regulations compiled by Ottoman officials. I was hoping that I could find some clear codes and regulations concerning associations that would help me track the perceptions of Ottoman bureaucrats concerning any type of associational activity. Searching through *Düstur*, and the compilation of Municipality regulations (*Mecelle-i Ahkam-ı Belediye*) I was disappointed. The first code concerning associations was promulgated in August 1909. Neither the works of the lawyers before this year were mentioning any legal code in this field. The absence of such codes, made me more sensitive to the documents produced by the Ottoman bureaucrats, as these became my only source

for interpreting the perception of Ottoman bureaucrats. With the hope of reaching as many correspondences as I could, I went through the written catalogues of two ministries: the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Education. This way, I could find some documents that I wouldn't locate through a keyword search in the electronic system. I chose these two ministries because the majority of the documents I located were prepared by them, and it seems to me that a convention developed among Ottoman bureaucrats that dealt with educational associations through the Ministry of Education, and philanthropic associations through the Ministry of the Interior.

As I read the documents I could locate, read the secondary literature concerning the topics I tackled, and discussed my findings with my thesis advisor, Vangelis Kechriotis, it occurred to me that the activities of the Ottoman government around Greek associations were not just about controlling, but they had plans and ambitions of their own. As will be apparent in the following chapters, these plans and ambitions are what my thesis is about.

As I am concerned primarily with the desires and plans of Ottoman officials, I tried to locate my thesis among the existing literature concerning four issues: *Tanzimat*, *Rum milleti*, education and philanthropy. I did not deem it necessary to start with a discussion of the existing literature on the so-called *sylogos movement* as I chose to focus on Ottoman bureaucracy's power strategies concerning these associations. Nevertheless, it is important to mention a few things about this literature. On the general Turkish historians are oblivious to Greek associations that existed before the Balkan Wars and whatever exists after the Balkan Wars are presented in a dichotomy between "useful" (*yararlı*) and "harmful" (*zararlı*)

associations. I chose not to address this kind of literature as I concentrated on an earlier period. The existing literature on the *sylogos* movement is produced mainly by Greek historians that can be chronologically divided into two broad categories. The first category, represented best by Kyriaki Mamoni provided rather descriptive works on Greek associations active in the Ottoman domains. The second category, represented by younger historians like Haris Exertzoglou and Efi Kanner, provided us with more analytical works discussing the meaning of Greek associational activity in broader contexts like education, philanthropy and nationalism. As will be apparent, I benefitted from the works of both of these categories.

I will start with an introduction on the *Tanzimat* and its meaning for the *Rum milleti*. My main concern in the introduction is to discuss Ottoman efforts and aims around the time I am concerned with, and to set the ground for the discussion that follows. My first chapter will be a discussion of the legal environment Greek associations had to operate in. Therefore, the first chapter will be about the meaning of the word *cemiyet* and its various uses in this period. I believe this is important, because Greek associations were overwhelmingly called *cemiyet* by the Ottoman bureaucrats, and their private names were almost never used. The second half of my first chapter will concern the chronological development of the Ottoman governments' legal perceptions of Greek associations.

The second chapter will be a discussion of the two main fields that Greek associations operated in: education and philanthropy. I will expand the discussion provided in the introduction to see what these two fields meant for the Ottomans in the unfolding of late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The third chapter will include discussions on the ways of legality for Greek associations. In the absence of

legal principles and codes, it is important to discover how the Ottoman bureaucrats legitimized the existence of such a variety of associations. Moreover, the daily correspondences concerning these associations can give us an insight on the structure of the *Rum millet*i and the Patriarchate's place in it.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The foundation of most Greek associations in the Ottoman Empire dates to 1860s. This was a period of increasing urban middle class activities in the larger cities of the Empire, especially in the areas of education and philanthropy. 1860s is also important as a decade because it was the period which saw the foundation of a Mixed Council and the promulgation of the “Organic Laws” for the *Rum milleti*. Also, the foundation of these associations came after the *ferman* of 1856, thus the relations between these associations and the Ottoman bureaucracy can tell us a lot about the structure of the *Rum milleti* in the eyes of the Ottoman bureaucracy. Therefore, before delving into the documents produced by Ottoman bureaucrats concerning such associations, a discussion of the *Tanzimat* and its possible meanings for the structure of the *Rum milleti* is in order.

Tanzimat

We name a period of the late Ottoman history which we suppose to have started with the Gülhane edict of 3 November 1839, as *Tanzimat*. Although the word has the meaning of “re-organizations,” in the scholarship it is generally used with the addition of “reform” becoming *Tanzimat Reforms*. Generally one tends to employ “several master words” all ending in “-ization” : centralization, modernization, Westernization, secularization etc.¹ Without denying the possible working quality of these master words, it is also important to realize the limits of these words and may be more important to be aware that the so called *Tanzimat project* is not a process of state imposed changes on a passive population in the entire Ottoman Empire. The

¹ Paul Dumont, “La Période des Tanzimat (1839-1878)”, Robert Mantran (ed.), *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, (Paris: Fayard, 1989), p. 459.

place of “negotiation” – arguably the most important of these words ending with the letter combination of “-ation”- should be recognized.

It should also be recognized that the narrative starting the *Tanzimat* only with the will of the central state officials is not sufficient. The idea that *Tanzimat* was all about the European pressure put on the high ranking central state officials who were increasingly worried about the military losses against rivaling powers and also about the nationalist uprisings does not give due credit to the internal developments and mechanisms of the Ottoman society. The idea that the Ottoman bureaucrats acted as a response to the decentralization of the eighteenth century which resulted in a loss of power in the centre leading to military defeats ignores other significant internal developments within the Empire. Further, seeing the Ottoman efforts during this “epoch” as an attempt of imposing reforms copied from the Western models, on an unresponsive Ottoman population contradicts Ottoman social reality.² Instead, we should recognize that the Ottoman effort “involved a process of mediation and translation to adopt new ideas from the West to radically different settings across the Empire.”³ We should also recognize the local setting the *Tanzimat* edict was prepared. It is important to realize that the Ottoman reformers were the products of a very Islamic local setting and that they were still acting in it. Butrus Abu-Manneh

² This was the general attitude of traditional views on the Ottoman Empire both by international and by Turkish historians. See for example: Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968). Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study of Modernisation of Turkish Political Ideas*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962). Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963). The more recent perspective of world-system theory also falls to the trap of reproducing the history of European expansion on an Ottoman context by seeing the *Tanzimat* as the outcome of a need to integrate the Ottoman Empire into the world market. For some of the works with the world-system perspective see: I. Wallerstein, “The Ottoman Empire and the Capitalist World Economy: Some Questions for Research”, *Review*, (II, 3, Winter 1979), pp. 389-398. Huri İslamoğlu İnanc (ed.), *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). Reşat Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy, the 19th Century*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988).

³ Eugene L. Rogan, *Frontiers of the State in the Late Ottoman Empire: Transjordan, 1850-1921*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 12.

argues convincingly for “the Islamic roots of the Gülhane rescript” by examining the education and environment of the high-ranking officials involved in the *Tanzimat* edict. It seems that even the three key concepts of the Gülhane edict of 1839 which the Ottoman government was promising to safeguard, “life, honor and property,” may have their roots in a very Islamic source: Ghazali’s al-Mustasfa.⁴ It seems that the *Tanzimat* reformers were the products of local developments in relation to the increasing penetration of Western models; we should not emphasize one to the point of denying the other.

The negotiation during the *Tanzimat* is not something that begins with state initiation, it is something that was always there and continued to be there after the *Tanzimat*, it was part of Ottoman governance from the start. Ottoman government officials did not act on a passive population. It was a population which saw the opportunities created by this new area and started to manipulate the *Tanzimat* project that was in the minds of and on the documents created by the Ottoman officials in the capital. This makes the *Tanzimat* edict a tactic of the Ottoman centre in a game of influences. In fact, we can safely modify what Foucault said on governmentality to suit the *Tanzimat*:

with government it is a question not of imposing law on men, but of disposing things: that is to say, of employing tactics rather than laws, and even of using laws themselves as tactics – to arrange things in such a way that, through a certain number of means, such and such ends may be achieved.⁵

In other terms, *Tanzimat* was not about imposing the Gülhane edict, or other documents compiled after 1839, on the Ottoman population; the document was itself

⁴ Butrus Abu-Manneh, “The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript”, *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. 34 (1994), p. 196.

⁵ Michel Foucault, “Governmentality”, Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 95.

a tactic of governmentality creating a field of negotiation. It was a response of the Ottoman bureaucrats in the center to the developments in different parts of the Empire, and this move created yet other developments.

To better appreciate that *Tanzimat* does not stand on its own without prior developments in the Ottoman society, let's consider the Greek Orthodox case as this thesis will concern itself with Ottoman Greeks. Though the fact of the 1821 complicates the story, and may produce doubts about how effectual the developments before 1821 were in the period after the foundation of the Greek Kingdom, I believe they can be used to speculate about Greek Ottomans just before the *Tanzimat*.

As early as 1755 there was a desire among the Orthodox lay people of the capital, to have a say in the workings of the Patriarchate, and as a result, of the community. The lay masses and especially the guild representatives of the city resented the increasing power of certain Phanariot families in the administration of the Church. Patriarch Cyril V was forced to accept the desires of this section of his flock, letting them take part in the administration of church affairs through a new institution within the Patriarchate called the Public Committee (Επιτροπή του κοινού)⁶. This practice was discontinued by an imperial order in 1757.⁷ However, this change could not be reversed so easily. In 1775, an Imperial *ferman* instituted this new committee permanently recognizing the right of the lay elite -including guild leaders and Phanariots- and the metropolitans to have a say in the election of

⁶ Paraskevas Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο - Βεράτια για τους προκαθήμενους της Μεγάλης Εκκλησίας 17ος- αρχές 20ού αιώνα*, (Athens: Alexandria Pub., 1998), p. 146.

⁷ Theodoros Papadopoulos, *Studies and documents relating to the history of the Greek Church and people under Turkish domination*, (New York: AMS Press, 1973), pp. 49-58.

the Patriarch and in the financial responsibilities of the Patriarchate. This committee stayed in power until the promulgation of the Organic Laws and the foundation of the Mixed Council in 1862.⁸ It seems as early as 1750s the involvement of non-clergy in the affairs of the Greek Orthodox Church was a serious question; and the Ottoman officials were ready to respond to such developments within the *Rum milleti*.⁹

Similarly, the events of 1819 in İzmir, foretells the tension within the Greek community after the *Tanzimat*. That year saw riots in İzmir organized by the rich merchants of the community against the control of the ecclesiastical authority of the local church.¹⁰ Although the Greek Independence came in between the *Tanzimat* and this specific event; it is not hard to see that this tension within Ottoman Greek population would continue to the *Tanzimat* and beyond. The reforms allowed the Ottoman government to be a player in this game of power over the structure of the community, playing down to a certain extent the tension inherent in this new area.

These events were also the results of a change in the composition of the Greek Ottoman community around late eighteenth early nineteenth centuries. Newspapers, schools, social clubs, political organizations sprang up in different parts of the Empire in the beginning of the century, pointing to the fact that Greek capital was able to organize itself and create a new area of organization in social life that was then outside the scope of Ottoman governmentality. The Greek Kingdom was

⁸ Paraskevas Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις*, p. 147.

⁹ It is not surprising to see that Paraskevas Konortas names the part of his book dealing with this period as “reforms before the Reforms” (*Οι μεταρρυθμίσεις πριν από τις Μεταρρυθμίσεις*). For a discussion of this period see Ibid, pp. 134-148.

¹⁰ Reşat Kasaba, “Economic Foundations of a Civil Society: Greeks in the Trade of Western Anatolia, 1840-1876,” Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the age of Nationalism*, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 84.

possible in part probably due to this lack of interaction between Ottoman government officials and this new area. When the Ottoman Greek capital regained its influence in the second half of the nineteenth century, *Tanzimat* and the areas it created were already in place to provide for the negotiation between the Ottoman state and the Greek capital crucial to the continuation of Ottoman government as an activity.

The examples pointing to possible developments before *Tanzimat* leading the Ottoman officials to promulgate the *Gülhane* edict can be multiplied. This should be seen as one of the reasons behind various dates given to the start and the end of the *Tanzimat* “epoch.”¹¹ The date set by any historian depends on what he sees the most important as an area of reform, therefore prioritizing one date over others as the start of the “reform era.” When the non-Muslim populations are concerned, 1856 is given as a better date, as the document produced at this date, *Islahat Fermanı*, is more specific about its aims concerning the non-Muslim populations of the Empire.

Whatever the start and the end dates given to the “epoch” are, it is clear that one of the main agents of this process of the creation of new fields of negotiation was the Ottoman government. It is also beyond doubt that *Tanzimat* was a project, at least in the minds of the Ottoman central bureaucrats. They defined goals in the documents they produced, and principally in the two *fermans* that are constantly referred to when talking about the intentions of the Ottoman officials in this “epoch.” But these goals were modifiable, i.e. open to negotiation, therefore brought about

¹¹ Roderic Davison sees the process beginning in 1856 as the title of his book suggests *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876*. For Donald Quataert 1826 is a better date to start the era as the destruction of the janissary corps coincided with this date, though he starts “reform” with 1812: Donald Quataert, “The Age of Reforms, 1812-1914”, Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 764. Ali Akyıldız would start it with 1836: Ali Akyıldız, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkezi Teşkilatında Reform, 1836-1856*, (İstanbul: Eren, 1993).

different results in different localities.¹² That is why it is possible for Yonca Köksal to speak about a difference in outcomes between Edirne and Ankara. According to her “the reforms were not a strict application of centrally planned policies, rather they evolved as a process in which the Ottoman state blended old administrative practices with new procedures and learned from the local level in devising new policies.”¹³ That is also what was going on in Cyprus according to Marc Aymes: “one needs to understand the events of this period not only as the unfolding of an empire-wide standard plot, but also as a compound of “several understandings, translations and fragmentations of imperial discourses of reform” mixing together in the singular Cyprus setting.”¹⁴

Further, there were some areas that were left undefined for a long time, not only giving more space to negotiation but also letting the historian speculate about the general intentions of the *Tanzimat* through daily practices of government officials and through the documents they produced. Associations, both Muslim and non-Muslim was one such field with no strict “secular” or “Islamic” principle guiding this field as I will discuss in the second chapter. The legality of these associations depended very much on what the government in power thought about such issues as urban collective activities, the place of the non-Muslim *millets* in the Ottoman

¹² Some of the works emphasizing the differences in the outcomes of the *Tanzimat* focusing on different localities would include: Beshara Doumani, *Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900*, (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995). Bülent Özdemir, *Ottoman Reform and Social Life: Reflections from Salonica 1830-1850*, (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2003). Eugene L. Rogan, *Frontiers of the State*. Haim Gerber, “A New Look at the Tanzimat: The Case of the Province of Jerusalem” in David Kushner (ed.), *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986).

¹³ Yonca Köksal, “Imperial Center and Local Groups: Tanzimat Reforms in the Provinces of Edirne and Ankara”, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no. 27(Fall 2002), p. 108.

¹⁴ Marc Aymes, “Reform Talks: Applying the Tanzimat to Cyprus”, in Michakis N. Michael, Matthias Kappler and Eftihios Gavriel (eds.), *Ottoman Cyprus: A Collection of Studies on History and Culture*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), p. 108.

society, Ottoman non-Muslim education, philanthropy etc. Therefore, in the case of Greek associations we can learn much about the intentions of the Ottoman bureaucrats concerning the definition, boundaries and the functioning of not only the *Rum milleti* but also of the *Osmanli milleti*, if it existed. This brings me to a discussion of the intentions of the Ottoman bureaucrats during this “epoch” concerning the composition of the Ottoman population, and the *millets*.

Millet System

It is clear that the Ottoman efforts in the nineteenth century concerning the non-Muslim populations of the Empire were not simply the outcome of foreign intervention. Foreign intervention, Great Power interests, the protection of non-Muslim populations by the Great Powers were generally used to explain away the Ottoman desire to re-consider and re-form the position of the non-Muslim populations of the Empire.¹⁵ Leaving aside the fact that Great Powers tried to ensure their own interests in Ottoman lands rather than being the benevolent humanist friends of the Eastern Christians, this approach fails to explain why the Ottoman governments would exert so much time and effort on reforming the structure of the non-Muslim *millets* if the developments in these structures were not seen as requiring the response of the central government. Moreover, if the Ottoman officials interested themselves with the non-Muslim populations of the Empire only because of the pressure of the Great powers – leave aside for a while that the Patriarchs and metropolitans can be perceived as government officials themselves – we have no tool left in our hands to examine the relations of the Ottoman bureaucracy with forms of non-Muslim urban and communal organization. That is part of the reason why most

¹⁵ For a similar explanation see Niyazi Berkes, *The development of Secularism in Turkey*, (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964), p. 96.

works concerning the organization of non-Muslim urban groups, the organization of non-Muslim education, or any urban collective activity of the non-Muslims of the Empire simply ignore the existence of the Ottoman government as a factor. The Ottoman government, we are told, did not interest itself with the organization of these activities and therefore created a sphere of “controlled toleration,”¹⁶ meaning they only monitored what was going on to interfere when something happened not to their liking. When the Ottoman government is introduced, it is generally there to control and to inhibit some activities.¹⁷ Therefore, there arises the contradiction of an Ottoman state trying to promote the idea of “Ottomanism” aiming to incorporate the entire population of the Empire into a single Ottoman identity with many different facets, talking about the equality of Muslims and non-Muslims; but at the same time a state which is overly suspicious of the non-Muslim populations to the point of not desiring their “advance” in any way. According to this perspective, the Ottoman bureaucracy did not try to convince the non-Muslim populations of their Empire to be loyal Ottoman citizens, because they were suspicious about their loyalties—especially of the Greeks. The only way to solve this contradiction is to accept—implicitly or explicitly—the Eurocentric account with the claim that the Ottoman bureaucrats concerned themselves with the non-Muslims of the Empire only because of Great Power intervention. This would not just be a claim to the ignorance of the late Ottoman bureaucrats concerning the non-Muslim populations of the Empire they

¹⁶ This is actually the heading of an article by Andreas Kazamias. Andreas Kazamias, “The Education of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1923: A Case study of Controlled Toleration”, in Janusz Tomiak (ed.), *Schooling, educational policy, and ethnic identity*, (New York: European Science Foundation: New York University Press, 1991), pp. 343-367.

¹⁷ See for example George A. Vassiadis, *The Syllogos Movement of Constantinople and Ottoman Greek Education 1861-1923*, (Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 2007). Speaking about the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople and the lack of a (known) written permit given to them Vassiadis speculates: “Perhaps the Ottoman government thought it unwise to create a precedent by sanctioning the foundation of a society aimed at encouraging the cultural advance of a particular *millet*.”, pp. 56-57.

were ruling; but also a denial of the earlier reality of the Ottoman governments' natural interest of ruling their subjects, non-Muslims included. I believe we have to recognize that it was to the interest of the Ottoman governments, before and after 1839, to respond to the developments within non-Muslim communities regardless of the intervention or influence of the European Powers, and that is what they did.

This response is generally considered to be the *millet* system. It is no longer argued that the *millet* system was constituted by Mehmet II when he conquered Constantinople and that it existed all along.¹⁸ The general trend is to see this system as the outcome of the Tanzimat. However, recent works show that the development of the Patriarchates (Armenian and Greek) as leaders of Empire-wide flocks of their believers occurred in the second half of the eighteenth century. When the Greek Orthodox Church is concerned, the leader status of the Patriarch in Istanbul emerged not only as a result of the closing down of the Patriarchate in Pec (1766) and the archbishopric in Ochrid (1767), but also as a result of the recognition of the Patriarch as the leader of an Empire-wide Greek-Orthodox flock by the Ottoman central authority. The Patriarchate, at this time, was still not recognized as a legal person; but economic, social and political developments led the Ottoman authority to recognize the collective character of the administration of the Patriarchate's finances. "The Ottoman legal system looked like it was being driven to the recognition of the Church as an institution and the Patriarchate as a legal person."¹⁹ The institutionalization of the Patriarchates as recognized structures of their

¹⁸ The starting point of the objection to this very generalizing idea was this article: Benjamin Braude, "Foundation Myths of the Millet System", in Braude and Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society*, (Holmes and Meier: 1982), pp. 69-88. For a lengthy discussion of the legal situation of the non-Muslim populations of the Ottoman Empire before 1856 see: M. Macit Kenanoğlu, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek*, (İstanbul: Klasik, 2004).

¹⁹ Paraskevas Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις*, p. 354.

corresponding *millets* emerged after 1856, making the Patriarchs the leaders of their corresponding *millets*, i.e. *milletbaşıs*. It is clear that this later development had its roots in the eighteenth century; the process was already going on before the *Islahat Fermanı*.

If this is the case, then we are left with certain questions. First, we need to answer what was significant in the *ferman* of 1856, other than formalizing an already existing development dating back to the eighteenth century. Was it just a declaration of the Ottoman central authority ending a process that started in the late eighteenth century or did it create a new ground for power plays between different actors, such as the Ottoman government, non-clerical non-Muslim power groups and the clergy? Second, we need to determine what the Ottoman authority aimed at with this institutionalization? At a time when there was talk about an *Osmanlı* identity, what was the meaning of creating other identity structures like *Rum milleti*, *Ermeni milleti* etc? If the society was to be broken down to its components according to religion, where was the *Osmanlı milleti*? Was it just an empty talk the Ottoman bureaucracy used to “deceive” the Great Powers? Related to this there is a third question. How could the Ottoman bureaucracy convince their Christian populations that they had their place within the Ottoman polity? In what ways could the Ottoman bureaucrats catch the loyalty of the subjects whose allegiances they suspected? What were their plans that would create a loyal Ottoman identity for non-Muslim populations? Lastly, we need to determine what *millet* was about to see how the Christian populations of the Empire were incorporated. What were the exact limits of this *millet* administration? Was it impossible for non-Muslims to organize in any other collective way? Did every kind of Greek organization in the Empire have to go

through the Patriarchal authority to be considered legal by the Ottoman government?

Let us consider some of these questions.

The *ferman* of 1856 declares that the Patriarchs and the clergy were to be paid by the government according to their ranks.²⁰ This never became a reality.²¹ This is probably because accepting payment from the government would make the clergy totally dependent on the Ottoman authority, narrowing the area the clergymen could operate in. As a result, regardless of the ability of the Ottoman Treasury to pay, the clergy never let this desire of the Ottoman authority become a reality, protecting their interests as a player in the *Tanzimat* arena. A more relevant example from the *ferman* would be the part about non-Muslim education. The desire of the Ottoman government was to control and inspect the educational materials, and the selection of the teachers through the Ministry of Public Education which was to be founded one year later.²² As education became a heated area in the following years, the Ottoman central bureaucracy never managed to impose this. A certain degree of inspection could only be achieved when the Inspectorate of Foreign and non-Muslim Schools was founded in 1886. I will expand on the issue of education later, but for our purposes here, it is obvious that the *ferman* of 1856 just created a new area for negotiations, in which there were limits to what the Ottoman central bureaucracy could do. This is to mean, *millet* structure was not a static area in which everyone

²⁰ “...patriklere ve cemaat başlarına varidat-ı muayyene tahsis ve ruhban-ı sairenin dahi rütbe ve mansıplarının ehemmiyetlerine ve bundan sonra verilecek karara göre kendilerine ber-vech-i hakkaniyet maaşlar tayin olunup...” taken from “Islahat Ferman-ı Hümayunu”, in Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, (Ankara: TTK, 1995), vol. 5, p. 260.

²¹ Anasthasia Anagnostopoulou, “Tanzimat ve Rum Milletinin Kuramsal Çerçevesi: Patrikhane, Cemaat Kurumları, Eğitim”, in Pinelopi Stathis (ed.), Foti&Stefo Benlisoy (trans.), *19. Yüzyıl İstanbul’unda Gayrimüslimler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003), p. 11.

²² The related part of the *ferman* in Ottoman Turkish reads: “ve bundan başka her bir cemaat maarif ve hıref ve sanayie dair milletçe mektepler yapmaya mezun olup fakat bu makule mekatib-i umumiyyenin usul-ı tedrisi ve muallimlerin intihabı azası taraf-ı şahanemden mansub muhtelit bir meclis-i maarifin nezaret ve teftiş altında olması.” “Islahat Ferman-ı Hümayunu”, p. 261.

knew what they could do. On the contrary, it was a fluid arena where the results were determined by power play. Therefore, focusing on the Greek *millet*, the *millet* system created a new area of power play among the various Greek Orthodox power groups and the Ottoman governments.

This is not to mean that the central government did not have any plans or desires. We need to be very careful when we consider the so-called *millet* system, so as not to mix the results of this process with the desires of the central bureaucracy. *Tanzimat* was a project after all. The Ottoman high officials in the capital did attempt at changing things according to their desires. This project emerged, as I have been trying to argue, from a need to answer the internal and external developments of the previous decades and they had very powerful reasons to attempt a reconsideration of the governing structure of the non-Muslims. Concerning the Greek-Orthodox, first among these was the desire of the non-clergy to have a stronger say in the administration of the Greek Patriarchate. By recognizing the Patriarchate the administrator of all its believers in the Empire, especially economically, the Ottoman government of the time created part of the problem. The emerging non-Phanariot power groups, as well as the guilds in the capital had every reason to claim a hand in the administration of these revenues. That is the reason behind Patriarch Cyril V's decision to allow "the masses" into the administration, even if briefly and behind the end result, the foundation of a Public Committee to manage the finances of the Patriarchate. This desire wasn't just in the capital as can be seen from developments in other localities like İzmir. What was different after 1821 is that the Phanariots were out of the game, and it took some time for the Greek lay element to gain back its influence to desire the reforms that came after the *ferman* of 1856. We should also be aware that the Ottoman central authority took care to be seen as the initiator of the

changes on the structure of the Patriarchate in 1860. Though the document was produced by Greek clergy and lay elements, the initiator and the final approver of the process was the Ottoman government of the time. It seems that, from a strictly legal point, the Ottoman government created and decided the boundaries of the *millet*. This is not to mean that Ottoman officials managed this in reality, they just wanted to be seen as the creators of the *millet* in the activities they undertook and the documents they produced. In reality, they were responding to the developments among the Greek Ottomans, and what they did was the outcome of negotiations between different power groups.

Another development the Ottoman bureaucrats had to respond to was the rise of a national identity that was distinguishable from a “traditional” Christian identity connected to the Patriarchate. As long as the Christian identity of the Greek-Orthodox was dominant, the Ottoman officials would not need to bother competing for identities in a non-existent arena; as the Patriarchate, no doubt following its own interests, served to legitimize Ottoman authority.²³ When the competing identity of Hellenism emerged, however, the Ottoman authority had to make its move as a response. The exact date of this response is not known, though the earliest clue is from the latest years of Sultan Mahmut II. Mahmut II is reported to have said to an audience of foreign representatives: “I recognize my Muslim flock in the Mosque, my Christian flock in the Church and my Jewish flock in the Synagogue. There is no other difference between them (for me). My love and justice for all of them are equal

²³ For example in a pamphlet by the Patriarchate dated 1798, it is argued that: “Our Lord in his infinite mercy and wisdom, in order to keep yet untainted the holy and orthodox faith of us the pious, and in order to be the salvation of all, raised from nothing this mighty kingdom of the Ottomans over the kingdom of us the Romans, which had begun in some wise to fall away from its orthodox beliefs.” In *Politika fylladia (1798-1831) tou Ad. Korai (1983)* cited in Alexis Politis, “From Christian Roman Emperors to the Glorious Greek ancestors”, in David Ricks and Pual Magdalino (eds.), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, p. 10.

and they are all my true sons.”²⁴ Other than making us aware of the possibility of a response earlier than *Tanzimat*, this quote makes us speculate on what Ottomanism may have meant. First, as Sia Anagnostopoulou argues²⁵, being an Ottoman was closely related to being member of a religion. However, this is not just for non-Muslims but it applies for Muslims as well. Religion was the only existent form of identity in the Empire, so it was retained and the Ottoman authority tried to manipulate it to its own interests creating yet another area of power play. Second, this Ottoman identity was paternalistic; it wasn't equality before the law, but equality before the Sultan.²⁶ Differences in identity were accepted outright, but it was expected from the holders of these identities to identify themselves with an Ottoman identity which was supposed to be the combination of all these ethnic identities, equal under the Sultan. If we accept that this was the plan for the *Osmanlı milleti* all along, we also need to accept that the celebration of particular ethno-religious identities could cause no problem for the Ottoman bureaucrats, and we need to find ways in which the Ottoman officials hoped to bring different religious identities together. I believe education and philanthropy was among the main tools the Ottoman bureaucrats used to catch the loyalty of their Greek subjects. The celebration of a particularly Greek identity through Greek activities in these two

²⁴ “Ben tebaamın Müslümanını camide, Hristiyanını kilisede, musevisini de havrada farkedirim, aralarında başka gûnâ bir fark yoktur. Cümlesi hakkındaki muhabbet ve adaletim kavidir ve hepsi hakikî evladımdır.” Mahmut II is reported to have said this in a meeting with foreign representatives in the last years of his rule. See Reşat Kaynar, *Mustafa Reşit Paşa ve Tanzimat*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1954), p. 100. The French ambassador Engelhardt quotes a similar sentence from the Sultan, see Engelhardt, *Tanzimat ve Türkiye*, trans. Ali Reşad, (İstanbul: Kaknüs, 1999), p. 41.

²⁵ Anastasia Anagnostopoulou, “Tanzimat ve Rum Milletinin Kuramsal Çerçevesi”, p. 5.

²⁶ Compare these words to the attitude of Foreign Minister Fuat Paşa in his attempts to restore order in Mount Lebanon after the Maronite massacres in 1860s. “... all people should act in accordance with the sultan's benevolent wishes, and each class of the imperial subjects should embrace tightly the principle of unity, patriotism, and service to the nation by obeying imperial orders and by zealously fulfilling humanitarian obligations.” From Fuad Paşa's address to the Lebanese in Ussama Makdisi, “After 1860: Debating Religion, Reform and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, v. 34, no.4 (Nov. 2002), p. 606.

fields was allowed to a great extent, and the Ottoman bureaucrats tried to channel such activities in a way that would tie them to an Ottoman identity. In fact, as I will argue in the second chapter, for a long time the Ottoman bureaucracy did not care about the celebration and advancement of Greek identity, as long as it was clearly distinguishable from Greek irredentism.

A related question is the boundaries of the *millet*. If it was the Ottoman central bureaucracy who forced, at least on paper, the foundation of the Mixed Council and the “National Regulations” on an unwilling clergy; from a legal point the Ottomans automatically become the founders of the *Rum milleti* as it operated in the late nineteenth century.²⁷ We also need to see where exactly the Patriarchate stood in the regulation of the relations between the Greek Orthodox people and the Ottoman bureaucracy. It is generally argued that not only the internal administration of the Orthodox communities, but also their social life including “schools, societies and philanthropic” organizations gained an institutional legitimacy only thanks to the existence of the Patriarchate.²⁸ This would mean that the Patriarchate was the main source of legitimacy for anything Greek in the Ottoman Empire. I think this view does not convey us the whole picture. It is true that Patriarchate played the most central role in the organization of the Greek populations in the Empire, however other collective activities without the involvement of the Patriarchate was possible. We are talking about a period of Ottoman history in which, especially in the urban centers, power cliques of Greek-Orthodox Ottomans existed without having the need to legitimize their relations with the Ottoman Empire through the Patriarchate. In

²⁷ In fact, the Ottoman authority tried and failed to force the inclusion of 3 lay members in the Greek synod as early as 1847. Roderic H. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, p. 127; Gülnihal Bozkurt, *Gayrimüslim Osmanlı Vatandaşlarının Hukuki Durumu*, (Ankara: T.T.K. Basımevi, 1996), p. 30.

²⁸ Anasthasia Anagnostopoulou, “Tanzimat ve Rum Milletinin Kuramsal Çerçevesi”, p. 1.

fact, an urban “middle class” space was developing both for the Muslim and the non-Muslim populations of the Empire to the point that a certain amount of interaction between Ottoman subjects was possible independent of their religion.²⁹

I believe the term “middle class” deserves an explanation before going on with its relation to Ottoman governmentality. I use the term middle class, meaning the cultural aspects of the term rather than economical ones. Recent studies on “middle class” emphasize the cultural practices of this group preferring to search for this class in daily practices rather than the economic standing of its members.³⁰ For example, it seems that the expression “middle class” in late nineteenth century France was used to define a group that was trying to be different than the masses rather than any economical group.³¹ The ideals this new “class” aspired to, were those such as respectability, “probity in commercial dealings, fidelity to one’s spouse, self-control in expenditure, the gospel of work, the love for beauty.”³² “By stressing the principles of achievement and education, work and self-reliance, a vision of a modern, secularized, self-regulating, enlightened “civil society” emerged that was supported by many middle-class persons, in opposition to people above and

²⁹ Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι «χαμένες πατρίδες» πέρα από τη νοσταλγία. Μια κοινωνική-πολιτισμική ιστορία των Ρωμιών της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας (μέσα 19^{ου} – αρχές 20ού αιώνα)*, (Athens: Nefelis, 2010), p. 23. Haris Exertzoglou would also argue that it is not possible to understand the development of Greek associations without considering the development of the new middle strata in the Ottoman Empire. Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19^ο αιώνα: ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, (Athens: Nefelis, 1996), p. 49.

³⁰ Carol E. Harrison, “The Bourgeois after the Bourgeois Revolution: Recent Approaches to the Middle Class in European Cities,” *Journal of Urban History*, 31/3 (2005), 382-392. John Smail, *The Origins of Middle Class Culture: Halifax, Yorkshire, 1660-1780*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

³¹ Christophe Charle, *Social History of France in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Miriam Kochan (Oxford: Berg, 1994), p. 278.

³² Peter Gay, *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*, v.3, *The Culmination of Hatred*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1993), p. 18.

below, the middle-class defined itself by culture.”³³ Of course, this cultural perception took the form of a mission as the middle-class started to take control of areas such as education. Voluntary associations were one of the outcomes of the middle class culture, serving not only to organize middle-class activities like education and philanthropy, but also to gather middle-class people together to experience their class. In social clubs and voluntary associations members of the middle class would gather, similar to what Keith Watenpaugh describes for Aleppo after 1908, “to see and be seen, ...revel in one another’s company, socialize, gossip, make business deals, scout out potential mates for their children, and moreover, reinforce those particular cultural and social bonds that distinguished them from the city’s poor.”³⁴ What Watenpaugh describes for Arab provinces after the Young Turk Revolution, was already in existence in late nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, no doubt parallel to what was happening among the European middle class. Especially among the Greeks the foundation of associations and the activities of the middle class in the capital, but also in other urban centers of the Empire, was very widespread.

If the Ottoman central authority responded to this development by making the Patriarchate the only authority for any activity of the Greek-Orthodox, the situation becomes a paradox. If it was not possible for the Greek-Orthodox to publish newspapers, found associations, organize philanthropy, even found schools – at least theoretically – without the permission of the Patriarchate; it means that the Ottoman state was blocking one of the few ways in which Ottomanism could work for the

³³ Jürgen Kocka, *Industrial Culture and Bourgeois Society*, (New York: Berghen Books, 1999), p. 233.

³⁴ Keith David Watenpaugh, *Being Modern in the Middle East: revolution, nationalism, colonialism and the Arab middle class*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), p. 2.

emerging middle class. I believe this was not the case. As will be seen throughout the remaining pages, it was possible to found a Greek association with the permission from the related state department without the involvement of the Patriarch or metropolitans – at least as far as the Ottoman bureaucracy was concerned. It was also possible to engage in philanthropy, or found clinics by directly applying to the related state department without going through an application process that was involving the Patriarchate. Other forms of urban activity like the publication of newspapers had nothing to do with the Patriarchate, their approval process being totally dependent on state institutions.³⁵

Moreover, this is also the time when it became possible for non-Muslims to be officially incorporated into the government structures of the Ottoman Empire. These non-Muslim groups cannot be included in the “middle class” like the many merchants and lawyers of urban cities; however it is clear that they belong to the non-clerical elite of the non-Muslim *millets*. Therefore, these non-Muslim Ottoman officials can also tell us about the possibilities of inclusion into a broader Ottoman identity and government structure. For sure, a Greek was seen by the state as a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, while an Armenian was seen as a member of the Armenian one, making it possible for them to take part in the Ottoman administration.³⁶ However, there is nothing to indicate that this relation was

³⁵ The laws concerning publication, as would be expected, link the process directly to the Ministry of Education. Religion does not seem as a factor in the application process; and religious institutions have no say in it. See “Dersaadette ve Memalik-i Şahanede tab ve neşr olunan her nev gazete ve evrak-ı havadis-i mülkiye ve politikkiye tab ve neşri hakkında bu kere tanzim olunan nizamnamedir”, *Düstur, Birinci Tertip*, v.2, (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1290 [1873]), 220 (This law is dated 31 December 1864). See also, “Matbaa Nizamnamesi”, *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, v.2, p. 227. (It is dated 16 February 1857).

³⁶ These “memberships” were also significant in the civil recruitment efforts of the bureaucracy. The labels *Rum* or *Ermeni* mattered as the fluctuation in the numbers of these ethno-religious groups in the Foreign Ministry shows. See Carter Findley, “The acid test of Ottomanism: The acceptance of non-Muslims in the late Ottoman bureaucracy”, in B. Braude and B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society*, (Holmes and Meier: 1982), 339-368. The

legitimized by the existence of the Patriarchate. Already before the *Tanzimat*, the Phanariot families of the capital played an important role in the Ottoman governance.³⁷ The Phanariot families did not need the legitimacy of the Patriarchate to become a part of Ottoman governance; conversely they took up positions in the Patriarchal institution thanks to their unique position in Ottoman governance. What this tells us about the period after 1821 and the *Tanzimat* reforms is open to discussion. We know at least that the neo-Phanariot families of the late nineteenth century showed similarities with their predecessors. The Caratheodorys family for example, owed their ascendance in the Ottoman state structure, not to any relation with the Patriarchate, but to the proximity of its founding members to influential people in Adrianople and the palace.³⁸ Other cases of non-Muslim incorporation into the Ottoman government after *Tanzimat*, also point to the recognition of power cliques by the Ottoman state who did not owe their ascendance to the Patriarchate. For instance, after the *Tanzimat* edict, when the local councils incorporated two non-Muslim members together with the local religious representative in places where there was a non-Muslim population, these lay members who were generally *kocabaşıs* did not owe their position to the religious hierarchy.³⁹

number of the Armenians was dwindling as the Armenian massacres commenced while the number of Greeks lessened during the Greek-Ottoman War. We have to be careful about the time, though. This was the time of Abdulhamid II, when the Ottomanism of the earlier period was not the same.

³⁷ They were not part of the Ottoman government structure, but they were governing as part of the Ottoman power, therefore “governance” is preferred when referring to them. See Christine Philliou, “Communities on the Verge: Unraveling the Phanariot Ascendancy in Ottoman Governance”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 2009, 51 (1).

³⁸ Maria Georgiadou, “Expert knowledge between tradition and reform The Caratheodorys: a Neo-Phanariot family in 19th century Constantinople”, Meropi Anastasiadou (ed.), *Medecines et Ingénieurs Ottomans a l’âge des Nationalismes*, (Paris: Institut Français d’Etudes Anatoliennes, 2003), pp. 243-293.

³⁹ Halil İnalcık, “Application of the *Tanzimat* and its social effects”, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 5(1973), p. 100.

To sum up, the Ottoman governments of the nineteenth century seem to be aware of the rising power groups who did not owe their rise either to the Patriarchate or to the Ottoman government. The need to incorporate them into the Ottoman power structure was apparent and this was attempted through different means. Not only it was possible for the non-Muslims to become state officials regardless of their relations with their religious leaders, but also non-clergy were increasingly allowed to enter the religious structure of their *millet*. In fact, the intention of the Ottoman government was to place Ottoman officials of Greek origin into the Patriarchate to better control the latter, and to ensure its harmony with state policies.⁴⁰ What the Ottoman legal system tried in 1856 with the call for a “national council” in the Greek Church was, I think, the result of a desire to laicize the structure of the *millet*. Unlike the Ottoman desire to be influential in education, or to control the Orthodox clergy by turning them into salaried officials, the Ottoman move to “laicize” the *millet* structure was a success. This was, no doubt, possible thanks to the willingness of the lay elements to be the allies of the government in this respect. In the last analysis, it seems that the Ottoman governments made it possible to locate non-clerical groups around the Patriarchal structure giving them a *millî* identity. I will be discussing this more in Chapter IV when I will be talking about the legality of Greek associations and what this could tell us about the structure of the *Rum milleti* in Ottoman officials’ eyes.

This discussion was crucial to argue that the Ottoman central bureaucracy had an interest in trying to regulate and in being a player in various arenas open to the

⁴⁰ Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, *Η εκκλησία ως πολιτεία, Αναπαραστάσεις του Ορθόδοξου Μιλλέτ και το Μοντέλο της Συνταγματικής Μοναρχίας (δεύτερο μισό 19^{ου} αι.)* (Church as a Polity: Representations of the Orthodox Millet and the Model of Constitutional Monarchy (second half of the 19th c.), (Mnimon, 23, 2001), pp. 192-193.

Rum milleti. If this is not the case, reading the documents created by the Ottoman bureaucrats concerning the Greek associations becomes futile. If the Ottoman bureaucracy was not a player in this arena, then reading these documents becomes a retelling of the story that the Ottoman bureaucrats only concerned themselves with Greek associations to inhibit the development of the *Rum milleti* and allowed the little activity it did just to please the Great Powers. I have been trying to argue the reverse, but what I tried was not to argue that the Ottoman governments were the benevolent governments that always wanted the best for their subjects. It was to point that the Ottoman center had every reason to be a player in the various arenas related to the *Rum milleti* that emerged in the nineteenth century, no doubt trying to secure its own interests. In fact, it is my belief that the moves by the Ottoman bureaucracy in the fields of education and philanthropy can be seen as attempts at “social engineering,” hoping to promote Ottomanism among the Greek populations of the Empire and to catch their loyalties. This is a time when the Ottoman state structure was evolving into a modern one, from a mechanism that simply follows and controls activities to one that has plans and ambitions. Therefore, the Ottoman bureaucracy’s relations to Greek associations were not simply about inspecting, to the contrary it was an attempt to create a loyal Greek Ottoman identity.

The concept of governmentality coined by Michel Foucault, seems useful in this context. As I quoted from him in the first pages of this introduction, Foucault sees the government as a mechanism that disposes of things and employs tactics rather than laws in a way to reach its goals. Governmentality, for him, is “the tactics of government which make possible the continual definition and redefinition of what is within the competence of the state and what is not.”⁴¹ Governmentality

⁴¹ Michel Foucault, *Governmentality*, p. 103.

“presupposes and requires the activity and freedom of the governed.”⁴² This perception forces us to reconsider our categories. In this perspective, there is no longer a duality and conflict between what has been called a “civil society” and the government anymore. Researchers of civil society started to emphasize the entanglement and working together of these two fields of power, to the point of erasing the conflicting duality thought to be a reality in previous studies.⁴³ Civil society and private initiatives are considered to create a “hybrid space of government;” and the “forms of power existing already within “civil society” are both legally enframed and instrumentalized as techniques of government.”⁴⁴

In Ottoman historiography, this relation was depicted generally as a duality, explaining the “inexistence” and the “weakness” of civilian initiative with the omnipotence and omnipresence of the state.⁴⁵ However, there is a developing historiography that emphasizes the intermingling and interdependence of these two concepts.⁴⁶ I believe we need to read the activities of the Ottoman bureaucrats in this respect. Their relations to Greek associations were tactics of government designed to reach an aim: the loyalty of the Greek subjects. The activities of the philanthropic and educational associations were not seen as undesirable events that the Ottoman

⁴² Graham Burchell, *Peculiar Interests: Civil Society and Governing “the System of Natural Liberty”* in *The Foucault Effect*, p. 119.

⁴³ For a collection of works utilising this new perspective see: Frank Trentman (ed.), *Paradoxes of Civil Society: New Perspectives on Modern German and British History*, (New York: Berghan Books, 2000).

⁴⁴ Graham Burchell, *Peculiar Interests*, p. 141.

⁴⁵ See Şerif Mardin, “Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1969), pp. 258-281; Şerif Mardin, “Civil Society and Islam,” in John A. Hall (ed.), *Civil Society, Theory, History, Comparison*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995); Metin Heper, “Center and Periphery in the Ottoman Empire with Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century,” *International Political Science Review* 1, n. 1 (1980), pp. 81-105.

⁴⁶ See for example: Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet 1876-1914*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2002).

bureaucracy had to deal with. They were rather required for the elaboration of an Ottoman identity incorporating the Greek subjects of the Empire. Also, what was acceptable, what was thought to be leading to the development of such an identity changed in time with internal and external developments, as we will see in the following chapters. This fluidity, points also to the process of negotiation I have been trying to argue for. What was thought to be within the governments' power and what was not, changed according to the responses Ottoman bureaucrats got in their relations with Greek associations.

What follows will be a brief discussion of education and philanthropy, and what they may have meant for the Ottoman bureaucracy. The most important Greek Ottoman associations founded after 1860s concerned themselves primarily with education and philanthropy. Moreover, the Ottoman bureaucrats attempted to define the associations they had to deal with primarily through three categories: educational (*maarifperver*), philanthropic (*fukaraperver*), and political (*siyasi*). When they had to deal with associations dealing with music or sports, they tried to fit them into these three categories to determine the course of action they would follow. In 1909, after the Young Turk Revolution, there emerged a discourse among Ottoman bureaucrats linking educational and philanthropic associations together against political ones. While the first two categories were seen less harmful, the last one was considered to be suspicious. This classification was not a smooth process; it created a constant tension, embarrassment and uneasiness when the Ottoman bureaucrats tried to classify associations. As we will see in the following pages, musical or sports associations were tried to fit into the existing categories when the Ottoman bureaucracy had to deal with them. While musical associations used a discourse that would fit them into the educational sphere, sports associations were less lucky in

their relations to the Ottoman government. Occasionally, they were blamed and closed down for being political. I will elaborate more on this point in the following chapters, with specific examples.

I see the following discussion on education and philanthropy's place in Ottoman legitimacy necessary because the dominant idea is that, the Ottoman authorities left education completely to the Patriarchates, and philanthropy could only be organized through the Patriarchate as far as the Ottoman government was concerned. I will argue instead that education and philanthropy were the two fields that played a very central role in the constitution of *Rum* in the eyes of Ottoman officials. The Ottoman bureaucrats hoped that they could bring the Greek populations of the Empire closer to the Ottoman state by their activities and regulations in these two fields. In essence, Ottoman plans for these two fields – though they developed separately in different times – were aimed at creating an Ottoman Greek identity that would catch the loyalty of its Greek subjects. Regardless of its success, this was a project of creating the loyal *Rum*.

Education

First of all, we have to be careful about time and chronology when talking about Ottoman plans on non-Muslim education. If the Ottoman reform efforts can be seen as responses to the internal developments within Ottoman society, and if the reform effort was an endeavor of negotiations between different power groups, one of them being the Ottoman central authority, then we have to recognize that what reform was about had to change throughout time as a result of the various responses the central bureaucracy received from different parts of the society. Further, the atmosphere in the capital changed continuously due to the developments at the international scene,

which had to have an effect on the perception of the *Tanzimat* by the central bureaucracy as well. The *Tanzimat* statesmen of 1839 who suffered serious defeats at the hands of Muhammad Ali of Egypt and who were very concerned about the future of the Empire were living in a different world than those statesmen of 1856 who were allies of two Great Powers in a war against their bitter enemy, Russia, and who also were under an increased direct influence from the English and the French due to the Crimean War and to the soldiers stationed in the Ottoman capital. The Ottoman bureaucrats of 1878, in turn, was in yet another universe in which the Ottoman armies suffered a major defeat at the hands of Russians, the result being a substantial difference in the composition of Ottoman society. My point is that, accepting the responsiveness of the Ottoman central bureaucracy to the internal and external developments forces us to recognize that what *Tanzimat* meant during the so-called *Tanzimat* “epoch” changed. This not only makes the search for “the *Tanzimat* project” difficult, but also makes the setting of starting and ending dates for this “epoch” futile.

For our purposes here, this discussion has another significance. If we accept that the *fermans* or any of the other documents produced during this “era of reform” are tactics in a game of negotiations – not denying the fact that they really show the aims of the people that issued them – then we also have to be very careful about reading the results of the processes as the intentions. This is very important for us to have a better idea on the Ottoman statesmen’s perceptions of the organization of non-Muslim education in the Empire. The *Islahat Fermanı*, or the *Maarif Nizamname-i Umumiyesi* (Regulation of Public Education) should be read in this perspective. When we say that, the *Islahat Fermanı* gives to the *millet*s the “privilege” of

organizing their own education⁴⁷, we have to recognize that we are talking about a time when the Ottoman central bureaucracy did not yet make its move to spread education in the Empire. A “secular” Ottoman school system was not yet in existence, and it was possible for private groups to found schools. Further, the *ferman* mentions that the method of education (*usul-ı tedris*) and the selection of the educators (*muallimlerin intihabı*) were to be under the surveillance of the Ministry of Education (*Maarif Nezareti*) which was founded later in 17 March 1857. We can never know the intended content of this surveillance, but it would be too simple to say that the Ottoman government simply left the area to each *millet* allowing them to act as free as they can. It would also be wrong to use this specific “regulation” to talk about the Hamidian era. Such an approach simply erases the difference between the perceptions of the Hamidian government and the government of 1856, creating a discourse which sees the Ottoman governments’ ideals, no matter who is in power, fixed in time. This underplays the role of negotiation in the process of *Tanzimat*.

Another document which is simply silenced or parried is the Regulation of Public Education in 1869. This is another regulation which is read with the reality of the Hamidian era resulting in the downplaying of its importance.⁴⁸ We are told that although there are some clauses of this regulation that concerned the education of non-Muslims in the Empire; they were just shams and they never materialized. Again, the influence of the French Minister of Education, Victor Duruy, is emphasized, to the point of saying that this regulation was the doing of the French

⁴⁷ The related part of the *ferman* in Ottoman Turkish reads: “ve bundan başka her bir cemaat maarif ve hıref ve sanayie dair milletçe mektepler yapmaya mezun olup fakat bu makule mekatib-i umumiye nin usul-ı tedrisi ve muallimlerin intihab-ı azası taraf-ı şahanemden mansub muhtelit bir meclis-i maarifin nezaret ve teftişi altında olması.” *Islahat Ferman-ı Hümayunu*, p. 261. For now, note that this part of the Imperial *ferman* only talks about the schools that are communal (*milletçe mektepler*) and the *ferman* does not talk about an impossibility of founding a private school.

⁴⁸ The copy I use for my thesis is in BOA, Y.EE 112 6.

Ministry of Education.⁴⁹ Without denying the French influence I would like to argue that this approach does not do justice to the agency of the Ottoman officials and turn them into mere puppets that do whatever the French government wants them to do. This not only goes against the idea of *Tanzimat* as an area of negotiation between different actors, including the Great Powers of course, but not excluding the Ottoman officials; but also turns the experience of *Mekteb-i Sultani* into mere French entrepreneurship. There is another wrong perception of the regulations: we are told that the parts on non-Muslim education do “not comprise a large segment of the code.”⁵⁰ However, this is a wrong reading of the code. It is simply taking the articles where there isn’t mention of non-Muslims (*gayr-i müslem*) as unrelated to them. Those articles are the ones that talk about education and the plans of the Ottoman government of the time in general therefore they are not related specifically to Muslims. They are simply talking about the general plan of education, Muslim and non-Muslim. And that plan was to have separate primary and secondary schools for Muslim and non-Muslim children, who would be mixed in the later years of their education.

What came out of this regulation is something quite different. The Ottoman government never attempted to organize education for the entire population regardless of religion. Leaving aside Galatasaray Lycée and a few other schools, there was no attempt to mix Muslims and non-Muslims in education. This fact is generally read into the past to argue that this was never the intention. We have to

⁴⁹ I do not mean to deny the significant influence of the French government during 1860s, I just wish to emphasize the internal needs and plans which were as real as the French influence. For historical works overemphasizing French influence in the Regulations of General Education see Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism*, pp. 179-180; Andreas Kazamias, *Education and the Quest for Modernity in Turkey*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 62.

⁵⁰ Ayşe Özlü, *Education in the Greek Orthodox Community of Pera in 19th century İstanbul*, unpublished MA thesis (Boğaziçi University, 2001).

recognize, as an answer to this perception, that the Ottoman education system started expanding only in the 1880s⁵¹ and the world of the Ottoman bureaucrat of 1880s was essentially different from that in the 1860s. Ottomanism changed faces with the Hamidian government. To be an *Osmanlı* after the abolition of the First Ottoman Constitution was no longer “regardless of religion,” even if this is not mentioned officially. Therefore, the world of *Maarif Nezaret-i Umumiyesi* is not the world of Hamidian education; instead it is the world of *Mekteb-i Sultani* which led in a few years to the proclamation of the First Ottoman Constitution declaring all the citizens of the Empire *Osmanlı* regardless of sect or religion.⁵² Therefore, we are not legitimized to think that it was never the intention of the Ottoman central bureaucracy to attempt organizing non-Muslim education just because it is the result of the process.

If the Ottoman central authority really thought that it had an interest in the organization of non-Muslim education, then we have to answer the question why it never managed to be a big player in this area. It seems that the real desire for the Ottoman central authority to organize an education system bringing together all Ottoman subjects emerged in late 1860s. Galatasaray Lycée was founded in 1868, and the Regulation of Public Education I was talking about was written down in 1869. It is not clear whether the Ottoman finances were solid enough to fund the ambitious project set up in this code. The Regulation talks about a plan to open *İdadi* schools in all major centers of the Empire. We know that this never came to pass, the real move for building schools in the Empire started in 1880s. The lack of funds could be one of the reasons that the Ottoman central authority never tried to start a

⁵¹ Benjamin C. Fortna, *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the state and education in the late Ottoman Empire*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 29.

⁵² “Kanun-u Esasi”, *Düstur, Birinci Tertip*, v. 4, (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1296[1880-1881]), p. 4.

rivaling education system for non-Muslims. Secondly, education acquired a more significant importance for the Greek Orthodox population with the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the following rivalry in Macedonia. It can be expected that the Greek Orthodox clergy would have found ready allies in the Greek laymen to ward off Ottoman attempts to penetrate in Greek education. Like the Ottoman desire to turn the clergy into salaried officials, this attempt at penetrating non-Muslim education failed due to the relative weakness of the Ottoman attempt in this struggle.

Seeing that competing with the Patriarchate was not an option, the only thing the central bureaucracy could do was to continue the established practice of allowing the Patriarchate to organize Greek education. This way, the situation in the *Islahat Fermanı* which allowed the Patriarchate to organize education was turning into a monopoly sanctioned by the state. The Ottoman bureaucrats tried to check the influence of Greek nationalism and irredentism by properly monitoring the Greek schools, sometimes using local Greek clergy as agents, as early as 1850s.⁵³ As I will discuss in the second chapter, when there emerged a struggle over the organization of Greek education between laity and Church hierarchy, the Ottomans did not hesitate to defend the monopoly of the Church. I will try to argue that the Ottomans had a hand in the final agreement between the *sylogos* movement and the Church hierarchy concerning education. Further, I will be discussing Ottoman non-Muslim education linking it with the activities of associations in detail in the third chapter of my thesis.

⁵³ George A. Vassiadis, *The Sylogos Movement*, pp. 34-35. The Ottoman government occasionally ordered the dismissal of teachers with Greek citizenship; acting through local Greek Orthodox clergy. They even tried to check the book stores to prevent “seditious” books from circulating.

Philanthropy

Philanthropy constituted a different arena in which Greek associations were really active. Poverty became a crucial issue for Muslim and non-Muslim middle-classes of the urban centers in late nineteenth century.⁵⁴ Philanthropic associations, although they came into existence at the same time with educational ones in early 1860s⁵⁵, seem to have been disregarded by the Ottoman authorities in their earlier existence. The earliest documents concerning philanthropic associations I could locate date from the Hamidian era. This is probably due to the relative ignorance of the previous governments of the philanthropic field. Only under the rule of Abdulhamid II, philanthropy became a crucial field for the legitimacy of the Ottoman regime.⁵⁶ For the non-Muslims, this could also be related to the failure to create a parallel state education for non-Muslims. It seems that the Hamidian regime tried to control and to manipulate voluntary philanthropic activity to promote an image of the Sultan as the protector of the poor. As will be apparent, the philanthropic arena was freer of the influence of the Patriarchate than the educational arena. In most of the correspondences regarding philanthropic associations Patriarchate is simply inexistent as a factor, for some associations it was even possible to found clinics – at least apply for them- directly to the Ministry of the Interior. The various fund-raising activities also did not depend on a permission from the Patriarchate creating a direct-link between the Ottoman bureaucracy and the urban middle class arena. I think this

⁵⁴ Haris Exertzoglou, “Medicine, Philanthropy and the Construction of Poverty in Istanbul in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries”, Lorans Tanatar Baruh and Vangelies Kechriotis (eds.), *Economy and Society on Both Shores of the Aegean*, (Athens: Alpha Bank Historical Archives, 2010), p. 250.

⁵⁵ For example Women’s Philanthropic Association of Staurodromi (Φιλόπρωχος Αδελφότης των κυρίων του Σταυροδρομίου) came into existence in 1861, the same year with the Greek Literary Society (Ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως). Kyriaki Mamoni, *Γυναικείοι Σύλλογοι στην Κωνσταντινούπολη (1861-1922)*, (Athens: Estia, 2002), p. 27.

⁵⁶ Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 31.

is another case which demonstrates that the Ottoman governments, naturally, did not disregard the developing middle class setting in the urban centers, and did not try to inhibit them by forcing them into the organizational structure of the Patriarchate. Instead, the bureaucracy addressed this field directly naming some of these associations *Rum cemiyeti*. As will be apparent in the fourth chapter the word *Rum* was rarely used to define a Greek association, especially when their relation to the Patriarchate was apparent in the related correspondence. Therefore, I think that philanthropy consisted one of those areas in which Greek urban middle class could organize without necessarily relating to the Patriarchate. The Ottoman bureaucracy made this possible by not forcing a link with the Patriarchate on them, seeing such organizations as part of the *Rum milleti* all the same. This is another case pointing to what I have been trying to argue: the boundaries of the *Rum milleti* were determined by the Ottoman state, not by the Patriarchate.

What was the *Rum* created by these activities then? First of all, it was a modern middle-class identity that was constituted around a belief in science, and the “burden” of the middle-class to emancipate the masses and to incorporate them into a supra-identity. It did not have a cultural aspect at least until the Young Turk Revolution; the Ottoman bureaucracy did not have a claim on the cultures of its non-Muslim populations until very late. Second, it did not have a history, as will be apparent in the second chapter; the Greeks could use the ancient Greek names of the localities they lived in. Third, it was an identity that was experienced through middle-class activities, like social gatherings, scholarly lectures, fund-raising campaigns and speeches. With Abdulhamid, the *Rum* identity was tied to the image of the Sultan as the benevolent father of the poor, and the modern progressive ruler.

The elements of this identity that was created around association will be clearer as we go through the remaining pages.

The Plan of the Study

I will start with a discussion of the legal environment Greek associations had to operate in. Therefore, the first chapter will be about the meaning of the word *cemiyet* and its various uses in this period. I believe this is important, because Greek associations were overwhelmingly called *cemiyet* by the Ottoman bureaucrats, and their private names were almost never used. The first chapter will also include a discussion of collectivities in the various Ottoman shapes of Islamic law before the nineteenth century and what this can tell us about the Ottoman perception of these collective activities. It is important in the absence of a “secular” regulation to see what Islamic law in its nineteenth century Ottoman shape could tell us about associations, and also in what ways it affected their daily activities. I am aware that making a distinction between secular and Islamic, not just in the area of law but in any late Ottoman area, is somewhat futile and increasingly criticized in recent historiography on the late Ottoman Empire. By making this distinction I do not argue for a binary opposition and I do not mean to say there were two types of law that were clearly defined and easily distinguishable. Further, I do not use “Islamic law” to refer to a well-defined unchanging code that came unchanged from the seventh - eighth centuries. Even the case of *Mecelle* should make us aware of the insufficiency of these two categories. However, to connect the specific issue of Greek associations with the previous Ottoman exercise of dealing with collectivities I decided to use the term “Islamic law.” What I mean is not a set of laws that was used all along; but rather a type of law that feels the need to relate itself to a tradition of law-giving, and to the ideas of very different jurists in the Muslim world for centuries. Especially in

the earlier periods this thesis discusses European-style codes were not yet compiled and even when they were, they left associations unmentioned. In this space, the only possible way of dealing with collectivities was benefiting from the form of Ottoman Islamic law in the nineteenth century which was shaped through experience as well as different juridical opinions throughout Ottoman centuries. Islamic law, when mentioned in this context, is the specific shape that it took in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire.

The second half of my first chapter will concern the chronological development of the Ottoman governments' legal perceptions of Greek associations. As I have been trying to argue, these perceptions changed over time according to the developments in the wider Ottoman environment, and we can learn about Ottoman ideas on the *Rum milleti* and the *Osmanlı milleti* following these changes.

The second chapter will be a discussion of the two main fields that Greek associations operated in: education and philanthropy. I will expand the discussion provided in this introduction to see what these two fields meant for the Ottomans in the unfolding of late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The third chapter will include discussions on the ways of legality for Greek associations. In the absence of legal principles and codes, it is important to discover how the Ottoman bureaucrats legitimized the existence of such a variety of associations. Moreover, the daily correspondences concerning these associations can give us an insight on the structure of the *Rum milleti* and the Patriarchate's place in it.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEGAL ENVIRONMENT

Ottoman State and Collective Activity

The number of Greek associations within the Ottoman Empire escalated quickly after the foundation of the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople (Ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως) in 1861. This association's name was translated into Ottoman Turkish as *Dersaadet Rum Cemiyet-i Edebiyesi*. There is no consistency in the Ottoman documents concerning its name though. Apart from the aforementioned translation which was used very rarely, the Ottoman documents also refer to it as “The Greek Scientific Society named Syllogos located in Beyoğlu” (*Beyoğlu’nda kain Sillogos nam Rum cemiyet-i ilmiyesi*)⁵⁷, “The Greek Scientific Society known as Syllogos” (*Sillogos namiyla maruf Rum cemiyet-i ilmiyesi*)⁵⁸, or more simply as the “Syllogos Greek Society” (*Sillogos cemiyet-i Rumiyesi*)⁵⁹. This approach of Ottoman bureaucrats in naming associations is not specific to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. As in this case, the general attitude of Ottoman bureaucrats was to define the association as a *cemiyet* and mention the place it was located. Again in accordance with the aforementioned case, Greek words like Syllogos (σύλλογος - association), Adelfotitos (αδελφότητα - brotherhood), Leschi (λέσχη - club) and Etaireia (εταιρεία - association) were not translated into Ottoman Turkish most of the time, which caused confusions in the correspondences. The Greek Patriarchate and the individual members of such associations felt the need to

⁵⁷ BOA, A.MKT.MHM 491/11, 23 Şevval 1303 (25 July 1886).

⁵⁸ BOA, BEO 3884/291273, 19 Rebiülahir 1329 (19 April 1911).

⁵⁹ BOA, DH.MKT 609/61, 16 Teşrin-i Evvel 1318 (29 October 1902).

explain the meaning of such terms to Ottoman authorities when they felt threatened. In fact, the Greek Literary *Syllogos* of Constantinople was named the Greek Literary *Etaireia* of Constantinople (Ελληνική Φιλολογική Έταιρεία Κωνσταντινουπόλεως) only to be changed later because of the very negative connotations the term “*etaireia*” had on Ottoman officials’ minds. The first president of the society, Stephanos Caratheodory, affected the change from *etaireia* to *syllogos*, exactly because of the negative meaning of the term “*etaireia*” in Ottoman bureaucrats’ mind which was the result of the activities of *Philiki Etaireia* (Φιλική εταιρεία – Friendly Society) during the Wars for the Greek Independence.⁶⁰

The word dominantly used by the Ottoman authorities to describe any association was, as I have already related, *cemiyet*. In the period we are concerned, and beforehand in the nineteenth century, this term had the simple meaning of “a gathering of people in a place.” Strangely, *syllogos* also had a similar meaning before the nineteenth century.⁶¹ Before 1850s *cemiyet* was generally used to describe a group of people that have gathered to cause trouble to the authorities, be it a protest or banditry. It never lost this main meaning of a “gathering of people,” but acquired the meaning of “a society founded to discuss and research subjects pertaining to science and knowledge” in time.⁶² It is telling that the latter meaning of the word is given by *Şemseddin Sami* as the third item under *cemiyet*, while the former is the first. This may lead one to think that the word when used for associations, had the

⁶⁰ George A. Vassiadis, *The Syllogos Movement*, 56. *Philiki Etaireia* (Friendly Society) was a secret organization in nineteenth century aiming the overthrow of the Ottoman government and the foundation of an Independent Greece. It was active mainly in the Danubian Principalities. It had a hand in the outbreak of the Greek Movement for Independence in 1821, and in the minds of Ottoman officials it was the main conspirator group causing the cessation of the Greek Kingdom from the Empire.

⁶¹ Ibid, p. 2.

⁶² “*Cemiyet*”, *Kamus-ı Türki* (1901).

meaning of “a loose gathering of people” in the Ottoman officials’ eyes. In the absence of a law governing the process of founding associations and the absence of legal personality in Ottoman Islamic and “secular” law, this line of thought is important to investigate.

My aim in this chapter is first to investigate the development of the Ottoman officials’ attitudes to Greek words in the names of associations. Second, I will follow the uses of the word *cemiyet* in Ottoman documents before and during this period to argue that parallel to the general use of the word, associations were basically seen by the Ottomans as loosely institutional gathering places of people with no legal personality until the promulgation of the Law of Associations. I will continue my discussion with Islamic law and the absence of corporations in it especially in its nineteenth century shape, and the effects this had on the legality of various Greek associations. Further, as “gatherings of people,” the associations were destined to be followed and monitored by the Ottoman state. I will discuss the Ottoman efforts to follow and monitor the Greek associations in the remainder of this chapter.

Ottoman Bureaucrats and Greek Words

Around 1910, in a village called *Kiliseli* in Turkish, in the *kaza* of *Alasonya* within the *Vilayet* of *Manastır*, the Ottoman officials closed down an association named *Anaplasi* (Ανάπλαση - Reformation). Among the many reasons counted by the Ministry of the Interior in a draft intended to the Grand Vizier’s Office, one was the word *adelfotis* (αδελφότης) in the association’s name.⁶³ The Ottoman authorities have recently uncovered a hidden association and found weapons in *Cisr-i Ergene* in the *Vilayet of Edirne*, so they started a thorough search in the Balkans. *Anaplasi* was

⁶³ BOA, DH.MUI 74-2/13, 15 Mayıs 1326 (28 May 1910).

one of the local associations that were closed down by the Ottoman authorities during this investigation. The members and founders of the association were arrested and they petitioned the Grand Vizier for their release as they “did not betray their fatherland in any way.”⁶⁴ They were found not guilty of any relations with the uncovered hidden association in *Cisr-i Ergene* in the investigation that the Grand Vizierate asked for⁶⁵, but the association was still closed, and the members were prosecuted for founding an association without permission.

The Greek terms used for associations were turned into generic expressions by the Ottoman bureaucrats. Generally they used the Ottomanized versions of these terms to identify an association, sometimes adding an Ottoman translation to it. In the above mentioned case, *adelfotis* became the generic term for an undesirable association in the minds of Ottoman bureaucrats. So, throughout this investigation another association with the same name was founded and closed down for having this undesirable expression. As in this case, the Patriarchate or the Greek Ottomans felt the need to explain the meaning of such words to the Ottoman authorities when they felt threatened. In 1903, there was a similar problem with confusion of words in the island of Midilli (Λέσβος – Lesbos). According to the petition from the Patriarchate to the Ministry of Justice and Religions, dated 9 February 1903; the local Ottoman authority wanted to close down a local association because it was founded without prior permission from the Ottoman government. While the required investigation was going on, a document was found on somebody coming from Athens, with a stamp quite similar to the one used by the local association. Further, the name of the association was also similar to the one in Midilli, it probably had the

⁶⁴ BOA, DH.MUI 74-2/13, 15 Nisan 1326 (28 April 1910).

⁶⁵ BOA, DH.MUI 74-2/13, 3 Mayıs 1326 (16 May 1910).

word *adelfotis* in its name. The Patriarchate explained that the local association was founded by “loyal subjects of the Ottomans under the leadership of the local Church’s preacher to improve the morals of the local people” and it was called *adelfotis*, meaning brotherhood.”⁶⁶ Later, it turned out that the story about the document found on a person from Athens was a sham. Still, the Ottoman authority affected the close down as the association did not have a permit from the government. The necessity felt by the Patriarchate to explain the Greek word’s meaning points, I believe, to a need to affect the categories Ottoman bureaucrats’ created around such Greek terms.

Generally, when the Ottoman documents include the Greek word in Ottomanized version, they use it as a proper noun, rather than a common one and add an Ottoman common one to describe it. The hidden association I just mentioned, uncovered in *Cisr-i Ergene*, was called *Adelfotita Uhuvvet* in Ottoman documents⁶⁷, both names meaning the same thing, brotherhood; the Ottomanized Greek one used as a proper noun with the *uhuvvet* as the common noun to describe it.

If we prepare a little list of the Greek words and their translations/perceptions by the Ottoman bureaucrats, we will see that *sylogos* was generally translated as *cemiyet-i ilmiye* (scientific association) and had very little negativity in the minds of the Ottoman bureaucrats as the case of Greek Literary Society shows. Another example would be an association from Ortaköy which was described in 1894 as the scientific society founded with the name of Sillogos (*Siliyos [Sic.] namıyla tesis ve*

⁶⁶ BOA, BEO, 1984/148729, 23 Zilkade 1320 (9 February 1903).

⁶⁷ BOA, DH.MKT, 2879/75, 19 Cemaziyelahir 1327 (5 July 1909) and 27 Haziran 325 (10 July 1909).

teşkil olunacak cemiyet-i ilmiye).⁶⁸ *Adelfotis* and its variations were generally used together and translated with words that meant brotherhood: *uhuvvet*, *biraderlik*⁶⁹, *karındaşlık*.⁷⁰ This term could be negative in Ottoman bureaucrats' minds as the above mentioned cases illustrate, but it was not necessarily negative in every case. *Leschi* was translated as *kulüp*, *salon* or *cemiyetgâh* in the documents and meant a social club and a gathering place rather than a scientific and philanthropic association.⁷¹ *Etaireia* was the most negative of these terms, and it was nearly never used in the names of Greek associations. In Ottoman bureaucrats' minds it had connection to the Greek Movement of Independence and the *Philiki Etaireia* as I already mentioned, and the foundation of *Ethniki Etereia* (National Society) in 1894. This political association founded in the Greek Kingdom, was also considered in very negative terms by the Ottoman government. In fact the possible activities of this association were followed with concern by Ottoman officials.⁷² As a result of the activities of these two political associations the word *etaireia* had a very negative place in Ottoman bureaucracy's vocabulary and therefore were never used by Ottoman Greek associations. It seems the Ottoman bureaucrats were using a similar word list -that emerged in their minds out of common practices rather than being a "real" list on paper -to help with their relations with the Greek associations.

Also, consider the examples I have given concerning the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in the beginning of this chapter. In all the examples I have

⁶⁸ BOA, MF.MKT, 211/43, 27 Zilkade 1311 (1 June 1894).

⁶⁹ As in BOA, DH.MUİ, 10-2/31, 4 Şevval 1327 (19 October 1909).

⁷⁰ As in BOA, DH.MKT, 2108/106, 9 Eylül 1314 (21 September 1898).

⁷¹ As in BOA, MF.MKT, 602/47, 10 Zilkade 1319 (18 February 1902).

⁷² See for example, a report on how to counter the activities of *Ethniki Etaireia*: BOA, DH.MKT, 2879/10, 5 Temmuz 1325 (18 July 1909).

provided *sylogos* is Ottomanized as a proper noun as “*sillogos*” to be followed by “*cemiyet*.” Therefore, it is my contention that regardless of the name the founders chose for their associations the Ottomans used the term *cemiyet* to describe it. This word was not a translation of *adelfotis/adelfotitos* or *sylogos* or any other Greek word, but it was a generic term devised and used by the Ottomans, before the start of the *sylogos* movement in the Empire. As the description of such associations by Ottoman authorities suggests, we need to see the Greek associations in the bigger picture of Ottoman reality and legality. That is why a discussion on the origins and the use of the word *cemiyet* is in order.

The Many Uses of the Word *Cemiyet*

In the period I am dealing with in this work, five different uses of the word *cemiyet* are identified.⁷³ The first one is the units created within state institutions (like the *Cemiyet-i Rüsumiye*, Tax Administration Office). The second one is taken from the Imperial Penal Code (*Ceza Kanunname-i Hümayunu*), which mentions *cemiyet-i fesadiye* (plotting group) which is used to define groups of people intending to harm the Ottoman polity in any way.⁷⁴ The third use, which is the most general one, means “a group of people.” The other uses identified are, the scientific and philanthropic associations – which are the topic of my thesis- and the committees of these associations which were sometimes called *cemiyet*. The term had a negative meaning before 1850s as we can infer from various Ottoman documents. However, in the period we are concerned with and before, *cemiyet* was mainly a loosely defined

⁷³ The uses listed here are identified in Mehmet Ö. Alkan, “Sivil Toplum Kurumlarının Hukuksal Çerçevesi 1839-1945” in A.N. Yüçetürk, İ. Turan, M.Ö. Alkan (eds.), *Tanzimattan Günümüze İstanbul’da Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1998), p. 50.

⁷⁴ A. İrfan, *Mecmua-i Kavanin ve Nizamât*, (İstanbul: Cemal Efendi Matbaası, 1316 [1889]), p. 22.

group of people that came together for any purpose. This use is also in line with the “normal,” non-technical meaning of the word. All other technical uses were derived from it, and as I will try to show, had this main meaning as their base. Let’s investigate this term further with a few examples.

I will begin with the simple meaning of the word, a group of people that came together, for no apparent political purpose. In a document written to the Office of the Imperial Secretary by the Minister of Education which summarizes a petition from Hacı Hüseyin Bey, the director of the Civil Medical School, it is told that the latter petitioned the Ministry of Education because he was insulted by Spiridon Mavroyeni in front of a group of people (*cemiyet*).⁷⁵ This document was dated 17 January 1889, which tells us that the main meaning of *cemiyet* as simply “a group of people” was in use nearly thirty years after the start of the foundation of scientific and philanthropic associations in the Empire. A second example I want to give is from Jerusalem four years later. According to a document sent from the Grand Vizier’s Office to the Ministry of Justice and Religions dated 24 January 1893, a group (*cemiyet*) of Orthodox clergy walked in procession in religious clothing from the southern gate of the city in Christmas Day (*veladet-i İsa Yortusu*).⁷⁶ The problem this created does not need to concern us here. What is evident is that the use of the word as a “group of people” was in circulation throughout this period.

Similarly, *cemiyet* was used to refer to social gatherings. A document dated 14 March 1888 from the *Şehremini* (prefect) of Istanbul to the Yıldız Palace talks about a *cemiyet-i şebâne* (evening gathering) held for the benefit of the schools in

⁷⁵ BOA, Y.MTV 37/28, 15 Cemaziyelevvel 1306 (17 January 1889).

⁷⁶ BOA, BEO 144/10733, 12 Kanun-u Sani 1308 (24 January 1893).

Heybeliada (Χάλκη).⁷⁷ Another example of this use is seen in a document sent from the Kosova Vilayet to the General Inspectorship of Rumeli Vilayet (*Rumeli Vilayet-i Şahanesi Müfettiş-i Umumiliği*) in 18 February 1904. The acting governor of Kosova, explains to the Inspectorship that a *cemiyet* was held for the deceased director of the Orthodox school in Prizren, a Russian citizen named Simon.⁷⁸ Such social gatherings would be described as *cemiyet* as they were simply a coming-together of a group of people and the group had no legality beyond the individual persons that constituted it. In other words, they did not constitute a legal personality beyond the natural persons that constituted the group.

Negatively, the use of *cemiyet* for armed groups was in circulation in the 1860s, and of course, later as well. Consider this example from 15 January 1863: It is from a draft intended to the Ministry of Public Education about an article from the newspaper *Takvim-i Efkar*. Seemingly, the article was based on false rumors about a group of *Rum* bandits gathering in a village called *Boran* in *Kuşadası*. The unknown writer of the document warns the Ministry of Public Education to be more careful about such publications.⁷⁹ For our purposes here it is important to note that the article informs that the alleged *Rum* bandits were “coming together with an intention of mischief.” (*cemiyet-i fesadiye teşekkül et-*) This negative use can be seen in a lot of the documents that were related to bandit groups, and social unrest. To give an example to both cases, the Ministry of the Interior in a draft intended to the Grand Vizier’s office dated 14 October 1901, describes a group in *Timurhisar* in the *Selanik Vilayet* who attacked the local metropolitan and the teachers in the local Greek

⁷⁷ BOA, Y.PRK.ŞH 2/71, 2 Mart 1304 (14 March 1888).

⁷⁸ BOA, TFR.I.KV 52/5121, 2 Zilhicce 321 (18 February 1904).

⁷⁹ BOA, A.MKT.MHM. 253/8, 25 Receb 1277 (15 January 1863).

school as a *cemiyet*;⁸⁰ while a paramilitary Greek group which was moving on the Ottoman border is described as a “*cemiyet-i fesadiye*” in a document by the Ministry of War dated 8 October 1905.⁸¹

I believe that all the examples I provided points to the fact that *cemiyet* was used simply to define “a group of people.” Except, may be, the case in which a state unit was described as a *cemiyet*, these groups did not have legal standing. They were not legal persons and their coming together did not depend on a legal principle recognized by the Ottoman authorities. Even, the units created by the state were called not *cemiyet* but *encümen* most of the time.⁸² This may be because of the “bad connotations” of the term due to the Imperial Penal Code, but it can also be because of the loose definition of the word *cemiyet* as a group with no legal basis.

Now consider that there is no Islamic principle legitimating legal personality⁸³ and the fact that the first code concerning the foundation of associations was written down in 16 August 1909. In a setting where there were no laws and guiding principles concerning the foundation of philanthropic or scientific associations, or any kind of social clubs; the Ottoman term used to describe them also did not have any legal meaning behind it. The associations, regardless of the community that founded it, were described as *cemiyet* exactly because this term could catch the legal loophole they were founded on. The way Ottoman documents dominantly refer to them, only using the name of the locality to describe them and not using any proper names, also shows the attitude of the Ottoman bureaucrats.

⁸⁰ BOA, DH.MKT 2544/75, 1 Recep 1319 (14 October 1901).

⁸¹ BOA, Y.MTV 279/42, 8 Şaban 1323 (8 October 1905).

⁸² Alkan, *Sivil Toplum Kurumları...*, p. 50.

⁸³ Joseph Schacht, *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, (Oxford, 1964), p. 155.

They were not legal persons as far as Ottoman officials were concerned; initially they were only possible because of the special permission by the Sultan and legally at least, that permission could be taken back. In the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century other ways to legality developed for the associations, but their legal personality was still not recognized. They were in a sense, a simple coming-together of people; but they assumed a character beyond the natural persons that founded them. This lack of legal personality makes them even more interesting for us to speculate about the Ottoman bureaucrats intentions concerning Greek associations. The lack of a set of regulations means that this field was dominated by negotiation *par excellence*, the changing intentions of the Ottoman governments and the Greek groups can be followed in Ottoman documents, thanks to this relatively free area. Further, we can speculate about the change in 1908 in Ottoman governing mentality through reading the documents produced around the associations, focusing on the changes in this new period with a legal code.

Before going on with the actual correspondences it is important to appreciate Islamic law's place in post-Tanzimat Ottoman Empire; and its importance in the legal position of associations in the Empire, Greek ones included.

Islamic Law and Associations

Historians writing on the Tanzimat and nineteenth century Ottoman reform quite legitimately emphasize European influences, and tend to look for European roots for the reforms attempted and the documents produced in this period. However, this attitude downplays the very local roots of Ottoman reform as discussed in the introduction. Without denying European influences; it is important to realize that the Ottoman reformers were the products of a very Islamic local setting and they were

still acting in it. Butrus Abu-Manneh in an article argues convincingly for “the Islamic roots of the Gülhane rescript.”⁸⁴ This was also true in the area of law. Though, the Ottomans were promulgating new laws outside *şeriat*, and founding *nizami* courts that operated outside the traditional *kadi* courts, it turns out that this duality created by the Ottoman reformers did not really operate in an antagonistic way. *Nizami* courts were incorporating local *ulama*, and at the head of the *nizami* court system there were again high ranking *ulama* acting as court presidents. These two different courts were not acting against each other as we would expect within a Westernization framework of study, but were actually “working together, mutually supporting an expanding central authority.”⁸⁵ The first civil code compiled in the Ottoman system, *Mecelle*, was also a codification of the *şeriat*. Therefore, it is important to realize how important Islam was in this era of reforms for the Ottomans without overlooking the effects of Europeanization.

As a logical consequence of this discussion; we have to recognize that Islamic law played an important role, of course together with other elements, in the Ottoman state’s perception of the associations. In this part, I will discuss the effects and consequences of Ottoman Islamic law, and the lack of corporate bodies in it, to the legality and daily activities of associations.

Although there is no principle in Islamic law legitimating corporate bodies and legal personality, Ottoman governments always found ways to deal with collectivities throughout the centuries of Ottoman rule. Especially the non-Muslim institutions in the Ottoman Empire forced Ottoman authorities to find ways to

⁸⁴ Butrus Abu-Manneh, *The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript*.

⁸⁵ Ruth A. Miller, “Apostates and Bandits: Religious and Secular Interaction in the Administration of Late Ottoman Criminal Law”, *Studia Islamica*, No. 97 (2003), p.166.

incorporate such institutions into the Ottoman legal system. The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Orthodox monasteries in the Empire provide examples of how the earlier Ottoman system incorporated such institutions into Ottoman legality.

For instance, a limit created by Islamic law concerning institutions was encountered in sixteenth century related to the Patmos and Mount Athos monasteries.⁸⁶ Ebu's Su'ud's efforts to reconcile *şeriat* with Ottoman customary law (*kanun*) led him and the Ottoman government to challenge the legal existence of monasteries. Normally under Islamic law, it was not acceptable to construct *waqfs* for the benefit of churches. Furthermore, because Islamic law accepts only legal persons, the monastic properties couldn't be owned collectively and after the monks died, the properties had to go to their descendants or to the state treasury. However, the confiscation attempt started in the second half of the sixteenth century ended with a compromise. The Ottoman government of the time was willing to negotiate as much as they were willing to enforce Ebu's Su'ud's opinions. The threat by the monks to abandon the lands was taken seriously by the Ottoman central bureaucracy. As a result Ebu's Su'ud found a way to circumvent "Islamic laws of inheritance and redefined the monastic *waqfs* as family *waqfs*."⁸⁷ It seems that Ottoman officials for reasons of their own found a way to incorporate a collective body into Ottoman legal system.

The lack of corporations in Islamic law also affected communal activities throughout the Ottoman period. For example, the Jewish communities in sixteenth-

⁸⁶ The following discussion is based on Eugenia Kermeli, "Central Administration versus Provincial Arbitrary Governance: Patmos and Mount Athos Monasteries in the 16th century", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 32, 2 (2008), pp. 189-202.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

century Jerusalem were able to act collectively, but they had to somehow reconcile their activities with Islamic law. So, when they had to borrow money for the community, they would provide names of private individuals as debtors, bringing the process in line with Islamic law.⁸⁸ This case points to the fact that the Ottoman authorities were aware that they had to deal with collectivities and that they had to bring collective activities under Islamic law. However, this should not mean that Islamic law was paid only lip-service. In an example given by Amnon Cohen, a certain Ishaq bin Murdakhay who was written down as a debtor for a communal borrowing by the Jewish community, had to pay the debt individually and the Ottoman authority did not see any problem with this situation: neither with the communal borrowing, nor with the enforcement of the communal debt on an individual.

Eleni Gara's research on Karaferye district reaches similar conclusions about the Ottoman authorities' reconciliation of collectivities with Islamic law. From the early seventeenth century onwards "the community as a corporate formation had administrative and judicial competences, as well as an important role in taxation. It was responsible for the internal distribution and collection of taxes and was itself entitled to impose taxes on the population in order to cover collective expenses or pay debts."⁸⁹ The local Ottoman court was given the chance to interfere with local

⁸⁸ This example is provided by Amnon Cohen in Amnon Cohen, "Communal legal- entities in a Muslim setting: Theory and practice: The Jewish community in sixteenth century Jerusalem", *Islamic Law and Society*, 3, 1 (1996), p. 80.

⁸⁹ Eleni Gara, "In search of Communities in Seventeenth century Ottoman Sources: The case of the Kara Ferye District", *Turcica*, 30 (1998), p. 139.

politics through the disputes taken to the *kadi* and seems to have recognized the collective character of the activities.⁹⁰

It should be obvious by now that the Ottoman statesmen of the nineteenth century had a tradition of dealing with collective bodies playing with the boundaries and the meaning of Islamic law. It is also clear that Ottoman bureaucrats took Islamic law as a point of reference and tried to come to terms with the reality around them using it. The recognition of corporate activities was not made despite Islamic law; on the contrary corporate bodies assumed a special shape with the influence of Islamic principles. As a result their legal standings as well as their daily activities were affected by the stipulations of the *şeriat*. This situation, although it changed significantly in the last century of the Empire, can help us grasp the late nineteenth century Ottoman attitude to corporate bodies, and the Greek associations which are the subject of this thesis.

As mentioned, associations, both Muslim and non-Muslim, had to operate in the late nineteenth century Ottoman reality. The legality of such associations was, for a time, closely linked to a permit by the Sultan. In the 1860s the associations had to apply to the Sultan or to the Ottoman government and receive an *irade-i seniyye*⁹¹ (Imperial rescript), linking them closely to the Sultanic law (*kanun*) in the absence of any Islamic principle to legitimate them. The earliest document I was able to locate concerning a Greek association, one from Izmir founded in 1864 points to this close relation with an *irade*. The association was founded by some people who call themselves the “doctors and the notable and skillful merchants living in Izmir”⁹² in a

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 161.

⁹¹ Mehmet Ö. Alkan, *Sivil toplum Kurumları*, 49.

⁹² BOA, MVL. 689/33, 29 Safer 1281 (3 August 1864).

petition to the Ministry of Public Education. Initially the permit was not given to them, because the Ministry of Foreign Relations pointed out that the association applied after it was founded, and the ministry “sensed a degree of intrigue.”⁹³ As a result the association was in a grey area between legality and illegality. It was not directly closed down, but the Ottoman authorities could proceed to affect the closure at any time. This state of ambiguity and the accompanying sense of urgency can be seen in another petition written by the founders of the association. In the document – most probably directed to the Grand Vizier – dated 15 March 1865 the petitioners were expressing that they “were in a real need of the Imperial rescript”(*irade-i aliyye-i adlilerine eşedd-i ihtiyac ile muhtac olmuşuzdur*).⁹⁴ The *irade* was the only way to safeguard the legality of this association in middle nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, as there were no secular laws concerning associations, and as Islamic law lacked the concept of corporate bodies.

However, this situation changed as other ways to legality for associations developed throughout the later years of the nineteenth century. These other ways to legality will be discussed for Greek associations in the following chapters. I will just give an example of a permit for the discussion here: the permit of a Greek association in Phanar called Mnemosyne given in 5 April 1875.⁹⁵ According to this copy, the application of “individuals from the *Rum milleti*” was considered by the Ministry of Public Education, and the permit was also given by the latter. In this case, although there still does not exist a law concerning associations; the widely used bureaucratic

⁹³ BOA, MVL 691/68, 16 Şaban 1281 (14 January 1865)

⁹⁴ BOA, MVL 467/66, 17 Şevval 1281 (15 March 1865)

⁹⁵ BOA, MF.MKT 26/160, 28 Safer 1292 (5 April 1875).

procedures linked the association with education and not with an Imperial rescript. The permit, therefore, was given directly by the Ministry of Education.

Imperial rescript or not, there is no question on the acceptance of associations' non-individual and long-lasting character for the Ottoman state authorities. True, they were seen as "gatherings of people" but they assumed a character beyond the individuals that founded them. They could and they did write down regulations, although these regulations had to be approved by the Ottoman state. They were free to choose their presidents without the need to get approval from the government, although the Ottoman bureaucrats tried to make sure most of the time that the president was an Ottoman subject.⁹⁶ They could gather and organize competitions without getting prior approval of the Ottoman state, though they had to be open to the Ottoman police whenever the latter wanted to inspect. They could even get into relations on an international level. In fact, the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople sent a letter of condolence to the daughter of Brazilian Emperor Pedro II, after the latter's death through the Ottoman ambassador.⁹⁷ It is not surprising as the Emperor was an honorary member of the association and even gave a speech in the association's building during his visit to the Ottoman capital. However, this seems as a personal relation between the Brazilian Emperor and the concerned association.

From the former discussion, it is apparent that the Ottoman governments of the late nineteenth century were ready to accept collective bodies as institutions. The

⁹⁶ This wasn't always the case. J. Millingen, the president of the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in 1869-1870 was not an Ottoman citizen. The Ottoman authorities should be aware of it, as this association was very famous in the Ottoman capital. Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα* p. 21.

⁹⁷ BOA, Y.PRK.TKM 23/53, 23 Cemaziyelevvel 1309 (25 December 1307).

Patriarchate was accepted as an institution for the first time in the Ottoman history after 1856;⁹⁸ and the associations founded in an increasing number after 1860s were all seen as institutional bodies. However, with the exception of the Patriarchate perhaps, these institutional bodies did not have legal personality, which had important results for the daily activities of the associations. For one thing, this meant that these associations could not own property, and quite similar to the case of the sixteenth century Jewish community of Jerusalem, they had to show natural persons as owners of property.

This is demonstrated by a group of correspondence from late 1910 and 1911, concerning again the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. The Ottoman government, now recognizing a difference between property held by natural and legal persons, asked for the payment of a property tax from the concerned association arguing that the gathering place of the association was held by a natural person and therefore was entitled to taxation. Normally, with the Law of Associations an association working for the “improvement and dissemination of knowledge” would be exempt from land tax, and it seems this was also the case before the Law. In a draft prepared by the Council of State concerning this case, it is stated that “although the place is registered under a personal name, it is understood that it does not belong to the concerned person and the previous government [meaning the Hamidian regime] never asked for the payment of taxes.”⁹⁹ Another document written by the Patriarchate makes this case clearer. According to this document intended for the Ministry of Justice and Religions, the place was not registered as a collective or *millî* property by the previous government, though the Patriarchate repeatedly asked for it.

⁹⁸ For the development of the Patriarchate’s place in Ottoman legality and its final recognition as a legal personality see Paraskevas Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις*, pp. 295-361.

⁹⁹ BOA, ŞD 2798/4, 16 Kanun-u Evvel 1326 (29 December 1910).

The document further states that this practice of registering property on individuals was “coming from the procedure of the times,”¹⁰⁰ which would allow us to conclude that this practice was the result of the dominant interpretation of Islamic law under Hamidian regime. The same document also tells that, even the previous government would be confused in this case, and they asked for the payment of taxes in two different cases. This case was solved in favor of the association and the property it had was recognized as belonging to the association. It should be clear by now that the absence of legal personality played a real role in the daily practices of Ottoman associations.

I already claimed that the Ottoman bureaucrats felt the need to interfere when the associations’ relations assumed an institutional form rather than a personal one. This is best illustrated by the cancellation in 1886 of the international congress organized by the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in honor of its twenty-fifth anniversary.¹⁰¹ Among other reasons the report of the cabinet (*Meclis-i Has*) cites in its decision dated 25 July 1886, one points that the association proceeded to invite related parties and it contacted with foreign embassies in the capital, without prior notice to the Ottoman authorities. The Ottoman government was not ready to allow an organization of this scale by a private group, and as it did not recognize the legal personality of associations it could not accept an organization having institutional relations with foreign dignitaries without the prior consent of the government. This should not mean that the absence of legal personality was among the primary reasons why the Ottoman bureaucrats could not comprehend an

¹⁰⁰ BOA, ŞD 2798/4, 20 Teşrin-i Evvel 1326 (2 November 1910).

¹⁰¹ My discussion of this event is very limited. For more information see George A. Vassiadis, *The Syllogos Movement*, pp. 157-162, and Loukia Droulia, “The Cancellation of the International Congress of Literary Societies for the furthering of Hellenic Studies, Constantinople, 1886” in *Actes du IIe Congrès International des Etudes du Sud-Est Européen* (1978), v.4, pp. 521-523.

association inviting foreign representatives without its knowledge. It was probably one of the minor reasons that accelerated Ottoman officials' response to this situation. It is not hard to imagine that Ottoman bureaucrats would not want any private group to bypass its authority and contact foreign dignitaries directly.

The absence of the idea of legal personality in Islamic law also had other consequences. As places where people gathered, associations were destined to be followed by the Ottoman governments. The Ottoman Empire of the nineteenth century, like every other modern state, was interested in following the collective activities of its citizens. I do not mean to say that, associations would not be followed if the Ottoman legal system saw them as legal persons. But it seems to me that the Ottoman central state, at least in the earlier stages, did not follow the associations as institutions; but it was rather interested in seeing what people did when they gathered. What the Ottoman police did was not controlling and monitoring a legal personality; but following the individuals and their activities. This, I think, resulted from the Ottoman view of associations as sums of natural persons.

Monitoring the Associations

The Ottoman state's interest in following groups and not institutions can best be seen in the fund-raising activities of most of these associations. The Ottoman government, especially under Abdülhamid II's rule attempted to control fund-raising activities like theatrical plays, balls and lotteries. These events were closely monitored; the amounts to be raised were decided by the government, the latter even wanted to control the places this money went.¹⁰² There were again no laws concerning fund-

¹⁰² Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 263. For an example from the Ottoman documents regarding the process see BOA, DH.TMIK-M 101/27, 11 Muharrem 1319 (30 April 1901).

raising activities until 1909¹⁰³, so the Hamidian government could monitor such activities as it saw fit. Although, there are a lot of documents relating to fund-raising activities, especially in Istanbul, there is simply no referral to any of the huge private donations given to the Greek associations at the same time.¹⁰⁴ This may point to a disinterest in Ottoman bureaucrats' mind. If there is a disinterest in following private donations to associations, I think it may be a result of the Ottoman government's interest in monitoring associations as places where people gather, rather than as institutions with economies of their own. A donation by a private person to an association would not be of great interest to the Ottoman bureaucrats, as they were not really monitoring the association. At the same time, a fund-raising activity would especially be in the Ottoman government's area of interest as it was a collective activity. Of course, this concerns the Ottoman bureaucrats' approach to the associations at a specific time before the Young Turk Revolution rather than their approach to every donation, regardless of time and place.

Clearly, fund-raising was not the only collective activity the Ottoman government undertook to monitor. At a time of increasing nationalism, the Ottoman government was interested to learn what was going on when its Greek subjects gathered. This is not to say every gathering of every Greek association was followed, but occasionally reports about bigger gatherings appear in Ottoman archives. For example, there is a report dated 31 March 1895, concerning again the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. In this document sent to the Yıldız Palace by the governor

¹⁰³ For a copy of the law, see BOA, DH.MUI, 74-2/13, 21 Şaban 1327 (7 September 1909).

¹⁰⁴ Especially the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople would receive special donations from the rich Greeks of Istanbul. They would serve to organize special competitions, but also for the continuation of the association. For more information on the Greek funding of competitions within the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople see especially Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα*, pp. 103-132.

of Beyoğlu district, it is reported that the Serbian ambassador went to the Society's building to give a speech in Greek regarding the Patriarchate and the Serbian people in the medieval era.¹⁰⁵ Such speeches tended to interest the Ottoman police, and the government usually wanted to know their contents. This interest was not only directed towards the speeches of foreign representatives. In 13 December 1891, the members of the Greek club Mnemosyne in the Phanar district were gathered to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the association's foundation. According to a report by the Ministry of Public Security, an Ottoman police approached the representative of the Patriarchate who was to deliver the speech for the occasion, asking for a copy of his speech. This created an uproar, and the representative saw the request as a sign of mistrust by the Ottoman police against the Patriarchate, as a result the gathering was called off by him.¹⁰⁶ Although this event created serious doubts for the Ministry of Public Security, the Ottoman government did not try to take action against or close down the Greek Club Mnemosyne. It seems the government was only interested in following this specific gathering, and what the people that came together at the event were doing at that particular moment. It is tempting to compare this attitude to the interest the Ottoman government showed to public-opinion and coffee-houses in the 1840s. According to Cengiz Kırılı, the various spy-reports that were sent to the Sultan around this time were not intended as police reports, but rather were assessment of public opinion.¹⁰⁷ The Ottoman government was simply interested in learning what

¹⁰⁵ BOA, Y.PRK.ZB 15/51, 19 Mart 1311 (31 March 1895).

¹⁰⁶ BOA, Y.PRK.ZB 9/53, 1 Kanun-u Evvel 1307 (13 December 1891). Such gatherings did not always cause problems. Five years later, the Ecumenical Patriarch was invited to give a speech in Mnemosyne, though the Ottomans were still interested in the contents of the speech to be delivered, the problems described here did not resurface. See BOA, MF.MKT 305/18, 24 Şaban 1313 (9 February 1896).

¹⁰⁷ Cengiz Kırılı, "Coffeehouses: Public Opinion in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire", in Armando Salvatore and Dale F. Eric (eds.), *Public Islam and the common good*, (Boston, Brill: 2006), pp. 75-97.

people were talking about. Similarly, in this incident concerning the Greek Club Mnemosyne, the Ottoman government seems only interested in what the people gathered for this occasion was listening to. Otherwise, this event would have caused greater troubles for the Club Mnemosyne, as the Ottoman government did not hesitate to close down those associations it suspected. We shouldn't be drawing conclusions from here though. There is a span of forty years in between what Cengiz Kırılı talks about, and the cases I am talking about. Not only the context, but also the nature of the Ottoman polity changed in between. The Ottoman bureaucracy of the 1880s is no longer one that simply follows activities; it is one that has plans and ambitions.

Moreover, especially in Macedonia after 1890s where a nationalist struggle was being waged between Greeks, Bulgarians and to an extent the Serbians, the Ottoman government would not be so "lax" in following the associations founded, and certainly would not just leave alone the ones it found suspect. The Ottoman authorities objected to "the promulgation of national propaganda and the encouragement of agitation" in Macedonia by especially the Greeks and the Bulgarians.¹⁰⁸ In this setting, propaganda efforts by associations would not be taken lightly, and they would be closed down like the association named *Philoproodhos* in *Langadhas* which was closed down in 1904.¹⁰⁹

Of course, not all Greek associations in the Balkans were followed by the Ottoman state for nationalist activities, and nationalism was not the only thing the Ottoman authorities were concerned when they followed an association and the

¹⁰⁸ Anastasia N. Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), p. 98.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

activities of the people involved. A very detailed document dated 2 August 1904 by the Karaferye Police Superintendant describes an event held by two local Greek associations in 31 July of the same year.¹¹⁰ The Superintendant describes in detail the procession, the music, the flags held by the members (Greek but also Ottoman flags), the football match played among two teams that were chosen from among the members, even the shirts worn by the players. True, the associations are described as “*Elenismos cemiyetleri*,” and also the concern of the police was mainly about the influence of the Greek Kingdom though he does not write it openly. However, it is also apparent that as an Ottoman official his concern is far beyond nationalist activities. He is simply informing the General Inspectorship of Rumelia about everything that is going on. The collective activities of Ottoman citizens came to acquire an increasing importance for the Ottoman state of the Hamidian era. The state was interested in everything going on among its citizens. Associations and their activities as places people came together had a special importance in this sense.

In sum, associations, Greek or not, were mainly places of gathering in the eyes of Ottoman bureaucrats before the Young Turk revolution. They were not clearly defined in legal terms, so they were dependent on the goodwill of the Ottoman state officials to continue operating. However, the situation was not as chaotic as it sounds. Islamic law and the Ottoman legal tradition provided a framework in which collective bodies could, and did act. These associations were almost always called *cemiyet* by the Ottoman officials pointing to their collective character. But they were not recognized as legal persons due to the effect of Islamic law, which in turn affected their legal status and their daily activities. Their legal status depended mainly on a Sultanic approval; but other ways to legality developed

¹¹⁰ BOA, TFR.I.ŞKT 48/4702, 20 Temmuz 1320 (2 August 1904).

in time, as I will argue in the following chapters. As gathering places, they were subject to the watchful eye of the Ottoman police. This is not to mean that the Ottoman police could effectively watch every association. In fact, most of the associations went unnoted in Ottoman documents. Even when they were noted, the Ottoman bureaucrats could not track older correspondences relating to them. Every time there was a discussion around an association, the Ottoman bureaucrats had to go back to the original founding documents, which most of the time could not be found. That is another reason why other ways of legality developed for Greek associations. Now, I want to continue the discussion of the development of legality referring to the various regulations and correspondences concerning Greek associations.

The Development of Ottoman Regulations Concerning Associations

As already mentioned, the first Ottoman code regulating the foundation of associations was promulgated in August 1909.¹¹¹ However, the foundation of Greek and other associations in the Empire dates back to 1860s. This does not mean that associations operated in a free zone, without any governmental intervention. It is natural to expect bureaucratic trends in dealing with and minor regulations concerning the legal aspect of association founding process in this period. These trends and regulations let us understand the Ottoman approach to associations in the specific times they were in use. I will now follow the development of such regulations from 1856 to 1912 through some specific examples, focusing on the Greek associations. Rather than using specific dates to divide this long period, I preferred to divide it into four broad time frames with very broad characteristics. 1860s is the time the movement of founding associations started. In the 1870s, the

¹¹¹ This is not surprising when we consider that the first French Law of Associations was drawn up in 1901.

Greek associations started involving themselves in the organization of *millî* education which created a huge difference in the Ottoman state's response. My next division, the Hamidian era, aims to discuss the development of changes concerning Ottoman authorities' perception of Ottoman Greek associations under the rule of Abdulhamid II. And the last part will focus on the Law of Associations.

1860s

To my knowledge, the first association to be founded in the Ottoman Empire with the consent of the Ottoman government was the Société Impériale de Médecine. This association was founded in 1856 by physicians from French and British armies' who came to the Ottoman capital during the Crimean War. From the Ottoman documents concerning this association of physicians, it seems that the founders did not feel the need to apply to the Ottoman government before founding it. They applied only later for the privilege to use the name "*Cemiyet-i Tıbbiye-i Şahane*" (The Imperial Society of Medicine).¹¹² The first Ottoman association also did not feel the need to apply for permission before it started operating. Founded in 1861 mainly by government officials including non-Muslims, *Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Osmaniye*¹¹³ (Ottoman Scientific Society) applied to the government after its foundation and its application had the aim of receiving support from the government for the books translated or written by

¹¹² BOA, İ.HR 130/6661, 5 Ramazan 1272 (10 May 1856).

¹¹³ I chose to translate Ottoman words derived from "ilm" as scientific or educational. In my terminology a scientific society is one that aims at acquiring and disseminating Western scientific knowledge through such means as gatherings, conferences, books, journals, and newspapers; while an educational society is one that relates itself to a school, funding it, helping its students, or trying to improve its curriculum.

its members, and also the aim of receiving a building as a gathering place for the association.¹¹⁴

The most famous Greek association, namely the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople, was founded in 1861, in the same year with the Ottoman Scientific Society. It is not known whether this society had a written permission with them,¹¹⁵ I could not locate any correspondence regarding its early existence. However, a correspondence from 1864, concerning the foundation of a Greek Scientific Association (referred to as *Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Rumiye* in the Ottoman documents¹¹⁶) in Izmir, refers to a permit given to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople upon request by the founders.¹¹⁷ This reference is made not by Ottoman officials though, but by the founders of the association in Izmir. Further, the nature of this “permit” is not known, we don’t know if it was given before the actual foundation or after it. Anyway, the founders of the Greek Scientific Association in Izmir, who called themselves “noted and talented doctors and merchants of Izmir,” felt the need to apply for permission before they founded their association in 1864.¹¹⁸ As this example shows, around 1860s the Ottoman officials started to consider the government’s permission necessary in founding such associations. This, of course, does not mean that every association applied for, or had permission from the Ottoman government. In fact, most of them continued to operate without any permission, even without any contact with the government.

¹¹⁴ BOA, İ.DH 472/31671, 8 Şevval 1277 (19 April 1861).

¹¹⁵ George A. Vassiadis, *The Syllogos Movement*, pp. 56-57. The author thinks that “the Ottoman government thought it unwise to create a precedent by sanctioning the foundation of a society aimed at encouraging the cultural advance of a particular *millet*.”

¹¹⁶ BOA, MVL 467/66, 17 Şevval 1281 (15 March 1865).

¹¹⁷ BOA, MVL 689/33, 29 Safer 1281 (3 August 1864).

¹¹⁸ BOA, MVL 691/68, 24 Teşrin-i Evvel 1280 (5 November 1864).

Regardless, from the internal regulations of and the state correspondences regarding the Ottoman Scientific Society and the Greek Scientific Society of Izmir, we can deduct what the Ottoman bureaucrats of the 1860s expected from such associations.¹¹⁹ Both of the regulations refer to “diffusion of arts and sciences” (*intişar-ı ulum ve funun*) as their aim. It is not hard to imagine how this had a receptive audience among the Ottoman bureaucrats in 1860s.¹²⁰ In fact, *Encümen-i Daniş*, a society founded by the Ottoman government in 1851 on the model of *Académie Française* listed its aim as “the dissemination of high sciences and useful arts to the country.”¹²¹ The regulations also mention that they will stay away from political and religious issues; and that the associations are open to everyone regardless of their religion or ethnicity. This is in line with what the Ottoman state was trying to achieve in “the *Tanzimat*”. The Ottoman government especially after the *Islahat Fermanı* of 1856 tried to create a space in which Muslim and non-Muslim populations of the Empire could be equal in being the subjects of the Sultan. Apart from bureaucracy; trade and knowledge provided such areas of “interaction.” Regardless of their religious backgrounds, the elite Ottoman subjects of the cosmopolitan cities shared the same language of “progress” and the same belief in the nature of science as a key to progress. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that the associations calling themselves “scientific,” included articles in their regulations providing for the membership of everyone regardless of their religious background. The possibility of membership regardless of religion was one of the things the

¹¹⁹ For the internal regulations of Ottoman Scientific Society, see the file BOA, İ.DH 472 31671; for an Ottoman translation of the internal regulations of the Greek Scientific Society of Izmir see the file BOA, MVL 689/ 33.

¹²⁰ For a brief discussion of the fascination with science in the Ottoman society of 1860s see: M. Şükrü Hanioglu, *The Young Turks in Opposition*, (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 10-13.

¹²¹ Bayram Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), p. 13.

Ottoman bureaucrats would insist on. Further, such associations considered their aims to be the “diffusion of arts and sciences” in the entire Empire, or the entire East. Similar to *Encümen-i Daniş*, The Greek Literary Society of Constantinople, for example, would define its aim in 1871 as “the improvement of education and their diffusion in the East”¹²². Moreover, the Ottoman government had no problem with an association founded specifically by Greeks, as long as membership was not confined to a specific “ethnicity” (*cinsiyet*). An association could call itself “Greek,” and use words like *Ellinikos/Elliniki* (*Ελληνικός/Ελληνική*) in its name, could aim to organize specifically among the *Rum* population of the Empire, and have exclusively Greek members as long as it did not ban the entrance of others. This would be seen by the Ottoman bureaucracy as the contribution of a specific *millet* to the common ground that was being created. It is an era in which being an *Osmanlı* was specifically tied to being the member of a *millet*.¹²³ Therefore, it was only normal that an association would be created by the members of a specific *millet*, and act in the boundaries of that *millet*, as long as it did not close its doors to the others.

Moreover, the Ottoman governments were really sensitive about associations with political aims in this era and afterwards. That is why associations were expected to clearly state that they would stay away from political and religious issues. The omission in the regulations of these associations of anything pertaining to politics does not mean that they could manage to draw a line between their activities and politics. To the contrary, their activities started acquiring a political character in

¹²² Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα*, pp. 21-22.

¹²³ Sia Anagnostopoulou, “Tanzimat ve Rum milletinin Kurumsal Çerçevesi, p. 5.

time.¹²⁴ Activities such as the organization of education, or philanthropic activities taken up by these associations, were essentially political after 1870s. These activities were not under the category of politics in the minds of Ottoman officials, however.

In short, in 1860s the Ottoman bureaucrats started to think that permission would be necessary for the foundation of an association though they did not yet force it on the associations and it was not written down as a regulation. Scientific associations, had a special significance as the promoters of the diffusion of knowledge, and they were expected to bring together members of different *millet*s in a common effort for progress. Moreover, associations founded exclusively by members of a specific *millet* was acceptable as long as they took care not to ban the membership of individuals from other communities. In fact, this is what the Ottoman government was expecting as an outcome of the *Tanzimat* project. In the next decade things were going to change as education became a contested ground between lay elite and the clerical structure of the *Rum milleti*. It is crucial to remember that these scientific societies were not dealing with educational issues yet, the great project of organizing Greek education in the Empire by the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople started only in 1871.¹²⁵ Keeping this in mind, I will move on to the next decade.

1870s

The main event affecting the structure of the *Rum milleti* in the 1870s was probably the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate by an imperial *ferman* in 12 March 1870.

¹²⁴ Efi Kanner, *Φτώχεια και Φιλανθρωπία στην Ορθόδοξη κοινότητα της Κωνσταντινούπολης 1753-1912*, (Katarti: Athens, 2004), p. 27.

¹²⁵ Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα*, p. 22.

Other than splitting the flock of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, it started a great race for winning converts for the national aspirations of Bulgarians and Greeks through the Exarchate and the Patriarchate. The *ferman* specified that a 2/3 majority was enough to declare a region either for the Patriarchate or the Exarchate. Education acquired primary importance in this race for numbers between the Greek and the Bulgarian sides. However, there were three contestants in this area of education: not only the Bulgarian and Greek nationalists, but also the Patriarchate which was following its own policy. It is generally assumed that the differences between the lay elite, who were trying to organize Greek education through the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople; and the clerical structure, which was trying to hold on to their control over education, were downplayed during the struggle created by the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. In the 1870s this was hardly the case, especially in the Balkan provinces. Not only did the clergymen resist the involvement of lay elites in education, but also they had ready allies in Ottoman officials in this issue. This is because the Ottoman bureaucracy's attitude concerning the lay-clergy struggle over the management of the Patriarchate seems to have changed. This is a time when the Ottoman bureaucracy's attitude to the lay participants in the administration of the Patriarchate changed due to the Bulgarian Question. The lay members of the general councils in the Patriarchate started to push the clerical structure to declare schism with the Bulgarian Exarchate. The Sublime Porte interfered to ban the involvement of lay representatives in these councils, trying to leave them out of the decision mechanism.¹²⁶ It seems that the developments concerning associations I will describe, was the result of a general change in Ottoman officials attitudes.

¹²⁶ Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, *Η Εκκλείσια ως Πολιτεία*, p. 198.

A long report written by the governor of Edirne Vilayet in 27 March 1875 details how such a conflict unfolded in Edirne, and how the highest ranking local Ottoman official responded.¹²⁷ Edirne was a developing province close to the capital to which the Ottoman state gave special interest. The local non-Muslim groups were able to financially support new schools, social clubs and literary societies. The local government followed what Yonca Köksal terms “an integrationist policy in Edirne, meaning that it directly intervened in the areas of interrelations and public life at the local level.”¹²⁸ This was also the case with local educational structures and local associations. The governor details in the report I mentioned, that an Educational Association (*Maarif Cemiyeti*) was founded in his region in 1872 with the aim of raising money to help improve the educational institutions of the *Rum milleti* in the region. In 1875, for reasons the governor does not speculate on, the representatives of this association applied to him for the approval of the association’s existence and offered him to be the honorary chairman. The governor rejected both requests and listed his concerns about the issue. First among them was the organization of the association without the opinion and knowledge of the local Greek metropolitanate (*Rum metropolithanesinin rey ve marifeti munazzam olmaksızın*). Second, he mentioned that the local school has always been under the responsibility of the metropolitan but these civilians took the road of rejecting the jurisdiction of the metropolitan and started to claim to be the reformers of the schools. It was imperative that such activities be done with the permission of the metropolitan and of the local government, but the actors in this case disregarded both and therefore the association should be closed down. The report was directed to the Ministry of Public

¹²⁷ BOA, A.MKT.MHM 478/19, 19 Safer 292 (27 March 1875).

¹²⁸ Yonca Köksal, *Imperial Centre and Local Groups*, p. 112.

Education and the governor was asking for orders about this specific association. Unfortunately the ministry's response is missing.

I believe that the association mentioned here was the local *Sylogos* in Edirne. I already mentioned that the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople started undertaking the responsibility of organizing Greek education throughout the Empire in 1872. Many other associations acting as local branches to the centre in Constantinople started being founded in different parts of the Empire after this. They were claiming to work for the betterment of education and they sometimes disregarded the clergy in their efforts. Such activities caused concern not only for the Patriarchate with a vested interest in protecting its monopoly over education, but also for the Ottoman bureaucrats who started to support the Patriarchate as the leader of Greek education. By trying to take education out of the hands of Orthodox clergy, the lay elite were also going against a *millet* privilege given to the clergy. The Ottoman government gave the right to organize education to the Patriarchate with the *Islahat Fermanı* and it developed into a privilege in the following years and Ottoman officials seemed ready to interfere when a problem arose in this respect as this example shows. However, in an era of increasing lay influence within different *millet* structures, simply banning the lay elite from the organization of education would not work. The Patriarchate came to an understanding with the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in time; this “understanding” would also be reflected in the Ottoman approach to similar associations. By 1875, the Ottoman bureaucracy started to accept the legality of associations founded for the funding of, or the bettering of the education of specific schools, but these associations had to be under the approval of

their metropolitans.¹²⁹ As I will argue in the next chapter this was a time when the Ottoman government felt that they could not longer start a parallel non-Muslim educational system, and was instead taking the full control of Muslim education making it impossible for Muslim associations to have a connection with the organization of education. Perhaps paradoxically, education became a way for Greek associations to be incorporated into Ottoman legality at around the same time. In short, the first change in 1870's in Ottoman officials' perception of the Greek associations was the creation of a new area of activity: education. I will leave the discussion about education's role in Ottoman perception of Greek associations' for the next chapter and continue with the peculiar case of the First Constitutional Period.

On 23 November 1876, the first Ottoman constitution was proclaimed, starting a period that lasted until 13 February 1878. The Ottoman constitution, as I already related, considered every Ottoman citizen to be an *Osmanlı* regardless of their faith.” However, this was not a change in the prevailing understanding of the *millet* system. *Millets* did not disappear as the sixteenth article of the constitution suggests. This article was declaring that all the schools in the Empire was under the state's responsibility, but was also guaranteeing the prevailing education style of religious matters of different *millets* (*millet-i muhtelifenin umur-u itikadiyelerine müteallık olan usul-ı talimiyeye halel getirilmeyecektir*). In this sense *millets* continued to exist and their monopoly on religious instruction was safeguarded by the constitution. In the more than one year life-span of the Ottoman constitution, there was no hindrance to organizing on a *milli* basis. Associations targeting specifically the *Rum milleti* could still be founded, and one was founded by a certain

¹²⁹ BOA, MF.MKT 31/179, 11 Eylül 1291 (23 September 1875).

Dr. Kaliyoris(?) in this period. The correspondence surrounding its foundation reveals a lot about the Ottoman officials attitudes in this time period. Before going on with this specific example, it is important to mention that none of the articles of the Ottoman constitution deal with associations. Freedom of association is not one of the rights the constitution safeguards. Only article six mentions something closer to a right of association: “Ottoman citizens are allowed to found partnerships for trade, crafts and agriculture.” However, the documents concerning the aforementioned association refer to article 16 which, as we have seen above, concerns the right of religious communities to stick to their education, rather than article 6. This is surprising in the sense that article 16 only refers to education of religious issues (*umur-u itikadiyelerine müteallık*), rather than any other cultural or national issue. This shows that *milli* education and a national identity of the *millet* was still in place in the minds of Ottoman bureaucrats. Further, the foundation of an association for educational purposes was seen as a part of the *milli* education structure rather than as a right of association.

Dr. Kaliyoris applied for the foundation of his association to the Ministry of Public Education, who in turn directed the application to the Council of State.¹³⁰ The correspondence begins in late 1876 before the proclamation of the Ottoman constitution. It does not continue until 1878 though, probably because of the Russo-Ottoman War that started in 24 April 1877. The process restarts in June 1878 after the Ottoman parliament was closed down by Sultan Abdulhamid II. The documents keep referring to the constitution however, as Abdulhamid II was not powerful enough to affect the suspension of the constitution at this point in his reign. Although

¹³⁰ The correspondences around the foundation of this association can be found in these files: BOA, MF.MKT 50/7; BOA, MF.MKT 43/106, 6 Şevval 1293 (25 October 1876); BOA, İ.ŞD 40/2095, 29 Recep 1295 (29 July 1878); BOA, ŞD. 208/9, 21 Cemaziyelahir 1295 (22 June 1878).

there is no reference to associations in the constitution, according to an *irade* dated 29 July 1878 compiled by the Council of State the foundation of associations was considered to be permitted by the constitution (*Kanun-u esasinin cevazı tahtında*) and this association's foundation was approved. There is an Ottoman translation of the internal regulations of the organization which will allow us to see what is permissible in Ottoman eyes.

According to the first article of the regulations, the association aimed at “spreading the enlightenment of arts and sciences among the *Rum milleti* through publications” and if they found enough funds it was to broaden its audience to include other populations of the East. This article is in line with the previous associations from 1860s having a “scientific” content and at least mentioning an Empire-wide perspective even if the main audience is the *Rum milleti*. The second article gives more detail about the association's aims. What is important for our purposes here is that, the article mentions that the association will publish a monthly journal including articles on, among other things, ancient Greek monuments, Greek language and Greek history. It was also to prepare books to teach ancient Greek literature and ancient Greek authors to be taught in Ottoman Greek schools. Not surprisingly, the regulations did not include anything about Ottoman history and language. The Ottoman officials did not see any problem with approving such associations as long as they would abide by Ottoman laws. In fact, it was to the interest of the Ottomans to allow organizations cherishing *millet* identities, in a hope to unite them under a broader Ottoman identity. Moreover, Greek associations bearing names as Mnemosyne, Athena, Orpheus with their references to Ancient Greece indicating the “national” if not “nationalist” identity of their founders, did not

produce any negative response from the Ottoman government.¹³¹ The Ottoman officials themselves were generally fascinated by ancient Greek history and language. They were interested in knowing the history of the lands they were living in before the Empire, and ancient Greek culture and language fascinated them as the foundation of the intellectual development of the West.¹³² Therefore, in the eyes of the Ottoman officials of 1860s and 1870s, Greek subjectss of the Ottoman Empire had every reason to celebrate their identities as long as this did not have separatist tones; and this way it was hoped that they would join the common ground that was trying to be created with the *Tanzimat*. Being an Ottoman, first and foremost, went through being the member of a *millet*.

We should also examine what the Ottoman officials insisted on for the permission to be given to this association. First, unlike other examples concerning educational associations, the government did not insist on the approval of the Patriarchate for this association. It is probably because this association did not relate itself directly to *milli* schools, and also because of the atmosphere of the Constitutional Period. As the eighth article of the constitution suggests, Ottoman citizenship was defined on more secular lines, therefore the increasing power of the lay elite on *milli* education also had to be realized breaking the Patriarchate's monopoly on it. Second, the government insisted that the president of the association be an Ottoman citizen (*teba-i devlet-i aliyyeden*). This is a condition that emerged in

¹³¹ Merih Erol, *Cultural identifications of the Greek Orthodox elite of Constantinople: discourse on music in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries*, (unpublished Ph. D thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2009), pp. 76-80.

¹³² Johann Strauss, "The Millets and the Ottoman Language: The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters (19th-20th centuries)", *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series, vol. 15, 2 (Nov. 1995), pp. 221-222.

the 1870s.¹³³ It existed neither for the Greek Scientific Association in Izmir, nor for the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. In fact, as I already mentioned in this chapter, the president of the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in 1869-1870 was a non-Ottoman, Julius Millingen.¹³⁴ This insistence became important in 1870s, probably because of the involvement of such associations in the organization of education as a result of the Bulgarian Question. Ottoman bureaucrats always feared the involvement of Greeks from the Greek Kingdom in *Rum* education. As already mentioned, the Ottoman government was trying to prevent the Greeks of the Kingdom from teaching in *Rum millet* schools early as 1850s. When the associations started entering the area of Greek Ottoman education, Ottoman officials felt the need to insist on this new article.

In short, the main change in the Ottoman government's attitude to Greek associations in this decade was the result of the increasing involvement of associations in the educational area. The lay elite of the Greek populations tried to break the monopoly of the Patriarchate over education in the midst of the struggle started with the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. The Ottoman bureaucracy was not too willing to allow the break-up of the Patriarch's monopoly over education and it chose to support the Orthodox clergy in the disputes. The Ottoman government responded by finding a middle way of insisting on the approval of the religious leaders, while also opening a way for the involvement of the lay elite in education. The Constitutional period allowed for a possible favor of the lay elite over the

¹³³ There are other cases of this insistence as well. For example, an association founded in Tulcea, in the Tuna Vilayet for the improvement of education in the region, was asked to have only Ottoman citizens as its presidents. See BOA, MF.MKT 26/53, 5 Safer 1292 (5 April 1875).

¹³⁴ Julius Millingen, was a prominent Dutch physician who also entered the service of Ottoman Imperial family. See T.B. Saunders, "Millingen, Julius Michael," in *Dictionary of National Biography*, v. 37 (London, 1984), pp. 439-440.

clergymen but this process was to be reversed as Abdulhamid II took the reins of power in his hands. The next part will deal with the changes brought forth in the Hamidian era.

The Hamidian Era

An increasing effort to spread education¹³⁵ and to control and organize philanthropic activities¹³⁶ characterize the Hamidian period. The Ottoman state in this period concentrated mainly on improving Muslim educational network throughout the Empire, leaving non-Muslim *millet*s with enough space to organize their own. However, the Ottoman bureaucrats took care to properly inspect the non-Muslim schools and became increasingly sensitive to the possible effects of nationalist teaching in them. In this process, the Public Education Law of 1869 was used as a constant point of reference, as a tactical tool in the power strategy of the Hamidian regime, although the plan of organizing state education for both the Muslim and non-Muslim populations throughout the Empire, set in this document was never followed. Instead, the Hamidian bureaucracy used article 129 of the Public Education Law to inspect non-Muslim schools, seeing them under the category of private

¹³⁵ The Public Education Law of 1869 set down the high aims of the Ottoman government in terms of education. But only during the Hamidian period, it was taken seriously and the Ottoman state began to work extensively to better its education system. This was especially true for the Muslim education system, while the non-Muslim *millet*s kept their privilege of organizing their own educational systems. This was in spite of the Education Law which envisaged the Ottoman state to invest in education for both Muslims and the non-Muslims. See the Public Education Law: BOA, Y. EE. 112/6, 24 Cemaziyelahir 1286 (1 October 1869). For Ottoman education in the Hamidian period see: Benjamin Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*; Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Osmanlı'da Eğitimin Modernleşmesi (1839-1908): İslamlaşma, Otokrasi ve Disiplin*, trans. Osman Yener (İstanbul: İletişim, 2010).; Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the legitimation of power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*, (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998), pp. 93-112. Education in its relation to Ottoman bureaucracy' perception of Greek associations will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

¹³⁶ Abdulhamid II made an effort to legitimize his rule through philanthropic activities, linking his person with the poor of the Empire, especially of the capital. For the role of philanthropy in the legitimation of the Hamidian rule see: Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet 1876-1914*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2002).

establishments. In 1887, the Inspectorate of non-Muslim and Foreign Schools was established; and what was considered non-harmful in the previous era, like the researches on Byzantine or Roman history became increasingly suspicious in Ottoman bureaucrats' eyes. For example, as I mentioned in this chapter, when Club Mnemosyne in Phanar, organized an anniversary for its 30th year, the Ottoman officials wanted to see the texts of the speech to be given by the representative of the Patriarchate because they received information that the speech was going to be about Roman history. A police officer was sent to the place and it resulted in a conflict between the officer and the deputy resulting in the cancellation of the program. A similar example, again as mentioned, is the speech the Serbian ambassador gave in the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople in 31 March 1895, on the early relations between the Serbian people and the Orthodox Patriarchate. The governor of Beyoğlu had to report on the content of the speech to Yıldız Palace, to satisfy the curiosity of the bureaucrats in Yıldız.

As the Ottoman state wanted to increase its control over non-Muslim education through inspection, it also tried to increase its control over associations relating themselves to non-Muslim education. As early as 1882 the Ottoman government started insisting that associations organizing for education get permits from the state before they were founded. Unlike the previous periods,¹³⁷ the Ottoman government in the Hamidian period took this issue seriously and closed down those associations without proper permits.¹³⁸ In the earlier part of the Hamidian era, it

¹³⁷ Club Mnemosyne, for example, was founded in 1862 but got a permit from the Ottoman state only in 1875. For the permit: BOA, MF.MKT 26/160, 28 Safer 1292 (5 April 1875). This does not mean that Club Mnemosyne did not get into touch with the Ottoman state before this time. It requested and got books for its library from the Ministry of Education in December 1874. See BOA, MF.MKT 22/85, 19 Zilkade 1291 (28 December 1874).

¹³⁸ The earliest document for this case I could find does not mention the name or the location of the association: BOA, MF.MKT 75/150, 21 Nisan 1298 (3 May 1882). Another document compiled in the

seems that the state did not insist for these associations to get the approval of the Patriarchate, although this also was to change in time. When, for example, the Epirot Philoeducational *Sylogos* of Constantinople (ο εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἡπειρωτικός Φιλεκπαιδευτικός Σύλλογος) applied to organize a play to raise funds for schools in the districts of *Görice*, *Kesriye* and *Ergiri* in the *Edirne Vilayet*, it applied through the Patriarchate. The letter from the Patriarchate to the governor of Beyoğlu dated 7 April 1898 declares that this association operated within the knowledge of the Patriarchate and was authorized by it to raise funds for the schools in the specified regions.¹³⁹ This situation points first, to the increasing rapprochement between the lay elite and the Patriarchate in the organization of Greek education of the Empire in the face of rivaling nationalisms. Secondly, it shows that the Hamidian regime was seeing the Patriarchate as a guarantee against the influences of the Greek Kingdom in the educational field. What started around 1875, with the insistence of the Ottoman bureaucrats, came to a culmination point around this time. As we have seen the governor of Edirne in 1875, was insisting for the approval of the metropolitan before an educational organization could interfere with educational structures. This time, the approval of the Patriarchate was required to guarantee the legitimacy of this fund-raising activity.

However, in the later years the consent of the Patriarchate started not to be enough. The Ottoman bureaucracy tried to be the main legitimizer of associational activity. Another correspondence from the year 1898, points exactly to this Ottoman project. A letter from the Ministry of the Interior to the Ministry of Justice and

same month is clearer. An association in Kala-i Sultaniye called Adelfotis (Brotherhood) in Ottoman documents was closed down because it did not apply for a permission although “its regulation did not have any harmful content” (*mezkur nizamnamenin mündericatında alfab-ı muzırradan bir şey olmadığı inde’t-tetkik anlaşılmış ise de*), BOA, MF.MKT 76/3, 1 Recep 1299 (19 Mat 1882).

¹³⁹ BOA, MF.MKT 390/40, 15 Zilkade 1315 (7 April 1898).

Religions reports a philanthropic association consisting of 7 people from the *Rum milleti* in Ortaköy. The people founding the association called Brotherhood in the document (*Karındaşlık* in Ottoman Turkish, probably *Adelfotis-Adelphótēs* in Greek) were interrogated and they revealed that they had the written approval of the Patriarchate. After learning this, the Ministry of Interior warned the Ministry of Justice and Religions to make it clear to the Patriarchate that it was not possible for the Patriarchate to give permissions by itself.¹⁴⁰ This may have created a tension between the Patriarchate and the Ottoman bureaucrats. It is hard to imagine that the Patriarchate would not respond to such a change in Ottoman policy around associations. Unfortunately, such a response could not be followed in the documents I was able to locate.

The previous correspondence reveals the second change in the Hamidian period concerning the state's attitude to Greek associations. The Ottoman bureaucracy started taking philanthropic associations seriously. While previously only educational and "scientific" associations were seen in Ottoman correspondences and only they were required to have permissions, now philanthropic activity also came under state's control. The Hamidian regime was trying to organize a widespread philanthropic activity constructed on the Sultan's image; therefore it aimed to control rivaling activities in this avenue. This does not mean, however, that voluntary philanthropic activities were banned. Rather, the Hamidian bureaucracy encouraged and helped voluntary philanthropic activities as long as these did not challenge the political discourse the government constructed around it.¹⁴¹ This encouragement and help was not limited to Muslim associations, there is a

¹⁴⁰ BOA, DH.MKT 2108/106, 9 September 1314 (21 September 1898).

¹⁴¹ Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 43.

correspondence detailing the assistance the Sultan gave to a Greek philanthropic association, probably Women's Philanthropic Association of Staurodromi (Φιλόπτωχος Αδελφότης των κυρίων του Σταυροδρομίου).¹⁴² This assistance was possible thanks to the close relations Spiridon Mavrogenis, Abdulhamid's private physician, had with the Sultan.¹⁴³ While the Ottoman state went to the extent of closing down an educational association for not having a permit from the State, it preferred to find a middle way for the philanthropic associations trying to co-opt them in its power strategies. This was, I think, in part due to the previous attitude of the Ottoman bureaucrats. Before the Hamidian period, the Ottoman state focused on scientific and educational societies, giving a freer space to philanthropic organizations. Therefore, when the government developed an interest in philanthropic associations it had to accept the legality of most of the existing associations through different links, because none of the philanthropic associations had a permit dating from 1860s. For example, when the Philanthropic Society of Tatavla (Φιλοπτωχός αδελφότης Ταταουλων) applied to the Ministry of Public Security in 20 October 1892 for organizing theatrical plays for fund-raising¹⁴⁴, in the following correspondence the Ministry of the Interior informed the Ministry of Public Security that this association was in existence for almost 30 years and that "although the association did not have a certificate, it was working for obtaining the

¹⁴² For more information on this association see: Kyriaki Mamoni, *Γυναικείαι Σύλλογοι...*, pp. 27-111.

¹⁴³ BOA, Y.MTV 26/25, 4 Nisan 1303 (16 April 1887).

¹⁴⁴ BOA, ZB 55/17, 8 Teşrin-i Evvel 1308 (20 October 1892).

necessities of the needy of Tatavla and applied every year to the local governor for the theatrical plays organized for fund-raising.”¹⁴⁵

Educational or philanthropic, the main impulse behind Ottoman bureaucrats’ attitude towards associations in this period was the desire to control. In fact, this is the time regulations concerning associations started appearing and the lawyers of the time occasionally referred to the issue of associations in their works. I already referred to the documents specifying the need for a permit before founding an association. This became a law later in 1889.¹⁴⁶ A few years later İbrahim Hakkı, later to be a Pasha and to serve as the Minister of Interior, the Minister of Public Education and eventually as the Grand Vizier after 1908, was referring to permits given to the associations as graces of the Sultan, given to them although they had no legal basis in Ottoman law.¹⁴⁷ This was very much in the interest of the Ottoman government under Abdulhamid II. As there was no right to associate in Ottoman laws, associations became a favor granted by the Sultan. This way, the government could control and decide the associations to be founded, could close down those that were founded outside its knowledge, and also could project a benevolent and “progressive” image by arguing that it was allowing philanthropic and educational association despite the law.

Apart from the regular controls and investigations there are two cases when the Ottoman bureaucracy wanted to know everything about the associations

¹⁴⁵“cemiyet-i mezkurenin her ne kadar ruhsatnamesi yok ise de otuz seneden beri Tatavla fukarasının temin-i ihtiyacatına çalışmakta olarak her sene dahi icra olunan oyunlar için daireye müracaatla istihsal-i ruhsat eyledikleri...” BOA, DH.MKT 2043/5, 4 Kanun-u Sani 1308 (16 January 1893).

¹⁴⁶ Miltiyades Karavokiros, *Lugat-ı Kavanin-i Osmaniye*, (İstanbul: Asaduryan Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası, 1310 [1893]), p. 227.

¹⁴⁷ İbrahim Hakkı, *Hukuk-u İdare*, v.1, (İstanbul, 1307 [1891]), p. 71.

throughout the Empire during Abdulhamid II's rule.¹⁴⁸ The first of these was started by a circular from the Ministry of Public Education dated 3 February 1892 sent to all local Education directorships.¹⁴⁹ It is hardly surprising as 1891-1892 is considered by some historians to be the point when the Hamidian policy took a heavy absolutist character.¹⁵⁰ It is also just after the outbreak of a crisis between the Ottoman government and the Patriarchate in 1890. The Sublime Porte in a *tezkere* sent to the Patriarchate declared its intention to intervene in the drawing up of curriculums and the appointment of teachers and boards of trustees (*mütevelli*) in the Greek Orthodox schools.¹⁵¹ The move of the Ministry of Public Education concerning educational institutions came after the settling of this problem by the issue of an *irade* recognizing these "privileges." Not being able to penetrate directly into educational institutions, the Ottoman bureaucrats were trying to control the associations around education. The Ministry, by issuing the mentioned circular, wanted the Directorates to inspect all association called *Cemiyet-i İlmiye* (Scientific/Educational Associations) and to compile reports on them. The Ministry wanted to get information especially on the following five issues: First it wanted to learn whether the founders of these associations had the means to realize their aims. Second, the Ministry asked whether the money collected till then was spent on the aims specified. Third, it wanted the Directorates to report whether these associations had the trust of the local people and the governors and as a result whether it was permissible to let them continue operating. Fourth, the Ministry was interested to whom these

¹⁴⁸ This does not mean that the Greek associations were the only targets. Ottoman bureaucracy targeted every association in these instances.

¹⁴⁹ Although I couldn't find the original document starting the process, I found references to it in: BOA, MF.MKT 149/66, 2 Şevval 1309 (5 May 1892).

¹⁵⁰ Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Osmanlı'da Eğitim*, p. 213.

¹⁵¹ Bülent Atalay, *Fener Rum Ortodoks Patrikhanesi'nin Siyasi Faaliyetleri (1908-1923)*, (İstanbul: TATAV Yayınları, 2000), 71.

associations considered themselves accountable. And last, the Ministry wondered who was affirming the budgets of these associations.¹⁵² Five years after the foundation of the Inspectorate of non-Muslim and Foreign Schools, the Ministry of Public Education was taking a step further to inspect the associations concerning themselves with the running of specific schools. Not only the curricula, but also the funding process of these schools entered to the Ministry's area of interest.

Before going on with the second case of Empire-wide inspection targeting associations, we should expand a bit on the Ottoman attempts at controlling the curricula and funding of Greek schools through associations. Not surprisingly, the Ottoman bureaucrats were especially suspicious about the possible influences from the Greek Kingdom. As early as 1882, a document compiled in the Yıldız Palace warns of possible influences in the Selanik Vilayet from the educational associations (*Cemiyet-i İlmiye* –it is probably a translation of *Syllogos*) founded in the Greek Kingdom. The report warns that these associations were working to “corrupt” the *Rum* population of the region and make them desire freedom and independence and to this effect the Greek associations were printing and allocating books and pamphlets. Moreover, young Greeks from the Kingdom were infiltrating Greek villages as teachers and doctors thanks to the works of these associations.¹⁵³ Especially one association, based in Athens, became the target of Ottoman officials' suspicions during Hamidian era: The Association of Asia Minor Anatoli (O Σύλλογος Των Μικρασιατών η Ανατολή). Founded in 1891 it was really active in

¹⁵² BOA, MF.MKT 149/110, 22 Nisan 1308 (4 May 1892).

¹⁵³ BOA, Y.PRK.MK 1/58, 27 Safer 1299 (17 January 1882).

Anatolian Greek Education.¹⁵⁴ According to Richard Clogg, the objective of this association was “to educate young Greeks from Anatolia, either at the University or at theological colleges of Greece or at the numerous Greek schools of Istanbul and Izmir.”¹⁵⁵ This association was also supported by the Greek State, the University of Athens, the Association for the Propagation of Greek Letters, Greek banks and various associations of Greeks from Asia Minor located in Alexandria and Cairo.¹⁵⁶ Although this association should not be perceived as a mindless tool of the Greek Kingdom in its efforts to Hellenize Ottoman Greek-Orthodox populations, it is clear that Ottoman bureaucrats perceived such a danger from its activities. In any case, the activities of the *Anatoli* “contributed immensely to the hellenization of a significant number of young people who migrated from different regions of Asia Minor to Izmir and then to Athens.”¹⁵⁷

Not surprisingly, for the Ottoman bureaucrats the *Anatoli* was an association serving the interests of the Greek Kingdom, and therefore they tried to take necessary steps to prevent its influence. In 28 November 1892, the Ministry of the Interior sent a circular to the governors of all *Vilayets* and *Livas* warning them against the activities of *Anatoli* which, according to the compilers of this document “wanted to

¹⁵⁴ For the activities of *Anatoli* among the Turcophone Orthodox populations see: Stefo Benlisoy, *Education in the Turcophone Orthodox Communities of Anatolia during the nineteenth century*, (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Boğaziçi University, 2010), pp. 399-408.

¹⁵⁵ Richard Clogg, “The Greek *millet* in the Ottoman Empire”, *Anatolica Studies in the Greek East in the 18th and 19th centuries*, (Hampshire: Variorum, 1996), p. 197.

¹⁵⁶ Nikos E. Milioris, “Ο Σύλλογος των Μικρασιατών η Ανατολή”, *Μικρασιατικά Χρονικά*, v.12 (1965), p. 344.

¹⁵⁷ Vangelis Kechriotis, “Educating the Nation: Migration and Acculturation on the Two Shores of the Aegean at the Turn of the Twentieth Century,” in Biray Kolluoğlu and Meltem Toksöz (eds.), *Cities of the Eastern Mediterranean: From the Ottomans to the Present Day*, (London ; New York : I.B. Tauris, 2010), p. 149.

confuse the Greek inhabitants and to direct them to the road of rebellion.”¹⁵⁸ In March 1893, the Ministry of Public Education, this time, sent another circular to all Directorates of Education in Ottoman provinces. It warned the directorates to be careful about *Anatoli* and wanted them not to allow the entrance of *Anaplasıs*¹⁵⁹, the journal of the association in their localities.¹⁶⁰ The first official contact between the association and the Ottoman state was also made in 1892. *Anatoli* applied to the Ottoman government for the authorization of their work in Ottoman lands. The letter signed by the association’s secretary Stavros Leonidiaris, its president Margaritis Evangelidis detailed that *Anatoli* was an association founded by Greeks born in Anatolia, and that their aim contained the research of the history and of the current situation of their homelands.¹⁶¹ The Ottoman officials’ translated and deliberated this letter together with the regulations of *Anatoli*, and started acting only in May of the next year. The correspondence between the Ministry of Public Education and the Ministry of Interior reveals that, Ottoman bureaucrats saw no harm in the content of the regulations, but found it harmful to allow an association based in Athens to operate in Ottoman lands.¹⁶² Two days later Aydın Vilayeti was ordered by the Ministry of the Interior not to allow the entrance and circulation of publications from this association.¹⁶³ The fact that the Ottomans tried to stop the activities of *Anatoli* does not mean that the association failed at its enterprise in Ottoman lands. To the

¹⁵⁸ “Rum mülükanenin efkarını teşviş ile tarik-i mefsedete sevk edilmek istenildiği...” BOA, DH.MKT 2025/88, 16 Teşrin-i Sani 1308 (28 November 1892).

¹⁵⁹ The Ottoman bureaucrat who prepared this document seems to have been confused, as the name of the periodical should be Xenophanes.

¹⁶⁰ BOA, MF.MKT 165/9, 3 Mart 1309 (15 March 1893).

¹⁶¹ BOA, DH.MKT 43/42, 24 Muharrem 1310 (18 August 1892).

¹⁶² See the report sent from the Ministry of Public Education to the Ministry of Interior in 6 Mayıs 1309 (18 May 1893) from the same file.

¹⁶³ “Bu gibi varakaların idhaline ve eyadi-i tebada intişar ve tedavülüne meydan verilmemesi” The document is in the same file.

contrary, it was very successful in organizing Greek education in Anatolia especially among the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Karamanli population providing teachers and educational materials for the schools, giving scholarships to successful students, even making it possible for them to pursue higher education in Athens.¹⁶⁴ What we need to see here is that the Ottoman bureaucracy became increasingly worried about the influence of the Greek Kingdom in Ottoman Greek education and tried to stop such influences before it turned into Greek Kingdom type of nationalism. Therefore, it is no surprise that the order of the Ministry of Public Education coincides with the contact the *Anatoli* made with the Ottoman government.

The second case of Empire-wide inspection of associations started in 9 April 1903 and it had a different perspective. It may be connected with the increasing tension in Macedonia just before the Illinden Uprising of August 1903, it shouldn't be a coincidence that this move of the central bureaucracy was made in the same month of Thessaloniki bombings, done by a group of Macedonian anarchists. The inspection was not concerned with the educational associations this time, it targeted clubs (*kulüp*) and gathering places instead. The correspondences make it clear that this time only the existence of clubs was inspected. The process was started by a circular from the Yıldız Palace and it is clear that the central bureaucracy wanted to see no clubs in existence.¹⁶⁵ Many of the replies specify that there were no clubs in the concerned region, while others report the closing down of some.¹⁶⁶ This shouldn't mean that there were really no clubs in the concerned localities, but instead

¹⁶⁴ Stefo Benlisoy, *Education in the Turcophone Orthodox Communities*, p. 403.

¹⁶⁵ BOA, Y.A.HUS 451/35, 4 Rebiulahir 1321 (30 Haziran 1903).

¹⁶⁶ For example the governors of Çatalca, Limni, Yanya, Kosova, Sivas, Erzurum, Suriye and Cebel-i Lübnan reported that there were no clubs in their regions. These and the other documents concerning the reports of local governors are in this file: BOA, DH.MKT 677/45, 29 Zilhicce 1320 (28 Mart 1903).

the local authorities overlooked most of them, not to cause greater problems. When there were clubs that were in existence for a long time, the local governor reported that it would serve no purpose to close them.¹⁶⁷ This move of the central bureaucracy was probably generated by the increasing suspicion and the fear of secret societies formed to overthrow the Hamidian regime. In 1900s, the Ottoman bureaucracy took care not to allow the foundation of new associations anywhere in the Empire as a result of this fear. An example is the failed attempt at founding a Greek association in *Gevgeli*, within the *Selanik Vilayet*. The metropolitan of *Gevgeli* applied to the local governor for the foundation of an association which aimed mainly at helping poor students, but also at helping needy families during the Easter. It was communicated to the Ministry of the Interior by the governor of Selanik, and the request was rejected. The document from the Ministry of the Interior explains that “raising funds through the foundation of an association whatever its aims may be, cannot be considered without any harm during these days.”¹⁶⁸ This attitude of the Ottoman government was to tighten in the remaining years of the Hamidian era. At last, with the overthrow of the Hamidian government in 1908 it became possible to found associations again.

After the Young Turk Revolution: Law of Associations of 1909

When the Young Turks movement succeeded in the restoration of the Ottoman Constitution in July 1908, a lot of things changed for the Ottoman populations. The Ottoman officials’ relations with associations, Greek or non-Greek, were among

¹⁶⁷ The governor of Midilli for example reported the existence of a club named Leski (Λέσχη, being the Greek of “club”), but also stated that closing it down would serve no purpose as it was in existence for nearly 45 years.

¹⁶⁸ “Şu sırada her ne suretle olursa olsun cemiyet teşkiliyle iane cemi mahzurdan salim olamayacağı,” BOA, DH.MKT 655/17, 19 Zilkade 1320 (17 February 1903).

those many things that changed. However, the Law of Associations was promulgated only in 1909, what dominated in the aftermath of the revolution was confusion for the Ottoman bureaucrats. The then-current Ottoman government “was completely demoralized and administration virtually came to a standstill.”¹⁶⁹ This situation was true for the associations as well. As we have seen, the Hamidian regime in its latest years was trying to prevent the foundation of any new association. Now that it fell, there was nothing to stop the foundation of new associations all over the Empire; especially with the government being in such a confusion. In fact, new associations sprang up all over the Empire “as an instinctive consequence of the regime of freedom”¹⁷⁰, reaching to an alarming point for the administrators of the Empire in less than a year. Ottoman officials did not know what to do with them until a law was drawn up; they were sometimes desperate in their calls for the promulgation of a law considering associations. For example, when the Philanthropic Society of Ottoman Women in Selanik (*Selanik'teki Osmanlı Kadınları Şefkat Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi*) applied to the local government in December 1908 for being allowed to use a building belonging to the government, the Ministry of the Interior informed the local government in Selanik that as there was no law about associations yet, the legality of such associations were not clear (*bu gibi cemiyetlerin vaz-ı kanunisi muayyen olmadığı*) and ordered it to delay the request.¹⁷¹ Another report, this time by the Ministry of Public Security to the Ministry of the Interior, was more urgent in tone. It was informing the latter ministry that “after the promulgation of the constitution a lot of associations and clubs were founded with different names and aims. Even if a

¹⁶⁹ Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks*, (London: Hurst Company, 2010 – first published in 1969), p. 13.

¹⁷⁰ Zafer Toprak, “1909 Cemiyetler Kanunu”, in Murat Belge (ed.), *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, v.1, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985), p. 205.

¹⁷¹ BOA, DH.MKT, 2698/45, 7 Zilhicce 1326 (31 December 1908).

regulation was going to be prepared about these associations which were locating themselves on different sides and following different aims; they were increasing day by day and it was possible that their aims may collide and create serious situations endangering security.”¹⁷² The Ministry of Public Security was asking the Ministry of the Interior to provide it with instructions to deal with associations until a law was promulgated. This feeling of urgency was very serious. The Law of Associations was passed a few months later in August, together with a lot of other laws that were passed after the counter-revolution attempt in 13 April 1909.¹⁷³

The most significant change in the new situation was probably the recognition of the right to association by the Ottoman government. After the promulgation of the Law of Associations the Ottoman Parliament added another article to the Ottoman constitution in August 21 as article 120, which read “Ottomans have the right to associate subject to the concerned laws. It is forbidden to found associations that violate the integrity of the Ottoman state, that aim to change the constitutional regime or the elected government, that act contrary to the Ottoman Constitution, that aim to separate Ottoman subjects, or that act contrary to public morality.”¹⁷⁴ Unlike the situation during the Hamidian regime, associations were no longer privileges granted by the Sultan, but they were natural rights of Ottoman

¹⁷² “İlan-ı meşrutiyeti müteakib muhtelif nam ve maksatlarla bir çok cemiyetler ve kulüpler teşekkül eylemiş ve bunların her biri taraf ve makasid-i muhtelifi takip eylemekte bulunmuş olup bu gibi cemiyetler ve kulüpler hakkında ileride nizamname yapılması dergâr ise de bunlar günbegün tekessür etmekte ve hatta makasid-i muhtelifelerinin ihtikak ve tesadümünden cidden işgal ve asayiş-i fevkalade eşkal edecek vakayi-i elime zuhuru da muhtemel bulunmakta idüğünden...” BOA, ZB 331/78, 21 Mart 1325 (3 April 1909).

¹⁷³ In a few months the Ottoman chamber passed the following laws: “Law on Vagabondage and Suspected Persons”, “Law on Public Meetings”, “Laws on the Press and Printing Establishments”, “Law on Strikes”, “Law concerning the conscription of non-Muslims”, “Law of Associations”, “Law for the Prevention of Brigandage and Sedition.” This was an attempt of the Unionists to centralize the Government and “Ottomanize” all diverse elements in the Empire. Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks*, p. 55.

¹⁷⁴ Zafer Toprak, 1909 Cemiyetler Kanunu, p. 206.

subjects. Moreover, it was no longer needed to get permits prior to the foundation of associations. The government officials were to be contacted after the foundation and a copy of the regulations of the association was to be given to them.

Another one of the most significant changes in the new legal environment concerning the associations was probably the possibility of founding political groups. Whereas, in all the previous periods, political associations were banned and even political talk in associations was not acceptable, with the Revolution it became possible to found associations on political principles as long as these did not have separatist aims. Of course, this was an arena that was taken very seriously by the Ottoman officials. Even before the drawing up of the Law of Associations there were political associations that needed the response of the centre. For example, a political association supporting the ideas of Prince Sebahattin on “de-centralization” (*adem-i merkeziyet*) called *Syllogos gia tin Patriida* (Σύλλογος για την Πατρίδα- Ottomanized as *Silloğos ya Patriya(sic)* in the document) was founded in early 1909 under the leadership of the metropolitan in *Alaşehir, Manisa*. The local governor asked for directions from the centre on this association, as there was no law regulating this area yet. The Ministry of the Interior asked the governor to inspect the association further and take necessary steps in case the association acted in violation of the then-current Ottoman laws.¹⁷⁵

When the Law of Associations was passed, probably the most controversial article was again concerning the political associations. The fourth article of the Law read: “It is forbidden to found political associations on the basis and with the names of ethnicities and nationalities.” (*Kavmiyet ve cinsiyet esas ve ünvanlarıyla siyasi*

¹⁷⁵ BOA, DH.MKT 2730/42, 20 Kanun-u Sani 1324 (2 February 1909).

cemiyetler teşkili memnudur)¹⁷⁶ This article created a new interest on the names of the associations as well as their aims and regulations. Although, it was clearly specified that this article considered only political associations, it was not taken as such by Christian communities of the Empire which made it necessary for the central officials to make it clear that this law did not prevent the formation of philanthropic and educational societies.¹⁷⁷ This stands to show what I have been trying to argue in the Introduction. By 1909, there was an established perception in the minds of Ottoman bureaucrats lumping together philanthropic and educational associations as opposed to political ones. It is also important to realize that these are the only three categories provided in the document.

The concerns around the fourth article were so serious that an order from the Ministry of the Interior to all provinces and sub-provinces dated 1 November 1909, insisted that local officials make it clear to their populations that “this article did not pursue any aim other than protecting the unity of the Ottomans which is essential for the common welfare and happiness.”¹⁷⁸ The document also orders the officials to make it clear that every community still retained the right to give primary education (*tedrisat-ı ibtidaiye*) in their own language and also there was no obstruction for the foundation of philanthropic and educational societies. We, again see philanthropic and educational associations being lumped together in the categories of the Ottoman bureaucrats.

¹⁷⁶ “Cemiyetler Kanunu”, Düstur, İkinci Tertip, v. 1, (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1329[1911]), p. 605.

¹⁷⁷ “cemiyat-ı hayriye ve ilmiyenin teşekkülüne müsaade edilmesine göre memnuiyyet-i vakıanın hiç bir suretle akvamın milliyetlerine taarruz şeklinde telakki edilemeyeceğinin” BOA, DH.MUI 28-2/16, 25 Muharrem 1328 (6 February 1910).

¹⁷⁸ From the same document: “Bu maddede selamet ve saadet-i umumiye için elzem olan vahdet-i Osmaniye muhafazadan başka bir maksad takib edilmediğinin...”

However, in practice, the article created many problems that went beyond the intended control of political associations. Even region names like Macedonia and Epirus were vetoed by Ottoman officials.¹⁷⁹ When the Greek name of a place was used instead of the Turkish one, this created serious problems for the officials. Therefore, when an association named *Adelfotis Filoptohos Perinthos* was suspected for being a separatist organization, the sub-governor of Ereğli in his report to the governor of Edirne was arguing that “the word Perinthos was the name of Ereğli before the Ottoman conquest, therefore [its usage] is an oblivion of the bonds of the fatherland and the resurrection of imagined memories and naturally creates a bad effect on the minds of the people.”¹⁸⁰ Non-Turkish place names were no longer desirable in the eyes of Ottoman officials who feared for a revival of interest in pre-Ottoman times. This is because; unlike the previous situation Ottomanism acquired a cultural aspect, a historicity. It was no longer desirable and acceptable to have a non-Ottoman past for Ottoman domains. This was taken as signs of separatism by Ottoman officials. This was a claim to the past of Ottoman lands, which became an important part of the new Ottoman identity. *Perinthos* in this new situation was no longer part of the Ottoman history, and the Greeks should be aware of that as Ottoman citizens.

Local governors were more sensitive about non-Turkish association names. For instance, the governor of Manastır did not approve the foundation of a Greek

¹⁷⁹ “Ruhsat itası için heyet-i idareleri tarafından müracaat olduğu beyan buyurulan cemiyetlerin ünvanları olan Makedonya ve Epir tabirlerinin tasdiki madde-i mezkure hükmüne gayr-i muvafık bulunduğundan...” It is a correspondence from the Ministry of the Interior sent to the governor of Istanbul dated 13 November 1909. BOA, DH.MUI, 28-2/16, 31 Teşrin-i Evvel 1321 (13 November 1909).

¹⁸⁰ “Perintos kelimesinin Ereğli’nin fütuhât-ı Osmaniyyeden mukaddemki nam-ı kadimi olmak dolayısıyla rabita-i vataniyeyi nisyan ve hatırat-ı mevhumeyi ihya ile ezhan-ı ahalide su’-i tesir husul-ü tabiyesi...” BOA, DH.MUI, 10-2/31, 30 Ağustos 1325 (12 September 1909).

association named *Politikos Syndesmos* (Πολιτικός Σύνδεσμος - Political Association, Ottomanized as *Politikos Sindezmos*) because he thought that the name conveyed the idea of a desire to keep the idea of ethnicity intact.¹⁸¹ The governor of Istanbul felt the need to contact the Ministry of the Interior asking “whether associations with names like *Rum Kulübü* (Greek Club), *Sırp Amele Cemiyeti* (Serbian Workers’ Association), *Rum Cemiyet-i Edebiyesi* (Greek Literary Society) or *Hayriyesi* (Greek Philanthropic Society) and *Musevi Esnaf Cemiyeti* (Jewish Tradesmen’s Association) implying ethnic and national boundaries were to be included in the political associations that were mentioned in the law.”¹⁸² Similarly the governor of Bandırma was asking the Ministry of the Interior whether the name “Greek Ottoman Club” (*Rum Osmanlı Kulübü*) was permissible according to the new law.¹⁸³ Unfortunately the replies of the Ministry are not kept together with these documents; however we know that such names were continued to be used in Ottoman documents in the following years which would let us speculate that at least in non-political associations the naming practice remained unchanged.

The Ottoman bureaucrats’ concerns were not confined to an interest with ethnical denominators in associations’ names. When in December 1909 the Social Democratic Hınçakyan Association (*Sosyal Demokrat Hınçakyan Cemiyeti* in the document) applied to be recognized as a legal association the Ministry of the Interior insisted that it added the noun “Osmanlı” to their name (*ünvanlarına Osmanlı kelimesinin de ilavesi lazım geleceği*).¹⁸⁴ From the same correspondence we infer that

¹⁸¹ BOA, DH.MUI, 28-2/16, 24 Şevval 1327 (8 November 1909).

¹⁸² BOA, DH. MUI, 28-2/16, 10 Zilkade 1327 (23 November 1909).

¹⁸³ BOA, DH.MUI, 28-2/16, 25 Zilkade 1327 (8 December 1909).

¹⁸⁴ BOA, DH.MUI, 28-2/16, 7 Kanun-ı Evvel 1325 (20 December 1909).

the insistence of the Ottoman bureaucrats' of 1860s for the possibility of inclusion from every denomination was retained – at least for the political associations. The Ministry of the Interior informed the governor of Istanbul that “although the administrative bodies of such associations can be drawn up from a single ethnicity, it should be made clear in their regulations that anyone wanting to join will be accepted regardless of which Ottoman ethnicity they belonged to.”¹⁸⁵ Different than the period of 1860-1880, the Ottoman governments after the Young Turk Revolution were stricter on the visibility and celebration of particular identities. This is why, especially for political associations, they insisted on the inclusion of “Ottoman” as a part of the associations’ name and also on removing ethnic denominators. For the new governments after the Revolution, Ottomanism was to be more about a single identity, than about the celebration of particular identities with the hope of including them under an Ottoman supra-identity.

Apart from the new perception of Ottoman identity, the interest of the central officials in following associations throughout the Empire took a new shape. In fact the concern with increasing nationalism and separatism was not new. But the new regime was stricter in its measures against the associations it suspected. A similar event to the one in the report from Karaferye district concerning the associations of the Greek people took place in Midilli in June 1909. This time two gymnastics associations, called *Diyagora* (Διαγόρας) and *Atlas* in the Ottoman documents caught the suspicious eyes of Ottoman officials. The issue first appears in a report from the governor of *Cezayir-i Bahr-i Sefid Vilayeti* sent to the Internal Affairs Department of the Sublime Porte. The governor reports that these clubs were

¹⁸⁵ From the same correspondence: “bu gibi cemiyetlerin heyet-i idaresi bir kavimden de müteşekkil olabilirse de herhangi anasır-ı Osmaniye mensub olursa olsun cemiyetlerine dahil olmak isteyenlerin kabul edilebileceklerinin nizamnamelerinde musarrah olması”.

organizing trips to villages, grouping in rows of two and walking in a military style (*meşiyet-i askeriye*) accompanied by the sounds of horns and tambours. The governor was asking for permission to close down these two associations with the reason that these two were not founded with a permit from the government.¹⁸⁶ It seems that this club was closed down by its founders after this correspondence but they asked for permission to build their clubs anew. This time, the Ministry of the Interior was stronger in its tone against the associations. In its report to the Grand Vizierate, the Ministry made it clear that it was not in favor of giving permission as “the villagers did not have time to do sports” (*köylülerin jimnastik yapmaya vakitleri müsait olmadığı*) and “the clubs in villages were trying to spread the ideas of Socialism among the villagers” (*köylerdeki kulüplerin avam-ı ahali arasında sosyalizm fikirlerini ilka etmeğe çalıştıkları*).¹⁸⁷ The Ministry then ordered the governor not to allow the foundation of any similar association or club. However, the case was re-opened a few months later. This time the two clubs were re-opened with the vague conditions that it did not engage in any action that were contrary to the laws of the state and morals of the society and its actions would be completely open to the inspection of the local police. The report of the governor of *Cezayir-i Bahr-i Sefid* informing the centre about the permit was also listing the reasons of the close-down in the first place. According to it these clubs were organizing trips to villages, walking in a military way in these trips, they were shouting “Zito!” (Hurray!) at every opportunity and they were shooting their guns in the air. According to the report

¹⁸⁶ BOA, DH.MKT 2852/89, 28 Mayıs 1325 (10 June 1909).

¹⁸⁷ BOA, DH.MKT 2852/89, 3 Cemaziyelahir 1327 (22 June 1909).

this situation created serious concerns for the Muslims of the island fearing that the Greeks of Midilli were training themselves for the day of clashes.¹⁸⁸

It is clear that this association was dealt with under the category of a “political” association by the Ottoman bureaucrats. This was an institution that would not fit into the categories of educational or philanthropic, therefore it had to fall under the political as a clear threat was felt. By perceiving this association as political; Ottoman bureaucrats could blame it for socialistic activities and try to close it down. Unlike what happened in Karaferye a few years ago, this time the interest of the Ottoman officials were not simply monitoring and reporting. They acted to take preventive measures closing down the associations. The collective activities of the Greek residents, although they were quite similar in the two cases, were perceived very differently. Whereas in Karaferye no legal measure was taken, in Midilli the associations were closed down immediately. I think this points to a stricter policy of the Ottoman centre against the possibilities of separatism. The Ottoman officials were more interested in taking what they perceived to be preemptive measures.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the legal environment of associations and to follow the changes in Ottoman governments’ responses to Greek associations chronologically. It was important to see what changed in these responses with specific developments in the Ottoman social and political scene. This effort could let us grasp the differences in the Ottoman perception of the *millet*s in different stages of Ottoman political life. The periodization provided here comes out of convenience rather than being a proper one. 1860s was important as a decade as it saw the

¹⁸⁸ BOA, DH.MKT 2907/67, 28 Temmuz 1325 (10 August 1909).

emergence of the so called “*syllogos* movement” and it came before a very significant development in the Greek *millet*: The foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. It seems the response of the Ottoman government to Greek associations in this period was one of allowance. The Ottoman bureaucrats hoped that the emphasis on science and learning would help unite the Ottoman urban elite under a loosely defined common identity. The “ethno-religious” boundaries were still important, but the government did not have any real problems with the celebration of ethnic identities, as long as these were not helping Greek separatism.

In the 1870s, the question of education became more important and the Ottoman governments took this issue seriously. After the foundation of the Exarchate, education became a “national” field of struggle with many different players. The “politicization” of education made it harder for the Ottoman government to follow the plan set in the 1869 Regulation of General Education. Neither Ottoman Greek lay elite, nor the Patriarchate would be willing to see the Ottoman government attempting to found its own parallel education system for the Greek populations. Further, it is very doubtful that the Ottoman government had the means to create such a system. In this background, the Ottoman bureaucrats had to content themselves with being a minor but important player in this area. It seems that the Ottoman government had a hand in the final solution of the conflict between the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople and the Patriarchate by its laws, and local agents. The former was forced to use the Patriarchate as an umbrella, while the latter had to recognize the Society’s activities as legitimate as long as they worked through the Patriarchate.

Further developments complicated the picture in the Hamidian era. The loss of huge non-Muslim populations was making it possible for the new regime to concentrate its efforts on Muslims. This, in turn, created a new understanding of the place of the Patriarchate's in organizing their *millets*. At least on Ottoman officials' perception, the Greek Patriarchate was becoming the uncontested leader of the *Rum milleti* in the educational field for the first time after 1856. The constant insistence of the Ottoman governments of the Hamidian regime on the approval of the Patriarchate for educational associations made the Patriarchate the sole legal organizer of Greek education. This change in the government's attitude is probably one of the factors making the foundation of an educational association by the Patriarchate in 1880, called *Agapate Allilous*, desirable. This association rivaled with the Greek Literary society of Constantinople and eventually forced it to limit its activities. The Ottoman insistence on the Patriarchate's consent for activities in the educational field, gave the Patriarchate enough space to organize its own mechanisms to contest with and eventually incorporate the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople.

Philanthropy was another space that the Ottoman government started to interest itself with in the Hamidian era. With the Hamidian policy to create a legitimating area around philanthropic activities, the philanthropic associations of the Greek *millet* acquired a new significance. Fund-raising activities were inspected more thoroughly and philanthropic associations like the educational ones were required to acquire permission from the Ottoman government. However, unlike the educational associations, they were freer of the constant involvement of the Patriarchate.

The initial consequence of the fall of the Hamidian regime was the springing up of a huge number of associations and clubs including political ones all over the Empire. It did not take long for the central bureaucrats to be alarmed by this process. A law of associations was prepared only a year after the Young Turk Revolution. With the new law, it was clear that the place of associations in the eyes of Ottoman officials changed. This was parallel to a change in the perception of Ottoman unity, being an *Osmanlı* was no longer conceived to be the result of free celebration of particular identities. Ottomanism acquired a historicity and a culture that was exclusive of particularities. Although the Ottoman central officials tried to make it clear to everyone that the naming regulations of the Law of Associations concerned only the political ones, in practice this was not the case. Even place names in Greek were, unlike previous periods, creating suspicions for the Ottoman officials. Social gatherings organized by associations, especially in the provinces, were followed with a more suspicious eye and associations that were found undesirable were closed down. Furthermore, both education and philanthropy gained new meanings for both the Ottoman governments and the Greek populations in this new period.

In the next chapter, I will be expanding on the significance of education and philanthropy as fields of activity for the Ottoman perception of Greek associations.

CHAPTER III

AREAS OF ACTIVITY: EDUCATION AND PHILANTHROPY

In 6 December 1896, the Sublime Porte communicated with the Ministry of General Education asking for information on an association called Beyoğlu Benevolent Women's Society (Beyoğlu Fukaraperver Kadınlar Cemiyeti in the document, probably Φιλόπτωχος Αδελφότης των κυρίων του Σταυροδρομίου in Greek) because some cigarette boxes bearing the name of the society on them were found.¹⁸⁹ The cigarette boxes were probably made for a fund-raising campaign, and the issue for the Internal Affairs Bureau of the Sublime Porte was that the association did not ask for permission beforehand. However, it is more important for us to realize that the Ministry of General Education was contacted to get information on this association, rather than the Ministry of Interior or the Ministry of Justice and Religions. In fact, the former ministry in its reply informed the Sublime Porte, that it was the latter ministry's responsibility to give permissions to and to observe such philanthropic associations.¹⁹⁰ This correspondence lets us understand the confusion in the Ottoman bureaucrats' minds concerning associations around 1890s. As I have argued in the previous chapter, the concern with the philanthropic associations developed only during the Hamidian period, and it is only natural that there would be similar confusions for Ottoman officials. After all, only the educational and scientific associations had been the concern of the central governments' in the previous decades, and any kind of fund-raising that caught the eye of the Ottoman official in those decades were related to schools and therefore were monitored by the Ministry of General Education.

¹⁸⁹ BOA, MF.MKT 345/27, 24 Teşrin-i Sani 1312 (6 December 1896).

¹⁹⁰ BOA, MF.MKT 345/27, 3 Kanun-ı Evvel 1312 (15 December 1896).

In this chapter, I aim to discuss these two fields, education and philanthropy, in which many Greek associations were actively involved. As I have argued in the introduction, the activities of the Ottoman governments in these two fields were designed so that a kind of loyalty to the Ottoman polity could develop among the Ottoman Greek populations. Moreover, the Ottoman bureaucracy tried to deal with associations classifying them under the categories educational/scientific, philanthropic and political. Education, was increasingly seen as a way to unite the Ottoman populations in the first decades following the *Islahat Fermanı*, though its meaning and significance changed as the nature of the Ottoman polity and legitimation changed in the Hamidian era. Similarly, as Nadir Özbek argues, philanthropy constituted one of the fields on which the legitimacy of the Hamidian regime was founded. Therefore, more than other kinds of associations, the educational and philanthropic ones can tell us about the complex relations between the Ottoman governments and Greek elite groups. This chapter will provide a discussion of Ottoman education and philanthropic activities in the Empire, telling this story around Greek associations.

Education

I do not aim to retell or paraphrase the story of the development, or “modernization” of Ottoman education in the nineteenth century. I will rather take the developments in the educational sphere to read them together with Ottoman documents concerning Greek educational associations, and examine what we can deduct from this information concerning such great questions as Ottoman identity, Ottoman central bureaucrats’ perception of Greek education and of Greek identity.

Although it is almost a tradition to talk about Mahmut II when writing on the change in the nineteenth century Ottoman education¹⁹¹, I will start with 1856, and the *Islahat Fermanı*. This is because the first attempts by the Ottoman government to penetrate into non-Muslim education were made after this edict. Also, as Selçuk Akşin Somel argues, before this time (especially primary) education was seen as a part of religious instruction.¹⁹² This explains why there was no reference to education in the *Tanzimat* edict. Moreover, it is part of the reason why the composers of the edict in 1856, reiterated the right to build *milli* schools in the document. Education was still a primarily religious affair in the minds of the Ottoman officials, and it was only normal that religious communities led by their spiritual leaders would found their own schools. However, we need to recognize a parallel development around this time concerning the Ottoman perception of non-Muslim education. A Mixed Council of Education (*Meclis-i Muhtelit-i Maarif*) was founded in 1856 with six members (a member from each community: Muslim, Greek, Armenian, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant) to decide on the educational system of the Empire. This committee decided on a three-leveled education system: In the first level, education was to be in each community's own language and the spiritual leader of the community was to be responsible for the organization of this level including the appointment of teachers.¹⁹³ The second level was to be in Ottoman Turkish and was to be mixed, while the third level aimed at teaching specific professions with a

¹⁹¹ See for example, Bayram Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*,; Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Osmanlı'da Eğitimin Modernleşmesi (1839-1908): İslamlaşma, Otokrasi ve Disiplin*, trans. Osman Yener (İstanbul: İletişim, 2010).

¹⁹² Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Osmanlı'da Eğitimin Modernleşmesi*, p. 22.

¹⁹³ It is interesting to compare this plan with the German Empire. In Prussia, elementary education was organized on a confessional basis until the revolution of 1918. For the education system in the German Empire see Marjorie Lamberti, *State, Society and the Elementary School in Imperial Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

language most suited to that profession.¹⁹⁴ Considering the first level of education that is laid out by this Mixed Council of Education, it should be clear that the Ottoman government had no objection to the teaching and celebration of particular (religious) identities of the *millets* in this period. The examples I provided concerning associations in the first chapter from 1860s and the First Constitutional Period also points to a similar attitude of the Ottomans to the identities of non-Muslim *millets*. However, excepting a few examples, the Ottoman governments never managed to create a mixed secondary and higher level education for the Empire's populations; therefore the work of this council remained as an intention.

True to the spirit of the 1860s the Ottoman central government intended to take other measures. For example, in 1861, it tried to create a structure that would bring together all schools in the Empire under the Ministry of Public Education which would inspect their regulations, and their management.¹⁹⁵ This, also, was to remain as an intention, as a relatively good functioning investigative structure in the Ministry of Public Education could only be founded in 1886.¹⁹⁶ Even then, the management of these schools remained out of Ottoman bureaucracy's reach and non-Muslim schools were not brought under the direct control of the Ministry of Education. The culmination point of the intentions of the Ottoman government in 1860s concerning non-Muslim education was the Regulations of General Education in 1869. With the Regulations, the Ottoman government was not just claiming to have a say in non-Muslim education, but also –at least on paper- was planning to build its own education structure for the non-Muslim populations of the Empire from

¹⁹⁴ Ali Akyıldız, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilatında Reform*, pp. 247-248.

¹⁹⁵ Aziz Berker, *Türkiye'de İlk Öğretim I: 1839-1908*, (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1945), pp. 46-47.

¹⁹⁶ Bayram Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri...*, p. 53.

primary schools to higher levels. Article 3 of the regulations claims that “there will be a primary school (*sıbyan mektebi*) in every village or district, or at least one in every two villages or every two districts; and in places with mixed populations the Muslim schools and non-Muslim schools will be separate.”¹⁹⁷ Further, according to the sixth article, non-Muslim children were to be taught their own religion in primary schools by people appointed by their religious leaders and the other courses offered to them could be in their own language.¹⁹⁸ The same distinction was to be retained in the secondary (*rüşdiye*) level as well.¹⁹⁹ The students were planned to be mixed in the third level of their education.

From the Regulations of Public Education it seems that the state was promising to build primary and secondary schools for each *millet* in which the students would be taught in their own language and religion, to be mixed in the later stages of their education. It is not clear how the Ottoman government planned to realize such an ambitious program; also it is hard to see how the non-Muslim populations would leave their relatively well-developed education systems to join Ottoman state schools. Whatever the intentions, this system never came to pass, and

¹⁹⁷ “Her mahalle ve karyede ve icabına göre bir iki mahalle veyahut bir iki karyede la-akal birer sıbyan mektebi bulunacak ve muhtelit olan karye ve mahallelerde İslam mektebi başka ve atfal-i gayr-i müslime mektebi başka olacaktır.”

¹⁹⁸ “Sunuf-ı gayr-i müslime etfaline kendi usul-ı dinyeleri tedris olunacaktır ve işbu usul-ı diniye tedrisleri rüesa-yı ruhaniye marifetleriyle bi’t-tayin tedris kılınacaktır... İşbu dersler sunuf-ı gayr-i müslimeye kendi lisanları üzere okutturulabilecektir.”

¹⁹⁹ The eighteenth article of the regulations reads: “Beşyüz haneyi mütecaviz olan bir kasaba ahalisi sırf İslam ise yalnız İslam ve sırf Hristiyan ise yalnız Hristiyan için birer mekteb-i rüşdiye olacaktır ve eğer ahalisi muhtelit ise İslam için başka ve Hristiyan için başka birer mekteb-i rüşdiye yapılacaktır ve bu vechile muhtelit kasabada mekteb-i rüşdiyesi olacak sunuf-ı ahalinin adedi yüz haneden ziyade olmak lazımdır ve sair sunuf-ı gayr-i müslime hakkında dahi bu kaide caridir.”

The twenty third article is about the language and the effect of religious leaders: “İş bu derslerden umur-ı mezhebiyeye ve fûnun-ı mezkûreye dair olan dersler her milletin kendi lisanı üzere takrir olunacak ve kendi lisanları dahi okutturulacaktır. Ve gayr-i müslim etfalinin umur-ı mezhebiye dersleri altında maddenin fıkra-i munassimesinde beyan olunan kaide mucibince rüesa-yı ruhaniye marifetleriyle bi’t-tayin tedris olunacaktır.”

part of the reason concerning the Greek case can be seen in the nature of Greek associations. Therefore, a comparison of Greek educational associations with the Muslim educational associations' role in the spread of Ottoman state education may let us speculate on Ottoman intentions concerning education.

Let's be cautious first. There are many reasons of the Ottoman "failure" to implement the Regulations and therefore to create an education system that would appeal to everyone in the Empire. The death of Âli Paşa and the appointment of Mahmud Nedim Paşa as Grand Vizier seem to have caused a shift in the Ottoman policy towards creating a common identity for all Ottoman subjects.²⁰⁰ Political turmoil was all apparent in the years 1871-1876, and this period ended with a catastrophic war against Russia. A significant expansion in the number of state schools was only seen in 1880s, with Abdulhamid II in power.²⁰¹ By that time, not only the Ottoman Empire lost a significant part of its non-Muslim population, but also the Muslim elite of the Empire came to think that they were lagging far behind the non-Muslim populations in terms of educational organization.²⁰² Perhaps, the paradox of Ottomanism was that the Sultan was also the Caliph, i.e. the political but also the spiritual leader of the Muslims in the Empire. In an empire divided along religious lines, the Sultan Caliph's first responsibility was to ensure the "advancement" of the Muslims. Especially during Abdulhamid's rule this role was emphasized more in expense of the role of the Sultan as the ruler of all his subjects.

Therefore, at a time when the proportion of non-Muslim populations decreased

²⁰⁰ Butrus Abu Manneh, "The Sultan and the Bureaucracy: The Anti-Tanzimat Concepts of Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, v. 22 (1990), pp. 257-274.

²⁰¹ Benjamin C. Fortna, *The Imperial Classroom*, p. 9.

²⁰² For the Ottoman bureaucrats' perception of non-Muslim education, the feeling of lagging behind and the projects compiled to combat this perceived situation see: Selim Deringil, *The Well Protected Domains*, pp. 93-111.

significantly and when the Muslim elite of the Empire felt that they lagged far behind the non-Muslims in educational organization, Abdulhamid II chose to expand education for Muslims, and the regime did not take significant steps in building its own non-Muslim education.

Keeping these in mind let's go back to associations and their role in Ottoman education. From the start, there were Muslim associations, like Greek ones, which would fund the foundation of schools in their localities, and support these schools financially.²⁰³ However, "these Muslim societies were generally only able to found a modest number of schools; those that were established were the exceptions that proved the rule."²⁰⁴ Still, the Ottoman government depended on local initiative, especially in the provinces, to spread its web of state education.²⁰⁵ Even in the Regulations of Public Education of 1869 it is written that "the cost of construction and upkeep of primary schools and the salaries and other expenditures of teachers will be paid by the administrative council of the community the school is located in."²⁰⁶ This local initiative generally took the shape of Muslim educational associations who would support the spread of Ottoman state education by becoming part of the educational bureaucracy, retaining their influence on the local level. For example, in Syria, educational associations were founded from 1875 and managed to construct a few schools. During the governorship of Midhat Pasha, these schools were taken over by the state and the educational associations were turned into local

²⁰³ For example see this correspondence concerning the foundation of a *rüşdiye* school in Teşvikiye, Istanbul: BOA, MF.MKT 23/53, 19 Zilkade 1291 (28 December 1874).

²⁰⁴ Benjamin C. Fortna, *The Imperial Classroom*, p. 50.

²⁰⁵ Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Osmanlı'da Eğitimin Modernleşmesi*, p. 128.

²⁰⁶ Article 4 - Sıbyan mekteplerinin masarîf-ı inşaiye ve tamiriyesi ve muallimlerinin mahsusatı ve masarîf-ı sairesi mahalle ve karyesinde bulunan cemaatlerinin heyet-i umumiyesi tarafından tesviye olunacaktır.

education branches of the Ministry of Public Education.²⁰⁷ This way, the local notables could benefit from the central government's support and financial backing while retaining their influence on local education; the central government in turn would get the much needed local support to spread state education.

If we compare this situation to Greek associations, the differences are apparent. For one thing, the Greek Literary Society in Constantinople by this time was able to organize and support by itself an empire-wide education system for Greeks to the point that it was likened by Elli Skopotea to a "Ministry of Education of the Empire's Greeks."²⁰⁸ Therefore, it did not necessarily need the support of the central government; and it would not be willing to negotiate its control over an Empire-wide system with the central state. This does not mean that the Ottoman governments ever attempted to take over Greek education; but rather to point that they could not find the support they needed even if they attempted to. As a result, the Ottoman bureaucracy's attempts around Greek education after 1870s were designed to control.

Secondly, especially after 1870 and the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate, education became a heated ground. In a struggle over numbers in Macedonia, it would be hard to imagine that the Greek elite of the Empire would be willing to lose anyone to a parallel Ottoman state education system. The Ottoman government of the time probably came to realize that the organization of a non-Muslim state education system would be hard to accomplish at a time when they couldn't even fund a proper Muslim primary education. In the 1870s we see the

²⁰⁷ Donald J. Cioeta, "Islamic Benevolent Societies and Public Education in Ottoman Syria, 1875-1882," *Islamic Quarterly*, v. 26, n.1 (1982), pp. 40-56.

²⁰⁸ Elli Skopotea, *Το Πρότυπο βασίλειο και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα: Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα (1830-1880)*, (Athens: Polytypo, 1988), p. 138.

government approving the foundation of educational associations with an aim to fund educational institutions around Macedonia.²⁰⁹ Of course this approval was not confined to Macedonia²¹⁰, and it does not mean that the Ottoman government was not accepting the foundation of associations beforehand. As argued in the first chapter, the character of the associations founded in 1860s was more “scientific,” while education acquired significance in 1870s. As I have already pointed out, we see the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople taking the organization of Greek education in the Empire in its hands together with the foundation of new associations in the 1870s. A parallel development is the foundation of the Educational Committee within the Patriarchate in 1873, which managed to take over the organization of Greek education in the following years.

The Greek Literary Society of Constantinople is especially important to understand the Ottoman perception of Greek education. This brings me to a third difference between the area Muslim educational associations were active and the area the Greek ones were operating in. The Muslim clergy was not the organizer of a “modern” or “secular” education in the Empire. It is generally argued that the *ulama* tended to be opponents of the new education system, but unlike the Greek Patriarchate, they were not organizers of a more or less European style education. Therefore, once the Ottoman state officials decided to found state schools, they were able to incorporate members of the *ulama* as supporters of the Hamidian educational

²⁰⁹ These associations were not just Greek. For a Bulgarian association that was founded in the vilayet of Selanik see: BOA, MF.MKT 29/123, 17 Cemaziyelevvel 1291 (2 July 1874).

²¹⁰ Two examples of Greek associations approved during this time by the Ottoman Empire: one association in Beyoğlu BOA, MF.MKT 22/76, 27 Teşrin-i Sani 1290 (9 December 1874); one in Tulcea BOA, MF.MKT 26/53, 5 Safer 1292(13 March 1875); another one whose locality is not clear: BOA, MF.MKT 19/38, 7 Ağustos 1290 (19 August 1874). Also: BOA, MF.MKT 26/95, 14 Safer 1292 (22 March 1875).

ideals.²¹¹ In the Greek case, however, thanks to the “privilege” given with the *Islahat Fermanı* in 1856, the Greek Patriarchate already undertook the spreading of a more or less “secular” school-system. In 1870s there was a rivalry over education between groups attached to the Patriarchate and the groups around the Greek Literary Society that were more or less opposed to the monopoly of the Patriarchate. Greek Literary Society at this time was strong enough to affect changes in the structures of many schools in the Empire. It is not hard to imagine that the Ottoman central state would not be able to enter this area as a rival to both of these groups. Therefore, due also to other reasons like the lack of funds, the Ottoman officials tried to regulate this area rather than entering it as a competent. One of the things the Ottoman state tried in the 1870s was to make sure that the Patriarchate’s monopoly over education was established. This is seen in the example of Edirne, I provided in the first chapter. In 1875, the governor of Edirne contacted the capital about an educational association which was disregarding the local metropolitan’s authority over the schools in the region, and claiming to reform the school system of the Greek *millet* around Edirne. They wanted to list the local governor as the honorary president of the association in a hope to get his backing, but this plan failed as the governor informed the centre about their activities asking for permission to close down the association. Therefore it seems that the Ottoman officials desired to see the Patriarchate as the organizer of Greek education, even if it was nominal. Rather than banning the activities of Greek educational associations, the Ottoman government in the 1870s insisted on the approval of the Patriarchate for their activities. A correspondence between the Ministry of Education and the Sublime Porte dated 23 September 1875 reveals part of this attitude. The Ministry informs the Sublime Porte that it received a petition

²¹¹ Benjamin Fortna argues that the *ulama* was involved in the Hamidian education project in many different ways. See for example Benjamin C. Fortna, *The Imperial Classroom*, p. 13.

from a certain Constantine Karapetros asking for permission to found an association to fund and manage a school in *Arnavutköy*.²¹² The document informs us that the funding and management of schools by associations was found harmful and banned by a circular dated 19 July 1875 giving this job to local branches of the Ministry of Education. However, the document continues, as the non-Muslims have always been funding their own schools this way, foundation of such associations would be acceptable as long as they were under the permission of their religious leaders.²¹³ This document tells us about the disinterest of the Ottoman authorities to fund and manage state schools for non-Muslims at this early date. It also tells us that the Ottoman authorities, by insisting on the approval of the Patriarchate for educational associations may have played a part in the final establishment of the problem over Ottoman Greek education.²¹⁴

In short, the ambitious plan set in 1869 was never followed as a result of many different developments in the Ottoman Empire. Part of this can be seen in the nature and ambitions of Ottoman Greek associations, and the structure of Ottoman Greek education at this time. In the end, the Ottoman central authorities did not attempt to organize a state education system for Greek Ottomans, and decided to control and monitor it through the Patriarchate without banning the involvement of private groups, like the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. Therefore, we can say that the attitudes and perceptions of the officials in the Ottoman centre played a

²¹² BOA, MF.MKT. 31/179, 11 Eylül 1291 (23 September 1875).

²¹³ A very similar case in the same year can be seen in another correspondence: BOA, MF.MKT. 26/95, 14 Safer 1292 (22 March 1875).

²¹⁴ The Greek Literary Society of Constantinople started to desire the Patriarchate's protection in 1870's, and ended being patronized by the Patriarchate in 1890's. Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Tanzimat ve Rum Milletinin Kurumsal Çerçevesi*, p. 25. In fact later in 1910s Ottoman documents start referring to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople as a school belonging to the Greek community. See BOA, BEO 3884/291273, 19 Rebiulahir 1329 (19 April 1911).

role in the shape Ottoman Greek education took in the following years. Let's now follow the changes during the rule of Abdulhamid II.

When the Ottoman Muslim state education began to spread in 1880, the Ottoman government did not disregard non-Muslim education completely. For sure, the state was no longer interested in founding non-Muslim state schools, or even in striving to found higher level mixed schools that were not predominantly Islamic; but the need to properly control and investigate non-Muslim schools was apparent to state officials as early as 1881. A report of the Ministry of Education dated 23 December 1881 detailed that “education was seen as the guarantee for the survival and progress of especially the Christian *millet*s” (*tebaa-ı saltanat-ı seniyyelerinin alelhusus Hristiyan kısmı milliyetlerinin beka ve terakkisi*). The report was praising the effort these *millet*s spent on education but was also pointing out to the need to bring their programs closer to the desires of the Empire. It was further suggesting the state to help funding the material for these schools.²¹⁵ I do not know whether the Ottoman governments ever provided non-Muslim schools with materials at this time; but we know that in 1870s, the Ottoman government did not hesitate to help Greek educational societies. The help offered to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople after the associations building was burnt down is known;²¹⁶ another example is the help provided to Club Mnemosyne in 5 December 1874 by the Ministry of Education.²¹⁷ Anyway, it seems that the Ottoman policy regarding non-Muslim education shifted to one of control in the 1880s; and as apparent from the

²¹⁵ Aziz Berker, *Türkiye’de İlk Öğrenim I*, 28; Bayram Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri...*, 45; Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Osmalı’da Eğitim*, pp. 132-133.

²¹⁶ George A. Vassiadis, *The Syllogos Movement*, p. 86.

²¹⁷ Club Mnemosyne asked for some books for its library from the Ministry of Education and they received them. BOA, MF.MKT 22/85, 23 Teşrin-i Sani 1290 (5 December 1874).

report of the Ministry, the efforts of non-Muslim communities concerning education was seen natural, and it was even applauded. However, the need to control and investigate – especially the nationalistic influences of the Greek Kingdom - was taken more and more seriously by the Ottoman officials, and it was to be institutionally implemented in 1886 with the foundation of the “Inspectorate of non-Muslim and Foreign Schools” within the Ministry of Education. Even before the foundation of the Inspectorate the Ottoman authorities took the issue of the influence of Athens very seriously. As already mentioned in the second chapter, in 17 January 1882, a report about the influence of “educational associations” (*cemiyet-i ilmiyeler*) and “young doctors and teachers who would infiltrate villages and work to diffuse the [harmful] ideas of the Greeks” (*hayli gençlerin mekteb hocalığı ve hekimlik ile karyelere sokulup neşr-i efkar-ı Yunaniyeye bezl-i mesai*) was sent to the Yıldız Palace warning the government to be careful about these activities, together with the activities of the Bulgarian committees.²¹⁸ With the foundation of the inspectorate, the Hamidian regime started to harden its line against non-Muslim educational institutions. It does not mean that, non-Muslim schools were closed or strict measures were taken against them; but as the name of the Inspectorate suggests, these schools started to be seen more as foreign than as Ottoman. The insistence of Abdulhamid II to have Muslims appointed as inspectors is another clue showing the hardening of Ottoman policy.²¹⁹ It is not surprising that this shift came after the developments in 1890s discussed in the second chapter. This shift in the Ottoman policy concerning non-Muslim education can also be seen in the field of educational

²¹⁸ BOA, Y.PRK.MK 1/58, 27 Safer 1299 (17. January 1882).

²¹⁹ The first director of this inspectorship was a non-Muslim called Konstantinidi Paşa, who was a professor at Galatasaray. A year later, non-Muslims were no longer accepted as inspectors, probably due to the insistence of the Sultan. Benjamin C. Fortna, *The Imperial Classroom*, pp. 97-98.

associations. Sia Anagnostopoulou talks about the closing down of many Greek associations in 1891-1892.²²⁰ It is hard to follow in the Ottoman documents the “closing down” Anagnostopoulou talks about, but the shift in attitude is apparent. A communication by the Ministry of the Interior to the *Vilayet* of Konya dated 18 September 1891, gives clues about this shift. It seems that a group of local Greeks asked for permission to build an educational association to fund the local Greek school. Interestingly, the local government sent the issue to the Ministry of the Interior, rather than sending it to the Ministry of Education. Further, unlike previous examples, the application was rejected claiming that there was no need to found an association for such a purpose; and that money could be raised without the foundation of an “official committee” (*heyet-i resmiye*) approved by the Ottoman central government.²²¹

Another shift concerning the Ottoman authorities’ attitude to Greek associations related to the place and the influence of the Patriarchate. Before 1891, the approval and knowledge of the Patriarchate was seen to be enough for the legitimacy of a Greek association in the Ottoman bureaucrats’ eyes. For example, when there was a problem concerning a fund-raising activity organized by an educational society for a Greek school in *Ayvansaray* of Istanbul, the Ministry of Police communicated the Ministry of the Interior, pointing out that this association did not have a permission from the government, though it has been supporting the concerned school for a very long time (*öteden beri*). The former Ministry also informed that this association was working with the permission of the Patriarchate, and it was hard for the police to follow such associations and their legality without a

²²⁰ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Rum Milletinin Kurumsal Çerçevesi*, p. 25.

²²¹ BOA, DH. MKT. 1869/2, 13 Safer 1309 (18 September 1891).

list of the approved ones from the Patriarchate. As a result, the Ministry demanded a list of associations approved by the Patriarchate.²²² The reply of the Ministry of the Interior is more surprising in that the Ministry of the Interior informs the Police that there was no need for a list, and the Police should only concern themselves with the process of fund-raising and not the legality of the association. This attitude, of seeing educational associations approved by the Patriarchate to be legal, is the result of previous developments in the area of Ottoman non-Muslim education. The Patriarchate, as we have seen, came to acquire the role of the “organizer of Ottoman Greek education” in Ottoman officials’ eyes and Ottoman governments until 1892, considered any association approved by the Patriarchate legal. After 1892, however, the Ottoman government started to take the issue more seriously. This shift in attitude can be deducted from an order sent from the Ministry of Education to the *Vilayet of Hüdavendigar* in 4 May 1892. The order states, first, that the local Education Branch in *Mudanya* informed the Ministry about the existence of two educational associations with the aim to serve the local educational institutions and to help the poor in the region and asked for an order regarding them. The Ministry in its order to the governor of the Hüdavendigar Vilayet does not mention anything about the clergy but rather emphasizes the need to inspect them in five terms detailed in Chapter II.²²³ It seems that around this time, the Ministry of Education decided to take the reins of power in its own hands and decided to evaluate the legality of the associations by itself rather than searching for the approval of the *milletbaşı*. The documents concerning this issue make it clear that it was no longer possible to found any educational associations without the prior approval of the Ministry. This is not to

²²² BOA, DH.MKT 1673/53, 14 Safer 1307 (10 October 1889).

²²³ BOA, MF.MKT 149/110, 22 Nisan 1308 (4 May 1892).

mean that the existing associations were closed down by the Ottoman authorities because they did not have permission. It seems rather that the Ottoman authorities tried to compile a list of non-Muslim associations, at least in the capital, to decide on their legality in late 1893. To this end the *millet* leaders were contacted, and lists were prepared by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Public Security.²²⁴ What happened to these associations is unfortunately unknown. The effort to draw up lists seems to have continued in the following year on a more local basis.²²⁵ The response of the Patriarchate to this change in policy is not known either. However, we know that a few years earlier the Patriarchate responded to Ottoman bureaucrats' attempts at infiltrating Ottoman Greek education by directly controlling schools which I mentioned in the second chapter, by declaring the Orthodox Church under siege.²²⁶ The Patriarchate should have taken this issue seriously, however as it was right after the settling down of the "privileges question" concerning education, we should not expect a reaction of the same magnitude.

While they were trying to increase their control over educational associations, the Hamidian bureaucrats were also promoting an image of the Sultan as a modern progressive ruler. We have seen in the first chapter how some Ottoman lawyers were talking about the foundation of associations as a privilege granted by the Sultan despite the law. This image was integrated by the Greek associations that contacted the Ottoman bureaucracy for various reasons, as well. The application by the

²²⁴ Unfortunately, the circular sent by the Sublime Porte to the concerned ministries does not include the lists prepared. BOA, BEO 305/22864, 21 Teşrin-i Evvel 1309 (2 November 1893).

²²⁵ BOA, BEO 348/26058, 17 Recep 1311 (24 January 1894). This document details an effort to compile a list of non-Muslim associations in Beyoğlu.

²²⁶ Cited in Vangelis Kechriotis, "The Modernization of the Empire and the Community 'Privileges': Greek Orthodox Responses to the Young Turk Policies", in Touraj Atabaki (ed.), *The State and the Subaltern: Modernization, Society and the State in Turkey and Iran*, (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007), p. 58.

metropolitan of *Gevgeli* in 1903 for a license to found an educational association, also mentioned in the first chapter, explains that “under the auspices of the powerful philoeducational Sultan Abdulhamid II an association named Orthodox Educational and Philanthropic Society is founded here.”²²⁷ The Sultan was described in such terms especially by associations that could not fit directly to the categories in the minds of Ottoman bureaucrats. For example, a musical association in *Ayvalık* in 1894 applied to receive the permission of the local governor in 1894. Their application describes that the association was founded: “with the beneficent aim of teaching and studying the powerful science [music] in the progressive age of our Lord the equity-loving and benevolent Sultan Abdulhamid Khan.”²²⁸ A musical association could not be fit into the categories developed by Ottoman bureaucrats directly. Therefore, it had to present itself as a scientific one, talking about the science of music and also progressive qualities of the Sultan. These two examples show a parallel to what has been going on about the Sultan’s image in the philanthropic scene. Leaving the discussion of philanthropy for the second part, we should realize that the Sultan’s image as the progressive leader was incorporated into the discourses of some Greek educational associations as well.

The shift in Ottoman bureaucrats’ perception of Greek educational associations seems to have accelerated the final rapprochement between the Patriarchate and private educational associations as well. At the very end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth the Patriarchate and Greek

²²⁷ “Kudretli maarifperver Sultan Abdulhamid-i Sani Efendimiz Hazretlerinin saye-i şahanelerinde burada dahi Ortodoks Maarif ve Fukaraperver Heyeti namında bir cemiyet teşkil etmiştir.” BOA, DH.MKT, 655/17, 14 Muharrem 1321 (12 April 1903).

²²⁸“ padişah-ı madeletperver ve şehinşah-ı şefkatküster Sultan Abdülhamid Han efendimiz hazretlerinin asr-ı terakkiyat-hasr-ı hazret-i hümayunlarında fenn-i celil-ül-kadrin buraca da tamim ve talim maksad-ı hayr-ı murassadıyla” BOA, DH.MKT 376/45, 7 Teşrin-i Sani 1310 (19 November 1894).

clergy become more visible in Ottoman documents concerning Greek educational associations. As the Ottoman officials started insisting on their approval for the foundation and the activities of non-Muslim associations, we start seeing metropolitans listed as members and presidents of associations in Ottoman documents. For instance, the *sylogos* founded in 1894 in the Ortaköy district of Edirne Vilayet, lists the local metropolitan as its president. Even the application for approval is made by the metropolitan.²²⁹ Through such processes metropolitans transformed from one among many local power holders to the leaders of their communities in the localities they were responsible for. This example should suffice for now, as I will expand on the role of the Patriarchate on the legality of Greek associations in the next chapter.

It seems that the Muslim elite became increasingly hostile to the efforts of the non-Muslim associations to celebrate and spread the education of their own language and culture, especially when this effort was concentrated on Turkish-speaking Christians. Şemseddin Sami, for example, resents in 1896 the influence of non-Muslim associations with these words: “Recently in these past few years, with the encouragement of so-called scientific societies they have been abandoning the official language of state, and have begun learning Greek and Armenian. This has led to the strange spectacle of fathers who do not speak a word of Greek or Armenian but who have sons who do not understand a word of Turkish!”²³⁰ Celebration of a particular culture and language based on a legitimacy derived from religion, which was the “norm” in 1860s came to acquire new meanings in late Hamidian rule. This

²²⁹ BOA, MF. MKT 211/43, 27 Zilkade 1311 (11 Haziran 1894).

²³⁰ Cited in Selim Deringil, “From Ottoman to Turk: Self-Image and Social Engineering in Turkey,” *Making Majorities*, Dru C. Gladney (ed.), (California: Stanford University Press, 1998), pp. 218-219.

is a transition period to a stricter line of Ottoman identity under the Constitutional regime after 1908, discussed in the second chapter.

In short, after 1891 Greek, but also other non-Muslim, educational associations were subjected to a more rigorous investigation by Ottoman governments, and they in turn tried to legitimize their existence through the involvement of Orthodox clergy. As we will see in the next chapter, the involvement of *millet* leaders did not always result in the approval of these associations. Further, hardly any new educational association was approved after this date; I did not encounter any cases of approval for a new educational association.²³¹ It seems that the Hamidian regime were strict on the foundation of any new associations excepting those concerning themselves with sports.²³² Even the older and more established associations had either to be listed under Patriarchal institutions, as the case of the Greek Literary Society shows; or get their legitimation from a long-lasting fund-raising activity which connected them to a *milli* school.²³³

Education, Associations and Ottoman Identity after the Young Turk Revolution

Education immediately became a contested ground in the parliamentary debates after the Young Turk Revolution. The discussions around education were directly related to what each party thought about Ottoman “unity” and “identity.” The new Education Law, which came before the Parliament in 8 June 1909, was proposing very similar

²³¹ There are cases of rejection however. The application of the educational association founded in *Gevgelii* in the Selanik Vilayet I just mentioned was rejected with the reason that “the foundation of any association in that region cannot be without harm during these times.” (*şu sırada oralarda her ne suretle olursa olsun cemiyet teşkiliyle iane cemi mahzurdan salim olmamasıyla...*) BOA, DH.MKT 655/17, 14 Muharrem 1321 (12 April 1903).

²³² Mehmet Ö. Alkan, *Sivil Toplum Kurumları*, pp. 95-96.

²³³ Club Mnemosyne, for example, is told to be found to fund educational tools (*levazım-ı kırtasiye*) for the local schools in Phanar. BOA, MF.MKT 828/2, 4 Şaban 1324 (4 October 1905).

things to the one in 1869. The most debated article read: “the instruction related to the religious creeds of the diverse communities should not be disturbed” (*ve milel-i muhtelifenin umur-ı itikadiyelerine müteallik olan usul-ı talimiyeye halel getirilmemek*).²³⁴ This article is quite similar to what Ottoman statesmen aimed at in the Regulations of Public Education in 1869. Religious education was being safeguarded, while at the same time the state was attempting to create a shared education experience in other fields. However, neither the atmosphere, nor the mindsets of the actors were similar to the situation in 1869. First of all, in the forty years that has passed in between, the meaning of *milli* identities changed significantly. It was no longer simply connected to religious differences, other factors like language and ethnicity came to play a more significant role. Second, the Regulations of Public Education was about the creation of a parallel Ottoman non-Muslim education led and financed by the State, while also allowing for private initiative; whereas the new situation was essentially about the existing Greek (more generally non-Muslim) school system, and the central officials’ attempts to change it. Therefore, the attempt was taken a lot more seriously by Ottoman Greeks this time. Pantelis Cosmidis, Istanbul deputy in the parliament wanted the article to be changed as “the age-old recognized instruction of the diverse communities should not be disturbed” (*ve milel-i muhtelifenin kadimen mer’i usul-ı talimiyelerine halel getirilmemek*).²³⁵ This is because education was no longer about religion, it can be argued that it never was, but for the first time such topics as geography and literature could start to cause problems between state officials and non-Muslim groups. While from the Regulation of 1869 it seems that the Ottomans had no problem with the

²³⁴ Cited in Vangelis Kechriotis, *The Modernization of the Empire*, p. 65.

²³⁵ Ibid.

teaching of these topics in community languages, the new regime was of the opposite opinion. Ahmet Şerif, a journalist in the Unionist newspaper *Tanin*, would voice the reservations of the new regime in this way: “the children of this country do not learn the names of continents and countries in geography, and certain arithmetical terms in Turkish. I do not find that right because these respected citizens of ours know Turkish as well as we do. If they use Turkish in their classes I believe it will be easier and more profitable.”²³⁶ The discussion boiled down to this: How was an Ottoman unity possible? The Christian communities’ representatives²³⁷, like the Bulgarian deputy Paңedoref, were arguing for “the right of all communities to develop separately, each contributing to the general progress of Ottoman state and society.”²³⁸ Whereas Ottoman officials would describe their aim as the abolition of “privileges other than those of purely religious kind.”²³⁹ This points to a clear change in Ottoman officials’ aims I already mentioned in the second chapter.

The most striking aspect of the discussions around laws on education and associations is probably, the significant difference of the representatives of the state from those of 1860-1880 in their attitudes towards non-Muslim identities.²⁴⁰ As I tried to argue in the previous chapter focusing on documents around Greek

²³⁶ Cited in Feroz Ahmad, “Unionist Relations with the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish Communities of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1914”, in Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society*, (New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 412.

²³⁷ The Jewish community seems to have supported the endeavors of the Young Turk government. For the Jewish community’s relation with the Young Turks see Ibid, pp. 425-428.

²³⁸ Ibid, p. 413.

²³⁹ Ibid, p. 412.

²⁴⁰ The representatives of the Committee of Union and Progress(CUP) were clearly seeing themselves as the representatives of the state in these discussions. Consider what Cavid Bey (deputy of Salonica) said on behalf of the CUP in the debates on education: “we must have control over ideas which pervade the schools otherwise it is impossible to have a constitution and Ottoman unity.” Ibid, p. 413. By “we” he was undoubtedly referring to the Ottoman state mechanism.

associations, Ottoman officials of the period before the Hamidian rule did not have any real problems with the celebration of particular identities as long as this did not have a clear irredentist tone. Even in the Hamidian rule, though the regime pulled itself out of the non-Muslim educational area preferring to be a controller rather than a competitor, this was the case. Actually, the Salonica deputy, Georgios Choneos, was pointing to this in his speech during the debate on education when he said that he considered “it impossible that the distinctive character of education, respected in the previous period, was going to be abolished now.”²⁴¹ Non-Muslim deputies clang to the older perception of non-Muslim education, like Choneos, believing it “will enhance Ottoman unity and love and serve the interests of the nation greatly.”²⁴² However, there was no longer any Ottoman authority in the other side of the debate willing to listen to such interpretations of Ottoman identity. The amendment of the non-Muslim representatives was put to vote and defeated. The Ministry of Education pointed out that “the education of all Ottoman citizens will be of the same form and order” (*tebaa-i Osmaniye'nin terbiyesi bir siyak ve intizam üzere olmak*).²⁴³ As I have been trying to argue throughout the previous pages, the Ottomanism of the 1860s was political rather than cultural. The Ottoman bureaucrats of the time did not have any claim to culture, history, even to language. In contrast, in this new era, it became a cultural project with its own language, its own history and its own geography. Like the case with the association using the name *Perinthos* rather than *Ereğli* in the second chapter, using non-Ottoman names could cause problems. The political loyalty of non-Muslim subjects was not enough anymore. Ottomanism became a

²⁴¹ Vangelis Kechriotis, *The Modernization*, p. 67.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Ibid, p. 66.

project with its own historicity and topography. Non-Muslim populations were now required to abide by it.

The debates on the Law of Associations were no different. It again came down to what was understood from being an Ottoman. The government wanted to take measures especially against political associations that, it thought, were encouraging separatism. The foundation of political associations on the basis of religion and ethnicity was to be banned with the new law. “Ottoman unity” scored high again in the discussions. The government representatives tried to make it clear that this law was no obstacle to the foundation of literary and cultural associations. Christian deputies talking against the law, however, believed the contrary. Vartakes Efendi, an Armenian deputy from Erzurum, claimed that the law was aiming at an imposed Ottoman unity which would prove futile in the end. Karolidi Efendi, a Greek deputy from Izmir, would relate the issue to the celebration of particular identities as a way to a shared Ottoman identity by these words: “I cannot be a good Ottoman without being a good Greek; I cannot love the Muslims without being a good Christian. We have the ‘Great Idea’ because we are the descendants of a great people.”²⁴⁴ Again, the government was not willing to listen, and the Associations Law was passed.

I think we can draw a general picture of education from the previous examples summing up the situation. First of all, education constituted an area in Ottoman officials’ minds that would create a loyal *Rum* identity. In 1860s, science and education were emphasized as common fields that would foster the loyalty of Greek populations, as various plans of the governments and their attitudes to Greek

²⁴⁴ Cited in Feroz Ahmad, *Unionist Relations*, p. 414.

associations show. It was hoped that, an Ottoman identity that would not deny particularities would be created through education and the state's support of scientific/educational activity. The Ottoman education plans drawn up in the period 1856-1869 point to such a hope. However, these plans were not followed for various reasons and when the Ottoman officials started finally to organize education the situation was essentially different from the one in 1860s. Faced with an already well-developed education system of the Ottoman Greeks and a struggle over identity around Macedonia, the Ottoman bureaucrats could not create a parallel non-Muslim education. Instead, they preferred to do everything they could to check the influence of the Greek Kingdom, to insist that the Patriarchate seems as the organizer of Greek education as an Ottoman institution and to inspect curriculums so that Ottoman loyalty could be hoped. It seems that the Hamidian regime became stricter and stricter in its relations to associations, in the end not allowing the foundation of any new one. This picture changed completely with the Young Turk Revolution. It was again possible to found any kind of associations but this time the perception of non-Muslim education changed. Topics like the teaching of non-religious courses like geography in languages other than Ottoman which would not cause any problems in the previous periods, were hotly debated. The new Ottoman identity was stricter on the celebration of particularities. They, unlike the previous regimes, aimed at creating a unitary Ottoman identity that would allow the minimum difference.

Philanthropy

It is no coincidence that the Benevolent Sisterhood of Women of Staurodromi was founded in 1861, the same year with the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. It also shouldn't be surprising that the founders of this philanthropic society were the wives and relatives of the founders of the latter association, who in turn were among

the leading lay members of the Mixed Council of the Patriarchate.²⁴⁵ These people were the active Greek lay elite of the Ottoman capital, who would define and organize the middle class environment of the capital, at least for the Greek-speaking *Rum*. Philanthropy was another important area of associational activity for these elite, as it helped them experience middle-class, and try to create a social sphere that would incorporate the Greek-speaking populations of the Empire into an imagined body that were defined by their ideals.

Obviously philanthropy was always directly linked to a definition of the needy. Before the second half of the nineteenth century the needy were defined very loosely and the help provided to them was conceived as a religious duty, both for Christians and Muslims. The poor and poverty were not conceived as an anomaly before the nineteenth century, they were even necessary for the fulfillment of religious duties of the believers.²⁴⁶ In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, the definition of and the institutions around the poor changed, in part due to the development of a modern medical discourse. This discourse – which developed primarily in the West, but had echoes in the Ottoman Empire as well- depending on the development of a scientific world-view and particular events in the Ottoman Empire, created the idea of “general population.” General population was conceived to be similar to the human body, and therefore had to be inspected, controlled and managed properly.²⁴⁷ This new perception led to the creation of new institutions in

²⁴⁵ Among the members of this society one can count names such as Eleni Zarifi, Harikleia Zafeiropoulou, Eleni Archigenous, Ypatia Sekiari, Penelopi A. Vlastou, A. Paspatis, Efthalia Eliaskou, Elene Skylitsi, Argyro Kalvokoresi, Loukia Karatheodori, Virginia Kalliadou, Soultana Semeriotou. Efi Kanner, *Φτώχεια και Φιλανθρωπία*, p. 146.

²⁴⁶ For a short discussion of the perception of the “needy” in the Ottoman Empire before the nineteenth century see: Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι χαμένες πατρίδες*, pp. 35-40.

²⁴⁷ Robert Nye, “The biomedical origins of urban sociology”, *Journal of Contemporary History* 4 (20) 1985, pp. 659-675.

Europe, like the Ministries of Statistics, Ministries of Public Health, hospitals, and urban planning. A similar movement could be seen in the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century as well. The Committee of Public Health, for example, was founded in 1838 to confront the epidemics which broke out constantly in the Empire.²⁴⁸ Hospitals and quarantines were founded by non-Muslim communities and by the Ottoman state officials from late eighteenth century on.

Poverty and the poor gained a very central place in this new picture. They were seen as a problem that needed to be solved.²⁴⁹ It was no longer simply a religious duty to help the needy - although philanthropic activities in this time drew heavily on religious discourse as well- it was rather the need to ascertain the welfare of the general population which necessitated one to engage in philanthropic activities.²⁵⁰ In the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, with the emerging medical discourse, the poor were confined in places of enclosure: hospitals. The first hospitals founded by the Greek community of Istanbul, served to separate the poor and the sick from the newly emerging public space. These institutions generally founded and supported by various guilds in the capital and always linked to a religious institution, were places of enclosure in the sense Michel Foucault talks about for France in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²⁵¹ The attitude of founding hospitals with the primary aim of enclosure was shared by the Ottoman officials too.

²⁴⁸ Carter V. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire. The Sublime Porte 1789-1922*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1980), p. 261.

²⁴⁹ For a discussion of the development of the medical discourse around the poor in the Ottoman Empire see Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι χαμένες πατρίδες*, pp. 42-70.

²⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 71.

²⁵¹ For a discussion of the early Greek hospitals in the Empire see: Ibid, pp. 57-73. By mentionin Foucault I refer to: Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*, trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith, (New York : Tavistock Publications , 1973).

As early as 1760s, Grand Vizier Ragıp Paşa was trying to found quarantines and plague hospitals in the Prince Islands.²⁵²

The medical discourse did not just enclose the poor, but also placed them in the centre of philanthropic activity. Being defined as a public health and a public security problem, poverty became an issue that surpassed ethnic and religious boundaries, as the public could only be defined in a way to encompass all Ottoman populations. As a result, not only the philanthropic-medical institutions founded by the Ottoman state, but also the ones founded by religious communities, started helping everyone regardless of religious affiliations.²⁵³ This is not to mean that the middle-class Greek philanthropists of 1860s and later were trying to promote a common ground around the “public body” for the Ottoman populations. On the contrary, what these people tried to promote was the homogenization of their own *millet* through the mechanisms of education and philanthropy created around the values of the middle class which would result in their incorporation in to the *Rum milleti* but also to the *Osmanli milleti*.²⁵⁴ However, to break the control of the Patriarchate over philanthropic activities, which was the result of historical developments in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, these elite had to define their aim as helping “all those proved to be in need” without religious distinctions. This liberated such philanthropic associations from the guardianship of the Patriarchate, by “betraying” the ecclesiastical character of the parishes they were founded in.²⁵⁵ Unlike hospitals, philanthropic associations were founded and

²⁵² Efi Kanner, *Φτώχεια και Φιλανθρωπία*, p. 64.

²⁵³ Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι χαμένες πατρίδες*, p. 48.

²⁵⁴ Efi Kanner, *Φτώχεια και Φιλανθρωπία*, p. 114.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p. 145.

controlled by the lay, although members of the clergy could be involved in their activities from time to time.

“Helping the poor regardless of religion” was not just a discursive tactic of these associations to get away from the control of the Patriarchate either. Not only their regulations but also their activities show that they took their aim to provide help to the poor regardless of religion, seriously. Also there is a case of an association which was organized mainly by Greek-speakers but also had members from other Ottoman communities, including the Muslims: Industrious Association (Φύλεργος Εταιρεία) which was founded in 1866 mentioned in its regulations that it was “consisting of members from any ethnicity, race and religion; intending to donate instruments of work to the needy and to increase employment.”²⁵⁶ This association is significant not only for being organized to spread a middle-class work ethic, but also for being a supporter of industrialization. The founding members of this association included prominent figures such as I.A. Vrettos, editor of the Greek Constantinopolitan newspaper *Neologos*, V. Sarakiotis, member of the Mixed Council, G. Zarifis, prominent banker, H. Zografos, another prominent banker and Spyridon Mavrogenis, the chief physician of Sultan Abdulhamid II. The list of its members included people from every community in the Empire, including names like Ohannes Hekim, Maurice Mir, Aziz Efendi, Mehmet Nuri Bey among others. Further its chief donators included figures like Hüsnü Paşa, the chief of police in Istanbul and the successor prince Murat.²⁵⁷ This association was also the first to use terms such as worker (*εργάτης*), working class (*εργατική τάξη*) and middle class

²⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 160.

²⁵⁷ Ibid. pp. 160-163.

(μεσαιά τάξη).²⁵⁸ The Industrious Association is important for organizing around middle class values, for its promotion of industrialization, and for bringing together the elites of different religious communities to serve a common purpose. It shows that a shared middle class arena was constituted around values such as respectable society, work ethic and industrialization. Philanthropy served to bring together the peoples of the Ottoman Empire, and I believe it was one of the ways the Ottoman bureaucrats would later use to foster loyalty to the Ottoman Empire. Now, I will try to investigate the place of philanthropy organized by the Greek speaking populations of the Empire, in the Ottoman documents.

Ottoman Bureaucracy and Greek Philanthropic Activity before the Young Turk Revolution

From the outset I should mention that the line between philanthropic and educational activities is not a clear one. The help provided to poor students constituted a very central part of Greek philanthropic activities at this time. Apart from the students, the money raising campaigns for schools also cuts between philanthropy and education. As early as 1860s, philanthropic associations were struggling to incorporate the poor into the process of education. In fact, the term “poor students” (*άποροι μαθητές*) emerged at this time in the various documents produced by Greek philanthropic activists in the Empire.²⁵⁹ This was also true for the perception of Ottoman bureaucrats in this matter. Philanthropy as the support of poor students existed in the regulations of the associations that applied for a license from the Ottoman government, but they were always dealt with as educational activity. The Greek Scientific Association of Izmir, which I have already referred to, mentions in the

²⁵⁸ Ibid, pp. 165.

²⁵⁹ Ibid, pp. 148

seventh article of its regulations that “each member will pay 3.5 gold a year. After the expenses of the association are paid, the amount left will be used to provide salaries for the teachers in poorer schools, for supplying books for students and for the hospital in İzmir.”²⁶⁰ This part of the regulations was never raised as an issue by the Ottoman bureaucrats. A very similar situation can be seen in the attempt of Alexander Constantinidis (Kostantinidi Efendi), who tried to found an association for the teaching of Turkish among the *Rum milleti*. The aim of the association he was trying to found in 1874, was to “support the poor children who would enter the Ottoman state schools in their means of livelihood and subsistence during their education, and to help those who would be working as Turkish language teachers in poor Greek schools until they finished their education.”²⁶¹ Again the correspondence was handled by the Ministry of Education, and the philanthropic part of this association was never raised as an issue. The conditions, the Ministry of Education put forth only concerned education: the teachers and the materials to be used were going to be under the approval of the Ministry.

This situation is not surprising as the real move of the Ottoman officials to control and create a legitimacy structure around philanthropy seems to have emerged in 1880s under the reign of Abdulhamid II. Therefore, the absence of documentation from before the Hamidian era concerning philanthropic associations may be related to the Ottoman governments’ disinterest in trying to create and foster loyalty to the

²⁶⁰ BOA, MVL, 691/68, 22 Şaban 1281 (20 January 1865). “Azadan her biri senede 3,5 yüzlük altun verecektir. Ve bu mebalığden hasıl olacak akçe cemiyetin masarıfat-ı vakıasını tesviyeden sonra fakir mekteplerin hocalarına maaş tahsisine ve muhtac olan talebenin kitapları ihtirasına ve İzmir hastahanesine istimal olunacaktır.”

²⁶¹ BOA, ŞD, 207/21, 23 Rebiülahir 1291 (9 July 1874). “Mekatib-i aliyye-i osmaniyeye dehalet edecek fukara çocuklarının müddet-i tahsillerinde esbab-ı idare ve tayişlerini tedarik ile eshab-ı fakir ve zarurettten olarak Rum mekteplerinde Türkçe hocalığı eyleyecek olanları dahi mekatib-i Osmaniyyede ikmal-i tahsil ile şehadetname ahzine kadar idare etmek.”

Ottoman polity using philanthropy as a means. It is clear that philanthropic activities were already widespread among the Greek populations of the Ottoman Empire before the Hamidian period; it would be meaningless to argue for their inexistence by a simple reading of the documents produced by Ottoman bureaucrats. It seems that the governments before 1880s, and especially 1890s considered philanthropy to be a relatively free area.

In the Hamidian era, especially with 1890s, philanthropy became a crucial strategy in the hands of the Ottoman bureaucracy. By personal donations, by founding philanthropic institutions like the *Darülaceze*²⁶², by helping but also controlling private activities by different groups in this field; the Ottoman bureaucracy hoped to create ties of protection, loyalty and love between the person of the Sultan and the common people.²⁶³ I believe that the Hamidian strategy was not limited to the poor. Because by allowing private activity in this sphere, the Sultan was linking his person not only to the poor but also to the developing middle class discourse and activity in this field. This middle class discourse was shared by the members of different religious groups in 1890s as the articles seen in Greek and Muslim press in 1890s can tell us. For example, any positive mention of the poor was absent in *Neologos*, their living conditions were depicted as responsible for the spread of microbes, linking epidemics directly with poverty.²⁶⁴ A very similar depiction of poverty could be gleaned from *Sabah*. In various issues, the newspaper

²⁶² Darülaceze was a hospital founded to serve the poor of the capital in 31 January 1896. Nadir Özbek argues that the main concern in its foundation was “to increase the social control over the city’s poor and to institute discipline.” Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorlu’ğunda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 202. For a descriptive study of the institution see Nuran Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Darülaceze Vakfı Yayını, 1997).

²⁶³ Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorlu’ğunda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 124.

²⁶⁴ “Προφύλαξης κατά της φθίσεως”, *Neologos*, 19 March 1890 cited in Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι χαμένες πατρίδες*, p. 63.

blamed the beggars for disturbing the public with their poor clothing, illnesses and disabilities.²⁶⁵ The poor and the beggars were constructed by this discourse to be harmful to “public health and order.” It is true that the Hamidian philanthropy did not foresee the removal of beggars from public places, or their total enclosure to the disappointment of these middle-class journalists. This was due to an effort not to alienate the poor completely. But, not alienating the poor should not be the only aim of the Hamidian regime. Nadir Özbek claims that “the political tension created by the expansion of civil and military bureaucracy during the nineteenth century resulted in a tension between a monarchical power form and a search for a base for constitutional politics. This tension shook the legitimacy of monarchical politics. However Abdulhamid, made an effort to remove this weakness in his regime’s legitimacy by strengthening the symbolic and ceremonial expressions of his regime.”²⁶⁶ If Abdulhamid was trying to build his legitimacy totally on the poor, disregarding the desires and politics of the middle-class in his capital, this would mean that he was shooting his own leg. His rivals’ aims were not the incorporation of the poor in to their movement, it would be simplistic to refer to the Young Turks movement as a middle-class movement, but it is beyond question that middle-class was part of it. Therefore, a struggle should have taken place in the middle class arena over the loyalties of the emerging middle-class sphere. Consequently, I believe an alternative reading of the Hamidian activities in this period could be the sharing of a philanthropic stage with the middle-class, bringing the strategies of the regime closer to the desires of this class, co-opting them and trying to use them as intermediaries for the diffusion of power before 1908, therefore retaining control – a very crucial

²⁶⁵ “Dilenciler”, *Sabah*, n.3356, 26 March 1899 cited in Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 81.

²⁶⁶ Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Sosyal Devlet*, pp. 122-123.

reflex of the Hamidian regime. I do not disagree with what Nadir Özbek says about the legitimacy strategies constructed on the poor; I am just trying to add a new perspective to incorporate the middle-class activity in it. To my mind, what the Hamidian regime tried was to broker a middle way. This way, the Hamidian bureaucracy could support the images of the Sultan both as the father of all, and as the progressive leader.

We know that the Sultan was personally involved in many fund-raising activities, encouraging private activities as long as these could be controlled by him. Though, activities such as balls and lotteries were considered suspicious, especially for the Muslim elite, the regime tried to find a middle way for them as well. As long as the activities and Muslims' participation in them did not damage the spiritual authority of the Sultan, they were permitted, or at least the bureaucrats' tried to turn a blind eye on them.²⁶⁷ The Sultan himself started many campaigns and ordered the participation of his bureaucrats. However, he also participated in philanthropic activities through the associations founded by the elite of the capital. There is documentation showing his participation in the philanthropic activities of Greek associations as well. As I argued in the second chapter the Sultan assisted at least one Greek philanthropic association, probably Women's Philanthropic Association of Staurodromi (Φιλόπτωχος Αδελφότης των κυρίων του Σταυροδρομίου) in 1887. This involvement signals an alliance between the Sultan and the philanthropic activities of the middle class, bringing the latter closer to the Hamidian regime. This move was not about the poor as the Sultan could have donated his money directly, but rather was about a need to create links between the middle class and the regime. This direct link also served to create a commonality of interests between the Greek elite that

²⁶⁷ Ibid, pp. 261-263.

were acting through this association and the person of the Sultan. This is why I believe, we have to add a middle-class dimension to the power strategies of the Hamidian bureaucracy around philanthropic activities.

The philanthropic discourse created by the Hamidian officials can also be followed in the documents concerning the activities of Greek associations. In these documents, the Ottoman government was constructed to be the greatest benefactor of its population, and it was argued that the private activities of individual groups could never reach the level of benevolence exercised by the Ottoman state. For instance, in 1892, the Ministry of Public Education received a report from the *Vilayet of Hüdavendigâr*, informing about two associations founded in *Mudanya*. One of these associations was founded to help the poor and the needy of the Christians in the region. The problem was whether these associations should be allowed to continue their activities or not. The reply given to the *Vilayet* informed that such activities were worthy of praise but they “could never reach the benevolence and the noble compassion of the government who is the legitimate sovereign and the tender father of the *millet* this association is protecting.”²⁶⁸ This document creates a discourse which talks about the Ottoman government not only as the supreme benefactor, but also the state which is the “legitimate sovereign” that a subject needs to be loyal to. In this case, the loyal subjects would be Greek-speaking Orthodox of *Mudanya*.

The discourse linking the different religious communities and the Ottoman government through philanthropy can be seen more clearly in a correspondence from 1908, just before the Young Turk Revolution took place. A women’s philanthropic association, the Sisterhood of Agios Eleftherios (Αδελφότης του Αγίου

²⁶⁸ BOA, MF.MKT, 149/66, 2 Şevval 1309 (5 May 1892). “ne kadar olsa yine o cemiyetin himaye ettiği milletin metbu-u meşru ve peder-i müşfik ve erhamı olan hükümet-i seniyyenin atıfet ve uluvv-u merhametine yetişemeyecekleri”

Ελευθερίου²⁶⁹) located in Beyoğlu applied to the Ottoman government for the foundation of a clinic serving pregnant women. The report of the Council of State concerning the application tells us that “the multiplying and foundation of such philanthropic institutions requires the beneficence of the government as long as they exercise and act in accordance with the established procedures, laws and regulations of the state, and the laws of science regardless of the state and community that owns them.”²⁷⁰ It seems that, philanthropy cut across religious and ethnic boundaries, to create a society of interests, and this did not just include the populations of the Ottoman Empire, but also -at least rhetorically- other nations of the world.

We can deduct from the same report, another concern of the Hamidian regime in monitoring philanthropic activities. The report informs us that “it is not possible to cover the initial and continual costs of this clinic with the donations [this association is receiving] and there is no need for such a clinic as there are many hospitals for the poor women and there is one gynecologist in every municipal division.”²⁷¹ The Hamidian regime tried to found the best of philanthropic institutions, even if these were going to serve the minimum of the poor. By founding institutions like *Darülaceze*, *Hamidiye Etfal Hastane-i Âlisi* (The Imperial Hospital for Children) and *Darülhayr-ı Âli*; Abdulhamid was investing on his image as a modern and progressive ruler not only in the eyes of his subjects, but also in the eyes of

²⁶⁹ Kyriaki Mamoni, *Γυναίκες Σύλλογοι*, p. 117.

²⁷⁰ BOA, DH.MKT 1155/22, 22 March 1324 (4 April 1908). “bu gibi müessesat-ı hayriyenin hangi devlet ve cemaate aid olur ise olsun bila istisna ol babdaki usul-ü mukarrere ve kavanin ve nizamat-ı seniyyeye ve şerait-i fenniyyeye tevfiq ve tatbik eylemek ve usulen teftişat-ı mütemadiye-i tibbiyeye tabi tutulmak üzere tekessür ve tesisi muhsinatı mucib”

²⁷¹ From the same document: “ancak bu gibi ianat-ı hayriye ile mezkur tedavihane masaríf-ı ibtidaiye ve daimesinin temini mümkün olamamağla beraber bu gibi aceze-i nisvan için müteaddid hastahaneler mevcut ve devair-i belediyede birer tabib-i mevlid müstahdem bulunmasına binaen böyle bir tedavihaneye esasen ihtiyac olmadığı”

foreigners.²⁷² In the case of this association, although the documents praised the efforts of these women, it was made clear to them that they could not compete with the benevolence of the Sultan as the Ottoman state under him had done everything to help pregnant women. This discourse was not just connected to benevolence and philanthropy, but also to the image of the Sultan as a believer in science and progress.

Both of these discourses, the Sultan as the greatest benefactor, and the Sultan as the supporter of progress were incorporated into the applications the Greek associations made to the Ottoman bureaucracy during his reign. In the application made by the Sisterhood of Agios Eleftherios signed by its president Katina P. Konstantinou, for example, the Sultan was described as “our benefactor lord, charitable and philanthropist Sultan the great Gazi Sultan Abdulhamid Khan II.”²⁷³ I already provided examples for his image as the promoter of knowledge and science in the first part of this chapter, so I won’t elaborate more on that.

The picture that emerges out of this discussion is as follows: Philanthropy became part of Ottoman state’s legitimacy strategies during the reign of Abdulhamid II. The Sultan and his bureaucracy tried to promote an image of him, as the father of the poor, as the promoter of knowledge and science. His image was not only aimed at the poor, but also at the middle classes, especially in his capital. By participating in the activities organized by private philanthropic groups and associations, by donating money to such associations and by sharing some of the discourses on the poor, it was hoped that the loyalty of this middle-class could be achieved without alienating the

²⁷² For the place of these institutions in Hamidian power strategies see: Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyal Devlet*, pp. 195-253.

²⁷³ BOA, DH.MKT, 1155/22 “veliyy-ün-nimet efendimiz merhametlu ve fukaraperver padişahımız büyük Gazi Sultan Abdulhamid Han-ı Sani efendimiz hazretleri”

poor. Further, the Ottoman bureaucracy's philanthropic strategies under Abdulhamid's rule did not disregard the non-Muslim populations and their associations. The discourse created around philanthropic activities, places them beyond ethnic and religious boundaries; the documents issued by the Ottoman officials used philanthropic activities to remind occasionally that loyalty belonged to the Sultan. More so than the earlier periods, loyalty to the Ottoman state was closely tied to the person of the Sultan.

Of course, what I have been trying to tell should not mean that the Hamidian regime invested the same amount of effort and material to philanthropic activities among Muslim and non-Muslim populations. It seems that, especially in some localities, there was a Muslim feeling of lagging behind the non-Muslims in terms of philanthropic activity. Very similar to the case with education, the Hamidian regime chose to invest its materials on the Muslim populations in such cases. For example, a report dated 14 September 1890 by the cabinet, raised the amount spent on the Muslim poor of Jerusalem from the coffers of the local government arguing that there was enough philanthropic institutions in Jerusalem for non-Muslims and the Muslims were devoid of such benevolent organizations and it was not permissible to let this situation continue.²⁷⁴ The Hamidian regime, like in education, took care to promote its activities primarily among the Muslim populations. However, as we have seen, this does not mean that the bureaucracy disregarded the non-Muslim activities, and did not try to foster their loyalty through different strategies.

One last thing to mention about Greek philanthropic activities' relations with the Ottoman bureaucracy would be the inexistence of the Patriarchate in most of

²⁷⁴ Cited in Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet*, p. 61.

these correspondences. It seems that the links in these situations were direct and the Ottoman officials did not require the involvement of the Patriarchate. This would mean that the Patriarchate was not the single most important authority linking Ottoman Greek activity to Ottoman legality. There existed ways other than the Patriarchal link providing philanthropic associations the legality they needed. I will discuss this issue in depth in the next chapter.

Philanthropy after the Young Turk Revolution

The new regime tried to purge the philanthropic discourse created around the person of the Sultan. Social aid in this new period became more periodic, modern and secular.²⁷⁵ It was no longer, a tool to create loyalty to the person of the Sultan and through him to the Ottoman state. The new situation gave a freer hand to the middle class in organizing philanthropic activity, constituting and experiencing their class identity. Of course, the Committee of Union and Progress tried to enter this field to enhance its position in the eyes of the common people. As early as 14 December 1908, CUP led the foundation of a philanthropic association called *Osmanlı Fukaraperver Cemiyeti* (Ottoman Philanthropic Association). The aim of this association was to open a branch in most of the neighborhoods of the capital and try to catch the loyalty of the masses. However, the members of this association were not insistent on their activities, so this association downsized its activities in the following years to be closed down in 1913.²⁷⁶

The branches of this association continued to be active in the organization of philanthropy. Its Topkapı branch, for example, had an “Ottoman” character in the

²⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 276.

²⁷⁶ Ibid, p. 280.

sense that it could bring together members from various religious communities of the Empire. Its founding members included an Armenian pharmacist named Onnik Mardirosyan, and a certain Greek named Bodos Efendi.²⁷⁷ This situation stands to show that philanthropy could still be considered an area that could bring together members of different communities, uniting them around a common activity. This is one of the cases which could allow an argumentation for a common Ottoman middle class. However, we know that such common endeavors were not very widespread and the Balkan Wars of 1912 turned the nature of Ottoman philanthropy into a struggle for creating a national identity.

Another significant change after the Revolution was the promulgation of a law regulating fund raising activities. This law, called *Cem-i İlanat Kanunu* (Law of Donations) linked the application for any fund-raising campaign to the municipality of the locality.²⁷⁸ This way, fund-raising campaigns were organized through the involvement of lesser bureaucracy unlike the previous periods. What went through the central bureaucrats of the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Public Security previously, was solved at the local level from then on. This should be why we see an abundance of documents concerning fund-raising activities written down by these two ministries in the Hamidian period, while they are missing after the Young Turk Revolution as long as a very significant problem does not arise.

Conclusion

Ottoman bureaucrats perceived their activities in the fields of education and philanthropy as power strategies which could foster the loyalties of their subjects.

²⁷⁷ Ibid, pp. 283-284.

²⁷⁸ A copy of the law could be found in BOA, İ.MMS 1329-M-10, 21 Şaban 1327 (7 September 1909).

From the start, it was thought that Ottomanism as a project could work through the activities of Ottoman bureaucracy in these two fields. In 1860s, the situation was slightly in favor of such a perception. Parallel middle class discourses emerged among different religious communities at around this time. The fascination with science and scientific knowledge was shared by the middle classes of different religious communities in the Empire. The perception of the poor and philanthropic activities was quite similar. It is not surprising that there were actually mixed philanthropic activities in these two fields in 1860s.

It is not surprising to see in this atmosphere the plans of Ottoman officials to create a mixed education system which they hoped would bring their “suspected” subjects – like the Greek-speaking Orthodox- closer to the Ottoman state. Not only this; but also their perception of Greek educational/scientific associations, their allowance of the celebration of cultural identities, were tools for a kind of loosely defined social engineering. By allowing such activities it was hoped that the Greek populations of the Ottoman Empire would share a common ground of Ottomanism retaining their Greek identity. For reasons, which I tried to list above, the plans of Ottoman bureaucracy concerning non-Muslim education never became a reality. In the new picture, Ottoman officials supported the Patriarchate in its educational endeavors helping the creation of the perception we have of the Patriarchal authority now: the organizer and the legitimizer of Greek education in the Ottoman Empire. In time, as the Hamidian era progressed, the Ottoman bureaucrats tried to make themselves the only legality provider for educational associations, although they still insisted on the approval of the Patriarchate for such associations. With the Young Turk Revolution, education became a heated ground again, this time the Ottoman bureaucrats were stricter on cultural issues. What would not cause problems in

1860s, like using Greek names for associations and for localities, were considered unacceptable in this new period. Ottomanism was a political project in the 1860s with no claim to the cultures of religious communities; it turned into a cultural project after the Young Turk Revolution.

Philanthropy started to interest Ottoman bureaucracy as a tool for legitimization during the Hamidian period, especially in 1890s. As I argued above, the efforts of the Hamidian regime around philanthropy were not just to gain the loyalty of the masses, but it also had a middle-class character as well. The Sultan, by acting through and beyond philanthropic associations, shared some of the middle-class perception of poverty being especially careful not to alienate the poor completely. The Hamidian bureaucracy tried to find a middle way between the image of the Sultan as the father of all, and as the modernist leader that shared the ideas of the middle-class of his subjects. The link created by the philanthropic activities of the Sultan concerned not only the poor, but the middle-class as well. Further, even if the main philanthropic activities of the Ottoman bureaucracy at this time concerned the Muslims, philanthropy was constituted to be beyond religious boundaries. Taking the Greek philanthropic associations into account, the discourse created in the documents around philanthropic activities produced by Ottoman officials linked loyalty to the person of the Sultan to his philanthropic activities and his modernist look. This discourse was also incorporated into the documents produced by Greek association when they applied to Ottoman bureaucracy.

Further, the link between philanthropic associations and the Ottoman government was direct. The Patriarchate does not emerge as a mediator in these relations. Whereas, in education the religious leadership of the *Rum milleti* seemed to be the only authority, in philanthropy its existence was not necessary.

I will elaborate on the Patriarchate's place in the legality of Greek associations, and the structure of the *Rum milleti* derived from these two fields of activity in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

WAYS TO LEGALITY: PATRIARCHAL LINKS AND SECULAR POSSIBILITIES

With the promulgation of the Organic Regulations in 1862, and the foundation of the Mixed National Council (Μικτό Εθνικό Συμβούλιο) the Patriarch became the leader of the *Rum millet*i and lay influence was all apparent in its workings. It is argued that, by this move the internal management and social life of the *Rum millet*i gained an institutional dimension.²⁷⁹ This means that the Greek schools, clubs and associations gained their legitimacy from the existence of the Patriarchate. However, especially for Greek associations, it is questionable how this legitimacy worked. Did every association have to be approved by the Patriarchate before they were founded, for them to be seen legal by the Ottoman bureaucrats? If not, what were the other ways that would give them legality as far as the Ottoman officials were concerned? In the absence of a code regulating associations, it is important to follow the development between the triangle of Associations, Ottoman officials and the Patriarchate to see not only how the *millet* operated, but also how the Ottoman bureaucracy constituted the *Rum millet*i in the different periods this thesis concerns itself with. My aim in this chapter is first to examine the Patriarchal links of many association between 1861 and 1912 and discuss what this may tell us of their legality, and secondly to argue for an alternative way of inclusion that did not necessitate the active involvement of the Patriarchate. This second way, I argue, helped the Ottoman bureaucrats place various *Rum* activity in the sphere created around the Patriarchate without necessarily involving it. Therefore, the Ottoman bureaucrats in the correspondences I examined use the term *Rum* for an association (as *Rum Cemiyeti*)

²⁷⁹ Athanasia Anagnostopoulou, *Tanzimat ve Rum Milleti*, p. 1.

only rarely, and mostly when the active involvement of the Patriarchate in the activities and the correspondences are missing. Parallely, when the involvement of the Patriarchate is apparent, the term *Rum* is rarely used to describe the association. I will try to examine the development of these two distinct legalities in the following pages.

The Place of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Correspondences Concerning Greek Associations

The Patriarchate, by insisting that every Greek activity in the Empire that would involve an approval from the state go through it, was protecting not only its position as the *milletbaşı* but also its economical interests. This became crucial for its existence in the later years of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, as it lost significant territories in Macedonia after the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the following struggle over “souls” in Macedonia. Moreover, in these later years, there was a stronger and more professional Ottoman bureaucracy that local groups could turn to when they desired to enhance their autonomy and break the monopoly of the Patriarchate.²⁸⁰ However, both the monopoly of the Patriarchate and the power struggles of local groups with the Imperial centre developed in time throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. What I aim here is to see this development, especially in education and philanthropy, through the documents produced by Ottoman bureaucrats concerning Greek associations. The discussion here will be a rather chronological one.

²⁸⁰ In the Izmir of 1909, the local community started to disregard the normal procedure of petitioning the Ottoman government through the Patriarchate for the construction of churches and schools. This created an important tension between the authorities in Istanbul and Izmir. See Vangelis Kechriotis, “Contesting the Imperial Centre: Political Elites in Smyrna and their rivalry with Istanbul”, in Elisabeth Özdalga, M.Sait Özervali, Feryal Tansuğ (eds), *Istanbul as seen from a distance, Center and provinces in the Ottoman Empire*, (Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2011), p. 89.

In their earlier existence, the associations did not necessarily have ties to the Patriarchate. The Greek Literary Society of Constantinople was founded at a time of tension between the non-clerical elements of the *Rum millet*i and the clergy.²⁸¹ It wouldn't be wise to expect from this association to gain its legality in Ottoman bureaucrats' eyes through its connection to the Patriarchate. The rapprochement between the Literary Society and the Patriarchate began in 1870s only with the crisis created with the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the struggle over Macedonia. The Greek Scientific Association of Izmir to which I referred to in the previous chapters did not apply to the government through the Patriarchate either. Their application was directly received by the Ministry of Public Education and it was signed by its founders who named themselves "doctors and the notable and skillful merchants living in İzmir"²⁸² In the political environment of the 1860, this was normal. Non-clerical elements of the *millet* were in a struggle of influence against the clergy not only over the control of the *millet* structure, i.e. the Patriarchate, but also over their daily activities. When the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople was founded it was in a tension with the Patriarchal authority because of the struggle over the "Organic Laws" so it did not ask for the Patriarchate's involvement; it was in antagonism with it. The association in Izmir, as is clear from the letters they wrote to the Ottoman authorities, was taking their example from the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. What is more significant is that, this process was acceptable for and even encouraged by the Ottoman authorities. I already argued about the place science played in the minds of the Ottoman elite of the time; a fascination of science was apparent in their attitudes. It was hoped that

²⁸¹ Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα*, p. 20.

²⁸² BOA, MVL. 689/33, 29 Safer 1281 (3 August 1864).

science and knowledge would play an important role in bringing together the various religious communities of the Empire. Connected to education it was one of the ways that the Ottoman governments hoped the loyalty of its Greek, but also other, subjects could be created. This perception did not necessitate the involvement of the Patriarchate.

Also, the Ottoman high officials in this earlier period tried to promote the involvement of Greek Ottoman bureaucrats in the Mixed Council and therefore in the management of the Patriarchate as discussed in the second chapter. The Ottoman high officials did not just aim at the involvement of the lay in the Patriarchal structure, but also the exclusion of the Patriarchate from matters that did not directly concern religious issues. In fact, in 1865 Âli Paşa sent a *tezkere* (notification) to the Patriarchate asking the latter to abstain from contacting the government for matters that did not pertain to clearly religious issues. By this, the aim was to cut the bureaucratic processes for matters of a secular character and establish a direct contact between the Ottoman government structure and its Greek subjects.²⁸³ Although this attempt failed, it is not surprising to see that in this environment the Ottoman officials would be willing to approve associations that contacted them without any intermediary.

The same situation with a few differences existed in the philanthropic scene of 1860s as well. Connected to the development of a public health discourse that Haris Exertzoglou talks about, philanthropy became a field in which the middle class of the bigger cities of the Empire could and did constitute their identity through their activities. Unlike hospitals and other health institutions that were under the

²⁸³ Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, *Η Εκκλησία ως Πολιτεία*, p. 193.

responsibility of the Orthodox authorities, benevolent and philanthropic societies were dependant on the voluntary activity of these groups and under their control as well.²⁸⁴ This does not tell us anything about their legality in the eyes of Ottoman bureaucrats however. As I argued in the previous chapter, the involvement of Ottoman authorities in philanthropy developed only later under the rule of Abdulhamid II. Although, the documents from later periods mention that such activities were always done under the direct permission of local state authorities,²⁸⁵ it is hard to make any conclusions in the absence of documentation from the period concerned. Moreover, the possibility of philanthropic activity outside the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate does not automatically mean that the Patriarchate had no relation to this field. It only seems that the Ottoman authorities made organizing philanthropic associations and fund-raising campaigns possible without necessitating the approval of the Patriarchate as long as the Ottoman authority was informed. Like science and education, philanthropy was another field whose organization and legitimacy the Ottomans tried to take upon themselves. This, it was hoped, would foster the loyalty of Greek subjects to the Empire.

It seems that the Ottoman officials continued this attitude of not requiring a link with the Patriarchate until 1875. A local association called *Ethna* (εθνά- Eşna in the Ottoman document) in Kadıkaryesi of Istanbul was founded in 1873 with a club, a theatre and a gathering place in which arts and sciences would be discussed, belonging to it. According to the license given to the association, the application was

²⁸⁴ Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι χαμένες πατρίδες*, p. 77.

²⁸⁵ A correspondence concerning the philanthropic association Φιλόπρωχος αδελφότης Ταταυλων (Benevolent Fraternity of Tatavla) states that the society has been getting the permission of the local authority for its fund-raising activities every year: “otuz seneden beri Tatavla fukarasının temin-i ihtiyacatına çalışmakta olarak her sene dahi icra olunan oyunlar için daireye müracaatla istihsal-i ruhsat eyledikleri gösterilmiş” BOA, ZB 55/17, 20 Cemaziyelahir 1310 (9 January 1893).

made by the association's president and secretary.²⁸⁶ Another example is the association that was founded by Kostantinidi Efendi (Alexander Constantinidis) which aimed at teaching Turkish to Greek students, I mentioned in the second chapter. As expected, Alexander Constantinidis who was a state official himself, applied directly to the Ministry of Public Education.²⁸⁷ There is nothing strange with this example however; as the issue was an association that desired to teach Turkish, rather than one that was concentrating on Greek language or history. A more significant license is the one given to a certain Doctor Bolonākis (?) three days later. The association Bolonākis founded aimed at helping "the poor children of the *Rum milleti* in their teaching and instruction" (*Rum milleti aceze-i etfalinin talim ve tedrisleri için*).²⁸⁸ Again, like the previous examples, the application was made directly by Bolonākis himself. This association is more significant because it was somewhat connected to *millî* education. Unlike the procedure concerning later educational associations a permit was given directly without asking for the approval of the Patriarchate. At a time education was becoming increasingly a contested ground between the Patriarchate, non-clerical organizations and Bulgarian and Greek nationalisms, the Ottoman officials became more insistent on the monopoly of the Patriarchate over education. The permit given to Bolonākis is the last one I encountered for which the Ottoman bureaucrats do not insist on the approval of the Patriarchate.

The change in Ottoman bureaucrats' attitude concerning educational associations and their relations to the Greek Patriarchate came about in 1875. This is

²⁸⁶ BOA, MF. MKT 16/28, 5 Zilkade 1290 (25 December 1873).

²⁸⁷ The license given to him can be found in BOA, MF. MKT 19/26, 3 Receb 1291 (16 August 1874). Other documents concerning the process can be found in BOA, ŞD 207/21 and BOA I.MMS 49/2128.

²⁸⁸ BOA, MF. MKT 19/38, 7 Ağustos 1290 (19 August 1874).

a time when the Ottoman bureaucracy's attitude to the lay participants in the administration of the Patriarchate changed due to the Bulgarian Question. As argued previously, The Sublime Porte interfered to ban the involvement of lay representatives in the councils deciding on the relation between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Exarchate, trying to leave them out of the decision mechanism. The development of the requirement of a permit from the Patriarchate for Greek associations emerged in this atmosphere.

I already talked about the educational association in Edirne and its attempt to make the local governor its honorary president, in the previous chapters. The directors of the association which had been operating for 3 years felt the need to get the backing of the local Ottoman governor to give their institution some legitimacy in its attempts to interfere the local schools that were under the jurisdiction of the local metropolitan. As they were operating outside the knowledge and approval of the Patriarchate, they hoped to get the backing of the Ottoman officials. However, the Ottoman bureaucrats who did not have any problem with creating a parallel legitimacy for the *Rum* activities – scientific/educational and philanthropic- that did not need the approval of the Patriarchate did not seem to be willing to back them completely against the Patriarchate. This is also the result of the “failure” to create a state education that would appeal to the non-Muslim *millets*, and the resulting status-quo in which non-Muslim education was considered to be legal under the jurisdiction of their *millet* leaders. Further, the governor of Edirne informs the Ministry of Public Education that the association was in existence for three years without the approval of the government.²⁸⁹ It is hard to imagine that this association operated without the knowledge of the governor, before the governor was offered its honorary presidency.

²⁸⁹ BOA, A.MKT.MHM 478/19, 19 Safer 1292 (27 March 1875).

The association does not have a license from the government, of course, but parallel to the other associations in early 1870s it should have been possible for it to organize around education without the consent of religious authorities. The problem seems to rise around 1875 when the Ottoman bureaucracy is no longer willing to see lay associations around education without the consent of the Patriarchate. That is why the educational association of Edirne caused problems for the Governor of the *Edirne Vilayeti*.

There are cases from 1875 demonstrating this change in attitude more clearly. In March 1875, the Ministry of the Interior informed the Sublime Porte about the foundation of an educational association (unfortunately the document does not mention a name, or a locality) which had the purpose of “attaining the circumstances of progress in education” (*tahsil-i maarifçe istihsal-i esbab-i terakkiyat*) for the children. The Ministry advised that the association was approved, and one of the conditions of approval was “being under the supervision of the local government and the metropolitan” (*metropolid ile hükümet-i mahalliyenin taht-ı nezaretinde bulunmak*).²⁹⁰ In this line, it is not strange that the first educational associations that apply to the government through religious leaders, at least as far as I am aware, appear in 1875. For instance, a report dated 13 March 1875 by the Ministry of Public Education informs the Sublime Porte that it received an application from the metropolitan of Tulcea for the approval of an educational association under his jurisdiction.²⁹¹ In short, it seems that a link with the Patriarchate or the metropolitans started to be considered necessary for the educational associations around 1875. The legitimacy of *Rum* education started to go through the Patriarchate around this time.

²⁹⁰ BOA, MF.MKT 26/95, 14 Safer 1292 (22 March 1875).

²⁹¹ BOA, MF.MKT 26/53, 5 Safer 1292 (13 March 1875).

Doubtless, it is the result of the struggles over education that started in early 1870s, and the end result was the insistence on the Ottoman officials' side, to give legitimacy through the *millet* hierarchy. Though this may have been reversed for a brief time with the Ottoman Constitution of 1876, this process accelerated with the start of the Hamidian regime.

For educational associations, the process of applying to the Ottoman authority through the metropolitans seems to have continued in the Hamidian era. There are examples from both earlier and later years. For example, an educational association in *Manastır* applied through the local metropolitan for its approval in 1879.²⁹² Another one mentioned before in this thesis, in the region called *Ortaköy* in the *Edirne Vilayeti* also applied through the local metropolitan in 1894 and listed him as honorary president.²⁹³ I think the position of the Patriarchate as the legitimizer of associational activity in the Hamidian era can best be appreciated in a document compiled by the Ministry of Public Security in 1889 that was discussed in the second chapter. This correspondence mentions a fund-raising lottery by a local association in *Ayvansaray* for the benefit of poor students which was stopped by the Istanbul police with the pretext that the association was not approved by the Ottoman government. In the ensuing inquiry it was found that the association was acting within the knowledge of the Patriarchate. The Ministry informed that it did not know which association was operating with the approval of the Patriarchate and which was not and therefore asked for a list of the associations that were approved by the Patriarchate and a list of non-Muslim schools and their administrations compiled by

²⁹² BOA, ŞD.MLK 208/41, 17 Zilhicce 1296 (2 December 1879).

²⁹³ BOA, MF.MKT 211/43, 27 Zilkade 1311 (1 June 1894).

the Ministry of Public Education.²⁹⁴ The reply it received from the Ministry of the Interior informed that there was no need to compile a list, and the police should concern itself only with the legality of the fund-raising process.²⁹⁵ For this association, which was closer to philanthropy than education, the knowledge and approval of the Patriarchate was enough to consider it legal. However, the activity itself was not left to the approval of the Patriarchate alone. To raise funds, the association had to get an approval from the state authorities and not the Patriarchate.

The picture we get from the Ottoman documents in the earlier part of the Hamidian regime is this: Especially educational associations had to register themselves with the Patriarchate and act only within its knowledge to be considered legal by the Ottoman officials. When they were involved in fund-raising they had to get the approval from the Ottoman bureaucracy and not from the Patriarchate. When their legality as an association was at stake they were considered legal if they were under the knowledge of the religious leadership without necessarily requiring a license from the Ottoman government. In other words, legally, these associations were placed within the sphere of the *Rum milleti* through their link to the religious authority and this link was enough for a while for the Ottoman bureaucrats. Especially for educational associations in these years it was not possible to be considered as legal outside the knowledge of the Patriarchate. The Ottoman bureaucrats insisted that they get approved by the religious leadership if they were to be approved by the Ottomans. In their activities, however, the Ottoman bureaucracy tried to be the real legitimizer. That is why it was not possible for the association in *Ayvansaray* to organize their fund-raising lottery without the approval of the

²⁹⁴ BOA, MF.MKT 1673/53, 14 Safer 1307 (10 October 1889).

²⁹⁵ BOA, MF.MKT 1673/53, 18 Rebiulahir 1307 (12 November 1889).

concerned Ottoman department, although they could exist without the license of the Ottoman government as long as they had the approval of the Patriarchate. A clearer example of this tension between the Ottoman government and the Patriarchal authority over the legitimacy of activities in these years is seen in 1891, in the 30th year anniversary of Club Mnemosyne in Phanar, which I already mentioned in the previous chapters. When the Ottoman police approached the representative of the Patriarchate, asking to see the texts of the speech to be delivered, the representative is reported to have said: “Isn’t this mistrust against the Patriarchate? Why is there a need to see the texts?” (*Patrikhaneye karşı emniyetsizlik değil midir ve nutukların görülmesine ne lüzum vardır?*)²⁹⁶ The police officer who compiled the report thought that the reaction of the representative and the resultant calling off of the occasion was suspicious. But we can read this case from the perspective of the legitimacy of *Rum* activity in the Ottoman Empire. The police officer sent to the meeting, and also the superiors who sent him, thought that such gatherings could only be legal through the approval of the concerned Ottoman officials. The program was probably not going to be cancelled depending on the contents of the speech, because no measure was taken against Mnemosyne after this particular incident. The presence of the Ottoman police officer was a message to show the people gathering in the place, telling them that the legitimacy of this gathering came from the approval of the Ottoman bureaucrats and not the involvement of a representative from the Patriarchate. The representative, on the contrary, believed that the involvement of the Patriarchal authority was enough for the legitimacy of this gathering, and thought the interference was mistrust on the officials’ side and called the meeting off.

²⁹⁶ BOA, Y.PRK.ZB 9/53, 1 Kanun-ı Evvel 1307 (13 December 1891).

The question that arises here is whether the activities of these associations needed to go through the Patriarchate before they reached the Ottoman government or not. Did the religious leadership constitute a link between the bureaucracy and the members of the *Rum milleti*, or was it possible to connect the activities of the *millet* to the Ottoman state mechanism without any middling agency?

When the activity was a fund-raising campaign for a school, the application generally went through the Patriarchate. There is nothing to indicate that this was the only possible way, but the reverse is also true. I could find no case of an application which did not go through the Patriarchate, but the documents do not indicate that the reverse was impossible. So, all the applications for fund-raising campaigns for schools available to me went through the religious leadership. This was the case for bigger educational associations like Epirot Phileducational Society of Constantinople (εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ηπειρωτικός Φιλεκπαιδευτικός Σύλλογος) as well.²⁹⁷ When this association applied for the approval of a theatrical play to raise funds for some schools in the Epirus region, the application was made through the Patriarchate. Further, the Patriarchate informed the Ministry of the Public Education that “the people organizing the play were known and trusted by the Patriarchate” (*oyunu tertib eyleyecek zevatın Patrikhanece maruf ve muteber zevattan olarak*). This testimony was considered by the Ministry to be enough evidence, as the order to the Ministry of Public Security and Istanbul Prefecture shows: “The report of the Patriarchate shows that the president and members of the mentioned association are well-known and trusted” (*cemiyet-i mezkure reisi ve azası maruf ve emin takımdan bulundukları*

²⁹⁷ This association was founded in 1872 in the midst of the crisis which started with the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. The association aimed specifically at organizing Ottoman Greek education around Epirus. Like the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople it started getting closer and closer to the Patriarchate in the following years. For more information on this society’s initial activities see George A. Vassiadis, *The Syllogos Movement*, pp.125-130.

Patrikhanenin ilmuhaberinden anlaşılmış).²⁹⁸ As such fund-raising activities involved schools that belonged to the *Rum milleti* in totality, which means they belonged to the Patriarchate, the involvement of the religious leadership in such issues should be normal. In fact, when there was no association involved, the application for the approval for such activities were always made by the Patriarchate. Cases involve the schools in Beşiktaş,²⁹⁹ Boyacı,³⁰⁰ Phanar³⁰¹ among others. Most of the educational associations, like the Epirot Phileducational Society of Constantinople, were trying to organize around the schools that were already in existence, and that were already recognized by the Ottoman bureaucracy as belonging to the Patriarchal authority. Like what happened in Edirne in 1875, it could be expected that the Ottoman bureaucrats would be willing to support the control of the Patriarchate over education.

On the contrary when the activity did not concern an institution controlled by the Patriarchate, no link to the religious leadership was required in the application process. This is especially true for many philanthropic associations. Not only the activities, but also the existences of these associations were considered legal by Ottoman bureaucrats through processes that involved only the Ottoman authorities. For instance, when the local *Rum* Philanthropic Association in Tatavla (*Tatavla'daki Rum Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi* in the document, Φιλόπτωχος αδελφότης Ταταύλων) wanted to organize a theatrical play to raise funds for the poor patients in their clinic in Tatavla, it sent its application directly to local police through a member called

²⁹⁸ BOA, MF.MKT 390/40, 12 Mart 1314 (24 March 1898).

²⁹⁹ BOA, MF.MKT, 540/23, 17 Cemaziyelahir 1318 (12 October 1900).

³⁰⁰ BOA, MF.MKT, 602/31, 11 Şevval 1319 (29 January 1902).

³⁰¹ BOA, ZB, 29/153, 19 Kanun-ı Evvel 1323 (1 January 1908).

Michaelis Aristophilis. This man was kept by the police for a while and certain questions were asked to him. Among other questions he was asked: “To which institution this association is tied to? Is the Greek Patriarchate overseeing it, or is it overseen by its own committee? Who is responsible for it and does it have an official license and from which department did it get the license?”³⁰² The answers Aristophilis gave to these questions make it possible for us to speculate on the nature of this association: “As far as I know, all the proceedings of this association are done by the association itself. No one has the right to oversee it. For now its president is Rigas Papadopoulos. They have an official license, and last year the sixth department of the municipality renewed the necessary protocol.”³⁰³ So, the Philanthropic Association of Tatavla did not have a link to the Patriarchate, it got its license directly from the Ottoman authorities and it applied to the municipality and the police for the organization of its philanthropic activities without going through the Patriarchate. However, when the Ottoman authorities searched for the permit given to this association on its foundation they couldn’t find it. So there was the question whether to allow its activity or not. As argued before, because this was a philanthropic association rather than an educational one its existence was continued. A philanthropic association with no link to the Patriarchate was considered legal by the Ottoman bureaucrats and it was called *Rum Cemiyeti* (Greek Association) in the correspondences unlike the many associations that had ties with the Patriarchate. I will turn to the significance of this naming exercise in the second part of this chapter.

³⁰² “Cemiyet-i mezkure esasen ve daimen kangı idareye merbuttur? Mesela buna Rum Patrikhanesi mi nezaret ediyor yoksa sırf keyfî ve heyeti tarafından idare olunmaktadır? Buna mesul olan kimdir ruhsat-ı resmiyesi var mıdır ve nereden alınmaktadır.” BOA, ZB, 55/17, 30 Kanun-ı Evvel 1308 (11 January 1893).

³⁰³ “Cemiyet-i mezkurenin kaffe-i muamelatı zann ettiğime göre yine o cemiyet tarafından görülmektedir. Hukuk-u nezaret kimseye aid değildir. Şimdilik müdür-i mesul “Rîğa Papadopoulou”dur. Bunların ruhsat-ı resmiyesi vardır hatta geçen sene altıncı daireden bu babda lazım gelen merasimi tekrar etmiştir.” BOA, ZB, 55/17, 30 Kanun-ı Evvel 1308 (11 January 1893).

It is important for now to realize that the Patriarchate was not the only legitimizer of associational activity.

In late 1890s another significant change in the religious leadership's place in the legitimacy of Greek – and also other non-Muslim- associations occurred. Whereas the knowledge and approval of the Patriarchate was considered to be enough for educational associations in the earlier part of the Hamidian rule; it was no longer enough in the later period. For the philanthropic associations, in contrast, the involvement of the Patriarchate rarely fostered legality in this and earlier periods. In 1898, for example, a philanthropic association in *Ortaköy* in İstanbul was closed down by the Ottoman authorities. The report compiled by the Ministry of the Interior informs the Ministry of Justice and Religions that “it was not acceptable for the Patriarchate to give licenses for the foundation of associations by itself” (*Patrikhanenin böyle hudbehud cemiyet teşkiline ruhsat vermesi gayr-i caiz olması*)³⁰⁴. For the educational associations, the legality provided by the knowledge of the Patriarchate ceased around the same time. In 1901, the Ministry of the Interior compiled a report concerning a Greek association founded around the Church of Agia Evangelistra with the purpose of “helping the poor children who are attending school, in their basic necessities” (*mektebe devam eden fukara evladının hevayic-i zaruriyelerine medar olmak*). They not only did not get permission for their activities, but also did not have a license from the government. As a result, the association was closed down although its members informed the government that they were operating with the approval of the Patriarchate. The Ministry informed them that the approval of the Patriarchate could not be considered an official license

³⁰⁴ Note that the document does not talk about the kind and function of the association. BOA, DH.MKT, 2108/106, 9 Eylül 1314 (21 September 1898).

(*Patrikhanenin müsaadesi ruhsat-ı resmiye demek olmayacağı*) and informed the Grand Vizierate that “it is suspicious if the Patriarchate gave a license without getting the permission of the government” (*Patrikhane tarafından hükümet-i seniyyeden müsaade istihsal edilmeksizin ruhsat verilmiş ise bu muamele de calib-i nazar-ı dikkat*).³⁰⁵ The Patriarchate was informed again that it could not give licenses to associations by itself. However, it seems that the practice was continued as the same issue arose again in 1906. This time, it was a philanthropic association in Beyoğlu, and according to the report it was organized and managed by the Patriarchate. The Ministry of Public Security informed the Ministry of Justice and Religions to warn the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates not to organize philanthropic associations without the official license of the government.³⁰⁶

This new situation is fostered not only by the efforts of the Hamidian regime in the philanthropic field discussed in the second chapter, but also by an increasing professionalization of the Ottoman government structure. Ottoman bureaucrats felt confident enough in organizing and monitoring associations without the involvement of the religious leadership, at least in the capital. Their success is open to question as the same issue emerged again and again in the Ottoman documents. Anyway, we can deduct that whereas the Patriarchate emerged as one of the legitimizers of associational activity in the early years of the Hamidian regime, it lost this position in the later years. The increasingly professional Ottoman bureaucracy desired to be the main authority deciding the legality of such associations and tried to enforce this.

Another thing to be careful when talking about the place of religious leadership is that not all the metropolitans were considered to be loyal servants of the

³⁰⁵ BOA, DH.TMIK.M, 103/40, 14 Muharrem 1319 (3 May 1901).

³⁰⁶ BOA, ZB, 310/72, 13 Kanun-ı Evvel 1322 (26 December 1906).

Sultan from the very early dates. In 1889, the same year when the Ministry of Public Security was asking for a list of Greek associations that were approved by the Patriarchate to help it in its operations, the Grand Vizierate was warning the governors in *Selanik*, *Yanya* and *Manastir* about the influence of associations in the Greek Kingdom and the collaboration of Greek metropolitans in the Empire, allowing their activities in Greek schools.³⁰⁷ One year later, an order from the Yıldız Palace ordered the closing down of a musical association in Phanar, most of the members of which were metropolitans; because they did not apply for a permit although they were informed about it.³⁰⁸ There are other cases from later years in which associations were closed down although a metropolitan oversaw them.³⁰⁹ Last, with the hardening-up of the Ottoman policy against associations, the application of a metropolitan for the foundation of an association did not have any meaning.³¹⁰ The religious authorities of the *Rum milleti* were not the unconditional allies of the Ottoman government, and they were not seen as such by the latter. They were considered to be another power group among the *Rum* that should be considered in the policies of the Ottoman central state. When it was to the interest of the Ottoman bureaucracy they would be supported and trusted, but this support and trust was not unconditional.

A last point to make about the Patriarchate's place in the activities of Greek associations would be its defense of such activities especially of those organized by metropolitans, when problems arose. This role emerged in the 1900s, as the problems

³⁰⁷ BOA, A.MKT.MHM, 499/25, 4 Mart 1305 (16 March 1889).

³⁰⁸ BOA, I.DH 1184/92629, 25 Safer 1306 (7 July 1890).

³⁰⁹ For example, a local association called Syllogos was closed down in Giresun because it didn't have a license, although it was led by the metropolitian. BOA, DH.TMIK.M, 79/39, 23 Şaban 1317 (27 December 1899).

³¹⁰ BOA, DH.MKT, 655/17, 10 Zilkade 1320 (8 February 1903).

around associations arose in number and the Patriarchate felt the need to be the defender of Greek activity in the Empire, as the leader of the *millet*. The Patriarchate generally interfered when a metropolitan was suspected by the Ottoman government, or the institution that is in question was organized by a metropolitan. For instance, when in 1903, the Ottoman local authorities closed down an association called Omonia (Ομόνοια - Omonya in the document) and asked for the removal of the local metropolitan, because the association was founded with his permission, the Patriarchate had to interfere on the metropolitan's behalf. The charge against the association was not just the absence of a license, it was thought that this association was the local branch of a Greek association in Athens. The Patriarchate had to act as the blamed person was the metropolitan. In its report to the Ministry of Justice and Religions, the Patriarchate defended the metropolitan and the association, arguing that the claim about the association being a branch of an Athens-based institution was a sham. Further, the report explained that this association was founded by some "loyal Ottoman subjects" (*tebaa-i sadıka-i Osmaniyyeden bazı zevat*) and it was founded "to improve the morals of the local people and to enlighten its members" (*ahalinin tehzib-i ahlak ve azasının tenvir-i efkari*). The metropolitan was only informed after the foundation and he only praised the people founding this association without giving them anything similar to a license.³¹¹ The involvement of the Patriarchate concerned primarily the metropolitan in this case. The association was of concern as long as it related to the metropolitan.

Another case from 1907, involved a philanthropic association in *Topkapı* that aimed at helping the poor of the region but also raised money to maintain the church of Agia Nicholas. The records of the association were confiscated by the Ottoman

³¹¹ BOA, BEO, 1984/148729, 27 Kanun-ı Sani 1318 (9 February 1903).

authorities, so the Patriarchate communicated the Ministry of Justice and Religions for the return of the records. However, this was rejected; the Ministry of Public Security informed the Ministry of Justice and Religions that the foundation of any new association would not be accepted.³¹²

The most dramatic move of the Patriarchate in defense of an association concerned the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople. I already talked about the problem that concerned taxation in the second chapter. It was the Patriarchate that came to the defense of the Literary Society in this conflict. It is surprising in the first look to see the change in the relations between the Patriarchate and the Literary Society over the years. However, I have already talked about the rapprochement between these two institutions; from the correspondence over this issue it seems that at some point in the history of the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople, it was recorded as “an institution belonging to the Patriarchate.” (*hükümet-i seniyyece öteden beri Patrikhaneye mensub bir müessese tanınmış*).³¹³ In another document from the same correspondence it is recorded as one of the schools belonging to the Rum community (*Rum cemaatine mahsus mekatib meyanında olarak musaddak bulunduğ*).³¹⁴ Here, again, the Patriarchate was coming to the defense of an institution that was under its jurisdiction. The report of the Patriarchate sent to the Ministry of Justice and Religions was reminding Ottoman officials that the Greek Literary society was “an Ottoman association which was the oldest among the Ottoman associations and the most famous and known in its service to science and knowledge” (*Osmanlı cemiyetleri arasında en kadim ve ulum ve fununa amillerinde*

³¹² BOA, ZB, 593/114, 13 Teşrin-i Sani 1323 (26 November 1907).

³¹³ BOA, İ.MMS 1329.M.10, 9 Muharrem 1309 (10 January 1911).

³¹⁴ BOA, MV, 151/35, 18 Rebiülevvel 1328 (30 March 1910).

en ziyade kesb-i şöhret ve marufiyet eylemiş bir Osmanlı cemiyeti)³¹⁵ The document continued to list the many accomplishments of the Greek Literary Society to ask for its exemption for taxation. It should be noted that this correspondence happened after the promulgation of the Law of Association in 1909. With the law, the Ottoman state authorities became the only possible legitimacy source for any association in the Empire. The connection to the Patriarchate, the link with education or philanthropy no longer mattered. Only the license of the Ottoman bureaucracy was acceptable after the Association Law. So, normally, the involvement of the Patriarchate should not have mattered in this situation. But, if we consider that the Ottoman documents talking about it consider this association “a school of the *Rum milleti*” than we can understand the possibility of the interference of the Greek Patriarchate. From an Ottoman legal view point the Patriarchate was simply defending one of its schools’ right to be exempt from land tax.

The change that came with the Young Turk Revolution did not only concern the associations of course. It was a more general change in the representation of the *Rum milleti* in the Ottoman legal system. The Patriarch was no longer recognized as the political leader of the *Rum milleti* and “the representation of the Greek Orthodox population would now be taken over by the civil leadership in Istanbul, namely the parliamentary deputies and the Society of Constantinople, a secret organization that supported their activity.”³¹⁶ This affected the legitimacy structures of the associations as well. While there was a new law that regulated this field and left little space for the Patriarchate as a legitimizer, the problems these associations encountered did not create a need for the Patriarchate to interfere as well. For instance, when in 1910, a

³¹⁵ BOA, ŞD, 2798/4, 30 Zilkade 1328 (3 December 1910).

³¹⁶ Vangelis Kechriotis, *The Modernization of the Empire...*, pp. 60-61.

local association was closed down for suspected relations with a hidden political association and its administrators were taken into custody, it was the Greek member of the Ottoman Parliament from Selanik Yorgi Buşo (Georgios Bousios) who was contacted, and not the Patriarchate. The petitions of the concerned people were forwarded to Ottoman government authorities through him.³¹⁷

To sum up, reading the story from the perspective of the Greek associations' relations with the Ottoman bureaucracy; the Patriarchate do not seem to be the legitimizer of Greek communal activity in the Empire. In the first decade of associational activity, the Ottoman legality did not require Greek associations to have ties with the Patriarchate. They were founded without an approval from the Patriarchate and they contacted Ottoman authorities directly. When education became a very important issue in 1870s, and when the Ottoman authorities had to accept the "monopoly" of the Patriarchate over Greek education for reasons briefly discussed in the second chapter, the situation changed. At this time, around 1875, it was possible for educational associations to be considered legal by the Ottoman bureaucracy without necessarily having a license from the government as long as the Patriarchate was aware of the situation. The Ottomans also tried to stop those associations which tried to interfere in the *millî* education system. The application for fund-raising campaigns also went through the Patriarchate in these years. This process accelerated during the first decade of the Hamidian era to be reversed around 1900. In the early years of the Hamidian regime, the Ottoman bureaucrats could accept the legality of an association as long as it was approved by the Patriarchate, but still they wanted to control the events organized by them. The legitimacy of any fund-raising activity or gathering went through the approval of Ottoman authorities.

³¹⁷ BOA, DH.MUI, 74-2/13, 1 Mart 1326 (14 March 1910).

In its later years, the situation changed yet again, and the Hamidian regime no longer accepted the legality of any association as long as it had no license from the Ottoman government. With the Young Turk Revolution, the situation changed completely, and the Patriarchate was no longer a provider of legality. In the area of philanthropy, it seems that from the start a Patriarchal link was not required. From the start, the institutional dimension of most of these activities was gained through the Ottoman bureaucracy and not the Patriarchate. The Patriarchate was the legitimizer of *Rum* activity in the educational field with certain limits for a certain time and this situation also developed in time.

Secular Possibilities for Greek Associations in Ottoman Legality

It seems that the Patriarchate gave only a partial legitimacy for Greek associations in Ottoman authorities' eyes. If there was no law yet, and if the religious leadership of the *millet* was not enough and not always necessary for legitimacy we have to look for other ways. One of these ways that was in effect in the first decades of associational activity, was the *irade* given by the highest Ottoman authorities, and by the Ministry of Public Education after 1870s. The licenses that were given to these associations by concerned authorities continued to be the main requirement, but other secular ways complementing them developed over time as well.

One of these was the backing of a local governor in the provinces. This is why the administrators of the Edirne association wanted to make the governor their honorary president in 1875. If they could have gotten the backing of the local governor they would be freer in their endeavors without worrying about the involvement of Ottoman authorities. A very similar case was seen in Ayvalık in 1895 as mentioned before. It seems that in 1894, the notables of Ayvalık contacted the

governor of the town, Muharrem Bey, asking for permission to found two different musical associations and they also offered him the honorary presidency of the association.³¹⁸ This time, the governor seems to have accepted the proposal, as a few months after he was appointed to another place, he was contacted by Ottoman bureaucrats, accusing him of allowing these “harmful” associations contrary to the laws and regulations.³¹⁹ It seems that these associations in the localities could get a “temporary” legality without having to go through the central bureaucracy with the agreement of their governor. This way, they could act freer as long as the governor did not change; but when he did, as in this case, problems were to be expected.

For the central bureaucracy the problem was of a different kind. If Ottoman officials accepted, as they did, the legality of some associations without the knowledge and approval of the Patriarchate or the metropolitans, where did they place these collective activities in the *millet* structure? As there was no doubt of the *Rumness* of these associations which organized almost exclusively among the Greek-Orthodox populations, and used Greek in their names and in their internal regulations, how did the Ottoman bureaucrats perceive them. It is obvious that they were not regarded as Ottoman associations that did not belong to any ethno-religious identity. And the only ethno-religious identity the Ottoman authorities accepted during this long period was the *millet*. So these associations had to be placed in the *millî* structure somehow, even if they did not have direct links to or licenses from the Patriarchate. I believe this was made through a naming practice: *Rum Cemiyeti*. I argued in the beginning of the first chapter that the Ottoman documents do not have consistent naming exercises. Further, most of the Greek associations do not have

³¹⁸ BOA, DH.MKT, 376/45, 7 Teşrin-i Sani 1310 (19 November 1894).

³¹⁹ BOA, DH.MKT, 376/45, 6 Mayıs 1311 (18 May 1895).

Rum in their titles when they are referred to in Ottoman documents; but this term's existence almost always means that this was a legal association. What is more, the disappearance or the sudden appearance of the word *Rum* for a Greek association in the correspondence between various state institutions can tell us a lot about what the state thought of that particular association at that particular moment. Still further, illegal associations or groups are never mentioned with the word *Rum* until the onset of the Balkan Wars. In short, the word *Rum* used for an association in an Ottoman document meant that this specific association was accepted in the Ottoman legal system through its inclusion in the *Rum millet*i by the will of the Ottoman authority. We need to examine each case *Rum* appeared to have a better understanding of its significance, but first let me expand on the usage of *Rum* and its possible meanings around the nineteenth century.

Basically, *Rum* means Roman as a result of the influence of the Qur'an and previous contacts Muslims populations had with the Byzantines, on the Ottoman society.³²⁰ It denotes those people that are considered to be the descendants of the Byzantine (i.e. Roman) Empire. Although *Rum* was used by the Seljuks and the Ottomans to denote Greek-Orthodox peoples in Anatolia and the Balkans until the fifteenth century, it seems to have disappeared around that time. From the fifteenth century on the most used terms were *nasrani* (Christian), *kefere* (infidels) and *zimmi*. Paraskevas Konortas examining the *berats* given to Greek-Orthodox Patriarchs sees this change to be in place around 1700. According to him, it is not a coincidence that this change took place at a time of economic and social ascension of the Orthodox element, and especially the Phanariots, in the Ottoman Empire.³²¹ The Ottomans

³²⁰ Qur'an 30:2.

³²¹ Paraskevas Konortas, Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο, p. 302.

were going to stick with *Rum* until the end of the Empire when talking about the Orthodox Christians in the Empire. However, as a result of the dominance of the Phanariot elite in Constantinople, *Rum* in the official Ottoman usage meant both the wider Orthodox community, and the Greek-speaking subjects of the Sultan.³²²

This duality acquired more significance after 1860s. In 1856, *Rum* officially became the name of a group defined by its religious identity, but at the same time increasing nationalism among different populations broke up the unity of Greek-Orthodox populations. The Bulgarian Exarchate was founded in 1870 and the unity of the *Rum* which would be defined regardless of ethnicity took a heavy blow. In the following years it became harder and harder, especially in the capital, to talk about the *Rum* as a religious identity beyond ethnicities. However, this does not mean that *Rum* became completely ethnic. This confusion can be seen in Ottoman documents as well. In Ottoman documents of late nineteenth century, the Arab Orthodox could be defined as belonging to the “*Ortodoks milleti*” rather than the *Rum milleti*.³²³ But at the same time, a decade later, even after the Young Turk revolution, an Albanian Orthodox could be called *Arnavut Rum*.³²⁴ In short, the term *Rum* used in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, had this duality of denoting both a wider religious group, and a narrower ethnic one. When it was used for Greek associations however, it was exclusively used in the names of associations founded by Greek-speakers. This does not mean that these associations were identified in an ethnic basis however. Their ethnic/national character was no wonder recognized, but they

³²² Ibid, p. 313.

³²³ See for example a report from the governor of Adana in 1896, in which an association is called “*Ortodoks milleti Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi*” by the governor. BOA, DH.TMIK.M, 4/9, 29 Nisan 1312 (11 May 1896).

³²⁴ BOA, DH.MKT, 2889/10, 19 Temmuz 1325 (1 August 1909).

were incorporated as *Rum* in to the Ottoman legal system, benefiting from the duality in the meanings of this term.

Ottoman Legality and the Meanings of *Rum* when Used for an Association in the Ottoman Empire

Both the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople and the Greek Scientific Society in Izmir are called *Rum* in Ottoman documents. For the association in Izmir the name used in the Ottoman documents was *Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Rumiye*, while the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople is referred in many different ways some of which has been mentioned in the first chapter, throughout its history. Generally *Rum* was part of its name in Ottoman correspondences, as in *Dersaadet Rum Cemiyet-i Edebiyesi*. I have already argued that these associations did not apply through the Patriarchate, in fact for a long while the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople was at odds with religious leadership. To include these associations, with no link to *millî* educational institutions and leadership, it seems that the Ottomans used the term *Rum* in their names. *Rum* meant not only that these associations were founded by Greeks but also that they were acting in the *millet* space created by the Ottoman bureaucracy around the Patriarchate. The inclusion of these associations into the *millet* framework was done through the initiation of the Ottoman officials and not through any link to the Patriarchate. In fact, the relationship between the Patriarchate and the legality of Greek associations in Ottoman officials' minds developed later in 1870s. And after this date, *Rum* was very rarely used for defining an Ottoman Greek association, although it stuck to the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople and was used in all the correspondences concerning this association. Let's examine some of the other cases where *Rum* is used.

I will start with the striking example of a Greek association in the village of *Çanta* in *Edirne Vilayeti*. The Ottoman bureaucrats thought that this association was somehow related to another group that was recently discovered in Ereğli which was described as a plotting group (*fesad cemiyeti*). Therefore the foundation documents of the association, which was named Educational and Charitable Brotherhood of Agios Stefanos in Tsanda (*εν Τσάνδω Φιλεκπαιδευτικής και Αγαθοεργού Αδελφότητος ο Άγιος Στεφάνος*), was translated to Ottoman Turkish and examined thoroughly by the Ottoman bureaucrats. Throughout the correspondence between the local authority of Edirne and the Ministry of Interior, this association was referred to simply as “*cemiyet*” as it was in a suspicious position between legality and illegality. There is only one case this association was referred to as *Rum cemiyeti*, and that is in a letter from the Edirne local authority to the Ministry of the Interior dated 2 September 1909. In this letter, the association is referred to as *Rum cemiyeti* and it informs the Ministry that it was discovered after a thorough search that this association was “a charitable brotherhood with no relation to the plotting group.”³²⁵ The Ministry was not convinced and asked for the closing of the association as it did not have an official permission, and the Ministry’s reply did not refer to the association as *Rum*. Therefore, it seems that the term *Rum* was a stamp word when used for a Greek association to denote its inclusion in the *Rum milleti* and through it in the Ottoman legal system. As in this case, an association could be listed as *Rum cemiyeti* only when the doubts around it were dispelled. However as long as it did not have the permission of the Ottoman government it still wouldn’t be recognized as one. An association unrecognized by the Ottoman state could not have the name *Rum* around it, though it would also not be referred with words containing a dose of enmity like

³²⁵ BOA, DH.MUI 10-2/31, 4 Şevval 1327 (19 October 1909).

fesad cemiyeti (a plotting group). Boundaries of the *Rum milleti* were organized by the Ottoman state. An institution could only be *Rum* if it was legal, and could only be legal if it was related to the *Rum milleti*. The key to solving this paradox was in the hands of the Ottoman state officials when, as with this case, the involvement of a metropolitan or the link with an educational institution was missing. Thus, the term *Rum* is taxonomic and not burdened with hostility in official usage for Greek associations.

Likewise, the tone of a specific document could decide whether an association would be mentioned as *Rum* or not. Two documents from 3 March 1907 and 4 April 1908 respectively concerning a Women's Philanthropic Association located in Beyoğlu illustrate this point. This association which we already encountered, Sisterhood of Agios Eleftherios founded in 1874, concerned itself with the funding of clinics for pregnant women. In the first document sent to the governor of Beyoğlu from the Ministry of Public Security, the association is referred to as "women's philanthropic association Agios Eleftherios located in Beyoğlu" (*Beyoğlunda vaki Ayos Elefterios nam kadınların cemiyet-i hayriyesi*). It is not referred to as *Rum* because the tone of the document is against the request of the association, and doubtful about the legality of the association. It seems that the association requested permission to stage a theatrical play to raise funds for a clinic. The Ministry of Public Security claims that no permission was found concerning that specific clinic, and blames the association for creating an excuse for fund-raising for unknown aims.³²⁶ In such situations, generally, the legality of the association would be challenged, but as it is the only document I could locate concerning this specific event I cannot arrive at any conclusions. However, the other document dating from

³²⁶ BOA, ZB 389/167.18 Şubat 1322 (3 March 1907).

more than a year later helps us understand the stance of the Ottoman government. It is a report compiled by the Council of State concerning the foundation of a clinic for pregnant women in Beyoğlu, by the same association. The tone of the document this time is pretty much in favor of the efforts of the association, the women are applauded for their efforts (*pek değerli ve şayan-ı takdir olan şu emr-i hayr*) although permission was not granted as the residents of the locality were against the foundation of a clinic in their neighborhood and the state officials were not convinced that the association could cover the costs of such an enterprise. What is important here is that the association is referred to as *Beyoğlu Rum Kadınlar Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi* (Rum Women's Philanthropic Association of Beyoğlu). In this report there is also mention of the legality of the association.³²⁷ Therefore, *Rum* in an association's name meant its inclusion in Ottoman legal system through its inclusion in the *Rum milleti*. When it was missing when referring to an association normally recognized as *Rum*, it may be because of the doubts existing around its legality.

However, the term *Rum* was but one of the ways to inclusion in Ottoman legality. As I have already mentioned, not all legal associations were recognized with the *Rum* in their name. Just to give one example, a local association from Manastır is referred in a document dated 2 December 1879 simply as *Manastır'da Maarif Cemiyeti*.³²⁸ It was an association founded for raising funds for the local school under the leadership of the metropolitan, so it was included in the framework of the *Rum milleti* through its connection to the metropolitan. We have seen many similar cases in the previous chapters where the expression *Rum* was missing. I will now

³²⁷ BOA, BEO 3289/246650, 22 Mart 1324 (4 April 1908).

³²⁸ BOA, ŞD.MLK, 208 41, 17 Zilhicce 1296 (2 December 1879).

investigate what being included in the legal system as *Rum cemiyeti* would mean as compared to having a link to the religious leadership.

Take for example, the Sisterhood of Agios Eleftherios I just mentioned. It was not connected to a *millî* educational institution, and it did not connect to the ecclesiastical hierarchy in an organic way. Unlike some other associations which would apply through the Patriarchate, it petitioned the Porte directly for the foundation of a clinic. Although hospitals like schools and churches are included in the *millet* framework - the Hospital of Agios Haralambos in İzmir would be recorded as a *Rum Hastanesi* for example - in this case an association is not going through the “normal” procedure by applying to the Patriarchate which would apply to the Sublime Porte, therefore it is forcing the boundaries of *Rum milleti*. For the Ottoman government, an association could only exist within *Rum milleti*, therefore this “anomaly” of women seeing in them the right to apply without the involvement of the Patriarchate had to be included in their specific *millet* through another mean. The term *Rum* put before its name in the official correspondence was this mean. The association by its totality, and although it had foreign members as well, was included in Ottoman legality, by the bestowal of the term *Rum* to their association by the Ottoman institutions. This way, the link with the *millet* framework was established without the direct involvement of the Patriarchate or any *millî* institution. *Rum* was used because these women were Greek Orthodox, and this gave them legitimacy, but it did not have to be legitimized again by the involvement of the Patriarchate in their activity.

A very similar case can be seen in the correspondences around the philanthropic association in Tatavla, Φιλότητος αδελφότης Ταταυλων from 1893 and 1900. In the first correspondence as already mentioned, the association was

applying for an approval to organize a theatrical play to raise funds for the poor patients in their clinic in Tatavla, it sent its application directly to local police through one of its members. In the correspondences surrounding this application the association is constantly called *Tatavla'daki Rum Cemiyet-i Hayriyesi* (Greek Philanthropic Association in Tatavla). As I argued in the first part of this chapter, the association applied directly to Ottoman officials for the organization of this activity and it made it clear that it did not have any ties to the Patriarchate. Therefore, it was mentioned as a *Rum Cemiyeti* in the correspondence. However, when the same association applied to the Ministry of Public Security seven years later in 1900, for the organization of a theatrical play for the benefit of the poor in the region, it was claimed that the association was founded thirty years ago with the license of the Greek Patriarchate.³²⁹ In this case the same association is referred as *Tatavla'da Fukaraperver Cemiyeti* (the philanthropic association in Tatavla). This is probably because the association was claiming a link to the Patriarchate this time, which was not challenged by the Ottoman authorities.

Similarly, *Kandiye Rum Cemiyet-i İlmiyesi* (the Greek Scientific Association in Candia) which was applying to the Porte for the inclusion of their museum among Imperial Museums could only be included into Ottoman legality through the term *Rum*. There was no involvement of the Patriarchate or the local metropolitan in the process of application, and the building of a museum by itself would be beyond what the Ottoman bureaucrats would think as supporting *millî* education. The Ottoman officials, when they included associations into Ottoman legality through their connection to *millî* education and the Patriarchate did not have in mind conferences, scientific journals, research foundations, museums or anything similar. As many of

³²⁹ BOA, ZB, 316/60, 20 Safer 1318 (19 June 1900).

the Ottoman documents show it was simply the funding of a specific school, and its poor students. It was a collective activity outside what the Ottoman bureaucrats would think as *millet* framework and therefore had to be brought into the *millet* framework by the term *Rum*.

To sum up, it should be clear now that the term *Rum* was not used for an association under “normal” circumstances. Those normal circumstances would be being directly related to a funding activity for a *millî* institution, mainly a school; and contacting the Ottoman government mainly through the Patriarchate or the local metropolitan. *Rum* was a tool for the Ottoman bureaucrats to fill legal gaps to accommodate a collective activity that was on the edges of *millet* structure. This helped Ottoman officials especially in their relations with philanthropic associations. As the Ottoman bureaucracy did not insist on the involvement of the Patriarchate, and to the contrary built their power strategies on direct links, naming an association *Rum* helped them place philanthropic associations in an area created around the Patriarchate without involving it.

Uses of *Rum* for Associations outside of the Empire

As we have seen, within the Empire an association would occasionally be described as *Rum*, mainly to serve the need of underlining its legitimacy when that specific association was acting on the edges of the legitimacy provided by *millî* activities. This is valid as long as the association was within Ottoman boundaries. In this part I will talk about two associations that were outside the Empire, but were described as *Rum* and try to find out what *Rum* meant in such cases.

The first association I will mention in this respect is one that we have encountered in the previous chapters. It was founded in Athens by some individuals

who were born in Ottoman lands and was named The Anatoli Association of Minor Asia in Athens (*Σύλλογος των Μικρασιατικών η Ανατολή εν Αθηναις*), and according to a letter sent to the Ottoman government in May 1893 by its founders, it was aiming to study the history and the present situation of the places its members were born, and to find solutions for the problems these places and its people were in.³³⁰ The Ottomans considered it dangerous to allow activities of an association based in Athens, although they admitted that “there seems nothing harmful in appearance.”³³¹ Throughout the correspondence this specific association was named “*Atina’da müteşekkil Anadolu Rum Cemiyeti*” (Anadolu Rum Association founded in Athens). *Rum* in this case was probably used to emphasize the Ottoman origins of this association’s members and their interest in Ottoman lands and people, an interest which wouldn’t be described as *Yunan* as the association’s aims did not seem harmful to the Ottomans.

The second case where there is talk of a *Rum cemiyeti* is in a letter sent to the Grand Vizierate by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 6 February 1897. An association named “Societe Nationale” is described as *Rum cemiyet-i fesadiyesi* and is blamed for transferring arms to Crete. It is the only case of the word *Rum* being used for a group of people that was considered harmful for the Empire before the Balkan Wars. However, both the fact that it was written by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, rather than any ministry that would be more familiar with the internal usage of the term; and its usage in a context of tense relations with the Greek Kingdom to erupt into a war in April 1897 is to be taken into consideration. The Ottomans were blaming the Greek Kingdom for sowing discord among the *Rum*, so this specific

³³⁰ BOA, DH.MKT. 43/42. 6 Mayıs 1309 (18 May 1893).

³³¹ BOA, DH.MKT. 43/42, letter from the Ministry of the Interior to Aydın Vilayeti dated 20 May 1893.

organization is described through its relation with the *Rum* of the Empire rather than its relations to the Greek Kingdom. The more important thing for this case was the *Rum* of Crete rather than the aims of the *Yunan*.

Especially in the correspondence among ministries related to the interior of the Empire, *Yunan* would be preferred for any association that had plans considered harmful to the Empire's integrity. Now I will turn to the description of Greek associations founded by non-Ottoman Greeks in the Empire and outside, and the use of *Yunan* by the Ottoman government in this context.

Yunan Associations

Yunan in Ottoman usage mainly referred to persons or institutions related to the Greek Kingdom. Therefore, a person with an identity from the Greek Kingdom would be *Yunan tebaasından*, the ambassador of Greece would be *Yunan konsolosu*. When not neutral, *Yunan* was always negative. Greek aspirations would be described as *Yunan âmâli* or *hesâbât-ı Yunaniye*, Greek interests in the Ottoman Empire would be described as *menâfi-i Yunaniye*, Greek irredentism would be described as *hissiyât-ı Yunaniye*.

With the effect of such negative uses, *Yunan* when used for a Greek association in or outside the Empire was always a group that was considered harmful to the Empire's interests. In contrast, those associations with no perceived danger did not have *Yunan* when they were referred to in Ottoman documents. Ottoman correspondence regarding a certain *Atina Cemiyet-i Musikisi* (Athens Society for Music)³³² never mentions it as *Yunan*. This society applied for permission to give

³³² I believe this society was the Ecclesiastical Music Society of Athens Merih Erol talks about briefly in her Ph.D dissertation. See Merih Erol, *Cultural Identification of the Greek Orthodox Elite of Constantinople*, pp. 144-152.

concerts in Istanbul and Izmir in 1893 and 1894 consecutively. Its first request was accepted, while the second one was denied.³³³ In both situations the association is simply mentioned as *Atina Cemiyet-i Musikisi*. Another example from within the Empire where *Yunan* is not used is an association founded by the Cephalonian Greeks in the capital. This association's aim is described as fund-raising activity for the poor Greeks from Cephalonia, and the problem that caused the interest of the Ottomans was their publication of their regulations and tickets for a fund-raising activity at the end of 1889 without taking permission from the Empire. But neither the letter sent from the Ministry of the Interior to the Grand Vizierate in 24 September 1889³³⁴, nor the one sent to the Ministry of Public Security in 7 January 1890³³⁵ refer to this association as *Yunan*. In fact, the legitimacy of the Greek associations founded by the citizens of the Greek Kingdom came from the Greek consulate; they had to make their requests and application for their foundation and their activities through the consulate and hope for the permission of the Porte. However, this did not lead them to be described as *Yunan*, as the term for the Ottomans had a negative meaning when used together with *cemiyet*. This use persisted in early twentieth century as well. Consequently, an association named *Evangelismos*, founded by the Greeks from Tinos Island was simply referred to as "*Evangelismos namındaki cemiyet*" by the Ministry of Public Security in a note to the application of the Greek consulate for the approval of a fund raising activity in 16 January 1908.³³⁶

³³³ BOA, HR.TO 17/21, 17 Mart 1309 (29 March 1893) and İ.HUS 26, 11 Muharrem 312 (15 July 1894).

³³⁴ BOA, DH. MKT. 1660/85, 12 Eylül 1305 (24 September 1889).

³³⁵ BOA, DH.MKT 1687/105, 26 Kanun-u Evvel 1305 (7 January 1890).

³³⁶ BOA, ZB 28/23, 3 Kanun-u Sani 323 (16 January 1908).

Conversely, a *Yunan cemiyeti* was generally looking to harm the Ottoman power as an armed group. Greek brigands acting together with the Greek army were generally described as *Yunan cemiyet-i fesadiyesi* (Greek group of plotters). An example of this usage would be a document by the Ministry of War dated 8 October 1905, reporting the mobilization of armed forces together with some paramilitary groups on the Ottoman border (*Yunan cemiyet-i fesadiyesinin Yunan askerleriyle...*).³³⁷ This usage of *Yunan* with a group of people also included associations with irredentist aims that were not simple paramilitary groups, but were acting as hidden societies with certain regulations. The Ottomans were alarmed when they found weapons in late 1909 in *Cisr-i Ergene* within the vilayet of Edirne. They made an investigation concerning the weapons and the people they found connected. The investigation led them to a hidden society which was founded by some citizens of the Greek Kingdom and called itself *Πανελλήνοι Οργάνωσις*. This society was called *Cemiyet-i Yunaniye* in all the documents concerning it.³³⁸

I think the above examples show that *Yunan* when used for an association was not simply an ethnic term, not even a term referring simply to Greek subjecthood. It was used to define certain groups that had irredentist aims concerning the Ottoman Empire regardless of their connection to the Greek state or their Greek citizenship. That is why it is never used for the associations that were founded by Greek citizens in the Ottoman Empire, which the Ottomans did not perceive as a threat.

³³⁷ BOA, Y.MTV 279/42. 8 Şaban 1323 (8 October 1905).

³³⁸ BOA, DH.MUI 10-2/31. 30 Ağustos 1325 (12 September 1909).

Conclusion

In the preceding pages I have been trying to follow the development of the legality of Greek associations in the eyes of the Ottoman bureaucrats. One of these ways was a relationship with the Patriarchate in foundation and in activities. However, this developed only in time and was valid more for educational associations than philanthropic ones. The emergence of the Greek Patriarchate as the leader of Greek education in the Empire in 1870s, made the educational associations dependant on it for their activities. So not only the attempts at interfering in the educational system, mainly organized through the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople; but also fund-raising activities for local schools had to have the backing of the Greek Patriarchate. The philanthropic associations, however, did not have to tie each of their activities to the Patriarchate. Although a link to the Patriarchate proved useful for them as well, it was not indispensable. Many philanthropic associations were connected to Ottoman legal system through applying only to Ottoman officials, and their activities were legalized only through a permit from the Ottoman bureaucracy. Further, the legitimating place of the Patriarchate was undermined with the Young Turk Revolution. As education became a political issue and the representation of the *Rum milleti* was taken over by lay elites in the Parliament, the Patriarchate could no longer be the legitimizer of any activity.

The other significant way of inclusion in Ottoman legality was the term *Rum* and its derivations in the Ottoman government's usage. My main aim was to understand what *Rum* and *Yunan* meant when used for the Greek associations from and outside the Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Leaving aside the earlier developments, the crucial period in the shaping of the term *Rum* was the eighteenth century. As a result of the historical developments beginning with the

eighteenth century and especially the dominance of the Phanariot elite in the Orthodox ecumene, *Rum* came to acquire the meaning of Greek added to its ecumenical character as a description of the Orthodox Christians. It was weakened by the Greek Independence, as the Ottomans took care to differentiate the subjects of the Greek Kingdom from their own Greek-speaking populations, reviving the term *Yunan*. *Rum* became equated with Ottoman subjecthood, and due to the developments within the Empire its use for Grecophones was strengthened. In the case of an association *Rum* was always referring to an association founded by Grecophones.

However, not all Greek associations were described as *Rum*, in fact its existence is rarer than its absence. This led me to scrutinize the cases an association was defined as *Rum*. In the documents I was able to locate, the word *Rum* was used by the Ottoman officials as a mean of locating a collective activity within the framework of *Rum milleti*. The associations which would be defined as *Rum cemiyeti* were acting on the boundaries of the *Rum milleti* and the tasks the edict of 1856 assigned to it. These associations may have been undertaking activities beyond education, like the Philological Society of Constantinople; or they may have been getting into a correspondence with the Ottoman government without the intermediary of the Patriarchate or its officials. The Ottoman government, in turn, would use the term *Rum* to put them into the framework of the *Rum milleti*. It is important to remind here that when it is clear that the Patriarchate was involved in the process or that the specific association was mentioned only in its relation to a school and funding activity for it, the same association was not listed as *Rum*. *Rum* existed only to underline the association's place within *Rum milleti* when it was needed.

Yunan, in turn, was only used when mentioning those associations which would be considered harmful to Ottoman interests, and generally there was also an element of armed struggle against Ottoman state. Therefore, the differentiation that the Ottomans tried to make in the context of associations was not really between *Yunan* and *Rum*.

What the Ottomans tried was to define the boundaries of legality. An association founded within the Empire by the citizens of the Greek Kingdom, which would proceed its activities through the Greek consulate was therefore never a *Yunan cemiyeti*, as there was no problem with defining its legality. Similarly, an association founded by the Rum, which applied to the Porte through the Patriarchate and whose activities would fit clearly in the categories Ottomans had in mind would not be described as *Rum cemiyeti*. Only those associations with aims and actions the Ottoman government could not directly fit into their perception of *millî* activities, those which preferred to apply directly to the Ottoman Empire would be given the name *Rum*. *Rum* served as a word to dissipate doubts. The Ottoman effort was to define the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion.

CHAPTER V

EPILOGUE

In the previous pages, I have been trying to explore the Ottoman correspondences concerning Greek associations. My main argument was that the efforts of Ottoman bureaucracy, although including a considerable desire to monitor and control, cannot be read as simply a reaction designed to inhibit the activities of Greek-speaking Ottomans to safeguard the continuity of the state mechanism. Ottoman bureaucrats had aims and ambitions of their own; they were not only responding to the developments, but were also forging and re-forging alliances, creating new possibilities, aiming to lead the elites of the Greek-Orthodox to an identity that would be loyal to the Ottoman polity. The Ottoman officials' moves in the two fields described, education and philanthropy, was an act of governmentality designed to create the loyal *Rum*. For that reason, the Ottoman bureaucracy and the Greek elite of the Empire –especially in the capital- should not be perceived as two antagonistic camps. The Ottoman bureaucrats' effort at creating a *Rum* identity through the activities of the Greek-speaking populations presupposed and required the endeavors of the Greek elite, while the latter had to act within an Ottoman legality, and negotiate the boundaries of this legality with the Ottoman bureaucracy.

The main bias of this study is the overwhelming dependence on the documents produced by Ottoman bureaucrats. It is expected, however, as this thesis focuses on the perception of Ottoman officials and their plans. Still, a reading of the documents produced by some of these associations and also the Patriarchal institution with the perception of the Ottoman bureaucracy in mind would aid greatly in our understanding of the processes I tried to sketch here. For example, when I say

Ottoman bureaucrats in 1860s insisted on the possibility of inclusion of everyone regardless of religion in the activities of these associations, it would be illuminating to see how this requirement worked in reality. Do we see, say, Ottoman Muslims giving lectures in, say, the Greek Literary society of Constantinople? If so, what is the language of such lectures? Again, there is the question of the responses of the Patriarchate. We have seen various turning points in the position of the Patriarchate concerning the legality of Greek associations in the eyes of the Ottoman bureaucrats. How did the Patriarchate respond to these changes? How did it see philanthropic activity when it was legalized by Ottoman officials without needing its consent? Considering the various stages of the Privileges Question which was barely touched here, it would be plausible to expect the Patriarchate to respond to these changes.

There is again, the question of setting. I have been trying to argue that Islam constituted a significant part in the worlds of the Ottoman bureaucrats. Selim Deringil argues that the typical late-Ottoman bureaucrat-statesman “was a man who had been imbued with the ideology of Islam from a very young age.”³³⁹ If this is the case, one wonders how was the involvement of non-Muslims in the power structures of the Empire was conceived. What was the “loyalty” of a non-Muslim in the eyes of Muslim jurists in the late Ottoman Empire? One wonders, how discussions of the incorporation of the non-Muslim populations into the Ottoman polity was conceived in this Islamic setting. The discussions around the place of the non-Muslims could be illuminating for a better understanding of what Ottomanism was about. It would aid in our understanding of the meanings of Ottoman bureaucrats’ power strategies, like the ones I have been describing in this thesis; and also provide us with a better

³³⁹ Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, p. 19.

understanding of the setting I tried to sketch in the first chapter. Unfortunately, such a discussion was beyond my aims in this thesis.

A related problem to the setting is the nature and exact areas of jurisdiction of Ottoman ministries. We know that until 1879, some of the issues concerning non-Muslim populations were dealt with by the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs. These issues were taken over by the Ministry of Justice and Religions in May 1879.³⁴⁰ One would expect these Greek associations to be dealt with these two ministries respectively throughout late Ottoman history. On the contrary, as we have seen in the various documents produced around associations, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Education were predominantly dealing with the correspondences around Greek associations. To be able to have a better understanding of the *millet* mechanism we have to determine the limits of these ministries, especially the Ministry of Justice and Religions founded in 1879.

Of course, if we desire to understand the power strategies of the Ottoman governments around Ottomanism, we have to consider how this worked in other fields, and how the concerned populations incorporated the discourses of Ottoman bureaucracy and responded to them as well. It is in the nature of governmentality that what is possible and what is not change with time in a process of acting and getting responses. I tried to present some examples around associations but these would not be enough to take the argument further.

All in all, this dissertation was targeting to provide a basis for the inclusion of the Ottoman bureaucracy in historical works on the working of fields that are considered outside the power of the Ottoman government in the dominant literature

³⁴⁰ Hulusi Yavuz, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, v. 1 (1988), s.v. “Adliye Nezareti.”

like education and philanthropy. I hoped to demonstrate that Ottoman officials' actions in these two fields were parts of Ottoman power strategies intended to catch the loyalties of the Empire's Greek subjects. I believe Ottoman officials tried to manipulate Greek associations in a way to serve their own needs, and preferred to co-opt them most of the time as part of their plans for the *Rum milleti*. Though, certain limitations I was talking about are apparent in this work, I think they were and necessary omissions that has to be studied separately to allow us a deeper insight to Ottoman power strategies aimed to create an Ottoman identity.

— ٦٠٤ —

معاشات داخلیه بودجه سی معاشات قسمه یکیدن برسنه لك اجرا ایدیلن ضامنك بش
آیلق فرقدن تسویه اولته جقدر .

ماده : ٤ اشبو قانونك اجرای احكامنه مالیه و داخلیه ناظرلری مأمورد .

٢٩ رجب ١٣٢٧ ٣ اغستوس ١٣٢٥

نومرو ١٢١ — جمعیتار قانونی (١)

٢٩ رجب ١٣٢٧ ٣ اغستوس ١٣٢٥

[تقریم وقایع ایله نشر واعلان : ٧ شعبان ١٣٢٧ ١٠ اغستوس ١٣٢٥ - نومرو ٣١٠]

برنجی فصل

ماده : ١ جمعیت اشخاص متعدده طرفقدن معلومات ویا مساعیلرینی صورت
دائمهده بالتوحید مقاسمه ربجدن غیری بر مقصدله تشکیل ایدیلن هیئتدر .

ماده : ٢ جمعیت تشکیلی اولجه رخصت استحصانه منوط دکدر شوقدر که تأسسنی
متعاقب آلتنجی مادهیه توفیقاً بهمه حال حکومته اخبار ایدلسی لازمدر .

ماده : ٣ احکام قوانینه و آداب عمومیهیه مغایر براساس غیر مشروعه ویا آسایش
ملکت و تمامیت ملکیه دولتی اخلال و شکل حاضر حکومتی تغیر وعناصر مختلفه عثمانیهیه
سیاسة تقریق مقصدینه مستند اولمق اوزره جمعیتلر تشکیلی جائز دکدر .

[١] سنه اجتماعیه : ١٣٢٤ - ١٣٢٥

جلسی مبعوثانه

تودیع مذاکره	اجتماع : ٧٤	[٥ مایس ١٣٢٥]	تقوم وقایع	نومرو : صحیفه
—	٩٦ :	[٦ حزیران —]	—	١٤ : ٢٢٤
—	—	—	—	٧ : ٢٥٦
—	—	—	—	٢ : ٢٥٧
—	—	—	—	٥ : ٢٥٨
—	١٠١ :	[١٣ —]	—	١٥ : ٢٦٩
—	—	—	—	١ : ٢٧٠
—	١٠٣ :	[١٦ —]	—	٥ : ٢٧٢
—	١٠٦ :	[٢٢ —]	—	٧ : ٢٧٩

[مابعدی : صحیفه : ٦٠٥]

ماده : ٤ قومیت و جنسیت اساس و عنوانلریله سیاسی جمعیتلر تشکیلی ممنوعدر .
ماده : ٥ جمعیتلر اعضاسنک یکرمی یاشندن دون اولماسی وبر جنایتله محکوم
ویا حقوق مدنیهدن محروم بولنماسی شرطدر .

ماده : ٦ خفی جمعیتلر تشکیلی قطعاً ممنوعدر . بناءً علیه بر جمعیت تأسیس ایدیلیر
ایدنلر اکر مرکز ادارهسی درسعادنده ایسه داخلیه نظارتنه وطشرده ایسه محکک ال
یووک ملکیه مأمورینه جمعیتک عنوان ومقصودینی ومركز ادارهسی وامور اداره ایله
مکلف اوله جققلرک اسم وصف و محل اقامتلرینی مین جمعیتک مؤسسعلری طرفندن مختوم
ومعنی بریئاننامه اعطا اولنه جق و یوکا مقابل بر علم وخبر ویریله جکدر . اشبو بیاننامه به
جمعیتک نظامنامه اساسیندن ایکی نسخهسی جمعیتک مهر رسمیسيله مصدق اوله رق ربط
ایدیله جکدر .

علم وخبر اخذندن صکره کیفیت مؤسسعلری طرفندن اعلان اولنه جقدر . جمعیتلر
کرك نظامنامه اساسی وکرك هیئت اداره ومحل اقامتلرنجه اجرا ایلدکلری تعدیلات
وتبدلاتی در حال حکومته بیلدیرمکه مجبور درلر .

اشبو تعدیلات وتبدلاتک شخص ثالثه قارشى حکمی انجق حکومته اخباری کونندن
معتبر اولور . اشبو تعدیلات وتبدلات بردقتر مخصوصه قید اولنه جق ودقتر مذکور
جهت عدلیه وملکیهدن مرنه زمان طلب ایدیلیرسه ابراز قله جقدر .

ماده : ٧ هر جمعیتک مرکزنده ایکی کشیدن آشاغی اولماق اوزره بر هیئت ادارهسی
واکر شعباتی وار ایسه انلرکده مرکزیه مربوط کذلک برر هیئت ادارهسی بولنق و یو
هیئتلرجه اولاً جمعیت اعضاسنک هویتلرینی وتاریخ دخوللرینی ثانیاً هیئت ادارهک
مقررات ومخابرات وتبلیغاتی ثالثاً جمعیته عائد واردات ومصارفک مفردات وجهله نوع

مذاکره	اجتماع : ١١٤	٦	تموز	١٣٢٥	تقریم وقایع : نومرو : صحیفه
—	— : ١١٥	٧	—	—	— : ٢٩٠
—	— : ١١٧	٩	—	—	— : ٢٩١
—	— : ١١٩	١٢	—	—	— : ٢٩٢
—	— : ١٢٧	٢٦	—	—	— : ٢٩٦
قبول	— : ١٢٧	٢٦	—	—	— : ٢٩٧
مجلس اعیانہ	(برنجی سنه اجتماعیه مذاکراتی خفياً جریان المذاکره)	—	—	—	— : ٢٩٧

و مقدارینی مین برر دفتر طولیق وجهت عدلیه و ملکیه دن هر نه زمان طلب ایدیلیرسه
ابراز ایدلک شرطدر .

ماده : ٨ آلتنجی ماده موجبجه بیاننامه اعطا ایتش اولان هر جمعیت طقوزنجی
مادهده کوسترلدیکی اوزره بالواسطه مدعی و مدعی علیه صقیله محاکمه حاضر بولمق
ولدی الایجاب دولتجه وقوع بولهجق اعانادن ماعدا اولاً اعضاسنک سنوی یکرمی درت
آلتونی تجاوز ایتهمک اوزره اعطا ایدهجکی حصص نقدیهی ثانیاً جمعیتک اداره سنه
واعضاسنک اجتماعه مخصوص اولان محلی ثالثاً مقصد اتخاذ ایتدیکی خصوصک اجرایی
ایچون الزم اولان اموال غیر منقوله یی نظام مخصوصنه توقیفاً تصرف و اداره ایتک
صلاحیتی حائز اوله بیلیر . جمعیتلرک بونلردن بشقه اموال غیر منقوله تصرف ایتلمری
منوعدر .

ماده : ٩ جمعیته عائد مصالح ایچون جمعیتلر نامنه مأمورین و محاکمه و مجالس رسمیه
وقوع بولهجق مراجعات و مطالبات کاتب عمومی و یا مدیرلرینک امضا و مهر ذاتیلری
آلتنده بوللی استدعاینامه لردن غیری و سائطله جریان ایده میه جکدر . جمعیت نامنه ایضای
معامله ایده جک بومثللو کیمسه لرک هویتلری جمعیتک نظامنامه اساسیسنده تصریح اوله جکدر .

ماده : ١٠ جمعیتلرک اعضاسی هر نه زمان ایستر ایسه نظامنامه اساسیلرنده عکسی
مشروط اولسه بیله یالکز زمان تسویه سی حلول ایدن وسال حاله عائد بولنان حصه نقدیهی
ایفا ایتدکدن صکره جمعیتدن آیریله بیلیرلر .

ماده : ١١ جمعیتلرک اجتماعکاهلرنده هر نوع اسلحه ناریه و جارحه نک ادخال
و حفظی ممنوعدر . یالکز صید و شکاره و میج تعلیمه مخصوص اوله جق قلوبلرده ضابطه نک
معلوماتی تحتنده اوله رق ایجاب ایدن اسلحه دن لزومی قدر بولندیریله بیلیر .

ماده : ١٢ ایکنجی و آلتنجی ماده لره توفیقاً بیاننامه اعطاسیله حکومته اخبار و اعلان
ایدلماش اولان جمعیتلر حکومتجه منع ایدلدکدن صکره مؤسساریله هیئت اداوه سی
رحل اجتماعک صاحب و یا مستأجری بش آلتوندن یکرمی بش آلتونه قدر جزای تقدی ایله
مجازات اوله جنی کبی اشبو جمعیتلر اوچنجی مادهده محرر و جزا قانوننده مصرح اولان
مقاصد مضره و ممنوعه دن بری ایچون تشکیل ایدلش اولدینی صورتنده قانون مذکوره
توفیقاً ترتب ایده جک جزا بشقه جه حکم اولتور .

ماده : ۱۳ آلتنجي ماده نك اخبار و اعلانه متعلق اوليان احكام سائره سيله دردنجي، بشنجي، يدنجي، طقوزنجي ماده لر احكامنه مغاير حركتده بولسائردن ايكي آلتوندن اون آلتونه قدر و تكرري حالده ايكي مثلي جزاي نقدي آلتور. اون ايكنجي ماده موجبجه منع ايديلان برجعتي اشبو قانونه مخالف اوله رق ابقا و يا خود يكي دن تأسيس و اداره ابدن لر اون آلتوندن اللي آلتونه قدر جزاي نقدي و ايكي آيدن برسنيه قدر حبس ايله مجازات ايديلير. منع ايدلش اولان برجعتك اعضاسنه محل اجتماع اولق اوزره كندى يرلريني استعمال ايتديرنر حقتده عين جزا ترتيب اولتور.

ماده : ۱۴ اعضاسنك رضا و اختيارلريله و يا نظامنامه داخليسي موجبجه منفسخ اولان و يا خود حكومتجه منع ايديلان جمعيتنه عائد اموال حقتده او جمعيتك نظامنامه اساسيسنده برصراحت اولديني حالده اكا و اولديني تقديرده جمعيتك هيئت عموميه سي طرفدن و يريله جك قراره توفيقاً معامله اولتور.

منع ايديلان جمعيت اوچنجي ماده ده مذكور مقاصد مضره و ممنوعه دن برى ايچون تشكيل ايدلش جمعيتلردن ايسه اموالى حكومتجه اخذ و ضبط اولتور.

ماده : ۱۵ قلوبار دخی اشبو فصلده مندرج جمعيتلر قيلندندر.

ماده : ۱۶ اليوم موجود اولان جمعيتلر اشبو قانونك اعلاني تاريخندن اعتباراً ايكي آي طرفنده ايكنجي و آلتنجي ماده لر موجبجه بياننامه اعطا و اعلان شرطى ايفايه و مواد سائره احكامنه توفيق معامله يه مجبوردرلر.

ايكنجي فصل

ماده : ۱۷ برجعتك منافع عموميه يه خادم عد اولمسي شوراي دولت قراريله دولتجه تصديق اولمسنه متوقفدر.

اشبو جمعيتلر نظامنامه اساسيلرينك مانع اولديني كافه معاملات حقوقيه يي ايشا ايديه بيليرلر. برجعتك مالك اوله جنى اسهام و تحويلاتدن حاملنه عائد اولانلرك بهمه حال جمعيت نامنه قيد و تحويلي لازمدر. وصيت و هبه ايديلان اموالى حكومتك رخصت مخصوصه سي اولقسزين جمعيت قبول ايدمه ز. وصيت و هبه ايديلان مال غير منقول اولديني و جمعيتك وظيفه ستى ايفا خصوصنده لزومى اولديني تقديرده اشبو مال ساتيلير. نه مدت

ظرفنده صائق لازم کله چي قبولی حقنده کی قرارده تصریح اولنور. صائیلان ملکک بدلی جمعیتک صندوقه تسلیم ایدیلیر .

ماده : ١٨ جمعیتلر وقلوبلر اوزرنده ضابطه نك حق تفتیشی واردر . بونلرك اجتماعكاهلری مأمورین ضابطه یه هر زمان كشاده بولنه جقدر شوقدركه اجتماعكاهلره ضابطه مأمورلری لزوم حقیقیه مستندأ كیردكلرینی لدی الحاجه اثبات ایچون درسعادتده ضبطیه ناظری وولایاتده محلك اك بیوك ملكیه مأموری ویا وکیللری طرفلرندن او محله دخول حقنده امر ویا اجازتی متضمن اوله رق ویرلش برورقه رسمیه ابرازینه مجبوردرلر .
ماده : ١٩ اشبو قانونك اجراسنه داخلیه وعدلیه نظارتلری مأموردر .

٢٩ رجب ١٣٢٧ ٣ اغستوس ١٣٢٥

The Associations Law of 1909 (Düstur, İkinci Tertip, v. 1, (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1329[1911]), pp. 604 -608.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

BOA (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri, İstanbul – İstanbul Prime Ministry Archives)

Sadaret Mektubi Kalemi Mühimme Odası Kalemi (A.MKT.MHM)

- BOA, A.MKT.MHM 491/11, 23 Şevval 1303 (25 July 1886)
BOA, A.MKT.MHM 253/8, 25 Receb 1277 (15 January 1863)
BOA, A.MKT.MHM 478/19, 19 Safer 292 (27 March 1875)
BOA, A.MKT.MHM 499/25, 14 Recep 1306 (16 March 1889)

Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası (BEO)

- BOA, BEO 3884/291273, 19 Rebiülahir 1329 (19 April 1911)
BOA, BEO 1984/148729, 23 Zilkade 1320 (9 February 1903)
BOA, BEO 144/10733, 6 Recep 1310 (24 January 1893)
BOA, BEO 305/22864, 22 Rebiülahir 1311 (2 November 1893)
BOA, BEO 348/26058, 17 Recep 1311 (24 January 1894)
BOA, BEO 3289/246650, 2 Rebiülevvel 1326 (4 April 1908)

Dahiliye Nezaerti Tesri-i Muamelat ve Islahat Komisyonu Muamelat Kısmı (DH.TMIK.M)

- BOA, DH.TMIK.M 103/40, 14 Muharrem 1319 (3 May 1901)
BOA, DH.TMIK.M 79/39, 23 Şaban 1317 (27 December 1899)
BOA, DH.TMIK.M 4/9, 28 Zilkade 1313 (11 May 1896)

Dahiliye Nezareti Mektubi Kalemi (DH.MKT)

- BOA, DH.MKT 609/61, 26 Recep 1320 (29 October 1902)
BOA, DH.MKT 2879/75, 19 Cemaziyelahir 1327 (5 July 1909)
BOA, DH.MKT 2108/106, 5 Cemaziyelevvel 1316 (21 September 1898)
BOA, DH.MKT 2879/10, 29 Cemaziyelahir 1327 (18 July 1909)
BOA, DH.MKT 2544/75, 1 Recep 1319 (14 October 1901)
BOA, DH.MKT 2043/5, 27 Cemaziyelahir 1310 (16 January 1893)
BOA, DH.MKT 2025/88, 8 Cemaziyelevvel 1310 (28 November 1892)
BOA, DH.MKT 43/42, 24 Muharrem 1310 (18 August 1892)
BOA, DH.MKT 677/45, 29 Zilhicce 1320 (28 Mart 1903)
BOA, DH.MKT 655/17, 19 Zilkade 1320 (17 February 1903)
BOA, DH.MKT, 2698/45, 7 Zilhicce 1326 (31 December 1908)
BOA, DH.MKT 2730/42, 11 Muharrem 1327 (2 February 1909)
BOA, DH.MKT 2852/89, 22 Cemaziyelevvel 1327 (10 June 1909)
BOA, DH.MKT 2907/67, 23 Recep 1327 (10 August 1909)
BOA, DH.MKT 1673/53, 14 Safer 1307 (10 October 1889)
BOA, DH.MKT 376/45, 20 Cemaziyelevvel 1312 (19 November 1894)
BOA, DH.MKT 1155/22, 2 Rebiülevvel 1326 (4 April 1908)
BOA, DH.MKT, 2889/10, 14 Recep 1327 (1 August 1909)
BOA, DH.MKT 1687/105, 15 Cemaziyelevvel 1307 (7 January 1890)

Dahiliye Nezareti Muhaberat-ı Umumiye İdaresi (DH.MUI)

- BOA, DH.MUI 74-2/13, 18 Cemaziyelevvel 1328 (28 May 1910)

BOA, DH.MUI, 10-2/31, 4 Şevval 1327 (19 October 1909)
BOA, DH.MUI 28-2/16, 25 Muharrem 1328 (6 February 1910)

Tercüme Odası Belgeleri (HR.TO)
BOA, HR.TO 17/21, 11 Ramazan 1310 (29 March 1893)

İrade Dahiliye (İ.DH)
BOA, İ.DH 472/31671, 8 Şevval 1277 (19 April 1861)

İrade Hariciye (İ.HR)
BOA, İ.HR 130/6661, 5 Ramazan 1272 (10 May 1856)

İrade Meclis-i Mahsus (İ.MMS)
BOA, İ.MMS 1329-M-10, 21 Şaban 1327 (7 September 1909)

İrade Şura-yı Devlet (İ.ŞD)
BOA, İ.ŞD 40/2095, 29 Recep 1295 (29 July 1878)

Maarif Nezareti Mektubi Kalemi (MF.MKT)
BOA, MF.MKT, 211/43, 27 Zilkade 1311 (1 June 1894)
BOA, MF.MKT, 602/47, 10 Zilkade 1319 (18 February 1902)
BOA, MF.MKT 26/160, 28 Safer 1292 (5 April 1875)
BOA, MF.MKT 305/18, 24 Şaban 1313 (9 February 1896)
BOA, MF.MKT 31/179, 22 Şaban 1292 (23 September 1875)
BOA, MF.MKT 43/106, 6 Şevval 1293 (25 October 1876)
BOA, MF.MKT 26/53, 5 Safer 1292 (5 April 1875)
BOA, MF.MKT 22/85, 19 Zilkade 1291 (28 December 1874)
BOA, MF.MKT 75/150, 14 Cemaziyelahir 1299 (3 May 1882)
BOA, MF.MKT 76/3, 1 Recep 1299 (19 March 1882)
BOA, MF.MKT 390/40, 15 Zilkade 1315 (7 April 1898)
BOA, MF.MKT 149/66, 2 Şevval 1309 (5 May 1892)
BOA, MF.MKT 149/110, 6 Şevval 1309 (4 May 1892)
BOA, MF.MKT 165/9, 26 Şaban 1310 (15 March 1893)
BOA, MF.MKT 345/27, 1 Recep 1314 (6 December 1896)
BOA, MF.MKT 23/53, 19 Zilkade 1291 (28 December 1874)
BOA, MF.MKT 29/123, 17 Cemaziyevvel 1291 (2 July 1874)
BOA, MF.MKT 22/76, 29 Şevval 1291 (9 December 1874)
BOA, MF.MKT 19/38, 7 Ağustos 1290 (19 August 1874)
BOA, MF.MKT 26/95, 14 Safer 1292 (22 March 1875)
BOA, MF.MKT 828/2, 4 Şaban 1324 (4 October 1905)
BOA, MF.MKT 1673/53, 14 Safer 1307 (10 October 1889)
BOA, MF.MKT, 540/23, 17 Cemaziyelahir 1318 (12 October 1900)
BOA, MF.MKT, 602/31, 11 Şevval 1319 (29 January 1902)

Meclis-i Vükela Mazbataları (MV)
BOA, MV 151/35, 18 Rebiülevvel 1328 (30 March 1910)

Meclis-i Vala Riyaseti Belgeleri (MVL)

BOA, MVL 689/33, 29 Safer 1281 (3 August 1864)

BOA, MVL 691/68, 16 Şaban 1281 (14 January 1865)

BOA, MVL 467/66, 17 Şevval 1281 (15 March 1865)

Şura-yı Devlet Belgeleri (ŞD)

BOA, ŞD 2798/4, 26 Zilhicce 1328 (29 December 1910)

BOA, ŞD 208/9, 21 Cemaziyelahir 1295 (22 June 1878)

BOA, ŞD 207/21, 23 Rebiülahir 1291 (9 July 1874)

Şura-yı Devlet Mülkiye Dairesi (ŞD.MLK)

BOA, ŞD.MLK 208/41, 17 Zilhicce 1296 (2 December 1879)

Rumeli Müfettişliği Kosova Evrakı (TFR.I.KV)

BOA, TFR.I.KV 52/5121, 2 Zilhicce 1321 (18 February 1904)

Rumeli Müfettişliği Arzuhalleri (TFR.I.ŞKT)

BOA, TFR.I.ŞKT 48/4702, 20 Cemaziyelevvel 1322 (2 August 1904)

Yıldız Sarayı Arşivi Sadaret Hususi Maruzat Evrakı (Y.A.HUS)

BOA, Y.A.HUS 451/35, 4 Rebiulahir 1321 (30 Haziran 1903)

Yıldız Mütenevvi Maruzat(Y.MTV)

BOA, Y.MTV 37/28, 15 Cemaziyelevvel 1306 (17 January 1889)

BOA, Y.MTV 279/42, 8 Şaban 1323 (8 October 1905)

BOA, Y.MTV 26/25, 22 Recep 1304 (16 April 1887)

Yıldız Perakende Evrakı– Müfettişlikler ve Komiserlikler Tahriratı (Y.PRK.MK)

BOA, Y.PRK.MK 1/58, 27 Safer 1299 (17 January 1882)

Yıldız Perakende Evrakı – Şehremaneti Maruzatı (Y.PRK.ŞH)

BOA, Y.PRK.ŞH 2/71, 1 Recep 1305 (14 March 1888)

Yıldız Perakende Evrakı – Tahrirat-ı Ecnebiye ve Mabeyn Mütercimliği
(Y.PRK.TKM)

BOA, Y.PRK.TKM 23/53, 23 Cemaziyelevvel 1309 (25 December 1307)

Yıldız Perakende Evrakı – Zabtiye Nezareti Maruzatı (Y.PRK.ZB)

BOA, Y.PRK.ZB 15/51, 4 Şevval 1312 (31 March 1895)

BOA, Y.PRK.ZB 9/53, 11 Cemaziyelevvel 1309 (13 December 1891)

Zabtiye Nezareti (ZB)

BOA, ZB 331/78, 12 Rebiülevvel 1327 (3 April 1909)

BOA, ZB 55/17, 20 Cemaziyelahir 1310 (9 January 1893)

BOA, ZB 29/153, 27 Zilkade 1325 (1 January 1908)

BOA, ZB 310/72, 10 Zilkade 1324 (26 December 1906)
BOA, ZB 593/114, 20 Şevval 1325 (26 November 1907)
BOA, ZB 389/167.18 Muharrem 1325 (3 March 1907)
BOA, ZB 316/60, 20 Safer 1318 (19 June 1900)
BOA, ZB 28/23, 12 Zilhicce 1325 (16 January 1908)

Published Primary Sources

Düstur, Birinci Tertip, v.2, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1290[1874-1875].
Düstur, Birinci Tertip, v. 4, (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1296[1880-1881].
İbrahim Hakkı, *Hukuk-ı İdare*, v.1, İstanbul, 1307 [1891].
İrfan, A. *Mecmua-i Kavanin ve Nizamat*, İstanbul: Cemal Efendi Matbaası, 1316 [1889].
Karavokiros, Miltiyades. *Lugat-ı Kavanin-i Osmaniye*, İstanbul: Asaduryan Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası, 1310 [1893].

Secondary Sources

Abu-Manneh, Butrus. “The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript” in *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. 34, 1994, pp. 173-203.
Abu Manneh, Butrus . “The Sultan and the Bureaucracy: The Anti-Tanzimat Concepts of Grand Vizier Mahmud Nedim Pasha” in *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, v. 22 (1990), pp. 257-274.
Ahmad, Feroz. *The Young Turks*, London: Hurst Company, 2010 – first published in 1969.
Ahmad, Feroz. “Unionist Raletions with the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish Communities of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1914”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society* ed. by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1982, pp. 402-434.
Akyıldız, Ali. *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkezi Teşkilatında Reform, 1836-1856*, İstanbul: Eren, 1993.
Alkan, Mehmet Ö. “Sivil Toplum Kurumlarının Hukuksal Çerçevesi 1839-1945” in *Tanzimattan Günümüze İstanbul’da Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları* ed. by A.N. Yücetürk, İ. Turan, M.Ö. Alkan, İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1998, 79-146.
Anagnostopoulou, Anasthasia. “Tanzimat ve Rum Milletinin Kurumsal Çerçevesi: Patrikhane, Cemaat Kurumları, Eğitim”, in *19. Yüzyıl İstanbul’unda Gayrimüslimler* ed. by Pinelopi Stathis, trans. by Foti&Stefo Benlisoy, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003, 1-38.

- Anagnostopoulou, Athanasia. *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nation-states*, Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2004.
- Atalay, Bülent . *Fener Rum Ortodoks Patrikhanesi 'nin Siyasi Faaliyetleri (1908-1923)*, İstanbul: TATAV Yayınları, 2000.
- Aymes, Marc. "Reform Talks: Applying the Tanzimat to Cyprus", in *Ottoman Cyprus: A Collection of Studies on History and Culture* ed. by Michakis N. Michael, Matthias Kappler and Eftihios Gavriel, Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 2009, pp. 107-116.
- Benlisoy, Stefo . *Education in the Turcophone Orthodox Communities of Anatolia during the nineteenth century*, unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Boğaziçi University, 2010.
- Berker, Aziz. *Türkiye 'de İlk Öğrenim I: 1839-1908*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1945.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *The development of Secularism in Turkey*, Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964.
- Bozkurt, Gülnihal. *Gayrimüslim Osmanlı Vatandaşlarının Hukuki Durumu*, Ankara: T.T.K. Basımevi, 1996.
- Braude, Benjamin. "Foundation Myths of the Millet System", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society* ed. by B. Braude and B. Lewis , Holmes and Meier: 1982, pp. 69-88.
- Burchell, Graham . "Peculiar Interests: Civil Society and Governing "the System of Natural Liberty" in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 119-150.
- Charle, Christophe. *Social History of France in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Miriam Kochan Oxford: Berg, 1994.
- Cioeta, Donald J. "Islamic Benevolent Societies and Public Education in Ottoman Syria, 1875-1882," in *Islamic Quarterly*, v. 26, n.1, (1982), pp. 40-56.
- Clogg, Richard. "The Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire", in *Anatolica: Studies in the Greek East in the 18th and 19th centuries* ed. by Richard Clogg, Hampshire: Variorum, 1996, pp. 185-207.
- Cohen, Amnon . "Communal legal- entities in a Muslim setting: Theory and practice: The Jewish community in sixteenth century Jerusalem," *Islamic Law and Society*, 3, 1 (1996), pp. 75-90.
- Davison, Roderic. *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

- Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the legitimation of power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*, London: I.B. Tauris, 1998.
- Deringil, Selim. "From Ottoman to Turk: Self-Image and Social Engineering in Turkey," in *Making Majorities* ed. by Dru C. Gladney, California: Stanford University Press, 1998, pp. 217-226.
- Doumani, Beshara. *Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900*, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Droulia, Loukia. "The Cancellation of the International Congress of Literary Societies for the furthering of Hellenic Studies, Constantinople, 1886" in *Actes du IIe Congrès International des Etudes du Sud-Est Européen* (1978), v.4, pp. 519-526.
- Dumont, Paul. "La Période des Tanzimat (1839-1878)," in *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* ed. by Robert Mantran, Paris: Fayard, 1989, pp. 459-522.
- Engelhardt, *Tanzimat ve Türkiye*, trans. Ali Reşad, İstanbul: Kaknüs, 1999.
- Erol, Merih. *Cultural identifications of the Greek Orthodox elite of Constantinople: discourse on music in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries*, unpublished Ph. D thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2009.
- Exertzoglou, Haris. *Οι «χαμένες πατρίδες» πέρα από τη νοσταλγία. Μια κοινωνική-πολιτισμική ιστορία των Ρωμιών της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας (μέσα 19^{ου} – αρχές 20ού αιώνα)*, Athens: Nefelis, 2010.
- Exertzoglou, Haris. *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19^ο αιώνα: ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, Athens: Nefelis, 1996.
- Exertzoglou, Haris. "Medicine, Philanthropy and the Construction of Poverty in Istanbul in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries", in *Economy and Society on Both Shores of the Aegean* ed. by Lorans Tanatar Baruh and Vangelies Kechriotis, Athens: Alpha Bank Historical Archives, 2010, pp. 249-276.
- Findley, Carter V. *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire. The Sublime Porte 1789-1922*, Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1980.
- Findley, Carter V. "The acid test of Ottomanism: The acceptance of non-Muslims in the late Ottoman bureaucracy", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the Functioning of a Plural Society* ed. by B. Braude and B. Lewis, Holmes and Meier: 1982, pp. 339-368.
- Fortna, Benjamin C. *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the state and education in the late Ottoman Empire*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. "Governmentality", in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 87-104.

- Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*, trans. By A. M. Sheridan Smith, New York : Tavistock Publications , 1973.
- Gara, Eleni. "In search of Communities in Seventeenth century Ottoman Sources: The case of the Kara Ferye District," *Turcica* 30(1998), pp. 135-162.
- Gay, Peter. *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*, v.3, *The Culmination of Hatred*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1993.
- Georgiadou, Maria. "Expert knowledge between tradition and reform The Caratheodorys: a Neo-Phanariot family in 19th century Constantinople", in *Medecines et Ingénieurs Ottomans a l'âge des Nationalismes* ed. by Meropi Anastasiadou, Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes, 2003, pp. 243-293.
- Gerber, Haim. "A New Look at the Tanzimat: The Case of the Province of Jerusalem" in *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period*, ed. by David Kushner , Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü . *The Young Turks in Opposition*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Harrison, Carol E. "The Bourgeois after the Bourgeois Revolution: Recent Approaches to the Middle Class in European Cities," *Journal of Urban History*, 31/3 (2005), pp. 382-392.
- Heper, Metin . "Center and Periphery in the Ottoman Empire with Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century," *International Political Science Review* 1, n. 1 (1980), pp. 81-105.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Application of the Tanzimat and its social effects", in *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 5(1973), pp. 97-127.
- İnan, Huri İslamoğlu (ed.). *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Kanner,Efi. *Φτώχεια και Φιλανθρωπία στην Ορθόδοξη κοινότητα της Κωνσταντινούπολης 1753-1912*, Katarti: Athens, 2004.
- Karakasidou, Anastasia N. *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Karal, Enver Ziya. *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Ankara: TTK, 1995.
- Kasaba, Reşat. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy, the 19th Century*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988.
- Kasaba, Reşat. "Economic Foundations of a Civil Society: Greek in the Trade of Western Anatolia, 1840-1876," in *Ottoman Greeks in the age of Nationalism* ed. by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999, pp. 77-88.

- Kaynar, Reşat. *Mustafa Reşit Paşa ve Tanzimat*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1954.
- Kazamias, Andreas. "The Education of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1923: A Case study of Controlled Toleration", in *Schooling, educational policy, and ethnic identity* ed. by Janusz Tomiak, New York: European Science Foundation: New York University Press, 1991, pp. 343-367.
- Kazamias, Andreas. *Education and the Quest for Modernity in Turkey*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Kechriotis, Vangelis. "The Modernization of the Empire and the Community 'Privileges': Greek Orthodox Responses to the Young Turk Policies", in *The State and the Subaltern: Modernization, Society and the State in Turkey and Iran* ed. by Touraj Atabaki, London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007, pp. 53-70.
- Kechriotis, Vangelis. "Contesting the Imperial Centre: Political Elites in Smyrna and their rivalry with Istanbul", in *Istanbul as seen from a distance, Center and provinces in the Ottoman Empire* ed. by Elisabeth Özdalga, M.Sait Özervali, Feryal Tansuğ, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2011, 83-100.
- Kechriotis, Vangelis. "Educating the Nation: Migration and Acculturation on the Two Shores of the Aegean at the Turn of the Twentieth Century," in *Cities of the Eastern Mediterranean: From the Ottomans to the Present Day* ed. by Biray Kolluoğlu and Meltem Toksöz, London ; New York : I.B. Tauris, 2010, pp. 133-150.
- Kenanoğlu, M. Macit. *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek*, İstanbul: Klasik, 2004.
- Kermeli, Eugenia. "Central Administration versus Provincial Arbitrary Governance: Patmos and Mount Athos Monasteries in the 16th century", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 32, 2 (2008), 189-202.
- Kırlı, Cengiz. "Coffeehouses: Public Opinion in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire", in *Public Islam and the Common Good* ed. by Armando Slavatore and Dale F. Eric, Boston, Brill: 2006, pp. 75-97.
- Kocka, Jürgen. *Industrial Culture and Bourgeois Society*, New York: Berghen Books, 1999.
- Kodaman, Bayram . *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.
- Konortas, Paraskevas. *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο - Βεράτια για τους προκαθήμενους της Μεγάλης Εκκλησίας 17ος- αρχές 20ού αιώνα*, Athens: Alexandria Pub.,1998.
- Köksal, Yonca. "Imperial Center and Local Groups: Tanzimat Reforms in the Provinces of Edirne and Ankara", in *New Perspectives on Turkey*, (Fall 2002), 27, pp. 107-138.
- Lamberti, Marjorie. *State, Society and the Elementary School in Imperial Germany*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Makdisi, Ussama. "After 1860: Debating Religion, Reform and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire, in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, v. 34, no.4 (Nov. 2002), pp. 601-617.
- Mamoni, Kyriaki. *Γυναικείοι Σύλλογοι στην Κωνσταντινούπολη (1861-1922)*, Athens: Estia, 2002.
- Milioris, Nikos E. "Ο Σύλλογος των Μικρασιατών η Ανατολή" in *Μικρασιατικά Χρονικά*, v.12 (1965), pp. 337-367.
- Miller, Ruth A. "Apostates and Bandits: Religious and Secular Interaction in the Administration of Late Ottoman Criminal Law", *Studia Islamica*, No. 97 (2003), pp. 155-178.
- Mardin, Şerif. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study of Modernisation of Turkish Political Ideas*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Mardin, Şerif . "Power, Civil Society and Culture in the Ottoman Empire," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1969), pp. 258-281.
- Mardin, Şerif. "Civil Society and Islam," in *Civil Society, Theory, History, Comparison* ed. by John A. Hall, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
- Nye, Robert. "The biomedical origins of urban sociology" in *Journal of Contemporary History* 4 (20) 1985, pp. 659-675.
- Özbek, Nadir. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşruiyet 1876-1914*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2002.
- Özdemir, Bülent. *Ottoman Reform and Social Life: Reflections from Salonica 1830-1850*, İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2003.
- Özil, Ayşe. *Education in the Greek Orthodox Community of Pera in 19th century İstanbul*, unpublished MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2001.
- Papadopoulos, Theodoros. *Studies and documents relating to the history of the Greek Church and people under Turkish domination*, New York: AMS Press, 1973.
- Politis, Alexis. "From Christian Roman Emperors to the Glorious Greek ancestors", in *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity* ed. by David Ricks and Pual Magdalino, Aldershot, Hampshire, Great Britain ; Brookfield, Vt., USA : Ashgate, 1998, pp. 1-14.
- Philliou, Christine. "Communities on the Verge: Unraveling the Phanariot Ascendancy in Ottoman Governance", in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 2009, 51 (1), pp. 151-181.

- Quataert, Donald. "The Age of Reforms, 1812-1914", in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, ed. by Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 761-943.
- Rogan, Eugene L. *Frontiers of the State in the Late Ottoman Empire: Transjordan, 1850-1921*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Schacht, Joseph. *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, Oxford, 1964.
- Skopetea, Elli .*Το Πρότυπο βασιλείο και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα: Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα (1830-1880)*, Athens: Polytypo, 1988.
- Smail, John. *The Origins of Middle Class Culture: Halifax, Yorkshire, 1660-1780*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *Osmanlı'da Eğitimin Modernleşmesi (1839-1908): İslamlaşma, Otokrasi ve Disiplin*, trans. by Osman Yener, İstanbul: İletişim, 2010.
- Stamatopoulos, Dimitrios. *Η εκκλησία ως πολιτεία, Αναπαραστάσεις του Ορθόδοξου Μιλλέτ και το Μοντέλο της Συνταγματικής Μοναρχίας (δεύτερο μισό 19^{ου} αι.)* (Church as a Polity: Representations of the Orthodox Millet and the Model of Constitutional Monarchy (second half of the 19th c.), in Mnimon, (23, 2001), pp. 183-220.
- Strauss, Johan. *The Millets and the Ottoman Language: The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters (19th-20th centuries)*, in *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series, vol. 15, 2 (Nov. 1995), pp. 189-249.
- Toprak, Zafer. "1909 Cemiyetler Kanunu", in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, v.1 ed. by Murat Belge, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985, pp. 205-208.
- Trentman, Frank (ed.) *Paradoxes of Civil Society: New Perspectives on Modern German and British History*, New York: Berghan Books, 2000.
- Vassiadis, George A. *The Syllogos Movement of Constantinople and Ottoman Greek Education 1861-1923*, Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 2007.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Ottoman Empire and the Capitalist World Economy: Some Questions for Research", *Review*, II, 3, Winter 1979, pp. 389-398.
- Watenpaugh, Keith David . *Being Modern in the Middle East: revolution, nationalism, colonialism and the Arab middle class*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Yavuz, Hulusi. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Adliye Nezareti." İstanbul: *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı*, 1988.
- Yıldırım, Nuran . *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi*, İstanbul: Darülaceze Vakfı Yayını, 1997.