

ALEXANDER MAVROYENI BEY: FROM THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY REFORM ERA  
TO THE YOUNG TURK REVOLUTION THROUGH THE LIFE AND IDEOLOGY  
OF A NEOPHANARIOT OTTOMAN BUREAUCRAT

Dissertation submitted to the  
Institute of Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts  
in  
History

by  
Konstantina Andrianopoulou

Boğaziçi University

2004

## ABSTRACT

The 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> had been of pivotal importance for the Ottoman Empire. The reforms and the social-political alterations the country underwent changed drastically the scenery. Among the different points of view that one can adopt in order to approach and examine what was going on in the Ottoman Empire during this period, the issue of the non-Muslim Ottoman communities presents peculiarities and particularities that could help us understand both how the Ottoman State responded to the problem its multiethnic character posed in a era of national building, how these communities reacted to the solutions adopted and in what ways these changes affected them .

The present work tries to unfold aspects of this problematic through the example of a Greek Orthodox Ottoman bureaucrat of Istanbul: Alexander Mavroyeni Bey. Through his personal writings—an example of his intimate thoughts and notes, which constitutes a special kind of primary source—and his discourses in the Ottoman Senate—an example of his official writings-, all of which are written during the first two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, we will try to shed some light in the changes both the Millet-i Rum and the Ottoman Empire were undergoing. During our analysis, we will deal with Mavroyeni Bey's case as a particular representative of a specific power-group-class and tradition inside the Greek Orthodox millet and the Ottoman state—that of the Neophanariots-, and we will try to understand his position in relation to the Ottoman power center, to the head of his respective community, as well as to the Greek state, that from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was enhancing its role on the Greek Orthodox population of the Empire.

We will also try to examine his ideological orientations concerning the past and the future of both the Ottoman state and the Greek Orthodox millet, as well as his ideological response to the changes in the aftermath of the Young Turk revolution.

## ÖZET

19. yüzyıl ve 20. yüzyılın başı, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu için tayin edici önemde olmuştur. Reformlar ve ülkenin geçirdiği dönüşümler sahneyi önemli ölçüde değiştirmiştir. Bu dönemde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda neler olup bittiğini ele almak için başvurulabilecek farklı perspektifler arasında gayrimüslim Osmanlı cemaatleri, hem Osmanlı devletinin kendi çoketnili yapısının ortaya koyduğu soruna nasıl yanıt verdiğini hem de bu cemaatlerin başvuru çözümlere nasıl reaksiyon gösterdiğini ve bu değişimlerin onları nasıl etkilediğini anlamamıza yardımcı olacak hususiyet ve özgünlükler arzeder.

Bu çalışma, bir Rum Ortodoks Osmanlı bürokratı, Aleksander Mavroyeni Bey vasıtasıyla bu problematiğin boyutlarını açığa çıkarmaya çalışmaktadır. Hepsi 20. yüzyılın ilk iki on yılında kaleme alınmış olan kişisel yazıları –özel bir birincil kaynak örneği oluşturan hususi düşünce ve notları- ve Osmanlı Ayan Meclisi'ndeki konuşmaları –resmi yazılarına örnek- aracılığıyla hem millet-i Rum'un hem de Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun geçirdiği dönüşümleri ele alacağız. İncelememiz esnasında Mavroyeni Bey vakasını, Osmanlı Rum milleti içerisinde belirli bir grubun/sınıfın ve bir geleneğin, yeni Fenerlilerin bir temsilcisi olarak alacağız ve kendi pozisyonunu Osmanlı iktidarı, kendi cemaatinin başı ve keza geç 19. yüzyıldan itibaren imparatorluk dahilindeki Rum Ortodoks ahali nezdindeki nüfuzunu artıran Yunan devleti ile ilişkili olarak anlamaya çalışacağız.

Keza, Mavroyeni Bey'in hem Osmanlı devletinin hem de Rum Ortodoks milletin geçmiş ve geleceğiyle ilgili ideolojik yönelimlerini ve de Jön Türk devriminin ertesindeki değişimlere ideolojik cevabını incelemeye çalışacağız.

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                                                         |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>- Introduction</b>                                                                                                   | <b>1</b>   |
| <br>                                                                                                                    |            |
| <b>- Part A</b>                                                                                                         |            |
| 1. Phanariots in History-The case of the Mavroyeni family                                                               | 8          |
| 2. Phanariots and the making of the Rum Milleti                                                                         | 18         |
| 3. Reforms in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century- Alexander Mavroyeni Bey and his father<br>through his ‘Notes et Souvenirs’. | 23         |
| 4. Rum Milleti in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century and Alexander Mavroyeni Bey’s place                                      | 51         |
| <br>                                                                                                                    |            |
| <b>- Part B</b>                                                                                                         |            |
| 1. Rum Milleti and the ideology of Hellenottomanism                                                                     | 67         |
| 2. The Young Turk Revolution- Alexander Mavroyeni Bey’s reaction                                                        | 83         |
| 3. Alexander Mavroyeni Bey’s ideological response to the changes through<br>his discourses in the Ottoman Senate        | 97         |
| 4. The last Greek Ottoman ambassador                                                                                    | 118        |
| <br>                                                                                                                    |            |
| <b>- Conclusion</b>                                                                                                     | <b>127</b> |
| <br>                                                                                                                    |            |
| <b>- Table</b>                                                                                                          | <b>132</b> |
| <br>                                                                                                                    |            |
| <b>- Bibliography</b>                                                                                                   | <b>133</b> |

## Introduction

During the last years, we notice a historiographical ‘re-discovery’ of the historic biography and the monography on particular people’s life and thoughts, as a means to understand and explore an era through their stories. Peoples’ writings (whether personal, in the form of memories, notes, diary, or more officially in the form of essays) can help us deepen our analysis of controversial and transitional periods, such as the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> was for the Ottoman Empire and the Balkans. Moreover, the attempt to analyze the situation of the non Muslims of the Ottoman Empire during that era through personal writings and stories offers us the possibility to examine on a micro level the changes –ideological, political, etc- their communities underwent. Indeed, as far as the Greek Orthodox of the Empire are concerned, we notice during the last years an increase in both researches and publications on several personalities that belonged mainly to the elite circles of Constantinople<sup>1</sup>.

In this framework, in the following pages we will attempt to examine Alexander Mavroyeni Bey’s -a Greek Ottoman bureaucrat, who lived in Istanbul in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> – life, role and place in the changing Ottoman Empire of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Our examination will be mostly based on his notes and souvenirs – a sample of an intimate writing-, and his politic

---

<sup>1</sup> See for instance, Christina Filiou’s work on Stephane Vogorides -‘Services in the Ottoman State as seen by Sthephan Vogorides’, Prince of Samos’, in *Ρωμιοί στην Υπηρεσία της Υψηλής Πύλης [Rum in the service of the Sublime Porte]*, Athens, 2002, pp. 145-163, as well as her Phd dissertation in Princeton University-, Maria Georgiadou’s and Katerina Gardika’s publications on the Karatheodory family and Alexander Karatheodory respectively, S. Anestides work on Ioakeim III, etc. In addition, Georgios Zarifis’ memoirs were published in 2002 – G. A.Zarifis, *Οι αναμνήσεις μου [My memories]*, Troxalia, Athens, 2002. For George Zarifi see also the Turkish edition on his bank activities, Murat Hülkiender, *Bir Galata Bankerinin Portresi, George Zarifi, 1806-1884*, Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi, İstanbul 2003- and Andreas Siggros three volume memoirs were re-published during the 1980’s.

discourses delivered in the Ottoman Senate after 1908 –a sample of a formal writing-. Both of them, along with other documents that were found in his personal archive kept in the Patriarchate, were published in 1950 by the Patriarchate's archivist Archimandrite Ieronimos Konstantinidis in a two volume book entitled *Contributions to the history of Near East, Unpublished Official Documents of Alexander Mavroyeni Bey, Prince of Samos, Ambassador of the Ottoman Empire in Vienna and Senator*<sup>2</sup>.

According to his editor, the publication aimed to constitute a kind of supplement<sup>3</sup> to another book on the Mavroyeni family, written by the French historian Theodore Blancard, published in 1909 in Paris – by the editions Ernest Leroux- under the title of *Mavroyéni, histoire d' Orient (de 1700 à nos jours)*. In fact, this was the second book the author had published on the family and it was followed by a third additional one<sup>4</sup>. Even though we were not able to collect more information on the writer, his origins, his ideological orientations, his status and his relations to the Mavroyeni, as well as to other Greek –Ottoman or not- families, or his possible relations to other people from the Ottoman Empire, a look at the introduction of his

---

<sup>2</sup> The book was published in Istanbul in 1950 and republished in Athens in 2002. The section entitled 'Notes et Souvenirs d' Alexander Mavroyéni' was published by Isis press in Istanbul in the series *Cahiers du Bosphore*. Except Mavroyeni Bey's notes and discourses in the Ottoman Senate, the original edition included also his official documents covering the period when he was Prince of Samos (1902-1904), as well as the confidential dispatches to the Sublime Porte during his embassy in Washington.

<sup>3</sup> I. Konstantinidis, *Συμβολαί εις την Ιστορία της Εγγύς Ανατολής...* [*Contributions to the history of Near East...*], Istanbul, 1950, introduction.

<sup>4</sup> In 1893 he published his first book on the Mavroyeni, entitled *Les Mavroyéni, Essai d' etude additionnelle à l' histoire de la Grèce, de la Turquie, de la Roumanie*, Paris, Ernest Flammarion. In the copy that exists in the Gennadeion Library of Athens, we found the prototype letter (8 June 1901) that Dimitri Mavroyeni –Alexander' brother- send to the Greek publisher Rodokanaki –involved somehow in the book's publishing-, as well as another letter of his (28 May 1894), probably an answer to a reader of Blancard's book, where Dimitri was praising the book as an occasion for the Greek nation to learn 'the things that concern their history but that they ignore'. Fourteen years latter he published the second book on the same family -*Les Mavroyéni; histoire d' Orient (de 1700 à nos jours)*, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1909-, which consists of two volumes and is more complete than the first one, and in 1921 he published an additional essay entitled *Quelques details additionnels à la monographie de Mavroyéni*, Marseilles. We were not able to find this last book. Blancard had also written and published a book on the Ottoman Empire and the situation created after the 1908 revolution, entitled *Autour de Jeune Turquie*, Paris 1911.

second book, where he stresses that he tries to unfold aspects of the great Greek history, can help us understand his point of view. Theodore Blancard was a 'Philhellen', preoccupied, as it becomes obvious from the thematology of his books, with the old 'glorious' Greek families that survived to his days.

His interest in the Phanariots and Neophanariots –by the time he is writing– derived from his preoccupation with the Orient and precisely the Ottoman Empire and its future in the light of the changes the latter was undergoing from the late 19<sup>th</sup> to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the face of the developments after the Young Turks revolution of 1908, Blancard was claiming that '*the various nationalities of the Orient owe their conservation to the Greek race, which was the regenerative race of the Orient*', he was stressing the Greek's superiority over the Turks and he was attributing to the former an important role in the reborn Empire<sup>5</sup>. Actually, Blancard views coincided with or expressed the views the majority of the Greek Ottomans carried about their exceptional role in the government of the Empire, in the aftermath of the 1908 revolution. In this framework, he was trying to prove through the specific example of the Mavroyeni family, a prominent family in the service of the Ottoman State, the importance of these elite Greek Ottomans and legitimize their role in the face of the situation created after the Young Turk revolution.

Ieronimos Konstantinidis' publication actually followed the same logic; The editor was claiming that he aimed to shed some light on the very important history of the Phanariots, which was not objectively and meticulously written. If in the case of Blancard the book on Mavroyeni could have been seen also as an indirect propagation

---

<sup>5</sup> Th. Blancard reproduces all the stereotypes of the era when juxtaposing Christians and Muslims. He says characteristically: '*Au point de vue musulman, il nous paraît bien difficile d'admettre une action commune avec les chrétiens. Le Turc n'aime point le travail et n'est, de sa nature, ni commerçant ni industriel...Le chrétien est tout autre....L'idée de la liberté, de la franche égalité et de la fraternité entre bien difficilement dans une cervelle turque*'. Th. Blancard, *Les Mavroyéni; Histoire d'Orient (de 1700 à nos jours)*, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1909, pp. xii-xv.

and defence of the Neophanariots and their role under the new regime, in view of the changes that were affecting them, in the case of Konstantinides, who writes almost 40 years latter, the publication of Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's documents could not have been nothing more than a 'contribution' of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the Greek national historiography, as the former was perceiving it<sup>6</sup>.

Be that as it may, Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's *Notes et Souvenirs*, a kind of diary that Mavroyeni Bey kept- not very regularly- from 1907 to 1921 presents special interest, since we do not have many such –at least published- samples of personal and intimate writing of the Greek Ottomans of the Ottoman Empire. Written in French – a language that Mavroyeni Bey had learned from his early childhood, in his grandfather's house-, in a form that resembles his consular dispatches, these notes consist of anecdotes on different important personalities of the Neophanariotic community of Constantinople, as well as on other Muslim and non Muslim Ottoman bureaucrats. Mavroyeni Bey also notes important historic events that concern exclusively the internal historical process of the Ottoman Empire. Careful with the reproduction of stories and narratives that he notes, hesitant to make comments on people and facts, or to write down his intimate thoughts, Mavroyeni Bey presents a *tableaux vivant* of the Empire's bureaucratic elite; His notes concern strictly a specific group of people, the Neophanariots, the elite of the other non Muslim communities, and, of course, the Muslim bureaucratic elite, their *modus vivendi*, their interests, their anxieties and preoccupations.

---

<sup>6</sup> In fact, the official Greek national historiography has not shown special interest to the Neophanariotic generation of the Ottoman Empire. In contrast to the Phanariots in the prerevolution era, the Neophanariots were not corresponding to the image of the 'Greek hero' the Phanariots were incarnating, all the more as their ideology was not congruent with the ideology produced in the Greek state. It is characteristic that many Greeks were criticizing the devotion that important Neophanariot bureaucrats showed to the Ottoman state and characterized them as '*Turks in all the senses of the word who profess Christianity*'. See, Christina Philiou, *ibid*, p. 147 and Elli Skopetea, *Το 'Πρότυπο Βασίλειο' και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα, Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα [The 'Ideal Kingdom' and the Great Idea, Views of the national question in Greece]*, Politipo, Athens, 1988, p. 315.

His descriptions of the relations that various Neophanariotic families, with special references to his own one, had with important Muslim bureaucrats, their status, position and power in the Ottoman state, constitutes the leitmotiv of his notes. Apart from presenting in this way the various networks that existed in the ranks of the Ottoman state and how these networks worked, Mavroyeni Bey is also trying to stress the importance of both his family as a Neophanariotic one with great influence in the Palace –especially during the reign of the sultan Abdul Hamid, due mostly to his father’s relation to the sultan-, and, on a second level, the importance of this special group of people inside the Rum milleti and the Ottoman government. Mavroyeni Bey is writing during a period that his role and status both as Greek Orthodox and as Ottoman bureaucrat was being undermined; By noting between 1907-1921 stories, information, and anecdotes that refer to a great extent to the pre-Young Turk period and that prove the Neophanariots importance and influence in the Ottoman bureaucracy, he tries in a way to legitimize his status in the changing Ottoman state, as well as in his also changing religious community. The relations that the Neophanariots had with the Ottoman state, their status as Ottoman bureaucrats during the Tanzimat era, their position in their respective community and the relationship between their role as members of the Ottoman bureaucratic elite and as prominent members of their *millet*, will constitute the basic thematic of the first part of this thesis.

While Mavroyeni Bey in his *Notes et Souvenirs* stresses, we could say, more the *ottoman* part of his identity, avoiding to make any comment on the changes that his millet was undergoing in the Young Turk era, in his discourses delivered in the Senate

(1910-1911, 1914, 1918)<sup>7</sup> we find him defending the rights and privileges of his community. Mavroyeni Bey was appointed Senator some months after the 1908 revolution and with this status he was now representing not only the Ottoman state and especially the Sultan who had chosen and nominated him Senator, but also the Rum milleti. But how was Mavroyeni Bey translating in his vocabulary his identity as Greek Orthodox citizen of the Ottoman Empire and what this identity meant for him? In order to understand how Mavroyeni Bey was viewing himself in relation to his millet and the Ottoman State, we will try in the second part to shed light in the ideological orientations of the Rum milleti of Istanbul and sketch Mavroyeni Bey's ideological profile.

In a controversial period during which both the Muslims and the non Muslims were in search of a national identity and were progressively overriding their common Ottoman identity for the shake of a Greek, Turkish, Armenian etc one, what was Mavroyeni Bey's stand? In a period during which the Rum milleti was gradually affiliating with the Greek state's aspirations and ideological orientations, where can we place a Neophanariot such as Alexander Mavroyeni Bey?

Somewhere in his notes Alexander Mavroyeni Bey characterizes himself as Greek, but never talks about the Greek state, in his speeches he praises the '*common Ottoman nation*', he stresses that all the people of the Empire are Ottomans, and simultaneously he defends the privileges that the Rum milleti was enjoying in the face of its *millet başı*, the Ecumenical Patriarch. All these controversial, as it might seem, positions unfold, on the one hand, the perplexity of the transitional era under

---

<sup>7</sup> His discourses in the Senate during the years 1910-1911 are published in Ieronimos Konstantinides edition. All of them are in French, except two, undated, that are written in Greek and that were probably never published. Most of the discourses exist in the *Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Türkiye Büyük Meclisi Basım Evi, Ankara, 1989 and 1990. After comparing the French and the Turkish versions we saw that they are identical. The two discourses delivered in 1914 and 1918 are not included in Konstantinidis' edition. For these two discourses we used the Turkish version.

examination, and on the other compose Mavroyeni Bey's identity. In the light of these changes, we will try to support the view that Mavroyeni Bey was, first and foremost, trying to defend his status as a Greek Orthodox member of the Ottoman bureaucratic elite and that he was identifying himself not on national but rather on 'class' terms. Child of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman reforms that legitimized and enforced his place as an Ottoman bureaucrat and as an influential member of his community, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century he was being progressively marginalized. Both his *greekness*, meaning his membership to the Greek Orthodox millet under the leadership of the Patriarchate and his *ottomanism*, his membership to the Ottoman state as statesman, are being redefined in a way that is not any more compatible with his Neophanariotic status.

## PART A

### 1. Phanariots in History- The case of the Mavroyeni family

The beginning of the Phanariots's influence era dates back to the years of the reign of Mehmet, IV, during the Venetian Ottoman War over Crete, when a Greek named Panagioti or Panagiotaki Nikousios after gaining the protection of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa managed to succeed in the office of the Palace's Great Translator<sup>8</sup>. It was around 1661 when Panagiotaki Nikousios inaugurated thus a period of prosperity and power for the wealthier members of the Empire's Orthodox population, who were henceforth officially recognized by the Ottoman government and accepted in the Ottoman administration as interpreters of the navy and the government<sup>9</sup>. They were called Phanariots after the district where they resided, in the south cost of the Golden Horn and they preserved close relationship with the Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople. It was actually because of the Patriarchate's installation in this region during the first years of the 17<sup>th</sup> century that many Greeks, and especially the wealthier members of the community, also settled there. In this way, they were close to their religious centre; they could easier take part in and influence the affairs of their

---

<sup>8</sup> Panagiotaki Nikousios persuaded several Ottoman ministers and paşas that it was dangerous for the Porte to rely to foreign translations in its relations with the European powers. Th, Blancard, *Les Mavroyeni, Histoire de l' Orient (de 1700 à nos jours)*, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1909, pp. 9, 10.

<sup>9</sup> The famous Greek Orthodox historian, who belonged to the inner circle of the Patriarchate, Manouil Gedeon is suggesting, following the famous Greek historiographer Konstantinos Paparigopoulos' theory, that the history of Fanariots dates back to the years just after the fall of Constantinople and that its first representatives are 'Kritovoulos, Fatih's secretary and Xristodoulos, his architect', Manouil Gedeon, 'Περί Φαναριώτικης Κοινωνίας', [On the Phanariotic Society] in the review of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople, vol. 41, 1887-1888 and 1888-1889, Constantinople, p. 56. Still, most historians are claiming that we cannot talk of a 'Phanariot spirit' before the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Gregoire Cassimatis, 'Esquisse d'une sociologie du Phanariotisme', in *L' époque Phanariote*, Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki, 1974, pp. 161-162.

community, and thus better serve their interests. Their influence reached such high levels that they could dethrone or enthrone the patriarchs of their preference<sup>10</sup>.

Regardless of whether they were of a noble or a humble origin, the Phanariots consisted of Greek families that acquired a significant economic power through their trade activities<sup>11</sup>. The accumulation of money gave them the opportunity to offer to their sons a good education by sending them to European Universities in Italy and France, where they mostly studied medicine. The combination of their wealth and cultivation, the fact that they knew European, as well as Oriental languages and that they were acquainted with western science offered them important places in the Ottoman state, officialdoms in the princely courts of the vassal countries of Moldavia and Walachia, and later in the foreign embassies –were they mostly served as interpreters-. A *noblesse de robe* was thus created, consisting of enclaves with internal structure and dynamics<sup>12</sup> and with a distinctive *cursus honorum*: appointment by the Sultan in the posts of translatorship of the Imperial Fleet, followed by that of the Imperial Divan and finally, by the first years of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, appointment to the

---

<sup>10</sup> Manouil Gedeon, when describing the role the Phanariotic families were playing in the community, is eloquently saying that *'the church, the genos [Christian Orthodox race] are being haunted by men and women'*. He is particularly stressing the role of the Phanariot women, who exercised a strong influence on their husbands; He cites many such examples, as for instance the example of Panagiotis' the Great wife who was constantly undermining and looking down upon Patriarch Dionisios until she managed to dethrone him. Manouil Gedeon, *ibid.*, p.58.

<sup>11</sup> From middle 16<sup>th</sup> century, they are developing relations with Walachia and Moldavia where they develop trading activities. Many of them become suppliers of the Gate in fairs and textiles. Gregoire Cassimatis, *ibid.*, pp. 161-162. X. Patrinelis, 'Οι Φαναριώτες πριν το 1821' [Phanariots before 1821], in *Οι Ρωμιοί στην υπηρεσία της Υψηλής Πύλης*, [Rum in the service of the Sublime Porte], I Kath Imas Anatoli, Athens 2002, p. 22.

<sup>12</sup> In order to eliminate the possibilities of degeneration, the Phanariots developed sophisticated networks of intermarriages, a practice that, as we will observe, will be continued also during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The remark of a historian of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century is eloquently expressing it: *'Despite their discords, the Phanariots never related by marriage with another cast of people, than with their own'*, Kouma, *Ιστορία των Ανθρωπίνων Πράξεων*, [Histories of Human Acts] Vienne, 1812, t. I, p. 535, cited in X. Patrinelis, *ibid.*

thrones of Walachia and Moldavia<sup>13</sup>. A quick look at the lists with the names of the Translators of the Imperial Divan and the Princes of Walachia and Moldavia until 1821 will show the monopolization of these posts by Phanariots; Mavrokordatos, Aristarchis, Karatzas, Mourouzis, Kallimachis, Gikas, Mavroyeni are some of the Phanariot families that occupied these officialdoms<sup>14</sup>. Especially, the princely posts of Moldavia and Walachia, played a nodal role to the creation of a powerful and respectful Phanariotic aristocracy for both the Palace and the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul.

The first prince of Walachia and Moldavia was Nicolas Mavrokordatos, who rose to the throne in 1709 and inaugurated the large list of Phanariot princes<sup>15</sup>. In 1821 and as a consequence of the outbreak of the Greek revolution, the last Phanariot prince, Skarlatos Kallimachis was dethroned and beheaded; the sultan had lost –at least for the time being- his confidence to the Phanariot class and respectively, the Phanariots had lost their place as the head of two vassal principalities.

### ***Origins of Mavroyeni family***

In the list of Phanariot princes of Walachia and Moldavia we find, during the years 1786-1790, the name of Nicolaos Mavroyeni, the first and only member of the Mavroyeni family appointed to this high office.

---

<sup>13</sup> Carter Findley, "The acid test of Ottomanism: The acceptance of Non-Muslims in the Late Ottoman Bureaucracy", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, USA, 1982, vol.1, p. 340.

<sup>14</sup> Ieronimos Konstantinidis, ed. by, *Συμβολαί εις την ιστορία της Εγγύς Ανατολής, Ανέκδοτα επίσημα έγγραφα και κείμενα του Αλεξάνδρου Μαυρογένη Μπέη* (*Contribution to the History of the Near East, Unpublished Official Documents and Texts of Alexander Mavroyeni Bey*) Istanbul 1950, vol.1, p. 13.

<sup>15</sup> The Phanariots replaced the indigenous princes who were suspected for infidelity to the sultan. Th. Blanchard, *ibid.*, p. 10.

The origins of the family are not clear; There exist several different versions, each one of which tries to relate the family with a glorious past that would legitimize its future status. Still it is interesting to briefly examine some of these and explore in this way the mechanisms through which in the pre 19<sup>th</sup> century a Christian orthodox inhabitant of the Ottoman Empire could become a prominent and influential member of his community and thus join the Phanariot group.

According to Pouqueville, the Mavroyeni are originating from Constantinople, which they abandoned after its capture from the Ottomans, finding refuge in the island of Euboea. In Euboea, they became fief holders and some time later one of their ancestors managed to become attached to the Porte<sup>16</sup>. Their relation to the old Byzantine families is ascertained by other sources, according to which the Mavroyeni were among those '*ancient Greek families of noble Byzantine origin*' that '*served the Porte*'<sup>17</sup>.

A second version relates Mavroyeni family to the prominent Venetian house of Morozini. The resemblance of names, the figure of Saint Mark's lion in Mavroyeni's coat of arms and some common traditions found in both families are used as proofs that Mavroyeni were either a branch of Morozini or that at some time during the first

---

<sup>16</sup> H.L. Pouqueville, *Histoire de la Régénération de la Grèce*, Paris 1825, t.II. p. 504. cited in Th. Blanchard, p. 230.

<sup>17</sup> 'Les Mavroyeni sont d'origine noble Byzantine. A la chute de l' Empire en 1453 ils se sont réfugiés au Péloponèse d'où un branche emmigra à l' île de Grèce où elle subsiste encore et une autre à l' île de Paros et de Myconos dans l' Archipèl grec, où cette famille était la première de pays au 17 et 18ème siècles'. R.E. Rizos, *Livre d'or de la noblesse Phanariote et des familles princières de Valachie et de Moldavie*, deuxième édition, Athènes 1904, p.139. 'Il existe encore en Turquie une trentaine environ d'anciennes familles grecques issues des différentes dynasties qui ont occupé successivement les trônes de Constantinople ou de Trébizonde, ou descendant des grands dignitaires de l' Empire de Byzance, telles que les Mavroyéni, les Hypsilanti, les Kantimir, les Mavrocordato, les Katakussi, les Kisko, etc. Quelques unes de ces familles, contentes de leur modeste patrimoine, menaient une vie patriarcale dans les îles ou sur le continent de la Turquie, mais la plupart habitaient la capitale, s'occupant de commerce, ou servant la Porte en qualité d'interprètes et dans quelques autres emplois subalternes, qui exigent des connaissances étrangères aux Turcs', M-F. A. Reider, *L' Empire turc considéré relativement à son existence future et à la cause des Grecs*, Leipzig, 1822, in Th. Blanchard, *ibid.*, p. 29.

Ottoman-Venetian war they became attached to them<sup>18</sup>. Theodore Blanchard seems to accept the version according to which Mavroyeni lived in the island of Euboea in the Aegean Sea that was ceded to the Venetians with the treaty of Karlovitz (1699). When the Turks recaptured the island, Mavroyeni were probably expelled because of their relationship to Morozini and moved to another island of the Archipelago, precisely to Paros<sup>19</sup>.

Leaving aside whether they were a branch of Morozini or an offspring of a prominent Byzantine family –both of which versions attempt to invest Mavroyeni's origin with a glorious past-, by the first years of 18<sup>th</sup> century (1706) we find a certain Tzanis Mavroyeni in the island of Paros; A manuscript found in the library of Vatican, containing documents of this family, offers us important information about Mavroyeni and their activities<sup>20</sup>. Tzanis Mavroyeni -ancestor of Alexander Mavroyeni- is being mentioned as consular of a power that is not being specified and as lender of money to islanders. Especially this latter information might serve as a proof of Tzanis' importance as an economic agent of the region, particularly during a time -after the

---

<sup>18</sup> C.M. Kouma, *ibid.*, p. 380. In an article of the Athenian newspaper *Ασπρ* [City], 7/12/1897, George Mavroyeni, nephew of Spiridon Mavroyeni as he informs us, comments on the issue of his family's origin and claims that they were indeed a branch of the Venetian Morozini family. The article was published when it was discovered that the Morozini family had a great fortune in Greece. The newspaper was ironically calling all the would be inheritors –since the variant of the surname Morozini, Mavroyeni was very popular in Greece- to prescribe the fortune. With this occasion George Mavroyeni wrote this article where he was claiming no rights on the fortune, just his family's kinship with the Morozini. The newspaper's page where the article was published had been added in the last page of another book of Th. Blanchard on the Mavroyeni – *Mavroyeni, Essai d' etude additionnelle à l' histoire de la Grèce, de la Turquie, de la Roumanie* Paris, Ernest Flammarion, 1893-, found in the Gennadeion library in Athens. The book is to a great extent a compressed version of the other book. According to another version, Mavroyeni were a prominent Venetian family that settled in one of the Cycladic islands –as many Venetian noblemen- during the first capture of Constantinople from the crusaders in 1204, Th. Blancard, *ibid.*, p. 32.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>20</sup> The code Vaticanus graecus 2336 and the information that it offers us are mentioned in Vasilis Sfyroeras, 'Les Mavroyéni et la vie économique de la mer égée' in *L' époque Phanariote*, *ibid.*, p. 329.

treaty of Karlowitz and the Ottoman-Venetian war- when commerce and trade were a prosperous field in the islands of the Aegean <sup>21</sup>.

Some years later, we find Tzanis's son Nicolas responsible for the collection of the island's tithe, office which brings the family in direct relation to the Porte. It is due to this Nicolas –uncle of future prince Nicolas Mavroyeni- that the family was introduced to the Phanariot circles. In 1744, Nicolas is being promoted to the office of translator of the Ottoman navy, a post that he will hold for 10 years. It is quite indicative of Mavroyeni's power and importance that once Nicolas acquired the high office of dragoman of the navy -the first step towards the highest target, the throne of the Danubian principalities-, a series of Mavroyeni succeeded him so that the family monopolized the post for the 32 following years<sup>22</sup>.

Introduction to the Phanariot circles did not mean only ascendance to high offices, but also intermarriages with daughters and sons of the phanariotic society. From the first generation of Mavroyeni that served to the Ottoman state we find the development of parental relations with the Karatza family and in the generations that followed marriages with members of the Kallimachi, Soutzo, Sturdza and Mano Phanariotic families<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup>A contract dated back in 28 July of 1706 informs us that Tzanis Mavroyenis gave to two inhabitants of Paros the sum of '100 réaux' to make *le voyage de Constantinople*. *ibid.*, pp. 328-330.

<sup>22</sup> Dragomans of navy from 1744 to 1790:  
1744-1750, 1756-1759, Nicolas Mavroyeni  
1762-1763, Thomas Dimakis, grandchild of Nicolas Mavroyeni  
1765, Etienne Mavroyeni, Nicola's brother  
1770-1786, Nicolas Mavroyeni, the future prince  
1786-1790, Etienne Mavroyeni,  
in *ibid.*, pp. 329-330.

<sup>23</sup> See table 1.

## *Prince Nicolaos Mavroyeni*

It was through one of these Mavroyeni, dragomans of the navy, precisely through Etienne, dragoman in 1765, that Nicolas Mavroyeni -Etienne's nephew-, will be sent from Paros to Constantinople<sup>24</sup>. Once in the capital and with the help of his uncle, he will start his carrier as a simple employee of a certain Nicolaki, a Christian banker; Soon, with the help of *Kaptan-ı Derya* Hasan Paşa, he will be promoted to the post of secretary of the navy's translator and then to the post of translator<sup>25</sup>. His close and intimate –according to various sources- relationship to Hasan Paşa, his loyalty to his protector and to the sultan were instrumental to his carrier<sup>26</sup>.

With Hasan Paşa's initiative and under his favorite's Great Vizier Youssouf Paşa auspices, Abdulhamid I (1774-1789) replaced the prince of Walachia C.M. Soutzo with N. Mavroyeni in 1786. From the post of navy's dragoman he became directly Prince, bypassing the intermediate stage of translator in the Imperial Divan and violating thus the existing *curcus honorum*, another proof of his influential

---

<sup>24</sup> Th. Blancard, *ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>25</sup> 'A la prière de Nicolaki, banquier de Djezaerli- Chazy-Hassan Pacha, Mavroyéni fut nommé secrétaire de l' interprète de la marine [...] Hassan Pacha [...] le fit nommer par une ordonnance impériale dragoman de la marine. Les Fanariots bien qu'énormément vexés de voir un simple employé du banquier Nicolaki devenir interprète de la marine, n'osèrent rien dire', Ahmed Cevdet, *Histoire de l' Empire Ottoman*, t.X, p. 406, cited in Th. Blancard, *op.cit.*, p. 45 and 'Hassan Pacha le prit bientôt à son service le fit nommer interprète de la marine et le choisit comme son conseiller privé et le guide de toutes ses actions', Kouma, *ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> Many writers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century stressed Nicolas' relationship with the Ottoman state and the importance of his role. For instance, Th. Hopes narrates stories on Nikolas Mavroyeni and notes that 'Une fois dragoman, Mavroyéni donna à cette place une importance qu' elle n' avait jamais eue. Mavroyéni devint l' ami et le conseiller du pacha le plus énergique et le plus clairvoyant qui eût jamais été à la tête de la marine turque'. Th. Hopes, *Anastase ou Mémoires d'un Grec*, Paris, 1820, t.I, p. 274. Another similar comment is formulated by a Greek 'L' audace et la présence d'esprit de Mavroyéni, l' adresse de sa conduite envers les Turks, le zèle qu' il montrait pour la gloire de l'Islam, et les extases dans les quelles il tombait souvent dans le Divan en criant d'un air inspire: 'Allah-Allah', le rendirent l' unique idole des Ottomans, aide de camp, interprète, conseiller et instrument de toutes les entreprises d' Hassan-Pacha', Xenos, Th. *Η Ηρωϊς της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*, Londres, 1861, t.I, p. 74, cited in Th. Blancard, *ibid.*, p.56. Also, A. C. Ipsilanti is noting that when Hasan pasa was informed about Mavroyeni's ascendance to the throne of Walachia cried with joy. *Μετά την Άλωση*, Constantinople, 1870, V.I. p.11.

position<sup>27</sup>. This 'violation' provoked the reaction of the Phanariot circles, that apparently and due to the high competition among them, did not welcome the nomination and the success of this '*peasant of the Archipelago*', as they were in a derogatory way calling Mavroyeni, a reminiscence without doubt of his non –at least immediate- phanariot origin<sup>28</sup>.

Some months after his ascendance to the throne (1786), the war against Russia and Austria broke out. The enemies penetrated Moldavia and captured its prince, Alexander Ipsilanti. Mavroyeni defended Walachia and prevented the Austrian invasion, an achievement that increased Nikolaos' influence and helped him ascend to the throne of Moldavia, which at that time was vacant. It was due to his role during the war that the sultan made him *serasker*, an office that no non Muslim had previously occupied. The power he acquired and his defense of the frontiers of the Empire acquired mythical dimensions that made many Greek historians and writers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century express the opinion that if it was not for Mavroyeni's contribution and help the whole Aimos peninsula would have become Russian and Austrian from 1788<sup>29</sup>.

Yet, by that time Mavroyeni's case had divided the phanariot circles into two opposed camps; On the one hand, Mavroyeni and his supporters and on the other Celebi Petraki – a prominent figure on the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul who firmly opposed to the ascendance of Nikolaos to the princely throne -<sup>30</sup> and the majority of the community's aristocracy. Such tensions and rivalries among

---

<sup>27</sup> S. Byzantios, *Κωνσταντινούπολις*, Athens, 1851-1869, t. II, p. 22.

<sup>28</sup> Th. Blancard, *ibid.*, pp. 150-151.

<sup>30</sup> Celebi Petraki was Mustafa's III (Abdulhamid's I brother) personal banker and in head of the imperial treasury. He was to such a degree opposed to Mavroyeni's nomination that when on 1786 Mavroyeni was actually appointed prince of Vlachia, Petraki was beheaded. *ibid.*, pp.156-157.

Phanariots must have been common and were to a certain extent justified. But at the same time, the specific case we examine can unfold a broader tension between the established elite families of Phanar and the new, upstart Mavroyeni. The fact that Mavroyeni was coming from a prominent Orthodox merchant family outside Constantinople, had no well established relations to the Phanariotic circles and had in a very short time acquired a significant position in the Ottoman state was probably showing that he was closer to the Ottoman state than to the Phanariots, something that could have generated a bilateral antipathy and mistrust among him and some Phanariots. In one of his letters to a certain Georges Frangopoulos, *aga* in the island of Naxos, we find Nikolaos Mavroyenis characterizing the Phanariots as ‘*gassy, with bad manners and traitors*’<sup>31</sup>, a characterization that could legitimize the above hypothesis for the existence of a certain tension.

The tension inside his community, combined with a defeat during another confrontation with the Austrians, some months after the glorious first one, the death of both his protectors, the sultan Abdul Hamid I and Hasan Paşa, as well as that during his reign he had made a good deal of enemies, lead to his decapitation in 1790 –a common outcome for many princes of Moldavia and Walachia-<sup>32</sup>.

With the outbreak of the Greek revolution, the family of Prince Mavroyeni –as many Phanariots- was exiled in Bursa until the end of the 1820’s. His children and grandchildren continued the tradition of Phanariots: most of them were married to sons and daughters of other phanariotic families, as for instance Smaragda Mavroyeni’s daughter – prince’s grand daughter- who was married to Konstantinos

---

<sup>31</sup> The word used for traitors is ‘*χαϊνδες*’, *hain*, 21 August 1790, General Archives of Athens, P. Zerlenti Collection, d.153, cited in Vasilis Sfyroeras, *ibid*, p. 339.

<sup>32</sup>I. Konstantinidis, *ibid*, pp. 14-15.

Kallimachi, son of Alexander Kallimachi, ex prince of Moldavia<sup>33</sup>. Others, as Jean Mavroyeni who served as *chargé d'affaires* in the Ottoman embassy in Vienna from 1811 to 1821 and then again in 1832<sup>34</sup>, continued to serve the Ottoman state from different post in the framework of the reformed 19<sup>th</sup> century ottoman administration. Alexander Mavroyeni meant to be the last member of the family that continued its tradition to the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the face of this last representative we will explore the continuities and the discontinuities of the changing Ottoman Empire and the Greek Orthodox millet.

---

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*, p. 23.

<sup>34</sup> R. Davison, 'Vienna as a major diplomatic post in the 19<sup>th</sup> century', in *19<sup>th</sup> Century Ottoman Diplomacy and Reforms*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 1999, p. 266.

## 2. Phanariots and the making of the Rum Milleti

The place the Phanariots had acquired both in their respective confessional community and in the Ottoman state not only set them off as powerful and influential elements of the Empire's social and political life; It also gave them an instrumental role in the making of the Rum millet. The transition from the *ta'ife* to the *Rum Milleti*, from a fragmented group of orthodox under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate to a 'homogeneous' community embracing all the orthodox subjects of the Empire under the unifying presence of the Patriarchate in Istanbul, was to a great extent the offspring of the Phanariots office as princes in Walachia and Moldavia<sup>35</sup>.

Even though many among the Phanariot princes were not Greek of origin<sup>36</sup>, from their high posts as governors of the Danuvian principalities that were inhabited mainly by orthodox Christian population, they propagated Greek civilization and culture by opening schools and academies for the Greek letters, by sponsoring the printing of books and financing poor students to continue their studying<sup>37</sup>. The

---

<sup>35</sup> P. Konortas' detailed and enlightening research, based on both Ottoman and Greek archival material, on the history of the Patriarchate in Istanbul has offered us a very interesting and historiographically pathbreaking approach on the background of the term 'Rum Milleti'. According to the writer, the application of the term in the prior to 18<sup>th</sup> century era constitutes a mere anachronism and do not correspond with the realities of the previous centuries. Until the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> –when the ecumenical patriarchate succeeded in incorporating the autocephalous archdioceses of Ochris and Ipek and in controlling the other patriarchates of Alexandria, Antiochia and Jerusalem, as well as the autocephalous archdioceses of Cyprus and Sinai- there were various terms to define the Orthodox subjects: *Nasrâni*, *kefere*. What this actually means is that until that time we can speak of different groups, of different *tevâ'if* of orthodox Christians. P. Konortas, 'From *ta'ife* to Millet: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community', in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed. by D. Gondicas and Charles Issawi, Princeton New Jersey, 1999, pp. 169-179. See also B. Braude 'Foundation myths of the millet system', in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, pp. 69-89.

<sup>36</sup> For instance, Kallimachi and Rakovirza were Hellenized Romanians, Karatza were probably Turkish speaking orthodox (*karamanli*), Aristarchi was Armenian speaking orthodox –of haihoroum origin-. Ch. G. Patrinelis, 'Οι Φαναριώτες πριν το 1821', *ibid*, p. 22. 'Notes et Souvenirs d'Alexander Mavroyéni', in *Συμβολαί εις την ιστορία της Εγγύς Ανατολής...*, *ibid*, v.2, p.10.

<sup>37</sup> For instance, Alexandros Mavrokordatos offered in 1709 the interest of an amount of money to poor students in Iasi and Bessarabia; In the principalities also there existed printing offices with a remarkable activity, Manouil Gedeon, *ibid*., p. 62-63.

Phanariots transmitted the experience and the knowledge they had acquired in Europe during their studies and became channels through which the enlightenment's spirit and principles was introduced; In fact, the principalities became the most important center of Enlightenment in South East Europe and princes, such as Nikolaos Mavrokordatos, engaged in writing valuable essays and studies on political theory<sup>38</sup>. The importance and centrality of Greek thought and language during the Enlightenment, as well as the role that the Greeks merchants and the Greek language had in the trade channels in the Balkans may explain the preference these people showed in using Greek almost as their official language and in promoting Greek culture. At that time, Greekness had a class rather than national connotation, acquaintance with Greek culture being a *sine qua non* for someone's economic and social ascendance.

The fidelity of the Phanariots to the Ottoman state -regardless of the fact that many of these princes terminated their carrier in a rather inglorious way, losing their life after decapitation- and the status that they acquired both as servants of the sultan and as prominent members of their community, offered them a leading place among all the orthodox population of the Empire. Along with the enhancement of the Patriarchate's power, they became the leaders of the orthodox community. The Orthodox religion and the Greek culture became the common denominators in the process of creating a 'homogeneous' orthodox community, the Millet-i Rum, which was nevertheless composed by orthodox who were non Greek speaking -Karamanli, Slavs, Albanians, etc-. The 'class' preponderance of the Greek Orthodox -meaning of

---

<sup>38</sup> P. Kitromilidis, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός [Neohellenic Enlightenment]*, MIET, Athens 2000, p. 32-42.

those people who were acquainted with the Greek language and culture- was being used as a proof of the ‘others’, the non-Greek orthodox’s inferiority<sup>39</sup>.

The chronology-milestone in the history of Phanariots is 1821, when the Greek revolt broke out and reprisals were taken by the Ottoman authorities against the leading figures of the orthodox community. The patriarch Gregory V was executed and the hospodar of Moldavia Mikhail Soutzi was denounced as an ‘*ingrate monster*’<sup>40</sup>. In one of his notes for the year 1907, Alexander Mavroyeni Bey refers to the loss of confidence and favoritism of the Ottoman state towards the Phanariots, once the Greeks revolted against the sultan, pinpoints to what extent the old and established Phanariot families had come to be regarded as Greeks, and at the same time reproduces the distinction between Greeks and non Greeks orthodox Christians: ‘*Nicolas Aristarchis’ father ... [was] a saraf, or banker of the time ... [he] was as well of ‘haihorom’ origins .... Little before the great Greek revolution of 1821, the Imperial Divan suspicious of what the Greeks of Phanar were contriving against the State, beheaded in 1820 Constantin Mourousis, a man with a great talent and Great Dragoman of the Imperial Divan, suspect of supporting the movement. He was going to be replaced by another Greek.... But the Porte had concluded not to entrust any more this high post to a man from the core of the Phanar noblesse .... Informed of the existence of the saraf’s son, the Porte named Stavraki Aristarchi Great Dragoman of the Imperial Divan. Once, some months later, the Greek revolution broke out, Stavraki Aristarchi was exiled in Brousse*’<sup>41</sup>.

---

<sup>39</sup> Elli Skopetea, *To ‘Πρότυπο Βασίλειο’ και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα [The ‘Model Kingdom’ and the Great Idea]*, Athens 1988, p. 315.

<sup>40</sup> R. Clogg, ‘The Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire’, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, pp.192-193.

<sup>41</sup> ‘Notes et Souvenirs...’, in *ibid*, p.10.

Along with the loss of confidence, the Phanariots lost their exclusivity as princes of Walachia and Moldavia and their priority in the high offices of the Ottoman state – mainly that of the translator in the navy and the Great Dragoman in the Palace. Also, the diplomatic services introduced by Selim III and held by and large by Greek Orthodox had been also abolished for the next few years<sup>42</sup>.

Mavroyeni Bey's note quoted in the previous paragraph shows a certain preference, in the years around the Greek revolution, of men with more humble and thus often not Greek origins among the orthodox of the empire. Even if the Porte was still in need of educated people from the orthodox community, since '*during that period only the Greeks knew foreign languages*'<sup>43</sup>, the old Greek Phanariot families were not any longer in a favored place. It is not by chance that the reconstruction of the Greek Orthodox elite of Istanbul in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was based on a previous officer in the court of a Phanariot, with Bulgarian origin –Vogoridis-, the son of the Armenian –haihorom- Stavraki Aristarchi that we just met, and an islander, from the destroyed island of Chios –Psixaris-<sup>44</sup>.

These changes in the Christian orthodox community of Istanbul were taking place during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the internal and external alterations in the Ottoman Empire were so many that only if we try to shed some light in the most important of them and approach them as versions of the same entity, will we be able to understand interrelations inside the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and thus place Alexander Mavroyeni Bey in the sociopolitical framework of

---

<sup>42</sup> C. Findley, *Bureaucratic reform in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, 1980, p.132.

<sup>43</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> D. Stamatopoulos, *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση [Reform and Secularization]*, Αλεξάνδρεια, 2003, p. 356-357.

his era and examine his story both as an individual and as a public Greek Ottoman Neophanariot persona .

### 3. Reforms in the 19<sup>th</sup> century

The Greek revolt in 1821 may have had a detrimental effect on the Greek Orthodox of Istanbul, and especially on the Greek elite and their monopolization in governing the two principalities in the north edges of the empire, but it did not mean their end. We know that Nikolaos Mavroyeni's grandson, Alexander Kallimachi, had in 1829 accompanied Reşit Paşa in his embassy to Paris as advisor and had been nominated ambassador in London and Paris as well as prince of Samos; and we already saw that his other grandson Jean Mavroyeni had been appointed *chargé d'affaires* in the Ottoman embassy in Vienna from 1811 to 1821 and then again in 1832. But in the second half of 19<sup>th</sup> century, the new Phanariotic elite established on the remnants of the pre 19<sup>th</sup> century group, henceforth referred to as *Neophanariots*<sup>45</sup>, will be accepted in the Ottoman bureaucracy under a different legal status, or to be more accurate they will acquire legal status.

The *Gülhane Edict* in 1839 and the *Hatt-ı Hümâyûn* of 1856 were the two most important reform attempts undertaken by the Ottoman state in its effort to modernize the administration, both provincial and central. At the same time the two edicts were expressing the need for a social reorganization on the basis of equality for all the people of the empire regardless of religion, the need to transcend the old basic discrimination in *djimmis* and Muslims and create a common Ottoman identity; The efforts were culminated with the constitution of 1876. Facing the danger of separatist national movements and pressures from the European economic powers<sup>46</sup>, as well as the

---

<sup>45</sup> The term is used by many scholars, who deal with issues of the Greek orthodox millet in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Especially D. Stamatopoulos applies the term widely in his research on the relationship of the upper strata of the Istanbul Greek community and the Patriarchate, D. Stamatopoulos, *ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> Many scholars have associated the *Gülhane Edict* of 1839 with the economic agreement of 1838 between the Ottoman Empire and England and the *Hatt-ı Hümâyûn* with the necessities and the

internal needs for changes, the reforms bent on reorganizing the different religious communities, the various millets of the Empire, and on introducing the principle of representation of the non-Muslims in the state's administration. With these efforts, they hoped to promote the notion of a common identity between Muslims and non Muslims, the cultivation of the common identity of *Osmanlılık*, which they hoped would unite people of the Empire on a non religious level. For the needs of our research we will shortly examine the extent to which the non Muslims, and especially the Greek Orthodox, were represented in the Ottoman state and the posts they were mainly appointed to.

What actually changed for the non Muslims and in particular for the elite of the Greek Orthodox millet, the Neophanariots, is that they no more served the Ottoman state as individuals, used in special posts because of lack of appropriate Muslim statesmen, without being integrated into the *Osmanlı* class<sup>47</sup>. Their exclusivity became a right claimed potentially by all the non Muslims of the Empire and their legal status changed: they now were –at least theoretically and rhetorically- officially equal in rank with the other Ottoman-Muslim statesmen<sup>48</sup>. Of course the latter's status was also changing according to the new 'modern' bureaucratic order espoused.

---

conditions created during the Crimean War (1854-56) and the Paris Treaty of 1856. See indicative, R. H. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876*, Princeton-New Jersey, 1963, B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, London, 1961.

<sup>47</sup> C. Findley stresses the fact that in the pre 19th century era those Greeks 'appear to have developed career patterns exclusive to themselves and to have been, not fully integrated into the ruling class, but rather enclave into it without loss of status as *djimmis*'. Especially, 'once the child levy and the palace school system had become fully developed, the role of non Muslims who had not gone through recruitment processes...was quite limited. ...They were on the fringes of the ruling class in a variety of roles, including those of interpreter and physician', C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform*...ibid, p. 23.

<sup>48</sup> Need is to say that this is mostly the theoretical part of the story. In reality, and as we will mention later, there existed limits in the prevailing patterns of service and promotion for the non Muslims, such as for instance, discriminations in the salary entitlements and other forms of reward, ibid, p. 207.

The *Gülhane edict* was by and large Reşid Paşa's creation -the *gavur paşa* as he was called because of his belief in the equal treatment of all ottoman people<sup>49</sup>. With the edict a new notion, the notion of a quasi citizenship was being introduced in the public arena and vocabulary, and was intended to replace the criterion of religion. But even if the edict claimed that '*the Muslim and non Muslim subjects of our lofty Sultanate shall, without exception enjoy our imperial concession*', little progress was done to that end during the first years<sup>50</sup>, at least as far as it concerned the central administration.

A first concrete effort was undertaken with the ferman of 1840 which concerned the reorganization of the local administration and was calling for the creation of administrative councils in each major division and subdivision of the Empire. Except the governmental appointed officials, there were also non Muslim members participating in those councils, representing their respective *millet*, where it existed<sup>51</sup>. Regardless the fact that the non Muslims' representation in these councils consisted mostly, if not exclusively, from the local notables, the *kocabasis*, accompanied by the representatives of the local ecclesiastical hierarchy, and despite that all of them were

---

<sup>49</sup> R. Davison, 'Turkish Attitudes Concerning Christian and Muslim Equality in the 19<sup>th</sup> century', in *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923, The Impact of the West*, Saqi Books, 1990, p. 123. Alexander Mavroyeni in his *Notes et Souvenirs* is mentioning the following anecdote as a proof of Reşit's belief in equality of all people, regardless religion. Abraham Paşa, senator in 1907, told Alexander that after his father was authorised by Abdul Mecid to bear a *toura* on his *fez* as a proof of the sultan's favour, Abraham Paşa, only 14 at the time asked the Grand Vizier Reşit Paşa to attribute him the same privilege. Reşit Paşa's answer is telling '*Enfant, je suis l' auteur du 'Houmayoun', du Tanzimat...Par ce Hatt toute dinstiction enter Musulmans et Chrétiens est abolie. Et tu veux que j' obtienne pour toi une faveur qui te distinguerait des autres Arméniens?*' We could possibly read in this passage a certain desire of the writer to underline this principle of equality. 'Notes et Souvenirs..', in *ibid*, p.12.

<sup>50</sup> C. Findley, 'The Acid test of Ottomanism', *ibid.*, p. 341. The scene of the customary invocation of God's blessing after the reading of the edict described by Davison eloquently shows how the notion of equality could not have been regarded as compatible with the prevailing notion of religion: the prayer was saying '*O God, have mercy on the people of Muhammad. O God, preserve the people of Muhhamad*'. R. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p.3.

<sup>51</sup> R. Davison, 'The Advent of the principle of representation in the Government of the ottoman Empire' in *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish history*, Saqi books, 1990, p. 100. İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğunun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Istanbul, 2003, pp. 59-89.

carriers of their own interests and points of view, which seldom coincided and expressed the grievances and the problems of the rest of the population, these councils were a progressive measure adopted by the government.

The reform decree of 1856 actually reaffirmed the promise of equality given some 20 years before, but tried to define more detailed what this equality entailed<sup>52</sup>. By proclaiming that *'all the subjects of [the] empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments, and qualified to fill them according to merit and conformably with rules to be generally applied'*<sup>53</sup> and by providing assurances to the non Muslims for their life and fortune, it was trying to enforce the identity of *Osmanli* and the notion of *Osmanlilik*<sup>54</sup>.

### ***Non Muslim Representatives in the State's administration***

In this framework of the Ottoman administration's opening to non Muslim Ottomans, we find Greeks Orthodox in the government of the autonomous island of Samos<sup>55</sup>, Greek Orthodox students in the college of Galatasaray and even Greek

---

<sup>52</sup> In the negotiations-discussions between the Ottoman Empire and the European powers, the former was represented by Âli and Fuat Paşa, Grand Vizier and Minister of foreign affairs respectively, and a Greek Orthodox of Istanbul, Prince Kallimachi, who was keeping records of the discussions. R. Davison, *ibid*, p. 53. Even if Kallimachis' role and inclusion in the debates could have been of more technical nature, the mere fact that a Greek Orthodox was participating in the discussions that resulted to Hatt-ı Hümayun might be seen as an example of the egalitarian premise.

<sup>53</sup> C. Findley, *ibid*, p. 341.

<sup>54</sup> Muslims and non Muslims would be henceforth equal in matters of military service – according to the Hatt the non Muslims as well would be conscribed, a measure that was actually never realized until the Young Turk era, meeting reaction from both Muslims and non Muslims-, of taxation, in the administration of the justice and in social respect. Deprecatory epithets on account of religion, language, race (e.g. *gâvur*, *kâfir*, etc) were banned. R. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p. 55.

<sup>55</sup> A. Alexandris, 'Οι Έλληνες στην Υπηρεσία της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας' ['Greeks in the service of the Ottoman Empire'], *Deltio Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etaireias Ellados*, Athens, 1980, v.23, p. 369. The almost exclusively greek- populated island of Samos was proclaimed autonomous hegemony in 1832, governed henceforth by a member of the Greek Orthodox Neophanariot elite of Istanbul. M. Georgiadou, 'Expert knowledge between tradition and reform. The Carathéodorys: a Neo-Phanariotic

Orthodox presidents of the school<sup>56</sup>. But the domain in which the non Muslims were mostly represented was that of the civil bureaucracy: in various ministries –with a significant high level of participation in different posts in the ministry of foreign affairs- councils, local administrative agencies and in the diplomatic services<sup>57</sup>. ‘Modern’, secular education and the knowledge of foreign languages was the key to enter the ottoman bureaucracy. From this aspect, the Greek orthodox and in particular the members of the Neophanariotic families, were in a privileged position; their long tradition in studying in European universities, their affiliation with the European political and law sciences –which they mostly studied-, and their mastering -compared to other millets- of foreign languages –both western and oriental-<sup>58</sup>, ensured them an important place among the other non Muslims in the Ottoman bureaucracy<sup>59</sup>. The need to modernize and legalize the Ottoman administration along the western model along with the promise of equality were the main reasons that especially from 1856 on non Muslims are integrated into the classes of Ottoman statesmen.

---

Family in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Constantinople’, in *Figures Anonymes, figures d’ elite: pour une anatomie de l’ Homo Ottomanicus*, ed. by Meropi Anastassiadou and Bernard Heyberger, Istanbul 1999, p. 254-255. We will refer to Samos in extend when we will be examining A. Mavroyeni Bey’s the life and carrier.

<sup>56</sup> Namely, Fotiadis in 1873, Savvas in 1874 and Karatzas in 1894, A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 370.

<sup>57</sup> Findley, ‘The Acid test of Ottomanism’, *ibid*, p. 341.

<sup>58</sup> C. Findley examined a significant number of personal files of the officers connected to the ministry of foreign affairs from 1856 to 1908 and came up with tables showing that whereas the ‘modernist’ group of muslim knew in average two to three foreign languages, the majority of their non Muslim colleagues could prove their aptness to five or six foreign languages. Needless to say that all of them had almost perfect knowledge of French, the language of diplomacy at the time. *Ibid*, p. 350.

<sup>59</sup> For instance, the Jews were less apt to foreign languages and in a way the ‘youngest group to enter’ the civil bureaucracy. Never the less, from 1856 the Armenians presence in the civil bureaucracy was straightened to such a degree that it almost outstripped the Greeks to form the most numerous contingent. *Ibid*, p. 347-349. C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid.*, p. 206.

Representatives of the non Muslims were added to the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Meclis-i vâlâ-i ahkâm-i adliye*) after 1856<sup>60</sup>. The *vilayet* law of 1864 enforced the presence of non Muslims in the local councils, assemblies and courts and was used according to some researchers as an example for the elections for the Parliament of 1876. In 1868 the Council of Judicial Ordinances was split into two<sup>61</sup>: the Judicial Council, with five non Muslims, among whom one was Greek orthodox, and the Council of State (*Şura-yi Devlet*) with one third of its members coming from the non Muslim millets. In this court of higher appeal the council of state had become, the Greek orthodox millet was represented by three Greeks Orthodox<sup>62</sup>; Non Muslims were also participating in the provincial delegations that met annually with the Council<sup>63</sup>. During the same year, an Armenian, Krikor Agathon became a full minister, the first non Muslim to be appointed in such a high office<sup>64</sup>.

The acceptance of non Muslims in the ottoman administration was achieved in greater proportion in the ministry of foreign affairs and the various diplomatic services. From 366 individuals in different posts of the ministry –especially in the Foreign Correspondence Office- in the period from 1856 to 1908, the 107 were non Muslims, a number which corresponds to 29%, among whom thirty were Greek

---

<sup>60</sup> The council had been established by Mahmout II. At the beginning there were no representatives of the non Muslim millets. R. Davison, *ibid*, p. 30 and 'The Advent of the principle of representation in the Government of the ottoman Empire', *ibid*, p. 102. The Greek orthodox millet was represented in the council by the prominent Greek Ottoman Stephanos Vogoridis. D. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 67-74.

<sup>61</sup> R. Davison is mentioning that by that split what was really achieved was a separation of powers , *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, pp.239-244.

<sup>62</sup> There were also two Jews, one Armenian Gregorian and one Bulgarian participating in the Council, R. Davison, *ibid*, p.103-105. The three Greeks were K. Karatheodoris, K. Mousouros and S. Aristarchis, A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 369.

<sup>63</sup> C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p.175.

<sup>64</sup> R. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p. 97.

orthodox<sup>65</sup>. The great majority of the prominent figures of the Neophanariot elite of Istanbul were engaged to the ministry of foreign affairs in one or another way: Ioannis Aristarchis had a brilliant career as ambassador in Vienna; Kostaki Musuros occupied the head of the important embassy in London for thirty-five years (1850-1895) and was highly appreciated by the sultan<sup>66</sup>; Alexandros Karatheodori had served as ambassador in Rome and had gained international reputation and a distinct place in the ottoman administration when he represented the Ottoman Empire as first plenipotentiary in the Congress of Berlin in 1878<sup>67</sup>. Just after the Congress, he was promoted to the head of the ministry of foreign affairs, the first time a Greek ottoman was occupying such an important office.

Still, the non Muslims representation was far from being satisfactory to them. To the contrary, Carter Findley claims that their place was rather undermined in the sense that there was a 'lack of proportion between compensation and level of qualifications', in that they were in general appointed in inferior offices and in that they were more vulnerable to 'various forms of punitive'<sup>68</sup>.

<sup>65</sup> There were also 52 Armenians and 12 Jews, C. Findley, 'The Acid test of Ottomanism', *ibid*, pp. 346-347.

<sup>66</sup> Musuros Paşa's daughters were married to the sons of Photiadis Paşa, ambassador in Rome and of Dr. Fenerlis'. Alexander Mavroyeni Bey inform us that '*Le Sultan Médjid assista aux noces du premier*', something that '*prouve l'énorme influence de Vogoridés à cette époque*', 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 7.

During his visit in London in 1867, Abdül Mecid promoted Musuros Paşa to the degree of Vizier. In addition Musuros Paşa was the first Greek Ottoman who became full ambassador –*büyükelçi*-. A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 374 and S. Kunalp, 'Bir Osmanlı Diplomat: Kostaki Musurus Paşa, 1807-1891', in *Beletten* 34, (1970), pp. 421-435.

<sup>67</sup> Of Bulgarian and humble origin – A. Mavroyeni Bey informs us that his grandfather was '*simple épicier (Ahtar) d'Andrinople*' - Alexander Karatheodori was the son of Stephan Karatheodori, imperial doctor of Mahmout II and Abdul Mecit. He was born in Istanbul (1833-1906) and studied law in Paris. When he returned to Istanbul he was first appointed as translator in the Council of State and then officer in the Ministry of foreign affairs. He became minister of foreign and public affairs, Prince of Samos and twice governor of Crete. He was supporter of the liberal ideology. A. Alexandris, *ibid* p. 371, Katerina Gardika, *Αλέξανδρος Καραθεοδωρής, Η ζωή και η σταδιοδρομία του*, in *Ρωμιοί στην υπηρεσία της Υψηλής Πύλης*, Athens, 2002, pp. 135-143.

<sup>68</sup> For instance, in the diplomatic service, Greek Ottomans were in principle appointed in inferior to the four most important Ottoman embassies (meaning Berlin, London, Paris, Vienna), or they were

The culmination of the reform movement and the effort to accept the non Muslims in the Ottoman administration came with the Midhatian constitution of 1876, which gave the people of the Empire the possibility to elect –even in an indirect way, violated in many occasions - their own representatives. The constitution was composed by a constitutional committee in which two Greeks orthodox–Al. Karatheodoris and I. Savvas- were participating<sup>69</sup>. Fifty non Muslims were representing their millets, both in the first and the second period of the Parliament (20 march -20 June 1877 and 13 December 1877-16 February 1878 respectively) and seven Greeks orthodox were appointed in the ottoman Senate<sup>70</sup>.

However, the constitution of 1876 would last only 2 years; Midhat Paşa was *‘seeing in the parliamentary regime a remedy for all evils, without suspecting that politics rebels against panaceas even more than medicine’*<sup>71</sup>. Abdul Hamid, who ascended to the throne in 1876, suspended after 2 years the application of the constitution and closed down the parliament, with pretext the venturous ness that the RussoOttoman war had created. In fact, the overall framework of the period –the economic difficulties the state was facing, the loss of regions with a considerable Muslim population, which on the one hand created a migratory movement towards the

---

appointed to inferior ranks inside these embassies. The case of Mavroyeni Bey was, as we will see, one of these cases; He was always appointed in second rank embassies. Also, very few Greek Ottomans managed to be appointed in the higher diplomatic rank, which was the office of ambassador. The hierarchy in the higher diplomatic ranks was as follows: ambassador, counsellor, secretary and attaché. In many of the historic references concerning the Greek Ottoman diplomats there is a confusion concerning the first two offices, that is why it is difficult to understand whether someone was an ambassador, or a counsellor. C. Findley, *‘The Acid Test of Ottomanism...’*, *ibid*, p. 355-364, R. Davison, *‘Vienna as a major diplomatic post in the 19<sup>th</sup> century’*, *ibid*, p. 270.

<sup>69</sup> A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 376.

<sup>70</sup> These were Marko Pasa, private doctor of Abdul Aziz and *hekimbaşı* of the palace, Stavrakis Aristarchis Pasa, Logothet in the Patriarchate, Kostaki Mousouros, K. Anthopoulos, ambassador in London, and Sp. Mavroyenis Paşa, private doctor of Abdul Hamid, See A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 378. Dereveux, *The First ottoman Constitutional Period*, Baltimore 1963, pp. 261-268.

<sup>71</sup> Charles Misner, *Souvenirs du monde musulman*, Paris, 1892, p. 20 cited in R. Davison, *‘The Advent of the principle of representation in the Government of the Ottoman Empire’*, *ibid*, p.105.

empire and on the other, toned up its Muslim element, in combination to an ascending sentiment of discontent with the west- called for the Hamidian regime established. The reforms and the process of modernization were not interrupted, but there was an attempt to project traditional values and the Islamic past as the right way for the improvement of the state. Pan-Islamism and anti-westernism became the dominant trends of thought<sup>72</sup>.

Nevertheless, Abdul Hamid's policy and attitude towards the non Muslim population did not change dramatically. Abdul Hamid continued to have as his personal doctor Alexander's father, Spiridon Mavroyeni and as his personal banker Xristaki Zografo<sup>73</sup>. And it was under his reign that Alexander Karatheodory had been nominated first plenipotentiary of the ottoman delegation in the Berlin congress, a post that as we saw paved his way to the head of a ministry of crucial importance such as the ministry of foreign affairs was<sup>74</sup>.

Abdulhamid's case –appointing non Muslims in his immediate service- could actually serve as an example of a long tradition of non Muslims serving in the immediate entourage of the sultan. Except the great posts that -as we mentioned in the beginning- the Phanariots were holding, from the early years of the Empire since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century we find Greeks Orthodox, Jews and Armenians serving in the palace as physicians—in many cases as personal doctors of the sultan and other high officers of the palace- as private teachers, *sarafs*, etc<sup>75</sup>. These examples of appointment, that

---

<sup>72</sup> See Niyazi Berkes, *The development of secularism in Turkey*, London, 1998, pp. 256-263, Selim Deringil, *The well protected domain. Ideology and Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*, (Greek translation), Papazisi editions, Athens, 2003.

<sup>73</sup> A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 383.

<sup>74</sup> There was another Greek ottoman that was nominated minister of foreign affairs, Ioannis Savvas Pasa, (1879-1880), A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 372.

<sup>75</sup> Constantin Karatheodory was Abdul Mecid's private doctor, Markos Pitsipios Paşa was the private doctor of Abdul Aziz, Dr. Stavridis the private doctor of the grand Vizier Kamil Pasa, Nikolas

do not follow any rational pattern of nomination but are based on personal favor and preference reminds us of pre 19<sup>th</sup> century patterns; They could serve as an example to examine shortly the continuities between the previous system of appointment and the new, rational one that was inaugurated and introduced with the reforms.

The passage from a patrimonial to a modern system of governing could not have been a simple and straightforward process for the Empire. The Tanzimat statesmen in their movement towards rational-legalism tried to reform the ruling class and opened the way to political power for the non Muslims<sup>76</sup>; Following the principle of equalitarianism, they fought against nepotism and patrimonial officialdom and they tried to establish a pattern of meritocracy. Henceforth, the political power would have been distributed and all the people of the Empire would be accepted in the state's bureaucracy on the basis of their achievement, personal value and education, not on the basis of their social status and personal connections<sup>77</sup>. Religion would no more stand as an obstacle to social mobility and the old '*will of fortune*' or '*Alladin's lamp mobility*'<sup>78</sup> pattern would be replaced by criteria such as education, capability,

---

Aristarchis was the private teacher of the future sultans Abdul Mecid and Abdul Aziz, etc, in 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *Contributions...*, pp. 9-14. This fact permits us to contradict Findley's view that 'non Muslims do not appear to have assumed places in the immediate entourage of the Sultan', C. Findley, 'The Acid test of Ottomanism', *ibid*, p. 343.

<sup>76</sup> The pre-19th century system in the Ottoman Empire was dividing the people in to two main groups: those who served the sultan, the ruling class, the *Osmani* or *askeri* and the others who did not. Social and economic status could not ensure political power. The differentiation that Findley is making between ruling class and elite is thus valuable. Indeed, the reforms -at least as far as it concerned the Millet-i Rum- offered to the members of the Greek Orthodox elite the 'legal' opportunity to acquire political power by joining the ottoman administration and legitimized their status. C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p. 15.

<sup>77</sup> R. Davison, 'The Advent of the principle of representation in the Government of the Ottoman Empire', *ibid*, p. 97. Also Metin Hepper pinpoints the role that education had acquired undermining thus the role that birth had as a guarantee of official position. M. Heper, *Bureaucracy in the Ottoman-Turkish State, An analysis of the Emergence and Development of a bureaucratic Ruling Tradition*, dissertation submitted in the Graduate School of Syracuse University, 1970, pp. 115-117.

<sup>78</sup> Two metaphors used by C. Findley to describe the pre-19<sup>th</sup> century situation in the ottoman administration where the patterns of promotion were reminiscenced of other models of achieving power. *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p. 24.

experience. The reforms aimed to the elimination of patterns of promotion based on networks of power and ‘protégés’, and criticized practices of the past that formed a mentality not compatible with the model the reformers had in their mind. It is in this framework that for instance, Alexander Mavroyenis—a typical Greek ottoman advocate of the modernizing reforms and a model-Ottoman statesman at least as far as it concerns his education and acquaintance with the western civilization—as we will see when examining thoroughly his career—is time and again criticizing various Ottoman statesmen that we meet throughout his *Notes et Souvenirs* for being bribed or for serving various ‘grand’ persons of the state in order to acquire their favor.

But the attempt to associate reforms with autocratic centralization was in itself a controversial one and it was meant to generate tension<sup>79</sup>. The reform movement, undertaken by and large by some modernist and western oriented Muslims coming from the ranks of bureaucracy, challenged at the same time the sultanic authority. It was to a great extent predictable that in such a transitory phase, this challenge would have provoked the sultan’s reaction. Indeed, we often find attempts from the central authority to continue applying patterns of the past; Even the leading statesmen were adopting practices of the previous system and applying them to the new state they were envisaging to create. Even though they were very critical towards the creation of patron-client networks and factions, they often acted contrary to their beliefs. They were adopting the practices of favoritism and venality that they were condemning; We must not forget, for instance, the distinct camps centered on Mehmed Ali Paşa or Mahmud Nedim. The same Mavroyeni Bey—a supporter and an offspring of the reforms—, who was criticizing the old mentality, does not hesitate—as we will examine—

---

<sup>79</sup> C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p.149.

to enumerate all the people that have used their power and influence to appoint him in the various posts where he served<sup>80</sup>.

As C. Findley has eloquently expressed it '*the discontinuity between principle and practice meant that the old and new patterns coexisted during this period, with the Tanzimat statesmen behaving like an enlarged version of a patrimonial household faction, or a set of factions, even as their reforms created a lengthening list of issues for controversy of the new kind*'<sup>81</sup>. These attitudes were creating patterns of neopatrimonialism; In a society where the modernization process was not embraced by all the people<sup>82</sup>, but was on the contrary met with skepticism -if not reaction- by the traditional Muslims, the rupture with the past could not have been an easy achievement and the adoption of past practices seemed 'fatal'.

The fact that the reformers and the mentality they espoused did not have an important popular impact facilitated Abdul Hamid's intentions; Once he came to power and found the appropriate moment, he denounced his faith to the constitution and in 1878 he suspended the parliament<sup>83</sup>. The suppression of the constitution was marking the end of an era and the beginning of a new one, a period that Niyazi Berkes has called 'constitutional absolutism'<sup>84</sup>. Yet, the reform project was not shelved and

---

<sup>80</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *Contributions*, *ibid*, p. 81.

<sup>81</sup> C. Findley, *ibid*, p. 166.

<sup>82</sup> This phenomenon resembles what S. N. Eisenstand has called 'split-up modernization', meaning basically that 'certain elements of the society push for modernization while others oppose it'. The advocates of change who are in positions of power promote changes in spheres which they think they can control and try to inhibit the generalization of the modernization process to all social spheres. However, 'as new ideas begin to spread through the society, this degree of control proves impossible to maintain', *Ibid*, p. 149.

<sup>83</sup> Still, in the beginning of his reign, Abdul Hamid was manifesting his faith to the reforms and to the constitution and presented himself as an ardent supporter of the Tanzimat statesmen, ready to adopt further reforming measures – a promise that as far as it concerns mostly education and technological improvements he kept- . *ibid*, p. 227.

<sup>84</sup> Niyazi Berkes, *The development of secularism in Turkey*, *ibid*, p. 253.

the efforts to construct a rational legal system and improve the civil bureaucracy were carried on. He inaugurated an era of a so called 'hamidian neopatrimonialism', but he did not gave up the project of the Empire's modernization<sup>85</sup>.

Nevertheless, the power centre had changed: it was no longer the Sublime Porte but the Palace instead, and that affected as it was logical the structure of the bureaucracy. Abdul Hamid's peculiar character, his suspiciousness of everything and everybody, his fears about his life and power made him want to impose a control system on the social and political mobilization that was already established during the Tanzimat period<sup>86</sup>. He was trying to bring the bureaucracy under his close control and he placed himself superior to the law. To achieve all these he adopted a system of patronage, of distribution of honours and donations not necessarily according to ones personal merit, but according to ones faith to his person<sup>87</sup>. It is characteristic that during his reign the number of the people who served in various domains of the bureaucracy increased dramatically<sup>88</sup>.

Under a system like that the status of those engaged in the state bureaucracy was depending on their good or bad relationship with the networks favoured by the sultan. The slightest 'wrong movement' could be translated as a threat to the status and could

---

<sup>85</sup> The case of Abdul Hamid serves as an example of how a patrimonial system could survive to the modern era and assume new forms. During his reign, technological improvements were introduced in the Empire –railways, telegraphs-, that they were on the one hand facilitating the organization of the control and spy networks, and on the other contributing to the progress of the country and exposing the Ottoman society increasingly to European influence. During the same period, special care was given to the educational system with the foundation of new schools in which many of the members of the future Young Turks studied, C. Findley, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, ibid, pp. 233-234, S. Deringil, ibid.

<sup>86</sup> During the hamidian period a complicated and sophisticated network of espionage and a parallel system of harsh censorship was established in order to protect the sultan. S. Deringil, ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Selim Deringil has explored the patterns and symbols of power in the Hamidian era and has eloquently characterized 19<sup>th</sup> century as the century of decoration, ibid, pp. 95- 140. The same practices were also adopted for the non Muslims groups towards which Abdul Hamid followed discrimination policies on the basis of estimates of their fidelity to the state. C. Findley, 'The Acid test of Ottomanism...', ibid, p. 356.

<sup>88</sup> N. Berkes, *The development of secularism in Turkey*, ibid, p. 253-322.

cost ones carrier. The pattern according to which one's political power was measured by how close he was to the sultan was once again valuable; one's relationship to the throne acquired once again critical importance<sup>89</sup>.

### *Spiridon Mavroyeni Paşa*

Both Spiridon and Alexander Mavroyeni seem to fit in the scheme presented above about the reformed bureaucracy, especially during the Hamidian period; Both of them –especially Spiridon, a representative of the Tanzimat non Muslim scientists who offered his services to the Ottoman state- had an intimate relationship with Abdul Hamid himself. Alexander started his carrier in the service of the sultan and obtained most of his nominations during his reign. In order to better understand them as individuals and as representatives in the Ottoman government of a certain social group of a non Muslim millet we should first of all take a short look at their lives and carriers. Successively, we will try to understand what exactly they were representing as members of the millet-i Rum of Istanbul and which were those developments inside their community that shaped on the one hand their ideology and identity and legitimized, on the other, their status both in the community and in the state.

Spiridon, son of Spiridon Mavroyeni<sup>90</sup> –secretary of the dragoman of the navy, Panagioti Muruzi-, and Smaragda Karatza – daughter of a prominent Phanariot family-, was born in Therapia the 3rd September 1817. After acquiring the basic education in the school of Yenikoy's parish and in the commercial school in the island of Chalki, his uncle Jean Mavroyeni, the Ottoman *chargé d' affaires* in Vienna and a

---

<sup>89</sup>C. Findley, *ibid*, p. 231.

<sup>90</sup> He died five days before his son was born. In memoriam they gave his name –Spiridon- to the new born child. Th. Blancard, *Les Mavroyeni*, *ibid*, p. 397.

prominent figure in the diplomatic circles of the period <sup>91</sup>, took Spiridon with him in Vienna. There, Spiridon studied medicine and acquired his diploma in 1843<sup>92</sup>. During the next 2 years he worked as doctor and then returned to Istanbul, where with the help and the mediation of Rifat Paşa he was appointed doctor in the hospital of artillery in Tophane. One and a half year later, he went to East Rumelia for medical inspection of the region and just after his return, he became first doctor (*hekim başı*) and director of the hospital in Haydar Paşa. He married Maria Kalliadi -sister of Konstantinos Kalliadis, who occupied an important post in the Greek orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul- and some time after, he became professor in the Imperial School of Medicine<sup>93</sup>.

Spiridon Mavroyenis was a prominent member of both the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul and the Ottoman state. He was one of the founding members of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople, he had been elected twice vice president and on three occasions president of the Society, and he had been nominated

---

<sup>91</sup> As we have already noted, Jean Mavroyeni headed the Vienna missions as *chargé d' affaires* from 1811 until just after the Greek revolt. From 1823 till 1831 – with the exception of one year- the embassy in Vienna was vacant. In 1832 Jean Mavroyeni is being again appointed as *chargé d' affaires*, the only resident diplomat in Europe at the time. See R. Davison, 'Vienna as a major Ottoman diplomatic post in the 19<sup>th</sup> century', *ibid*, p.266. Among other information that we were able to collect about Jean Mavroyeni, Spiridon Mavroyenis in one of his published essays informs us that: '[Jean Mavroyeni était] ami intime du plus grand diplomate éminent de son temps de S.A. le prince Metternich', Sp. Mavroyeni, *Les Chiens errants de Constantinople*, Paris, Librairie Orientale et Américaine, p. 21. Also Ieronimos Konstantinidis is characterizing him 'close friend of Reşit Paşa', *Contribution to the History of the Near East*, *ibid*, p. 23.

<sup>92</sup> Spyridon Mavroyeni Paşa was a great admirer of the German science, something that also his son Alexander notes in his diary. But as far as it concerned politics, he was very critical towards the '*sympathies allemandes du Sultan Hamid*'. During the First World War, Alexander Mavroyeni Bey is reproducing the following telling dialogue that had taken place between his father and Abdul Hamid: '*Sa Majesté parlait des Allemands à mon père et faisait leur éloge. 'Oui, aurait dit mon père, les Allemands ont du bon. Ils sont même remarquables en plusieurs choses. Mais, prenez garde; ils accapareront tout*'. 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 70.

<sup>93</sup> The biographical information were extracted from Th. Blancard, *ibid*, p. 397-414 and from his biographer, doctor Keovoulos Kokkolatos who wrote his biography, that was delivered in the regular meeting of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople in 11 March 1902, on the occasion of Mavroyenis Paşa's death. K. Kokkolatos, *Βίος του Σπυρίδωνα Μαρκογιάννη Πασά [The life of Spiridon Mavroyenis Paşa]*, Athens, 1902, pp. 3-24.

honorary member, honour rarely attributed<sup>94</sup>. He had also been an active member of other prominent associations of the community, such as the *Filergos Etairia*<sup>95</sup>. But we could assume that his importance and prestige were mainly emanating from his place in the Ottoman state and his role as the private doctor of the sultan Abdul Hamid.

Spiridon's acceptance to the medicine service of the palace during the reign of Abdul Mecid came as a result of the networks of patronage and clientalism that as we saw survived during the whole period of the Tamzimat<sup>96</sup>. As Spiridon's son, Alexander Mavroyeni remembers, around the late 1850's, because of his father's friendship with the general Wildenbrooh, plenipotentiary minister of Prussia in the Empire, '*it resulted that one day the Count Wildenbruch mentionned to the Sultan Médjid the name of my father and by extoling him solicited His Majesty for placing my father among the medecins of the Imperial Court. The Sultan accepted.*'<sup>97</sup> Thus, Spiridon became one of the imperial doctors. One day that Spiridon was on duty, Prince Abdul Hamid felt ill; Spiridon took care of him and healed him gaining at the same time the prince's favour and trust<sup>98</sup>. For a person so spleenful and ill-fovic as

---

<sup>94</sup> For the importance of the Society in the internal affairs of the community and the role it played in the formation of the community's ideology we will refer in the next part. As for the foundation of the Society, according to one source, the idea was conceived during discussions held in the house of Spiridon Mavroyeni in Beyoglu. The other two founding members were Aristidis Palaiologos and Ieroklis Vasiadis. K. Kokkolatos, *ibid*, p. 8.

<sup>95</sup> The association was founded for the propagation of work and economic support to workers, regardless of religion. M. Kouroupou, 'Η φίλεργος Εταιρεία της Κωνσταντινούπολης, 1866-1876' [The Filergos Etairia of Constantinople, 1866-1876], in *ΔΚΜΣ [Bulletin of Centre for Asia Minor Studies]*, 5, 1984-1988. Th. Blanchard, *ibid*, p. 472. Spiridon Mavroyeni Paşa had also intervened as Abdul Hamid's confident private doctor for the creation of a charitable woman's association. See Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet*, İletişim Yayinevi, İstanbul, 2002, p. 263.

<sup>96</sup> Of course we might consider that professions such as doctors could have been more sensible to such patterns of appointment, because of the very nature of the profession itself.

<sup>97</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *Contributions...*, *ibid*, p. 70.

<sup>98</sup> Th. Blanchard is quoting the following characteristic statements of Compte de Kératry and D. Gregoriadis: '*C'est au Docteur Mavroyéni qu' Abdul Hamid doit d' avoir vecu et d' être monté sur le trône*', and '*C'est ainsi qu'il est de notorité publique, que c'est à Mavroyéne pacha que le sultan actuel, Abdul Hamid II doit d'être sur le trône*' *Compte de Kératry, Mourad V*, Paris, 1878, pp. 71-72,

Abdul Hamid was, Spiridon's capability in healing him was so important that the future sultan appointed him his personal doctor and, once he became sultan, first doctor (*hekim başı*) in the palace<sup>99</sup>. His great influence on the sultan is testified by many incidents and anecdotes<sup>100</sup>—concerning mainly Spyridon's mediation for many of his coreligionists, as well as for other muslim statesmen to obtain this or that post -, as well as statements made mainly by foreigners. For instance, a French newspaper of the time had written that ‘ *Dr. Mavroyéni is not only the doctor but also friend of the Sultan and for somebody to achieve both these high fonctions and this precious title, he must not be an ordinary man*’<sup>101</sup> and M.P. de Réglé was stating- maybe with a dose of exaggeration- that ‘ *Mavroyeni pasa has been not only a good doctor for his imperial client...[but] he was advising him, he became an industrious diplomat to please his master...There is not in Orient a political case...where you can not find Abdul Hamid's doctor's hand. This man knows the secret history of his reign....*’<sup>102</sup>

Spiridon Mavroyeni Paşa must have indeed played some role in the espionage network that Abdul Hamid had set up; A book published in France in 1891 under the title *La Police Secrète en Turquie* was said that it had been written by the sultan's doctor<sup>103</sup>:

---

208 and D. Georgiadis *Turquie actuelle*, Paris, 1892, respectively, both cited in Th. Blancard, *ibid*, p. 420.

<sup>99</sup> *ibid*, p. 416-417.

<sup>100</sup> For instance, Blancard is mentioning that the Sultan was sleeping with Spiridon Mavroyeni in the same bed. Such was the sultan's suspiciousness and fear about his life that he was putting his doctor in the outer side of the bed so that in a possible attack during the night he would not be killed. Th. Blancard, *ibid*, p. 451.

<sup>101</sup> *Journal d' Alsace*, cited in K. Kokkolatos, *ibid*, p. 8.

<sup>102</sup> M.P. Regla, *Au pays de l' espionnage. Les Sultans Mourad V et Abd-ul-Hamid II*, Librairie J. Strauss, Paris, 1902, p. 45.

<sup>103</sup> There is information that it was Abdul Hamid himself who ordered Mavroyeni Paşa to write and publish this book. Taner Timur, “Mavroyani Paşa anlatıyor: Osmanlı Gizli Polis Örgütü nasıl Kuruldu?”, and “Son dönem osmanlı hekimleri üzerine birkaç not” in *Tarih ve Toplum*, 6, 1984, pp. 414

The culmination of his career was when the sultan nominated him Senator in the first Ottoman Parliament and when in 1883 he attributed to him the title of Vizier<sup>104</sup>. A series of other nominations and honours both in the Empire and in Europe just reaffirm the status Mavroyeni Paşa had acquired<sup>105</sup>.

Nevertheless, according to Th. Blanchard, around 1892 Mavroyeni Paşa fell into disgrace; The relationship he had with his second wife -after Maria died- was apparently facing problems and resulted to divorce. As revenge, his wife stole Spiridon's eight volumes 'Memoirs Imperiaux' that he had written and managed to tattle to the palace and the sultan the rumor that in these writing Mavroyeni was calumniating the sultan. When the sultan asked Mavroyeni to bring him his 'Memoirs' in order to prove that in fact these rumors were nothing more than rumors, Spyridon could not find them. The incident caused a certain disgrace from the part of the sultan. Alexander Mavroyeni Bey is also noting that at some time his father lost this '*grande influence*'. But contrary to Th. Blanchard's version of the story, he is attributing this loss of power to his age<sup>106</sup>.

---

-419, and *Tarih ve Toplum*, 14, 1987, respectively. Orhan Koloğlu, *Avrupa Kiskacına Abdülhamit*, İletişim Yayınları 1998, pp. 302-303. Konstantinos Troboukis, *Η ελληνική Ιατρική στην Κωνσταντινούπολη 1856-1923 [Greek Medicine in Constantinople, 1856-1923]*, Athens, 2000, pp.100-103.

<sup>104</sup> Th. Blanchard, *ibid*, p. 470.

<sup>105</sup> The Vienna University attributed him in 1893 a diploma *honoris causa*, he was nominated honorary member of the Medicine Academy in New York, decorated with two medals of the Ottoman order of İmtihaz, with the great cross of the order of Medjdie and Osmanie, etc. Th. Blanchard, *ibid*, p. 470-472, *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια [Ecclesiastic Truth]*, 27 October 1882, p. 63. These decorations and titles can be seen under the light of Selim Deringil's examination of the dimensions of the power symbols in the Hamidian regime. Decorations are seen by the writer as demonstrations of imperial generosity. S. Deringil, *ibid*, pp. 124-136.

<sup>106</sup> Th. Blanchard, *ibid*, p. 440-444., 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *ibid*, p. 22.

*Alexander Mavroyeni Bey and his family through his 'Notes et Souvenirs'.*

His son, Alexander Mavroyeni was born in Arnavütköy in 1845. He started his studies in Constantinople and continued in Paris where he obtained his diploma in law<sup>107</sup>. In the short biographical reference he makes in his *Notes et Souvenirs*, he provides us with information about his life. Since we have the unique chance to hear the story from its protagonist, we are quoting Mavroyeni's narration *'At the age from 15 to 16 years old, I left Constantinople for Paris, where, at the expenses of the Ottoman government, I completed my studies until the Diploma in Law, the latter included. Since my return in Constantinople, on the basis of my grand-uncle, from the side of my mother, Jean Aristarchi's, ambassador of Turquie in Berlin, demand, I was aiming at the post of attaché in the above embassy. The Sublime Porte did not accept my grand-uncle's demand, so I left Constantinople for England where I entered the great house of the Ralli Brothers. There, I stayed almost 5 years. But I was not of the stuff of commerce so I returned to Istanbul and I became attaché in the Secretariat of the Sultan Abdul-Hamid. Two years later, I started my diplomatic carrier. I passed 8 years as secretary and then as counsellor, first in Belgrade and then in Madrid. From Madrid, I was nominated Minister in Washington, a post that I retained for 9 years. After this time, I was recalled in Constantinople and some time after I was named member of the Civil Section of the Council of State, where I stayed 4 years. From that*

---

<sup>107</sup> We do not have any information about the school where he attended his first courses in Istanbul. Th. Blanchard, *ibid*, p.525. But we know that he was born and brought up in the house of his mother's father, A. Kalliadis—a prominent figure in the community, Great Logothet in the Patriarchate—where he received from his early years a very good education, *Ορθοδοξία*, 30 September 1929, 45, p. 414. It would be useful to say here that in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and due to the changing patterns of non Muslim's acceptance to the Ottoman bureaucracy, we note a significant change in the Neophanariot's education. While in the previous centuries medicine was the science that most of the Phanariots were studying, in the 19<sup>th</sup> the majority is studying law and political sciences that could serve as a 'passport' to the ottoman bureaucratic posts. Katerina Gardika, *Αλέξανδρος Καραθεοδωρής, Η ζωή και η σταδιοδρομία του*, [Alexandros Karatheodoris, *His life and his carrier*], in Rum in the service of the Ottoman Empire, *ibid*, pp. 135-143.

post, I was named prince of Samos. Two and a half years later, I resigned and I returned to Constantinople and just after I was renamed Member of the Civil Section of the Council of State. 3 years after I was appointed permanent Senator. On December 1911, I was sent to Viena as ambassador, where I stayed for one year. For the time being [May 1917], I am senator, just like before going to Vienna<sup>108</sup>. Mavroyeni Bey had also been proposed from Russia for the post of Crete's governor in 1897, before the Greek-Ottoman war<sup>109</sup>.

It seems that he never got married and that he never had children<sup>110</sup>. He died on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 1929<sup>111</sup> in Istanbul and was buried in his family's grave in Therapia. Apparently, he never left Istanbul after the exchange of population and it is quite possible that it was his choice to stay in his hometown even after the regime change<sup>112</sup>; Somewhere among his notes, almost 20 years before the exchange, we find him saying that his '*ambition was to live there in tranquillity, respected by everybody and loved by a few*'<sup>113</sup>.

---

<sup>108</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *Contributions...*, ibid, p. 81. Alexander is writing this kind of curriculum vitae in 1917 on the occasion of '*quelqu'un me demandait aujourd'hui de résumer en très peu de mots mon existence jusqu'ici*'. As we will see later, during the years of the First World War Alexander is writing down his philosophic thoughts and ideas concerning human vanity and arrogance. In this context, we could suppose that by this biographical note he wanted to draw a summary of his life in an attempt to look back and survey the things he had done and maybe feel more comfortable with the idea of death, a daily reality during that time.

<sup>109</sup> Th. Blanchard, ibid, p. 526.

<sup>110</sup> Even though we do not have any information or proof that he never got married or had children, the silence of the sources concerning this matter permits us to make such a hypothesis. Even his *Notes et Souvenirs* is dedicated to Pierre Mavroyeni '*dernier descendant de la Famille de Mavroyeni*', who must have been his nephew.

<sup>111</sup> Notice on his death and funeral in *Ορθοδοξία*, 30 September 1929, 45, p. 414.

<sup>112</sup> It is being testified that during the period that the Mixed Committee on the Exchange of Population was providing certifications of non exchangeability, A. Mavroyenis went to *Mega Reuma* (Arnavutkoy) and asked to find the record of his birth, Metropolitan Of Ilioupoli Gennadios, *Η Ιστορία του Μεγάλου Ρεύματος* (*The History of Mega Reuma*), Stambul 1949, p. 180.

<sup>113</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *Contributions...*, ibid, p.25.

As his father, Alexander Mavroyeni was a prominent figure of his era, both for his religious community and the Ottoman state. Even more than his father or because of his father's position and influence, he served the Ottoman state from different posts under the reign of Abdul Hamid and continued to play an important role as senator and ambassador during the first period of the Young Turks government<sup>114</sup> (from 1908-1912, a period which we will examine in the second part).

From the narration of his life, we learn that he managed to start his carrier in the ottoman administration and in the diplomatic service, only when Abdul Hamid came to power -an indirect indication that his carrier was closely related to and even depended on the sultan himself. The efforts of his powerful uncle Jean Aristarchi, ambassador in Vienna, to appoint him in the embassy did not have any result; Mavroyeni Bey was obliged to search for another job, so he was sent, as we saw – again through a network of relatives and friends- to England, to a well know commercial house. But, apparently and as he admits, he was not for trade and commerce. Combining statements that we find interspersed in his notes, we could suppose that being admitted in the bureaucracy was very important for him. It was a question of prestige and a matter of social credit, as well as the weight of the phanariot tradition's continuation. When in 1907, for instance, Musuros Paşa died and a matter of vacancy of the post arose, the grand vizier Ferid Paşa proposed him to succeed Musuros Paşa, but he refused saying that *'[he] do not any more feel any desire to become Ambassador, something that [he] aspired to very much some time ago'*<sup>115</sup>.

---

<sup>115</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *Contributions...*, ibid, p. 24-25. His rejection of the post can also be seen under the light of his relation to power after he resigned from the post of Prince in Samos. His personal thoughts that he notes on December of 1907 unfolds his ideas about governing: *'Je sens surtout ce dégoût et cet écoeurement depuis que j' ai gouverné les homes comme Prince de Samos....Depuis la*

It was only when Abdul Hamid succeeded to the throne that Mavroyeni Bey's carrier in the ottoman administration begun; And it was mainly because of his father post as the sultan's private doctor and the great influence he exercised on the latter. Actually, the case of Mavroyeni Bey comes to confirm what we have already described as Hamidian neo-patrimonial patterns. The place Spiridon had in the palace, the networks of power and influence he had created, on the one hand, and the need of the Ottoman administration -in the context of reforms and especially during the reign of Hamid- to have some confident and faithful 'agents' among the non Muslims<sup>116</sup>, helped Mavroyeni son's acceptance to the ottoman administration. Alexander Mavroyeni himself is on many occasions offering examples that prove the existence of these networks and show how the rules of social mobility were -to a great extent- obeying the personal preferences and dislikes of the sultan and of his intimate and confident entourage. In the framework of a regime like that, we could suppose that the confidence the sultan had on the non Muslims would have been more 'fragile' than during the Tanzimat period, and that at any given time even the most confident statesmen could find themselves in disgrace.

Alexander Mavroyeni seems acquainted with this system of promotion to such a degree that he does not hesitate to enumerate the people who have helped him during his carrier, finding this help not only natural, but also legitimate and very frequent. In this logic, he provides us with a short list of these people with a certain sentiment of

---

*dite date, dans chaque home je vois l' animal et je me dis souvent que l' home n' est qu' un animal habillé', ibid, p. 25.*

<sup>116</sup> Even though, many among the members of the Millet-i Rum and especially the elite expressed their loyalty to the new regime, collaborating with it, just as Spiridon Mavroyeni did, and continued to support the ideology of collaboration with the Ottoman state, some others with a liberal ideological orientation, such as Kleanthi Skalieri, were organized in mystic societies pro Muradian and proconstitutional, against the sultan. Skalieri together with Aziz Bey had founded a society which had as its main aim the dethronement of Abdul Hamid and the restoration of Murad V. A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 385.

honour and in an attempt to accentuate his status. Among those who have helped him he enumerates: *'1st my father who sent me to Paris, 2nd Doctor Paspati, who recommended me to the Ralli brothers, 3d My father again who attached my to the secretariat of Abdul Hamid, 4th my father and Bahram who recommended me to the Sultan for the post of secretary in the Legation in Belgrade, 5th my father as always who recommended my for the post of counsellor in Madrid, as well as for the post of Minister in Washington, 6th The Arab Izzet Paşa who recommended me (twice) for the post of member of the Civil section in the Council of State [...], 7th My nomination as prince of Samos was done directly by the Sultan Abdul Hamid, almost immediately after the death of my father in 1902 and without any previous recommendation, 8th Kiamil Pacha, Grand -Vizier, who named me Senator and 9o Koutzouk Said Pacha, Grand Vizier, who named my Ambassador'*<sup>117</sup>.

It becomes obvious that his father played an important role in his carrier as he was his main connection with the power centre. Throughout his memories, Mavroyeni Bey is unfolding the various networks existing among the high officials of the Ottoman state and administration, regardless religion. The world he is presenting is the world of the Ottoman bureaucrat and contrary to our expectations and retrospective perceptions of the non Muslim communities, Alexander's immediate environment –at least as presented in his *Notes* – consists mostly of Muslim high officials. The non Muslims -whether his coreligionists, or Armenians and Jews- who are 'participating' in his narration belong strictly to his class/status group and any reference made to them is inscribed in the framework of Ottoman administration, on the basis of their power, their role and their influence networks created inside the Ottoman state. European diplomats and non Muslim Ottoman doctors with whom

---

<sup>117</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *ibid*, p. 82.

Mavroyenis often discusses and exchanges ideas fit in the same logic; the former are in a way his 'colleagues', with whom he must be in touch, the later are a part of his social life, colleagues of his father, with whom he shares *grosso modo* a common identity and social status.

Thus, he is presenting for instance how Nicolas Aristarchi –his grand uncle from his mother side- started his carrier as the protégé of the '*Kehaya Pacha*' and the '*Capoutan Pacha*' of the time, and the role he had played in the reappointment of Reşid Paşa in the post of Grand vizier in 1854<sup>118</sup>. He notes Stephan Vogoride's '*dominant influence in the affairs of the State between the years 1835 to 1855*', describes how the doctors Stavrides and Kozzonis –both in the service of the palace- intervened and made Abdul Hamid appoint Kamil Paşa governor of Aydın and not of Aleppo –the latter being regarded as an ill-favoured transfer- and narrates how doctor Marco Pitzipio Paşa helped Aziz Efendi, future sultan, hide his son Yusuf Izzedin Effendi and thus make the sultan Mecid abolish the old and '*barbarian practice*' of strangling the sons of the hereditary princes<sup>119</sup>.

By describing the role various personalities of his respective *millet* played in the Ottoman administration, he also unfolds the antagonisms that existed among them for

---

<sup>118</sup> Alexander narrates the story that Dr. Fenerli –a doctor from the Greek orthodox community in Istanbul- told him. According to it, in 1854 the sultan Abdul Mecid wanted to replace Reşid Paşa with Mehmed Ali Paşa. Reşid Paşa asked his friend Aristarchi to take advantage of his '*excellents termes avec le Prince Mentchicoff [qui] se trouvait à cette époque à Constantinople en mission spéciale pour régler avec la Turquie la question des Lieux Saints*' and ask him to write a letter saying that if Reşit would continue to be Grand Vizier then '*la Russie finirait sûrement par s'entendre avec la Turquie sur la question des Lieux- Saints*'. So was done and Reşit remained in his post; Nevertheless Aristarchi was sent to exile. *ibid*, pp. 6-7, 9. Aristarchi's role in relation to Mentzicof and Reşit Paşa during that time was more complicated than what Alexander Mavroyeni is showing. During admiral Mentzicof's staying in Istanbul, N. Aristarchi had been participating as Grand Logothete of the Patriarchate in the discussions and meetings. N. Aristarchi was trying to defend the Patriarchate's interests and reacted against Mentzikof's aspirations to promote the Russian ones. Thus, he decided to support the Anglophile Reşit Paşa. But the latter was 'ungrateful' and 'paid him back' by sending him to exile. D. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, pp. 68, 399.

<sup>119</sup> '*Notes et Souvenirs...*', *ibid*, pp. 7, 28-29, 50. Of course the practice had been discontinued at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

the important posts and places they could reach in the government. For a non Muslim participation in the Ottoman administration meant more than acquiring an important place in the government; It was also a way to enhance his role in his respective religious community. Being a member of the Ottoman bureaucracy was ensuring at the same time an important place in the community's affairs and administration, as we will analyze thoroughly in the next pages.

It is interesting that even if Mavroyeni Bey in his *Notes* seems to describe and present all these networks and antagonisms from a distance, without making any critical comments that could expose him to his readers, at some points he is accepting the challenge and places his family-especially his father and secondly his self- in this antagonism.

Thus, a great part of his writings is dedicated in analyzing his father's influence and power in the Ottoman state and especially the '*great influence*' he enjoyed by the sultan Abdul Hamid. He presents him intermediating for various Ottoman personalities, such as for example, the son of Kurd Said Paşa, who was president of the Council of the State<sup>120</sup> and Said Paşa, Grand Vizier in 1911, whom he helped to return from his exile in Bursa during the first years of Hamid's reign; In Alexander's version of the story his father even hid Said Paşa in his house for a night<sup>121</sup>.

Even more than the Muslim officials, his father was helping his coreligionists who were also participating in the administration and were seeking for a better post. Many times, Alexander narrates stories about how his father had in different occasions helped the Karatheodori family; We have already referred to Alexander

---

<sup>120</sup> The story goes that his father '*travailla même à faire de son fils Shérif, surnommé le Beau Shérif – bosh érif signifie en turc: homme nul, homme sans valeur- gendre du Sultan. Shérif est affecté d' un faible bégayement, et ce petit défaut fit qu'il n'épousa pas une des filles du Sultan*', *ibid*, p. 19.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid*, p. 53.

Karatheodori's appointment as first plenipotentiary of the Ottoman Empire in the Berlin congress after Spiridon Mavroyeni's proposal to the sultan. It was also his father that succeeded in making Abdul Hamid nominate Constantine Effendi Karatheodory, sultan Abdul Mecid's private doctor, senator of the Empire<sup>122</sup>.

In general, Alexander is stressing that his father *'was using almost all his influence by the Sultan for the good of all people'*, that he had *'an infinite courtesy'* and that *'his only ambition was to help those who were close to him, without distinction of race and religion'*<sup>123</sup>. In other words, he is acting and helping not only on the basis of his community's interests, but as an Ottoman statesman and bureaucrat with considerable influence.

At the same time and while underlining his father's influence in the Palace during the reign of the flightily 'Kızıl Sultan', Alexander Mavroyeni Bey tries to protect his reputation, and praise the probity of his character. The fact that he was so close to the Sultan would have created different impressions among different groups of people: admiration and respect, if not flattery for obvious reasons, but also hatred, especially among those Greek-Ottomans who were opposed to the despotic figure of the Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Thus, Alexander is on different occasions claiming *'the independence of his [father's] character'*, and *'his normal, without annoyances relationship with his Lord and Master the sultan Hamid'*<sup>124</sup>. What he is trying to prove is that even if his father ascended to the post of the first doctor of the palace and private doctor of the sultan with the mediation of some influencing personalities –

---

<sup>122</sup> *ibid*, p. 15.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 15, 57.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid*.

something that seems congruent with Alexander's view and positions- it could not mean that he submitted totally to the will and vagaries of the sultan<sup>125</sup>.

Finally, Alexander is also trying to show his own influence and power among the high ottoman statesmen, and he is doing so in a rather discreet and modest way. He is on many occasions noting Grand Vizier Ferid Paşa's approve of, for example, his report on the political situation in the island of Samos and notes the Paşa's request for his help, something that makes Alexander comment with a certain pride that '*the fact that a Grand Vizier asks for my help and seems to be jealous of my supposed influence on other persons, is indicative*'<sup>126</sup>. In general, when talking about prominent Ottoman statesmen that had in past or present expressed themselves favorably to himself, he is always noting their positive comments, regardless of whether they are relevant to his subject or not.

As it has become clear, one of the main themes of his memories is the place and the influence his family exercised in the bossom of the Ottoman bureaucracy. Mavroyeni Bey is presenting the story of his family as closely related to the Palace and the Sultan, in whom he finds the legitimizing framework of the Mavroyeni importance. It is true after all that the Mavroyeni family was not one of these Neophanariotic families that were extracting their power from their preponderant place in the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul, meaning in particular an important role in the Patriarchate, as for instance Aristarchi, Vogorides, etc, was; For them the process was in a way reversed: it was their position in the Ottoman

---

<sup>125</sup> To prove that, he is mentioning different anecdotes that friends of his father have told him. For instance, one summer during his vacation in Prinkipo, Spiridon Mavroyeni was called to the Palace to examine the Sultan who was not feeling good. When Spiridon left the island and came to the palace he found out that the Sultan was not there. Abdul Hamid had authorized one of his servants to describe to his doctor what the problem was. Spiridon furious with the sultan's behaviour did the following diagnosis: '*Vous direz a Son Altesse: Tchok sikmessin*'. Also, Spiridon was not wearing the clothes Abdul Hamid had given him as an expression and proof of his favor, as he used to. Ibid, p. 5, 12.

<sup>126</sup> *ibid*, p. 17.

government that was ensuring them an important position also in their respective *millet*.

Yet, by describing and narrating all these stories and anecdotes that unfold Mavroyenis' importance, by quoting statements such as for instance, Izzet Paşa's affirmation that '*among the Greeks, it is to the Mavroyeni mostly that the sultan has confidence*'<sup>127</sup>, he is not only expressing this self evident status of his family; to grasp the real meaning of his sayings, we have to describe the ideological framework of the Greek orthodox community in the reform era and try to understand that a Greek orthodox importance in the 19<sup>th</sup> century did not depend only on his place in the community or in the Ottoman administration separately, but that it was the outcome of a combination of the two; The one was legitimizing the other and together they were shaping the Neophanariotic identity.

---

<sup>127</sup> That was how Izzet Paşa reacted when he learned that Alexander Mavroyeni had turned down the proposal of becoming prince of Samos for a second time, *ibid*, p. 11.

#### 4. Rum Milleti in the 19<sup>th</sup> century-Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's place among the Greek Orthodox community

Following this logic, we should examine Mavroyeni Bey not only as a diplomat of the Ottoman state, but also as an important member of his religious community, - we know that he was quite active in the intellectual life of the community<sup>128</sup>, even to a lesser degree than his father-, regardless the lack of direct references in his memoirs about this side of his identity. Such an examination will help us understand that his identity was composed by his 'double' role as an influential member of the millet-i Rum and as an important Ottoman bureaucrat; In fact, this 'duality' made him what he was and served to legitimize him both in the community and in the Ottoman state.

Alexander Mavroyeni Bey is offering us an interesting and rather accurate characterization of his respective group inside the community: he identifies the group he represents with the '*Greek high society*'<sup>129</sup> of Istanbul. This *high society* includes all the prominent figures of the Greek Ottoman community, some of whom we already saw, through the references Mavroyeni Bey makes to various anecdotes about their life. All of them are either doctors in the imperial service or bureaucrats in the Ottoman state, and members of the Neophanariot group. This people constitute his immediate environment in the community and it is with this people that -to a certain extent- he shares the same ideas and preoccupations and the same views for the community with respect to the Ottoman state<sup>130</sup>.

---

<sup>128</sup> He delivered speeches in the meetings of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople and supported it materially. I. Konstantinidis, *ibid*, pp. 34-35, Kl. Kokkolatos, *ibid*, p. 11.

<sup>129</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *ibid*, p. 6.

<sup>130</sup> The fact that in his memoirs he is limiting his narration to this group of people could be interpreted -with many reservations- as a sign of a certain 'class consciousness'. Actually, an almost contemporary to Mavroyeni Bey European writer was noting that '*In Turkey, outside a comparatively few wealthy families- many of which are Phanariote Greek Christians who have supplied high official*

But, in the context of the 19<sup>th</sup> century –and especially the second half of it- with the reforms and the direct impact that they had on the reorganization of the different *millets*, as well as the high rate of social mobility, the boundaries of this *high society* were more fluid and could comprise members of the community from different backgrounds, that even if Mavroyeni Bey do not mention, collaborate with the Neophanariots and relate to them in different ways.

These people are members of the emerging Greek-Ottoman bourgeoisie, favored by the economic changes taking place in the empire, its gradual incorporation in the capitalistic world economy, the development of trade and the increase of commercial and economic transactions with the major economic powers of the West (France, England, Italy). The higher strata of this emerging bourgeoisie after a successful process of capital accumulation, taking advantage of the international situation during the first decades of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (1850-1870's), made a significant passage from the commercial domain to banking<sup>131</sup>. From this transition rose prominent bankers, such as Xristaki Zografo – personal banker of the sultan Abdul Hamid-, Zarifi, Mavrokordato and Eugenidi, who will consolidate their place in the head of the Greek bourgeoisie in Istanbul and will simultaneously approach and join the Greek Ottoman elite, the Neophanariots<sup>132</sup>.

---

*servants for generations to the Turkish state and hold themselves somewhat aloof from the Mohammedans- there is little superiority of caste or the arrogance of class consciousness*'. Sidney Whitman, *Turkish Memoirs*, London, 1919, pp. 237-238, cited in M. Heper, *ibid*, p. 116.

<sup>131</sup> Xaris Exertzoglou has made an interesting internal differentiation of the Greek bourgeoisie in higher, middle and lower strata, according to the degree and the nature of the trade they are involved in and the economic power emanating from their commercial activities. Their economic status reflects and defines also their social one, as well as their ideological orientations. X. Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα, ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως 1861-1912*, [National Identity in Constantinople in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, The Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople, 1861-1912], Nefeli editions, Athens 1996, pp. 41-48. See also, X. Exertzoglou, 'The development of a Greek Ottoman Bourgeoisie: investment Patterns in the Ottoman Empire, 1850-1914', in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, *ibid*, pp. 89-115.

<sup>132</sup> The high posts and the power these people had both in the community and the Ottoman state, as well as their common politico-ideological views made S. Anagnostopoulou approach all of them –

The basic means to achieve their introduction to the elite circles of the community was through the creation of a network of intermarriages<sup>133</sup>. Besides the need of these wealthy families to merge their economic capital and empower their family enterprises through marriages and development of kinship relations with other prominent and economic powerful members of their respective group, they also expanded this kinship network to the Neophanariotic families. It was actually a matter of prestige, social status and the need to relate themselves with the upper strata of the Ottoman society –who had direct or indirect relations with the centers of power, be that the ottoman administration or the foreign powers-. The sons and daughters of the prominent Neophanariotic families of Istanbul continued the tradition of marrying each other – when Mavroyeni Bey refers to different Neophanariot personalities is noting their degree of kinship to other Neophanariots, and the overall impression that one obtains is that almost every body was somehow relative to each other-; But in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and mostly after the first decades, we note an increase in ‘mixed’ weddings. The example of Alexander Karatheodoris’ –married to Musuros’ daughter-daughter who married to Siniosoglu, a prominent Greek Orthodox merchant was a typical one<sup>134</sup>. Even Mavroyenis family, one of the few Neophanariotic families with a long phanariotic tradition, had to display such intermarriages: Alexander’s brother

---

bankers, financiers, great merchants and state bureaucrats- as an entity under the common characterization as *Great Urban Rum ‘Class’*. This class is contrasted to the middle urban strata that will have a different conception of their identity as members of the millet-i Rum and distinct ideological orientations. S. Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία 19<sup>ος</sup> αιώνας-1919, Οι ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες* [*Asia Minor, 19<sup>th</sup> century-1919, The Greek orthodox communities*], Athens 1997, p. 302.

<sup>133</sup> This tactic of intermarriages is not an exclusive phenomenon of these wealthy merchants and bankers but it was a common practice observed in every group that tried to serve through the creation of kinship relations its respective economic and social interests. Following this logic, a merchant such as Georgios Zarifis was married to the daughter of another Greek merchant of Istanbul Zafiropoulos uniting and straightening thus his economic power, and a prominent neophanariot such as St. Vogorides had married one of his daughters to the Prince of Moldavia Stourdza in order to exercise indirect control to the post. X. Exertzoglou, *ibid*, p. 48-54 and Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 41-43. See also above.

<sup>134</sup> X. Exertzoglou, *ibid*, pp. 58-59.

Dimitri had married Zoi Ralli - member of the powerful merchant house of Ralli brothers- and their daughter Mado Mavroyeni –Alexander Mavroyeni’s niece- was married to the rich George Zafiropoulo<sup>135</sup>.

The members of this high society that Mavroyenis is referring to shared -to a great extent- the same ideological and political views and a common code of social behavior and values. They were to a great extent supporters of the reforms and loyal to the doctrine of Ottomanism. They were attributing great importance to education and knowledge of foreign languages, seen not only as a prerequisite and a key to join the elite of the empire, as we already stressed, but also as indicative of a certain *modus vivendi*, western and progress oriented and as a social investment<sup>136</sup>. Alexander Mavroyeni Bey –a typical example of this society – is, for instance, on many occasions commending on the level of education of different persons. Well educated himself, with knowledge of western culture and science<sup>137</sup>, he attributes special importance and thinks that in order for a person ‘*to be really someone in the society....intelligence is not enough. In addition, education and morality –morality especially- is needed*’. Even when talking about Abdul Hamid after 1909, he is

---

<sup>135</sup> Dimitri Mavroyeni was Spiridon Mavroyeni’s second son. He was also a diplomat and he had served as counsellor in the Ottoman embassies in Italy, Malta and Marseilles. When he married to Zoi Ralli and even though he had a successful career as diplomat, he abandoned diplomacy and politics and he engaged to commerce through the commercial house of Ralli Brothers. I. Konstantinidis, *Contributions...*, *ibid*, p. 36.

<sup>136</sup> Thus, many of the more economically prosperous families of Istanbul were on the one hand trying to continue their family, by and large, business by introducing their sons in commerce or banking, but on the other, they were encouraging those of their sons who had a certain inclination towards studying to continue by sending some them to European universities. X. Exertzoglou, *Εθνική ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη...*, *ibid*, p. 35.

<sup>137</sup> Alexander Mavroyeni Bey had delivered two speeches in the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople, one on ‘German and French Philosophy in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with special reference to scientific materialism’ (published in the Society’s review of 1871-1872) and another on ‘Voltaire, with special reference to his essays on philanthropy’ (published in the Society’s review of 1881-1882). In the collection of his personal notes and documents in 1950 we also find an unpublished essay on ‘The Issue of abolition or not of the death Penalty’, where he examines the theme from a philosophic and moral point of view.

choosing to base his criticism on his lack of education and attributes his '*remarkable weaknesses mainly to education*'<sup>138</sup>.

Education, travels and studies in Europe, acquaintance with western civilization in a period during which the Ottoman Empire was turning to the West to find remedies, had contributed to the development of a cosmopolitan spirit, which the Greek Orthodox elite had adopted. In Alexander's *Notes* this cosmopolitan spirit is omnipresent: besides his coreligionists and the members of the Ottoman administration, we meet Austrians, Russians, English, etc. Most of them are coming from the diplomatic circles and from this point of view it seems natural that Alexander relates to them. But, at the same time, such relations in Istanbul of the 19<sup>th</sup> century must have enforced the feeling of belonging to an international elite.

These alterations in the high society of the Greek orthodox community must be examined also under the light of the internal changes taking place in the community. The change of the millets role in the Ottoman Empire was a part of the reform and modernization processes of the 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>139</sup>. The only way to make the non Muslims equal members of the Ottoman society and introduce to them the notion of *Osmanlilik* was to recognize their respective community and offer them institutionally the right to administer their internal affairs. Thus, the attempt to create a unified Ottoman society encompassing in equal terms all the population of the empire would be based on the subdivisions of this unity-the millet.

---

<sup>138</sup> Ibid, p. 67. It was not only Alexander Mavroyeni, but also his father who was attributing special importance to education, as a means for the Ottoman Empire to catch up with Europe. It is indicative that when he was professor in the Imperial Medical School of Constantinople, he tried to keep French as the official language of teaching, see Th. Blanchard, *ibid*, p. 414.

<sup>139</sup> The reorganization of the millets must be examined in the framework of the administrative reforms undertaken by the Ottoman state in its attempt to better organize and improve the function of its administrative mechanism (taxation, regional administration, etc). At the same time, the danger of the emerging nationalisms –especially the creation of an independent Greek state in the west edges of the empire– and the pressures from the Great Powers made the Ottoman state adopt new methods of integrating the non Muslims population in the ottoman state. S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 278.

What the reorganization of the Greek millet entailed was on the one hand the enactment from the Ottoman state of practices that existed in the past -meaning basically the recognition of the Patriarch as the head of the community, responsible for its administration; Yet at the same time that the status of the Patriarch as *millet başı* was sanctioned and thus straightened, it was also curtailed by legitimizing the participation of the community's lay elements in the administration of both secular and ecclesiastical affairs. These lay representatives would become the channels through which the Ottoman state would introduce to the Greek Orthodox *millet* the project of modernization and westernization, the program of reform itself<sup>140</sup>.

In 1857 the Sublime Porte sent to the various *millets* of the empire instructions to form provisional national assemblies in order to draw the text of the 'General Ordinances', which would regulate the administration of their community. The national assembly of the Millet-i Rum met between 1858-1860 with the participation of representatives both from the high clergy and the lay element of the capital and the provinces<sup>141</sup>; even though the reforms introduced were not that 'radical' as in the case of the Armenian millet<sup>142</sup>, the basic change was that they entrusted the higher authority of the community not only to the Patriarch and to the Holy Synod<sup>143</sup>, as it was the case in the past, but also to a new organ-creation of the provisional

---

<sup>140</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 301.

<sup>141</sup> The representatives of Istanbul were: the prince S. Vogoridis, Great Logothetis of the Patriarchate N. Aristarchis, I. Psicharis Bey, the doctor S. Karatheodori, K. Adosidis, T. Xatzifotiou, V. Krikotzos, T. Konstantinidis, E. Kiriakou, and X. Zografos. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 403. It is indicative that half of them are among the protagonistic figures in Mavroyeni Bey's notes.

<sup>142</sup> The Armenian millet's reforms -in which some researchers see a prelude to the Ottoman constitution of 1876, - are characterized by Clogg as more 'wide ranging and 'democratic' than the Greek millet's. In contrast to the Armenians, the Greeks had no permanent national assembly. R. Clogg, 'The Greek millet in the Ottoman empire', *ibid*, p. 195.

<sup>143</sup> The Holy Synod was also reorganized: membership was now open in rotation to all the metropolitans of the Ottoman Empire and would be renewed every two years, R. Clogg, *ibid*, p. 195, Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 93.

assembly, the National Permanent Mixed Council. This mixed council consisted of four metropolitans and eight lay representatives from Istanbul<sup>144</sup> that together with the other two directories –the Patriarchate and the Holy Synod- were responsible for the administration of the community's finances, education and the foundations of social care (hospitals, orphanages, nursing homes, etc). The confinement of the patriarchate's power<sup>145</sup>, the dissolution of the system of *Gerondism*<sup>146</sup> was something that both the Greek bourgeoisie and the Phanariots wanted, the former because they would like to increase their power in the Ottoman state, the latter because they were advocates of the Ottoman reforms in any way<sup>147</sup>.

Their national assembly with the participation of the most important members of the community –among whom the Prince of Samos, three among the Greek Ottomans who served in the Ottoman bureaucracy and the four most respectful scientists and intellectuals members of the community<sup>148</sup> - was to be summoned only for the election of a patriarch.

---

<sup>144</sup> These were St. Karatheodoris, V. Krikotzos, Xr. Zografos, Tz. Konstantinidis, K. Karatheodoris and P. Musuros and two Bulgarians, G. Krestovitz and D. Gesoglu, see Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 175.

<sup>145</sup> It was not only the introduction of the lay representatives in the affairs of the community that challenged the Patriarch's authority but also the direct involvement of the Porte in the patriarchal election, with the latter reserving the right of exclusion from the list of the proposed patriarchs the non appropriate –to its view- candidates. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 138.

<sup>146</sup> Lay elements had also participated in the administration of the community in the past, mainly in the election of the patriarch. We have already seen in the first part that the Phanariots were influential personalities, active in the affairs of the community to such an extent that they could dethrone and enthrone respectively patriarchs according to their interests. But, the main power lied in the hand of the *gerondes*, the senior metropolitans of the twelve-man Holy Synod. During the Tanzimat, the demands of the lay element to participate on a more regular basis provoked the intervention of the Porte which in 1847 added 3 lay members in the Holy Synod. These attempts were completed during the next decade when according to the provision of the Hatt-i Hûmayun the system of gerondism was decomposed and the lay participation was sanctioned. R. Clogg, 'The Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire', p.194-195.

<sup>147</sup> D. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 95.

<sup>148</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 381.

Even though the lay representation in the administration of the community was not open to representatives of all the different groups in the community<sup>149</sup> – not even to representatives from the different parts of the Empire-, the reforms were welcomed especially by the Neophanariots and the prominent bankers and merchants. By this way, these groups acquired a legitimate place in the affairs of the community next to the Patriarchate –something which had not only political but also economic implications and connotations<sup>150</sup>– and on the other, they restricted the patriarchal authority to their advantage.

These two groups became actually in many occasions the check points of the Ottoman administration in the internal affairs of the community, a development that was welcomed by many among them. Alexander Mavroyeni is offering us an eloquent expression of this new reality, when in 1907 he is noting –with a certain satisfaction– that when in 1866 the patriarch Sofronios proposed for the post of Great Logothete of the Patriarchate either Constantin Adossides, or Christaki Effendi Zografos, Ali Pasa intervened and indicated Stavraki Aristarchi, son of his '*friend and protégé*' Nicola Aristarchi. For Mavroyenis this was proving that '*in order for someone to become Great Logothete it [was] necessary to have at least the tacit consent of the Porte*' and that '*the will only of the Patriarch [was] not enough*'<sup>151</sup>.

Moreover, it is interesting to see not only how the Ottoman state was on the one hand institutionalizing the self administration of the millet –investing thus the community with a 'political' role- and on the other legitimizing a kind of control

---

<sup>149</sup> For instance the guilds traditional role was to a great extent curtailed. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*.

<sup>150</sup> For instance, the Patriarchate had important economic revenues in the monasteries in Walachia and Moldavia, *ibid*, p. 38.

<sup>151</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *ibid*, p. 13.

through mainly these prominent Greek Ottomans<sup>152</sup>, but try also to understand where Alexander Mavroyeni Bey and his like stood in relation to their respective *millet* and to their government. In other words, except the literal sense of the characterization ‘Greek Ottoman’, the duality of this term unfolds at the same time a social and political reality; Mavroyeni Bey –as all his coreligionists – is ‘using’ his membership in the Greek millet as the legitimizing framework for his Ottomanism, at the same time that his Ottoman identity legitimizes him as a member of the Rum millet-i<sup>153</sup>.

Alexander Mavroyeni is eloquently expressing this duality when, as we already noted, mentions that ‘*among the Greeks it is to the Mavroyeni mostly that [the sultan] has confidence*’ or when he is remembering a story his father had told him about the Sultan Hamid. After the ceremony of enthronement had finished, Abdul Hamid asked his father, Spiridon Mavroyeni, to come near him in order to ‘*prove to everybody his good thoughts about him and his preference to the others*’<sup>154</sup>. Through such statements Alexander is not only praising his place in the Ottoman administration as a favored of the sultan, but he is showing the interaction of the Neophanariots’ role as members of the millet-i Rum and as Ottoman citizens in the formation of their identity. Both Spiridon and Alexander Mavroyeni, as well as all their coreligionists were Greeks Orthodox because they were Ottomans and Ottomans because they were members of the millet-i Rum<sup>155</sup>.

---

<sup>152</sup> The Sublime Porte had the final right to appoint the lay representatives in the Mixed Council and chose among the Greek statesmen. The Hatt-i Humayun introduced the principle of the Patriarch’s payment of wages from the ottoman state and legalized, as we just mentioned, its interference in the election of the Patriarch in a further attempt to check the autonomy it had just offered to the millets. Stamatopoulos, p. 70, 83, 138.

<sup>153</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 271-315.

<sup>154</sup> A. Mavroyeni, *ibid*, p. 41.

<sup>155</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*.

In addition, Alexander as a representative of the Greek-Ottoman elite seems to play an intermediate role, seems to stand in between his community and the Ottoman state. He functions -we could say- as a channel of communication between the two. As Prince of Samos, appointed by the sultan, he governs the Greek people of the island, and has the right to participate in the election of the Patriarch<sup>156</sup>, as Senator he defends the privileges of his millet -as we will analytically examine in the second part-; as member of the civil section of the council of state, he is being called to participate in discussions held between the Patriarch and the Sultan's representative, etc.<sup>157</sup> Also, his father had played an important role as intermediary between the Sultan Abdul Hamid and the Patriarch Ioakeim III during the first phase of the privilege question, in the early 1880's<sup>158</sup>.

This 'in between' position had always been a source of power. The Greek Ottomans' dedication to the Ottoman state was rewarded in one or another way. For instance, Kostaki Mousouros Paşa had been appointed Ottoman minister in Athens in 1847, where his fervent defense of the Ottoman interests lead to the disruption of the diplomatic relations between the two countries. As a reward for his devotion to the Ottoman state, Kostaki Mousouros was appointed ambassador (Sefir-i Kebir) in London -the first non muslim to be appointed to the higher diplomatic post-, a post that he kept for thirtyfive years and was attributed the title of Paşa -again the first non

---

<sup>156</sup> Mavroyeni Bey participated in the patriarchal electoral assembly of 1901 as representative of the Ottoman State. His father had also participated with the same status in the patriarchal electoral assemblies of 1884, 1891, 1901 Konstantinos P. Spanoudis, *Ιστορικά Σελίδια, Ιωακείμ Γ'* [Historic Pages, Joachim III], Constantinople, 1902, p. 57, 76, 151.

<sup>157</sup> During 1907, he participates in discussions concerning the situation in Macedonia, 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 5.

<sup>158</sup> For the question of privileges see in the second part. Spiridon Mavroyeni Paşa had tried to persuade the Sultan to support the candidature of Ioakeim III, whom the former did not like. Throughout 1883 he was communicating the Sultan's messages to the Patriarch and was trying to persuade the Patriarch to conform to the Sultan's commands. Ch. Kardaras, *Το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και ο Αλύτρωτος Ελληνισμός* [The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Unredeemed Hellenism], Athens, 1996, pp. 30, 298, 340.

muslim to acquire such a high nomination<sup>159</sup>. Mavroyeni Bey had also kept the post of counselor in the Ottoman embassy for the considerable period of nine years, during which he had fervently defended the interests of the Ottoman state<sup>160</sup>.

Yet at the same time, the fact that these statesmen were non Muslim generated certain mistrust. Alexander Mavroyeni Bey had been paused from his office as ambassador in Washington, in 1889, due to the complications of the Armenian question, despite the 'antiarmenian' reports he was sending to the Ottoman Ministry of Foreign Affairs throughout the crisis<sup>161</sup>. Also Alexander Karatheodori Paşa was careful with his movements; Alexander Mavroyeni is describing his unease when during Queen Victoria's funeral General Reinach, member of the Greek mission and first *aide de camp* of King George, distant relative of Karatheodory, approached him and talked to him. Alexander Karatheodory tried to avoid the meeting in order '*not to show to his Turk colleagues that he had intimate relations with the Greek mission*'<sup>162</sup>.

This mistrust towards the non Muslim was a general phenomenon throughout the Tanzimat period, as we have already mentioned. These discrimination policies

---

<sup>159</sup> Sinan Kuncralp, *ibid*, p. 432-434.

<sup>160</sup> Mavroyeni Bey had not only defended the economic and political interest of the Ottoman state but he had also shown a considerable care in matters that touched upon the Islamic religion. For instance, when some Egyptian dervishes were discovered performing their *zikr* in the streets of Washington, Mavroyeni Bey intervened and asked from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to stop them, since such an act constituted an 'insult and damage to the Islamic religion'. Cited in S. Deringil, *ibid*, pp. 434-436.

<sup>161</sup> From 1890 Mavroyeni Bey was sending thorough letters to the Ottoman Minister of Foreign Affairs reporting on the Armenians activities, energies, etc in America as well as on any suspect movement of their community. He was also reporting on the effect that the 'rumours' concerning the Armenian question had on the American society. See Mavroyeni's correspondence with the Sublime Porte in *Documents Diplomatiques Ottomans, Affaires Armeniennes*, two volumes, ed by Bilâl N.Şimşir, Ankara, 1993. Th. Blancard says that such a replacement was unexpected, because in a period during which in America there was a high anti-ottoman spirit, Alexander defended honestly his government. He also adds that the sultan's decision was highly criticized by the diplomatic circles of the period. Th. Blancard, *ibid*, p. 526. To the contrary Alexander in his memoirs never commended on this incident or criticized the sultan –except once during 1911 when talking about Cevat Paşa remembered that the latter was opposing the sultan's demand to recall Alexander from his post.

<sup>162</sup> Actually, A. Mavroyeni is narrating the anecdote in order to '*montrer hélas le caractère pusillanime de feu Caratheodory Pacha*', '*Notes et Souvenirs...*', *ibid*, p. 51-52.

were increased during the Hamidian regime when one's fidelity to the person of the 'Kizil Sultan' was a prerequisite for a carrier in the Ottoman bureaucracy. As we have already mentioned, this did not mean that Greeks were not employed in the ottoman administration; yet the choice was carefully made among those who supported the sultan Abdul Hamid. A Greek Ottoman's proximity to the throne was all the more important now that the patriarchate was suffering serious 'wound' as the legitimizing authority of the empire's Christians, after the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 and the first attempts of the Ottoman government to cut down its privileges. Once again Alexander Mavroyeni Bey will use his and his father's status as confident members of the sultan's entourage to legitimize his place.

However, the mistrust and misunderstandings concerned not only the relations between Greek Ottomans and the state but also the Neophanariots themselves. The criticism Mavroyeni Bey makes to various personalities of the neophanariotic circles of the capital, his mentions to personal antipathies and sympathies inside the community could be seen as an indirect expression of this tension. Kostaki Mousouros Paşa is presented to be *'jealous of Alexander Karatheodory because the latter represented Turkey in the Congress of Berlin as first delegate'*<sup>163</sup>; Karatheodory on the other hand is qualified of *'a not very noble character'*, presented as a man with *'a stony heart [...], a heart without grandeur'*<sup>164</sup>. The main cause of these characterizations of A. Karatheodory is the interruption of his relations with his father, Spiridon Mavroyeni Paşa. Mavroyeni Bey notes that even if his father had helped him become first plenipotentiary of the Ottoman delegetation in the Berlin

---

<sup>163</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 22.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid*.

congress<sup>165</sup>, Prince of Samos and General Governor of Crete, Karatheodory stopped visiting his father once the latter's influence was reduced because of his old age and since he was not any more 'useful'<sup>166</sup>.

Maybe the real reason behind this 'antipathy' lays in the antagonism between Alexander Mavroyeni Bey himself and the Karatheodory family for the post of Prince of Samos, a post of significant political and economic importance that preserved something of the past glory of the phanariot princes in Moldavia and Walachia. In 1834 Samos was proclaimed autonomous tributary hegemony with a liberal constitution governed by a Christian prince appointed by the Sublime Porte<sup>167</sup>. From that time until the beginning of the century, when Mavroyeni Bey is writing, the post had been occupied by some of the most prominent members of the Neophanariotic elite of Istanbul<sup>168</sup>.

---

<sup>165</sup> Alexander Mavroyeni Bey is mentioning that it was his father who intervened and proposed A. Karatheodory for this post. That is how he is presenting Alexander Pasa's nomination '*on sait que le Sultan ne voulut jamais consentir à la nomination à ce poste de Carathéodory Pacha. Le Sultan s' était toujours repenti d' avoir nommé, sur la recommandation de Mon père, Carathéodory Pacha comme premier Délégué du Congrès de Berlin*'. *ibid*, p. 22.

<sup>166</sup> The tone and style of Alexander's writing here becomes ironic and high egoistic: '*Malgré cet appui qui après tout fut la cause principale de la renommée de Caratheodory, celui-ci, doué qu'il était d'un caractère peu noble.....*', *ibid*.

<sup>167</sup> The principality of Samos was founded under the auspices of the Great Powers with the condition that the prince would be Christian, citizen of the Ottoman Empire. The organic chart accorded arranged the internal organization of the island and its relation to the Sublime Porte –to which they had to pay an annual poll tax- : authority resided in a council composed of members chosen, according to custom, from among the notables of the region. The head of this council was the prince, chosen by the sultan, and dressed with the right of veto in all the branches of the administration, as well as the right of high surveillance. He could also govern the island through a representative, a deputy, a right most of the princes took over-advantage of. In 1850, a revolt broke out, prince Vogorides was dismissed and an analytical firman specifying the rights attributed to the island was promulgated. In the course of the years, the national assembly acquired a great importance and power and was in a position to bring down the princes who were offending their interests. Maria Georgiadou, 'Expert knowledge between tradition and reform. The Karathéodorys: A Neo-Phanariot Family in 19<sup>th</sup> Century Constantinople', *ibid*, p. 254, Th. Blancard, *Les Mavroyeni*, *ibid*, p. 546-559, Gregoire Aristarchi Bey, *Legislation Ottomane*, Constantinople, 1873-1888, 2:145-146, cited in Davison, 'The principle of representation', *ibid*, p. 109, A. Mavroyeni, *Notes et Souvenirs*, *ibid*, p. 15-17.

<sup>168</sup> The first governor of Samos was Etienne Vogorides, who administrated the island until 1850 through his deputies Kostaki Mousouros and Yanko Fotiadi. The list with the princes before Mavroyeni is the following: Etienne Vogorides 1834-1850, Alexander Callimachi 1850-1854, Jean Chika 1854-1858, Miltiade Aristarchi 1859-1866, Paul Musurus 1867-1873, Constantin Adossides

The administration of the island had always been problematic and was characterized by political instability, due mainly to the rivalries between the factions and parties of the island's notables and the antagonisms among the neophanariots. Mavroyeni Bey, who was appointed Prince of Samos in 1902, '*almost immediately after his father's death and without any previous recommendation*'<sup>169</sup>, governed the island for a relatively short period of time –until 1904– and had, as many of his predecessors, resigned because of the pressures and the predominance of his political islander rivals. Theodore Blancard is mentioning that even if Alexander's reign in the island was one of the better Samos had known, his disagreement to release some deputies-debtors to the state, as well as his initiative to contract a loan with the Ottoman state in order to carry out public works cost him his throne<sup>170</sup>. His rejection of the proposal of the Council of Deputies to become for the second time prince of Samos could be seen under the light of this unpleasant situation created.

Mavroyeni Bey explains the reasons of his rejection and says that he could not return to an island which the '*Sublime Porte does not actually want to progress*', but on the contrary '*offers secret encouragement to the parties in opposition*'<sup>171</sup>. The reasons he communicates to the Grand Vezir unfold the antagonism between him and Constantin Karatheodory, the ex-prince of Samos, whom Mavroyeni was proposed to replace. Mavroyenis is saying that he could not accept the post because, besides his

---

1873-1874, Constantin Photiades 1874-1879, Constantin Adossides 1879-1885, Alexander Caratheodory 1885-1894, Georges Berovitz 1894-1896, Etienne Musurus 1896-1899, Constantin Vayiannis 1899-1901, Michel Gregoriades 1901-1902, Th. Blancard, *Les Mavroyeni*, *ibid*, p. 559

<sup>169</sup> A. Mavroyeni, p. 83. According to the editor of his documents and notes, the Sultan appointed him prince to cheer him up after his father's death, I. Konstantinidis, in *ibid*, p. 33.

<sup>170</sup> Blanchard is referring to Mavroyeni Bey's efforts to promote the island's agriculture by inviting specialist scientists, the foundation of schools of skills, his encouragement to exportation of Samian smoke, the foundation of a society of steam navigation. During his reign, the society acquired its first samian steam ship which carried his name. Th. Blancard, *ibid*, pp. 601-614.

<sup>171</sup> Yet, as he notes he '*naturellement ne dit pas ça à Férid Pacha*'. '*Notes et Souvenirs...*', in *ibid*, pp. 10-12.

bad health, he wanted to contradict the calumnies Constantin Effendi Karatheodory and his wife were dispersing about his supposed intrigues in order to be renamed prince of the island<sup>172</sup>. Still, Mavroyeni did not give up the struggle for the succession that easy and he supported the proposal of Izzet Paşa to nominate as Prince his brother Dimitri Mavroyeni<sup>173</sup>.

Apparently, the two men –Mavroyeni and Karatheodori- supported rival parties as princes of Samos <sup>174</sup>. Alexander is accusing Constantine that his eleven month governing in Samos had provoked *'the total disorganization of the internal administration of the island'*<sup>175</sup> and Constantine is -as we just saw- characterizing Alexander as intriguer. Finally, the post was offered to Georgiades Effendi –whom Mavroyenis is characterizing as *'honest'* but at the same time *'bullheaded'*<sup>176</sup>- and the case was closed.

The incident generated tension in Mavroyeni Bey's relation to Constantine Karatheodory and probably his supporters; Once again, Mavroyeni Bey is 'using' his place and the preference he enjoyed among the higher officers of the palace as a proof of his superiority. He notes that once he announced his refusal to the Grand Vezir Ferid Paşa, the latter was *'very surprised'*. Some days later, the same Paşa asked Mavroyeni Bey to expose him in written his opinion on the political issue-trouble of

---

<sup>172</sup> *ibid*, p. 11.

<sup>173</sup> The proposal was rejected on the basis that Dimitri had not occupied a post since his replacement as General Consul in Marseille and had not returned to the capital since then, so he could not have been able to deal with the bad and hard situation of the island. *ibid*.

<sup>174</sup> A. Mavroyeni is noting *'Je me rappelle parfaitement que quand j'étais Prince de Samos, M. Sofoulis soutenait une théorie tout opposée. Si en ce moment il a change d'avis [...] c'est parce qu'il a mis dans sa tête de renvoyer le prince actuel, Grégoriades Effendi, et de ramener à Vathy, Constantin Effendi Karatheodory, à cause surtout de la fille et de la femme de ce dernier. La chose est triste mais vraie'*. *Ibid*, p. 15.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid*, p. 11

<sup>176</sup> *ibid*.

Samos; when Alexander read to him what he wrote, Ferid Paşa interrupted him shouting '*Bravo, Bravo*' and congratulated him saying that he '*will not only use his exposé in the next Ministerial council but that [he] would also inspire from its context in the new instructions to the Prince of Samos*'<sup>177</sup>. Even though Mavroyeni Bey – quite blusteringly- is wondering '*if it exists in all the empire another Greek who would have refused [the post of prince] like he did*', it becomes obvious, for another time, that he is legitimizing and relating his 'uniqueness' to his place in the Ottoman state and his status as 'protégé' of some of the more influential personalities of the state<sup>178</sup>. For one more time the limits between his 'Greekness' and his 'Ottomanism' are difficult to trace; Schematically, we could say that the one begins where the other ends and vice versa.

---

<sup>177</sup> *ibid*, p. 17

<sup>178</sup> *ibid*, p. 8.

## PART B

### 1. Rum milleti and ideology- Hellenottomanism

In the first part, we basically examined how Alexander Mavroyeni was trying, through his *Notes and Souvenirs* to legitimize his and his likes' –members of the Neophanariotic elite- place and importance in the Ottoman state's administration, as well as in his respective religious community, during a period -1907-1921-, when the political and ideological developments were altering the 19<sup>th</sup> century scenery. In order now to understand Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's ideological-political orientations during this period, we have to look at the respective ideological evolutions of the Greek orthodox community, we have to see how the changes emanating with the Young Turks revolution in 1908 affected him and analyze the way he responded to these changes. We have to try in other words to decode what being *Greek*<sup>179</sup> –as Mavroyeni Bey identifies himself, in the quotation we saw in the previous page- and *patriot*<sup>180</sup> meant for him, and how he was viewing himself –and the specific group of people he represented- in the changing Ottoman Empire.

Alexander Mavroyeni Bey was a Neophanariot-offspring of the changes that the Rum milleti underwent in the 19<sup>th</sup> century not only administratively –something we already examined-, but also ideologically. Ubiqini in the middle 19<sup>th</sup> century was

---

<sup>179</sup> Mavroyeni Bey is also using the term *la nation grecque* in various instances in his memories. For example, when narrating an anecdote concerning Constantin Effendi Karatheodory and the sultan Abdul Mecid, where the latter '*un ou deux jours avant sa mort, fit appeler son médecin Constantin Effendi, lui fit part qu'il se sentait mourir, lui dit qu' il regrettait de n'avoir pas fait à lui ainsi qu' à la nation grecque tout le bien qu' il avait desiré leur faire....*'. '*Notes et Souvenirs...*', *ibid*, p. 15.

<sup>180</sup> Alexander Mavroyeni is using both in his '*Notes et Souvenirs*' and in his discourses in the senate the term *patriot*, either to praise personalities of the ottoman bureaucracy, or more often and as we will examine further to define all the citizens of the Ottoman Empire.

noting the existence of two parties in the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul: the first one consisted of the Neophanariots, the lay dignitaries of the Patriarchate and the wealthier merchants -in other words, what Alexander characterized as the *high society* of the millet-, those constituting the leadership of the Greek Orthodox millet, as well as the higher clergy. The common point of all these groups was that they were advocates of the preservation of the status quo, as it had been formed after the reform degrees and that they were demonstrating their loyalty to the Ottoman state and to the doctrine of Ottomanism, while propagating at the same time the Greek education and culture. The second one included people from the new professional groups (lawyers, teachers, and journalists, etc), the middle and lower urban strata. The ideological orientations of this second group were bringing its members closer to the politics and the ideology of the Greek state<sup>181</sup>.

The first group's ideological orientations would actually constitute the core of an ideology that has been known as the ideology of Hellenottomanism. As far as it concerned its *ottoman* part, the ideology, supported by the majority of the community's high strata, meant the true belief of its supporters in the existence of a reformed Ottoman state, in the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and in the creation of a common identity for all the citizens of the Empire. From that point of view, they were not different from other Muslim statesmen and intellectuals who were approaching the reforms as a way to avoid the Empire's possible distraction. As for the ideology's *Hellenic* part, the issue is more complicated and needs to be addressed in a wider framework, in order to avoid the simplistic associations of the Hellenic features with the Greek state and the ideology the latter produced<sup>182</sup>.

---

<sup>181</sup> H.A.Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey*, London, 1856, v. I p. 236f, cited in R. Clogg, 'The Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire', *ibid*, p. 196-197.

<sup>182</sup> See S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p.

Hellenottomanism was an attempt from a part of the Rum milleti of Istanbul to articulate its own ideology in a period during which the independent Greek state had started to present and slowly claim for itself the right to decide for the fate, not only of its citizens, but also of its 'unredeemed children', citizens of the Ottoman Empire. It was also a response and a way to counteract the Pan- Slavic danger that throughout the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century constituted a serious threat. In a way, the doctrine of Hellenottomanism was the answer and the adaptation of the ideology of *Megali [Great] Idea* in the Greek Ottomans' 'vernacular', meaning basically the preservation of the Empire's integrity and the coexistence and cooperation between the Greek Orthodox and the Muslim population of the Empire. The political and historical circumstances of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that gave birth and bred this particular ideology made progressively the Greek state accept the doctrine<sup>183</sup>. But, the latter and a group inside the community –originating mostly from the middle urban strata- will see progressively in the ideology an alternative version of the irredentist policies: for them, hellenottomanism was standing for the resurrection of the Byzantine Empire through the predominance of the Greek element of the Empire, whereas the Greek Ottomans coming from the leading groups were actually

---

<sup>183</sup> Actually, the Greek state had accepted –or, had been obliged to accept by the events and the facts, in a framework of a tactic- the doctrine of Hellenottomanism, from the early years of its inception, during the Crimean war, as a realistic perspective. The idea of a cooperation between the Turks and the Greeks was gaining support, especially while the situation in Macedonia with the Slavs and the augmenting Russian influence was becoming dangerous for the Greek state, that was trying to defend and 'protect' the orthodox population of the region. The Greek Prime Minister E. Deligiorgis is considered to have been the initiator of the Turkish-Greek approach of 1873 and had been criticized for this attempt. The crisis of 1875-78 was attributed to a great extent to this approach. Elli Skopetea supports the view that the idea of a Greek Ottoman approach in the framework of the respective ideology did not last after this crisis. E. Skopetea, *ibid*, p. 320-324. A. Alexandris on the other hand attributes the initiation of the approach to Xarilaos Trikoupi and claims that the idea of cooperation between the Greek orthodox and Muslim elements of the Empire was reinforced after the Greek Turkish war of 1897 that proved the bankruptcy of the traditional irredentist policy of the Greek state. A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 384. In any way and as far as it concerns the Greek Ottomans of the Empire, we think that the ideology of Hellenottomanism survived in its different versions until the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and more precisely until the beginning of the First World War. See also S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*.

supporting the maintenance of the status quo, envisaging keeping on and maybe empowering their place by their participation in the administration of the Ottoman Empire<sup>184</sup>.

Especially, for the Neophanariots the ideology of hellenottomanism was compatible with their status in the Ottoman state and the loyalty and dedication they were professing towards it, as well as their faith to Ottomanism. Families such as the Mavroyeni were envisaging themselves 'not only as chosen members of the Rum milleti, but also if not mostly as privileged Ottoman citizens'<sup>185</sup> who were playing an active role in the administration of the state.

But at same time that the Neophanariots were seeing in the concept of Hellenottomanism the preservation and enhancement of their place mostly as Ottoman bureaucrats, they were stressing their Hellenic identity. It might seem strange that a person like Alexander Mavroyeni –who, for instance writes in fluent French, and is a member of the cosmopolitan society of Constantinople that he describes in his *Notes and Souvenirs*, a society that he defines not ethnically but mostly from the point of view of class - defines himself as Greek<sup>186</sup> and in other instances, that we will

---

<sup>184</sup> The doctrine of Hellenottomanism has been qualified as an ideology which propagated the gradual hellenization of the Ottoman Empire. Even though some interpreters and carriers of the ideology were indeed espousing such ideas, these aspects tell us only a part of the story and in any case are not explaining the realities under which the ideology was formatted. We could also say that it was the Greek state that believed more in the '*prolongation of this [Ottoman] state, that has rotten and temporary bases, only by becoming truly Hellenottoman or Ottomanhellenic*' - cited in Elli Skopetea, *ibid*, p. 313.

<sup>185</sup> E. Skopetea, *ibid*, p. 315. Skopetea is quoting a characteristic passage from a greek newspaper, concerning the way the Neophanariots were viewed by some greek intellectual circles. The writer is characterizing those Greek ottomans as '*simple Turks with all the meaning of the word, who profess the Christian religion*'. ΕΛΠΙΣ, 15-11-1867, cited in E. Skopetea, *ibid*, p. 316. In this context of the Neophanariots loyalty to the Ottoman state suffice is here to remember the interruption of the diplomatic relations of the two states during the embassies in Athens of K. Musuros and I. Fotiadis. Al. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 374.

<sup>186</sup> It is interesting that Mavroyeni Bey adopts and reproduces the characteristics of the Greek nation as they had been formatted by the Greek historiography of the time, as well as the narratives about the nation's coherence and continuance from the ancient times, from the time of Pericles, until his days. For instance, when talking about his experience as governor of Samos and the bad situation created in the island, because of the antagonism between the different political parties, he says that '*C'est triste à*

examine, differentiates himself from the non Greek orthodox of the Empire, in particular from the Bulgarians, but something like that was actually compatible with his status and his ideological orientations.

Alexander starts keeping his diary in 1907, when the situation in Macedonia for the contested regions, that were a constant matter of controversy between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Exarchate, was tense. The Bulgarian question seems to preoccupy him a lot during the time until the Young Turks revolution. The first note he writes down on May of 1907 is about a meeting that he had with the Greek ambassador in Istanbul, Mr. Gryparis. Maybe for avoidance of misunderstandings<sup>187</sup> and in an effort to underline his role as a representative of the Ottoman state, he says that he visited the Greek ambassador following the orders of '*his Majesty*'; the purpose of his visit was to '*expose to him [to the Greek ambassador] the intolerable situation that was created in Macedonia by the Greek bands and ask him to act by his government so as to achieve the total suppression of the bands*'<sup>188</sup>. Alexander is

---

*dire, mais il est pourtant vrai que si le Grec, pris individuellement, est un être intelligent et capable, pris collectivement, il semble devenir défectueux. L'envie du prochain et l'absence de discipline l'empêchent de répondre convenablement aux besoins de la société moderne. Les Grecs de l'antiquité avaient peut être aussi les mêmes défauts. Mais les temps ont changé depuis et de nos jours pour devenir vraiment grand un peuple a besoin de qualités qui n'étaient sûrement pas indispensables à l'époque de Périclès*'. 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 20. It is also interesting to note that these negative characteristics that Mavroyeni is enumerating constitute until nowadays the core of a simplistic discourse about the negative aspects of the Greek people.

<sup>187</sup> The situation created in Macedonia after the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the emergence of Panslavic tensions had become a constant worry for the Patriarchate and the Greek state. Actually, during the first patriarchate of Joachim III (1878-1884), there was some kind of collaboration –not always with good terms– between the two centers. Among other things, Greece was offering economic support to the various bishoprics of the region and Joachim was communicating to the Greek ambassador in Constantinople copies of secret reports by metropolitans. The Ottoman state suspicious of the collaboration between the Patriarch and the Greek state for matters of education in Macedonia reacted and proceeded in the temporary curtailing of some of the Patriarchate's authorities, including education. This will constitute the first phase of the privileges issue. As a result the Patriarch Joachim resigned. See E. Kofos, 'Patriarch Joachim III (1878-1884) and the irredentist policy of the Greek State', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 4:2 (1986), pp. 107-120.

<sup>188</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 5. From the last years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, during the time Mavroyeni is writing and until 1908 the situation in Macedonia had been really serious with Greek and Bulgarian guerrilla groups creating a climate of terror. Elli Skopetea, 'Μακεδονικό και Ανατολικό Ζήτημα'

transferring to the Greek ambassador the sultan's positions that '*the Bulgarian is the common enemy of both Greeks and Turks*' and that '*the Greeks should leave the field to the Turks in order to fight against this common enemy*'. Even though Mavroyeni Bey is not expressing directly his own opinion about the Bulgarian question, still he does it in an indirect way. He thus notes that the sultan remembered that '*in the époque during which he was Prince and when his [Alexander's] father was his doctor and his intimate confidant, his father often repeated to him [Abdul Hamid] that the question of the Bulgarian schism was going to end up on the detriment not only of the Greek nation but also of the Turkish one*'<sup>189</sup>; Now –at the time Mavroyeni Bey is writing-, 35 years later the sultan was recognizing how right Mavroyeni Paşa was. Mavroyeni Bey goes on and unfolds his thought that it was because of and in memoriam of his father's view that the Sultan authorized him to handle such a crucial matter<sup>190</sup>.

The Bulgarian question that seems to preoccupy Mavroyeni Bey had been of crucial importance, not only for the Ottoman Empire and the Greek state, but also in the process of the *nationalization* of the Rum milleti. From this point of view, a short analysis of the question will help us understand what the Hellenic part of the hellenottoman ideology stood for the millet in general and in particular for the leading Neophanariots, such as Mavroyeni.

---

[Macedonia and the Eastern Question], in *Ta Iστορικά [Historica]*, June-December 1993, no.18/19, pp. 144-150.

<sup>189</sup> Mavroyeni Bey also notes that the sultan ordered his first secretary Tahsin Paşa to communicate to the Patriarch Joachim III his saying, 'Notes et Souvenirs...', p. 5. The above scheme according to which the sultan is praising in front of the patriarch the Mavroyeni's loyalty to the Ottoman state and the concurrence of their millet's interests with those of the state is another proof of the extent to which their place in the Orthodox Greek community of Istanbul was passing first through their place and the favor they enjoyed by the sultan.

<sup>190</sup> Alexander is noting that: '*Comme jamais, au paravant le Sultan ne me chargea d'une mission confidentielle quelconque, je suppose que c'est en souvenir de la sus-dite opinion de mon père qu'il me fit faire la démarche ci dessus auprès de Mr. Griparis*', *ibid*, p. 5-6.

In the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Rum milletî was undergoing internal changes due mainly to the successful attempts of the different ethno linguistic groups of the orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire to release themselves from the Greek orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. The proclamation of the independent Romanian Church in 1865 and the creation of the Bulgarian exarchate in 1870, with the direct involvement of the Porte<sup>191</sup>, had generated a shock both for the Greek orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul and for the community itself, especially for those – Phanariots and wealthy merchants- who were seeing in the Patriarchate their legitimizing framework as the leaders of all the Orthodox population of the Empire.

As we have already seen in the first part, in the process of the making of the millet-i Rum, the Phanariots had acquired, due to their political and economical power, a preponderant and leading role upon the Christian orthodox population of the Empire. At that era the common and unifying characteristic of all these people was religion and they were all under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch. Phanariots were stressing the orthodox element of their identity and preserved close relationships with the Patriarchate; Their greekness was also socially defined, meaning basically that it carried a connotation of belonging to a specific powerful group or class.

With the secession movements of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, religion ceased to constitute the bounding element of all the Orthodox of the Empire. From the

---

<sup>191</sup> The Sublime Porte had proposed two plans introducing the representation of the orthodox population of Macedonia by two ecclesiastical rules, one Bulgarian and the Patriarchate, both of which the latter turned down. Again, with the Sublime Porte's initiative, in 1869 Ali Pasa composed a mixed council of Bulgarian and Greek representatives of the Ottoman state (those participating were Al. Karatheodoris, X. Zografos, ambassador Photiadis, and Krestovitz, member of the Judicial council, and two Bulgarians, Stoyanovits and Stogianof, members of the Council of State), who louned a project for the creation of an autocephalous Bulgarian church. The project was once more rejected by the Patriarch Gregorios, who was approaching the Bulgarian issue as an internal problem of the orthodox patriarchate and did not want the involvement of the state and its representatives. Finally, the firman proclaiming the creation of an independent Bulgarian exarchate was issued in 1870. D. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 311-312.

moment that the Patriarchate had lost its role as the one and unifying center of the Balkan Orthodox population and since Orthodox religion could not any more be seen as an exclusive characteristic of the Greek Orthodox millet, the Greek ottomans had to give priority to and stress other characteristics. Since the Neophanariots and the other members of the high society of the millet-i Rûm had lost their place in the leadership of all the Orthodox, they tried to consolidate and protect their place in the Greek Orthodox community by stressing the Greek part of their identity and by launching a 'project' of *hellenization* of their own millet. In this process, the notion of greekness starts loosing its previous connotation of belonging to a class and becomes a national characteristic<sup>192</sup>.

#### *Alexander Mavroyeni Bey and the Hellenization of the Greek Orthodox millet.*

In this context, it is very interesting to see that Mavroyeni Bey is in 1907 still preoccupied with the Bulgarians not only as a matter of a separate ecclesiastic authority and as a national entity that threatened the Greek Orthodox population of Macedonia, but also as an internal problem of the community, that touched upon its national identity. When the Bulgarian question arose, the leading members of the community approached the issue from different points of view, following different paths for its resolution. In a rather generalizing way and for the needs of our examination, we could say that the influential men of the community were divided into two groups, the ones supporting a possible collaboration with the Ottoman state in order to face their common enemy, the Bulgarians, and the others seeking to find

<sup>192</sup> These alterations in the notion of greekness concerning the Rûm millet and the passage from a class to a national connotation are eloquently expressed by E. Skopetea, *To 'Ippókrato Þaotlaio' kai ηΜεγάλη Ιδέα*, ibid, p. 315.

the solution away from the Sublime Port and the Great Powers, collaborating with the Russians and the Bulgarians themselves<sup>193</sup>.

Actually, this is the scheme that Mavroyeni Bey is also using when presenting the process that lead to the creation of the Bulgarian exarchate. He narrates that *'under the reign of Sultan Aziz and when Aali Pacha was still alive, the Greek patriarch Gregory VI prepared a project according to which, even the Ecumenical Patriarch was admitting the creation of a Bulgarian Exarchate, within the limits of the ecclesiastical rules. Aali Pacha accepted the project, which was also sanctioned by an Imperial Irade. But because of the reaction it provoked in the Greek community, it was never applied. After the death of Aali Pacha [...], Mahmoud Nedim Pacha, Grand Vizier (surnamed Mahmoudoff, because of his friendship with Russia) pushed by Ignatieff, Ambassador of Russia, and helped to some extent by Alexander Effendi Karatheodory, undersecretary at the time in the ministry of foreign affairs, to whom Ignatieff promised the moon and the stars, made the sultan sanction a project that it was not only more detailed than the one proposed by Gregoire VI, but also more anti canonic. It was this second project that provoked the schism.[...]Alexander Effendi Karatheodory had as his collaborator in this anti-Greek and pro-Bulgarian act Christaki Effendi Zografo, a rich banker of the time'*<sup>194</sup>.

---

<sup>193</sup> D. Stamatopoulos is referring extensively to this internal separation of the community. According to his research, most of the Neophanariots, such as K. Karatheodoris, D. Aristarchis, many bankers and wealthy merchants envisaged the solution through the collaboration with the Ottoman state. On the other edge, stood the Patriarchate and some of the Neophanariots -A. Karatheodoris, St. Aristarchi. The internal differentiation of the Karatheodory and Aristarchi family –both of whom participated in the initiatives undertaken by the Patriarch Grigorios VI- is very interesting; For the latter and his supporters, any idea of collaboration with the Ottoman state and the Great powers would authorize the latter to interfere in the community's affairs and split the orthodox. In this logic, the problem was approached as an internal question of the orthodox community and the solution was going to be found in collaboration with the Bulgarians themselves and the Russians, the traditional protectors of orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire. See D. Stamatopoulos, *ibid*, p. 364-367.

<sup>194</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 27.

Except the fact that Mavroyeni through his narration is indirectly taking sides – pro the part of the community that sought the collaboration or agreement of the reformist, anglophile representatives of the Sublime Porte, against the Russophiles-, it is interesting that he characterizes the schism with national terms: an anti-Greek and pro-Bulgarian act. The issue becomes more interesting when we look at some other comments that Alexander Mavroyeni is making concerning the protagonists of the Bulgarian question.

Before going on explaining how we came to the schism, he notes that according to his sources the idea of a separate Bulgarian Orthodox Church was first conceived by Stephanaki Bey Vogorides<sup>195</sup> and Chrestovitch Paşa, both of whom had Bulgarian origin. In another part of his diary, he notes again the Bulgarian origin of the former and of Alexander Karatheodory and he adds that both had ‘humble descent’. By this stress on their non Greek humble origins –and having also in mind that Alexander Mavroyeni is criticizing Alexander Karatheodory’s attitude, as we saw in the first part-, we could possibly talk about a certain tension inside the Neophanariotic community, a tension that explains itself at the same time in national terms. Mavroyeni Bey is viewing himself as a representative of an old and important Greek orthodox family, continuing the Phanariotic tradition and in this context he is differentiating himself from the other Neophanariots, some of whom were not Greeks and acquired their power through their interrelations with prominent Greek orthodox families, such as his. It is characteristic that when talking for Stephan Vogorides he is noting that *‘his father was of Bulgarian origin and pig-merchant. He had an uncle who was priest and lived in Yassi. Through this uncle he became attached to the house of my [Alexander’s] great uncle, Callimachi, prince of Moldavia. It was the*

---

<sup>195</sup> Indeed, Stephanos Vogorides was from 1847 supporting the idea of creating an autonomous Bulgarian principality. D. Stamatoopoulos, *ibid*, p. 67-74.

latter that protected him and recommended him to the Imperial Divan due to his intelligence and capacities'<sup>196</sup>.

He offers a similar explanation for the ascendance of Alexander Karatheodory's family, which had as well poor origin, descending from a simple grocer from Adrianopolis. Yet, Alexander Karatheodory's father '*distinguished for his love of letters was sent by the Archbishop of Andrinople, Kyrillos, to Pisa to study medicine on the expenses of the archbishopric*' and then moved to Constantinople where he became prominent doctor and joined the phanariotic elite<sup>197</sup>.

In both cases Mavroyeni Bey is on the one hand underlying in an indirect way his privileged position in the community in relation to other prominent families, which nevertheless were neither Greek, nor important, or maybe we could say, not important because they were not Greek –here greekness preserving its social-class connotation- ;and on the other, underlines the Greek character of the Rum milleti, which despite the fact that it consisted of Christian orthodox people with different and various origins, it was in its essence, and as far as it concerned at least its leadership, Greek.

This issue of the Greek character of the Rum milleti became pivotal and of crucial importance especially from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as we already mentioned, when the intellectual and elite circles of the community had to define it

---

<sup>196</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, p. 8. Stephan Vgorides real name –as Alexander Mavroyeni Bey also informs us- was Stephan Saros. He was born in 1773 or 1775 in Kazan, in Tirnovo. He was sent to Constantinople to continue his studies where he joined the service of the well known Karatza family. In 1820 he was appointed *kaymakam* in Moldavia, in 1834 Prince of Samos. He had created intimate relations with various important Ottoman bureaucrats, such as Mustafa Reşid Paşa, Hüsvrev Paşa. See Christina Filiou, *ibid*.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid*, p. 7. Until the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the Bulgarians were still members of the Greek Orthodox community, the characterization 'Bulgarian' had not a national, but rather a social connotation. Bulgarian was the simple, uneducated, illiterate, and poor but hardworking, kind and naïve peasant, who only with the acquaintance of Greek culture and following a process of hellenization could achieve social and economic recognition. For the relationship of Greeks and Bulgarians see P. Matalas, *Έθνος και Ορθοδοξία, Οι περιπέτειες μιας σχέσης [Nation and Orthodoxy, The adventures of a relation]*, Iraklio, 2002, pp. 35-41.

not only on religious, but also on national terms. The process of hellenization of the millet was mainly undertaken through education and the development of a school network, where the orthodox children of the Ottoman Empire would learn the 'Greek letters'. If as Alexander Mavroyeni is stressing in the case of Alexander Karatheodory's father the knowledge of '*letters*', meaning Greek letters was a first step for someone's social and economic ascendance<sup>198</sup>, by the time Mavroyeni is writing, Greek education had become instrumental in the creation of a Greek identity for the members of the Rum milleti.

In this framework, during the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century we notice the development in the Ottoman Empire of a network of schools, societies and associations for the propagation of Greek letters and culture, which would come not only to vitalize the religious feeling but mostly, if not exclusively, 'cultivate' and propagate the *greekness* of the orthodox population of the empire. After all education was also a field of change in the framework of Ottoman reforms and in the name of secularization that these reforms were espousing, the education of the members of the Rum milleti acquired a national character. Such a process might seem contradictory, since the millet was still defined on religious terms, but from the moment that orthodox Christianity had lost its exclusivity as a differentiating characteristic from other non Muslim Ottomans, and the concurrence of *Greek* and *orthodox* had been broken even the religious leader of the community, the Patriarch, and overall the

---

<sup>198</sup> During the era to which Alexander is referring, when an organized and sophisticated school system and network did not exist, the only means for an orthodox inhabitant of a village or a city to receive some kind of education was through the ecclesiastic authority of the region. The language these people were learning through the church was the Greek language, the language of the orthodox liturgy in the Balkans. In a period during which the Greek language was the *lingua franca* of trade and a prerequisite to economic and social award, learning Greek was an indispensable qualification. The issue of education and knowledge of Greek is stressed by A. Mavroyeni Bey in various instances, in the case of Karatheodory, as we examined, in the case of Stavradi Aristarchi, etc.

church would accept to a certain degree the national character of education<sup>199</sup>. Education, meaning Greek education, came to be regarded as the only way to create a common consciousness and identity among the different orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire and counteract the nationalistic movements.

The diffuse process of a secular, free from religious prejudices and bias, congruent with the spirit and the ideas of Enlightenment education became the main objective of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople<sup>200</sup>. The society became one of the most important agents in this process of *hellenization* of the orthodox millet, by supporting the foundation of new schools in different regions of the Ottoman Empire, by organizing lectures and competitions on themes of Greek history, literature and folklore, by publishing a review, and in general by propagating in many ways the Greek culture and civilization.

The members of the Neophanariotic elite will take active part in these associations and societies and they will show special interest for the educational issues of their millet, in their attempt to preserve and readjust their role as the head of their community. As we already saw, Spiridon Mavroyenis was one of the founding members of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople and he was participating in its various activities, as well as in the activities of other philanthropic and

---

<sup>199</sup> Responsible for education (function of schools, drawing up of the annual school programs, etc.) was a council consisted of representatives of both the Patriarchate and the lay members of the community. The secularization of education, in the name of Ottoman reforms, had generated tension between the traditional centre, the Patriarchate and the members of the community who were now claiming legitimately their 'share' in the organization and formation of their millet. Especially, after the secession of the Bulgarian speaking orthodox from its jurisdiction, the Patriarch was feeling threatened and the enforcement of the lay element into such a sensitive field as education was, was seen by the former as an additional 'danger'. See S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 291-293.

<sup>200</sup> During the first years of the Society's creation (1861), the relationship between the former and the Patriarchate were tense; Its first president's -Iroklis Vasiadis- insistence in the creation of a secular, European, away from the religious obscurantism, education provoked the Patriarchate's reaction, characterizing the society's tension and intensions as '*subverting of its prestige*'. Yet, soon the Society will -even typically and for external reasons- turn to the Patriarchate and the two centers will collaborate. *Ibid*, p. 295-297, X. Exertoglou, *ibid*, pp. 19-31.

educational societies. Alexander continued this 'tradition' and he was also participating in the Society's activities by delivering speeches and through economic contributions<sup>201</sup>.

But at the same time that the *hellenization* of the Rum milleti was aiming to homogenize and rally the community round its 'new' identity, it was simultaneously disrupting its congruity. If the Neophanariots in their majority –as well as the Patriarchate and the wealthy merchants- were viewing their future as Greeks of the Ottoman Empire in a reformed Ottoman state, where they would play an important role as bureaucrats, other members of the community, especially those coming from the middle and lower urban strata, were progressively affiliating with the other center of Hellenism, the Greek state and the irredentist ideology the latter produced. Education seen as a means to nationalize the millet, served at the same time as a way for the Greek state to increase its influence on the Greek Orthodox population of the empire<sup>202</sup>. By this and other means, and as the social and politic circumstances were changing, the Greek state would progressively, as we will also see later, undermine Constantinople as a center able to produce and articulate an ideological discourse

---

<sup>201</sup> We have already mentioned in Part A the two speeches he delivered in the Society. Alexander Mavroyeni had also contributed to the prosperity and economic support of the society, either by donations to the library –in 1902 and after his father's death he donated to the society's library his father's 'rich an invaluable' book collection, along with 500 books of his own library-, or by financial donations –in 1910 he set a prize, the 'Mavroyeni's prize of virtue', which consisted of an economic reward attributed to 'all the nations of Constantinople regardless religion', on his name day. K. Kokkolatos, *ibid*, p. 11, I. Konstantinidis, *ibid*, p. 34.

<sup>202</sup> Actually, and as far as it concerned the educational matters, it was the Greek state and especially Athens –and not Constantinople- with its University that constituted the main center producing a national ideology, that was going to be transmitted and diffused through the school network and thus bring up 'generations of Greek children'. From the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was very common that teachers-graduates of the Athenian University would be sent to different parts of the Ottoman Empire, where there existed Orthodox population, to staff the newly created schools. And, it was also common that Greek ottoman citizens would study in Athens and then return to their hometowns and teach the Greek letters and culture to their compatriots. See S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 299, S. Benlisoy, *Education in the Orthodox Community of Nevşehir during the nineteenth century*, master thesis Boğaziçi University, 2002.

independent from the one produced in the former –as the ideology of hellenottomanism had been-.

The hellenization of the orthodox community of the Ottoman Empire will create tension in the relationship between the Greek state and the traditional leaders of the community, meaning mainly the Patriarchate and the Neophanariots, and between the two will develop a rival relationship; Both centers would try to legitimize themselves in the leadership of the unredeemed Greek Orthodox population of the Empire, only that, as S. Anagnostopoulou has eloquently pointed out, the Greek state would do so in the name of a Greek *national* legitimacy, whereas the patriarchate in the name of a Greek-orthodox *ecumenical* one<sup>203</sup>.

That is to say that during the period that Alexander Mavroyeni is writing, the notions of *Greek nation* and the self definition of a member of the Greek orthodox community of the Ottoman Empire as *Greek* had different if not contradictory meanings, depending on who was using these terms, the place that the individual had in the community and the tension it represented. From this spectrum, we could say that when Mavroyeni Bey is using national characterizations and defines himself as Greek, he is talking more as an Ottoman Greek Orthodox, who views his future, his existence and carrier in a modernized and powerful Ottoman Empire and not as a representative of the Greek nation as perceived by the Greek State and its supporters inside the community. Yet, the changes that both the Ottoman State and the Rum

---

<sup>203</sup> In the framework of the 19<sup>th</sup> century reforms and the progressive secularization of the millet, the Patriarchate could not any more act as the leader of a religious community, since this community was now being defined in ethno-religious terms. Thus, the Patriarchate, responsible together with the lay representatives to the Ottoman state for the community's administration, had to redefine its character and give to it also a national –meaning Greek- dimension. The problem of the boundaries between the greek *ethnos-genos* (: nation-Christian orthodox race) as defined by the Patriarchate, especially during the second term of Joachim III's office (1901-1912) and by the Greek state is eloquently described by S. Anagnostopoulou, 'The terms Millet, Génos, Ethnos, Oikoumenikótita, Alytrotismos in Greek Historiography', in *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nation-States*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2004, pp. 38-55.

milleti underwent after the Young Turks revolution will marginalize him and the tension it represented.

## 2. The Young Turks revolution -Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's reaction

The Young Turks revolution was a breaking event for many reasons and from many points of view. From an absolutist regime we pass to constitutional monarchy, from the Young Turk's ideological point of view, we follow a course which varies from Westernism, Ottomanism, Islamism and takes its final shape in the ideology of Turkism<sup>204</sup>, from a multinational empire we pass progressively to an Empire where the predominant element would be the Turkish one, from the point of view of the Rum millet we observe its gradual transformation to a political entity, depending increasingly more and more on the Greek state.

The restoration of the Constitution of 1876 and the promise for 'Liberty, Equality, and Justice'<sup>205</sup> were accepted by the non Muslim communities in general and the Greek Orthodox in particular, with enthusiasm and hope for the beginning of a new era<sup>206</sup>. With the exception of Patriarch Joachim III, who reacted negatively to the revolution and the developments that followed<sup>207</sup>, the members of the Rum milleti,

---

<sup>204</sup> See Doğu Ergil, 'A Reassessment, the Young Turks, their politics, and anti-colonial struggle', in *Balkan Studies*, v. 16, num. 2, 1975, pp. 39-43.

<sup>205</sup> Feroz Ahmad is underlying that the Unionist slogan was 'Liberty, Equality, and Justice' and not 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', as for instance Abraham Benaroya and others were saying. Feroz Ahmad, 'Unionist relations with the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish Communities', in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, *ibid*, p. 429.

<sup>206</sup> Besides, the Committee of 'Union and Progress', had collaborated with members of the various non Muslim millets of the Empire, even during the years before the revolution. In particular, the committee had developed good relations with the Greeks in Macedonia, whose organizations the exiled in Europe members of the committee were using in order to enter the country. See D. Dakin, *The Greek struggle in Macedonia 1897-1913*, Thessaloniki, 1966, pp. 376-378, cited in Katerina Boura, 'Οι Βουλευτικές Εκλογές στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία', ['The Parliamentary elections in the Ottoman Empire'], *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* [Bulletin of the Center for Asia Minor Studies], 4, Athens, 1983, p. 70, see also A. J. Panayotopoulos, 'Early relations between the Greeks and the Turks', *Balkan Studies*, vol. 21, no 1, Thessaloniki, 1980, pp. 86-95.

<sup>207</sup> Joachim's dissatisfaction with the development of July 1908 and his indirect support to the *ancien régime*, provoked the reaction of the Greek Ottomans of the empire, who were planning anti-patriarchal demonstrations. Finally, the Patriarch backed out and compromised. Thanos Veremis and Katerina Boura had interpreted Joachim's reaction as a 'prophetic' attempt 'to protect the privileges of the Patriarchate that he identified with the privileges of Hellenism'. See K. Boura, *ibid*, p. 71, A. Souliotis-

regardless social status and ideological position, welcomed the event<sup>208</sup>. So did Alexander Mavroyeni Bey, who on 24 July of 1908 was noting in his diary the event with these words: *'today the Sultan re-established the Constitution of Midhat Pacha...We have here an event of colossal importance...From today, a new era is beginning for Turkey'*<sup>209</sup>. And he went on reporting and presenting the well known from the literature of the time image of the peoples' reaction in Istanbul: *'A crowd of almost 40.000 people of all races and status gathered massively today in the afternoon in the Sublime Porte where successively came in front of it the Grand Vizier Said and the Minister of Foreign Affairs Tevfik to express to them their joy on the occasion of the reestablishment of the 1876 Constitution'*<sup>210</sup>.

---

Nikolaidis, *Organization of Constantinople*, ed. by Katerina Boura and Thanos Veremis, Athens-Ioannina, 1984, p. 14. Sia Anagnostopoulou has also pinpointed the issue of the privileges' danger, but had also attributed the patriarch's reaction to his fear of the future devaluation of the Patriarchate's importance and 'the capture' of the millet's power from the lay representatives both of the community and the Greek state, S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 458.

<sup>208</sup> The Greek Ottoman population, of Istanbul at least, expressed its enthusiasm for the event. Behind this enthusiasm an envoy of the Greek state to the committee of Union and Progress, Apostolos Alexandris was seeing a *'chaos of opinions concerning hellenism'*. In his memories he is saying that most of the Greek Ottomans were *'drifted by the friendly demonstrations and the democratic beliefs of Prince Sabahettin and the declarations of equality'*. Others such as Ion Dragoumis, the secretary of the Greek embassy in Constantinople and founding member of the *'Organization of Constantinople'*, as we will see, and G. Bousios, the future deputy, were viewing in the revolution a way for *'Hellenism [to] impose itself to the reborn Empire, which would be soon transformed to a new Byzance with the propagation of the Greek ideas and politic principles through the Parliament'*. Ap. Alexandris, *Πολιτικά Αναμνήσεις*, Patra 1940, p. 19 cited in A. Souliotis-Nikolaidis, *ibid*.

<sup>209</sup> The fact that the Committee did not dethrone the sultan made the latter seem the hero of the new era. From this point of view it is almost natural that A. Mavroyeni Bey—a favor of the Sultan— is attributing the restoration to the latter. Never the less, one year after, when describing the counter revolution of March- April 1909, he will note: *'La revolution du 24 Juillet dernier qui ramena la Constitution fut, comme on sait, l' oeuvre du comité "Union et Progrès". Les troupes de Salonique, ou plutôt de la macédoine furent les initiatrices de cette restauration de la Constitution'*. *'Notes et Souvenirs...'*, *ibid*, p. 30-31, 36.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid*, p. 31. For a description of the people's reaction on the occasion of the constitution's reestablishment, see also among others, Abraham Benaroyia, *Η πρώτη σταδιοδρομία του Ελληνικού προλεταριάτου [The first carrier of the Greek proletariat]*, Athens, 1975, p. 41-45. Such reactions could also be seen as signs of a new conception of the public space in contrast to the prevailing in the past years situation. Alexander is not making any such comment. Yet, when referring to the opening of the parliament he sees a certain change in attitudes, noting characteristically that *'Djévad Bey, Premier Secrétaire du Sultan, lit le discours du Trône d'une manière énergique et en élevant très haut la voix, ce qui n'était pas admis jadis d' après les usages turcs'*. *'Notes et Souvenirs'*, *ibid*. p. 33.

Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's reaction to the announcement of the reestablishment of the 1876 constitution was totally normal; As a member of a non Muslim millet he was seeing in the promises of the Young Turks the enhancement of his role and status as a representative of the non Muslims in the Ottoman state. Also, as a member of the Ottoman bureaucratic elite, sympathizer of the liberal ideology, he was seeing in the constitution a remedy for the despotic regime of AbdulHamid, which nevertheless had served from the beginning of the latter's reign. Some months after the revolution, and before Abdulhamid's dethronement, in one of his notes we find him criticizing both the sultan and the *'horrors and dangers of the despotic regimes'*<sup>211</sup>. Even though Alexander Mavroyeni Bey in his notes praised the favour that his family enjoyed by the sultan and clearly showed that to a great extent his owed his position to the Hamidian regime, he does not hesitate to criticize not the sultan's authority in general, but in particular the despotic regime under the sultan Abdul Hamid.

We could possibly relate his critics of the Hamidian regime first of all with the changes that the Ottoman state was undergoing after the 1908 revolution, as well as with his ideological orientations and affiliations. We have already mentioned that Alexander Mavroyeni Bey was actually a representative of a cosmopolitan, western oriented Ottoman bureaucratic elite, loyal to the ideal of the sultanic authority. He is presented as a typical Ottoman reformer who thinks that the remedy of the Empire's

---

<sup>211</sup> Alexander Mavroyeni is quoting an anecdote that his friend and old school mate of his, Azarian Effendi, minister of Turkey in Belgrade, told him about his father and how the Sultan was suspecting him of conspiring against his life. The charge proved of course false and Mavroyeni Bey is on the occasion of this story commenting on the dangers that the authoritarian Hamidian regime had created. 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, pp. 34-35. Maybe the exaggerations of the Hamidian regime had made Alexander Mavroyeni question the whole issue of power. During the winter of 1907 we find him for the first time writing down a more personal, philosophic like, note: *'Mon sentiment est que plus on occupe un rang élevé plus on sent pénétré de la bêtise humaine ainsi que d' un reel mépris pour les soi-disant grandeurs d' ici bas....Rien ne nous rend plus philosophe que le gouvernement du troupeau humain.....Si j' étais Roi, j'aurais eu des nausées tous les jours et j'aurais senti une espèce d' horreur en me voyant adulé et flatté par les individus de notre espèce'*. *ibid*, p. 25.

problems lays in its westernization and modernization. He praises, for instance, the 'superiority of Europeans, their richness and material force' and believes that the contacts with the European world can exemplify the Ottomans<sup>212</sup>.

To the contrary, he expresses his dislike for the way the people live, act and think in the Orient, adopting a quite 'orientalistic' view of the region's and its people situation<sup>213</sup> and criticizes the survival of such attitudes in the higher strata of the Ottoman state. For instance, he characterizes the heir prince Youssouf Izzeddin Effendi's intimate milieu as 'oriental, very oriental' and asks ironically how such an entourage will 'make the heir of the Throne profit of his staying in Europe...' <sup>214</sup>. He is also very critical towards practices that survive in the ranks of the bureaucracy and are reminiscent of past periods and circumstances, such as the 'backshish' or flattery and sycophantism<sup>215</sup>. He views all these practices as non congruent with the country's progress and the government's rationalization and he indirectly attributes them to the 'despotic' regime of Abdul Hamid, a man 'of remarkable intelligence' but with lack of significant education<sup>216</sup>, as he was noting.

As a pro western, reformer, non Muslim Ottoman bureaucrat, Alexander Mavroyeni Bey had supported the effort for the creation of a common Ottoman identity for all the citizens of the Ottoman Empire, regardless religion. Praising the

---

<sup>212</sup> *ibid*, p. 19.

<sup>213</sup> For instance, when talking with the general consul of Russia in Bayreuth for the situation in Syria, he quotes the ambassador's saying about the bad situation '*du niveau moral des Syriens tant musulmans que chrétiens. Le mensonge régnerait suprême en Syrie. Le vol aussi*'. *ibid*, p. 28.

<sup>214</sup> During his embassy in Vienna in 1912, Alexander Mavroyeni visited the heir prince who was in Edlach, in a sanatorium. The author informs us that the prince was suffering from '*neurasthénie*'. *ibid*, p. 56.

<sup>215</sup> When talking about important personalities of the Ottoman state, he sometimes notes negatively or positively, whether the *backshish* was interesting him or not, whether he '*touchait le backshich*' or not. *ibid*, pp. 19, 25, etc.

<sup>216</sup> *ibid*, p. 65.

liberal ideology that recognized ‘no fanaticism, either of race, or of religion’<sup>217</sup>, he sees in the Young Turks revolution a further step to the realization of the ideal of Ottomanism. Thus, during the first year of the revolution and before the counter revolution of 1909, that unfolded the different tenses and tensions inside the Committee and the state<sup>218</sup>, Mavroyeni Bey repeatedly expressed his satisfaction with the new regime.

He praised Enver Paşa, ‘one of the heroes of the recent revolution’, who was claiming that ‘we are all brothers. There exist no more in Turkey Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbians, Rumanians, Muslims and Jews; Under the same blue sky, we are all proud to be Ottomans’<sup>219</sup>. On the occasion of an honorary celebration for Enver Paşa, Mavroyeni Bey delivered –and then noted in his diary– a speech praising the unity of all the Empire’s races and their ‘common preoccupation to serve [their] common homeland with enthusiasm’<sup>220</sup>. In his speech he was also congratulating the officers involved in the revolution for ‘their perseverance, honesty and courage’ and for their

---

<sup>217</sup> *ibid*, p. 52.

<sup>218</sup> During this first year, there has been developed a double opposition to the core of the CUP: on the one hand the liberal wing of the committee and on the other the conservative and lower religious strata. The disappointment was expressed through a mutiny by the so-called Muhammedan Union who joined round it soldiers, *medresse* students and other religious groups which were being undermined by the new regime in the name of ‘the restoration of the Şariat’. The counter revolution was followed by the dethronement of the sultan and the expulsion of some of the high rank officials of the ancient regime, such as for instance Arap İzzet Paşa. Doğu Ergil, *ibid*, p. 30, E. Zürcher, *Turkey. A Modern History*, (greek forthcoming translation), Alexandria, Athens, p. 132-143.

<sup>219</sup> Alexander Mavroyeni is quoting in a footnote this passage from a discourse Enver Paşa delivered in Thessalonica on July 1908, *ibid*, p. 35. The specific passage is also cited by William Miller, *The Ottoman Empire and its Successors, 1801-1927*, Cambridge 1936, p. 476, cited in Doğu Ergil, *ibid*, p. 29.

<sup>220</sup> This is how Alexander is describing the occasion ‘*Quelques membres du Club d’Orient ont voulu fêter Enver Bey, un tout jeune homme, très doux et modeste d’apparence. On donna donc un dîner hier soir en son honneur...A la fin du dîner, on fit des speeches, en turc bien entendu...*’. A. Mavroyeni, *ibid*, p. 35.

act based on the principles of *'justice and equality'*, and wished for a *'common effort to complete their act and thus place their country where their patriotism deserves'*<sup>221</sup>.

His enthusiasm about the reestablishment of the constitution was accompanied by his nomination as Senator in December 1908. His appointment to such a high post was –at least theoretically– empowering his role in the Ottoman State, even if it was to a great extent due once again to his relationship with the sultan and the palace. After all, the Committee of Union and Progress did not –at least at the beginning– aim at eliminating the power of the old bureaucrats, members of the previous government, or even at abolishing the power of the sultan. Their basic preoccupation was to save the Empire and protect its integrity through curbing, but not abolishing the power of the sultan. Many of the old bureaucrats were used in various posts and continued to play an important role; Even the post of the grand vizierate itself was left in the hands of Said Paşa<sup>222</sup>.

In this framework, it seems quite logical that Alexander Mavroyeni attributes to the revolution such a special importance. Actually, we have to stress that Mavroyeni Bey was viewing in the restoration of the constitution a promise and a guaranty for his place and status, not simply as a non Muslim of the Empire, but mostly as a Neophanariot, meaning a representative of the Greek Ottoman elite. For him the ideal of Ottomanism, or Hellenottomanism, as it was translated in the vernacular of his respective religious community, did not mean much more than the enhancement of his

---

<sup>221</sup> Ibid.

<sup>222</sup> In fact, the Committee of Union and Progress constrained itself to the role of vigilant safeguard of the constitution. After all, the Young Turks were belonging to the newly emerging professional classes; they were products of the modern secular, military or civilian professional schools, children of middle class families and did have neither the experience to govern, nor the required background for entering the higher ranks of bureaucracy. To face the difficulties that they encountered during the first months after the revolution, they had to collaborate with the old bureaucrats and use their experience. Besides, their basic aim –at least during the first months– was to satisfy the minorities in order to prevent disruptive tendencies and any anomaly, but not promote any significant social change. Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks, The Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics 1908-1914*, Oxford University Press, 1969, p. 16-17. Doğu Ergil, *ibid*, p. 26-27.

position as a Greek Ottoman statesman. The reforms of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, enforced with the constitution of 1876 and its restoration in 1908, were creating for the elites of the non Muslim millets, representative of which Mavroyeni Bey was, the appropriate conditions for their existence and the enforcement of their status. And this was a basic reason why progressively after 1908, the policies and the practices that the CUP will adopt –practices which will challenge the non Muslim millets’ status, shaped under these reforms- will generate tension between the former and the leaders of the non Muslim millets, who will find their interests injured<sup>223</sup>.

Actually, the status of Alexander Mavroyeni Bey will be undermined both by the internal developments in the Rum millet-i and in the Ottoman state, developments which will reduce his importance and marginalize him and the group/class he represented.

***Changes inside the Rum milleti-Their impact on Alexander Mavroyeni Bey as Neophanariot.***

First of all, with the restoration of the constitution and during the first elections of 1908, a shift of power inside the community became apparent. The role of the Greek orthodox elite -the great urban Greek Orthodox ‘class’ and especially the Neophanariots- in the administration and organization of the community would be

---

<sup>223</sup> Feroz Ahmad has very eloquently expressed the view that the leaders of the Greek community ‘realized that Unionist aspirations were not compatible with their own traditional privileges and long-term interests. The atmosphere of distrust and confrontation between the community and the Unionists arose out of this realization’. So, according always to F. Ahmad, the basis of the antagonism between the two ‘was rooted in class conflict in so far as the Unionist scheme to transform Ottoman society undermined the position of all privileged classes, regardless of race or religion’. F. Ahmad, ‘Unionist Relations with the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish Communities’, *ibid*, p. 403. The explanation that Ahmad is furnishing is finding us to a great extent congruent and we will use it as the model of our further examination of the Greek Orthodox community’s stand in the years especially after the counter revolution of 1909.

gradually undermined and challenged by the middle urban classes, which will become the protagonists and the main representatives of the community in the Ottoman parliament. This change affected also the ideological orientations of the community: its new representatives were affiliating themselves to the Greek state and its ideological-political 'commands', something that in combination with the problems and difficulties the Greek Orthodox of the Empire were facing by the Young Turks' government, especially after the outburst of the Balkan Wars, led to the millet's ideological 'subjection' to the Greek state.

This shift became apparent during the first elections and was reflected in the way the community prepared itself for them, as well as in the electoral result itself. Neither the Patriarchate, nor the traditional head of the community had the upper hand in the political mobilization of the Greek Orthodox; It was mainly the 'Greek Political Association', a branch of the 'Organization of Constantinople' created for the electoral needs. The 'Organization of Constantinople' was a society founded some months before the Young Turks revolution by two Greek citizens, Athanasios Souliotis- Nikolaidis<sup>224</sup>, an officer of the Greek army, and his friend Ion Dragoumis, secretary of the Greek embassy in Constantinople, and rallied round it and its quasi-nationalistic ideology the majority of the Greek Orthodox population<sup>225</sup>.

---

<sup>224</sup> Athanasios Souliotis Nikolaidis was a representative of the generation that experienced the defeat of 1897 and saw in the Macedonian conflicts a chance to defend the Greek nation against the Bulgarian claims. He had first moved to Macedonia where he became an agent of the Greek state and created in 1906 the 'Organization of Thessaloniki' to counteract the Bulgarian attacks. The 'Organization of Thessaloniki' was a prelude to the 'Organization of Constantinople'. A. Souliotis-Nikolaidis, *ibid*, p. 9-10.

<sup>225</sup> The Organisation was created in April 1908 and set as its concrete aim the 'combat against Bulgarianism'. Soon after the Young Turks revolution, the political orientations of the organization shifted and centred around the 'mutual understanding and the cooperation of the peoples of the East, e.g. of the Balkan Peninsula and Asia Minor'. Souliotis-Nicolaides was advocating a collaboration between Greeks, Turks and all the others races of the Empire, a collaboration which in his view would lead to the gradual *hellenization* of the Empire and the domination of the Hellenic civilization in all the domains of life in the East, since 'Greek Spirit' possessed this conquering and civilizing power. This ideology started as a reconsideration and a more concrete version of the 'Great Idea' but ended up to challenge it. From 1908, the 'Organization of Constantinople', the diplomatic authorities and the press

It was also the Greek consular authorities and representatives, something that provoked the Young Turks' reaction<sup>226</sup>. The elections were held in a rather tensed atmosphere: the Patriarchate<sup>227</sup> was hostile both to the Young Turks and the initiative of the 'Political Association' to organize electors and candidates, but finally compromised and collaborated with the latter. The developments of October 1908 in the Balkan provinces of the Empire, and especially the proclamation of the Cretan's decision for annexation to the Greek State had a negative impact on the electoral procedure and generated mistrust from the CUP towards the Greek Ottomans<sup>228</sup>. Moreover, the recorded incidents of electoral illegalities to the detriment of the Greek orthodox community provoked the latter's reaction. Finally, 24 Greek ottomans deputies were elected in the second ottoman parliament<sup>229</sup>. Many among them were members of the Organization of Constantinople and were representing the emerging professional classes. With the exception of Georgantzoglou Pasa, most of them

---

will assume the politic authority and guidance of the millet. On the Organization see S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 304, Thanos Veremis, 'Ιδεολογικές Προϋποθέσεις για μια συνεργασία Ελλήνων και Τούρκων' ['Ideological Preconditions for a collaboration between Greek and Turks'], *Δελτίο Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής Εταιρείας Ελλάδος* [Bulletin of the Historic and Ethnological Association of Greece], Athens, 1980, v. 23, p. 405-407, A. Souliotis-Nikolaidis, *ibid*, p. 9-23, and A. J. Panayotopoulos, 'The "Great Idea" and the Vision of Eastern Federation: A Propos of the Views of I. Dragoumis and A. Souliotis-Nikolaidis', in *Balkan Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, Thessaloniki 1980, p. 331-338.

<sup>226</sup> For instance, in Samsun and Trabzon the fact that the Greek consuls were visiting the Greek candidates deprived them of the votes of their Muslim compatriots. K. Boura, *ibid*, pp.72- 73.

<sup>227</sup> For the Patriarchates attitude towards the CUP, see F. Ahmad, 'Unionist relations...' *ibid*, pp. 407-410.

<sup>228</sup> The same day that the Cretans declared their unification with Greece -6 October 1908- Austria Hungary declared the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and a day before Bulgaria had proclaimed its independence. K. Boura, *ibid*, p. 72.

<sup>229</sup> *ibid*, p. 73. Feroz Ahmad is mistakenly noting that the number of elected deputies was 26, *The Young Turks*, *ibid*, p. 28, and F. Ahmad and D.A. Rustow, 'İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Meclisler 1908-1912', *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1976, p. 4-5, cited in K. Boura, *ibid*, p. 73.

belonged to the middle urban strata<sup>230</sup> –just as the majority of the CUP’s supporters-: they were lawyers, merchants, professors, employees in the Regie, etc<sup>231</sup>.

The representation of the traditional Neophanariotic class was restrained and its members were now basically appointed as Senators or in specific ministries<sup>232</sup>. As we already mentioned, Alexander Mavroyeni Bey had been appointed permanent senator on December 1908. But the Senate, a traditional body exclusively appointed by the Sultan, and composed of old –literally and metaphorically- bureaucrats was representing a conservative group and tension inside the Ottoman state. Despite the fact that the Senate preserved the right of the authentic interpretation of the constitution, overall it was regarded as a body of minor importance that did not have the power to play an active role in the political life of the state. It is indicative that there had been proposes to abolish it, or to change the way it was composed –as we will further examine in one of Mavroyeni’s discourses-, and that progressively and especially after 1914 the government was not paying significant attention to its proposals and questions<sup>233</sup>.

At the same time that his place in the community was challenged by the empowerment and the predominance of its new economic and politic powers and by

---

<sup>230</sup> He had been elected deputy of Smyrna but in 1911 he was replaced and nominated senator, S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 468.

<sup>231</sup> Among them, there was also Pavlos Karolidis, professor of history in Athens University, who had lost his ottoman nationality and had become Greek citizen. Karolidis will support the CUP and become one of the more fervent critics of the Organization and its policies. His attitude and ideology was opposed by the Organization, which in its attempt to undermine him tattled that he had even converted to Islamism. A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 395.

<sup>232</sup> In the beginning of the constitutional era we find, except A. Mavroyeni four Greek Ottoman Senators: Stavraki Aristarchi, D. Mavrokordatos, Georgiadis, A. Georgantzoglou. E. Emmanouilidis, *Τα τελευταία έτη της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας, [The last years of the Ottoman Empire]*, Athens, 1924, p. 301. Also, the governments between 1908-1913 were always appointing a Greek orthodox member of the Senate in the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Forests and Mines. A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 392.

<sup>233</sup> E. Emmanouilidis, *ibid*, p. 239. The author is characterizing the senate as ‘*inutile body that never took any salutary initiative*’ for which the ‘*governmental circles were talking in a contemptuous way*’.

the downgrading of his status in the Ottoman state, his status also as a member of a non Muslim community of the Empire was changing.

The changes were an offspring of the Young Turks revolution, who laid as their basic aim the preservation of the Ottoman state and its amelioration in the name of social change. For the Young Turks the main objective of the revolution was the secularization and modernization of the state. In order to achieve it, they aimed at the creation of a common to all the citizens of the Empire sense of belonging to a secular Ottoman nation, which nevertheless was vaguely defined. What they wanted was the replacement of a broken into religious millets ottoman society by a unified, secular one. But their attempts for equality and free representation of all the citizens of the empire in the State and the newly elected Parliament were once again based on the millet system. The elections were held to a great extent on religious criteria, meaning that each religious community was voting for its co religionist representatives. By this way, on the one hand the non Muslim deputies could not have been regarded or could not have acted as representatives of the espoused by the Young Turks Ottoman nation, but mostly as representatives of their respective millets; and on the other, in the name of secularization, the non Muslim millets were being politicized, something which will lead to their gradual nationalisation , rather than to their ottomanization<sup>234</sup>.

The problems the Young Turks started facing from October 1908 –with the complications in the Balkan provinces and Crete-, made them reconsider their attitudes towards the non Muslim communities, as well as their conceptions concerning the state's nature<sup>235</sup> and the definition of a common ottoman identity.

---

<sup>234</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 456-498.

<sup>235</sup> The issue of the state's redefinition was in the core of different approaches concerning the future of the Ottoman Empire. According to Yusuf Akçura there had been three different schools of thought, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*: the Westernists, the Islamists and the Turkists, each one of who had a different view about the new state. Very schematically, the Westernists wanted a secular, western like state, the

Especially, the counter revolution of 1909, which unfolded the different tensions that existed inside the state, provoked an ideological shock, and made them re-examine their conceptions about ottomanism. And even though we are not legitimate to talk of policies of *turcification* by the Young Turks, or of a clear cut ideology of turkism from such an early period, still we could possibly seek for the seeds of the future awareness of the Young Turks turkishness in that period<sup>236</sup>.

With the counter revolution of 1909, the Young Turks saw clearly that the attempts of negotiating with the non Muslims were not having the expected results. Besides, many Greek Orthodox were affiliating to the liberals, who by 1909 constituted a considerable opposition to the CUP. The views of Prince Sabahettin about 'administrative decentralization and personal initiative', that the liberals were stressing, had a significant effect on the non Muslims, many of whom collaborated with the party the liberals formed in 1908 (*Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası*)<sup>237</sup>. In particular, the patriarch Joachim III himself was informally discussing with the representatives of the Liberals a possible collaboration of the two for the elections, and the Greek orthodox representatives in the Assembly were supporting them<sup>238</sup>.

---

Islamists a religious based state and the Turkists a national one. See, Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasî Fikirleri 1895-1908*, Istanbul 2002, pp. 275-286 and Niyazi Berkes, *ibid*, p. 337-346.

<sup>236</sup> This awareness will become noticeable only during the Balkan wars. F. Ahmad, 'Unionist Relations with the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish Communities', *ibid*, p. 411.

<sup>237</sup> Many Greek ottomans –as well as other non Muslims- had supported the liberal movements from the very beginning. They had participated in the first 'Congress of the Liberals' held in Paris in 1902 and had supported Prince Sabahettin's wing. Actually, V. Mousouros-Gikas, ex member of the Council of State was personal friend with the latter and had collaborated with the liberals in the composition of their programme concerning decentralization. After the revolution, a considerable part of the Greek ottomans were continuing to support the Liberals. Indeed, three important personalities of the community, Kosmidis, Skalieris and Kazanovas had been among the founding members of the *Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası*. See A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 392.

<sup>238</sup> It is also characteristic and telling that the Greek orthodox –at least a significant proportion among them- adopted a negative stand towards the CUP. For instance, the Greek newspaper *Neologos* was praising the outbreak of armed conflicts in 12 April of 1909. F. Ahmad, *ibid*, p. 409-410.

These ideological orientations of a significant part among the Greek Ottomans and the overall situation made the CUP inaugurate, after the dethronement of the Sultan Abdul Hamid<sup>239</sup> -in an attempt to control the situation created- a period of constitutional changes which had as their main aim to enforce the Assembly's role to the detriment of the sultan and curb the autonomy and the privileges of the non Muslim millets. A new crisis in the Cretan question in 1909 and the imposition by the government of the Young Turks of a boycott on the products of the Greek state aggravated the situation. The Greek Ottomans were expressing their reaction from the Ottoman Parliament and were opposing the CUP and its politics. Actually, the situation in the Greek Orthodox community was not characterised by unity of opinions about the position that its representatives had to adopt. The Organization of Constantinople had created a 'Greek group' inside the Assembly, composed of 16 out of the 24 Greek deputies that was constantly attacking the CUP<sup>240</sup> and was trying to find a way to bring together the non Muslim deputies and unite their claims<sup>241</sup>. These deputies were mainly supporting the Liberals and their views; Their affiliation to the latter was enforced after the creation in November of 1911 of the Liberal Union (*Hürriyet ve İttilaf Fırkası*), which gathered around it all the anti-Unionists forces of the Empire. The Organization collaborated with the party in the elections of 1912.

---

<sup>239</sup> A. Mavroyeni is supporting the view that the sultan was behind the uprising of 1909: *'La conviction deviant Presque générale que l' auteur principal du mouvement du 31/12 Avril dernier serait le Sultan Hamid lui-même. Dans tout les cas, c'est là l' opinion unanime du Comité 'Union et Progrés', qui ne desire qu' une chose, à savoir, déposer de suite Hamid'*, A. Mavroyeni, *ibid*, p. 36.

<sup>240</sup> The deputies of this group had many times evoked the reactions of the CUP, by their provocative declarations and remarks. G. Bousios, for instance, had once declared in the Parliament that he *'was as Ottoman as the Ottoman bank was'*. A. Alexandris, *ibid*, p. 394.

<sup>241</sup> In 1911, 30 non Muslim deputies were brought together under the initiatives of the 'Political Organization'. They also published a common newspaper, *'La Tribune des Nationalités'*. At the same time, the Organization was concluding an agreement with some Bulgarian deputies about their collaboration in the future elections. K. Boura, *ibid*, p. 78.

On the other hand, the Patriarchate and some other Greek deputies were not approving the policies of the Organization; Even the Greek state was critical towards the Organization's activities. The latter was accusing those deputies who did not want to cooperate with the Organization of being 'anti-national' and the overall situation in the community was tense. The Patriarch Joachim III himself had reached an agreement with the CUP, which he promised to support in the elections of 1912<sup>242</sup>. These elections were held in an atmosphere of violence and terror –they had been known as 'Sopalı Seçim'- in an attempt from the part of CUP to counter and curb the liberal's influence and power. It is characteristic that the number of Greek Orthodox deputies was reduced to 15, most of whom –actually, 12 of them- had supported the Committee<sup>243</sup>.

---

<sup>242</sup> Nevertheless, the Organization intervened and cancelled the agreement, according to which the Greek orthodox community was going to raise the number of its deputies in the future elections from 24 to 37. K. Boura, *ibid*, p. 78-79.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid*, E. Zürcher, *ibid*, p. 145-150.

### **3. A. Mavroyeni Bey's ideological response to the changes through his discourses in the Ottoman Senate.**

How was Alexander Mavroyeni Bey reacting to these developments and which was his ideological position? How was he viewing the situation and the future of the Ottoman Empire, the place, the role and the nature of the Rum milleti in the changing Ottoman state, as well as his own position as a Neophanariot bureaucrat? During the first period of the Young Turks government, the period of 'liberal or conventional reforms' (1908-1913), as Doğu Ergil has called it<sup>244</sup>, Alexander Mavroyeni Bey was still an active representative of his respective group -, the Neophanariots and the traditional representatives of the Greek Orthodox in the Ottoman bureaucracy- and his millet in the State, even though his place had been seriously undermined. His reaction to these developments is all the more interesting, because it could help us understand, or at least try to decode his personal thoughts and interpretations of what was going both in the Rum milleti and in the Ottoman state.

If we are to judge from his personal souvenirs, we will see that at least until the Bab-i Ali Coup of January 1913, Mavroyeni Bey does not seem really preoccupied with the evolutions in the Empire. He constrains himself in quoting different versions of the Sultan Abdulhamid's dethronement, he continues narrating anecdotes concerning various Neophanariots and Ottoman statesmen, he notes without making any significant comments all the crises that the government was going through (the counterrevolution of 1909, the crisis in the CUP with Sadik Bey, the involvement of the militaries in the state's administration, the culmination of the crisis in April 1911,

---

<sup>244</sup> Doğu Ergil, *ibid*, p. 27.

the war with Italy), and he refers to his term in the embassy of Vienna, but without again providing us with any significant information<sup>245</sup>

Yet, during this same period, precisely during the years 1910-1911, 1914 and 1918, Mavroyeni Bey delivered discourses in the Ottoman Senate, concerning all the matters and issues that arose –directly relevant to the Rum milleti or not –, on which he could and he wanted to comment. Even if the nature of these discourses is more formal and more stereotypic, still they are very useful in our attempt to compose Mavroyeni Bey's ideological point of view. Briefly and in order to better organize our examination, we can divide his discourses into two categories: those concerning more strictly the Ottoman state, and those where Mavroyeni Bey is speaking as a representative of the Greek orthodox community, defending its privileges and criticising the measures taken against the orthodox Christians. When examining this last category, we will divide it into two subcategories, the first one comprising those discourses where Mavroyeni Bey seems to speak as a representative of his community and the second one comprising those where it seems that he speaks more as a representative of his specific group/class. Overall, Mavroyeni Bey structures his discourses around and bases his judgements and thoughts on the tripartite motto of liberty, equality and justice among all the Ottoman citizens. The issue of respect of the non Muslims rights constitutes the ideological core of all of his discourses and he relates it directly with the preservation and empowerment of the Ottoman Empire.

---

<sup>245</sup> For instance, he provides us with details concerning the situation of the embassy's building, or the reception ceremony, etc, 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid*, pp. 30-59.

For Alexander Mavroyeni Bey, as for the majority of the Ottoman statesmen, the basic question that had to be answered, the main problem that had to be solved was how to save, regenerate and empower the state. Mavroyeni Bey was centring his proposals and views on three issues: the economic development of the country, the application of a true policy of equality and justice among the Ottoman citizens and the avoidance of any war like encounters with other countries<sup>246</sup>.

In all of his discourses, either on the projects of the answers to the Discourse of the Throne or on the projects of the laws concerning the Budget, Mavroyeni Bey is stressing the '*absolute necessity to become rich*'; For him, the country's '*salvation laid there*'<sup>247</sup>, viewing the remedy for the empire's problems in the amelioration essentially of its economic situation. This amelioration would be achieved only by developing the national sources of wealth, such as agriculture, industry and commerce, by making productive investments, in public works and public instruction and by applying a better administration in the various domains of the state, especially in the ministry of Economy<sup>248</sup>. Mavroyeni Bey was juxtaposing the Empire's good military status with its deplorable economic situation and its bad internal organization. 'Declaring that he was '*of course an admirer of our Minister of War*' and that he was recognizing the need of a powerful army and navy, especially after the outbreak of the war with Italy, he was linking directly the state's military situation with its economic

---

<sup>246</sup> That is how Alexander Mavroyeni Bey himself is articulating his views in his 'Discours sur l'ensemble du projet de loi concernant le Budget', 23 Mai 1911, in I. Konstantinidis, *ibid*, pp. 114-124.

<sup>247</sup> 'Discours sur le Projet de reponse au Discours du Trône', 30 November 1910, in *ibid*, p. 109.

<sup>248</sup> Mavroyeni Bey was stressing the need to staff the ministries with competent and responsible civil servants who would better control the administration of the more sensible domains of the state, as well the need for tax changes. 'Discours sur l'ensemble du projet de loi concernant le Budget', 28 June 1910, in *ibid*, p. 105.

empowerment: *'We have to become rich: it is the essential. After achieving that, let arm us to the teeth; lets have the strongest army of the world'*. In his view, the two domains should develop harmonically, since the *'predominance of the military effort on the effort of internal reorganization would in the long run lead either to war, or to bankruptcy'* <sup>249</sup>. And even in a period of war, just as was the case with the Italian – Ottoman war of 1911, he was suggesting that the government should not neglect the economic prosperity of the country, since economic enfeeblement was making the country vulnerable to foreign enemies.

But, according always to Mavroyeni Bey, for the country to develop its national sources, there was need of capital: *'We need capital, and more capital and always capital...Since we need much money for the army and the navy...since we do not currently have in our disposition the number of sufficient millions to offer them all to the country's rectification and to the augmentation of our national wealth by the construction of works of public utility, since in order to make our nation strong, there is absolute necessity to augment considerably our national wealth, and since if we do not succeed in augmenting the latter we will find ourselves in a position that my patriotism does not allow me to envisage...we must have recourse in capitals' ... 'Let us be large with capital, either national, which is unfortunately without great importance, or foreign, which has an immense importance'* <sup>250</sup>. He accepts that they have to be careful with capital and capitalists, but he finds the fear some Ottomans approve towards capital irrational and exaggerated and ascertains that once the capital enters the country, it becomes Ottoman. Reposing his hope for national economic development and empowerment on the economic support of foreign investors, he

---

<sup>249</sup> 'Discours sur le Projet de reponse au Discours du Trône', 30 November 1910, in *ibid* p. 110.

<sup>250</sup> Discourse of 28 June 1910, *ibid*, p. 106, and of 23 May 1911, *ibid*, p. 115.

ironically says that the capitalists won't help them '*only for their beautiful eyes*' and praises for administrative reorganization of the government and economic facilities in the import and export trade, so that the latter will be attracted<sup>251</sup>.

Actually, Mavroyeni Bey's views of economy coincided with those of the Liberals -and especially with the programme Prince Sabahettin had drawn-, who were thinking that the key to the country's development was to pursue a liberal economic policy and create a *laissez faire* liberal capitalistic Ottoman economy<sup>252</sup>. In their opinion, the creation of a powerful Ottoman economy was depending on the economic 'help' that the foreign investors would offer; Thus, they were praising the opening of the Ottoman Empire's market to the world of trade and seeking to surmount all the possible obstacles in order to meet this end<sup>253</sup>.

As we already said, Mavroyeni Bey is relating the issue of the Empire's well being with the well being of all its citizens, regardless religious differences. Even in these discourses that are concerning laws or modification of laws that do not -at least directly- touch exclusively upon the non Muslims, he stresses that the State's prosperity passes through the application of equality, '*not the equality proclaimed in words on every occasion, but never applied in reality, nor the equality seen as an inanimate statue that deserves to be conserved in one of our museums, but real equality*' and justice, that unfortunately, according to Mavroyeni Bey, '*has not taken*

---

<sup>251</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>252</sup> N. Berkes, *The Development of secularism in Turkey*, *ibid.*, p. 333-334.

<sup>253</sup> In this framework, they were, for instance, opposing the capitulations not because they were impeding the creation of a national economy, but because they were contrary to the philosophy of *laissez faire-laissez passer* practices. N. Berkes, *ibid.* Mavroyeni Bey was also opposing the capitulations; On the occasion of the capitulations abolition in September 1914, he was noting in his diary that '*la date d'aujourd'hui deviendra célèbre car c'est aujourd'hui que le Cabinet Said Halim Pacha notifie officiellement l'abolition des Capitulations qui datent de l'année 1535*' and he was also quoting the Irade Imperial of the abolition. Yet, the importance he was attributing to the event was both economic -the commercial agreement will be henceforth conducted according to the international law-, but also national, meaning that the abolition of capitulations was enforcing the 'national sovereignty'. A. Mavroyeni, 'Notes et Souvenirs', *ibid.*, p. 63.

*strong roots*’ in the Empire<sup>254</sup>. In 1911, he openly criticizes the internal politics of the State for chauvinism and attributes the problems the country is facing to the policy followed by the government.

If in these discourses the governmental policies adopted after 1909 towards the non Muslims and in particular the Christians make up only a part of his sayings, in the rest of them they will constitute the main theme.

### ***A. Mavroyeni Bey defending the millet’s privileges.***

In the beginning of the era that was inaugurated with the Young Turks revolution of 1908, the former had ‘no intention of altering the basic state structure’<sup>255</sup> and they believed that the constitution and the promises of equality and justice would solve the problems of the Ottoman state and eliminate the nationalistic tendencies of the non Muslims. But the developments of the first months that we surveyed in the previous pages were contradicting their aspirations. In 1910, Talat Paşa was declaring that they ‘*had made unsuccessful attempts to convert the non-Muslim into a loyal Ottoman. There can therefore be no question of equality, until we have succeeded in our task of Ottomanizing the Empire*’<sup>256</sup>.

In practice, the Young Turks project of Ottomanization of the non Muslims –and in particular the Greek orthodox in our case- would pass through significant modifications in various articles of the constitution, which were gradually changing

---

<sup>254</sup> A. Mavroyeni, 23 May 1911, *ibid.*, p. 115, ‘Discours sur le projet de réponse au Discours du Trône’, 4 November 1911, *op.cit.*, p. 131-132. This last discourse was partially delivered because it was interrupted by some ‘*honorable Senators*’, as Mavroyeni Bey is informing us.

<sup>255</sup> Doğu Ergil, *ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>256</sup> At the same time, he stressed that ‘the Şariat, all our historic past and the susceptibilities of hundred million Muslims are an insurmountable obstacle to the establishment of real equality’, in Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1968, p. 218.

their prior to 1908 status. The first changes were realized during 1909, when it was decided that all Ottoman citizens, regardless religion and race, would serve their military service in the Ottoman army<sup>257</sup>. In 1910 the legislative changes became more systematic and were directly attacking the status of the non Muslims privileges: the supervision of the school's administration was brought under the jurisdiction of the ministry of education, a uniform legal code was prepared, etc<sup>258</sup>.

Alexander Mavroyeni was attacking the changes of the constitution on a legal basis. Declaring that he was a partisan of the partial change of the constitution, since that one of 1876 was not perfect, he was nonetheless viewing in the importance of the modifications the impact of '*an anti-liberal wind that was blowing in the higher spheres*' and an attempt to modify the constitution '*in its totality and all at once*'. According to Mavroyeni Bey, such a change was not permitted by the constitution itself, since the latter was previewing in the first paragraph of its 116 article the change of only some of its clauses, in case of ascertained necessity. Besides, for such a radical change of the Constitution, which would amount to its replacement by a new one, there was need of a Constitutional Assembly, a function that neither the Senate nor the Assembly had; In addition, in order for a change to become absolutely necessary, they had to let a considerable period of time to pass and prove the necessity of the espoused changes. And it was basically the public opinion -the press, the meetings all over the country- through its demands that could prove the necessity of a

---

<sup>257</sup> Traditionally, the non Muslims were 'buying' off their non conscription to the ottoman army in the form of a tax. Even if the Greek orthodox accepted the law -the first conscription took place in 1910-, there were still some who preferred to buy off their military service. Finally, in 1915 the Assembly restored the tax exemption for military service. F. Ahmad, 'Unionist Relations with the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish Communities', *ibid.*, p. 413. During the same year, two other laws were voted: the 'Law of Associations', prohibiting the formation of political associations, whose basis and name was ethnic, national or religious, and a 'Law for the prevention of Brigandage and Sedition'. Doğu Ergil, *ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>258</sup> See, S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid.*, pp. 461-464, A. Souliotis-Nikolaidis, *ibid.*, pp. 18-23, F. Ahmad, *ibid.*, pp. 412-414.

a new Constitution. Since none of these preconditions existed in their case, Mavroyeni Bey could not legitimize such a radical change. After all, he was claiming, *“the people’s happiness did not exclusively depend on the laws’ perfection, but mostly on the perfection of the people in charge to apply them, as well as on the perfection of the persons that constitute the mass of people”*<sup>259</sup>.

In principal, what it had provoked Mavroyeni Bey’s reaction and critics was not the quantity of the articles changed, but the importance of the introduced changes that were basically altering the status of the non Muslims. The changes were aiming to the state’s secularization and the creation of a common ottoman identity by eliminating the differences between Muslims and non Muslims, something which was translated into curtailing the millet’s administrative autonomy to organize its internal life. And if the Greek Ottomans’ reaction towards the law for the Christian’s military service was positive, it was not the same with other laws that were virtually violating the legal status of the millet system, and thus taking away from the millet’s traditional power centers –patriarchate, Neophanariots and important bourgeois- the privilege to be in charge of their community.

Indeed, in the first case of the Christians conscription, both the Patriarchate and the lay representatives of the Rum milleti had not expressed a significant opposition. Mavroyeni Bey in his discourses<sup>260</sup> was expressing the common view that the military service was a sacred case and that every sage Ottoman should not avoid it. Mavroyeni Bey’s only comment was that the conscription of the non Muslims in an army

---

<sup>259</sup> ‘Discours sur l’ ensemble du projet de loi concernant la revision de la Constitution’, 20 April 1910, in *ibid*, pp. 92-93.

<sup>260</sup> We found two discourses on the issue of military service –one on the student’s deferment of their military service, and another on the non Muslims military service- both of which are without date and exist only in Greek. They do not exist in the proceedings of the Ottoman Senate, which probably means that they were never delivered.

exclusively composed by Muslims, whose principal ideal was the defense of the Muslim religion –even though the notion of homeland had been added-, should have been accompanied by certain modifications in the internal regulation of the army. In this framework, he was asking for assurances that no conversion or proselytism would be allowed in the army, that the non Muslims would be free to perform their religious duties and that the non Muslims who were studying either abroad, or in non governmental higher schools would be equally deferred on the ground of their studies<sup>261</sup>. In his view, only with respect to other's religion and by eliminating the discrimination policies it would be possible to promote the notion of homeland and make the citizens of the Ottoman Empire defend its salvation; Maltreating the Christians would be as encouraging them to buy off their service, while their basic aim should be '*the cultivation of love for the military service*', and at the same time it would oppose the principles of equality and justice<sup>262</sup>.

Actually, Mavroyeni Bey's views were coinciding with and following the Patriarchate's line. The latter in its circular about the military service and in a series of articles, published in the *Ekklesiastiki Alitheia* –the Patriarchate's official review- was inducing the Greek Ottomans '*to perform their military duties, in the name of patriotism*', and was seeing in this great event a proof for the establishment of equality<sup>263</sup>. But, just as Mavroyeni Bey was claiming, for the army to transform from

---

<sup>261</sup> A. Mavroyeni was claiming that since the Schools of the Government were not as good as others inside and outside the Empire, it was natural that many Ottoman young people would prefer continuing their studies in the latter. Not deferring these students was in his opinion an indirect way just to make them prefer the Government schools. 'About student's deferment', undated, in *ibid.*, p. XVII.

<sup>262</sup> *ibid.*, pp. XVI, XVII, and 'About the non Muslim's Military Service', undated, in *ibid.*, pp. XVII, XIX.

<sup>263</sup> *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, [Ecclesiastic Truth], 2 September 1909, p. 273 and 21 October 1909, p. 329. The Greek Orthodox deputies, especially those of the Organization of Constantinople, welcomed the event. In particular, G. Bousios was so enthusiastic that he was characterizing the conscription of Greek orthodox to the ottoman army as way for the former to mix with the Turk soldiers and thus promote the ideal of the creation of a multiethnic Anatolian federation. A. Alexandris, *ibid.*, p. 394.

Muslim to Ottoman the Patriarchate was praising for the respect of the Christians religious beliefs<sup>264</sup>, for the creation of companies exclusively composed only by coreligionists, and if possible by soldiers of the same social rank<sup>265</sup>, as well as for the promotion of the educated Christians inside the army according to their qualifications.

We find the same congruence of opinions between Mavroyeni Bey and the Patriarchate also in the case of the privileges' curtailing, which provoked the unanimous reaction of the millet's representatives. The issue of the privileges that the Greek orthodox community was enjoying in the Ottoman Empire did not arise suddenly in 1910, but it had constituted a matter of controversy between the Ottoman government and the Patriarchate from the time of Abdulhamid's reign<sup>266</sup>. The issue was brought up again in 1910, when the government attempted to unify the educational system of the Empire, thus bringing the non Muslim's education under the government's direct control –meaning the direct control on the Greek orthodox school's economics and on the composition of the school committees. What this

---

<sup>264</sup> That meant, according to the Patriarchate, the prohibition of proselytism and conversions, the existence in the army of Christian priests, as well as the existence of a separate place in the army which would serve as a church, and the respect of their religious feasts and fasts, *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 2 December 1909, p. 378.

<sup>265</sup> It is very characteristic that the Patriarch in a letter to the Sultan is stressing that '*young gentle men from the town who possess a good education from their families and their schools cannot easily mix with their colleges who come from villages, without having any education either from their families or from the school*'. Even though in the letter the nationality of these young townsmen is not clarified, we suppose that the author was indirectly pinpointing the cultural differences between the Greek orthodox townsmen and the Muslim peasants. *ibid*, p. 379.

<sup>266</sup> Its first phase took place in 1883 under the first patriarchate of Joachim III (1878-1884), when the patriarch protested against the government's initiative to send orders, according to which the civil affairs of the priests were going to be judged by the region's *kadis*, cases of testaments and alimony were going to be approved by the Ministry of Justice, etc. The tension created lead to Joachim's resignation from the patriarchal throne, even though just after his resignation the government accepted the recognition of the church 'ancient status'. The second phase took place in 1890, when the Patriarchate protested against the violation of the imperial *ferman* of 1884 concerning cases of marriages, divorces and alimonies and the state's intension to make the teaching of the Turkish language imperative. The new Patriarch Dionisios V resigned as well, the Orthodox Church declared that it was under the status of captivity and the Holy Synod decided the closing down of the churches. The situation was once again set out in 1891. Its third phase coincided with the Young Turks revolution. X. Exertzoglou, 'Το Πρινομακό ζήτημα' [The Privilege Issue], in *Τα Ιστορικά* [Historica], Athens pp. 65-70.

actually meant was that there was an attempt to remove education from the Patriarchate's jurisdiction by bringing it under the jurisdiction of the State, in the framework of the Young Turk's effort to eliminate the Patriarch's power as the higher and recognized by the Ottoman state representative of the Rum milleti. In the secular state that the Young Turks were envisaging the role of the Patriarch –a religious representative- as the *millet başı* of the Greek Orthodox community was being gradually de-legitimized<sup>267</sup>. In the framework of the attempt to unify the Ottoman society by eliminating the religious criterion as the basic criterion for the social organization, institutions, such as education were being unified.

Mavroyeni Bey was approaching the issue of education through the general framework of the Christians privileges' legitimacy in the Ottoman state. With his law knowledge, he was trying to prove that the privileges were not simple concessions that Mehmet the Conqueror had attributed to the non Muslims, the '*Eski Kitab*', since the conquest of Constantinople, but that were emanating from the Islamic religion itself, the *Şeriat*, which was recognized even by the constitution as the official religion of the Ottoman state; And that as such, they were not contrary to the espoused by the constitution equality. Mavroyeni Bey was stressing that they were not privileges, but rights that a State governed by the *Şeriat* was attributing to the non Muslims, just as the rights that the Muslims were enjoying in a non Muslim state<sup>268</sup>. In his opinion, the quintessential for the existence of these rights was emanating from the nature and the

---

<sup>267</sup> The Patriarch will soon loose his right to mediate in favour of the Greek Orthodox, who would henceforth address the state authorities for any problem they were facing. See S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, pp. 461-464.

<sup>268</sup> He was offering the examples of the English in India, or the French in Tunisia who were respecting the Muslim's privileges and he was also making references to the case of a small Muslim community that in the Byzantine times resided in Constantinople, in the region of Eyüp and to which the Byzantine Emperors had attributed similar privileges. 'Révision de la Constitution. Discours sur la Question de l'Enseignement', in *ibid.*, p. 96. In the published collection of his writings and documents, we also find an extended essay on the privileges' origins and nature, with special reference to education, on which he must have based his discourse in the Senate. Al. Mavroyeni, 'Origines des privilèges dont jouissent les non Musulmans en Turquie', in *ibid.*, appendix, pp.136-147.

differences between the two religions and the structure of the Ottoman state. It was actually a question on what grounds these privileges/rights were being defined. Mavroyeni Bey was trying to pinpoint that *'the matters constituting the privileges' object have a religious character only for the Muslims. For the Christians, some of the privileges under question are really of religious nature, and they are referring to the Christian faith, whereas some others are purely secular and interest the civic code. But in both cases, they are obligatory*<sup>269</sup>. In his opinion, in the nature of the Christian's privileges laid their immobility and their invulnerability; *'Any effort to abolish or even modify... the privileges that exist in nowadays would alter the nature of the Muslim religion itself'*, which was the base of the Ottoman state, and would insult the *Şeriat*. After all, according always to Mavroyeni Bey, the privileges were recognized by all the important *Irade* and *Hat* during the reforms in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, even by the Constitution it self in its 11<sup>th</sup> article<sup>270</sup>.

Therefore, Mavroyeni Bey was concluding that the non Muslims education, religious or not, was a part of the privileges that they were enjoying in an Islamic State. And it was exactly this Islamic character of the State, the lack of distinction between the religious and the secular, –since *'the Sultan was not only secular sovereign, but at the same time,... Khalife, meaning 'supreme chef of the Muslim*

---

<sup>269</sup> 'Révision de la Constitution. Discours sur la Question de l' Enseignement', *ibid.*, p. 98. In his extended examination of the privileges, he is expaining what the privileges included: 1) the religious cult, 2) the particular situation of the Christian clergy, 3) The Churches and Monasteries, 4) The school instruction, 5) The welfare institutions, 6) The personal status, 6) The right that the non Muslim people have to organize themselves in separate communities. Mavroyeni Bey was also adding in a very didactic and religious manner that *'tout gouvernement musulman qui contreviendrait à ces principes s' attirerait fatalement d' après la religion Islamique elle-même, les foudres d' Allah'*, 'Origines des privilèges dont jouissent les non Musulmans en Turquie', *ibid.*, p. 137, 142.

<sup>270</sup> 'Révision de la Constitution. Discours sur la Question de l' Enseignement', *ibid.*, pp. 97-98.

religion' <sup>271</sup>-, that not only the purely religious, but also the secular education could not be violated by the Ottoman State, but just supervised by it <sup>272</sup>.

As for the question of unification of races that the government was envisaging through the unification of institutions such as education, Mavroyeni Bey was adding to his arguments concerning the privilege status of education that *'union was not only the product of Education, but mainly the product of justice and equality'* <sup>273</sup>..... *the result of a politic that applies justice and practices equality* <sup>274</sup>.

For Mavroyeni Bey the issue of equality and justice constituted the core of his view of the changes under the new *regime* and the check point for every law change that the Assembly was promoting. Thus, he was qualifying as contrary to the spirit of the principle of equality the proposed changes, according to which only the non Muslims would be obliged to mention in their civil status' certificate their particular rite and race. Mavroyeni Bey was claiming that since the Muslim community consisted also of people from different races and rites, obliging only the non Muslims to specify their race and rite was unjust. He was also criticizing the law that was introducing the promulgation of the state's laws and regulations only in the official-Ottoman language, on the grounds that it was favoring the Muslim population by forcing the non Muslims to learn two languages, their mother tongue and the official language of the state. He was also stressing that such a modulation would make it

---

<sup>271</sup> 'Origine des privileges dont jouissent les non Musulmans en Turquie', *ibid.*, p. 141.

<sup>272</sup> 'Révision de la Constitution. Discours sur la Question de l' Enseignement', *ibid.*, 97. It is interesting that even if Mavroyeni Bey in his discourse in the Senate is supporting the view that the word '*enseignement religieux*', must be replaced by only the word '*enseignement*' in the 19<sup>th</sup> article -so that it would take the following form: 'il ne pourra pas être potré atteinte à l' Enseignement des diverses communautés'- in his essay on the privilege's examination he is claiming that the education of the Christians in Orient is based on religion.

<sup>273</sup> Discours sur le projet de réponse au Discours du Trône', 30 November 1910, *ibid.*, p.111.

<sup>274</sup> 'Discours sur le projet de réponse au Discours du Trône', 4 November 1911, *ibid.*, p. 133.

even harder for the non Muslims to understand the difficult and complicated language of the bureaucracy and thus weaken their love for their government<sup>275</sup>.

All the above issues that Mavroyeni Bey was commending on were generating tension between the community's representatives and the Young Turk's government. Yet, the culmination of this tension during this first period of 'liberal or conventional reforms' came with the voting in July 1910 of the law about the contested churches, schools and cemeteries in the regions of Macedonia and Thrace, according to which if the majority -the two thirds- of a population residing in an area of this region belonged to the Bulgarian community, then these foundations would come under the ecclesiastic authority of the Bulgarian exarchate. The issue provoked the reaction not only of the Patriarchate, but also of some of the Greek and Serbian orthodox deputies in the Assembly, who left the conference room<sup>276</sup>.

Once again, Mavroyeni Bey defended the rights of his community in the Ottoman senate. Using once more his juristic knowledge, he tried to prove that the issue of handing on the Greek Orthodox churches, which were built after the Patriarch had asked for and succeeded in obtaining an imperial *ferman*, to people who had been detached '*either voluntarily, or by force*' from the Patriarchate was a spoilage that the

---

<sup>275</sup> 'Discours sur le projet de loi concernant les actes de l' Etat civil', 26 December 1910, *ibid*, pp.111-112 and 'Discussion sur le projet de loi concernant la promulgation des Lois et Réglements', 24 Mai 1911, *ibid*, pp. 124-126. Especially, in the case of the language in which the laws would be published, Mavroyeni Bey was stressing that '*pour se faire aimer, il faut que ces memes peuples sentient et voient dans les faits et non pas en paroles seulement qu'ils ne sont pas traités d'une façon inégale et soupçonneuse*'. *ibid*, p.125.

<sup>276</sup> 24 Greek and Serbian deputies composed and sent a letter to the Assembly's president, condemning the law and announcing that as a token of their protest against it they would not attend the table. *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 19 June 1910, pp. 187-188. Another group of Greek deputies addressed the minister of interior affairs, Talat Bey. *Weekly Budget*, 16 July 1910, cited in X. Exertzoglou, *ibid*, p. 73. As for the patriarchate's reaction, the Patriarch Joachim III convoked immediately after the law's proclamation both the Holy Synod and the Mixed Council and visited the Sultan to ask for his intervention and the imposition of veto. But neither Talat Bey, nor the Sultan -who had no more the right of veto- did anything to suspend the law; They just ascertained that the law would have a retroactive validity. Thus, the two bodies and the patriarch decided to convoke a general assembly provoking the government's reaction; Many participants in the Assembly were arrested and thus the Assembly was cancelled. *ibid.*, pp. 72-74.

government should stop in any way. It was also a matter that had acquired a false judicial dimension for several reasons. First of all, these foundations were belonging to the community and had been brought under the system of *vakıfs*, which meant that they could not be sold, bought or change surveillance, and that if something like that would happen, it would constitute a violation of the *vakf* law of the Empire, that was emanating from the *Şeriat* and had also been sanctioned by the constitution. Moreover, the retroactive nature of the law was contrary to the fact that the laws were not promulgated exclusively for issues that concerned only the past.

Mavroyeni Bey was stressing that the issue was not a political one, but rather a question of property titles and as such had to be solved by the Judiciary power rather than by the legislative one. Denying approaching the issue judiciary by claiming that *'both parties, meaning both the Greeks and the Bulgarians, have the same rights, both being Orthodox'* was for Mavroyeni Bey *'to make a false assertion'*, since only the Ecumenical Patriarch could decide on who was or who was not Orthodox. And in any case the question *'did not concern the sharing of churches between two nationalities of the same religion'* but it was purely a question of property titles<sup>277</sup>.

Mavroyeni Bey's discourses both for the privileges -and more precisely the issue of education- and the question of the contested churches in Macedonia and Thrace were quoted and reproduced in the Patriarchate's official organ, *Ekklesiastiki Alitheia*<sup>278</sup>. The congruence of Mavroyeni Bey's point of view -a representative of the Neophanariotic elite of the Rum milleti- with that of the Patriarchate's - *'the higher*

---

<sup>277</sup> 'Discours sur le projet de loi relative aux Eglises et Ecoles contestées en Macédoine', *ibid.*, 27 June 1910, pp. 100-104.

<sup>278</sup> *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 4 June 1910, where his discourse on the privileges and education is being reproduced and praised as *'valuable not only to the interests of our genos [race], but also to the interests of the reborn Turkey'*, pp. 169-170 and *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 19 June 1910, where we find a Greek translation of his discourse on the issue of the contested churches in the Senate, pp. 189-191.

*religious and national Authority of the Greek Orthodox*<sup>279</sup>- is characteristic of the way the former was viewing the millet's and his own status in the Empire after the 1908 revolution.

By supporting the '*Greek Patriarchate as the spiritual center of the world's Orthodoxy*'<sup>280</sup> and as the guarantor of the privileges of a '*Christian nation*' in an Islamic State, Mavroyeni Bey was probably trying, on the one hand to counteract the nationalistic discourse of the Greek state that was challenging the Patriarchate's role as the authority responsible for the Greek orthodox population of the Empire; And on the other, he was trying to defend the status quo of his millet, as it had been shaped with the reforms of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In other words, he was defending the millet system, the division of the Ottoman Empire's society into separate ethno religious communities, because this system was offering him, as a representative of the elite of the Rum milleti, the legitimizing framework to participate in the administration not only of his community, but also and mostly in the government and administration of the Ottoman state, it was in other words legitimizing his privileged position. Since the guarantor of this system that was ensuring Mavroyeni Bey's status, as well as his Ottoman identity, was on the one hand the religious center of his community, the Patriarchate, and on the other the Sultan, it was logic that in his discourses he would defend these two traditional and conservative authorities and contravene the changes the Young Turks government was trying to implement.

---

<sup>279</sup> *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 2 September 1909, p. 273.

<sup>280</sup> Al. Mavroyeni, *ibid.*, p. 104.

### ***A. Mavroyeni Bey defending his status as Neophanariot***

The attempt of Alexander Mavroyeni Bey to defend in his discourses his status not only as a non Muslim, but also –if not mostly- as a member of the traditional bureaucratic elite -as opposed to the representatives of the emerging middle urban strata- was two sided: it included both the defense of the governmental body he was representing -meaning the Senate and simultaneously the sultanic authority on which the former depended-, as well as the defense of the non Muslims participation in the Ottoman administration.

In the first case, his discourse was delivered in the framework of the constitution's revision and the question of the Senate's composition. Mavroyeni Bey, who had been appointed Senator some months after the 1908 revolution, was trying to prove the legitimacy of the senate's composition exclusively – or at least to its two thirds- by the Sultan himself. He was basing his position on the role and the nature of the Sultanic authority, from which the senate was emanating, in a constitutional regime as the Ottoman one. Mavroyeni Bey was claiming that *'the Sultan is the live representation of the whole Nation...the representative and the heart of all the powers of the State...the executive, the judiciary and the legislative'* and as such *'it was not strange that he was participating in the composition of one of the most important parties of the legislative power that the Senate was'*. After all, the Senators by being appointed for life by the higher authority, the Sultan, were acting also as vigilant guardians and protectors of the principles of liberty, justice and equality. For Mavroyeni Bey these *'three beautiful things'* needed a higher authority to check and control them in order to protect them from exaggerations that could lead either to

*'anarchy or to despotism' ; And only 'an enlightened, favorable to progress, balanced and sage' force such as the senate was could play this role*<sup>281</sup>.

Mavroyeni Bey was, through an indirect exposition of his political and ideological orientations, defending his and his colleagues' status as Senators, meaning as high rank bureaucrats who were legitimizing their role in the new regime in the face of the Sultan. Aware that in the political situation created after 1908, the role of the Sultan -and respectively of those statesmen who were depending on him and were contrary to the changes the CUP was introducing- was being gradually impoverished<sup>282</sup>, Mavroyeni Bey was trying to prove the necessity of the authority he was representing in the name of the regime's protection from any sort of exaggerations<sup>283</sup>.

In the second case, Mavroyeni Bey was once again talking as a representative of the bureaucratic elite of the Empire, but he was constraining his discourse in his status as a non Muslim statesman and diplomat. Centering his discourse on the fact that the non Muslims constituted a significant and important proportion of the Empire's population, both numerically and from the point of view of qualifications, he was criticizing the unsatisfactory numerical representation of the non Muslims in the Ottoman administration. In a population of almost *'eight millions non Muslims...many hundreds of whom were possessing the knowledge of the Turkish language just as the*

---

<sup>281</sup> 'Révision de la Constitution. Discours concernant la Composition du Sénat', 17 May 1910, *ibid*, p. 98-100.

<sup>282</sup> After all the reestablishment of the constitution had as one of its main aims the confinement of the sultan's authority. After the counter-revolution of 1909, the dethronement of the sultan Abdul Hamid and the enforcement of the CUP in government, the new legislative programme inaugurated enforced the parliament to the detriment of the sultan's power. E. Zürcher, *ibid*, pp. 145-150.

<sup>283</sup> It is characteristic that in the argumentation he uses in his discourse, he is saying that *'Il nous faut l' Autorité qui existe meme dans les pays les plus démocratiques du monde, tels que l'Amérique'*. Al. Mavroyeni, *op.cit.*, p. 99.

*more educated Turks*<sup>284</sup>, the fact that their representation in the country's administration was not surpassing some tens was against the promises of equality and justice and contrary to the effort of creating a common Ottoman identity; Mavroyeni Bey was stressing that for these promises to come true there was need of a just apportionment among all Ottoman citizens of the benefits and the charges that the country's governing according to the Constitution was implementing.

What in his opinion was even more inadmissible was that the non Muslims' participation especially in the higher state offices was almost inexistent. Leaving aside the participation of the non Muslims in the state's executive power – since these participants, meaning mainly the deputies, were not representing the traditional bureaucratic class to which Mavroyeni belonged-, he was focusing on the non Muslim –Christian and Armenian –elite's representation in the government. Mavroyeni Bey was highly criticizing the fact that *'one, only one non Muslim was until that time possessing a really high post in the government'* –meaning Sousa Efendi who was General Commander of the Aegean Sea and Naoum Paşa who had been nevertheless replaced after his death by Rifat Paşa. He was also accusing the government for having appointed not even one non Muslim among the seven first class Ottoman ambassadors, something that was not at all in conformity with the spirit of equality that the Ottoman statesmen were trying to implement, already from the reforms of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As an expression of his disappointment from the situation created Mavroyeni Bey was rhetorically asking his audience *'what would the great Reşid Paşa say, if he was able to come out of his grave!'*<sup>285</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> 'Discours sur le projet de réponse au Discours du Trône', 4 Novembre 1911, in *ibid*, p. 131.

<sup>285</sup> *ibid.*, p. 132.

His disappointment was being further boosted by the fact that *'whenever the government wanted to honor a non Muslim and raise him to a high place, it was searching for him not among the Greek Orthodox or the Armenians, but among the communities of the Catholic Maronits or the Orthodox Chaldeans'*<sup>286</sup>. Mavroyeni Bey was not contrary to the appointment of high officials from these non Muslim communities, but he was stressing that the Armenians and the Greek orthodox should be equally represented. After all, these non Muslims had always played a very important role in the Empire and with their participation in its administration *'they constituted a sinequa non element for the Empire's strengthening and progress*. In order to support his views, Mavroyeni Bey was citing examples from the past proving the help that the non Muslims had always furnished to the State. He was remembering that the non Muslims had always contributed to the Empire's glory not only economically or diplomatically, but also in the field of war. He was thus giving the examples of *'Mihal and Avranos Bey'*, who were Islamized Christians, as well as the example of his great, grand father Nikolaos Mavroyenis, a Christian who refused to Islamize and who *'in 1788 with his heroic resistance, saved the Empire from a certain dismemberment'*<sup>287</sup>.

The examples and the structuring of Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's discourse shows clearly that he perceived himself as the heir of a long tradition of the non Muslim participation in the Ottoman state that was legitimized with the 19<sup>th</sup> century reforms. And it was through the data of this status that he was trying to interpret, visualize and face the changes that the establishment of the constitution was bringing; it was through this privileged position that he was attacking the curtailing of the

---

<sup>286</sup> Ibid.

<sup>287</sup> *ibid.*, p. 134.

community's privileges and the under representation of his coreligionists in the state's administration, it was through his identity as a Greek orthodox elite that he was trying to counteract the 'leveling policy of the Turkish government', as Sir Gerard was noticing in 1910<sup>288</sup>.

An interval for Mavroyeni Bey -in the framework of this process of changes that were altering his status- came with his nomination as ambassador in the Ottoman embassy in Vienna. However, the interval was not only short, but also violently interrupted by the declaration of the Balkan states' war against the Ottoman Empire.

---

<sup>288</sup> Lowther to Grey, no. 611 confidential, Therapia 29 August 1910, F.O. 371/998/32221, cited in F. Ahmad, 'Unionist Relations.....', *ibid.*, p. 431.

The last discourse that Mavroyeni delivered in the Senate before the Balkan wars was in November 1911. In the meanwhile, during the past months the Empire had recovered from a governmental crisis that had lead to the resignation of several hard-shell members of the CUP in the government<sup>289</sup>; In September, Italy had declared war against the Ottoman Empire, and almost immediately the Grand Vizier Hakkı Paşa had resigned accepting thus full responsibility for the situation. He was succeeded by Küçük Said Paşa who on 30 September 1911 was appointed Grand Vizier for the eighth time<sup>290</sup>. The outbreak of the war had created further problems to the CUP and had enforced the opposition against it; In particular the Liberals had started challenging the CUP with new vigor, especially after the formation in November of the Liberal Union (*Hürriyet ve İttilaf Fırkası*), which had gathered around it 'a mass of contrast and confusions' -where the non Muslims were constituting a very important element<sup>291</sup> - the common point of all of which was the overthrowing of the CUP<sup>292</sup>.

<sup>289</sup> That is how A. Mavroyeni Bey is presenting the crisis of April 1911 in his notes: 'Il y a trois jours de cela [14/27 Avril], un conflit sérieux éclata dans le sein.... du parti 'Union et Progrès'. Quatres sont les causes principales du conflit: 1o caractère autoritaire et despotique des principaux chefs de ce parti.... 2o jalousie de ceux qui se voient négligés par les sus dits chefs. 3o influence prédominante de l'élément juif dans les Conseils du gouvernement.... et 4o relâchement plus ou moins réel des principes religieux émanant du Chérif.... Le colonel Sadyk Bey est le principal auteur de la crise actuelle dans le parti 'Union et Progrès'. Notes et Souvenirs...., ibid., pp. 49-50.

<sup>290</sup> F. Ahmad, *The Young Turks*, ibid., p. 94. Küçük Said Paşa had served under the Hamidian regime in different posts. In 1879 he was appointed Grand Vizier for the first time, in a total of nine times. E. Zürcher, ibid., p. 27.

<sup>291</sup> However, the Committee's contact towards the non Muslims had become more moderate and conciliatory by the second half of 1910. The Young Turks had acknowledged that they had over exaggerated on the issue of the unity of the different races in the Empire, and prior to the founding of the Liberal Union, they had officially recognized the privileges that the various non Muslim communities were enjoying. F. Ahmad, 'Unionist Relations with the Greeks....', ibid., p. 415.

<sup>292</sup> The contradictory character of the new party is eloquently expressed by the following description '[In the Liberal Union] liberals mingled with conservatives, clericals with free thinkers, and constitutionalists with absolutists', F. Ahmad, *The Young Turks*, ibid., p. 99.

The change in the political life of the Empire was welcomed by Mavroyeni Bey who in his first –and only– discourse under Said Paşa’s cabinet, saw in the new cabinet a remedy and a promise to counter ‘the anti-liberal wind’ for which he was talking and around which he was centering his previous discourses. The opening words of this discourse are indicative: *‘A Cabinet under the presidency of Said Paşa whose brilliant intelligence....., presents, I think, sufficient guaranties to realize a sensible amelioration in the affairs of our homeland....I wish him the most possible success in his hard work’*<sup>293</sup>. Some days after his speech in the Senate –where as we saw he was criticizing the governmental policies not to appoint non Muslims in high administrative and diplomatic posts–, he was nominated ambassador in Vienna<sup>294</sup>. His nomination can be examined under the light of these governmental changes and could be possibly seen as a gesture of the government’s ‘good intentions’ towards the non Muslims, during a period that a European power –Italy– was attacking the Empire<sup>295</sup> and the government’s internal affairs were going through a crisis.

In fact, Mavroyeni Bey in his personal notes is clearly attributing his nomination to the Grand Vizier Said Paşa. On the occasion of his nomination, he describes –with

---

<sup>293</sup> ‘Discours sur le projet de réponse au Discours du Trône’, 4 November 1911, *ibid*, p. 126.

<sup>294</sup> The Ottoman embassy in Vienna was one of the most important Ottoman embassies in Europe throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It has accommodated the earliest permanent resident Ottoman ambassador and had also been one of the most important centres that helped the transmission of new ideas, technological improvements and promoted acquaintance with the western culture. Among those who served in the embassy, in the various ambassadorial posts and ranks, we find some of the most prominent figures of the Ottoman bureaucracy, both Muslims and non Muslims. We find for instance Kostaki Mousouros, Mehmet Şekib, Hüseyin Hilmi, etc. Among the non Muslims that served in the higher ranks of the embassy we find almost exclusively Greek orthodox diplomats. We have already mentioned that Alexander Mavroyeni Bey’s grand uncle, Jean Mavroyeni had occupied the post of *chargé d’ affaires* for a long period of time –from 1811-1821, while according to R. Davison calculations the average tenure was two years and seven months–. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century the post was preserving his importance, even though Mavroyeni Bey informs us that –at least– the Embassy’s building had been abandoned and that *‘la société viennoise ignore Presque l’ existence de cette Ambassade’*, ‘Notes et Souvenirs...’. *Ibid*, p. 54., R. Davison, ‘Vienna as a major diplomatic post in the 19<sup>th</sup> century’, *ibid*, pp. 257-262.

<sup>295</sup> The occupation by the Italian forces of a number of Aegean islands in spring 1912 was encouraging the nationalistic aspirations at least of the lower class of the Greek orthodox population of these islands. See Bilal N. Şimşir, *Ege Sorunu*, Istanbul, 1976, pp. 566-567.

the same tone he always uses in his notes when describing the relationships that he or his family had with important personalities- the good relationship that he had with him from the time that they were both serving under Abdul Hamid's reign <sup>296</sup> ; In 1917, when naming the different personalities that had helped him during his carrier, he clearly mentions, as we have already seen, that his nomination as ambassador in Vienna was due to '*Koutzouk Said Paşa*'<sup>297</sup>.

Mavroyeni Bey stayed in the Ottoman embassy in Vienna for only one year. During his first month as ambassador he had tried to come in an agreement with the Austrian government in order to counteract the Balkan threat. In the belligerent situation that the Empire had found itself –meaning the Italian war and the mobilization in the Balkans-, Mavroyeni Bey, without any previous order of the Sublime Porte, and regardless the fact that he was aware of the government's pro British movements, had undertaken the initiative to negotiate with the prime minister of Austria-Hungary, Count d' Arhenthal, and had succeeded in extracting a positive response concerning the creation of an alliance between the two countries on the basis of the preservation of the status quo in the Balkans<sup>298</sup>.

---

<sup>296</sup> In his note of 3/16 November 1911 he describes his nomination and his relationship with Said Paşa as follows: '*Said Pacha, tenait à ce que j' acceptasse cet honneur...Mon acceptation au poste de Vienne lui produisit une visible satisfaction. Said a toujours eu une haute estime pour moi. Il me connaît de longue date. Dans ces dernières trois années comme président se Sénat, Said ne manqua Presque pas une seule occasion de me féliciter pour mes discours au Sénat.....A une occasion, au commencement du règne [d' Abdul Hamid], mon père qui admirait beaucoup la grande intelligence de Said, le sauva de l' exil et le fit venir secrètement de Brousse sous la conduite de Mr. Coumbaris, Directeur de l' Observatoire Impérial.....Said resta une nuit caché dans la maison de mon père*'. Notes et Souvenirs..', *ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

<sup>297</sup> *ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>298</sup> During his appointment with Comte d' Arhenthal, Mavroyeni Bey was stressing that as far as it concerned the situation in the Balkans, they had to take under serious consideration first of all '*la force incontestée et incontestable du soldat Turc*' and the need for the formation of an alliance between '*une Puissance qui ferait partie d'une Alliance ou d' une Entente et une autre Puissance qui serait libre de toutes Alliances ou Entente sans appartenir aux groupe d' alliés*'. As far as it concerned the last observation, Mavroyeni Bey was assuring the Comte that the Empire had already made up her mind and had decided to cooperate with Austria and that the different tensions-parties inside the country would respect such a decision. Vienne 1/14 Dec. 1911 à Assim Bey, Minist. des affaires Etrangères, in

However, Mavroyeni Bey's proposal was never neither seriously examined by the Porte, nor realized. In fact, and according to his notes, Mavroyeni Bey had never received any response from the ministry of foreign affairs to the confidential telegrams he had sent<sup>299</sup>; When on his return from Vienna, he met with the Sultan Mehmed Reşad and exposed him Austria's friendly position towards the Empire, as well as the Count d'Arhenthal acceptance of his proposition for the creation of a Turkish-Austrian alliance, the sultan told him that nobody had ever informed him about the latter<sup>300</sup>.

However, Mavroyeni Bey insisted on stressing the importance that such an alliance would have had. In one of his discourses just after the Great War, he was indirectly claiming that if his proposal had been accepted by the government, neither the Balkan Wars, nor the First World War would have occurred<sup>301</sup>. Also in his diary, he had noted that as a guest in a dinner of the Swedish legation in 1916 he was 'agreeably surprised to hear the first secretary of the Austrian-Hungarian embassy, Mr. Tcheconitz saying out loud' that if they had heard H. E. Mavroyeni Bey, 'the only

---

'Copies des depeches confidentielles de A. Mavroyeni Bey, Ambassadeur de Turquie en Vienne', in I. Konstantinidis, *ibid.*, 151.

<sup>299</sup> Mavroyeni Bey is attributing this non acceptance to the government's pro British attitude; in a note of his in 1917 he was saying that '*les dits gouvernants [Turcs] penchaient vers l' Angleterre surtout. Et la prevue que la chose était ainsi, c'est le silence obsolu que la Porte garda à mes efforts, comme Ambassadeur à Vienne, de conclure une Entente Turco-Autrichienne sur la base du statu quo Balkanique...*' 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid.*, 80. Indeed, at the outbreak of the Turkish-Italian war, there was a resurgence of pro-British sentiments and in particular the Grand Vizier Sait Paşa had called for British intervention. F. Ahmad, *The Young Turks*, *ibid.*, pp. 94-95.

<sup>300</sup> "A ces mots, le Sultan party vivement intéressé et m' assura que c'était pour la première fois qu'il entendait parler de la chose. Je lui dis alors que ses deux ex-Ministres des Affaires Etrangères .....Le Sultan exclama alors: 'C'est donc qu'ils sont des traits!'" 'Notes et Souvenirs', in *ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>301</sup> 'Keza 1911senesinin karumuevvelinde; yani Balkan hükümetlerinin Türkiye'ye karşı akdi ittifakından dört ay akdem ve Birinci Balkan Harbinden 11 mah evvel Balkan statükosuna iptinaen bir ihtilafın akdi zümünde süferamızdan biri tarafından tevessül edilen ve münteci muvaffakiyet olan teşebbüsâtı ibtidaiye nazari itibara alınmış olsaydı, Türkiye'ye karşı olarak dört Balkan hükümetinin muharebesi vukua gelecek miydi? Ve az vakitten sonra ve binnetice ehyevm bütün milletleri harap eden bu Cihan Harbi zuhur edecek miydi?' Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre: 3 İçtima Senesi: 5, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Basım Evi, Ankara, 1990.

one in Europe who was clearly thinking, when there was still time, there would have been neither the Balkan War, nor the European one<sup>302</sup>.

Nevertheless, one year after his nomination and under the circumstances created by the developments in the Balkans - the First Balkan War broke out in October 1912 and by early November the situation acquired dramatic dimensions for the Empire, whose forces had been driven back to the Çatalca line making the defeat seem imminent<sup>303</sup>-, Mavroyeni Bey had been replaced by Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa<sup>304</sup>, the ex Grand Vezir and minister of Justice in the 'Great Cabinet' of Gazi Ahmed Muhtar Paşa<sup>305</sup>. Even though in his personal notes Mavroyeni Bey did not comment on the event, but simply noted the arrival of his successor in Vienna, in a personal note found among the copies of his confidential dispatches from Vienna, he criticized his replacement with these words: *'My replacement in November 1912 by Hilmi Paşa demonstrated to all the world that the Sublime Porte did not want during that date a Christian Ottoman Ambassador, even if the latter was going to save Turkey'*<sup>306</sup>;

Actually, this note was briefly expressing Mavroyeni Bey's -as a Greek Orthodox statesman- reaction to the developments taking place in the Empire. When he returned to Istanbul on May 1913, the situation had drastically changed. The war, the loss of the empire's Balkan provinces, the migration of many Muslim from the

<sup>302</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', in *ibid.*, p. 70.

<sup>303</sup> F. Ahmad, *The Young Turks*, *ibid.*, p. 114.

<sup>304</sup> M. K. İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadrazamlar*, İstanbul, 1940-1953, pp. 1674-1675. Hüseyin Hilmi Paşa stayed in that post until 1918, until the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire. He had been a friend of Austria Hungary. 'During one of his terms as Grand Vizier he had presided over the conclusion of the Ottoman the Austrian agreement that settled the Bosnian annexation crisis and ended the Ottoman boycott of Austrian goods', R. Davison, *ibid.*, p. 274.

<sup>305</sup> Gazi Ahmed Muntar Paşa had replaced Said Paşa in the Grand Vezirate after the latter had resigned and had formed a cabinet which was known as 'Great Cabinet' because of the array of three ex-Grand Vezirs in its ranks. *ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>306</sup> 'Notes Personelles de Mavroyéni Bey', in 'Copies des depeches confidentielles de A. Mavroyeni Bey, Ambassadeur de Turquie en Vienne', published by I. Konstantinidis, *ibid.*, p. 154.

Balkans to the Ottoman Empire had created a sentiment of disillusionment in the social and politic life of the country. In particular, the Bab-i Ali coup of 1913 had reinforced the CUP's presence in the government and had inaugurated a new phase in the country's history, during which the central characteristic was the monopolization of the politic life by the Committee. The Committee's ideological orientations were not any more directed towards the unification of the Empire's various ethnic elements, but rather towards the unification of the Turks, espousing the development of a no longer Ottoman but Turkish national consciousness<sup>307</sup>. All these changes had a direct impact on the non Muslim population, altering their status and curtailing their privileges and *milli* rights<sup>308</sup>.

For the first time in his notes Mavroyeni Bey was openly criticizing the government and the policies it was adopting, by accusing it for carrying '*aspirations of turkification*'<sup>309</sup>. Meanwhile, in his last two discourses in the Senate before and after the Great War, he was commenting on the anti non Muslim practices the government was adopting; in his discourse delivered in May 1914, he was indirectly

---

<sup>307</sup> N. Berkes, *The development of secularism in Turkey*, *ibid.*, p. 335-336. Doğu Ergil has characterized the years 1913-1918 as period of '*bourgeois revolution*', during which the *turkification* of the Empire became '*a burning desire*'. Doğu Ergil, *ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>308</sup> On a purely political level and in the general framework of the opposition's elimination by the Committee, the Organization of Constantinople was almost dissolved, many of its members started abandoning Istanbul, and some Greek Orthodox deputies -Bousios and Kosmidis- were deported. In the elections that took place during the last months of 1913, the new Patriarch Germanos V accepted the proposals of cooperation with the Committee, but the latter rejected its demand of a proportional representation of the Greek Orthodox in the Parliament. As far as it concerns the social changes, especially after the Empire's entry in the First World War, the Turkish government attacked for the last time the Greek Orthodox community's privileges: in 1915, it brought the community's schools under the immediate control of the Ministry of Education, the next year it abolished the existence of separate communities - the term *millet* was replaced by the term *cemaat*- and in 1917 it sanctioned the civil marriage for all the citizens of the Empire, regardless religion. K. Boura, *ibid.*, pp. 82-83, X. Exertzoglou, *ibid.*, p. 74, A. Alexandris, *The Greek community of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish relations 1918-1974*, Athens 1983, pp. 32-36.

<sup>309</sup> Actually, Mavroyeni Bey was reproducing Carasso Effendi's -deputy of Thessalonika- critics about the Committee's policies. After Mavroyeni Bey, Carasso Effendi was saying that '*trois mois après la chute d' Abdul Hamid, l' 'Union et Progrès' perdit sa direction première.....Les aspirations de turquisation s'emparèrent de la plupart des dirigeants du Comité...*' '*Notes et Souvenirs...*', *ibid.*, p. 58.

criticizing the persecutions against the non Muslim population and he was proposing to add to the Throne's discourse answer a sentence saying that *'it [was] to the country's political and economic interest to adopt the appropriate measures so as to restore the security, prosperity and welfare in those regions of the country where misery and disorder prevails'*<sup>310</sup>.

He was also stressing the need for the application of equality and justice and the securing of good relationships among the different nationalities (*mileli muhtelife*) in the name of the country's progress and well being; In his opinion, if these principles had guided the government's attitude towards the non Muslims, there would have been no disorder and foreign intervention. He was praising the government *'to open the doors of its various offices to all the millets'* and was condemning the governmental practices not to appoint non Muslims not only in the higher but also in the lower governmental posts<sup>311</sup>.

With the exception of these discourses, in his personal notes Mavroyeni Bey does not make any comment on the developments taking place in the Ottoman Empire that were altering his status as a Greek Ottoman and as a Neophanariot. Until 1921, when he stopped keeping this kind of diary, regardless the dramatic changes that both the Empire and his respective community were undergoing, Mavroyeni Bey restrained himself in noting –as usual– anecdotes concerning either his family or various personalities of the Ottoman bureaucratic elite and various important events, such as the beginning and the end of the First World War, the denouncement of the Treaties

---

<sup>310</sup> *Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre: 3, İctima senesi: 1, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Basım Evi, Ankara, 1989. Mavroyeni Bey's discourse was criticized in *Tanin*, which in its 15 May issue was writing that the vagueness of his discourse had provoked the reactions of some Senators, who asked to know to which regions he was referring. Instead of Mavroyeni Bey it was Aristidi Paşa who answered and talked clearly about the Christians' of Thrace displacements. On this occasion, the newspaper highly criticized the Greek orthodox senators. in E. Emmanouilidis, *ibid.*, p.301.

<sup>311</sup> *Meclis-i Ayan Zabıt Ceridesi*, Devre: 3, İctima Senesi: 5, *ibid.*

of Paris and Berlin, etc<sup>312</sup>. His critics concerning the Empire's participation to the war on Germany's side varied from rather neutral ascertainment about Enver Paşa's initiative and responsibility for this participation, to reproduction of various information about Enver's and Cemal's receiving some millions of marks as '*presents from Germany*' for Ottoman Empire's alliance with Germany<sup>313</sup>.

In a period during which the political and social changes were drastically altering the scenery created with the 19<sup>th</sup> century reforms, Mavroyeni Bey was still trying to legitimize –as far as we can judge from his personal notes at least- his existence and his status through the 19<sup>th</sup> century social realities; but neither the millet system nor his intimate relations with the Palace and the Sultan could any more legitimize him. Moreover, the ideological changes inside his own community, the enhancement of the role and the hold of the Greek state on the Greek orthodox communities of the Ottoman Empire and the concurrence, from 1912 on, of the fate of these communities with the official ideology produced in the Greek state, marginalized both ideologically and politically Mavroyeni Bey.

The undermining of his position and the horror of the First World War must have generated a shock for Mavroyeni Bey, who notes in his diary his personal philosophic thoughts about the human nature. Even though these thoughts do not constitute a concrete position on the developments taking place, they could be seen as a sign of the effect that all these changes had on him and could be translated as an indirect reaction. From 1915 until 1917, Mavroyeni Bey notes in his diary on various occasions that to his view man '*is the most intelligent and the most brutal of all the*

---

<sup>312</sup> It is interesting that Mavroyeni Bey remains silent about Greece's position during the First World War and does not note anything in his diary even when on May 1919 the Greek army was disembarking in Smyrna's port.

<sup>313</sup> 'Notes et Souvenirs...', *ibid.*, p. 86.

animals. But he accepts with difficulty his animal nature.... The reason for this is that he is dressed.<sup>314</sup> Even if, according to Mavroyeni Bey, dressing had helped man conceptualize the highest values of equality and justice, had made him more clever and industrial, nevertheless it had also made him forget his animal nature and had turned him into the most brutal of all other animals. 'Through his inventions and the every day development of destructive arms, man turns the world into hell'. 'His killings, his wars...his rage to feed himself with the flesh of millions of beings that he massacres daily—and yet what an indignation when by chance a tiger devours a man',<sup>315</sup> are according to Mavroyeni Bey unfolding man's terrible and hypocrite nature, all the more that man justifies his acts in the name of a just God.

His Notes et Souvenirs end in 7 December of 1921. Eight years later Alexander Mavroyeni Bey died in Istanbul, some years after Ottoman Empire's 'death'. We do not have any information about his life after 1922. What is for sure is that Mavroyeni Bey was the stub of an era and a society that no longer existed.

---

<sup>314</sup> Ibid, p. 79.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid, pp. 69, 71, 79.

## Conclusion

Alexander Mavroyeni Bey was the heir of a long Phanariotic tradition in a controversial and perplex era, such as the last years of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were for the Ottoman Empire. He was an offspring of the changes that the Orthodox community of the Empire and the Empire itself underwent throughout its historical process and an heir of the reforms of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. His past, his present and his future -as his was envisaging it- were strongly related to the traditional power centers of both the Ottoman State -the Palace- and the Greek Orthodox community of the Empire -the Patriarchate. Mavroyeni Bey's status as a Greek Orthodox Ottoman bureaucrat and as a prominent figure of his respective community was sanctioned by the 19<sup>th</sup> century reforms. Even though his Phanariot ancestors had also played an important role both in the Ottoman state and in their religious community, the Neophanariot Mavroyeni Bey was now acquiring the legal framework to act as a representative of the Rum milleti and the Ottoman state.

The reforms along with the promises of equality and justice propagated the creation of a common to all the people of the Empire, regardless religion, Ottoman identity. However, in the framework of the social reorganization that the reforms entailed, the religious criterion was not only undermined, but it constituted the basis of this reorganization. The quasi autonomy that the various non Muslim communities had in administrating the affairs of their communities was sanctioned in the face of their religious leaders -in the case of the Rum milleti in the face of the Ecumenical Patriarch. But at the same that the Patriarch was recognized as the *millet başı*, his authority was curtailed by the lay representatives -Neophanariots and other important members of the community- who acquired a legitimate position in the administration

of the community. The orthodox community did no more constitute the 'Patriarch's faithful flock, but it became an ethno religious, political entity in the Ottoman world'<sup>316</sup>. The more influential members of this entity would on the one hand participate in the administration of their community, and on the other in the Ottoman state's administration. Their power as leading members of the Greek Orthodox community would legitimize them to enter the Ottoman bureaucracy, and their important place in the Ottoman state would offer them the chance to participate in the millet's administration.

Alexander Mavroyeni Bey actually fits in the second category, that is to this group of Greek orthodox who had joined the Ottoman bureaucracy, and through this status they also participated in the community's affairs. All the times that we find Mavroyeni Bey taking active role in the administration of his *millet*, as for instance in the Patriarchal elections, it is under his status as Ottoman statesman, either as member of the Council of state, or as Prince of Samos, etc.

Alexander Mavroyeni's status as statesman and as prominent figure of the Rum milleti was further legitimized by his father's, Spyridon Mavroyeni, position. The fact that his father had been the personal doctor and a favor of the sultan Abdul Hamid had played a pivotal role in his carrier under the reign of the 'Kızıl Sultan', during which patrimonial patterns of promotion prevailed.

Mavroyeni Bey welcomed the Young Turks revolution of 1908. As a non Muslim member of the pro western cosmopolitan elite of the Empire, he viewed in the reestablishment of the constitution and the promises of equality, justice, and liberty not only a remedy for the despotic regime of Abdul Hamid, but also a promise for the enhancement of his position. Even though he was a product of this regime, Mavroyeni

---

<sup>316</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, 'Millet, Génos, Ethnos, Cinoumenikotita, Alitrotismos', in *ibid*, p. 41.

Bey was –at least after the revolution- criticizing both the regime itself under which ‘*infamies, horror and danger*’ prevailed and its initiator, the sultan Abdul Hamid, ‘*a person who was said to be intelligent, but who in reality was nothing more than insidious*’<sup>317</sup>. The solution of constitutional monarchy under which all the people of the Empire would be equally treated regardless religion was congruent with Mavroyeni Bey’s views.

However, the developments and the policies that the CUP adopted regarding the non Muslim’s position, and the internal changes and response of the Greek Orthodox community of the Empire undermined his status. On the one hand the alteration and the gradual disintegration of the *millet* system by the progressive abolition of the community’s privileges and on the other the prevalence inside the Rum *milleti* of the nationalistic ideology and the policies of the Greek state, as they were represented by the middle urban strata, were altering the traditional framework that legitimized Mavroyeni Bey’s status as Neophanariot Ottoman bureaucrat.

Through his Notes et Souvenirs, as well as through his discourses in the Ottoman Senate, Mavroyeni Bey is exposing his reaction to these changes and explains –directly or indirectly- how he was viewing his place in the Empire. In our opinion, his insistence to present in his Notes the world of the Ottoman bureaucratic elite, with special reference to his coreligionists Neophanariots and to his own family must not be seen just as a natural description of his world, but also as an attempt to stress his –and the status group he represented- influential role in the administration both of his community and of the State, in a period -1907-1921- during which their role was seriously damaged.

---

<sup>317</sup> ‘Notes et Souvenirs...’, *ibid*, p. 35.

In his discourses he becomes more concrete and makes us understand that he is 'reading' the promises of equality and justice, as well as the notion of *patriotism*, of a *common homeland* and identity through the vocabulary of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. On the one hand, for Mavroyeni Bey equality meant to a great extent the representation of the Greek Orthodox –as well as of the other non Muslim- in the Ottoman administration and the respect of the privileges the non Muslim communities were enjoying; Throughout his discourse he defends these rights, as he characterizes the privileges, and his status as non Muslim bureaucrat.

On the other hand, the notion of a common Ottoman identity was for Mavroyeni Bey passing through his identity as a Greek Orthodox elite. When we say Greek Orthodox identity, we have to underline that Mavroyeni Bey was not interpreting his Greekness as the nationalists of the Greek state were, but mostly as the Ecumenical Patriarchate was. As the religious authority was 'obliged' -as a response to the challenges of the period- to 'define and ensure the cohesion and homogeneity' of the orthodox community 'on national-religious terms'<sup>318</sup>, so did Mavroyeni Bey. To his view, only the '*spiritual center of the world's Orthodoxy that [was] the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople*'<sup>319</sup> was the legitimate guarantor of the Greek orthodox population privileges.

In one of his discourses Alexander Mavroyeni Bey was emphatically saying that '*the people have been awaked. They do not live anymore in the lethargy*'. However, the awaking to which he referred was translated to a complicated and controversial process of passage from the multiethnic religious based Ottoman Empire to the

---

<sup>318</sup> S. Anagnostopoulou, *ibid*, p. 44.

<sup>319</sup> Al. Mavroyeni, 'Origine des privileges dont jouissent les non –musulmans en Turquie', *ibid*, pp. 136-147.

national secular states. In the new realities created Alexander Mavroyeni Bey as an Ottoman Greek Orthodox bureaucrat had no place.

**Table: Mavroyeni's Genealogy\***

|                                                                                                                                  |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Tzanis Mavroyeni</b> (archon of Paros, 1706) + <b>Marrousia</b> or Kiria Maroussaki <sup>320</sup>                            |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
| ↓                                                                                                                                |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
| <b>Stephane</b> (dragoman of the Ottoman Navy, 1765)<br>+ Rallou Karatza<br>59 <sup>321</sup> )                                  |  | <b>Nicolas</b> (dragoman of the Ottoman Navy, 1744-50, 1756-59 <sup>321</sup> )                                                      |                                                               |
| <b>Pierre</b> (consul of Austria in Myconos, established in Phanar after 1737)<br>+Prepoulina                                    |  | <b>Granetta</b>                                                                                                                      | <b>Maria Emmanuel</b>                                         |
| ↓                                                                                                                                |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
| <b>Nicolaos</b> (1738-1790)<br>Dragoman of the Ottoman Navy, 1782<br>Prince of Walachia and Moldavia (1786-89)<br>+Maria Scanavi |  | <b>Dimitris</b><br>Bey of Myconos<br>+ Maria Scordilli (three children)<br>+ Irini Kotcos                                            |                                                               |
| ↓                                                                                                                                |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
| <b>Jean</b><br>Chargés d' affaires in Vienna (1811-1821)<br>In London (1832-1835)<br>+Therese Gaertner                           |  | <b>Katerina</b>                                                                                                                      | <b>Pierre Michel</b><br>treasurer in Moldavia<br>+ R. Sturdza |
| <b>Spiridon</b> (1777-1817)<br>Secretary of the Dragoman of the navy<br>+S. Karatza                                              |  | <b>Maria</b><br>+ Dr. Varlam                                                                                                         | <b>Flora Eleni</b><br>+ A. Paximadi +L. Metaxas               |
| ↓                                                                                                                                |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
| <b>Dimitris</b>                                                                                                                  |  | <b>Spiridon Paşa</b> (1817-1902)<br>Private Doctor of Abdul Hamid II<br>Senator<br>∞M. Kalliadi<br>∞ Marguerite Lafont (no children) |                                                               |
| ↓                                                                                                                                |  |                                                                                                                                      |                                                               |
| <b>Dimitri</b> (1851-1921)<br>Consul in Marseilles, Malta and Italy<br>∞Zoi Ralli                                                |  | <b>Alexander Bey</b> (1845-1929)<br>Consul in Washington,<br>Prince of Samos<br>Ambassador in Vienna,<br>Senator                     | <b>Eleni</b><br>∞ J. Risakis                                  |

\* The table was based on the genealogies of Mavroyeni given by Sturdza, Mihail Dimitri, *Grandes familles de Grèce*, Paris, 1983 and Th. Blancard, *Les Mavroyéni, Essai d' étude additionnele à l' histoire de la Grèce, de la Turquie, de la Roumanie*, Paris, Ernest Flammarion, 1893, with certain additions or corrections wherever we deem it necessary.

<sup>320</sup> Mihail Dimitri Sturdza and Th. Blancard give the name of a certain Dimitri as archon of Miconos. We follow the manuscript Vaticanus Graecus 2336 referred in V. Sfyroeras, 'Les Mavroyéni et la vie économique de la mer Egée', *ibid.*

## Bibliography

### 1. Primary Sources

-Alexander Mavroyeni Bey's personal Notes, Documents and Discourses in the Ottoman Senate, published by Konstantinidis, Ieronimos (archimandrite and archivist of the Ecumenical Patriarchate), *Συμβολαί εις την Ιστορία της Εγγύς Ανατολής* [*Contributions to the History of Near East*], Istanbul, 1950.

#### -Newspapers:

Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια [Ecclesiastic Truth], 27 October 1882, pp. 63-64.

11 January 1902, pp. 21-22.

2 September 1909, pp. 273-276.

21 October 1909, pp.329-330.

2 December 1909, pp. 377-379.

28 May 1910, pp. 161-163.

4 June 1910, pp.169-170.

19 June 1910, pp. 185-191

26 June 1910, pp.193-197.

Ορθοδοξία [Orthodoxy], 30 September 1929.

2. Secondary Sources

Ahmad, Feroz, *The Young Turks. The Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics. 1908-1914*, Claredon Press, Oxford, 1969.

Ahmad, Feroz 'Unionist relations with the Greek, Armenian and Jewish communities of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1914', in Braude Benjamin and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I : *The Central Lands*, Holmes & Meier, New York-London, 1982, pp. 401-434.

Alexandris, Alexis, 'Οι Έλληνες στην Υπηρεσία της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας' [Greeks in the service of the Ottoman Empire], *Δελτίο Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής εταιρείας Ελλάδας* [Bulletin of the Historic and Ethnographic Association of Greece], Athens, 1980, pp. 365-404.

Alexandris, Alexis, *The Greek community of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish relations 1918-1974*, Centre for Asia Minor Studies, Athens, 1983.

Anagnostopoulou, Sia 'The terms Millet, Genos, Ethnos, Oikoumenikótita, Altyotismos in Greek Historiography', in *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nation-States*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2004, pp. 38-55.

Anagnostopoulou, Sia, *Mikrá Asia, 19<sup>ος</sup> αιώνας-1919, Οι Ελληνοποιοσόμενοι κοινότητες: από το μιλλέτ των Ρωμίων στο Ελληνικό Έθνος* [Asia Minor, 19<sup>th</sup> century-

1919, *The Greek Orthodox communities: from the Millet-i Rum to the Greek Nation*],  
Ellinika Grammata, Athens, 1998.

Benaroyia, Abraham *Η πρώτη σταδιοδρομία του Ελληνικού προλεταριάτου [The first carrier of the Greek proletariat]*, Olkos, Athens, 1975.

Benlisoy, Stefo, *Education in the Orthodox Community of Nevşehir during the nineteenth century*, master thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2002.

Berkes, Niyazi, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, Hurst & Company, London, 1998.

Blancard, Theodore, *Les Mavroyéni, Essai d' etude additionnele à l' histoire de la Grèce, de la Turquie, de la Roumanie*, Paris, Ernest Flammarion, 1893.

Blancard, Theodore, *Les Mavroyéni, Histoire de l' Orient (de 1700 à nos jours)*, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1909.

Boura, Katerina 'Οι Βουλευτικές Εκλογές στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία' ['The Parliamentary elections in the Ottoman Empire'], *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών [Bulletin of the Center for Asia Minor Studies]*, no 4, Athens, 1983, p. 69-83.

Braude, Benjamin, 'Foundation myths of the Millet System', in Braude Benjamin and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of*

*a Plural Society*, vol. I : *The Central Lands*, Holmes & Meier, New York-London, 1982, pp.69- 88.

Byzantios, Skarlatos, *Κωνσταντινούπολις [Constantinopolis]*, 3 volumes, Athens, 1851-1869.

Clogg, Richard, 'The Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire', in Braude Benjamin and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I : *The Central Lands*, Holmes & Meier, New York-London, 1982, pp. 185-208.

Cassimatis, Gregoire 'Esquisse d'une sociologie du Phanariotisme', in *L' époque Phanariote*, symposium, Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki, 1974, pp.159-166.

Davison, H. Roderic, 'Vienna as a major diplomatic post in the 19<sup>th</sup> century', in *19<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman Diplomacy and Reforms*, Issis Press, Istanbul, 1999.

Davison, H. Roderic, 'Turkish Attitudes Concerning Christian and Muslim Equality in the 19<sup>th</sup> century', in *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923, The Impact of the West*, Saqi Books, 1990.

Davison, H. Roderic, 'The Advent of the principle of representation in the Government of the Ottoman Empire', in *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish history, 1774-1923, The Impact of the West*, Saqi books, 1990.

Davison, H. Roderic, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1963.

Dereveux, R., *The First ottoman Constitutional Period*, Baltimore 1963.

Deringil, Selim, *The Well- Protected Domain. Ideology and Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*, I.B.Tauris Publishers, London-New York, 1999.

Emmanouilidis, Emmanouil, *Τα τελευταία έτη της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας*, [*The last years of the Ottoman Empire*], Athens, 1924.

Ergil, Doğu 'A Reassessment, the Young Turks, their politics, and anti-colonial struggle', in *Balkan Studies*, v. 16, num. 2, 1975, pp. 39-72.

Exertzoglou, Xaris, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα, ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως 1861-1912* [*National Identity in Constantinople in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, The Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople, 1861-1912*], Nefeli editions, Athens 1996.

X. Exertzoglou, 'Το Προνομιακό ζήτημα' [*The Privilege Issue*], in *Τα Ιστορικά* [*Historica*], Athens pp. 65-70.

X. Exertzoglou, 'The development of a Greek Ottoman Bourgeoisie: investment Patterns in the Ottoman Empire, 1850-1914', in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of*

*Nationalism*, ed by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, The Darwin Press, Princeton New Jersey, pp. 89-115.

Filiou, Xristina, '«Της Υψηλοῦς τα Καθήκοντα». Υπηρεσίες στο οθωμανικό Κράτος μέσα από την οπτική του Στέφανου Βογορίδη, Πρίγκιπα Σάμου' [ 'Services in the Ottoman State through Stefanos Vogoridis, Prince of Samos, view'], in *Ρωμιοί στη υπηρεσία της Υψηλής Πύλης [Rum in the service of the Sublime Porte]*, proceedings of a symposium held in Athens, 13 January 2001, I kath imas Anatoli, Athens, 2002, pp.145-163.

Findley, V. Carter, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire, The Sublime Porte 1789-1922*, Princeton University Press, Princeton-New Jersey, 1980.

Findley, V. Carter, 'The acid test of Ottomanism: The acceptance of Non-Muslims in the Late Ottoman Bureaucracy', in Braude Benjamin and Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I : *The Central Lands*, Holmes & Meier, New York-London, 1982, pp. 339-368.

Gardika, Katerina, 'Αλέξανδρος Καραθεοδωρής, Η ζωή και η σταδιοδρομία του' ['Alexandros Karatheodory, his life and carrier'] in *Ρωμιοί στη υπηρεσία της Υψηλής Πύλης [Rum in the service of the Sublime Porte]*, proceedings of a symposium held in Athens, 13 January 2001, I kath imas Anatoli, Athens, 2002, pp. 135-143.

Gedeon, Manouil 'Περί της Φαναριώτικης κοινωνίας' ['On the Phanariotic Society'], in *Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος, σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν [Review of the Hellenic*

*Literary Society of Constantinople*], v. 31, Istanbul, 1887-1888 and 1888-1889, pp.55-71.

Gennadios, Metropolitan of Ilioupoli, *Η Ιστορία του Μεγάλου Πεύματος* [*The History of Mega Reuma*], Istanbul, 1949.

Georgiadou, Maria, 'Expert knowledge between tradition and reform. The Carathéodorys: a Neo-Phanariotic Family in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Constantinople', in *Figures Anonymes, figures d' elite: pour une anatomie de l' Homo Ottomanicus*, ed. by Meropi Anastassiadou and Bernard Heyberger, Istanbul 1999, pp.243-294.

Heper, Metin, *Bureaucracy in the Ottoman-Turkish State, An analysis of the Emergence and Development of a bureaucratic Ruling Tradition*, dissertation submitted in the Graduate School of Syracuse University, 1970.

Hopes, Thomas, *Anastase ou Mémoires d'un Grec*, Paris, 1820.

İnal, M. K. , *Osmanlı Devrimde Son Sadrazamlar*, İstanbul, 1940-1953.

Ipsilanti, Athanasios, Komninos, *Τα Μετά την Άλωση (1453-1789)* [*After the Capture of Constantinople, 1453-1789*], Istanbul, 1870.

Kardaras, Christos, *Το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και ο Αλότρωτος Ελληνισμός* [*The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Unredeemed Hellenism*], Athens, 1996.

Kitromilidis, Paschalis, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός [Neohellenic Enlightenment]*, MIET, Athens, 2000.

Kofos, Evangelos, 'Patriarch Joachim III (1878-1884) and the irredentist policy of the Greek State', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 4:2 (1986), pp. 107-120.

Kokkolatos, Kleovoulos, *Βίος του Σπυρίδωνα Μαυρογένη Πασά [The life of Spiridon Mavroyenis Paşa]*, Athens, 1902.

Konortas, Paraskevas, 'From ta'ife to Millet: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek orthodox Community ', in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, ed by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, The Darwin Press, Princeton New Jersey, pp.169-179.

Kuneralp, Sinan, 'Bir Osmanlı Diplomat: Kostaki Musurus Paşa, 1807-1891', in *Beletten* 34, Istanbul, 1970, pp. 421-435.

Orhan Koloğlu, *Avrupa Kiskacına Abdülhamit*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 1998.

M. Kouroupou, 'Η φίλεργος Εταιρεία της Κωνσταντινούπολης, 1866-1876' ['The Filergos Etairia of Constantinople, 1866-1876'], in *ΔΚΜΣ [Bulletin of Centre for Asia Minor Studies]*, 5, 1984-1988.

Mardin, Şerif, *Jön Türklerin Siyasî Fikirleri 1895-1908*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul 2002.

Matalas, Paraskevas, *Εθνος και Ορθοδοξία, Οι περιπέτειες μιας σχέσης [Nation and Orthodoxy, The adventures of a relation]*, Cretan University Editions, Iraklio, 2002.

Mavroyeni, Spiridon, *Les Chiens errants de Constantinople*, Paris, Librairie Orientale et Américaine (without date).

Ortaylı, İlber, *İmparatorluğunun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2003.

Özbek, Nadir *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet*, İletişim Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2002.

Panayotopoulos, A. J., 'Early relations between the Greeks and the Turks', in *Balkan Studies*, vol. 21, no 1, Thessaloniki, 1980, pp. 86-95.

Panayotopoulos, A. J., 'The "Great Idea" and the Vision of Eastern Federation: A Propos of the Views of I. Dragoumis and A. Souliotis-Nicolaidis', in *Balkan Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, Thessaloniki 1980, p. 331-365.

Patrinelis, Xristos, 'Οι Φαναριώτες πριν το 1821' ['Phanariots before 1821'], in *Ρωμιοί στη υπηρεσία της Υψηλής Πόλης [Rum in the service of the Sublime Porte]*, proceedings of a symposium held in Athens, 13 January 2001, I kath imas Anatoli, Athens, 2002.

Regla, Paul de, *Au pays de l' espionnage, les Sultans Mourad V et Abd-ul-Hamid II*, Librairie J. Strauss, Paris, 1902.

Rizos, R.E., *Livre d'or de la noblesse Phanariote et des familles principales de Valachie et de Moldavie*, second edition, Athens, 1904.

Sfyroeras, Vasilis, 'Les Mavroyéni et la vie économique de la mer Egée' in *L' époque Phanariote*, symposium, Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki, 1974, pp.327-339.

Ell! Skopetea, *To 'Ippovro Baaikeio' kai η Meydalan Ideā, Oyets tou eθvikoū epobalhturos stn Ellada [The 'Ideal Kingdom' and the Great Idea, Views of the national question in Greece]*, Politipo, Athens, 1988.

Ell! Skopetea, 'Μακεδονικό kai Avatolικό Zήτημα' ['Macedonia and the Eastern Question'], in *Ta Istorika [Historica]*, June-December 1993, no.18/19, pp. 144-150.

Souliotis-Nikolaidis, Athanasios, *Opydwotc Kowtatwvovotōλecw [Organization of Constantinople]*, ed. by Katerina Boura and Thanos Veremis, Dodoni, Athens-Ioannina, 1984.

Spanoudis, Konstantinos P. *Istorikai Zelōai, Ioakeim T' [Historic Pages, Joachim III]*, Constantinople, 1902.

D. Stamatopoulos, *Metapptōuon kai Ekkoqutkevon. Ipos gia avatōtheon tnc istorias tou Oikoumevikoū Iatpiaoyetou [Reforms and Secularization. Towards a re-shaping of the Ecumenical Patriarchate's History during the 19<sup>th</sup> century]*, Alexandria editions, Athens, 2003.

Sturdza, Mihail Dimitri, *Grandes familles de Grèce*, Paris, 1983.

Şimşir, Bilâl N. (ed. by), *Documents Diplomatiques Ottomans, Affaires Armeniennes*, 2 volumes (1886-1893, 1894-1895), Imprimerie de la Société Turque d' Histoire-Ankara, 1989 and 1993.

Şimşir, Bilâl N. (ed. by), *Ege Sorunu, Belgeler*, cilt, 1 (1912-1913), Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi- Ankara, 1989.

Taner, Timur, 'Mavroyani Paşa anlatıyor: Osmanlı Gizli Polis Örgütü nasıl Kuruldu?', in *Tarih ve Toplum*, 6, 1984, pp. 414 -419.

Taner, Timur, 'Son dönem Osmanlı hekimleri üzerine birkaç not', in *Tarih ve Toplum*, 14, 1987.

Troboukis, Konstantinos, *Η ελληνική Ιατρική στην Κωνσταντινούπολη 1856-1923* [*Greek Medicine in Constantinople, 1856-1923*], Athens, 2000.

Veremis, Thanos, 'Ιδεολογικές Προϋποθέσεις για μια Συνεργασία Ελλήνων και Τούρκων' ['Ideological Preconditions for a cooperation between Greeks and Turks'], in *Δελτίο Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής εταιρείας Ελλάδας* [*Bulletin of the Historic and Ethnographic Association of Greece*], Athens, 1980, pp. 404-421.