

A CHRISTIAN PRINTER ON TRIAL IN THE TANZİMAT COUNCIL OF *SELANİK*, EARLY 1850S: KIRIAKOS DARZİLOVİTİS AND HIS SEDİTİOUS BOOKS

Anna Vakalı*

Abstract

The present article deals with Kiriakos Darzilovitis, a Greek-educated Slavophone and the second Christian printer of Selanik. This article touches on some of the main points in Kiriakos's biography, with two main stations: first, his trial by the city's Tanzimat council because of the seditious books he was accused of printing; and second, the closure of his bookstore some years later, orchestrated by two Orthodox metropolitans and the local Ottoman authorities. The article follows how an ordinary Ottoman subject was consciously able to manoeuvre his way through different lingual, ethnic identities, citizenships, and even legal jurisdictions. More importantly, Kiriakos's life story sets an example for the limits of such "navigation." Indeed, the different governing authorities in the late Ottoman world could punish an individual for not fulfilling the expected commitments of each identity he or she asserted.

Keywords: printing, Ottoman Balkans, *Selanik*, sedition

1850'lerin Başında *Selanik* Tanzimat Meclisinde Bir Hristiyan Matbaacının Yargılanması: Kiriakos Darzilovitis ve Fesat Kitapları

Özet

Bu makale Selanik'in ikinci Hristiyan matbaacısı, Yunan eğitimi almış bir Slavofon olan Kiriakos Darzilovitis hakkındadır ve Kiriakos'un hayatındaki bazı önemli dönüm noktalarına temas etmektedir. Bu dönüm noktalarından ilki, şehrin Tanzimat meclisinde zararlı (*fesat*) kitaplar basmış olması nedeniyle yargılanması; bir diğeri ise, sahip olduğu kitapçı dükkânının bir kaç yıl sonra iki Ortodoks Metropolit ve yerel Osmanlı otoriteleri eliyle kapatılmasıdır. Bu makale bir Osmanlı tebaasının farklı dilsel, etnik kimlikler ve vatandaşlıklar ve de farklı yargı yetki alanları arasında kendine bilinçli bir biçimde nasıl manevra alanları yarattığının izlerini sürmeyi hedeflemektedir. Daha önemlisi, bu yazı Kiriakos'un kimlikler arasındaki bu yolculuğunun sınırları olduğunu, otoritelerin onun yüklenmek istedikleri kimliklerin gereklerini yerine getirmediği ölçüde cezalandırıcı bir rol üstlendiğini ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: matbaa, Osmanlı Balkanları, *Selanik*, fesat

* Ph.D. Candidate, *University of Basel*.

Introduction¹

Though we still lack an extensive literature on nineteenth-century Ottoman *Selanik* (modern Thessaloniki), especially during the *Tanzimat*, the city has been increasingly explored within the paradigm of Ottoman “port cities.” The latter are understood as spaces for flows of people, goods, and ideas, which grew in proportion to port cities’ increasing integration into the world economy, and were accompanied by urban development and spatial reconstruction through the mid-nineteenth century. Scholars working on the Ottoman Mediterranean have focused on, among other topics, the crucial role of port cities in the region’s economy, on the role played by the inhabitants of port cities in regional and international trade, and on the influence of nascent nationalism in port cities.² Thus, Ottoman port cities of the Mediterranean, including Istanbul, Izmir, Beirut, and *Selanik* have been analyzed within a framework of “communities that fall short of nation-building, individuals of indeterminate identity, milieus based not on ethnic origin but on common practices or political convictions, characters marginalized because of their immoral or criminal behaviour, and so forth.”³ Moreover, due to their role as dynamic nodes in the world economy and therefore leading loci of technological innovation, as well as their relatively cheap and efficient access to transportation, port-cities have also been linked to printing activities: in the Armenians’ case, for example, printing emerged “either in or near port cities or was facilitated by maritime connections to such cities.”⁴

24

Picking up on these features of port-cities, the present article seeks to present the life story of a local printer of *Selanik*, Kiriakos Darzilovitis. It also contributes to the literature through its use of a still widely undiscovered source in Ottoman historiography: the interrogation protocols (*istintakname*)⁵ of the local councils established during the *Tanzimat* reforms. A rather unknown figure, Kiriakos (1817-1877) serves as an example of how an individual could consciously

¹ I thank Gergana Georgieva, Yura Konstantinova and Tasos Kostopoulos for providing me with Bulgarian archives and literature related to the subject; and Gergana Georgieva and Andreas Lyberatos for translating the necessary Bulgarian abstracts. I also thank Alexander E. Balistreri, Özde Çeliktemel-Thomen, Maurus Reinkowski and Seçil Uluşık for reading early drafts and providing me with valuable comments, as well as the two anonymous reviewers of *Cibannümâ* for their careful reading of my manuscript and their insightful comments and suggestions.

² Nurçin İleri, “Rewriting the History of Port Cities in the Light of Contemporary Global Capitalism”, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no. 47, (2012), p. 188.

³ Malte Fuhrmann, Vangelis Kechriotis, “The Late-Ottoman Port-Cities and their Inhabitants: Subjectivity, Urbanity, and Conflicting Orders”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 24:2, (2009), p. 73.

⁴ For a connection between early modern Armenian printing in the Ottoman Empire and port-cities, see Sebouh Aslanian, “Port Cities and Printers: Reflection on Early modern Global Armenian Print Culture,” *Book History*, Volume 17, (2014), pp. 55, 58.

⁵ The writing down of interrogation protocols (that is, of verbatim accounts of the litigants’ testimonies, as well as their dialogues with the interrogators) was a novel practice taking place for the first time in the Ottoman Empire’s history in the framework of the local councils of the *Tanzimat* (see also below).

navigate between various citizenships, ethnic claims, even legal jurisdictions of different states in the rapidly changing environment of the mid-nineteenth century Ottoman urban milieu. In the next pages he will appear as a student in the Greek Kingdom's capital town signing a petition together with other Greek classmates; as a defender of Greek citizenship demanding the application of Greek law during his trial at the local (Ottoman) council; as someone claiming to be a loyal and honourable Ottoman subject in a petition addressed to the governor (*vali*) of *Selanik*; as an advocate of Bulgarians when the latter started actively pressing for their cultural rights against both Ottoman Greeks and the Ottoman authorities in the late 1850s and during the 1860s; and finally, as a leading member of *Selanik*'s newly organized Bulgarian community between the late 1860s through his death in 1877.

Kyriakos Darzilovitis's Life Story

Kiriakos Darzilovitis (Darzilovets),⁶ born in 1817, was a Greek-educated Slavophone from a village outside *Vodina* (today's Edessa), northwest of *Selanik*. Following the Greek War of Independence (1821-1829), his merchant father moved the family to *Vodina*. Sometime later, probably in the mid-1840s, Kiriakos left for Athens, where, in October 1847, he enrolled at the Philosophical School of the University of Athens.⁷ In February 1848 he was one of many students who signed a letter supporting their history professor, Theodoros Manousis, after the latter was accused by students of the Theological School for mocking the name of Jesus Christ.⁸

In the autumn of 1850, Kiriakos came to *Selanik*. At the time, Jews accounted for at least half of the city's population, followed by Muslims, Greek Orthodox Christians (comprising also a smaller group of Bulgarians), Armenians and foreign residents.⁹ Taking over the necessary equipment from Miltiadis Garbolas,¹⁰ a Vlach who had opened the town's first Christian printing house

⁶ These are his respective surnames in Greek (Δαρζιλοβίτης) and Bulgarian (Дарзилевич) languages. I chose the Greek version in this article's title, since this was the version he used to sign his interrogation document and his petition to the governor.

⁷ Vaia E. Dragati, *The Macedonians in the Greek Kingdom in the Middle of the 19th Century* (in Greek), Aristotle University, MA, Thessaloniki 2010, p. 114.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁹ For more information, see Meropi Anastasiadou, *Thessaloniki 1830-1912, A Metropolis at the Time of Ottoman Reform* (in Greek), Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias, 2008, pp. 97, 141-144.

¹⁰ Miltiadis belonged to the famous Vlach family Garbolas, originally from the Mount Olympus near *Katrin* (Katerini), who had formed a dynasty of printers and bookstore holders. His father Konstantinos resided in Vienna, and moved to Athens in 1838, where he founded a printing house and a bookstore. He operated his store until 1842. Charalampos K. Papastathis, "The First Greek Printing-Offices in Thessaloniki (in Greek)", *Makedonika*, H', Thessaloniki, (1968), p. 240. Panagiotis Kokkas, "The Garbolas Family and the First Greek Newspaper of Thessaloniki (in Greek)", *Makedonika*, 21, Thessaloniki, (1981), p. 231.

approximately a year earlier, Kiriakos opened his own bookstore and printing office on *Sultanije* Street.¹¹ In fact, Kiriakos had worked together with Miltiadis's brother, Alexandros, in the latter's printing house in Athens.¹² Only few months after arriving in *Selanik*, in February 1851, Kiriakos was tried by the provincial council of *Selanik* (*Selanik eyaleti meclisi*). He was accused both of acquiring a Greek passport¹³ some months before,¹⁴ but mainly of printing books that were said to "corrupt the minds of the people" and "incite sedition."¹⁵

Following his trial, the details of which will be given in the next section, Kiriakos continued printing books through 1860, when his printing house was completely shut down, leaving him only with his bookstore.¹⁶ The reason for the closure was Kiriakos's support for the Bulgarians of the city of *Avrethisar* (today's Kilkis, north of *Selanik*) after they demanded the appointment of their own Bulgarian bishop, Parthenios. As is widely known, the *Rum milleti* (Greek-Orthodox religious community) of the Ottoman Empire comprised all of the empire's Greek-Orthodox subjects, regardless of what language they spoke (be it Greek, Slavic languages, Albanian, etc.). Its administration was dominated by the Greek-speaking clergy. Starting in the 1850s, however, the Slavic populations of the southern Balkans increasingly started asking for clergy and schools in their own language.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 245. Papastathis erroneously dates the foundation of Kiriakos's store to 1852. According to what Kiriakos stated later during his interrogation, he operated his store together with eight partners, six of whom were merchants. During his testimony, he revealed some of their names: Kostanti Dinke (his brother), Nikola Ispala (known as Nikolaos Psaltis, who had also been a partner of Garbolas), Dimitri Tzortzi in Trieste, and Karbola and Kostanti Varvat in Athens.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 245.

¹³ The passport was included in the case's file; it was issued in September 1850 and was valid for six months. Beyond indicating nationality, the passport was a slip of paper which should grant Kiriakos a free passage from Athens to *Selanik*.

¹⁴ Ottoman Christians' visits to the Kingdom of Greece in order to receive a Greek passport and their return to the Ottoman Empire constituted an issue of contention between Greece and the Ottoman Empire starting from the 1830s. According to Greek law, a precondition for issuing a Greek passport in such cases was a three-year long residence on Greek territory, while individuals who had migrated between 1830 and 1837 were recognized as Greeks by the Ottoman Empire. According to the Ottoman authorities, in order to gain this status individuals had sold their property before their departure, and had stayed for at least three years in Greek territory. The Ottoman authorities recognized as Greeks only those who had migrated between 1830 and 1837, had sold their property before their departure, and had stayed for at least three years in Greek territory. Georgios Georgis, *The First Longstanding Greek-Turkish Dispute: The Issue of Nationality, 1830-1869* (in Greek), Athens: Kastaniotis, 1996, pp. 157, 217.

¹⁵ BOA (State Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey, Istanbul), I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851), A.MKT.NZD. 31 40 (3 April 1851), A.MKT.MVL. 41 8 (31 March 1851). All documents pertaining to this case, including the interrogation of Kiriakos, were handwritten in Ottoman Turkish. In addition, two documents in Greek, that is, Kiriakos's Greek passport and his petition to the governor of *Selanik* (see below), were also included in the files.

¹⁶ Kiriakos described the incident in a letter to Rakovski on October 1860, stating that it had taken place six months before, Nikola Traikov (ed.), *Archive G.S. Rakovski. Vol. 2. Letters to Rakovski (1841-1860)* (in Bulgarian and Greek), Sofya: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1957, p. 621.

The area of *Avrethisar* was inhabited mainly by Bulgarians. According to a diplomatic official from the Greek Embassy in Istanbul, the Bulgarians of *Avrethisar* had sent a report to the Patriarchate in Istanbul, requesting the removal of the local bishop Meletios of Greek origins and his replacement by the Bulgarian Parthenios. Following a series of events including the pressure exerted by some Bulgarian families of *Avrethisar*, who declared their willingness to join the Catholic Church, the Patriarchate decided to give in and to appoint Parthenios as bishop of *Avrethisar* (1859-1867). However, Neofitos, the metropolitan of *Selanik* (1858-1874), had actively tried to prevent the appointment of Parthenios. Instead, he had tried to secure the appointment of the bishop of Platamonas (near *Katrin*, today's Katerini), from whom he had received a bribe.¹⁷

Kiriakos paid for his support of Parthenios with the closure of his printing house. He described this affair in a letter dated 25 October 1860 addressed to Georgi Sava Rakovski, an important figure of the Bulgarian National Revival movement with whom Kiriakos had regular correspondence. In this letter Kiriakos argued that the Greeks (*Γραικοί*, meaning here the Greek-speaking Ottoman Christians), especially the notables, had collaborated with the metropolitans of *Selanik*, Neofitos, and of *Vodina*, Nikodimos (1859-1870). As a group, Kiriakos explained, they had persuaded the governor of *Selanik* to close his printing house. Given the fact that Kiriakos was printing the Greek books for the town's schools,¹⁸ the decision of the Orthodox ecclesiastical authorities to shut down his printing house seems a rather harsh and unexpected one. The third known printer of *Selanik*, Nikolaos Vaglamalis, started his business in 1866.¹⁹ Thus, we do not know how the provisioning of the Greek schools with books was secured in the meantime.

In the same letter to Rakovski, Kiriakos identified himself as “a Bulgarian who does not know the Bulgarian [written] language.” He also supported Bulgarians' right to seek the progress and dissemination of their mother tongue. Furthermore, he accused the Greeks (again, *Γραικοί*), who were aided by their Church clergy and the Ottoman officials, of actively fighting against the Bulgarians.²⁰ In another letter written to Rakovski on 5 October 1860, Kiriakos had similarly expressed his support for the Bulgarians in their dispute with the

¹⁷ Dimitris Stamatopoulos, “Thessaloniki: 1858-1874. The Implementation of the General Regulations and Metropolitan Neofitos (in Greek)”, *Thessalonikeon Polis*, 1, (1997), pp. 97-98.

¹⁸ See also footnote 36.

¹⁹ Charalampos K. Papastathis, “The First Greek Printing-Offices in Thessaloniki (in Greek)”, *Makedonika*, H', Thessaloniki, (1968), pp. 253-254. Panagiotis Kokkas, “The Garbolas Family and the First Greek Newspaper of Thessaloniki (in Greek)”, *Makedonika*, 21, Thessaloniki, (1981), p. 231. See also BOA, I.MVL. 546 24520 (9 January 1866).

²⁰ Nikola Traikov (ed.), *Archive G.S. Rakovski. Vol. 2. Letters to Rakovski (1841-1860)* (in Bulgarian and Greek), Sofya: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1957, p. 621. The letter to Rakovski was also reprinted in the latter's Bulgarian newspaper, *Dunavski Lebed* (The Swan of the Danube), on 8 November 1860.

Greeks. The Bulgarians, Kiriakos continued, faced great religious and political prosecution by the latter, whose head priests regarded the Bulgarian provinces merely as fiefs.²¹ All in all, Kiriakos, who had studied in Greece, printed both Greek and Slavic books, and supported the Bulgarians in their demands towards the Greek-speaking elites of the *Rum milleti*, was thus forced to take an active stand in the ongoing polarization between Bulgarian- and Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians. We can only guess that the closing of his printing house moved Kiriakos one step away from his mode of switching between identities and led him one step closer to his self-identification as a “Bulgarian.”

Indeed, in the following years until his death in *Selanik* in 1877, Kiriakos would increasingly get involved in the Bulgarian cause. In 1867, he was appointed to the office of superintendent of the city’s Bulgarian girls’ school, and in 1868, he became a leading member of its Bulgarian community. Kiriakos’s brother, Konstantinos, had been more involved in the Bulgarian cause from the very beginning, having become in 1865 the Bulgarian community’s first president.²² In 1866, Konstantinos converted his house into the first Bulgarian school of the city. His son, Georgi, a fervent supporter of the Bulgarian cause, moved suddenly to Athens in 1874. Georgi’s son, Dimitrios Digkas, who had studied law in Athens and then settled in *Selanik*, was one of the first Greek deputies in the Ottoman Parliament after 1908. Following *Selanik*’s annexation to the Greek Kingdom in 1912, he also entered into the Greek Parliament.²³

Why Seditious Books?

In the beginning of 1851 Kiriakos had to stand trial in front of the provincial council of *Selanik*, a novel institution of the *Tanzimat*. The accusation Kiriakos faced was twofold: firstly, it comprised his acquisition of a Greek passport in Athens immediately before coming to *Selanik*. Secondly, he was accused of having opened his store without obtaining the necessary license beforehand and of printing and selling improper and seditious books, which could “corrupt the minds of the people.”²⁴ The acquisition of the passport was defined as a (minor) offence

²¹ Ivan Snegarov, *Thessaloniki in Bulgarian Spiritual Culture* (in Bulgarian), Sofia: Pridvorna Pechatnitsa, 1937, p. 200.

²² Nikolai Genchev, Krassimira Daskalova (ed.), *The Bulgarian Intelligentsia during the Revival. Encyclopedia* (in Bulgarian), Sofia: Petur Beron, 1988, p. 231.

²³ I thank Yura Konstantinova (Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) for the information on the extended Darzilovitis family. An article by her, entitled “The dissolution of the Rum millet-Some Greek-Bulgarian Cases,” will be printed by the University of Athens in the near future.

²⁴ The books were described variously as *mülke müzır kitaplar* (books harmful to the state) during the interrogations, as *tağyir-i eñkar-ı nasa sebep olacak kitaplar* (books that will cause the change of the thoughts of the people) and *uygunsuz kitaplar* (improper books) in the report (*tabirât*) of the governor of Selanik, and as *ıfsad-ı ezhan-ı abalıye mucib bir takım kitaplar* (several books giving rise to subversion in the minds of the people) in the official report (*mazbata*) of the Supreme Council of Judicial Ordinances (*Meclis-i Vala-ı Ahkam-ı Adliye*) and in the Sultan’s decree (*irade*).

(*kabahat, töhmet*) in the Ottoman documents.²⁵ Yet, his unlicensed shop and its printing activities were classified as more threatening, as they were against the order (*mugayir-i nizâm ba‘zî hareket*) and could incite sedition or disorder (*fesat-amiz şeyler*).²⁶ Before elaborating on the details of Kiriakos’s trial, let us consider for a moment the factors which could have rendered Kiriakos’s books so dangerous to the state. Their exact titles and content were not specified during Kiriakos’s interrogation and in the accompanying Ottoman documents; rather, we encounter merely the reference to “books harmful to the state” (*mülke muzır kitaplar*).

One may thus only speculate on the content of Kiriakos’s books by looking at the titles of the books he printed after his trial and after having received respective warnings. In fact the titles of these books are known to us from other sources. Between 1852 and 1860, Kiriakos printed twelve books in Greek language and one book in Slavic translation, though printed with Greek letters, a common practice at that time. The Greek books were books pamphlets for the Greek schools of the town with topics ranging from French language to ethics, arithmetic, physics and geography. Other printed books had a focus on Christian theology with a special emphasis on religious services, the New Testament and canonical references. There were also books of general knowledge on medical advices as well as history of the creation of the world.²⁷ Finally, the Slavic book was the “Konikovo Gospel” (*Kovikovsko Evangelie*), the oldest known major text reflecting the area’s living Slavic dialects. It consisted of a Gospel lectionary for Sunday services in Slavic translation, printed in Greek letters with corrections by Pavel Božigropski from the village of Konikovo and issued in 1852.²⁸

In addition, several other factors could give us some clues about the kind of books Kiriakos might have been circulating before his trial in 1851. On the one hand, books or pamphlets smuggled into the Ottoman Empire from Greece often related to claims of Greek nationalism, intending to incite the Christians subjects of the empire. Particularly, in February 1854 a decree was issued against the circulation of a nationalist, eleven-page pamphlet, printed in 1853 on the Aegean

²⁵ BOA, I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851), see respective writing of the governor of *Selanik* on 25 February 1851.

²⁶ BOA, I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851), *ibid*.

²⁷ To name just three examples (all printed in Greek language), *Geography of Elementary Subjects (to be Used in the Elementary Schools)* (1855), Dimitrios N. Davaris, *Christian Manual with Short Explanation* (1858), S. Samartzidis, *Practicing Medicine Without a Doctor* (1853). For a full list of the books printed by Kiriakos, see Charalampos K. Papastathis, “The First Greek Printing-Offices in Thessaloniki (in Greek)” *Makedonika*, H, Thessaloniki, (1968), pp. 245-248.

²⁸ In fact, Kiriakos printed only four pages, comprising a title page and four Gospel readings in Slavic translation, of an original bilingual (Greek-Slavic) manuscript of the Konikovo Gospel, which was found in 2003 by researchers from the University of Helsinki in the library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and All Africa and has been dated back to the late 18th or early 19th century. See <http://www.helsinki.fi/~jslindst/268/> (retrieved in September 2015).

island of Syros. It had been brought to *Selanik*, with the aim, according to the Ottoman authorities, of “inciting the minds of the non-Muslims subjects (*tabrik-i ezhan-ı reaya*).”²⁹ Particularly, the pamphlet’s content was addressed to the “Greeks of enslaved Greece” (*Έλληνες της δούλης Ελλάδος*), at other places called the “Greek Christians” (*Έλληνες Χριστιανοί*) or all the “Christian brothers” (*και πάντες οι εν Χριστώ αδελφοί*), specified later in the text as the “Greeks, Macedonians, men from Epirus, Thessaly, the Ionian Islands, Crete, Thrace, as well as Bulgarians, Serbs and Montenegrins.” In this pamphlet, they were all called to revolt against the “yoke of the Asian tyrant,” which had been plaguing the motherland for four hundred years, and reacquire their freedom. At a time when Europe’s nations were not bearing their own tyrants, with whom they were sharing the same religion and/or language, the addressed Greeks were urged not to support their Muslim tyrants. Many examples of heroic deeds and battles of the “Greek nation” from antiquity until the present time were being evoked while many heroes were listed. They should remind the readers of their glorious past and motivate them to fight for their own “freedom and independence,” in order to complete what had begun in 1821. However, the governor of *Selanik* assured in his report that the city’s non-Muslims were not paying attention to such publications, since they were enjoying unprecedented privileges and complete safety and comfort (*mazhar oldukları imtiyazat ve kemal-ı emniyet ve istirahat*). The Sultan’s final decree nevertheless stipulated that the dissemination of similar publications should be banned (*bu makule evrakın adem-i neşrine dikkat olunmak üzere*).

30

Lastly, several examples of similar trials or petitions of Ottoman Christian printers at that time provide us with valuable information. Indeed, they all reveal a common pattern of defence or argumentation employed by the printers when confronting the Ottoman authorities. The printers’ discourses aimed at convincing the authorities that the books which they had been printing or circulating were produced exclusively for students and for usage in schools and churches. The Bulgarian teacher Todor, the son of Todor, for example, was tried at the local council of *Ziştovi* (Shistov) in 1864 for picking up some seditious books from the customs. In his testimony, Todor argued that his supplier from Odessa had informed him that they were “books for children to read.”³⁰ In the same year, Tome, his brother Petro, as well as Anastas Makri were tried in the council of *Manastır* for selling books which were said to incite the minds of the people. In parallel to Todor’s claims, they argued that their books were only for the education of the Christian students (*millet-i hristiyanın sıbyanlarına talim olunmak üzere*) and that no book among them pertained to freedom (*serbestiye müteallik*).³¹

Examples from related trials in *Selanik* reveal a surprisingly similar thread of argumentation. Nikolas Vaglamalis, the third Christian printer of *Selanik* (after

²⁹ BOA, I.MTZ. (01) 9 227 (11 February 1854).

³⁰ BOA, MVL. 949 49 (25 April 1864).

³¹ BOA, MVL. 967 61 (13 July 1864).

Garbolas and Kiriakos) petitioned the state in 1866 in order to open a printing house in the town. In his petition, he underlined that his printing house would print “solely books which would be read by students in the schools and churches (*yalnız mekteplerde ve kiliselerde sıbyanın kiraatına mahsus kitap*).”³² The provincial council of *Selanik*,³³ noting that similar pretences had been used previously for printing other kinds of books, ordered that Vaglamalis should be bound to a guarantee (*kefalete rabî*). In addition, the exact titles of the books Vaglamalis would print were listed in Greek but written with Arabic letters, all of them dealing with religious education and instruction of the Greek language. It was also stated that the books did not include harmful elements to the sovereign and the state (*mülkçe ve devletçe müzir şey tab olunmamak*). The final decree approved the opening of the printing house of Vaglamalis on the conditions mentioned above. Finally, few years later Nikola Mihal, a resident of *Selanik*, was granted permission to open a printing house (*matbaa*) on the same conditions, that is, that the books and pamphlets would be only for educational purposes and that he would be bound to a guarantee.³⁴ Further south, in *Yanya*, the establishment of a printing house and the printing of a Greek newspaper were allowed in 1866 in order to counteract newspapers which had been printed in nearby Greece and which contained seditious (*fesat-amiz*) material. In addition, the printing house was instructed to print books for the local schools so that they did not have to be imported from Greece.³⁵

In sum, following his trial in 1851, Kiriakos continued his printing activity, but this time by focusing, like other printers did, on books related mainly to education. In his above-mentioned letter to Rakovski in October 1860, Kiriakos stated that he used to print in his printing house “all the Greek books used in the schools.”³⁶ Pertaining to the books which had caused his arrest in 1850, we can assume that their content must have been related to inciting claims of Greek nationalism and/or were destined for a wider public exceeding the boundaries of schools and churches.

³² BOA, I.MVL. 546 24520 (9 January 1866).

³³ The council members appear with their seals in the council’s minutes: the provincial governor Mehmed Akif, the religious judge Mehmed Bedreddin, the accountant Ömer Besim, the mufti Mustafa, the administrator of the pious foundations Abdülkadir, member Refik Yusuf, member (not readable), member (not readable), member Hilmi Hüseyin, member Mehmed Şevki, the scribe Receb (not readable), the scribe (not readable), the (Greek-Orthodox) representative Atanas Bladi (*Αθανάσιος Βλιάτης*), member (not readable), the (Greek-Orthodox) representative Lazaraki, the (Jewish) representative (not readable), the (Jewish) representative İsak (not readable).

³⁴ BOA, MF.MKT. 1 3 (7 May 1872).

³⁵ BOA, I.DH. 554 38571 (1 October 1866).

³⁶ Nikola Traikov (ed.), *Archive G.S. Rakovski. Vol. 2. Letters to Rakovski (1841-1860)* (in Bulgarian and Greek), Sofya: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1957, p. 621.

Kyriakos's Trial and Acquittal by the Provincial Council of *Selanik*

Faced with the charges pertaining to holding an illegal Greek passport and propagating seditious books, Kiriakos had to defend himself in front of the provincial council of *Selanik* (*meclis*). These councils constituted novel institutions established right from the beginning of the *Tanzimat*. They were assigned both administrative and legal functions, gradually taking over the adjudication first of penal and much later also of civil cases from the *sharia* courts. The adjudication of penal cases was made based on new penal codes, introduced respectively in 1840, 1851 and 1858.³⁷ Moreover, the local councils were staffed with state-appointed bureaucrats and elected Muslim as well as non-Muslim notables.³⁸

Faced with this novel institution, Kiriakos was subjected to several questions regarding his acquisition of a Greek passport and the activities of his printing house. Pertaining to Greek passports, only the former Ottoman subjects who had changed to the Greek citizenship before 1837 were interpreted as Greek subjects by the Ottoman authorities in accordance with the Protocol of London signed in July 1837.³⁹ In his defence, Kiriakos, without making any reference to the legal framework, stated in court that upon his return to the Ottoman Empire, many friends and officials had offered him to return to the status of being an Ottoman subject (*tebaiyet*). However, he said, he was not in a rush (expressed also by his use of the word *bakalım*, “let’s see”). First, he wanted to wait and see whether he would be accepted as a foreign subject and then, if it suited his

³⁷ For more information, see Sedat Bingöl, *Legal Reform in the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat Period. The Foundation and Proceeding of the Nizamiye Courts (1840-1876)* (in Turkish), Eskisehir, Anadolu Universitesi: Edebiyat Fakultesi Yayınları, 2004, pp. 57-86, 151-156, 208-215.

³⁸ Contrary to usual practice, the minutes of the council proceedings (*meclis mazbatası*), including the seals of the council's members, were not included in Kiriakos's case's file. However, from other penal cases tried during the same period on behalf of the provincial council of Selanik, we can infer that the people interrogating Kiriakos included (at least) the following: the governor of the province Yakub Pasha, its finance director Ishak Nureddin, the mufti Hüseyin Zühdü, council member Numan Tayyib, council member Ahmed, the city's metropolitan Ieronimos, the Greek-Orthodox representative Gavril Zarkavi (Γαβριήλ Ζ/Χαρκάδης) and the Jewish representative Yako, son of Avram (Fransez).

We still lack any extensive information on the city's notables during the 19th century. In my ongoing PhD dissertation, dealing with the local *Tanzimat* courts in a variety of Balkan cities, and especially with their adjudication of cases of sedition (*jesat*) and banditry (*eskejiya*), I try to help fill this gap by analyzing, among other cities, *Selanik*'s local councils' members during the first decades of the reforms.

³⁹ Georgios Georgis, *The First Longstanding Greek-Turkish Dispute: The Issue of Nationality, 1830-1869* (in Greek), Athens: Kastaniotis, 1996, pp. 219, 221, 227. The author cites a report of the Greek consul in Istanbul (dated November 1848), in which the latter mentioned that the Ottoman authorities were imprisoning many holders of Greek passports, demanding that they pay the tax levied on non-Muslim Ottoman subjects, the *reyaya* (απαίτησιν χαρατζοχαρτίου ως ριανιάδας). None of this, however, was mentioned during Kiriakos's trial.

interests (*işime gelir ise*), he would consider again becoming an Ottoman subject.⁴⁰ In addition, Kiriakos claimed that, although he had no license for his shop, he came to the Ottoman Empire to work according to the established law and order of the empire as well as “our own law (*kendî kanunumuz ile beraber*).” This latter law he stated to be the law of the Greek state (*benim kanunum Yunan devleti kanunudur*). Otherwise, Kiriakos continued, had not followed Greek law, he would have suffered a loss, given the fact that in the Greek Kingdom everybody was printing without a license. This had been the case, according to Kiriakos, especially after the declaration of the Greek Constitution (*konstotasyon-u Yunan*) in 1843.

In the same line, he stated that the Greek Constitution was valid for Greeks (*Yunanlar*, meaning here the citizens of the Greek Kingdom) even when they travelled and came under the jurisdiction of other governments.⁴¹ In sum, Kiriakos did not base the (re)acquisition of a certain citizenship on specific bureaucratic procedures and legal prerequisites, but rather on his own willingness and convenience. Furthermore, he felt confident enough to plea for the applicability of Greek law in his individual case, because of his status “as a Greek.” All these arguments speak to a high degree of fluidity in the passage from one citizenship to another, at least in the beginning of the *Tanzimat* and in the setting of *Selanik*.

As for his books, Kiriakos testified during his interrogation that he had been advised by the authorities to show them any book he was about to print. Nevertheless, Kiriakos argued that he had not followed the orders, as the “warning had not been in written form (*tabirilen*)”, and the books he printed were “harmless (*zararsız*)”. He also noted that the books he printed were totally harmless (*zararsız*).” In addition, following these first warnings, his printing was left undisturbed. So, he had not seen any reason to apply to the Ottoman authorities.⁴² Asked specifically about one “improper” book that he had brought from Greece, Kiriakos maintained that he had sold only some copies of it, and then, after having being warned, had stopped doing so. The interrogators referred also to another book, which Kiriakos had picked up from the customs, and which had led to his arrest. Apart from these books seized by the government, Kiriakos continued, there had been eight to ten books, which he had piled up in a corner of his store, again after having received respective warnings.

The ease and confidence Kiriakos demonstrated in front of *Selanik*'s local council, especially when juxtaposed with the petition he submitted only one day later to the city's governor, provides us with some clues as to how Kiriakos viewed this very novel institution of the *Tanzimat*, at that point only ten years old. Different than being in a traditional Ottoman *sharia* court, Kiriakos, when

⁴⁰ BOA, I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851): “Eğer teba'a-ı ecnebiyelere ruhsat olmaz ise o vakit işime gelir ise olurum [*teba'a-ı devlet-i aliye*].”

⁴¹ BOA, I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851). In Kiriakos's words: “Yunanlar hükümet-i abara dahi gittiklerinde [*konstotasyon-u Yunan*] haklarında cari olur.”

⁴² Kiriakos referred to the local authorities both as *hükümet* and as *meclis*.

testifying in front of this council, treated the trial as a more informal setting or forum where he could express himself without employing special filters. On the other hand, taking into account that the interrogation protocols (*istintakname*) were being sent to Istanbul, it becomes obvious that the *meclis* facilitated, among other aims, the better monitoring of an individual in a time of increased governmentality exerted by the state. The bureaucrats in Istanbul could therefore form a first-hand idea of the subjects' thoughts and attitudes, especially of those residing in the provinces.

Nevertheless, Kiriakos's placidity mutated only one day later, when he addressed a petition of forgiveness to the city's governor Yakub Paşa. In this petition, written in Greek by Kiriakos and then translated into Ottoman, Kiriakos appealed for forgiveness for having obtained the citizenship of another country. Admitting that he had committed a sin (*αμάρτημα*), he claimed that he had acted out of ignorance of the Ottoman laws. He stated that from now on he wished to live as an honourable citizen of his mother county (*πατρίδα*), that is, the Ottoman Empire, and promised never again to act against the laws of the empire, of which he would remain a loyal subject.⁴³ Though Kiriakos had expressed himself in the local council in a more informal way, he was aware of the fact that, in order to achieve a favourable decision in his legal case, he had to address a higher authority, using a standardized and submissive terminology. Indeed, similar to other cases found in the archives, the submission of a petition of regret which was always addressed to the province's governor or even the sultan himself after having committed any kind of "sedition," was a necessary tool of restoring the unspoken contract between the sovereign and his refined subjects.⁴⁴

Similarly, three decades earlier, Mahmud II and Ottoman administrators saw only one solution to the Greek insurgency beginning in 1821: a forced peace, for which the Greeks of the insurgent provinces were to accept Ottoman subjecthood (*raijet*). The realization of this pact would entail Greeks' concession to take poll-tax tickets (*cizye kağıdı*), followed by signing a deed of obedience (*sened*), and finally

⁴³ BOA, I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851): "Επιθυμώ να ζήσω εις την πατρίδα μου ως έντιμος πολίτης", "... της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας, της οποίας πάντοτε θέλω μείνει πιστός υπήκοος καθώς και πρώτον."

⁴⁴ Similar petitions written by non-Muslim Ottoman subjects after having committed sedition (*fesat*) and thus betrayed the Ottoman sovereign can be found, to name just one example, in the case of local notables who had allied with bandits coming from the Greek Kingdom. Often these local notables petitioned within few weeks the Ottoman authorities asking for forgiveness and promising to remain loyal subjects of the empire, See I.MVL. 310 12874 (6 July 1854). In addition, "In the 1830s, the content of the Ayvalık petitions was highly formalized in a submissive style, [...] through which the petition functioned as a statement of submission to sultan rule. Drafters of such petitions, among others, humbly recognized their mistakes and stated that thereafter they would refrain from 'meaningless passions' and lead a 'peaceful life.'" Evthymios Papataxiarchis, "Reconfiguring the Ottoman Political Imagination: Petitioning and Print Culture in the Early Tanzimat" in *Political Initiatives "From the Bottom Up" in the Ottoman Empire, Halcyon Days in Crete VII. A Symposium Held in Rethymno, 9-11 January 2009*, Antonis Anastasopoulos (ed.), Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2012, pp. 188, 190.

registering the deed at the local court. The Greeks' status was to be placed back into its existing legal infrastructure within Islamic laws and Ottoman customs through a bureaucratic process linking the Greek individuals to the empire.⁴⁵ During the early *Tanzimat*, then, the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and its subjects rested on the employment of a vocabulary marked by submission and magnanimity, as it was known from earlier practices.

Kyriakos's petition succeeded its goal.⁴⁶ Despite his seditious books, the imperial decree (*irade*) pardoned him (*afiv*) in an act meant to demonstrate imperial mercy (*merhamet-i seniye*). The decree recognized the regret Kiriakos had demonstrated in his petition (*nedam ve pişman*) and the fact that he had returned (*recat*) to his original citizenship (*tebaiyet-i asliyyesine*) as before (*kama kana*). In addition, a condition of Kiriakos's pardon was that he would remain under life-long surveillance in *Selanik*, that his seditious books would be confiscated and burned, and that he would never again act against the "sublime consent" (*rızq-a-ı ali*).⁴⁷

Conclusion

The case of *Selanik*'s second Christian printer does not only constitute a typical example of an Ottoman subject's navigation among citizenships and legal jurisdictions during the turbulent nineteenth century. Indeed, similar life stories have been delivered to us through the example of more known intellectual figures of the time.⁴⁸ The importance of Kiriakos's life story lies especially in the demonstration of the limits of such navigation for socially less influential persons. On the one hand, rather than trying to pinpoint the "real" and "prior" identity of such persons, or portray their navigation as mere opportunism, this article seeks to underline how normal and self-evident it could be for these individuals to pose

⁴⁵ Huseyin Sukru Ilicak, *A Radical Rethinking of the Ottoman Empire: Ottoman State and Society during the Greek War of Independence 1821-1826*, Harvard University, History and Middle Eastern Studies, PhD thesis, 2011, p. 167.

⁴⁶ To note, the Penal Code of 1840 lacked a specific clause about illegal printing offices and books. Particularly, in the penal code of 1840 (Chapter 2, First article) and 1851 (Chapter 1, Fifth article) there existed the notion of 'saying words which provoke somebody into actions against the Ottoman Empire and law and order', an act being punished with hard labor from one to five years. Ahmed Lüftü, *The Ottoman Order of Justice* (in Turkish), İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1997, pp. 117, 132. Only in the Penal Code of 1858 (Chapter 13) we find clauses about opening a printing office without a license (article 137) and about printing, in authorized printing offices, items injurious to the Ottoman Empire. These offenses were punished with respective fines of fifty and ten to fifty gold mecdiyes (mecdkiye: a silver coin of 20 piastres) respectively. *The Ottoman Penal Code, translated from the French text*, London: Clowes, 1888, p. 61.

⁴⁷ BOA, I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851).

⁴⁸ Other cases of more prominent individuals are more well known; see Vangelis Kechriotis, "In Athens a Cappadocian, in Izmir an Athenian, in Istanbul a Parliamentarian: The Various Personalities and State of Belongings of Pavlos Karolidis (in Turkish)", *Toplumsal Tarih*, 257, (May 2015), pp. 28-35.

such claims. On the other hand, it provided an idea of the political limitations which constrained such a “pendulum between identities,” as each political authority (here the Ottoman one, that is, the provincial governor of *Selanike* and the sultan’s decree, as well as the local Orthodox metropolitans) set the conditions of their relations with their subjects and punished them accordingly should they demonstrate disloyal behaviour. Indeed, an individual’s assertion of a certain identity was rendered possible as long as the conditions set by each governing authority were fulfilled for the individual. Stating loyalty and submission to the Ottoman Empire, as well as abstaining from any nationalist activity (here: printing), were preconditions for remaining a free subject in the nineteenth-century empire. Supporting, on the other hand, the Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate in its encounter with Bulgarian demands launched from the 1850s was a precondition for retaining the support of the Orthodox clergy, which administered the *Rum milleti*. Thus, Kiriakos could remain an Ottoman subject after submitting the necessary petition to the provincial governor, but was forced to definitely close his printing house when he breached his unwritten “contract” with the administration of the *Rum milleti* by openly offering his support to the Bulgarian cause.

References

Archival Documents

- BOA (State Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey, Istanbul), I.MVL. 204 6505 (24 March 1851); I.MVL. 310 12874 (6 July 1854); I.MVL. 546 24520 (9 January 1866).
- BOA, A.MKT.NZD. 31 40 (3 April 1851).
- BOA, A.MKT.MVL. 41 8 (31 March 1851).
- BOA, I.MTZ. (01) 9 227 (11 February 1854).
- BOA, MVL. 949 49 (25 April 1864); MVL. 967 61 (13 July 1864).
- BOA, I.DH. 554 38571 (1 October 1866).
- BOA, MF.MKT. 1 3 (7 May 1872).

Secondary Sources

- Anastasiadou, Meropi, *Thessaloniki 1830-1912: A Metropolis at the Time of Ottoman Reforms* (in Greek), Athens: Estia, 2008.
- Aslanian, Sebouh, “Port Cities and Printers: Reflection on Early modern Global Armenian Print culture,” *Book History*, Volume 17 (2014), pp. 51-93.
- Bingöl, Sedat, *Legal Reform in the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat Period. The Foundation and Proceeding of the Nizamiye Courts (1840-1876)* (in Turkish), Eskisehir, Anadolu Universitesi: Edebiyat Fakultesi Yayinlari, 2004.
- Dragati, Vaia E., *The Macedonians in the Greek Kingdom in the Middle of the 19th century* (in Greek), Aristotle University, MA, Thessaloniki 2010.

- Fuhrmann, Malte and Kechriotis, Vangelis, “The Late-Ottoman Port-Cities and their Inhabitants: Subjectivity, Urbanity, and Conflicting Orders”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 24:2, (2009), pp. 71-78.
- Genchev, Nikolai and Daskalova, Krassimira (ed), *The Bulgarian Intelligentsia during the Revival. Encyclopedia* (in Bulgarian), Sofia: Petur Beron, 1988.
- Georgis, Georgios, *The First Longstanding Greek-Turkish Dispute: The Issue of Nationality, 1830-1869* (in Greek), Athens: Kastaniotis, 1996.
- Ileri, Nurçin, “Rewriting the History of Port Cities in the Light of Contemporary Global Capitalism”, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no. 47, (2012), pp. 185-209.
- Ilicak, Huseyin Sukru, *A Radical Rethinking of the Ottoman Empire: Ottoman State and Society during the Greek War of Independence 1821-1826*, Harvard University, History and Middle Eastern Studies, PhD thesis, 2011.
- Kechriotis, Vangelis, “In Athens a Cappadocian, in Izmir an Athenian, in Istanbul a Parliamentarian: The Various Personalities and State of Belongings of Pavlos Karolidis (in Turkish)”, *Toplumsal Tarih*, 257, (May 2015), pp. 28-35.
- Kokkas, Panagiotis, “The Garbolas Family and the First Greek Newspaper of Thessaloniki (in Greek)”, *Makedonika*, 21, Thessaloniki, (1981), pp. 222-251.
- Lüfti, Ahmed, *The Ottoman Order of Justice* (in Turkish), İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1997.
- Papastathis, Charalampos K., “The First Greek Printing-Offices in Thessaloniki (in Greek)”, *Makedonika*, H, Thessaloniki, (1968), pp. 239-256.
- Papataxiarchis, Evthymios, “Reconfiguring the Ottoman Political Imagination: Petitioning and Print Culture in the Early Tanzimat” in *Political Initiatives “From the Bottom Up” in the Ottoman Empire, Halcyon Days in Crete VII. A Symposium Held in Rethymno, 9-11 January 2009*, Anastasopoulos, Antonis (ed.), Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2012, pp. 179-218.
- Snegarov, Ivan, *Thessaloniki in Bulgarian Spiritual Culture* (in Bulgarian), Sofia: Pridvorna Pechatnitsa, 1937.
- Stamatopoulos, Dimitris, “Thessaloniki: 1858-1874. The Implementation of the General Regulations and Metropolitan Neofitos (in Greek)”, *Thessalonikeon Polis*, 1, (1997), pp. 87-99.
- The Ottoman Penal Code, translated from the French text*, London: Clowes, 1888.
- Traikov, Nikola (ed.), *Archive G.S. Rakovski. Vol. 2. Letters to Rakovski (1841-1860)* (in Bulgarian and Greek), Sofya: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1957.

