

Historein

Vol 21, No 1 (2023)

Where was 1821? Space and Territory in the Greek Revolution



The Transformation of Urban Space before and after the Greek Revolution

Esra Ansel

doi: [10.12681/historein.23469](https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.23469)

Copyright © 2024, Esra Ansel



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Ansel, E. (2023). The Transformation of Urban Space before and after the Greek Revolution: The Case of Mega Revma (Arnavutköy). *Historein*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.23469>



The Transformation of Urban Space before and after the Greek Revolution: The Case of Mega Revma (Arnavutköy)

Esra Ansel

doi: 10.12681/historein.23469

To cite this article:

Ansel, Esra. 2023. "The Transformation of Urban Space before and after the Greek Revolution: The Case of Mega Revma (Arnavutköy)". *Historein* 21 (1). <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.23469>.

The Transformation of Urban Space before and after the Greek Revolution:

The Case of Mega Revma (Arnavutköy)

Esra Ansel
Bilkent University

When the news of the Greek rebellion under the leadership of Alexander Ypsilantis and Michail Soutsos (the hospodar of Moldavia) reached Istanbul in early spring 1821, all eyes were fixated on the Phanariots, a quasi-aristocratic group that took its name from an historical neighbourhood in Istanbul, Phanar (Turkish: Fener). This elite group had summer residences in Bosphorus villages and had to reside in their seaside mansions on the Bosphorus when they were dismissed from their offices and fell out of favour during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Since, according to contemporary sources such as the Bostancıbaşı registers,¹ the Kuruçeşme–Arnavutköy (Greek: Mega Revma) area had the highest number of Phanariot houses among these suburban villages, it was one of the places that attracted the attention of the Ottoman state and underwent through processes that altered its social character during the Greek Revolution and its aftermath. This article aims to answer two questions about the revolution’s spatial aspect while dealing with the revolution as a local phenomenon. What were the immediate effects of the revolution on the reorganisation of urban space in the capital? What kind of processes did the Ottoman state employ to reorganise the space of this Bosphorus village? This article argues that the revolution marks a period of social and spatial transformation for Mega Revma. However, it was not a moment of complete transformation. It was instead a long process that consisted of two main phases. The first phase involved the Ottoman state’s immediate reactions to the revolution from the spring of 1821, a sort of crisis management that was rather impetuous and violent. The second phase started around 1828–1829, when the Ottoman state shifted its strategy towards a more conciliatory and organised measures with the aim of the gradual Islamisation of this space. Despite all Ottoman state efforts, the neighbourhood’s Islamisation failed in the short run and was only realised after many years and waves of emigration from this Bosphorus village (mainly to Greece) during the Turkish Republican era.

To understand the rest of the story, we need to briefly explain Phanariot identity and its relationship with this Bosphorus village. Christine Philliou describes the Phanariots as “a

composite Orthodox Christian elite that grew out of the social and political fabric of Ottoman governance”.² With its Byzantine lineage claims, this elite group accumulated great fortunes through their trading activities during the seventeenth century, making them also politically powerful. Just as this wealth could provide their children with a good education in European cities and the opportunity to acquire European languages, it also gave them the power to lend money to patriarchal candidates and influence the internal matters of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate.³ Hence, for a long time, they chose to live in proximity to the Patriarchate in the Phanar district. The education they received in Europe enabled them to enter the Ottoman imperial service as court physicians or dragomans (interpreters). After the removal of Moldavian prince Dimitri Cantemir in 1711, the hospodars (*voivodes*) of the Danubian Principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia) started to be drawn from Phanariot families.

The Ottoman state required their male relatives to stay in Istanbul as hostages (*esir*) when Phanariot beys were appointed as hospodar of the Danubian Principalities. These relatives were seen as insurance to be interrogated in cases of defection, treason or any other suspicious activity of the ruling hospodar. Also, once appointed as hospodar, a Phanariot was expected to appoint a *kapukethüda* (steward), who acted almost like an ambassador for him in Istanbul.⁴ The Ottomans also saw them as sources from whom to regularly extract information and they held them responsible for the actions of the hospodar in question. A Phanariot hospodar often chose his *kapukethüda* and his many servants from his male relatives or in-laws. These great families often intermarried, creating aristocratic dynasties in Ottoman society, which provided the human resources for the administration of the Danubian Principalities.

Official and contemporary sources suggest that these Phanariot families had summer residences along the Bosphorus in villages such as Tarabya (Therapia), Yeniköy (Nichori), Kuruçeşme and Arnavutköy (Mega Revma). According to the rule, when they were dismissed from the office of the hospodarships of Wallachia and Moldavia and recalled to Istanbul by the Ottoman state, they could not reside in Phanar but in their country houses, in other words, in their seaside mansions (*yali*) on the Bosphorus.⁵ On numerous occasions, a Phanariot prince was dismissed from their offices in Moldo-Wallachia, then pardoned and recalled to serve in the Danubian Principalities for another period, which extended the time they had to spend in their Bosphorus mansions while waiting to be reappointed by the Ottoman state. Both Ismail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı and Ahmet Cevdet Pasha recount this situation in their histories.⁶

Gugios Incicyan, a contemporary, eighteenth-century writer, recounts that

when the leading members of the Greek community [meaning the Phanariot hospodars] fell out of favour and could not reside inside the city, they had to move to these suburban villages on the Bosphorus. Hence, their relatives and friends who

came to pay a visit to them eventually grew fond of the atmosphere, and their surroundings decided to buy houses in these villages and settle there.⁷

In keeping with the fashion of the day, during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the great Phanariot families such as Soutsos (Turkish: Suço), Callimachi (Kalimaki), Mourouzis (Muruzi), Ypsilantis (Ipsilanti), Mavrocordatos (Mavrokordato), Caradjas (Karaca), Hantzeris (Hañçerli) and Mavrogenis (Mavroyeni) had houses and seaside mansions in the Bosphorus villages but, most especially, in the Kuruçeşme–Mega Revma area.

Whatever their motivations may have been for living in the area, a microcosm of Phanariots in Mega Revma–Kuruçeşme can be traced from contemporary sources such as the Bostancıbaşı registers.⁸ It is easy to recognise the houses and lands that belonged to the Phanariots in this area in the Bostancıbaşı registers since they were mostly recorded with their family names such as Kalimaki, Muruzi, and Hañçerlioğlu (Callimachi, Mourouzis and Hantzeris) or with their professional titles such as *bogdan* (Moldovia), *kapukethüdası*, *divan tercümanı* (imperial dragoman), *voyvoda* (voivode)⁹ and *boyar*. In all of the available printed registers (from 1791, 1803 and 1815), Jews and Muslims each had only one spot in Mega Revma, while the rest of the shoreline belonged to Greek Orthodox subjects, at least half of which consisted of Phanariots. While the first part of Kuruçeşme, which is closer to Ortaköy, listed *yalıs* (seaside mansions) and palaces of the Ottoman imperial household and other Muslim properties, the latter part, which was closer to Mega Revma, listed houses that belonged to Phanariots such as Mavrocordatos, Callimachi and Mourouzis. If we compare the two neighbourhoods, we may see that Kuruçeşme had an ethnically and religiously mixed population, while Mega Revma lacked Armenian inhabitants and had only one spot for Jewish and Muslim residents each. Similarly, if we compare the Bostancıbaşı registers (1815) of Phanar and the Mega Revma–Kuruçeşme area, we can see that Phanar seems to be inhabited by middle-class Greek Orthodox subjects such as artisans, shopkeepers and doctors rather than Phanariots. Hence, we may argue that a considerable portion of the Greek elite started to move to Bosphorus villages and Pera to live during the nineteenth century while Phanar kept its symbolic importance.

Ypsilantis and Soutsos were the names of two Phanariot families very closely related to the history of Mega Revma. Both families had several houses and mansions in this village. The Soutsos family even had a street in this village named after them due to the existence of their mansion on this street. Thus, when the news of the leaders who started the Greek insurgency reached Istanbul in 1821, it is no surprise that Arnavutköy (Mega Revma) was one of the places that saw immediate reactions and violence from the Ottoman state and the mob. Following the massacre of Muslims in the Morea on 12 April, “the metropolitan, Panos Mavrocordatos, Panos Hantzeris who was 70 years old at the time, imperial dragoman Stefanaki Mavrogenis, Federico Spenciari, who was caught with a confidential letter, also four poor Christians, eight clergymen, and eight laymen were

arrested and tortured on 17 April, in Mega Revma".¹⁰ On Easter Sunday, 22 April, the religious leader of the Greeks of Mega Revma, Anthimos Efendi, was brutally executed together with the Greek Orthodox Patriarch.¹¹ These immediate reactions clearly show how Mega Revma was connected to the Greek Revolution in the Ottoman mind.

Şanizade, the official Ottoman chronicler at the time, records that the violence against the Greeks was concentrated in Bosphorus villages such as Mega Revma, Kuruçeşme, Yeniköy, Therapia and Phanari, in short, places where Phanariots had houses.¹² There are numerous examples where Phanariots, Orthodox clergy and common Greek subjects were executed by hanging or by the sword (*salben ve seyfen katl*), which took place in Mega Revma in April 1821 and the following months.¹³ Here are some instances that Şanizade recounts in his chronicles, which depict Arnavutköy as a crime scene:

The former voivode of Moldavia, rebel Mihailis's *tüfengci odabaşı* [musketeer captain] was hanged in his disguise clothes as an object lesson in Akıntıburnu, Arnavutköy [10 May 1821] ... The aforementioned traitors were executed in their clothes by the revenge of the sword. One in Phanarkapu, one in Arnavutköy and one in Yeniköy [17 May 1821] ... It has been decided to execute three men harmful to the Ottoman state and the Greek *millet* on the tenth day of Ramadan. Bostancıbaşı Ağa¹⁴ was appointed to kill these men by hanging. One in Arnavutköy, one in Yeniköy and one in Therapia [10 June 1821] ... Six priests who were jailed and sent from other places were executed on the mentioned day. Two in Beşiktaş, one in Ortaköy, one in Kuruçeşme and two of them were killed in Arnavutköy [6 July 1821].

More incidents where state officials and clergymen were killed on the spot with their official garments "as examples" took place in Arnavutköy but they are not listed here. Şanizade indicated the accusations and charges that led to their deaths as "being involved in the sedition that spread among the Rum *millet*".¹⁵ He used the term "*Rum fesadı*" (Greek sedition) repeatedly in his chronicle. He also frequently referred to Michail Soutsos and Alexander Ypsilantis as "the rebel" and "the traitor", respectively. While Şanizade referred to Soutsos as *Mihal-i hıyanet-iştimal* and *Mihal-i sadakat-muhal* (Michail who has treachery in his nature and is incapable of being loyal), he referred to Ypsilantis as "the son of a defector", which is an allusion to his father Constantin Ypsilantis, who defected to Russia.

The violence and pogroms were not only limited to Mega Revma but scattered around the city. Şükrü İlicak points to the execution of prominent Greeks like the patriarch and other archbishops, as well as others killed by the mob.¹⁶

In greater Istanbul, vagabonds and bachelors, predominantly Greek and Russian, were deported from the city to surrounding areas as they were seen as dangerous and sources of trouble in the city.¹⁷ At some point, Christians who were not subjects of foreign embassies were also considered potentially harmful and deported from the city. The Ottoman authorities saw even those who were not unemployed or idle as a threat. For

instance, they settled the Russian merchants in a han specially reserved for them to be sure that they could not mingle with non-Muslim Ottoman subjects.¹⁸

Sultan Mahmud II and his advisors were afraid of any possibility of turmoil in Istanbul and the massacre of Muslims. Thus, as a precaution, one of their immediate reactions was to disarm its Christian subjects and provide arms to the Muslims.¹⁹ Armenian and Greek households were required to hand in their weapons to their patriarchates. In the event of a discovery of any weapon in a Christian house, they had to find a guarantor (*kefil*) to vouch for them, and failing to provide one, the state had the right to deport them from the city. A document from 1821 lists people residing in Mega Revma in whose homes 30 cannons of various shapes and sizes were found.²⁰ According to this document, some house owners found a chance to escape while state officials arrested the rest. Another document similarly states that officials collected weapons from the houses of Mega Revma and lists guarantors of the people who owned these weapons.

One of the immediate reactions of the Ottoman state was to kill the imperial dragoman, Constantinos Mourouzis. The hospodar of Wallachia, Skarlatos Callimachi, who was appointed to his post just before the revolution took place, was exiled to Bolu and suspiciously murdered there by a poison prepared by the imperial physician.²¹ Even though the Ottoman state repeatedly asked for the extradition of Michail Soutsos and Alexander Ypsilantis from Austria and Russia, these states refused the requests, fearing that they might share the same fate as Mourouzis and Callimachi. In the following years, the sultan more than once considered massacring the Phanariots but these ideas were never put into practice.²²

The rest of the Phanariots were exiled from Istanbul to Anatolian cities together with their families and their entire retinues. Simultaneously, their moveable and immoveable properties, such as their houses and mansions in Mega Revma, were confiscated by the state and sold by auction. The income from these auctions went directly to the imperial treasury.²³ Phanariot families such as the Mavrogenis, Soutsos, Callimachi, Mavrocordatos, Hantzeris and Caradjas, all of which had houses in Mega Revma, were exiled to Anatolian cities such as Ankara, Çankırı, Kastamonu, Tokat, Amasya, Bursa and Zile (a town which lies to the south of Amasya and the west of Tokat in northeast Turkey).²⁴ Some of their relations succeeded in escaping from exile and taking their moveable property such as money and precious jewellery with them.²⁵ The fate of the houses and mansions of the fugitive Phanariots was the same as those of the exiled. These houses were sold by auction to whomever could afford them, regardless of their ethno-religious identity.²⁶

The state issued orders to set up a surveillance system on land and especially at sea, to prevent others from escaping penalties and controls. Foreign ships were sent away in fear that they would attract defectors and/or seek to offer foreign protection to Christians, mostly Greek Orthodox, whom the Ottoman state saw as highly likely to be involved in the revolution.²⁷

The presence or lack of Phanariots in a place was a decisive factor for the reputation

and future planning of that space. Sources suggest a direct link between the Phanariots and insurgencies in the eyes of Mahmud II, who once said that “those regions are free of mutiny since there were no Phanariots in the region”.²⁸ As the hometown to many Phanariots, Mega Revma had been a scene of crime and punishment during the first phase when executions and pogroms took place, and houses were abandoned, confiscated and sold to the highest bidder. This vengeful first phase, which started in 1821 and lasted approximately eight years, began to change around 1829–1830. At this time, the independent Greek state had been established, and there was significant international pressure on the Ottoman state. It could no longer afford to alienate its taxpaying Christian subjects, predominantly the many Greek Orthodox who did not abandon the Ottoman lands for the newly established Greek state. In Mega Revma, the dominant population was still Greek Orthodox, even in the absence of the Phanariots. The sultan pardoned the Phanariots in 1830 and permitted them to return to Istanbul from the Anatolian cities to which they were exiled.

The social makeup of Mega Revma was unique because it completely lacked a Muslim population, while its relationship with Christianity had deep roots that go back to the period of Constantine the Great (306–337). Sources suggest that Constantine commissioned its main church, Taxiarchis, and dedicated it to Archangel Michael, which inspired people to name the village after this church as Michailion and Asomaton.²⁹

Even though its immediate neighbour Kuruçeşme was also adorned by Phanariot mansions, it had a much more mixed population, a mosque and mansions owned by the imperial family and Muslim elite. In Mega Revma, the only building that belonged to a member of the Muslim elite was Grand Vizier Izzet Mehmet Pasha’s mansion, but it had a short life span since it was built around 1794 and was burned down during the great fire four years later. Moreover, the area between Kuruçeşme and Mega Revma, which belonged to another grand vizier, Çorlulu Ali Pasha, was vacant for many years. Sources suggest that Armenians, and not Muslims, bought the houses that were abandoned by the Greeks in Mega Revma. When the Ottoman government realised that it could no longer overtly alienate and punish its Christian subjects, the Muslim elite felt compelled to change its attitude through a gradual process of Turkification and Islamicisation.

Thus, the second phase of changing the social and religious composition of Mega Revma started around 1829. It was a slow process of Islamicisation through attracting a Muslim population to the area by creating opportunities, gradually eliminating and controlling the Christian population, and building a mosque on the shoreline. Some imperial orders which concerned not only Mega Revma but greater Istanbul indirectly contributed to this effort. For instance, according to an imperial order issued in 1829, Armenian subjects who had houses in Galata, Beyoğlu and Bosphorus villages were ordered to immediately sell their houses to Muslims. In the following years, many orders repeated the obligatory

auctioning off of Armenian mansions and houses to Muslims.³⁰ There were also instances when the state bought them as imperial property to be sold and rented to Muslims. As documents from 1849–1850 suggest, the state monitored the dealings to ensure that these properties would be kept in Muslim hands. A Christian subject or a foreigner could not even rent these properties. For instance, documents suggest that according to rumours in Mega Revma, Doctor Stefenaki sold his house to a foreigner, and later when the state officials investigated, it was understood that it was a misunderstanding and the house still belonged to Stefenaki and his wife.³¹

When Ottoman authorities realised that Muslims were unwilling to live in this area, they tried other methods, such as building projects, to woo them. For instance, the estate of Çorlulu Ali Pasha between Kuruçeşme and Mega Revma was vacant for more than a decade, and no Muslim was willing to buy the house together with the plot of land.³² The authorities decided to divide the land and open it to construction in order to erect new houses and a fountain in this area to create a new neighbourhood suitable for Muslim accommodation.³³ Some places were considered not “appropriate for Muslims to settle in due to its social topography because most of the residents were non-Muslims”.³⁴ Scholars have also debated that the layout of Christian houses was different to Muslim houses, and it was one of the reasons why Muslims were reluctant to settle in the former.³⁵ In the end, the estate was divided up, and parcels were sold separately to whomever was willing and able to buy them.

Another project relevant to the restructuring of the social space was the construction of the Tefikiye Mosque and a police station on the shoreline of Mega Revma. This project is particularly noteworthy since this settlement lacked a Muslim congregation, and the mosque was on the same axis as the main church of the Taxiarchis when one looks to the village from the sea. Because the main access was from the sea and the most prominent landmark of this village was the Taxiarchis church, this selection of this site for the construction of a mosque and police station was hardly a coincidence but rather a statement of Ottoman state power. Although one may associate a police station with surveillance and state control, between 1831 and 1939 the Ottoman state constructed many new police stations throughout Istanbul, and Mega Revma was chosen for this purpose. After the abolition of the Janissary and Bostancıbaşı corps in 1826, Mahmud II established a new police force and ordered the construction of numerous buildings in the neoclassical and empire style to house this new force to ensure law and order in Istanbul.³⁶ What is extraordinary is that there was no need or request for a mosque in this neighbourhood with very few or no Muslim residents. Works on Ottoman art and architecture, as well as official state documents,³⁷ show that the sultan entrusted this mosque to Kirkor Kalfa (the first architect known from the Balyan family) in 1831.³⁸ However, we also know that Kirkor Balyan passed away in 1831, in which case this edifice was probably completed either by his son Garabed Amira Balyan or son-in-law Ohannes Amira Severian. The inscriptions on the mosque’s gates, its *muvaqqithane* (timekeeper’s

office) and the karakol building provide clues for the importance and purpose of these buildings, a curious line on the gate of the timekeeper's office states that "many difficult matters were solved during your [Mahmud II] reign".³⁹ This may be an allusion to the 1821 Greek Revolution.

The residents of Mega Revma did not need to understand these inscriptions, though; the mere existence of which and the mosque were "symbols of Ottoman imperial presence and Muslim piety, erected on the shoreline to remind people that they were living under the authority of the Ottoman Sultan".⁴⁰ As Leslie Peirce puts it, "the most useful function that the sovereign might perform was to furnish visible symbols of majesty and piety to maintain the subjects' loyalty and sense of community".⁴¹

The lands of the most prominent churches of Mega Revma, namely Profitis Ilias and Taxiarchis, were never confiscated by the Ottoman state and were renovated numerous times after earthquakes and great fires. In keeping with the rooted Islamic tradition (the ordinances of 'Umar-al shurût al-'umariyya) that allowed the reconstruction of churches and synagogues in places where the majority of the population were non-Muslims,⁴² the main church was rebuilt and renovated many times by the contributions from the village's prominent families, such as the Musurus, Caratheodoris and Mavrocordatos, and even grand viziers.⁴³ Taxiarchis took its final shape in 1899 with its prominent dome and tall belfry. The Greek Orthodox subjects of Mega Revma were permitted to continue their religious practices in their local churches. However, the construction of the Tefikiye Mosque and a police station just in front of the most revered landmark of Greek Orthodoxy in this area was an act that marked the beginning of a symbolic victory, a process of the transformation and internal Islamisation of the neighbourhood.

Appendix: Arnavutköy in the Bostancıbaşı Registers of 1791, 1803 and 1815

1791	1803	1815
Lady Sultana Çorlulu's mansion	Fatma Hanım Sultan's seaside mansion	Çorlulu Ali Pasha's seaside mansion, boathouse and vacant shops
Lady Sultana's boathouse and six shops	Her Excellency Lady Sultana's shops, boathouse and lumber shops	Lady Sultana's boathouses and vacant shops
Shop and room of dhimmi lumberjack	Seaside mansion of Doctor Mikeloğlu Nikolaki's wife	Land and lumberjack shop of Hristooğlu
Arnavudköy pier	Mansion of Andimor dhimmi, deputy of Bursa Metropolitan	House of Mikeoğlu's wife
Seaside mansion of Dhimmi Doctor Nikola	Arnavudköy pier	Arnavudköy pier
Seaside mansion of Dhimmi Todoraki	Seaside mansion of the steward of Moldovia, Dhimmi Kostaki	House of the orphans of Dhimmi Kostaki
Seaside mansion of Barbooğlu Aleksi	Land of the former voivode Deli Bey's steward Logofet İskerlet	House of Dhimmi Lagofet İskerletoğlu
Seaside mansion of Delibeyoğulları	Small pier	Small pier
Seaside mansion of Doctor Küçük Toma	Seaside mansion of Mihal Bey's steward (<i>portalbaşısı</i>) Dhimmi Dimitraki	House of Dhimmi Behar Nikos Dimitraki
Small pier	Seaside mansion of Imperial Lumberjack Dhimmi Zotraki	House of lumberjack Dhimmi Sotraki
Seaside mansion of Limari	Rundown seaside mansion of Dhimmi Andonaki's wife	House of Dhimmi Andonaki's son
Seaside mansion of Andonaki	Seaside mansion of Dhimmi Andimoz, the Despot of Nicomedia's steward	House of moneylender Dhimmi Kostandi
Seaside mansion of Yorgaki	Seaside mansion of Mihal Bey's kamina Dhimmi Dimitraki	House of Dhimmi Miçko's orphan

Seaside mansion of Konstantaki	Seaside mansion and şerbethane of Dhimmi Zaniti Mahko	House of moneylender Dhimmi Diyamandi
Seaside mansion of Zambeti	Seaside mansion of Kaminar Dhimmi Yeco Dimitraki	House of Dhimmi Kömürcüoğlu Dimitraki
Seaside mansion of the orphans of Hristo	Seaside mansion of Commander Yamandi, subject/subordinate to Mihal Bey	House of commander Dhimmi Yamandaki
Small pier	Köybaşı pier	Small pier
Seaside mansion of Çuhacı Konstantin	Seaside mansion of Dhimmi Çuhacı Dimitraki	House and shop of boatman Dhimmi Yorgaki
Seaside mansion of the Jewish <i>mastariyeci</i> (customs officer)	Seaside mansion of customs officer Rabbi Avram	Land of the Jewish synagogue and two fishing shops
Seaside mansion of Reisoğlu Yorgaki	Seaside mansion of İstepar Nikolaki	House of Deli Bey's grandson Dhimmi Nikola
Seaside mansion of Yazıcı (scribe) Manol	Seaside mansion of scribe Manol	House of Dhimmi Çoke
Seaside mansion of Mihal Bey's brother Dimitraki	Voli Yeri pier	Place named Voli Yeri
Seaside mansion of the daughters of Halebli	Seaside mansion of İstepar Nikolaki	Land of Dhimmi Bişe Yorgi
Seaside mansion of the voivode of Moldovia's wife	Seaside mansion of Dhimmi Bihar Niko Vasil	House of Commander (Hatman) Yorgaki
Seaside mansion of İstavraki's scribe/clerk Yorgaki	Seaside mansion of İstepar Yorgaki	Dereağzı pier
Seaside mansion of Dimitraşko	Seaside mansion of Dhimmi İstetaki, Moriz Aleksan Bey's steward	House of the sons of Dhimmi İstyaki
Seaside mansion of the late Imperial Dragoman Nikolaki	Land of widow Sanrida (a Christian)	Land of Dhimmi Dimitraki's wife
Seaside mansion of	Land of Imperial Dragoman	Land of Aleks Bey

Cevahiroğlu's wife	Dhimmi Aliko	
Seaside mansion of Çuhacı Dimitraki from Chios	Seaside mansion of Kebabi Dimitraki's daughter Marpuç	House of Boyar Yorgaki
Seaside mansion of steward (<i>kapı kethüdası</i>) Mişoğlu	Land of Dhimmi Chief Butcher Mişoğlu İstefan	House of Dhimmi Kamburoğlu Yani
Seaside mansion of Hatmanoğlu Yorgaki	Seaside mansion of Hancerlioğlu Kostaki's wife	House of Doctor Desile
Akıntıburnu	Place called Akıntıburnu	House of Bişe Yorgi
		House of Hançerli's (a Christian) wife

¹ These registers are detailed records kept by the head of the Bostancıbaşı corps (which was a part of the Ottoman imperial guard corps known as Janissary corps) listing all private and public structures along the shores of the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn.

² Christine M. Philliou, *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 5.

³ Zeynep Sözen, *Fenerli beyler: 110 yılın öyküsü (1711–1821)* (Istanbul: Aybay Yayınları, 2000), 40.

⁴ “Kapı kethüdası or kapı kahyası, stewards of the Princes of Moldavia and Wallachia representing the interests of their masters at the imperial divan.” Ethem Eldem, “Istanbul: From Imperial to Peripheralized Capital,” in *The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir, and Istanbul*, ed. Ethem Eldem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Masters (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 159.

⁵ Marc-Philippe Zallony, *Essai sur les fanariotes, où l'on voit les causes primitives de leur élévation aux hospodariats de la Valachie et de la Moldavie, leur mode d'administration, et les causes principes de leur chute; suivi de quelques réflexions sur l'état actuel de la Grèce* (1824; n.p.: Kessinger, 2010), 92–93.

⁶ “According to Uzunçarşılı, Mihail Rakovitza [Turkish: Rakoviça] had to reside in his mansion in Kuruçeşme after his dismissal from Moldavia and waited there until his appointment as the hospodar of Wallachia. Ahmet Cevdet Pasha similarly narrates that Alexander Ypsilantis stayed in his mansions in Arnavutköy and Therapia while waiting for another appointment [in the principalities].” Esra Ansel, “Continuity and Change on the Bosphorus Shore: Arnavutköy Before and After the Greek Revolution of 1821” (MA diss., Boğaziçi University, 2016), 37.

⁷ Gugios V. İncicyan, *Boğaziçi Sayfıyeleri* (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2000), 80–81, quoted in Esra Ansel, “Continuity and Change on the Bosphorus Shore,” 38.

⁸ Since there were no clear-cut boundaries between these two villages and as immediate neighbours they showed similar patterns in social topography, this study will evaluate both neighbourhoods and occasionally treat it as a single area.

⁹ Philliou explains the term *voyvoda* (Turkish: bey, voyvoda; Greek: hegemonas, pringips; Slavic: voivode, hospodar) in *Biography of an Empire*, 11.

- ¹⁰ Orhan Türker, *Mega Revma'dan Arnavutköy'e: Bir Boğaziçi hikayesi* (Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 1999), 50. The author indicates his source as a special issue of *Pandora* of 15 July 1863 on the events of 1821 Revolution.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Yusuf Ziya Karabıçak indicates that Şanizade argues that the rebellion was “known to all *Rums* and a secret pact and agreement among approximately eight thousand vermin, to save the *millet-i Rum* from the Islamic government was made through the intermediary of the Phanariots, the *voivodes* of the Two Principalities and priests and merchants of other places where there were leaders of the *Rum*.” “Ottoman Attempts to Define the Rebels during the Greek War of Independence,” *Studia Islamica* 114, no. 3 (2020): 343, <https://doi.org/10.1163/19585705-12341403>.
- ¹³ Şanizade Mehmet Ataullah Efendi was the official chronicler during the first year of the revolution. His chronicles, which span from 1808 to 1821, are an invaluable contemporary source to understand the Ottoman reactions to the revolution during its first and most violent year. He was succeeded by Esad Efendi, who took up the events from September 1821 and continued until 1826.
- ¹⁴ The chief officer of the Bostancıbaşı corps.
- ¹⁵ “Rum milleti beyninde derkâr olan fesadda medhal-i küllisi olduğu tahkik olunarak” and “fesadda medhali tahakkuk ederek”.
- ¹⁶ Şükrü Ilıcak, “The Revolt of Alexandros Ipsilantis,” in *The Greek Revolution of 1821: A European Event*, ed. Petros Pizaniyas (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2011), 235.
- ¹⁷ Şanizade, *Sânî-zâde târîhî: 1223–1237/1808–1821* (Istanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2008), 1209–210. “Dersaadet'in dahil ü haricinde o makuleden ne mikdar Moralı ve Agrafalı Rum var ise, cümlesi deftere alınarak heman İznikmid'e ve ol havalıye nefy ü izhab ile Der-aliyye'den def olunmaları ... Ve Galata ve Beyoğlu ve ol havalide dahi gerek serseri ve gerek yerlü yurdlu reayadan başka eli ve ayağı tutar reaya ve gerek dahi Devlet-i Aliyye tebaasından ve düvel sefaretleri müteallıklarından olmayan sair ecnas-i Nasara haneleriyle kaldırılıp, ... İznikmid tarafına def için.”
- ¹⁸ Başkanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Ottoman Archives, BOA), HAT, 46003, “Rusya'ya firar eden Mihal vesairlerinin iadesi, Dersaadet'te bulunan serserilerin Rusya'ya iadesi ve Rus tüccarının reaya arasında oturmayıp kendilerine tahsis olunacak bir handa oturması hakkında elçiye verilecek takrir.” The document does not mention the specific location of the han reserved for the Russian tradesmen. It states: “Rusya tüccarı dahi reaya ile mahlûten ikamet etmeyüb ehl-i İslam ile beraber iskanlarıçün bir han tahsisi suretlerini mutazammın Rusya elçisi tarafına def'a-i saniye virilen mezkureye cevab olmak üzere takdim eylediği iki kıt'a takrirleri bad'el-tercüme meclisde” [A note to be given to the Russian ambassador about the Russian merchants not living among the reaya but residing in an inn to be allocated to them], H.1236 (1821).
- ¹⁹ BOA: HAT, 44138, “Ehl-i İslamın silahsız gezmeleri ve silah alamayacaklara silah temini,” H.1236 (1821).
- ²⁰ BOA, HAT, 51291, H.1236 (1821).
- ²¹ Ilıcak, “The Revolt of Alexandros Ipsilantis,” 238.
- ²² BOA, HAT, 39285, “Rumların günden güne artan şekavetleri Moskovlunun ilan-i harb etmesine maruf bulunduğundan böyle bir halin tahakkuku halinde Anadolu tarafında menfi olan Fenerli takımının cümleten idamlarıyla İstanbul'da bulunan Rumların kamilen Anadolu'ya defleri ve saire gibi ittihazı icab eden tedabir,” H.1238 (1823); BOA, HAT, 50200, “Bu Fenerlu gavurların külliye izale-i vücudları hasıl olmadıkça tahrikatın ardı kesilmeyeceği vazıh ve celi olduğuna bina'en böyle olmakdan ise Rusya elçisi kalkub Boğazdan çıkdıktan sonra Anadolu tarafında menfi olan Fenerlu takımının tekrar bi'l mulahaza idam ve izalesine bakılması hususları beyne'l huzzar tezekkür olunmuş idüğü.”
- ²³ BOA, D.BŞM.MHF.d, 13719, “Fesada karışmış olan firari Rumların ehl-i İslam, Yahudi ve Ermeni taifelerine değer fiyatlarıyla satılan hane ve sahilhanelerini mübeyyin defter,” undated. The document contains only the

names of the former owners of sahilhanes and hanes (mansions and households) and their locations. It does not give any information of their new owners or prospective buyers. There are 5 from Büyükdere, 13 from Therapia, 9 from Arnavutköy–Kuruçeşme area (7 from Arnavudkaryesi and 2 from Kuruçeşme), 2 from Mirgün and 1 from Yeniköy. The owners vary from tradesmen (mostly referred as “Avrupa tüccarından”) to Phanariots (such as Mavrokordato and the former kapukethüda of Moldovia İstetaki) and clergyman (Kuşadası despota).

²⁴ BOA, HAT, 36544A, “İhtilalden Anadolu’ya nefyedilen fenerlilerin esami ve miktarlarını mübeyyin,” H.1245 (1830); BOA, HAT, 40222, “İşkerlit, Mavrokordato, Maktul Hançerli Dimitraki, İstefanaki ve Tercüman Yakovalı ile ailelerinden Anadolu’ya sürgün edilenlerin isimleri,” H. 1240 (1824).

²⁵ BOA, HAT, 16341, “Boğdan voyvodasının Arnavudköyü’ndeki kapukethüdası ve kardeşiyle, Kuruçeşme Kaymakamlığı’ndaki damadı Eşkına ve oğlunun zi-kıymet mücevherat ve eşya ile kaçtıkları hakkında,” H.1236 (1821). The document does not give any names except for the son-in-law of the kapukethüda “Boğdan voyvodasının Arnavud karyesi’ndeki kapukethüdası ve karındaşı ve Kuruçeşme’deki Damadı Eşkına’nın oğlu bazı zi-kıymet mücevherat ve eşyalarını alub.” His name should be İstetaki as an undated document suggests. According to this document, the former kapukethüda İstetaki, now a fugitive, had sahilhanes in Kuruçeşme and Arnavutköy. See BOA, D.BŞM.MHF.d, 13719.

²⁶ Most probably, the sultan hoped to create some kind of a balance in the social topography of this area by attracting wealthy Muslim and Armenian subjects to buy these houses.

²⁷ BOA, HAT, 44138, “Rum ve Hristiyan geçmemek için karadan ve denizden tertibat alınması, İstanbul’daki ecnebi gemilerinin toplu bir halde bulunması caiz olmadığından memleketten uzaklaştırılmaları,” H. 30.11.1236 (29 August 1821); BOA, C.AS, 29543, “Rumların isyanına binaen ve hiçbir ferden ecnebi gemileriyle Akdeniz ve Karadeniz tarafına firar edememeleri ve berren Rumeli tarafına reayanın firar etmemesi.” H. 12.02.1237 (15 November 1821).

²⁸ İlıcak, “The Revolt of Alexandros Ipsilantis,” 234. “Havali-yi merkumede Fenarlu takımı olmadığından bu fesaddan asudedir.”

²⁹ The church was rebuilt numerous times under Ottoman rule after its destruction in earthquakes and fires.

³⁰ BOA, C.DH, 4263, “Vilayetlere ve İstanbul’daki Ermeni mahallerine nakil ve iskan edilen Ermenilerin Galata, Beyoğlu ve Boğaziçi’ndeki yalı, ev ve bağlarının değer bahası ile Müslümanlara satılması hakkındaki emir,” H. 1245 (1829); BOA, C.DH, 6180, “Ba-irade-i seniyye gerek vilayetlerine ve gerek mahall-i saireye defolunan Ermenilerin Üsküdar, İstanbul ve Boğaziçi’ndeki emlaklerinin bilmüzayede Müslümanlara satılması, o yerlerde kefereye mal satılmaması ve icar edilmemesi muktaza-yı ferman olmakla,” H.1244 (1828); BOA, C.DH, 2238, “Ba-irade-i seniyye vilayetlerine ve mahall-i saireye gönderilmiş ve İstanbul ve Üsküdar’daki Ermeni mahallerine nakledilmiş olan Ermenilerin, Galata ve Beyoğlu ve Boğaziçi’nde uhdelerinde bulunan ev, yalı ve bağların değer bahalarıyla Müslümanlara satılmak ve sonraları Müslümanların elinden çıkmaması için gayrimüslimlere sattırılmamak,” H.1244 (1829); BOA, C.DH, 6219, “Ermeni mahallatine nakil ve iskan ettirilmiş olan Ermeni reayasının Boğaziçi’deki yalı ve konak ve bağları değer bahalarıyla alınarak İslamlara satılmak ve bundan sonra Müslümanların elinden çıkmaması için Hristiyanlara icar olunmamak,” H. 1244 (1829).

³¹ BOA, İ.MVL, 4882, BOA, A.AMD, 71.

³² BOA, HAT, 1548 (1820).

³³ BOA, HAT, 27035 (1832).

³⁴ Ansel, “Continuity and Change on the Bosphorus Shore,” 79.

³⁵ See, for instance, Kemal Beydilli, *Recognition of Armenian Catholic Community and the Church in the Reign of Mahmud II (1830)* (Harvard: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations of Harvard University, 1995), 17.

³⁶ Aynur Çiftçi, “The Military Structures of Mahmud II in Istanbul,” in *II. Mahmud: Yeniden yapılanma sürecinde İstanbul/İstanbul in the Process of Being Rebuilt*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz (Istanbul: Avrupa Kültür Başkenti, 2010), 174.

³⁷ BOA, HAT, 1585/37.

³⁸ For instance, see, Alyson Wharton, *The Architects of Ottoman Constantinople: The Balyan Family and the History of Ottoman Architecture* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2015), 200.

³⁹ "Nice müşkil umûr ahd-i hümayûnunda halloldu." *Database for Ottoman Inscriptions. Osmanlı Kitabeleri Projesi*, accessed 14 June 2020, <http://www.ottomaninscriptions.com/verse.aspx?ref=list&bid=1381&hid=5120>.

⁴⁰ Ansel, "Continuity and Change on the Bosphorus Shore," 92.

⁴¹ Marc David Baer, "The Great Fire of 1660 and the Islamization of Christian and Jewish Space in Istanbul," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36, no. 2 (2004): 163, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002074380436201X>.

⁴² With the condition of adhering to the original plan and not enlarging it.

⁴³ Selim III approved of its reconstruction on a bigger scale after the great fire of 1798 and his grand vizier, İzzet Mehmed Pasha, who had a mansion and a biniş köşkü (leisure mansion) in Mega Revma, was said to have contributed greatly to its renovation.