Historein

Vol 21, No 1 (2023)

Where was 1821? Space and Territory in the Greek Revolution

Where was 1821?

Michalis Sotiropoulos, Antonis Hadjikyriacou, Ada Dialla

doi: 10.12681/historein.35712

To cite this article:

Sotiropoulos, M., Hadjikyriacou, A., & Dialla, A. (2023). Where was 1821? Space and Territory in the Greek Revolution. *Historein*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.35712

Historein

Vol 21, No 1 (2023)

Historein 21/1 (2023)

Where was 1821? Space and Territory in the Greek Revolution

Michalis Sotiropoulos
Antonis Hadjikyriacou
Ada Dialla

doi: 10.12681/historein.35712

To cite this article:

Sotiropoulos, Michalis, Antonis Hadjikyriacou and Ada Dialla. 2023. “Where was 1821? Space and Territory in the Greek Revolution”. *Historein* 21 (1). https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.35712.

Where was 1821?
Space and Territory in the Greek Revolution

Michalis Sotiropoulos
Antonis Hadjikyriacou
Ada Dialla

Spatial history and notions of space more generally have become increasingly important to the practice of historians and other social scientists. Despite programmatic declarations such as the "spatial turn", interest in space is of course nothing new.[1] Similar questions on how geography had no monosemous qualities have been articulated for more than a century, most notably in France and Germany.[2] More recently, themes such as the "international", the "global", "borderlands", "territoriality", "scale", as well as notions like "sacred space", "provincialising", or "mental maps" – to name just a few – have come to acquire an almost canonical status in the discipline of history. Whether studied through GIS, usually with quantitative data, or in its conceptual guises that problematise notions of space, spatial history opened a new vista by being conducive to multiple historical approaches: economic, environmental, social, intellectual and cultural history.[3] Even studies that do not fall explicitly into the field cannot but take space seriously, either as a theme of study, an analytical category, or a heuristic tool.

This is the case in particular with studies on the Age of Revolutions.[4] Although scholarly interest in the field is also hardly new, recent scholarship rejuvenated discussions by expanding the geographical scope of studies to include revolutionary experiences in the colonial and "peripheral" world, and by embracing the insights of global history. Apart from recovering the history of hitherto unknown revolutionary cases and questioning the Western or Eurocentrism of conventional accounts, this renewed interest has led many scholars to propose both alternative chronologies of historical change and alternative spatial frames in which to understand these changes. This has been the case for example of the revolutionary wave of the 1810s and 1820s, particularly in Latin America and the Mediterranean, increasingly seen as a liberal constitutional moment of global significance. In fact, historians of both regions have started raising important questions about the temporal and spatial context in which to locate the revolutionary developments of the 1820s in order to make sense of them. That is not, of course, to say that they have come up with an overarching spatial context, but, as in other cases where global accounts and spatial concerns came together, that they have complicated our understanding of space by treating

as a multivalent referent that took on multiple forms.[5] To take but one simple but very productive example, by bringing into focus the "World Crisis" of empires in the transatlantic and the Eurasian regions, many studies have shown the importance of empires and inter-imperiality for understanding the age's transformations, revising in the process the conventional emphases on national contexts.[6] This reappreciation of empire has led many studies to reassess the variety of ways with which people understood and produced space. Although the nation had a central place in their imagination (with or without a state), it was one spatial configuration among others.[7] What is more, historical agents did not always imagine these spatial configurations in the same way. In fact, people were (and indeed are) embedded in diverse sociospatial configurations – local, national, regional and imperial – that created connections between them. And as historians have shown, in this era, as in many others, movement or exile was both an outcome and an incentive of these diverse configurations.[8]

What about the Greek Revolution? To what extent have its historians followed this spatial turn? Although the revolution took place in time *and* space, it is questions of temporality that have mainly preoccupied historians of it. Indeed, whether it is the long nineteenth century, the Enlightenment, the Restoration, the Post-Napoleonic era or the Age of Revolutions, historians have long grappled with situating the revolution in a temporal context.[9]

This can hardly be said about space. In fact, the spatial categories historians have used have had a "natural" and self-evident character that required little or no probing. More often than not, they have employed conventional geographical categories and spatial contexts with which they are more familiar. Depending on the author, one is to learn that the Greek Revolution took place in the Balkans and it was against the Ottoman Empire; that it was a modern European revolution, which sought to create a Greek nation-state; or that it was a traditional revolt, with which local power holders (marginal elites in some accounts) sought to acquire more privileges for their provinces within the context of a decentralised Ottoman Empire.[10] This was convenient for historians confined to national geographical categories though they may have been, whether these categories conformed to how contemporaries experienced, talked or thought about space is rarely, if at all, explored.[11]

The starting point of this special issue is that there is nothing obvious or self-explanatory about space. In fact, the space that the Greek-speaking populations inhabited around the time of the revolution was a slippery one, to say the least. Indeed, historians have long shown that the Eastern Mediterranean region, where most Greek-speaking peoples lived and moved, entered a state of flux from the late eighteenth century. This was so for three reasons. The first was the Russian advance in the Black Sea and the Mediterranean after 1770, when the Orlov expedition entered the Mediterranean through Gibraltar, causing the biggest geopolitical shock in the "inner sea" up to that point.[12] The

second was the long-term phenomenon of “centripetal centralization” across the Ottoman world,[13] when local warlords and notables-cum-portfolio capitalists such as Ali Pasha[14] gradually acquired control over their territories, coming in many cases to administer them as semi-autonomous state-like political orders (a period historians have characteristically called ayanisation).[15] As the central state sought to exert more direct control over its territories from the beginning of the nineteenth century onwards, it turned aggressively against the most powerful of the ayans. Thus, the kind of hard-won administrative balance and the stability of the empire fell into disarray.[16] The third reason for the destabilisation of the region was the coming of the French, not least to the Ionian Islands and the shores of Rumelia and the Peloponnese across from them. Their arrival also brought other imperial powers and transformed the Eastern Mediterranean into a battleground – real, political and economic – further contributing to the breakdown of political and social systems in the area.[17]

In this geopolitical context, mobility (of information, goods and human beings) and the crossing of borders (physical, cultural, social) intensified. So did contact and exchanges. As historians of the Mediterranean have contended, during this time, the region – east and west – became smaller, more interconnected and more contested than before.[18] What is more, new types of movement appeared as the geopolitical context was changing. The imperial expansion of certain powers such as Britain, France and Russia and the collapse or crises of others (the Venetian, Habsburg and Ottoman empires) altered the landscape and established new routes. This mobile mode of existence left a deep mark on many people’s lives, recasting their senses of belonging and reshaping their political, cultural and ideological outlooks.[19]

In that sense, the Greek world and the revolution that broke out in a part of this world in 1821 provide a rich setting to think through space and pose questions about spatiality. To think, for example, about certain localities and their spatial characteristics; about the definitional role of “regions” and their boundaries – whether maritime or land-based; about how space was used and experienced in the conjuncture of the 1820s by contemporaries and without imposing geographical categories. It also provides an ideal vantage point for “inverting the gaze” and challenging some basic Eurocentric assumptions still implicit in approaches on the Greek Revolution and on the region more generally.

To be sure, this special issue does not seek to delimit the wide range of potential approaches to “space”. Rather, it brings together contributions that span a variety of conceptions of space. More than anything, it investigates the conceptualisation of space by historical actors, or examines how it was transformed in their daily experience. While each piece constitutes a convincing contribution in its own right, we contend that these articles can also be seen as falling into three very broad categories depending on the type of space they feature. Some have focused on space as a specific kind of place, often, though not exclusively, territory, tracing its entanglements with law, politics and empire as these took place in the region (the articles on Syros by Kousouris, on the castles in the Peloponnese

by Özkan Pantazis, on the Phanariot neighbourhood of Mega Revma (Arnavutköy) by Ansel). Others have engaged with more abstract (if not analytical) notions of space such as islandness (Gekas), in an effort to decentre our understanding of the space of the revolution, so often informed by a focus on the land-based spaces of the Peloponnese and Rumelia. In so doing, these articles show the significance of developments in the region for broader debates on territorialisation and reterritorialisation – the regulation, that is, of space by empires, nation-states or other state-like and hybrid political entities. Changes in regimes of territoriality, as Sebastian Conrad has proposed to call them, "result from the dissolution of some ties, while other structures and forms of embeddedness come to the fore".[20] These articles address exactly such changes in different places across the Eastern Mediterranean. Some of them also remind us of the importance of maritime space (as castles and islands belong also, but not exclusively, to the maritime space) and, in so doing, the benefits of "de-landing" our spatial gaze. Last but not least, some articles engage with more personalised understandings of space (Papalexopoulou and Kalinowska). Papalexopoulou's case brings into the discussion two perspectives that rarely meet in the historiography of the Greek Revolution, that of microhistory and gender.

In what follows, we briefly introduce the articles that comprise the special issue. Our point of departure is what was perhaps a major force in imagining Greek space, namely philhellenism. We chose to focus on a less-studied aspect: Polish philhellenism. Maria Kalinowska provides valuable insights by tracing the various spatial framings of the Greek 1821, as these can be found in the Polish philhellenic poetic imagination. As the author argues, one feature of the philhellenic romantic poetry, as highlighted by two great Polish romantic poets, Juliusz Słowacki (1809–1849) and Cyprian Norwid (1821–1883), was the Polish–Greek parallel as a literary trend. Poetic imagination depicted mutual permeation of the times and spaces of Greece and Poland, producing highly metaphorised meanings of space and time and consequently de- and re-territorialising the events of 1821. For Romantic Polish poetry, the space of the unfolding revolutionary events was Europe and, more concretely, the Europe of nations seeking their freedom. Poetic and thematic patterns such as the Crusades, a universal struggle between East and West, between good and evil since mythical times, placed the Greek Revolution in a European space and simultaneously in a universal space with apocalyptic dimensions.

Elisavet Papalexopoulou shifts attention to gendered and social dimensions of spatial imagination by seeing how certain upper- and middle-class female scholars (mainly Aikaterini Rasti, Evanthia Kairi, Angelica Palli and Elisavet Moutzan-Martinengou) who self-identified as Greeks conceptualised space: Greece, its position in Europe, Europe itself, as well as the Greek Revolution. As the author shows, there were significant fluctuations on how these women did so. In her account, space is used in two ways: as an imagined category, as a way, that is, in which these thinkers thought about Greece, Europe, and

other spatial categories before and during the revolution; but it is also used by way of the networks in which these women moved when making these spatial conceptualisations. By reconstructing these networks and the changes in their thought, the author shows that womanhood was not a stable category but, rather, one that involved (and involves) many intricate identifications, embedded in class and origin. She also shows that in order to understand these women's views on patriotism and nationalism, we need to adopt approaches that put more weight on the social and cultural situatedness of individuals, thus criticising the more abstract or ideational approaches of many historians of political thought (one of the writers of this introduction included).[21] In so doing, the author succeeds in challenging traditional localities of the Greek Revolution by including women who lived in areas that did not become part of the imagined national geography of the Greek nation-state after its inception, and did not necessarily use the Greek language in their writings.

The next three articles examine the geographical dimensions of space both in their material as well as mental dimensions. Sakis Gekas draws attention to the islands during the Greek revolution. Often overlooked in many of the accounts, the islands – and the naval force they provided – constituted one of the central pillars of the revolution. Starting with a conceptual problematique on insularity, that is, the shifting spatial conditions of being an island, he calls for a broadening of the temporal scope of inquiry to stretch back to the Napoleonic Wars, when a respatialisation of the Mediterranean was already underway since the French Revolution.[22] He then shifts to examine how the Greek Revolution reconfigured the Aegean – materially, intellectually and conceptually – to produce a multipolar world of "patriotic localisms and centralism", much like the Caribbean and Atlantic.[23] The rising importance of the islands in the revolutionary effort in exerting a great degree of maritime control allowed the islanders and their leaders to develop a distinct sense of representation and participation in the collective effort of the revolutionaries and the emerging political structures. Here, *patria* and its fluctuating meanings across different spatial scales of identification played a central role. Yet, Gekas identifies a great degree of ambiguity in the how islanders saw the revolution, with varying degrees of commitment, most notably depending on the extent of their exposure to Ottoman authority. When examining the construction of the new fiscal space of the islands in revolutionary Greece, Gekas identifies a corresponding degree of ambiguity, with varying degrees, most prominently depending on the class position of the historical actors involved. In short, despite valiant declarations on the commitment to the national cause, when it came to monetary contributions to it things became more complicated. At the same time, Gekas identifies a great degree of continuity between the Ottoman past and revolutionary conditions. Overall, despite the great degree of connectivity identified between the Aegean islands, Gekas is prudent enough not to identify this with uniformity, noting the highly differentiated experience of the revolutionary years across the archipelago.

Dimitris Kousouris' article focuses on Syros, an island that was one of the most contested places during the Greek Revolution, itself part of a region that was already a

contested domain between the various masters of Istanbul, Venice and the European powers since the late Byzantine era. Situated at a crossroads of the Eastern Mediterranean Sea routes, away from the big land fortresses, the isles of the Greek archipelago offer for the author a panorama of forms of shared and extraterritorial sovereignty and an instructive insight into the emergence of the notion of territorial sovereignty in the maritime space. As the author argues, in this region, as in many in the extra-European world, imperial antagonisms and vacuums of sovereignty gave rise to sharp conflicts over jurisdiction, in particular in borderlands and in the sea. He focuses on Syros, and examines the changing and conflicting claims for political sovereignty in Syros during the 1820s. And he does so, by turning to the view "from the hill", that is, to the view of the traditional inhabitants and protectors of the island, the local Catholic religious and secular authorities, and the political projects that were elaborated and promoted by the archipelago's bishops through the intermediary of the Vicariate of Constantinople, the Propaganda Fide, the French admirals and various local vice-consuls. In this saddle-space of contact where traders, sailors, soldiers, pirates, refugees, insurgents and local populations met and interacted, the local Latins had to negotiate their long-cherished autonomy and turn from subjects of the sultan protected by the French king to Greek citizens "of the Western Church". For the author, this process of the *territorialisation* of the maritime space marks a broader transition that involved (and was fuelled by) the democratisation of politics and the experience of an unprecedented acceleration of political dynamics, technological progress and social transformation.

Dilek Özkan Pantazis tackles the transformation of the Peloponnese, technically a peninsula during the revolution, but for all intents and purposes a Braudelian "miniature continent". She chooses to examine one of the most central sites of the revolution – but certainly not the only one – through an examination of fortresses and the military forces and civilians who witnessed some of the most serious sieges. Opening with a discussion on Peloponnesian geography and how it affected, and was affected by, the revolution, she moves on to investigate the material and cultural significance of fortresses in the imperial vision. A crucial aspect of the role of fortresses on the eve of the revolution was the steady decline of the garrisons in almost all of them, while imperial administration faced several challenges in maintaining a firm military presence, both in terms of the structures themselves as well as manpower. These urban centres with a strong Muslim population quickly became Ottoman strongholds. Despite some repairs, once the revolution broke out much of the Peloponnese fell under rebel control relatively quickly. The Isthmus of Corinth, the narrow strip of land connecting the Peloponnese with the mainland, became at that point a crucial site and occupied a central position in Ottoman considerations to protect the fortresses that were still holding out against the revolutionaries. Four key fortresses (Methoni, Koroni, Rio and Patras) stood out in the rebel archipelago that the Peloponnese

became and remained the only remaining semblance of imperial authority. This required a whole reconsideration of how to deal with logistics. This had to be done by sea, which entailed dealing with the rebel fleet. Rather than providing more manpower and provisions to the besieged, the Ottomans opted to shift all their energies to the Messolongi campaign, as the crossing of more rebels into the Peloponnese was seen by Hüsrev Pasha as certain doom for the resisting fortresses.

The reconfiguration of space during the Greek Revolution did not just concern the regions that eventually became part of the newly independent state. Shifting to a totally different scale of analysis, Esra Ansel examines the famed Istanbul suburb of Mega Revma (Arnavütköy). Traditionally, it had been a site of mansions belonging to the Phanariot Greek Orthodox community, the quasi-aristocratic group which in the seventeenth and eighteenth century became one of the most important stakeholders in the imperial project by occupying high-level positions, most notably that of the grand dragoman, deeply involved in foreign relations, and the prestigious (and lucrative) post of the rulers of the quasi-autonomous Wallachian principalities, the empire's breadbasket. By the early nineteenth century, Mega Revma came to be closely associated with the Phanariots. The outbreak of the revolution marked a major break in the relationship between this group and the Ottoman state, for the latter felt that they could no longer be trusted. After the purging, execution and exile of Phanariots who were considered to be responsible for the revolution, the Ottoman state engaged in a systematic project to transform the social, confessional and architectural character of Mega Revma. As Ansel points out, not all Phanariots lived there; but the suburb was exclusively non-Muslim. Moreover, it carried specific cultural, social and confessional connotations. Claiming the re-establishment of imperial order entailed a radical change at the material and symbolic level. Describing this process, she defines it as a "slow process of Islamisation". Although at first sight this may echo what Halil İnalcık called "Ottoman methods of conquest", one can notice that the Age of Revolutions and the fierce encounter of nationhood and religion that this entailed, it took much more violent forms to what early Ottomans practised in dealing with confessional difference. This involved the forced expulsion or sale of Christian (including Armenian) houses to Muslims – a practice encountered elsewhere in Istanbul. When it became clear that Muslims were indifferent to the prospect of moving to Mega Revma, either because of the cost of acquiring a house (usually mansions), or because of the non-Muslim character of the landscape, the Ottoman state moved to transform that as well, by redeveloping the suburb to construct smaller houses, fountains, a mosque and other structures associated with an Islamic urban setting. The state's control and presence were sealed with the construction of a police station and a timekeeper's office. Through these means, the symbolic and material dimensions of a suburban landscape like Mega Revma were radically transformed within a few decades.

To be sure, these are only some vistas of research where a "spatial" vantage point can take us. When we first conceived of this special issue, we intended to open the

discussion and provide food for thought. In other words, what we present certainly does not offer exhaustive coverage of the topic, but rather an instigation for a more systematic engagement with it. We would like to end this introduction by considering other possibilities that can widen the scope of research on space and the Greek Revolution. One thing to note is that, although movement has been related to different and changing "spatial framings", we are still to engage more fully with how mobility, forced or otherwise, informed the spatial imagination of people for whom movement was not exceptional or circumstantial, but was a fact, and indeed a very stable one, of their lives. That could and should include merchants, shepherds, sailors, pirates, corsairs and, in general, people who moved long before the Greek Revolution, either because they wanted or because they had to. But it could and should also include refugees, exiles and many others who were forced to move, and not only once, willingly or unwillingly because of the revolution and the war as well as of the effects the war had on their livelihoods (think again of shepherds, farmers and sailors), in the towns and the villages and, more generally, in the settlement patterns and the landscape both on the mainland and on the islands.[24] These processes did not only change the material conditions of everyday life, but unsettled the way people thought about their world and their political communities. Recent studies on some these groups, such as sailors and corsairs, as well as on the changes in everyday life caused by the war, have emerged in recent years, making significant contributions to research on the revolution and the early nineteenth century more generally.[25] In fact, as some of them have shown, this experience of movement created repertoires of political action that were novel, or at least necessitated a novel political language.[26] And yet, we are still to grasp how this wide movement, and the unsettlement that went with it, changed the way in which contemporaries thought about place and space. Some recent studies have tried to address such questions by focusing on the prerevolutionary experiences of some of the political and military leaders of the revolution.[27] But this is only one small example of where research could go.

The more general point that such cases invite us to understand is that, as in previous centuries, moving across the Mediterranean offered possibilities of renegotiation and the acquisition of new and unexpected cultural and political affiliations. It also led to the formation of new conceptions of space. This was a result of ideological and political transformations, but also of material circumstances and personal choices. In that sense, a spatial approach could help us study experiences like revolution, but also categories like the nation, liberalism and volunteerism, in a far more fluid and nuanced way than we have generally been accustomed. What is more, the increased movements of people across borders changed spatial framings for another reason. It made state authorities approach people's movement as a problem to be reckoned with, or even as a threat. In their effort to control, and put a stop to transnational conspiratorial activities, states started approaching their frontiers in a novel way. Although this did not prevent revolutions and radical political

movements from breaking out across southern Europe in the years to follow, it did give birth to a novel way of thinking about state space. Indeed, one immediate consequence of the Napoleonic Wars, but also of the 1820s uprisings throughout the Mediterranean, was the tightening of borders by the states affected by them. This is evidenced, for example, in the cases of Portugal, Spain and France, as the restored absolutist regimes sought to expel all undesirable individuals and increase controls at their frontiers.[28] But the same sort of willingness to produce a novel state space applied increasingly to the revolutionary authorities in Greece, as indeed Kousouris' study of the Syros case indicates. The coming of Kapodistrias to power would make this willingness even stronger, even if this tendency was sometimes a response to urgent situations on the ground, as the outbreak of the bubonic plague in the Argo-Saronic islands in the spring of 1828 indicates – an incident that forced the governor to use the naval forces to blockade the islands and the surrounding coastal areas, thereby producing de facto a space for action for the state, and a novel role for the Greek navy, as it was transformed overnight from a navy of corsairs and privateers, who usually affiliated with the authority of some of the islands, into a sort of a state navy that had the right to use violence to impose central state orders. More generally, one could, in fact, argue that the political struggles that ensued after Kapodistrias came to power were, to a large extent, struggles over state space.[29] The main question, of course, has to do with what kind of state space the Kapodistrias administration sought to produce and what sort of alternative spatial framings oppositional forces put forward, and how they were put forward, after the arrival of the governor and the realisation that a new political entity was being created.

This last point about the production of state space brings to the fore another issue: that of periodisation. Most studies of the Greek Revolution essentially define its temporality in terms of developments in either the war or the diplomatic front. This periodisation, however logical and practical, can be misleading as it mainly answers the question of when the war ended rather than when the revolution ended. Although the issue cannot be addressed here, it suffices to say that from a spatial perspective this is too strained a view. Thus, we think that studies of the revolution could broaden the analytical and temporal scope in which they study the revolution, and seek to locate it in the wider context of the Age of Revolutions. Historians working on other parts of Europe are increasingly defining this period as one spanning from the 1760s to the late 1840s. Even here, however, the Greek case, as many others probably outside the European core, show that such a periodisation may be too Western-centric. As at least one of the authors of this introduction has argued, if we change the gaze, it would probably be more meaningful to define the period as one spanning from the 1770s to the 1860s, if not the 1880s.[30]

Finally, one of the key units of analysis that the plethora of works produced in the context of the bicentenary of the Greek Revolution is empire. We have consciously tried to include what the Ottoman perspective was at different scales of analysis. But what of other empires? Greeks were denizens of, or peregrinated many an empire, just as these empires

were important factors in the outbreak of the Greek Revolution – not only as state actors, but also as imperial economies, societies and cultures. More focused research is therefore necessary to shed light on these questions. We can only hope that this special issue can inspire more fruitful and intellectual exchanges in the future by taking space as a meaningful object of inquiry.

---

[1] For the classic example, see Edward Soja, "The Socio-Spatial Dialectic," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70, no. 2 (1980): 207–25, https://www.jstor.org/stable/2562950. For an overview, see Jörg Döring and Tristan Thielman, eds., *Spatial Turn: Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008); Barney Warf and Santa Arias, *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2009).

[2] Lucien Febvre, in collaboration with Lionel Bataillon, *A Geographical Introduction to History*, trans. E.G. Mountford and J.H. Paxton (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1996); Cornel Zwierlein, "Early Modern History," in *Handbuch der Mediterranistik: Systematische Mittelmeerforschung und disziplinäre Zugänge*, ed. Mihran Dabag et al. (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2015), 87–105, https://doi.org/10.30965/9783657766277_009.

[3] Richard White, "What is Spatial History?" (working paper, Spatial History Lab, 1 February 2010, https://web.stanford.edu/group/spatialhistory/media/images/publication/what%20is%20spatial%20history%20pub%20020110.pdf; Riccardo Bavaj, Konrad Lawson and Bernhard Struck, eds., *Doing Spatial History* (London: Routledge, 2022); Konrad Lawson, Riccardo Bavaj and Bernhard Struck, *A Guide to Spatial History: Areas, Aspects, and Avenues of Research* (Edinburgh: Olsokhagen Publishing, 2022), http://hdl.handle.net/10023/24722.

[4] Antonis Hadjikyriacou, *Χερσαίο νησί: Η Μεσόγειος και η Κύπρος στην οθωμανική εποχή των επαναστάσεων* [Peninsular island: Cyprus and the Mediterranean in the Ottoman age of revolutions] (Thessaloniki: Psifides, 2023).

[5] For global history and space, see Matthias Middell and Katja Naumann, "Global History and the Spatial Turn: From the Impact of Area Studies to the Study of Critical Junctures of Globalization," *Journal of Global History* 5, no. 1 (2010): 149–70, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022809990362; Sebastian Conrad, *What is Global History?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), 115–40.

[6] Jeremy Adelman, "An Age of Imperial Revolutions," *American Historical Review* 113, no. 2 (2008): 319–40, https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr.113.2.319.

[7] David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmannyam, eds., *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760–1840* (London: Palgrave, 2010); Jeremy Adelman, *Sovereignty and Revolution in the Iberian Atlantic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Gabriel Paquette, *Imperial Portugal in the Age of Atlantic Revolutions: The Luso-Brazilian World, c. 1770–1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Sujit Sivasundaram, *Waves across the South: A New History of Revolution and Empire* (London: Harper Collins, 2020).

[8] Konstantina Zanou, *Transnational Patriotism in the Mediterranean, 1800–1850: Stammering the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018); Maurizio Isabella and Konstantina Zanou, eds., *Mediterranean Diasporas: Ideas and Politics in the Long Nineteenth Century* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); Joanna Innes and Mark Philp, eds., *Re-imagining Democracy in the Mediterranean, 1750–1860* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018); Maurizio Isabella, *Risorgimento in Exile: Italian Émigrés and the Liberal International in the Post-Napoleonic Era* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Christopher A. Bayly, *Recovering Liberties: Indian Thought in the Age of Liberalism and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Maurizio Isabella, *Southern Europe in the Age of Revolutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2023), esp. 218–57.

[9] Michalis Sotiropoulos, *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση και η ιστορία: Το χθες, το σήμερα και το αύριο της ιστοριογραφίας για το 1821* [Reappraising the Historiography of the 1821 Revolution], 1821 Digital Library, Research Center for the Humanities, 2021, https://doi.org/10.12681/rch.79.

[10] The bibliography is voluminous: for recent explorations and use of different temporal framings, see Paschalis Kitromilides, ed., *The Greek Revolution and the Age of Revolutions (1776–1848): Reappraisals and Comparisons* (London: Routledge, 2021); Paschalis Kitromilides and Constantinos Tsoukalas, eds., *The Greek Revolution: A Critical Dictionary* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2021), Kostas Kostis and Elias Kolovos, eds., *Κατανοώντας τον πόλεμο της ανεξαρτησίας* [Understanding the war of independence] (Athens: Patakis, 2022).

[11] For an exception, see Andreas Lyberatos, "Révolutions dans les Balkans: 1821 et ses héritages," in *Une histoire globale des revolutions*, ed. Ludivine Bantigny, Quentin Deluermoz, Boris Gobille, Laurent Jeanpierre and Eugénia Palieraki (Paris: La Decouverte, 2023), 343–66.

[12] Ada Dialla, *Η Ρωσική Αυτοκρατορία και ο ελληνικός κόσμος: Τοπικές, ευρωπαϊκές και παγκόσμιες ιστορίες στην Εποχή των Επαναστάσεων* [The Russian Empire and the Greek World: Local, European and global histories in the Age of Revolutions] (Athens: Alexandria, 2023).

[13] Ariel Salzmann, "An Ancien Régime Revisited: 'Privatization' and Political Economy in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire," *Politics and Society* 21, no. 4 (1993): 393–423, https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329293021004003.

[14] Ali Yaycıoğlu, "Provincial Power-holders and the Empire in the Later Ottoman World: Conflict or Partnership?" in *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead (London: Routledge, 2012), 436–52.

[15] Antonis Anastasopoulos, ed., *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire* (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2015) and in particular Yuzo Nagata, "Ayan in Anatolia and the Balkans during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: A Case Study of the Karaosmanoglu Family," 247–68; Ali Yaycıoğlu, *Partners of the Empire: The Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2016); Robert Zens, "Provincial Powers: The Rise of Ottoman Local Notables (Ayan)," *History Studies* 3, no. 3 (2011): 433–47; Kostis Papagiorgis, *Τα καπάκια: Βαρνακιώτης, Καραϊσκάκης, Ανδρούτσος* [The kapakia: Varnakiotis, Karaiskakis, Androutsos] (Athens: Kastaniotis, 2003). See also Peter Hill, "How Global was the Age of Revolutions? The Case of Mount Lebanon, 1821," *Journal of Global History* 16, no. 1 (2020): 1–20, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022820000145; Katherine E. Fleming, *The Muslim Bonaparte: Diplomacy and Orientalism in Ali Pasha's Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, eds., *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation* (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2007).

[16] Yaycıoğlu, *Partners of the Empire*; Christine M. Philliou, *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011); Dean J. Konstantaras, "Christian Elites of the Peloponnese and the Ottoman State, 1715–1821," *European History Quarterly* 43, no. 4 (2013): 637–38, https://doi.org/10.1177/0265691413499712; Thomas W. Gallant, *The Edinburgh History of the Greeks, 1768 to 1913: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015).

[17] Zanou, *Transnational Patriotism*; Dimitris Arvanitakis, *Η αγωγή του πολίτη: Η Γαλλική παρουσία στο Ιόνιο (1797-1799) και το έθνος των Ελλήνων* [The education of the citizen: The French presence in the Ionian Sea and the nation of the Greeks] (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2020); Yanni Kotsonis, *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση και οι αυτοκρατορίες: Η Γαλλία και οι Έλληνες, 1797–1830* [The Greek Revolution and empires: France and the Greeks, 1797–1830] (Athens: Alexandria, 2021); also his *The Greek Revolution and the Empires that made a Nation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, forthcoming).

[18] Hadjikyriacou, *Χερσαίο νησί*, 40–46.

[19] Zanou and Isabella, *Mediterranean Diasporas*.

[20] Conrad, *What is Global History?*, 123–24.

[21] Michalis Sotiropoulos, *Liberalism after the Revolution: The Intellectual Foundations of the Greek state, ca. 1830–1880* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023).

[22] Megan Maruschke and Matthias Middell, eds., *The French Revolution as a Moment of Respatialization* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019).

[23] Adelman, *Sovereignty and Revolution*, 391.

[24] For a classic study, see Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Πρόσφυγες και προσφυγικόν ζήτημα κατά την Επανάστασιν του 1821: Ιστορική μελέτη* (1939; Athens: Irodotos, 2001); see also Michalis Festas, *Το οικιστικό πλέγμα της Πελοποννήσου στα χρόνια της Επανάστασης: Ιστοριογραφικές και μεθοδολογικές προϋποθέσεις, ερευνητικά ζητούμενα, παραδείγματα επεξεργασίας δεδομένων* [Settlement patterns in the Peloponnese during the Greek Revolution: Methodological and historiographical prerequisites, research objectives and case studies], 1821 Digital Library, Research Center for the Humanities, 2021, https://doi.org/10.12681/rch.69; Christos Loukos, *Όψεις της ζωής των επαναστατών κατά το 1821: Η μαρτυρία του Νικολάου Κασομούλη* [Aspects of revolutionary life in 1821: The testimony of Nikolaos Kasomoulis], 1821 Digital Library, Research Center for the Humanities, 2021, https://doi.org/10.12681/rch.190.

[25] See Dilek Özkan Pantazis, "Migrations, Exodus, and Resettlement during the Greek War of Independence (1821–1830)," in *New Perspectives on the Greek War of Independence: Myths, Realities, Legacies and Reflections*, ed. Yianni Cartledge and Andrekos Varnava (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022), 109–28, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10849-5_6; and Katerina Galani and Gelina Harlaftis, "Privateering during the Greek War of Independence (1821–1829): Issues of Legitimacy, Organisation, and Economics of a War-Induced Practice," in Cartledge and Varnava, *New Perspectives*, 129–54, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10849-5_7; Dimitris Dimitropoulos, "Pirates during a Revolution: The Many Faces of Piracy and the Reaction of Local Communities," in *Corsairs and Pirates in the Eastern Mediterranean, Fifteenth–Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. Gelina Harlaftis, Dimitris Dimitropoulos and David J. Starkey (Athens: Sylvia Ioannou Foundation, 2016), 29–40; and Apostolos Delis, "A Hub of Piracy in the Aegean: Syros during the Greek War of Independence," in Harlaftis, Dimitropoulos and Starkey, *Corsairs and Pirates*, 41–54.

[26] Dimitris Dimitropoulos, "Πειρατές στη στεριά; Πρόσφυγες, καταδρομείς και καθημερινότητα των παράκτιων οικισμών στα χρόνια του Αγώνα" [Pirates ashore? Refugees, corsairs and everyday life in the coastal settlements during the Greek Revolution], in *Όψεις της Επανάστασης του 1821: Πρακτικά συνεδρίου* [Aspects of the 1821 Revolution: Conference proceedings], ed. Dimitris Dimitropoulos, Christos Loukos and Panagiotis Michailaris (Athens: Mnimon, 2018), 87–105.

[27] Michalis Sotiropoulos, "The Transnational Foundations of the Greek Revolution of 1821," in Cartledge and Varnava, *New Perspectives*, 23–44, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10849-5_2.

[28] Isabella, *Southern Europe*, 251–53. Beatrice de Graaf, Ido de Haan and Brian Vick, eds., *Securing Europe after Napoleon: 1815 and the new European Security Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

[29] For a classic study of these struggles, see Christos Loukos, *Η Αντιπολίτευση κατά του Κυβερνήτη Ιω. Καποδίστρια, 1828–1831* [The opposition to Governor I. Kapodistrias, 1828–1831] (Athens: Themelio, 1988); see also his recent *Ιωάννης Καποδίστριας: Μια απόπειρα ιστορικής βιογραφίας* [Ioannis Kapodistrias: An attempt at a historical biography] (Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, 2022). However, the spatial aspect is missing from these studies.

[30] Hadjikyriacou, *Χερσαίο νησί*, 287–340.