The Mysteries of Constantinople.

Greek "social fiction" in the Ottoman Empire.

A discourse about a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity

in the late nineteenth century?

Dissertation

zur Erlangung des Grades der Doktorin der Philosophie

an der Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften der Universität Hamburg

vorgelegt von

Zoi Georgiadou

aus Xanthi (Griechenland)

Hamburg, 2021

Members of the examination committee:

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Moennig

Universität Hamburg

Prof. Dr. Petr Kučera

Universität Hamburg

Prof. Dr. Marilisa Mitsou

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales of Paris

Date of Disputation: 16.12.2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

The Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* in the second half of the nineteenth century: a short presentation

CHAPTER IV

The formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity: an open discourse between Constantinopolitan and non-Constantinopolitan Greek authors

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Institute of Greek and Latin Philology as well as at the Institute of Asian and African Studies, which allowed me to meet and interact with several remarkable young researchers and Ph.D. candidates. The exchange of views during these meetings was particularly fruitful and the feedback of the other participants/colleagues on my work has been more than useful, helping me view my subject from a broader perspective. Thank you all.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my parents, Dimitris and Despoina, for supporting me spiritually throughout writing my thesis and through my life in general. Most importantly, I wish to thank Daniel for his encouragement, patience, and support throughout the long way as well as for his contribution to the formatting of the final text.

<div align="right">

Zoi Georgiadou

Hamburg, November 2021

</div>

INTRODUCTION

My first contact with nineteenth-century Greek novels belonging to the *City Mysteries* literary genre came five years ago – and rather coincidentally: while researching for my MA thesis, a list of literary works published in Constantinople in the nineteenth century came to my attention. I was immediately interested in these works, given that I hardly had heard anything about their existence previously. As I proceeded to a more systematic study of the texts, I realized that some of them share common characteristics and could, therefore, be considered as a corpus: they refer to the Greeks of Constantinople, are all written (and published) in the second half of the nineteenth century and most of them are labeled as "social fiction" (in Greek: "κοινωνικόν μυθιστόρημα" or "κοινωνική μυθιστορία"). Therefore, I gained the impression that during the nineteenth century there was a literary production in Constantinople analogous to the Athenian realism, which is worth being further studied. The scholarship that I received from the University of Hamburg in April 2016, with the guidance and support of my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ulrich Moennig, provided me the opportunity to undertake my doctoral research in Hamburg, the product of which is the current thesis. Writing my thesis at the University of Hamburg enabled me to do my research in libraries with access to all possible resources, especially regarding both the theoretical part of my work and the aspects of comparative data, at the level of European literature, of the series of nineteenth-century *City Mysteries*.

The subject of my thesis, thus, is a study of works written in the second half of the nineteenth century by Greek authors, who either originate from and live in Constantinople or simply had a thorough knowledge of the city by living there for some time. The objective of my research is to approach these texts from a rather ideological point of view, giving answers to questions like: what is the political or social purpose of each author? How and from which ideological perspective does he portray the society of Constantinople? How does he perceive the city and its Greek population, from the perspective of the citizen of the Greek Kingdom or from a Constantinopolitan Greek perspective? Does he constitute a member of this society or does he approach it as an outsider? How is the position of the Self concerning the Other defined in the various texts? Is the relationship between the two important centers of Hellenism, namely, the capital of the Greek Kingdom and the capital of the Ottoman Empire, perceived as one of parallel existence and mutual solidarity? And thus, could these

texts be seen as a corpus that claims the existence of a particular social group of people with their own conscience, that is, the Greeks of (Ottoman) Constantinople?

In order to achieve the objectives of my research and to give answers to the questions raised, it was necessary, at a first level, to establish a theoretical framework concerning the evolvement of the modern Greek novel within and outside the independent Greek state in general, as well as the emergence and development of the *City Mysteries* as a distinct literary genre in the nineteenth century. Consequently, I studied all the available material about the ten texts as well as numerous studies referring to the history, human geography, and social formation of Constantinople during the nineteenth century, to have an overview of these texts as a corpus as well as of the social, political, and cultural environment in which they emerged. In other words, I tried to study and make use, to the fullest extent, of the available bibliography in various fields related to the development of the Constantinopolitan Greek community and its literary production in the second half of the nineteenth century.

My thesis consists of four main chapters, structured in a logical order and in relation to each other. After clarifying a couple of methodological issues, chapter I offers a general presentation of the *City Mysteries* as an independent literary genre in the nineteenth century, focusing mainly on the social circumstances that led to its emergence, its main literary conventions, and its close connection with the new publishing method of the time, the *feuilleton*. A short presentation of the most successful European *City Mysteries* of the nineteenth century, namely, the novels written by Eugène Sue, George Reynolds, and Paul Féval, was considered necessary since these novels constitute the models of the genre and had a great influence on the production of the Greek *City Mysteries* through their numerous translations in the Greek language. After that, the chapter focuses on the respective original Greek novels published in the second half of the nineteenth century and, more precisely, on the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries*, which constitute the subject of this thesis.

Chapter II approaches the subject from a historical and social perspective and deals with the development of the Constantinopolitan Greeks within the Ottoman Empire and the formation of their collective identity in the second half of the nineteenth century. The chapter begins with the definition of the term *millet*, *genos*, and *ethnos*, which have always been complicated but, at the same time, critical for the deeper understanding of my subject. What follows next is a short presentation of the incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the European world-economy, the

introduction of the reforms of the Tanzimat, and the concept of *Ottomanism*, which decisively affected the course of the Constantinopolitan Greeks in the nineteenth century. Consequently, focusing on the Constantinopolitan Greek community, my objective was to follow its gradual transition from Rum to Greek and the process of the formation of its collective identity in the second half of the nineteenth century; its relationship with the subjects of the Greek Kingdom focused, to a large extent, on the vision of *Megali Idea* as well as the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism* that prevailed in the Ottoman Empire during this period, played a decisive role throughout this process.

Chapter III includes a short presentation of the authors and the novels that constitute the subject of study in my thesis, as I believe that it is important to have a clear picture of the authors, their experiences, and their ideological orientation to have a full understanding of their texts. As mentioned above, I tried to make use of all the available bibliography so that the picture of each one of the ten authors and his novel(s) becomes as clear as possible; unfortunately, this was not easy for all cases.

Chapter IV goes deeper into the ideology of each author and tries to follow the literary and/or ideological discourse that develops among them. In other words, in this last chapter, I focus on how each one of these ten authors views the development of the Constantinopolitan Greek community in the second half of the nineteenth century, that is, whether he sees it from the perspective of the Self or the Other as well as how he sees the formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity during these critical decades. I also try to present the ideological discourse that unfolds, in several cases, among these authors regarding the relationship, existent or non-existent, between the Greeks at the opposite shores of the Aegean and the future of the Greek community within the Ottoman Empire in the twentieth century.

Finally, the conclusions, which constitute by no means final and absolute positions but rather my point of view as the product of a *de facto* time-limited research, give an overall picture of the subject and raise questions for further study.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Before we begin the study of the texts, it is important to clarify a couple of methodological issues to have a full understanding of the subject and a steady basis for assumptions and remarks. At first, the theoretical concept of the "genre" in literature needs to be presented in short, since, according to my perception, the subject of my study, namely, the (Constantinopolitan Greek) *City Mysteries*, constitutes a distinct literary genre of the nineteenth century, which has not, until lately, received proper attention. Subsequently, I will clarify the criteria according to which the corpus of my study was compiled.

Genres and subgenres in literature

Every literary work is conditioned by "alterity", that is, is always seen in relation to another work. This practically means that, when reading a literary work, the horizon of expectations of the reader is constituted from out of a tradition or series of previously known works and from a specific attitude, mediated by one (or more) genre[1] and dissolved through new works.[2] It is unimaginable that a literary work sets itself into an informational vacuum, without indicating a specific situation of understanding. To this extent, we could say that every work belongs to a genre, that is, a pre-constituted horizon of expectations on behalf of the reader. In theory, the genre can be described as a recurring type or category of text, as defined by structural, thematic, and/or functional criteria; in other words, the term "genre" designates the literary form or type into which works are classified according to what they have in common, either in their formal structures or in their treatment of the subject matter, or both. This means that, if we recognize the genre of a text, we may have a better idea of its intended overall

---

[1]   Genre is a French term derived from the Latin *genus, generis*, meaning "type", "sort" or "kind". In English, "genre" and "kind" are used as synonymous terms, while in German, the term "Genre" appears to be synonymous with the terms "Gattung" or "Untergattung". Until the eighteenth century, the recognized genres – or poetic "kinds" as they were then called – were widely thought to be fixed literary types. However, in the eighteenth century, the emergence of new literary types such as the novel helped weaken confidence in the fixity and stability of genres.

[2]   Influenced by the work of the Russian Formalists and Czech Structuralists, Hans Robert Jauss defines the relationship between the individual text and the series of texts formative of a genre as "a process of the continual founding and altering of horizons". According to the German literary historian and theorist, "the new text evokes for the reader the horizon of expectations and 'rules of the game' familiar to him from earlier texts, which as such can then be varied, extended, corrected, but also transformed, crossed out, or simply reproduced" (Jauss 1982, 88).

structure and/or subject.[1] Besides, a genre-approach can deepen our sense of the value of any single text, by allowing us to view it comparatively, alongside many other texts of its type. In their historical development, genres change, combine, regroup, or form what seem to be new alignments altogether. The boundaries between different genres are indistinct and shifting, overlapping, and allowing intricate mixture.[2] Therefore, the distinctions between genres and subgenres[3] are flexible and loosely defined, often with subgroups.[4]

Genres and subgenres are notoriously resistant to definition; in fact, they can only be defined by the general cultural movement of the historical period in which they were composed. Hans Robert Jauss focuses on the altering responses, interpretive and evaluative, of the general reading public over time. According to him, the response of a particular reader is the joint product of the reader's own "horizon of expectations" and the confirmations, disappointments, refutations, and reformulations of these expectations, when they are "challenged" by the features of the text itself.[5] Therefore, a continuing "dialectic" or "dialogue" develops between a text and the horizons of successive readers; this means that a literary text possesses no fixed and final meanings or value in itself.

Structuralist critics such as Roland Barthes conceive the genre as a set of constitutive conventions and codes, altering from age to age, but shared by a kind of implicit contract between reader and writer. These codes make possible the writing of a particular literary text, though the writer may play against as well as with the prevailing generic conventions. For the reader, such conventions function as a set of expectations, which may be controverted rather than satisfied, but enable the reader to

---

[1] However, when we assign a literary work to a generic type, we do not suppose that all its characteristic traits need to be shared by every other embodiment of the type. New works may contribute additional characteristics to the genre; therefore, a literary genre changes with time (Fowler 1982, 37-38).

[2] Fowler 1982, 39-45.

[3] The subgenre is a type or class of text, which is identifiable as a subclass or offshoot of a larger category; for instance, the epistolary novel and the historical novel are both subgenres of the novel. Division of genres into subgenres normally goes by subject matter or motifs. Subgenres have the common features of the kind and, over and above these, add special substantive features. If subgenres are made by distinguishing additional genre-linked motifs or topics, it follows that we can carry the division and subdivision of genres even further by specifying more and more minutely (Fowler 1982, 112).

[4] Several scholars and theorists, as, for example, Howard Abrams, do not accept the distinction between genres and subgenres but speak of "larger and smaller genres" (Abrams [6]1993, 68). Alastair Fowler divides literary texts into generic categories, classes, subclasses, and sub-subgenres (Fowler 1982, 37-45).

[5] Jauss 1970, 7-37.

make the work intelligible – that is, to *naturalize* it, by relating it to the world as defined and ordered by the prevailing culture.[1] We could say that in each case, that is, in every literary work, there is a set of expectations connected to its type, to its generic tradition, as well as to the *Zeitgeist*, that is, the "spirit of the time", in which the work was written. Most works combine many generic types; this means that literary works can always be grouped in different ways. Therefore, every genre has a unique generic repertoire, that is, a whole range of potential points of resemblance, from which its representatives select characteristics or distinguishing features that may be either formal or substantive.[2]

According to Hans Robert Jauss, "the function, reception, and influence of literary works and genres in their historical reality and social environment" is a significant factor for the development of a genre.[3] Literary genres reflect social aspects of the historical time in which they arise and serve to connect the individual work to the larger social system. This assumes that literature is a part of social life rather than distinct from it, where genres serve particular functions within the social/historical context in which they exist. Moreover, since genres are socially/historically constructed, they can only be understood by examining how they were received at the time. For the German theorist, genres transform in nonlinear, heterogeneous ways, altering in conjunction with changes in the cultural, religious, social, and/or historical climate.[4] Following Jauss's theoretical model, I argue that the *City Mysteries* constitute a distinct literary genre of the nineteenth century with its own social and historical development, its own representation of the spirit of the time, and of course, its own common features and literary conventions.[5]

It is important to note here that, contrary to the past, in modern literature, the classification of a text in a specific literary genre does not aim at "proving" or "disproving" its literary value, but mainly functions as a description of the conventions that its author follows. What we know for sure is that today more texts can be classified as "literature" compared to the past, since the critics have overcome, to a great extent, the chasm between "literature" and "para-literature", namely, the distinction between

---

[1]   Abrams 1993, 75-78.
[2]   Fowler 1982, 54-55.
[3]   Jauss 1982, 143.
[4]   Jauss 1982, 130.
[5]   The study of genres essentially is the study of conventions; in other words, the genre describes a body of literary works, which share specific conventions and/or common features. For the conventions of the *City Mysteries* literary genre see below, p. 22.

texts of a "recognized literary value" and texts that are not "literary enough" or are considered "second-class literature". In other words, today we know that the "literary value" of a text does not depend on the genre in which it belongs, since genres, which were regarded, much or less, "second-class literature" a century ago, have been incorporated into the wide field of modern literature and deserve not only to be read but also to be methodically studied.[1] We should always bear in mind that literature depends on the expectations of the readership and the cultural and/or social needs of a particular period. Therefore, the readership of the time is the main factor that determines what can be regarded as "literature" and what not.

It is also important to add that a rather significant part of the nineteenth-century prose fiction could be and was classified in the past as "popular novels" or "romans populaires", often with a sense of depreciation or challenge of their "literary value".[2] Taking into account the social and cultural context of the nineteenth century, critics and scholars used the term "popular" to identify a series of novels with particular common features: familiar and rather expected structure and plot, repetitions, stereotypical protagonists, conventional narrative organization, intensive succession of chapters and/or scenes, reference to current topics and events in the plot, but also a great appeal to a broader readership[3] beyond the narrow circle of scholars and intellectuals.[4] The *City Mysteries* novels, in particular, can be defined as a significant category of the nineteenth-century "popular novel" or, in other words, as a distinct literary genre (or subgenre). However, regarding the Greek *City Mysteries* literary production, scholars and critics express different opinions: some argue that one can find rather heterogeneous material under the general title "City Mysteries", therefore,

---

[1] The *Gothic novel* constitutes a typical example: during the period of its blooming, namely, the eighteenth century, it was considered as the "epitome of para-literature"; however, in the next two centuries, it was gradually "whitewashed", offering the readership a series of interesting texts. For further information about the evolution and the context of the *Gothic novel* see below, p. 17, footnote 4.

[2] The "popular novel" bloomed in France after the French Revolution through adventurous and/or sensational novels, while after the restoration (1815-1830) through historical novels. These popular texts addressed a broader readership and became, therefore, very attractive for newspapers and journals (Bachleitner 2012, 22). Wolfgang Langenbucher was the first who saw the popular novel as a "phenomenon of social communication within a certain time" (Langenbucher 1964, 13).

[3] Although the eighteenth-century readership in France was largely limited to the commercial middle class, it expanded significantly during the following century, not only in absolute terms but also as a percentage of the total population. It was chiefly "from among skilled workers, small shopkeepers, clerks and the better grade of domestic servants that the new mass readership for printed matter was recruited during the first half of the nineteenth century" since these were the principal groups whose occupations required literacy (Law 2000, 13-14).

[4] Miano 2011, 176-186.

it is difficult to speak of a distinct literary genre,[1] while others suggest a different classification for the above-mentioned novels, incorporating most of them into the *socially conscious novel*[2] or classifying them as a subcategory of crime prose fiction.[3] In any case, I believe that the nineteenth-century *City Mysteries* novels, European and/or Greek, constitute a distinct category of texts worth being read and studied.

The compilation of the corpus

Coming to the texts that constitute the corpus of my thesis, I should note that, after extensive study of a broader series of texts, I decided to focus on ten novels, following four main criteria in combination: the extensive novels a) were written in the Greek language by an Ottoman Greek author,[4] b) were published in the second half of the nineteenth century regardless of the place of their publication, that is, in the Ottoman capital or elsewhere,[5] c) are classified, to a greater or lesser extent, into the *City Mysteries* literary genre, that is, drawing the main conventions and common features of the particular genre[6] and d) present in detail the Constantinopolitan Greek society, its structure, and the collective consciousness of its members.[7]

---

[1] Katsanos 2018, 453-457.

[2] For the *socially conscious novel* see below, p. 20, footnote 4.

[3] Denisi 1997, 50-60. According to Meyer H. Abrams, the term *crime fiction* describes narratives that center on criminal acts and especially on the investigation, either by an amateur or a professional detective, of a serious crime, generally a murder. *Crime fiction* has multiple subgenres, including detective fiction, courtroom drama, and legal thrillers. Suspense and mystery are key elements that are nearly ubiquitous to the genre, enabling readers to become mediated witnesses through identifying with eyewitnesses to a crime (Abrams 1993, 69). The difference, therefore, between *crime fiction* and *City Mysteries* lies mainly in the subject matter, even though they both follow common conventions such as the dark and mysterious big city or the life of the underworld.

[4] Half of the ten authors originate from Constantinople (Petros Ioannidis, Christophoros Samartsidis, Epameinondas Kyriakidis, Dimitrios Melissopoulos, and Dimitrios Spathiotis), while the other half originate from other regions belonging to the Ottoman Empire (Stephanos Xenos, Konstantinos Ramphos, Konstantinos Goussopoulos, Georgios Koutsouris, and Georgios Polychroniadis).

[5] Eight of the ten novels were originally published in the Ottoman capital as independent books, while only two were published in Athens (Xenos's novel was originally published in London in English and republished in Athens in Greek).

[6] For the conventions of the *City Mysteries* literary genre see below, p. 22.

[7] Several novels, which drew my attention at first, were finally not included in the corpus of my thesis for different reasons. Nikolaos Votyras's short novel entitled *Consequence of sin* (*Συνέπεια της αμαρτίας*), published in 1873 in Constantinople, constitutes such a case. The text follows, to a large extent, the main conventions of the *City Mysteries* genre, since it critically reveals several "dark" and "mysterious" aspects of modern Greek reality; however, it does not constitute a typical *City Mysteries* novel. Moreover, the plot does not take place in the Ottoman capital but mainly in Athens (at the end, Smyrna/Izmir also plays a role in the plot). The novel, therefore, gives us a picture of how a non-Constantinopolitan, namely, a citizen of the Greek Kingdom, who lived in the Ottoman capital for a short period, views the situation in the Kingdom and, for his own reasons, decides to publish his work (as an independent book) in Constantinople during a particularly critical period.

Following the above-mentioned criteria in combination, the corpus of my study consists of the following ten works (presented in chronological order): *The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople* (1855) by Petros Ioannidis, *The Devil in Turkey* (1851/1862) by Stephanos Xenos, the *Halet Efendi* (1867-1869) by Konstantinos Ramphos, the *Mysteries of Constantinople* (1868) by Christophoros Samartsidis, the *Customs of Constantinople Elpiniki* (1885) and *Peran Mysteries of Constantinople* (1890) by Epameinondas Kyriakidis, the *Dramas of Constantinople* (1888) by Konstantinos Goussopoulos, *The Orphaned Girl* (1889) by Georgios Koutsouris, *The Firefighter* (undated but probably not after 1890) by Dimitrios Spathiotis and Georgios Polychroniadis, and last, but not least, *The Maidservant* (1897) by Dimitrios Melissopoulos. But before we come to the study of the texts, it is more than necessary to have a closer look at the *City Mysteries* as a distinct literary genre that emerged and spread rapidly around Europe, and not only, in the nineteenth century.

However, since the novel does not give the reader a picture of the Constantinopolitan Greek society, I decided not to include it in the corpus of my thesis.

CHAPTER I

The *City Mysteries* literary genre during the nineteenth century

Before we begin to study the emergence and evolution of the *City Mysteries* as an independent literary genre throughout Europe, it is important to clarify a few things about the *roman feuilleton*, as most of the texts belonging to the above-mentioned literary genre were originally published serially in newspapers and/or journals, namely, as *romans feuilletons*.[1] In other words, the terms *City Mysteries* and *roman feuilleton* appear to be interwoven and almost identical, at least during the nineteenth century. However, the relationship between these two terms should be clear from the beginning: the *City Mysteries* is a literary genre that emerged and became particularly popular in the nineteenth century, while the *feuilleton* is one of the main features of this particular genre, namely, the common publishing practice for these novels. As it will be shown below, the fact that the terms *City Mysteries* and *feuilleton* were so closely connected, in several cases almost identical, is no coincidence. Both of them developed significantly within the nineteenth century, the former as a new literary genre, the latter as a new publishing practice and, in a way, "boosted" each other: the establishment of the *feuilleton* as the main publishing practice of novels since the beginning of the century contributed to the rapid acceptance of the *City Mysteries* by a broader readership, while the popularity of the *City Mysteries* novels increased the sales of hundreds of newspapers and journals around Europe and concretized the new publishing practice. What follows next is a closer examination of the emergence and evolution of the *roman feuilleton* in the nineteenth century.

---

[1]   Several scholars and critics perceive the *roman feuilleton* as a distinct literary genre or as a subgenre of the novel with its own conventions and generic features. The texts belonging to this genre (or subgenre) are planned to be originally published in newspapers and/or journals, share particular features regarding structure and context, and aim mainly at creating suspense and entertaining the readership. At the same time, other scholars and critics see the *roman feuilleton* as a specific publishing practice, therefore, as a generic feature of several different literary genres; this means that every novel published serially in a newspaper or journal is a *roman feuilleton* (Bachleitner 2012, 8). In the context of my thesis, I perceive the term from the latter perspective, namely, as a publishing practice or a literary form and not as a distinct literary genre.

1.0.   The emergence and evolution of the *roman feuilleton*

The nineteenth century was characterized by the capitalist handling of the literary world, where the pursuit of profit became the main objective. Since the beginning of the century, several French newspapers, which were facing a significant decrease in their sales, were seeking new ways to attract the interest of a more loyal readership. A reliable practice to get over this financial crisis by multiplying the number of readers and subscribers and attracting advertising was to include popular novels,[1] original and/or translated, into their pages. In other words, several editors decided to utilize the popularity of fiction to raise the sales of their newspapers.

This new practice led to the emergence of the *roman feuilleton*, which was printed in sequels (in most cases, daily) at the lower part of the front page of a political newspaper (and not, for example, in a family magazine), namely, the *feuilleton*, but later also on a separate page or pages.[2] Lise Queffélec identifies 1836 as the year when the *roman feuilleton* was born[3] and simply defines it as "roman publié par tranches dans le 'feuilleton' des quotidiens – c'est-à-dire dans un espace reserve au bas du journal".[4] The new publishing practice flourished in France in the 1840s, bringing great financial rewards to authors such as Honoré de Balzac, Eugène Sue, Paul Féval, Frédéric Soulié, George Sand, and Alexandre Dumas. Moreover, the readership of the French capital had the opportunity to enjoy the latest products of well-known French novelists or translations of famous foreign novels for little money. We should note here that the practice of including an additional text, often with political, critical, or cultural context, at the bottom of the front page of a daily newspaper was introduced already at the beginning of the century, but it was in 1836 that this additional text began having literary context.[5] Queffélec distinguishes two major periods of the evolution of the

---

[1]   For the term "popular novel" see above, p. 7.
[2]   A literary text published in a newspaper is considered a *roman feuilleton*, if it consists of, at least, twenty sequels.
[3]   In 1836, two newspapers were edited in Paris for the first time, namely, *La Presse* and *Le Siècle*. To make their newspapers more accessible to a broader readership, the editors decided to cut down the yearly subscription to half (from 80 to 40 francs). This decision, however, created the urgent need for doubling the circulation of their newspapers to remain in profit. Therefore, the editors decided to include an "entertainment part" consisting mainly of sequels of novels, original and/or translated, to make their newspapers more attractive to the readership of the French capital. In a short time, every new novel was originally published in the *feuilleton* of a newspaper (Queffélec 1989, 9).
[4]   Queffélec 1989, 9.
[5]   For further information about the emergence and evolution of the *roman feuilleton* in France during the nineteenth century see Queffélec 1989; Thérenty 2007.

roman feuilleton, separated by a brief interim stage occupying the years 1866-1875. The early period was dominated by Romantic chroniclers of the stature of Balzac, Sue, and Dumas, who appealed to a very wide social cross-section. In terms of quantity, the later period, that is, after 1875, represents the peak of the popularity of the *roman feuilleton*, as both the number of participating newspapers and their readership expanded rapidly. In terms of quality, however, the later period marks the beginning of the decline since the narrative contents became uniform as they conformed increasingly to a dominant national ideology.[1]

The term *roman feuilleton* is often related to the term *serialized novel* and the two terms are used interchangeably to define a text which is not published as an independent book – at least, not originally – but serially. John Anthony Cuddon defines the *roman feuilleton* as "a novel published in installments in a daily paper" and the *serialized novel* as "a story occurring in sections in a magazine", noting the difference between these two concepts only as differentiation of literatures: the same fact is called *feuilleton* in French and *serial* in English.[2] However, several modern scholars argue that there are significant differences regarding the purposes and the form between a novel first written and then published serially as independent installments, that is, the *serialized novel*, and a novel first serialized, that is, published in sequels at the *feuilleton* of a newspaper or a journal and then published as an independent book, that is, the *roman feuilleton*.[3]

After considering the above-mentioned information regarding the emergence of the *roman feuilleton*, it is not difficult to understand how serialization significantly affects the evolution and the form of the novel. As the *roman feuilleton* builds its success around the satisfaction of the curiosity and interest of the newspaper's readership – mainly members of the middle classes – the authors are obliged not only to respond to the conditions and the time-schedule set by the editor of the newspaper but also to adapt their writing in a way that will make readers await anxiously for the next issue. The responses of the readers to the plot could be observed daily and the sequel of the text could be formed or transformed according to these responses. In other words, the author could easily change the plot, the characters, even the *finale* of his novel, following the "demands" or expectations of the readers. This means that the *roman feuilleton* is being

---

[1]   Queffélec 1989, 9-119.
[2]   Cuddon 1999, 764, 810.
[3]   Serdar, Serdar 2014, 5-9.

written day by day, going almost parallelly with its publication. Therefore, the development of the story is not planned from the beginning but gets created according to the reaction of the readers: if the novel gains success, the story goes on; if not, it gets a sudden end.[1]

The new publishing practice created several narrative conventions in structure and context, such as dramatic and adventurous plot, flat and typified characters with controversial behaviors, long and fragmented intriguing stories with plenty of narrative gaps.[2] The narrator, therefore, jumps here and there in the plot and creates suspense, as the reader does not get informed about the future of the protagonists until several chapters later. Several "cliff-hangers" at the end of every sequel also create tension and anxiety for the salvation of the protagonist in danger. At the same time, due to its partial structure, repetition is a common feature of the *roman feuilleton*, which determines the construction of the plot as well as the formation of the characters.

In addition, the *roman feuilleton* contains realistic details as well as similarities and connections to news of the time and often refers to studies and historical documents on current matters to be accepted as "fictional reality". Moreover, the coexistence of fictional and informative texts, as, for example, political articles, on the same page of the newspaper create direct or indirect interactions that cross-feed their reading. Michael Lund argues that a *roman feuilleton* is not a text read independently, as it is published on a page where news, headlines, columns, and advertisements also take their place.[3] Therefore, it can be claimed that since the novel is published on the same page, where "real" news also appears, the perception of the readers at that time could be easily influenced in a way that they could also begin to perceive the novel as "real".[4] It is no wonder, therefore, that the novelists of the nineteenth century took account of these interactions and often "experimented" with the limits between reality and fiction, "crossing" the thin black line that practically separated the *roman feuilleton* from journalistic articles.

In general, we could say that this new publishing practice determined both the formal features of the novels and the perception of the readers. The authors could now easily reach a broader readership with their *romans feuilletons*, especially the middle

---

[1] Bachleitner 2012, 8-9.
[2] Ziras, Despotidis 2007, 674.
[3] Lund 1993, 19.
[4] Serdar, Serdar 2014, 11.

and lower social classes, and express, directly or indirectly, their ideas about social reformation. The *roman feuilleton* appeared to be an expression of the liberalization of modern society and pluralism of opinions; therefore, its emergence and evolution during a rather critical period for France, that is, the mid-nineteenth century, raised concerns and aroused reactions. Critical opinion was generally dismissive of the *roman feuilleton*, as most critics strongly questioned its "literary value". The Church turned against it, as the *roman feuilleton* was considered "liberal and revolutionary", while the French National Assembly imposed special taxation (the "Riancy" tax) on every newspaper that continued publishing novels during the political repression of the press under the Second Empire (1852-1870).[1]

Although Alexandre Dumas and Honoré de Balzac were the initiators of the *roman feuilleton*, the productive French author and publisher Eugène Sue, who, as we will see below, was the initiator of the *City Mysteries* literary genre, was the one who officially established the new publishing practice, as he succeeded not only in increasing the sales of his newspaper as no other editor before him did but also in introducing innumerable readers to his new literary world. His extensive novel *Les Mystères de Paris* (see below, p. 26), which is considered the model or archetype of the "typical" *roman feuilleton*, was published serially in the French newspaper *Le Journal des Débats*[2] from June 19, 1842, until October 15, 1843, and since then, the publishing practice of the newspapers and the motive of the readership entirely changed. Other French novelists, who produced popular *romans feuilletons* in the first half of the nineteenth century, were Frédéric Soulié with *Les mémoires du diable* (1837-1838), Paul Fèval with *Les Mystères de Londres* (1844) and Alexandre Dumas with *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo* (1844-1846). Of course, this development in the publication of literary texts was not only confined to France but spread rapidly in several countries throughout Europe. The new practice also led to a publishing revolution in the Greek-speaking literary world: from the mid-nineteenth century, several Greek novels, original and/or translated, were not published as independent books anymore but appeared as additional material of journals and newspapers. Especially after 1880, when the number of daily

---

[1] Vellianitis 1963, 462.
[2] *Le Journal des Débats* was a French newspaper, published during the period 1789-1944, which changed its title several times. It was the most read newspaper during the Restoration Period and the July Monarchy, before being surpassed by *La Presse* and later by *Le Petit Journal*. Its numerous articles established the *Journal*'s reputation as a major factor of influence on French culture and literature in the first half of the nineteenth century. All issues of the newspaper from 1814 to 1944 are available online (https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb39294634r/date).

newspapers increased, the *feuilleton* became the most common publishing form of literary texts. If considered successful, this first form of publication was often followed by one as an independent book.[1]

---

[1]   Ziras, Despotidis 2007, 674.

2.0.   The *City Mysteries* as an independent literary genre

As mentioned in the introduction of the chapter, most of the novels belonging to the *City Mysteries* literary genre[1] were originally published as *romans feuilletons*; this practically means that the *City Mysteries* novels combine several of the above-mentioned conventions of the *roman feuilleton*. However, the publication in sequels is only one of the main generic features of the *City Mysteries*, which will be analyzed below.

The *City Mysteries* are a form of a nineteenth-century social novel, which was born in France in the 1840s, reached its heyday in the following decade, and spread rapidly in many countries, inside and outside Europe.[2] The extensive novels belonging to this literary genre deal with the "unseen" aspects of the miserable life of the lower classes in modern urban centers and the criminal action of the underworld, the private daily life of the middle classes as well as the corruption and criminal behavior of the upper economic and social classes that usually remain "unseen". Moreover, they often favor a "socialist form" of societal organization, mainly of Christian character, that asks for justice and protection of the weakest and the poorest, however, without really questioning the established political system.

Stephen Knight concisely defines the *City mysteries* as "a nineteenth-century genre of the popular novel, in which characters explore the secret underworlds of cities and reveal corruption and exploitation, depicting violence and deviant sexuality".[3] These novels are all set in the vivid present of the complex and alarming modern cities that gradually emerged by the mid-nineteenth century, as mechanization and rapidly increasing commerce created the modern megalopolis for the first time (for example, Paris or London). The genre combines characteristics of other literary genres: it inherits its dark and scary atmosphere from the *Gothic novel*,[4] its criminal and detective action

---

[1]   Although the international bibliography mostly uses the terms *City Mysteries* or *Novels of the Cities* to label this literary genre, Greek critics and scholars show a clear preference for the synonymous term *Apocrypha* (in Greek: *Απόκρυφο μυθιστόρημα* or *Μυθιστορία Αποκρύφων*), trying to offer an accurate translation in Greek of the French term *Mystères* or the English *Mysteries*; but we are practically talking about the same thing. Nasos Vagenas was the first Greek scholar who spoke in 1977 about the *City Mysteries* as a distinct genre of nineteenth-century Greek literature in his article about the author Nikolaos V. Votyras.

[2]   For example, during the second half of the nineteenth century, the *City Mysteries* genre was also very popular in the United States.

[3]   Knight 2012, 3.

[4]   The *Gothic novel* (or *Gothic romance*), strongly influenced by Romanticism, took shape in Britain around 1790-1830, although its origins can be found much earlier in writing dating back to the

from the *Newgate novel*[1] and its figures of sensationalism – light pornography, description of violence – from the *Sensation novel*.[2] Combining extensive information on contemporary social events with emotive descriptions, romantic incidents, and intense action, it was easily consumed by the broader readership of the middle and lower classes; this is why it is often regarded as "popular literature" (see above, p. 7). The authors seek to denounce phenomena of social decay and propose solutions, mainly in the context of a "paternalistic socialism" that requires magnanimity from the wealthy ones and patience from the poor.[3] As Georgia Gotsi notes, the proposed measures for social remediation seem to correspond to the beliefs and expectations of an intermediate social group that probably constituted the readership of these novels.[4]

To a certain extent, the *City Mysteries* function as another form of "exoticism" in nineteenth-century literature. Just as a series of literary works fascinated the readers with the unknown and strange ethics and customs of the "uncivilized" people of the East, Africa, and America about a century earlier, the readers are now fascinated by the life of the underworld and the miserable lower social classes of Paris, London, or other European cities. The reader discovers a reality that was until now "unseen", as the authors of the *City Mysteries* shed light on specific aspects of life in urban centers that cover a wide range of criminal actions and groups: illegal secret gangs of corrupt

---

Middle Ages. Its name comes from the fact that its imaginative impulse was drawn from medieval buildings and ruins. The authors used settings such as dark forests, cliffs, castles, or monasteries equipped with subterranean passages, dungeons, hidden panels, and trapdoors to create a threatening atmosphere, often dealing with disturbed psychological situations and melodramatic incidents. The term "Gothic" has also been extended to a type of fiction that lacks the medieval setting but develops a brooding atmosphere of gloom and terror, representing events that are uncanny, macabre, or melodramatically violent. For further information about the *Gothic novel* and its evolution see Miles 1993; Davison 2009. Stephen Knight notes that the *City Mysteries* have at times been described as "urban Gothic" as if they are some late reformation, and so reduction, of *Gothic* fiction (Knight 2012, 9).

[1] The *Newgate novels* (or *Old Bailey novels*) were published in Britain from the late 1820s until the 1840s and were thought to glamorize the lives of the criminals that they portrayed. They took their name from London's famous prison (Old Bailey) and most of them drew their inspiration from the *Newgate Calendar*, a biography of famous criminals published at various times during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but usually rearranged or embellished the original tale for melodramatic effect. The novels caused great controversy and notably drew criticism from William M. Thackeray, who satirized them in several of his novels and attacked their authors openly. For further information about the *Newgate novel* see Juliet 1998.

[2] The *Sensation novel* was a literary genre of fiction that achieved peak popularity in Great Britain in the 1860s and 1870s. Its literary forebears included the melodramatic novels and the *Newgate novels*; it also drew on the gothic and romantic genres of fiction. The *Sensation* novelists commonly wrote stories that were allegorical and abstract. This gave them room to explore scenarios that wrestled with the social anxieties of the Victorian era, as, for example, the loss of identity. For further information about the *Sensation novel* see Pykett 2011.

[3] For further information about *paternalism* and its trends see Coons 2013.

[4] Gotsi 1997 ("Introductory note"), 4.

wealthy people, robberies, murders, underworld, underprivileged social classes, abandoned children, exploited women. The author undertakes the role of the careful observer and interpreter of the phenomena in modern cities and the third-person narrator turns the city into a subject of research, focusing mainly on phenomena of social pathogenesis.

Although this literary genre had a considerable impact on the readership of the time, the most popular European *City Mysteries* of the nineteenth century remain today little known; in fact, only *Les Mystères de Paris* by Eugène Sue is still being republished. Steven Knight notes that "the lack of surviving interest for these texts essentially derives – with the partial exception of Sue – from the hostility of the literary and academic elite in the past and present to such essentially popular fiction". [1] Moreover, I believe that one of the main reasons for the contemporary readership's "indifference" towards these texts is their ephemeral character, that is, the fact that many of them were only a product of the commercial needs of the daily press. However, this does not automatically reduce the value of this literary genre.

The social circumstances and the emergence of the genre

As mentioned above, the *City Mysteries* as a literary genre originally emerged in France in the 1840s. Of course, this is not a coincidence, but it closely relates to the political developments and the social circumstances in the country in the first half of the nineteenth century. The July Monarchy of Louis Philippe I (1830-1848),[2] a period when the politicization of the society reached its peak, was extremely crucial for France. The July Revolution in 1830 caused considerable upheavals and rearrangements in the French society: the *bourgeoisie*, having adopted the practices of the old aristocracy, gained social power, while nobility no longer played an important role in decision-making. Capital has triumphed over land ownership and possession of money was now the only means of gaining power. The working class, which had until then fought together with the middle class for political reforms, separated its position, and deep

---

[1]   Knight 2012, 7.
[2]   Louis Philippe's constitutional monarchy was dominated by the wealthy *bourgeoisie* and numerous former Napoleonic officials, and followed conservative policies, especially under the influence of François Guizot (1840-1848). By 1848, a year in which many European states experienced revolutions, the popularity of Louis Philippe had collapsed and he was overthrown. For further information see Collingham 1988.

contradictions between industrial capitalism and members of the middle class took place.[1]

As a result, from 1830 onwards, the social consciousness of the working class was awakened, leading to the formation of democratic associations and parties and the outbreak of strikes and riots that cultivated a situation of permanent revolution in the French capital. At the same time, the continuous social upheavals grew the fear of a conspiracy or riot against the regime and tended to associate the working with other "dangerous" classes.[2] Within this political and social environment, a strong political tension also appeared in literature: a group of authors, such as Eugène Sue or George Sand, envisioned a new organization of society and met with *utopian socialism*;[3] practically, the way towards the *socially conscious novel* was open.[4] The "socially sensitive" authors of the 1830s and 1840s reacted strongly to materialism, trying to ensure a sense of humanity and solidarity against the inhumanity and injustice of modern society. In fact, intellectuals attacked a part of capitalism, yet without questioning its entire system.

The *City Mysteries* genre, which emerged in the 1840s, flourished in a period of rapid and uncontrolled urban development that caused the feeling of living in a hostile and chaotic place. Public space appeared in the mid-nineteenth century as an inscrutable threat, making the citizen more cautious and skeptical towards the strangers that surrounded him. Thus, the *City Mysteries* came to fulfill the desire of exploring and understanding this threatening public space, as the narrator raised the luxurious curtains of wealth, social status, and cultural development to reveal the internal social decay. In most of the novels belonging to this genre, the reader could feel the anxiety of the dominant *bourgeoisie* for the epidemic spread of corruption and the fear for the

---

[1]   For the political and social developments in the French capital during the first half of the nineteenth century see Mansel 2001; Berenson 2014.

[2]   See Chevalier 1958.

[3]   The main representatives of *utopian socialism* were Henri Saint Simon, Charles Fourier, and Robert Owen, who envisioned a new organization of society that would improve the living conditions of all its members and asked for everyone's contribution, regardless of social status. At the same time, they blocked any revolutionary action, seeking to achieve their goals through peaceful means. Their positive perceptions for the future society, such as the abolition of the contradiction between city and countryside, the abolition of the institution of the family, of individual profit and employment, or the declaration of social harmony had utopian meaning at the time that they were expressed. For the theory of *utopian socialism* see Owen 2013.

[4]   According to Meyer H. Abrams, "the *socially conscious novel* focuses on the social and economic circumstances of a time and examines how these certain circumstances shape characters and determine events. It often includes a direct or indirect statement in favor of a political or social reform" (Abrams [6]1993, 133).

subversive power of the impoverished lower social strata. Thus, the depiction of this misery through literature often aimed at alarming the political powers and the *bourgeois* reader to take measures and improve the living conditions of the underprivileged fellow-citizens, assuaging any revolutionary and subversive intentions. The *City Mysteries* authors, therefore, sought the treatment of social misery through solutions of *urban paternalism*,[1] such as the humanitarian reform of upper classes or the state provision for educating the lower social classes; however, these solutions did not invalidate the conditions that caused the problem. The practices of supervising the "dangerous" lower social classes were combined with practices of social integration through education, labor, and moral upbringing. In the novels, the reader could also find propagandistic references to charitable institutions that served the state's policy "education-labor-integration" and contributed to the spirit of progress that promoted technological upgrade and industrialization.[2]

At the same time, though, the enthusiasm for industrial development caused the fear of economic insecurity and social exclusion. As Ioannis Kondylakis notes in the prologue of his novel *The miserable [people] of Athens* (*Οι άθλιοι των Αθηνών*, 1895) several decades later, the experience of the city, ambiguous and contradictory, "corresponds to the variation of the nineteenth-century society between admiration for the achievements of western civilization and resentment for the dangerous effects of uncontrolled urbanization".[3] In general, the *City Mysteries* depict the world of the new massive conurbation, where people no longer live in well-established rural communities, where everyone knows each other and where social hierarchy and popular tradition act as forces of control. Unguarded by the traditional extended families of the countryside, people, especially young women, could fall into danger, both physically and morally, suffering degradation and despair at the hands of exploitative men and women. Young men might with less resistance be seduced into gambling and its inevitable partner, crime. As Steven Knight notes, it was the first time that these dramatic events were represented in literature in a coherent and extended way.[4]

---

[1]   See above, p. 18, footnote 3.
[2]   Gotsi 1999, 33-34, 43.
[3]   Kondylakis 1895, 6-7 (my translation). In the novel, Kondylakis attempts to depict life in the capital of the Greek Kingdom, which has gradually developed into an urban center during the last decades of the nineteenth century.
[4]   Knight 2012, 5-6.

Features and literary conventions of the genre

According to the theory of literature (see above, p. 5), conventions are traditionally defined as conspicuous generic features of subject matter, form, or technique, as, for example, recurrent types of character, turns of plot, or kinds of diction and style, which build tacit agreements between author and reader that make possible certain types of artistic representation of reality. The assimilation – often unconscious – of these conventions are the basis of what Jonathan Culler calls "a reader's literary competence".[1]

The *City Mysteries* authors aim at a realistic[2] development of the plot within the modern urban world through a combination of literary conventions and generic features. The action takes place in a certain and recognizable space-time of the present or the recent past. In other words, the plot unfolds in a time frame clearly defined through references to historical persons and/or events[3] and in actual urban places presented in all their details and peculiarities, but with several exaggerations and improbabilities as well. Therefore, the text gives the reader information about the customs and morals of a place, which, in combination with sociopolitical information, functions as a mechanism for attracting readers. Moreover, we should always bear in mind that the *City Mysteries* are closely related to statistics and current affairs that appear in daily newspapers, which are either incorporated in the novel or given in extended footnotes. At the same time, the language of narration is combined with the *argot* that the protagonists often use in the interlocutory parts of the text to gain "phonographic fidelity"[4] or the use of local names, which are often further-analyzed in footnotes as an indication of the author's long "scientific" research and/or personal experience. The authors of the *City Mysteries*

---

[1] Culler 1975, 113-130.

[2] Realist authors present social reality with detailed precision, objectivity, and unpretentious style, draw their stories from the everyday life of the *bourgeoisie* and/or the common people, delineate time and place of action with historical precision, and deepen into the psychic world, that is, the deeper thoughts and emotions, of their protagonists. In other words, there is an attempt to depict modern social reality literarily as the result of industrialization, urbanization, and technological development (see Grant, Chatzidimou, Ralli 1988; Preisendanz 1990). The *City Mysteries* authors adopt these features of *realism* but always combine them with features of *romanticism*.

[3] For example, regarding the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries*, the terrible fire that broke out in Pera/Beyoğlu in May 1870 is directly connected to the plot and its cause is explained in different ways in two novels of my corpus, namely, in *The Dramas of Constantinople* by Konstantinos Goussopoulos and in *Peran Mysteries of Constantinople* by Epameinondas Kyriakidis.

[4] Vulgar expressions and criminal idioms convert the predominant style of the novel to achieve authenticity. The *argot* intensifies the impression of decline and reflects the social gap between the *bourgeoisie* and the underworld.

refer, often through a critical perspective, to the problems of modern society, which often draws from primary sources, that is, daily press, diaries, or personal testimonies, and is accompanied by rough descriptions of abominable, that is, bloody or pornographic, scenes. The *City Mysteries* also focus on behaviors that could be considered "social aberrations", as, for example, stealing, gambling, or prostitution, depict in detail the life of the working classes and the underworld in modern urban centers, reproduce literary and ideological (stereo)types, and systematically use the first narrative person, aiming at equating narration with testimony. According to Pantelis Voutouris, most of the above-mentioned features, which constitute the narrative typology of the genre, are related to the general matter of plausibility, that is, the deliberate processing and development of the story in a way that it gives the impression of a "real" one.[1] This "dedication to the truth" is usually expressed in the prologues of the novels as the author's commitment to his readers.[2]

In addition, the *City Mysteries* authors make use of several stereotypical motifs and literary allegories, such as the complex labyrinths of poor neighborhoods that imply delinquency and crime,[3] the miscellaneous crowd that overruns the streets, the city's panorama, and the role of paper as a means of revealing secrets or as a symbol that indicates different forms of power. The city becomes even more intimidating as many scenes in the novels take place during the night, especially at midnight;[4] thus, the city stereotypically appears as a place of moral and social corruption.[5] But it is easily understood that the authors depict only a selective picture of the city, focusing mainly on the places of the underworld or the luxurious living rooms of the *bourgeoisie*. Moreover, a common denominator in the *City Mysteries* is the social pathogenesis of

---

[1] Voutouris 1997, 34.

[2] For example, we read a typical declaration of his "dedication to the truth" in the prologue of Ned Buntline's novel entitled *The mysteries and miseries of New York: a story of real life*: "I dislike prefatory remarks, but so singular is the work I have now to write, so strange its scenes and incidents, so various and peculiar the characters which I have to delineate, that I feel bound to tell the reader that strange as all may be, it is drawn from *life*, heart-sickening, *too-real* life. Not one scene of vice or horror is given in the following pages, which has not been enacted over and over again in this city. […] I have sought out and studied the reality of each person and scene which I portray. […] Therefore, though this book bears the title of a *novel*, it is written with the ink of truth and deserves the name of a *history* more than that of a *romance*. […] I write for the good of my fellow-mortals and shall do it with a bold, truthful, fearless hand, aiming to do my *whole duty*, regardless of all consequences" (Buntline 1849, 7).

[3] The depiction of the big city as a labyrinth is a stereotypical motif in nineteenth-century novels in general.

[4] According to Lambros Varelas, the choice of night-time is inevitable, since illegal activities revealed by the authors take place while the city is "asleep" (Varelas 2007, 6).

[5] More "vulnerable" to corruption are coastal cities, especially large ports, as, for example, London, Constantinople, or Smyrna/Izmir.

crime, regardless of its type or severity. The authors criticize, directly or indirectly, the moral and material abandonment of modern people, the unfair system of justice that supports the "strong" instead of protecting the "weak", and the penal system (namely, prisons and mental institutions), which permanently "distorts" the internees instead of "reforming" them.

As mentioned above, the political dimension of the *City Mysteries* novels is particularly interesting, as the authors try to awaken the *bourgeoisie* regarding the future of the underprivileged social strata in modern urban centers to prevent social inversion. Although the authors often share the belief in the inherent predisposition towards virtue or evil, in their novels, they search for the social circumstances that lead people to crime to warn about the boundaries between misery, depravity, and insurgency. Through rhetorical interference of the narrator or the protagonists, the author suggests preventive and/or repressive measures, inspired by the humanitarian heritage of the Enlightenment, but, at the same time, determined by the spirit of urban ideology and Christian ethics. Moreover, in most cases, Providence is what liberates the protagonists from their pitiful adventures and restores moral order. Inevitably, the author's realistic disposition recedes towards a happy, or at least fair, ending.[1]

The main protagonist of the European *City Mysteries* in the 1840s and 1850s combines several (stereo)typical characteristics that the Greek novels often adopt as well: he (or she) has a strong, unique and charming personality, with an idiosyncratic sense of justice, but also with an ambiguous attitude towards good and evil; an angel and a devil at the same time.[2] Apart from the main protagonist, the recurring dynamic of the *City Mysteries* is "the interrelation of the rich and the very poor, and, also, the people awkwardly in the middle, for the good and ill of all parties".[3] All the characters are part of the economy of the cities, of its social interaction, its topographical interconnections, and, not coincidentally, the conflictive drive to make money in this new world of the cash nexus.

From the above, it becomes clear that the *City Mysteries* have their systems of emphasis and focus, combining multiple narratives and varying tones in measured and skillful ways, just as they have their structures of analysis, both moral and political.

---

[1] Gotsi 1997 ("Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"), 11.
[2] See, for example, in chapter III, the cases of Dimitrios/Epameinondas Komorinos in Konstantinos Goussopoulos's *The Dramas of Constantinople* (1888) or Georgios Kallias/Baron Kallimachis in Epameinondas Kyriakidis's *Peran Mysteries of Constantinople* (1890).
[3] Knight 2012, 11.

Their forms and themes depict and point out insistently and often dramatically the problems and the possibilities of life in modern urban centers, especially the elements of crime and disorder that threatened the newly metropolitan women and men in the nineteenth century. As Stephen Knight characteristically puts it, "the *Mysteries* consistently tell us that urban life is simply that, a *mystery*".[1]

---

[1]   Knight 2012, 8.

3.0.   European *City Mysteries* in the 1840s and 1850s: the models of the genre

Several times in the 1840s and 1850s, the streets of a European capital throbbed with excitement about a new popular publishing "venture": Eugène Sue, Paul Féval, and George Reynolds, among others, generated enormous public excitement – and some literary resentment – with their lengthy, serially published stories of crime, mystery, and revelation. What follows next is a short presentation of these authors' most well-known *City Mysteries*, which share the main features of the genre and significantly influenced the respective novels that were written in the Greek language in the following decades.[1]

Scholars often speak about the phenomenon of *mystery mania* spreading around Europe during the nineteenth century: original novels, translations, adaptations, parodies, multi-editions. The French author and journalist Eugène Sue (1804-1857) is regarded as the initiator of the *City Mysteries* literary genre and his novel *Les Mystères de Paris* as an incredible literary template, able to permeate all geographic places and all social classes.[2] Sue began collaborating with Parisian newspapers and publishing *romans feuilletons* in 1837.[3] While he worked mostly for *La Presse*, he also contributed to the daily *Le Journal des Débats*. In June 1842, after a visit – with the status of the doctor – at a poor worker's house, Sue began publishing serially in the latter newspaper his novel *Les Mystères de Paris*. The publication was completed in one hundred forty-seven sequels.[4] It is noteworthy that before the publication of the text in the newspaper

---

[1]   I have chosen to focus on Sue, Féval, and Reynolds, as they are, in my opinion, the ones who influenced the most the (Constantinopolitan) Greek authors in their own *City Mysteries* in the second half of the nineteenth century.

[2]   Thérenty 2013, 53-54.

[3]   During the period 1837-1842, Sue published several *romans feuilletons* in daily newspapers: *Arthur, Mathilde, L' Hôtel Lambert*, and others; but it was with *Les Mystères de Paris* in 1842-1843 that he gained incredible success.

[4]   The novel's plot is exciting: *Les Mystères de Paris* is a lost child story. The heroine Fleur-de-Marie, the lost child of prince Rodolphe, for all her beauty, innate purity, and generosity of spirit, is not able to cast off the stain of her urban degradation and dies in a nunnery at the end of the novel. By deepening the story of the abduction of Fleur-de-Marie to encompass in some detail the agents of the villainous aristocrat Sarah Macgregor (she is, in fact, prince Rodolphe's ex-wife and mother of their lost daughter) and their autonomous criminal activities, Sue has effectively extended his story into the world of criminal Paris and somewhat outside. The mysterious and distinguished Gustavus Rodolphe, who is, in fact, the Grand Duke of Gerolstein (a fictional grand duchy of Germany), can speak the *argot*, is extremely strong and a good fighter. He resides in Paris under the name of Count de Duren. Yet he also shows great compassion for the underprivileged classes, good judgment, and a brilliant mind. According to Lise Queffélec, [Rodolphe is] "le surhomme mythique, doué de tous les pouvoirs et de toutes les seductions, le mage et le justicier, protecteur des faibles et des opprimés, persécuteur des méchants, vengeur des victimes, 'convertisseur' et rédempteur" (Queffélec 1989, 14-15). He associates all social classes, trying to experience their problems and understand how they

was completed, its translations had already begun and respective works were already released around Europe. This is the main reason that this novel is considered as the model of the *City Mysteries* literary genre. Lise Queffélec describes *Les Mystères de Paris* as a "social novel", a "novel of exotic adventures" and a "populist novel", where the poor, powerless, underprivileged people, namely, the workers and the villains play the leading role, with their own language (*argot*), their customs and destinies.[1]

Paris was in 1830 still a city with narrow streets filled with mud – and worse; its central districts were the hideaway of underprivileged people, whose problems often pressured them towards crime, so joining the substantial population of hardened criminals. At the same time, a few autonomous elegant *quartiers* acted as reservations for the gentry. In the period, when Sue emerged as an author, Paris was not only in the process of establishing a new form of government after the parallel excesses of both royal and revolutionary systems but was also rapidly developing a new urban world, focusing at first on artisanal and small industry and then swiftly expanding major industries, enabled by capitalist forces focused on banking and relying on completely new levels of both the production and the mobility of goods.[2] For Sue, Paris was a murky labyrinth, a setting for intricate conspiracies and terrible, secret deeds permeating the whole of society. His main goal was the denunciation of the misery of people's life in Paris, which he described, at first, with the superiority of the *bourgeois*, who worries about the misery and poverty of the masses. But he gradually became an apostle of social problems and a healer of the disease, dealing with moral proclamations and "revolutionary" proposals.[3] He depicts the Parisian nobility as deaf to the misfortunes

---

are linked to each other. Rodolphe is accompanied by his friends Sir Walter Murph, an Englishman, and David, a gifted black doctor, formerly a slave. The first figures they meet are Le Chourineur (a former butcher, who has served fifteen years in prison for murder; his name means "Stabber" or "Knifer") and a poor young creature of seventeen, La Goualeuse (a prostitute; she is, in fact, Marie-de-Fleure; her name means "Singer"). Rodolphe saves La Goualeuse from Le Chourineur's brutality and also saves Le Chourineur from himself, knowing that the man still has some good in him. Both characters are grateful for Rodolphe's assistance, as are many other characters in the novel. In the end, after Fleur-de-Marie's death, Rodolphe goes back to Gerolstein to take on the role to which he was destined by birth, rather than staying in Paris to help the underprivileged classes.

[1] [C'est] "un roman mondain, un roman d' aventures exotiques, où les apaches de Paris remplacent ceux de l' Amérique, et un roman populiste, mettant en scène les marginaux de Paris, pauvres, petit peuple, ouvriers, bandits, avec leur langage propre (l' argot), leurs moeurs et leurs destins" (Queffélec 1989, 14).

[2] Knight 2012, 23-25.

[3] *Les Mystères de Paris* combines successfully romantic elements and realistic episodes of the Parisian underworld with Sue's social and political ideas. In his novel, the author makes his proposals for the reformation of the justice and prison system, the reorganization of the agricultural economy, and the support of the unemployed in modern megalopolises. For further information about Sue's stance regarding the Parisian society and its problems see Bory 1973.

of the common people and focused on meaningless intrigues. Stephen Knight notes that Sue's megalopolis is modernized, elaborated, and brought under the control of a hero, who combined the heights of aristocratic power with the breadth of liberal sympathy.[1]

Workers, peasants, and proletarians of Paris recognized themselves in the pages of the novel; this has resulted in countless letters arriving daily to the newspaper's office with desperate petitions for the formation or prolongation of the story. This was the first time that an author took his readership's preferences into account in writing the next episode of his plot and accepting passively its "demands". However, to respect the "rules of commerce", Sue was unfortunately forced to resort to sloppiness and repetitions, to flatter the reader and advertise the exciting sequel. At the end of the novel, Sue calls for a reformation of the social system through the actions of the enlightened rich, who enjoy doing charities. At the same time, the virtuous, honest poor people give back with gratitude to the rich ones everything that the latter offered them during the time of their unemployment. So, practically, in the end, everything stays the same. Where Sue goes substantially further than other authors is in his statements about the need for better systems of moral guidance. In *Les Mystères de Paris*, he sees problems much more clearly than solutions and there is an inevitable lack of real social strategy in the text. Moreover, it is likely that the passive nature of the text's social issues arises not so much from Sue's strategic naivety in political terms as from the fact that his novelistic imagination was much more focused on issues of gender- than class-difference.[2]

The political and literary world reacted to the novel in various ways: many accused Sue of being responsible for the revolution in February 1848;[3] the left-wing party condemned him by calling him "a dealer of emotion, who profits from human suffering". But the strongest criticism came from Karl Marx, who denounced Sue not as a naive social democrat, but as a "submissive rebel" since he proclaimed social reconciliation through charity.[4] The extensive novel was considered by many a

---

[1] Knight 2012, 14-29.
[2] Knight 2012, 51-52.
[3] The society tried to implement the reforms that were proposed in *Les Mystères de Paris*, as, for example, prisoner's farms, individual cells in prisons, reorganization of the Pawnshop, or abolition of the death penalty, until the upheavals of 1848 broke out, after which Sue participated in the elections with the Social Democratic Party.
[4] Marx's basic point in his *Holly Family* (1845) was that although the social conditions of Paris under Louis Philippe I had indeed improved, the underlying belief systems were still "medieval". According to him, whatever sympathy Sue created for the poor, he failed to come to terms with the true nature of the city, which had little changed (Lehan 1998, 55).

revolutionary, while, at the same time, by others a profoundly conservative text. The reviews of two important literati on *Les Mystères de Paris* are indicative of the atmosphere that this novel created. The English novelist William M. Thackeray characterized Sue as "the most successful literary merchant in France", who "has kept the town with him for three years"[1] and noted that although the novel is a big commercial success and so instigating for the readers, its author "*must* see that his book is bad and vulgar".[2] And the American writer Edgar Alan Poe added: "*Les Mystères de Paris* is a work of unquestionable power, a museum of novel and ingenious incident, a paradox of childish folly and consummate skill. Sue's first, and in fact sole object, is to make an exciting, and therefore saleable book".[3] Despite the criticism, it is a fact that the enormous commercial success of *Les Mystères de Paris* drew a crowd of imitators eager to capitalize on the "mysteries formula" by focusing on the unrevealed secrets of their cities.

During the same period, everyone recognized the huge growth of London, the biggest city in the world by far. At about two million people, including outer suburbs, its population was well over double that of Paris. Moreover, the underworld of nineteenth-century London was described as a subterranean social space intimately connected with urban poverty and crime. Kellow Chesney usefully defined it as the realm of "certain classes of people whose very manner of living seemed a challenge to an ordered society and the tissue of laws, moralities, and taboos holding it together".[4] The French author Paul Féval (1816-1887), whose literary work consists in total of more than two hundred (!) volumes initially published in daily newspapers, undertook to depict the situation in the British capital and published his novel *Les Mystères de Londres* in the French newspaper *Le Courrier français* during the same time as Eugène Sue, that is, from December 1843 to September 1844[5] under the nickname "Sir Francis

---

[1] Thackeray 1977, 240.
[2] Thackeray 1977, 247.
[3] Poe 1977, 251.
[4] Chesney 1991, 32.
[5] The main protagonist is the mysterious Irishman Fergus O' Breanne, alias Marquis de Rio Santo, the head of the criminal association "Gentlemen of the Night", who secretly prepare a political revolution to free Ireland and all the colonies from British domination. After spreading "revolutionary seeds" to the British colonies, Rio Santo arrives in London, where he becomes a distinguished member of the "high society", while, at the same time, he reigns over the underworld. Rio Santo violates the honor of the young noble Franck Perceval's sister and tries to marry his fiancée. The young man decides to take revenge, with the help of the young *bourgeois* Stephen Mac Nab, whose father has been killed by Rio Santo in a duel. The plot is full of conspiracies, prosecutions, and assassinations. In the end, Rio Santo gets arrested and is sentenced to death, but he is finally murdered by Clary, the daughter of Santo's Scottish opponent, in a crisis of madness.

Trolopp".[1] The success was immediate: twenty republications that offered the author a great reputation. The novel transfers Sue's idea about urban mystery to London and depicts the poor neighborhoods of the industrial British capital. Several structural resemblances between the two novels are clear: the central figure is a powerful, determined, and resourceful aristocrat with a strong mission in life, which is to be enacted in a great European city. However, the most striking absence in *Les Mystères de Londres* is the moral, social, and political direct commentary that Sue was famous for. For Féval, the corrupt professionals and uncontrolled criminals are all merely elements in the action, not structures to be analyzed and evaluatively assessed, with recommendations for improvement and reform.

What Féval produced was a brilliant portrayal of the French concept of London, a nineteenth-century city, which was interesting, intriguing, even appalling, both overcrowded and undermanaged.[2] In the novel, London is an exotic but ultimately gratifying Parisian Other and this perspective is what differentiates Féval from Sue and Reynolds, who both wrote about the Self, namely, their home cities. In other words, Féval sees modern London and its society from the perspective of the Other and not its permanent resident who has a thorough knowledge about what goes on in his home city. Moreover, Stephen Knight notes Féval's controversial stance towards aristocracy: as a modern Frenchman, the author is recurrently skeptical about the value of aristocracy, but as a conservative, he sees this class's enduring value, as Sue has already done and Reynolds, with a difference, will also do.[3]

As mentioned above, as the *City Mysteries* genre spread rapidly around Europe in the 1840s, it was Sue's pattern that was to be dominant. The British author and journalist George William MacArthur Reynolds (1814-1879) became the greatest English "imitator" of Sue, who, after much immersion in French fiction[4] – he even published an enthusiastic book on the subject – put pen to paper and brought forth his

---

[1]   For further information about Fèval's life and literary production see Rohou 1992.
[2]   In the novel, the topography of London exhibits a French viewpoint. It is said, apparently with some basis, that Féval started writing the story in Paris and, when he visited London in the course of writing, he was pleased with what he had done. He had a few locations in mind; but this was all tourist London, readily available in the thriving genre of city guidebooks and contemporary descriptions (Knight 2012, 125).
[3]   Knight 2012, 113-130.
[4]   Reynolds traveled a great deal, particularly in France, and became a naturalized French citizen. For further information about Reynolds's life and literary production see Humpherys, James 2008.

long-running serial *The Mysteries of London* (October 1844-September 1846),[1] which borrowed liberally in concept from Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*.[2] The novel constitutes a literary approach to the urban British capital and depicts the enigmatic complexity of a great city: London is perceived as a gigantic web of secrets; it is built on intrigue, a fact brought conspicuously to the reader's attention by miraculous materialism.[3]

Like Sue, Reynolds presents through his protagonist Eugene the threatening financial forces of urban capitalism, but in much greater detail, with a fuller understanding of the processes and an insistence that they are structural to modernity. While Sue imagines a world where "if only the rich knew" how much the poor suffered, things would improve, and prince Rodolphe is presented as a model of this plan to adjust systems through charity and a noble heart, Reynolds from the start, and recurrently, insists on the opposition of Wealth and Poverty.[4] In story after story, poor people who have gone astray show how their movement towards crime was a natural, indeed rational, response to the pressure put upon them. Reynolds's treatment of the aristocracy is satirical, but he does not present its members as core figures in corruption or repression. Moreover, a recurrent theme for Reynolds is the politics involved in both crime and crime prevention.[5] Like many in the period, he is critical of the death sentence and the treatment of criminals in prison.[6] The British author also goes much further with

---

[1] *The Mysteries of London* is the story of two brothers, namely, Richard and Eugene Markham. Eugene goes off to seek his fortune in the city, having been too stubborn to settle a quarrel with his father. He promises to meet Richard again twelve years from the day of their parting, at which time the brothers will compare their fortunes. The narrative then follows alternately the careers of Richard and Eugene. Richard, after being duped by a gang of forgers and imprisoned for two years in the Old Bailey, leads a revolution in an Italian state and wins the hand of a princess. Eugene, under the name Montague Greenwood, becomes an accomplished financial swindler and a member of the Parliament. Eventually, Greenwood is driven to moral and financial desperation, dying repentantly a few moments after he is reunited with his brother. Meanwhile, the reader has made his way through a huge maze of characters, who have gathered around the two brothers: gypsies, faithful and unfaithful retainers, criminals, victimized working girls, men of fashion, politicians, bankers, and many others. The novel offers a completed set of interrelating stories.

[2] Though there were six translations of *Les Mystères de Paris* in English available by 1844, Reynolds must have probably read Sue in French, like many others in London – there was a remarkable amount of French work being published there and just as many British writers were also published in Paris.

[3] Maxwell 1977, 190-193.

[4] According to the author, "there are but two words known in the moral alphabet of this great city [that is, London]; for all virtues are summed up in the one, and all vices in the other: and those words are WEALTH │ POVERTY [sic]" (Reynolds 1890, 1).

[5] Knight 2012, 90-96.

[6] "The Law", Reynolds notes, "is vindictive, cowardly, mean, and ignorant. It is vindictive, because its punishments are more severe than the offences, and because its officers descend to any dirtiness to obtain a conviction. It is cowardly, because it cuts off from the world, with a rope or an axe, those men whose dispositions it fears to undertake to curb. It is mean, because it is all in favor of the wealthy, and reserves its thunders for the poor and obscure who have no powerful interest to protect them; and because itself originates nearly half the crimes which it punishes. And it is ignorant because it erects the gibbet where it should rear the cross" (Reynolds 1890, 101).

women than Sue did, deploying them in larger numbers and giving them the strength to endure and amend their misfortunes, which have mostly to do with poverty or manipulative men. In the end, some of them manage to come through to calm, happy and generously interactive conclusions.[1]

The Mysteries of London was originally produced in eight-page weekly booklets with one illustration, selling about forty thousand copies a week. In 1846, it was published as an independent book in four volumes, enjoying international circulation in French, German, Italian, and Spanish translations. Although Reynolds was unusual in his religious skepticism (one of the main characters in *The Mysteries of London* was a clergyman turned libertine) and political radicalism, his tales were intended for his mostly middle- and lower-class readers, who made it the most widely read novel of its time with several republications.[2]

As we have seen above, the two megalopolises of Paris and London gave the international *City Mysteries* genre a tremendously energetic and compelling start in 1842-1846: varying degrees of crimes from petty to enormous in scale; nobilities of both birth and simple honesty; degradations and self-renewals; *bourgeois* malice and professional probity; urban decay and social reconstruction; European self-obsession and worldwide possibilities; sadistic cruelty and gentle cooperation; love; courage; hate; lunacy; corruption beyond control; and purity beyond defilement. And all that in big modern cities, with palaces, cellars, dark streets, grand prospects, threatening rivers, lighted windows, prisons, asylums, courts for kings and courts for criminals. Around the world, many young authors saw the point, accepted the challenge, and located *City Mysteries* in their own time, their own concerns, and, above all, their own cities. Notable examples of the *City Mysteries* genre include: *Les Vrais Mystères de Paris* (1844) by

---

[1]   Knight 2012, 68-72. For example, Reynolds's middle-class heroin, Ellen Monroe (one of Eugene's dirty deals), who was impoverished by circumstance rather than born into squalor, manages to survive at the end of the text. It is interesting to compare Ellen Monroe to La Goualeuse, Sue's protagonist, who does not survive at the end of the novel, despite her noble origins.

[2]   In general, during his lifetime, Reynolds was more read in Britain than Dickens or Thackeray.

Eugène François Vidocq,[1] *Die Mysterien von Berlin* (1844) by August Brass,[2] *Die Geheimnisse von Hamburg* (1845) by Johann Wilhelm Christern,[3] *Les Mystères de Marseille* (1867) by Émile Zola,[4] *I misteri di Napoli* (1869-1870) by Francesco Mastriani,[5] and many others.

---

[1]   Eugène François Vidocq (1775-1857) was a French criminal and criminalist, whose life story inspired several writers, including Victor Hugo, Edgar Allan Poe, and Honoré de Balzac. The former criminal became the founder and first director of the crime-detection *Sûreté Nationale* as well as the head of the first known private detective agency. Vidocq is regarded as the father of modern criminology and the first private detective. The novel *Les vrais mystères de Paris* was published in 1844 under Vidocq's name, though authored by Horace Raisson and Maurice Alhoy. For further information see Morton 2005.

[2]   August Heinrich Brass (1818-1876) was a German democratic-revolutionary-minded author and journalist, who supported Otto von Bismarck's politics with his texts. The novel *Die Mysterien von Berlin* was published in 1844 in five volumes.

[3]   Johann Wilhelm Christern (1809/1811-1876) was a German author and musician, who lived in Hamburg from 1832 to 1841. During this period, he started publishing cultural articles and critiques in the *Hamburger Neue Zeitung* under the pseudonym Wilhelm von Reinbek. He also published several novels, among which *Die Geheimnisse von Hamburg* in 1845.

[4]   The novel *Les Mystères de Marseille* was published in sequels in *Le Messager de Provence* in 1867, while Zola was writing *Thérèse Raquin*. In the popular *City Mysteries* novel, typical of the genre in its various and unexpected twists and turns, we can see Zola's style, his palate for real life, his indignation about injustice, and his art of depicting social strata (the wealthy, the clergy, the deviants, the common man) as well as events (the Revolution of 1848, the cholera epidemic). With this canvas as a background, he has painted a breathtaking adventure, the thrilling story of the impossible love of Philippe Cayol, poor, untitled, republican, and of young Blanche de Cazalis, the niece of De Cazalis, a millionaire, politician, and all-powerful in Marseilles. Philippe's brother, Marius, devotes himself to protecting the two lovers – and the child Blanche gave birth to before entering a convent – from the anger of De Cazalis.

[5]   Francesco Mastriani (1819-1891) was an Italian novelist, who wrote in a variety of genres. The novel *I misteri di Napoli* was inspired by Eugène Sue's *Les mystères de Paris* and was serially published from 1869 to 1870 in the daily newspaper *Roma*.

4.0.   The nineteenth-century Greek *City Mysteries*

Following European traditions and patterns, the Greek *City Mysteries* of the nineteenth century combine romantic and adventurous elements with the realistic desire to depict the misery and corruption in modern cities – to the extent, of course, that we can speak of such in the nineteenth-century Greek-speaking world – and to declare, sometimes with the enthusiasm of *utopian socialism* (see above, p. 20) the need for social reforms. Ioannis Kondylakis notes in the prologue of his above-mentioned novel *The miserable [people] of Athens* (*Οι άθλιοι των Αθηνών*, 1895) that, having the indication "Apocrypha", "Mysteries", or "Dramas" in their titles, these Greek novels promise an "educating tour" to the "invisible sights" of the Greek modern city,[1] following the pattern of respective European popular novels, especially *Les Mystères de Paris* and *The Mysteries of London*.[2] These two novels, especially the former, became a "malleable textual template"[3] and were used, until the 1880s, as a model for the Greek *City Mysteries*.[4]

Before we proceed to the study of the Greek *City Mysteries* of the nineteenth century, original and/or translated, a general picture of the situation in the Greek Kingdom at that time on a political, social, and cultural level is considered necessary, since it significantly affected its literary production as well as its relationship with the Greek-speaking population at the opposite shore of the Aegean. After the establishment of the Kingdom in 1832, the Greek-speaking world was automatically divided into two parts, the Greeks (defined by language and religion) who lived within its borders and the Greeks who lived outside its borders (mainly, in the Ottoman Empire and the Diaspora) or, in the words of the citizens of the newly established Kingdom, the "freed" and the "unredeemed" Hellenism. According to several sources of the time, the situation of the Greek Kingdom in the first decades after its establishment was characterized by anarchy and chaos, "a political, administrative, economic, social chaos", as the journalist Georgios Tsokopoulos described it. It was nothing more than

---

[1]   After 1832, the most significant modern cities with a Greek-speaking population were not included in the newly established Greek state but were still a part of the Ottoman Empire, as, for example, Constantinople, Smyrna/Izmir, and Thessaloniki. The only cities of the Greek Kingdom, which could be regarded, to some extent, as "modern", were Athens and Ermoupolis (the capital of Syros island).
[2]   Kondylakis 1895, 6-7.
[3]   Katsanos 2015, 1.
[4]   Voutouris 1997, 32.

"heterogenous figures unsuccessfully trying to get connected and reconciled to constitute a society, a state".[1]

As Roderick Beaton argues, the history of the Greek Kingdom in the nineteenth century is a stormy one. The task of creating the institutions of a nation-state, more or less, overnight was far from easy – and the creation of a national literature during this period was undoubtedly an important component in this process. The capital of the Greek Kingdom from 1834 onwards was, by that time, little more than a village.[2] Moreover, the progress in the direction of an urban way of life and towards civil and political institutions modelled on those of western Europe was slow throughout the nineteenth century.[3] The first written constitution in 1844 was established to restrict the powers of the King, but Otto's reign was eventually brought to an end by civil and military unrest, which forced him to leave the country in 1862. A second and more liberal constitution was drawn up in 1864, after the accession of King George I. In addition to the political instability and other internal difficulties up until the end of the century and beyond, the Kingdom was crippled by foreign debt. Therefore, a sense of frustration, together with a concomitant tendency to resent foreign interference at the same time as inevitably relying on foreign help, is a fundamental facet of nineteenth-century Greek culture.[4] This is, in short, the atmosphere that prevailed in the Greek Kingdom during the nineteenth century. Moreover, since there was no formed society, it was certainly unlikely that there would be an organized cultural life. Therefore, it is easy to understand the difficulties that literature and more specifically, prose fiction and novel-writing had to face in the first decades after the establishment of the Greek

---

[1] Tsokopoulos 1916, 10-11 (my translation) (cited in Sachinis 1958, 17).

[2] Just before the Revolution of 1821, Athens was counted among the top ten cities of the southern Balkans, after Constantinople, Adrianople, Thessaloniki, Ioannina, Serres, Larisa, Tripoli, and Patras. The exact number of its inhabitants is difficult to be determined, but all indicators suggest that, in the first decades of the nineteenth century, the number was in the range of ten thousand. After the establishment of the Greek Kingdom in 1832, Jean-Lionel Lacour, part of the expeditionary force of General Maison, described the terrible situation in Athens as follows: "New ruins cover the ancient, which are buried in the earth. […] Narrow, dark, muddy, erratic paths. Filthy, sooty and foul-smelling shops, with goods that would be held in contempt even by the traveling merchants at our village festivals […]" (Lacour 1834, 170).

[3] We can find a descriptive picture of the situation prevailing in the Greek Kingdom in the first decades after its establishment in Pavlos Kalligas's novel entitled *Thanos Vlekas*, which was published in 1855 and is considered the first realistic social novel in modern Greek literature. The author mainly focuses on the phenomena of brigandage, corruption, and bureaucratic irregularities that plagued the newly established state.

[4] Beaton [2]2004, 25-27.

Kingdom.[1] However, as it will be shown in detail in chapter II, the situation of the Greeks living at the opposite shore of the Aegean was quite different.

Greek translations of European nineteenth-century City Mysteries

In the Greek-speaking world, the translation of *Les Mystères de Paris* was published twice in 1845 concurrently.[2] The first publication is entitled *Απόκρυφα Παρισίων* [*Apocrypha of Paris*] and the translated text constitutes only a part of Sue's novel. It was translated by Nikolaos Aivazidis and published in Athens as an appendix of the journal *Apocrypha of Paris*. The second (concurrent) publication is entitled *Παρισίων Απόκρυφα* [in English, also *Apocrypha of Paris*] and was the product of work of a young professional translator and journalist from Smyrna/Izmir, Ioannis Isidoridis Skylitsis. The text was published in two volumes in the Ottoman city[3] by the printing house "Parisian Apocrypha".[4] As Georgia Drakou notes, the name of a journal and a printing house under the title of Sue's novel indicates the great influence of the French author and the "mysterious" depiction of the French capital on the Greek literary world.[5] We must note that the appearance of these first translations of *Les Mystères de Paris* in Greek took place in an atmosphere of disdain towards fiction imported from abroad, as it was accused of corrupting local morals and ethics.[6] After 1845, numerous translations of popular European *City Mysteries* followed. This year can, therefore, be considered as the milestone in the evolvement of Greek *City Mysteries*, not only because in that year we have the two above-mentioned Greek translations of *Les*

---

[1] As Alexis Politis notes, during the first fifty years after the establishment of the Greek Kingdom, which coincide with Romanticism, trends regarding literary tastes in three centers of Hellenism peripheral to Athens, namely, the commercial centers of Constantinople, Smyrna/Izmir, and Ermoupolis, were markedly different from those in Athens. While interest in poetry was minimal in the above-mentioned three centers, interest in prose fiction was much more intense – and it was in translations rather than in original works (Politis 2009, 225).

[2] This dual concurrent translation depicts eloquently the division of the Greek-speaking world into two parts, on both sides of the Aegean, respectively.

[3] This translation was first published as an annex in the newspaper *Amaltheia* (*Αμάλθεια*) of Smyrna/Izmir and was republished as an independent book several times until the end of the century in all major cities with Greek-speaking readership, namely, Smyrna/Izmir, Constantinople, and Athens.

[4] This printing house, founded in 1844, was the realization of Skylitsis's dream for a modern printing house in Smyrna/Izmir, according to the pattern of the modern European publishing houses that he visited in Paris (Katsanos 2015, 4).

[5] Drakou 1997, 18.

[6] See Sachinis 1958, 29-35.

Mystères de Paris,[1] but also because, as Lambros Varelas notes, we can place in the same year the appearance of the first Greek *roman feuilleton* and, at the same time, the beginning of writing original *City Mysteries* in Greek.[2]

Original Greek City Mysteries

After 1845, the spread of *City Mysteries* in the Greek-speaking world developed almost parallel to the genre's spread in Europe.[3] It is beyond doubt that the original Greek *City Mysteries* were influenced, to a great extent, by the European ones. However, most scholars agree that the content of the Greek *City Mysteries* certainly differs from the corresponding European, since the Greek society – rural at its basis – had practically no similarities to the urban society of the modern European states, as, for example, France or Britain. Thus, the first original Greek *City Mysteries*, following main European patterns, deal mainly with political and social issues that reflect a different reality. The main problem, therefore, of the aspirant (Greek) author was how to adapt European patterns to the Greek reality, that is, how to write a novel that meets the international standards of the genre as much as possible, using Greek "mysteries" as material. However, despite all difficulties, it seems that several people gave it a try. We must note here that the fact that a novel's plot unfolds in the underworld of a city does not

---

[1]   For further information about the translation of European novels to Greek in the nineteenth century see Pappas 2011.

[2]   Varelas 2003, 717.

[3]   We should note here that individual features of the *City Mysteries* genre can be traced earlier in some of the first original Greek novels. For example, in his two picaresque novels, published in the first half of the century, the Constantinopolitan Greek Grigorios Palaiologos, who settled in the Greek Kingdom and undertook several posts in the Greek administration, depicts in detail the situation in modern society, focusing on phenomena of social pathogenesis. *The Long-suffering* (*Ο Πολυπαθής*, 1839), one of the first modern Greek novels, follows the pattern of well-known adventurous European texts. Palaiologos states in the prologue that he tried to give his readers a "pleasant story", aiming at the "rectification of morals" in modern Greek society. In the novel, Alexandros Favinis narrates the adventures of his life in Eastern and Western Europe and, at the same time, depicts the morals and customs of different human characters, social classes, and places, satirizes behaviors and attitudes, and criticizes several aspects of modern Greek society. A couple of years later, with his second novel entitled *The Painter* (*Ο Ζωγράφος*), published in Constantinople in two volumes in 1842, Palaiologos satirizes the social and political life in the new capital of the newly established Greek state. Combining Romanticism with several realistic features, the author focuses on aspects of modern life in a developing nineteenth-century urban center. The plot unfolds around a young man of the province (Filaretos Kalamas) and the family of his uncle, a corrupt and immoral politician. Being particularly critical, the author expresses his progressive view regarding politics, religion, and social life. Through the eyes of the main character, the behavior and morals of the uprising *bourgeoisie* and those involved in politics are satirized strongly, a thing that reminds us of the depiction of the upper social strata in the *City Mysteries* novels.

necessarily classify it into the *City Mysteries* genre, but makes it, more likely, a novel of "social concern".[1]

The first Greek *City Mysteries* were published in the five years period 1845-1850 in Athens, which, as mentioned above, at the mid-nineteenth century remained a provincial city compared to European capitals and constituted a capital under construction for the newly established Greek Kingdom. The *Apocrypha of Athens* (*Αθηνών Απόκρυφα*), written in 1848 by Georgios Aspridis, constitutes the first attempt at writing an original Greek *City Mysteries* novel; unfortunately, the text remained incomplete (only a first sixteen-pages issue was published). After Aspridis, three other Greek authors, who attempted to adapt the genre to the Greek reality, were Marinos Papadopoulos Vretos with his novel *The Patrokataratos* (*Ο Πατροκατάρατος*, 1845)[2] and Konstantinos Pop in collaboration with Nikolaos Aivazidis with the novel *Apocrypha of Athens* (*Απόκρυφα Αθηνών*, 1848). According to Georgia Drakou, who compiled a full catalog of the original Greek *City Mysteries* in the nineteenth century, the year 1855 is considered the final limit of this first – we could call it experimental – period of Greek production, because in that year we have the publication of Petros Ioannidis's novel entitled *The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople*, the first extensive Greek *City Mysteries* (although, as we will see in chapter III, it was also left unfinished), which constitutes the first productive intersection of the genre with its European models and tries to adapt all the elements that characterize the genre to a (Constantinopolitan) Greek reality.[3]

In general, the Greek *City Mysteries* place their plot in cities which by that time had a significant Greek-speaking population, as, for example, Athens, Constantinople, Smyrna/Izmir, [4] Cairo, Ermoupolis (capital of Syros island), [5] Kefalonia, and

---

[1] A typical example of this kind is the novel entitled *The mysterious night-thieves* (*Οι μυστηριώδεις νυκτοκλέπται*) by Minas D. Hamoudopoulos, which was published in Smyrna/Izmir in 1871. The use of the adjective "mysterious" in the title does not make this novel a *City Mysteries* one.

[2] In translation: the man who was cursed by his father.

[3] Drakou 1997, 18.

[4] The Greek-speaking population of Smyrna/Izmir grew constantly throughout the nineteenth century, increasing from forty-five thousand as estimated in 1838 to reach approximately one hundred thousand by about 1880. Education was flourishing, commerce was expanding at a dizzying rate, several newspapers and magazines circulated. However, the great proportion of the literary production consisted of translations of prose fiction (Politis 2009, 228).

[5] Ermoupolis was a refugee town born of the Greek Revolution of 1821. In 1830, it had begun to resemble a city; by 1840, it may have been slightly smaller than Athens in terms of population but was far wealthier (Politis 2009, 226).

Zakynthos,[1] and seek to reveal the economic and moral wrongdoings of its wealthy and/or politically powerful citizens, the illegal action of the underworld as well as the miserable living conditions of the lower social classes.[2] Of course, we should always bear in mind that the only two cities with a Greek population that approached the size and character of a western European city in the mid-nineteenth century were Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir. As mentioned above, the Greek authors tried to "Hellenize" the (stereo)typical motifs of the European *City Mysteries* and adapt them to the Greek reality of the mid-nineteenth century. Popular themes of the Greek *City Mysteries* were a series of "real" – as their authors declared – scenes of everyday life in urban society: robberies and night-time thefts, uncontrollable drunkenness in dark squalid bars, gambling, murders, and prostitution. Pantelis Voutouris notes that in the Greek *City Mysteries*, as in the European ones, the responsibility for the moral decay of urban society is consistently ascribed to the decadent *bourgeoisie* and the ineffective social institutions and not to the perpetrators of the various crimes, who appear to be victims of the system.[3]

As expected, this spate of Greek *City Mysteries*, original and/or translated, in the second half of the nineteenth century and their intention to portray the "darkest" aspects of urban life has caused various reactions, mostly negative, which were mainly based on moral principles: themes coming from the life of the underworld – it was argued – do not function as a deterrent to the readers; instead, they inure them to corruption and criminality.[4] Theodoros Orfanidis, who lived in Paris for four years and was acquainted with French *City Mysteries*, notes in 1859: "Greece and the whole world has read *Les Mystères de Paris* and several other similar texts. The list is very long. In these novels, crime, theft, and all kinds of abominable acts are vividly portrayed. The authors seem to have copied the inimitable and living prototypes that appeared in front of their own eyes. Thank God! Greece is free of such criminal monsters! [...] Of course, religion and

---

[1] The authors were aware that their small cities had nothing to do with the modern European urban centers, but they seemed to be so fascinated by the *City Mysteries* genre that they gave it a try, explaining themselves in the prologues of their novels. Dimosthenis N. Lyberiou, for example, states in the prologue of his *Apocrypha of Syros* in 1866 that he did not hesitate to write a *City Mysteries* novel referring to the society of the Greek island, as "even the smallest village, including only fifty impoverished houses, is full of mysteries, if it is governed for several years as Greece has been governed until this day" (my translation) (Lyberiou 1866, prologue, ii-iii).

[2] For further information about the literary production of Greek *City Mysteries* or other relevant texts in the nineteenth century see Katsanos 2021.

[3] Voutouris 1977, 32.

[4] Voutouris 1995, 184.

morals as well as the character of the Greek nation close the door, once and for all, to all kinds of European corruption, which will never be naturalized under a sky inspiring different desires and passions" (my translation).[1] And A. Zanetakis Stephanopoulos, referring to the Greek translations of European *City Mysteries*, adds: "[Most often] we translate novels that inspire the terrible picture of moral misery, intellectual sickness, and the fallacy of a small number of the population in big cities, and we think that we are studying European ethics and customs because we see through the mire of Paris or London the most abominable and obscene aspect of the most miserable part of their inhabitants" (my translation).[2]

On the other side of the spectrum, several authors, translators, and journalists of the time defended the *City Mysteries* genre against accusations of immorality and bold imagination. Their main argument was that misery is a reality that needs to be exposed to awaken the citizen's social conscience and, in some cases, to provoke state intervention.[3] As we will see in chapter IV, Georgios Koutsouris constitutes such an example, as with his novel entitled *The orphaned girl* (*Η απορφανισθείσα κόρη*), published in 1889 in Constantinople, he focuses on the causes of social pathogenesis in the modern Constantinopolitan Greek society (see below, p. 182). Ioannis E. Giannopoulos characteristically states in 1849 that "the city [that is, Athens] does not lack mystery material. We have no Sue here yet, but if he were here, he would see Athens as a miniature of Paris" (my translation).[4] One of the main supporters of the *City Mysteries* genre was Skylitsis himself, who maintained that these novels are not only "moral, benevolent, and godly texts", but also texts useful to the reader as he gains experience about the world around him.[5]

---

[1] "Η Ελλάς και σύμπας ο κόσμος ανέγνωσε τα *Απόκρυφα των Παρισίων* και πληθύν άλλων ομοίας φύσεως συγγραμμάτων, ων ο κατάλογος είναι λίαν μακρός. Εις ταύτα ζωγραφείται η κακουργία, η κλοπή, και πάσαι αποτρόπαιαι πράξεις, διά ζωηρών χρωμάτων, και οι συγγραφείς φαίνεται ότι αντέγραψαν τα υπό τους οφθαλμούς των αμίμητα και ζώντα πρωτότυπα. Δόξα τω Θεώ! η Ελλάς είναι ελευθέρα των τοιούτων κακοποιών τεράτων! [...] Βεβαίως, και η θρησκεία, και τα ήθη, και ο χαρακτήρ του Ελληνικού έθνους κλείουσι την θύραν διά παντός, εις πολλά είδη Ευρωπαϊκής διαφθοράς, τα οποία ποτέ δε θέλουσι πολιτογραφηθή υπ' ουρανόν εμπνέοντα άλλας επιθυμίας, και άλλα πάθη" (Orfanidis 1859, 235-237).

[2] "[...] μεταφράζομεν μυθιστορήματα άτινα εμπνέουσι το δυσειδές θέαμα της ηθικής αθλιότητος, της πνευματικής νοσηλείας, της πλάνης μικρού τινός του πληθυσμού των μεγάλων πόλεων και [...] αναλογιζώμεθα ότι νομίζομεν, ότι σπουδάζομεν τα ήθη της εσπερίας Ευρώπης, διότι διαβλέπομεν διά του βορβόρου των Παρισίων ή του Λονδίνου, την βδελυροτέραν και αισχροτέραν όψιν του ελεεινοτέρου μέρους των κατοίκων αυτών" (Stephanopoulos 1869, 85).

[3] Gotsi 1997 ("Greek *City Mysteries* of the nineteenth century"), 6.

[4] "Η πόλις [ενν. η Αθήνα] δεν είναι άμοιρος και μυστηρίων ύλης. Δεν έχομεν εδώ εισέτι κανέναν Σύϊον, αλλ' αν εκείνος εδώ ήτον, θα έβλεπε τας Αθήνας μικρογραφία των Παρισίων" (Giannopoulos 1848-1849, 188).

[5] Katsanos 2015, 9.

The Constantinopolitan Greek City Mysteries

The emergence of the Constantinopolitan Greek novels was contemporary with the consolidation of literate and economically powerful – if politically subdued – social groups in the evolving environment of the late Ottoman Empire. In fact, from the beginning of the nineteenth century, a local culture of the novel started to emerge in the Ottoman capital under the influence of a massive influx of fiction imported from abroad, bringing with it a major upheaval of the domestic cultural and literary landscape. It is beyond doubt that the translation of popular European *City Mysteries*, written by the initiator of the urban mysteries Eugène Sue[1] and his followers and imitators, was a necessary stage in the elaboration of domestic practices of both novel writing and novel consumption in the late Ottoman Empire.[2] The translation of these works by Ottoman Greek literati formed the template of future developments in Greek prose fiction and constituted the basis for stylistic and thematic experimentations that would in a short time find their way into original works.[3] These original Greek *City Mysteries* usually bear the subtitle "original social novel" or something similar, to make a clear distinction from the numerous translations of respective European novels and a clear statement of their social character and context. Moreover, we should always keep in mind that the Greek *City Mysteries* written from the 1840s onwards were the product of deep politico-economical mutations that appeared simultaneously on both shores of the Aegean.

As mentioned above, the Ottoman capital played a significant role in the Greek *City Mysteries*, as it was, in fact, the only city with a Greek population that could be compared to the huge megalopolises of Paris and London. Constantinople, as a modern cosmopolitan center, with its massive population, its multinational character, and its importance as a transit port, offered an ideal place for fictional activity: densely

---

[1] With one hundred thirty-one book-length translations (including reprints) between 1845 and 1900, Eugène Sue was the second most popular foreign author in the Greek-speaking world during the nineteenth century after Alexandre Dumas and almost one out of every twenty translated books published during this period, regardless of genre, was one of his novels (Charriere 2016, 113).

[2] We should note here that the Ottoman Turkish novels in Constantinople emerged and developed a bit later than the Ottoman Greek ones, namely, in the 1870s. However, as in the Greek case, Ottoman Turkish readers were also first introduced to translated European novels that were serialized in newspapers and then began to read original novels written by Ottoman Turkish authors. In other words, Ottoman Turkish novels and novel readers have also arisen and developed through the serial tradition of translated European novels (Serdar 2014, 9-11).

[3] Charriere 2016, 81.

populated and labyrinthine, that is, built with no urban development plan,[1] it brought together people of different origins, religions, and social strata and created the proper conditions for the appearance of "the improbable, the unexpected, and the coincidental".[2] The novels, the plot of which unfolds in the Ottoman Empire and most specifically in its capital, were characterized by an intense Gothic atmosphere[3] and a complex plot and, at the same time, were related to contemporary developments and concerns.

The Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* of the second half of the nineteenth century appear to be involved in a broader ideological dispute between the "ethnocentric" and the "cosmopolitan" perspective of the Ottoman Greek society. The Constantinopolitan Greek authors produced and published their works in a political climate that required literature to express the unity and the uniqueness of the ethnoreligious group to which they belonged within the multireligious and multinational Ottoman Empire. All that these authors did was to answer the call for action inserted by Stephanos Xenos in his prologue to the 1851 original English edition of his novel *The Devil in Turkey*: "We must *ourselves* write about *ourselves*" (English version, prologue, viii). These authors, following the literary tendencies in Europe but also the needs of the domestic market, saw the *City Mysteries* not as a field of bringing out the virtues of the Greek nation, but rather as a means of improving the situation of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire. As Marie-Ève Thérenty notes, the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* reflect the effort of the Ottoman Greeks to build a national identity through the study of morals and physiology of the people. They are based on a desire for social reformation and are often organized around a problematic concerning modern identities.[4] Following the patterns of their European models, these texts depict the social stratification of the Constantinopolitan Greek community and are mainly addressed to the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, since interaction with the literature produced in the Greek Kingdom in the second half of the nineteenth century appears to be, other than for certain cases that will be shortly pointed out in the course of my study, rather pale.

---

[1] We should not forget that the depiction of the city as a labyrinth is one of the main conventions of the *City Mysteries* literary genre (see above, p. 24).

[2] Gotsi 1997 ("Greek *City Mysteries* of the nineteenth century"), 10-11. For the role of Constantinople in the nineteenth-century Greek novel in general see Tonnet 1992; Tsapanidou 2012; Varelas 2018.

[3] For the influence of the *Gothic novel* on the *City Mysteries* see above, p. 17, footnote 4.

[4] Thérenty 2013, 58.

The current study focuses on ten texts, all of them belonging, to a greater or lesser extent, to the *City Mysteries* genre and written by Greek authors, who either originated from and lived in Constantinople or simply had a thorough knowledge of the city by living there for some time and attempts to approach them from an ideological point of view. What will be examined is the political and/or social purpose of each author and the ideological perspective with which he portrays the Constantinopolitan Greek society. While studying these texts, it is more than obvious that some of the authors perceive the city and its Greek population from the perspective of the citizen of the Greek Kingdom, while others from the perspective of the subject of the Ottoman Empire. So, the main question raised here is whether there is a literary discourse that unfolds between these two groups during the second half of the nineteenth century and whether there is a relationship of parallel existence between the two important centers of Hellenism at the two opposite shores of the Aegean, that is, the capital under construction of the newly established Greek Kingdom and the capital of the Ottoman Empire.

Those authors, who came from Constantinople or have lived there a long period, perceive "Greekness" from a Constantinopolitan perspective, that is, the perspective of the Self. In other words, as members of the Constantinopolitan Greek community themselves, in their novels, they show the reader how they see their community, its future in the Ottoman Empire, the formation of its collective identity, and its relationship with the Greek Kingdom. These narratives are based on stories revolved around the Greek population of the city, discussing the social parameters of the Greek community and proposing patterns for its future evolvement. The novels of this group reflect the need of the Greek community to define its presence – detached from the interests of the Greek Kingdom – within the Ottoman Empire, which was developing optimistically within the context of the *Tanzimat*. But do all of them constitute a corpus with a common perspective and objective?

On the other hand, those novels written by authors, who, having initially read travel narratives, became acquainted with Constantinople as visitors and decided to give their readers the picture of the city through their own view, that is, the view of the Other, namely, the Greek of the Independent Kingdom and/or the Diaspora, constitute a second group. The plot of these narratives develops during the reign of Sultan

Mahmud II (1808-1839), [1] when the independent Greek Kingdom was founded. The texts are focused on issues concerning the Greek collective consciousness in terms of nationality, reflect the issues of Greek claims about areas belonging to the Ottoman Empire and participate in the discussion about the position of the Greeks between "eastern" and "western" civilization, that is, about the relationship of the collective Self as a national subject to other collectives, namely, the Ottomans or western Europe, with narrative reference to recent historical developments.

But before we come to the study of the ten texts, it is more than necessary to have a closer look at the development of the Ottoman capital in the second half of the nineteenth century and the way its modernization affected the mentality and the formation of the collective consciousness of its Greek community.

---

[1]   Mahmud II (1785-1839) was the sultan of the Ottoman Empire from 1808 until his death. His reign was characterized by the extensive administrative, military, and fiscal reforms that he introduced and tried to establish. He aimed at confronting the feudal fragmentation of the Empire and providing it with a sense of Europeanization. He also tried to secure equal rights for all his subjects, which led to the empowerment of the minorities of the Empire; but these changes did not succeed in eliminating the main causes for the Empire's decline (Mansel 1999, 345-398).

CHAPTER II

**The Constantinopolitan Greeks and the formation of their collective identity
in the second half of the nineteenth century**

1.0. Forming national identities in the nineteenth century

Before we focus on the formation of the collective identity and consciousness of the Constantinopolitan Greeks in the nineteenth century, it is important to clear a few things regarding the formation of nations and national identities in Europe during the same period. According to several historians, the modern concepts of nation-state and national identity emerged in Europe as early as the eighteenth century and are for the most part recent constructions.[1] However, the idea of belonging to a community of people that share similar cultural attributes, namely, to a *nation*, has existed for a longer time.

In the nineteenth century, Europe experienced a period of intense nationalism that promoted the formation of nation-states. Nations like France, Spain, and Britain had early consolidated their people and territory around large kingdoms. These kingdoms gradually became modern nation-states, as monarchs lost their divine and absolute authority and people began to define themselves in terms of belonging to a nation rather than as the subjects of a supreme ruler. Meanwhile, multiethnic empires such as Russia, the Ottoman Empire, and Austro-Hungary, struggled to maintain their territories. By the nineteenth century, the multitude of ethnic groups that comprised these empires sought to break from the yoke of their authority and form independent states.[2] According to Ernest Renan, "the modern nation is a historical result brought about by a series of convergent facts. Sometimes unity has been affected by a dynasty, as was the case in France; sometimes it has been brought about by the direct will of provinces, as was the case with Holland, Switzerland, and Belgium; sometimes it has been the work of a general consciousness, belatedly victorious over the caprices of feudalism, as was the case in Italy and Germany".[3]

Contemporary scholars such as Benedict Anderson, Etienne Balibar, Michael Hertzfeld, Eric Hobsbawm, Terrence Ranger, David Lowenthal, and Anthony Smith agree that national identity is linked to the collective cultural identity and the shared

---

[1] See Davies 1996; Merriman [3]2010.

[2] In the case of the Ottoman Empire, the Greeks were not the first to rebel against Ottoman rule: the Serbs, having rebelled in 1804, and again in 1815, and having won their battles without western intervention that would prove decisive in the case of Greece, were obliged to be content, in 1829, with a degree of autonomy that fell significantly short of full sovereignty, a situation that would not be remedied until the Congress of Berlin in 1878. Rumania and Montenegro would be recognized as independent states at the same time, while Bulgaria and what was then Eastern Rumelia would remain for even longer under nominal Ottoman suzerainty (Jelavich 1977, 31-37, 55-58, 156).

[3] Renan 1996, 41-42.

memories of a community. Nations are formed around communities that share a common religion, language, and set of customs, and are strengthened by the creation of a national history that focuses on the accomplishments of the community's heroes, inventors, scientists, artists, writers, and philosophers. Scholars also agree that these three basic cultural factors, namely, language, religion and history, help unite a people around a common collective identity and reinforce a sense of "otherness", of "us" and "them" that overshadows any underlying similarities to other peoples. The people of a nation are bound together by a common understanding of one another and a common understanding of their history and culture.[1] A nation can also bring together its members by reminding them of past difficulties, struggles, and miseries. In other words, unity is formed around a common historical experience even when that experience involves being oppressed and persecuted.

Several scholars on the topic of collective memory and the construction of national identity suggest that both are socially constructed to serve the political and ideological interests of the nation-state. Maurice Halbwachs describes "collective memory" as a group's common understanding of the past, noting that it is usually produced in local communities first and becomes later part of a nation's broader and collective understanding of the past.[2] Collective memory, thus, helps shape a nation's collective identity and unites the nation around it. Moreover, we should bear in mind that memories and identities are not fixed things but representations or constructions of reality. In other words, collective memory and national identity are socially constructed phenomena that usually serve the interest of the nation-state and in the long run benefit the nation-state by uniting its people under a common experience and understanding of a shared historical past.

In contrast to most other national identities in Europe, a Greek identity was arguably imported before the formation of the modern Greek state in 1832. Greek intellectuals and wealthy Greek business elites living in Europe and Constantinople as well as a relatively large contingent of western European writers and artists helped formulate and import a Greek identity into the Greek Kingdom before its actual establishment. This identity was primarily based on modern Greek cultural, historical,

---

[1] In the case of the Greek nation, this was manifested through well-known historical figures, events, and accomplishments including Socrates, Homer, the Battle of Marathon, the early Olympic Games, Alexander the Great, democracy, philosophy, the Acropolis, and others. For further information see Carras 1983.

[2] Halbwachs 1992, 46-51.

and linguistic roots in ancient Greece with Orthodox Christian links to the Byzantine Empire. However, as it will be shown below, such a belief was limited to a marginal group of Greek-speaking intellectuals in Europe, while most of the Greeks living in the Ottoman Empire were not necessarily aware of this connection. Consequently, the above-described differentiated orientation and perspective would create dilemmas and cause great conflict regarding the position of the newly established Greek Kingdom – and Hellenism in general – between East and West.

Hellenism in the nineteenth century: the "dilemma" between East and West[1]

The ambiguous position of Hellenism between East and West as well as between the ideal of the past and its contemporary image are important issues that determined the evolvement of the Greeks on both shores of the Aegean already since the end of the eighteenth century. Therefore, the process of forming a national Greek identity in the nineteenth century was particularly complex. Along the way, the Greek Kingdom was confronted and would struggle long and hard with its eastern traditions and western cultural legacies, its Orthodox Christian religious beliefs and modern secular aspirations, its traditional, that is, rural lifestyle and customs and its ambition to modernize and westernize. However, according to my perspective, these dilemmas were, in fact, fake ones, since they reflected contradictory expectations and predispositions at the time of the formation of a modern Greek collective identity and consciousness, forming further questions rather than giving answers.

For several centuries, the territory that would later become the independent Greek state was part of the Ottoman Empire; this automatically meant that it was part of the East, of the "oriental world" as viewed and defined by the European Powers.[2] For most western travelers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the above-described territory represented the paradoxical meeting of place and time: while

---

[1] It must be clear from the beginning that, when we use the terms "East" and "West", we do not speak of two distinct worlds or territories with determinate geographical borders. In the nineteenth century, the dilemma between East and West was mainly related to the conflict between religions: "East" was identified with the Islamic world, while "West" with the Christian world; therefore, the presence of Christian Hellenism in a Muslim empire appeared to be problematic. However, such dilemmas (or pseudo-dilemmas) remain unanswered even in the twenty-first century, as, for example, whether Greece is truly part of the West or whether the Greek nation is culturally and politically suspended between East and West.

[2] Edward Said defines *orientalism* as a "western way of domination, reconstruction, and the exercise of western power on the East" (Said 1978, 13-14).

ancient Greece belonged to the West, modern (Ottoman) "Greece", at least until 1832, belonged to the East as part of the Ottoman Empire. However, for the western European intellectuals of the time,[1] "Greece" was, at the same time, the source of western civilization, and as such, western Europe owed much of its intellectual roots to the Greeks.[2] Much of the evidence of how "Others", that is, western Europeans viewed the modern Greeks came in the form of art and literature from the time just before Greek Independence.

Several scholars such as Edward Said have contended that the *philhellenic* movement was one half of a power struggle between the "Occidental West" and the "Oriental East" and that the territory, which would later become the independent Greek state, was merely the playing field on which this struggle took place. The *Philhellenes* and their movement since the late eighteenth century played an important role in shaping a modern Greek identity.[3] By the early nineteenth century, the movement of *philhellenism* had garnered worldwide support, partly for humanitarian reasons, partly for political reasons, and partly for animating the ancient Greek world. Not surprisingly, the *Philhellenes* saw themselves as protectors of both European civilization and classical Greek thinking, all the while portraying the Ottoman as both "Other" and "inferior". They believed that the liberation of "Greece" from its "oriental" oppressors would save the modern Greeks and their ancestral roots, bringing them back to the West, where, it was assumed, that they belonged. The *Philhellenes* also argued that freeing "Greece" would enrich European civilization, causing it to reach or exceed the glories of the ancient Greek past and increase Europe's global influence.

The Greek Revolution of 1821 was the official action of linking Hellenism with Europe, while with the establishment of the Greek Kingdom in 1832 its citizens believed that they would in a short time become equal European partners. However, it soon became clear that this change was not as easy as first thought. In fact, in the first

---

[1] Since the beginning of the eighteenth century, ancient Greek works had helped shape the foundation of western European intellectual thought, while enlightened thought was often presented as originating in classical Greek and Roman texts. Thus, the West became interested in modern (Ottoman) "Greece", since enlightened thought had originated in ancient Greece.

[2] However, not all scholars agreed that the modern Greeks were the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. For example, the German journalist and historian Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790-1861) argued that there were few similarities between the modern and the ancient Greeks since the ancient Greek population had been replaced by a massive Slavic migration. For further information see Veloudis 1982; Skopetea 1997.

[3] The *Philhellenes* originally fashioned themselves as students of ancient Greece. Later, however, they transitioned into a political movement that used its artistic, literary, and political voice to push the western world to support an independent Greek Kingdom.

decades after the independence, the distance between the Greek Kingdom and the European/Western Powers grew, both on an economic and a political level, since none of these Powers supported the Greek expansionary dreams. Despite that, the admiration of the Greeks for anything European/Western remained great.[1] However, in the mid-nineteenth century, the orientation of the Greeks began to change. According to Alexis Politis, the dilemma "East or West" emerged as a serious matter of the independent Greek state, as defined in 1842 by the young scholar Markos Renieris. "As years pass by", he notes, "there is an orientation shift. Greece begins to look to the East as well. Is this an ablactation from Mother Europe? A boasting confidence? Or a fake dilemma, covering the most intractable questions with ideological complexion?". In any case, as pointed out by Politis, "over the years, the distance grew, and worse, many European states showed a more hostile attitude" towards the newly established Greek state.[2]

---

[1] Politis 2017, 17.
[2] Politis 1998, 91-93.

2.0. *Millet*, *genos*, *ethnos*: terminology issues

Leaving the development of the Greek Kingdom between East and West aside and before we proceed to the study of the Constantinopolitan Greek community in the second half of the nineteenth century and the formation of its collective identity under the influence of significant developments within and outside the developing or declining, according to one's perspective, nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, it is necessary to define and clarify the terms *millet*, *genos*, and *ethnos* that will be often used in this chapter and are crucial for the deeper understanding of the subject.

The term millet and its development during the nineteenth century

Religion has been the main criterion of social differentiation in Ottoman society since the sixteenth century. Official Ottoman documents until the eighteenth century employ the concept of the *taif'e kâfirleri*, that is, of a community of "non-believers", to define Orthodox populations of the Ottoman Empire that came under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Nonetheless, a fundamental conceptual shift took place around 1700: the primary division of the population between "believers" and "non-believers" gradually transformed into a division between Muslims, Orthodox Christians, Gregorian Armenians, Jews, and Catholics.[1] This religious communal system was officially recognized as the *millet* system, which created a way of perceiving the world and a way of perceiving one another that mainly focused on religion and excluded nationalism; it excluded, that is, the emergence of secular forms of belonging, which rested on language and identification with "a nation".[2] Religion provided a universal belief system to all members of the *millet*, while ethnic and linguistic differences only provided for divisions and subdivisions within it.[3] Apart from the ruling *millet*, the non-Muslim religious communities of the Empire were defined by their own names: *Rumi* (Christian Orthodox), *Ermeni* (Armenians: Apostolic, Catholic, and Evangelical), *Yahudi* (Jews), and *Efrenci* (Franks, that is, Catholics).[4] Each religious group inhabiting the Empire was a more or less self-

---

[1] Konortas 1998, 299.
[2] Livanios 2006, 43.
[3] Karpat 1982, 141-142.
[4] Konortas 1999, 171-173.

governing unit under the spiritual and, to some extent, temporal jurisdiction of its religious leader. Its identity mainly came from a common religious affiliation.

Rather than a uniformly adopted system, the *millet* system, although based on classical Islamic law (more precisely, on the distinction between *dhimmi*, that is, non-Muslims, and Muslims), could be more accurately described as a series of *ad hoc* arrangements made over the years, which gave each of the major religious communities of the Empire a degree of legal autonomy and authority with the acquiescence of the Ottoman state.[1] It emerged gradually as an answer to the efforts of the Ottoman administration to take into account the organization and culture of the various religious groups that it ruled. The system provided, on the one hand, a degree of religious, cultural, and ethnic continuity within these communities, while, on the other hand, it permitted their incorporation into the Ottoman administrative, economic, and political system. Each religious group preserved its culture and religion while being subject to continuous "Ottomanization" in other spheres of life. According to Kemal Karpat, the paradox of the situation lies in the fact that the *millet* system brought the non-Muslims within a Muslim principle of organization while recognizing their religious and cultural freedom.[2]

Within this socio-cultural and communal framework, the Orthodox *millet* included all Orthodox ethnolinguistic groups: Greeks and non-Greeks, namely, Bulgarians, Serbs, Rumanians, Vlachs, Albanians, Karamanlı, that is, Turkish-speaking Orthodox, and Arabs. Called the *Rum milleti* (or *millet-i Rûm*), it was placed under the leadership of the Patriarch of Constantinople, namely, the *milletbaşı*, who no longer appeared in the official *berat* ascribed to him as "Patriarch of the non-believers," but as "Patriarch of the Romans" (or *Rums*, that is, Orthodox Christians of the Empire) and was responsible to the Ottoman administration for all matters concerning the Orthodox religious community.[3] The Patriarchate promoted the concept of the community of the Orthodox Christians, that is, the "Christian Commonwealth", which was shared to varying degrees by all Balkan peoples and made no particular reference to ethnic or national identification. That said, the unity imposed in the Balkans by religion should not be confused with uniformity: customs, regional fragmentation,

---

[1]   Braude, Lewis 1982, 12-13.
[2]   Karpat 1985, 149-150.
[3]   In general, the Greek clergy had always played an important role in maintaining the loyalty of the Orthodox Christians to the Sultan. This service was recognized and rewarded (Konortas 1999, 170).

social organization of households, language, and divisions of labor, to name but a few factors, all pointed to obvious divisions within the Balkan Christian body, even among the speakers of the same language. However, these cleavages did not have "national" character until well into the nineteenth century,[1] when they would cause antagonism and serious conflicts between the Balkan ethnicities.[2] Moreover, although the Greeks were always the dominant ethnolinguistic group within the *Rum milleti* through their stranglehold over the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Holy Synod, and the higher reaches of the Orthodox ecclesiastical hierarchy, their community was also by no means homogenous.

From genos to ethnos

The terms *genos* (γένος) and *ethnos* (έθνος) were particularly fluid and uncertain in the nineteenth century; therefore, their use has caused several misunderstandings and conflicts between the scholars. While the eighteenth century bequeathed the extended use of the term *genos*, the nineteenth century and its enlightening-romantic hybrids consolidated the dominance of the term *ethnos* (*nation*).[3] But what is the difference between these two terms?

To begin with, we should note that, already since the sixteenth century, the Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire used the name *genos* to describe themselves, a name that linguistically carries connotations of lineage in terms of ancestry and remains notoriously untranslatable. Both "race" and "nation" have been used to translate it but are equally inadequate as they reflect different concepts and refer to different collective identities. In other words, *genos* is the one single word that was used throughout the period of Ottoman rule by the Orthodox Christians to denote the wider community they thought that they belonged to. What appears to be certain is that ethnicity and language did not play a role in the definition of the *genos*. In fact, it was this multiethnic and polyglot community that comprised the community of the Patriarchate's flock, the *genos*. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand that *genos*

---

[1]   Livanios 2006, 45-46.
[2]   For example, until the mid-nineteenth century, the language of the liturgy, especially in the Bulgarian lands to the south of the Balkan Mountains and in Macedonia, was mainly (although not exclusively) Greek. Moreover, Greek was the *lingua franca* of high culture and commerce, so much so that many educated Vlachs and Bulgarians referred to themselves as "Greeks". After the mid-nineteenth century, this situation would rapidly change (Livanios 2006, 44-45).
[3]   Stamatopoulos 2003, 358-359.

not only coincided with the *Rum milleti*, given that the limits of both entities overlapped, but it was also used as a literal translation of the term *millet* into Greek. Significantly, with the rise of nationalism, *millet* and *genos* would gradually cease to have the broad and religious connotations of the previous periods and the impulse to translate both as "nation" in the modern sense of the word would correspondingly increase.[1]

Despite how a part of the western intelligentsia saw the relationship between ancient and modern Greeks, by the time of the Greek Revolution, most Greeks did not yet think in terms of national identity and most did not consider themselves as the heirs of the ancient Greek world. In fact, at that point, the common Greek speaker had not yet developed an understanding of historical continuity from the ancient past to the present and how it was connected to his national identity. Until the nineteenth century, the great majority of Greek peasants saw themselves first as members of a family, then as members of a village, and lastly as part of the *Rum milleti*. Furthermore, most peasants did not have a strong sense of time and its importance to the historical past. This perspective was rather the product of an intellectual elite and did not correspond to the collective identity of the peasants. Instead, the latter were more interested in maintaining the political and social *status quo* and looked at revolution only as means to consolidate their power. Wealthy Greek elites were also comfortable with the way things were since they had gained influence and status within the highest offices of the Ottoman political hierarchy and had benefited financially from trade throughout and beyond the Empire. Moreover, they were socially well-regarded by their Muslim counterparts and were able to practice their Orthodox Christian faith with an extensive degree of freedom. In short, from an economic and nationalist perspective, self-determination did not make sense for most Greeks, neither peasants nor elites, since both groups had more to lose than to gain from a revolt. Therefore, the greater task of Greek and European intellectuals was to convince the members of the Greek population that they were the ancestral descendants of the ancient Greeks since the great majority of the population did not see themselves this way.

The modern Greek Enlightenment (spanning roughly the last third of the eighteenth and the first third of the nineteenth century) and the Greek Revolution of 1821 opened the way to the emergence of a hitherto unknown quantity: the term *ethnos*

---

[1] Livanios 2006, 49-51.

(*nation*), to denote the new collective identity of the Greeks. This ushered in a new phase concerning the crucial issue of who is or should be Greek. It was this period that saw the first sightings of nationalism in the modern sense of the word, both as a political program aiming at the establishment of a nation-state and as an ideology, that is, a commonality based on a "Hellenic", pre-Byzantine lineage and Greek language. It also witnessed the resurfacing of terms like "Hellenes" that had been buried, although never entirely forgotten, under a thick layer of Christianity during the period of Ottoman rule. National motivation was one of the forces that emerged during this period, assisted by growing awareness, mainly among a small but highly influential Westernized elite, about the classical past and the glory of ancient "Hellas", the discovery of which was one of the most important preoccupations of the Greek Enlightenment. However, during the period of the Greek Revolution, the meaning of the term "Hellenes" was unclear, since both language and religion were employed as criteria for denoting the "Greek". It should be added here that, although several constitutional documents referred to "Hellenes", very few Greeks beyond a segment of intellectuals would have used that term to describe themselves. Most would continue to use "Roman" or "Christian",[1] although the more educated would also opt for "Graikos" (*Γραικός*), a term which has also had a long pedigree.[2]

After the establishment of the Greek Kingdom in 1832, the inclusion of all "Greeks" within a single state gave new urgency to the need of defining the "Greek". But the main issue remained open: how could the "Greek" be defined? How much land could Greek nationalism claim as being legitimately, that is, "ethnically", its own? If "Greekness" was allowed to be confined to the Greek-speakers only, then "Greece" itself would have to be cut down to its linguistic size and could not make much headway, for example, in Macedonia. Consequently, the power of language to determine ethnicity had to be somehow tempered. A solution to such a problem came

---

[1]   Richard Clogg quotes an interesting dialogue that took place between a Greek nationalist and a Greek speaker from Asia Minor in 1891. The former appears to be distressed to find out that the latter still sees himself as a Christian and not a Greek, and asserts: "For if today you ask a Christian, even one speaking a corrupted Greek [language]: -What are you? -A Christian (Christianos), he will unhesitatingly reply. -All right, but other people are Christians, the Armenians, the Franks, the Russians… -I don't know, he will answer, yes, these people believe in Christ, but I am a Christian, - Perhaps you are a Greek? -No, I am not anything, I've told you that I'm a Christian, and once again I say to you that I am a Christian!" (cited in Clogg 1992, 67). Although the contexts of these observations are at best vague, these accounts indicate that the common Greek people did not, even at the end of the nineteenth century, have a strong sense of historical connection.

[2]   Livanios 2006, 53-56.

through the application of two relatively novel terms: "national descent" (*εθνική καταγωγή*) and "national sentiment" or, perhaps, "national consciousness" (*εθνικό φρόνημα*). The employment of Orthodoxy and national descent, as equally conclusive "proofs" of Greek ancestry and consciousness, enabled Greek nationalism to downplay the role of language, when needed, and to cast a very wide net.[1] Therefore, the romantic perception of the unbroken continuity of the "Greeks" from antiquity to modern times through the Byzantine Empire, established by Spyridon Zampelios and Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos (see below, p. 67, footnote 1), together with the Greek language and Orthodox Christianity became the three main features which supported the Greek nation in the second half of the nineteenth century.[2]

---

[1]   Livanios 2006, 58-60.
[2]   Politis [2]1998, 32.

3.0.   The Constantinopolitan Greeks in the developing Ottoman Empire

After defining the terms *millet*, *genos*, and *ethnos*, we can proceed to the study of the development of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. Modern scholars of Ottoman history claim that the transformations and crises that the Empire experienced during this century were, in fact, a consequence of its incorporation into the European world-economy that turned the Ottoman world into a periphery of Europe and a part of the global capitalist system. Already since the end of the eighteenth century, Constantinople has been part of a banking network centered in France; it had, therefore, transformed into a commercial hub, connecting the Empire with the European world-economy.[1] A few decades later, the signing of the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Treaty of 1838 officially opened the way for the implementation of modernizing reforms. Consequently, the Crimean War in 1853-1856, the Treaty of Paris, and, especially, the Edict of 1856 paved the way for the rise of European influence in the Ottoman Empire and indirectly facilitated the social and economic rise of a non-Muslim upper and middle class.[2] By the end of the 1860s, Constantinople had become an important financial center, mainly due to the rapid incorporation of the Empire into the Western capitalist system. The security that the Debt Administration Arrangement in 1881 gave to would-be foreign investors attracted yet additional European capital, mainly to invest in railroads, ports, and public utilities. In fact, all such facilities that existed in the late Ottoman Empire derived from foreign capital ventures. And so, needed improvements in transportation, commerce, and urban facilities were made, but at the price of further foreign capital control over the Ottoman economy.[3]

Due to this process of capital accumulation and the diverse relations of the Ottoman Empire with the Western Powers,[4] the Ottoman social structure, based on religious, ethnic, and linguistic separation, began adopting a cosmopolitan lifestyle and

---

[1]   Faroqhi 2009, 19-21, 77.

[2]   More specifically, already at the mid-nineteenth century, Pera/Beyoğlu had increasingly become the center of economic and social importance in the Ottoman capital, symbolizing the ascendancy of Europe over traditional Ottoman culture in all fields of activity. The Ottoman capital presented a visible dichotomy in its "old" and "modern" sections: Pera/Beyoğlu and Galata, these two modern districts on the northern shore of the Golden Horn, just opposite the part of the old city, inhabited mainly by Europeans, grew and became a kind of colonial replica of European cities, while the old city stagnated and decayed (Karpat 1985, 86-95).

[3]   Quataert 2000, 71-72.

[4]   The term "Western Powers" or "Western Europe" refers to the three powers that influenced the political and financial decisions of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century, namely, Britain, France, and Austro-Hungary.

was soon replaced by a social structure based mainly on social status and financial power.[1] More specifically, the *Levantines*[2] and the non-Muslim minorities of the Empire (mainly Greeks, Armenians, and Jews) that had already developed relations in trade and shipping with the European capitals, sowed the seeds to create a modern *bourgeoisie*, mainly in the two significant urban centers of the Empire, Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir. At the same time, they became the representatives of western lifestyle and civilization in the Empire.[3]

In general, the association of the non-Muslim communities with the escalating number of European residents in the Empire, engaged in commerce and diplomacy, increased considerably during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In other words, the non-Muslims associated closely with European merchants and diplomats, often working for or with them.[4] In Constantinople, the significant cultural capital and the proficiency in European languages of several members of the non-Muslim communities enabled them to serve as translators in the European embassies and the commercial houses of foreign residents. As a result, more and more members of these communities participated in European trade and shipping and developed a closer relationship with their foreign partners. Under these circumstances, the hypothesis that the non-Muslim communities served as agents, channels, or filters for western ideas and concepts in the Ottoman Empire appears to have some basis.

More precisely, regarding the Constantinopolitan Greek community, more effective communication with Western Europe was achieved after the 1840s, both on a professional and a social level, mainly due to the dissemination of the French language in the community[5] and the familiarization of the latter with the western lifestyle.[6] The dominant cultural and political position of France in the district of Pera/Beyoğlu was maintained and, in fact, increased throughout the century despite the limited number of Frenchmen living there. At the same time, Britain was advocating

---

[1] Akbulut 2009, 114.
[2] The term *Levantines* (or *Francs*) refers to the descendants of Europeans, who settled (already since the twelfth century) in the coastal cities of the Ottoman Empire to be engaged in trade. Most of them were of Italian, Spanish, Dutch, French, German, and English origin. They acquired Ottoman citizenship only under the rule of Sultan Abdülhamid II, that is, after 1876. In their social life, although born and brought up in the East, they generally imitated the European lifestyle, referred to as *alafranga* (Schmitt 2011, 556-558).
[3] Akbulut 2009, 103-105.
[4] Davison 1982, 319.
[5] In the mid-nineteenth century, the main language of communication in Pera/Beyoğlu was French.
[6] Svolopoulos 1994, 52-53.

extensive commercial liberalization and looked upon the Constantinopolitan Greeks as the group best qualified strategically and professionally to help establish the British commercial hegemony in the Mediterranean and the Middle East.[1] The collaboration of Constantinopolitan Greek merchants with France and Britain often took the form of requesting and usually acquiring diplomatic passports, trading privileges, or foreign protection in trade.[2]

The Constantinopolitan Greeks were the first non-Muslim community to embrace the expanding European capitalist system and became its main proponents. As the beneficiaries of a combination of historical, national, and economic forces and aided by a privileged position in the Ottoman hierarchy, the Greeks were able to develop economically and create a fast-expanding upper and middle class.[3] They participated actively in sectors of the economy such as foreign trade with Europe, mechanized transport, export-orientated agriculture, and modern industries. Furthermore, after the mid-century, although trade remained a priority, Greek entrepreneurs, strengthened by the reforms of the Tanzimat and the westernization of the Ottoman economy, shifted some of their capital to other sectors. In the years between 1850 and 1881, a cohesive class of Greek – and Armenian – entrepreneurial *bourgeoisie* of traders, brokers, moneylenders, and commissioners appeared in Constantinople[4] as well as in other urban centers of the Empire. The members of this group of bankers and wealthy merchants were former members of the guilds of the Ottoman capital and took advantage of the trade opportunities created in the Ottoman Empire after the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Treaty of 1838.

Along with this commercial class, Greeks (and Armenians) staffed the liberal professions and were distinguished as physicians, pharmacists, engineers, lawyers, bank managers, and teachers. They also formed an important sector of the salaried middle class, employed mainly by large European enterprises such as banks, railways, public utilities, and industries.[5] In addition to bringing Western goods into the Empire, these Europeanized Greeks must certainly have also introduced some Western business concepts and practices and were probably aligned with Europeans in pressing the

---

[1]   Karpat 1985, 98.
[2]   Göçek 1996, 88-89.
[3]   Karpat 1985, 46-47.
[4]   For example, the famous Galata bankers (*Sarrafs*) were predominantly Greeks and Armenians.
[5]   Alexandris 1992, 31-32.

Ottoman Porte[1] for secular, westernized commercial law and commercial courts.[2] Furthermore, with their acquired wealth, these Greek merchants, tradesmen, and manufacturers often sent the younger members of their families to study at European universities, but they also established schools within the Empire and endowed them with books and scholarships. The economic expansion created a class of intellectuals, who provided their community with a historical past and interpreted its future according to the precepts of the Enlightenment. They were also instrumental in endowing the "ethnoreligious" identity of the Ottoman Greeks with a political consciousness.[3]

---

[1]   The term *Ottoman Porte*, as Richard Clogg introduced it in 1979, is used as a metonymy for the central government of the Ottoman Empire. Several scholars also use the synonym term *Sublime Porte*, referring to the monumental gate (known as *Bab-ı Ali* or *paşa kapusu*) of the Vizierate of Constantinople, seat of the Sultan's government. The term was adopted in most European languages, including English, to refer not only to the actual gate but as a metaphor for the Ottoman Empire.

[2]   Davison 1982, 324.

[3]   Jusdanis 1991, 19.

4.0. The Tanzimat reforms and the concept of *Ottomanism*

As mentioned above, the nineteenth century was a period of westernization of the Ottoman Empire; the reforms of the Tanzimat signal the beginning of this modernizing process.[1] The revolutionary movements in Serbia (1804 and 1815) and Greece (1821) were an indication to the Ottoman statesmen that the secession of territories and the possible dismemberment of the Empire was a threat that they had to face before it was too late.[2] Therefore, the main objective of this modernizing effort was the establishment of a modern state for the salvation of the Empire, but also the establishment of a modern society, which would function as a stable basis for this new state. In other words, through the reforms, the Ottoman Empire attempted to homogenize its space and population, based on Ottoman westernization.

On November 3, 1839, a very significant proclamation was made, known as the *Rose Chamber Edict* (*Hatt-ı Şerif of Gülhane*), which was an important statement of Ottoman intentions. In a sense, the document served as an assurance to the Great Powers of Europe[3] that demanded domestic reforms in return for future recognition of the Ottoman Empire as a member of the Concert of Europe. The edict indicated a change in the official ideology of the Empire, and this was a significant first step towards the transformation of hitherto Muslim, Christian, and Jewish subjects into Ottomans.[4] With the *Hatt-ı Şerif of Gülhane*, the *Ottoman Porte* agreed to adopt westernized concepts by modernizing its administration and the general economy, law, education, and military affairs of the Empire.

The new policy of 1839 was confirmed in a more extensive reform edict, the *Hatt-ı Hümayun* (*Islahat Fermanı*), which granted equal treatment for adherents of all religions in such matters as educational opportunity, appointment to governmental posts, and the administration of justice as well as in taxation and military service. This edict – prepared under strong pressure from the British, French, and Austrian

---

[1] We should note here that the first reformist attempt was made by Selim III in 1789 when the Sultan attempted military modernization through the creation of a new army based upon modern European standards. Unfortunately, Selim was forced to abdicate and, a few years later (1808), was murdered by the Janissaries.

[2] Stamatopoulos 2006, 256.

[3] The term "Great Powers of Europe" refers to the four major European Powers, namely, Britain, France, Austro-Hungary, and Russia, which were pulling the strings of the European political scene in the nineteenth century.

[4] Hanioğlu 2008, 72-74.

Ambassadors in Constantinople – was promulgated by Sultan Abdülmecid I[1] on February 18, 1856. The efforts for modernization were carried on by the succeeding sultan, Abdülaziz.[2] Even more significant was the promulgation of the first Ottoman Constitution in 1876, establishing a constitutional monarchy, whose subjects were considered "Ottoman, whatever religion or creed they hold".[3]

The reforms of the Tanzimat sought on the one hand, to eliminate the legal privileges of the Muslims and on the other hand, to bring back under direct Ottoman state jurisdiction the Christian subjects who had become *protégés* of foreign states. Promising equality, the Ottoman state sought to regain or maintain the loyalty of its Balkan Christian citizens who were tending towards Russia, the Hapsburgs, or revolutionary movements in the first half of the nineteenth century. This concept of *Ottomanism*, as it will be analyzed below, remained the central pillar of the official Ottoman policy, at least, on a theoretical basis, until the Young Turks Revolution in 1908.[4]

The immediate results of the Tanzimat were advantageous to both parties. However, the wide authority on internal affairs granted to the *millets* ultimately proved fatal to the effective incorporation of the non-Muslims into the Ottoman political body.[5] In Roderic Davison's words, "the imperial decree of 1856 was characterized by one essential contradiction ('dualism'): while it insisted on the theme of equality among Ottoman subjects, irrespective of their religion, it preserved, at the same time, the *millet* system as a basic organizing principle of the Ottoman society".[6] Furthermore, the continued existence of these distinct religious communities offered a convenient opportunity to the Great Powers of Europe for intrigue among them and intervention in the Ottoman Empire.

---

[1] Sultan Abdülmecid I (1823-1861) succeeded his father Mahmud II in 1839 when he was only fifteen years old and continued his reformative efforts. The young sultan was distinguished by his "open spirit" and intelligence. His vision for the Empire was to create one nation from the several different races and religions (Mansel 1999, 401-420).

[2] Sultan Abdülaziz (1830-1876) was the son of Mahmud II and succeeded his brother Abdülmecid I in 1861. Abdülaziz received an Ottoman education but was nevertheless an ardent admirer of the material progress in western Europe; however, he could not always accept the adoption of Western institutions and customs. He continued the westernizing reforms that had been initiated by his predecessors until 1871, developed good relations with France and Britain, and was the first Ottoman Sultan to visit western Europe in 1867. However, after 1871, without powerful ministers to limit his authority, Abdülaziz put greater emphasis on the Islamic character of the Empire (Mansel 1999, 421-422).

[3] Alexandris 1992, 26.

[4] Quataert 2000, 66, 120.

[5] Alexandris 1992, 24.

[6] Davison 1963, 56.

As far as the Ottoman Greeks are concerned, an important parameter that strongly influenced their attitude towards the policy of the reforms was, of course, the attitude of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The Church did not share the enthusiasm of the upper class regarding the reforms proclaimed in the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*; on the contrary, it felt threatened by these developments. The main argument of the ecclesiastical side was that the Patriarch should retain his spiritual and political authority over the Orthodox *millet*, an authority that was now challenged by the participation of the lay element in the administration of the *millet*.[1] Apart from the circles of the Patriarchate, several members of the Ottoman Greek community did not see the reformation of the Empire positively as well. Cevdet Paşa, a prominent figure in the Tanzimat reforms, documented the various reactions of the Ottoman Greeks to the signing of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*. "As for the non-Muslims", he states, "this day, when they left the status of *reaya*[2] and gained equality with the ruling *millet*, was a day of rejoicing. But the patriarchs and other spiritual chiefs were displeased because their appointments were incorporated in the *ferman*. Another point was that whereas in former times, in the Ottoman state, the communities were ranked, with the Muslims first, then the Greeks, then the Armenians, then the Jews, now all of them were put on the same level. Some Greeks objected to this, saying: 'The government has put us together with the Jews. We are content with the supremacy of Islam'".[3] I believe that this Ottoman source, taking into account that it presents only one perspective of the subject, gives us an interesting picture of how the ruling Ottomans saw the transformations within the Ottoman society and the reception of the reforms by a big part of the Ottoman Greek community.

Although substantive equality was never attained in the Ottoman Empire, the reforms of the Tanzimat undoubtedly served well the non-Muslim subjects of the Sultan. The position of the Greeks, therefore, though profoundly shaken by the outbreak of the Greek Revolution in 1821, was to a considerable extent restored by the mid-nineteenth century.[4] Due to the opening of the Ottoman economy towards Europe

---

[1] Stamatopoulos 2003, 20, 25-26, 30-31, 62-63, 69, 365.
[2] A *reaya* (also: *rayah*) was a member of the tax-paying lower class of the Ottoman society, in contrast to the *askeri* (upper class) and the *kul* (slaves). The *reaya*, literally meaning "member of the flock", made up over 90% of the general population and included Christians, Armenians, Muslims, and Jews who were paying taxes to support the Ottoman state but were not eligible for military service. For further information see Sugar 1977; Greene 2000.
[3] Baysun 1963, 67-68.
[4] Alexandris 1992, 27-30.

and the formation of a Constantinopolitan capitalist society as well as due to their special abilities and qualifications, the non-Muslim communities, especially the Greek and the Armenian, gained a privileged position in modern Ottoman society. Those with average or high income experienced a rapid process of urbanization, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century.[1] According to the census of 1885, 47% of Pera/Beyoğlu's residents were foreign nationals, 32% Christians with Ottoman citizenship, and only 21% Muslims.[2] It is noteworthy that the large majority of Greek bankers and merchants in Constantinople in the latter part of the nineteenth century did not attempt to acquire European passports and place themselves under the protection of European embassies, as they did in the past; many of them did not even seek Greek nationality. Instead, within the context of *Greco-Ottomanism*, which will be analyzed below, they followed a friendly policy towards the Ottoman state without provoking it and in most cases kept a low political profile, even when important issues, such as the Cretan Revolt in 1866, surfaced.[3]

The concept of Ottomanism and its transformation in the nineteenth century

As mentioned above, seeking to modernize and westernize the political and administrative institutions of the Empire, the reformers of the Tanzimat espoused the new concept of *Ottomanism* (*Osmanlılık*), that is, the concept of a common Ottoman citizenship and loyalty, which practically suggested a dynamic coexistence of citizens of different ethnic origin and religion within a single state structure. It was mainly introduced by the reforms of 1856 and crystallized with the Constitution of 1876. As an ideology, *Ottomanism* was strongly influenced by thinkers such as Montesquieu and Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the sermons of the French Revolution. The main objective was to rally all Ottoman subjects under a common "state" identity, where everyone, irrespective of religion and ethnicity, would be equal but also loyal citizens. In other words, *Ottomanism* was aiming at the integration of all citizens into the Ottoman social structure equally and the homogenization of the fragmented Ottoman society, which would gradually transform into a modern, non-discriminatory, political society. The notion of egalitarian citizenship was employed as a means of bringing about a sense of

---

[1] Akbulut 2009, 126.
[2] Bozi 2002, 67-68.
[3] Exertzoglou 1999, 89-91.

fraternity and solidarity among the members of the Ottoman society: a concept of Ottoman "patriotism".[1] Its proponents believed that this new concept could solve the social issues that the Empire was facing in the nineteenth century by uniting its citizens under one state entity. In its essence, *Ottomanism* was a form of *nationalism*, likely inspired and created as a reaction to European ideas of nationalism and the growing western involvement in the Ottoman Empire. In other words, *Ottomanism* was developed as a social and political response and a hope to help save the Empire from its downfall.

But what did this concept mean for the future of the *Rum milleti* and the Ottoman Greek community? To begin with, *Ottomanism* promoted equality among the *millet*s. Put simply, all separate ethnicities were accepted in the Empire regardless of their religion: they were all "Ottomans" with equal rights. Therefore, the essence of the *millet* system was not dismantled, but secular organizations and policies were applied. Primary education, conscription, taxation, and military service were to be applied to non-Muslims and Muslims alike. As expected, *Ottomanism* was rejected by several members of the non-Muslim *millets* as it was perceived as a step towards dismantling their traditional privileges since they were now recognized as coequal Ottoman citizens. At the same time, the Muslims saw it as the elimination of their superior position in the Empire.

Ottoman attempts to promote the concept of *Ottomanism* failed, when it was discovered that there were no strong imagined unifying patterns among the multiplicity of groups comprising the Empire; this meant that it would be practically impossible to treat all Ottoman subjects as coequal citizens. Two factors played a significant role in the shift of Ottoman policy at the end of the nineteenth century: the first was the loss of territories mostly comprised of Christian populations, which altered the demography of the Empire, making the Muslim element dominant; the second was the rise of nationalism among the different non-Muslim communities.[2] During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the only other possible pattern based on the dominant religion generated the possibility of *Pan-Islamism* as a mobilizing form.[3]

---

[1] Alexandris 1980, 366; Anagnostopoulou 1997, 271; Davison 1990, 114, 117-119; Deringil 1999, 44; Kanner 2004, 25.
[2] The gradual fragmentation of the Empire's new lands, following the creation of a Bulgarian nation-state based on the Treaty of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin in 1878, finalized the Ottoman elite's alienation from any reforms that might have led to the incorporation of the Christian peoples of the Balkan Peninsula.
[3] Göçek 1996, 134.

Being an Ottoman was now identified with being a Muslim. As a national ideology, *Pan-Islamism* was introduced as a reaction to *Ottomanism*, when it was felt that the non-Muslims were not eager to leave their former privileges (for example, exemption from military service) and integrate into the Ottoman society with equal duties; but this new concept was interrupting the process of reformation. The main objective of its main proponent, Sultan Abdülhamid II,[1] was to knit together the Muslim elements of the Empire into a cohesive new core of identity; in fact, he attempted to forge a multiethnic brotherhood of Muslims. Although Abdülhamid theoretically continued the modernization program initiated by the reforms of the Tanzimat, by placing *Pan-Islamism* at the center of his policy, he excluded the non-Muslim communities from the Ottoman nation, contrary to the original aim of the reformists.[2] As expected, this new framework affected the position of the non-Muslim communities. As for the Ottoman Greek community, the new regime soon sought to limit its "privileges": both in 1883-1884 and 1891, the Ottoman government demanded the transfer of powers previously claimed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the Ottoman state. And more importantly, the Ottoman state targeted the relative autonomy enjoyed by the Greek Orthodox communities in the matter of managing their education and activities.[3] When the Arabs and afterward, the Albanians (both Muslim communities) seceded through national uprisings, several Ottoman intellectuals supported the alternative concept of *Turkism* as a solution for the state's cohesion. The concept of a Turkish identity began to gain ground at the beginning of the twentieth century.[4]

---

[1] Abdülhamid II (1842-1918) was the last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. During his rule (1876-1909), the Empire went through a period of decline, with rebellions in the Balkans and an unsuccessful war with the Russian Empire. Abdülhamid promulgated the first Ottoman Constitution in 1876, which was a sign of progressive thinking that marked his early rule. Later, however, due to the increasing Western influence on Ottoman affairs and constant disagreements with the Parliament, he suspended both the short-lived Constitution and Parliament in 1878 and accomplished highly effective power and control. Towards the end of the century, his adhesion to Ottoman tradition and Islam overshadowed any efforts for modernization and industrialization in the Empire. As expected, the Ottoman elite opposed Abdülhamid and his policy, however, the lower classes and the minorities (apart from the Armenians) regarded him as a charitable ruler and supported his power (Mansel 1999, 473-516).

[2] Kamouzis 2013, 25.

[3] Stamatopoulos 2006, 265.

[4] Millas 2001, 27-28.

5.0. The formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity in the second half of the nineteenth century: *Megali Idea* or *Greco-Ottomanism*?

As we have seen above, during the second half of the nineteenth century, the Constantinopolitan Greek community transformed economically and socially within the context of the Tanzimat. But it also went through a process of forming a collective identity adapted to modern circumstances and needs to take its place into the developing Ottoman Empire. This formation was the result of the discourse and/or contradistinction of two ideological concepts or, in other words, of two contradictory political programs grounded on a different base: the concept of *Megali Idea*[1] in the Greek Kingdom and the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism* in the Ottoman Empire. The problem, that is, the contradictory relationship between these two political programs, lies in the fact that they both looked to the incorporation of the same population into their lands, that is, into the Greek Kingdom or the Ottoman Empire, respectively, to achieve their political goals. As it will be shown below, we should perceive them as two parallelly evolving identities, a "national" and a "state" one, respectively, grounded on two different states, which viewed each other with suspicion and/or hostility and resulted in an inevitable rupture and conflict.

The concept of the Megali Idea and the Greek Kingdom

After the establishment of the Greek Kingdom in 1832, the citizens of the new state attempted to build a common "national" identity based on the triple perspective "Ancient Greece-Byzantium-Modern Greek State". This belief in their historical course as a linear continuation gave birth to the vision of integrating the populations which had the same language and religion with the citizens of the Greek Kingdom but were still living in the Ottoman Empire, that is, the so-called "unredeemed brothers" (*αλύτρωτοι αδελφοί*).[2] This imagined common "national identity" created a kind of

---

[1] Although several scholars use the term *Great Idea*, I prefer the term *Megali Idea*, which is widely used in the international bibliography.

[2] In 1852, the historians Spyridon Zampelios and Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos provided ideological support for this irredentist policy. The former, attempting to determine the historical and geographical limits of modern Greek ethnicity (*νεοελληνική εθνότητα*), identified three significant periods in the history of Hellenism: ancient, medieval, and modern. This constructed hybrid concept, a product of the nineteenth-century Romanticism, named "Hellenochristian civilization" (*Ελληνοχριστιανικός πολιτισμός*) united for the first time two terms which were, until his time, considered mutually exclusive: "Hellenism" was decontaminated from paganism and was fused with

coherence between Greeks within and outside the newly established state; it also politically justified any attempts for its territorial expansion. As a national vision, *Megali Idea* was aiming at extending the geographical borders of the new state and retrieving as many territories with Greek population as possible to rebuild the former Byzantine Empire, that is, a modern "Greek Empire". In other words, *Megali Idea* was a campaign, whose objective was the unification of all Greek-speaking people in the Near East. This ideology gained broader consensus among the citizens of the Greek Kingdom and was soon transformed into a political program, which constituted, in one way or another, the main pivot of the internal and foreign policy of the Greek Kingdom until the third decade of the twentieth century.

The concept of the *Megali Idea* was inspired by Ioannis Kolettis, the first constitutional Prime Minister of the Greek Kingdom, and was officially verbalized for the first time during a discussion in the Greek Parliament in 1844 in the context of the deliberations on the first Constitution. According to the Greek politician, "the Kingdom of Greece is not Greece. [Greece] constitutes only one part, the smallest and poorest. A Greek is not only a man who lives within this kingdom but also one who lives in Jannina, in Salonica, in Serres, in Adrianople, in Constantinople, in Smyrna, in Trebizond, in Crete, in Samos, and in any land associated with Greek history or the Greek race. […] There are two main centers of Hellenism: Athens, the capital of the Greek Kingdom, [and] 'The City' [Constantinople], the dream and hope of all Greeks".[1] And continues: "The citizens of the Greek Kingdom must always stay focused on the *great idea* of 'refining' the East and, following the example of their ancestors, speak not for regions but the whole Christendom. […] Those with a Greek heart should not support *minor ideas*, unworthy of themselves and the glory of the Greek nation" (my translation).[2] The goal of national policy was, therefore, to "redeem" those Greeks living beyond the confines of the nation-state and, in particular,

---

Christianity to produce what was regarded as the essence of modern Greek national identity. This concept, therefore, stressed the unproblematic and unbroken continuity between ancient, byzantine, and modern Greece (Livanios 2006, 61-64).

[1]   Cited in Clogg 1979, 76.

[2]   "Ημείς, Κύριοι, κατοικούμεν αυτήν την ένδοξον Ελλάδα, ημείς πρέπει να δώσωμεν τον εξευγενισμόν εις την Ανατολήν. Από αυτόν τον όρκον, και από την *μεγάλην ιδέαν*, την οποίαν πρέπει να έχωμεν περί του εαυτού μας, είδον εμπνευσμένους τους πληρεξουσίους εις τας παρελθούσας Συνελεύσεις μας να ομιλώσιν όχι περί επαρχιών, αλλά περί ολοκλήρου του Χριστιανισμού. […] Όσοι έχουσι καρδίαν Ελληνικήν, και την έχετε όλοι, να παρουσιασθώσι με *ιδέας μικράς*, αναξίας του εαυτού των, και της ευκλείας του Ελληνικού Έθνους;" (Ioannis Kolettis, excerpt from the speech in the Greek Parliament, 11.01.1844).

to re-establish Constantinople, the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church and once the capital of the Greek-speaking Empire of Byzantium, alongside Athens as the twin centers of this wider Hellenism.[1] This abstract political program summarized the concerns of the newly established state regarding its future and was, in fact, a political proposal for the formation of a common "national" identity of the Greeks within and outside the state. The entire political and diplomatic development of the Greek Kingdom until 1922 evolved around this basis.

According to Elli Skopetea, the ideology of the *Megali Idea* went through three distinct phases, adapting to the political and diplomatic developments of the nineteenth century. In the first phase, directly after the establishment of the Greek Kingdom, the utopian plan of rebuilding a "Greek or Eastern Empire", with Constantinople as its capital, prevailed.[2] After the humiliation of 1854-1857 (foreign occupation, commercial downturn, food riots) and the eviction of King Otto in 1862, the political program was re-oriented towards Athens[3] and was confined to the (diplomatically tolerated) expansion of the national borders with the new King's (George I) moderate consensus. Finally, in the third phase, that is, the period between the Cretan Revolt of 1866 and the Balkan crisis of 1875-1878, we can see a rather realistic effort to reconcile the two centers, namely, Athens and Constantinople, in the context of a clear Greek-Ottoman approach, aiming mainly at the material development of both capitals.[4] In general, we could say that the vision of the *Megali Idea* was *de facto* considered an undertaking, which lagged behind its successful transformation from vision to action. In Elli Skopetea's words, "until the end (that is, in 1922), *Megali Idea* maintained its ambiguity for the Greeks and the intrusive character of an irrational desire for the European Powers, since it sought to fulfill a *de facto* unachievable goal".[5]

Almost all subjects of the newly established Greek state subscribed to the vision of the *Megali Idea*, the only argument being as to how it could best be implemented. As Richard Clogg notes, there were two basic schools of thought in the Greek

---

[1] Beaton [2]2004, 66.

[2] In 1834, Ioannis Kolettis characterized Athens as a "temporary center of Hellenism" and suggested that the newly established Greek Kingdom should not have an official capital yet, as its real capital was Constantinople.

[3] According to an article published in the newspaper *Athinà* (*Αθηνά*) in 1861, "the capital of Greece, Athens, is the heart and center of illumination and culture of two, so to speak, concentric states, that is, the state of free Greece and the great state of the unredeemed brothers" (my translation) (*Athinà*, 11.11.1861).

[4] Skopetea 1988, 269-320.

[5] Skopetea 1988, 347.

Kingdom. The militant proponents of the *Megali Idea* agreed that the Kingdom was poor, backward, and essentially non-viable, but they argued that its admitted inadequacies were mainly because the most wealthy and productive regions of the Greek world lay outside the narrow bounds of the Kingdom. Until all Greek people had been united within a state entity, there could be no real hope for progress; therefore, the struggle for their unification should take priority over all else. On the other hand, the most cautious advocates of the *Megali Idea* argued that it was unwise to underestimate the residual strength of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. Thus, to pursue an adventurist foreign policy, before the existing Greek state had been consolidated in terms of its economic and military resources, could only lead to disaster.[1]

But how did the large Greek populations still under Ottoman rule perceive these irredentist aspirations? As mentioned above, many of them (in particular, the Turkish-speaking Greeks of Anatolia) had little consciousness of being Greek. However, those in the large and prosperous communities of the coastal cities of the Empire, as, for example, Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir, with their excellent and richly endowed schools, were fully conscious of their Greek heritage. So, how did they look upon the irredentist fervor of the Greek Kingdom? Richard Clogg argues that two basic currents of thought can be detected here as well. On the one hand, there were those, mainly teachers, doctors, and lawyers, who fully shared in the irredentist aspirations of the Kingdom and placed their hopes in the early fulfilment of the *Megali Idea*. On the other hand, there were those who argued that the hostile policies of the Kingdom towards the Ottoman Empire were wholly misguided. Rather, they believed, the Ottoman Greeks should work towards a formation of a strong collective Greek identity and a gradual and peaceable Hellenization of the Ottoman Empire from within.[2]

The concept of Greco-Ottomanism and the Constantinopolitan Greeks

While the subjects of the Greek Kingdom were trying to build a common "national" identity to incorporate their "unredeemed brothers" into their newly established state, the Ottoman Greeks were rather focused on a different ideology, that is, the ideology

---

[1]   Clogg 1979, 76-77.
[2]   Clogg 1979, 77-78.

of *Greco-Ottomanism* (*Ελληνοθωμανισμός*, 1839-1912), which evolved within the context of the reforms of the Tanzimat and the concept of *Ottomanism* and promoted the cooperation of Orthodox Greeks and Muslims within the Ottoman Empire. *Greco-Ottomanism* was presented as a new "state" identity of preserving ethnoreligious diversity within a multicultural and multiethnic state entity, where *Ottomanism*, that is, the consciousness of belonging to this state, would be the common reference of all citizens.

On a political level, *Greco-Ottomanism* was translated as an effort to ensure the integrity of the Empire, while, on a cultural level, as an effort to ensure the "Greek identity" (or "Greekness") of the *Rum milleti*. As for the former, the concept coincided with the reality of the reformation after 1839 and, hence, with the new prospects that it opened for the non-Muslims of the Empire. Moreover, the recognition of the Ottoman legitimacy by the wealthy Constantinopolitan Greeks was directly related to their political and economic interests. Evangelos Kechriotis informs us that in a memorandum submitted to the Patriarchate in 1864 by a three-member committee under the chairmanship of Stephanos Karatheodoris,[1] it was clearly stated that in the Ottoman Empire "there only exists one nation, the Ottoman; the Greeks or the Bulgarians should not be considered as separate nations". The authors of this text used the term *genos* (*γένος*) to describe the above-mentioned populations, that is, the Greek and the Bulgarian, to differentiate them from the Turkish *genos*.[2] The *Greco-Ottoman* ideology of the 1860s and 1870s could be perceived as a "diarchy" of political hegemony of the Muslim-Turkish element and cultural-economic hegemony of the Orthodox-Greek. *Greco-Ottomanism* did not seek for the erosion of the Ottoman Empire from within, but the full integration of the Greeks in the Ottoman state apparatus. In this sense, the Greeks of the Empire would not function as members of the Greek nation, but as privileged Ottoman citizens.

During the last decades of the nineteenth century and within the context of *Greco-Ottomanism*, several wealthy and powerful Constantinopolitan Greeks, who believed in the need for a generalized Greek education accessible to all members of the Greek community, undertook direct action, providing significant sums to the education of their Greek fellow-citizens. Since "Greekness" was not identified with the Greek

---

[1] Stephanos Karatheodoris was a member of a well-known Constantinopolitan Greek family, a diplomat, and the father of the mathematician Konstantinos Karatheodoris.

[2] Kechriotis 2008 (available online, without pagination).

state but with one of the various aspects of *Ottomanism*, the Greek state did not constitute a threat against the Ottoman legitimacy over the Ottoman Greeks.[1] In other words, it is important to see *Greco-Ottomanism* as a political behavior within a certain statehood, that is, the Ottoman Empire. In this context, the Constantinopolitan Greeks, through the reorganization of their community and the promotion of educational, literary, and cultural associations, also known as *syllogoi*,[2] constituted in the second half of the nineteenth century an Ottoman ethnoreligious community rather than a separate community with a Greek "national" identity that aimed at its liberation and annexation to the Greek state. The case of the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*), established in 1861 by a group of eminent Constantinopolitan Greeks, is a typical example. The members of the *Association* sought the preservation of the cultural and religious difference of the Greek community within the "state" identity of *Ottomanism* through various open lectures, cultural events, and publications.[3] It is understood that, at that time, the preservation of linguistic difference and religious freedom seemed possible within an Ottoman Empire that allowed for the preservation of any ethnic characteristics, always in the context of state participation in the identity of *Ottomanism*.

However, in the Greek Kingdom, the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism* was approached from a different perspective. The arrival of wealthy Constantinopolitan Greeks in Athens, such as Andreas Syngros,[4] who excited the imagination of the Athenian people about the affluence and opulence at the shores of the Bosporus with their luxurious life and prospects for dynamic economic ventures, led, for the first time, particular political circles in Athens to a perspective of political cooperation with the Ottoman Empire. Even if it was considered a political maneuver, either against the

---

[1]   Anagnostopoulou 1997, 304-306.
[2]   During the period 1861-1922, approximately five hundred *syllogoi* or associations were formed in different parts of the Ottoman capital, a phenomenon called at the time *syllogomania* (*συλλογομανία*, that is, "association-mania"). For further information about the establishment and activity of the associations in Constantinople see Mamoni 1975, 103-112.
[3]   For further information about the objectives and the activity of the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* see Stavrou 1967; Exertzoglou 1996. For the contribution of the *Association* to the preservation and strengthening of the Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity see Zborowski 2019.
[4]   Andreas Syngros (1830-1899) was a powerful Constantinopolitan Greek banker. In 1871, he moved to Athens, when he planned the foundation of a new bank. In the Greek Kingdom, he was also involved in numerous works of public philanthropy.

common Slavic danger[1] or as a consequence of the Kingdom's weakness to pursue a more aggressive policy, the main representative of this new perspective, Epameinondas Deligeorgis,[2] proclaimed in his public speeches in 1873 the necessity of *Greco-Ottomanism*. The years that followed would cancel this prospect, at least in the form of cooperation between the two countries.[3]

The reorganization of the Constantinopolitan Greek community
within the concept of Greco-Ottomanism: the transition from Rum to Greek

As already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter (see above, p. 46), the nineteenth century was a period of transition to and consolidation of national ideologies. In the Ottoman Empire, the ecumenist and nationalist discourses were in parallel development: while the former was "building" identities, the latter, following and relying on the emergence of already established nation-states, was constantly "rebuilding" identities. In fact, after the mid-century, the ecumenist perspective attempted to prevent the development of ethnocentric-secessionist visions: it is indicative that from the Crimean until the Balkan wars no serious secessionist movement in the Empire supported the irredentist policies of the Greek state.[4]

As we have already seen, after the mid-nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire was being reconstructed not as a cohesive and homogeneous space, but as the aggregate of its *millets*. In other words, the reconstruction of the Ottoman society took place through the reconstruction and transformation of its *millets* into larger ethnoreligious communities.[5] In the case of the *Rum milleti*, through a long and rather complicated process, it gradually transformed from a grouping that embraced all Orthodox inhabitants of the Empire into one that was largely, but still by no means exclusively, ethnically Greek.[6] As I will try to show below, this transformation was mainly dictated

---

[1] Already since the 1860s, turbulence in the Balkan Peninsula started to be expressed and the tendency of the Slavic nations, namely, the Bulgarian and Serbian nations, towards the establishment of independent states was more than visible.

[2] Epameinondas Deligeorgis (1829-1879) was a Greek lawyer, journalist, and politician, who also served as a prime minister. He believed that the best solution to the *Eastern Question* would be the improvement of the condition of the Greeks living in the Ottoman-controlled Macedonia, Epirus, Thrace, and Asia Minor by liberalizing the Ottoman Empire.

[3] Kechriotis 2008 (available online, without pagination).

[4] Stamatopoulos 2003, 361-362.

[5] Anagnostopoulou 1997, 25.

[6] Clogg 1982, 194.

by several parameters: the emergence of nationalisms in the Balkan Peninsula, the development of the Bulgarian issue and the policy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the reorganization of the *millet* through the reforms of the Tanzimat and the participation of lay element in the Patriarchate's administration, the emergence of new social groups, the ideological divisions and subdivisions within the Greek community, the shift from religion to language as the uniting bond of the Ottoman Greeks, the transformation of the relationship between Russian foreign policy and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the policy of the Greek Kingdom towards Constantinople in matters of national consciousness and education. All these parameters had a common impact on the reformation of the *Rum milleti* and gradually led to its split into distinct ethnoreligious communities in the late nineteenth century.

Since the beginning of the century, western ideas of belonging and an awareness of a distinctive "national" (and, of course, glorious) past, started to penetrate the Balkans. This penetration of nationalist ideas came from the fringes of the Empire, where connections with the West (mainly with France, Austria, Germany, and Italy) were easier, mainly through western-educated Greek intellectuals, living mostly abroad. At about the same time, the new revolutionary political ideas of the French Revolution started reaching the Empire. As expected, the Patriarchate of Constantinople predictably resisted the "new ideas" of nationalism and revolution which threatened the Empire, the "purity" of the Orthodox doctrine, and, with it, the unity of the *genos* as it was defined until the beginning of the century.[1] However, the social, educational, and cultural changes within the *Rum milleti* gradually led to the awakening of an ethnic awareness, which aimed not at political independence and statehood but at building internal solidarity of the people who spoke the same language and shared the same culture. In the second half of the century, language and ethnicity gained higher political priority than religion; but the shift from religion to language as the uniting bond of a community was against the very essence of the traditional *millet*.[2]

After the 1840s, the emergence of the Bulgarian national movement, which claimed not only a separate national entity but also the independence of its people/faithful from the Patriarchate's control, played a significant role in the developments within the traditional *Rum millet*. This new phenomenon directly

---

[1]   Livanios 2006, 51-52.
[2]   Karpat 1982, 159-165.

threatened the imperial ecumenicity with which the Patriarchate identified itself already since the sixteenth century. In other words, the Bulgarian issue endangered not just the imaginary community of the Orthodox world, but also the political unity of the *Rum milleti* within the Ottoman Empire. At first, the Patriarchate sustained that it could not cede ecclesiastic autonomy or independence, if there was no political annexation from the Empire, as it has already happened in the case of the Greeks and the Serbians. But on an ideological level, the Patriarchate realized that the time of national movements foresaw the end of its ecumenicity.

The French historian and journalist of the time Abdolonyme Ubicini describes the antagonistic relationship between Greeks and Bulgarians within the *Rum milleti* in the mid-nineteenth century, noting characteristically that "there is no possibility of a combined action [of the Greek populations] with the Bulgarians and the other Slavonic populations, the antipathy between the races being such that they would rather perish separately than be saved together."[1] This antipathy had started to build up after the Greek Revolution of 1821-1828, a turning point in the consciousness of the non-Greek Orthodox populations. The revolution delivered a severe blow to the pre-revolutionary supranational role of the Greek-speaking leadership of the *millet*.[2] Therefore, the Bulgarians would eventually demand the establishment of an autonomous Bulgarian church congruent with the language of the Bulgarian ethnoreligious community. Apart from the Patriarchate, the reformist elite of the Constantinopolitan Greek community, especially the bankers Christakis Zografos and Georgios Zarifis, promoted a policy of resistance to these Bulgarian demands, since they believed that the claim for an independent church was, mainly, aiming at the political secession of the Bulgarians that would endanger areas with either Greek or mixed populations.[3] Finally, the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the schism of 1872 created a new *millet* in the Ottoman Empire, namely, the Bulgarian *millet* (*Bulgar milleti*), which was followed by the establishment of an autonomous Bulgarian state under nominal Ottoman sovereignty in 1878.[4]

These developments, combined with the creation of several other independent nationalized Orthodox churches, namely, the Greek in 1850, the Serbian in 1879, and

---

[1] Ubicini 1856, 238.
[2] Clogg 1982, 189; Stamatopoulos 2006, 261.
[3] Kamouzis 2013, 19.
[4] Konortas 1998, 305-310; Stamatopoulos 2003, 316, 334, 342; Stamatopoulos 2006, 261-262.

the Rumanian in 1885,[1] strongly affected the formation of the collective identity of the Constantinopolitan Greeks: since the 1860s, as the religious schism with the Bulgarians was becoming more evident, the connection between Hellenism and Orthodox Christianity was stressed both by the clergy and the ethnocentric Constantinopolitan Greek press. The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1872 forced the leadership of the *millet* to identify a multiplicity of symbols that would stress the different ways members of the group were similar to each other and collectively different from others: Ελληνορθοδοξία (*Hellenorthodoxia*, that is, Greek Orthodoxy) became the symbolic name of this multi-symbol congruence defining a Greek ethnic group, namely, the Greek Orthodox community.[2] In other words, the traditional *Rum milleti* gradually assumed a more "Greek" ethnic character, since the majority of the "flock" remaining under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate was mainly composed of Greek-speaking populations.

At the same time, the economic and political aspirations of the secular intelligentsia and the entrepreneurial elites of the *millet* came into conflict with the traditionalist ideological position of the Orthodox Patriarchate and its circles. The aim of the intellectuals was first to undermine the church's jurisdiction over cultural production and then to devise a secular culture that would act as the binding agent in the community. In other words, they strove to create a new realm of shared values to attain and preserve "national unity".[3] Joining forces with Muslim reformers, the Greek upper and middle class pressed for lay participation in the administration of the community. As expected, the Greek ecclesiastical hierarchy resisted these changes and advised Greeks to continue supporting the established system of *Gerondism*,[4] which assured an overwhelming clerical dominance over all affairs regarding the *millet*. The passive attitude of the *Gerondes* to preserve the *status quo* that implied an association

---

[1] In a rather odd sense, this process began with the declaration of the Greek Church as *autocephalous* in 1833, a decision promoted by the British and French Embassies to cut off the Orthodox clergy of the newly established Greek state from Russian influence, of which they considered the Ecumenical Patriarchate to be a bearer (Stamatopoulos 2006, 257).

[2] Kamouzis 2013, 25.

[3] Jusdanis 1991, 20.

[4] *Gerondism* (Γεροντισμός) was a conservative Synodal system within the Ecumenical Patriarchate, where senior Hierarchs (*Gerondes*) were given responsibility for the administration of the Patriarchate (in cooperation with the Patriarch). The system was established in the mid-eighteenth century and remained in force until 1860.

with the Ottoman government was often described by critics as *ethelodouleia* (εθελοδουλεία), that is, volitional submission.[1]

It is easy to understand that the reorganization of the administration of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the creation of new balances within its circles also played a significant role in the formation of the Greek ethnoreligious community. As we have already seen, after the introduction of the reforms of the Tanzimat, on a theoretical level, the Patriarchate saw the equation of rights between Christians and Muslims positively, but it was particularly cautious regarding the limitation of its political power and its privileges within the *millet* as well as the increasing control of the state authority over the Orthodox churches and the Greek schools.[2] This reaction was expected, as, until the mid-nineteenth century, the Patriarch, in addition to his traditional spiritual powers, assumed an extensive civil authority over matters of internal *millet* administration. As the head of the *Rum milleti*, he controlled not only the ecclesiastical, educational, and charitable institutions of the Ottoman Orthodox but also the regulation of matters relating to personal status, such as marriage, divorce, and inheritance.[3] However, the edict of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun* and the following validation of the text of the "General Regulations" (later known as "National Regulations") in 1860 introduced significant changes to the administration of the *millet*, as it provided for the formation of a mixed council comprising both clerical and lay members that would manage communal affairs. Therefore, it provided the lay element with the opportunity to participate officially in the governance of the *millet* and to assume the role of the second pole of authority alongside the Ecumenical Patriarchate. At the same time, the role of the *syntechnies* (συντεχνίες, that is, guilds) was drastically limited, both in the process of electing the Patriarch and in the administration of the Patriarchate, to the benefit of the *Neo-Phanariots* and the *bourgeoises* merchants and bankers.[4] These changes would soon cause turbulence and create new balances not only within the circles of the Patriarchate but within the Constantinopolitan Greek community as well.[5]

---

[1] Alexandris 1992, 32-37.

[2] Svolopoulos 1994, 32.

[3] The Phanariot clergy had jurisdiction over all legal cases involving members of the *millet*, except in criminal matters.

[4] The leaders of the guilds of Constantinople had played a decisive role in the election of Patriarchs as early as the mid-eighteenth century, even though they were often controlled by powerful *Phanariots* (Stamatopoulos 2006, 260).

[5] For further information about the transformation of the role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate within the *Rum milleti* in the nineteenth century see Apostolopoulos 1995; Konortas 1998; Stamatopoulos 2003.

The introduction of the lay element into the management of the finances of the *millet* was mainly aiming at the elimination of corruption among the higher clergy in provincial regions, the separation of spiritual and material duties, and, consequently, the reduction of the jurisdiction of the highest-ranking members of the clergy in the *millet*. Concerning the entrance of lay individuals, the reformers hoped to extend the social support of *Ottomanism* to the inner structure of the *millet*, while simultaneously promoting the separation of political and religious fields.[1] The lay element was mainly constituted by representatives of the *Neo-Phanariot* circles, that is, families which substituted the old *Phanariots* after the end of the Greek Revolution (the term *Neo-Phanariots* was originally introduced by the Greek scholar Manuel Gedeon) and the rising social strata, namely, *bourgeoises* merchants and bankers. As Dimitris Stamatopoulos notes, behind the officially declared objectives, there were two basic parameters in the introduction of the lay element to the administration of the Patriarchate: the eradication of all support for Russian foreign policy within the Patriarchate and the overturning of the balance in favor of the *Neo-Phanariot* families, who were pro-Western and supported the reforms in the Ottoman Empire.[2]

This development of the communal structure was affected by and itself affected at the same time the balances and the relationships within the Greek community. As Dimitris Kamouzis argues, the intra-communal antagonism that developed in the context of the reform program was one of the main factors that gradually led to the transformation of the community from religious to national.[3] The different elites, that is, the different influential lay and religious subgroups of the Greek community, played a significant role in this transformation. It is important to understand that the religious and the lay element were not two strictly defined groups that fought against each other for the leadership of the community. On the contrary, there were further divisions and subdivisions within their circles, with different objectives and interests. Moreover, relations of dependency developed amongst members of the higher clergy and powerful representatives of the *Neo-Phanariots* and the *bourgeoises* circles, which indicates that the new balance within the Constantinopolitan Greek community was more complicated than we think.

---

[1]   Davison 1963, 56.
[2]   Stamatopoulos 2006, 260.
[3]   Kamouzis 2013, 13.

More specifically, in the mid-nineteenth century, there were two basic ideological parties within the lay strata of the *millet*. According to Abdolonyme Ubicini, the first party, which was the largest and composed of the *Neo-Phanariot* elite, government functionaries, high officials, the lay dignitaries of the Patriarchate, wealthy merchants, bankers, and financiers, was firmly attached to the maintenance of the *status quo*, since its interests were closely bound to the interests of the Sultan.[1] In other words, this "class" of Greek laymen, which was referred to as the *bourgeoisie*, was devoted to the Ottoman government and supported the reforms. It also supported a more liberal political governance, which would respond more to the interests and needs of these cosmopolitans, inspired by European patterns. According to them, from an economic point of view, the Ottoman Empire already constituted a "Greek state" since all economic life and many public works were carried out either by Greeks or by Greek capital. However, we should note here that the circle of wealthy merchants and bankers, although they belonged to the supporters of the "Greco-Ottoman coalition", did not hesitate to move, in several cases, towards positions of radical and nationalistic character, as, for example, concerning the Bulgarian issue in the 1860s. Moreover, it is important to see this ideological party as a heterogeneous group with contradictory interests that often brought one subgroup against the other. For example, from a certain point onwards, the wealthy bankers attempted to marginalize the political influence of the *Neo-Phanariots* to become the dominant leadership group within the *Greco-Ottoman* party and the whole community.[2]

The second ideological party within the lay strata of the *millet*, which was referred to as the *middle bourgeoisie*, emerged gradually in the second half of the nineteenth century. These uprising merchants and craftsmen accepted the principles of the European economic system (namely, its capitalist philosophy) and conformed to some extent to its business practices.[3] The middle classes mainly constituted of liberal professions, shopkeepers, and petty manufacturers, who were socially differentiated from workers and street vendors on the one hand and the upper *bourgeoisie* on the other.[4] Abdolonyme Ubicini describes them as "partisans of change, desiring or rather dreaming, of the emancipation of the Greek people", who opposed Ottoman

---

[1] Ubicini 1856, 235-237.
[2] Kamouzis 2013, 20.
[3] Karpat 1985, 90.
[4] Chatziioannou, Kamouzis 2013, 123.

domination but did not have a clear idea about the right time or object of a revolutionary movement. [1] Their aspirations varied from the establishment of an independent "Romaic" (*Rum*) state to their annexation by the Greek Kingdom. The latter view was mainly supported by the more radical ethnocentric circles of the group, the so-called "Hellenists" (or "party of Hellenism"),[2] who supported the irredentist policies of the Greek state that were regularly manifested at times of crisis for the Ottoman Empire.[3] The main reason behind the development of an *ethnocentric* proclivity among the middle class was that the political framework formed during the reforms did not allow its members to participate substantially in the administration of the Orthodox *millet*.[4] Furthermore, a significant proportion of this group was educated either in Europe or in the Greek Kingdom and was the vehicle of national ideologies that were reproduced in these academic circles during this time. As a result, they played a more active role in the cultural life of the Greek community, especially in the establishment of institutions, associations, and schools, where Greek culture and education became dominant.[5] We should note here that their involvement in the cultural affairs of the community was, to a large extent, reinforced by the increasing nationalistic antagonism with the Bulgarians after the 1860s.[6] This educated strata of the middle class carried out the effort for the cultural renewal and regeneration of the Ottoman Greeks through various cultural associations, as, for example, the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*), which was already mentioned above (see above, p. 72).[7] As expected, the *ethnocentric* spirit of these associations, expressed through the methodical promotion of the Greek language and culture, threatened the Church's position as an ecumenical and pan-Orthodox institution.[8] It is particularly interesting that, despite their great differences, these two ideological parties shared one basic common objective, namely, instilling a sense of

---

[1] Ubicini 1856, 235-237.
[2] Ubicini 1856, 235-237.
[3] Anagnostopoulou 1997, 301-303.
[4] Stamatopoulos, 2003, 81-83.
[5] Exertzoglou 1996, 55.
[6] Mamoni 1990, 215-216.
[7] We should note that although the *Association* was the brainchild of the *ethnocentric* elites, it gradually attracted members belonging to all factions of the upper and middle classes. Hence, it became the vehicle of a lay-dominated culture, which reflected the effort of the different elites to promote Greek education within the Empire, but also use it as a means for the achievement of their political aims and interests (Exertzoglou 1996, 20, 34-42; Stamatopoulos 2003, 217-219).
[8] Kitromilidis 1994, 51-53; Exertzoglou 1996, 92.

Greek consciousness in those members of the Greek community, who even in the later nineteenth century thought of themselves as Christians rather than Greeks.[1]

At the same time, an analogous division emerged within the circles of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the religious element in general. After 1876, within the higher echelons of the Orthodox clergy, there appeared a split between those who sympathized with nationalistic ideals and those who insisted on preserving the Patriarchate's ecumenical character (in practical terms, this meant maintaining its bridges with the Russians and with the other Slavic peoples of the Balkans). An external divide corresponding to this internal one also appeared at this juncture, namely, a confrontation between the faction of the Orthodox clergy that believed in the ecumenical ideal and, therefore, the preservation of the imperial model, and the faction that condoned the irredentist policies that the Greek state had set into motion in the late nineteenth century.[2]

Thus, due to the parallel influence of the above-mentioned interrelated parameters, together with the existence of the Greek Kingdom that provided an alternative focus for the loyalty of the Ottoman Greeks (this parameter will be separately studied below), the *Rum milleti* gradually transformed into a distinct ethnoreligious community within the context of *Ottomanism*. At the end of the nineteenth century, the traditional Orthodox Christian *millet* practically came to mean Greek *millet*.[3] On the whole, already by the end of the Tanzimat period in 1876 the Ottoman Empire no longer represented a multi-religious, but rather a multi-ethnic state.[4] What is particularly interesting is that although the reforms did indeed bring about the internal reorganization of the traditional *millets* and their transformation into ethnoreligious communities, they recognized, at the same time, that the Ottoman government was the source of their rights and freedoms. In other words, the reforms made the "new *millets*" increasingly subject to governmental control and regulation.

---

[1]   Clogg 1982, 197-198; see also p. 55, footnote 1.
[2]   Stamatopoulos 2006, 266.
[3]   We should note here that the Armenian and Jewish *millet*s experienced an inner upheaval similar to the one created in the *Rum milleti* by the reforms of the Tanzimat. In other words, the clash between conservatives and reformists also played a significant role in the transformation of these two religious communities into an Armenian and Jewish ethnic group, respectively.
[4]   Kamouzis 2013, 25.

The Greek Kingdom and the relationship between its subjects and the Ottoman Greeks in the second half of the nineteenth century

In order to understand the relationship between the subjects of the Greek Kingdom and the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, it is necessary, at first, to distinguish the terms *Hellenism* (ελληνισμός) and *Helladism* (ελλαδισμός). *Hellenism* refers to the ethnic-cultural entity that is characterized by a historical continuity of three thousand years and includes all Greeks throughout the Balkans, central and western Europe, and the Near East. *Helladism*, on the other hand, is a much younger term, which emerged after the establishment of the independent Greek state and refers to all the political, economic, social, institutional, and cultural expressions manifested in it. As for the relationship between the two terms, Giorgos Prevelakis aptly observes that in the conducive geopolitical and ideological context of the nineteenth century, *Helladism* claimed to incorporate all the expressions of *Hellenism*.[1] In other words, on the one side, there was a wide Greek-Orthodox world, with a stable, ecumenical perception of things, led by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and, on the other side, there was the Greek world, with an ethnocentric perception of things, "Hellene-centered", led by the Greek state. In the relationship between these two worlds prevailed *ab initio* the stereotype of conflict: Constantinople versus Athens, ecumenism versus ethnocentrism, ecumenical Patriarchate versus ethnocentric Greek state. This relationship manifested itself as a conflict insofar as it expressed the attempt to legitimize both the Greek state as the national center of the *millet* and the power of the Patriarchate on the Greek *genos*.[2] Moreover, the term which was used to refer to the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire was indicative of the way that the subjects of the Greek Kingdom saw them; for the latter, the Ottoman Greeks were the "unredeemed brothers" (αλύτρωτοι αδελφοί), a term which was closely related to the vision of the *Megali Idea*. In the last decade of the century, a reciprocal relationship would eventually develop between the Patriarchate and the Greek state, which would become clear from 1908 onwards, when the situation of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire would completely change.[3]

---

[1] Prevelakis 1998, 14.
[2] Anagnostopoulou 1997, 421-422.
[3] Anagnostopoulou 1997, 34-36.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the basic coherent tie that kept the subjects of the Greek Kingdom connected with Constantinople were the capital funds of the Ottoman Greeks; thus, their irredentist aspirations regarding the Ottoman capital developed mainly in relation to this coherent tie. Initially, it was the vision of reconquering Constantinople, namely, the *Megali Idea*, which was gradually replaced by more realistic visions that were aiming more at exploiting the capital funds of the expatriates and at achieving Greek-Ottoman cooperation for the interest of the Greek Kingdom. On the other hand, as mentioned above, the Greeks of Constantinople embraced the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism*, which essentially presupposed the integrity of the Empire. Besides, we should note here that the Church settlement, enacted in July 1833, affected significantly the relationship of the Greeks on both shores of the Aegean for several decades: as it was held to be unbefitting the dignity of the newly established state that its Church should remain under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch, himself highly susceptible to the pressure of the Sultan, the Greek Church was declared to be independent or *autocephalous*, a declaration that caused serious reactions at the opposite shore of the Aegean. Relations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate were not formally restored until 1850 when Constantinople was obliged to recognize the essentials of the settlement of 1833.[1] As expected, the Greek authors of the nineteenth century on both sides of the Aegean evolved within this twofold context; in other words, their perception of Constantinople was based on their national and historical consciousness, their personal experiences, and their idiosyncrasy.

Despite the antagonism between Athens and Constantinople, it is impossible to ignore the great influence of the national ideology of the former on the Greek population of the latter. Already since the establishment of the independent Greek state, the *Megali Idea*, flowing from the political base of Athens, was, in fact, a centripetal force that aimed at attracting all Ottoman citizens who had conscience of their "Greekness"; thus, the Greek Kingdom emerged as a statehood that would enshrine all Greeks. At the same time, seemingly paradoxically, an acceleration of Greek migration from the independent Kingdom to the main urban centers of the Ottoman Empire, namely, Smyrna/Izmir, Thessaloniki, Alexandria, and Constantinople, took place after

---

[1]   Clogg 1979, 72.

the reforming decrees of 1839 and 1856.[1] Motivated largely by economic considerations, several subjects of the Greek Kingdom emigrated to the Ottoman Empire, which offered far greater scope for entrepreneurial talent than did the restricted markets of the Greek state.[2]

The 1870s brought new premises to the relationship between the two sides: those Constantinopolitan Greeks, who had benefited from the reforms of the Tanzimat, whether they honestly embraced the ideology of *Ottomanism* or not, supported openly the territorial integrity of the Empire, saw the spasmodic actions of the Greek Kingdom with suspicion or even open hostility and resisted the effort of Athenian circles to rule Hellenism ideologically.[3] In other words, the relations of the powerful and wealthy Constantinopolitan Greeks with the Greek state, both political and economic, were mainly dictated by their devotion to the Ottoman authority and their economic interests. As expected, this attitude caused the dissatisfaction of the opposite side: the accusations of *reayadism*, that is, of being servile to the Ottoman authority, was often expressed against the Constantinopolitan Greeks.[4] An article published in the Athenian newspaper *Elpis* (*Ελπίς*) is indicative of this perception. According to the anonymous journalist, "the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire are not who they were before 1821, that is, the protectors of Hellenism […], they are simply Turks in every sense of the word, who believe in the Christian religion" (my translation).[5]

After 1875, with the emergence of Charilaos Trikoupis at the political scene of Athens,[6] the Greek state began an effort to be imposed as the only national center of Hellenism. This practically meant that it was claiming the privileges of the Patriarch.[7] The first and most important privilege claimed by the Greek state was, of course, education.[8] The Patriarchate reacted immediately and strove, with the support of

---

[1] According to the census of 1881, more than 50% of the two hundred thousand Greeks living in Constantinople were not born in the Ottoman capital. A big part of them came from the Greek Kingdom (Mansel 1999, 425-426).

[2] Alexandris 1992, 49.

[3] Kechriotis 2008 (available online, without pagination).

[4] Anagnostopoulou 1997, 306-307.

[5] "Οι εν τη οθωμανική επικρατεία διατελούντες Έλληνες δεν είναι πλέον οι πρό της εποχής του 1821 προστατεύσαντες τον ελληνισμόν […], είναι απλώς Τούρκοι καθ' όλην της λέξεως την έννοιαν πρεσβεύοντες το χριστιανικόν θρήσκευμα" (*Elpis*, 15.11.1867).

[6] Charilaos Trikoupis (1832-1896) served as Prime Minister of Greece seven times from 1875 until 1895.

[7] As mentioned above, the privileges of the Ecumenical Patriarch, the "head of the *reayas*", as he was called, were both ecclesiastical and political. The latter mainly referred to the functioning of the justice system and the organization of education.

[8] After the establishment of the independent Greek state, the Greek school system was chosen to serve as the main catalyst in shaping a historical consciousness to unite the nation around a common

wealthy Constantinopolitan Greeks, to face the "danger": namely, it undertook, for the first time, to become itself the main agent of secular education, both on an ideological and an educational level. Constantinople, therefore, asserted its role as the center of Ottoman Hellenism and defined its area to achieve the unity of the Ottoman Greek community in the context of Ottoman legitimacy. Moreover, due to political developments and pressure, it would gradually be limited to the role of the "multiplicator" of the values that came from Athens.[1]

The Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity in the second half of the nineteenth century

All the above-mentioned parameters had a great influence on the formation of the Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity in the second half of the nineteenth century. During this period, the official boundaries between religion and ethnicity became increasingly blurred. On the one hand, religion still served as the principal organizational and ideological focus of the Constantinopolitan Greek community and was so treated by the authorities. We should not forget that being the dominant group within the *Rum milleti*, the Greeks have always consistently identified their "national conscience" with their religious beliefs.[2] Yet in the mid-nineteenth century, certain reforms launched by the state tended to subvert the religious nature of the community. This new policy led to a significant transformation of the historical consciousness and the ideological identity of the Ottoman Greeks: while in the eighteenth century they claimed to be "Romans" (or *Rums*, in Greek: *Ρωμιοί*),[3] in the nineteenth century, they saw themselves as "Greeks". In other words, before the establishment of the Greek Kingdom, faithful to the belief that they descended directly from the citizens of Roman-Byzantine Constantinople, most Greeks of the Ottoman lands saw themselves as Romans, heirs of the Byzantium.[4] Moreover, since 1832, the term *Rum* was used as an

---

national identity. As expected, in this school system, Greek history was portrayed as an unbroken historical continuum from past to present. Schools were bestowed with the task of inculcating a Greek identity to both Greek-speaking populations and to those who were not quite certain what to call themselves.

[1] Anagnostopoulou 1997, 299, 428-433.
[2] Svolopoulos 1994, 12-13.
[3] The Ottomans also acknowledged this fact by addressing the Orthodox community as *Rum milleti*.
[4] The Byzantine Empire, also referred to as the Eastern Roman Empire, was the continuation of the Roman Empire in its eastern provinces during Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, when its capital was Constantinople, also known as the "New Rome". Its citizens referred to their empire simply as

ingenious device to distinguish a Greek of the Ottoman Empire from a Greek of the independent state, whose citizens were known to the Ottomans as *Yunanlı*.[1]

However, due to the expansion of nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula, the equation of "Christian" with "Greek" was coming under an increasingly strong attack. Religion, although still important, was now not enough; on the contrary, language became increasingly accepted as a valid criterion of ethnicity and the main signifier of the "Greek". For Adamantios Korais and many intellectuals of Modern Greek Enlightenment, the "Greek" could only be someone who speaks Greek. In fact, after the mid-century, within the new political and social framework of the Ottoman Empire, together with the establishment of the independent Greek state, language and culture were the elements that contributed to the strengthening of a "national consciousness" between groups that had been subjected for centuries to a simplistic distinction based on religion.[2] The main agent of this process was, of course, the *bourgeoisie*, whose members began to increase both in numbers and power. These modern *bourgeoises*, who had the opportunity to travel abroad (to the newly established Greek Kingdom as well), mainly to trade or study, took the initiative, at least some of them, to transfer all those liberal, humanitarian, and/or democratic ideologies that they got acquainted with to the other members of the Greek community. Centers for further development and cultivation of the above-mentioned ideologies were, amongst others, schools and cultural associations in the Ottoman capital, which began to be systematically established, especially after the beginning of the Tanzimat period. In the 1860s, the Greek language and culture were already the basic elements of a Constantinopolitan Greek "national" identity,[3] which also prevailed in the circles of the Patriarchate and was used as the main "weapon" against the Bulgarian and Rumanian demands for ecclesiastical autonomy. The main objective of the Ottoman Greeks was to disseminate the Greek language and culture, but this policy of promoting a cultural hegemony did not question the Ottoman political context at all. Instead, it used this context and thus, legitimized it and made it necessary.

We should note here that with the expansion of nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula and the establishment of nation-states, the relationship between religion and

---

the "Roman Empire" or "Romania" and to themselves as "Romans" (Ostrogorsky 1969, 27; Kaldellis 2007, 2-3).

[1] Alexandris 1992, 17.
[2] Livanios 2006, 58.
[3] See Zborowski 2019.

nationalism was placed on a completely different footing. What followed was the nationalization of religion, that is, the attempt of the nation-states to harness Christianity to the particular national movement, be it Greek, Serbian, or (much later) Bulgarian. As we have already seen, this process was marked by the creation of the independent national Orthodox Churches in the Balkans. Through the medium of national Churches, religion became the champion of nationalism, for the Church was now attached to national states, or, in the Bulgarian case, to a national cause. As expected, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, still viewing the world largely through pre-national spectacles, condemned the introduction of nationalism into the Church.[1]

Until the end of the nineteenth century, the ethnological composition of the *Rum milleti* had gradually changed: it assumed a more "Greek" ethnic character since the majority of the "flock" remaining under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate was mainly composed of Greek-speaking populations. Therefore, regular communication within the same ethnoreligious group led gradually to the strengthening of the consciousness of a common identity for the Ottoman Greeks.[2] This new sense of identity defined that "every young *Rum* (here, meaning "Greek") was responsible to two distinct authorities: his family and his *ethnos* (*nation*), which was conceived of as the totality of those of the "same race" (*omogeneis*), past, present, and future, who were conscious of their rights and responsibilities within the Ottoman Empire".[3] Indeed, this new conception allowed for new loyalties to develop to the abstract notion of the *ethnos* as defined by the new leaders in contradistinction to the former conceptions developed by the Church and its communal leaders. As expected, the press and literature also played a decisive role within this transformational process.

---

[1]   Livanios 2006, 64-66.
[2]   Svolopoulos 1994, 81-82.
[3]   Göçek 1996, 109.

6.0.   The Constantinopolitan Greek press and literary production in the second half of the nineteenth century

The nineteenth century may be described as an age of immense publishing activity in the Ottoman Empire. Besides the increase in the number of books printed independently, from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, newspapers circulating in various languages and alphabets started to become one of the fundamental tools of literary production, especially due to *romans feuilletons*, book announcements, printing house advertisements, and readers' letters. As mentioned above, since the mid-century, in the context of the political, administrative, and social changes brought about by the reforms of the Tanzimat, the Constantinopolitan Greek community experienced unprecedented cultural, educational, and literary prosperity. The 1860s brought a huge boom in the Greek-speaking press of Constantinople, which was related to the internal reconstruction of the Greek community with the National Assembly of 1858-1860 and the "General Regulations" of 1862.[1] Ali Arslan cites two hundred forty-eight newspapers and magazines printed in Greek, or in both Greek and Turkish, or in Greek and other languages like French and Italian, which circulated in the Ottoman Empire between the years 1831 and 1923. Interestingly, Greek newspapers were not only established by Greeks, but also by Muslim journalists. Likewise, there were Greek figures who contributed to Ottoman journalism through their Turkish newspapers.[2] Having a look at the list of Greek newspapers and journals published in the second half of the nineteenth century, one can recognize few newspapers that enjoyed long-term circulation; among them are *Amaltheia* (*Αμάλθεια*, 1838-1923), *Byzantis* (*Βυζαντίς*, 1850-1906/7?), *Neologos* (*Νεολόγος*, 1861-1923), *Anatolikos Astir* (*Ανατολικός Αστήρ*, 1861-1900?), *Ellinikos Filologikos Syllogos* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος*, that is, the journal published by the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople*, 1864-1922), *Konstantinoupolis* (*Κωνσταντινούπολις*, 1868-?) and *Ekklisiastiki Alitheia* (*Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 1888-1922).[3]

However, we should always bear in mind that the free circulation of texts of all kinds was hampered by the Ottoman censorship, which became more pervasive during

---

[1]   Stamatopoulos 2008 (available online, without pagination).
[2]   Arslan 2005, 85
[3]   Şimşek 2010, 110.

the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid II.[1] On February 15, 1857, the Ottoman government issued a law defining the functioning of printing houses (*Basmahane Nizamnamesi*) in the Empire: books first had to be shown to the governor, who forwarded them to the commission for education (*Maarif Meclisi*) and the police; if no objection was made, the Sultanate would then inspect them. Without censure from the court of the Sultan, books could not be legally issued. After 1878, the inspection of all printed material as well as printing houses and theaters was placed under the authority of the Management of Press Affairs, which was overseen by the Ministries of Police and Education. According to the Law of Printing Presses of 1888, publishers of books and journals were required to obtain licenses from the Ministry of Education in Constantinople before publication.[2] Censorship was lifted in 1908, at the beginning of the Second Constitutional Era. However, newspapers publishing stories that were deemed a danger to the interior or exterior state security were closed.[3]

Despite these restrictive circumstances, the Constantinopolitan Greek Press managed to flourish and the literary production of the Constantinopolitan Greeks developed significantly in the second half of the nineteenth century. However, most of the Constantinopolitan Greek scholars and authors had no relations with the subjects of the Greek Kingdom and its literary production. According to the anonymous editor of an article published in a Greek literary journal in 1880, "the scholars of Constantinople and Athens were practically two different worlds with no connection between them – as if they were angry neighbors […]. They were like wild tribes […] that have laws and customs of their own, with no communication between them, except if the fight for existence throws them against each other" (my translation).[4] Even if we accept that the editor of the article presents the relationship of the scholars of Constantinople and Athens rather excessively, it is a fact that in the second half of the century, most Constantinopolitan Greeks produced literary texts addressed, to a great extent, to the Greek community of the Ottoman Empire.

---

[1]   Apart from the Ottoman censorship, Greek books and newspapers also had to go through the control of the *Central Educational Commission of the Patriarchate* (*Κεντρική Εκπαιδευτική Επιτροπή των Πατριαρχείων*) (Strauss 1992, 330).
[2]   Yosmaoğlu 2003, 21-25.
[3]   Şahhüseyinoğlu 2005 (available online, without pagination).
[4]   "[…] ο λόγιος της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως και ο των Αθηνών αποτελούσι κράτη ιδιαίτερα, εν ουδεμιά διατελούντα σχέσει – ως να ήσαν γειτόνισσαι κακιωμέναι – […] είναι ως φυλαί αγρίων, πολλάκις μη υποπτεύουσαι η μία την άλλην, έχουσι ιδίους νόμους, ίδια έθιμα, μη κοινωνούσαι αλλήλαις, εκτός εάν ο περί υπάρξεως αγών ρίψη τας μεν εναντίον των δε" (journal *Mi Chanesai*, 1.60 (1880), 5-7).

As already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, narratives have always been essential to the formation of collective identities. Building a national identity entails the invention of collective narratives, the homogenization of ethnic differences, and the induction of citizens into the ideology of the imagined community. Literature, together with language, has always played a key role in the construction of national and/or cultural identities; it practically serves as a mirror of the collective identity. Literary culture permits groups to empower themselves, particularly when, in societies of belated modernization such as the Constantinopolitan Greek one, they feel politically disenfranchised.[1] All of this aims at fostering a feeling of belonging to help create a sense of national unity and promote loyalty to the nation.

As already mentioned in chapter I (see above, p. 41), during the second half of the nineteenth century, a local culture of the novel started to emerge in Constantinople under the influence of a massive influx of fiction imported from abroad, especially from France. This led to a major upheaval of the domestic cultural and literary landscape, which coincided with the strengthening of the Greek community due to the reforms of the Tanzimat and the re-orientation of the relationship between the two important Greek centers, namely, Constantinople and Athens. In his doctoral thesis, Etienne Charrière speaks of four "narrow literary fields"[2] in Constantinople during this period; in other words, he argues that, in the still relatively contained space of the Ottoman capital, literature was written, published, consumed, and translated in four main languages: Turkish, Greek, Armenian, and Ladino (Judeo-Spanish).[3] The members of each of these "literary fields" "faced the difficulties of writing and publishing original prose fiction in a market dominated by the influx of imported works and dealt simultaneously with a political climate that required literature to express at once the unity and the uniqueness of the national group to which they belonged".[4]

I believe that the ten novels, which constitute the corpus of my thesis and will be presented thoroughly in the following chapter, attempt to attain this objective, that is, to express the unique character and the mentality of the Constantinopolitan Greeks in the second half of the nineteenth century. Each author can be regarded as a special

---

[1]   Jusdanis 1991, 28, 40, 161.
[2]   Charrière defines the term "narrow literary field" as one with a relatively small "human capital", that is, a small number of potential authors and readers (Charrière 2016, 39).
[3]   However, we should note here that the quantitative production and the response of the readership were not equal in all four cases. The Turkish and the Greek literary production were the most dominant ones.
[4]   Charrière 2016, 16.

case with his objectives and expectations: the origin, the national ideology, and the perspective from which he views the Constantinopolitan Greek community open an interesting literary discourse regarding the future of the Constantinopolitan Greeks and the formation of their collective identity in the second half of the nineteenth century.

CHAPTER III

The Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries*
in the second half of the nineteenth century: a short presentation

Within the economic, social, and cultural environment described in chapter II, several Greek authors published their *City Mysteries* novels in the Ottoman capital in the second half of the nineteenth century. I argue that the ten texts, which constitute the corpus of my thesis, develop a productive literary and, at the same time, ideological discourse and interaction with each other as well as with several novels published in the Greek Kingdom during the same period. According to my perspective, each one of these authors takes his place in this open discourse that follows the developments within the Constantinopolitan Greek community and its relations with the Greeks of the independent state. Petros Ioannidis is the first one who opens this discourse in 1855, that is, one year before the signing of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*, with the first Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* novel entitled *The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople*. In his text, he gives the impression that he sees the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a Constantinopolitan perspective and practically asks for changes and reforms for its future development. Stephanos Xenos with his *Devil in Turkey*, published in Greek in 1862 (the English version was published in 1851) and Konstantinos Ramphos with his *Halet Efendi* in 1867-1869 give us the view of the Greek Other, since they do not originate from Constantinople and, compared to Ioannidis, perceive the city from a rather different perspective; in fact, they both give their readers a rather *orientalistic* picture of it. On the contrary, the Constantinopolitan Christophoros Samartsidis, who published his *Mysteries of Constantinople* during the same period (in 1868), sees the city through the eyes of its permanent resident and presents the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism* that gained ground in the Empire in the 1860s and 1870s. A couple of decades later, we meet two Constantinopolitan Greek authors, who express two contradictory points of view regarding the future of the Greek community: Konstantinos Goussopoulos with his *Dramas of Constantinople* in 1888 sees its future within the Ottoman Empire, while Epameinondas Kyriakidis in his two *City Mysteries* novels entitled *Customs of Constantinople Elpiniki* and *The Mysteries of Constantinople*, published in 1885 and 1890, respectively, views it from a different perspective, that is, through the eyes of the citizen of the independent Greek state, expressing a different ideology and orientation. During the same decade, Georgios Koutsouris with *The Orphaned Girl* (1889) gives us the perspective of the Greek of the Ottoman provinces and focuses mainly on the causes of social pathogenesis in modern society, while Georgios Polychroniadis and Dimitrios Spathiotis, who published together the sequel of *The Orphaned Girl* entitled

The Firefighter (undated but probably not after 1890) give the reader a picture of the Constantinopolitan Greek community at the end of the century. Last, but not least, the Constantinopolitan Dimitrios Melissopoulos closes this literary and ideological discourse with *The Maidservant* in 1897, stressing the need for education for all Ottoman Greeks at the end of the century.

Before we proceed to the study of this ideological discourse, which developed between the *City Mysteries* authors, Constantinopolitan and non-Constantinopolitan, in the second half of the nineteenth century, I believe that a short presentation of the authors and the novels that constitute the corpus of this thesis is more than necessary. Therefore, I decided to include the following short presentations of the texts and short biographies of the authors, especially since some of them cannot be traced in Modern Greek Bibliographies (in fact, only those who also developed their activities in the Greek Kingdom are included in them, as, for example, Stephanos Xenos, Konstantinos Ramphos, Christophoros Samartsidis, and Epameinondas Kyriakidis). The texts will be presented in chronological order according to the original date of their publication as an independent book.[1]

I should also note in advance that the presentation of the ten authors varies in extent. For most of the cases, we can find full or enough biographical data that allow us to have a comprehensive picture of their experiences and orientations; however, for some of them, information is scarce, which sometimes makes the understanding of their texts and the ideology expressed in them rather problematic. In these cases, I mainly look to para- and/or intra-textual information, coming, for example, from the prologues of the novels or other similar sources. Of course, the fact that we have more information about some authors, while less for some others is not to be overlooked: some of them were well-known at their time, particularly productive and active as members of their society, as, for example, Stephanos Xenos or Epameinondas Kyriakidis; therefore, we find several texts of them published in journals and/or newspapers, speeches given at significant occasions, reviews of their published texts and many more. On the other hand, some others, mainly Constantinopolitan Greeks, were only known within the local society, as, for example, Konstantinos Goussopoulos or Dimitrios Melissopoulos, remaining unknown to the readership of the Greek capital and, therefore, to Modern

---

[1] Stephanos Xenos and his *Devil in Turkey* constitute an exception: although the novel was originally published in 1851 in English and should, therefore, chronologically be the first text of my corpus, I decided to present it second, since its Greek publication did not come before 1862.

Greek Bibliographies. I hope that my thesis will shed some light on these special and, according to my point of view, particularly interesting personalities.

1.0. Petros Ioannidis (the "Agerochos"):[1] *The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople* (1855)

Unfortunately, we do not have any biographical data about the first author of this corpus, Petros Ioannidis. From para- and/or intra-textual information, we assume that he lived and worked, at least for some time, in Constantinople in the mid-nineteenth century. Manouil Gedeon [2] informs us in his *Memories of a Chronographer* (*Αποσημειώματα Χρονογράφου*, 1932) that the author of the *Eptalophos*[3] was the later Bishop of Vlanga/Langa, Kyrillos. In Gedeon's words: "The novel *Eptalophos*, a kind of a *libel* [sic],[4] under the name of a pseudonym author, was written, as a very experienced friend of mine confirmed, by Kyrillos, who would be ordinated Bishop of Anastasioupolis (for the parish of Vlanga/Langa) in June 1861" (my translation);[5] however, we don't get more information about this "experienced" friend of Gedeon. In his study on the titular high priests in the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Christos Tsouvalis confirms that "the hieromonk Kyrillos was elected titular Bishop of Anastasioupolis as the head of the Church of Agioi Theodoroi in Vlanga/Langa on June 3, 1861" (my translation).[6] But the information that the hieromonk and later Bishop Kyrillos is the author of our novel cannot be crosschecked. We should note here that the first volume of the novel develops a "mild level" of social criticism and does not in itself justify Gedeon's characterization of the text as a *libel* (*pamphlet*). It is possible that Gedeon bases this characterization on the content of the missing second volume. I believe that

---

[1]   The adjective that the author uses to characterize his person at the cover of the publication is particularly interesting: "αγέρωχος" (agerochos) usually means "imperious" or "lofty" and Ioannidis must be using it as a self-confident pseudonym. Anastasia Tsapanidou wonders whether it could be a family title. I hypothesize that it could also be an addition of the editor next to the author's name to attract the interest and curiosity of the readership.

[2]   Manouil Gedeon (1851-1943) was a Constantinopolitan Greek scholar, author, and historian, closely related to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He has been characterized as the "last genuine Phanariot".

[3]   "Eptalophos", meaning "city of the seven hills", is one of the most commonly used metonymies for Constantinople.

[4]   A *libel* [*livelos*] or *pamphlet* was originally a short of treatise or tract. It then came to mean a short work written on a topical subject on which the author feels strongly, in other words, a confrontational and/or aggressive text, which attacks a person or an idea. Several outstanding authors have used the *libel* to express vigorous political or religious views (Cuddon 1977, 467). Manouil Gedeon notes that *libels* or *pamphlets* were very widespread in Constantinople in the second half of the nineteenth century. The objective of their authors was to correct malignities in modern society and defend religious rights and national interests (Gedeon 1932, 59).

[5]   "Το μυθιστόρημα *Επτάλοφος*, είδος τι λιβέλλου φέρον έξωθεν αυτού συγγραφέα ψευδώνυμον, εγράφη, καθώς εβεβαίωσέ με πολύπειρος φίλος, υπό του κατά ιούνιον [sic] του 1861 χειροτονηθέντος επισκόπου (διά την ενορίαν Βλάγκας) Αναστασιουπόλεως Κυρίλλου" (Gedeon 1932, 60). Sophia Denisi is the first scholar who traced this reference in Gedeon's text (Denisi 1997, 57).

[6]   Tsouvalis 1992, 537-538, footnote 7.

the lack of information about Petros Ioannidis might be an indication of the readership's weak response to his novel, especially if it was the only one that he ever published. But it is also important to bear in mind that the *Eptalophos* was the first original Constantinopolitan Greek novel combining – to a great extent – several conventions and key features of the *City Mysteries* literary genre, published already in 1855, which means that maybe the Greek readership of the Ottoman capital was not yet "mature" enough for such literary works.

As mentioned above, the first volume of the novel was published in Constantinople in 1855 under the title *The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople*.[1] No copy of a second volume is preserved.[2] According to information in the bibliographical catalogs of Ginis-Mexas and Tefarikis, a second edition of the first volume was probably released in Constantinople in 1862.[3] The first volume was also republished in Athens in 1866 under a more intriguing title: *Mysteries of Constantinople*.[4] Classifying the novel into the popular *City Mysteries* genre, with which the Athenian readership was acquainted during the past two decades mainly by reading translations of respective European texts, the editor sought to excite the curiosity of the Athenian readers who were eager to learn more about the second capital of Hellenism and its "mysteries" at the opposite shore of the Aegean. Sophia Denisi regards this republication in Athens as an indication of the novel's publishing success,[5] while Anastasia Tsapanidou believes that the republication of 1866 is a tangible example of treating a literary work as a commercial product and of successful

---

[1] Petros Ioannidis (The "Agerochos"), *Η Επτάλοφος ή Ήθη και Έθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Μυθιστόρημα πρωτότυπον* [*The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople. Original novel*], Constantinople: Printing house "Anatoli" of Evangelinos Misailidis, 1855. This is the publication that will be used in the context of my thesis.

[2] According to the bibliographical catalog of Heliou-Polemi, it was mentioned in the Constantinopolitan newspaper *Anatolikos Astir* (*Ανατολικός Αστήρ*) that a second volume was published in 1865 by the same publishing house. This second volume contained chapters I to III with one hundred forty-four pages; unfortunately, the volume is missing.

[3] The only new thing in this second edition was the cover with the new chronology. In general, the book itself remained the same.

[4] Petros Ioannidis the "Agerochos", *Απόκρυφα της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Μυθιστόρημα πρωτότυπον* [*Mysteries of Constantinople. Original novel*], Athens: Printed by Dimitrios Spyropoulos, 1866. The only thing that has been changed in this publication is the cover with the new – more intriguing – title, while the editor uses the original title of the novel on the first page of the text. This comes as no surprise, since the expectations of the readership in Athens were, to a large extent, different from the expectations of the Constantinopolitan Greeks. The novel promises to reveal the "mysteries" of the second most important center of Hellenism, attempting to bring the Greeks on both shores of the Aegean to some kind of communication. We should not forget that Ioannidis's text is the first Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* novel that was ever (re)published in the capital of the Greek Kingdom.

[5] Denisi 1997, 57.

marketing.[1] Sophia Denisi also argues that the publication of the *Eptalophos* was never completed either due to financial reasons or because of its social content that Gedeon described as a *libel* (*pamphlet*).[2] Anastasia Tsapanidou states that the author is likely to have experienced financial misery, especially if we take into account his intra-textual comments about the low income of the lower clergy in Constantinople (of course, if we accept the hypothesis stated above that he was a member of the clergy). She also finds Denisi's second hypothesis plausible, given that the second (missing) volume was more attacking than the first one, criticizing social and/or religious issues that rankled the Sultan or the ecclesiastical circles in the Ottoman capital.[3]

According to Sophia Denisi, the *Eptalophos* is the first *City Mysteries* novel written in the Greek language, since it combines several conventions and key features of the literary genre, as presented in chapter I (see above, p. 22), adapted to a "Greek" reality.[4] Although Ioannidis does not introduce his novel with a prologue,[5] it becomes clear, already from the first chapter, that he intends to write a *City Mysteries* novel, following the pattern of respective European texts, where he will present the life of the lower class – "τα της εσχάτης κλάσεως", as he notes – in the Ottoman capital as well as of the other two classes, namely, the upper and the middle class. In his novel, Ioannidis reveals the miserable life of poor, common Ottoman Greek people, as, for example, tailors, members of the lower clergy and peasants and, at the same time, the secret abuses and scams of the wealthy *bourgeoises* and the state officials that are often committed for speculative reasons and usually remain unseen. The novel focuses (mainly) on the social phenomena of the urban Greek society of Constantinople. The author criticizes strongly the social injustice and the impoverishment of the "social institutions" of the Ottoman capital, as, for example, hospitals, prisons, and workhouses. The *Eptalophos*, therefore, is an original Greek *City Mysteries* novel,

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 318-319.
[2]   Denisi 1997, 57.
[3]   Tsapanidou 2012, 318.
[4]   Denisi 1997, 56.
[5]   Instead, Ioannidis prefers to introduce the reader into his novel with an excerpt from Xenophon's *Memoirs*: "It is not very easy to find an action, which does not attract criticism; because it is difficult to do something in a way that you make no mistakes; but it is also difficult, after doing something unmistakably, not to find an ignorant judge" (my translation) ("Οὐ πάνυ γε ῥάδιον ἐστιν εὑρεῖν ἔργον, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ οὐκ ἄν τις αἰτίαν ἔχοι· χαλεπὸν γὰρ οὕτω τι ποιῆσαι, ὥστε μηδὲν ἁμαρτεῖν· χαλεπὸν δὲ καὶ ἀναμαρτήτως τι ποιήσαντας μὴ ἀγνώμονι κριτῇ περιτυχεῖν", Ξενοφ. *Απομν.* β΄, η΄, στ΄). The author seems to believe that every action or decision attracts criticism, no matter what; he is, therefore, ready to face any criticism on his first literary project.

depicting the social decay and injustice in Constantinople, an "eastern"[1] urban center, which can, to a large extent, be compared to the megalopolises of western Europe in the mid-nineteenth century. The extensive novel (the first volume exceeds four hundred pages) intertwines several stories and characters and reveals the corruption that exists primarily within the middle and upper classes of modern society.

The plot of the *Eptalophos* is based on three main stories. "Jumping" from one story to the other the narrator often promises the reader that he will, later on, fill in all temporary gaps in the plot with clarifications and explanations. The story begins on May Day, 1845, but in the next chapters, the plot goes back to the past through several flashbacks until the massacre of Chios island in 1822 (that is, at the beginning of the Greek Revolution). Firstly, the narration revolves around an impoverished tailor from the district of Sarmasikion/Sarmaşık at the "old" part of the Ottoman capital,[2] who is driven out of his own house by his heartless wife due to his poverty. The reader finds again the thread of this story at the end of the first volume, where he is informed that the long-suffering tailor, after wandering around the streets of Constantinople for a long time, meets accidentally, but without recognizing him, his long-awaited son, who has just returned to Constantinople after completing his studies in Europe. The second story revolves around a young couple, Alexandros and Aikaterini, who grew up together in the house of the former's father, a virtuous priest, who provided shelter to the young girl and her mother, a former captive after the massacre of Chios island. The two young people are innocent, unaware of human evil, and practically unprotected since the only parent still alive is Aikaterini's father, an insane, bedridden old man. Their fraternal friend, Paraskevas, is the only one who supports them through their problems and adventures. The third story revolves around Aikaterini's uncle named Minas Kalimeropoulos, brother and former commercial partner of her father, who is a banker and lives, in contrast to his niece, in extreme opulence and debauchery. During the past five years, he has been borrowing large sums of money from the Armenian banker and moneylender Karabet Ağa, and now it is impossible to pay him back. To get out of this difficult situation, the corrupted and shameless Minas promises his lender to help him have sexual intercourse with his niece, Aikaterini: so, he sets a trap

---

[1] "Eastern" compared to the urban centers of western Europe, as, for example, Paris or London.
[2] The district of Sarmasikion/Sarmaşık (formerly: Sarmation) was situated at the northwestern inner part of the old town. All neighborhoods bordering with the (land) gates of the old city were mainly inhabited by Greeks, densely populated, filthy, and stench.

to get her out of her home alone and takes her to a village at the Asiatic coast of the Bosporus. There, he persuades its unaware inhabitants with lies to help him achieve his purpose. Aikaterini is saved from disgrace at the last moment, thanks to the timely intervention of Paraskevas and her beloved Alexandros. At the end of the first volume, the story remains open until the complete remediation of the miserable heroes and the restitution of moral order.[1] As mentioned above, being the first original Greek *City Mysteries* novel, the *Eptalophos* compiles several conventions and key features of the literary genre, following the patterns of respective European texts, as, for example, Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*.

---

[1] We should note here that the narrator promises his readers, almost from the beginning of the novel, that Aikaterini's virtue will triumph in the end, with her dead mother's protection and the help of God.

2.0. Stephanos Xenos: *The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople* (1851/1862)

Unlike Petros Ioannidis, we have plenty of information about the life and the action of the second author who will be a subject of study in the context of this thesis, Stephanos Xenos. All this ample information comes from the fact that Xenos was an extremely active Greek of the Diaspora, that is, a respected member of the Greek community in London, but also quite well-known in the Greek Kingdom, mainly for his enterprising commercial activities. As the author and historian Konstantinos Rados noted in his open lecture about Xenos at the Literary Association "Parnassos" (*Παρνασσός*) in 1917, "his brain, for almost thirty years of continuous and large production, literary and industrial at the same time, was 'boiling' like a real Vesuvius in tumult, hurling lavas, ashes, but also inflamed fireballs of admirable brightness, enlightening around the Greek horizon" (my translation).[1] Stephanos Xenos was a well-known businessman and owner of twenty-five steam-powered ships, but also a successful newspaper publisher, journalist, and author.[2] Moreover, he is considered by several scholars as the main initiator of the Greek historical novel.[3] With his most popular novel entitled *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution* (*Η Ηρωίς της Ελληνικής Επαναστάσεως*),[4] the ingenious businessman managed to gain the acceptance of his contemporaries as a litterateur.

In general, we can gather information about his life and writing activity from his own published texts (namely, novels, articles, essays, and prologues). Stephanos Xenos was born in Smyrna/Izmir in 1821. He came from a well-known and distinguished in commerce Greek family of Patmos island. His father Theodoros was

---

[1] "Ο εγκέφαλός του επί τριάκοντα σχεδόν έτη απαύστου και αδράς παραγωγής, φιλολογικής άμα και βιομηχανικής, εκόχλαζεν ωσεί εν αναβρασμώ αληθής Βεζούβιος, σφενδονίζων λάβας, τέφραν, αλλά και διαπύρους μύδρους θαυμαστής λαμπηδόνος, φωτίζοντας γύρω και εις απόστασιν τον ελληνικόν ορίζοντα" (Rados 1917, 6).

[2] Vikelas 1908, 359-375; Rados 1917, 36-48, 60-61.

[3] Konstantinos Rados was the first to point out Stephanos Xenos's relationship with the great British historical novelist, Walter Scott, in 1917. Later, in 1953, Angelos Fouriotis argued that "by analyzing these historical novels [that is, the whole of Xenos's literary production] we see that Scott's historical novels are always the pattern" (my translation) (Fouriotis 1953, 543). In other words, Fouriotis believes that Scott has influenced the whole literary work of Xenos. And this is not surprising: the young Greek author lived in London for almost thirty years during the period of flourishing of the historical novel and of Walter Scott's great success and was strongly influenced by the British author; this influence is recognized mainly in *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution*, published in 1861.

[4] Following the pattern of Walter Scott, Xenos began to write his novel in 1852. The book was originally published in London (in Greek) in 1861 in Xenos's own journal, *The British Star* (*Ο Βρεττανικός Αστήρ*) and was republished several times in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Denisi 1994, 231).

a member of *Filiki Etairia* (*Φιλική Εταιρεία*), that is, the secret nineteenth-century organization that prepared the Greek War of Independence in 1821, offering large sums of money to the revolution; Stephanos must have been influenced by these revolutionary ideas. After completing his studies in Smyrna/Izmir and Athens and traveling to several European cities, Xenos settled down in England in 1847, where he lived for almost thirty years and was engaged in shipping and mining commercial activities;[1] unfortunately, all his entrepreneurial ventures failed, causing his financial disaster.[2] Alongside his business activities, Xenos participated actively in both the political and social life of the Greek community in London and the political developments in the newly established Greek state,[3] being a member of philhellenic and patriotic organizations, such as the "Philhellenic Association" and the "Committee of Epirus and Thessaly" and taking part in demonstrations against the Ottoman rule.[4] In the context of his political action, he ran in London the journal *The British Star* (*O Βρεττανικός Αστήρ*),[5] where he published articles against King Otto,[6] as well as various texts of commercial, economic, political and literary content; in this journal, he also published serially some of his novels. Xenos returned to Athens in 1877, where he continued being engaged in the public sphere. He died, alone and in a very bad financial condition, in the Greek capital in 1894.[7]

According to Anastasia Tsapanidou, Xenos's literary production is for its most part a combination of his personal and family experiences with political, economic, historical, and social matters that "concerned Greece, European West, and Ottoman East" in the second half of the nineteenth century.[8] He was known for his modernism, his eccentric and enthusiastic personality, and his admiration for the English

---

[1] Xenos was one of the first Greek entrepreneurs to invest in steamships, taking advantage of the developments during and after the Crimean war. In 1857, he founded the "Hellenic and Eastern Steamship Company" and in 1865 the "Anglo-Greek Steamship and Commercial Company". A few years later, he also entered the sector of the mining industry by founding the "Royal Greek Iron Foundry" in Newcastle (1871).

[2] Xenos explains the reasons that led him to his financial disaster and narrates his adventures in Britain in his long prologue of the second (Greek) edition of *The Devil in Turkey* in 1887.

[3] For example, Xenos occupied the position of the Greek consul in London for a short time and pursued (unsuccessfully) a position at the parliamentary and municipal elections in Cyclades and Attiki.

[4] Rados 1917, 60-61.

[5] The newspaper was published weekly in London (1860-1862) and later in Athens (1890-1892). Xenos's original objective was to establish a newspaper that would function as an intermediary between "us", that is, the Greek nation, and Europe (Rados 1917, 41).

[6] Xenos was against King Otto, as, according to the author, the latter did not enjoy European support and did not implement the Constitution (Rados 1917, 40).

[7] For further information about the biography and literary production of Xenos, see Rados 1917, 5-61.

[8] Tsapanidou 2012, 424.

administration and lifestyle. He saw, from a very early stage, the need to modernize the Greek society and criticized strongly several aspects of the administration and organization of the newly established Greek state. At the same time, despite his admiration for the organization of the English society, he intervened critically in English politics, especially regarding the "Eastern Question", that is, the political considerations of the European Great Powers regarding the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire. Konstantinos Rados states that Xenos's biography is, in fact, the history of nineteenth-century Greece through the eyes of a *Homo Universalis*.[1]

Xenos began to get involved in literary production in 1843-1844. His first literary work entitled *The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople* was originally published in English in London (1851).[2] Therefore, theoretically, *The Devil in Turkey* should chronologically be the first novel of my corpus, but I have chosen to present it second since its Greek (re)publication did not come before 1862 (in London).[3] Originally, the main objective of the young author was to attract the attention of the English society with his (English) novels in order to become part of London's intellectual and cultural life. With the publication of *The Devil in Turkey* in 1851, Xenos easily achieved his goal: in the enthusiastic book reviews in English newspapers, the novel was presented as one of the most insightful and pertinent fictional descriptions of the "Ottoman East", especially of Constantinople. As Xenos himself informs us, the sales of the book offered him a net profit of £3,072.[4] It should be noted here that the (re)publication of the novel in Greek in 1862 did not have the same enthusiastic reception by the Greek readership, perhaps because in the meantime (in 1861) Xenos had published (in Greek) his second, most successful and directly connected to the Greek reality novel entitled *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution*. According to Konstantinos Rados, the title and several elements of the narration

---

[1] Rados 1917, 5-6.

[2] Xenos informs us that he finished writing the novel at the beginning of 1848 (Xenos 1887, prologue, XIX).

[3] Stefanos Xenos, *The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople*, translated from the author's unpublished Greek manuscript by Henry Corpe, London: Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange, 1851. The English version consists of three volumes and approximately one thousand and five hundred pages. As mentioned above, the Greek version came out eleven years later: Stephanos Xenos, *Ο Διάβολος εν Τουρκία· ήτοι Σκηναί εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει* [*The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople*], London: Published in the journal *Βρεττανικός Αστήρ* (*British Star*), 1862. A second (Greek) edition came in Athens in 1887 and others followed. In the context of my thesis, I studied the text in its fourth publication in 1892 (by the Publishing House of Anastasios D. Fexis).

[4] Xenos 1887, prologue, XLI.

indicate that *The Devil in Turkey* was influenced by a much older literary work, namely, Alain-René Lesage's *Le Diable Boiteux*[1] (1707).[2] However, I believe that, despite any influences, Xenos managed to create a completely new novel, situated in a different place and time, with its own plot and characters, pursuing very specific objectives.

The plot of *The Devil in Turkey* unfolds during the second half of the reign of Sultan Mahmud II (see above, p. 44, footnote 1), a period linked to reforms in the Ottoman Empire and intense internal expostulations. Constantinople is the main place of the action, although Smyrna/Izmir also plays a significant role in the plot. The extensive novel is not a continuous story, but, as its subtitle (*Scenes in Constantinople*) indicates, consists of a series of interrelated episodes, full of incredible love stories, dramatic adventures, intrigues, and criminal acts related to the main protagonist, the evil Dalpatan Pasha or, as he is called, the "Devil in Turkey". However, from a certain point onwards, the actual plot does not play an important role anymore and Xenos uses all the episodes to reconstruct the picture of the Ottoman "East" in the first decades of the nineteenth century.

The historical context evolves around the Sultan, who is receptive to the implementation of reforms, the Seyhülislam,[3] who protects the interests of the monarch, and Prince Kallimachis (he also appears with the pseudonym Daniil Kokkalas), who tries to influence the Sultan in taking innovative measures to save his Empire. At the same time, the fictional plot revolves around two main protagonists: Malamatenia, the innocent and virtuous daughter of Logothetis P. [sic], a wealthy Greek merchant of Constantinople, and the evil Dalpatan Pasha, a criminal counterfeiter, who managed to climb to the position of the Grand Vizier by using illegitimate means and hinders the modernization of the Empire. Dalpatan involves

---

[1] Alain-René Lesage (1668-1747) was a French satirical dramatist, poet, and novelist. His prose *Le Diable Boiteux* (*The Devil upon Two Sticks*, 1707) was set in Spain around 1700. The plot is particularly intriguing: Don Cleophas Leandro Perez Zambullo, a Madrid gallant, accidentally frees a demon from captivity. In gratitude, the demon takes him up to a high place and makes all the roofs of Madrid transparent so that he can see what is going on everywhere. The demon narrates the stories of the people he can see. These stories of true and false love, robberies, duels, enslavements, and liberations make up the bulk of the book, and the follies, vices, and corruption of the *ancien régime* are mercilessly satirized in dozens of character sketches of people of every kind. Although the work was of Spanish inspiration, its satire was aimed at Parisian society. For further information, see Assaf 1983.

[2] Rados 2017, 27.

[3] The Seyhülislam performed several functions, including advising the Sultan on religious matters, legitimizing government policies, appointing judges, and issuing *fatwas*, that is, written interpretations of the Quran that had authority over the community. He also had the power to confirm new Sultans, but once the Sultan was affirmed, it was him who retained a higher authority than the Seyhülislam. For further information, see Kramers, Bulliet, Repp 1997, 399-402.

Malamatenia's father in an intrigue, accuses him of counterfeiting, and closes him in prison. Eventually, Malamatenia's brother, Leonidas, returns from Europe and saves the honor of his father and his family.[1] The criminal Grand Vizier is judged by the Sultan himself and is sentenced to forced labor on Chios island, while the honor of Logothetis's family is restored. At the end of the novel, Leonidas asks and obtains a pardon for Dalpatan, who repents and decides to embrace Christianity. Zefyros Kafkalidis argues that "the novel is the moral triumph of Christianity over Islam";[2] in other words, he believes that the concept of Christian forgiveness, which covers the last pages of the novel, together with the presentation of the cruelty and injustice of Islam is a way for Xenos to show to the "Christian West" the great difference between them and the "Islamic East". However, I believe that the novel is much more than that, namely, a full historical and sociological description of the Ottoman Empire in the first decades of the nineteenth century, its peoples, and morals.

Apart from the above-mentioned protagonists, the reader meets several other characters that influence the developments and, at the same time, are affected by them. Several different types of citizens and visitors of the Empire are outlined, as well as their degree of assimilation into the Ottoman society. As Anastasia Tsapanidou argues, the element of heterogeneity is present concerning the several ethnicities and their cultural tradition in the multi-ethnic anthropogeography of the novel but also occurs when comparisons between the present and the past of the transforming Empire are made.[3] It is a fact that Xenos fuses the historical with the fictitious figures so successfully that, in the end, the reader cannot distinguish the historical element from the fictional one.

Xenos's first, very brief visit to Constantinople took place in 1842 when the twenty-year-old young man arrived in the Ottoman capital on a French military steamship authorized to anchor in Bosporus; Xenos was hosted on the steamship by the lieutenant Leonidas Palaskas. The two men toured Constantinople for ten days and experienced "the strange side of the Ottoman capital". As Xenos himself stated, he owed "the original idea of writing *The Devil in Turkey* to Palaskas and to this unique

---

[1]   I believe that this could be read as an exhortation to the Ottoman Greeks who have left the "uncivilized" Empire, continued their studies in Europe and adopted European values to return to the Empire to relieve their compatriots from the Ottoman oppression and arbitrariness. According to Xenos, the nation needs these westernized, therefore, "civilized" Greeks (vol. I, chapter I, 8-9).
[2]   Kafkalidis 1998, 100.
[3]   Tsapanidou 2012, 465-466.

experience". It did not take long until the second visit: in June 1843, Xenos arrived in Constantinople as an official guest of Dr. Constanten, the doctor of the vizier Hüsrev Pasha, who hosted him in his mansion for about forty days and allowed him to study the Ottoman capital and collect experiences, which would constitute the material for his novel.[1] However, this short stay in the city is not possible to have objectively offered him the chance to gain profound knowledge of the Ottoman reality; yet Xenos began writing his novel on the spot.[2] In 1845, the author returned to the Ottoman capital, where he stayed for about two months; during his stay, he had the opportunity to collect various topographic and social information concerning the life of the city and its population. As Konstantinos Rados also confirms, "*The Devil in Turkey* is the product of a twenty-two-year-old genius, who wrote most of its chapters while being in Constantinople".[3] The writing was interrupted and continued later when Xenos settled down in London in 1847.[4]

The situation in Constantinople in the mid-nineteenth century disappointed the young author completely. Although he acknowledged the good intentions of Sultan Abdülmecid (see above, p. 62, footnote 1) as the main proponent of the reforms, he believed that this was not enough. A discourse that took place between Xenos and Patriarch Cyril VII of Constantinople (1855-1860), when the former visited the Ottoman capital for one more time after the Crimean war, shows clearly the way that the young author saw the future of the Ottoman capital and its Greek community: while the Patriarch optimistically expressed his certainty about the completion and implementation of the reforms,[5] Xenos expressed his doubt and disbelief, noting that "Sultan Abdülmecid might indeed be the most gentle Monarch that Turkey had seen until this day and, besides that, a man who wants equality and bliss for all of his subjects;

---

[1] Rados 1917, 15-16.
[2] As he notes in the prologue of his first (English) publication, "I commenced this undertaking on the beautiful shores of the Bosporus and little did I then think that it would make its first appearance clad in an English dress" (English version, prologue, iii-iv).
[3] Rados 1917, 17.
[4] Xenos states in the prologue of the (Greek) edition of 1887 that the main motive for completing the writing of *The Devil in Turkey* was his ambition to be accepted as an author by the cultured and refined British high society (Xenos 1887, prologue, x).
[5] "When Ali Pasha returns from Paris", said the Patriarch, "there is no doubt that the reformation will take place. The current Sultan is a man of several strengths, who loves all his subjects and tries to make everyone happy. However, such a great reformation cannot take place immediately; everything will be settled over time" (my translation) (cited in Kafkalidis 1998, 188-189).

however, the Sultan is not the whole Turkey, or, in other words, he is not all Turks" (my translation).[1]

As mentioned above, *The Devil in Turkey* constitutes one of the most pertinent fictional descriptions of Ottoman society in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The novel is full of adventures, but the reader sees Xenos's clear intention to depict the Empire's gradual decline. In his text about Stephanos Xenos in 1895, Timoleon Filimon states that "the central point of Xenos's writings was the beatification of the past and the benefit of the Greek Nation, the assertion of the claims of the Greek race in the East and the defense against those who have slandered it" (my translation).[2] Extremely enlightening regarding the intentions and the objectives of Xenos is the prologue of the first (English) publication of the novel in 1851, where the author states that he does not write the text "as a historian because history is necessarily compelled to pass over the transactions and occurrences of private life: it does not enter into domestic privacy; it records only the acts of government and those of distinguished individuals" (prologue, iv). Neither does he write as a traveler, because "travelers indulge rather in describing the wonders of nature or the magnificent works of art" (prologue, iv). Instead, he writes as a novelist, as he believes that the (historical) novel is the most proper way of bringing the reader in contact with his past and history.

In the same prologue, Xenos states that his main objective with *The Devil in Turkey* was "to make known to his countrymen who live in free Greece and who had never visited Turkey, the condition, customs, and sentiments of the different tribes of that Empire, both before and after the Reformation" (prologue, iv). However, in 1851, the only Greeks that he could communicate his (English) novel to were those living in the British capital, coming mainly from the Ottoman Empire and being there for commercial reasons. His objective to introduce the citizens of the Greek state to the peoples of the Ottoman Empire would probably be achieved eleven years later (in 1862) with the Greek version of *The Devil in Turkey* and, mainly, in 1887, when the novel was republished in Athens. Therefore, I believe that the main purpose of the English

---

[1] "[…] ο Σουλτάν Απτούλ Μετζίτ είναι τωόντι ο ηπιώτερος Μονάρχης, ον άχρις ώρας η Τουρκία είδε, εκτός δε τούτου, ανήρ όστις επιθυμεί την ισότητα όλων των υπηκόων του και την ευδαιμονίαν αυτών. Πλην ο Σουλτάνος δεν είναι όλη η Τουρκία, ή διά να είπω ούτω, δεν είναι οι Τούρκοι" (cited in Kafkalidis 1998, 28-29).

[2] "[…] κέντρον έσχον αι συγγραφαί αυτού [του Ξένου] την εξύμνησιν του παρελθόντος και την υπηρεσίαν του μέλλοντος του Ελληνικού Έθνους, την διεκδίκησιν δε των αξιώσεων της ελληνικής φυλής εν τη Ανατολή, και την απολογίαν κατά των συκοφαντησάντων αυτήν" (Filimon 1895, without pagination).

edition was to dispel several prejudices, which have been created in the mind of the English and European readers by travelers and travelogues referring to the peoples of the Ottoman Empire. As Xenos himself notes, "those travelers visit us for a short period and then profess to describe us, who are divided into so many tribes, speaking so many dialects, and whose feelings, habits, mode of life, and domestic economy differ so widely from their own. […] The foreigner, however long he may reside among them [that is, the various nations of the Empire], however familiar he may become with their language, cannot enter into those domestic privacies, which form our life, and in which human nature and the discrimination of individual character can only be correctly studied" (prologue, vii-viii). The author argues that the traveler is not in the position to distinguish and write down correctly something unfamiliar to him, that is, the cultural differences that divide the seemingly similar races of the Ottoman Empire, namely, the Turks, the Greeks, the Jews, and the Armenians. "We must *ourselves* write about *ourselves*", says the author, "we must make known our sayings and our doings, and then you will be enabled to judge for yourselves who are right and who are wrong" (prologue, viii). With his first novel, therefore, Xenos seeks to present to the European public several scenes from the "East", where he comes from. In this way, he will reveal to the English people who support Turkey in the mid-nineteenth century how people live in this country, as well as the misery and intrigue that prevail in the Ottoman administration.[1]

Already at the beginning of the novel, the author informs his English readership that the terrible scenes described in the text are real: "In the following scenes are represented enormities so horrible, as to appear undeserving of credit, and justify the reader in throwing the book aside; and yet nothing is more true than that they have been actually perpetrated. […] The narrative of these inhuman acts inspired us in our childhood with terror", he notes (prologue, ix). And continues: "It will doubtlessly seem strange to the English reader to find a Satrap and a Vizier described as plunderers and coiners of false money. But he ought to appreciate the greatness of such characters

---

[1] It is particularly interesting that, in his novel, Xenos, unlike the other *City Mysteries* authors, consistently uses the terms "Turkey" and "Turks" instead of "Ottoman Empire" and "ruling Ottomans", trying to show the English people that he is referring to a different nation in comparison to the Greeks of the Empire (the use of the terms *Ottoman Muslim* and *Ottoman Greek* would probably show some kind of connection between them). He sees, therefore, a huge chasm between the ruling Ottomans and the other ethnoreligious communities of the Empire that is impossible to be bridged. We should have in mind that Xenos published his text in a period when the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism* was born and began gaining ground within the context of the *Tanzimat*; apparently, his novel was a reaction to this ideology.

as it really is, and not compare it with that of the distinguished men of his own nation. Let him do this, and what will he find? A slave who has risen to the rank of Pasha; gross ignorance, fanaticism in religion, unbridled profligacy, and an unquenchable thirst after money, for it is only by bribery that these men can hope to retain their position" (prologue, ix-x). The Ottoman Empire is presented as a gigantic arbitrariness; Xenos, therefore, defends the historical truth of his work and warns his English readership that all the felonies and crimes described in it are real and already known to the Greeks of the past, who experienced them as witnesses. The readers should not consider what he writes exaggerations, but accept them as part of the Ottoman reality, where power is associated with great ignorance, religious fanatism, uncontrollable debauchery, and unbridled thirst for money.[1]

Consequently, the main objective of Stephanos Xenos in writing his *Devil in Turkey* was to depict the Ottoman reality through the eyes of the inside observer, who knows it in-depth and not the outer visitor, who cannot reach its deeper side. Moreover, as we have seen above, he presents himself to the English readership as an Ottoman Greek, using the first-person plural ("us"), when he refers to the peoples of the Empire. In the prologue to the English publication, he answers, directly or indirectly, to the English travelers, who argued that the Greeks were so much better under the Turkish yoke, and glorifies the Greek Revolution projecting the ideal of freedom: "As to the ridiculous idea, that a happy slavery is preferable to suffering freedom, I shall leave that to the good sense of the English people, who sent to our aid in that glorious cause some of the greatest characters of the age. […] The independence of Greece has opened the eyes of the Sultan Mahmud and caused him to introduce the reforms he did into his Empire and put a stop to the atrocious acts which the great had hitherto perpetrated with impunity" (prologue, x-xi).

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 455-457.

3.0. Konstantinos Ramphos: *Halet Efendi* (1867-1869)

Like Stephanos Xenos, Konstantinos Ramphos was a rather well-known Greek author of the second half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, we have plenty of information about his life (at least, after the age of forty) and his literary production. Ramphos is the kind of person, whose long life and intense action was devoted to the service of the Greek nation: he was a nineteenth-century Ottoman Greek, who was actively engaged in common matters and developed a functional relationship with his nation and the Greek Kingdom. He was born in the Ottoman Empire, on Chios island, in 1776 and originated from a wealthy family. He grew up on the island, where he studied and graduated from the famous *Great School of Chios* (*Μεγάλη Σχολή της Χίου*);[1] after that, he got engaged in maritime trade. We do not know much about his pre-revolutionary life, that is, for the first forty years of his life, except that he became a member of *Filiki Etairia* (*Φιλική Εταιρεία*), contributed to the dissemination of its revolutionary ideas to several regions of the "enslaved Hellenism" (mainly to the islands of Psara and Hydra) and, when the Greek Revolution broke out and although he was already forty-five years old, he joined the revolutionary struggle[2] and distinguished himself in several battles. After the end of the revolution and the establishment of the independent Greek state, Ramphos undertook action in the political and diplomatic field. He was a member of the Russian party (*Ναπαίοι*), supported the first Governor of the Greek state, Ioannis Kapodistrias,[3] and afterward King Otto and his policy.[4] During Otto's reign, Ramphos served as Greek consul in Thessaloniki (1849), Ioannina (1856) and Samos island (1858-1861), important Greek centers that were still under the Ottoman rule; thus, he

---

[1]   The famous *Great School of Chios* was an important spiritual center of Hellenism, where the Helleno-Christian ideals and principles were cultivated as a protection-shield against the European spirit of Enlightenment that was promoting rationalism and atheism. For further information, see Charokopou 2006.

[2]   Ramphos immediately joined the Greek revolutionary army that was organized under the command of Dimitrios Ypsilandis in Kalamata (Peloponnese) (Filimon 1871, no pagination).

[3]   During Kapodistrias's governance (1828-1831), Ramphos served the newly established state as a judge, commander of the fortresses of Messinia (1828-1830), and governor of Poros island (1831). He openly expressed his sympathy and respect for Kapodistrias in his first novel entitled *Katsantonis* (*Κατσαντώνης*, 1860), through its main protagonist (Tsapanidou 1998, 8-9).

[4] On May 20, 1835, when King Otto undertook the reign of the Greek state, Ramphos gave a celebratory speech in the Cathedral of Aegina island, welcoming the young monarch at the Greek throne. In this didactic speech, the author argues that the main reason for the current miserable situation of the Greek state is the national disunity and the pursuit of personal interest that has destroyed this glorious land and led its once invincible people to the contempt of other nations. Ramphos welcomes King Otto as a representative of the nation's unity, freedom, and independence and states that all rational and peaceful citizens, who love their homeland, must join Otto in his regenerating effort, leaving all antagonisms and disputes behind (Ramphos 1835, 1-8).

had the opportunity to keep in touch with the administrative methods, customs and beliefs of the Ottomans. After the end of his diplomatic mandate, he settled in Athens, where he worked as a lawyer[1] and was the editor of *Syntaktiki* (*Συντακτική*), a newspaper of political and juridical context. He died in the Greek capital in 1871, having spent the last years of his long life in misery and poverty.[2]

During the last ten years of his life, Konstantinos Ramphos focused, almost exclusively, on literature and got involved in writing shorter and/or longer texts referring to the recent historical past. Apart from his inherent inclination to writing, there must have been several other stimuli that prompted him to get engaged in literary production in a particularly critical period such as the 1850s and 1860s, when both internal political developments and negative external interventions created an atmosphere of pessimism and misery in the newly established Greek state.[3] As Anastasia Tsapanidou notes, his great experience in life and all the knowledge that he acquired, constantly moving through the Greek territories and serving in several military and administrative posts in the Greek Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire, must certainly have helped him in writing his texts.[4] All this knowledge allowed him to (re)filter his personal beliefs on major national issues: the relation of the newly established Greek state to tradition, orthodoxy and its cultural heritage, the role of the Western Powers and the Ottoman Empire, the vision of *Megali Idea* and *irredentism* in the second half of the nineteenth century.[5] His literary works became quite popular among the masses for some time, maybe because of their topics that revolved around heroic achievements of the recent past. Ramphos combined ethical and patriotic issues with an attempt of historical and political thinking, romanticism with realistic elements, nostalgia for the recent heroic past with an attempt to guide the new generation. However, we should note here that by choosing to express his ideas mainly through the novel of "national content", that is, the historical novel,[6] Ramphos represented a

---

[1] Ramphos gives us this information in the first volume of the *Halet Efendi* (Ramphos 1867, 196).

[2] Henri Tonnet estimates that the financial difficulties that the author was facing during the last years of his life might have led him to the mass production of "popular novels" (Tonnet 1996, 285).

[3] Koumarianou 1994, 28-29.

[4] Of course, Ramphos also used several written sources, but he wanted his readers to believe that everything that he wrote about was the product of personal experience.

[5] Tsapanidou 1998, 13-14.

[6] Ramphos's novels were characterized as "historical-national" already at his time by several critics such as Alexandros Byzantios and Angelos Vlachos since their plot was mainly based on historical facts and the protagonists were, to a great extent, historical figures, that is, "real" people (Koumarianou 1994, 41).

tendency that was not favored by the new social circumstances of the Greek reality, which was moving fast towards urbanization and modernization. The models that he provided to this developing society, did no longer seem to satisfy its needs;[1] Ramphos, therefore, did not succeed in becoming recognized as one of the representative authors of nineteenth-century Greek literature.

With the three volumes of the *Halet Efendi*, published successively in 1867, 1868, and 1869, Konstantinos Ramphos attempted a synthetic presentation of the political and social life in Constantinople during the first decades of the nineteenth century. Through the extensive novel, which was originally published serially in Ramphos's own newspaper in Athens in 1862-1863 and subsequently as an independent book,[2] he intermingled Greek and Ottoman history, attempting to give the panorama of the latter in close connection with the life of Hellenism.[3] The novel was republished (in Athens) in 1872 with its three volumes tied to one and again in 1878;[4] finally, it was republished in Constantinople in 1909.

The plot evolves within an atmosphere of mystery, deceit, and murder, which allows us to classify it, to a great extent, into the *City Mysteries* genre and include it in the corpus of this thesis.[5] The story takes place in Constantinople between 1816 and 1822, that is, before and during the Greek Revolution, which corresponds to Halet's tenure as Minister of Internal Affairs (*Kayabey*) until his deposition and decapitation. The narration revolves around the public and hidden action of Halet,[6] who took advantage of his great influence on Sultan Mahmud II (see above, p. 44, footnote 1) and expedited, with constant intrigues and conspiracies, the persecution of the Janissaries, of Ali Pasha of Ioannina, of the wealthy Armenian family of Düzoğlu and of the Greeks, before and during the outbreak of the Greek Revolution of 1821. The

---

[1] Koumarianou 1997, 246-248.
[2] Konstantinos Ramphos, *Χαλέτ Εφέντη* [*Halet Efendi*], volume I, Athens: published by A. Ktenas and P. Soutsas, 1867; volume II, Athens: published by A. Ktenas and P. Soutsas, 1868; volume III, Athens: published by A. Ktenas and S. Oikonomou, 1869. In the context of this thesis, the novel will be studied in this (first) publication.
[3] Koumarianou 1997, 249-250.
[4] Several footnotes have been omitted from the republication of 1878, where the author mainly cited historical information (Katsigianni 1997, 39-40).
[5] In the prologue of his novel, Ramphos himself states that he will give the reader "a historical novel of the recent past", which also contains several elements of the ethnographic and the *City Mysteries* novel (Ramphos 1867, prologue, 1-2).
[6] As a historical figure, Halet was an educated Ottoman minister, who managed to "charm" and "control" Sultan Mahmud II and fiercely persecute the Greek Revolution. As a fictional figure, he is a fanatic Muslim and persecutor of the Christians, but also the corrupt Ottoman officer, who deceives the Sultan, defalcates public money, and disrupts the reformation of the Empire.

fiction relates mostly to historical figures, who are connected to the state and non-state Ottoman administration (as, for example, Mahmut, Halet, several state, religious and/or military officials, representatives of the Janissary corpses and others), some of the executive subjects of the Sultan (as, for example, the Jewish banker Ezkell, the Armenian treasurers Düzoğlu and the Ambassadors of the Great Powers in Constantinople), Greeks associated with the Revolution (as, for example, Patriarch Gregorios V or the family of Mourouzis) and, to a lesser extent, people from the lower social strata, who serve those in power.[1] The author tries to give a rough outline of the Greek and the Ottoman customs and morals of the recent past (direct references) and the present (indirect references), in order to define the existing and the lacking political, national, and social ethics of the newly established Greek state.[2] In other words, through his extensive novel, Ramphos expresses his political point of view, commenting on the attitude that the Greek state should follow towards the "East" and the "West",[3] to cope with the needs of modern times.

Angelos Vlachos, in his book review of the *Halet Efendi* in the journal *Pandora* (*Πανδώρα*), recognizes the precise and deep knowledge of history, space, and people through personal experience, as one of Ramphos's greatest literary virtues.[4] In the prologue of volume I, the author himself states that he does not simply undertake to narrate the unknown, to most people, Ottoman history, but to illuminate it through the presentation of the Ottoman Empire's "real physiognomy", the main characteristics of which are the unlawful distribution of power to uneducated, fanatic and/or devious people (as, for example, Halet) and the "intolerant Muslim religion" that will always impend the cultural development of the Ottoman people (prologue, 1).

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 552.
[2]   Tsapanidou 1998, 53.
[3]   For the dilemma of Hellenism between "East" and "West", see above, p. 49.
[4]   Vlachos 1867-1869, 343.

4.0. Christophoros Samartsidis: *Mysteries of Constantinople* (1868)

Christophoros Samartsidis [1] is regarded by several scholars as one of the most significant representatives of Greek literary prose fiction in the second half of the nineteenth century. He was born in Constantinople in 1843 into a family of intellectuals: his mother Ephrosini[2] was a poet and pedagogue and his father was a doctor. After completing his basic studies in the Ottoman capital, Samartsidis came to Athens to study at the School of Philosophy, where he obtained his doctoral degree in 1865. Afterward, he worked for many years as an educator and pedagogue in several cities of the Ottoman Empire: we find him as a teacher in Serres, Monastir, Philippopolis, and Constantinople and a headmaster at the Gymnasium of Andrianopolis.[3] He also undertook the post of the Patriarchal Supervisor of the Greek schools in Thrace, Macedonia, and Constantinople, giving his best for the development of the Greek population of the Empire, both nationally and culturally.[4] This was an indication that he was quite well-known and respected in the Ottoman capital, both by the circles of the Patriarchate and the Ottoman administration. For his contribution to the education of the Greek population of the Ottoman Empire, he was awarded the *Silver Cross of the Royal Order of the Savior* (*Αργυρός Σταυρός του Βασιλικού Τάγματος του Σωτήρος*) by the Greek state, although he remained unknown to the Athenian readership as an author, as the editor of the tribute on Samartsidis in 1880 informs us.[5]

Along with his educational and pedagogical action, Samartsidis was also very active in the field of journalism and press. Originally, he was constantly writing for the most "combative" Constantinopolitan Greek journal, *Neologos*, collaborated with

---

[1] Samartsidis or Samartzidis is an issue that is still under discussion. In Greek, it is difficult to pronounce -rts- without being heard as -rtz- and this is probably the reason that caused the frequent conversion of Samartsidis to Samartzidis. Both forms are also used for his mother Ephrosini (Samartsidou or Samartzidou). In the context of this thesis, we will be using the original form (Samartsidis).

[2] Ephrosini Samartsidou (1810-1877) was a significant female poet and author and probably the first feminist in the Greek-speaking world, who consciously defended women's rights. Originally, she worked as a teacher in the Greek schools of Constantinople, and afterward, she visited several regions of the Greek Kingdom, setting the basis for the development of a modern educational system.

[3] According to the anonymous author of the tribute on Samartsidis in 1880, "the death of his first wife, […] the harsh conditions of modern society and the exploitation of journalists by publishers and editors – a particularly vile group – filled Samartsidis with disappointment and frustration and turned this liberal, openminded, revolutionary and romantic poet and thinker into a teacher, who left the Ottoman capital to work at the center of Macedonia (Serres). New horizons were opened for him and together with the spiritual reformer of Macedonia, Maroulis, he worked there full of enthusiasm for several years" (my translation) (journal *Mi Chanesai* 1880, 6).

[4] *National Logbook of Skokos* (*Εθνικόν Ημερολόγιον Σκόκου*) 1901, 143-144.

[5] *Mi Chanesai* (*Μη Χάνεσai*) 1880, 6.

Evangelinos Misailidis for the Greek edition of the newspaper *Anatoli* (1865)[1] and with Dimitrios Nikolaidis for the (French) edition of *Le Phare du Bosphore* (1869). In 1890, he left the Ottoman capital and settled in Athens, where he co-edited, together with the journalist, poet, and theatrical author Babis Anninos *Parnassos* (1890-1892), the journal of the homonymous philological and cultural association. Towards the end of his life, he returned to his homeland Constantinople, where he died in 1900.[2]

Samartsidis was also very productive as an author and got engaged in poetry, prose fiction, translation, theater, pedagogical and historical studies. He published his first poetry collection in 1860 [3] and eight years later the novel *Mysteries of Constantinople* in three volumes. In general, his literary works were characterized by the strong influence of Phanariot Romanticism.[4] Along with his literary production, he never stopped writing articles and studies until the day that he died[5] and most of his texts were published in newspapers and journals of the Ottoman and the Greek capital.[6] He was also an entrepreneurial pedagogue with ideas that influenced the later development of the science of pedagogy in the Greek state. We read in the Athenian politico-satirical journal *Mi Chanesai* (*Μη Χάνεσαι*) that, when he returned from Serres to Constantinople, "he introduced [in the Ottoman capital] a modern system of elementary education, which transformed the 'cemetery-school' to a theater and the 'dry as pharmacology teaching' to poetry" (my translation).[7] Samartsidis was also a

---

[1] Being one of the oldest newspapers of the Ottoman press and the most influential example of the *karamanlı* press, *Anatoli* (*Ανατολή*) started to circulate in Constantinople in 1850 under the guidance of Evangelinos Misailidis. It was one of the first newspapers to serialize novels for its Turcophone Christian Orthodox readers. Thus, besides articles and news concerning politics in the Empire and abroad and writings about historical aspects of Anatolia, *Anatoli* contributed to the literary production of the period with its permanent column that provided a distinguished place for serialized novels and short stories that came mostly from Western literature (Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2014, 429).
[2] For the biography of Christophoros Samartsidis, see Varelas 2019, 28.
[3] In the following decade, Samartsidis published three more poetry collections.
[4] The Phanariots introduced *Katharevousa*, that is, the purist Greek language, and Romanticism, which prevailed in European literature at that time, to modern Greek literature. Romanticism found fertile ground in the Greek Kingdom since its miserable reality with all the social, economic, and political problems in the first decades after its establishment favored the escaping to imagination or created a depressive mental state. The Phanariot Romanticism turns to the glorious past, ancient and/or recent, makes use of the *Katharevousa* and with melancholic mood and pompous style often reaches pessimism. For further information about Greek Romanticism, see Politis 2017.
[5] "Such a nature could only be fed through journalism; Samartsidis […] had the opposite qualities, for example, high journalistic ability, in contradistinction with the Byzantines [that is, Phanariot journalists], who believed that writing incomprehensibly in a style full of Homeric adjectives, with five or six stereotypical Latin phrases and trivial pictures […] was a sign of superiority" (my translation) (journal *Mi Chanesai* 1880, 6).
[6] Samartsidis published plenty of didactic/educative studies: schoolbooks, pedagogical handbooks for teachers and parents, translations of ancient Greek texts, and comments on ancient Greek literature.
[7] *Mi Chanesai* 1880, 7.

very active member of the Constantinopolitan Greek society, participating in various cultural activities. I have traced his name in the catalog of the elected full members of the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*), where it is stated that he was originally elected in 1877 and was at that time serving as the headmaster of the Gymnasium in Vitolia ("εν Βιτωλίοις"), a city in the Northern Macedonia (later: Bitola or Monastir), a region of the Ottoman Empire.[1]

As for his political action, according to the journal *Mi Chanesai*, Samartsidis had close relations with the American and British Ambassadors in Constantinople and had established, together with other Constantinopolitan Greeks, a center of political (Greek) action in Pera/Beyoğlu, which publicly declared political and intellectual liberty for the Ottoman Greeks, organized associations and demonstrations and was in contact with Great Britain and the United States. His action excited the sentiment of his fellow-citizens and caused serious concerns to the Ottoman government.[2] In 1862, Samartsidis participated in the revolutionary movement against King Otto that led to his dethronement, while in August 1868, head of a group of Constantinopolitan Greeks, welcomed enthusiastically the first American frigate under the command of Admiral David G. Farragut that anchored in Bosporus, publicly asking the United States to mediate and support the annexation of Crete to the Greek Kingdom. This initiative resulted in Samartsidis's arrest and imprisonment in Constantinople for ten days by the Minister of the Police Husni Pasha.[3]

When the *Mysteries of Constantinople* was originally published in the Ottoman capital in 1868,[4] Samartsidis was already well-known in the Constantinopolitan Greek community, mainly for his poetic and journalistic work as well as for his above-mentioned political action. It appears that the novel was well received by the Greek-speaking readership of the Ottoman capital – and not only there: the catalog included at the end of the second volume of the 1883 edition proves that there were several

---

[1] *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople*, vol. XVIII (member's list), no pagination.
[2] *Mi Chanesai* (*Μη Χάνεσαι*)1880, 6.
[3] *Mi Chanesai* (*Μη Χάνεσαι*) 1880, 5-7 and *National Logbook of Skokos* (*Εθνικόν Ημερολόγιον Σκόκου*) 1901, 143-144. For more information regarding this political endeavor, see Tsapanidou 2014.
[4] The novel was originally published in three parts: the first part by the "Printing house of Eptalophos", while the second and third one by "Il Commercio Orientale". One year later, it was republished by the printing houses "Il Commercio Orientale" (vol. I) and "L' Omnipus" (vol. II and III).

subscribers from Athens, Piraeus, Cairo, and Mytilini.[1] The novel was republished at least three times in the last three decades of the nineteenth century; in 1883, it was also released in Athens in two volumes.[2]

Entitling his novel *Mysteries of Constantinople*[3] Samartsidis, already from the cover, draws the reader's attention to the main place of action, namely, the Ottoman capital. As expected, the Constantinopolitan Greek author is familiar with the topography and the society of mid-nineteenth century Constantinople. However, he does not describe districts and places of the city, which are probably already known from prior narrations and descriptions of other authors, but following the pattern of European *City Mysteries*, he attempts to explore and reveal its "mysteries". The intriguing title aims at attracting the readership's attention, which was already familiar with the *City Mysteries* literary genre through translations and original Greek novels published in the past few decades. The fact that Samartsidis chose for his novel a title so similar to *Les Mystères de Paris* by Eugène Sue or *Les Mystères de Londres* by Paul Féval is an indication that he was not trying to avoid the comparison with his French models, whose structure and theme he clearly imitated.[4] With his novel, he succeeded in connecting Constantinople to the main European megalopolises of the time, namely, Paris and London, following the conventions of the *City Mysteries* literary genre. In the prologue of his text, he argues that the strategic position and multiethnicity of the Ottoman capital makes it "a micrography of the whole world";[5] he believes, therefore,

---

[1]   The significant number of subscribers from Cairo (about thirty) is of particular interest, especially if we compare it to the smaller numbers of subscribers from Athens, Piraeus, and Mytilini. One of the former subscribers appears to be a bookseller, who ordered ten copies of the novel, apparently, for sale.

[2]   In the context of this thesis, the novel will be studied in the original publications of 1868-1869: Christophoros Samartsidis, *Απόκρυφα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Μυθιστόρημα Πρωτότυπον* [*Mysteries of Constantinople, Original Novel*], part I, vol. I, sponsored by Dimitrios A. Fexis, published by Il Commercio Orientale, Constantinople 1869; part I, vol. II and III, published by L' Omnipus, Constantinople 1869; part II, vol. I, published by Eptalophos, Constantinople 1868; part II, vol. II and III, published by Il Commercio Orientale, Constantinople 1868.

[3]   We should note here that Samartsidis was the first Greek author who used the word "Mysteries" in the title of his novel (see comparatively the titles of preceding novels: *The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople*, *The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople*, *Halet Efendi*), following the European models of the genre (for example, *Les Mystères de Paris* or *The Mysteries of London*) and making clear, already from the beginning, that his text is exactly that, a *City Mysteries* novel.

[4]   "Samartsidis […] followed Sue step by step and wrote several picturesque pages of fictional narration and social philosophy" (my translation) (*Mi Chanesai* 1880, 7).

[5]   "The geographical position of Constantinople is such that Bosporus emerges as a bridge which mixes Eastern and Western nations" (my translation) (Samartsidis 1869, prologue, 5).

that his own *Mysteries* are superior to other texts of the genre, at least regarding the authenticity of the context.

   The novel's plot takes place between 1842 and 1855, that is, during the first phase of the *Tanzimat* period, while the text was published in 1868 (it was probably written during the previous couple of years). The story begins in Bucharest with the horrible assassination of K. Voithidis, one of the "wealthiest and most reputable" Greek merchants of the Rumanian capital.[1] The three perpetrators of the crime, Theophylaktos, Paschalis, and Angelis, run away to Constantinople with the help of their accomplice Polykarpos, where, a few years later, they establish the secret, criminal "association of the thirty-six", consisting of thieves, murderers, and counterfeiters and walk around the city freely as virtuous citizens. The leader of this association is Theophylaktos, who succeeds in establishing himself in the Constantinopolitan Greek society as an honest merchant with a fake identity (Theodoros Trypanis) and plans to marry Ianthi, the daughter of a wealthy banker (Aristos), to defalcate her fortune. At the same time, the virtuous young assistant of Aristos (Efstathios), who is the son of the "assassinated" K. Voithidis and has not stopped investigating the murder of his father since, is secretly in love with Ianthi. The second criminal (Paschalis), with the fake identity of an Italian exile (Tonneras), coordinates the action in the counterfeiting workshop that the association has established in the district of Kadıköy (former Byzantine Chalcedon). Trypanis organizes a scheme to exterminate the banker Aristos, incriminating, at the same time, his young assistant Efstathios. This scheme causes a series of chain events and adventures, which involve members of his criminal association, the family of Aristos, Efstathios and his widow sister (Filti), and several other characters. Significant figures in the plot are also Paschalis's virtuous only-son Ioakeim, who dramatically commits suicide when he finds out who his father is, the criminal Ploumistos, who repents for his crimes and strives, from a certain point onwards, to protect his former victims, the poor boy of the streets Mountzouris, who tries to discover the identity of his father (it will be proven in the end that his father is the wealthy but corrupt merchant Chrysodaktylos), the English lord John Figaro, who has abandoned his family in London because of his love for the virtuous Magdalini, and many others. Until the end

---

[1]   However, it will be proven in the next chapters that K. Voithidis managed to survive unrealistically and escaped from his grave in the middle of the night!

of the novel, several initially independent stories are connected, revealing the "secret and dark sides" of the protagonists as well as "mysterious and unseen" aspects of the city. Anastasia Tsapanidou notes that one of the virtues of the novel is that most of its protagonists are multifaceted, evolving alongside the plot and "improving their moral existence".[1]

Enlightening regarding the author's intentions and objectives for writing the *Mysteries of Constantinople* is the short prologue that Samartsidis himself puts forward at the beginning of his text, where he clearly states that the current novel is not one of the "random and aimless" ones that have been published lately. I believe that this comment could be read as an indirect implication against other Greek *City Mysteries* authors of the time, as, for example, Stephanos Xenos or Konstantinos Ramphos, who also placed the plot of their novels in Constantinople, but, according to Samartsidis, only managed to give a superficial and misleading picture of the Ottoman capital and its Greek population. On the contrary, his *Mysteries of Constantinople* have a significant purpose, that is, to criticize and control "dysfunctional" people and behaviors and to praise and honor virtuous characters. The reader should be prepared to face the evil, the virtue, and the misery of the Ottoman capital in the nineteenth century "as in a mirror" (prologue, 6).

From the first pages of the novel, Samartsidis challenges the reader to ask himself about the true nature of the beautiful Ottoman capital, as, according to his perspective, the external picture is usually misleading and causes deceiving impressions. The foreign travelers, poets, and authors, who have visited Constantinople in the first half of the century, made the mistake to remain only at the surface, when writing about the city, and judge it from its external picture; so, in the end, they only gave their readership too enthusiastic – therefore, misleading – descriptions of the Ottoman capital and its population. On the contrary, Samartsidis, following "Shakespeare's method" ("την μέθοδον του Σακεσπήρου"),[2] as he states in the prologue of his text, will attempt to study the "externally beautiful Constantinople"

---

[1] Tsapanidou 2012, 383.

[2] Filippos Katsanos argues that, from the beginning, Samartsidis makes a strategic choice, when he states that his novel will not be one more imitation of *Les Mystères de Paris*; instead, following Shakespeare's method, he will be the first to write about Constantinople by applying the "poetic of revelation". In this way, by separating his novel from the *City Mysteries* genre and by integrating it into the category of Shakespearean works, he succeeds in "legalizing" it and integrating it into the field of "literature" (Katsanos 2014, without pagination).

deeply and internally.[1] Since the external picture of the city is visible to everyone, while its internal side has only been revealed fragmentally and epidermically and, in fact, remains a "mystery", the author undertakes to shed light on "this concealed side of the externally beautiful city of Constantine". What Samartsidis tries to make clear from the beginning is that he is not looking for an ideal world behind the phenomena, but for another, deeper, reality.[2] The author also declares his intention of concentrating on the truth, noting that those who have already read the *Mysteries of Paris* or the *Mysteries of London* are aware of the fact that there is always a sense of exaggeration in the descriptions of the crimes and miseries that take place in modern European capitals. On the contrary, he will write down the facts and characters in their "real dimensions", however surprising, paradoxical, or horrible they might seem at first reading.[3] Nevertheless, we should not forget that this was a stereotypical conventional claim of most of the *City Mysteries* authors of the century.

---

[1] "Who knows whether we, following Shakespeare's method and studying mentally, that is, internally, the externally exquisite Constantinople, will not emerge, if not superior, at least not inferior, compared to those who have enthusiastically praised its external beauties?", he wonders (my translation) (prologue, 4).

[2] Tonnet 1997, 27.

[3] Of course, in practice, Samartsidis does not succeed in avoiding the several improbabilities of the plot, as, for example, the resurrection (!) of K. Voithidis.

5.0. Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis: *Customs of Constantinople Elpiniki* **(1885) and**
Peran Mysteries of Constantinople **(1890)**

The following Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* were published a couple of decades later, that is, in the 1880s, a period particularly fruitful regarding the production of such novels by Constantinopolitan Greek authors. Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis was one of them. Firstly, we should note that we are talking about a multifaceted personality: journalist and author, historian and diplomat, he spent his life between Constantinople (Ottoman Empire), Athens (Greek Kingdom), and Paris (western European capital); I believe that this fact itself was quite decisive for the formation of his personality and way of thinking. Kyriakidis was a very productive author, who published thousands of pages, not only of literary but of scientific and journalistic content, as well. He was born in Constantinople (in Galata/Karaköy)[1] in 1861, that is, during the period of reformation and modernization of the Ottoman capital, into a wealthy family (his father was a very successful merchant). After completing his studies at the *Great School of the Nation* (*Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή*), he followed the common trajectory of many young Constantinopolitan Greeks of the time and came to the capital of the Greek Kingdom to study law at the National University of Athens.[2] But he never really cut his bonds with his home-city: during his stay in Athens, he was engaged in journalism, sending texts back to Constantinople to be published in local newspapers. After completing his studies, he returned to the Ottoman capital, where he started working as a full-time journalist.[3] During the last two decades of the century, Kyriakidis commuted between Constantinople and Athens and published a series of novels as *romans feuilletons* in newspapers of both cities.[4]

---

[1]   Galata/Karaköy is the central coastal area of Constantinople with port facilities, situated at the northeastern side of the Golden Horn, which has been a vivid commercial center since its establishment. Its apogee dates back to the second half of the nineteenth century, when commerce was mainly in Greek hands, while Jews and French were also very active (Byzantios 1862, 33-44).

[2]   During the nineteenth century, it was very common for young Ottoman Greeks from wealthy families, after graduating from a secondary school of the Empire, to move to Athens (or to a European capital like Paris or Wien) to study at the university. For them, entrance examinations were not necessary. We must note here that the University of Athens was in the nineteenth century the only university in Southeastern Europe.

[3]   From 1884 to 1887, he was the editor of the Constantinopolitan newspapers *Neologos* (*Νεολόγος*) and *Constantinople* (*Κωνσταντινούπολις*) and from 1887 to 1890, he was publishing his own newspaper *Epitheoresis* (*Επιθεώρησις*). During his stay in Constantinople, he was also a correspondent of the Athenian newspaper *Akropolis* (*Ακρόπολις*) and other Athenian newspapers, as well as of Greek newspapers published in Egypt.

[4]   For further information about the biography and literary production of Kyriakidis, see Varelas 2018, 129-133.

Most of these novels were republished in a short time as independent books, which is an indication that they must have been successful.

Lambros Varelas, who studied Kyriakidis's literary and journalistic production in its whole, characterizes the novels published in Athens as "more daring", while the ones published in Constantinople as "more conservative", although all of them were published during the same period. Of course, this comes as no surprise: the main reason for the difference in context and style must probably be the Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88). Kyriakidis himself notes that his literary works in general "do not belong to the romantic, but to the realistic and psychological school".[1] The author, therefore, declares that he prefers to explain phenomena based on their social causes and the psychology of the individuals.

Kyriakidis had a strong political orientation and undertook political action from a younger age. It is noteworthy that, in November 1888, when the author was only twenty-seven years old, he was awarded by Trikoupis's government with the *Silver Cross of the Royal Order of the Savior* (*Αργυρός Σταυρός του Βασιλικού Τάγματος του Σωτήρος*) for his services in favor of national interests,[2] after being nominated by Stefanos Dragoumis.[3] It is interesting that Kyriakidis followed closely the political developments within and outside the Ottoman Empire during these critical decades and did not hesitate to change his orientation, when and if necessary. For example, at the end of the nineteenth century, he appears to be closely associated with the circle of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Patriarch Ioakim III[4] himself, and was oriented towards Russia as a supporter of the Greek claims since he believed in the union of the Balkan peoples and their co-operation with Russia against the Ottoman Empire.[5] However, during World War I, he reconsidered: he became politically connected to

---

[1] Kyriakidis 1893, 3.
[2] FEK 298A/23.11.1888.
[3] Stefanos Dragoumis served as Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Governments of Charilaos Trikoupis for the period 1886-1890 and 1892-1893, as well as Minister of Internal Affairs (1888-1890). He was one of the leading figures of the Macedonian Struggle, along with his son, Ion Dragoumis, and his brother-in-law, Pavlos Melas. The fact that he nominated Kyriakidis must be an indication of the political orientation of the latter and his support of the national claims of the Greek Kingdom, namely, the *Megali Idea*.
[4] During both his tenures at the patriarchal throne (1878-1884 and 1901-1912), Ioakeim III undertook intense action, aiming at reorganizing the administration of the Patriarchate and organizing a modern educational system for all Ottoman Greeks. In 1884, he was forced to resign from the patriarchal throne, because he protested to the demands of the Ottoman government to abolish the privileges granted to the Orthodox Church. For further information, see Stamatopoulos 2003.
[5] During this period, Kyriakidis believed that Great Britain would not favor the establishment of a competitive naval state in the southern Balkan peninsula; therefore, he turned for support to Orthodox Russia.

Eleftherios Venizelos, shared his orientation towards the Entente Powers,[1] especially Great Britain, and published dozens of articles in the newspapers *Ethnos* (Έθνος) and *Patris* (Πατρίς) supporting the choices of the popular Greek politician. Venizelos sent him to Paris, where Kyriakidis stayed for about fifteen years, developing close relations with important French politicians and people of the press, and informing Venizelos about everything that was going on in the French capital. In Paris, he also published several texts (in French), supporting the Entente Powers and the Greek claims in World War I. We could say that during the second decade of the twentieth century, Kyriakidis functioned as an "unofficial diplomat" of the Greek government.

We can draw significant information about Kyriakidis's identity and ideology from his two major historical works, the *History of Modern Hellenism from the establishment of the Kingdom of Greece to the present 1832-1892* (1892-1894, two volumes) and the *Nineteenth Century* (1902), published in Athens and Constantinople, respectively.[2] According to the academic Michael Sakellariou, Kyriakidis can be regarded as the first historian of modern Hellenism (after the first attempts of George Finlay and Gustav Hertzberg),[3] who "exceeded the boundaries of the Greek Kingdom and its political history" by examining not only the history of the independent but also of the "enslaved nation" and "declared the unity of the Greek nation, regardless if he lived – at that time – in the independent state or the Ottoman Empire", by shedding light to its political, social and cultural history, concurrently.[4] In other words, Kyriakidis appears to be the first modern Greek historian, who focused his studies not only on the establishment and development of the Greek Kingdom in the nineteenth century but on the development of Hellenism as a whole.

---

[1] The "Allies of World War I" or the "Entente Powers" are the names commonly used for the coalition that opposed the Central Powers of Germany, Austro-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and Bulgaria during World War I (1914-1918), originally consisting of France, Great Britain, and Russia. For further information, see Tucker 1996.

[2] Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis, Constantinopolitan, *Ιστορία του Συγχρόνου Ελληνισμού από της ιδρύσεως του Βασιλείου της Ελλάδος μέχρι των ημερών μας 1832-1892* [*History of Modern Hellenism from the establishment of the Kingdom of Greece to the present 1832-1892*], vol. I-II, Athens: Royal Printing House of N. G. Igglesis, 1892-1894; Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis, *Δεκάτη Ενάτη Εκατονταετηρίς* [*Nineteenth Century*], Constantinople: Published by Gerardos Brothers, 1902.

[3] The Scottish George Finlay (1799-1875) and the German Gustav Herzberg (1826-1907) were the first non-Greek historians who saw the history of modern Hellenism as a continuity from the Roman conquest to the nineteenth century.

[4] Sakellariou 1943, 439-440.

On the cover of his first historical project, Kyriakidis introduces himself as a Constantinopolitan Greek.[1] At the prologue of the publication, he states that he decided to write down the *History of Modern Hellenism*, as lately several issues have arisen in the Balkan Peninsula and "fierce competition" among the Balkan nations has been raised.[2] According to Kyriakidis, the Greeks believed that, after "the liberation from the Ottomans", the only danger threatening the newly established Greek state would come from the ambitious conquering plans of the European Powers and that, if this danger was repelled, the Greeks "could quietly devote themselves to the regenerating effort and the gradual cultivation of their national resources". However, the competition among European Powers has led them to "seek customers" in the Balkan Peninsula to accomplish their ambitious plans. Therefore, the main responsibility of all Greeks is to gain detailed knowledge of the causes and motives that led the nation to its current situation, as well as of the dangers that the nation is facing at the end of the nineteenth century.[3]

Kyriakidis supports the idea that, after the establishment of the Greek Kingdom in 1832, Hellenism was divided into two parts, "the liberated and the enslaved Greece".[4] The first part devoted itself to its internal issues and did not pay proper attention to the problems of the "enslaved Hellenism", so that most of those who visit the various cities of the Ottoman Empire as representatives of the Greek Kingdom, practically ignore the ethnological and religious issues of the "enslaved Greeks". On the other hand, the second part was "sentenced to live under relentless tyranny", managed to evolve morally and materially, but lacks political education and comes to the unfair conclusion that in the "liberated homeland", that is, in the Greek Kingdom, "nothing is properly organized". It is, therefore, necessary that the "liberated Greeks" gain detailed knowledge of the situation of the "enslaved Greeks" and vice versa, so that more effective co-operation will be developed between the two parts.[5] It is important to note again that, when Kyriakidis speaks to the Athenian Greeks, he refers to the Constantinopolitan Greeks as "enslaved brothers"; this indicates that he supports

---

[1] Lambros Varelas presumes that Kyriakidis sometimes added the adjective "Constantinopolitan" next to his name to distinguish himself from Epameinondas Th. Kyriakidis (1868-1916), who came from Trabzon and published a few studies on the history and culture of his region.

[2] We should not forget that the last decade of the nineteenth century was very critical for all Balkan nations, as the collapse of the Ottoman Empire was already visible.

[3] Kyriakidis 1892, 5.

[4] According to Kyriakidis, Hellenism must be considered as a whole regardless of where the Greeks are living.

[5] Kyriakidis 1892, 5-6.

the vision of the *Megali Idea*. Looking closely at Kyriakidis's action, it is not difficult to identify his ideology, although his orientation changed during his long life. The Venizelist journalist and historian Georgios Ventiris, who published Kyriakidis's eulogy after his death in 1934, presents him as a supporter of the *Megali Idea* and characterizes him as a "romantic figure" of his time.[1]

In 1885, Kyriakidis published the novel *Customs of Constantinople Elpiniki* (from now on: *Elpiniki*) in the Constantinopolitan newspaper *Neologos* (Νεολόγος)[2] as a *roman feuilleton* in sixty-eight sequels.[3] The novel was republished within the same year as an independent book in two thousand and five hundred copies (!).[4] The direct republication of the novel in such a large number of copies is an indication of its popularity in the Ottoman capital. Lambros Varelas has also traced two registered "illegitimate" publications of the same year (1885) in Athens and Smyrna/Izmir. The novel draws its main subject from the Constantinopolitan Greek society of the second half of the nineteenth century, consists of over six hundred pages, and is divided into seventeen chapters. Neither the author nor the publisher introduces the text with a prologue.[5] *Elpiniki* is regarded as a combination of a *City Mysteries* novel, a realistic and a naturalistic novel, as well as a romantic adventurous narrative. According to Lambros Varelas, it contains several detailed descriptions that remind us of Émile Zola's "naturalistic school",[6] as, for example, the wedding-fest of Georgios and Elpiniki in their luxurious mansion, where all members of the Constantinopolitan

---

[1] Ventiris 1934; the eulogy was republished in the newspaper *Dimokratikos Agon* (*Δημοκρατικός Αγών*).

[2] We should not forget that Kyriakidis was the head-editor of *Neologos* for almost four years (1884-1887).

[3] Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis, "Ελπινίκη. Πρωτότυπος κοινωνική μυθιστορία" ["Elpiniki. Original social novel"], *Neologos*, 1/13.5.1885-24.8/5.9.1885.

[4] Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis, *Έθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Ελπινίκη.* Πρωτότυπος κοινωνική μυθιστορία δημοσιευθείσα εν επιφυλλίδι του *Νεολόγου* [*Customs of Constantinople. Elpiniki. Original social novel published in Neologos*], Constantinople: Published by S. I. Voutyras, 1885. This is the publication that will be used in the context of this thesis.

[5] This was not a common practice in nineteenth-century prose fiction since most of the novels were introduced with a short prologue by the publisher or the author himself. In general, the prologue has always been an important part of literary works, as many authors seek to alert the reader not only to what he is about to read but also to the way that he should read it. It was also common for authors of the so-called "popular literature" to use an introductory note to "defend" their work towards readership and critics (Mastrodimitris ²1984, 17, 23). However, Kyriakidis does not seem to have such a need.

[6] Émile Zola defines *naturalism* as a literary movement, which emphasizes observation and the scientific method in the fictional portrayal of reality. The novel is an experiment, where the author tries to discover and analyze the forces or scientific laws that influence human behavior. For further information, see Bunzel 2008.

uprising *bourgeoisie* are invited.[1] At the same time, the novel is quite educative, as Kyriakidis strongly criticizes the corrupt morals of the modern Greek *bourgeoisie*. The reader can find scattered lectures aiming at social improvement regarding the role of the modern woman, the need for charity and honesty, the unwavering faith in the power of God.

We can get a general picture of how the novel was perceived by the critics and the readership of its time from a book review in the Athenian newspaper *Chronos Athenon* (*Χρόνος Αθηνών*). The reviewer notes that, in comparison to several translated novels, *Elpiniki* is "not a totally mediocre work"; on the contrary, it can compete with several foreign novels, especially French ones, as it successfully presents "national morals and customs" and criticizes "our social wounds". Kyriakidis attempted to give his readers "a moral literary work" connected to "our contemporary national life" and, according to the reviewer, this is the main reason that the novel has already gained great success in the Ottoman capital and is worth being read.[2]

In *Elpiniki*, the reader follows the adventures of Georgios Drosas and his wife, the titular female protagonist, who struggle to escape the conspiracies of the evil Ioannis Vargis. The novel begins *in medias res* in August 1869 and the plot mainly takes place in the European (or Europeanized) part of the city, namely, in Galata/Karaköy and Pera/Beyoğlu, which present a quite contradictory picture: one can meet hundreds of people getting involved in commercial activities during the day, but also witnesses terrible crimes committed during the night. Kyriakidis states that even these Europeanized and modernized districts are not, in fact, what they seem: there is a contrast between what they look like and what they really are.[3] Following the conventions of the *City Mysteries* genre, the evil protagonists take action in impoverished and infamous neighborhoods, as, for example, in Tatavla/Kurtuluş,

---

1   Varelas 2018, 131.

2   "[…] Η *Ελπινίκη* εν τούτοις δεν είνε [sic] έργον όλως μέτριον. Επιτυχώς προς πολλά των ξένων δυνάμενη να διαγωνισθή, έχει τούτο το πλεονέκτημα, ότι εθνικά ήθη και έθιμα περιγράφουσα και τας κοινωνικάς ημών πληγάς καυτηριάζουσα, πολύ παρέχει το ενδιαφέρον εις τον αναγνώστην· εφ' ώ και μετά περιεργίας ανεγνώσθη υπό του κοινού της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως και πολλών ευμενών κρίσεων ηξιώθη παρά του βυζαντινού τύπου. Εις τους Έλληνας αναγνώστας συνιστώμεν την ανάγνωσιν του πρωτοτύπου τούτου έργου. Αφού εκορέσθημεν πλέον φυλλομετρούντες και τα μετριώτερα των Γάλλων ιδία μυθιστοριογράφων έργα, ας παρακολουθήσωμεν και συνδράμωμεν τους μοχθούντας να παράσχωσιν ημίν, αν ουχί τελειότερα, καινοφανέστερα όμως και ηθικώτερα έργα συνδεόμενα προς τον σύγχρονον ημών εθνικόν βίον, περιγράφοντα τας αρετάς και τας κακίας μας, και επιζητούντα την διάδοσιν των πρώτων και την από των δευτέρων απαλλαγήν" (K. Dounis, "Βιβλιοκρισία" ["Book review"], *Chronos Athenon*, 9.11.1885).

3   In other words, there is a great difference between "φαίνεσθαι" and "είναι".

where members of the underworld gather during the night to plan their criminal activities. In the first chapter, the reader meets the two main male protagonists at the Constantinopolitan stock market ("Chaviarochano"). According to Kyriakidis, during this period, that is, after the Crimean war, the economic life of the Ottoman capital evolved around the stock market and "Constantinople could be considered as an inexhaustible treasure, a wide commercial center, a new California in all kinds of products" (chapter III, 49-50). In the next chapters, the narration goes back to 1860 to present the life story of the virtuous and honest Georgios, son of a wealthy mercantile Constantinopolitan Greek family. Georgios graduates from the *Great School of the Nation* (*Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή*), takes over his father's trade house and succeeds in commerce. He lives in the old, aristocratic district of Fanar/Fener, has an office in Galata/Karaköy, and does his shopping in Stavrodromeion.[1] He is distinguished by his philanthropic feelings and undertakes to protect a poor child from the streets, Thrasyvoulos. He is also treating his employees fairly, causing the dissatisfaction of other merchants/employers. The second male protagonist, Ioannis Vargis, also graduates from the *Great School of the Nation*, but follows a different course: he becomes a reckless gambler, procurer of young women, crook, and thief. He wastes his family's fortune and moves to Paris, where he continues his dissolute life, becomes rich again due to stock market activities, and decides to return to the "new California", namely, Constantinople, to expand his stock market investments. The two old friends and classmates meet again after several years and Vargis tries to persuade Georgios to leave commerce and get involved in the stock market. In the meantime, Georgios gets married to the beautiful and virtuous Elpiniki, the daughter of a Greek middle merchant, but Vargis organizes an evil plan, with the assistance of several old acquaintances of him from his sinful past (namely, corrupt people of the "high society" and members of the underworld), to lead Georgios to his financial destruction and to win Elpiniki for himself. He achieves his goal to a certain point, as Georgios loses his fortune – which Vargis misappropriates himself – and goes to prison as a supposed counterfeiter. In the end, virtue overcomes evil: people who have helped Vargis repent and confess their crimes, while those who have been treated unfairly by him in the past (as, for example, his former mistress, Marianna, who got pregnant and abandoned by

---

[1]   Stavrodromeion was another name for the district of Pera/Beyoğlu; Kyriakidis prefers to use this name.

him – in the end, it will be revealed that Thrasyvoulos is their son), avenge and punish him. Vargis's partners are arrested, Georgios is released from prison and acquires back his property, Vargis dies, Marianna lives with Georgios's family, Thrasyvoulos never learns who his father was, and prepares to marry Ourania, Georgios's and Elpiniki's daughter. In the end, everything is back in order.

Kyriakidis's second *City Mysteries* novel was published a few years later. What is noteworthy about this novel is that it was published as a *roman feuilleton* in a Constantinopolitan and an Athenian newspaper at the same time, that is, in 1888-1889.[1] In the Ottoman capital, it was published in Kyriakidis's own newspaper *Epitheorisis* (*Επιθεώρησις*) with the title *Epiphyllis. By Bosporus. Peran Apocrypha* and in the Greek capital, it was published (in one hundred and fifty-five sequels, 27.5.1888-18.2.1889) in Dimitrios Koromilas's newspaper *Efimeris* (*Εφημερίς*) with the slightly varied title *By Bosporus (Apocrypha of Stavrodromeion)*. The text gained great success and it was published again as an independent book in Constantinople in 1890 in three thousand copies entitled *Peran Mysteries of Constantinople*.[2] One more fact that proves the novel's great success and acceptance by the Ottoman Greeks, in general, is that it was, at the same time, translated to *karamanlı* by Evangelinos Misailidis for the Turkish-speaking Greeks[3] and was published serially in his own newspaper *Anatoli* (*Ανατολή*)[4] from June 28, 1888, to August 26, 1889.[5] According to reviews in several newspapers of the time, the novel succeeded in capturing the interest of the readership in both capitals and to make the author's name even more popular than it already was.

The narration begins on Sunday, May 24, 1870, the day, when the great fire broke out in Pera/Beyoğlu. According to the narrator, everything started, when Andreas Zinoviou, having serious suspicions that his young wife was unfaithful to him, follows

---

[1] Kyriakidis was sending the sequels of the novel to the editor of the Athenian newspaper by mail. As expected, this tactic caused several problems and delays, as some sequels were lost on the way to Athens and never arrived at the office of the Athenian newspaper.

[2] Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis, *Πέραν Απόκρυφα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Πρωτότυπον κοινωνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*Peran Mysteries of Constantinople, Original social novel*], vol. I-II, Constantinople: Published in *Epitheorisis*, Edited by N. G. Kephalidis with the official permission of the Imperial Ministry of Education, 1890. This is the publication that will be used in the context of this thesis.

[3] The readership of the *karamanlı* press and publications was the Turkish-speaking Rums of Constantinople, a class of merchants and professional craftsmen, who had migrated to the capital of the Empire from the heartland of Asia Minor. Wealthy and of established social status, they wished to be informed of what was going on inside the Ottoman Empire, as well as in the world at large, just as they also needed a platform to express themselves. For further information about the *karamanlı* production, see Balta 2018.

[4] See above, p. 115, footnote 1.

[5] Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2014, 433, 446.

her to a disreputable district, kills the man that his wife meets, throws her in a water well, sets the house on fire and tries to kill himself. The man is saved at the last minute by baron Kallimachis, the main protagonist of the novel, and is transported to the "National Charitable Institutions" ("Εθνικά Φιλανθρωπικά Καταστήματα") of Eptapyrgion/Yedikule, where he later dies. After these first few chapters (about one hundred and seventy pages!), the narrator takes us back to 1847: the reader follows retrospectively the adventures of Georgios Kallimachis (or Kallias, as his original name was), who comes from a well-known family, but lost both his parents at a very young age and came to Constantinople to work. There, he married Ephrosini, had a daughter, and lived happily for a short time in Therapeia/Tarabya.[1] However, a few months later, his highly ambitious wife reunited with her former lover, Antonios Vodinas, a corrupt member of the Constantinopolitan Greek "high society" and ran away with him abandoning her baby daughter to a woman in Tatavla/Kurtuluş. The "illegal couple" resorted to Paris, however, a few years later they separated. Ephrosini returns to Constantinople with a new identity (she is now the wealthy Eve Allain, widow of a French banker), while her abandoned husband, who spent several years in Russia, also returns to the Ottoman capital as the wealthy and respectable baron Kallimachis. The two ex-husbands meet again, but do not initially recognize each other, nor do they recognize their daughter Ermioni, who was the protagonist of the first scene of the novel and hopefully managed to survive. It will be proven in the following chapters that all these tragic events that led to the disastrous fire in 1870 were only a scheme organized by Eve Allain due to her love for the married (to her daughter) Andreas Zinoviou. In the extensive novel, the reader has the chance to meet various characters of the "high society" and the underworld and becomes acquainted with corruption and immorality that prevail in these circles (for example, adultery, extortion, prostitution, conventional marriages, etc.). With the help of Iakovos, the virtuous son of the procurer Karikena, Kallimachis finds out the real identity of Eve Allain and plans the punishment of his ex-wife: during a charitable event organized in the English Embassy to support the victims of the fire, he brings Eve face to face with her sinful past, leads her to madness and, finally, to death. In the end, the evil characters are punished, while

---

[1] Therapeia/Tarabya, situated at the European shore of Upper Bosporus, is one of the oldest villages inhabited by Greeks. In the seventeenth century, Tarabya was referred to as a Rum village and from the eighteenth century, it became the resort of the Greek upper class of Constantinople, as well as of the wealthy Europeans of the city. It was also known as the "Summer Fener" (Byzantios 1862, 150-153).

the virtuous and honest ones are rewarded: Vodinas gets murdered by his criminal partners of the underworld, while Iakovos is sent to study at a commercial school in Great Britain and becomes a successful captain. Kallimachis with his daughter Ermioni and her two children leave Constantinople and settle in Athens. Twelve years later (1882/1883), Iakovos returns to the Greek Kingdom as a hero, becomes an officer of the Greek Royal Navy, and marries Ermioni.

At the prologue of the publication, the editor N. G. Kephalidis states that he decided to publish Kyriakidis's novel as an independent book, as he saw that it has already aroused the interest of a broader readership in the Ottoman capital. He also comments on the content of the novel, stating that "the author's jocosity and mature cognition of the Constantinopolitan society shines from the first until the last page" (my translation).[1] Moreover, the main principles of social institutions are studied in-depth and several intruding customs[2] are recounted in a "graceful way". According to Kephalidis, this practically means that the text is not basically a novel, but a "social study", as the author criticizes western customs and patterns that cause the corruption of the Constantinopolitan Greek identity. Another advantage of the novel is that it reveals to the unaware reader several "dark habits" of the inhabitants of Constantinople, concerning "the diet, the grooming, and the social needs".[3] As a result of all these, the descriptive value of the text makes it comparable to similar European novels.[4] As Kephalidis notes, the characters of "the immoral rich young man and the corrupt wife" (that is, Antonios Vodinas and Ephrosini, respectively), who depict the social prostration that is caused "with no awareness and as a result of lack of education",[5] are "successfully displayed". The editor states again that he offers the readers not a "simple novel", but a "serious study, covered under the thin robe of fiction"[6] and believes that his Constantinopolitan Greek fellow-citizens will give the two-volume novel the reception that it deserves.

In the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, as in most of his novels, Kyriakidis's main objective is the *nouveau riche* Greek society of Pera/Beyoğlu, whose wealth and

---

[1] "[…] διαλάμπει αμεταπτώτως απ' αρχής μέχρι τέλους η ευτραπελία του συγγραφέως και η ώριμος γνώσις της παρ' ημίν κοινωνίας" (prologue, 1).
[2] Interestingly, the editor refers to the western customs, which were introduced to the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth century, as "unwanted and intruding".
[3] "[…] την δίαιταν, τον καλλωπισμόν και τας κοινωνικάς ανάγκας" (prologue, 2).
[4] Kephalidis appears to be familiar with the tradition of the *City Mysteries* genre in western Europe.
[5] "[…] ανεπιγνώτως και εξ ημιμαθείας" (prologue, 2).
[6] "[…] μελέτην σοβαράν, τον λεπτόν χιτώνα της μυθιστορίας περιβεβλημένην" (prologue, 2).

customs he describes and strongly criticizes. According to the author, after the Crimean war and until the great fire of 1870, the Greek (and European or Europeanized) Pera/Beyoğlu was the center of the stock market and commerce, but also of corruption and pleasure due to the invasion of European customs. The underworld and the impoverished districts of the Ottoman capital are also present in the text, as in all *City Mysteries* novels. This practically means that Kyriakidis draws the material for his novel from the society of modern and wealthy Ottoman Greeks, its customs and morals, focusing on its "dark and mysterious" side that brings it into contact with the underworld. The author's perspective regarding the future of the Constantinopolitan Greek society might be pessimistic, but his objective is educative/didactic.

6.0. Konstantinos D. Goussopoulos: *The Dramas of Constantinople* (1888)

Konstantinos D. Goussopoulos is one of the *City Mysteries* authors who face the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a Constantinopolitan Greek perspective. Information about his life is scarce, but we know for sure that he did not originate from Constantinople; his homeland was Agrafa of Thessaly, a provincial region of the Ottoman Empire.[1] At a younger age, he moved to the Ottoman capital, completed his school studies at the *Great School of the Nation* (*Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή*)[2] and, consequently, he probably studied Medicine at the *Imperial Medical School of Constantinople* (*Αυτοκρατορική Ιατρική Σχολή Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*). Goussopoulos, therefore, followed a converse trajectory than most of the young Ottoman Greeks of his time and completed his studies in the Ottoman Empire.[3] After his graduation, he did not leave Constantinople and continued working in the Ottoman capital as a doctor;[4] later, he also served as director of the *National Mental Institution of Constantinople* (*Εθνικό Φρενοκομείο Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*).[5] Apart from his medical activity,[6] he appears to be very active in matters considering the life of his

---

[1] Agrafa of Thessaly (in contemporary Central Greece) was a region still under the Ottoman regime at the time that Goussopoulos was born, around 1860, but part of the independent Greek state, when he published his novel in 1888 (Thessaly became a part of the Greek state in 1881). We can say, therefore, that the author is an Ottoman Greek, but not a native Constantinopolitan.

[2] According to the catalog of graduates, Konstantinos Goussopoulos graduated in 1883 (Kremmydas 2007, 69).

[3] Unlike other young Ottoman Greeks of the time, as, for example, Epameinondas Kyriakidis, Goussopoulos decided to stay and study in the Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately, the lack of information about his family and his life does not help us understand whether this choice was indicated by other, maybe practical, reasons.

[4] In the second half of the nineteenth century, pharmacies in Constantinople also functioned as examination centers. The practice of medicine in pharmacies was usually performed by younger doctors, especially during the last two decades of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. We have the information that Konstantinos Goussopoulos was engaged in "surgical operations of all kinds at his home" and examined patients in two pharmacies in Galata (Tromboukis 2000, 118).

[5] At the time that he was working at the *National Mental Institution of Constantinople*, one of the four departments of the "National Charitable Institutions" (*Balıklı Hospital* in Eptapyrgion/Yedikule), he published a study on the organization and function of this charitable institution: Konstantinos D. Goussopoulos, *Τα Απόκρυφα του Φρενοκομείου ήτοι Λεπτομερής περιγραφή του εν Επταπυργίω Εθνικού Φρενοκομείου…* [*The Apocrypha of the Mental Institution, that is, Extensive Description of the organization of the National Mental Institution in Eptapyrgion…*], published by the Brothers Georgios and Ioannis Mavropoulos head of the institution, Constantinople: Printing house of A. Maxouris and B. Filippidis, 1889. It is particularly interesting that Goussopoulos, one year after the publication of his *City Mysteries* novel (see below, p. 133, footnote 3), chose to use the term "Apocrypha" in the title of his above-mentioned scientific/social study, probably to attract the attention of the readership that was intrigued by *City Mysteries* novels at that time.

[6] We should note here that the medical community of Constantinople has always participated actively in the cultural life of the city. For example, forty percent of the founders of the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*), established

Constantinopolitan fellow citizens;[1] in this sense, we can consider him a "real" Constantinopolitan. In 1905, we also find him as the counselor of the religious society "The Orthodoxy" in a parish of Galata/Karaköy.[2]

In 1888, Goussopoulos published serially in Dimitrios Nikolaidis's newspaper *Constantinople* (*Κωνσταντινούπολις*) his extensive "original social novel" entitled *The Dramas of Constantinople*. The text was published later in the same year (in Constantinople) as an independent book in four volumes, most likely on Goussopoulos's expenses, with "the authorization of the (Ottoman) Ministry of Public Education".[3] *The Dramas of Constantinople* seems to be Goussopoulos's single novel.[4] Its four volumes reach in total about nine hundred (!) pages and are entitled "The fall" (*Η πτώσις*, vol. I), "The husband" (*Ο σύζυγος*, vol. II) and "The repentance" (*Η μετάνοια*, vol. IV). The third volume bears no title. In his long text, the author gives the impression that he has a thorough knowledge of important aspects of life in the Ottoman capital.

The reader follows the adventures of a virtuous young worker named Dimitrios, who, being deeply hurt by the betrayal of his beloved wife Angeliki, decides to take revenge not only from the unfaithful woman and her lover but also from society as a whole: he blows up the Austrian ship with which the two lovers are trying to get away (of course, both of them are saved at the last minute); he becomes a member of a gang of Ottoman bandits on the mountains of Samsun; he returns to Constantinople with a new identity, that of the wealthy banker Epameinondas Komorinos; he establishes the "criminal association of the iron ring" and commits a series of crimes. Apart from the main protagonist, several characters play an important

---

in 1861, belonged to the so-called "medical philosophers" of the Ottoman capital (Tsapanidou, Kougkoulos, 2020, 364).

[1] The name "K. D. Goussopoulos" is also involved in three collective studies of broader philological/historical interest, which were published in Constantinople in the last decade of the nineteenth century: a "Grammar of Modern Greek Language" in connection to Ancient Greek (1890), a "Handbook of Natural History" (1894) and a "Holy History" in three volumes (1895), all three for educational use. It is more than obvious that we are dealing with an active personality with broader interests and deeper knowledge in more than one scientific field, who believed in the great significance of education for the future of the Greek community.

[2] Tsapanidou, Kougkoulos, 2020, 364, footnote 6.

[3] Konstantinos D. Goussopoulos, *Τα Δράματα της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Πρωτότυπον κοινωνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*The Dramas of Constantinople. Original social novel*], volumes I, II, III, IV, published in *Epiphylis of Constantinople*, authorized by the Ministry of Public Education, Constantinople 1888. This is the publication that will be used in the context of this thesis.

[4] He also published a short story entitled *Τα καΰμένα!* [*The unfortunate ones!*] at the *Oikogeneiakon Imerologion of 1890* (D. M. Giannarakis, I. Ch. Raptopoulos, Constantinople: Printing House of N. G. Kephalidis, 1890, 161-165). I would like to thank Anastasia Tsapanidou and Thanasis Kougkoulos for sharing this information.

role in the plot: Dimitrios/Komorinos's two children, his adopted son, Alexandros, and his virtuous and delicate daughter, Eleni (in the end, it will be revealed that she is the daughter of Dimitrios's lost brother and virtuous priest); his evil wife, Angeliki, whose name contrasts her diabolic personality; his loyal assistant and partner in crime, Narcissus;[1] his lost brother and charismatic priest, Agathangelos, who contributes to Dimitrios/Komorinos's moral reversal at the end of the novel;[2] the devious deputy commander of the criminal association, Mythridatis,[3] who covets the position of the leader and tries to exterminate Dimitrios/Komorinos, and many others. At the end of the novel, the moral order is restored and the repentant former criminal departs from Constantinople to begin a new life in America, with a stopover in Athens, where his beloved ones are waiting for him. The story takes place from October 1852 until 1871; this means that the plot begins shortly before the outbreak of the Crimean war and the signing of the decree of *Hatt-ı Hümayun* in 1856 that created the legal framework of reforms through which the Ottoman Empire tried to implement a modern way of administration to avoid its final decline.

---

[1] Goussopoulos, as most of the *City Mysteries* authors, chooses carefully and meaningfully the names of his protagonists. As in the case of Mythridatis (see below, footnote 3), the author does not choose the name Narcissus by chance. Here, we have an interesting paradox: Narcissus is a hunchbacked man with a repulsive appearance, who, of course, does not show even the slightest foppery or self-admiration.

[2] For the choice of the name "Agathangelos" see below, p. 178, footnote 1.

[3] *Mythridatism* is the practice of protecting oneself against a poison by gradually self-administering non-lethal amounts. The word is derived from Mythridatis VI, the King of Pontus, who so feared being poisoned that he regularly ingested small doses, aiming to develop immunity. Hence, the name that the author chooses for this particular villain, cannot be a coincidence: it expresses his suspicion and his permanent fear of everyone and everything.

7.0. Georgios K. Koutsouris: *The Orphaned Girl* **(1889)**

Georgios Koutsouris published his novel entitled *The Orphaned Girl* (*H απορφανισθείσα κόρη*) within the same decade as Konstantinos Goussopoulos and Epameinondas Kyriakidis. Information about the author is scarce. A travel narration entitled "Letter from Sürmene" ("Επιστολή εκ Σουρμένων") with his impressions of his visit to the small town near Trabzon, published in an encyclopaedical journal in Trabzon and partially republished in an Athenian journal in 1907,[1] gives us a general idea of who Koutsouris was. He probably originated from Pontus, a region of the Ottoman Empire with a solid Greek-speaking population and has visited Constantinople at least once. He was also a proud member of the Educational Fraternity of Sürmene (*Φιλεκπαιδευτική Αδελφότητα Σουρμένων*) "Οι τρεις ιεράρχαι", established in Batumi in Southern Russia[2] to raise money for the support of the Greek schools in Sürmene. Koutsouris seems to be particularly interested in matters of religion and education; we suppose, therefore, that he was an Ottoman Greek of the Eastern provinces of the Empire in the late nineteenth century, who was interested in cultural and educational matters regarding the local Greek community and was engaged in writing as well. What we know for sure is that *The Orphaned Girl*, published as an independent book in Constantinople in 1889,[3] was Koutsouris's first novel, which he dedicated to the honorable and eminent Christos Zappas[4] as a sign of his gratitude and respect for everything that the great benefactor has offered to the Greek nation. The novel consists of about four hundred and twenty pages and although there is no such indication in its title, it can easily be regarded as a *City Mysteries* novel, since it combines several conventions and features of the genre. At the end of the publication, the author includes a long list (about seven hundred names) of subscribers in the

---

[1] Georgios K. Koutsouris, "Επιστολή εκ Σουρμένων" ["Letter from Sürmene"], *Xenophanis*, vol. 5, issue I and II, 1907-1908, 359-360. I would like to thank Thanasis Kougkoulos for sending me a copy of this text.

[2] Southern Russia was largely populated by Greeks from ancient times and has always been important in social, educational, financial, and military terms. In the nineteenth century, privileges were assigned to the members of the Greek community by Emperor Alexander I, who contributed to the increase of its population and its further economic and cultural development.

[3] Georgios K. Koutsouris, *H απορφανισθείσα κόρη, Πρωτότυπον κοινωνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*The Orphaned Girl, Original social novel*], Constantinople: Published by A. Nomismatidis and Co with the authorization of the Ministerium for Public Education, 1889. This is the publication that will be used in the context of this thesis.

[4] Christos Zappas, the father of Konstantinos Zappas, was a prominent Greek entrepreneur, philanthropist, and benefactor of the Greek nation.

Ottoman capital, noting that about one thousand (!) more names of subscribers from the Ottoman Empire and "from abroad" are left out for practical reasons, as, for example, belated arrival of subscriptions or illegible signatures.[1] Apart from this novel, Koutsouris also appears to have published a collection of poems and short stories (*Ποιήσεις και διηγήματα*, 1897) in Athens in collaboration with Chr. Symvoulidis;[2] however, a copy of this publication has not been preserved. Unfortunately, beyond the above-mentioned information regarding his literary production, we do not know more about Koutsouris's life, personality, and/or profession.

As mentioned above, *The Orphaned Girl* follows the plot of a typical *City Mysteries* novel: love, rage, revenge, murders, people of the *bourgeoisie*, and people of the underworld mixing in the Constantinopolitan Greek society of the end-nineteenth century. The biggest part of the plot develops in the Ottoman Empire, more precisely, in Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir, while a few chapters take place in Paris and London. The reader follows the adventures of the main (female) protagonist, the "orphaned girl" Anthoula, who experiences the horrible murder of her mother (Evanthia) and her brother (Georgios) in the house of her mother's childhood friend (Eleni), while the young girl manages to survive the attack. Responsible for the double murder is Petros, the brother of Evanthia's husband (Iakovos), who wants to take revenge for all his sufferings. The narrator takes the reader in the past when everything started: the two brothers grow up in Smyrna/Izmir under the protection of Evanthia's father; Iakovos and Evanthia fall in love, but the young man decides to continue his studies in Paris; there, he falls in love with the young Parisian Lisa and sends a letter to Evanthia asking her to end their relationship; Lisa commits suicide, asking Iakovos to return to Constantinople, where his family now lives and marry Evanthia; Iakovos complies in Lisa's last will, but when he arrives in the Ottoman capital, Evanthia is already engaged to his brother; in the end, Petros retreats, although he is madly in love with Evanthia, settles in London with a new identity (John), joins a criminal group and gets engaged in crimes and felonies. A few years later, he returns to Constantinople determined to take revenge on his brother, but the latter is already dead; instead, he kills Evanthia and her son. Eleni's husband is regarded guilty of the double murder and

---

[1]   However, this number is too large to be real.
[2]   According to the bibliographical catalog of Heliou-Polemi (no. 1897.813): Chr. Symvoulidis, Geor. K. Koutsouris, *Ποιήσεις και διηγήματα* [*Poems and short stories*], Athens: Publishing house of A. Kalarakis, 1897; traced by Anastasia Tsapanidou and Thanasis Kougkoulos (Tsapanidou, Kougkoulos, 2020, 363).

is imprisoned. Petros, with a new identity (Dimitrios Aggeligis), approaches a young urchin of the streets, Kostas, who is in love with Anthoula and offers to adopt him; in fact, Petros's new plan is to misappropriate the young girl's fortune in the Ottoman bank. The truth is revealed after a magnificent celebration in Eleni's house: Kostas is reunited with his biological father, who had to give him away when he was a baby and has been looking for him ever since; Petros falls in love with Eleni, forgets his criminal plans, confesses his crimes and gets arrested. In the end, Kostas marries Anthoula, while the name of Eleni's husband is restored. In a short epilogue, the narrator informs the reader that he will have the chance to meet again the main protagonists of *The Orphaned Girl* in Koutsouris's upcoming – second – novel entitled *Firefighter of Constantinople* (*Πυροσβέστης της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*).

8.0. Georgios K. Polychroniadis and Dimitrios A. Spathiotis: *The Firefighter* (undated)

Although Georgios Koutsouris announced the publication of his second novel, which would constitute the sequel of *The Orphaned Girl*, the text was eventually published with a slightly shorter title (*The Firefighter)*[1] by the journalist Georgios Polychroniadis and the translator of French novels Dimitrios Spathiotis.[2] The fact that the novel was written by two authors is rather notable for the Constantinopolitan Greek literary production of the second half of the nineteenth century.

In his *Memories of a Chronographer* (*Αποσημειώματα Χρονογράφου*), Manuil Gedeon gives us a short biography of the former coauthor: Georgios Polychroniadis was born in 1837 and grew up in a village in Epirus (Skamneli), near Ioannina, which was in the nineteenth century still part of the Ottoman Empire. His father was a merchant. Polychroniadis studied at the famous *Zosimaia School of Ioannina* (*Ζωσιμαία Σχολή Ιωαννίνων*)[3] and, for a short time, at the *Great School of the Nation* (*Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή*) in Constantinople. After 1861, we find him working in the Ottoman capital as a journalist,[4] historian and translator;[5] he was also known for his folkloric research in Epirus and published a study on the subject. He died in Constantinople in 1890.[6] Polychroniadis, therefore, followed the same course as Konstantinos Goussopoulos: originating from a region of the Ottoman periphery, he came to the capital to complete his studies and never left Constantinople; he was an

---

[1] G. K. Polychroniadis and D. A. Spathiotis, *Ο Πυροσβέστης. Πρωτότυπος κοινωνική μυθιστορία* [*The Firefighter. Original social novel*], Constantinople: Published by A. Nomismatidis and Co with the authorization of the Ministerium for Public Education, undated. This is the publication that will be used in the context of this thesis.

[2] Due to lack of information regarding Koutsouris's life and literary activity, the reasons that he did not write and publish the novel himself (as already announced) or his presumed relations with Polychroniadis and Spathiotis, unfortunately, remain unclear.

[3] The *Zosimaia School of Ioannina* (in Epirus) was one of the most significant Greek middle-level educational institutions during the last period of Ottoman rule in the region. The school was founded in 1828 through personal expenses of the Zosimas brothers, after whom it was named. For further information, see Sakellariou 1997.

[4] Polychroniadis was collaborating with the Constantinopolitan Greek newspapers *Omonoia* (*Ομόνοια*) and *Byzantis* (*Βυζαντίς*). In 1874 he undertook, for a very short time, the Greek edition of the *karamanlı* newspaper *Mikra Asia* (*Μικρά Ασία*). With his articles, he was often attacking the editors of *Anatolikos Astir* (*Ανατολικός Αστήρ*) for speaking against Patriarch Ioakeim II (Gedeon 1932, 27).

[5] Polychroniadis translated several texts from Turkish and French to Greek, among which Alexandre Dumas's *Le Fils de Monte Christo* in 1886.

[6] Gedeon 1932, 27-28.

Ottoman Greek of the nineteenth century with no particular relations with the Greek Kingdom.

The second co-author of *The Firefighter*, Dimitrios Spathiotis, originated from Constantinople and completed his studies at the *Great School of the Nation* (*Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή*) in 1882.[1] In collaboration with G. N. Kalogeridis, he published in the Ottoman capital the journal *Eftrapelon Imerologion* (*Ευτράπελον Ημερολόγιον*) in 1891 και translated numerous popular French novels[2] for the publishing house of A. Nomismatidis and Co. Anastasia Tsapanidou and Thanasis Kougkoulos make the hypothesis that the Constantinopolitan Greek translator could maybe be identified with a doctor (with the same name) who appears to be a curator of the Greek schools in the parish of Diplokionion/Beşiktaş [3] in 1905; however, this hypothesis cannot be crosschecked.[4]

The "original social novel" entitled *The Firefighter* was published in Constantinople by the same publishing house as Koutsouris's *The Orphaned Girl* (A. Nomismatidis and Co). Thanasis Kougkoulos argues that the year 1890 must probably be regarded as the *terminus ante quem* for the publication of the novel since Polychroniadis died in that year; therefore, considering that *The Orphaned Girl* was published in 1889, *The Firefighter* must have been published within the following year. However, I argue that the fact that the novel was written by two authors is not of minor importance regarding its dating: I hypothesize that Polychroniadis began writing *The Firefighter* shortly after the publication of *The Orphaned Girl* in 1889 but died in the following year; Spathiotis decided to complete the writing and published the novel under both names within the next couple of years. In either case, the extensive sequel of Koutsouris's novel must have been published within the last decade of the nineteenth century.

The relationship between the two novels is an interesting subject worth being further searched. Even though they share the same plot, the two texts have several stylistic differences. Moreover, *The Firefighter* is much more extensive than *The Orphaned Girl* but appears to have fewer listed subscribers. *The Firefighter* consists of

---

[1]   Kremmydas 2007, 69.
[2]   For example, *Le Testament rouge* by Xavier de Montépin in 1889-1890 and *Les aventures de Rocambole* by Ponson du Terrail in 1890-1891.
[3]   Diplokionion/Beşiktaş is a district at the European side of Constantinople, next to the Bosporus (Byzantios 1862, 93-97).
[4]   Tsapanidou, Kougkoulos, 2020, 367, footnote 19.

a long prologue, three main parts (entitled "The Devil", "Petros Prionas", "The Knights of the rag"), and a short epilogue. The plot takes place in the nineteenth-century Ottoman capital and the narrator follows the thread of the story of *The Orphaned Girl*: Petros is led to prison for the crimes that he had committed; in prison, he meets two other criminals and together they establish an association, convert more men to it and organize their plans for revenge against the whole society. A few years later, the three criminals are released from prison: Eleftherios Velonas (or Grigorios Avgerinos, as his real name is) approaches the innocent husband of Anthoula (the orphaned girl/main female protagonist in Koutsouris's novel) and persuades him to invest all his money to a very profitable investment, a gold mine in Australia (!). At the same time, Petros (or the "Satan", as his pseudonym in the novel is) plans a conspiracy against Pelopidas and his virtuous wife Eleni: he makes Pelopidas question the faith of his wife, leads Eleni to an infamous house, drugs her together with a young man (Themistoklis) and makes them look as if they were lovers; when Pelopidas arrives at the house, he gets driven to madness by jealousy and kills his wife with a knife. However, it will be proven in the end that Eleni managed to survive thanks to the help of the main protagonist of the novel, the Firefighter. Sixteen years later, the reader meets again the miserable Pelopidas living in a deserted house with his young daughter Ourania, together with their "loyal" servant Iakovos, who is, in fact, the "Satan"; the devious criminal is planning to drive Pelopidas to madness and lead his daughter to disgrace. In the meantime, the young girl falls in love with a virtuous young man (Dimitrios) and meets him secretly in the garden of her house; but her father, led by the "Satan", shoots the young man, and almost kills him. After a short period and several adventures, the virtuous protagonists of the story (namely, the Firefighter, Dimitrios, Themistoklis, Evanthia, and her husband) unite their powers and organize a plan to trap the "Satan", who now appears in the "high society" of Constantinople with a new identity, that of a French Marquise. After a couple of very adventurous last scenes, the moral order is finally restored: the devious criminals are punished, while the virtuous protagonists live happily ever after. The main protagonist of the novel, as its title indicates, is the Firefighter (or Heraklis Avgerinos, as his name is), a brave, virtuous, and philanthropist Constantinopolitan Greek man, who always appears as *deus ex machina* and saves everyone in need or danger. Following the pattern of *The Orphaned Girl*, the novel mainly focuses on the depiction of the Constantinopolitan Greek community at the end of the nineteenth century and the problems of social pathogenesis in modern society.

9.0. Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos: *The Maidservant* (1897)

Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos is the last – but not least – Constantinopolitan Greek author, who will be a subject of study in the context of this thesis. We get plenty of information about his life from the introductory note entitled "Biographical notes" in Melissopoulos's "original Greek novel" *Fig leaf* (*Φύλλον συκῆς*), published in Constantinople in 1912.[1] We read, for example, that he was born in 1873 in Therapeia/Tarabya (see above, p. 129, footnote 1) of Constantinople, he was the son-in-law of the Archbishop Chrysostomos of Tyroloi/Çorlu in Eastern Thrace, and worked for several years as a professor of Religion, French Language, Calligraphy, Music, Commerce, and Technology in the newly established (in 1892) Russian School of Commerce (*École Russe à Pancaldy*) in Constantinople, which was situated on the hill of Pangaltı, next to the Russian Hospital, northwest of Pera/Beyoğlu. He also taught the Greek language to the young Russian monks of Mount Athos and the personnel of the Russian Embassy in Constantinople. As it will be presented below, he was particularly active in matters of novel-writing and education in the Ottoman capital.[2]

We get plenty of information about Melissopoulos's literary production from the announcement/advertisement of his upcoming works in his already published novels. To begin with, he published three novels under the general title *Customs and Morals of Constantinople* in the Ottoman capital: the "original Greek novel" entitled *The Maidservant* (*Η υπηρέτρια*) in 1897,[3] which was his first literary work, the "original Greek dramatic novel" entitled *Heart of the old man* (*Γέροντος καρδία*) in 1898,[4] and *Amvrosia* (*Αμβροσία*) in 1899.[5] Within the same period, he also published a *Handbook of the Elementary Liturgy of the Orthodox Christian Church* for ecclesiastical and educational use in forty-eight pages to be used in the Schools for

---

[1] Melissopoulos 1912, i-iii.

[2] For further information regarding Melissopoulos's life and literary production, see Tsapanidou 2019, 19-30.

[3] Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos, Professor in the Russian School, *Ἤθη καὶ ἔθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Η υπηρέτρια* [*Morals and customs of Constantinople. The maidservant*], original Greek novel, Constantinople: Published by "Konstantinopolis", 1897. This is the publication that will be used in the context of this thesis.

[4] Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos, Professor in the Russian School and Novelist, *Ἤθη καὶ ἔθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Γέροντος καρδία* [*Morals and customs of Constantinople. Heart of the old man*], original Greek dramatic novel, Constantinople: Published by A. Koromilas, 1898.

[5] Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos, Professor in the Russian School, *Ἤθη καὶ ἔθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Αμβροσία* [*Morals and customs of Constantinople. Amvrosia*], original Greek novel, Constantinople: Published by K. Zividis, 1899.

Boys and Girls and by every Orthodox Christian. In the prologue of *The Maidservant*, the reader gets informed that Melissopoulos is planning to publish in 1899 one more "original Greek social novel" entitled *The daughter of the religious man* (*Η κόρη του θρήσκου*). In general, in the above-mentioned introductory note, Melissopoulos is described as a "tireless and deeply educated man", a "well-read historian and colorful novelist", who was widely recognized in the "East", since "there is no Greek who has not already read one of his numerous literary works (!)".[1]

In the first pages of *The Maidservant*, Melissopoulos also informs the reader that he has already published two textbooks of educational context. The first one is entitled "French Language Lessons" (in three hundred pages), based on a new, original method that facilitates and accelerates the complete and excellent learning of the French language. The textbook is widely advertised as a necessary travel handbook, is addressed to readers of every age and social class, and is also available in the Greek Kingdom and abroad. The second textbook is a series of "Greek Calligraphy Books" (twenty pages each), which includes twelve small booklets: the first six have already been published and each booklet consists of forty writing-templates. Melissopoulos informs the reader that he is also planning to publish an "Algebra" and a "Trigonometry Handbook".

The plot of *The Maidservant* evolves in only one hundred and sixty pages. Although the novel is markedly shorter compared to the above-presented extensive Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries*, it compiles several conventions and features of the *City Mysteries* literary genre; therefore, I considered it necessary to include it in the corpus of my thesis. The story begins in November 189* [sic], namely, in the last decade of the nineteenth century, in the Ottoman capital. The reader follows the adventures of Andronikos Fakidis, whose only aim is to take revenge on his ex-wife, the "deceitful and adulteress" Myrorroi and her new husband Kleanthis Kallistos. In the following chapters, the narrator takes the reader in the past and narrates Andronikos's life story: he comes from a wealthy mercantile family of Constantinople, falls in love with the poor and uneducated but very beautiful maidservant Myrorroi and sends her to the French Boarding School for girls so that she can get the proper education and be an appropriate wife for him. Unfortunately, Myrorroi falls in love with her classmate's cousin, Kleanthis. When she graduates from

---

[1]   Melissopoulos 1912, ii.

school, she gets married to Andronikos, as promised, but maintains her secret affair with Kleanthis. Andronikos finds out the truth but decides to endure the disgrace for the sake of their children. A couple of years later, the desperate Kleanthis decides to murder Andronikos in a gambling-house in Galata/Karaköy and throws his body to the sea to have Myrorroi finally for himself. Andronikos manages to survive, gets arrested, and stays in prison for four years, where he organizes his revenge. When he is released, he approaches Kleanthis's family with a fake identity (Ioakeim), develops friendly relations with his wife's new husband, and manages to kidnap Myrorroi, planning to lead her to prostitution and disgrace. In the end, Andronikos murders Kleanthis and Myrorroi commits suicide. We should note here that *The Maidservant* is the only novel in this corpus that has no happy end: the titular female protagonist (the maidservant Myrorroi) dies in despair, while the main male protagonist (her husband Andronikos) manages to get revenge but has to continue his life miserable and alone.

In the last pages of the publication, the reader finds an appendix that includes three unpublished erotic poems, written by Melissopoulos within the same year (1897). Two of them are also "set in European music" by the author himself. After that, he has included a long list of subscribers from the Russian School and the Ottoman capital, noting that four hundred more names have been excluded "for practical reasons".

10.0. General profile of the ten authors

After this short presentation of the ten authors and their *City Mysteries* novels, it is easily understood that we cannot speak of a homogenous group with a common ideology and orientation. We could distinguish two general tendencies (or groups) among them: those who see the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from the perspective of the Self, that is, the citizen of the Empire, and those who see it from the perspective of the Other, that is, the citizen of the Greek Kingdom or the Greek of the Diaspora. Moreover, the authors who constitute the first group often express different opinions regarding the position and the future development of the Constantinopolitan Greek community within the Ottoman Empire. It is clear, therefore, that an interesting literary and/or ideological discourse develops among them, which is worth being further studied.

But before we proceed to the ideological approach of the ten novels, a couple of general remarks regarding the position of the authors in the Constantinopolitan Greek community and their relations with the Greek Kingdom could be rather useful. The first thing that we could note is that, during the nineteenth century, the Constantinopolitan Greek intellectual life shows low interaction with that of the Greek Kingdom. The literary products of the former do not easily cross the Ottoman borders and reach the market of the Greek capital, while, at the same time, the latter seems to show almost complete indifference towards the production of the Constantinopolitan Greeks. Therefore, the main objective of most of the Constantinopolitan Greek authors is to claim a position, permanent or occasional, in the cultural circles of the Ottoman capital. However, it is important to avoid generalizations, since we can always find exceptions, as, for example, the Constantinopolitan Greek journalist and historian Epameinondas Kyriakidis, who developed close relations with the Greek Kingdom and its cultural and political circles.

The *City Mysteries* authors, who make their living in Constantinople for a shorter or a longer time, mainly as priests (Petros Ioannidis), professors (Christophoros Samartsidis, Dimitrios Melissopoulos), translators (Dimitrios Spathiotis), doctors (Konstantinos Goussopoulos), and journalists (Georgios Polychroniadis, Epameinondas Kyriakidis) represent the middle class of the Ottoman capital and belong to the intellectual elite of the Constantinopolitan Greek community. In the second half of the nineteenth century, this middle class seeks to adopt a specific code of morals and

values and broaden its educational horizons, participating in various cultural and educational associations and forming, therefore, a collective consciousness for all Constantinopolitan Greeks. Moreover, Constantinopolitan Greek scientists and scholars undertake to improve the living conditions of all members of the community and build a modernized Greek society.[1] However, as it will be shown in the following chapter, each one of these authors constitutes a special case. At the same time, the non-Constantinopolitan authors (Stephanos Xenos and Konstantinos Ramphos) represent a rather different perspective and seem to come into an ideological conflict with their "colleagues" at the opposite shore of the Aegean.

Despite this ideological conflict that develops among the above-mentioned authors, I argue that the literary genre of the *City Mysteries*, very popular in western European literature at that time, was probably the most appropriate means for these authors to express their opinions and perspectives regarding the Constantinopolitan Greek "reality" in the second half of the nineteenth century and propose solutions to its problems.

---

[1]   Anastasiadou 2012, 154, 179-205.

CHAPTER IV

The formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity:
an open discourse between Constantinopolitan and non-Constantinopolitan
Greek authors

After the short presentation of the ten Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* in chapter III, which helps us get a closer look at their content as well as at the main objectives of their authors, chapter IV goes a bit deeper into the ideology of the texts and follows the literary discourse that develops among their authors. In chapter IV, therefore, we will study how each one of these authors looks at the development of the Constantinopolitan Greek community in the second half of the nineteenth century, that is, whether he views it from the perspective of the Self or the perspective of the Other, as well as how he sees the formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity during these critical decades. In other words, through this study, we will have the chance to follow the literary and/or ideological discourse that developed among them regarding the future of the Constantinopolitan Greek community and its relationship with the residents of the Greek Kingdom.

1.0. Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors: the perspective of the Self

1.1. Petros Ioannidis: a Constantinopolitan Greek of the mid-nineteenth century

Petros Ioannidis is the first author who opens this literary and/or ideological discourse in 1855, viewing the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a Constantinopolitan Greek perspective. As mentioned in the previous chapter (see above, p. 96), the *Eptalophos*, the first Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* novel, refers to a transitional and particularly critical period of Ottoman history, that is, the period 1822-1845. This allows Ioannidis to describe the decadent and obsolete situation in the Ottoman capital concerning its administration and economy before the beginning of the *Tanzimat* era (namely, before 1839) and also the first reforming efforts after the signing of the first decree in 1839 (see above, p. 61). The author mainly emphasizes the need for changes and transformation of the Ottoman society. As a Constantinopolitan Greek of the mid-century, Ioannidis is aware of the situation in the city before the signing of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*, traces all the things that need to be improved and modernized, and practically asks for changes and reforms within the spirit of the *Tanzimat*.

What attracts the reader's attention in the novel is the absolute absence of the Greek Kingdom and its capital. But this comes as no surprise if we consider that in the 1850s there hardly existed any substantial relationship between Constantinople and Athens. As we have already seen in chapter II (see above, p. 67), since its establishment, the Greek Kingdom was oriented towards *Megali Idea*, while the main objective of the Constantinopolitan Greeks after the mid-century was the reformation of their community in order to occupy a better position in the modernizing Ottoman Empire within the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism*. I believe that Ioannidis as a Constantinopolitan Greek of his time expresses clearly this orientation. Moreover, he appears to be quite defensive against all those who criticize the current situation of the Constantinopolitan Greek community, against all those who "show excessive zeal for the nation's dignity" and informs them that the Greek nation is not deprived of real protectors and leaders, who have the will and the power to put the national affairs back

in order.[1] Ioannidis probably refers to the Greeks of the independent Kingdom, who criticize the attitude of the Constantinopolitan Greeks, often accusing them of *reayadism* and argue that they must interfere and save their "enslaved brothers", as they call them. The author notes that the Constantinopolitan Greeks have their own leaders and can take care of their own problems. The only disadvantage he imputes to the Constantinopolitan Greeks is their indifference towards their fellow-citizens and the lack of cohesion within the Greek community. We should always have in mind that the 1850s were for the Constantinopolitan Greek community a very uncertain time: the *Rum milleti* in its traditional form was gradually breaking apart and new ethnoreligious communities were emerging. Therefore, according to Ioannidis, the future of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire lies in its reorganization and homogenization within the context of the *Tanzimat*.

On the contrary to the absolute absence of the Greek Kingdom, the presence of Western Europe and its modernized capitals is easily perceptible in the novel. I believe that this strong presence aims mainly at pointing the long way that the obsolete Ottoman Empire has to go through to resemble, as far as possible, the modern European centers. According to Ioannidis, a typical example that proves the great difference between "East" and "West" in the first half of the nineteenth century are the terrible and inhuman conditions in the Ottoman prison: imprisonment of innocent people together with terrible criminals, violent assaults of the prison guards against prisoners, merciless beating and tremendous insults describe the situation in the Ottoman prison (chapter III, 27-51).[2] For Ioannidis, this obsolete situation has nothing in common with the administration and infrastructure of modern European countries. In another chapter, this great chasm is stressed by one of the protagonists: the young son of the tailor, who has been away from the Empire for a long time in order "to study in the West"[3] and has just returned to his home-city, appears to be disappointed by the

---

[1] "Οι τοιούτοι οι τοσούτον υπέρμαχον ζήλον υπέρ της αξιοπρεπείας δήθεν του έθνους των επιδεικνύμενοι, ας ησυχάσωσι λαμβάνοντες την μεγαλητέραν αμεριμνησίαν, ως πληροφορούμενοι ότι το έθνος αυτό, το και αυτών και ημών επίσης, δεν στερείται αληθών και πραγματικών ουκ ολίγων προστατών, οίτινες έχουσι και την θέλησιν και την δύναμιν διά να τακτοποιήσωσι τα εθνικά πράγματα όταν αυτά ατάκτως φέρωνται, […]" (chapter XXVI, 384 [footnote]).

[2] We should note here that several authors present and strongly criticize the terrible conditions prevailing in the Ottoman prison in the nineteenth century. For example, Georgios Polychroniadis and Dimitrios Spathiotis (see below, p. 189) devote a long chapter of their novel entitled *The Firefighter* to the description of the terrible conditions prevailing in the Ottoman prison, where one of the main protagonists of the novel (Petros Prionas) spends a part of his life, as well as of the wretched appearance and the disputable behavior of its internees (part II, chapter I, 257-281).

[3] "[…] λείπει έξω ς' ταις φραγγιαίς διά την σπουδή του" (chapter XXVIII, 399).

current situation in Constantinople: the streets are dirty and from the windows of the houses in Christian neighborhoods, one can overhear "shameful conversations" and "the malicious oddities of deplorable women".[1] The great distance between "East" and "West", as already presented in chapter II (see above, p. 48), clearly influences the way that Ioannidis sees the Constantinopolitan Greek community, its position in the Ottoman Empire, and its relationship with the modernized European societies of the mid-nineteenth century. The reader easily understands that the only thing that seems to concern the author is the implementation of the reforms that will improve the situation in the Constantinopolitan Greek society and the Ottoman capital in general.

As mentioned above, in the *Eptalophos* we find no reference to the relationship between the two important centers of Hellenism, namely, Athens and Constantinople. Instead, another relationship seems to bother the author, that between the urban center and the periphery, and he devotes two (long) chapters (XX and XXI) to the depiction of the great contrast between the Ottoman capital and its provinces. More specifically, Ioannidis presents in detail the morals and customs as well as the character of the Greek peasants living a couple of hours away from the Ottoman capital in the village of Bakkalköy.[2] What is particularly interesting is that, for the Constantinopolitan Greek Self, the Other is not the Ottoman Muslim or the Armenian living in the multiethnic and multireligious Ottoman capital, but the Greek villager of the Ottoman province. Anastasia Tsapanidou argues that this contradistinction between the urban center and the periphery does not appear with such intensity in any other novel of the nineteenth century about Constantinople.[3] According to my perspective, Ioannidis persistently emphasizes the lack of homogeneity within the Ottoman Greek community in the first half of the nineteenth century. Through the eyes of the Constantinopolitan *bourgeois* (Self), such as the evil Minas Kalimeropoulos, the Ottoman Greek peasants (Other) are seen as barbarian, savage and uncivilized, greedy and untrustworthy (chapter XVIII, 263). However, the author hastens to support them by adding that these humble peasants have several virtues that are difficult to be found in the Ottoman capital, as, for example, hospitality and honesty. But the chasm

---

[1] "[…] τας κακοήθεις περιεργείας των αθλίων Κωνσταντινουπολιτισσών" (chapter XXVIII, 400-401).
[2] *Bakkalköy* is a Greek village in the municipality of Ataşehir on the Asian side of the Bosporus. The name means "grocery village" and it is said to come from the market that formerly took place there. The village is also said to date back from Byzantine times.
[3] Tsapanidou 2012, 337. Regarding the novels of my corpus, the chasm between capital and province is also present in Christophoros Samartsidis's novel entitled *Mysteries of Constantinople* (see below, p. 167), however, not at the same level of intensity.

between these two groups is huge: the "citizens" ("πολιτάκια") appear to be proud of their noble origin compared to the humble villagers; they consider themselves distinguished for the virtue of sharp thinking and quick perception of things "as true descendants of the Byzantines". However, the author expresses a different opinion: he states that those who live outside the Constantinopolitan walls, do not fall short in comparison to the "noble inhabitants of the capital", but, in fact, outweigh them regarding virtue and morals.

This contradictory relationship between Self and Other functions the other way around as well. For the local girls of the village (Self), the young Constantinopolitan woman (Aikaterini), who visits their village, is also the Other and constitutes, in fact, an "intriguing spectacle"; therefore, they gather together and gape at her ("χαίνουσι στόμασι", chapter XX, 287). For them, women of the capital are "crazy and uncontrolled" ("τρελλοκόριτζα", chapter XXII, 325); those who "are not shameless and barefaced, are consumptive and sickly".[1] On the contrary, young women of the village prefer to lose their lives rather than get involved in disgraceful actions; moreover, they are extremely pretty. In general, in the novel, peasants are presented as people of different morals and customs compared to the residents of Constantinople. According to the author, they constitute a different world than that of the Ottoman capital.

Moreover, I believe that through this reference to the relationship between the capital and the provinces, Ioannidis attempts to raise a serious problem of his time: the uncontrolled population growth of the Ottoman capital. According to historians of the time, in the first half of the nineteenth century, thousands of people have gathered in Constantinople, a city with no production of its own, which made it totally dependent on the provinces. This situation caused several problems in difficult times in the following decades, when the city could not feed its population.[2] Constantinople is depicted in the novel as "a gigantic consuming center" that eviscerates the wealth-producing resources of the provinces. The peasants, or "aliment providers",[3] as they are called in the text, transport daily hundreds of products of their regions to

---

[1] "[…] όσα δεν έτυχε να ήναι ξετζιπωμένα κι' αδιάντροπα, όλα είναι χτικιάρικα και παθιασμένα" (chapter XXII, 325).

[2] Faroqhi 2009, 75-76.

[3] "[…] τους χωρικούς τούτους τροφοκομιστάς" (chapter II, 15).

Constantinople. However, the greed of the numerous inhabitants of the capital is huge; and all these great amounts of products are consumed in no time.

But Ioannidis believes that the geographical distinction between the capital and the provinces is not the only separation within the Greek community: class diversification, that is, the distinction between the notables or *bourgeoises* and the middle and lower-class citizens is also significant. According to the author, the Constantinopolitan Greek society is divided into three distinct economic and social classes: upper, middle, and lower. Already in the first chapter, the custom of May Day celebration becomes the first occasion for the author to depict this social chasm: although families belonging to the "wealthy aristocratic class" do not differ at all from members of the lower class concerning "superstitious customs and beliefs", they do not condescend to be humiliated by mixing with the "public and non-honorable mob" and choose to celebrate May Day in the private gardens of their summer houses or their magnificent seaside mansions (chapter I, 5-7). Members of the upper class try to keep a distance from "common people", avoiding any contact with them; in fact, it is like in the Ottoman capital there exist two separate worlds. An analogous class differentiation can also be traced within the rural Ottoman Greek society: the wealthy notables of the village can use the money of the "common local treasury"[1] that comes from the "hard work of the populace" for their own needs, for example, to organize plentiful dinners for their guests. In the end, they offer the leftovers of the meal to "their starving fellow-villagers",[2] who are waiting patiently for their turn like dogs. For one more time, Ioannidis points out the lack of homogeneity within the Ottoman Greek community, urban and rural.

Moreover, the phenomenon of social injustice is highlighted in the novel, although the author does not go deeper into its root causes. In the Ottoman capital, one can see a part of the population enjoying a wealthy and luxurious life, ignoring, at the same time, the needs of their miserable fellow-citizens, while another part, the most numerous, lives in misery and ends up in desperation due to various abuses. In the first chapter, the dramatic narration of the miserable tailor portrays in vivid colors the struggle for survival that the fringe groups of the Ottoman capital give daily. The description of the tailor's miserable house in the impoverished district of

---

[1] "[…] το επιτόπιον γενικόν βαλάντιον" (chapter XXI, 310).
[2] "[…] εις μέθεξιν των λιμοθνήτων συνεγχωρίων των" (chapter XXI, 310).

Sarmasikion/Sarmaşık (see above, p. 99, footnote 1) gives us an indicative picture of the terrible conditions of the life of the lower strata. Although this deplorable man is a hardworking craftsman, the life of his family does not improve. No matter how hard he works, there seems to be no hope for a better future (chapter I, 7-14).

Within this diversified Greek community, it is very interesting that the deviations from the code of moral values are presented mainly concerning members of the upper and the lower social classes, while members of the middle class are usually distinguished by honesty and virtue. Therefore, the reader finds in Ioannidis's novel a social stratification of immorality analogous to that in Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris* (see above, p. 27). This resemblance comes as no surprise, especially if we consider that Ioannidis was the first Greek author who attempted to write a Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* novel, apparently under the great influence of the European models of the genre. The difference is that Ioannidis only traces and describes social problems, criticizes the unequal treatment of social classes and the absurdity of contemporary society, but does not propose any solutions. Moreover, his ideology has an intense Christian character, which is an indication that he belonged to the circles of the clergy.[1]

Another interesting thing in the novel is the fact that Ioannidis criticizes the corruption of the uprising Constantinopolitan Greek *bourgeoisie* but does not see the problem as a consequence of the westernization and modernization of the Ottoman Empire, like other authors, after him, did. However, we should note here that this "corrupted modern society", where the plot of the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* evolves, is, to a large extent, nothing more than the result of the social changes that took place due to the urbanization in the nineteenth century, which led to the decline of traditional values and morals and was often seen as "corruption". As mentioned above, the *Eptalophos* refers to a former period, before the beginning of the *Tanzimat* era and was published one year before the signing of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*. This means that Ioannidis, following the pattern of Eugène Sue, interprets the problems of the Constantinopolitan Greek society mainly from the perspective of social diversification and injustice. The upper classes are represented in the novel mainly by the Constantinopolitan Greek merchants and bankers, who have gained power in the

---

[1]   However, we should not forget that this Christian character is one of the main features of the *City Mysteries* literary genre (see above, p. 22).

Ottoman capital during the past couple of decades, as they were chosen by the Sultan to serve the financial needs of the royal treasury, enjoying the analogous reputation and respect. Minas Kalimeropoulos, a middle-class banker, is the perfect example of a corrupted Constantinopolitan Greek *bourgeois*: debauchery, voluptuousness, and dissoluteness ("η βροτοφθόρος κραιπάλη", chapter VII, 87) has become his nature and gradually lead him to destruction. In a short time, he has committed terrible crimes, murders, and kidnapping. He does not even hesitate to deny his "fatherly religion" and embrace Islam to satisfy his interests (that is, to marry a wealthy Ottoman woman and grab hold of her fortune). Therefore, according to Ioannidis, it is not direct contact with Europe that causes the corruption of the Constantinopolitan Greek character, but the great financial development and corruption of the uprising *bourgeoisie* that magnifies the already existing social chasm.

Apart from these social differentiations within the Greek community, the novel depicts the multireligious and multiethnic population of the Ottoman capital in general, focusing mainly on the Greeks and the Armenians and, to a lesser extent, the ruling Ottomans. The latter usually appear with neutral or slightly negative attributes, when they represent the Ottoman administration, as, for example, police officers or prison guards. Several positive characteristics are attributed to them,[1] while we also find in the novel two cases of virtuous Ottoman Muslims, who are presented as behavioral models in contradistinction with Greeks of the same social class: the wealthy Ottoman, who decides to liberate his captive from Chios island (Aikaterini's mother) thanks to the entreaty of his Greek friend and priest (Alexandros's father), despite his primary intention to offer her as a present to one of his powerful protectors,[2] and the poor Ottoman father, who opens his humble home to the Greek tailor to express his gratitude to him for saving his child from certain death. The Sultan plays no significant role in the plot; the author only presents his royal procession in great grandeur to the Eyüp Mosque on Friday for his weekly peregrination. Moreover, in a short footnote, Ioannidis moderately and indirectly "praises" the "Holly Sultan" Abdülmecid (see above, p. 62, footnote 1), "the independent representative and Emperor of an invaluable

---

[1] For example, according to the author, "sympathy and compassion are the main characteristics of the Ottoman race" (chapter II, 26).

[2] Ioannidis informs the reader that until the mid-nineteenth century, many pretty captive young girls were treated as objects of ownership and were offered by the Ottoman conquerors as a present to high-standing officials of the Empire and, consequently, to the Sultan to gain his favor. "Some of these girls, attracting the admiration of the Sultan, were honored to become the glorious mothers of several kings of the East" (chapter VI, 74).

territory", as he calls him (chapter III, 48). I believe that this "moderate praise" should not be interpreted as the result of the power of the Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88), but rather as the author's way to show his support to the reformist Sultan, who offered the Constantinopolitan Greek community new ways of development within the modernizing Empire.

It is easily understood that Ioannidis is a Constantinopolitan Greek of the mid-nineteenth century, who sees the future of the Greek community within the Ottoman Empire. At the same time, he views the Armenian population as competitors, whose only goal is to undermine the position of the Greeks for their interests. We should note here that one of the most striking consequences of the Greek Revolution of 1821 was the elimination of the Greeks from important positions in the bureaucratic and social structure of the Empire, which led to the rise of the Armenians. From the 1840s onwards, the Armenians were heavily favored over the Greeks in public offices and many of them became intendants of customhouses and bankers to local pashas. They also became increasingly involved in the Ottoman administration, which caused the hatred and dislike of the Greeks.[1] In the novel, a sense of antipathy towards the Armenians, based on pre-existing stereotypes, is more than obvious: the Armenian protagonist, the banker Karabet Ağa, is presented as a typical representative of his nation's negative characteristics. The author criticizes his penurious personality that leads him to profit-driven, speculative activities. Through various schemes and malevolent conspiracies, this dangerous man succeeded in becoming powerful by gaining the favor of the "most powerful statesmen", as, for example, the governor of Smyrna/Izmir, a powerful despot, who managed to occupy his significant post thanks to the Armenian banker's money. By lending money to people of every ethnicity, who visit his banking house daily, Karabet managed to increase his financial and societal power in the Ottoman capital. Due to his scheming activity and his inventive way of thinking, this evil Armenian managed to become in a short time almost equivalent to the most prominent and powerful bankers in Constantinople.

Under the above-described circumstances, according to Ioannidis, it was more than necessary for the Constantinopolitan Greek community of the mid-nineteenth century to reconstruct itself and form a strong collective identity. If we accept the hypothesis that the author belonged to the circles of the clergy, we could see his novel

---

[1] Stamatopoulos 2006, 256.

as a way to support the value and importance of religion in the formation of this identity in the second half of the century. We should always bear in mind that, since 1839, the reforms of the *Tanzimat* gradually changed the balance within the traditional *Rum milleti* and gave language and culture, not religion, the main role in this collective consciousness. Ioannidis reacts to this change, stating that the Christian ideology must remain the main element of this identity.[1] To achieve this goal, he creates two virtuous and religious young characters, Alexandros and Aikaterini, and projects them in his novel as models of Christian behavior. The young man has spent his childhood guided by moral ethics and examples and has been taught "through healthy education"[2] all those principles that constitute the "true representation of the Creator's wisdom".[3] His father was the model of a cleric: a respectable priest, a deeply educated man, a bearer of true Christian virtues, he preached the word of God for several years in the parish of Diplokionion/Beşiktaş. Due to his righteousness and virtue, he was honored with the ecclesiastical office of "Economos".[4] In other words, he was a holy man and, according to Ioannidis, this is exactly the kind of religious leader that the Greek community needs during these critical times. The author appears to be very defensive and conservative in religious matters, which is another indication that he was probably a member of the Orthodox clergy. He criticizes the supporters of the various innovations (regarding religion) in the nineteenth century, which, according to him, can be extremely harmful to the Greek community.

Ioannidis's comments on ecclesiastical issues are probably not far from reality. During the nineteenth century, the members of the clergy were not supported by a regular salary, but by income derived from religious services. Therefore, their financial situation was sometimes so bad that they even exploited the believers to make some extra money.[5] In his novel, the author depicts the miserable condition of the lower clergy: in the church of the small parish of Sarmasikion/Sarmaşık, the reader meets two

---

[1] For Ioannidis, the Greek language does not seem to play a significant role in the formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity. In fact, in the novel, members of the Greek community appear to speak different dialects, which often makes the communication among them hard: for example, the young maidservant (Zambeta) in Aikaterini's house wonders whether the older servant (barba Giannis) speaks to her "roman" (*ρωμαίικα*) as she cannot understand him (chapter IIX, 274).

[2] "[…] υπ' ανόσου και υγειούς διδασκαλίας" (chapter III, 36).

[3] "[…] αληθές απεικόνισμα της πανυπερσόφου σοφίας του Δημιουργού" (chapter III, 36).

[4] "Economos" (*Οικονόμος*) was a supreme ecclesiastical office of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which first appeared in the eleventh century. It referred to the clergy responsible for the church's finances and was awarded only to married priests, who were over thirty years of age and have graduated from a Higher Ecclesiastical School.

[5] Karpat 1982, 155.

priests, a "prime" and a subordinate one. They both sit idle and deplore their fate, as for one whole week they haven't practiced any religious ceremony at all. The subordinate priest receives from his supervisor an extremely low monthly salary (one hundred piastres), which is hardly enough for him to avoid starvation. At the same time, the "prime" priest is dependent on a layman, that is, the church's commissioner,[1] who has full control of the church's fund; the priest has to pay him a significant sum,[2] otherwise, the commissioner has the power to replace him.[3] Although the "prime" priest addressed the church's commissioner several times, describing the terrible conditions of the ecclesiastical buildings and asking for his contribution for some minor repairs, his requests have not been heard. According to the author, these complex relations of dependency are the reason that we should not be critical towards the miserable clergymen; instead, we should face them with tolerance and sympathy. Ioannidis also presents the paradoxical relationship of the "prime" priest with his subordinate: if the former decided to remove his subordinate, the friends and relatives of the latter could cause agitation in the entire parish and restore the expelled to the "prime" priest's position (!). At the end of the chapter, Ioannidis promises to speak about the almost merciless behavior of some of those who rule the ecclesiastical things in the Ottoman Empire on another, more suitable, occasion.

In the novel, the expulsion of the miserable tailor from the church as well as the episode with the impoverished priests of Sarmasikion/Sarmaşık, suggest that, according to the author's perspective, there are several "black clouds" in the way that the lower clergy of Constantinople operates. We can also find analogous comments and implications in Christophoros Samartsidis's *Mysteries of Constantinople*, where the author states that secular people are occasionally named priests to perform extraordinary, usually hasty, "ceremonies". But in the case of Ioannidis, we go deeper into the world of the clergy and learn about their problems in everyday life. Moreover, his sensitivity to the misery and the terrible situation that members of the lower clergy face in the Ottoman capital is a strong indication that Ioannidis was a priest, especially

---

[1] "[…] ο εφορεύων εκείνος λαϊκός" (chapter XXVIII, 401).

[2] "[…] της συμπεφωνημένης ταύτης εισπράξεως ήν συνήθως *εμβαδοίκιον* αποκαλούσι" (chapter XXVIII, 402).

[3] "[…] ποσώς δεν εδυσκολεύετο να φροντίση αμέσως έτερον εκκλησιαστικόν πρόσωπον προς διαδοχήν αυτού, και μάλιστα με υπερθεματικήν προσθήκην, άκρως ικανήν να επισύρη τας ευφημίας των ενοριτών υπέρ της αξιότητος του εφόρου εκείνου, του επί των ημερών της επιστασίας του πραγματοποιήσαντος έν τοιούτον αείμνηστον κατόρθωμα" (chapter XXVIII, 402).

if we consider that the comments concerning ecclesiastical issues are, in fact, the only time that the narration goes deeper to identify the reasons that cause the problems.

What also attracts the reader's attention in the *Eptalophos* is Ioannidis's almost "misogynist" perspective towards the majority of the Constantinopolitan women. A typical example in the novel is the presentation of the tailor's wife, who is portrayed negatively in the episode of May Day when she kicks her husband out of the family house,[1] but also at the end of the novel, when she shows disdain and complete lack of maternal affection towards her only son, who has just returned home from Europe. The heartless and avaricious woman, speaking with disdain for the value of education,[2] imprecates her son, when she realizes that he has not brought back material goods from Europe. The only exceptions in the novel are some women, whose physical virtues combined with their "healthy" upbringing make them stand out from the mass. But these positive female figures seem to be a minority in the Constantinopolitan Greek society and are mainly related to the middle class of the Ottoman capital and its rural region. Aikaterini appears to be such an exception: she is an angel, a model of goodness, virtue, and modesty, and does not share the undignified way of thinking of other young women belonging to her nation. However, we should note here that, in the novel, misogyny is not considered in modern terms, but rather as a disapproval of the female character.

Petros Ioannidis appears to be the first Constantinopolitan Greek author, who "experimented" with the new literary genre. As expected, the text follows the main literary conventions of the genre and is strongly influenced by its European models, mainly by Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*, which was published only a decade before the *Eptalophos*. Although the mid-nineteenth century was the period when the uprising *bourgeoisie* was gaining financial and societal power within the Ottoman Greek community, Ioannidis seems to be in favor of the ordinary citizen, mainly, of the peasant of the Ottoman periphery. Moreover, if we accept the hypothesis that the author was a member of the clergy, it is not difficult to understand the various references to the problems of the church in the mid-nineteenth century. As mentioned above, the novel was written before the signing of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*, so its

---

[1]   The greedy woman does not even hesitate to get violent towards her husband ("[…] έφερεν επί του προσώπου του μανιώδες ράπισμα διά της μιας χειρός", chapter I, 14).

[2]   "[…] από τα μέρη εκείνα όπου τόσα χρόνια επήγες να μου παραλύης μαθαίνωντας χιλίων ειδών φράγγικες κατεργαριαίς!" (chapter XXVIII, 414).

differences compared to the novels that followed are quite expected. Ioannidis sees the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a Constantinopolitan Greek perspective, that is, from the perspective of the Self, representing the attitude and policy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the mid-century. We should not forget that the text was published in a period when the character of the traditional *Rum milleti* was changing rapidly and the Ottoman Greeks were trying to find new balances within the transforming community. The Constantinopolitan Greek authors, who published their *City Mysteries* novels in the following decades, as, for example, Christophoros Samartsidis, would take Ioannidis's ideology a step further, transforming it according to the changing circumstances within the Ottoman Empire and the developments in the Balkan Peninsula.

1.2. Christophoros Samartsidis: a Constantinopolitan Greek at the service of Greek education

In the late 1860s, a decade after Ioannidis's *Eptalophos* and almost simultaneously with Konstantinos Ramphos (see below, p. 232), the Constantinopolitan Greek Christophoros Samartsidis published his *City Mysteries* novel entitled *Mysteries of Constantinople*. In the prologue, he stresses the particularity of the Ottoman capital compared to European ones, as, for example, Paris or London, noting that Constantinople with the multiethnicity of its population constitutes a modern "Tower of Babel".[1] Anyone who attempts to write *Mysteries of Constantinople* should be aware of the particularities of the Ottoman capital, he says. He also tries to make clear through the various descriptions of Constantinople that the city has experienced an impressive transformation during the past few decades. In several parts of the text, he describes in detail the narrow, filthy, and dark streets of the city, especially of the district of Galata/Karaköy, in the past and notes that this picture would disgust any traveler who would visit the Ottoman capital for the first time. However, this description has nothing to do with the current picture of the city: after the Crimean war, Constantinople has been "magically transformed" from a big "eastern" city to a "western" capital, he states. It is true that in the late 1860s when the novel was published, the Ottoman capital had already acquired a rather European character.[2] We can easily understand that Samartsidis also sees Constantinople and its population from the perspective of the Self, that is, its permanent resident, who is (or can be regarded as) a connoisseur of the city and not from the perspective of the Other, that is, the traveler, who has a transient and superficial contact with it. According to Anastasia Tsapanidou, the author makes clear from the beginning that he will not deal with the refutation of fallacious or distorted impressions of the Other about Constantinople. Instead, he will try to reveal its

---

[1] "[...] Multitude of races gathered [in one city]; here is, in short, the population of the capital of Constantine. Ottomans, Greeks, Jews, French, English, Armenians, Americans, Germans, Spaniards, Arabs, Egyptians, Tartars, Kirkassians, Russians and, in general, all nations living together as in a miniature", he notes (my translation) (prologue, 5).

[2] With initial steps taken in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, nineteenth-century Constantinople underwent a major change under the profound economic and political transformation that excelled during the century. What started only in the field of military reforms was now expanding to include education, legislation, and administration. The increasing penetration of the West into the economic and political realms of the Ottoman Empire made the adoption of western features necessary. For further information about the Europeanization of Constantinople in the nineteenth century, see Demirakin 2006.

"mysterious" sides, which are invisible to the Other and can only be identified by the Self with great effort and deep research.[1] However, we should always have in mind that this is one of the main literary conventions of the *City Mysteries* genre, followed, to a greater or lesser extent, by all the authors of this corpus.

It seems that Samartsidis, as an eminent and respected member of the Greek community of the Ottoman capital, was originally ideologically oriented towards the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism*, which, as presented in chapter II (see above, p. 70), promoted the integrity of the Empire but, at the same time, the cultural expansion and domination of the Greek nation in the East through the strengthening of its collective identity.[2] This perspective was potentiated after the Crimean war and the reforms of the *Tanzimat*, that is, during the period that Samartsidis wrote his novel. The young author sees the Ottoman Greeks not as subjugated and subservient subjects of the Sultan, but as bold "revolutionaries", inspired by the liberal European principles of the time, who claim a powerful position in the Empire. In other words, he sees their future within the Ottoman Empire as pioneers and pathfinders of development and modernization. Moreover, we should not forget that Samartsidis had close relations with the Ottoman authorities and the Patriarchate of Constantinople and this is probably one of the main reasons that he was assigned the post of the Patriarchal Supervisor of the Greek schools in Thrace, Macedonia, and Constantinople and was so respected by the Ottoman authorities, at least, until a certain time.

However, Samartsidis's political action at the time that he published the *Mysteries of Constantinople* appears to be contradictory to the above-mentioned activity, therefore, rather problematic. More precisely, it seems quite paradoxical that in 1868, while the author was praising the Sultan and was seeing positively the future of the Ottoman Greeks within the Empire (as expressed in his novel), he was also speaking about the liberation of Constantinople in his memorandum addressed to the Americans;[3] he was even asking them to visit Constantinople again after one year when the city would be the capital of the Greek Kingdom![4] How can this paradox be explained? Is it possible that the young author initially believed in the reformative

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 381.
[2]   We should not forget that Samartsidis was a member of the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*) that aimed at promoting Greek education not only within the Greek community of the Ottoman capital but throughout the whole Empire.
[3]   For the memorandum to the Americans see above, p. 116, footnote 1.
[4]   Montgomery 1869, 400-403.

effort for the modernization of the Ottoman Empire that would be beneficial to the Greek community, but, over time, when he saw that the reforms of the *Tanzimat* did not guarantee equal rights for the non-Muslims, followed disappointed a different – more revolutionary – way? This hypothesis could make sense, especially if we think that the reign of Abdülmecid I (see above, p. 62, footnote 1) was considered in general quite successful by the Ottoman Greeks – by the citizens of the Greek Kingdom as well – mainly because this particular Sultan was distinguished for his reformative spirit as well as for his conciliatory attitude towards the West.[1] The young author probably believed in the reforms that would bring the modernization and Europeanization of the Empire and this could be one of the reasons that he was praising Abdülmecid I, who expedited this process. Of course, we should always keep in mind that some of these positive comments might be the result of the restrictions and/or fear of Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88). On the other hand, this overwhelming praise of Abdülmecid I might also be because this Sultan was, according to Samartsidis, the most appropriate representative of the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism* that the Greek author was – at least, originally – supporting.[2] However, although after 1856 the most important thing for the Ottoman Greeks was the reforms within the Empire, over the next two decades, the vision of the *Megali Idea* was intensively promoted and strengthened by the Greek state, while the Ottoman Empire began facing serious financial problems and the European Powers became more powerful and oppressive towards the Empire. Is it possible that these developments influenced Samartsidis's way of thinking decisively and led to a turnaround of his attitude in such a short time? Is it possible that from the period of writing the *Mysteries of Constantinople* until August 1868, when the Americans visited Constantinople, significant developments took place in the ideology and the attitude of the Ottoman Greeks, in general? Unfortunately, we do not have clear answers to these questions; all we can do is make hypotheses. If we knew how long Samartsidis was writing his novel, we could probably understand the turnover of his orientation better. What we know for sure is that by the

---

[1] The Constantinopolitan Greeks officially began to face problems of coexistence with the ruling Ottomans during the reign of Abdülhamid II (namely, after 1876) due to his extremely conservative and nationalist attitude and the expanded financial problems that the Ottoman Empire was facing.

[2] Abdülmecid I tried to encourage the concept of *Ottomanism* among the subject nations and stop the rise of nationalist movements within the Empire by integrating non-Muslims and non-Turks more thoroughly into the Ottoman society with new laws and reforms. His greatest achievement was the announcement and application of the *Tanzimat* reforms (prepared by his father Mahmud II) in 1856 (see above, p. 62).

time that the novel was almost ready to be published, the situation in Constantinople was quite tense due to the upcoming schism of the Orthodox *millet* and the outbreak of the revolt in Crete.

In the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, the Greek element within and outside the Ottoman Empire is presented in several ways, giving us a picture of how Samartsidis as a Constantinopolitan Greek saw the Ottoman Greeks as well as the Greeks of the independent state and the Diaspora. To begin with, the relationship of the Greek state with the Ottoman Empire appears to be close, but only at the level of shipping and commerce. At the second volume of the novel, the reader watches a Greek small ship from Syros, an island belonging to the Greek Kingdom, anchoring at the Byzantine shore and its Greek captain handing over to the Ottoman official, as demanded, his certificates as well as the passports of the two passengers. According to these passports, the first passenger is a citizen of Chalkida, a small town of the Greek state, who came to Constantinople for commercial purposes, while the second one, a citizen of Patras, only makes a short stopover to Constantinople on his way to Bucharest (vol. II, chapter XVIII, 57-59). The Ottoman capital, therefore, appears in the novel as the final destination or a stopover for many residents of the Greek Kingdom, mainly for commercial purposes. However, apart from the close commercial relations, the Greek Kingdom and its capital do not play any other role in the novel or influence the developments in the Ottoman capital. On the contrary, the Hellenism of the Danubian Principalities has a strong presence in the Constantinopolitan Greek society. For example, in the novel, the reader meets the young Efstathios Voithidis, who comes from a wealthy mercantile Greek family of Bucharest and is raised according to the traditional Orthodox Greek values. After completing his basic studies in Bucharest, the young man goes to Paris to "study science" and, afterward, decides to settle in Constantinople (vol. II, chapter XLII, 49-51).

As for the Constantinopolitan Greek society, according to Samartsidis, it is constituted by both members of the "high society", namely, the uprising *bourgeoisie*, who hide their immorality behind their financial prosperity, and members of the lower classes, who defend justice with the same ease that they commit terrible crimes.[1] The family of Chrysodaktylos is a typical example of the corrupt *bourgeoisie* that ravages everything to satisfy its interests. Both parents of the family constitute perfect examples

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 384.

of corruption and debauchery: the father stubbornly refuses to recognize his illegitimate child (Mountzouris) with one of his young maidservants, while the mother has several casual lovers (from whom she receives lots of money or expensive presents) and does not hesitate to murder her own daughter (!) in a moment of rivalry for one of her sexual objects. At the same time, as in all *City Mysteries*, members of the lower classes play a significant role in the plot, intermingling with members of the wealthy *bourgeoisie*, but the chasm between the higher and the lower social strata always remains huge. Anastasia Tsapanidou notes that reading the novel, we get the impression that there are, in fact, two separate societies in Constantinople: the directly visible society and the obscure society of the underworld, which preserves its existence due to strict internal rules and is protected by the outside world due to various mechanisms, strategies, and a secret language.[1] The "criminal association of the thirty-six", which consists of miscellaneous social figures, is a typical example: its members, most of them Greeks, meet in the middle of the night in a dark shelter, wear masks, speak their allegorical language (that the author "translates" in footnotes), hand in their prey, report to their leader (Trypanis) on the crimes that they committed, while each member is known by a code name (namely, a number) (vol. I, chapter IV, 43-50).

Within the lower strata of the Constantinopolitan Greek society, the reader also meets two special groups: the deceitful beggars and the abandoned children of the streets. Nikolis belongs to the first group: pretending to be blind, he managed to get enough money by begging in the streets of the Ottoman capital and now prepares to return to his homeland, Kravara, a village belonging to the Greek Kingdom, where he plans to continue his life "like a king". At a footnote, the author gives the reader more information about Kravara, noting that most of its inhabitants make their living as professional beggars in various cities of the East. After getting rich by their "profession", they return to their homeland and continue their lives as "honorable landlords" (vol. I, chapter VII, 62). I believe that this reference could be read as an implication of the relationship of exploitation and deception between the Greek Kingdom and the Ottoman capital. According to Samartsidis, the inhabitants of the Greek Kingdom are only interested in the money of the Ottoman Greeks, seeing the Ottoman capital and its population with self-interest and opportunism.

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 387-388. We should not forget that the existence of two separate worlds in modern society constitutes one of the main conventions of the *City Mysteries* literary genre.

According to the ideology of the novel, social injustice is one of the main reasons that lead people to criminal actions, which consequently cause social instability and disorder.[1] Following the ideas about poverty and social injustice originally expressed in *Les Mystères de Paris*, Samartsidis also relates these social phenomena to illegal action and crime. Therefore, he asks the reader to read carefully the "biographical testimonies" of the miserable young women, who were forced to prostitution and are now detained at the police department of Constantinople, to understand that two are the main reasons of their misery, namely, poverty and deceit. Some of these women originate from good families but were orphaned at a younger age and were deceived by dishonest procurers, who promised them protection, some others were deceived by a man, who left them disgraced, and ended up in prostitution to survive, while others originate from poor families that gave them "poor upbringing" and got them used to "an unabashed and shameless way of life" from a younger age (vol. I, chapter XIII, 87-104). The author concludes that social inequality and injustice can only cause problems, as the one who suffers will not hesitate to break the law. However, Samartsidis goes one step further than other *City Mysteries* authors and proposes ways to improve the situation in modern society, speaking about the value of work and the need for legal wages.[2]

In general, in the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, Samartsidis expresses his ideas about the reformation of modern society more directly than other *City Mysteries* authors. These ideas appear to be quite "revolutionary" for his time, largely reflecting the ideas of the French Revolution regarding liberty and human rights. According to Samartsidis, the world should peacefully strive for a common religion for everyone, that is, "Christians, Jews, Ottomans, Indians, etc.",[3] justice for the working classes and a law that declares assassination the most terrible crime. Through the long confession of one of the repentant criminals (Tonneras), the author deplores the hypocrisy of modern society, the perversion of the laws of nature, the exploitation of the peasants by the village headmen, the moral corruption of young people, the phenomena of urbanization and prostitution, the outdated custom of dowry that turns marriage into a

---

[1]   As mentioned in chapter I, this is a typical feature of the *City Mysteries* genre (see above, p. 22).

[2]   "Ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη νὰ δοθῇ δικαιοσύνη καὶ νόμιμος ἀμοιβὴ εἰς τοὺς ἐργάτας. Ἐὰν ἐγὼ ἐργάτης ὤν ἀπήλαυον ἀναλόγως τῶν κόπων μου, δὲν ἤθελον ἀποβῆ ἐγκληματίας καὶ ὀλέθριος εἰς ὁμοίους μου ἀνθρώπους" (vol. II, chapter XLIV, 22-23).

[3]   The repentant criminal Paschalis Tonneras proposes a "unified doctrine", namely, the belief in one common God, as the solution to all religious conflicts; this idea was revolutionary for the mid-nineteenth century.

commercial agreement and the suicide that may be due to a moment of insanity. Real wealth comes from the cultivation of land and not from the debauchery and opportunism of the cities, he argues (vol. II, chapter XLIV, 7-33). Through the English lord Figaro, who views the Constantinopolitan society from the perspective of the external observer, Samartsidis deplores the injustice of modern society: the misdemeanors of its impoverished members are usually punished as terrible felonies, while the crimes of its wealthy and aristocratic members as harmless misconducts. In their despair, its miserable and impoverished members are often forced to act violently against those who have the power in their hands. According to my perspective, the novel serves, to a large extent, social and educative objectives, as Samartsidis presents several negative social types as warning examples, trying to propose solutions to the existing phenomena of social decay.

Apart from the chasm between different social classes, the distance between the capital and the provinces is particularly highlighted in the novel, as in Ioannidis's novel as well (see above, p. 150). In the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, a typical example is Paschalis Tonneras, who originates from a poor and humble family of Rodosto,[1] a small town of the Ottoman periphery, was raised in misery and deprivation and complains about the social inequality that he has been experiencing since his childhood. The young provincial man soon realizes that although the poor and naive people in the country work hard, they hardly manage to survive. He decides, therefore, to leave his homeland and move to Naples and thence, to Bucharest until he finally settles in Constantinople, dreaming of a better future (vol. II, chapter XLV, 8-12).

As in most of the *City Mysteries* novels of the time published in Constantinople, in Samartsidis's novel*,* we hardly find any references to the Ottoman Muslim population. The few ruling Ottomans that appear in the text are mainly members of the authorities, as, for example, gendarmes, the minister of the police and, as expected, Sultan Abdülmecid I. All of them are presented with positive characteristics, as sympathetic figures, who restore the order that has been disturbed by "evil" Greeks.[2] It is clear, therefore, that for Samartsidis the Ottomans are not the oppressive tyrants who threaten the future of the Greek community, but rather a symbol of order and

---

[1] Rodosto (today: Terkidağ) is a small town in Eastern Thrace, built on the shore of the Sea of Marmara. During Byzantine times, it developed a remarkable culture and experienced considerable prosperity.

[2] Tonnet 1997, 29.

organization in the multiethnic and multireligious Empire. In other words, they constitute the framework of power and administration, within which the Ottoman Greeks have the opportunity to develop further. According to my perspective, this is another indication that the author was supporting – at least, originally – the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism*.

Moreover, as mentioned above, Samartsidis expresses great admiration for Sultan Abdülmecid I, which might, at first reading, seem a bit excessive. In the novel, the glorious Sultan is presented as "a model of goodness and righteousness", a virtuous and philanthropist monarch with a pleasant figure and a tender heart, who does great beneficences every single day. Due to his philanthropist attitude, the Greek protagonists of the novel do not hesitate to ask for his support and protection, declaring that they will always be "faithful and devoted to his will". For example, in volume II, we see the Sultan being emotionally moved by the story of the abandoned young Mountzouris, whom he takes under his protection, while he provides his miserable mother a monthly pension from the imperial treasury (vol. II, chapter XLII, 58-63). In return, the young boy will stay devoted to the Sultan as an expression of gratitude and will gladly take on the honorary post of the first interpreter of the commander in the Ottoman army and leave for Crimea, even if he has to leave his family behind. Anastasia Tsapanidou argues that with this excessive presentation of the Sultan as a philanthropist protector, Samartsidis intersperses the ideology of his novel with sermons of *paternalistic socialism*, which, as we have already seen in chapter I (see above, p. 20), constitute a common feature of the *City Mysteries* genre.[1] Nevertheless, Abdülmecid's glorifying picture remains problematic, especially if we take into account that in the same year, when the novel was published, Samartsidis was insistently demanding the liberation of Constantinople and the abolition of the Ottoman power. According to the above-mentioned researcher, in his novel, Samartsidis might be indirectly "reminding" the new Sultan Abdülaziz (see above, p. 62, footnote 1) of the virtues and assets of his predecessor, "encouraging" him to continue the reformative efforts.[2] At the same time, Henri Tonnet sees the idealized Sultan as "the stable moral reference-point" that the novel needs, although he is not directly involved in the plot and only appears twice in the extensive text.[3]

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 417.
[2]   Tsapanidou 2012, 418.
[3]   Tonnet 1997, 29.

From the multitude of nations in the Ottoman capital listed in the prologue (see above, p. 160, footnote 1), Samartsidis finally refers mainly to the Greeks and, to a lesser extent, with short references, to the Armenians and the Jews. The latter are presented most negatively: the reader meets the old Abraham, "procurer and vile intercessor of immorality" (vol. I, chapter XII, 82-85) as well as the wealthy and penurious Jew, who has hidden a fabulous treasure under the flagstones of his garden (vol. II, chapter XXXVIII, 62-69). The reader also meets representatives of several European nations, such as Italians, English, and Poles. For example, the English lord Figaro, a descendant of a great family, who has settled in the Ottoman capital for a few years, plays an important role in the plot. Through this character, who sees Constantinople from the perspective of the European Other and cannot perceive its "mysterious and dark" side, Samartsidis, as Xenos and Ramphos also did (see below, p. 219 and 232, respectively), indirectly criticizes all citizens of Western countries, who cannot or do not want to see the "real picture" of the Ottoman capital and its population. Another interesting example is the Polish music teacher Filivaux, who once belonged to one of the most aristocratic families of his nation but was forced to abandon his homeland when his family fortune in the outskirts of Warsaw was confiscated by the Russians. In general, these few representatives of the multiethnic element of the Ottoman capital are not presented adequately as different national types but are only depicted as such because they are followed by a stereotypical characteristic of their nation; for example, the English lord is refined, the Jew is penurious, and the Maltese is a ripper.[1]

We should note here that the Greek element in the *Mysteries of Constantinople* does not have distinct characteristics that would contribute to the formation of a collective Greek identity. This kind of "neutralized" identity might probably reflect the dominant ideological figures of the time, as in the late 1860s the Constantinopolitan Greek community had already replaced its "national" ideology with that of economic development within the Empire and the *Greco-Ottoman* perspective. Of course, religion still plays an important but not dominant role in the process of forming a collective consciousness. The role of "our heavenly religion" is mainly compassionate to people's misfortunes, says the author; in fact, it is the Greek education that will bring all members of the Ottoman Greek community together. We

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 421.

should not forget that Samartsidis supported this belief for several years with his work as a pedagogue and supervisor of Greek schools throughout the Empire.

Moreover, quite indicative of the author's ideology is the way that the novel ends: the story ends in 1855 at the camp of an English battalion on a hill near a Crimean small town, where Mountzouris serves the interests of the Sultan as a colonel of the Ottoman army against the Russians. On the opposite side, the criminal Trypanis serves voluntarily in the Russian army, having most of his partners-in-crime at his side. In other words, the virtuous Greek protagonists draw on the side of the Sultan and fight for the interests of the Empire, while the criminals fight for its enemies. According to my perspective, this is another indication that Samartsidis believed in the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism*, viewing the Greek population as an organic part of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the author seems to express a pro-Western tendency and sees Russia along with its protected allies (namely, Bulgaria) as the enemy. We should not forget that the novel was written in the 1860s when everything indicated that Bulgarian nationalism was gradually becoming more intense and that Russia was constantly following a philoslavic policy.

As a distinguished member of the Constantinopolitan Greek community of the second half of the nineteenth century, Christophoros Samartsidis supports, at least until a certain point, the *Greco-Ottoman* perspective that promoted the cultural expansion and supremacy of the Greek nation in the East and the preservation of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. As Henri Tonnet argues, Samartsidis's Constantinople is not the picturesque Eastern capital, full of violence and political intrigue, as the Constantinople of Stephanos Xenos or Konstantinos Ramphos (see below, p. 219 and 232, respectively).[1] On the contrary, it is the capital of the Ottoman Empire that must follow a steady pace of modernization and westernization to take the place that it deserves in twentieth-century Europe; and the Greek subjects of the Sultan their place in the evolving Empire.

---

[1]   Tonnet 1997, 31.

1.3. Konstantinos D. Goussopoulos: a *Greco-Ottoman* approach at the end of the nineteenth century

The Constantinopolitan Greek Konstantinos Goussopoulos published his *Dramas of Constantinople* a couple of decades later, that is, at the end-1880s. From the first pages of the novel, he gives the impression that he is addressed to readers who do not have sufficient knowledge of the topography and the social structure of the Ottoman capital, although the novel was only published in Constantinople. Therefore, as a Constantinopolitan himself, who has a thorough knowledge of his city, he undertakes to fill this gap[1] and states that before beginning the narration of the story, he will present, in brief, the past and the present of "our beautiful city", emphasizing its topographic and social perspective.[2] This brief presentation will be a major contribution to the full understanding of the story, he explains. Goussopoulos compares the Ottoman capital with the European urban centers of the time, noting that Constantinople with its suburbs can be assorted among the "capital cities" of Europe, not only because of its natural beauty but also because of its diversity and multiculturalism. The description of the district of Galata/Karaköy (see above, p. 121, footnote 1), where a big part of the story takes place, is quite interesting. The author observes its vivid commercial activity, as thousands of people, Ottomans, Greeks, Armenians, Jews, and citizens of all states not only of Europe but of other continents as well, come and go "in a diabolical movement". He seems to be fascinated by this multiethnic, "Babylonian" crowd;[3] one can easily distinguish the unusual uniforms of foreigners and the colorful dresses of Ottoman women, he states (vol. I, part I, chapter I, 4-5). Moreover, the author notes that, despite the coexistence of such a heterogeneous population, in a rather strange way, the perpetration of crime in Constantinople is rarer compared to other European capitals; in other words, despite the city's multinational and multicultural character, all its inhabitants manage to communicate wonderfully and coexist harmoniously.

---

[1] As we have seen in chapter I (see above, p. 22), this is a common literary convention of the *City Mysteries* genre: the author presents himself as a "reliable witness", who has a thorough knowledge of the city, its districts, and, of course, its "mysteries" and reveals to the unaware reader a part of his city that remained invisible to him until then. We should note that Goussopoulos must have been living in the Ottoman capital (at least) for a decade before publishing *The Dramas of Constantinople*.

[2] Indicatively, the first chapter of volume I is entitled "Constantinople".

[3] The depiction of Constantinople as a modern Babel is used by several authors of this corpus, as, for example, Christophoros Samartsidis, Stephanos Xenos, and Konstantinos Goussopoulos, stressing the multicultural and multinational character of the Ottoman capital.

Goussopoulos enthusiastically welcomes the city's Europeanization and modernization that has been accomplished, to a large extent, in the past few decades: stone houses have been built according to an architectural plan (in the past, the majority of the houses were wooden); wide and symmetrical streets have been constructed (in the past, the streets were narrow and muddy); modern districts have been built, which give Constantinople the character of a European city (vol. I, part I, chapter I, 5-6). This contemporary picture of Constantinople based on European standards seems to satisfy the author. However, he notes that the general picture of the Ottoman capital is contradictory, as its modernization does not refer to the entire city and all citizens. Many districts remain in a despicable situation, such as the small coastal neighborhood of Mumhane, located between the districts of Galata/Karaköy and Tophane. According to Goussopoulos, the few houses of this "barbarous and dangerous neighborhood" are inhabited by people of the lower social classes, that is, sailors, criminals, thieves, and Italian refugees (vol. I, part II, chapter VI, 137-138).

As mentioned in chapter III (see above, p. 134), the author places the plot in the 1850s and 1860s, that is, the period of modernization of Constantinople according to European standards.[1] In one of the novel's first chapters, the young protagonist Dimitrios, after completing his studies at a Greek school in Constantinople, becomes the apprentice of the "virtuous and noble" Mr. Smith, an English engineer. As Goussopoulos notes, the young man "[…] decided to leave *Athenà* [that is, theoretical studies] and follow *Hephaestos* [that is, practical, non-academic education], who was at that time in feverish motion in Europe, threatening to conquer the world".[2] The experienced Englishman sees in Dimitrios an assiduous and hardworking young man and encourages him to evolve; as a result of his support, in a short time, Dimitrios evolves into a first-class worker. However, Goussopoulos notes that, despite all the efforts for modernization made in the past few decades, there are still structures that need to be improved. A typical example is the obsolete fire-extinguishing system of the Ottoman capital. The fire-fighters are depicted in the novel as "a mob of half-naked men", who run around the streets like demons, yell and tear everything down.

---

[1] After the mid-century, Constantinople was in constant, direct communication with Paris, London, and Vienna. The social structure of these European capitals and their urban lifestyle in all aspects of everyday life functioned as an example to be imitated (Bozi 2002, 17-33).

[2] "[Ο Δημήτριος] απεφάσισε να εγκαταλείψη την Αθηνάν και ακολουθήση τον Ήφαιστον, όστις κατά ταύτην την εποχήν, εν Ευρώπη, εις πυρετωδεστάτην ευρίσκεται κίνησιν, επαπειλών να κατακυριεύση τον κόσμον" (vol. I, part I, chapter III, 18-19).

According to Goussopoulos, the system is so ineffective, that even the slightest spark may bring the ultimate catastrophe, as it has already happened several times during the nineteenth century (vol. I, part II, chapter I, 79).[1]

Although Goussopoulos enthusiastically welcomes the modernization of Constantinople on a material level, in several parts of his novel, he disapproves – directly or indirectly – of the unconsidered and uncritical imitation of modern European morals that have already caused significant changes in every part of the Greek community's daily life. In fact, Goussopoulos is – together with Epameinondas Kyriakidis – one of the first Constantinopolitan Greek authors who criticize this social phenomenon. We must note here that his criticism is mainly directed towards the members of the uprising *bourgeoisie* of the Ottoman capital; in the novel, the majority frequents taverns and backstreet bars, where the regular customers are addicted to bad habits, as, for example, card playing, drinking, and smoking. What is very interesting is the way that the author presents the influence of European ethics on the character of Ottoman Greek women and their relationship with men. In a conversation between two young men, namely, Georgios and our protagonist Dimitrios, the reader follows the conflict between the old, the conservative, the "Eastern" and the new, the modern, the "European", in other words, the conflict between Self and Other. Georgios disapproves of the hypocrisy of modern women: the boatman's wife wears impressive clothes and walks in the streets "like a lady of the high society", he comments, while at home her family is starving. The young man claims that the woman must fear her husband, otherwise, his honor is in danger. On the contrary, Dimitrios expresses a modern opinion, influenced by the ideas of the French Revolution regarding liberty and human rights: the woman should no longer be a slave to her husband, but his equal partner (vol. I, part I, chapter II, 14-15). In the novel, a typical example of the modern corrupt woman is the devious Angeliki, a woman of humble origin but extremely ambitious and remorseless. However, although the author imputes several negative attributes to

---

[1]   In his novel, Goussopoulos refers to several actual events that marked the course of the Ottoman capital in the nineteenth century. One of them was the great fire of 1870, which spread across Pera/Beyoğlu and caused an indescribable catastrophe. The toll of the fire was terrible: hundreds of people dead; thousands in the streets naked, hungry, and homeless; incalculable material losses. One of the buildings that were torn down by the fire was that of the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*) along with its library. According to the author, the unfortunate victims of the fire managed to survive thanks to the magnanimous Sultan, his government, and several philanthropist citizens (vol. III, part I, chapter XI, 111-132). As we have seen in chapter I, reference to actual events is a common feature of the *City Mysteries* genre (see above, p. 22).

women, we do not find any tendency towards "misogyny", in the modern sense of the word, in the presentation of the female character. On the contrary, Goussopoulos, unlike other authors,[1] believes that women, like men, often drift into immorality and corruption, but always have the chance to repent and return to the path of virtue.

In *The Dramas of Constantinople*, the author's main objective is to reveal the decline of values in modern Constantinopolitan Greek society and contribute to its moral restoration.[2] According to Goussopoulos, corruption is directly related to Europeanization. Its center is Galata/Karaköy's central street, along which, close to one another, one can find dozens of European-style theaters and "singing cafés" that are considered as the center of ultimate turpitude, debauchery, and corruption: family fortunes are squandered, alcohol is consumed in large quantities, murders are committed, and unbelievable abuses take place (vol. II, part II, chapter X, 190-194). In the novel, the type of the corrupt *bourgeois* is represented by Theodoros, the self-indulgent lover of Angeliki, who is characterized by the narrator as "a typical young man of his time", namely, a dissolute, corrupt, inane, emotionless *bourgeois*, who spends his days in idleness and his nights in debauchery, playing cards and drinking with his friends (vol. I, part II, chapter II, 100).

As promised in the first chapter of his novel, Goussopoulos reveals to the reader the "hidden face" of the Ottoman capital, which is not easily visible by the inexperienced observer. As in all *City Mysteries* novels, several figures of the plot come from the lower social strata, live under terrible conditions, and therefore, often express a tendency towards illegal action and crime. The boatmen working at the numerous docks of the harbor constitute a typical example: they are uneducated, speak the *argot* (for example, "επήγε 'ς το καρακόλι", "δυο ποτηράκια κι έχασε την πούσουλα") and often threaten to throw the unaware passengers into the sea if they do not satisfy their "excessive economic demands" (vol. I, part II, chapter VI, 139). As in Samartsidis's novel (see above, p. 164), the abandoned children of Constantinople constitute a special case: for example, Panos, the deputy leader of the "criminal association of the iron ring", loses both his parents at a very young age and spends his childhood in the streets,

---

[1] For example, as we have seen above, Petros Ioannidis in his *Eptalophos* makes strong discrimination between the sexes and appears to be rather disapproving of the female character (see above, p. 159).

[2] Goussopoulos points out the distortion of values in modern society: friendship, love, trust, gratitude, benevolence, and integrity have no value anymore; on the contrary, duplicity, hypocrisy, stupidity, insensibility, insanity, and impotence are regarded as the "modern values" (vol. I, part I, chapter VIII, 74-75).

sleeping with the stray dogs at the corners and fighting against them to get the leftovers of the houses (vol. II, part I, chapter IV, 39). The main protagonist (Dimitrios) appears to be the victim of modern society that exploits its honest and virtuous members. As we have seen in chapter I, this is another common feature of the *City Mysteries* genre: modern society disdains the poor, who starves and lives under terrible conditions, although he works hard. In several chapters of the novel, where the author criticizes the injustice and exploitation of poor, virtuous people and the struggle between the rich and the poor in modern society, we can pinpoint the influence of George W. Reynolds (see above, p. 31), who gave his novel *The Mysteries of London* a political-reformist dimension, analyzing the opposition of Wealth and Poverty and the exploitation of the poor that leads them directly to crime as a natural reaction to social pressure put on them. Thus, in *The Dramas of Constantinople*, the young protagonist (Dimitrios), with a new identity (that of the wealthy banker of Galata/Karaköy, Epameinondas Komorinos), decides to take harsh revenge from the unjust society for all the crimes that it commits against innocent and virtuous people.

Studying the role of the Constantinopolitan Greek community, as presented in the novel, we could note that it develops on two levels, a horizontal and a vertical one: the first one deals with the position of the Greeks within the Ottoman society and their relationship with the other ethnicities of the Empire, while the second one refers to the social stratification in the context of their community. In *The Dramas of Constantinople*, the reader finds several references to the character of the ruling Ottomans, mainly with positive connotations regarding higher officials;[1] this comes to us as no surprise, as the author publishes his novel under the strict control of Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88). For example, the Pasha is presented in the novel as a fair and prudent man and for this reason, Angeliki asks for his intervention in solving her problem (vol. I, part II, chapter IV, 124). In one of the next chapters, the reader experiences the integrity and disinterest of an Ottoman official: when Theodoros tries to give him money as a reward for his services, the honest Ottoman does not accept it, saying that he just did his duty (vol. I, part II, chapter VIII, 162). We find numerous examples of this kind in the extensive novel. A special case is, of course, the

---

[1]   In only two cases in the extensive novel, the Ottomans are characterized by a negative attribute: the credulous and greedy Ottoman prison-guard and the warlike Ottoman bandits on the mountains of Samsun.

philanthropist Sultan Abdülaziz, who offers ten thousand Ottoman piasters from his treasury to help the victims of the great fire of 1870 (vol. III, part I, chapter XI, 132).

Apart from the ruling Ottomans, two more ethnicities appear in the novel: the Russians and the Montenegrins. The reference to the Russian community of the Ottoman capital has no positive attribute: the reader meets Georgios Alexandrovic, a Russian citizen who settled for several years in Constantinople. "Suspicious people" come and go in his house, especially during the night. The neighbors of the Russian landowner get the impression that he is a very "unusual" man, a "savage peasant who got rich by chance" and keeps living following his homeland's customs, that is, engaging in criminal activities (vol. II, part I, chapter II, 14-15). In another chapter, the author presents the Montenegrins, whose outward appearance and character contrasts their position in the Ottoman capital: they are presented as giant and warlike men, but, at the same time, as miserable and seedy people (vol. III, part I, chapter V-VI, 54, 64-65). We must note here that the author does not mention at all the Armenian and the Jewish community, which also played an important role in the life of the Ottoman capital.[1] It seems that Goussopoulos intentionally ignores their presence and action in the city, focusing almost exclusively on the Constantinopolitan Greeks and their relationship with the ruling Ottomans.

What is very interesting is the way that the author depicts the social structure of the Constantinopolitan Greek community, which, according to him, consists of three separate social classes. He sharply criticizes the members of the "first class", namely, the uprising *bourgeoisie*, as these wealthy bankers and merchants, a weird "mixture of emptiness and intelligence, nobility and triviality, pride and obsequiousness",[2] as he describes them, blindly imitate European customs. In a short time, they managed to keep pace with citizens of European capitals in splendor and luxury, but, at the same time, in debauchery and corruption as well. It is a fact that the Crimean war gave great opportunities to the *bourgeoises* of the Constantinopolitan Greek society, mainly to powerful and wealthy merchants and bankers, such as Georgios Zarifis and Christakis Zografos, to encroach the monopolization of the Armenian bankers in the Ottoman capital and "re-negotiate" with the *neo-Phanariot* elite for the leadership of the

---

[1]   During the nineteenth century, the proportion of the Greek population in Constantinople remained unchanged, reaching 35% of the total (45-50% were Muslims and 10% Armenians; the rest were Jews and foreigners) (Apostolidis 1996, 19).

[2]   "[…] μίγμα κουφότητος και ευφυΐας, ευγενείας και μηδαμινότητος, υπερηφανείας και κολακείας" (vol. I, part I, chapter I, 7).

community. The latter constitutes, according to Goussopoulos, the "second class" of the Constantinopolitan society and includes "serious" people, wealthy aristocrats and scholars, who occupy high offices in the Ottoman administration and face everything that goes on around them with indifference, avoiding any social interaction with other classes and living a "philosophical" life; all they care about is how to preserve their reputation and earn more money. It is obvious that Goussopoulos strongly criticizes here the indifferent attitude of the *Neo-Phanariots*, who seem to be living in their own world without any participation in the evolvement of society. The "third class" consists of common citizens, that is, a miscellaneous group that combines several virtues and devilries at the same time;[1] everyone, therefore, can evolve into a virtuous man or a terrible criminal according to the education that he receives. It is not difficult to understand that Goussopoulos criticizes the modern Constantinopolitan Greek society as a whole since he traces significant flaws in each one of its social classes: exacerbated mimicry, xenomania, and tendency to corruption in the first class, indifference and pursuit of personal interest in the second, moral instability in the third. In the latter, however, he sees many virtues and potentials as well, as long as these are developed through the right education. According to Sia Anagnostopoulou, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the chasm between the *higher bourgeois class*, which consisted of merchants, bankers, and stockbrokers as well as higher state or ministry officials, who were members of well-known *Phanariot* families, and the *middle urban class* that claimed the power and control of the community, was great.[2] In several chapters of the novel, Goussopoulos notes that heterogeneity is one of the main characteristics of the Constantinopolitan Greek society. In this sense, it is difficult to speak of a solid Greek collective identity during this period.

However, there are still two significant common elements that connect the members of the Greek community and support their collective consciousness, namely, the Greek language and the Orthodox religion. At the end of the nineteenth century, the *Katharevousa*, that is, the purist Greek archaizing form of the modern Greek language has become the mother-tongue of the educated *bourgeoises*, while the

---

[1]   "[They combine] kindness with barbarism and ferocity, indifference with hardness, philanthropy with vengeance, hatred with love, deception with honesty, industriousness with indolence, poverty with unconcern, insobriety with philosophy, selfishness with modesty, envy with true respect, superstition and fear with atheism and self-sacrifice, and ignorance with slight foolishness, apt and perceptive answers, and insightfulness" (my translation) (vol. I, part I, chapter I, 7-8).

[2]   Anagnostopoulou 1997, 302-303.

common Greek idiom, with many Turkish words adapted to Greek, was the language of the rest.[1] According to Goussopoulos, this language constitutes the first coherent element for all Constantinopolitan Greeks. In *The Dramas of Constantinople*, the proper use of the Greek language is considered an indication of higher education. During a conversation of two Greek men, one of them uses the word "confidentiality" (in Greek: *εχεμύθεια*), but his interlocutor notes that "this is *very Greek* and he does not understand it"; so, he asks for an explanation (vol. I, part II, chapter V, 136). This clearly shows that, although the members of the Greek community theoretically spoke the same language, there were still diversifications among them.

Apart from language, religion is the second significant element that configures the collective identity of the Constantinopolitan Greeks. It is a fact that during the second half of the nineteenth century, religion still functioned as one among many ways of diversification of the Ottoman subjects; it did not bestow a social position by itself, but only in combination with other forms of identity.[2] This means that the "title" of Muslim or Christian did not predetermine by itself the social, economic, and political reality of a person, but was one of the many qualities that determined his identity.[3] In the novel, the Orthodox Greeks of Constantinople appear as a homogeneous group. The picture of Orthodox Greeks, men, women, and children, who go to church, wearing their festive clothes, to attend the Sunday mass, is very typical. But we must note again that the religious identity of the Greeks is not presented in the text as a special quality that differentiates them from members of other communities. Moreover, the author criticizes the clergy's attitude towards the developments and the modernization of the Ottoman society in the second half of the century. Goussopoulos sadly notes that the lower clergy lacks the proper education, aiming only at its interest and at meaningless formalities; thus, its members are not able to function as the leaders of the Greek community. Despite that, he still believes in the unifying role of the Orthodox religion, as long as its members are characterized by true Christian principles, as, for example, virtue, honesty, and philanthropy. The indifference towards "our holy religion", he argues, leads to moral decay, which gradually leads to corruption and misery. The virtuous and respectable priest

---

[1] Bozi 2002, 307.
[2] For the role of religion in the formation of the collective identity of the Ottoman Greeks see above, p. 89.
[3] Quataert 2000, 250.

Agathangelos,[1] the lost brother of our protagonist is presented in the novel as a model of Christian virtue: his only concern is to help the unfortunate ones. Giving the example himself, he preaches that true happiness does not come from material goods, but the benevolence of others. This priest is an unwearied worker of virtue and has all these moral principles, which "managed to disperse the darkness of ignorance, superstition, and barbarism for centuries" (vol. IV, part II, chapter I, 145-148). The Constantinopolitan Greek community needs such inspired leaders. We should not forget that *The Dramas of Constantinople* were published within a critical period when the Greek community of the Ottoman Empire had to face two major dangers: the Bulgarian propaganda that became even more intense after the schism of the Orthodox *millet* and the establishment of the Exarchate in 1872 as well as the ideology of *Pan-Islamism* that was rapidly spreading in the Empire after 1880 (see above, p. 65). As a counteraction to these dangers, Goussopoulos puts forward a collective Greek identity based on the Greek language and the Orthodox religion. The author asks for educated and open-minded members of the clergy, who will only care for the benefit of the community and not their interests.

In the novel, as in most *City Mysteries* published in Constantinople, the reader can only find a few references to the Greek Kingdom and its capital. The first one is related to the adventures of the younger Panos (he will later become the deputy leader of the "criminal association of the iron ring"), who, being an orphan and starving young man, decides to leave Constantinople and voluntarily join the Greek army. He participates in the revolution of Crete [2] and after its suppression, returns to

---

[1] *Agathangelos; or prophecies for the future of nations and, in particular, for Greece* (*Ο Αγαθάγγελος: ήτοι προφητείαι περί του μέλλοντος των εθνών και ιδίως περί της Ελλάδος*) is a prophetic and apocalyptic Christian text, which was originally regarded to have been written by the hieromonk Agathangelos in 1279, but, according to modern scholars, was written by the hierarch and scholar of Modern Greek Enlightenment Theoclitos Polyeidis. The text was originally published in 1750, a time when severe conflicts between Russia and the Ottoman Empire were taking place and Orthodox Hellenism was placing the hopes for its restoration in the win of Orthodox Russia. For more information about the text, see Politis 1969; Michalopoulos 1991. I believe that Goussopoulos deliberately chose the name Agathangelos for this virtuous and respectable priest, as he wanted to stress the need for strengthening the collective consciousness of the Constantinopolitan Greeks, based on the Orthodox religion and the Greek language, to empower their position in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century.

[2] Goussopoulos probably refers to the Cretan Revolt of 1866-1869, which was one of the most significant in a series of Cretan revolts against Ottoman domination in the nineteenth century. Although the revolution caused great excitement in the Greek Kingdom, the position of the Greek government was particularly difficult: officially, it could not support the Cretan Revolt militarily, as such an action would practically mean open war with the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the Greek government only confined itself to an unofficial and limited mission of volunteers and supplies to Crete. Goussopoulos must probably refer to this unofficial mission.

Constantinople and gets involved in criminal activities. Goussopoulos argues that this talented and decisive young man could easily become a distinguished officer of the Greek army if the circumstances in the Greek Kingdom favored him.[1] A second reference to territories belonging to the Greek Kingdom is the narration of the adventures of the pirate Captain Panayis, who comes from Hydra island and takes action with his ship in the Aegean Sea. For one more time, the author criticizes the terrible circumstances prevailing in the Greek Kingdom a few decades after its independence, referring to the problem of piracy that plagued shipping and sea transports. We can also find an interesting reference to the Greek state in the novel's epilogue, where the narrator informs the reader about the course of the protagonists in the future: the moral and virtuous protagonists (namely, Alexandros and Eftychia) as well as the ex-criminals who have repented (namely, Komorinos, Narcissus, Panos, and Captain Panayis), decide to leave the corrupted Ottoman capital; their first stop is the Greek state. However, they do not intend to settle there, but plan to depart for America, dreaming of a safe, new life; the Greek Kingdom is, therefore, an intermediate stopover on their way to "a new world". On the contrary, the unrepentant criminals, as, for example, Mythridatis, remain in Constantinople.

Apart from what goes on within the Ottoman Empire, Goussopoulos seems to be quite interested in the international political situation in the 1860s and 1870s and often includes his critical comments in the narration of the story. For example, he speaks about the tense relations between France and Germany, which, according to him, can be very critical for the future of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the relationship between the Empire and the Western Powers is portrayed in the novel in various ways, as, for example, through the comparison between "Eastern" and "Western" novels, where Goussopoulos reveals the way he sees "us", that is, "Eastern"

---

[1]   Goussopoulos's comments on the situation of the Greek army after the mid-nineteenth century remind us of Charilaos Dimopoulos's narrative entitled *The military life in Greece* (*Η στρατιωτική ζωή εν Ελλάδι*, 1870), where a non-commissioned officer of the Greek army narrates his adventures in first person. The story takes place after the Crimean war, that is, in the second half of the nineteenth century, and mainly revolves around the phenomenon of robbery in Athens and the situation in the Greek army. The young protagonist, full of enthusiasm, comes from Constantinople to the Greek Kingdom to do his service in the Greek army and experiences absolute frustration regarding the circumstances that prevail in this area. He describes the way that the military mechanism functions and explains how his dreams of being part of this mechanism collapsed, when, following the idealized descriptions of his teacher in Constantinople, he decided to come to the independent state and voluntarily join the Greek army; unfortunately, the young man would soon be strongly disappointed. The customs and institutions of the modern Greek state are realistically depicted in the text as well as the distorted understanding that the Greeks living outside the state have of it.

novelists, in contradistinction to the "others": "*our* names", he notes, "do not sound well to the readership, because the poor and miserable novelists of the East are deprived of the impressive titles that the *others* have" (vol. III, chapter I, 5-6). The great distance between "West" and "East" (see above, p. 48) is also depicted through a comparison between the Parisian and the Constantinopolitan society in the mid-nineteenth century: the former requires refinement, elegance, and intelligence, qualities that one is not easy to find in people of the "East". A typical example that shows this great distance is the case of Angeliki and her lover Theodoros, who decide to leave Constantinople and settle in Paris, but soon realize that it is not easy to be integrated into this European environment (vol. III, part II, chapter III, 158-159). However, the author is pleased to note that the situation in the Empire is gradually improving and the "East" is being modernized, transportation is becoming easier and people are being "civilized and refined". He wishes, therefore, that the leaders who determine the future of "our state", that is, of the Ottoman Empire, will always look for the welfare of their subjects, the development of trade and industry, and, above all, the propagation of education, through which the "intelligent peoples of the East" will awaken from their lethargy and will "courageously walk the path of progress and culture" of other nations. It is obvious that the author enthusiastically welcomes the introduction of reforms in the Ottoman Empire and, at the same time, criticizes its slow development in comparison to Western countries, noting that "while all nations walk with giant steps, we crawl behind them like worms" (vol. III, chapter I, 6-7). He strongly believes that it is time for the Empire to wake up.

Konstantinos Goussopoulos was an active Ottoman Greek of the second half of the nineteenth century, who decided to live his whole life in the Empire and did not seem to have any expectations regarding the Greek Kingdom; his life choices and the ideas expressed in his novel indicate so. On the contrary, he seems to be disappointed by the situation in the Greek state. Through his novel, he sees the Constantinopolitan Greek community from the perspective of the Self, supports the efforts for modernization, and appears to be rather satisfied with the picture of Constantinople at the end of the nineteenth century, even though he believes that there is still a lot to be done. He sees the future of the Constantinopolitan Greeks within the Empire and asks for the implementation of the reforms for their future development. He calls the Ottoman Empire "our state" in a "non-irredentist" way and greets enthusiastically the multiethnic face of "our city", dreaming of a modern Constantinople, organized

according to European standards, where its inhabitants keep on coexisting harmoniously. Goussopoulos believes that it is necessary to form a strong Greek collective identity, which should be based on the Greek language and the Orthodox religion, asking for educated and open-minded members of the clergy, who will only care for the benefit of the community and not their personal interest. According to the author, the old aristocracy, that is, the *Phanariots*, are no longer the leaders of the Ottoman Greeks, who need inspiration and proper guidance to find their future place in the developing Empire. Goussopoulos is pleased to note that the situation in the Empire is gradually improving since the mid-nineteenth century and enthusiastically welcomes the introduction of reforms, but he also sees a big danger, namely, the mimicry and xenomania, the corruption and hypocrisy of the rising *bourgeoisie*, who is now in charge. According to him, corruption is directly related to Europeanization, but this does not mean that he denies the latter; on the contrary, he asks for the modernization of the Ottoman Empire based on its customs and values – in so far as is possible. The Greek community must reconstruct its forces and bring forth new, inspired leaders, with the action and guidance of whom the Ottoman Greeks will be able to face the dangers that threaten them and find their place in the twentieth-century Ottoman Empire.

1.4. Georgios K. Koutsouris: a Greek of the Ottoman provinces at the end of the nineteenth century

The Orphaned Girl, published in the Ottoman capital one year after Goussopoulos's *Dramas of Constantinople*, gives us a different perspective of the Constantinopolitan Greek community and its collective identity at the end of the nineteenth century, that is, the perspective of the Greek of the Ottoman provinces. Following closely the pattern of Eugène Sue and George Reynolds, Koutsouris focuses on the causes of social pathogenesis and projects the virtues that, according to him, should prevail in modern society. "Even the purest hearts often reach the very bottom of corruption and dishonesty, committing terrible crimes due to disillusionment, passion or avarice", he states. For example, in the novel, due to his mischievous relations with the wrong people from a younger age and the lack of proper education, Petros evolves into a corrupted and immoral man; however, his soul remains pure deep inside. Moreover, proper education is presented in the novel, as in most of the novels of this corpus, as the greatest value that decisively influences one's personality and course in the future. The two main male protagonists and brothers, Iakovos and Petros, follow a different course due to the education that they receive: the former becomes a noble young man and decides to go to Paris to study law, as many young men of his time did (see above, p. 121, footnote 1), while the latter gets involved in dissolute activities. At the same time, Evanthia attends a school for girls in Smyrna/Izmir and evolves into an assiduous and kind young woman (part II, chapter II, 42-43). Regarding education, Koutsouris believes that it is never too late: the uneducated Kostas, a young urchin of the dives and the streets of Constantinople, makes tremendous progress regarding his behavior due to the education that he did not receive as a child but as a teenager, and gradually transforms to a noble young man (part III, chapter XIII, 355).

As already mentioned in chapter III, a part of the plot takes place in the French and the British capital, which are depicted thoroughly in several chapters of the novel. More precisely, Koutsouris presents the contradictory character of Paris at the end of the nineteenth century that paradoxically combines progress and corruption: the French capital appears to be the center of the aristocracy, of great men, wonderful minds, and fine arts; it is "the mother of development", but, at the same time, the center of corruption, misery, despicable feelings, and depraved people (part II, chapter V, 79). London is described similarly: chaos prevails; in the streets, one can meet a wealthy

aristocrat walking next to a criminal ready to mug him (part II, chapter XIII, 145-149). In the European capitals, the chasm between different social strata appears to be huge: rich and poor, outcasts and aristocrats, people of the streets and people of the *bourgeoisie* constitute a miscellaneous society.

As for the Ottoman Empire, in *The Orphaned Girl*, Koutsouris mainly focuses on the presentation of the Greek communities of Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir. Concerning the presence of the ruling Ottomans in the novel, he only makes an indirect reference to the Sultan, noting that it was his "charitable mercy" that gave Eleni's husband his freedom: "our monarch", he states, granted him pardon because of his good conduct in prison, his humble and gentle behavior, his willing obedience, and his courtesy (part III, chapter XII, 343-344). We should not forget that the novel was published in Constantinople during a period when the Ottoman censorship was becoming increasingly strict (see above, p. 88); therefore, the reference to the Sultan could only be laudatory.

As Goussopoulos also did one year before (1888) in his *Dramas of Constantinople* (see above, p. 179), Koutsouris makes a clear distinction between Self and Other, namely, between East/Ottoman and West/European. In the novel, the young Lisa is portrayed as the "Parisian beauty" that can easily impress and enchant an "Eastern man" like Iakovos (part II, chapter VI, 83). We should always have in mind that Koutsouris came from Pontus, a region that in the nineteenth century still retained its "Eastern" character and lifestyle.[1] Therefore, according to the author's perspective, there exists a great chasm between the subjects of the Ottoman Empire and the citizens of Europe, viewing the latter from a rather "Eastern" perspective.

As mentioned above, the Greek community of the two important urban centers of the Ottoman Empire, namely, Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir, is depicted in detail and, as in most *City Mysteries* novels, Koutsouris also focuses on the uprising *bourgeoisie* that consists mainly of wealthy merchants and bankers. A typical example

---

[1]   In the case of Pontus, since the fifteenth century, the management of the Byzantine cultural delivery in the new political and cultural Ottoman system created dilemmas related to the choice between "West" and "East". The process of assimilation to the new religious-cultural identity and values flowing from the Ecumenical Patriarchate was rejected by several Pontian scholars, who selected the Christian Catholic West and the adherence to the intellectual life of Italian Humanism; this choice was of great importance but did not have much appeal to the Pontian people. The rejection of the Western model from the seventeenth century onwards was due to the contribution of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the need for the configuration of an institutional center with cultural relations with Byzantium, which could be capable to maintain the Greek education. For further information on the course of Pontus in the nineteenth century, see Iliadou-Tachou 2008.

of this social group is Vamvakis, Evanthia's father, who lives in a house in a small but very aristocratic street of Smyrna/Izmir. The author critically and a bit ironically notes that "we – namely, the Greeks – also have our aristocrats" (part II, chapter X, 124). Vamvakis is an honest man and honorable merchant, who always keeps his promises in commerce and life. His "adopted" sons, Iakovos and Petros, follow his steps in commerce, establish a large commercial house with "colonial goods"[1] and do business with every big city in Europe. The author notes that, at that time, when a large commercial house with significant goodwill and credits in the market was established in an Ottoman city, it easily became a "treasure of gold" in a short time ("χρυσούχος πακτωλός", part II, chapter XII, 144). According to Koutsouris, members of the *bourgeoisie* usually enjoy a magnificent life and spend their money profusely (part III, chapter VI, 245). At the same time, the wealthy wife of an imprisoned criminal can organize magnificent celebrations and welcome "the elite of the aristocratic high society" in her mansion; money seems to be the main value in modern Greek society (part III, chapter XII, 336). But what bothers the author more is the hypocrisy of this "high society": its younger members, who bear titles and diplomas, who appear to be noble and aristocratic, who "are dressed like lions and smoke cigarettes from Havana", do not hesitate to mock the naivety and misery of an innocent, poor girl in a rather terrible way (part II, chapter VI, 84).

In *The Orphaned Girl*, as in all *City Mysteries* novels, a big part of the plot takes place in the underworld of modern urban centers. For example, in chapter XIII, the narrator takes the reader to an infamous neighborhood in London, where one can find several dives and taverns, which are the "common meeting-point" for members of the lower classes and the underworld. The reader is invited to enter one of them, where sailors, criminals, thieves and drunken gather (part II, chapter XIII, 146-147). What characterizes the members of the lower social strata and the underworld is the lack of education, which makes them naive and superstitious. A typical example is an old woman, who works in Vamvakis's house as a maidservant and "asks the cards and the

---

[1] "Colonial goods" is a term that chiefly refers to foods and other goods imported from the European colonies, which were consumed in Europe, notably sugar, rice, coffee, tea, cocoa, and tobacco. These goods tended to be sold in specialized shops, which were regarded as a distinctive commercial sector. In the Ottoman Empire, which had gradually become a part of the European trading system, the flow of "colonial goods" increased since the mid-eighteenth century, mainly due to the improvement of transportation. Ships transporting "colonial goods" needed in Europe, mainly, raw materials, textiles, and spices, from the colonies to the European urban centers often made a stopover in ports of the Ottoman Empire, such as Smyrna/Izmir or Constantinople. Therefore, Ottoman imports primarily also consisted of colonial products. For further information, see Kucukkalay, Elibol 2006.

beans about the future" (part II, chapter IV, 72-73). Thousands of impoverished families in Constantinople live under terrible conditions, in dilapidated huts, in the freezing cold, in poverty. On the Grand Rue de Pera, numerous beggars stand patiently outside the luxurious European commercial houses, begging for some money. Members of the lower social strata drink and play cards in dives and taverns. Kostas, a young man of the streets, "the urchin of Paris, as the great Victor Hugo would describe him", frequents these places and is constantly drunk (part III, chapter I, 179-183). Unfortunately, poverty leads several of these people to immorality: the old lady who lives under terrible conditions and tells the cards to survive, is easily bribed by Petros to lead him to the room of the innocent girl, who lives next door; however, in the end, her consciousness leads her to repentance and suicide (part III, chapter X, 316-323).

What characterizes the Constantinopolitan Greek community is heterogeneity; however, according to Koutsouris, there is one thing that keeps its members united, that is, the Orthodox religion. The novel begins in a beautiful suburb of the Ottoman capital at the end of July, on the day of St. Panteleimon's fest: hundreds of people of every social class and age participate with piety and enthusiasm in the festive ceremony (part I, chapter I, 5-6). In general, in the novel, religion plays a significant role in people's life: when one gets carried away in the path of immorality and dishonesty, the Orthodox religion appears to be the only salvation (part III, chapter I, 181). Eleni is presented as a model of Christian virtue, as she always tries to do her duty as a Christian, helping people in need (part III, chapter VIII, 270). Although we are almost in the last decade of the nineteenth century, religion seems to be important for the author, at least from what we read in his "Letter from Sürmene" (see above, p. 135): Koutsouris speaks, full of enthusiasm, about the magnificent Orthodox Church that he visited near the Pontian town (that is, Sürmene), where he had the chance to "raise his sinful soul to God", pray, shed tears of joy and leave relieved.

Apart from the depiction of modern society, which is a common feature of the *City Mysteries* novels, Koutsouris mainly focuses on matters of social injustice, reminding us, to a large extent, of the social concerns of Eugène Sue and George Reynolds (see above, p. 27 and 31, respectively). In the novel, the young Parisian Lisa is presented as the victim of social injustice and exploitation: she is a seduced and expelled by the society miserable human being that gets "purified" due to Iakovos's love. In chapter IX, the young girl narrates her story in the first person: hunger and impoverishment inevitably leads her to prostitution; one day she finds an "honorable"

work and manages to get away from her procurer; at that time, she meets Iakovos and falls in love with him. But when she finds out about the existence of Evanthia back in Smyrna/Izmir, she decides to sacrifice herself and commits suicide, stating that "a Parisian prostitute has no right to become a hindrance to the happiness of an honest and moral Greek woman" (part II, chapter IX, 113-116). Koutsouris strongly criticizes the hypocrisy of modern society that, according to him, "destroys its innocent and unprotected members and then treats them with contempt" (part II, chapter IX, 119-120). The main characteristic of modern society is injustice: some of its members bear so much suffering and spend their whole life under terrible conditions, while others scatter huge sums of money for a secret love affair. However, the author sees the future in a rather positive way and, following the sermons of *urban paternalism* (see above, p. 18), argues that one day soon the wealthy ones will understand that it is not right to thoughtlessly waste money belonging to their poor fellow-citizens, which is taken away from them due to avarice, speculation, and misappropriation. Another typical example of social injustice in the novel is the young girl Fani, another victim of Petros, who spends her entire childhood in the house of a mean old lady that forces her to beg in the streets, abuses and tortures her (part III, chapter VIII, 272-282). Koutsouris tries to go deeper into the causes of social pathogenesis, noting that miserable creatures are often "rolled in the mire of dishonesty and immorality" due to the terrible circumstances prevailing in their lives. These miserable abandoned human beings have no family and no hope and are plagued by poverty, deprivation, dishonesty, and bad luck. They spend their whole lives in bitterness and sorrow; however, many of them manage to preserve their religious feelings in their hearts, turning in difficult times to the only one that can protect and save them, namely, God (part III, chapter VIII, 268-269).

Compared to other authors of this corpus, I believe that Koutsouris manages to go deeper into the souls of his protagonists, trying to explain their criminal behavior: Petros, for example, is not a criminal by nature, but it is the circumstances that led him to crime; now he only acts as "a blind instrument of his passion and hatred" (part III, chapter X, 319-320). According to the author, poverty and abandonment lead people to crime: therefore, it is not the criminal to blame for ending up in immorality, since he could have been an honorable and virtuous family man, a reputable worker, and/or a respected father, but the fact that he was abandoned by his parents together with the

lack of education made him a terrible criminal (part III, chapter XIV, 370-371). For one more time, the influence of Eugène Sue and his social ideas is easily identified.

Georgios Koutsouris, a Greek of the provinces of the Ottoman Empire, following the patterns of the *City Mysteries* novels, original and/or translated, which were published in the previous decades, consciously chose to express his ideas about the social reformation of the Ottoman Greek society at the end of the nineteenth century through a text belonging to this particular literary genre. Therefore, his novel mainly revolves around the Ottoman Greek community, focusing on issues of social reformation through the right education and does not include any references to other ethnicities of the multiethnic and multireligious Empire or to the Greek Kingdom. In other words, we could say that *The Orphaned Girl* is simply what its subtitle indicates, an "original social novel" of its time.

1.5. Georgios Polychroniadis/Dimitrios Spathiotis: following the patterns of the *City Mysteries* genre at the end of the nineteenth century

As we have seen in chapter III (see above, p. 138), *The Firefighter* constitutes a special case in this corpus, mainly for two reasons: first, because it is the only novel that appears to be written by two co-authors, and second, because it is the sequel of another *City Mysteries* novel, published in Constantinople a couple of years earlier. Following the main conventions of the genre, Polychroniadis and Spathiothis wrote a "typical" Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* novel, focusing mainly on the depiction of the Greek society and issues of social pathogenesis. Interestingly, they present the Ottoman capital of the end-nineteenth century as a modern urban center that combines several contrasts: vivid day-life versus mysterious nightlife, crowded commercial houses versus dark dives and "singing cafés", peaceful family men versus unscrupulous criminals, counterfeiters, thieves, drunken men, and immoral women (part I, chapter VI, 173-174).

In the novel, the authors emphasize the position of the Ottoman capital between East and West (see above, p. 48), a position that often creates situations that seem, at first, rather paradoxical. For example, in one of the first chapters, the reader meets two old friends and classmates, Dimitrios and Georgios, who speak to each other in French, although they were born and raised in the Ottoman capital, but, at the same time, enjoy "eastern" habits like drinking coffee and smoking the oriental pipe (prologue, chapter V, 23-26). Polychroniadis and Spathiotis find the combination of such habits, that is, smoking the oriental pipe while making a conversation in French, completely normal in the Ottoman capital of the end-nineteenth century. According to them, although Constantinople has been gradually modernized and westernized during the past few decades, it never lost its "oriental" character as a part of the East. In one of the last chapters, Petros uses a "strange narcotic", which was brought to him from India, to drive the virtuous Eleni to madness. As the devious criminal explains, one can easily find such "paradoxical things" in the East (part III, chapter XII, 561).

In *The Firefighter*, Paris is described as a western modern urban center, as the "metropolis of the world", where superstitions and irrational beliefs have no place. On the contrary, the French capital is characterized by luxury and wealth, by the impressive development of arts and sciences, music and theater as well as by the beauty and elegance of its women (prologue, chapter V, 23-24). The description of European urban

centers comes from the young protagonist (Dimitrios), who spent several years in the French capital studying Medicine: "In Europe, everything is art", he says; however, no European capital has the "enchanting naturalness" of Constantinople, he adds (prologue, chapter V, 27). In one of the last chapters, the reader finds a direct comparison between the French and the Ottoman capital: although the former is described as "the world's most glorious city", it is "nothing special" compared to "our beautiful Constantinople" (part III, chapter XVI, 595).

It is easily understood that the two authors view the Ottoman capital from the perspective of the Self. For them, Constantinople is "their city" ("εν τη ημετέρα πόλει", part I, chapter VIII, 232). Following the pattern of European *City Mysteries* authors, who often refer to the significant role of charitable institutions in modern society,[1] Polychroniadis and Spathiotis give the reader a detailed description of "our National Charitable Institutions" ("Εθνικά Φιλανθρωπικά Καταστήματα"), consisting of a hospital, a mental institution, a nursing home, and an orphanage, which, according to them, have always been funded by members of "our nation".[2] The narrator notes that these four institutions have been modernized according to European standards in the past couple of decades. At the time, when the story took place, they consisted only of a small hospital that could house up to fifty patients and an orphanage together with a nursing home and a mental hospital, built in 1852 at the initiative of Patriarch Germanos IV.[3] However, due to the contributions of distinguished members of the Greek community, the "National Charitable Institutions" managed to be expanded and modernized in a short time: in 1879, Patriarch Ioakeim III[4] succeeded in persuading wealthy Ottoman Greeks to offer money for the establishment of a separate mental hospital. As the narrator informs the reader, a philanthropist Constantinopolitan Greek,

---

[1] Epameinondas Kyriakidis also refers to the situation of the "National Charitable Institutions" in the second half of the nineteenth century (see below, p. 210), his reference, however, is not so extended as that of Polychroniadis and Spathiotis.

[2] "[…] εις θέσιν ευάερον, εν τω μέσω καταφύτων και εκτεταμένων λαχανοκήπων κείνται τα ημέτερα Εθν. Φιλανθρ. Καταστήματα [sic], αποτελούμενα εκ του Νοσοκομείου, του Φρενοκομείου, του Γηροκομείου και του Ορφανοτροφείου, πάντων κτιρίων ωραίων και μεγαλοπρεπεστάτων, αναλόγως των χρηματικών πόρων τους οποίους ηδυνήθη να διαθέση το ημέτερον έθνος προς οικοδομήν και συντήρησιν αυτών" (part III, chapter I, 427-428).

[3] Patriarch Germanos IV (1842-1845 and 1852-1853) was particularly interested in improving the life of the poor people in the Ottoman capital, founding churches, libraries, and orphanages. He also believed in the need of educating the Orthodox clergy; thus, he founded in 1844 the *Theological School* (*Θεολογική Σχολή της Χάλκης*) on Chalki/Heybeliada island, which constituted the main school of theology of the Ecumenical Patriarchate until 1971.

[4] Patriarch Ioakeim III (1878-1884 and 1901-1912) worked on the improvement of the financial state of the Patriarchate and did various charitable acts. He repeatedly attempted to find a solution to the Bulgarian schism, to little avail, and is seen as one of the most prominent Patriarchs of modern times.

whose name should not be revealed, according to his requirement, offered money in 1886 for building separate wings for men and women. At the same time, the hard-working manager of the Institutions worked for the renovation of the miserable rooms of the hospital, the expansion of the nursing home, the building of a separate hospital for infectious diseases, and several more reformations and improvements. As the result of this modernizing effort, the "National Charitable Institutions" could, at the end of the nineteenth century, be compared to respective European Institutions, housing more than eight hundred patients in total (part III, chapter I, 427-430). The authors appear to be proud of the philanthropic action of several wealthy Ottoman Greeks in the second half of the nineteenth century, noting that the Greek community does not depend on "external powers" (as, for example, the Greek Kingdom), but manages to take care of its members on its own resources.

Looking closely at the depiction of the Constantinopolitan Greek society in the novel, the reader understands that the authors make a clear distinction between different social strata in the Ottoman capital, noting the great social chasm that separates them. While virtuous and honest family-men suffer from poverty and misery, "others sleep blissfully and carelessly, relying on their wealth and their great posts" (part I, chapter VII, 191). As expected, Polychroniadis and Spathiotis focus on the habits of the members of the "high society" ("μεγαλοσιάνοι", part I, chapter V, 155), who live in aristocratic and luxurious mansions in Pera/Beyoğlu, are expensively dressed, speak the French language, entertain themselves in theaters and balls (part I, chapter I, 90). However, we should note here that the authors do not present members of the "high society" in a particularly negative way, focusing on corruption and debauchery, as other authors of this corpus do. On the contrary, following the pattern of Eugène Sue, Polychroniadis and Spathiotis stress the philanthropic attitude of several wealthy Constantinopolitan Greeks, whose only concern is to relieve their poor fellow-citizens of their misery (part III, chapter IX, 525). At the same time, the lower social strata, especially the abandoned children and the unprotected women, live under terrible conditions, in wooden and almost dilapidated old houses in the impoverished neighborhoods of the Ottoman capital, being deprived of food and medical care. A typical example is the young urchin of the streets Atsidi: he is an orphaned child, who has no hope in life and inevitably ends up being a member of Petros's criminal association. He is particularly clever, as his name indicates (in Greek: *Ατσίδας* means "sharp"), brave, devious, flattering, and eager to sacrifice himself for his "master" (part

I, chapter III, 134). He lives in a wooden, dilapidated house at a narrow and muddy street in the impoverished district of Pankaltı (part I, chapter V, 151-152). However, despite the great chasm that seems to separate the social classes in Constantinople, according to the authors, there are a few places in the Ottoman capital where members of all classes meet and intermingle, as, for example, at the Grand Rue de Pera or the garden of Taksim, where "wealthy and poor, aristocrats, scientists, and craftsmen, ladies of the high society and maidservants spend their summer evenings together" (part II, chapter X, 387-388).

In *The Firefighter*, as in all *City Mysteries* novels, the underworld plays an important role in the plot. The reader meets the members of the criminal association established by Petros or the "Satan", as his pseudonym is, namely, criminals, thieves, counterfeiters, and murderers, who meet and plan their criminal action at the numerous cafés and squalid bars of Galata/Karaköy during the night. They speak the *argot*, that is, the language of the underworld, wear dirty clothes, and look vicious and bloodthirsty. Their names appear to be indicative of their character, as, for example, "Wild cat", "Ripper", or "Flycatcher" (part I, chapter VI, 178-179). However, unlike other novels of this corpus, in *The Firefighter*, two members of the criminal association (Katsaros and Londos) are presented in a rather comical way, gaining the reader's sympathy with their "ludicrous adventures", as, for example, when the two uneducated criminals participate in a "poetic contest" (part III, chapter VI, 491-494).

As most of the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors in the 1880s, Polychroniadis and Spathiotis focus on the causes of social pathogenesis, however, without really proposing solutions. For example, in several chapters of the novel, they search for the reasons which lead women to immorality in modern society. The narrator presents a group of women walking drunkenly in the streets of the Ottoman capital during the night, singing shameless songs and making vulgar gestures, and sadly notes that these miserable creatures were once innocent and virtuous young women, who, at some point, became victims of immoral men that exploited, seduced, and abandoned them. As a result, these "disgraced women" experienced the rejection of society and were led to debauchery and immorality to survive (part I, chapter V, 159-161). Following the pattern of Eugène Sue and George Reynolds, Polychroniadis and Spathiotis note that poverty, misery, hunger, and the indifference of modern society can easily "turn a good person into a bad one" and lead him to immorality (part III, chapter II, 449).

According to the authors, deceit, illegal enrichment, and injustice prevail in the Constantinopolitan Greek society at the end of the nineteenth century. Therefore, an impoverished and miserable man can easily rise socially and economically, if he decides to follow the path of immorality and debauchery (part III, chapter III, 458). Moreover, the power of money in modern society is great and leads to the distortion of morals and values. Those who have much money are socially honored and praised, are regarded as wise and intelligent, although they might be fools, as capable and skillful, although they might be worthless and ineffective, as cultivated and knowledgeable, although they might be completely uneducated. On the contrary, those who are deprived of money are socially disdained and ignored, and are regarded as fools and insane, although they might be wise and educated, responsible and honorable. Tradesmen, who pretended to have gone bankrupt, are highly regarded in the Constantinopolitan Greek society, while those, who have experienced an economic catastrophe, are socially disdained and starve to death (part III, chapter XIV, 579-580). Therefore, according to the narrator, the only goal of the modern citizen is to gain more money, regardless of by what means.

Apart from social injustice and deceit, the authors also criticize phenomena of moral disorder, as, for example, the habit of card-playing and gambling, stressing its consequences for modern society. In one of the first chapters, the reader is led to an impoverished house in the district of Mumhane, where several imprudent and reprobate young men gather every night to play cards and gamble (part I, chapter VI, 171-172). Describing these pale, exhausted, and desperate young men, the narrator speaks of the catastrophic consequences of such bad habits, as significant amounts of money are lost on the card-playing table overnight. The addicted gambler plays passionately, dreaming of great profits. However, in the end, he loses everything, money, family, and honor. He is, therefore, forced to stealing, deceit, and crime to keep on playing and often ends up being a terrible criminal (part I, chapter VIII, 221-222).

Although several figures play a significant role in the plot, the main protagonist of the novel is the titular Firefighter, who is presented as a role model in modern society: he is a humble, merciful, and philanthropist man of the middle class, a defender of justice and protector of his miserable fellow-citizens. In other words, he is a virtuous and selfless Constantinopolitan Greek of his time, the exact opposite of the evil main protagonist of the novel (namely, Petros or the "Satan"). Polychroniadis and Spathiotis, therefore, do not deal with matters of forming collective identities at the end of the

nineteenth century, as other *City Mysteries* authors before them did (see, for example, Christophoros Samartsidis or Konstantinos Goussopoulos). With their "original social novel", they rather focus on the reformation of the Constantinopolitan Greek society according to European standards at the end of the century, following the tradition of Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* published in the 1880s and, more precisely, the pattern of Georgios Koutsouris with *The Orphaned Girl*, the plot of which they came to "complete".

1.6. Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos: the Constantinopolitan Greek of the end-nineteenth century

Dimitrios Melissopoulos chronologically completes the circle of the Constantinopolitan Greek authors, who wrote and published their *City Mysteries* novels in the Ottoman capital in the second half of the nineteenth century. Following the main conventions of the genre, in *The Maidservant*, he depicts the two contradictory "worlds" within the Constantinopolitan Greek community in the last decade of the century, namely, the *bourgeoisie* and the underworld. Kleanthis Kallistos represents the former: he is a successful banker, who lives in a luxurious mansion at the Grand Rue de Pera, is well-dressed according to European standards, smokes cigarettes, and reads European newspapers. In the novel, members of the Constantinopolitan Greek "high society" live *alafranga*[1] and often talk to each other in French. On the opposite side, the reader meets members of the underworld in the "topically and morally infectious neighborhood" of Yeni Şehir, where dozens of dives of the lowest level are located (chapter I, 14-16). However, Melissopoulos does not go deeper into the detailed depiction of the Constantinopolitan Greek society and the exposition of its problems but settles only for what the *City Mysteries* genre requires. According to the author, the main female protagonist (Myrorroi) represents the type of the Greek woman of the end-nineteenth century: "nothing more than genuine Greek characteristics of the face, vanity and pride for her beauty". Her behavior reveals the dubious and obscure character of women who "live in naivety and improperly conceived freedom and only care for the satisfaction of their fiery passions" (chapter II, 20-22). As other Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors before him as, for example, Petros Ioannidis (see above, p. 158), Melissopoulos does not seem to have a high opinion of the female character, although we cannot speak of a clear misogynist attitude as we understand it today.

Following the ideas originally expressed by Eugène Sue and George Reynolds in their *City Mysteries* novels, Melissopoulos states that proper education is the most decisive factor for the formation of one's character and personality. According to the

---

[1] The two concepts *alaturca* and *alafranga* point to the sense of distinction between Eastern and Western culture in the Balkans. This distinction, applicable to various cultural features and aspects of everyday life, encompasses the opposition between old-fashioned (*alaturca*) and modern (*alafranga*).

author, one has an innate tendency towards corruption and immorality. Therefore, the main duty of all parents is to raise their children morally and educate them properly. For example, in the novel, responsible for Andronikos's mean and impudent character appears to be the improper upbringing that his parents gave him and not "bad associations" (chapter IV, 39-42). Moreover, proper education can transform people in a short time, as, for example, the "humble maidservant" into an "intellectual lady of the high society": when the maidservant Myrorroi graduates from the school for girls, she speaks French and German and plays the piano. The poor girl, whose only dowry was her beauty and had no aspirations for the future, succeeded "in rising from the muck to the gallery of eminent society" in a short time due to proper education (chapter VIII, 80).

As mentioned above, Melissopoulos does not go deeper into the structure of the Constantinopolitan Greek society and the formation of its collective identity at the end of the nineteenth century; the novel mainly settles for the narration of the story. I believe that the most important part of the publication is not the novel itself, which compiles several features and conventions of the *City Mysteries* literary genre (see above, p. 22), but the short text at the end of the publication entitled "And a few words" ("Και ολίγαι λέξεις"), where the author expresses his concerns regarding the Greek literary production in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century. Melissopoulos states that it is sad and a little bit humiliating for the Constantinopolitan Greek community to neglect the original Greek literary production, especially during such a critical period. "The Greek must write for the Greek", he notes, and this statement reminds us, in a way, of Stephanos Xenos's analogous "We must ourselves write about ourselves" in 1851 (see above, p. 108). According to Melissopoulos, even the most malignant and insignificant novel is making sales in Constantinople, if it bears the indication "translation from the French language" on its cover and if its author has a "European" name. On the contrary, the original Greek novel that refers to the modern Greek society and family, to the nation, to Greek customs and morals, is often treated with irony and indifference by the Constantinopolitan Greek readership and ends up in poor condition in the warehouses of the bookstores. In other words, according to the author, in the last decade of the century, Greek literature remains "stagnant and dead", while the European ones are developing rapidly. Melissopoulos argues that the translated novel has no value "for us Greeks" since it mainly carries and promotes European customs and attitudes. Therefore, he invites translators and publishers of

foreign literature "to fall into line and change their attitude". The Constantinopolitan Greek editors should set a good example excluding any foreign text from the pages of their newspapers and journals in order "to bring the Greeks back into contact with paternal morals and national issues".[1] The author also argues that with his first own "original Greek" novel he sets himself up as a model for other aspiring authors and adds that he is not seeking personal interests. On the contrary, his main objectives are to save the prestige of Greek philology during these critical times and contribute, in his way, to the formation of a modern Greek collective identity through literary production.

I believe that Dimitrios Melissopoulos as a Constantinopolitan Greek of the end-nineteenth century was not a conscious *City Mysteries* author, as, for example, Christophoros Samartsidis or Konstantinos Goussopoulos, who took advantage of the conventions of the literary genre to express their ideas regarding the future of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire. In other words, according to my point of view, the author of *The Maidservant* had rather different objectives compared to the other authors of my corpus. Melissopoulos does not seem to have a clear ideological orientation; on the contrary, he decided to experiment with the popular nineteenth-century literary genre, following, to a greater or lesser extent, the patterns of its European prototypes, however, without going deeper into the actual problems that his fellow-citizens were facing at that time.

---

[1]   We should note here that the call for original Greek novel-writing had become more intense in the last decades of the nineteenth century, mainly as a means of resistance towards the "corrosive European novels" and the formation of a strong collective Greek consciousness.

1.7. Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis: facing the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a different perspective

The Constantinopolitan Greek journalist, author, historian, and "unofficial" diplomat Epameinondas K. Kyriakidis, who published his two *City Mysteries* novels during the same decade as Konstantinos Goussopoulos, Georgios Koutsouris, Georgios Polychroniadis, and Dimitrios Spathiotis, is a completely different case. Therefore, I decided to present him separately, since he sees the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a different perspective. In both texts, published in 1885 and 1890, respectively, he depicts in detail the economic development of the Ottoman Empire after the mid-nineteenth century, focusing on the activities at the stock market and the modernization of the infrastructure in the Ottoman capital, and expresses his point of view regarding the position of the Constantinopolitan Greeks within this modernizing process. It is a fact that the development of the Constantinopolitan stock market was, to a large extent, based on short-term speculative activities and depended on the development of the European stock markets. The financial crises in Europe influenced Constantinople directly, leading to great losses and bankruptcies, as it happened, for example, in 1869 and 1873. All these caused serious difficulties for both Greek and non-Greek banking investments in the Ottoman capital, mainly because of credit restrictions from European money markets. Overall, however, and despite periodic crises that the bankers eventually learned to deal with, Greek banking in Constantinople proved to be a major success and Greek investments experienced periods of great profit, strengthening the position of the Greek bankers and merchants in the local market – and not only. Moreover, after 1881, among other activities, the Empire also experienced an impressive development in transport through new railway and shipping lines, roads, and port facilities, mostly due to foreign capital.[1] Greek capital also participated in these investments, considering them both a challenge and an opportunity to enhance its position and its economic power in the Ottoman Empire.[2] We should note here that, during this period, the Ottoman diplomacy leaned towards France and consequently, the Ottoman economy was closely related to the French stock market.

---

[1] For example, the German capital financed the Anatolian railway (Quataert 2000, 122-123).

[2] Exertzoglou 1998, 92-93.

However, France was both unwilling and unable to provide the Empire a comparable measure of support and protection against Russian advances.[1]

In the first novel (*Elpiniki*), Kyriakidis depicts in detail the above-described situation and applauds the ongoing modernization of the Ottoman Empire and its capital, which took place during the last decades of the nineteenth century. We should note *ab initio* that in this first novel, the author mainly focuses on material and economic issues and their influence on the Constantinopolitan Greek society, while a few years later, with the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, he goes deeper into issues of social reformation, ideology, and the collective consciousness of the Constantinopolitan Greeks. Back to *Elpiniki*: in several chapters, Kyriakidis compares the current situation of the Empire, that is, in the 1880s, to its former situation, that is, before the reforms of the Tanzimat. According to the author, all sectors of public life have been improved, as, for example, the organization of the Ottoman justice system, which has been modernized according to European standards in the past two decades and has become "fair and flexible" (chapter XIII, 474-477). Moreover, the process of westernization of the Empire due to investments and financing of infrastructure is present in the whole novel. A typical example of this modernizing effort that took place in the second half of the nineteenth century are Ioannis Vargis's ambitious and grandiose plans: he is thinking of establishing a large agricultural bank in Constantinople that will provide maximum benefit to the rural population and a railway-line connecting Bosporus with inner Asia (chapter XV, 537-538).[2] In *Elpiniki*, the future of the Ottoman capital in matters of materialism and economy appears to be auspicious and promising.

The Great Powers of Europe play a significant role in the novel, as they influence and control the development of the Ottoman Empire. America is presented as the model of development for every modern society; the author, therefore, estimates that it will destroy Russia in a short time and gain absolute control of Europe (chapter VI, 200-201). I believe that Kyriakidis's estimation of the strengthening role of America and the expansion of its control over Europe is, at the end of the nineteenth century, a clear sign of globalization, which would become more intense in the

---

[1] Hanioğlu 2008, 83.

[2] It seems that Vargis is planning an expansion of the *Orient Express*, which, at the end of the nineteenth century, basically connected two cities, namely, Paris and Constantinople, traversing central and eastern Europe.

following century. Meanwhile, serious political developments arise in Europe: the issue of the succession of the Spanish throne and the rivalry between Germany and France lead the two forces to an armed settlement of their differences in July 1870.[1] France suffers a humiliating defeat[2] and the fall of the Napoleon dynasty is announced, which causes huge disappointment and sorrow across Europe. The days are considered "black" for those who love France "as a mother, as a second home, as the great force that pushed mankind forward", says the narrator (chapter IX, 322-323). We should not forget that the *City Mysteries* authors often refer to historical events and transfer political information through their novels, since this mechanism was particularly helpful in attracting readers and making the plot more realistic (see above, p. 22).

As mentioned above, the author notes that, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the economic development of the Ottoman capital was mainly based on stock market activities. Therefore, an important part of the novel's plot takes place in *Chaviarochano* (*Χαβιαρόχανο*), a narrow, paved passage in Galata/Karaköy, where the stock market of Constantinople was located.[3] The stock market is described as "a field of uncontrollable speculation", as, at that time, it was not officially organized and constituted "a prey in the hands of the deceptive and the impudent ones" (chapter I, 5). According to the author, it was only in 1872 that an official regulation was finally enacted, validated by an imperial decree, according to which the stock market of Constantinople was equated with the European ones, regarding organization and security. Kyriakidis points the reader for further information to a study written by N. Fotiadis, the president of the stock market of Constantinople, entitled "Stock Market and the law", published in 1882.[4] Moreover, the author strongly disapproves of the

---

[1]   The Franco-Prussian War (July 1870-May 1871) was the armed conflict between the Second French Empire under Napoleon III and the Prussian-led association of German nations. The French were defeated in the Battle of Sedan in northeastern France, Napoleon III was captured together with one hundred thousand soldiers and the Empire collapsed; however, France continued the war. The final capitulation between the two powers was signed in February 1871. The Treaty imposed the payment of one-two billion francs on France as war compensation as well as the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine in Germany. For further information see Wawro 2003.

[2]   "[…] το αίμα ήρξατο να ρέη ποταμηδόν και η ανθρωπότης άπασα εκπεπληγμένη είδεν εν μια στιγμή την άμωμον της Γαλλίας τιμήν κυλιομένην εν τω βορβόρω" (chapter IX, 322-323).

[3]   The Constantinopolitan Stock Exchange was established in 1854 at *Chaviarochano* (*Χαβιαρόχανο*) in Galata/Karaköy. According to its regulation, it was administrated by a committee of fourteen members elected every year, namely, five Greeks, four Armenians, three Levantines, and two Jews (Bozi 2002, 203).

[4]   I have traced Fotiadis's study in Heliou-Polemi's Greek Bibliography (vol. II): N. Fotiadis, President of the Stock Market of Constantinople, *Το χρηματιστήριον και ο νόμος* [*Stock Market and the law*], originally published in the journal *O Kosmos*, Constantinople: Published by S. Voutyras and Co, 1882.

dependence of the Ottoman economy on Europe, especially on France, estimating that the situation in Constantinople is so unstable that even a rumor about Napoleon's health can cause panic in the Ottoman capital and chaos in the financial market for several weeks. At that time, the French Emperor was pulling the strings of the European economy and his death would have disastrous consequences in the political and financial sphere all over Europe (chapter I, 15-16). We should always bear in mind that, at that time, Kyriakidis was expressing, mainly through journalistic texts, his serious objections to the intervention of the Great Powers of Europe, namely, France and Britain, in the Balkan Peninsula and their control over the Ottoman Empire and the Greek Kingdom. The author also estimates that the fact that Constantinople converted the basis of its economy from commerce to the stock market was a fatal mistake: after the 1860s, several successful Constantinopolitan Greek merchants decided to leave their commercial activities and invest their money in the stock market, which promised them great profits, establishing financial and stock marketing stores in *Chaviarochano* (*Χαβιαρόχανο*). Unfortunately, this decision led in a short time to their decline and economic disaster (chapter VI, 203).

With extensive parentheses in the plot, Kyriakidis focuses on the Constantinopolitan Greek community and its course in the nineteenth century, namely, its economic development due to commercial and banking activities that led to its cultural revival. The narrator takes the reader back to the time before the signing of the Tanzimat (in the 1830s) when the stock market did not yet exist and the commerce in the East was almost exclusively in Greek hands. The bold Greek sailors crossed the seas and the oceans with their sailboats and "the Greek flag was waving in every port of Western Europe", even of America, he notes proudly. Therefore, the Constantinopolitan Greeks were making great profits from this "honorable activity" and their commercial houses gained the respect of all nations (chapter III, 49-50). As expected, this economic growth led to the intellectual and cultural revival of the nation. According to the author, a big part of the above-mentioned profits was invested in the establishment of "educational nurseries" throughout the East. The Greek society, reconstructed constantly from its ruins, raised "brilliant and luminous lanterns" in every corner of Hellenism, from Morea[1] to the Danube. Kyriakidis sees Hellenism as

---

[1]   Morea (in Greek: *Μωρέας* or *Μωριάς*) was the name of the Peloponnese peninsula in southern Greece during the Middle Ages and the early modern period.

a unity and the Greeks as one nation spread in the Balkan Peninsula, Asia Minor, and Central Europe. Therefore, he considers it necessary to praise all those generous and enlightened Greeks, those "honest men", as he calls them, who invested all their money with no sense of *phyletism*, no personal ambitions, and no arrogance in establishing "magnificent temples of the Muses".[1] In these schools, hundreds of young people of the Greek nation were educated together with several of those who "slander the Greek nation" in the last decades of the century (chapter II, 30-31). Kyriakidis probably refers here to members of the Bulgarian and/or Serbian nation that until the 1860s took advantage of the potentials for cultural and economic development given to all members of the Orthodox *millet*, who came against Hellenism a couple of decades later as a consequence of the expanding nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula. We should note again that the author sees Hellenism, that is, the Greeks of the independent state, the Ottoman Empire, and the Danubian Principalities as a whole and speaks of their enemies, that is, the Slavic people, who benefited from their development for several decades, but now come against them.

According to Kyriakidis, the Constantinopolitan Greek community of the second half of the nineteenth century is not characterized by homogeneity. On the contrary, the reader has the chance to meet members of the "high society", the underworld, the circles of middle merchants, the streets. In the novel, his main objective is to criticize the character of the modern "high society", where immorality and corruption prevail. Moreover, he disapproves of the adventurousness of a big part of the Constantinopolitan Greek community that, amazed by wealth and opulence, has abandoned its commercial activities and is pursuing quick profit in the stock market. The reader has the chance to meet this Constantinopolitan Greek "high society" at Georgios and Elpiniki's wedding. According to the narrator, what characterizes its members is "oriental prurience and luxury": women dressed in the latest fashion, with expensive dresses and jewelry; European adventurers, who came from their countries completely broke and gained millions overnight, proudly speaking of their great origin and their relations with princes and noblemen; merchants and bankers, who rose overnight all levels of the social scale; "obese" landowners; embassy secretaries, who speak proudly of their great posts; newspaper correspondents, who pretend to be

---

[1]   For example, several important benefactors of the nation provided young students with scholarships for studies in Europe or established educational institutions all over the Ottoman Empire.

familiar to politics as secret advisers of important diplomats; idle and lazy men, who disseminate that they are planning to establish big companies while being completely broke; "human parasites", who starve but are dressed like princes; sons of honorable merchants, who squander the fortune of the parents. For Kyriakidis, they are nothing more than a "gilded mass" ("κεχρυσωμένη μάζα") of meaningless men, who boast about their wealth, and immoral women, who lack honor and virtue (chapter V, 116-119). Honest merchants and bankers, scholars and scientists do not belong to this "high society". Ioannis Vargis epitomizes the adventurous *nouveau riche bourgeois*, who is characterized by self-interest, debauchery, corruption, and scheming. By projecting in the novel Georgios and Elpiniki as examples of morality and virtue that abstain from the lifestyle of the "high society" of Pera/Beyoğlu, Kyriakidis puts forward the values that, according to him, should characterize the modern Greek *bourgeois*.

However, the author makes clear that the Constantinopolitan Greek society does not only consist of the uprising *bourgeoisie*. On the contrary, impoverished and unfortunate Greeks, who struggle for their survival every day, constitute a big part of this society. Thrasyvoulos, a barefoot and ravenous seven-year-old boy, a child of the streets, who does not ask for charity but works hard for some money and sleeps in the streets, is a typical example of the lower social class. At the same time, as all *City Mysteries* authors, Kyriakidis appears to be familiar with the underworld of Constantinople. Stravomouris (in Greek: *Στραβομούρης*), the leader of a criminal gang, is in the novel a typical representative of this world. His name, meaning "crooked face", is indicative of his terrible appearance and his perverted personality. Moreover, Kyriakidis critically notes that, although Stravomouris has been practicing "the profession of stealing" in the streets of Constantinople for several years, he was never been arrested and imprisoned; this practically means that he can easily occupy a public office in the Ottoman administration (chapter XI, 400). I believe that this comment could be read as an implication against those who hold public offices in the Ottoman capital, as their character and their former activity do not stop them from becoming powerful and well-respected. The author is also familiar with the "allegorical" language of the underworld and often "translates" or "interprets" it to the reader in footnotes. As mentioned above, criminals mainly take action in specific districts of Constantinople, as, for example, in the neighborhood Kanli-Tsikour, the so-called "Bloodstream" ("του Αιματόεντος Βόθρου"), where the most terrible crimes are

committed every day.[1] The most terrible taverns, the hideaways of the most notorious criminals, the center of the underworld is located there (chapter XI, 395-396). However, according to Kyriakidis, by the time that the novel was published (in the mid-1880s), the situation had changed significantly: going through this district during the night was still dangerous, but no terrible crimes were committed anymore.

The author also makes clear that heterogeneity prevails within the same social group as well, as, for example, the group of the Constantinopolitan Greek merchants. Its wealthier members enjoy a luxurious life: they spend the winter at their luxurious mansions in Pera/Beyoğlu, while, during the summer, they move with their families to their country houses, as, for example, on the island of Chalki/Heybeliada, where the *Theological School* (*Θεολογική Σχολή*) and the *Greek Business School* (*Ελληνική Εμπορική Σχολή*) are also located. At the same time, the reader meets "middle-class merchants", as, for example, Elpiniki's father. The financial and social "distance" among Greek merchants is a restraining factor for intermarriage; this means that wealthy merchants usually marry a woman of their social and economic level. However, after 1870, the greatest power in the Constantinopolitan Greek community was held by the bankers and the stockbrokers: according to Kyriakidis, these powerful men socialize with politicians, diplomats, ministers, and princes. They act as diplomats themselves, play with luck, calculate political developments, enter the "mysteries of the high society" and treasure millions overnight.

Following the pattern of European *City Mysteries* (see above, p. 21), in several chapters of his novel, the author speaks of the role of women and the unfair way that they are treated in modern society. The disgraced young girl is not protected but insulted and marginalized, he states, while poor young women have to work hard to make a living. We should note though that Kyriakidis, as Ioannidis, Goussopoulos, and Melissopoulos as well, does not seem to have a high opinion of the female character, especially of women of the "high society". However, the virtuous and modest titular protagonist (Elpiniki) comes as an exception in this world of corruption and immorality related to the character of the modern woman.

As mentioned above, Kyriakidis sees Hellenism as a whole; thus, apart from the Greek subjects of the Ottoman Empire, he also gives the reader a picture of the

---

[1]   In this chapter of the novel, the reader can find several conventions of the *City Mysteries* genre, as, for example, the mysterious night, the infamous district, the secret meeting in a tavern, the world of criminals.

Greeks of the independent state and the Diaspora. The latter appear in the novel concerning Georgios's family: his father refuges in Russia, where he marries a young and beautiful Greek woman, a member of a commercial family settled in Taiganio[1] for a long time. Finally, after several adventures, he manages to return to his home-city Constantinople and resettle in the paternal house in Fanar/Fener. In the Ottoman capital, he establishes a commercial house with branches in Marseille and London, and successfully continues the trade of grain (chapter II, 29-30). In the novel, Russia is presented as a country that offers the Ottoman Greeks several opportunities for economic and cultural development in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Regarding the other part of Hellenism, that is, the Greeks of the independent state, it is interesting that we can only find two references to Athens and the Greek Kingdom in the whole novel. The first one is related to the identity of the leader of the investigation in Georgios's house: he is a Muslim from Epirus, at that time still under the Ottoman regime, who speaks the Greek language, studied at the University of Athens and afterward, settled in Constantinople (chapter XII, 448). According to Kyriakidis, in several regions of the Ottoman Empire, as, for example, in Epirus, there were Greek-speaking populations of Muslim origin that had close ties with the Greek Kingdom and took advantage of the opportunities for cultural development that were offered there; however, they always remained Ottoman subjects and were oriented towards the Empire. The second reference is related to the identity of Georgios's lawyer, who followed an equivalent course: he came from Caesarea,[2] studied Law at the University of Athens and settled in the Ottoman capital (chapter XIII, 480). These two references probably point to the lack of higher education in Constantinople, which inevitably led young people, who were seeking higher education, to the University of Athens or universities of European capitals.[3] No further relation between the independent state and the Ottoman Empire is depicted in *Elpiniki*, which could, to a large extent, be explained due to the strict control of the Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88).

---

[1] Taiganio is the older name of Taganrog, a port city in Southern Russia. In the nineteenth century, the former military base became important as a commercial port, used mainly for the import and export of grain. For the Greek presence in Southern Russia see above, p. 135, footnote 2.

[2] The province of Caesarea was located in central Anatolia, in the region of Cappadocia. It is quite impressive that the young man, coming from a province in the depths of the Ottoman Empire, chose to study in Athens. However, we should not forget that the University of Athens was in the nineteenth century the only university in Southeastern Europe.

[3] See above, p. 121, footnote 2.

In general, we could say that with *Elpiniki*, Kyriakidis gives the reader a complete picture of the self-sufficient Constantinopolitan Greek community, which, after 1870, continues to evolve within the Ottoman Empire, independently of the Greek Kingdom. The author follows closely the political and economic developments in Europe, mainly in France, expressing his disapproval of the financial dependence of the Ottoman economy on European capitals, which causes anxiety and insecurity to merchants and investors. He supports the modernization of the Empire and believes that the uprising Constantinopolitan Greek *bourgeoisie* should continue the financial and cultural development that began in the decades after the Crimean War but must be careful in adopting western morals and customs. The main female protagonist of the novel, the virtuous Elpiniki, who succeeds in overcoming all sorts of difficulties in the end, constitutes a model for the *bourgeois* Constantinopolitan Greek society.

Five years after *Elpiniki*, Kyriakidis publishes his second *City Mysteries* novel entitled *Peran Mysteries of Constantinople*. As the title indicates, the plot also evolves in the Ottoman capital and more specifically, in its European districts. Following the common literary conventions of the genre, the author appears to be familiar with the topography of the Ottoman capital and the district of Pera/Beyoğlu in particular, which is depicted as a labyrinth.[1] He also seems to be familiar with the impoverished, non-modernized, and often disreputable districts of the city. The reader is informed about the administration of the various districts of the Ottoman capital: he learns, for example, that, during the second half of the nineteenth century, every district of Constantinople was under the jurisdiction of a church or a mosque or a synagogue – according to the population that prevailed in each neighborhood (vol. I, chapter IV, 61). The author criticizes the Ottoman administration and the complex system of its organization, and notes that it is very difficult for a non-Constantinopolitan to understand this specific "mechanism", which stems from the heterogeneity of the population in the capital and the Empire in general. In other words, according to Kyriakidis, the diversity of religions and nations in Constantinople makes the system more complex than it already is. For one more time, the author indirectly stresses the great distance between "West" and "East", that is, between modern European countries and the Ottoman Empire, noting that, despite all efforts for reformation and modernization in the past few decades, the

---

[1] As we have already seen, the depiction of the modern city or a district as a labyrinth is another literary convention of the *City Mysteries* genre (see above, p. 22).

Ottoman character remains "Eastern", that is, difficult to be understood by the European Other.

In his second *City Mysteries* novel, as in *Elpiniki*, Kyriakidis also speaks about the Europeanization of Constantinople after the 1840s administratively, economically, and socially (vol. I, chapter IX, 172), the development of the stock market, the gradual dereliction and decline of commerce (vol. I, chapter IV, 58-59), the waste and immorality of the Europeanized district of Pera/Beyoğlu, the "European and non-European", at the same time, character of the Ottoman capital, and the "boundless materialism" of the prosperous Constantinopolitan Greek society. In other words, he depicts the changes in the structure of the city in the second half of the nineteenth century. But what about the structure of the local society, its morals and customs as well as its collective identity? As we have already seen, in his first *City Mysteries* novel, Kyriakidis mainly focuses on the material and economic development of the Ottoman capital and its influence on the character of the Constantinopolitan Greek community. But in the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, he goes one step further: he focuses on the social development of the Greek community and the strengthening of its collective consciousness that would probably define its future.

Although the plot evolves in the multinational and multicultural environment of the Ottoman capital, Kyriakidis mainly focuses on members of the Constantinopolitan Greek community. However, we find a few references to the ruling Ottomans, to the extent, of course, that it was allowed by the Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88). It is noteworthy that the author completely ignores the presence of members of other communities in the city, as, for example, the Armenians or the Jews. He presents the moral decline of the Constantinopolitan Greek society as a result "of the violent stream of the *supposedly* [sic] European culture" that had been introduced to the Ottoman Empire after the Crimean War and started "to drag down the Constantinopolitan Greek society that was getting reconstructed from its ruins just at that time due to the privileges of the Tanzimat" (vol. I, chapter IX, 172, my translation). The author estimates that imitation of foreign ethics and morals can be disastrous for a newbuilt society. Besides, the Constantinopolitan Greeks tended to imitate the "upper class" of European societies, which were formed with different customs, under different social circumstances. Sadly, what characterizes this "miniature society", that is, the Ottoman Greek society, is moral depravity, worship of wealth, and a supposedly innovative spirit. The author refers to the "liberal" lifestyle of Constantinopolitan

Greek women that surprises Georgios when he first comes to the Ottoman capital. In Ankara, where he grew up, women were very restricted and had a more "Eastern" lifestyle;[1] even Christian women were dressed like the Muslims, covering themselves with a veil in front of men (vol. I, chapter IX, 177). However, despite Georgios's first impression, he soon realizes that this modern and "European" lifestyle is more suited to the society of his nation, making, for one more time, a clear distinction between "East" and "West" (see above, p. 48).

According to Kyriakidis, from the mid-nineteenth century, that is, when the inflow of western morals and customs into the Ottoman Empire became more intense, the Constantinopolitan Greek society fell easily into the trap of mimicry and xenomania. Members of the Ottoman Greek *bourgeoisie*, "morally untrained, were drawn into the violent stream of the so-called European civilization, which, after the Crimean war, had fled [into the Ottoman Empire] through every door and carried away this society that was struggling to reconstruct itself", he notes (vol. I, chapter V, 115, my translation). This uncritical acceptance and mimicry led in a short time to the corruption of the Greek character and identity. In the novel, Antonios Vodinas, the son of a very wealthy Constantinopolitan Greek merchant, constitutes a typical example of a corrupt and immoral *bourgeois*. On the contrary, an exception to the social decay prevailing in the Ottoman capital is the virtuous young Iakovos, who argues that the immoral members of the "high society" are, in fact, worse than dishonest women, as the latter, at least, were led to corruption and dishonesty due to poverty, lack of education and moral virtues. This statement of Kyriakidis reminds us of Eugène Sue's ideology that considers poverty and lack of education as the main causes of social pathogenesis (see above, p. 27). The author notes that the terrible fire in 1870 was, in fact, a consequence of the moral decline of the Constantinopolitan Greek society. The fire, only five years after the epidemic of cholera, came to put an end to the moral decline, the "irrepressible

---

[1] In the nineteenth century, Ottoman women's everyday clothing consisted of the *salvar* (trousers), the *gömlek* (chemise) that came down to the mid-calf or ankle, the *hirka*, a short, fitted jacket, and a *sash* or belt tied at or just below the waist. For formal occasions, such as visiting friends, the woman added the *entari*, a long robe that was cut like the *hirka* apart from the length. All these garments could be brightly colored and patterned. When the woman left the house, she covered her clothes with the *ferace*, a dark, modestly cut robe that buttoned all the way to the throat; she also covered her face with a variety of veils or wraps. In large residential centers such as Constantinople and Smyrna/Izmir, where women gradually began to participate in the city's social life, the garments became more "showy and extravagant". Pera/Beyoğlu became the center of fashion and the new trends in clothing coming from Paris were followed by Greek and Armenian tailors. On the contrary, the rural sector continued its traditional style of clothing. For further information see Quataert 1997.

carnal pleasures", the voluptuousness, the indolence, the opulence, and the unrestrained waste of wealth in the Ottoman capital. According to Kyriakidis, the fire came as a means "to cleanse the atmosphere of pleasure and immorality, as a redeeming epidemic" (vol. I, chapter IV, 57-58).

Apart from the corrupt world of the uprising Constantinopolitan Greek *bourgeoisie*, which appears to be another convention of the literary genre, the novel, as all *City Mysteries*, also presents the underworld of the Ottoman capital. The description of a group of criminals in one of the first chapters is very typical: its members spend their whole life "in malice", speak the *argot*, are eager to commit any crime for money, and frequent the tavern of Lachlas, which is described as "a workshop, where all abominable crimes are committed" and "a copper-mine of dishonesty and crime". Their uniform clothing reveals people belonging to the lowest social class and more precisely, to "the class of bloodthirsty criminals". Even their names are indicative of their personalities; for example, one of them is called "Babesis" (in Greek: *Μπαμπέσης*), meaning "traitor" in Turkish (vol. II, chapter VIII, 185-186).

Next to the bloodthirsty criminals, the reader meets a group of deceitful women, the most representative of whom is the famous "kokkinadoú" (in Greek: "κοκκιναδού") of Constantinople, Karikena.[1] However, for this old woman, the title "kokkinadoú" is simply a cover, a veneer, so that she can freely perform her illegal activities: she is, in fact, a procurer of innocent, young women (vol. II, chapter II, 23). Her daughter Loxandra or Loxi[2] is completely uneducated, speaks a vulgar language, and follows her mother's path to immorality. On the contrary, her son Iakovos seems to be an exception: he has graduated from the *Great School of the Nation* (*Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή*) and, due to his studies, has developed a virtuous and moral personality (vol. II, chapter II, 26-27). Another typical example of this social group is Marigó, who practices the profession of "floudistra" (in Greek: "φλουδίστρα") or "chnoudistra" (in Greek: "χνουδίστρα"), that is, removing women's facial hair, a profession that, according to the narrator, dates back to ancient times and survived until the nineteenth

---

[1] Kyriakidis informs the reader that, during the nineteenth century, the "kokkinadoú" was the improvised female doctor. As the "title" implies, these women undertake to treat rubella (in Greek: "κοκκινάδα") as well as other "similar" diseases by providing their naive customers/patients a "medicine" consisting of feces (!) and herbs (vol. II, chapter II, 23).

[2] Loxi (in Greek: *Λοξή*) means "oblique, slanted"; in the *argot*, it also means "weirdo, odd, unpleasantly strange", a name that matches the young girl's personality.

century.[1] These professionals, usually elderly women, develop a familiarity with their female customers, become their supposed discreet secret-keepers, and lead them to corruption by providing them a secret place for sexual intercourse with their illicit lovers. The ignorance of these uneducated women intensifies their superstitions (vol. II, chapter I, 12-14).[2]

From the beginning of the novel, Kyriakidis notes the lack of homogeneity within the Constantinopolitan Greek society. In fact, the financial and social gap between "members of the high society" or "μεγαλουσιάνοι", as he calls them, and impoverished citizens is huge. For example, the young women of the lower classes comment with envy that only one of the expensive jewels of the ladies of the "high society" could solve their financial problems for life (vol. II, chapter XI, 312). On the opposite side of the social scale, members of prominent Constantinopolitan Greek families do nothing more than boast about the wealth of their parents. Wealthy residents of Pera/Beyoğlu distinguish themselves from the masses and somehow regard themselves as European citizens. For example, while Eve Allain calls herself "Peraiotis", that is, an inhabitant of Pera/Beyoğlu, with a sense of arrogance, she thinks of herself as a "Parisian of Constantinople" (vol. I, chapter V, 99). However, despite this heterogeneity and distance between different social strata, Kyriakidis notes that, in crucial times, as, for example, after the destructive fire of 1870, the wealthy *bourgeoisie* expressed its solidarity towards its unfortunate fellow-citizens. The organization of the "National Charitable Institutions" ("Εθνικά Φιλανθρωπικά Καταστήματα"), built outside the walls of Ipsomatheion/Samatya, is an indication of the solidarity within the Constantinopolitan Greek community. The narrator informs the reader that these institutions reflect the "Greek spirit", are built thanks to the private initiative of the Greek nation and have been considerably modernized in the past years due to the "Great Reforms" of the Tanzimat. These four institutions (namely, a hospital, a mental hospital, a workhouse, and an orphanage) were built with donations from

---

[1] The narrator informs the reader that this habit has Eastern origins, was adopted by the ancient Greeks, and soon "floudisma" (in Greek: "φλούδισμα") spread throughout Europe. However, at the end of the nineteenth century, this habit tends to disappear and is mainly found among people of the lower classes (vol. II, chapter I, 12-13).

[2] For example, Karikena is thinking of visiting a "black woman" in Belgrade, who "looks into the water well" and tells people's fortune (vol. II, chapter VIII, 181-182).

philanthropists and are supported by spontaneous subscriptions of the Greek nation all over Europe (vol. I, chapter VIII, 152-153).[1]

Kyriakidis argues that, since the first decades of the nineteenth century, the structure of the Constantinopolitan Greek community has significantly changed, as the old *Phanariot* aristocracy went through a phase of decline. Georgios's mother (Roxani) is a typical example of this transformation: although she comes from an eminent *Phanariot* family, raised in wealth and with higher education, she is forced to become a seamstress in Ankara to raise her son after the sudden death of her husband. Instead, an uprising Greek *bourgeoisie* has taken the old aristocracy's place, but its character and values are rather different. According to the author, a significant role in the Ottoman Greek social hierarchy is played by the "curators" (in Greek: "έφοροι"): members of this "elite" are elected by the residents of each neighborhood or village, and their main responsibility is to make decisions about financing and supervision of the local Greek schools.[2] Kyriakidis critically notes that many of them, even the wealthier ones, are often completely uneducated (vol. I, chapter XIII, 282-283). Moreover, he also states that hereditary titles of nobility still play a significant role in the Constantinopolitan Greek society, but, in the 1870s, other titles seem to have more value, namely, those awarded due to estimable action. In other words, more praiseworthy are those who "create" and not those who "inherit glorious names". Besides, as the author notes, the Greek nation never had a distinguished noble class of its own; the greatest title of nobility for the Greeks has always been "their national name". This comes in contradistinction to Western Europe, where one can find classes that are regarded to be noble "by blood" and hold hereditary titles of Marquises, Earls, or Barons (vol. I, chapter XII, 236).

According to Kyriakidis, social mobility and flexibility are two of the main characteristics of the mid-nineteenth century Constantinopolitan Greek society. As we read in the novel, it is not so difficult for a Constantinopolitan Greek of the time to change his social status and reappear in the Ottoman capital with a new identity. For example, the poor teacher of Therapeia/Tarabya could easily become a prince, while

---

[1] See comparatively the detailed description of the "National Charitable Institutions" in Polychroniadis/Spathiotis's novel (see above, p. 190).

[2] According to Merope Anastasiadou, in the nineteenth century, in most Greek parishes of Constantinople, the "executive" power was limited to a single administrative body called "commission of the curators", dealing both with the schools and the churches of the parish. In larger parishes/communities, there was a distinction between commissions that supervised the schools and commissions that managed the churches (Anastasiadou 2008, without pagination).

his uneducated young wife could reappear, after a short period of absence, as an experienced lady of the "high society", with foreign languages, travels, and readings. According to the author, in the second half of the nineteenth century, Constantinople provides several opportunities for social elevation and enrichment: a man with an entrepreneurial spirit can easily become a "commercial giant" with a good reputation and credibility in European markets, while one who is an "economic genius", can become a banker and influence the stock markets, providing loans to governments, treasuring money, but also becoming useful to his nation that is so much in need of wealthy philanthropists.[1] Skilled and hard-working people have the responsibility to "throw themselves into social struggles" and devote their powers to the development of their nation, says the narrator (vol. II, chapter XVIII, 463-464). However, we should note that social mobility in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire was quite different viewed from today's perspective.

On several occasions in the novel, Kyriakidis refers to the Greeks of the Diaspora and, more specifically, to the Greek community in the Danubian Principalities, using mainly negative connotations, and criticizes strongly the corruption and immorality of the Greek *bourgeoisie* in Bucharest. The Greek community of the Rumanian capital is described as "a mixed, disorganized society" (vol. I, chapter V, 94), which is mainly distinguished by two things, its wealth and immorality. The author notes, though, that there are certainly many prominent families still preserving paternal virtues and deservedly representing Greek values amidst foreign populations (vol. I, chapter V, 116). However, Ioanna's family was not one of them, as it belonged to the class that had renounced its Greek identity to serve its interests, but, at the same time, was led to immorality. Her father, a very wealthy merchant, pretended to be indigenous, renouncing anything Greek – although the family spoke the Greek language in private – and ending up being a rabid opponent of the Greek nation, just to have the opportunity of being promoted to the high offices of the Principality. According to Kyriakidis, the "irresponsible" way that Ioanna was raised in Bucharest justifies her expected ending: her upbringing took place in

---

[1] We should note here that, from the sixteenth until the beginning of the nineteenth century, social mobility in the Ottoman Empire was mainly gained through patron-client relationships or marriage. However, by the end of the 1830s, avenues for social mobility began to change due to the opening of Ottoman markets to the global economy and the rapid growth of the civil-servant sector. In general, we could say that narrow as its path was, social mobility was always possible under the Ottoman regime, but, from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, it became more open to the masses (Paz 2017, 383-387).

luxuriation and "selfishness of wealth" and this had consequences on her personality and way of thinking (vol. I, chapter V, 116-117). For one more time, the author speaks of the importance of preserving paternal values and Greek consciousness to keep the Greek nation united and powerful and deplores all those adventurers, who were willing to abandon their origins and identity for their personal interest.

In the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, Kyriakidis also deals with an issue that concerned scientists and historians in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: the origin of the prominent Greek families of the Danubian Principalities.[1] The reader follows the story of the prominent family of Kallimachis,[2] which first appeared in Constantinople in 1740, when the *Ottoman Porte*, having developed close relations with Poland, asked the Prince of Moldova to send them a man who speaks the Polish language as an interpreter. The Prince suggested Ioannis Kallimachis, who came to the Ottoman capital with his whole family. However, according to the author, some historians of the time express serious doubts concerning the ethnicity of the family. They argue that its ancestors were called "Kalmoukai" (in Greek: "Καλμούκαι") and that the origin of the family was, in fact, Moldavian, basing their argument on the fact that the family had obtained a significant property in a city of Moldova. Kyriakidis questions the validity of these allegations, attributing the inception of the family to Kallimachos and supporting its ancestry from the circle of the last Byzantine Emperors. According to his point of view, settling in the Moldavian city does not prove in any way that the family was *hellenized* afterward, while there is much evidence of the "very Greek" origin of this historic family. What is certain, he argues, is that the family settled in Moldavia in the fourteenth century, evolved there as great landowners, obtained wealth and power, were associated due intermarriage with various local rulers, and several of its members were raised to the hegemonic throne. Kyriakidis notes that, besides this historic family, members of several Moldavian Greek families followed the same course (vol. I, chapter IX, 167-168). The author stresses the role of origin and, more precisely, the descent of the nineteenth-century Greeks from their Byzantine

---

[1] The Greek presence in the Danubian Principalities, namely, in Moldavia and Wallachia, dates back to the seventh century BC. At times, as during the *Phanariot* era, this presence has amounted to hegemony. At other times, the Greeks have simply been one among the several ethnic minorities in the Principalities. With the early eighteenth-century emergence of *Phanariot* rule over the Principalities, Greek culture became a norm. In time, however, most Greeks lost their specificity and became fully integrated (Deletant 1981, 229-248).

[2] The family of Kallimachis was a Greek *Phanariot* family of Constantinople, several members of which were appointed Princes in Moldavia. The family had close relations to other prominent Constantinopolitan Greek families, as, for example, the family of Soutsos, through marriage.

predecessors, arguing that this constitutes one of the main characteristics of their collective identity. In other words, all Greeks, regardless of their residence, should focus on their common origin to keep the nation united at the end of the nineteenth century.

Apart from the Greek origin, for the author, religion still plays a significant role in the formation of the Constantinopolitan Greek identity. In several chapters, the main protagonist speaks of the greatness of God and the power that he gives to people. But, according to Kyriakidis, the collective Greek identity must be mainly based on the Greek education. Georgios Kallimachis is presented in the novel as an example of an educated Greek, who was raised "the Greek way" by his mother and decides to fulfill his mission as a "teacher of the nation". He speaks the French language and this skill allows him to follow closely the developments in the field of pedagogy and science in Europe. He also appears to be an admirer of the life of the ancient Greeks, "our respected ancestors", as he calls them. [1] The Greek nation is characterized as "uneducated" and needs capable and enlightened leaders, who will bring "illumination" in the field of literature, commerce, industry, arts, and sciences. Therefore, Georgios's main purpose is to introduce reforms to the Greek educational system in the Ottoman Empire, envisioning a reconstruction of the education of the Greek nation in general. In his prayers to God, he often asks for support for all those who dream of "wider horizons" (vol. I, chapter XII, 268). Kyriakidis refers here to *Megali Idea* and argues that this vision will only be fulfilled through the expansion of Greek education in the Ottoman Empire. In the last chapter of volume I, the virtuous priest encourages Georgios to go to the "hospitable and welcoming" Russia,[2] where he will find universities to complete his studies; afterward, he will return to the Empire and open "new horizons" to the education of his nation (vol. I, chapter XIV, 317, 319-320). We must not forget that, during the time of the novel's writing, Kyriakidis was oriented towards Russia as a supporter of the Greek claims. Therefore, he does not hesitate to present the Orthodox "Great Power" as a "Promise Land" that offers several development opportunities. In the novel, Georgios, inglorious and unknown, settles in Russia and soon becomes "well-known", gains glory and honor in the local society, and earns millions.

---

[1]   For the continuity of the Greek identity from antiquity to modern times see above, p. 67, footnote 2.
[2]   For the Greek presence in Southern Russia see above, p. 135, footnote 2.

Kyriakidis, as most of the Greek authors who published their literary works in the Ottoman Empire, avoids references to Ottoman characters in the *Mysteries of Constantinople*. This results in the appearance of only a few Ottoman figures in the novel's plot, and these, as expected, with positive characterizations and/or connotations. For example, when Georgios's father suddenly dies in Ankara, his mother receives a widow pension from the Ottoman state thanks to the compassion of the local General Governor's wife, a virtuous Ottoman lady. The author also informs the reader that "modernized and educated Ottoman women" are distinguished for their virtues. Moreover, as a Constantinopolitan Greek himself, he is familiar with the administration and legislation of the Ottoman state and gives the reader useful information, as, for example, regarding the Ottoman system of *Vakıf* (*βακούφια*).[1]

What is very interesting about Kyriakidis's second *City Mysteries* novel is the almost absolute absence of references to the Greek Kingdom. The Greek capital appears only at the end of the novel: the reader meets again Georgios Kallimachis and his daughter (with her two children) at their new house in Faliron, the coastal district at the southern part of Athens, where they have started a new life away from corrupt Constantinople and its "mysteries". According to the author, this coastal district is constantly being developed and embellished, and has become a "great summer residence" for the inhabitants of the Greek capital in the second half of the nineteenth century.[2] After a few years, the virtuous Iakovos arrives at the Greek capital as well, where he is nominated for a high position in the royal navy due to his bravery. Kyriakidis seems to believe that the center of Hellenism lies in the Greek Kingdom and appeals, indirectly, to all members of the Greek nation to close ranks within the independent national state. Moreover, the protagonists of the novel appear to be familiar with the cultural life in the Greek Kingdom and its literary production in the mid-nineteenth century. In one of the last chapters, Ephrosini, who has lost her mind,

---

[1] According to the Muslim Law, the *Vakıf* (or *Waqf*) was a legal action through which an individual/natural person waives one or more of his belongings and removes them from commercial exploit by dedicating them for life to a holy, charitable, or social purpose. From a legal point of view, it was one of the most complex constructions of Muslim Law, which – although keeping all the semantic components of an institution – developed significantly during the centuries. This religious endowment in Islam was, in principle, motivated by piety. However, the driving force behind the establishment of *Vakifs* often went beyond a simple act of goodwill and served as a channel for the achievement of status, protection of wealth as well as the extension of the government's power (Anastasiadou 2008, without pagination).

[2] As Angela Gioti notes in her article about the early development of tourism in Ioannis Kondylakis's journalistic texts, until the end of the nineteenth century, the beaches of Palaion and Neon Faliron have evolved into the basic reference of summer life in the Greek capital (Gioti 2012, 168-170).

mumbles a poem by Achilleas Paraschos,[1] "which was very popular at that time" (vol. II, chapter XVI, 435-436).[2] But what is the purpose of this reference to Achilleas Paraschos? I argue that there might be different reasons for this reference, "literary" and "social/ideological" ones. To begin with, the fact that the Constantinopolitan Greeks appear to be conversant with the literary production in the Greek capital could be read as an indication of the interaction between the two capitals and of the unity of Hellenism in general, which Kyriakidis strongly believed and supported. However, as he refers rather sarcastically to Paraschos's literary production, it could also be a way for Kyriakidis to show his disapproval towards the invasion of French Romanticism and its patterns – that Paraschos was, to a great extent, representing – in urban Greek society. Besides, we should not forget that the author was not an advocate of Romanticism and wanted to make clear that his literary works "do not belong to the romantic but to the realistic and psychological school" (see above, p. 122). Since the corrupted Ephrosini is the one who recites Paraschos's verses, could he be the poet that suits the most the character of the Constantinopolitan Greek *bourgeoisie* and its values at the end of the nineteenth century? Or does Kyriakidis present Paraschos, regarding his activity in the Greek capital, as one of the Athenian Greeks who were enjoying an idle and rather adventurist life, taking advantage of the general instability in the Greek Kingdom and, in fact, harmed their nation instead of helping it develop during this critical period? I consider all these hypotheses very likely. The fact is that this reference cannot be regarded as random and meaningless.

As expected, the Great Powers of Europe and the European customs and morals play a significant role in the *Mysteries of Constantinople*, as in most Greek *City Mysteries* novels. More precisely, in volume II, members of European countries

---

[1] Achilleas Paraschos (1838-1895) was a Greek romantic poet of the nineteenth century and a representative of the "First Athenian School". He never really worked, as his lyrics always gave him money and fame. Politicians of the time appointed him to various positions, just to get a salary. At a younger age, he was involved in the "Golden Youth", the circle of students and intellectuals who were aiming at dethroning King Otto. Paraschos was considered a "national poet" at that time and his reputation reached every village of the Greek Kingdom. However, in the years that followed, his highly romantic poetry was pillaged and forgotten. His success is regarded due to the special circumstances of an uncertain period, which was characterized by intense expectations and disappointments, creating an atmosphere that favored excesses. For further information about the life and literary production of Achilleas Paraschos see Ouranis 1944.

[2] "[…] Μια μέρα που καθούμασταν 'ς τα χόρτα τ' ανθισμένα,/ Μάρω 'να λόγο θα σε πω/ Μάρω της είπα σ' αγαπώ/ τρελλαίνομαι για σένα…/ Από την μέση μ' άρπαξε/ με φίλησε 'ς το στόμα/ και μ' είπε γι' αναστεναγμούς/ για της αγάπης τους καϋμούς είσαι μικρός ακόμα./ Μεγάλωσα και την ζητώ/ Άλλον ζητεί η καρδιά της/ Και με ξεχνάει τ' ορφανό/ Μα γω ποτέ δεν λησμονώ, ποτέ το φίλημά της…" (vol. II, chapter XVI, 435).

residing in Constantinople appear to play an active role in the public life of the Ottoman capital and to be closely connected with the local population. In critical times, they often take initiatives; for example, a philanthropic event is organized with the initiative of the British Ambassador's wife at the British Embassy in Therapeia/Tarabya to raise money for the victims of the disastrous fire of 1870. All the ladies of the European "high society" in Constantinople are there. One of them, the French countess Leonecq, organizes an improvised "oriental market" in the garden of the Embassy, with the help of two Greek women, dressed "according to the oriental mode with the expensive and golden silks of Smyrna". The narrator describes in detail the improvised "oriental café", where "its lustful visitors seek the oblivion of this material world in an aromatic atmosphere" and gives the reader a picture of pure "oriental exoticism" (vol. II, chapter XI, 240-243, my translation). The way that this "oriental world and attitude" is presented in the text is particularly interesting, showing that Kyriakidis sees the "eastern world" through a colonial perspective, expressing his disappointment for the decline of these pure "eastern values"; in other words, he sees this world through the perspective of the (Western) Other.

As we read in the novel, communication between Constantinople and western Europe is constant. Members of the uprising Constantinopolitan Greek *bourgeoisie* get daily informed about the developments in western Europe, as, for example, about the situation between France and Germany in the 1870s. Georgios Kallimachis is also informed about the developments in the Greek Kingdom, expressing his disapproval of the political actions of Alexandros Koumoundouros [1] and Dimitrios Voulgaris. [2] Kyriakidis also criticizes the lack of established academic institutions in the Greek Kingdom, which inevitably leads young Greeks, who come from aristocratic and

---

[1] Alexandros Koumoundouros (1815-1883) was a political personality (he served as Prime Minister of the Greek Kingdom ten times) famous for his work towards national progress, his patriotism, and unselfishness, despite his having been in office during a very unsettled period of the Greek history. During his fifty-year-long period of political involvement, he tried to remain neutral and avoid confrontation with the three Great Powers of Europe. The time of Koumoundouros's greatest achievement came in 1881 during his last premiership, when, after diplomatic contacts with the Ottoman Empire, he managed to bring about the annexation of Thessaly and Arta to the Greek mainland. For further information about Koumoundouros's political action see Mazarakis 1946.

[2] Dimitrios Voulgaris (1802-1877) was a fighter during the Greek Revolution of 1821, who became involved in politics after the establishment of the independent state as a bitter opponent of Governor Ioannis Kapodistrias. He became Prime Minister with an anglophile government for the first time in 1855 during the Crimean War (in total, he served as Prime Minister eight times), while in 1862 he was involved in the coup against King Otto. His terms in office were characterized by corruption and political conflicts. For further information about Voulgaris's political action see Puchner 1981.

wealthy Constantinopolitan families, to study in Europe:[1] "those who wish to enter into letters or arts study in Paris, those who want to become merchants study at the Commercial School of Marseilles, while those who are interested in getting involved in shipping, attend the Nautical School of London" (vol. II, chapter XVIII, 466, my translation). Moreover, English structure and administration are presented in the novel as a model of development and modernization. The English nation is characterized as "great, powerful, and wealthy" and the English people, with their positivity and practicality, provide great examples for imitation for the Constantinopolitan Greeks. According to Kyriakidis, modern ideas of the European societies should be transferred to "our countries", which lack social education and customs (vol. II, chapter XX, 494-496). The author sees the Greek Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire as "non-European" countries, which can benefit a lot by following European examples and patterns.

It is particularly interesting that although, as mentioned above, the plot evolves in the Ottoman capital, the novel ends in Athens. The deplorable and corrupted protagonists are left behind (in Constantinople), while the virtuous and moral ones, who cannot be integrated into the "unhealthy urban environment" of the Ottoman capital, settle within the borders of the Greek Kingdom. Could this be read as an indication? Does this mean that all roads lead to Athens? Most likely. Kyriakidis seems to believe that the future of Hellenism lies in the Greek capital. He dreams of a national state and in this period, at the end of the nineteenth century, when the decline of the Ottoman Empire is quite visible, this expectation appears to be quite "realizable". Although he is a Constantinopolitan Greek, he uses the first-person plural referring to the Greek Kingdom and its citizens. Moreover, he believes in the unity of Hellenism and dreams of closer cooperation of its two parts, the "liberated" and the "enslaved" one (see above, p. 124). According to Kyriakidis, the Greek nation is facing new dangers, that is, the interests of the European Powers and/or the competition among the various nations in the Balkan Peninsula, and Greeks must deal with them united. The author supports that the privileges granted to the Ottoman Greeks with the Tanzimat led them to a new course of development and they should continue developing on this basis, avoiding the pitfall of xenomania and the loss of their collective identity.

---

[1] It is interesting that Kyriakidis uses the first-person plural referring to the Greek Kingdom and its citizens ("[…] ακόμη δεν έχομεν όλας τας αναγκαίας σχολάς και […] διά να διδασκώμεθα είμεθα αναγκασμένοι να μεταβαίνωμεν εις τας ξένας χώρας", vol. II, chapter XVIII, 473).

It is clear from all the above that Kyriakidis is a multifaceted personality: as a historian, he has good knowledge of the past; as a journalist, he follows closely the developments of his time, both in the Ottoman Empire and in Europe as well as in the Greek Kingdom; as an author, he develops the plot of his novels following French patterns. He is a Constantinopolitan Greek of the second half of the nineteenth century, who is oriented towards the Greek Kingdom and a proponent of the communication between Constantinople and the developed European centers, but he disapproves of the sterile imitation of western patterns and the decline of morals of the Constantinopolitan Greek society. But above all, he is a proponent of *Megali Idea* and the unity of Hellenism in one powerful national state. It is not easy to define to which extent what Kyriakidis describes in his *City Mysteries* novels is the result of experience, personal reading, or influence of European patterns. As Lambros Varelas notes, it is rather obvious that he has been influenced by Stephanos Xenos (especially by the *Devil in Turkey*, see below, p. 219) and Èmile Zola (by his detailed descriptions and the naturalistic attempt to interpret the behavior of the protagonists through heredity and social *milieu*).[1] Although we can find no direct references in his novels, Kyriakidis had likely read the preceding popular Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries*, which develop a similar problematic and thematic. However, he decides to "use" this literary genre to express his own ideology and criticism, occupying, therefore, a special case in my corpus.

[1]   Varelas 2018, 131.

2.0. Non-Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors: the perspective of the Greek Other

2.1. Stephanos Xenos: a "realistic" perspective of the Ottoman Empire through the eyes of a Greek of the Diaspora

Stephanos Xenos published his first literary work entitled *The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople* at (about) the same period that Petros Ioannidis, the first Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* author, published his *Eptalophos* (see above, p. 96); in fact, the English version of the *Devil* is chronologically the first novel of my corpus. However, compared to the above-presented Constantinopolitan Greek authors, Xenos constitutes a different case: although he also comes from the Ottoman Empire (as we have seen in the previous chapter, he was born in Smyrna/Izmir), he sees the Ottoman capital and its Greek population from a different perspective. We could say that Ioannidis and Xenos represent two opposing perspectives in the mid-nineteenth century: the former is the Constantinopolitan Greek, who sees the future of his community within the Ottoman Empire, while the latter is the Greek of the Diaspora, raised with the ideology of the *Filiki Etairia* (*Φιλική Εταιρεία*)[1] and influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment, who sees the "enslaved brothers" of the Ottoman Empire from the perspective of the Greek Other, that is, the citizen of the Greek Kingdom, even though he was not living there himself. This means that Xenos adopted the perspective and ideology of the Greek Kingdom regarding the Greeks still living in the Ottoman Empire, even though he lived, for a long period, in a different environment, that is, the developing British capital. It is very interesting that, although Xenos was an Ottoman Greek, he speaks about "our country" ("το καθ᾽ ημάς"), referring to the Greek Kingdom and not the Ottoman Empire. I argue that his ideological background and his life choices and experiences are the main reasons for this differentiation compared to Ioannidis and other Ottoman Greek authors of the time.

As mentioned in chapter III, Xenos's novel was originally published in English (in London) in 1851. After the mid-nineteenth century, the large Greek community of London was quite powerful and active, consisting mainly of Ottoman Greeks, who

---

[1] We should not forget that his father and uncle were active members of the *Filiki Etairia* (*Φιλική Εταιρεία*) (see above, p. 101).

have settled there due to commercial activities. However, Xenos originally seems to have the intention to address mainly the English readership and not his compatriots living in the British capital. The Greek republication of the *Devil* (in Athens) a decade later addressed a different readership. We do not have any indication that Ioannidis (1855) was acquainted with Xenos's text (1851): although the English version of *The Devil in Turkey* was a great publishing success, the novel mainly circulated within the society of London. Moreover, it would be almost impossible for the novel to reach the Constantinopolitan market due to its "daring" content and the strict restrictions of the Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88).

In the novel, the reader easily identifies Xenos's intention to depict the Empire's gradual decline during the nineteenth century.[1] Moreover, the author appears to watch closely the developments within the Empire, but also the diplomatic and political action in Europe. He often refers to the reformative efforts of Sultan Mahmud II, criticizing the fact that a part of the Ottoman administration stood out against the Sultan's reforms and innovations (as, for example, the Grand Vizier Dalpatan), aggravating the already terrible situation of the Empire. Mario Vitti argues that the novel was aligned with "the oriental trend of the time" in Western Europe,[2] but I believe that Xenos goes one step further: with his novel, he is trying to prove wrong all those travelers, who have built a romantic and exotic picture about the life in the Ottoman Empire during the previous decades and "to depict the Ottoman reality as it actually is". In this sense, we can say that the author's perspective is rather "anti-orientalistic", as it comes to disprove the "orientalistic" perspective of Western Europe towards the Ottoman "East" in the first half of the nineteenth century.

I also believe that the publication of the novel in two languages served two different purposes. We should have in mind that Xenos began writing his novel in Greek but decided to publish it first in English;[3] this means that, from the beginning, he intended to address both readerships, the English and the Greek one. The English edition (in 1851) aimed at raising several prejudices which have been created in the

---

[1] The historical context of the novel is set in the first half of the nineteenth century, that is, during the reign of Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839) (see above, p. 44, footnote 1).

[2] Vitti 2003, 279-280.

[3] A comparison between the two versions of the novel, namely, the English and the Greek one, shows that the author did not make significant changes to the original text. In general, the structure and the context remain the same. However, Xenos does not hesitate to give in the English version more detailed descriptions of places in the Ottoman capital, which were probably unknown to the English readership.

mind of English and European readers by travelers referring to the Ottoman Empire and its multiethnic population. With his novel, Xenos would show the English people who support the Empire, how people actually live in this country as well as the misery and intrigue prevailing in the Ottoman administration. In other words, as mentioned above, Xenos wanted to depict the "Ottoman reality" more accurately than the various English travel books before him did, through the eyes of the inside observer, who knows it in depth and not the outer visitor, who cannot reach its deeper side. And this is clear by the way that the English people are presented in the novel: a characteristic example is the family of the English consul in Constantinople, who does not, of course, participate in the crimes and intrigues of the local population, but, at the same time, is unaware of what goes on in the city (vol. I, chapter XVIII, 314-324). The author indirectly states that English people, even those who have lived in the Ottoman capital for some time, are far from seeing and understanding the "Ottoman reality". In another chapter, Xenos presents a group of travelers, more precisely, of English tourists, who have just arrived in Constantinople, walking around the "mercantile labyrinth" of the Old Bedesten[1] with small notebooks in their hands (vol. II, chapter XXII, 334-342). This is also an indirect note towards the English readers that their knowledge of the Ottoman capital will remain superficial and deceptive, as long as they keep observing it like these inquisitive and enquiring travelers, who are unsuspecting for the reality that surrounds them.

The Greek publication in 1862 had different objectives. As Xenos himself notes, his main aim was "to make known to his countrymen who live in free Greece and who have never visited Turkey, the condition, customs, and sentiments of the different tribes of this Empire, both before and after the Reformation" (my translation) (prologue, iv).

---

[1] The Old Bedesten (or Grand Bazaar) of Constantinople was one of the largest and oldest covered markets in the world with hundreds of visitors daily. Xenos gives the reader a detailed description of the market in the English version of his novel (in the Greek version the description takes only a few lines): "The Bezesteins or magazines of Constantinople are situated within the precincts of the ancient Byzantium. They constitute a singular, and at the same time a beautiful sight, and consist of a profusely decorated labyrinth of shops and stores, in which every sort of merchandise is to be found. These lofty edifices, constructed of marble, stone, and brick, surmounted by large domes, from the windows of which the lower part is lighted, communicate for the most part with each other. They resemble streets and have large gates, which are opened in the morning and closed at night. These Bezesteins have different names given to them, denoting the kind of commodities that are sold. For instance, there is the *Tchovaer-Bezestein*, wherein are sold gems and stones of precious value. Further on is the *Cavaf-Bezestein*, in which mirrors and slippers are sold. Then there are other Bezensteins, devoted to the sale of silk goods, swords, guns, and other arms, pipes of every description, drugs and perfumes, beads or chaplets, and other manufactures peculiar to Asia" (English version, vol. III, chapter XXI, 412-413).

Influenced by the vision of the *Megali Idea*, which was the dominant ideology in the Greek Kingdom in the mid-nineteenth century, the author undertook to introduce the citizens of the Greek state, "his countrymen" as he calls them, to the peoples of the Ottoman Empire, mainly to raise their awareness and sensitize them about the present and future of their "enslaved brothers". As the editor of the fourth (Greek) publication informs us in his prologue in 1892, the author wrote his novel during difficult times for the Greek Kingdom, "when journalists and artists, patriots and heralds of freedom were imprisoned, when the voice of the press was suppressed, when robbery ravaged the country, when the Constitution had become a 'servile make-up', when the freedom of the press and the citizen in the Kingdom was completely controlled by the censorship of despotism. In this atmosphere of political and economic misery of the first decades of the Greek Kingdom, Stephanos Xenos, as a real cosmopolitan Greek of his time, sought and, in several occasions, succeeded in preserving his *Greekness* and fought for the Greek rights in East and West" (my translation) (prologue, 3). We should not forget that Xenos belonged to the political opposition against King Otto and was strongly criticizing the situation of the newly established Greek Kingdom under his governance (see above, p. 102, footnote 1). Very often in the text, he gives us the impression that the terrible situation of the Ottoman Empire described could also apply to the Greek Kingdom; he asks, therefore, for all these reforms not for the westernization and modernization of the Empire, but of the Greek Kingdom. As Zefyros Kafkalidis notes, Xenos's dream has always been the industrialization and westernization of the Greek Kingdom according to the pattern of Great Britain.[1] Therefore, I believe that he chose this indirect way to criticize the current situation and make his suggestions for the development of "his country".

Stephanos Xenos believes in the continuity of Hellenism from antiquity to modern times and sees contemporary Constantinopolitan Greeks as descendants of the ancient Greeks and the Byzantines. As we have already seen in chapter II, at that time, that is, in the mid-nineteenth century, Spyridon Zampelios and Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos established their theories regarding the continuity of the Greek identity from antiquity to modern times (see above, p. 67, footnote 1). Influenced by these ideas, Xenos often reminisces the glory of Byzantium and the triumphs of Byzantine Emperors such as Theodosius the Great, the last emperor to rule over both the eastern

---

[1]   Kafkalidis 1998, 31-32, 96-97.

and the western halves of the Roman Empire. Full of pride for his ancestors, he informs the reader that Constantinople and the other big cities of the Empire gave birth to the most significant men, who enlightened and educated the whole world. In these cultural centers, poetry, sciences, and arts have flourished for centuries. Thus, the author cannot wait for the moment that Hellenism will shine again, united and powerful. It is noteworthy that in one of the last chapters of volume I, he expresses openly his expectations of Constantinople's retrieval by the Greeks and the restoration of the Greek nation in its former, that is, Byzantine, borders. More precisely, we read in the will of the wealthy banker and moneylender Iannakis that he decided to hide his fortune in the basement of his house so that the Greeks "who will eventually come to Constantinople" find it and establish with it a school for "our poor youth". He wants this school to be named "Panhellenion" ("Πανελλήνιον"), that is, "school for all Greeks" and be led by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, together with two "of the most learned men of the nation". If his fortune is discovered "before the reconquering of Constantinople", Iannakis asks the Russian consul in the Ottoman capital to send the money to St. Petersburg, that is, to a coreligionist center, "until the nation is restored" (vol. I, chapter XXIII, 421-422). The representative of the Ottoman government Mazar Pasha mocks these expectations of the Greek banker, considering the reconquering of the Ottoman capital by the Greeks unlikely, especially when the Turks themselves are preparing for the conquering of St. Petersburg (!).[1] The fact that Xenos published his novel in London (and later in Athens) gave him the freedom to express such *irredentist* ideas openly.

Typical of the way that Xenos views the Ottoman Greeks is his dedication to his uncle Emmanuel and his father Theodoros in the first edition of his second novel entitled *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution* (*Η Ηρωίς της Ελληνικής Επαναστάσεως*, 1861).[2] The author notes: "Once there was a euphoric period, when all Christians living under Ottoman slavery, took their weapons and bearing no other name but HELLENES [sic], attempted to crush the yoke of slavery and rebuild the Byzantine Empire. Their struggle lasted seven terrible years, but, full of enthusiasm, every real patriot did his

---

[1] We should not forget that the novel was written during a preparatory and particularly critical period that soon led to the Crimean war (1853-1856), that is, one more conflict between the Ottoman Empire and Russia.

[2] For the novel see above, p. 101, footnote 4.

duty towards his country" (my translation).[1] Interestingly, Xenos sees Hellenism united under one common identity and believes in the reconstruction of the Byzantine Empire. These ideas, expressed in 1861, clearly show how the citizens of the Greek Kingdom saw the Ottoman Greeks and the Greeks of the Diaspora. In one of the last chapters of the *Devil*, the young protagonist Malamatenia introduces herself as "Hellenis" ("Ελληνίς", vol. II, chapter XXIII, 352), that is, member of the Greek nation, although she comes from the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, in the first chapter of the second volume, the anonymous editor of a memorandum addressed to the Sultan introduces himself "as a Christian and not an Ottoman" (vol. II, chapter I, 27), identifying the term "Ottoman" with that of "Muslim". According to Xenos, the Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity in the mid-nineteenth century was mainly based on the Greek language and the Orthodox religion. The language was the "Rum" or "Roman", that is, the common and deformed Greek language, mixed with several Italian, Turkish, and French words. As for the religion, Xenos states that the Orthodox Christians must defend their beliefs and face the great hatred of the Catholics and the Muslims. However, we should note here that, although the author speaks enthusiastically about the unity of Hellenism and the formation of a common Greek identity, we find no direct reference to the Greek Kingdom and its citizens in the novel, even though it was not published under the strict Ottoman censorship (see above, p. 88).

In the novel, nineteenth-century Constantinople is presented as the "Tower of Babel", as various languages and dialects of "Armenian, Turk, Orthodox, Western, Jewish, and other races" can be heard. But this heterogeneity does not bother the author.[2] According to Xenos, the decline of the Ottoman Empire is linked directly to the idiosyncrasy and the character of the ruling Ottomans. Bribery, corruption, and venality are the main characteristics of the Ottoman administration;[3] the circulation of counterfeit currencies is spreading rapidly; arbitrariness, misappropriation, and

---

[1] "Υπήρξε ποτέ εποχή τρισευδαίμων, καθ' ην άπαντες οι υπό την δουλείαν του Οθωμανικού Κράτους Χριστιανοί […], δράξαντες τα όπλα, και μηδεμίαν άλλην φέροντες ονομασίαν ή ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ [sic], επειράθησαν να συντρίψωσι τον ζυγόν της δουλείας και εγείρωσι το Βυζαντινόν Κράτος. Ο αγών διήρκεσεν επτά σκληρά έτη, αλλά πλήρης […] ενθουσιασμού έκαστος αληθής πατριώτης τότε […] επλήρωσε το προς την πατρίδα χρέος του" (*The Heroine of the Greek Revolution*, 31).

[2] For the presentation of Constantinople as a modern "Tower of Babel" also see Christophoros Samartsidis (see above, p. 161).

[3] A typical example of this situation is the organization of the customhouse, which is simply characterized as "ridiculous". According to the author, the Ottoman government could have made great profit from trade and shipping, if the organization of the customhouse were "more European" (vol. I, chapter XII, 187-190).

debauchery prevail; arts and sciences have no place in Ottoman society.[1] The situation of the Ottoman nation can be identified with the body of a dead man that his relatives and friends are vainly trying to bring back to life, embellishing it "with golden and shiny jewelry" (vol. I, chapter XXII, 200).

As most of the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors, Xenos stresses the need for reforms in the Ottoman Empire so that all citizens can enjoy equal rights and expresses his proposals through his novel in an indirect way. At the beginning of the second volume, the anonymous editor of the above-mentioned memorandum addressed to the Sultan, points out what needs to be changed in the Empire, as, for example, the establishment of courts similar to those in European countries,[2] the proper education of the heads of the state in order to work for the welfare of all citizens and not for their personal interest, and the establishment of modern schools according to European patterns. In other words, a general reformation of the "tyrannical and obsolete customs" of the Empire is considered necessary (vol. II, chapter I, 19-27). I believe that these proposals for modernization are, in fact, addressed to those who rule the Greek state. Describing the terrible situation of the Ottoman Empire, Xenos wants to show "his countrymen" that the situation in the Greek Kingdom is not that different. We should not forget that, during the first decades after its establishment, the Greek state was facing serious problems, which, according to the author, were mainly related to King Otto's governance. This is the reason that the author was persistently demanding Otto's eviction from the Greek throne.

Particularly indicative of the way that Xenos sees the organization of the Ottoman Greek community is the presentation of the Patriarchate and its administration in the novel. While Ioannidis in his *Eptalophos* mainly depicts the situation within the circles of the lower clergy, probably having himself deep knowledge of its problems (see above, p. 156), Xenos focuses on the Patriarchate and the unbelievable crimes

---

[1] For example, as Xenos notes, in the Ottoman Empire the profession of the doctor is "open" to everyone. This means that anyone can be easily "named" a doctor in Constantinople and practice this profession no matter if he is, in fact, a shoemaker or a tailor. Turks and Jews, both ignorant and superstitious, are easily deceived by these "witch doctors", who cause terrible damages to their patients. However, Xenos estimates that, even if the Ottoman government establishes medicine schools, it is impossible for the "thick-headed" Turks to study this science successfully in only four years (vol. I, chapter XII, 198-200).

[2] In several parts of his text, Xenos disapproves of the unequal treatment of criminals by the Ottoman justice: if the criminal is a Turk (namely, a Muslim), he will either be secretly released or exiled for a short period, but if he is a Christian, he will probably be tortured to confess the committed or non-committed crime.

committed by members of the higher clergy. He does not hesitate to demystify the sanctity of the Patriarchate, describing the deplorable and unethical actions of higher clerics, the Patriarch included, which have nothing to do with Christian ethics and moral behavior. As Anastasia Tsapanidou notes, in Xenos's novel, "the reader sees the Patriarchate transform from the pillar of Orthodoxy and supporter of the Greek revolution to a despicable criminal gang".[1] And, partly, Xenos's criticism has some basis, as during the decade preceding the publication of the *Devil*, the situation in the Patriarchate of Constantinople was quite turbulent: consecutive changes of Patriarchs, internal conflicts for the participation of laymen in the works of the Holy Synod, attempts of obtaining and controlling the revenue of regional metropolises and monasteries.[2] In the novel, Archbishop Neophytos constitutes a typical example of this situation: on the one hand, he speaks of "the paralysis of our holy religion", as the priests in vain try to bring the believers back to their Christian duties through moral preaching, while, on the other hand, he has a secret love affair with a young girl, Polyxeni. When the girl gets pregnant, Neophytos does not hesitate to bribe the Patriarch himself with one hundred thousand piasters to arrange Polyxeni's secret marriage to a young man in the Patriarchate, even by force (vol. II, chapter VII-VIII, 132-145). Xenos also notes the frequent disagreements and ruptures between the Patriarch of Western Armenians and the Orthodox Patriarch, the "Patriarch of the Greeks", as he calls him, which often lead to briberies, slanders, and scandals that threaten the religious order in the Ottoman capital (vol. I, chapter XVIII, 309-311).

Although Xenos does not have to face the Ottoman censorship, his anti-Ottoman comments are expressed indirectly and concealed, on the one hand, because the novel's first edition was addressed to the English readership that Xenos did not want to repel with his "nationalist rhetoric" and, on the other hand, because it refers to a historical period (1827-1829), when Sultan Mahmud II was following a systematic policy of reformation and modernization. The Ottoman Sultans in general are presented in the novel as monarchs blinded by flattery, deceit, and hypocrisy, who do not accept any criticism or guidance. However, Sultan Mahmud II appears as a figure with mixed positive and negative characteristics, open to reforms and modernization but, at the same time, unable to see the conspiracies and crimes that take place in his capital and

---

[1] Tsapanidou 2012, 476-477.
[2] Stamatopoulos 2003, 44-52.

the Empire in general.[1] Xenos notes that Mahmud II was a man with a deep and thoughtful spirit. His main objective was to establish a modern state similar to other "Enlightened nations" and if he only had some "European experience", he would have probably prevented the decline of his Empire. On the opposite side, the reader meets Dalpatan Pasha as a typical example of a tyrannical representative of the Ottoman administration, who is characterized by ignorance, fanaticism, arrogance, and arbitrariness and succeeded in occupying the office of the Grand Vizier by using all powerful means, intrigues, and bribery. According to Xenos, the above-mentioned characteristics are to be found in most of the prominent Ottoman officials. In general, the ruling Ottomans are presented as ignorant and superstitious people. Even when they have lived in Europe for several years, it is very difficult for them to get rid of their superstition and fear of anything new.

As mentioned above, in contradistinction to other Ottoman Greek authors, Xenos expresses his clear opposition to the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism*, presenting in his novel the problematic relationship between Muslims and Christians in the Ottoman Empire; these two can never live harmoniously, he argues. In "despicable Turkey", as the young Armenian Kielkadhin calls the Ottoman Empire, the non-Muslim subject of the Sultan is unprotected against the arbitrary abuses of the Muslim (vol. I, chapter X, 150). The ruling Ottomans always see the Christians as *giaurs* (non-believers) and accuse them that, despite all the privileges that they enjoy, they are constantly causing revolts and riots (vol. I, chapter XIII, 240-241). In the next chapter, the Ottoman slave comments that the Sultan in vain tries to keep the *giaurs* under his domination. Thus, he expresses his certainty that they, together with the Janissaries, will eventually bring the collapse of the Empire. The Ottoman also expresses his fears about the future of his race and the danger of Europeanization: sooner or later, he states, the Empire will be ruled exclusively by the *giaurs*, who will destroy the Muslim religion and compel everything *alafranga* (see above, p. 194, footnote 1) (vol. I, chapter XIV, 252-253). The Vizier argues that although the Christians show obedience and respect towards the Muslim officials, deep inside they only feel hatred and anger against them. Therefore, although superficially Christians and Muslims give the impression that they live in harmony, the chasm between them remains deep. According to the Ottoman

---

[1] Tsapanidou 2012, 425-426, 491.

official, the only solution to this problem is the execution of this "damned genos" (vol. I, chapter XXIII, 425).

Apart from the ruling Ottomans, in the novel, a dangerous enemy for the Constantinopolitan Greeks are the Jews. Anastasia Tsapanidou argues that Xenos presents the Jews as the "dangerous Other", drawing every possible negative characteristic from the Greek pool of ethnic-racial stereotypes. The author relates the Jew with several stereotypical characteristics, already known from other Greek novels of the nineteenth century, as, for example, avarice, usury, and insult to Christianity (see, for example, the scene when the rabbis "humiliate" the ecclesiastical vestments of the Orthodox priests, vol. II, chapter V, 113-115).[1] Xenos also presents a fictional version of rumors about Jewish infanticide rituals: in the Jewish district of Balata/Balat, the reader enters the underground Synagogue of a Jewish sect that sacrifices young children, a large darkroom communicating with neighboring houses in order to transport secretly the dead bodies of the Christian children (vol. II, chapter V, 105-117).[2] A typical representative of the Jewish Other is the wealthy banker Vemvenistas, who is extremely fanatic about his religion and wishes, if possible, "to avenge all Christians" (vol. II, chapter I, 36). In the novel, the religious hatred of the Jews against Christians and Muslims appears to be huge.

At the same time, the Armenian community of Constantinople is also presented in the novel as the Other in relation to the Greeks, but not with so many negative connotations compared to the Jews. On the contrary, Xenos points out the tendency of the Armenians towards knowledge and learning foreign languages. A typical representative of this community is the young Kielkadhin, who comes from a wealthy Constantinopolitan family and is distinguished for her beauty and intelligence. Her uncle, the Western Armenian Patriarch, who had close relations with several European officials, had led her into a boarding school to be properly educated. In a short time, the

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 474-475.

[2]   We read in the extract of the English version, which has no differences compared to the Greek text: "This poor victim [that is, the abducted Christian boy], when sufficiently fat for their purpose, it was the intention of these Jews to place alive in a great barrel, which on the inside was stuck full of nails and iron spikes. These, on its being turned around, would penetrate into the flesh and draw out every drop of blood. The body afterwards would be privately buried, and the blood distributed among the various synagogues, and employed by way of communion. They give two reasons for this frightful and abominable rite. 'If Jesus Christ', say they, 'is in truth the expected Messiah, we are faithfully carrying out the injunction implied in these words: - *Take this, and divide it among yourselves, for it is my blood, which is shed for you*. If he is not, then we are turning you and your faith into derision, and you only are to blame for it'" (English version, vol. III, chapter II, 30-31). However, Xenos clarifies that this is only an abominable habit of a specific heresy and not of all Jews (!).

young girl was already speaking the Greek, French and English language perfectly (vol. I, chapter IX, 105-106).

In the novel, the reader also meets the underworld of the Ottoman capital in several chapters, which is a clear indication that, despite its historical character, *The Devil in Turkey* belongs, to a large extent, to the *City Mysteries* genre.[1] What is very interesting is that the main representative of the underworld is, in fact, a woman, the old lady Sphyrla: intrigue, deceit, avarice, and malice are the main characteristics of her personality. She does not even hesitate to murder the young Kielkadhin to embezzle her expensive jewelry and hide the dead body in the attic of her house (!) (vol. I, chapter VIII, 92-94). According to Xenos, delinquency and crime are related to particular social classes, but, surprisingly, these are not the lower classes and/or the underworld of the modern city. Although "in almost every nation", he notes, "a number of the worst of characters, such as thieves, murderers, criminals of every grade, and coiners, are to be found among the lower orders" and are led to crime "either from a natural propensity […] or from the necessities they are driven to by their poverty and inability to procure the necessaries of life", in the Ottoman Empire, common people work hard to survive, while "the rich and powerful are ready to perpetrate every abuse" to satisfy their avarice or "stop the mouths of their superiors and induce them to connive at their enormities" (English version, vol. I, chapter VII, 219).

Another interesting thing in the novel is the way that the Great Powers of Europe are presented: most of the time, they appear as perfidious allies, who covet the Sultan's Empire, pursuing their interests. According to Xenos, the coreligionist Russia is the sneakiest of all, as it has already gradually incorporated several regions belonging to the Ottoman Empire such as Moldavia, Circassia, and Poland and is waiting patiently for its final disintegration. Constantinople is Russia's main target to secure its control over the Black Sea and the Mediterranean and thus, block the expansion of Britain towards the East.[2] On the other hand, Austria pretends not to interfere in the issues of

---

[1]   As Anastasia Tsapanidou notes, the novel reflects the particularities of the (pre-/semi-) urban Ottoman East, namely, the characteristics that represent the "Eastern version" of the urban center that differs from the Western centers not as a place, that is, at the level of urban construction and development, but mainly as a society, that is, at the level of social stratification: Constantinople is primarily stratified according to ethnographic and not social class characteristics. From this perspective, we could consider the novel as a typical example of an "Eastern *City Mysteries* novel" (Tsapanidou 2012, 498).

[2]   Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, Britain's population increased at a dramatic rate, accompanied by rapid urbanization, which caused significant social and economic stresses. To seek new markets and sources of raw materials, the British government under Benjamin Disraeli initiated

the Ottoman Empire, but, at the same time, clearly declares its hatred against the Christians of the Empire by indirectly supporting Islam's oppression of them. Xenos estimates that Austria seeks a close alliance with the Sultan due to Russia's further expansion but will be the first to abandon the Empire in difficult times, using the excuse of the different religion, customs, and laws. As mentioned above, Britain appears to be the European Power whose commercial interests are closely linked to the Ottoman territory. Therefore, in the second half of the nineteenth century, its only goal is to have access to cities of commercial interest in the East to secure its Indian conquests. Finally, France is presented in the novel as the nation which gives the impression that it does not interfere in other people's business; however, it can unexpectedly arise and spread terror in whole Europe. In general, Xenos disapproves of the expansionary tendency of the powerful European nations towards the East, as their main purpose is to conquer and control more and more people in Asia and Africa.

Although the author might not agree with the European Powers on their diplomatic and expansionary plans in the East, he often expresses his admiration for European achievements in science and culture that improve people's everyday life. For example, in one of the first chapters, the young Armenian Kielkadhin, full of enthusiasm, describes life in the "great London": inventions and discoveries make people's lives easy; the upper classes consist of people with various titles of nobility; the English people are distinguished for their elegant manners, their steady character and their respect towards their wives (vol. I, chapter IX, 138-140). According to Xenos, who had personal experience of living in both capitals, namely, London and Constantinople, there is still a great distance between "West" and "East": the ladies of the British society, "blooming, graceful, and elegant in figure, […] shine like stars and fully deserve the reputation they enjoy", he notes. Therefore, they see the "young woman of the East" (Kielkadhin), who has just arrived in London, with a sense of curiosity and/or a feeling of contempt; for them, she comes from a different world (English version, vol. I, chapter VIII, 259). Moreover, in these enlightened European countries, although one can easily differentiate the distinct social classes, the wealthy aristocrats and the members of the middle and lower classes enjoy the same rights and are all equal before the law. Harmony and justice promote sciences and arts and develop

---

a period of imperial expansion towards the East. In the following decades, the British Empire expanded gradually to include most of India, large parts of Africa, and many other territories throughout the world. For further information see Porter, Louis 1999.

these already civilized societies further. However, the unaware and uneducated Dalpatan Pasha states that this "diabolical" way of life will never be accepted in Turkey.

As Konstantinos Rados argues, *The Devil in Turkey*, despite its historical scenes and references, as, for example, the outbreak of the Greek Revolution or the revolt of Ali Pasha of Ioannina, is mainly a novel "full of adventures and scenes of contemporary life in the Ottoman East" (see again the novel's subtitle).[1] I believe that it constitutes the first text written by an Ottoman Greek, who views the situation in the Empire in the first half of the nineteenth century from the perspective of the Greek Other, who is aiming at "revealing" a "reality" that remains, to a large extent, unseen by the members of Western societies. As we will see below, Stephanos Xenos seems to be inspired by the same chapters of history as Konstantinos Ramphos, but sees the Ottoman Greeks from a different perspective, that of the Greek of the Diaspora, while Ramphos constitutes a different case.

---

[1] Rados 1917, 28.

2.2. Konstantinos Ramphos: an Ottoman Greek at the service of the *irredentist* visions of the Greek Kingdom

Konstantinos Ramphos sees the Ottoman Empire and its Greek population from a rather different perspective. As mentioned in chapter III (see above, p. 113), the author's prologue at the first volume of the *Halet Efendi* is particularly enlightening regarding his objectives: as Ramphos himself states, the main subject of study in his novel is the ruling Ottoman in his "mysterious" life, either as an individual citizen or as a wielder of power,[1] who believes that innovations, changes in customs and social development contradict and fundamentally overthrow his religion. The highest offices of the Ottoman administration are usually occupied by ignorant people, who lack virtues, abilities, and proper education. Ramphos, therefore, appears to be "urged" to write the current novel by the fact that the history of the Ottoman Empire, full of political and diplomatic intrigues, remains largely unknown and causes misinterpretations, mainly on the part of Europeans. However, it is worth noting that although he declares that he addresses his novel mainly to Europeans, he decides to publish it in Greek, unlike Stephanos Xenos, who, as mentioned above, originally published his *Devil in Turkey* in English. I believe that this practically indicates that Ramphos wanted, in fact, to address the Greek-speaking world and proves how closely tied to the Greek Kingdom this Ottoman Greek was. The author is not only interested in disseminating historical information about the Ottoman past, but also in expressing, in an indirect way, that is, through a text belonging to the popular, at that time, *City Mysteries* genre, his political ideology about the Greek-Ottoman present.[2] We should always have in mind that the political scene in 1867 was particularly tense for the Greek Kingdom and Hellenism in general: with the Cretan Revolt of 1866, the hopes for a new "Great Greece" were once again revived and collapsed (again) after a couple of years due to the intervention of the European Powers, who decided, for one more time, to safeguard the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. At this critical point, Ramphos chooses to express his political ideology and communicate his ideas through literature.

---

[1] "The *mysterious* Ottoman in his private life is also *mysterious* in his social and political life", says the author (my translation) (prologue, 1).

[2] Ramphos also broaches the main political issues of the *Halet Efendi* in a more direct way at the prologue of his study entitled *Matters concerning the Greek legion of Emperor Nikolaos I, established in 1853 in Moldavia-Wallachia* (*Τα την ελληνικήν λεγεώνα του Αυτοκράτορος Νικολάου Α΄, την κατά το 1853 εν Μολδοβλαχία συστηθείσαν αφορώντα*), which was published during the same year (1867) in Athens.

As mentioned above, at the prologue of the *Halet Efendi*, Ramphos states that his text is mainly addressed to the pro-Ottoman, "due to deceit or intention", European diplomacy and criticizes strongly the "inability" of the West to detect the "real Ottoman idiosyncrasy" as well as its "blindness" due to political and/or religious interests (prologue, 1). Like *The Devil in Turkey*, the *Halet Efendi* also deals with the depiction of an earlier, decadent period of Ottoman history that, combined with the fictional depiction of the Ottoman inability for cultural and social development, sends the message that the final collapse of the Empire was prescribed already since the first decades of the nineteenth century. In other words, as Anastasia Tsapanidou notes, the *Halet Efendi* presents in detail the circumstances that led the Ottoman Empire to decline, to raise, consequently, the issue of the resurgence of the *Megali Idea* in the last decades of the century.[1] Lambros Varelas argues that the novel should be read as "a kind of indication and/or suggestion" to the European Powers that still believed, after the Crimean war, that the Ottoman Empire could be civilized and modernized as a state.[2] According to Ramphos, the problem is that the European Powers get informed about the situation in the Empire by their representatives there, as, for example, diplomats and ambassadors and they, in turn, by the Armenian Catholics, who play an important role in the Ottoman administration. So, everything that the European Powers know about the Empire is, in fact, what the Catholic diplomacy presents them and, as a result, they have never been able to see the intrigues and the scheming prevailing in the Empire.

We should note here that, in general, Ramphos believes in the benevolent support of the Great Powers of Europe and encourages Greek people to show their respect and gratitude towards them for everything that they have already offered to the Greek nation. But, at the same time, he foresees their indirect expansionist and controlling attitude: under the guise of civilizing and supporting, Western Europe follows a directed Europeanizing policy towards the peoples of the East to maximize its expansion and control on them and preserve their dependence and obedience. The author estimates that the Ottoman Empire takes advantage of this situation and is reinforced by European support, which does not favor the Greek interests. It is important to bear in mind that at the end of the 1860s, when the novel was published,

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 2012, 574-575.
[2]   Varelas 2014, 694-695.

the citizens of the Greek Kingdom were, indeed, facing European interventionism in Greek issues in a rather negative way, since the European Powers have clearly stated that they did not intend to partition the Ottoman Empire and "offer" its territories to the Greek Kingdom. On the contrary, for reasons of economic and political interest, but also in order to preserve the balance among them, they favored the maintenance of the Empire under their own "European" terms, that is, its development through a "guided Europeanization" that would gradually transform it to their "puppet".

In the *Halet Efendi*, Ramphos goes one step further and presents the European Powers in a more "attacking" way, mainly through the eyes of the Ottoman officials, which gives him a sense of freedom to be more critical. The former appear to be quite concessional: they do not put any pressure on the Ottoman Empire, as they are afraid of causing its further weakening and collapsing that might be a great benefit for Russia; so, they pretend to support the Empire, as long as "its existence offers them more benefits than its collapse". At the same time, the Ottomans deliberately deceive the European Powers, pretending to support and expedite the modernization of the Empire, while the European diplomacy and press preach its "supposed great progress and development" (vol. II, chapter LIII, 142-143). In several chapters of his novel, Ramphos is particularly critical towards the European Powers, presenting their leaders or "despots", as he calls them, "more barbarous and brute" than the Sultans themselves. According to the author, the "noblemen of the West" do not differ from those who held the higher offices in the Ottoman Empire and it is questionable which one of them, that is, the "Christian Westerners" or the "Muslim Ottomans", is the greater danger for "Eastern Christians" (vol. III, chapter LXI, 18). For example, the author estimates that the terrible massacre of the Greek population in Constantinople in retribution to the outbreak of the Greek Revolution in 1821 could have been confined or even completely avoided if the Ambassadors of the European Powers in the Ottoman capital have reacted collectively and expostulated to the *Ottoman Porte*. Unfortunately, most of them were dissatisfied with the situation, as the "outcasts of the East" (the Greeks) dared to revolt against their "legitimate tyranny" (the Sultan), who enjoyed European support (vol. III, chapter LXXXIV, 181). However, Ramphos wants to be fair and notes that some diplomats, who manage to see a little bit further, as, for example, the British Ambassador Lord Stratford, argue that the Ottomans will never be modernized despite all British efforts, exhortations, guidance, and concessions (vol. II, chapter LXIII, 227). However, their words are not or do not want to be heard by European diplomacy.

Another important issue that seems to bother the author is the relationship between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, which appears to be particularly tense in the nineteenth century. At a footnote in one of the last chapters of the novel, Ramphos directly criticizes the Western diplomacy, which has gradually weakened the role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople due to intrigues and scheming and argues that, if the Patriarch were Latin, that is, Catholic, the Western Powers would do anything to protect his privileges (vol. III, chapter LIIVI, 129). In another part of the text, where he describes the infamous prison of Constantinople, the author speaks ironically about the inhuman torture that is still being used in the "enlightened and civilized" Europe by the representatives of God, namely, the clerics of the Catholic Church, against innocent but heterodox human beings (vol. I, chapter IIIV, 246). According to Ramphos, there are, in fact, two "infallible men" in this world, that is, the Sultan and the Pope, who are supported by any means by the Western diplomacy in order to prolong their power and sovereignty as the cornerstones of the "rotten structure of Despotism" (vol. III, chapter LIIIV, 201). We should note here that Ramphos is the only Greek *City Mysteries* author who speaks openly against Catholicism and its influence on the development of the Greek issues in the nineteenth century. This straight attack can easily be explained if we consider that the author has always been a supporter of coreligionist Russia and a member of the Russian political party in the Greek Kingdom.

Apart from these direct and/or indirect comments on behalf of the author, what is particularly interesting is the presentation of the Europeans through the eyes of the main representatives of the Ottoman administration. In a conversation between Sultan Mahmud II (see above, p. 44, footnote 1) and Halet (see above, p. 112, footnote 1), the former complains that the "infidel" British people did not keep their promises to him, selling Parga to his enemy Ali Pasha of Ioannina. Nevertheless, the Sultan does not intend to engage in friction with Great Britain, because he is afraid of a potential attack against Constantinople by the British fleet and appears to be determined to stay away from the conflicts among the Great Powers, as, in the past, that is, in 1788, they led the Ottoman Empire to war with Catherine the Great, during which the Empire lost its domination over several fortresses and cities of Moldova. Ever since, the Great Powers, "this pack of filthy pigs" (!), as the Sultan calls them, have been spreading disunity among the Ottomans and their neighbors, so that the former constantly remain in danger. Halet adds that the British people are eager to trade even their faith for money

and thus, reinforce the evil Ali Pasha at the expense of the Empire (vol. II, chapter LV, 167-168). In the past, "the nomadic people of Osman were powerful, full-blooded and warlike" and derived their superiority and power from wars and conquests. However, since the "West" started to advise the latest Sultans to reform and europeanize the Empire, that is, to introduce a modern system of administration that is contrary to the Muslim religion and the Ottoman customs and morals, the Empire is in great danger of losing its original character (vol. II, chapter LV, 175-176).

The situation in the Ottoman Empire in the first decades of the nineteenth century is depicted and criticized in several chapters of the novel. What is particularly interesting is that the terrible political situation in the Empire is presented by representatives of the Ottoman administration, as, for example, the Grand Vizier, and not by the Greeks: despicable and mercenary criminals have taken over the Ottoman administration; laws are condemned and ignored; immoral and mean people occupy higher offices, committing all kinds of abuses and crimes; the Ottoman government has lost its most powerful ally, namely, the people; the army consists of disobedient and dissolute Janissaries, who are even planning to murder the Sultan. At the same time, the latter ignores under which circumstances his subjects live and learns only what his adulators want him to learn (vol. I, chapter V, 31-32).

Ramphos notes that even after the introduction of the reforms, the Ottomans have not really been modernized, on the contrary, they stagnate. "Changing one's clothes does not mean changing one's mind", states the author and adds that due to the conservatism of the Muslim religion, the Ottomans will never be able to develop culturally and politically (vol. III, chapter XCV, 271). The Ottoman clergy, namely, the *ulema*, together with the Janissaries, cause the weakening of the Ottoman government: the former is misappropriating the public wealth, while the latter have gained more power than the Sultan himself, anathematizing every reform that Mahmud II was trying to introduce as opposed to their holy religion (vol. III, chapter LXI, 17). But the only thing they have done is to cause chaos in the Empire, sustaining the Ottoman people "into darkness and ignorance", spreading disorder through their insidious preaching and turning their students into fanatic Muslims. However, despite this terrible situation, the Sultan appears to be determined to humiliate the *ulema*, who constitute "a state within the state", preserving their power by distorting the orders of the Koran (vol. III, chapter LXXII, 56).

The main issues raised in the *Halet Efendi* are the Ottoman despotism, fanaticism, intolerance and barbarism, the lack of education and cultural development, the "misbehavior" of the Janissaries[1] and the full of schemes and injustice Ottoman administration that mainly come from "Helleno-centric" stereotypes of the nineteenth century for the Ottoman Other. It should be noted, however, that Ramphos does not seem to be disapproving of *Ottomanism* as a whole, but of all those anachronistic elements that become prohibitive for the integration of the Ottoman Empire into the circle of civilized nations, namely, of the Islamic religion and the maladministration. In other words, he accepts the "mysterious" character of the Ottomans but attempts to present it in its "real dimensions" through a realistic presentation of Constantinople and its population.[2] Ramphos criticizes the superstition and the obscurantism of the Ottomans as well as the incomprehensible administration of the Empire, where despotism and democracy, arbitrariness and freedom, selfishness and popularity, luxury and poverty, grandeur and humility are paradoxically combined (vol. II, chapter XXXVII, 4-6). The Ottomans are raised "in darkness and mystery" with an intolerant religion, considering every non-Muslim worth being exterminated as a sacrifice to God. Yet, some naive and/or foolish European diplomats still believe or pretend to believe in the reformation and modernization of such a "barbarous nation", whose religion comes against culture and development (vol. II, chapter XLVII, 93-94). In other words, according to Ramphos, the Ottoman Empire will never be reformed enough to resemble European countries. Despite the reformist efforts of Sultan Mahmud II, the Islamic religion, which is essentially anachronistic and intolerant, will always resist any progress. Quoting several verses of the Koran and the Sunnah in his novel, the author gives the reader a picture of the Islamic doctrine that defines the physiognomy of the Ottoman administration and argues, for the umpteenth time, that the modernization of the Ottoman Empire is, in fact, unachievable.

As expected, the Sultan plays an important role in the novel, where he appears as an ambiguous personality: on the one hand, he governs his Empire with an iron fist, fearlessly deals with danger, and stubbornly supports his beliefs, but, on the other hand, he is abrupt, penurious, and unstable in his favor to his subjects. He is fair and wants

---

[1] The novel is full of dismissive descriptions and characterizations of the Janissaries, as, for example, "powerful means of a military tyranny", "uncontrollable and ragging wolves of Constantinople", "destroyers of Mahmut's reign" and many others.

[2] Tsapanidou 2012, 564-565, 580-581.

to bring the Empire back in order, but, unfortunately, has numerous impediments to overcome: the savagery of the Janissaries, the fanaticism of the *ulema*, the avarice of the tycoons, the ignorance of Ottoman people (vol. III, chapter XCV, 271). For Ramphos, the main problem was that Mahmud II was surrounded by scheming, vicious, covetous, and ignorant courtiers, who were concealing or distorting the truth; however, he managed to accomplish a lot with his persistence and patience. According to the author, the current situation of the Empire is the result of his reforming efforts (vol. II, chapter LVII, 182). At the same time, Halet is presented as a self-serving, scheming and highly ambitious man, who wants to appear powerful and fearless to his enemies having the support of the Janissaries, but also due to the Sultan's favor. Ramphos notes that one can find several officers of this kind in Ottoman history (vol. I, chapter VI, 40). Although he spent several years at the "center of civilization and culture", namely, in Paris, he failed to eliminate his preconceptions. When he returned to the Ottoman capital, his Ottoman upbringing "awoke again his sleeping superstitions" (vol. II, chapter XXXVII, 9).

Apart from the Ottomans, the Armenians and the Jews also play an important role in the *Halet Efendi* as well as in Samartsidis's *Mysteries of Constantinople* that was published during the same period (see above, p. 168). With the extensive references to the Armenian family of Düzoğlu, who are the main administrators of the imperial mint, Ramphos gives us a stereotypical picture of the Armenian race that deals exclusively with economic activities and is mainly engaged in banking.[1] Along with the Armenians, the Jews also take action in the same economic circles as bankers, money lenders, and merchants.[2] However, if the Armenians are presented with some kind of sympathy in the novel, it is very difficult for the author to say anything positive about the Jews.[3] The bankers Hotza Yosef and Ezkell as well as the merchant Konortos are representative examples of a community that, according to Ramphos, contrives all kinds of intrigues to satisfy its avarice. The description of the powerful banker Hotza Josef is stereotypical of how the Greek Other sees the members of this community:

---

[1] According to the Greek scholar of the nineteenth century Skarlatos Byzantios, the Armenians are those who "are most easily acquainted with the Ottoman character and manage to cope with the Ottoman despotism to satisfy their avarice" (my translation) (Byzantios 1869, 338-340).

[2] Skarlatos Byzantios notes that although the Jews are "innate merchants", they mainly trade products of little value so that they do not have to take great financial risks (Byzantios 1869, 340-342).

[3] We should note here that the Jews were mainly presented with negative connotations in the Greek prose fiction of the nineteenth century. The name "Jew" has always been derogatory for the Greeks, as it refers to Judah's betrayal and the great differences between the Jewish and the Christian religion.

skinny and pale, he approaches Halet with a hypocritically friendly mood, when he finds out that the latter is about to occupy a higher office in the Ottoman government (vol. I, chapter I, 6, 12-13). The relationship of the Jews with the Ottoman administration appears to be very close; in fact, the Jews do not hesitate to change sides if their interests indicate so. In the novel, they are treated with contempt and/or anger by the author and are excluded from the "healthy non-Ottoman element" that should be in charge of all economic affairs and activities in the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century.[1]

What is particularly interesting is the way that the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire are presented in the novel, mainly through the eyes of the ruling Ottomans. They appear to be the "breadwinners" of the Empire, that is, those who preserve and promote the process of production, while, at the same time, the Ottomans watch the process as "uninvolved spectators", the Jews exploit the Ottoman economy for their interests and the Catholic residents of the Empire do the same for the diplomatic interests of the West. The Valide Sultan, that is, the mother of the ruling Sultan, stresses characteristically the importance of the Christians, namely, the Greeks, for the Ottoman Empire: "they are the bees of the Kingdom", she says, "they work and produce, while the sponger ministers and the Ottoman people live idly, draining the labor of the Christians" (vol. II, chapter LVII, 183). Thus, the destruction of the Christians will be the destruction of the Empire. At the same time, the titular protagonist of the novel faces the Ottoman Greeks as a great danger for the Empire, as, in the past few decades, they dominate its ports with their high-speed ships under the protection of the Empire's greatest enemy, namely, Russia (vol. I, chapter XXVII, 206). This "diabolical nation", says Halet, has organized five revolts and eighteen rebellions over the past four centuries and will eventually lead the Empire to destruction. So, he urges the Sultan to slaughter their archbishops and ealdormen throughout the Empire at first and the whole *genos* afterwards, since the Greeks are nothing more than "malicious dogs" that cause problems (vol. III, chapter LXXIV, 63-64).

We should note here that this intense activity and development of the Greek population of Constantinople constituted for Ramphos a "danger" to the aspirations of the Greek Kingdom in the second half of the nineteenth century. In other words, he saw the ideology of *Greco-Ottomanism*, which was supported by a big part of the

---

[1]   Tsapanidou 1998, 109-110.

Constantinopolitan Greeks, as a great "danger" to the *Megali Idea*. For the author, this practically meant that the disintegration of the Empire was not even visible in the near future but also that the economic strengthening of the Greek Kingdom through the capital of the Ottoman Greeks was prevented. Nevertheless, he proudly notes that the Ottoman Greeks managed to preserve their ethnicity, customs, and morals for four whole centuries, although being under the Ottoman rule. Their bravery lies in the purity and uniqueness of their morals, while their religion protects them from corruption and immorality (vol. II, chapter LXIII, 228-229). In the novel, the two sons of the noble family of Mourouzis (Konstantinos and Nikolaos) are presented as great examples of the ideals of Hellenism: these two members of this "patriotic family", which has gained the gratitude and respect of the Greek nation for the foundation of several Greek schools and charitable institutions, decided to sacrifice themselves, together with Patriarch Gregorios V, for their nation, when the Greek Revolution of 1821 broke out (vol. III, chapter LXXXIV, 184-186).

When Ramphos presents the Greeks of the independent Kingdom, they are also seen through the eyes of the ruling Ottomans. According to Henri Tonnet, this is a means of "indirectly glorifying" the virtues of the Greeks that are more emphasized through the recognition of their enemies.[1] The situation in the Greek Kingdom is depicted in several chapters of the novel, mainly in longer or shorter footnotes, where the author directly or indirectly criticizes its lack of modernization and the inability of its citizens to form a strong collective consciousness. In volume II, for example, he presents the case of Serbia, which, although territorially smaller and more sparsely populated than the Greek Kingdom, by preserving its traditional system of frugality and austerity as well as its paternal morals and customs, has in the second half of the nineteenth century a numerous and powerful army and can claim its interests in the Balkan Peninsula. On the contrary, the Greek Kingdom, "shifting from its paternal values to Western corruption", became weaker in a short time and lost the opportunity to develop and function as an independent state. Ramphos, therefore, asks the Greeks to "close their ears to the deceitful guidance of European diplomacy" in order "to liberate their kingdom from European control" (vol. II, chapter LV, 176-177). In another chapter, he notes that the Greek Kingdom is governed mainly by chance and estimates that the administration could never thrive in a state, where significant offices

---

[1]   Tonnet 1996, 298.

are given to incapable people due to sympathies or personal interests (vol. III, chapter LXXXVII, 209). The author also broaches a very important issue of the time, that is, the terrible situation of those who fought for the independence of the Greek Kingdom a few decades ago: the ingratitude and ignorance of the government towards their wives and children, he argues, deadens the patriotism of the younger generation, who meets "the defenders of their homeland starving and begging in the streets", while those who "did not even see the smoke of war" have occupied higher offices in the administration. Ramphos estimates that injustice is destructive for a modern state (vol. III, chapter XCIII, 260).[1]

According to the author, the formation of a strong collective identity, mainly based on the Orthodox religion, which constitutes a uniting bond and a civilizing means for the Greek nation and is the direct opposite of the fraudulent Catholicism and the anachronistic Islamism, is more than necessary in the second half of the nineteenth century. We should note here that Ramphos speaks for a collective Greek identity of all Greeks and not only of the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. Apart from religion, this collective identity should also be built on the idea that modern Greeks are the descendants of ancient Greeks.[2] The citizens of the Greek Kingdom will feel complete again only when they manage to liberate their "enslaved brothers" and incorporate them into a powerful modern Greek state, says the author. He also argues that the Greeks should familiarize themselves with the European achievements regarding the organization and administration of a modern state, adapting them to the Greek reality and the Greek needs, but renounce, at the same time, foreign customs and morals that corrode the traditional Greek character and, above all, preserve the subordination of the Greek Kingdom to European interests that are incompatible to Greek aspirations. In other words, the Greeks should join modern European culture, but, at the same time, be the worthy continuators of their unique ancestral heritage.

In the *Halet Efendi*, as in all his works, literary and non-literary ones, Ramphos, directly or indirectly, expresses his political ideology and proposes solutions to the

---

[1] We should note here that Ramphos is the only Ottoman Greek author, who focuses on the problems of the Greek Kingdom in the first decades after its establishment and raises issues that afflicted the development of its society. But this comes to us as no surprise, since the author, although originating from the Ottoman Empire, sees the future of Hellenism on both shores of the Aegean from the perspective of the citizen of the Greek Kingdom and not the subject of the Sultan.

[2] We should not forget that the *Halet Efendi* was published within a period when the concept of "Hellenochristian civilization" (*Ελληνοχριστιανός πολιτισμός*) in the Greek Kingdom came to produce the essence of a modern Greek national identity and stressed the unbroken continuity between ancient, byzantine, and modern Greece (see above, p. 67, footnote 2).

political and social problems of his time. We can easily understand that throughout his long life, he has always been overwhelmed by his deep love towards his homeland, that is, the Greek Kingdom and not the Ottoman Empire, and his devotion to the Greek nation that he served as a member of the *Filiki Etairia* (*Φιλική Εταιρεία*) during the pro-revolutionary period, a military man during the revolution, a public officer and diplomat during the time of Governor Kapodistrias and King Otto. In his literary works, he tried to depict his time, as he had deep knowledge and personal experience of the pro-revolutionary situation in the Ottoman Empire, the Greek struggle for independence, and the difficult first decades of the newly established Greek Kingdom. Constantly concentrated on national ideas and ardently supporting the vision of the *Megali Idea*, Ramphos was aiming at empowering the injured by recent experiences collective consciousness of the Greeks and, at the same time, reassuring his personal agonies about the future of his nation.[1]

Through his novels, Ramphos expresses his strong belief in some fundamental values, such as faith in his homeland and his nation, expressing his opinion that the younger Greek generation is destined to fulfill the national goals that could not be fulfilled by their predecessors. He does not try to hide his *irredentist* ideas: he believes in the vision of reconstructing the great "Greek Byzantine Empire" and estimates that, for historical and religious reasons, Russia is the Great Power that could support its realization. Concentrated on this vision, he remained faithful to King Otto, having the belief that the King, with the support of Russian politics, could make this vision come true. In the novel, Constantinople is characterized as "the long-suffering Metropolis of modern Hellenism" (vol. I, chapter XX, 156), while the *Filiki Etairia* (*Φιλική Εταιρεία*) is described as an association that aims at destroying the Ottoman and reviving the Byzantine Empire (vol. II, chapter LXII, 215). According to Ramphos, the driving forces to achieve national goals are education, Christianity, and devotion to national ideals.

As expected, his literary work, inspired by the "national consciousness" but also full of concern about the future of Hellenism, was directly influenced by the political, social, economic, and cultural circumstances in the Greek Kingdom after the mid-nineteenth century. The author expresses, directly or indirectly, the desire to extend the borders of the Kingdom and strengthen the collective Greek consciousness,

---

[1]   Koumarianou 1997, 250-251.

although he does not make any clear proposals about the way that this desire could be accomplished. Although he was born and raised in the Ottoman Empire (namely, he is an Ottoman Greek of the end-eighteenth and nineteenth century), Ramphos sees both Ottomans and Europeans from the perspective of the citizen of the Greek Kingdom and interprets European diplomacy through the Greek, national "We", where the view of the Other seems incomprehensible, particularly when it contradicts national politics. In other words, with the *Halet Efendi*, he tries to build an undivided "We", that is, a common Greek collective identity that comes to oppose the European and/or Ottoman Other.

Regarding the relationship of Ramphos to other *City Mysteries* authors of the time, as Henri Tonnet notes, the novel against which Ramphos "competed" with his *Halet Efendi*, at least at the beginning, was Xenos's *Devil in Turkey*. Both novels refer to the same period and handle the same issue, that is, the struggle of the enlightened reformers of the Ottoman Empire against the obscurantism of the conservative and anachronistic Islam. However, Ramphos seems to be more interested than Xenos in depicting the Ottoman "reality": his objective is not just to depict the "general atmosphere" in the Empire, but to take his reader to the actual scene of action, as, for example, the secret rooms of the Seraglio, where numerous intrigues and schemes take place. This kind of "realism" differs significantly from Xenos's or Samartsidis's "romantic" realism, as it minimizes or almost completely sets aside the elements of mystery.[1]

As mentioned above, although the plot in the *Halet Efendi* evolves in the Ottoman capital, the reader often has the feeling that the author has turned his attention exclusively to the Greek state and its issues. Even when Ramphos depicts the situation in the Ottoman Empire and makes his proposals about the improvement of its administration and governance, the reader has the feeling that he is, in fact, addressed to the inhabitants of the Greek state. In a more general context, the novel is a condemnation of power, when it is practiced in an immoral and corrupted way, away from the needs and problems of the people. In his extensive novel, Ramphos develops an indirect speech about the Greek-Ottoman coexistence in the nineteenth century, not within the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism* but the ideology of the *Megali Idea*, broaching, for one more time, significant issues of Greek foreign policy like

---

[1]   Tonnet 1996, 292-293.

irredentism, *anti-Westernism*, and *pro-Russianism*, along with several domestic problems of the modern Greek state.

CONCLUSIONS

Studying closely the ten novels that constitute the corpus of this thesis, we can form a general picture of the way that the *City Mysteries* literary genre, which emerged in France and spread rapidly around Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century, was adapted to the Ottoman Greek reality, a reality significantly different from that in modern western capitals such as Paris or London. The original Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries*, following European patterns, deal mainly with political and social issues that reflect this different reality. Therefore, in my opinion, these texts constitute a special case, a subcategory of the *City Mysteries* literary genre, with its own objectives and expectations regarding the future of the Ottoman Greeks. Although these texts have been neglected for a long time, I believe that they are worth being studied mostly for ideological, social, and political reasons. Could we accept that, although the initiators of the *City Mysteries* literary genre, as, for example, Eugène Sue, George Reynolds, or Paul Féval, used their novels as a powerful "means" to express their political and social ideas so openly, their Greek followers and imitators produced texts of the same genre aiming only at entertaining the Constantinopolitan Greek readership? Could we believe that these texts have no ideological objective when we consider that the genre became so popular in the Constantinopolitan Greek society during such a critical period when the Ottoman Greeks were trying to resist the uprising nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula and define their future in the transforming Ottoman Empire? I believe that the answer to these questions can only be negative.

The Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors appear to have a clear genre-consciousness when writing their extensive novels; this means that they have full awareness of the conventions and the potentials of the literary tradition that they follow, adapting it to the circumstances of a rather "eastern" society. Therefore, according to my point of view, the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors, especially those who write and publish their novels within the critical last two decades of the nineteenth century, make a very conscious choice: aware of the power and the potentials of the new literary genre, they decide to express their ideas and expectations regarding the future of the Ottoman Greek community through this particular "means". In other words, they deploy the popularity of the genre after the mid-nineteenth century to communicate their ideas to a broader readership. Of course, each one of them constitutes a special case; however, most of them have specific intentions and expectations that they try to express, directly or indirectly, through their extensive novels. I should note again that I decided to focus only on the novels that were published

or republished as independent books.[1] However, there is a long list of texts which circulated in the Ottoman capital only as *romans feuilletons* and, according to my opinion, are worth being separately studied. A quick flipping through the front pages of popular Constantinopolitan Greek newspapers, as, for example, *Neologos* (*Νεολόγος*), can reveal a great number of narratives, which might not have been published as independent books but can be regarded as a significant factor for the deeper understanding of the cultural life of the Constantinopolitan Greeks in the second half of the nineteenth century.

During this critical time, Constantinople did not only constitute one of the most developed cities with a Greek-speaking population, but also the most urbanized city of the Near East with its own cultural and educational circles detached, to a great extent, from the circles of the Greek Kingdom. Therefore, the number of Constantinopolitan Greek authors and literati, who also appear in the context of the Greek Kingdom, is scarce and this is probably the main reason that we know so little about them since they were not included in the Histories of Modern Greek Literature until very recently. The Constantinopolitan Greek community, transforming economically and socially within the context of the *Tanzimat*, went through a process of forming a collective identity through the parallel development and interaction between two competing forces, the vision of the *Megali Idea* and the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism*. Within this context, the Constantinopolitan Greeks, through the reorganization of their community on a political, social, and cultural level, constituted in the second half of the nineteenth century an Ottoman ethnoreligious community rather than a separate community with a Greek "national identity" that aimed at its liberation and annexation to the Greek state. Due to the political changes in the Balkans, an ethnic awareness was awakened for the Ottoman Greeks, which aimed not at political independence and statehood but at building internal solidarity of the people who spoke the same language and shared the same culture, since, after the mid-century, language and ethnicity gradually gained higher political priority than religion.

Through the study of the ten extensive novels that constitute the corpus of this thesis, it becomes clear that some of the authors perceive Constantinople and its Greek population from a Constantinopolitan Greek perspective, while others from the

---

[1] Half of the novels of my corpus were originally published as *romans feuilletons* in popular Constantinopolitan Greek newspapers before being republished as independent books.

perspective of the citizen of the Greek Kingdom or the Diaspora. In this sense, I argue that there is a literary and ideological discourse that unfolds between these two perspectives during the second half of the nineteenth century. The authors of the first group perceive "Greekness" from the view of the Self. As members of the Constantinopolitan Greek community themselves, in their novels, they show the reader how they see their own community, its future within the Ottoman Empire, the formation of its collective identity and its relationship with the Greek Kingdom. On the opposite side, those authors, who give their readers the picture of the city from the view of the Other, irrespective of whether they originate from the Ottoman capital or not, keep on seeing the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire as the "unredeemed brothers". It is particularly interesting that the authors of the first group support the modernization of the developing Ottoman Empire, while, at the same time, the authors of the second group speak of its decline at the end of the nineteenth century. It is clear, therefore, that the way that each author sees the Ottoman Empire is a matter of perspective.

Regarding the ideological perspective of the Constantinopolitan Greek *City Mysteries* authors, that is, those who come from the Ottoman capital or have lived there a long time, I argue that most of them represent a common tendency that prevailed within the upper and middle classes of the Greek community in the second half of the nineteenth century. Following the main conventions of the genre and seeing the Greek community from the perspective of the Self, these authors speak about the heterogeneity of the society, focusing on its strict stratification and the great social chasm among different social strata. At the same time, they criticize the social injustice and the exploitation of the poor in modern society that often leads them to crime. In other words, the ideas expressed through the *City Mysteries* novels of the second half of the century depict the complex framework of relationships and interactions within the Constantinopolitan Greek community. At the same time, the authors adopt a neutral position towards the ruling Ottomans, as most of them are presented with positive characteristics, while, in most cases, the "enemies" within the Ottoman society are the Armenians and the Jews. Most of the Constantinopolitan Greek authors appear to be supporters of the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism*, stressing the need for the formation of a collective identity based on the Greek language and the Orthodox religion that would function as a "weapon" against the uprising nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula. Epameinondas Kyriakidis constitutes an exception among these authors, since he sees

the Constantinopolitan community from the perspective of the Greek citizen, mainly due to his close relationship with the Greek Kingdom.

As mentioned above, there seems to be no significant relationship between the Constantinopolitan Greek community and the Greek Kingdom, since we hardly find any references to the latter and its population in most of the novels of my corpus. According to several scholars, the main reason for this almost non-existent interaction is the conservatism of the majority of the Constantinopolitan Greek authors and scholars, still attached to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the *Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople* (*Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*) and the *Katharevousa*. However, I believe that it is something more than that: the Constantinopolitan Greeks, taking advantage of the opportunities for economic and cultural development offered to them in the second half of the nineteenth century within the concept of *Greco-Ottomanism*, remained detached from the nationalistic plans of the Greek Kingdom, which were openly expressed through the vision of the *Megali Idea*. Constantinople, therefore, produced literature for its own readership, for the Constantinopolitan Greeks, who had their own problems and expectations and dealt with a different reality, which they tried to depict through their novels.

Moreover, most of the Constantinopolitan Greek authors, belonging to the upper and middle class of the local society (as we have seen in chapter III, Samartsidis was a journalist and pedagogue, Goussopoulos a doctor, Spathiotis a translator, Melissopoulos a professor, etc.), see themselves and the future of the Greek community within the Ottoman Empire. Following closely the developments in the Balkan Peninsula, namely, the uprising nationalism and the intervention of the European Powers, these authors aim at strengthening the collective consciousness of the Ottoman Greeks in the second half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, taking advantage of the potentials that the popular *City Mysteries* literary genre offers and adapting the conventions of the genre to the Ottoman Greek reality of the time, they decide to express their ideology through literature, communicating their ideas regarding the social reformation of modern society to a broader readership that pleasantly read *roman feuilletons* and *City Mysteries* novels. At the same time, those authors who see the Constantinopolitan Greek community from the perspective of the citizen of the Greek Kingdom or the Greek of the Diaspora, as, for example, Stephanos Xenos and Konstantinos Ramphos, try to build an undivided "We", that is, a common Greek

collective identity that comes to oppose the European and/or Ottoman Other. Despite their great differences, though, these two groups shared one basic common objective, namely, instilling a sense of Greek consciousness in those members of the Greek community, who even in the later nineteenth century thought of themselves as Christians rather than Greeks.

However, although we speak of two groups of authors, who see the Constantinopolitan Greek community from two different perspectives, we should avoid making categorizations in the strict sense of "supporters of the *Megali Idea*" and "supporters of *Greco-Ottomanism*", since the situation of the Greek-speaking world in the nineteenth century appears to be more complex. In other words, we should avoid generalizations in terms of ideological perspectives, especially when we refer to an active community such as the Constantinopolitan Greek one, where we can find different ideological parties with contradictory ideas, interests and expectations or authors who do not hesitate to change their perspective, following the developments within and outside the Ottoman Empire. What we can say for sure is that for the Constantinopolitan Greeks of the second half of the nineteenth century "Greekness" was not necessarily identified with the Greek state. Therefore, I argue that it is important to examine the political and/or social purpose of each author and the ideological perspective from which he sees the Constantinopolitan Greek society independently to have a clear idea of what he represents.

Studying the corpus of the ten extensive novels closely, it becomes clear that *intertextuality* as defined by Julia Kristeva [1] is one of its main characteristics, irrespective of whether the text was written by a Constantinopolitan or non-Constantinopolitan Greek author. I argue that *intertextuality* comes mainly from the fact that they all belong, to a greater or lesser extent, to the same nineteenth-century literary genre that combines common features and literary conventions. Therefore, in my opinion, there is a relationship, implicit or explicit, among these ten novels, as the authors often cite or assimilate each other, following the main conventions of the *City Mysteries* genre and forming a kind of literary and/or ideological discourse.

In conclusion, I believe that these novels served in the second half of the nineteenth century, apart from entertainment, cultural and ideological goals, as, for

---

[1] According to Julia Kristeva, who introduced the term, *intertextuality* denotes any relationship, implicit or explicit, between two or more texts or "signifying systems", including relationships constituted by genre. For further information see Kristeva 1970.

example, the unification of the Constantinopolitan Greek community, its national orientation within the Ottoman Empire (at least, most of them), the strengthening of its cultural identity, the protection against the danger of mimicry of western morals and customs and the formation of a strong collective identity that would function as a "shield" against the uprising nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula. For all the above-mentioned reasons, these novels, which were understated and neglected for more than a century, are worth being revived and studied anew, this time with a critical eye and a fresh perspective.

ABSTRACT

Scholars often speak of the phenomenon of "mysterymania" spreading in Europe during the nineteenth century, referring to the numerous original *City Mysteries* novels and their translations in several languages, which were published in various modern urban centers during this period. Most of these novels were originally published as *romans feuilletons*, that is, in sequels (in most cases, daily), at the lower part of the front page of political newspapers and journals. Combining extensive information on contemporary political and social events with emotive descriptions, romantic incidents, and intense action, the *City Mysteries* appealed to the broader readership of the middle and working classes of modern urban centers, referring, often from a critical perspective, to the problems of modern society and searching for the reasons that lead people to crime and immorality.

Under the influence of this influx of fiction imported from abroad, a local culture of the novel started to emerge in the Ottoman capital during the second half of the nineteenth century. The translation of popular European *City Mysteries*, such as Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*, Paul Fèval's *Les Mystères de Londres* or George Reynolds's *The Mysteries of London*, by Ottoman Greek literati formed the matrix of future developments in Greek prose fiction and constituted the locus for stylistic and thematic experimentations that would later find their way into a series of original Constantinopolitan Greek works. The Ottoman capital, as a modern cosmopolitan center, with its massive population, its multinational character, and its importance as a transit port, offered an ideal place for Greek-speaking fictional activity, as it was, in fact, the only city with a Greek-speaking population that could be compared to the urban centers of Paris and London.

My doctoral thesis focuses on a group of authors, who either originated from and lived in Constantinople or simply had a thorough knowledge of the city by living there for some time and published their *City Mysteries* novels in the second half of the nineteenth century, referring to the Constantinopolitan Greek community and the formation of its collective identity as the by-product of two competing forces of the time, namely, *Megali Idea* and *Greco-Ottomanism*. From my perspective, these texts appear to be involved in the ideological discourse between the "ethnocentric" and the "cosmopolitan" perspective of the Constantinopolitan Greek society during a particularly critical time. Following the literary tendencies in Europe but also the needs

of the domestic market, the authors saw their works as a means of improving the situation of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire, expressing the unique character and the mentality of the Constantinopolitan Greeks and contributing to the formation of a Constantinopolitan Greek collective identity in the second half of the century. Therefore, I argue that these popular novels develop a productive literary and, at the same time, ideological discourse and interaction with each other as well as with several novels published in the Greek Kingdom during the same period.

The corpus of my study consists of ten extensive novels, published in the second half of the nineteenth century and classified, to a greater or lesser extent, into the *City Mysteries* literary genre, that is, drawing the main conventions and common features of the genre and presenting vividly the structure of the Constantinopolitan Greek community and the collective consciousness of its members. In my doctoral thesis, I study the political and social purpose of each author, the ideological perspective from which he portrays the society of Constantinople as well as the way that the relationship between the two important centers of Hellenism, namely, the capital of the Greek Kingdom and the capital of the Ottoman Empire, is perceived. These authors appear to have full awareness of the conventions and the potentials of the literary tradition that they follow, adapting it to the circumstances of an "eastern" society. Therefore, the ideas expressed in their *City Mysteries* novels depict the complex framework of relationships and interactions within the transforming Constantinopolitan Greek community of the second half of the nineteenth century. Studying the corpus of these texts closely and taking into account the tradition of the literary genre to which they belong as well as the ideological development of the Constantinopolitan Greeks during a particularly critical period, I argue that these novels served, apart from entertainment, cultural and ideological objectives, as, for example, the unification of the Constantinopolitan Greek community, its national orientation within or outside the Ottoman Empire and the strengthening of its collective identity that would function as a "shield" against the uprising nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Gelehrte sprechen unter Bezug auf die zahlreichen ursprünglichen *City Mysteries* Romane und deren Übersetzungen in einige Sprachen, die während des 19. Jahrhunderts in verschiedenen modernen Stadtzentren veröffentlicht worden sind, oft von dem Phänomen der „Mysterymania", die sich während dieser Zeitspanne in Europa verbreitet hat. Die meisten dieser Romane wurden als *Feuilletonromane* erstveröffentlicht, das heißt in Folgen (meistens täglich) im unteren Teil der Titelseite von politischen Zeitungen und Magazinen. Durch das Verbinden von umfangreichen Informationen über zeitgenössische politische und soziale Veranstaltungen mit lebhaften Beschreibungen, romantischen Begebenheiten und spannender Handlung, sprachen die *City Mysteries* Romane eine breite Leserschaft aus der Mittel- und Arbeiterklasse der modernen Stadtzentren an und suchten nach den Gründen, die Menschen in die Kriminalität und Sittenlosigkeit führten.

Unter dem Einfluss dieses Zustroms an aus dem Ausland importierter Erzählliteratur begann während der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts in der osmanischen Hauptstadt eine lokale Kultur der Romane zu entstehen. Die Übersetzungen populärer europäischer *City Mysteries* Romane wie *Les Mystères de Paris* von Eugène Sue, *Les Mystères de Londres* von Paul Fèval oder *The Mysteries of London* von George Reynolds von osmanischen griechischen Literaten bildeten die Grundlage für künftige Entwicklungen in griechischer Prosaliteratur und waren die Basis für stilistische und thematische Experimente, die später ihren Weg in eine Reihe von konstantinopolitanisch-griechischen Werken finden würden. Die osmanische Hauptstadt, ein modernes Stadtzentrum mit einer riesigen Bevölkerung, multinationalem Charakter und ihrer Bedeutung als Durchgangshafen, stellte einen idealen Ort für das Verfassen von griechischsprachigen Romanen dar, da sie tatsächlich die einzige Stadt mit griechischsprachiger Bevölkerung war, welche mit den Stadtzentren von Paris und London vergleichbar war.

Meine Dissertation konzentriert sich auf eine Gruppe von Autoren, die ihre *City Mysteries* Romane in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts veröffentlicht haben und die entweder aus Konstantinopel stammen und dort gelebt haben oder einfach nur ein eingehendes Wissen über die Stadt hatten, da sie dort einige Zeit gelebt haben. Diese Autoren beziehen sich durch ihre Texte auf die konstantinopolitanisch-griechische Gesellschaft und die Entstehung ihrer kollektiven Identität als Nebenprodukt von zwei

konkurrierenden Ideologien dieser Zeit, die *Megali Idea* und die *Greco-Ottomanism*. Aus meiner Sicht scheinen diese Texte während einer teilweise kritischen Zeit an dem ideologischen Diskurs zwischen der „ethnozentrischen" und der „kosmopolitischen" Perspektive der konstantinopolitanisch-griechischen Gesellschaft beteiligt zu sein. Dem literarischen Trend und genauso dem Bedarf des heimischen Marktes folgend, sahen die Autoren ihre Werke als einen Weg die Situation der griechischen Gesellschaft im Osmanischen Reich zu verbessern und den einzigartigen Charakter und die Mentalität der konstantinopolitanischen Griechen auszudrücken und zur Bildung einer kollektiven konstantinopolitanisch-griechischen Identität in der zweiten Hälfte des Jahrhunderts beizutragen. Daher nehme ich an, dass diese populären Romane einen produktiven literarischen und gleichzeitig ideologischen Diskurs sowie Interaktion sowohl untereinander, als auch mit diversen Romanen, die in der gleichen Zeitspanne im Griechischen Königreich veröffentlicht worden sind, entwickeln.

Das Korpus meiner Untersuchungen bezieht sich auf zehn umfangreiche Romane, die in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts veröffentlicht worden sind, und mehr oder weniger dem literarischen Genre der *City Mysteries* zugeordnet werden können, da sie den Standardkonventionen und üblichen Hauptmerkmalen dieses speziellen Genres folgen und lebhaft die Struktur der konstantinopolitanisch-griechischen Gesellschaft und das kollektive Bewusstsein ihrer Mitglieder aufzeigen. In meiner Dissertation befasse ich mich mit den politischen und sozialen Absichten jedes Autors und betrachte die ideologische Perspektive, aus der er die Gesellschaft Konstantinopels porträtiert, genauso wie die Art und Weise in der die Beziehung zwischen den beiden wichtigen Zentren des Hellenismus, der Hauptstadt des Griechischen Königreichs und der Hauptstadt des Osmanischen Reichs, wahrgenommen wird. Diese Autoren scheinen sich der Konventionen und Potentiale der literarischen Tradition, der sie folgen, vollständig bewusst zu sein und passen diese den Umständen der „östlichen" Gesellschaft an. Daher repräsentieren die Ideen, die in ihren *City Mysteries* Romanen ausgedrückt werden, das komplexe Gerüst von Beziehungen und Wechselwirkungen innerhalb der sich wandelnden konstantinopolitanisch-griechischen Gesellschaft aus der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Bei sorgfältiger Betrachtung des Korpus dieser Texte und bei Berücksichtigung der Tradition des literarischen Genres, zu dem diese gehören, sowie der ideologischen Entwicklung der konstantinopolitanischer Griechen während einer teilweise kritischen Zeitperiode, erläutere ich, dass diese Romane neben der

Unterhaltung kulturellen und ideologischen Zielen gedient haben, wie zum Beispiel die Vereinigung der konstantinopolitanisch-griechischen Gesellschaft, ihrer nationalen Orientierung innerhalb oder außerhalb des Osmanischen Reichs und der Stärkung ihrer gemeinsamen Identität, die ein Schutzschild gegen den aufkommenden Nationalismus auf der Balkanhalbinsel darstellen würde.

LITERATURE

Abatzis, Aris, *Μαρμαρωμένη Ρωμιοσύνη. Οι Έλληνες της Κωνσταντινούπολης* [*Petrified Modern Greece. The Greeks of Constantinople*], Athens: Livanis 2005

Abbott, George Frederick, *Turkey, Greece and the Great Powers: A Study in Friendship and Hate*, London: Robert Scott, 1916

Abou-El-Haj, Rifa'at Ali, *Formation of the Ottoman State, The Ottoman Empire, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Albany NY: SUNY Press, 1991

Abrams, Meyer Howard, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, Fort Worth [u.a.]: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, [6]1993

Agathocleous, Tanya, *Urban realism and the cosmopolitan imagination in the nineteenth century: visible city, invisible world*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2011

Alexandris, Alexis P., "Έλληνες στην υπηρεσία της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας 1850-1922" ["Greeks in the Service of the Ottoman Empire 1850-1922"], *Bulletin of the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece* 23, 1980, 365-404

_____, *The Greek Minority in Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations*, Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1983

Alliston, April, "Transnational Sympathies, Imaginary Communities", in: Margaret Cohen, Carolyn Dever (eds.), *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the* Novel, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002

Altick, Richard D., *The English Common Reader: a Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*, Chicago, III: University of Chicago Press, 1957

Amilitou, Effie, "Apocryphes urbains, ou la construction d'un mystérieux genre romanesque en Grèce", in: Marie-Ève Thérenty (ed), *Les Mystères urbains au prisme de l'identité nationale*, available online: http://www.medias19.org/index.php?id=14891

Anagnostopoulou, Sia, "Οι μεταρρυθμίσεις του Τανζιμάτ και το θεσμικό πλαίσιο του *μιλλέτ* των Ρωμιών. Πατριαρχείο, Κοινοτικοί Θεσμοί, Παιδεία" ["The reforms of Tanzimat and the institutional framework of the *Rum millet*"], in: *Πρακτικά Επιστημονικής Ημερίδας "Η παρουσία των εθνικών μειονοτήτων στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19ο αιώνα"* [*Proceedings of Scientific Workshop "The presence of national minorities in Constantinople in 19th century"*], Association of the Members of the 'Megali Scholi' in Athens, 1996

_____, *Μικρά Ασία, 19ος αι.-1919. Οι ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες. Από το Μιλλέτ των Ρωμιών στο Ελληνικό Έθνος* [*Asia Minor, 19th c.-1919. The Orthodox Greek communities. From the Rum millet to the Greek Nation*], Athens: Hellenika Grammata, 1997

Anastasiadou, Merope, Paul Dumnot, *Οι Ρωμηοί της πόλης. Τραύματα και προσδοκίες* [*The Rums of Constantinople. Traumas and expectations*], Athens: Bookstore of "Estia", [2]2007

Anastasiadou, Merope, "Κοινοτική οργάνωση των Ρωμιών της Κωνσταντινούπολης 1839-1923" ["Communal organization of the Constantinopolitan Rums 1839-1923"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online: http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11010

_____, "Χριστιανικά βακούφια της Κωνσταντινούπολης" [Christian Vaqfs of Constantinople"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online: constantinople.ehw.gr/forms/

_____, *Les grecs d'Istanbul au XIXe siècle: histoire socioculturelle de la communauté de Péra*, Leiden [u. a.]: Brill, 2012

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, New York: Verso, 1983

_____, "Nationalism, Identity, and the World-in-Motion: On the Logics of Seriality", in: Pheng Cheah, Bruce Robbins (eds.), *Cosmopolitics: thinking and feeling beyond the nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998, 117-133

Anderson, Perry, *Lineages of the Absolutist State*, London: Verso, 1979

Apostoli, Persa, "Βωτυράς, Νικόλαος Β." ["Votyras, Nikolaos V."], in: *Λεξικό Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι* [*Glossary of Modern Greek Literature. People, works, streams, terms*], Athens: Patakis, 2007, 341

Apostolidis, Nikos, *Αναμνήσεις από την Κωνσταντινούπολη* [*Memories of Constantinople*], Athens: Trochalia, 1996

Apostolopoulos, Dimitris, *Οι ιδεολογικοί προσανατολισμοί του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου μετά την Άλωση* [*The ideological orientations of the Ecumenical Patriarchate after the Fall*], Athens: Goulandri-Horn Foundation, 1995

Arslan, Ali, *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyete Rum Basını*, Istanbul: Truva, 2005

Assaf, Francis, *Lesage et le picaresque*, Paris: Nizet, 1983

Bachleitner, Norbert, *Fiktive Nachrichten. Die Anfänge des europäischen Feuilletonromans*, Königshausen & Neumann: Würzburg, 2012

Balta, Evangelia, Mehmet Ölmez (eds.), *Between Religion and Language. Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire*, Istanbul: Eren, 2011

Balta, Evangelia, *Karamanlica Kitaplar. Yunan Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserlerin Çözümlemeli Bibliyografyası, vol. I: 1718-1839*, Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2018

Baysun, Cavid (ed.), *Cevdet Paşa, Tezakir*, vol. I, Ankara 1963

Beaton, Roderick, *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, [2]2004

Berenson, Edward, *Populist religion and left-wing politics in France, 1830-1852*, Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2014

Binnie, Jon *et al.* (eds.), *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, New York: Routledge, 2006

Blaisdell, Donald, *European financial control in the Ottoman Empire*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1929

Bory, Jean-Louis, *Eugène Sue, dandy mais socialiste*, Paris: Hachette, 1973

Bozi, Soula, *Ο Ελληνισμός της Κωνσταντινούπολης. Κοινότητα Σταυροδρομίου-Πέραν, 19ος-20ός αιώνας* [*The Hellenism of Constantinople. Community of Stavrodomeion-Pera, 19th-20th century*], Athens: Hellenika Grammata, 2002

Brass, Paul, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison*, New Delhi, Newbury Park, London: Sage, 1991

Braude, Benjamin, Lewis Bernard (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the function of a plural society*, vol. I (The Central Lands), New York, London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982

Brennan, Timothy, "The National Longing for Form", in: Homi K. Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration*, London: Routledge, 1990

Buntline, Ned, *The mysteries and miseries of New York: a story of real life*, Dublin: J. M' Glashan, 1849

Byzantios, Skarlatos D., *Η Κωνσταντινούπολις: η περιγραφή τοπογραφική, αρχαιολογική και ιστορική της περιωνύμου ταύτης μεγαλοπόλεως και των εκατέρωθεν του κόλπου και του Βοσπόρου προαστείων αυτής* [*Constantinople: topographic, archaeological and historical description of this famous megalopolis and its suburbs on both shores of the gulf and Bosporus*], vol. I, II, III, Athens: Publishing house of Andreas Koromilas, 1851, 1862, 1869

Cantemir, Demetrius, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire*, N. Tindal (trans.), 2 volumes, London: John James & Paul Knapton, 1734

Carras, Costas, *3,000 Years of Greek Identity: Myth or Reality*, Athens: Domus Books, 1983

Carver, Steven, "'The Wrongs and Crimes of the Poor': the Urban Underworld of *The Mysteries of London* in Context", *Ainsworth and Friends, Essays on 19th century literature and the Gothic*, available online: https://ainsworthandfriends.wordpress.com/2013/02/13/the-wrongs-and-crimes-of-the-poor-the-urban-underworld-of-the-mysteries-of-london-in-context/

Casanova, Pascale, *The World Republic of Letters*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004

Cawelti, John G., *Adventure, Mystery and Romance. Formula stories as Art and Popular Culture*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1976

Chandler, James, Kevin Gilmartin (eds.), *Romantic metropolis: the urban scene of British culture, 1780-1840*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2005

Charrière, Etienne E., *"We Must Ourselves Write About Ourselves": The Trans-Communal Rise of the Novel in the Late Ottoman Empire*, University of Michigan: doctoral thesis, 2016

Chesney, Kellow, *The Victorian Underworld*, London: Penguin, 1991

Chevalier, Meyer Howard, *Classes laborieuses et classes dangereuses à Paris pendant la première moitiè du XIXe siècle*, Paris: Librairie Plon, 1958

Chevasco, Palmer Berry, *Mysterymania: The Reception of Eugene Sue in Britain 1838-1860*, Berne: European Connections, Peter Lang, 2003

Clogg, Richard, "The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire", in: Benjamin Braude, Bernard Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I: *The Central Lands*, New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1982, 185-207

_____, *Anatolica: Studies in the Greek East in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, Aldershot, Hampshire [u.a.]: Variorum, 1996

_____, *A Short Story of Modern Greece*, Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2004

Cohen, Margaret, Carolyn Dever (eds.), *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002

Collingham, Hugh A. C., *The July Monarchy: A political history of France 1830-1848*, London [u.a.]: Longman, 1988

Compère, Daniel, *Dictionnaire du roman populaire francophone*, Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2007

_____, *Les romans populaires*, Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2012

Coons, Christian (ed.), *Paternalism: theory and practice*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2013

Cuddon, John Anthony, *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, London: Penguin Books, 1999

Culler, Jonathan, *Structuralist poetics: structuralism, linguistics and the study of literature*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975

Daniel, Norman, *Islam and the West, The Making of an Image*, Oxford: One-world Publications, 1993

Dalziel, Margaret, *Popular Fiction One Hundred Years Ago: An Unexpected Tract of Literary History*, London: Cohen and West, 1957

Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History*, Oxford [u. a.]: Oxford University Press, 1996

Davison, Carol Margaret, *Gothic Literature 1764-1824*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2009

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

_____, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923: The Impact of the West*, London: Saqi Books, 1990

_____, "Turkish Attitudes Concerning Christian: Muslim Equality in the Nineteenth Century", *The Modern Middle East: a reader*, 2004, 61-82

Deletant, Denis, "Romanian society in the Danubian principalities in the early 19th century", in: Richard Clogg, *Balkan society in the age of Greek independence*, London: Machmillan, 1981, 229-248

Demirakin, Işik, *A study of Ottoman modernization on the city: the sixth municipal district of Istanbul (1858-1877)*, M.A. thesis, Ankara: Department of History, Bilkent University, 2006

Denisi, Sophia, *Το ελληνικό μυθιστόρημα και ο sir Walter Scott, 1830-1880* [*The Greek novel and sir Walter Scott, 1830-1880*], Athens: Kastaniotis, 1994

_____, "Μυθιστόρημα των *Αποκρύφων*: Μια μορφή κοινωνικού μυθιστορήματος του 19ου αιώνα" ["*City Mysteries*: A form of social novel of the 19th century"], *Periplous* 43, July 1996-February 1997, 38-46

Deringil, Selim, "Legitimacy Structures in the Ottoman State: The Reign of Sultan Abdülhamid II (1876-1909)", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 23, 1991, 345-359

_____, *The Well-Protected Domains, Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*, London: I. B. Tauris, 1998

Dianina, Katia, "The Feuilleton: An Everyday Guide to Russian Public Culture in the Age of the Great Reforms", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 47, no. 2, Summer 2003, 187-210

Dimaras, Konstantinos, "Η ιδεολογική υποδομή του ελληνικού κράτους" ["The ideological infrastructure of the Greek State"], *Hellenikos Romantismos*, Athens 1985

Dimitroulia, Titika, "Ο Νικόλαος Βωτυράς και *Η Σπάθη της εκδικήσεως*" ["Nikolaos Votyras and *The Sword of revenge*"], Introduction to the republication of *Η Σπάθη της εκδικήσεως* [*The Sword of revenge*], Athens: Institution of Kostas and Eleni Ourani, 1994, 9-21

Drakou, Georgia, "*... αναλόγως της σμικρότητος ημών*. Οι πρώτες προσπάθειες μεταφύτευσης των Αποκρύφων στην Ελλάδα (1845-1855)" ["*... in proportion to our smallness*. The first attempts of transplanting *City Mysteries* in Greece (1845-1855)"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"), 18-25

Droulia, Loukia, "Towards Modern Greek consciousness", *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* (Institute for Neohellenic Research, INR/NHRF, Athens) 1, 51-67

Dumasy, Lise, *La querelle du roman-feuilleton: Littérature, presse et politique, un débat précurseur (1836-1848)*, Grenoble: Ellug, 1999

Eldem, Edhem, "The Ethnic Structure of Galata", *Biannual Istanbul* 1, 1993, 28-33

_____, *French Trade in Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century*, Leiden, Brill:1999

_____, Daniel Goffman, Bruce Bruce, *The Ottoman City between East and West, Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999

_____, "(A quest for) the bourgeoisie of Istanbul. Identities, roles and conflicts", in: Ulrike Freitag, Nora Lafi (eds.), *Urban Governance Under the Ottomans. Between cosmopolitanism and conflict*, New York: Routledge 2014, 159-186

Enepekidis, Polichronis, *Τραπεζούντα, Κωνσταντινούπολη, Σμύρνη, 1800-1923. Γερμανοί, Αυστριακοί και Ελβετοί πολιτικοί, διπλωμάτες, λόγιοι και συγγραφείς γράφουν για την άνθηση και την καταστροφή πόλεων του Μικρασιατικού Ελληνισμού* [*Trebizond, Constantinople, Smyrna, 1800-1923. German, Austrian and Swiss politicians, diplomats, scholars and authors write about the flowering and destruction of cities of Asia Minor*], Athens: Okeanida, 1989

Erickson, Lee, *The Economy of Literary Form: English Literature and the Industrialization of Publishing, 1800-1850*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996

Erickson, Paul, *Welcome to Sodom: the cultural work of City-Mysteries fiction, Antebellum America*, Austin: University of Texas, 2005

Evin, Ahmet O., *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*, Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1983

Exertzoglou, Charis, "Η ελληνική ιστοριογραφία και το ομογενές κεφάλαιο: προβλήματα μεθόδου και ερμηνείας" ["Greek historiography and the capital of the expatriates: problems of method and interpretation"], *Synchrona Themata*, issues 36-37-38, December 1988

_____, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19ο αιώνα. Ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως 1861-1912* [*National Identity in Constantinople in 19th century. The Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople 1861-1912*], Athens: Nefeli, 1996

_____, "Οικονομία, κοινωνική διαστρωμάτωση και πολιτισμική παρέμβαση: Η παρουσία των επιχειρηματικών ομάδων στα εκπαιδευτικά και πολιτιστικά πράγματα της Πόλης, 1850-1912" ["Economy, Social Stratification and Cultural Interference: The Presence of Business Groups in the Educational and Cultural Affairs of Constantinople, 1850-1912"], in: *Πόλη και Παιδεία. Η ελληνική παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τα τελευταία 200 χρόνια* [*Constantinople and Education. The Greek education in Istanbul during the last 200 years*], edited by Syllogos Konstantinoupoliton, Athens: Hellenika Grammata, 1997, 155-176

_____, "Η συγκρότηση του δημόσιου χώρου στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19ο αιώνα" ["The construction of public space in Constantinople in 19th century"], in: *Ο εξω-*

ελληνισμός. Κωνσταντινούπολη και Σμύρνη 1800-1922. Πνευματικός και κοινωνικός βίος [*The outer Hellenism. Constantinople and Smyrna 1800-1922. Intellectual and social life*], Scientific Symposium, Soxiety of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, 30-31 October 1998

_____, "Τράπεζες και ρωμιοί τραπεζίτες στην Κωνσταντινούπολη" ["Banks and Rum bankers in Constantinople"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online: http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11040

_____, "Σύλλογοι των Ρωμιών της Κωνσταντινούπολης" ["Associations of the Constantinopolitan Rums"], Constantinople, Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online: http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11017

Faroqhi, Suraiya, *Approaching Ottoman History, An introduction to the sources*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 1999

_____, *The Ottoman Empire and the world around it*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2006

_____, "Did cosmopolitanism exist in eighteenth-century Istanbul? Stories of Christian and Jewish artisans", in: Ulrike Freitag, Nora Lafi (eds.), *Urban Governance Under the Ottomans. Between cosmopolitanism and conflict*, New York: Routledge, 2014, 21-36

Féval, Paul, *Les Mystères de Londres. Roman*, Paris: Phébus, 1998

Filimon, Ioannis, "Obituary for Konstantinos Ramphos", *Aion*, 28th October 1871

Finn, Robert P., *The early Turkish novel, 1872-1900*, Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1984

Fowler, Alastair, *Kinds of literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982

Frazee, Charles, *The Orthodox Church and Independent Greece, 1821-1852*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969

Fritz-El-Ahmad, Dorothée, *Untersuchungen zu den Feuilletonromanen von Paul Féval*, Frankfurt am Main: Lang 1986

Galvan, Jean-Pierre, *Les mystères de Paris: Eugene Sue et ses lecteurs*, Paris: L' Harmattan, 2004

Gara, Eleni, "Οθωμανική κοινωνική ιστορία: αναστοχασμός και τάσεις έρευνας" ["Ottoman social history: reflection and research tendencies"], in: Fotini Tsimbiridou, Dimitris Stamatopoulos (eds.), *Οριενταλισμός στα όρια. Από τα οθωμανικά Βαλκάνια στη σύγχρονη Μέση Ανατολή* [*Orientalism at the limits. from Ottoman Balkans to modern Middle East*], Athens: Kritiki, 2008, 99-124

Gedeon, Manuil, *Αποσημειώματα Χρονογράφου 1780-1800-1869-1913* [*Memories of a Chronographer 1780-1800-1869-1913*], Athens: Foinix, 1932

Georgiades-Arnakis, George, "The Greek church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire", *Journal of Modern History*, 24, 1953, 235-252

Georgiadou, Zoi, in: "Η κοινότητα των Ρωμιών και τα *Δράματα της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* του Κωνσταντίνου Δ. Γουσσόπουλου: μια συλλογική συνείδηση σε κρίση;" [The Constantinopolitan Greek community and the *Dramas of Constantinople* by Konstantinos D. Goussopoulos: a collective identity in crisis?", in: V. Sabatakakis (ed.), *6ᵗʰ European Congress of Modern Greek Studies*, *The Greek World in Periods of Crisis and Recovery, 1204-2018,* Conference Proceedings, Lund, 4-7 October 2018, vol. 2, Athens: European Society of Modern Greek Studies, 2020, 97-111

_____, "Τα Απόκρυφα μυθιστορήματα του Κωνσταντίνου Γουσσόπουλου και του Επαμεινώνδα Κυριακίδη: (ανα)κατασκευάζοντας τη συλλογική ταυτότητα των Ελλήνων της Κωνσταντινούπολης στα τέλη του 19ᵒᵘ αιώνα;" ["The City Mysteries of Konstantinos Goussopoulos and Epameinondas Kyriakidis: (re)forming the collective identity of the Constantinopolitan Greeks at the end of the nineteenth century?"] , in: *Το ελληνικό λαϊκό μυθιστόρημα του 19ᵒᵘ αιώνα* [*The Greek popular novel of the 19ᵗʰ century*], Athens: Gutenberg Publications, 2021, 505-532

_____, "The popular *City Mysteries* literary genre: the case of the Constantinopolitan Greek novels in the second half of the nineteenth century", in: *Rethinking genre in the Islamicate Middle East*, Conference Proceedings, Hamburg: University of Hamburg, Asia-Afrika-Institute, 5-7 September 2016, to be published

Gilles, Pierre, *The Antiquities of Constantinople*, John Ball (trsl.), New York: Italica Press, 1988

Gioti, Angela, *"Περί λουτρών": Παρατηρήσεις και σκέψεις για την πρώιμη ανάπτυξη του τουρισμού στον δημοσιογραφικό λόγο του Ιωάννη Κονδυλάκη* [*"About baths": Observations and thoughts on the early development of tourism in Ioannis Kondylakis' journalistic texts"*], Offprint from the issue 29 (Autumn 2012) of the journal "Palimpsiston", Herakleion: Vikelaia Public Library, 2012, 167-198

Gkikas, Giannis, "Βιογραφία Χριστόφορου Σαμαρτζίδη" ["Christophoros Samartzidis' Biography"], *Great Encyclopedia of Charis Patsis*, vol. 12, Athens 1966-1975

Göçek, Müge Fatma, "Segmentation, Western Education, and Political Outcomes: Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Society", *Poetics Today*, 14, 3, Autumn 1993, 507-538

_____, *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire. Ottoman Westernization and Social Change*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1996

_____ (ed.), *Social constructions of nationalism in the Middle East*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002

_____, *The transformation of Turkey: redefining state and society from the Ottoman Empire to the modern era*, London [u.a.]: Library of Modern Middle East Studies 103, 2011

Goffman, Daniel, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Gondicas, Dimitri, Charles Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1999

Gorpas, Thomas, "Μνημείο λαϊκής φιλολογίας" ["Reminder of popular literature"], Introduction in: Nikolaos V. Votyras, *Η μάγκα του Ωρολογίου* [*The urchin of the Clock Tower*], Athens: Exodos, 1983, 8-10

Gotsi Georgia, "Η ελληνική μυθιστορία Αποκρύφων του 19ου αιώνα" ["Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"), 6-17

_____, "Μυθιστορίες Αποκρύφων και συναφών έργων, 1845-1900. Πρώτη καταγραφή" ["*City Mysteries* and related works, 1845-1900. First record"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century")*,* 12-13

_____, "Μεταφράσεις μυθιστοριών Αποκρύφων και συναφών έργων, 1845-1900. Πρώτη καταγραφή" ["Translations of *City Mysteries* and related works, 1845-1900. First record"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"), 14-17

_____, "Υποθέσεις για το εικονογραφημένο μυθιστόρημα του 19ου αιώνα. Η περίπτωση των Αποκρύφων" ["Hypotheses on the illustrated novel of the 19th

century. The Case of *City Mysteries*"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"), 42-47

_____ (ed.), *Ιωάννης Δ. Κονδυλάκης, Οι άθλιοι των Αθηνών* [*Ioannis D. Kondylakis, The miserable [people] of Athens*], 2 volumes, Athens: Nefeli, 1999

_____, *Η ζωή εν τη πρωτευούση. Θέματα αστικής πεζογραφίας από το τέλος του 19ου αιώνα* [*The life in the capital. Issues of urban prose fiction from the end of the 19th century*], Athens: Nefeli, 2004

Goudmand, Anaïs, "Le roman-feuilleton ou l'écriture mercenaire: l'exemple des *Mystères de Paris*", *Cahiers de Narratologie* 31, 2016, available online: https://journals.openedition.org/narratologie/7589

Goussopoulos, Konstantinos D., *Τὰ δράματα τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Πρωτότυπον κοινωνικὸν μυθιστόρημα* [*The Dramas of Constantinople. Original social novel*], vol. I, II, III, IV, authorized by the Ministry of Public Education, Constantinople: published in *Epiphylis of Constantinople*, 1888

_____, *Τὰ ἀπόκρυφα τοῦ Φρενοκομείου ἤτοι Λεπτομερὴς περιγραφὴ τῆς διοργανώσεως τοῦ ἐν Ἑπταπυργίῳ Ἐθνικοῦ Φρενοκομείου* [*The Apocrypha of the Mental Institution, i.e. Extensive Description of the organization of the National Mental Institution in Eptapyrgion*], Constantinople: published by the Brothers Georgios and Ioannis Mavropoulos head of the institution, Printing house of A. Maxouris and B. Filippidis, 1889

Gramsci, Antonio, *Letteratura e Vita Nazionale*, volume I, Roma: Editori riunti, [3]1996

Grant, Damian, Kaiti Chatzidimou, Ioulietta Ralli, *Ρεαλισμός* [*Realism*], Athens: Ermis, 1988

Greene, Molly (ed.), *Minorities in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2005

de Grève, Claude, "Des *Mystères de Paris* d' Eugène Sue aux *Nouveaux Mystères de Paris* de Léo Malet", *Cahiers de l' Association international des études françaises* 40 (1988), 151-166

Grosvenor, Edwin A., *Constantinople*, Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895

Grubitzsch, Helga, *Materialen zur Kritik des Feuilleton-Romans "Die Geheimnisse von Paris" von Eugène Sue*, Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1977

Guise, René, *Le phénomène du roman-feuilleton (1828-1848). La crise de croissance du roman. Première partie: La presse et la littérature facile (1828-1835)*, Nancy: Thèse d' état, 1975

_____, "Les Mystères de Paris. Histoire d' un texte: légende et vérité", *Bulletin du Bibliophile* 3, 1982, 358-374

Gürel, Sükrü S., *Turkish-Greek Relations in Historical Context, 1821-1993*, Ankara: Űmit Yayincilik, 1993

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Thomas Burger (transl.), Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1989

Halbwachs, Maurice, *On Collective Memory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992

Hassiotis, Ioannis K., "From the 'Refledging' to the 'Illumination of the Nation': Aspects of Political Ideology in the Greek Church under Ottoman Domination", *Balkan Studies*, 40, 1999, 41-55

Hastings, Adrian, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

Hatzigeorgiou-Hassioti, Victoria (ed.), *Στέφανος Ξένος, Η Ηρωίς της Ελληνικής Επαναστάσεως· ήτοι σκηναί εν Ελλάδι από έτους 1821-1828* [*Stephanos Xenos, The Heroine of the Greek Revolution, i.e. scenes in Greece from the year 1821-1828*], vol. I and II, Modern Greek Library, Athens: Foundation of Kostas and Eleni Ourani, 1988

_____, "Οι διπλωματικές πρωτοβουλίες του Στέφανου Ξένου για την προσάρτηση της Ηπειροθεσσαλίας και ο σατιρικός Τύπος της εποχής" ["The diplomatic initiatives of Stephanos Xenos for the annexation of Epiro-Thessaly and the satirical Press of the time"], in *Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης: τιμητικός τόμος στη μνήμη Σταμάτη Καρατζά* [Scientific Yearbook of the School of Philosophy of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki: honorary volume in *memory of Stamatis Karatzas*], Conference proceedings, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University Press, 1990, 147-161

_____, "Δημοσιογραφία και πολιτική: Οι περιπέτειες της εφημερίδας *Ο Βρεττανικός Αστήρ* (1860-1862)" ["Journalism and politics: The adventures of the journal *Ο Vrettanikos Astir* (1860-1862)"] in: *Μνήμη Γ. Π. Σαββίδη. Θέματα Νεοελληνικής*

Φιλολογίας [*Memory of G. P. Savvidis. Issues of Modern Greek Philology*], Conference proceedings, Athens: Hermis, 2001, 152-164

_____, *Ο Στέφανος Ξένος (1821-1894) και ο Βρεττανικός Αστήρ* [*Stephanos Xenos and the Vrettanikos Astir*], doctoral thesis, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2003

Hernadi, Paul, *Beyond Genre. New directions in literary classification*, Ithaka and London: Cornell University Press, 1972

Herzfeld, Michael, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982

_____, *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*, New York: Routledge, [2]2005

Hobsbawm, Eric, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990

Humpherys Anne, "G.W.M. Reynolds: Popular Literature and popular Politics", *Victorian Periodicals Review* 16, 1983

_____, Louis James (eds.), *G.W.M. Reynolds: Fiction, Politics, and the Press in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008

Humphreys, Steven R., *Islamic Society, A Framework for Inquiry*, London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 1995

Iliadou-Tachou, Sofia, "Educational Mechanisms, Religious-Cultural Identities and National Consciousness in the Ottoman Pontos (1860-1922)", *Atelier De Travail-Research Seminar Education and Culture XIXe-XXes: Education and Culture 19th and 20th Century in Multicultural Environment*, Greece Europe, Mediterranean, Rhodes 11-12 November 2008

Inalcik, Halil, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire", *The Journal of Economic History*, XXIX, 1, 1969

_____, "Application of the Tanzimat and its social effects", *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 5, 1973, 97-128

_____, Donald Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-191,4*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

Ioannidis, Petros (the Agerochos), *Η Επτάλοφος ή Ήθη και Έθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Μυθιστόρημα πρωτότυπον* [*The Eptalophos or Morals and Customs of Constantinople. Original novel*], Constantinople: Printing house "Anatoli" of Evangelinos Misailidis, 1855

_____, *Απόκρυφα της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Μυθιστόρημα πρωτότυπον* [*Apocrypha of Constantinople. Original novel*], Athens: Published by Dimitrios Spyropoulos, 1866

Issawi, Charles, *The Economic History of Turkey 1800-1914*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980

_____, "The Transformation of the Economic Position of the *Millets* in the Nineteenth Century", in: B. Braude, B. Lewis (eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society, Volume 1. The Central Lands*, New York and London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982, 261-286

James, Sara, "Detecting Paris: The character of the City in Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*", *Modern and Contemporary France* 8, no. 3, 2000, 305-313

_____, "Eugène Sue, G.W.M. Reynolds and the Representation of the City as *Mystery*", in: Valeria Tinkler-Villani (ed.), *Babylon or New Jerusalem. Perceptions of the City in Literature*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005, 247-258

Jauss, Hans Robert, "Literary History as a challenge to literary theory", *New Literary History* 2, 1970, 7-37

_____, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti, with an introduction by Paul de Man, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982

_____, "Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature", in: David Duff (ed.), *Modern Genre Theory*, Pearson: Longman, 2000, 127-147

Jelavich, Charles, Barbara Jelavich, *The establishment of the Balkan national states, 1804-1920*, Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1977

Jost, Hans Ulrich, Peter Utz, Felix Vallotton (eds.), *Littérature "bas de page". Le feuilleton et ses enjeux dans la société des 19e et 20e siècle / Literatur "unter dem Strich". Funktionen des Feuilletons in der Gesellschaft des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Lausanne: Antipodes, 1996

Juliet, John (ed.), *Cult Criminals: The Newgate Novels (1830-1847)*, London: Routledge/Thoemes, 1998

Jusdanis, Gregory, *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture. Inventing National Literature*, Minneapolis: Univeristy of Minnesota Press, 1991

_____, *The necessary nation*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001

Kafadar, Cemal, *Between Two Worlds, The Construction of the Ottoman State*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995

Kafkalidis, Zephyros, *Στέφανος Ξένος. Σκηνές από το δράμα του ελληνισμού σε Ανατολή και Δύση (1821-1894)* [*Stephanos Xenos. Scenes of the drama of Hellenism in East and West (1821-1894)*], Athens: Kastaniotis, 1998

Kaldellis, Anthony, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007

Kaminski, Nicola, Nora Ramtke, Carsten Zelle (eds.), *Zeitschriftenliteratur/Fortsetzungsliteratur*, Hannover: Wehrhahn Verlag, 2014

Kamouzis, Dimitris, "Elites and the formation of national identity: the case of the Greek Orthodox *millet* (mid-nineteenth century to 1922)", in: Benjamin Fortna, Stefanos Katsikas, Dimitris Kamouzis, Paraskevas Konortas, *State-Nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire, Greece and Turkey: Orthodox and Muslims, 1830-1945*, Oxon: SOAS/ Routledge studies on the Middle East, 2013, 13-46

_____, Maria Christina Chatziioannou, "From a Multiethnic Empire to Two National States: The Economic Activities of the Greek Orthodox Population of Istanbul, ca. 1870-1939", in: Darja Reuschke, Monika Salzbrunn, Korinna Schönhärl (eds), *The Economies of Urban Diversity: Ruhr Area and Istanbul*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013

Kanner, Efi, *Φτώχεια και Φιλανθρωπία στην Ορθόδοξη κοινότητα της Κωνσταντινούπολης 1753-1912* [*Poverty and Philanthropy in the Orthodox community of Constantinople 1753-1912*], Athens: Katarti, 2004

Karpat, Kemal H., *Ottoman Population 1830-1914. Demographic and Social Characteristics*, Wisconsin and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985

Karpozilou, Martha, "Από την άγνωστη εκδοτική δραστηριότητα του Νικολάου Β. Βωτυρά" ["From the unknown publishing activity of Nikolaos V. Votyras"], in: Nasos Vagenas (ed), *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830-1880* [*From Leander to Loukis Laras. Essays for the prose fiction of the period 1830-1880*], Conference proceedings, Herakleion: University Publications of Crete, 1997, 257-268

Kasaba, Reşat, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy, The Nineteenth Century*, Albany NY: SUNY Press, 1988

Kasinis, Konstantinos G., *Βιβλιογραφία των ελληνικών μεταφράσεων της ξένης λογοτεχνίας, ΙΘ'-Κ΄ αιώνας. Αυτοτελείς Εκδόσεις* [*Bibliography of Greek*

translations of foreign literature, 19ᵗʰ-20ᵗʰ century. Independent Publications], volume I: 1801-1900, Athens: Association for Dissemination of Beneficial Books, 2006

Kassis, Kiriakos D., *Το ελληνικό λαϊκό μυθιστόρημα 1840-*1940 [*Greek popular prose fiction 1840-1940*], Athens: Eirini, 1981

Katsanos, Filippos, "*Face à l' horrible Lingua Franca*: la traduction de l' argot des *Mystères de Paris* en Grèce au XIXᵉ siècle", *RIRRA* 21, Université Montpellier 3, Université de Patras, 2014

_____, "Christophoros Samartsidis. Les Mystères de Constantinople", *Anthologie des Mystères urbains*, *Médias 19*, 2014, available online: http://www.medias19.org/index.php?id=630

_____, "Réceptions croisées: les enjeux de la traduction des Mystères de Paris en Grande-Bretagne et en Grèce", *Les Mystères urbains au XIXe siècle: circulations, transferts, appropriations, Medias* 19, 2015

_____, *La fiction mystériographique: émergence et dissémination d'une poétique en France, en Grèce et en Grande Bretagne au XIXe siècle*, doctoral thesis, Université Paul Valéry-University of Patras, 2018

_____, "Η μυστηριομανία στην Ελλάδα: ιστορικές και θεωρητικές προσεγγίσεις της μαζικής κουλτούρας του 19ᵒᵘ αιώνα" ["Mystery mania in Greece: historical and theoretical approaches of 19ᵗʰ-century mass culture"], in: Thanasis B. Kougkoulos (ed), *Το ελληνικό "λαϊκό" μυθιστόρημα του 19ᵒᵘ αιώνα* [*Greek "popular" prose fiction of the 19ᵗʰ century*], Athens: Gutenberg, 2021, 171-196

Katsiardi-Hering, Olga, Anastasia Papadia-Lala, Katerina Nikolaou, Vaggelis Karamanolakis (eds.), *Έλλην, Ρωμηός, Γραικός. Συλλογικοί προσδιορισμοί και ταυτότητες* [*Hellen, Romios, Graikos. Collective identifications and identities*], Historemata 7/Department of History and Archeology of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens: Evrasia, 2018

Katsigianni, Anna, "Ένας άνισος αγώνας δρόμου. Εκδοτικές πληροφορίες για τα πρώτα ελληνικά μυθιστορήματα" ["An unequal road race. Publishing information about the first Greek novels"], in: Nasos Vagenas (ed), *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830-1880* [*From Leander to Loukis Laras. Essays for the prose fiction of the period 1830-1880*], Conference proceedings, Herakleion: University Publications of Crete, 1997, 31-41

Kechriotis, Evangelos, "Ελληνοθωμανισμός" ["Hellenottomanism"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online: http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11012

_____, "Μεταρρυθμίσεις στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία" ["Reforms in the Ottoman Empire"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online:
http://constantinople.ehw.gr/forms/fLemmaBodyExtended.aspx?lemmaId=11702

Kercheval, Jesse Lee, *Short stories, novellas, novel-in-stories. Building Fiction*, Cincinnati, Ohio: Story Press, 1997

Kitromilides, Paschalis, "Imagined Communities", reprinted in *Enlightenment, Nationalism and Orthodoxy: Studies in the Culture and Political Thought of South-eastern Europe*, Study XI, Aldershot: Variorum, 1994

_____, "Orthodoxy and Nationalism", in: John Hutchinson, Anthony Smith, *Ethnicity (Oxford Readers)*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996

Knight, Stephen, *The mysteries of the cities: urban crime fiction in the nineteenth century*, Jefferson, North Carolina and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2012

Koliopoulos, Ioannis, *Η "πέραν" Ελλάς και οι άλλοι "Έλληνες": το σύγχρονο ελληνικό έθνος και οι ετερόγλωσσοι σύνοικοι χριστιανοί (1800-1912)* [*The "beyond" Hellas and the other "Greeks": the modern Greek nation and the hetero-lingual congregational Christians (1800-1912)*], Thessaloniki: Vanias, 2003

Kolokotroni, Vasiliki, Efterpi Mitsi (eds.), *Στη χώρα του φεγγαριού: Βρετανίδες περιηγήτριες στην Ελλάδα (1718-1932)* [*In the country of the moon: British female travelers in Greece (1718-1932)*], Athens: Estia, 2005

Konortas, Paraskevas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο, 17ος-αρχές 20ου αιώνα* [*Ottoman perspectives on the Ecumenical Patriarchate, 17th-beginning of the 20th century*], Athens: Alexandreia, 1998

_____, "From Tai'fe to Millet: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Ottoman Community", in: Dimitris Gondicas, Charles Issawi (eds), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy and Society in the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999, 169-179

Kostakiotis, Georges, *Images de Constantinople dans la prose neo-hellenique. OEuvres des XIXe, XXe et XXIe siecles*, doctoral thesis, Paris: Institut National des Langues et des Civilisations Orientales, 2011

_____, "Αναζητήσεις εθνικής ταυτότητας στο λαϊκό μυθιστόρημα της Κωνσταντινούπολης" ["Searching for national identity in Constantinopolitan popular novels"], in: Anna Tabaki, Ourania Polikandrioti (eds.), *Ελληνικότητα και ετερότητα: πολιτισμικές διαμεσολαβήσεις και 'εθνικός χαρακτήρας' στον 19ο αιώνα* [*Hellenism and Heterogeneity. Cultural mediations and "national character" in the 19th century*], Symposium Proceedings, vol. I, Athens: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Department of Theatre Studies-National Institution of Research, 2016, 377-385

Kougkoulos, Thanasis B., "Καπνίζοντας στην Κωνσταντινούπολη του 19ου αιώνα: Μαρτυρίες από το ελληνικό μυθιστόρημα των 'Αποκρύφων'" ["Smoking Habits in Constantinople during the 19th century: Evidence from the Greek 'City Mystery' novel"], Proceedings of the 1st Scientific Conference *Ο καπνός στην ιστορία: οικονομικές, κοινωνικές και πολιτισμικές προσεγγίσεις* [*Tobacco in history: economic, social and cultural approaches*], Kavala, 7-9 December 2018, Kavala: Institute of Social Movements and History of Tobacco, 2020, 332-349

_____, "Μια συμμορία ληστών στον Πόντο του 19ου αιώνα από το μυθιστόρημα *Τα Δράματα της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* του Κ. Δ. Γουσσόπουλου" ["A gang of bandits in 19th-century Pontus from the novel *The Dramas of Constantinople* of K. D. Goussopoulos"], in: Manolis Varvounis, Rea Kakamboura, Myrophora Eustathiadou (eds.), *Λαϊκή Παράδοση του Πόντου. Από το παρελθόν στο παρόν* [*Folk Tradition of Pontus. From the past to the present*], Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference of Folk Culture, Thessaloniki, 29 November-1 December 2019, *Archive of Pontus* 61, 2021, 111-132

Koulouri, Christina, *Dimensions idéologiques de l'historicité en Grèce, 1834-1914. Les manuels scolaires d'histoire et de géographie*, Frankfurt am Main and New York: P. Lang, 1991

Koumarianou, Aikaterini, "Εισαγωγή" ["Introduction"] in: Konstantinos Ramphos, *Κατσαντώνης. Οι τελευταίες ημέρες του Αλή Πασά* [*Katsantonis. The last days of Ali Pasha*], Athens: Institution of Kostas and Eleni Ourani, 1994

_____, "Κωνσταντίνος Ράμφος: άγνωστος άνθρωπος-αγνοημένος συγγραφέας" [Konstantinos Ramphos: unknown man-disregarded author"], in: Nasos Vagenas

(ed), *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830-1880* [*From Leander to Loukis Laras. Essays for the prose fiction of the period 1830-1880*], Conference proceedings, Herakleion: University Publications of Crete, 1997

Kouroupou, Matoula, "Βιβλιογραφία εντύπων των μικρασιατικών ιδρυμάτων και συλλόγων 1846-1922" ["Bibliography of the publications of Asia Minor Institutions and Associations 1846-1922"], *Report of the Center for Asia Minor Studies*, 3, 149-183

Koutsouris, Georgios K., *Η απορφανισθείσα κόρη, Πρωτότυπον κοινωνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*The orphaned girl, Original social novel*], Constantinople: Published by A. Nomismatidis and Co with the authorization of the Ministerium for Public Education, 1889

_____, "Επιστολή εκ Σουρμένων" ["Letter from Surmene"], *Xenophanis*, vol. 5, issue I and II, 1907-1908, 359-360

Kramers, Johannes H./Richard W. Bulliet, Richard C. Repp, "Shaykh al-Islām", in: Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, Wolfhart P. Heinrichs, Gérard Lecomte (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume IX: San–Sze*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997, 399–402

Kremmydas, Vasilis, *Οι Μεγαλοσχολίτες 1863-1974* [*The Graduates of the Great School of the Nation 1863-1974*], Athens: Association of Graduates of the Great School of the Nation in Athens, 2007

_____, *Η Μεγάλη Ιδέα: μεταμορφώσεις ενός εθνικού ιδεολογήματος* [*Megali Idea: transformations of a national ideology*], Athens: Typothito, 2010

Kristeva, Julia, *Le texte du roman*, Paris and the Hague: Mouton, 1970

Kučera, Petr, "The Ideal of the West, the Reality of the East. Towards a New Poetics of Ottoman Modernization in the Novels of *Edebiyat-ı Cedide* (1890s-1900s)", *Rubrica Contemporanea*, vol. VI, n. 12, 2017, 19-41

Kucukkalay, Mesud, Numan Elibol, "Ottoman Imports in the Eighteenth Century: Smyrna (1771-72)", *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 42, no. 5, September 2006, 723-740

Kyriakidis, Epameinondas K., *Έθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Ελπινίκη. Πρωτότυπος κοινωνική μυθιστορία δημοσιευθείσα εν επιφυλλίδι του Νεολόγου* [*Customs of Constantinople. Elpiniki. Original social novel published in Neologos*], Constantinople: published by S. I. Voutyras, 1885

_____, *Πέραν Απόκρυφα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Πρωτότυπον κοινωνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*Peran Mysteries of Constantinople. Original social novel*], edited by N. G. Kephalidis with the official permission of the Imperial Ministry of Education, part A, vol. A-part B, vol. B, Constantinople: published in *Epitheorisis*, 1890

_____, *Ιστορία του συγχρόνου ελληνισμού από της ιδρύσεως του Βασιλείου της Ελλάδος μέχρι των ημερών μας, 1832-1892* [*History of Modern Hellenism from the establishment of the Kingdom of Greece to the present 1832-1892*], vol. I and II, Athens: 1892

_____, "Οι ψευδοηθικολόγοι εις όλα υπερβολικοί" ["The pseudo-moralists extravagant in everything"], *Akropolis* 3982, 3.3.1893

Lacour, Jean-Lionel, *Excursions en Grèce dans les années 1832 et 1833*, Paris 1834

Langenbucher, Wolfgang, *Der aktuelle Unterhaltungsroman. Beiträge zu Geschichte und Theorie der massenhaft verbreiteten Literatur* (Bonner Beiträge zur Bibliotheks- und Bücherkunde 9), Bonn: Bouvier, 1964

Law, Graham, *Serializing Fiction in the Victorian Press*, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2000

Lehan, Richard Daniel, *The City in Literature: An Intellectual and Cultural History, Berkeley*, California: University of California Press, 1998

Letourneux, Matthieu, *Fictions à la chaîne. Littératures sérielles et culture médiatique*, Seuil: Paris, 2017

Leustean, Lucian N. (ed.), *Orthodox Christianity and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Southeastern Europe*, New York: Fordham University Press, 2014

Liakos, Antonis, "The Construction of National Time: The Making of the Modern Greek Historical Imagination", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 16, 2001

Livanios, Dimitris, "Christians, Heroes and Barbarians: Serbs and Bulgarians in the Modern Greek Historical Imagination (1602-1950)", in: Dimitris Tziovas (ed.), *Greece and the Balkans: Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, 68-83

_____, "The Quest for Hellenism: Religion, Nationalism and Collective Identities in Greece (1453-1913)", *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 3, 2006, 33-70

Loudi, Aggeliki, "Ανωφελής μετάνοια: Ένα άγνωστο διήγημα του Ν. Β. Βωτυρά" ["Unavailing repentance: An unknown short story by N. V. Votyras"], *Microphilologika*, issue 2 (1997), 8-13

_____, "Για μια περίπτωση λαθροχειρίας: *Το υποτιθέμενον φάντασμα* του Νικολάου Β. Βωτυρά" ["A case of manipulation: *The putative ghost* by Nikolaos V. Votyras"], *Microphilologika*, issue 3 (1998), 15-16

Lowenthal, David, *The Past as a Foreign Country*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985

Lund, Michael, *America's Continuing Story: An Introduction to Serial Fiction, 1850-1900*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993

Lyberiou, Dimosthenis, *Απόκρυφα Σύρου. Μυθιστορία* [*Apocrypha of Syros. Prose fiction*], volume I, Ermoupolis: Published by "Ethnos", 1866

Mamoni, Kiriaki, "Les associations pour la propagation de l' instruction grecque à Constantinople (1861-1922)", *BS* 16/1 (1975), 103-112

Mansel, Philip, *Constantinople, City of the world's desire*, *1453-1924*, London: John Murray, 1995

_____, *Paris between Empires, 1814-1852*, London: John Murray, 2001

Mantran, Robert, *Istanbul das la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle: Essai d'histoire institutionelle, économique, et sociale*, Paris-Istanbul: Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul-Adrien Maisonneuve 1962

_____, "Les debuts de la question d'Orient", in: *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman*, Paris: Fayard, 1989

Mardin Şerif, "Super-westernization in urban life in the last quarter of the nineteenth century", in: Peter Benedict, *et als* (ed.), *Turkey: Geographical and social perspectives*, Leiden, 1974, 403-445

Massavetas, Alexandros, *Κωνσταντινούπολη. Η Πόλη των Απόντων* [*Constantinople. The City of the Absents*], Athens: Patakis, [7]2013

Mastrodimitris, Panayiotis, *Πρόλογοι νεοελληνικών μυθιστορημάτων (1830-1930)* [*Prefaces of modern Greek novels (1830-1930)*], Athens: Domos, [2]1984

Mavridis, Dimitris, *Από την Κωνσταντινούπολη στη Ραιδεστό. Σε αναζήτηση της νεοελληνικής ταυτότητας* [*From Constantinople to Rodosto. In search of modern Greek identity*], Xanthi: Cultural Developmental Centre of Thrace, 2003

Maxwell, Richard C., "G.W.M. Reynolds, Dickens, and the *Mysteries of London*", *Nineteenth Century Fiction* 32, no. 2, September 1977

_____, *The mysteries of Paris and London*, Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1992

Mazarakis, Periklis I., *Πολιτικαί Φυσιογνωμίαι. Χαρίλαος Τρικούπης. Αλέξανδρος Κουμουνδούρος* [*Political figures, Charilaos Trikoupis. Alexandros Koumoundouros*], Athens: Publishing House of Dimitrios Dimitrakos, 1946

Melissopoulos, Dimitrios M., Professor in the Russian School, *Ήθη και έθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Η υπηρέτρια. Πρωτότυπον ελληνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*Morals and customs of Constantinople. The maidservant. Original Greek novel*], Constantinople: Published by "Konstantinopolis", 1897

_____, Professor in the Russian School and Novelist, *Ήθη και έθιμα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Γέροντος καρδία* [*Morals and customs of Constantinople. Heart of the old man*], original Greek dramatic novel, Constantinople: Published by A. Koromilas, 1898

_____, Professor in the Russial School of Commerce, *Φύλλον συκής. Πρωτότυπον ελληνικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*Fig leaf. Original Greek novel*], Constantinople: Published by E. Vasileiadis, 1912

Melman, Billie, *Women's Orients, English Women and the Middle East 1718-1918, Sexuality, Religion and Work*, London, Basingstoke: McMillan, 1992

Merriman, John M., *A History of Modern Europe from the Renaissance to the Present*, New York, NY [u. a.]: Norton, [3]2010

Miano, Matteo, "Paraliteratura în Grecia la sfârşitul secolului XIX", *Neograeca Bucurestiensia*, vol. 2, Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2011, 176-186

Michail, Domna, *Έθνος, Εθνικισμός και Εθνική Συνείδηση, Μία ανθρωπολογική προσέγγιση* [*Nation, Nationalism and National Consciousness, An anthropological approach*], Thessaloniki: Stamoulis [3]2003

Michalopoulos, Dimitrios, "Αγαθάγγελος. Από τη νοσταλγία της νίκης στο όραμα του σύγχρονου κόσμου" ["Agathangelos. From nostalgia for the victory to the vision of the modern world"], *Efthini*, 230, February 1991, 56-60

Miles, Robert, *Gothic writing: 1750-1820; a genealogy*, London [u.a.]: Routledge, 1993

Millas, Hercules, "The Image of Greeks in Turkish Literature: Fiction and Memoirs", *Oil on Fire? Textbooks, Ethnic Stereotypes and Violence in South-Eastern Europe*, Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung 1996

_____, "Non-Muslim Minorities in the Historiography of Republican Turkey: The Greek Case", in: Fikret Adanir, Suraiya Faroqhi (eds), *The Ottomans and the Balkan: a Discussion of Historiography*, Leiden: Brill 2002

_____, "National Perception of the 'Other' and the Persistence of Some Images", in: Aydin Mustafa, Ifantis Kostas (eds), *Turkish-Greek Relations. The Security Dilemma in the Aegean*, London and New York: Routledge 2004

_____, *Εικόνες Ελλήνων και Τούρκων: σχολικά βιβλία, ιστοριογραφία, λογοτεχνία και εθνικά στερεότυπα* [*Images of Greeks and Turks: schoolbooks, historiography, literature and ethnic stereotypes*], Athens: Alexandreia, 2005

Montgomery, James Eglinton, *Our admiral's flag abroad. The cruise of admiral D. G. Farragut, commanding the european squadron in 1867-68, in the flag-ship Franklin*, New York: G.P. Putnam & Son, 1869

Moretti, Franco, *Atlas of the European Novel*, *1800-1900*, London, New York: Verso, 1998

Morton, James, *The First Detective: The Life and Revolutionary Times of Vidocq*, London: Ebury Press, 2005

Moullas, Panagiotis, "Μυστήρια, απόκρυφα, δράματα ή 'Ιδού πού παρασύρουσιν αι ρωμάντσαι!'" ["Mysteries, apocrypha, dramas or 'Behold where romances lure us!'"], in the series *Η παλαιότερη πεζογραφία μας* [*Our Olden Prose Fiction*], vol. I, Athens: Sokolis, 1998, 135-150

_____, *Ο χώρος του εφήμερου. Στοιχεία για την παραλογοτεχνία του 19ου αιώνα* [*The space of the ephemeral. Aspects of paralittérature in the 19th century*], Athens: Sokolis, 2007

Nance, Agnieszka Barbara, *Literary and cultural images of a nation without a state: the case of nineteenth-century Poland*, New York, NY [u.a.]: Lang, 2008

Neuschäfer, Hans-Jörg, Dorothee Fritz-El-Ahmad, Klaus-Peter Walter, *Der Französische Feuilletonroman. Die Entstehung der Serienliteratur im Medium der Tageszeitung*, Darmstadt: Wissenschafliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986

Ostrogorsky, George, *History of the Byzantine State*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969

Ouranis, Kostas, *Αχιλλεύς Παράσχος: η ζωή του* [*Achilleus Parashos: his life*], Athens: O Glaros, 1944

Owen, Robert, *Writings of the Utopian Socialists: A New View of Society, Looking Backward, On Trade*, St. Petersburg [u.a.]: Red and Black Publ., 2013

Özkirimli, Umut, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000

Palaiologos, Grigorios, *Ο πολυπαθής* [*The long-suffering*], Athens: Ermis, 1989

_____, *Ο Ζωγράφος* [*The painter*], vol. I and II, Constantinople: Printing house "I agathi Elpis", 1842

Pamuk, Şevket, *The Ottoman Empire and European capitalism, 1820-1913*, Cambridge: Cambridge Middle East Library, 1987

Papageorgiou, Stephanos, *Από το Έθνος στο Γένος. Η Θεμελίωση του ελληνικού κράτους (1821-1862)* [*From Nation to Genre. The foundation of the Greek State (1821-1862)*], Athens: Papazisis, 2003

Pappas, Philippos, *Ο διάλογος της Ελληνικής με τις ξένες λογοτεχνίες μέσω της μετάφρασης (1830-1909)* [*The dialogue of Greek with Foreign Literatures through Translation (1830-1909)*], doctoral thesis, Rethymno: Department of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Crete, 2011

Paz, Omri, "Civil-Servant Aspirants: Ottoman Social Mobility in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 60 (2017), 381-419

Peirce, Leslie, *The Imperial Harem, Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993

Pike, Burton, *The image of the city in modern literature*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981

Pike, David, *Metropolis on the Styx: The Underworlds of Modern Urban Culture, 1800-2001*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007

Pollard, Graham, "Serial Fiction", in: John Carter (ed.), New Paths in Book Collecting, London: Constable and Co., 1934, 247-277

Polychronidis, Ioannis, *Ελληνορθόδοξες κοινότητες στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία (18ος-19ος-αρχές 20ού αιώνα). Μέριμνα για την υγεία και την πρόνοια* [*Greek-Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Empire (18th-19th-early 20th century). Care for health and welfare*], Athens: Tsoukatos, 2017

Politis, Alexis, "Η προσγραφόμενη στον Ρήγα πρώτη έκδοση του Αγαθάγγελου. Το μόνο γνωστό αντίτυπο" ["The attributed to Rigas first publication of Agathangelos. The only known copy"], *O Eranistis*, volume 7, issue 42, December 1969, 173-192

_____, *Ρομαντικά χρόνια. Ιδεολογίες και νοοτροπίες στην Ελλάδα του 1830-1880* [*Romantic years. Ideologies and mentalities in Greece, 1830-1880*], Athens: E.M.N.E.-Mnimon, [2]1998

_____, "Αναζητώντας ορισμένους σταθμούς στην εξέλιξη της πεζογραφίας του 19ου αιώνα" ["Seeking some milestones in the evolution of 19th-century prose fiction"], *Nea Estia*, vol. 157, issue 1777, April 2005, 557-568

_____, "Literature as national cause: poetry and prose fiction in the national and commercial capitals of the Greek-speaking world", in: Roderick Beaton, David Ricks (eds), *The making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the uses of the past (1797-1896)*, Farnham [u. a.]: Ashgate, 2009, 225-238

_____, "Η *Μεγάλη Ιδέα* των Ελλήνων αντιμέτωπη με έναν φιλελληνισμό που έχει πια σβήσει (1850-1880)" ["The *Megali Idea* of the Greeks confronted with a philhellenism that has already faded"], *Synchrona Themata*, issue 132-133, July 2016

_____, *Η Ρομαντική Λογοτεχνία στο Εθνικό Κράτος 1830-1880* [*Romantic Literature in the National State 1830-1880*], Irakleio: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2017

Polychroniadis, Georgios K., Dimitrios A. Spathiotis, *Ο Πυροσβέστης. Πρωτότυπος κοινωνική μυθιστορία* [*The Firefighter. Original social novel*], Constantinople: Published by A. Nomismatidis and Co with the authorization of the Ministerium for Public Education, undated

Porter, Andrew, William Roger Louis (eds.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol. III: The nineteenth century*, Oxford [u. a.]: Oxford University Press, 1999

Prendergast, Christopher, *For the People, by the People? Eugène Sue's 'Les Mystères de Paris.' A Hypothesis in the Sociology of Literature*, Oxford: Legenda, 2003

Puchner, Walter, "Vulgaris, Dimitrios", in: *Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas*, vol. IV, München: Published by Mathias Bernath and Karl Nehring, 1981, 453-454

Pykett, Lyn, *The Nineteenth-Century Sensation Novel*, Tavistock: Northcote, 2011

Quataert, Donald, "The age of reforms, 1812-1914", in: Halil Inlcik, Donald Quataert (eds.), *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 759-943

_____, "Clothing laws, state, and society in the Ottoman Empire, 1720-1829", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 29, no. 3, August 1997, 403-425

_____, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2000

_____, "Recent Writings in Late Ottoman History", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 35, 2003, 133-139

Queffélec, Lise, *Le roman-feuilleton français au XIXe siècle*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1989

Rados, Konstantinos, *Ο Στέφανος Ξένος και το ιστορικόν μυθιστόρημα* [*Stephanos Xenos and the historical novel*], Athens: Eleftheroudakis & Bart, 1917

Ramphos, Konstantinos, *Λόγος συντεθείς υπό Κ. Ράμφου και εκφωνηθείς υπό του ιδίου εις την Καθεδρικήν Εκκλησίαν της Αιγίνη, κατά την αξιομνημόνευτον ημέραν της 20 Μαΐου 1835 καθ' ην ο Μεγ. Βασιλεύς της Ελλάδος Όθων έλαβε τας ηνίας του κράτους* [*Speech written by K. Ramphos and given by Ramphos himself in the Cathedral of Aegina, on the memorable day of May 20, 1835, when the Great King of Greece Otto took the lead of the state*], Aegina: Publishing House of Andreas Koromilas, 1835

_____, *Χαλέτ Εφέντη* [*Halet Efendi*], vol. I, Athens: published by A. Ktenas and P. Soutsas, 1867; vol. II, Athens: published by A. Ktenas and P. Soutsas, 1868; vol. III, Athens: published by A. Ktenas and S. Oikonomou, 1869

Renan, Ernest, "What is a Nation?", in: Geoff Eley, Ronald Grigor Suny (eds.), *Becoming National: A Reader*, New York [u. a.]: Oxford University Press, 1996, 41-55

Reynolds, George W. M., *The Mysteries of London*, London: The Booksellers, 1890

Rohou, Jean, *Paul Fèval: romancier populaire; colloque de Rennes 1987*, Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 1992

Sachinis, Apostolos, *Το νεοελληνικό μυθιστόρημα. Ιστορία και κριτική* [*The modern Greek novel. History and critique*], Athens: S. Papadogiannis, 1958

_____, *Θεωρία και άγνωστη ιστορία του μυθιστορήματος στην Ελλάδα 1760-1870* [*Theory and unknown history of the novel in Greece 1760-1870*], Athens: Kardamitsa 1992

Şahhüseyinoğlu, Nedim H., *Censorship of Thought and the Press from Yesterday to Today*, Ankara: Paragraf 2005

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books, 1978

Said, Naum Duhani, *Vieilles gens, vieilles demeures. Topographie sociale de Beyoğlu au XIXe siècle*, Istanbul: Édition du Touring et automobile Club de Turquie, 1947

Sakellariou, Michael V. (ed.), *Epirus, 4000 years of Greek history and civilization*, Athens: Ekdotiki Athenon, 1997

Samartsidis, Christophoros, *Απόκρυφα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Μυθιστόρημα Πρωτότυπον* [*Mysteries of Constantinople, Original Novel*], part I, vol. I, with the expenses of Dimitrios A. Fexis, Constantinople: published by Il Commercio Orientale, 1869; part I, vol. II and III, Constantinople: published by L' Omnipus, 1869; part II, vol. I, Constantinople: published by *Eptalophos*, 1868; part II, vol. II and III, Constantinople: published by Il Commercio Orientale, 1868

Sarigiannis, Marinos, "Περιθωριακές ομάδες στην οθωμανική Κωνσταντινούπολη" ["Marginal groups in ottoman Constantinople"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online: http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11958

Schmitt, Oliver Jens, "Levantines in the Ottoman Empire and in the Eastern Mediterranean Since the 19th Century", *The encyclopedia of migration and minorities in Europe: from the 17th century to the present*, Cambridge [u. a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 556-558

Serdar, Ali, Reyhan Tumutlu Serdar, "Tradition of Serial Novels in Ottoman/Turkish Literature", Athens: ATINER's Conference Paper Series, 2014

Shaw, Stanford J., *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Selim III, 1789-1807*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971

_____, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 2 volumes (vol. II coauthored with Ezel Kural Shaw), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977

_____, "The Population of Istanbul in the Nineteenth Century", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 10, 1979, 265-277

_____, Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Siskind, Mariano, "The Globalization of the Novel, and the Novelization of the Global: A Critique of World Literature", *Comparative Literature* 62.4, 2010, 336-60

Şişmanoğlu Şimşek, Şehnaz, "The *Anatoli* Newspaper and the Heyday of the Karamanli Press", in: Evangelia Balta, Matthias Kappler (eds), *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books*, Proceedings of the First International

Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia, 11th-13th September 2008), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010, 109-123

_____, "Karamanlidika Literary Production at the end of the 19th century as reflected in the pages of *Anatoli*", in: Evangelia Balta (ed), *Cultural Encounters in The Turkish-Speaking Communities of The Late Ottoman Empire*, Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2014, 429-447

Sklavenitis, Triantafyllos, "Τα *συστήματα των εμπόρων* της Σμύρνης και της Κωνσταντινούπολης (1806-1820)" ["*Merchant systems* of Smyrna and Constantinople (1806-1820)"], in: *Ο εξω-ελληνισμός. Κωνσταντινούπολη και Σμύρνη 1800-1922. Πνευματικός και κοινωνικός βίος* [*The outer Hellenism. Constantinople and Smyrna 1800-1922. Intellectual and social life*], Scientific Symposium, Society of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, 30-31 October 1998

Skopetea, Elli, *Το «Πρότυπο Βασίλειο» και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα: Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα, 1830-1880* [*The "Model Kingdom" and Megali Idea: Aspects of the national problem in Greece, 1830-1880*], Athens: Polytypo, 1988

_____, *Η Δύση της Ανατολής, Εικόνες από το τέλος της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας* [*The West of the East, Images from the late Ottoman Empire*], Athens: Gnosi, 1992

_____, *Φαλμεράϋερ: το τέχνασμα του αντιπάλου δέους* [*Fallmerayer: the artifice of the counterweight*], Athens: Themelio, 1997

Smith, Anthony, *National Identity: Ethnonationalism in Comparative Perspective*, Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 1993

Stamatopoulos, Dimitrios, *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση: προς μια ανασύνθεση της Ιστορίας του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου τον 19ο αιώνα* [*Reform and Secularization: Towards a Reconstruction of the History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the 19th century*], Athens: Alexandreia 2003

_____, "From Millets to Minorities in the 19th-Century Ottoman Empire: An Ambiguous Modernization", in: Steven G. Ellis, Guðmundur Hálfdanarson, Ann Katherine Isaacs (eds.), *Citizenship in Historical Perspective*, Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2006, 253-273

_____, "Ελληνικός Τύπος της οθωμανικής Κωνσταντινούπολης" ["Greek Press of the Ottoman Constantinople"], Constantinople: Encyclopedia of Major Hellenism, 2008, available online:

http://constantinople.ehw.gr/forms/fLemmaBodyExtended.aspx?lemmaId=110
35

_____, "Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1839-1923", Constantinople: Encyclopedia of the Hellenic World, 2008, available online: http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11472

_____(ed.), *Balkan Nationalism(s) and the Ottoman Empire, vol. I: National Movements and Representations*, Istanbul: Isis Press, 2015

Stamatopoulou-Vasilakou, Chrysothemis, "Το θέατρο και οι ελληνικές συσσωματώσεις στην Κωνσταντινούπολη. Η περίπτωση του Ελληνικού Φιλολογικού Συλλόγου (1861-1922)" ["Theater and Greek aggregations in Constantinople. The case of the Hellenic Philological Association (1861-1922)"], in: *Ο εξω-ελληνισμός. Κωνσταντινούπολη και Σμύρνη 1800-1922. Πνευματικός και κοινωνικός βίος* [*The outer Hellenism. Constantinople and Smyrna 1800-1922. Intellectual and social life*], Scientific Symposium, Soxiety of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, 30-31 October 1998

Stavrou, Tatiana, *Ο εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος. Το Υπουργείον Παιδείας του αλύτρωτου ελληνισμού* [*The Hellenic Philological Association of Constantinople. The Ministry of Education of the unredeemed Hellenism*], Athens: Printing House of Filopoulos-Alexias, 1967

Stemberger, Martina, Ingo Pohn-Lauggas, Daniel Winkler (eds.), *Serialität und Moderne: Feuilleton, Stummfilm, Avantgarde*, Bielefeld: transcript, 2018

Strauss, Johann, "Zum Istanbuler Buchwesen in der Zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts", Osmanlı Araştirmaları XII, *The Journal of Ottoman Studies XII*, Istanbul 1992

_____, "The Millets and the Ottoman Language: The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters (19th-20th Centuries)", *Die Welt des Islams*, New Ser., vol. 35, issue 2 (Nov. 1995), 189-249

_____, "Le livre français d' Istanbul (1730-1908)", *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 87/88, 1999, 277-301

_____, "Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th-20th centuries)?", *Middle Eastern Literatures* 6.1, 2003, 39-76

_____, "The Greek Connection in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Intellectual History", in: Dimitris Tziovas (ed.), *Greece and the Balkans. Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment*, London: Routledge, 2003

Sue, Eugène, *Les mystères de Paris*, Paris: Hallier, 1977

Sugar, Peter, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1977

Svolopoulos, Konstantinos, *Κωνσταντινούπολη 1856-1908. Η ακμή του ελληνισμού* [*Constantinople 1856-1908. Hellenism at the Peak*], Athens: Ekdotiki Athenon 1994

Svoronos, Nikos, *Το ελληνικό έθνος. Γένεση και διαμόρφωση του νέου ελληνισμού* [*The Greek nation. Origins and formation of modern Hellenism*], Athens: Polis, 2004

Tabaki, Anna, "Οι Φαναριώτες ανάμεσα στην Ανατολή και τη Δύση" ["The Phanariots between East and West"], in: Charalampos Minaoglou (ed.), *Η Κωνσταντινούπολη στην Ιστορία και την Λογοτεχνία* [*Constantinople in History and Literature*], Conference Proceedings, 13-14 May 2016, Athens: Association of Constantinopolitans, 2018, 17-25

Thérenty, Marie-Ève, *La Littérature au quotidien. Poétiques journalistiques au XIXe siècle*, collection Poétique dirigée par Gérard Genette, Paris: Édition Seuil, 2007

_____, "Mysterymania. Essor et limites de la globalisation culturelle au XIXe siècle", *Romantisme*, 2013/2, no. 160, 53-64

_____, "La rue au quotidien. Lisibilités urbaines, des tableaux de Paris aux déambulations surrealists", *Romantisme*, 2016/1, no. 171, 5-14

Thiesse, Anne-Marie, *Le roman du quotidien. Lecteurs et lectures populaires à la Belle Epoque*, Paris: Chemin Vert, 1984

Thériault Barbara, "Das Feuilleton. Biographie eines Genres, inspiriert von Siegfried Kracauer", *Trivium* 26, 2017

Thompson Victoria, "Telling Spatial Stories: Urban Space and Bourgeois Identity in Early Nineteenth-Century Paris", *The Journal of Modern History* 75, 2003, 523-556

Todorov, Nikolaj, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, Washington: University of Washington Press, 1983

Todorova, Maria, "The Ottoman Legacy and the Balkans", in: Leon Carl Brown (ed.), *Imperial Legacy: The Ottoman Imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, 45-77

_____, *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory*, New York: NYU Press, 2004

Tonnet Henri, "Les premiers romans grecs à sujet turc", *Revue des études néo-helléniques* I (1), 1992, 5-19

_____, "Κωνσταντίνος Ράμφος" ["Konstantinos Ramphos"], in the series *Η παλαιότερη πεζογραφία μας* [*Our Olden Prose Fiction*], vol. IV, Athens: Sokolis, 1996

_____, "Ο χώρος και η σημασία του στα *Απόκρυφα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (1868) του Χριστόφορου Σαμαρτσίδη" ["Space and its significance in *Apocrypha of Constantinople* (1868) by Christophoros Samartsides"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19ᵗʰ century"), 26-31

_____, "*Les Mystères de Constantinople* (1868) de Christophoros Samartsidis, un roman populaire grec à la française", *Etudes sur la nouvelle et le roman grecs modernes*, Athènes: Daedalus, 2002, 153-197

Tromboukis, Konstantinos, *Η ελληνική ιατρική στην Κωνσταντινούπολη 1856-1923* [*Greek Medicine in Constantinople 1856-1923*], Athens: Association of Graduates of the "Great School" in Athens, 2000

Tsapanidou, Anastasia, *Κωνσταντίνος Ράμφος: Βιογραφία-Εργογραφία-Ιδεολογικές κατευθύνσεις του συγγραφικού του έργου* [*Konstantinos Ramphos: Biography-Literary production-Ideological orientation of his publications*], postgraduate essay, Department of Philology, Specialization in Medieval and Modern Greek Studies, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 1998

_____, *Η Κωνσταντινούπολη στην ελληνική πεζογραφία 1830-1880* [*Constantinople in Greek prose writing 1830-1880*], doctoral thesis, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2012

_____, "Ένα παράτολμο εγχείρημα του Χρ. Σαμαρτζίδη (1868)" ["A venturous endeavor of Chr. Samartzides (1868)"], *Microphilologika* 35, spring 2014, 7-12

_____, "Μεταξύ οθωμανικής αυτοκρατορίας και ελληνικού βασιλείου. Αναζητήσεις της 'φιλτάτης πατρίδος' στη μετεπαναστατική φαναριώτικη λογοτεχνία" ["Between the Ottoman empire and the Greek kingdom. Searching of the 'beloved fatherland' in post-revolutionary Phanariot literature"], in: *Περάσματα, μεταβάσεις, διελεύσεις. Όψεις μιας λογοτεχνίας εν κινήσει* [*Trails, transitions, crossings. Aspects of a literature in motion*], Proceedings of the XV International Scientific Meeting, 1-4 March 2017, In Memory of D. N. Maronitis, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Faculty of Philology, Department of Medieval and Modern Greek Studies, 2018

_____, "Έλληνες πολέμιοι και θεράποντες του σουλτάνου στην Κωνσταντινούπολη του 19ου αιώνα" ["Greek opponents and supporters of the sultan in 19th-century Constantinople"], in: Charalampos Minaoglou (ed.), *Η Κωνσταντινούπολη στην Ιστορία και την Λογοτεχνία* [*Constantinople in History and Literature*], Conference Proceedings, 13-14 May 2016, Athens: Association of Constantinopolitans, 2018, 517-538

_____, "Δημήτριος Μ. Μελισσόπουλος. Ένας ξεχασμένος λογοτέχνης της Πόλης στις αρχές του 20ού αιώνα" ["Dimitrios M. Melissopoulos. A forgotten author of Constantinople at the beginning of the 20th century"], *Microphilologika* 46, autumn 2019, 19-30

_____, Thanasis B. Kougkoulos, "Αχαρτογράφητα στοιχεία της ελληνικής πεζογραφίας του 19ου αιώνα. Οι αυτοτελείς εκδόσεις της Κωνσταντινούπολης κατά την κρίσιμη εικοσαετία 1880-1900" ["Uncharted elements of 19th century Greek prose. The Constantinople's book-editions during the critical twenty years 1880-1900"], in: V. Sabatakakis (ed.), *6th European Congress of Modern Greek Studies*, *The Greek World in Periods of Crisis and Recovery, 1204-2018,* Conference Proceedings, Lund, 4-7 October 2018, vol. 2, Athens: European Society of Modern Greek Studies, 2020, 355-377

Tsiakiri, Tzoulia (ed.), *Γεώργιος Λ. Ζαρίφης, Οι αναμνήσεις μου. Ένας κόσμος που έφυγε: Κωνσταντινούπολη 1800-1920* [*Georgios L. Zarifis, My Memoirs: a world that has gone: Constantinople 1800-1920*], Athens: Trohalia 2002

Tsibidaros, Vasos, *Οι Έλληνες στην Αγγλία* [*The Greeks in England*], Athens: Alkaios 1974

Tsirimokou, Lizi, *Γραμματολογία της πόλης, λογοτεχνία της πόλης, πόλεις της λογοτεχνίας* [*Literature of the city, cities of literature*], Athens: Lotos, 1988

Tsokopoulos, Georgios, *Οι Σούτσοι και η πολιτική ποίησις επί Όθωνος* [*The Soutsos brothers and the political poetry in Otto's time*], 1916

Tsouvalis, Christos K., "Οι τιτουλάριοι αρχιερείς εις το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Κεφάλαιον ΣΤ΄. Από του έτους 1860 μέχρι του έτους 1918" ["The titular high priests in the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Chapter VI. From the year 1860 until the year 1918"], *Theologia* 63, vol. III (July-September 1992), 537-538

Tucker, Spencer (ed.), *The European powers in the First World War: an encyclopedia*, New York, NY [u. a.]: Garland, 1996

Ubicini, Abdolonyme, *Letters from Turkey: An Account of Religious, Political, Social and Commercial Conditions of the Ottoman Empire; the Reformed Institutions, Army, Navy etc.*, Lady Easthope (trsl.), London: John Murray, 1856

Vagenas, Nasos, "Ένας τελικά λαϊκός πεζογράφος" ["A finally popular prose writer"], *To Vima*, 12. 2. 1995

_____, "Νικόλαος Β. Βωτυράς" ["Nikolaos V. Votyras"], in the series *Η παλαιότερη πεζογραφία μας* [*Our Olden Prose Fiction*], volume IV, Athens: Sokolis, 1996, 256-264

_____, *Σημειώσεις από το τέλος του αιώνα* [*Notes from the end of the century*], Athens: Kedros, 1999

Valetas, Giorgos, *Ο νεοελληνικός νατουραλισμός και οι αρχές της ηθογραφίας* [*Modern Greek Naturalism and the beginnings of Ethographia*], Athens: Publications of the Hellenic Literary Centre, 1981

Varelas, Lambros, "Ο *Πατροκατάρατος* του Μαρίνου Παπαδόπουλου Βρετού (1845): Το πρώτο (;) ελληνικό roman-feuilleton και το πρώτο (;) ελληνικό απόκρυφο μυθιστόρημα" ["The *Patrokataratos* by Marinos Papadopoulos Vretos (1845): The first (?) Greek *roman feuilleton* and the first (?) Greek *City Mystery*"], *Nea Estia* 153, issue 1755, April 2003, 709-771

_____, "Η εικόνα του άστεως σε ελληνικά *Απόκρυφα* Μυθιστορήματα του 19ου αιώνα" ["The image of the city in Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"], Program "Development of modern methodology for teaching literature in the context of Open and Distance Education" (Pythagoras-E.P.E.A.E.K. II), Faculty of Humanitarian Studies, Hellenic Open University, 2007, available online: http://openlit.teimes.gr/city/varelas.htm

_____, "*Παραμονή Πρωτοχρονιάς στης Πόλης τα παζάρια*. Ένα λησμονημένο ποίημα του Χριστόφορου Σαμαρτσίδη για την αγορά της Κωνσταντινούπολης" ["*New Year's Eve in the bazaars of the City*. A forgotten poem by Christophoros Samartsides about the market of Constantinople"], *The Athens Review of books*, vol. 102 (January 2019), 28

Vellianitis Theodoros, "Επιφυλλίς" ["Epiphyllis"], in: Pavlos Drakakis, *Μεγάλη Ελληνική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια* [*Great Greek Encyclopedia*], vol. 11, Athens: Phoenix, 1963, 462

Veloudis, Giorgos, *Ο Jakob Phillip Fallmerayer και η γένεση του ελληνικού ιστορισμού* [*Jakob Phillip Fallmerayer and the genesis of Greek historicism*], Athens: Mnimon, 1982

Veremis, Thanos (ed.), *Εθνική ταυτότητα και εθνικισμός* [*National identity and nationalism*], Athens: MIET, 1997

Votyras, Nikolaos V., Lieutenant of the Infantry, *Συνέπεια της αμαρτίας, πρωτότυπον μυθιστόρημα* [*Consequence of sin, original novel*], Constantinople: Publishing house of "Byzantis", 1873

Voutouris, Pantelis, *Ως εις καθρέπτην… Προτάσεις και υποθέσεις για την ελληνική πεζογραφία του 19ου αιώνα* [*As in a mirror… Proposals and assumptions about 19th-century Greek prose fiction*], Athens: Nefeli, 1995

_____, "Ο Ιωάννης Σ. Ζερβός και το απόκρυφο μυθιστόρημα. Eugène Sue και Émile Zola" ["Ioannis S. Zervos and the *City Mysteries*. Eugène Sue and Émile Zola"], *Anti* 641, 1. 8. 1997 (feature on "The Greek *City Mysteries* of the 19th century"), 32-40

_____, Georgios Georgis (eds.), *Ο ελληνισμός στον 19ο αιώνα. Ιδεολογικές και αισθητικές αναζητήσεις* [*Hellenism in the 19th century. Ideological and aesthetic quests*], Athens: Kastaniotis, 2006

Vryonis, Speros, "Byzantine Cultural Self-consciousness in the Fifteenth Century", in: Slobodan Curcic and Doula Mouriki (eds), *The Twilight of Byzantium: Aspects of Cultural and Religious History in the Late Byzantine Empire*, Princeton: Dept of Art and Archaeology, Program in Hellenic Studies, Princeton University, 1991, 5-14

Wawro, Geoffry, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press, 2003

Wellek, Renè, Austin Warren, *Theorie der Literatur*, Weinheim: Beltz, Athenäum, 1995

Whybrow, Nicolas (ed.), *Performance and the contemporary city: an interdisciplinary reader*, Basingstoke [u.a.]: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010

Wigelsworth, Amy, *Rewriting "Les Mystères de Paris". The "Mystères Urbains" and the Palimpsest*, Cambridge and New York: Modern Humanities Research Association and Routledge, 2016

Wood, John S., "Situations des Mystères de Paris", *Europe* 643-644, Nov.-Dec. 1982

Xenos, Stephanos, *The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople*, translated from the author's unpublished Greek manuscript by Henry Corpe, London: Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange, 1851

_____, *Ο Διάβολος εν Τουρκία· ήτοι Σκηναί εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει* [*The Devil in Turkey; or Scenes in Constantinople*], London: Publishing house of *Vrettanikos Astir*, 1862

Yosmaoğlu, Ipek, "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913", *The Turkish Studies Association Journal*, vol. 27, no. 1-2, 2003, 15-49

Zborowski, Antje, *Griechisch, Osmanisch, Modern – Spätosmanische Identitäten. Der Griechische Philologische Verein in Konstantinopel 1861-1911/12*, Baden-Baden: Ergon Verlag, 2019

Ziras, Alexis, Antonis Despotidis, "Επιφυλλιδικό μυθιστόρημα" ["Roman Feuilleton"], in: *Λεξικό Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι* [*Glossary of Modern Greek Literature. People, works, streams, terms*], Athens: Patakis, 2007, 67

Eidesstattliche Erklärung

Ich versichere ausdrücklich, dass ich die vorstehende Dissertation selbständig und ohne fremde Hilfe verfasst, andere als die von mir angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel nicht benutzt und die aus den benutzten Werken wörtlich oder inhaltlich entnommenen Stellen einzeln nach Ausgabe (Auflage und Jahr des Erscheinens), Band und Seite des benutzten Werkes kenntlich gemacht habe. Ferner versichere ich, dass ich die Dissertation vorher nicht in einem anderen Prüfungsverfahren eingereicht habe.

Hamburg, 14.11.2021

Zoi Georgiadou