

# ADALYA

26 2023



**AKMED**

KOÇ UNIVERSITY

Suna & İnan Kırac

Research Center for

Mediterranean Civilizations



26 2023

ISSN 1301-2746

# ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Center  
for Mediterranean Civilizations

(OFFPRINT)



# ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kırac Research Center  
for Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED)

Adalya, a peer reviewed publication, is indexed in the A&HCI (Arts & Humanities Citation Index) – CC / A&H (Current Contents / Arts & Humanities), Social Sciences and Humanities Database of TÜBİTAK / ULAKBİM Tr Index, ERIH PLUS (European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences), Scopus, and Index Copernicus.

<i>Mode of publication</i>	Worldwide periodical
<i>Publisher certificate number</i>	18318
ISSN	1301-2746
<i>Publisher management</i>	Koç University Rumelifeneri Yolu, 34450 Sarıyer / İstanbul
<i>Publisher</i>	Metin Sitti, President, on behalf of Koç University
<i>Editor-in-chief</i>	Oğuz Tekin
<i>Editors</i>	Tarkan Kahya and Arif Yacı
<i>English copyediting</i>	Mark Wilson
<i>Editorial advisory board</i>	(Members serve for a period of five years) Emanuela Borgia, Università di Roma Sapienza (2021-2025) Ian Hodder, Koç Üniversitesi (2023-2027) Nevra Necipoğlu, Boğaziçi University (2023-2027) Fatih Onur, Akdeniz University (2023-2027) Christopher H. Roosevelt, Koç University (2021-2025) Charlotte Roueché, Emerita, King's College London (2019-2023) Mustafa H. Sayar, İstanbul University (2023-2027) Peter van Alfen, American Numismatic Society (2023-2027)
©	Koç University AKMED, 2023
<i>Production</i>	Zero Production Ltd. Abdullah Sok. No. 17 Taksim 34433 İstanbul Tel: +90 (212) 244 75 21 • Fax: +90 (212) 244 32 09 info@zerobooksonline.com; www.zerobooksonline.com
<i>Printing</i>	Fotokitap Fotoğraf Ürünleri Paz. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti. Oruç Reis Mah. Tekstilkent B-5 Blok No. 10-AH111 Esenler - İstanbul / Türkiye Certificate number: 47448
<i>Mailing address</i>	Barbaros Mah. Kocatepe Sok. No. 22 Kaleiçi 07100 Antalya / Türkiye Tel: +90 (242) 243 42 74 • Fax: +90 (242) 243 80 13 https://akmed.ku.edu.tr
<i>E-mail address</i>	adalya@ku.edu.tr

# Contents

Güzel Öztürk <i>Cultural Continuity from the Ka`rum Period to the Hittite Empire Period in Light of Stamp Seals and Impressions</i> .....	1
Müge Bulu <i>Contextualizing the Consumption of Syro-Cilician Ware at Tell Atchana / Alalakh (Hatay, Türkiye): A Functional Analysis</i> .....	37
Gülgüney Masalcı Şahin – Özlem Sir Gavaz <i>New Tablet Fragments on Dreams from the Boğazkale Archive</i> .....	75
Aytaç Dönmez – Halil Mert Erdoğan <i>Xanthos West Agora III: Dynastic Nele</i> .....	97
Oğuz Tekin <i>Weights of Alexandria in the Troad: Forms, Types, Units, and Chronology</i> .....	127
Erkan Alkaç – Beste Tomay <i>Amphora Stamps of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Myra and its Harbor Neighborhood of Andriake</i> .....	149
Mehmet Özhanlı <i>New Votive Plates Discovered in the Temple of Men and its Sanctuary in Pisidian Antioch</i> .....	171
Asuman Coşkun Abuğla <i>Nominative and Genitive Endings of Some Epichoric Personal Names in Light of Inscriptions from Tymbrida</i> .....	185
Nergis Ataç – Guntram Koch <i>Figürliche Reliefs frühchristlicher Zeit in Kleinasien (4.-6. / 7. Jahrhundert n.Chr.)</i> .....	197
Orçun Erdoğan – Hatice Pamir <i>The Temple Church at Epiphaneia in Cilicia Pedias and its Terracotta Frieze</i> .....	233
Yavuz Selim Güler <i>A Roman Steelyard with a Control Inscription from the Roman Imperial Period in the Pera Museum</i> .....	257
Mehmet Önal – Sevcan Ölçer <i>Research on the History, Function and Architectural Features of the Harran Saqiyas</i> .....	265
Seçkin Evcim <i>The Discovery in Olympus (Lycia) of One of the Oldest Known Paintings of Christ Pantocrator with a Discussion of its Iconography</i> .....	289

Reyhan Yirşen

*The Problem of Piracy in Commercial Relations between the Ottoman State and the Kingdom  
of Two Sicilies (Sicilyateyn) between 1740 and 1804* ..... 319

Ahmet Kısa

*Antalya Junior High School as the First Example Reflecting the Ottoman Modern Educational  
Approach in Antalya* ..... 337

Evren Dayar

*Three Periods of Antalya in the 19th Century* ..... 363

## Three Periods of Antalya in the 19th Century

EVREN DAYAR\*

### Abstract

This article covers three periods of Antalya in the 19th century. The first of these periods, dated between 1814 and 1840, witnessed the regression caused by the revolt initiated by the Tekelioğlu family, one of the prominent actors of the “age of ayans” in the region, and efforts of the Sublime Porte to prevent this process of regression. In the second period, roughly dated between 1840 and 1890, the city benefited from the rapid growth of foreign trade in the Ottoman geographical sphere. After the 1890s, the city’s history was determined by economic stagnation and inter-communal conflicts, the effects of which became more pronounced afterwards. Based on this periodization, this article attempts to evaluate the history of Antalya in the 19th century from the perspective of the Ottoman Empire’s centralization and modernization efforts, and to determine Antalya’s status among the port cities of the Eastern Mediterranean.

**Keywords:** Antalya, modernization, Eastern Mediterranean, port cities

### Öz

Bu makalede 19. yüzyıl Antalya’sının üç dönemi ele alınmıştır. 1814 ilâ 1840 arasına tarihlenen bu dönemlerden ilki, “ayanlar çağı”nın Doğu Akdeniz’deki önemli aktörlerinden olan Tekelioğlu Ailesi’nin başlattığı isyanın (1812-1814) bölgede yol açtığı gerilemeye ve başkentin gerileme sürecinin önüne geçme çabalarına sahne olmuştur. Ana hatlarıyla, 1840’lar ilâ 1890’lar arasına tarihlenen ikinci dönemde kent, Osmanlı coğrafyasındaki dış ticaretin hızla büyümesinin sonuçlarından faydalanmıştır. 1890’lardan sonra ise kentin tarihini ekonomik durgunluk ve bu dönemden itibaren etkileri daha fazla hissedilen cemaatler arası çekişmeler belirlemiştir. Bu dönemleştirmeden hareketle bu makale, 19. yüzyılda Antalya’nın tarihini, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun merkezileşme ve modernleşme çabaları açısından değerlendirme ve Antalya’nın Doğu Akdeniz liman kentleri arasındaki statüsünü tespit etme girişimidir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Antalya, modernleşme, Doğu Akdeniz, liman kentleri

### Introduction

In the 19th century, the port city of Antalya experienced the effects of three major “transformative forces.”<sup>1</sup> The first of these was state-supported administrative and economic reforms aimed at increasing the empire’s influence in the region. Due to the great ayan (local notable) revolt at the beginning of the century, the city faced a series of interventions by the central state from the reign of Mahmud II onwards. During this process, the Sublime Porte dismantled the

\* Dr. Evren Dayar, Antalya Kent Araştırmaları Merkezi, Antalya, Türkiye. E-mail: evrendayar@gmail.com ; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6593-7238>

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and constructive criticism, which helped to improve my article.

<sup>1</sup> I am using the concept of “transformative forces” inspired by Erol’s work; see Erol 2016.

influence of the dominant actors of the “age of ayans” in the city and encouraged the emergence of new actors to consolidate its power in the region.

The centralization process entered a new phase with the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict in 1839. One of the major political and social consequences of the Tanzimat in Antalya was the permanent transformation which it wrought upon the rule in the city. The most important instrument of this transformation was the establishment of the system of councils (*meclisler*). The system, which was initiated under the name of muhassilship councils (*mubasillik meclisleri*) in 1840, became widespread after the enactment of the Provincial Reform Law (*Vilayet Nizamnamesi*) in 1864. This law provided for the election of local representatives to administrative councils, municipal councils and court systems to enable members of the local community to represent their communal interests.<sup>2</sup> Thus, “the era of reform”<sup>3</sup> contributed to the crystallization and consolidation of the urban leadership of new actors by the establishment of councils in the city.

In the 19th century, Antalya was also affected by the consequences of the incorporation of port cities into global capitalism. The city’s foreign trade volume increased particularly between 1840 and 1890, and the expansion of economic opportunities led to the arrival of many immigrants to Antalya. These immigrants not only changed the city’s demographic structure, but also became the most important actors in the city’s administrative and economic life by participating in the Tanzimat councils. However, Antalya was never fully incorporated into global capitalism during the 19th century and was adversely affected by Izmir’s transformation into the Ottoman Empire’s leading export port in the last quarter of the century. This development caused Antalya’s small or medium-scale commercial activities to be limited to nearby coastal traffic or neighboring towns.

And finally, starting from the end of the century, Antalya was impacted by inter-communal conflicts. In fact, the city had managed to stay away from the devastating consequences of inter-communal conflicts for a long time. The most important reason for this was the relatively “homogeneous” cultural makeup of the city’s population and the partially balanced distribution of wealth between Muslims and non-Muslims. This feature of Antalya caused the increasing influence of the capital on the city since the reign of Mahmud II to continue during the Tanzimat period. Also for this reason, Antalya became a city where the ideal of “the union of components” (*ittibâd-ı anâsır*) of the Tanzimat was implemented and where the state-society relations were more balanced. However, this balance was disrupted due to inter-communal conflicts triggered by the economic crisis at the end of the century and a series of external developments.

To put it briefly, Antalya was affected by three major transformative forces –state-sponsored administrative and economic reforms, economic incorporation into global capitalism, and the inter-communal conflict– that impacted the empire’s port cities during 19th century. However, due to historical, geographical and demographic reasons, it experienced this process within its own conditions, unlike other port cities of the empire.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Rogan 2002, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Ma’oz 1968, 87.

<sup>4</sup> Cem Emrence emphasizes that a mere geographical location was not enough to ensure free admission to a historical trajectory. In other words, simply being located in a particular region or area did not automatically guarantee a particular historical experience or outcome; see Emrence 2011, 8.



This article aims to examine the 19th century in Antalya in terms of its political, economic, and social aspects, and to establish a dialogue between Antalya's history and modern literature on Ottoman port cities. Two things have been instrumental in determining such a purpose. The first reason is that studies on Antalya have not determined the city's position among port cities, nor have they thoroughly discussed the transformative forces that have affected it. Additionally, it cannot be said that the studies on the Ottoman period of Antalya, with a few exceptions,<sup>5</sup> approached the city's 19th century with a comprehensive and comparative perspective. Most of the existing studies are either limited to compiling statistical data<sup>6</sup> or consider historical events as unique to Antalya.<sup>7</sup> Lastly, it is not possible to say that in these studies, the sources to be introduced in the next section are used together and compared with each other.

When viewed from the perspective of the literature of port cities, it is necessary to emphasize the following point. Over the past few decades, modern studies have extensively discussed the effects of incorporation into global capitalism on Ottoman port cities.<sup>8</sup> Despite theoretical differences, the most notable feature of such studies on port cities is that it generally focuses on cities that have benefited from the blessings of the process of incorporation. Conversely, as a result of the great transformation that took place in the 19th century, a new hierarchy was formed among port cities. While international trade cities with modern ports and railways were at the top of this hierarchy, some cities were pushed to a subordinate position.<sup>9</sup> The new hierarchy among Eastern Mediterranean port cities caused Damietta to fall behind Alexandria,<sup>10</sup> Acre to fall behind Haifa,<sup>11</sup> and Sidon to fall behind Beirut.<sup>12</sup> A similar hierarchy was also established between Izmir and Antalya during this period, and therefore Antalya was pushed to a subordinate position among the Eastern Mediterranean port cities.

For all these reasons, the aim of this article is to place the history of Antalya within a broader framework of Eastern Mediterranean port cities with a comprehensive understanding, as well as to look at the history of 19th century Eastern Mediterranean port cities through the window of a city that was pushed into a subordinate position during this period. My purpose is to concentrate on the political, economic and social dimensions of Antalya's development in the 19th century, and then to write a history of the city, taking into account the transformative forces impacting the development of the city. Methodologically, the article attempts to strike a balance between general grand theory and microhistory. At this point, my approach diverges from systemic narratives that explain the historical processes only in terms of general variables. Similarly, historical studies that do not include comparisons and only emphasize local details do not overlap with the approach of this article.

---

<sup>5</sup> For a few studies that are exceptions, see Dinç 2016; Dayar 2020b, 2022b; Ozil 2020.

<sup>6</sup> Ak 2014; Doğan 2014; Dinç 2017a, 2017b.

<sup>7</sup> Dayar 2018b.

<sup>8</sup> Keyder et al. 1993; Hanssen et al. 2002; Kolluoğlu and Toksöz 2010; Emrence 2011; Erol 2016.

<sup>9</sup> The attention has been drawn to this issue in a study related to the port cities of South and Southeast Asia; see McPherson 2002, 85.

<sup>10</sup> Crecelius 2010, 173.

<sup>11</sup> Seikaly 2002, 97.

<sup>12</sup> Arnaud 2008, 954.

## The Sources

It is undoubtedly difficult to cover Antalya's 19th century in all its aspects in a single article. The only reason for this difficulty is not the broad scope of the period under consideration. To provide a comprehensive overview, it is necessary to refer to different sources that also determine its content and manner, such as court registers (*şer'iyye sicilleri*), Ottoman state archives (*Başkanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri*), consular reports, travel accounts, newspapers from Istanbul and Athens and memoirs. The content of different types of sources reveals the effects of transformative forces and internal dynamics on the city. For example, with the exception of court registers, documents dating back to the early 19th century were predominantly produced by the central bureaucracy. This is due to the extension of direct Ottoman rule in the provinces, and this development led primarily to a depiction of this period as one of instability in the early years of the century, from the perspective of the capital. This situation, which arises from the sources influencing the content,<sup>13</sup> is the reason for the significant difference between the first and subsequent parts of the article.

The enormous increase in the number of documents produced in the provinces from the Tanzimat period onwards also affected Antalya. Among these documents, especially the minutes (*mazbata*) sent from the Antalya administrative council to Konya (center of the province) or to the capital city, are noteworthy. These minutes not only diversify the sources, but also indicate that the administrative council, which was a Tanzimat institution, was actively used. This situation in Antalya can be considered a reflection of the process that Jens Hanssen defined as the "internalization of the workings of the Tanzimat"<sup>14</sup> and can be interpreted as the success of the Tanzimat.

As for the consular reports, which are important sources for the article, they need to be divided into two categories. For there are remarkable differences in content between the consular reports dating back to the middle of the 19th century and those from the end of that century. Those who wrote the early reports were merchants who had been involved in commerce and were parties to local conflicts; therefore, their reports do not contain "objective" or, more accurately, statistical information. On the other hand, the vice-consuls who wrote the aforementioned reports provided "inside" information on local disputes since they were parties of the local relations networks. The consular reports from the end of the century contain detailed statistical data and therefore facilitate the identification of changes in the city's economic life and their effects on the local community.

According to the literature on Ottoman port cities, the intensified commercial activities that occurred in the 19th century brought greater benefits to non-Muslims than to Muslims. The main source of such claims is foreign travelers who usually had relations with the non-Muslim population and gained local knowledge through them. Similar claims are also made in the travel accounts used as sources in this article. However, local sources such as court registers are extremely useful in demonstrating that at least for Antalya, this claim is not entirely accurate and that Muslim merchants also benefited from the blessings of intensified commercial activities during this period.

The memoirs written by the Greeks in Antalya, among the sources used in the article, contain important information about the nature of inter-communal relations in Antalya in the 19th

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion on the content-determining effect of sources in urban historiography, see Eldem et al. 1999, 8-9.

<sup>14</sup> Hanssen 2002, 68-69.

century. However, these sources, written in the second half of the 20th century by the Ottoman Greeks born Antalya, who were citizens of the Greek state at that time, should be approached with caution. For example, Greek memoirs distort history by tracing the roots of Greek nationalism in Antalya back to the early 19th century.<sup>15</sup> Similar cautious attitude should be taken when using oral history studies compiled at the Centre for Asia Minor Studies,<sup>16</sup> which romanticize inter-communal relations during the Ottoman period and, in fact, are consciously directed towards such idealization.<sup>17</sup> Both forms of idealization are objectionable in terms of historiography because using sources comparatively supports a more “objective” approach on a micro historical scale and provides a research agenda where general theories can be tested.

## A Brief History

Antalya was founded by King Attalos II Philadelphos of Pergamum in the mid-second century BC. It was situated on a plateau that was a natural threshold of the city and on the shore of an eponymous bay where the Mediterranean Sea meets a vast plain. The choice of its founding location was probably due to its easy access to the sea, as well as the existence of a small inlet which later became a sheltered harbor. In fact, this was the only place on this part of the coast where one could easily reach the sea since high and steep cliffs were found on the west, south, and southeast.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the port city established by Attalos II became one of the most important port cities of the Eastern Mediterranean and one of the five major cities of the Pamphylia region during antiquity.

The importance of the city in the commercial life of the Eastern Mediterranean continued even after the Seljuk conquest, which dates to the early 13th century. Under Seljuks rule, Antalya was a crucial transit center for the export of Anatolian products and the import of merchandise from Egypt, Syria and Europe. Antalya, along with the area where the main routes leading to Bursa lay, remained under the control of the Hamid dynasty until the Ottoman invasion of the area in 1381 and 1390. The reason for the centuries-long struggle between the Ottomans and Karamanids for control of the region was its economic significance.<sup>19</sup>

Antalya came under the rule of the Ottoman Empire in the late 14th century and continued to be an important Mediterranean port during this period as well. However, after the conquest of Egypt in 1516-1517, the volume of goods going directly to Istanbul via the sea increased, and the Antalya-Bursa road lost its former importance. Therefore, by the 17th century, Antalya had become an insignificant local port.<sup>20</sup>

Antalya’s commercial life again became active in the late 18th century. By the end of the century, the port had become an important departure point for grain exported to the Aegean islands and Europe from the interior regions of Anatolia. During this period, the Tekelioğlu family, whose most important source of wealth was overseas grain trade, emerged as a notable

<sup>15</sup> For example, Pehlivanidis describes the Danieloğlu family as patriots (*πατριώτες*). He claims that Danieloğlu Hacı Strat Aga (*Χατζη Στρατ Αγα*) and his cousin Hacı Evren Aga (*Χατζη Εβρεν Αγα*) supported the Peloponnese Revolution and as a result, they were exiled to Kastamonu by the Sublime Porte. However, this claim is definitely not consistent; because contemporary sources indicate that the main reason for the exile was the family’s involvement in gold smuggling. See Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:131-34; to compare, see *BOA.*, HAT. 501/24565.

<sup>16</sup> Pehlivanidis includes oral history interviews with Greeks from Antalya in his book; see Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:346-47.

<sup>17</sup> Especially for this issue, one should refer to the following study: Papailias 2005, 102-5.

<sup>18</sup> Varkıvaç 2008, 135.

<sup>19</sup> İnalçık 1960, 143.

<sup>20</sup> İnalçık 1989, 128.

provincial power in the region and managed to dominate the city for 40 years. The first person who made the Tekelioğlu family an important provincial power in and around Antalya was Hacı Osman. However, the family reached its zenith under the rule of Hacı Mehmet, Hacı Osman's son. Hacı Mehmet was interested in the overseas grain trade and acquired his fortune largely through his commercial relationships. As a token of his wealth, he had many palaces and commercial facilities built both inside the walls of Kaleiçi as well as outside the old city's walls.<sup>21</sup>

After Hacı Mehmet's death, the administration of the city passed on to his son İbrahim. However, the Sublime Porte did not accept his rule and declared that Antalya would be governed by a *mutasellim* (deputy governor) appointed from Istanbul. İbrahim revolted against this decision from the capital. He took refuge in the Antalya Castle, relying on his local support. As a result, the city was besieged, and after a two-year-long siege, it came back under the control of the Ottoman Empire on June 13, 1814.<sup>22</sup>

The re-conquest of the city in 1814 opened the door to the 19th century in Antalya, wherein different actors and conditions were influential in the city's development. From this date on, local political, economic and social conditions, along with three major transformative forces, determined the city's development through the end of the century. I will next discuss the 19th century in Antalya under three headings and try to evaluate the city's peculiarities.

### Antalya (1814-1840): Strengthening of the Central Authority After the Ayan Revolt

The history of this port city in the 19th century was shaped by the unique circumstances of three distinct periods. The first of these began on June 13, 1814, after the suppression of the great revolt incited by the Tekelioğlu family, the dynasty that had been the absolute ruler of Antalya from the late 18th century until 1812.<sup>23</sup> The revolt lasted between 1812 and 1814 and resulted in a loss of population,<sup>24</sup> the destruction of agricultural lands, and severed the connection between the port and its hinterland. Given these circumstances, as daily life rapidly regressed towards minimal subsistence conditions,<sup>25</sup> commercial activities in the port were restricted to allowing only the most essential goods for several years.<sup>26</sup>

The primary aim of the Sublime Porte in the post-revolt period was to ensure the safety of the city, where the memories about the Tekelioğulları were still alive and therefore open to the threat of a new revolt.<sup>27</sup> As a first step to eliminating such a threat, all members of the rebel family were exiled to Thessaloniki.<sup>28</sup> Later the city walls, which had been destroyed during the revolt, were repaired.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Dayar 2020b, 2022b.

<sup>22</sup> Dayar 2022b.

<sup>23</sup> Dayar 2022b.

<sup>24</sup> BOA., C. DH. 76/3780.

<sup>25</sup> BOA., HAT. 535/26320.

<sup>26</sup> The customs records of the Antalya Port between June 1814 and June 1815 are listed in the following source: AŞS., 1/94, 95, 96.

<sup>27</sup> On December 21, 1815, when the balance of power was restored within the sanjak, *Mutasarrıf* Vahid Pasha expressed the Sublime Porte's concern for a potential new revolt with these words: "the presence of Tugayoğulları, one of Tekelioğlu's supporters, as the ayan in Manavgat, is the reason that could spark a new revolt in Karahisar-Teke." (*Tekelioğlu a'vânından Tugayoğullarının Manavgat'ta ayan bulunması Karahisar-Teke'nin yeni baştan ibtilalini muceb baletten olmağla*.) See BOA., C. ZB. 26/1270.

<sup>28</sup> Dayar 2022b.

<sup>29</sup> Dayar 2020a.

Another aim of the Sublime Porte in the region was to regain the authority lost in the previous century. For this purpose Teke Sanjak, whose center was in Antalya, was annexed to Hamid Sanjak, and its administration was handed over to *mutasarrıf*s (governor of an administrative district) with the rank of vizier to be appointed from Istanbul. In addition, it was decided that the *iltizam* (tax-farming), usually given to Tekelioğulları in the past, would be entrusted to the newly appointed *mutasarrıf*s.<sup>30</sup>

The effects of economic and demographic regression,<sup>31</sup> which continued for several years, also triggered attempts to provide minimum living conditions in the sanjak. Some of these initiatives included the resettlement of the population, which had left the city and its countryside during the period of revolt, back to the region.<sup>32</sup> Also, a road project connecting Isparta and Antalya was put forward to strengthen the relationship between the most important port of the region and its hinterland.<sup>33</sup> The land and property endowed by the Tekelioğulları, including numerous gardens in the eastern part of the city, were transferred to the Hamidiye Foundation in 1815.<sup>34</sup> In addition, it was decided that tax-farming of 12 of the 38 *çiftlik*s (large estates) belonging to the family would be given to *mutasarrıf*s, and the rest sold to their suitors.<sup>35</sup> The fact that these fertile *çiftlik*s were left at the tenure of the *mutasarrıf*s<sup>36</sup> showed that the Sublime Porte wanted to maintain central control over the production process, while at the same time aiming to increase it.

However, the Sublime Porte's attempts did not succeed in the short term. It took several years for the rebel family's assets to be listed; the improvements of the city walls, especially the building of a modern fortification system (redoubt) remained unfinished, and modernization attempts did not go beyond partial improvements.<sup>37</sup> The road project to strengthen the connection between Antalya and its hinterland was never realized.

The challenges faced in achieving primary objectives during this period indicate that the Ottoman Empire's influence on the region was limited, despite its efforts. The most important reason for this situation was the short tenure of the *mutasarrıf*s and the change of place (*becayış*) that prevented a stable administration. Between 1814 and 1823, a new *mutasarrıf* was appointed to the city almost every two years, some of whom were dismissed before completing their first year in office.<sup>38</sup> The Greek Revolution in the Peloponnese in 1821 further perpetuated the political and administrative instability in the region. After the years of revolution,

<sup>30</sup> The practice of allocating tax-farming to *valis* (provincial governors) and *mutasarrıf*s was not unique to Antalya during this period. See *BOA.*, C. DH. 155/7750.

<sup>31</sup> Upon examining the customs summary records in *AŞS.*, 2, Suraiya Faroqhi observed a significant decline in the number of ships arriving and departing from the port between 1818-1819. She attributed this situation to the changing global context. However, it is important to note that this decline was actually a natural result of the Tekelioğlu revolt. See Faroqhi 1981, 1464. For the custom summary records, see *AŞS.*, 2/2a; *AŞS.*, 2/2b; *AŞS.*, 2/5b; *AŞS.*, 2/9b; *AŞS.*, 2/33b; *AŞS.*, 2/103.

<sup>32</sup> For the edict issued on this matter, see *BOA.*, C. DH. 40/1979.

<sup>33</sup> Babacan 2012, 495.

<sup>34</sup> *BOA.*, D. HMH. d. 21786.

<sup>35</sup> *BOA.*, C. DH. 121/6010. These 12 *çiftlik*s were tendered to *Mutasarrıf* Vahid Pasha in 1816 and to Mahmud Pasha two years later for their management. See *BOA.*, C. ML. 137/5846; *TS. MA. E.* 1268-3.

<sup>36</sup> *BOA.*, C. ML. 496/20149.

<sup>37</sup> In 1835 there was a plan to construct eight bastions outside Kaleiçi. However, the plan was abandoned a year later due to its high cost. See *AŞS.*, 6/66, 68; *BOA.*, HAT. 1330/51889-A; *BOA.*, D. BŞM. BNE. d. 16431, p. 8-10.

<sup>38</sup> The following served as Teke and Hamid *mutasarrıf*s: between 1814 and 1816 Vahid Pasha, Derviş Pasha between 1816-1817, Hafız Ali Pasha between 1817-1818, Rauf Pasha between 1819-1821, Yusuf Pasha between 1821-22, and Mustafa Pasha in 1823. See *BOA.*, C. ML. 457/18541.

the *mutasarrıfs* had either never come to Antalya or stayed in the city for a short time, thus were the cause of many complaints.<sup>39</sup>

As a result, this process created a short-term period where the *mutasellims* regained their effectiveness in administering the region, similar to the “age of ayans” when the Tekelioğulları were the dominant actors. But as the power of the local aristocracy was broken in the revolt at the turn of the century, the Sublime Porte had to appoint non-local *mutasellims* to the city. Although the name of Karaosmanoğulları was especially prominent among these *mutasellims* in the 1820s,<sup>40</sup> the family soon faced strong social opposition.<sup>41</sup> In 1827 Karaosmanoğlu Ahmet Ağa was expelled from Antalya by the inhabitants of the city.<sup>42</sup>

An edict dated 1830 mentions that Teke Sanjak was not well managed by the vizier *mutasarrıfs* and non-local *mutasellims* in the past years. As per the aforementioned edict, the mismanagement had led the people of the sanjak to impoverishment, causing them to abandon agriculture and trade, and eventually to fall into a state of misery (*perîşâniyete yüz tutmuş*).<sup>43</sup> These events made it necessary for the Sublime Porte to support local intermediaries who would stand by the central authority in the city. In this process the İdriszades from Elmalı, who were among the few families that supported the capital during the years of revolt, gained prominence. Some of the *çiftlik*s previously belonging to the Tekelioğulları were sold to them.<sup>44</sup> However, while attempting to establish its authority in the region, the Sublime Porte faced difficulty in finding a powerful family that had neither formed alliances with the Tekelioğulları in the past nor supported the revolt. For this reason, after a while Ebubekirzade Hacı Mehmed Ağa, who had previously served as the *kethüda* (butler)<sup>45</sup> for the Tekelioğulları, was appointed as the *ayan* of the city.<sup>46</sup> In addition, the Danieloğulları (Zaneler / Ζάνελλερ),<sup>47</sup> who were the Tekelioğulları’s “moneylenders and confidants” (*sarrağ ve sırdaşı*), were appointed as the *kocabaş* (heads of the local Greek community).<sup>48</sup> To put it succinctly, during the early stages of the centralization process, there existed an indirect state dominance that required the cooperation of local intermediaries in Antalya.

<sup>39</sup> For the allegations regarding the collection of undue money from the people, see *BOA.*, HAT. 1443/59325; *AŞS.*, 3/11; *AŞS.*, 3/13; *AŞS.*, 3/14; *AŞS.*, 3/212.

<sup>40</sup> The interest of the Karaosmanoğlu family in Antalya was not a recent development. They had previously supported Ahmet, who had rebelled against Tekelioğlu Hacı Mehmed and had also participated in the suppression of the 1812-1814 revolt. Between 1822-1827, after the capture of the city, several members of the Karaosmanoğulları served as administrators in Antalya. Karaosmanoğlu Eyüp Ağa in 1822-1823, Karaosmanoğlu Selim Ağa in 1824, and Karaosmanoğlu Ahmet Ağa in 1825 served as *mutasellims* in the city. See *BOA.*, HAT. 1224/47831; *BOA.*, HAT. 1350/52756; *BOA.*, HAT. 1224/47830; *AŞS.*, 3/7; *AŞS.*, 3/10; *AŞS.*, 3/35; *AŞS.*, 3/97.

<sup>41</sup> For example, it was demanded that Karaosmanoğlu Eyüp Ağa be dismissed on the grounds that he was not a good administrator and was bullying (*büsn-i idâreye muvafık olmadığı ve zulmü sebebiyle*). See *BOA.*, HAT. 666/32413.

<sup>42</sup> *AŞS.*, 3/105; *BOA.*, HAT. 735/34902.

<sup>43</sup> *AŞS.*, 3/213.

<sup>44</sup> *BOA.*, C. ML. 496/20149.

<sup>45</sup> *BOA.*, D. BSM. d. 6947/8, p. 20.

<sup>46</sup> *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3190, p. 6.

<sup>47</sup> While “Zanel” may not be a name in itself, it was a name used by the Turks to refer the local Greek family name “Daniel”; see Chatzipetrou 1969, 51. For the role by Danieloğulları in the commercial relations between Egypt and Antalya, see Ritter 1859, 653.

<sup>48</sup> Until the Second Constitutional Period, the family had significant influence in many local institutions, particularly in the councils. In recognition of his contributions to government affairs, Danieloğlu Kiryak (Κυριακ) was awarded the fifth-degree Mecidiye Order in late 1900. See *BOA.*, DH. MKT. 2440/117.

At the beginning of 1833, Antalya was occupied by the Egyptian army during the Anatolian campaign of Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Pasha. The primary motive for Mehmed Ali Pasha's interest in the region was the abundant timber resources that were possessed by Antalya and its surrounding area. Even in the early years of the 19th century, Mehmet Ali Pasha had commercial relations with Antalya and had imported timber from the city. Because of this, a few years before the Anatolian campaign, he had requested to be given Kastellorizo to be close to these timber sources.<sup>49</sup> However, the occupation of Antalya ended after the temporary reconciliation between Mahmud II and Kavalalı Mehmed Ali Pasha, and the Egyptian dominance in the city remained limited to a few months (January 11, 1833 to May 14, 1833).

After coming under Ottoman rule again, the unfavorable conditions in the city began to improve. The first factor that contributed to the improved conditions was the influx of Muslim immigrants who arrived in the city from the Peloponnese following the Greek Revolution. There was also an Arab migration triggered by the Egyptian occupation. The Peloponnesian Muslim farmers, who mostly settled in the suburbs, compensated somewhat for the population loss caused by the ayan revolt at the beginning of the century. Therefore, they partially satisfied the city's need for a productive population.<sup>50</sup> Besides, the Peloponnesian immigrants showed their main influence on the city as reformers in its local political life starting in the second half of the century. On the other hand, the arrival of Arab immigrants to Antalya, which was not limited to a single period, was triggered by the commercial activity between Egypt and Antalya, as will be discussed later.

Another trigger for the change was the reforms implemented by Mahmud II in the provinces from the early 1830s. The aim of these reforms was to increase the authority of the capital in the region while also providing administrative and political stability to the city. Steps taken to achieve this goal included conducting the first census in 1831, forming a new guard group by removing the guards responsible for the security of the castle and the public order of the city for centuries,<sup>51</sup> recruiting soldiers from the region for the *Teke Redif Taburu* (Teke Military Reserve Battalion) in 1834,<sup>52</sup> and commissioning mukhtars in 1836.<sup>53</sup>

The other purpose of the reforms during the period of Mahmud II was the "public improvements of the country," as emphasized by Mehmed Said Efendi, Antalya's *mutasellim* between 1830-1832. Mehmed Said explicitly stated that the previous *mutasellims* did not have such a duty, but that the development of the country and the growth of trade were then among the duties of the *mutasellims*. As a matter of fact, Mehmed Said's distribution of agricultural tools to the people of the sanjak in order to improve agriculture<sup>54</sup> and his attempt to include wild trees in the production process by grafting were directly related to this purpose.<sup>55</sup> Similarly, activities such as the *yed-i vahid* (monopoly)<sup>56</sup> method applied under the supervision of Muhassil Osman Pasha (1833-1837)<sup>57</sup> and the construction of roads outside the city by Muhassil Necip

<sup>49</sup> Dayar 2019, 111.

<sup>50</sup> Dayar 2018a.

<sup>51</sup> BOA., D. PYM. d. 35918, p. 2.

<sup>52</sup> BOA., HAT. 332/19116.

<sup>53</sup> BOA., HAT. 491/24053.

<sup>54</sup> BOA., HAT. 659/32163

<sup>55</sup> BOA., C. İKTS. 37/1806; BOA., C. İKTS. 32/1560.

<sup>56</sup> *Yed-i vahid* refers to the state's monopolistic and proactive involvement in the trading sector with the aim of generating revenue for the treasury.

<sup>57</sup> Between 1834-1835, Muhassil Osman Pasha provided capital to nearly 60 Muslim and non-Muslim merchants selected within the sanjak, granting them a monopoly on the trade of certain products; see Güran 2014, 354.

Pasha in 1838 aimed at the development of the country and the promotion of its commercial life.<sup>58</sup> By the end of the 1830s, these attempts produced their first results. After the suppression of the Tekelioğlu revolt, the production in the *çiftlik*s that joined the Hamidiye Foundations increased.<sup>59</sup> In conclusion, as a result of all these efforts, the British traveler John Carne, who visited Antalya around this time, could say that the city had good administration.<sup>60</sup> In the 1840s Spratt and Forbes described Antalya as the largest and most important city on the south coast of Anatolia.<sup>61</sup>

### Antalya (1840-1890): Commercial Developments and Population Growth

Despite all the progress made, the main reason that changed the poor conditions and accelerated Antalya's development after the proclamation of the Tanzimat was the increased volume of foreign trade in the Eastern Mediterranean.<sup>62</sup> At the beginning of this period dating between 1840 and 1890, the commercial life of the city was largely determined by Egypt's demand for timber. Starting from the mid-1830s, Egyptian ships frequently visited Antalya to purchase this commodity.<sup>63</sup> By 1842 most of Alexandria's annual timber requirements were being supplied from Finike, a sub-district (*nabiye*) of Antalya and its surrounding areas.<sup>64</sup> Albert Graf von Pourtalès visited the city in mid-October 1843, and likened it to an Arab city due to the intense commercial relations between Egypt and Antalya.<sup>65</sup> During the winter of 1847, a Scottish traveler in Antalya witnessed a surge of commercial activity in the harbor, despite the seasonal conditions, and mentioned a business agreement signed between Antalya and Egypt regarding the timber trade.<sup>66</sup> The opportunities provided by the timber trade increased the influence of the Danieloğlu family in the city,<sup>67</sup> who had played an important role in the commercial relations between Egypt and Antalya since the 1840s.<sup>68</sup> In the second half of the century, the beneficiaries of these opportunities were Arab immigrant merchants such as Lülüs (*Lû-Lû*)<sup>69</sup> and Bileydis.

The other major products exported from Antalya during this period were grain and flour milled in the mills surrounding the city. The most important actor in this trade in the city was the local Greeks, just as they were at the beginning of the century.<sup>70</sup> However, the grain trade had become an important source of income since the 1840s due to the strong demand from the European markets. This occurrence caused the appointment of a deputy vice-consul to Antalya by the British consulate in Izmir in 1842.<sup>71</sup> While the grain crisis in

<sup>58</sup> Spratt and Forbes 1847, 1:221-22.

<sup>59</sup> In 1838 numerous peasants were working on these *çiftlik*s. For more information on the state of the *çiftlik*s in İstanos (Korkuteli) during that time, see *BOA.*, EV. d. 10835.

<sup>60</sup> Carne et al. 1836-1838, 3:9.

<sup>61</sup> Spratt and Forbes 1847, 1:211.

<sup>62</sup> Pamuk 2018, 26.

<sup>63</sup> *BOA.*, C. NF. 43/2131.

<sup>64</sup> Spratt and Forbes 1847, 1:172.

<sup>65</sup> Ritter 1859, 655.

<sup>66</sup> Anonymous 1847, 745. During this time, the Sublime Porte had granted Mehmed Ali Pasha permission to purchase timber from Antalya. See *BOA.*, İ. MTZ. (05) 12/336; *BOA.*, İ. MTZ. (05) 11/3.

<sup>67</sup> Danieloğlu Evren and Strat were appointed as the *batab emini* (timber supplier) by the capital in the mid-1830s; see *AŞS.*, 5/105.

<sup>68</sup> Ritter 1859, 653.

<sup>69</sup> For the biography of Ömer Lütü Efendi Lülü, see Dayar, 2016.

<sup>70</sup> Beaufort 1817, 124-26; Cockerell 1903, 174.

<sup>71</sup> *FO.*, 78-490, p. 458.



1846<sup>72</sup> and the drought in the early 1850s, along with the conditions caused by the Crimean War increased the demand for grain,<sup>73</sup> the opportunities created by the crisis mainly benefited the vice-consuls and some merchants.

In brief, the main products exported during the second half of the 19th century were grain, flour and timber, although there were other traded goods such as coal and animal products. During this whole period, these three products were among the main sources of wealth, and the demographic result of the developments in commercial life was the population increase experienced after the 1830s. First of all, the Arab immigration that took place after the short-term Egyptian domination in the beginning of 1833 was mainly triggered by the commercial relations between Egypt and Antalya.<sup>74</sup> Due to this commercial activity, the inns in the port and bazaar of the city were frequently visited by non-Muslim merchants from inner Anatolia or the Mediterranean islands and Europe.<sup>75</sup> Since the second half of the 19th century, the commercial activity contributed to an increased Greek population in the city.<sup>76</sup>

TABLE 1. Population of Antalya with data compiled from these sources: *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3190; *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3203; *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3206; *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3233; Dinç 2017, 461; *KVS.*, Def'a 10/1294, 154; Cuinet 1892, 860; Alishan 1899, 359.

Muslim		Greek		Total	
1831	5,758	1831	2,186	1831	7,944
1840	-	1840	2,524	1840	-
1845	7,282	1845	2,802	1845	10,084
1864	-	1869	-	1864	14,184
1877	-	1877	-	1877	15,736
1890	15,664	1890	8,967	1890	24,631
1897	18,000	1897	7,000	1897	25,000

The increase in commercial activity also resulted in the settlement of many immigrant Jews from Mediterranean islands in Antalya, particularly from Rhodes.<sup>77</sup> The most influential non-Muslim community after the local Greek population was the Jews who numbered nearly 300 in 1890.<sup>78</sup> The only community not affected by the population increase was the Armenians who were exiled from Iran and had settled in Antalya at the beginning of the 18th century. Their small community, who had settled around the Persian inn (*Acembane*)<sup>79</sup> upon arriving in the city, never became a significant component of the population. As a matter of fact, by the end of the 19th century, there were only about 40 Armenians living in Antalya.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Amidst the crisis, the British Vice-Consul managed to earn a profit of 50,000 francs by dispatching several ships loaded with wheat and rye to Europe; see Tchihatcheff 1850, 843.

<sup>73</sup> Dayar 2018b, 366.

<sup>74</sup> Dayar 2019, 112.

<sup>75</sup> In 1845 thirty Greek and Armenian merchants who had arrived in Antalya for business were residing in İki Kapılı Han. The registers detailing the list of merchants who visited the city during this period are as follows: *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3230; *BOA.*, NFS. d. 3231.

<sup>76</sup> Iatridou 1911, 110-11.

<sup>77</sup> During the late 19th century the Jewish community, which was experiencing population growth, attempted to establish a cemetery within the city. See *BOA.*, ŞD. 2617/36 and *BOA.*, BEO. 273/20465.

<sup>78</sup> Cuinet 1892, 860.

<sup>79</sup> For the estates of Armenians who died in Acemhane, see *AŞS.*, 11/269; *AŞS.*, 11/271; *AŞS.*, 93/85.

<sup>80</sup> Cuinet 1892, 860.

The effect of demographic growth in the second half of the 19th century on the macro level was the inability of the traditional residential area in Kaleiçi to supply the housing needs. This settlement area of approximately 30 hectares<sup>81</sup> was home to 3,866 inhabitants in 1831, but 15 years later it accommodated 4,963 persons. Continued population pressure in the Greek neighborhoods, which constituted almost half of Kaleiçi, led to the establishment of new neighborhoods outside the city walls in the years following. Thus, the city expanded for the first time towards the gardens southeast of Kaleiçi during the Turkish-Islamic period. The Muslim population, which increased from 7,282 to 15,664 between 1845 and 1890, also expanded the borders of their neighborhoods outside the walls, and this increase led to expansion in the north and east.<sup>82</sup>

During the period of commercial progress, the political life of the city was shaped by these demographic and economic developments. At the beginning of the Tanzimat period, Antalya was the scene of conflicts between the immigrant Arab merchants who came to the city after the short-term Egyptian occupation and the local families, many of whom had been allies of the Tekelioğulları in the past. These conflicts took their final form with the grain riot in the autumn of 1853. The riot came at a time of severe food shortages, and was reportedly sparked by rumors of grain hoarding by immigrant merchants. During the riot Greek and Muslim inhabitants looted the grain warehouses of immigrant merchants as a result of the instigation by the local aristocracy.<sup>83</sup>

Another target of the 1853 riot was the British and Greek vice-consuls, whose power in the city had increased as a result of the growing importance of the grain trade since the 1840s.<sup>84</sup> The real reason behind this opposition was their growing role as an important actor in the commercial life and their expansion of influence to the interior. Especially after the 1850s, the vice-consuls succeeded in expanding their influence by offering protection to certain Muslim and non-Muslim merchants,<sup>85</sup> assisting poor peasants, or employing them.<sup>86</sup>

The influence of the vice-consuls reached its peak during the tenure of F. Gadaleta, the British vice consul appointed to Antalya in late 1857.<sup>87</sup> Gadelata immediately took some merchants under his protection upon his arrival. By operating in towns in and around Antalya, such as Burdur and Isparta, he succeeded in being at the center of a wider communication network than any other foreign state representative before him. However, Gadelata's activities soon encountered strong opposition; and as a result of these increasingly violent reactions, he was dismissed from his post.<sup>88</sup>

Opposition to the vice-consuls served to relieve tensions between native families and immigrant merchants. This relief was to such an extent that by the 1860s local conflicts seemed

---

<sup>81</sup> Hellenkemper and Hild 2004, 1:332.

<sup>82</sup> Dayar 2020b.

<sup>83</sup> Dayar 2018b.

<sup>84</sup> The Greek Vice Consul, who was engaged in the grain trade, took office in 1849; see Chatzipetrou 1969, 38.

<sup>85</sup> Dayar 2018b.

<sup>86</sup> For instance, in 1855, when famine and harsh conditions prevailed, British Vice-Consul Mr. Purdie distributed wheat to the villagers of Antalya and provided a loan of 4,250 pounds to most of his sharecropper farmers; see Kurmuş 1974, 149, 256.

<sup>87</sup> *BOA*, A.) DVN. DVE. 23/50.

<sup>88</sup> For the complaints about the Vice-Consul and the investigation of the inspector who came to the city in the autumn of 1859, see *FO*, 78-1554 and Samaha 2002.

to have generally ended. Undoubtedly, the discontent caused by the vice-consuls was not the only thing that alleviated the strife. The Ottoman unity policy (*ittibâd-ı anâsır*), based on the legal equality of the imperial subjects of the Tanzimat along with many other events such as marriage ties or commercial partnerships between immigrant and native Muslim families, had eroded the differences between the communities.

These developments led to the formation of a wealthy merchant class that could be an alternative to the old powerful families and at the same time could adopt the Tanzimat policies. Immigrant Arabs almost always took part in the provincial councils and various commissions that were institutionalized after the proclamation of the Tanzimat.<sup>89</sup> In the last quarter of the century, all of the mayors of the city were among the Arab merchants.<sup>90</sup> On the other hand, Westernized Peloponnesian immigrants, such as the Moravi family, wholeheartedly supported the Tanzimat reforms. At the end of the 19th century, they were among the opponents of the regime, which began to have an increasingly authoritarian character.<sup>91</sup> The effects of this community, mainly composed of immigrant merchants, on the political and administrative life of the city continued until the years of the Second Constitutional Period (1908-1918).

The contribution of the local Greek community to the formation of an urban community believing in Ottoman unity during the Tanzimat period should not be underestimated. These Greeks, although an important component of the urban population, did not act as a monolithic community even during the period of local conflicts. For instance, the religious leader of the community, who was also a merchant, was a partner of the Arab immigrants. The Danieloğlu family played an important role in the timber trade between Egypt and Antalya and had close relations with immigrant traders. On the other hand, some local Greeks participated in the grain riot of 1853 and took part in the looting of the warehouses of immigrant Arab merchants along with the Muslim community. In addition, the vast majority of local Greeks had acted together with Muslim merchants in their opposition to foreign state representatives, including the Greek Vice-Consul.<sup>92</sup>

There are multiple reasons for these close relationships which are not limited to just one case. First of all, the local Greeks spoke the same language with the Muslim natives, “lived almost like” Turks, and shared a common culture. A contemporary source wrote:

“And so it is, that of all the Greeks of Adalia, not one can converse in the language of their fathers. Separated from their countrymen, they have become almost a distinct race; and, losing that language of which they have no practice, have learnt to use as their own the vernacular of the land in which they are immigrants of such antique standing. They talk Turkish-live almost like Turks; and by their religion only are distinguished from their neighbours.”<sup>93</sup>

<sup>89</sup> For the biographies of Hacı Ömer Ağa, Arap Süleyman and Ömer Lütfi Lülü, one of the city’s leading Arab merchants, see Dayar 2016, 2019.

<sup>90</sup> Mehmed Said Efendi was the mayor of Antalya between 1880 and 1888. For his mayoral term, see *KVS. Def’a* 14/1298, 131 and *KVS. Def’a* 21/1305, 181. Ömer Lütfi Efendi Lülü was elected mayor for two terms, the first between 1888-1897 and the other between 1905-1908. For his mayoral term, see *KVS. Def’a* 22/1306, 183; *KVS. Def’a* 27/1314, 172; *KVS. Def’a* 29/1322, 147 and Dayar 2017c, 51.

<sup>91</sup> Dayar 2018a.

<sup>92</sup> Dayar 2018b.

<sup>93</sup> Anonymous 1847, 751.

The common customs and traditions of the local Greeks and Muslims were always despised by the Christian missionaries who visited Antalya during the 19th century<sup>94</sup> or by the educated Greeks who came to the city from Athens and the islands.<sup>95</sup> At the end of the 19th century, French geographer Vital Cuinet wrote that the local Greeks of Antalya, whose customs and traditions caused them to resemble Muslims, did not respect their co-religionists in Greece, the archipelago and Russia until twenty years ago, and even referred to them as “stranger dogs” (*chiens d'étrangers*).<sup>96</sup>

The relations of the local Greeks with the producers in the Turkish villages were also good, and their course was determined by common interests.<sup>97</sup> Except for the city and a few small town centers, Greek merchants were in need of Muslim-Turkish producers since they did not have much of a population in the province. The producers were also in need of Greek merchants who bought their products and exported them to the islands.<sup>98</sup>

Another point to be underlined here is that the population balance in the 19th century created a situation of equilibrium in which the two communities could not establish absolute dominance over each other. Therefore, during the Tanzimat period, Muslims and Greeks were represented almost equally on the administrative and municipal councils and courts that were institutionalized in this period (see table 2). Thus, these councils turned into boards where Muslim and non-Muslim Antalyans discussed civic matters and negotiated with the central government. In short, although religion constituted the most important difference between Muslims and local Greeks in the 19th century,<sup>99</sup> it was often not possible to distinguish between these two communities culturally. As a result of these shared characteristics, even during the political conflicts that ensued after the proclamation of the Second Constitution, the local Greek population did not act as homogenous community.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>94</sup> The Catholic Priest Joseph Wolff wrote in 1831: “In those places which have not been visited by Roman Catholic missioneries, great barbarity exists, this may be said of the whole of the provinces of Pisidia and Pamphylia: they are ignorant of their religion and ignorant of their history”; see Wolff 1837, 8-9.

<sup>95</sup> French Vice-Consul Leonidas Leatry claimed that the Greeks of Antalya did not know any language other than Turkish and wrote Turkish with a Greek alphabet. He also stated that they were very backward in terms of their customs and traditions: “Les chrétiens qui sont d’origine hellène ne parlent guère que le turc, qu’ils écrivent en se servant des caractères grecs leurs mœurs et coutumes sont très arriérées”; see Alishan 1899, 359.

<sup>96</sup> According to Vital Cuinet, who visited Antalya in the late 1880s, this hostility had recently subsided in part; see Cuinet 1892, 810. Katherine Poseidon offers an explanation for the distinctive character of Antalya within the framework of the local Greek community, stating: “Furthermore, its (Antalya) geographical isolation and relationships with other cities and regions meant that the Orthodox there negotiated changing dynamics mostly on their own terms without direct influence from the Greek state”; see Poseidon 2013, 6-8.

<sup>97</sup> Poseidon 2013, 20.

<sup>98</sup> Chatzipetrou 1969, 37. In 1850 Dimitri Danieloğlu and his friends journeyed to the eastern part of Antalya, where they were met with great respect from the Turkish villagers they encountered. This suggests that the relationship between the two communities was also cordial in rural areas; see Ozil 2010.

<sup>99</sup> The customs and traditions of the local Greeks, which are very similar to the Muslims, are summarized in Chatzipetrou 1969, 74-98; Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:23.

<sup>100</sup> Dayar 2017c.

TABLE 2. Muslim and non-Muslim members represented in the administrative and municipal councils, as well as the commercial tribunal. The table only includes members; officials such as clerks, doctors, and translators are not shown. The heads of municipal council and the commercial tribunal are shown in parentheses. (Sources: Compiled from all published issues of *KVS.*)

	Elected Members of the Administrative Council		Members of the Municipal Council		Members of the Commercial Tribunal	
	Muslims	Non-Muslims	Muslims	Non-Muslims	Muslims	Non-Muslims
1868-1869	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	3
1869-1870	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	3
1870-1871	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	3
1871-1872	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	3
1872-1873	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	3
1873-1874	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	3
1874-1875	2	2	(1) 4	3	(1) 3	3
1875-1876	2	2	(1) 4	3	(1) 3	3
1876-1877	2	2	(1) 4	3	(1) 3	3
1877-1878	2	2	(1) 4	4	(1) 4	3
1878	2	2	(1) 3	2	(1) 4	1
1878-1879	2	2	(1) 3	3	(1) 3	2
1880-1881	2	2	(1) 2	3	(1) 3	2
1881-1882	2	2	(1) 2	3	3	2
1882-1883	2	2	(1) 2	3	(1) 3	2
1883-1884	2	2	(1) 2	3	(1) 3	2
1884-1885	2	2	(1) 3	2	(1) 3	4
1885-1886	2	2	(1) 3	2	(1) 3	3
1886-1887	2	2	(1) 1	2	(1) 3	3
1887-1888	3	1	(1) 1	2	3	(1) 3
1888-1889	3	1	(1) 3	2	-	-
1889-1890	2	2	(1) 3	3	-	-
1891-1892	2	2	(1) 4	4	-	-
1892-1893	2	2	(1) 4	4	(1) 2	3
1894-1895	3	1	(1) 2	4	(1) 2	1
1896-1897	3	1	(1) 3	3	1	(1) 2
1899-1900	2	2	(1) 2	2	2	(1) -
1904-1905	2	2	(1) 4	3	(1) 3	2

All these factors created favorable conditions for the formation of a wealthy merchant class, which had strong relations with the city. It defined itself as “*Antalyalı*” (from Antalya) and had a common sensitivity to the primary challenges of the city. This class, including the local Greeks, sincerely supported the urban infrastructure reforms of the Tanzimat and played a very important role in the transformation of Antalya. The merchants conveyed their demands, such as the modernization of the urban infrastructure<sup>101</sup> or the opening of modern educational institutions,<sup>102</sup> to Konya and the capital through the Antalya Administrative Council or the Municipal Council in which they were active. The merchants, who also took initiatives to improve the commercial potential and competition conditions of the city, demanded that Antalya

<sup>101</sup> For the minutes of the Antalya Administrative Council dated July 23, 1864, which state that a commission will be established for the repair of sidewalks, see *BOA.*, MVL. 691/39.

<sup>102</sup> For the minutes of the Antalya Administrative Council dated December 15, 1864, regarding the demand for the construction of the Rüşdiye School, see *BOA.*, İ. MVL. 532/23879.

be connected to the Aydın Province in 1869. The reason for this was the commercial relations of Antalya with Izmir; however, this attempt was not successful because of the opposition of the city's artisans.<sup>103</sup> The merchants of Antalya, who thought that civic development depended on the construction of a modern port, also attempted to renovate the port facilities and the pier in 1868. Even a tax was levied for this.<sup>104</sup> The continuation of similar efforts in the years following shows the continuity of the responsibility undertaken by Muslim and Christian merchants for the development of the city.<sup>105</sup> As all these examples show, a new wealthy class, formed in Antalya in the middle of the 19th century, had adopted the Tanzimat policies in general and was able to integrate its personal interests with the common good of the city.

During this period when the influence of the merchants increased, Antalya witnessed the emergence of a European consumer culture and a different daily lifestyle, although not as much as other port cities that developed in the 19th century.<sup>106</sup> For example, from the 1850s onwards, the inheritance records of wealthy Muslim women began to include imported consumer goods such as English dresses, English plates, Frankish dresses, Frankish robes, and Frankish cloth.<sup>107</sup> These indicate the emergence of a European consumer culture in Antalya. In addition, since the 1860s, the number of places where Muslims and non-Muslims socialized together had increased. Even taverns and casinos, which numbered among them, spread to a wider area, including Muslim neighborhoods.<sup>108</sup> At the beginning of the 20th century, the number of taverns in the city was 13.<sup>109</sup> The existence of 20 coffeehouses was recorded in 1894,<sup>110</sup> a number that increased to 52 in 1904<sup>111</sup> and 98 in 1914.<sup>112</sup> Towards the end of the 19th century, some of these coffeehouses had turned into places where the urban middle class and citizens got their information. Here Istanbul newspapers, including those in Karamanlidika, a Turkish language written with Greek characters, and magazines were read.<sup>113</sup> In the same period, European fashion became widespread in the city. Local Greek youth, educated in modern dance schools in Izmir, Istanbul and Athens, learned to perform European dances.<sup>114</sup>

### Antalya (1890-1914): Economic Recession and Inter-Community Conflicts

The conditions that gave rise to the urban community that embraced the Tanzimat policies were the economic prosperity of the 1840s to the 1890s, the population balance between the communities, and the fact that nationalism had not yet separated the peoples into homogeneous communities. However, starting from the late 1880s, economic prosperity suffered as

<sup>103</sup> *Ceride-i Havadis*, 15 Receb 1286 (October 21, 1869); 26 Ramazan 1286 (December 30, 1869).

<sup>104</sup> For an example of the Antalya Administrative Council's minutes dated 1868 on the modernization of the port, see *BOA.*, A.) MKT. MHM. 423/29.

<sup>105</sup> For the samples of the minutes sent by the Antalya Administrative Council to the Konya Province on various dates regarding the modernization of the port, see *BOA.*, ŞD. 570/17, p. 4 (August 29, 1881) and *BOA.*, ŞD. 1736/12, p. 2 (October 27, 1898).

<sup>106</sup> For a study that deals with the subject in this context, see Fuhrmann 2020.

<sup>107</sup> Examples dating to the 1850s were compiled from the following sources: *AŞS.*, 6/158; *AŞS.*, 10/10; *AŞS.*, 11/83, 84, 108.

<sup>108</sup> For the reactions to the taverns opened in Muslim neighborhoods, see *BOA.*, HR. MKT. 373/19.

<sup>109</sup> *KVS. Def'a* 30/1332, 649.

<sup>110</sup> *KVS. Def'a* 26/1312, 115.

<sup>111</sup> *KVS. Def'a* 29/1322, 150.

<sup>112</sup> *KVS. Def'a* 30/1332, 649.

<sup>113</sup> Dayar 2017b, 199.

<sup>114</sup> Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:26.

a result of commercial stagnation and even decline. Moreover, at the beginning of the 20th century, each community in the city became increasingly exposed to the effects of nationalism.

The commercial stagnation that characterized the third period of Antalya was partly related to the great depression of the world economy, whose results had been felt since the 1870s.<sup>115</sup> But the main reason for the stagnation was the Izmir-Aydın railway reaching Dinar in the early 1890s.<sup>116</sup> With the completion of this railway, a large interior region previously part of Antalya's hinterland became linked to Izmir, which had become the empire's largest exporting port by the end of the 19th century. As a result, the grain that had previously been exported through the port of Antalya to the islands and Egypt was redirected to Izmir. This caused a decline in the dominant role that grain exports had played in Antalya's economy.

Timber exports, on the other hand, declined as the central government increased its control over forests, and a series of bans was implemented. These prohibitions not only negatively affected the merchants, but also caused a great crisis that resulted in the unemployment of thousands of villagers who made their living from forestry work.<sup>117</sup> By the early 20th century, another factor that negatively affected timber exports was the competition among merchants.<sup>118</sup>

TABLE 3. The annual import and export data for the city reveals the commercial stagnation that took place towards the end of the 19th century, as well as the subsequent decline. (1890 figures from Cuinet 1892, 858; other figures were compiled from various issues of the *RCL*).

	Import (kuruş)	Export (kuruş)
1890	37,160,000	104,000,000
1892	18,542,400	29,083,600
1893	16,752,160	21,947,260
1894	13,221,300	13,267,550
1896	10,046,655	23,389,392
1898	12,524,690	26,469,455
1899	13,146,621	14,676,891
1900	10,939,698	18,296,484
1902	14,579,334	26,128,747

The negative effects of the city's loss of its hinterland to Izmir were mainly seen in imports. In 1892 annual sugar imports fell from 12,000-15,000 bags to 4,000-5,000 bags; similarly, coffee imports fell from 5,000-6,000 bags to 3,000 bags. A similar decline was experienced in oil imports which fell from 30,000 to 10,000 barrels per year as the oil was purchased only for domestic consumption beginning in the 1890s.<sup>119</sup>

In the last decade of the century, the place of exports in the foreign trade volume continued to be more important than imports. Despite the decline in grain and timber exports, the main reason for this situation was the flour shipped to ports in Egypt, Cyprus and Syria but

<sup>115</sup> Pamuk 2018, 26-36.

<sup>116</sup> *BOA.*, Y. MTV. 183/163.

<sup>117</sup> *RCL*, no. 71, 28 Février 1893, 21 and *BOA.*, İ. HUS. 9/58.

<sup>118</sup> *RCL*, no. 184, 31 Juillet 1902, 55.

<sup>119</sup> *RCL*, no. 68, 30 Novembre 1892, 31.

most importantly to those in the Aegean islands.<sup>120</sup> Towards the end of the 1880s, the modernization of traditional mills and the initiation of six factories with the capacity of producing 2,400 bushels of flour per day increased the importance of flour in Antalya's exports.<sup>121</sup>

However, the continued stagnation in commercial life in the city was inevitable, since it did not have a modern port and had limited road access to the inner regions. This situation made the city's economy more vulnerable to the effects of calamities such as drought<sup>122</sup> or epidemics.<sup>123</sup> By the end of the century, the market conditions had caused a major cash crisis and inflation.<sup>124</sup> Imports were limited to the most basic needs of the city,<sup>125</sup> and droughts experienced in the same period as the current cash crisis had worsened the misery. In June 1899 most of the mills in the city were closed, and a very rare event then occurred in Antalya's commercial history: flour had to be imported from Izmir and Thessaloniki.<sup>126</sup>

Although efforts were made to improve silkworm breeding and the supply of manufactured goods to prevent stagnation in economic life and to increase exports, the expected benefit from the production of cocoons and silk could not be achieved due to the lack of education of the producers as well as other reasons.<sup>127</sup> Under these conditions, the merchants of Antalya had only two options to break the hegemony of Izmir over Antalya's hinterland and to remove the effects of the recession period. The first of these was the construction of a modern port, which has always been on the agenda since the 1860s. The attempt by merchants in this regard in the early 1890s was inconclusive, although its necessity was accepted by the Ministry of Public Works, and a comprehensive plan was prepared. The repair, initiated by the merchants in 1898 and whose construction expenses were to be covered by a tax requested by them, was not as extensive as the previous project. After the repair was concluded in November 1901, the dock was partially enlarged. However, even with this attempt, the existing port was not modernized or equipped with new facilities.<sup>128</sup> Furthermore, by the end of the 19th century, the construction of a modern port was no longer a priority for many of the merchants, due to the railway connection established between Izmir and Dinar. Given these circumstances, the merchants of Antalya had no other option but to seek out a new hinterland for the city.

The most suitable region to become the new hinterland for urban merchants was the plain where Beyşehir, Seydişehir and Bozkır were located. This vast and fertile land had a large population and preferred to supply its basic needs from Antalya instead of Konya, where prices were higher. Also Antalya had a port where the agricultural and animal products of the region could be exported.<sup>129</sup> The most important condition for connecting the new hinterland to

<sup>120</sup> *RCL*, no. 112, 31 Juillet 1896, 99; *RCL*, no. 118, 31 Janvier 1897, 68.

<sup>121</sup> *RCL*, no. 99, 30 Juin 1895, 160.

<sup>122</sup> For instance, after 1897 the demand for grain from Europe helped revive commercial life. Nevertheless, this revival was short-lived as it was soon replaced by stagnation due to the drought that hit the region towards the end of the 19th century. See *RCL*, no. 118, 31 Janvier 1897, 68; *RCL*, no. 147, 30 Juin 1899, 1187.

<sup>123</sup> The quarantine measures imposed due to outbreaks of plague and cholera often disrupted the city's trading ties with Egypt, which further destabilized the local economy. See *RCL*, no. 96, 7 Février 1895, 60; *RCL*, no. 147, 30 Juin 1899, 1188; *RCL*, no. 154, 31 Janvier 1900, 64.

<sup>124</sup> *RCL*, no. 76, 31 Juillet 1893, 22.

<sup>125</sup> *RCL*, no. 99, 30 Juin 1895, 162; *RCL*, no. 166, 31 Janvier 1901, 60.

<sup>126</sup> *RCL*, no. 147, 30 Juin 1899, 1187.

<sup>127</sup> *RCL*, no. 154, 31 Janvier 1900, 64; *RCL*, no. 161, 31 Août 1900, 262; *RCL*, no. 171, 31 Juin 1901, 994; *RCL*, no. 182, 31 Mai 1902, 1061; *RCL*, no. 184, 31 Juillet 1902, 55, 56.

<sup>128</sup> Dayar 2022a.

<sup>129</sup> *RCL*, no. 112, 31 Juillet 1896, 100.



Antalya was the modernization of the historical Kesikbeli Road, which provided transportation between Antalya and Konya. The slow progress of the work started in 1894 led to a renewed demand for the road the following year.<sup>130</sup> But for several years almost no progress was made. Therefore, in January 1901 the French Vice-Consul reported that the work begun in 1894 had not yet yielded any results and that this road was Antalya's last hope.<sup>131</sup>

All these efforts are the latest examples of joint attempts by Muslim and Christian merchants to create new opportunities for their city. For by the end of the century, commercial stagnation and the end of the period of prosperity were not the only problems faced by the merchants. From this period onwards, the city was much more exposed to the influence of nationalism that separated communities into monolithic entities.

The nationalist politics that divided the urban community that had adopted the Tanzimat policies were fed from more than one source. First of all, the political atmosphere of the period of Abdülhamid II created favorable conditions for Turkish nationalism to flourish. Similarly, in the city the influence of educational institutions and night schools supported by Athens, as well as associations such as the Philanthropic Brotherhood (*Φιλοθρησκευτικός Αδελφοτικός*) and Michael the Attaleiates (*Μικαήλ ο Ατταλειάτης*), which fostered learning the Greek language among the Turkophone Greek population, had been growing since the end of the century.<sup>132</sup>

On the other hand, the Turkish-Greek War in 1897 exacerbated the stagnation in commercial life.<sup>133</sup> It also deepened the division between the two communities, since it caused many losses among the Muslims of Antalya who were sent to the front line.<sup>134</sup> In no other period in the 19th century had the urban Muslim population suffered such significant losses in the empire's war against a Christian state. The mass immigration from Crete that took place following the war, on the other hand, caused conflicts between the immigrants and the local Greeks, and perpetuated the negative effects of the war.<sup>135</sup>

It is possible to observe the effects of the split between the two communities in the events that developed after the Kaleiçi Fire in 1895. In this great fire (*bârik-i kebir*), about five hundred houses belonging to the Greeks were burned. However, after the fire no aid was given to the Greeks, except for 6,000 drachmas sent by the Association of Asia Minor (*Μικρασιατών Σύλλογος*) in Athens.<sup>136</sup> On June 9, 1899, a telegram was sent to the capital by the heads of the community stating that, while houses were being built for the immigrants coming from Crete, the abandonment of loyal subjects (*tebaa-i sâdıka*) on the streets led them to great despair.<sup>137</sup>

Another development that increased social segregation and paved the way for inter-communal conflicts was the aggravation of the economic recession, which negatively affected the urban merchants. Indeed, except for a few exceptional years, between 1890 and 1912 the city's foreign trade gradually declined. The most important indicator of this is the great decrease

<sup>130</sup> BOA., DH. MKT. 390/12.

<sup>131</sup> RCL, no. 166, 31 Janvier 1901, 60.

<sup>132</sup> Chatzipetrou 1969, 41-42 and Kechriotis 2010, 47.

<sup>133</sup> RCL, no. 124, 31 Juillet 1897, 52.

<sup>134</sup> For the names of some of Antalya's residents who died in Thessaly, see AŞS., 54/348; AŞS., 54/349; AŞS., 54/369; AŞS., 54/392; AŞS., 57/147. The records of some soldiers who died at the front among the inhabitants of the villages and sub-districts of the city are mentioned below: AŞS., 50/558; AŞS., 50/559; AŞS., 50/560; AŞS., 54/381.

<sup>135</sup> Dayar 2017a, 66. Erol discusses external factors, such as migrations and wars, that affected the spread of nationalism in the context of Foça. For comparison, see Erol 2016, 6.

<sup>136</sup> Anonýmou 1907, 254.

<sup>137</sup> BOA., YPRK. AZJ. 38/97.

in the number of ships arriving at the port. While 645 ships, including 470 sailboats and 175 steamboats, arrived at the port in 1889, this number declined every year. In 1912 it decreased to 325 ships, of which 226 were sailboats and 99 were steamboats (see table 4).<sup>138</sup> The economic recession negatively affected many Muslim merchants who dominated political life in the 19th century and were mainly engaged in the timber and grain trade. Muslim merchants, who were an important component of the Tanzimat-era urban bourgeoisie, began to lose their influence, with the increased influence of a new nationalist Muslim middle class, many of which came from artisan families.<sup>139</sup>

TABLE 4. Maritime and commercial movement in Antalya between 1892-1912. (The first seven rows are taken from the relevant numbers of *RCL*; the next rows are taken from the table in Korkmaz 2022).

	Sailer	Steamship	Total Navigation
1892	404	232	636 ships and 138,889 tons
1893	361	192	553 ships and 123,199 tons
1894	354	170	524 ships and 109,775 tons
1896	375	184	659 ships and 116,711 tons
1899	326	140	466 ships and 91,750 tons
1900	345	112	457 ships and 75,155 tons
1902	442	120	562 ships and 72,732 tons
1903	414	112	526 ships and 67,049 tons
1904	432	121	553 ships and 78,237 tons
1905	283	126	409 ships and 66,866 tons
1906	246	119	365 ships and 52,260 tons
1907	235	125	360 ships and 59,202 tons
1908	212	116	328 ships and 51,299 tons
1909	235	114	349 ships and 52,539 tons
1910	128	128	256 ships and 74,124 tons
1911	210	93	303 ships and 56,740 tons
1912	226	99	325 ships and 49,079 tons

The conditions that emerged after all these developments caused the nationalist divisions to evolve into inter-communal conflicts at the beginning of the 20th century. On January 28, 1902, Blanc, the French Consul of Izmir, wrote in his report that Muslim women were forbidden to shop in Christian stores, and Christians were forbidden to enter Muslim houses. In the announcement made by the bellmen, men who violated the ban would be imprisoned, and the women would be subject to financial sanctions.<sup>140</sup> The national economic policy implemented after 1908 to strengthen the new Muslim middle class, the 1910 boycotts in which Muslims targeted non-Muslims in the city,<sup>141</sup> the deportation of wealthy Greeks in May 1915,<sup>142</sup> and the forced departure of Greeks from the city in October 1922 were all natural consequences of this

<sup>138</sup> For the detailed table, see Korkmaz 2022, 354. To detect the decline in the foreign trade of the city, it is necessary to use the total navigation figures due to the increase in prices and inflation in order to obtain more accurate results.

<sup>139</sup> Dayar 2018c, 71-72, 89.

<sup>140</sup> Kechriotis 2010, 50.

<sup>141</sup> Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:368 and Dayar 2017a, 66.

<sup>142</sup> Dayar 2017a, 68.

period.<sup>143</sup> As a result, when the first quarter of the 20th century came to a close, Antalya –the Mediterranean city where the Tanzimat’s “unity policy” was put into practice for a period of time – had become a settlement entirely devoid of non-Muslim residents.

## Conclusion

The increase in the volume of foreign trade in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 19th century made the port cities of the Ottoman Empire a center of attraction for the people living in the interior regions. During this period, port cities became differentiated from interior cities, and their populations increased dramatically as a result of the incessant influx of immigrants. However, this event did not affect all port cities equally. The cities that benefited the most from commercial mobility were those that had a modern port and were connected to their hinterlands by railroads. Cities identified with the “golden age” of the Eastern Mediterranean were the ones that had the necessary infrastructure and transportation facilities. Among these were Beirut whose population increased from around 6,000 in 1820 to over 100,000 at the end of the 19th century,<sup>144</sup> Thessaloniki which had a population of about 15,000 on the eve of the Tanzimat period but had a population of 157,889 in 1913,<sup>145</sup> or Alexandria whose population increased from around 13,000 in 1821 to 320,000 in 1897.<sup>146</sup> Even though Antalya did not have a modern port nor a road network connected with the hinterland, it was relatively a developed city between 1840 and 1890. Nevertheless, it did not benefit from the growth of foreign trade steadily, so its population did not exceed 25,000 throughout this period.

Since Antalya could not benefit consistently from the transformation of port cities in the 19th century, European trade companies did not invest in the city, and service sectors such as banking and insurance did not develop either. So in 1894 the French Consul wrote that there were only two insurance companies in the city –German Norddeutsch and Greek Phoenix–with which no one was satisfied.<sup>147</sup> In this period, industry and textiles remained at a primitive level, and the city was unable to go beyond being a production center mainly for domestic consumption.<sup>148</sup> It is not possible to talk about a developed industry or mechanized agricultural sector in the city, except for the mills that can be considered as light industrial facilities and the leather factory,<sup>149</sup> built in 1882 by the timber merchant, Mustafa Nafiz Efendi, who brought craftsmen and workers from Europe.

In summary, Antalya was unable to fully capitalize on the economic boom of the Eastern Mediterranean during its “golden age.” However, this situation led the way for the formation of an relatively integrated society of Antalya in the 19th century, when in other places religious, ethnic and cultural differences gained an exclusionary status like never before.<sup>150</sup> Indeed, in the 19th century, while cities in the Eastern Mediterranean became the scene of many bloody ethnic conflicts,<sup>151</sup> this was not the case with Antalya. This most important feature

---

<sup>143</sup> Dayar 2017d.

<sup>144</sup> Fawaz 1983, 31.

<sup>145</sup> Anastassiadou 1998, 55, 90.

<sup>146</sup> Ilbert 2006, 24-25.

<sup>147</sup> *RCL*, no. 91, 31 Octobre 1894, 32.

<sup>148</sup> *KVS*. Def'a 30/1332, 488.

<sup>149</sup> *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, 5 Cemazeyilevvel 1299 (March 25, 1882).

<sup>150</sup> Zandi-Sayek 2012, 7.

<sup>151</sup> Mansel 2011, 3, 39, 99.

distinguished Antalya's society from that in other major port cities such as the "plural society" of Izmir<sup>152</sup> or the "cosmopolitanism" of Alexandria.<sup>153</sup> However, this situation was not the result of partnerships, which Nicholas Doumanis considers to be an intrinsic feature of daily life.<sup>154</sup> Rather it was the result of the delicate population balance that emerged in the 19th century and the relatively equal influence of Muslims and local Greeks on the commercial life of the city. The chronic stagnation in commercial life and the increasing influence of nationalism on the communities in the city beginning at the end of the century revealed the fragility of this unity, which had been integrated around a common urban identity.

Another point shown by Antalya is that the transformation of the city, especially until the 1890s, did not take place apart from the imperial center. Eastern Mediterranean port cities in the 19th century were often characterized as places where the influence of the state was weak. It is even claimed that this was what gave these cities their unique character.<sup>155</sup> However, the example of Antalya does not fully support this claim. The centralization policies of the Sultan were decisive for the development of the city during the reign of Mahmud II. Despite its merchants being influential in the transformation of the city and almost all of the public investments during the Tanzimat period, they were almost always supported in their endeavors by the reformist administrators. In fact, this situation shows that the state's cooperation with local actors did not adversely affect the centralization process.<sup>156</sup> The idea of assigning more responsibility to the local community within the framework of the Tanzimat's ideal of "Ottomanism" achieved success in Antalya.

## Bibliography

### Archival Documents

#### *Unpublished Documents*

AŞS. *Antalya Şer'iyye Sicilleri/Antalya Court Records*. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 50, 54, 57, 93.

BOA. *T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi / Turkish Presidency State Archives of the Republic of Turkey Department of Ottoman Archives*

BOA., A.} DVN. DVE. (Saderet Düvel-i Ecnebiyye Evrakı)

BOA., A.} MKT. MHM. (Saderet Mühimme Kalemi Evrakı)

BOA., BEO. (Bab-ı Ali Evrak Odası)

BOA., C. DH. (Cevdet Dâhiliye)

BOA., C. İKTS. (Cevdet İktisat)

BOA., C. ML. (Cevdet Maliye)

BOA., C. NF. (Cevdet Nafia)

BOA., C. ZB. (Cevdet Zabtiye)

<sup>152</sup> Zandi-Sayek 2012, 7.

<sup>153</sup> Ilbert 2006, 28.

<sup>154</sup> Doumanis 2013, 91.

<sup>155</sup> Keyder 2010, 21.

<sup>156</sup> In her comparison of the provinces of Edirne and Ankara during the Tanzimat period, Köksal-Özyaşar highlights the importance of involving local actors in the administration to ensure effective state control; see Köksal-Özyaşar 2022, 37-38.

- BOA., D. BSM. d. (Bab-ı Defteri Başbakikulu Kalemî Evrakı)  
 BOA., D. BŞM. BNE. d. (Bab-ı Defteri Bina Eminliği)  
 BOA., D. HMMH. d. (Bab-ı Defteri Haremeyn Muhasebesi Defterleri)  
 BOA., D. PYM. d. (Bab-ı Defteri Piyade Mukabelesi Kalemî Defterleri)  
 BOA., DH. MKT. (Dâhiliye Nezareti Mektubi Kalemî)  
 BOA., EV. d. (Evkaf Defterleri)  
 BOA., HAT. (Hatt-ı Hümayun)  
 BOA., HR. MKT. (Hariciye Nezareti Mektubi Kalemî)  
 BOA., İ. HUS. (İrade Hususî)  
 BOA., İ. MVL. (İrade Meclis-i Vala)  
 BOA., İ. MTZ. (05) (İrade Mısır)  
 BOA., MVL. (Meclis-i Vala)  
 BOA., NFS. d. (Nüfus Defteri)  
 BOA., ŞD. (Şûra-yı Devlet)  
 BOA., Y. MTV. (Yıldız Mütenevvi Maruzat)  
 BOA., YPRK. AZJ. (Yıldız Perakende Arzuhal Jurnal)

#### *The National Archives (TNA)*

FO. 78-490.

FO. 78-1554.

TS. MA. E 1268-3. Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi Evrakı

#### *Published Documents*

- KVS. *Konya Vilayeti Salmamesi/Yearbook of the Vilâyet Konya*. KVS., Def'a (Number)/Hicri (Hijri)  
 KVS., Def'a 1/1285; KVS., Def'a 2/1286; KVS., Def'a 3/1287; KVS., Def'a 4/1288; KVS., Def'a 5/1289; KVS.,  
 Def'a 6/1290; KVS., Def'a 7/1291; KVS., Def'a 8/1292; KVS., Def'a 9/1293; KVS., Def'a 10/1294;  
 KVS., Def'a 11/1295; KVS., Def'a 12/1296; KVS., Def'a 14/1298; KVS., Def'a 15/1299; KVS., Def'a  
 16/1300; KVS., Def'a 17/1301; KVS., Def'a 18/1302; KVS., Def'a 19/1903; KVS., Def'a 20/1304;  
 KVS., Def'a 21/1305; KVS., Def'a 22/1306; KVS., Def'a 23/1307; KVS., Def'a 24/1309; KVS., Def'a  
 25/1310; KVS., Def'a 26/1312; KVS., Def'a 27/1314; KVS., Def'a 28/1317; KVS., Def'a 29/1322;  
 KVS., Def'a 30/1332.

#### *Contemporary Journals and Newspapers*

Anonýmou. 1907. "Perigrafî tis Póleos Attaleías." *Periodikó Xenofánis* 5:244-59.

*Ceride-i Havadis*, 15 Receb 1286 (October 21, 1869); *Ceride-i Havadis*, 26 Ramazan 1286 (December 30, 1869).

#### *RCL Revue Commerciale du Levant*

RCL, no: 68, 30 Novembre 1892; RCL, no: 71, 28 Février 1893; RCL, no: 76, 31 Juillet 1893; RCL, no: 91, 31  
 Octobre 1894; RCL, no: 96, 7 Février 1895; RCL, no: 99, 30 Juin 1895; RCL, no: 112, 31 Juillet 1896;  
 RCL, no: 118, 31 Janvier 1897; RCL, no: 124, 31 Juillet 1897; RCL, no: 147, 30 Juin 1899; RCL, no:  
 154, 31 Janvier 1900; RCL, no. 161, 31 Août 1900; RCL, no: 166, 31 Janvier 1901; RCL, no. 171, 31  
 Juin 1901; RCL, no. 182, 31 Mai 1902; RCL, no: 184, 31 Juillet 1902.

*Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, 5 Cemazeyilevvel 1299 (March 25, 1882).

### Modern Works

- Ak, M. 2014. "Teke Sancağında 1831 Sayımına Göre Nüfus ve Yerleşme." *History Studies International Journal of History* 6.3:15-44.
- Alishan, L.M. 1899. *Sissouan, ou l'Arméno-Cilicie: description géographique et historique, avec cartes et illustrations*. Venice: S. Lazare.
- Anastassiadou, M. 1998. *Tanzimat Çağında Bir Osmanlı Şehri: Selanik (1830-1912)*. Translated by I. Ergüden. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Anonymous. 1847. "A Turkish Watering-Place 1847." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 380.61:735-54.
- Arnaud, J.L. 2008. "Tradition and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century. Modernization of the Cities of the Ottoman Empire (1800-1920)." In *The City in the Islamic World*, edited by S.K. Jayyusi, R. Holod, A. Petruccioli, and A. Raymond, 953-75. Leiden: Brill.
- Babacan, H., ed. 2012. *Isparta Tarihi, Böcüzade Süleyman Sami*. Isparta: Isparta İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü.
- Beaufort, F. 1817. *Karamania or a Brief Description of the South Coast of Asia-Minor and of the Remains of Antiquity with Plans, Views, &c. Collected during a Survey of that Coast, under the Orders of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, in the Years 1811 & 1812*. London: R. Hunter.
- Carne, J., T. Allom, W. Purser, and W.H. Bartlett. 1836-1838. *Syria, the Holy Land, Asia Minor, &c. Illustrated. In a Series of Views Drawn from Nature by W.H. Bartlett, William Purser, &c. With Descriptions of the Plates*. 3 vols. London / Paris / New York: Fisher, Son, & Co.
- Chatzipetrou, P.P. 1969. *Istoria Tis Attaleias Tis Mikras Asias Apo Tis Ktiseos Afti Mecbri Tou 1922*. Athens.
- Cockerell, C.R. 1903. *Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, 1810-1817. The Journal of C.R. Cockerell*. London: Longmans, Green, and Company.
- Crecelius, D. 2010. "Damiette and Syrian-Egyptian Trade in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century." In *Syria and Bilad al-Sham under Ottoman Rule Essays in Honour of Abdul Karim Rafeq*, edited by P. Sluglett and S. Weber, 155-75. Leiden: Brill.
- Cuinet, V. 1892. *La Turquie d'Asie: Géographie administrative, statistique descriptive et raisonnée de chaque Province de l'Asie-Mineure*. Vol. 1. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Dayar, E. 2016. "Antalya'da Bir Devr-i Sâbık Mütegalibesi: Ömer Lütfi Efendi Lülü (1859-1912)." *Toplumsal Tarih* 271:30-37.
- Dayar, E. 2017a. "Antalya'da Girit Göçmenleri: Göç, İskân ve Siyaset." *Toplumsal Tarih* 279:64-73.
- Dayar, E. 2017b. "Antalya'da "Lisan-ı Millet" in İlk Temsilcilerinden Akdeniz Gazetesi (1925-1926)." *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13.26:181-207.
- Dayar, E. 2017c. "Antalya'da Eşraf, Siyaset ve II. Meşrutiyet (1908-1912)." *Kebikeç, İnsan Bilimleri İçin Araştırma Dergisi* 44:51-70.
- Dayar, E. 2017d. "Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi ve Antalya." *Toplumsal Tarih* 285:44-54.
- Dayar, E. 2018a. "19. Yüzyıl Antalya'sında Mora Göçmeni Bir Aile: Moraviler." *Toplumsal Tarih* 292:24-33.
- Dayar, E. 2018b. "1853 Antalya İsyanı." *Adalya* 21:363-78.
- Dayar, E. 2018c. "Nihayetsiz Bir Cidal: Antalya Gazetesinin Kurucusu Mehmet Emin ve Muarızları (1878-1928)." *Erdem, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi* 75:67-98.
- Dayar, E. 2019. "Antalya'da Mehmet Ali Paşa'nın Arapları-Hacı Ömer Ağa ve Süleyman Efendi." In *Antalya Kitabı*. Vol. 2, *Antalya'da Türk-İslâm Medeniyetinin İzleri*, edited by B. Koçakoğlu, B. Karşlı, and D. Çakılcı, 111-23. Konya: Palet Yayınları.
- Dayar, E. 2020a. "1815 Haritası'nda Antalya Kalesi: Surlar, Kapılar ve Burçlar." *Belleten* 84.300:667-715.
- Dayar, E. 2020b. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Son Dönemlerinde Antalya Kaleiçi ve Çevresi." *Middle East Technical University Journal of the Faculty of Architecture* 37.2:59-84.

- Dayar, E. 2022a. "19. Yüzyılda Antalya'nın Mahfuz Liman Sorunu ve İskele Tamiratları." In *Antalya'nın Denizcilik ve Deniz Ticareti Tarihi*, edited by F. Şimşek, 277-97. Istanbul: Zero Books.
- Dayar, E. 2022b. "Âyânlar Çağında Antalyalı Bir Hânedân: Tekelioğulları (1770-1814)." *The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 59.59:117-56.
- Dinç, G. 2016. "Mehmet Ali Paşa İsyanı'nın Antalya'ya Etkileri (1831-1833)." *Belleten* 80.289:857-84.
- Dinç, G. 2017a. "The Social and Economic Status of the Rum (Greeks) of Antalya in the First Half of the 19th Century." *Adalya* 20:449-90.
- Dinç, G. 2017b. "Tanzimat Dönemi Cizye Defterlerine Göre Antalya Gayrimüslimleri." *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities* 7.2:159-81.
- Doğan, A. 2014. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Modern Anlamda Yapılan İlk Nüfus Sayımı Verilerine Göre Antalya Kaleiçi Nüfusu Üzerine Demografik Bir İnceleme." *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities* 4.2:71-88.
- Doumanis, N. 2013. *Before the Religion, Muslim-Christian Coexistence and its Destruction in late Ottoman Anatolia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eldem, E., D. Goffman, and B. Masters. 1999. *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, İzmir, and Istanbul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Emrence, C. 2011. *Remapping the Ottoman Middle East: Modernity, Imperial Bureaucracy and the Islamic State*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Erol, E. 2016. *The Ottoman Crisis in Western Anatolia: Turkey's Belle Époque and the Transition to a Modern Nation State*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Faroqhi, S. 1981. "Ondokuzuncu Yüzyılın Başlarında Antalya Limanı." In *8. Türk Tarıh Kongresi, Ankara, Türkiye 11-15 Ekim 1976, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*. Vol. 2, 1461-471. Ankara: TTK Yayınları.
- Fawaz, L.T. 1983. *Merchants and Migrants in Nineteenth-Century Beirut*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fawaz, L.T. 1994. *An Occasion for War: Civil Conflict in Lebanon and Damascus in 1860*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fellows, C. 1841. *An Account of Discoveries in Lycia Being a Journal Kept During a Second Excursion in Asia Minor*. London: J. Murray.
- Fuhrmann, M. 2020. *Port Cities of the Eastern Mediterranean: Urban Culture in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Güran, T. 2014. "Bölgesel Ticarete 'Yed-i Vahid' Uygulaması: Teke Sancağı (Antalya Bölgesi) Örneği." In *19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Ekonomisi Üzerine Araştırmalar*, edited by E. Yalçın, 353-66. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Hanssen, J. 2002. "Practices of Integration - Center-Periphery Relations in the Ottoman Empire." In *The Empire in the City Arab Provincial Capitals in the Late Ottoman Empire*, edited by J. Hanssen, T. Philipp, and S. Weber, 49-74. Beirut: Ergon Verlag.
- Hanssen, J., T. Philipp, and S. Weber. 2002. "Introduction: Towards A New Urban Paradigm." In *The Empire in the City Arab Provincial Capitals in the Late Ottoman Empire*, edited by J. Hanssen, T. Philipp, and S. Weber, 1-25. Beirut: Ergon Verlag.
- Hellenkemper, H., and F. Hild. 2004. *Lykien und Pamphylien*. 3 Vols. TIB 8.1. DenkschrWien 320. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Iatridou, K.Sp. 1911. *Symptiki Istoria Attaleias*. Attaleia: N.K. Meli.
- Ilbert, R. 2006. "Dünyaya Açık Bir Akdeniz Simgesi." In *Geçici Bir Hoşgörü Modeli: Cemaatler ve Kozmopolit Kimlik İskenderiye 1860-1960*, edited by R. Ilbert, I. Yannakakis, and J. Hassoun, 21-32. Translated by B. Kılıçbay. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- İnalçık, H. 1960. "Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 3,2:131-47.
- İnalçık, H. 1989. *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age 1300-1600*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Kechriotis, V. 2010. "Bir Nizamnameye Göre 20. Yüzyılın Başında Antalya'daki Rumlar." *Toplumsal Tarih* 201:42-51.
- Keyder, Ç. 2010. "Port-cities in the Belle Epoque." In *Cities of the Mediterranean: From the Ottomans to the Present Day*, edited by B. Kolluoğlu and M. Toksöz, 14-22. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Keyder, Ç., Y.E. Özveren, and D. Quataert. 1993. "Port-Cities in the Ottoman Empire: Some Theoretical and Historical Perspectives." *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 16,4:519-58.
- Kolluoğlu, B., and M. Toksöz. 2010. *Cities of the Mediterranean: From the Ottomans to the Present Day*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Korkmaz, S. 2022. "Geç Osmanlı'dan Erken Cumhuriyet'e Antalya'da Deniz Ticareti ve Ticari Yaşam (1881-1930)." In *Antalya'nın Denizcilik ve Deniz Ticareti Tarihi*, edited by F. Şimşek, 347-81. Istanbul: Zero Books.
- Köksal-Özyaşar, Y. 2022. *Tanzimat Döneminde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu: Ankara ve Edirne'den Bakış*. Istanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Kurmuş, O. 1974. "The Role of British Capital in the Economic Development of Western Anatolia 1850-1913." Ph.D. diss., University of London.
- Mansel, P. 2011. *Levant: Splendour and Catastrophe on the Mediterranean*. London: Yale University Press.
- Ma'oz, M. 1968. *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840-1861. The Impact of the Tanzimat on Politics and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McPherson, K. 2002. "Port Cities as Nodal Points of Change: The Indian Ocean, 1890s-1920s." In *Modernity and Culture. From the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean*, edited by L.T. Fawaz and C.A. Bayly, 75-95. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ozil, A., trans. 2010. *1850 Yılında Yapılan Bir Pamphylia Seyabati. Antalyalı D.E. Danieloğlu*. Istanbul: AKMED.
- Ozil, A. 2020. "A Traveller in One's Homeland: Local Interest in Archaeology and Travel Writing in the Ottoman Greek World in 19th Century Anatolia." *Adalya* 23:497-515.
- Pamuk, Ş. 2018. *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme (1820-1913)*. Istanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Papailias, P. 2005. *Genres of Recollection: Archival Poetics and Modern Greece*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pehlivanidis, G. 1989. *Attaleia kai Attaleiotes*. 2 vols. Athens: Atlantis.
- Poseidon, K. 2013. "Conviviality or Confrontation? How and Why the Role and Character of Education Changed in the Greek Orthodox Community of Antalya between 1869 and 1913." MSc dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Ritter, C. 1859. *Die Erdkunde im Verhältnis zur Natur und zur Geschichte des Menschen: Oder allgemeine vergleichende Geographie: als Sichere Grundlage des Studiums und Unterrichts in physikalischen und historischen Wissenschaften*. Vol. 19, *West Asien*. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- Rogan, E.L. 2002. *Frontiers of the State in the Late Ottoman Empire Transjordan, 1850-1921*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Samaha, C.M., ed. 2002. *Gadaleta's Affair Adalia 1859 or Correspondence Regarding Complaints Against Her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul in that Port*. Istanbul: The Isis Press.
- Seikaly, M. 2002. "Haifa at the Crossroads: An Outpost of the New World Order." In *Modernity and Culture. From the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean*, edited by L.T. Fawaz and C.A. Bayly, 96-111. New York: Columbia University Press.



- Spratt, T.A.B., and E. Forbes. 1847. *Travels in Lycia, Milyas, and the Cibyratis*. 2 vols. London: John van Voorst.
- Tchihatchef, P. 1850. "L'Asie-Mineure et l'Empire Ottoman: Situation politique, militaire et financière de la Turquie." *Revue des Deux Mondes* 6.5:840-63.
- Varkıvanç, B. 2008. "Some Thoughts on the Development of the Walls of Antalya." In *Taşta Yazılan Zafer: Antalya İçkale Surlarındaki Selçuklu Fetihnâmesi / Victory Inscribed, The Seljuk Fetihname on the Citadel Walls of Antalya*, edited by S. Redford and G. Leiser, 133-39. Adalya Suppl. 7. Antalya: AKMED.
- Weber, S. 2010. "The Making of an Ottoman Harbour Town: Sidon / Saida from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries." In *Syria and Bilad al-Sham under Ottoman Rule Essays in Honour of Abdul Karim Rafeq*, edited by P. Sluglett and S. Weber, 179-239. Ottoman Empire and its Heritage 43. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Wolff, J. 1837. *Researches and Missionary Labours Among the Jews, Mobammedans, and Other Sects*. 1st American ed., rev. and cor. by the author. Philadelphia: Orrin Rogers.
- Zandi-Sayek, S. 2012. *Ottoman Izmir: The Rise of a Cosmopolitan Port, 1840-1880*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.





