

The Morean Rebellion and National Heroes in the Greek Public Opinion in the Two-Hundredth Year of the Rebellion

Esra Özsüer*

Abstract

The nation-state model, which emerged as an idealized structure in Central Europe in the 19th century, is an important starting point for the disintegration of multi-ethnic political institutions such as the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire, which gathered many different identities and belongings in terms of socio-political terms, witnessed the armed struggles of different nations that wanted to become a nation in the Balkan geography, especially since the 18th century, due to the political deformation that occurred in the institutional framework of the state. As a result of these rebellion movements in the Balkans; Greece, which was the first to gain its independence from the Ottoman Empire, carried the “Greek” perception in the Turkish national memory from the “loyal nation” to the “treacherous nation” in terms of both initiating the loss of the empire in European lands and exemplifying the crash of the Pax-Ottomana system.

First of all, in order to analyze the ‘treacherous Greek’ image in Turkish historical construction, it is necessary to understand the ‘System of Nation (millet)’ that constitutes the institutional structure of the Ottoman Empire and what the “nations” that are members of this system mean. As a matter of fact, the Serbs, Bulgarians and Romanians, who rose up and gained their independence after the Greeks in Turkish History, were not devalued (they were not discredited) as much as the Greeks. The general opinion formed in official historiography is that these nations caused rebellion or disorder, but the Greeks betrayed the Ottomans. At this point, it is important to analyze the role of the Greek nation in the institutionalization of the state in detail.

* Assoc. Prof., İstanbul University, Institute of Turkic Studies, İstanbul/TÜRKİYE,
esra.ozsuer@istanbul.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-6299-5929
DOI:10.37879/9789751758866.2024.185

In Greek historiography, the Peloponnese Revolt symbolizes the establishment of independent Greece as the “Greek Revolution”. Therefore, the separation of Greece from the Ottoman Empire is described as a victory contrary to Turkish historiography. Celebrating the bicentennial of the Peloponnese Revolt in 2021, Greece has carried out many studies on the subject and conducted surveys re-evaluating the Greek Revolt in the collective perception. In this paper, an evaluation will be made about how the Peloponnese Revolt was perceived in Greece in its bicentennial year. In the paper, the literature on the subject will be searched and the Greek people’s view of the rebellion in the sociological context will be analyzed in the light of new data.

Keywords: The Morean Rebellion, Greece, National Heroes, Greek Historiography, Turkish Historiography.

İki Yüzüncü Yılında Yunan Kamuoyunda Mora İsyanı ve Ulusal Kahramanlar

Öz

19. yüzyılda merkez Avrupa’da idealleştirilmiş bir yapı olarak ortaya çıkan ulus-devlet modeli, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu gibi çok etnili siyasi kurumların dağılıp parçalanmasında önemli bir başlangıç noktasıdır. Sosyo-politik açıdan birçok farklı kimlik ve aidiyeti bünyesinde toplayan Osmanlı, bilhassa 18. yüzyıldan itibaren devletin kurumsal çatısında meydana gelen politik deformasyondan ötürü Balkan coğrafyasında uluslaşmak isteyen farklı milletlerin silahlı mücadelelerine tanıklık etmiştir. Balkanlarda çıkan bu isyan hareketleri sonucunda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndan bağımsızlığını ilk alan Yunanistan, hem İmparatorluğun Avrupa topraklarındaki kaybını başlatması hem de Pax-Ottomana sisteminin iflasını örneklemesi bakımından “Yunan” algısını Türk ulusal belleğinde “sadık milletten” “hain millete” taşımıştır.

Öncelikle Türk tarih inşasında “hain Yunan” imgesinin çözümlenebilmesi için Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun kurumsal yapısını oluşturan “Millet Sistemi”ni ve bu sisteme üye olan “milletler”in ne anlama geldiğini iyi anlamak gerekmektedir. Nitekim Türk tarihinde Yunanlılardan sonra ayaklanıp bağımsızlıklarını elde eden Sırlar, Bulgar ve Romenler, Yunanlılar kadar değersizleştirilmemişlerdir. Resmi tarih yazımında oluşturulan genel kanı bu milletlerin isyan ya da karışıklık çıkardığı ancak Yunanların ihanet ettiğine yöneliktir. Bu noktada devletin kurumsallığı içinde Yunan milletinin rolünün detaylı analiz edilmesi önemlidir.

Yunan tarihyazımında ise Mora İsyanı, “Yunan Devrimi” olarak bağımsız Yunanistan’ın kuruluşunu simgelemektedir. Dolayısıyla Yunanistan’ın Osmanlı hakimiyetinden ayrılması Türk tarihyazımının aksine bir zafer olarak nitelendirilmektedir. 2021 yılında Mora İsyanı’nın iki yüzüncü yılını kutlayan Yunanistan konuyla ilgili birçok çalışmayı gerçekleştirmiş ve kolektif algıda Yunan Ayaklanması’nı yeniden değerlendiren anketler gerçekleştirmişlerdir. Bu bildiriye iki yüzüncü yılında Mora İsyanı’nın Yunanistan’da nasıl algılandığına dair bir değerlendirme yapılacaktır. Bildiriye konuyla ilgili literatür taraması yapılacak ve sosyolojik bağlamda Yunan halkının isyana bakışı yeni veriler ışığında analiz edilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mora İsyanı, Yunanistan, Ulusal Kahramanlar, Yunan Tarihyazımı, Türk Tarihyazımı.

Introduction

When compared to the characteristics of the previous centuries, perhaps the most important characteristics of the 19th and 20th centuries are their departure from the hazy image of the ethnic feelings and gaining a more salient silhouette. In fact, just like many theorists, who made theoretical and empirical studies on nationalism, Ernest Gellner characterized the first nationalist rebellions in the 1830s as the second stage¹ of nationalism.² However, the French Revolution of 1789, which the Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm defined as *double revolution*,³ and the [British] Industrial Revolution, which is deemed as its contemporaneous, are the first stage of the transformation that the world has encountered, and in essence they are a twin chaos, because the French Revolution, which has political characteristics, and the British Revolution, which has more industrial characteristics, surpassed their local boundaries -those revolutions are not phenomena that purely belong to France and England- and turned into large scale mass movements.

1 The first stage starts with replacing a universal order and those who rule it with the sovereign states. When history of Europe is considered, the emergence of nations and nationalism is also the process of creation of a new system of states since the 18th century. This system which is defined as the nation-state system is a new political construction from the feudal political order to the central state structure. This construction is exported to other corners of the World by the Europeans in the following stages and it has different phases. Ernest Gellner, *Milliyetçiliğe Bakmak*, trans. Simten Coşar, Saltuk Özürtürk, Nalan Soyarık, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 2013, pp. 45-47; Ozan Erözden, *Ulus-Devlet*, On İki Levha Yay., İstanbul 2013, s. 3.

2 Gellner, *ibid*, p. 48.

3 Eric Hobsbawm, *Devrim Çağı 1789-1848*, trans. Bahadır Sina Şener, Dost Yay., Ankara 2013, p. 7.

Especially the second half of the 18th century became an era of crisis for the political regimes and economic systems of Europe. Moreover, the last decades of the century continued by turmoil which from time to time amounted to rebellion or the independence movements of the colonies that sometimes amounted to separation. The political tensions which took place in America (1776-1783), Ireland (1783-1784), Belgium and Liege (1787-1790), the Netherlands (1783-1787) and Geneva (1779) distanced some of the historians from perceiving the French Revolution as an isolated incident in itself, because the French Revolution, which was ecumenical and whose impacts are deemed as long-termed, was only one of the revolutions that took place at the age of democratic revolutions. On the other hand, among the contemporary revolutions, only the French revolution is deemed as having ideas that revolutionized the world and in terms of its characteristics, it has the overarching quality that includes the world. For instance, the American Revolution, which gave birth to crucial consequences for the American history, did not leave an important mark other than the countries that were involved with and included in it. However, the French Revolution became a turning point in all countries. Namely, the rebellions that have led to the independence of the Latin American countries after 1808 were the repercussions of the French Revolution rather than the American Revolution. In addition, the Hindu Reform Movement and Hindu nationalism had been inspired by the French Revolution and they revealed that the French Revolution had an impact up to Bengal. For this reason, the French Revolution acquired itself a strong place as the revolution of its century although it was not the only example of its kind.⁴

Although the process was painful, the 19th century, which became the stage for radical changes especially in the political, legal and social structures of states, was a century where the *Anciens régime*, which represented the monarchies and the privileges of the monarchies in many places of Europe, was terminated and afterwards the democratic republics were established. The full political and military hegemony of Europe around the world was also the product of the double revolution. The problem of nationalities, which emerged everywhere, turned the Eastern Question into a permanent crisis in the Ottoman Empire, which entered into a period of regression against the threat created by both the internal disintegration and the ambitions of rival Great Powers, primarily Great Britain, Russia and France to a lesser

4 Hobsbawm, *ibid*, pp. 64-65.

degree. Therefore, the Ottoman State, which from time to time experienced traumas due to the military power of Europe and Russia, had to face the threat directed to its existence at the beginning of the 19th century which was regarded as the longest century of the empire⁵; and here the contribution of the strengthening of Austria and Russia and increasing their commercial and cultural impacts may not be ignored.⁶

The nation-state model, which emerged as an idealized structure in Central Europe in the 19th century, was an important departure in the disintegration of the multiethnic political institutions such as the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman State⁷, which turned into a Balkan empire at the end of the 15th century, gathered many different identities and loyalties in itself in terms of the socio-political perspective. Especially with the political deformation that took place in the institutional umbrella of the Ottoman state starting from the 18th century, the nationalist currents and movements in the Balkans (indeed nationalism was a phenomenon, which existed in essence since the beginning of the Ottoman hegemony in the Balkans and developed and strengthened over time)⁸ caused the armed struggles of the Christian communities, which wanted to become a nation. Additionally, the Ottoman State, which lost its authority domestically and internationally after the Second Siege of Vienna, and became unsuccessful, was unable to prevent the development of nationalist movements in the Balkan Peninsula, because the unsuccessful Second Siege of Vienna, when the problem of nations became concrete, indicated not only to the European states, but also to the Balkan peoples that the Ottoman power could be defeated. Therefore, this fiasco brought the Ottoman Rumelia in the 17th century to a dynamism, which was different from that of the previous periods.

Indeed, such kinds of rebellious movements may neither be explained by the actual and visible entry of the Ottoman State into the disintegration process, nor be indicated as an ordinary outcome of the French Revolution of 1789. Merely, those two approaches would not go beyond a hasty judgement, because the self-enclosed religious and ethnic groups within the Ottoman Empire, namely the cosmopolitan structure, was far from having the ability

5 İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Kronik Yay., İstanbul 2019.

6 Hobsbawm, *ibid*, p. 113, 34.

7 The borders of the Ottoman Empire in the 15th century extended from Bosnia in the West to Bessarabia in the north. Ortaylı, *ibid*, p. 61.

8 Ortaylı, *ibid*, p. 61.

to adapt to the world of the 18th and 19th centuries. Additionally, the vast majority of the subjects comprising the Empire were groups of people who had earlier established states, and owned independent churches and literary languages. There were also nationalist movements between both the Slavic and Greek intellectuals since the Renaissance [For instance, Rigas of Velestin (Rigas Fereos) was a respectable pioneer in his country in the national and social liberation of Greece]. Those peoples started to adopt the nationalist current and organize with the impact of the bourgeoisie who became rich through trade, the clergy and the Philhellenes in Europe in the 18th century. Ortaylı explains one of the factors that accelerated the beginning of this process by eliminating the *devshirme* system in the 17th century. According to Ortaylı, the prominence of Anatolian Turkishness in the Ottoman rule and the dominant Ottoman culture brought the end of Ottomanness in the traditional empire which may be characterized as cosmopolitan just like the Rome of the Ancient Times and Byzantine of the Middle Age and “Ottoman” in the real sense.⁹

Nationalism and the nationalist movements that arose in the Balkan Peninsula need to be evaluated separately from the Western Europe¹⁰ because the Balkan nationalism in the 19th century differed from the nationalist movements in the colonial countries of the contemporary world. This had two salient reasons: First reason was the absence of the bourgeoisie in the Balkans as this is the case in western Europe.¹¹ Second reason was the fact that the Balkan nationalism displays different characteristics than the Western nationalism. The basic point of differentiation while explaining the nation building process in Europe was the mutual interaction of the state and nation. While the oldest modern nations, Great Britain and France, had a long state tradition, the “late” nations such as Germany and Italy in the 19th century brought together the national union struggle by a united state struggle based on a cultural movement uniting people sharing the same

9 Ortaylı, *ibid*, pp. 63-64.

10 For detailed information regarding the subject matter, see: Elie Kedourie, *Avrupa’da Milliyetçilik*, trans. Haluk Timurtaş, Köprü Kitap, İstanbul 2017; Miroslav Hroch, *Avrupa’da Milliyetçi Uyanış Toplumsal Koşulların ve Toplulukların Karşılaştırmalı Analizi*, trans. Ayşe Özdemir, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 2011.

11 When the 18th century came, the Serbian and Greek bourgeoisie started to appear. When compared to the Serbs, the Greek bourgeoisie appears to be more international. In many places around the world, Greek trading colonies were formed such as Odessa, Marseilles, Trieste and London. The powerful presence of the Greeks in the trade of Thessaloniki allowed them to expand throughout Balkans and Eastern Europe over time.

ancestry and language.¹² The Eastern European national movements were mostly a kind of independence movements fighting for separating from big and multiethnic empires such as Habsburgs, Romanovs and Ottomans. The nation building process of Western Europe took place within the already existing state and accompanied the establishment of the state following political modernization. However, nationalism in Eastern Europe¹³ was in essence conducted outside of the already existing state or against it. While nationalism in the West was more socio-political oriented and had a definition of more volunteer nationhood as it might be seen in the French Revolution, nationalism in the East primarily emphasized cultural and linguistic rights based on a nation-based perception.

Hans Kohn (1891-1971) who is regarded as an authority regarding the history of nationalism examined the phenomenon of nationalism in two sharply separated areas such as the Western and Eastern Nationalisms in his studies regarding the topic.¹⁴ Alternatively, the variants of nationalism were considered as bipolar such as the West and the rest¹⁵ as Stuart Hall expressed. In those two types of nationalisms, which are independent from each other, the Western nationalism is explained as based on citizenship and politics, and the Eastern nationalism is explained as based on ethnicity and culture. Moreover, against the Western nationalism, which is regarded as moderate, the Eastern nationalism is regarded as “hostile”, “non-liberal”, “oppressive” and “dangerous”.¹⁶ Namely, against the liberal Western

12 Claus Offe, *Varieties of Transition: The East European and East German Experience*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1997, pp. 51-52.

13 Indeed, it is not correct to classify all Eastern European nations as “ethnic nationalists”. For instance, nationalism of Poland and Hungary may be associated more with the Western nationalism because those two states developed on a long independent state tradition and the basis of ruling elites. Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups Among the Smaller European Nations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1985, p. 9.

14 Hans Kohn, “Western and Eastern Nationalisms”, *Nationalism*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1994, pp. 162-164.

15 Stuart Hall, “The West and the Rest Discourse and Power”, *Formations of Modernity*, eds. Stuart Hall & Bram Gieben, Polity Press, Cambridge 1992, p. 276.

16 This type of approach is a thesis which is put forward in the studies of Anglophone nationalism. Namely, in the perspective of Anglophone nationalism, the West is associated with “good” nationalism and non-Western world (East) is associated with “bad” nationalism. Krzysztof Jaskułowski, “Western (civic) versus Eastern (ethnic) Nationalism the Origins and

nationalism, the Eastern nationalism is exclusionary and authoritarian.¹⁷ The nationalist current in the Balkans, which was mostly identified with the Eastern nationalism, found itself an area of activity in a later period when compared to the Western European nationalism. The Balkan nationalism had some special characteristics that differentiates it from its counterparts in Western Europe. For instance, Karpat uses the phrase of “community nationalism” to define the Balkan nationalism, which was formed by the mixture of religious and ethnic characteristics.¹⁸ Maria Todorova, who also has remarkable studies regarding the Balkans, considered “the Orthodox” belief as the specific gravity of this community nationalism with a similar approach.¹⁹ In the national independence movements that mostly emerged in the Balkans, the Orthodox Church manipulated Christianity and the ideology of nationalism simultaneously.

Karpat, who mentioned that the powerful popular communitarianism on which the Balkan nations relied for legitimacy and power had been inherited from the Ottomans, indicated that the element of ethnic affinity, which was part of the mutualism of communitarianism and nationalism, developed and got stronger during the Ottoman rule. Indeed, the deepening of the Orthodox Christian peoples in the Balkans their loyalties towards belief and the representatives of the communities through belief by their feelings of religious identity and their development of their ethnic identities, which became the other component of their modern political identities, took place under the Ottoman “millet system”. Although, the Ottomans did not encourage them to develop their ethnic and political identities, it was the purpose of the millet system to develop their religious feelings of identity or encourage their loyalty to their beliefs or the representatives of their beliefs.²⁰ On the other hand, the religious ties of Orthodox Christianity were not about the feelings of dissatisfaction of the people against the regime, they were actually about the fact that the Ottomans perceived the religious ties as the most important distinguishing feature among the people. The existence of community nationalism was possible by the unity of the community, because the community nationalism, which was composed of the mixture of

Critique of the Dichotomy”, *Polish Sociological Review*, 3/2010, Vol. 171, p. 290.

17 James Kellas, *Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1991, pp. 73-74.

18 Kemal Karpat, *Balkanlar'da Osmanlı Mirası ve Milliyetçilik*, Timaş Yay., İstanbul 2019, p. 20.

19 Maria Todorova, *Balkanlar'ı Tabayyül Etmek*, tr. Dilek Şendil, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 2015.

20 Karpat, *ibid*, pp. 20-21.

religious and ethnic characteristics, may only create an area of activity with the unity of a community. This popular element, whose impact was powerful, opened the door for some hesitation regarding the secular identities of the Balkan states. Although those states, especially Greece, provided the guarantee that they were secular to the West, they may not hide the fact that they persistently adopted religious – ethnic nationalism when their policies and political programs were examined.

The nationalist currents in the Balkans developed with the purpose of establishing a new state by the conflicting nations against the already existing state rule which is different from Western Europe [what is meant by the already existing rule are the Ottoman and Habsburg rules]. In fact, as the defenders of the national movements in the Balkans acted with the idea of including the regions where their kin located beyond the central geography where they lived into their own lands, the ideal of establishing a “Grand” state is the key of the expansionist nationalism in the Balkans when the matter is evaluated within the boundaries of Eastern nationalism (for instance, the Megali Idea of Greece is the most appropriate example to be given in this regard).²¹ In fact, the emergence of Balkan nationalism corresponded with the collapse of the traditional Ottoman order. The militaristic and political attacks of the European states towards the Balkan lands after 1683 caused both the disintegration of the Ottoman social structure and thusly the establishment of independent states in the region either directly or indirectly. The first and the most important factor in the development of the nationalist feelings that surfaced in the Balkans before the signature of the Treaty of Berlin was the defeat of the Ottoman military power at the gates of Vienna in 1683. Following this defeat, the Habsburgs occupied Buda in Hungary and some parts of Serbia and destroyed the Muslim population in those places by emphasizing that the Catholic Christians were dominant there. However, as the Orthodox Christians did not trust the Papacy and they preferred the Ottoman rule rather than the Catholic rule, it did not become possible for the Austrian expedition to create an effective propaganda regarding rebellion.

The real factor that sparked the rebellions in the Balkans were the Russian attacks on the Ottoman Empire. Tsar Petro’s desire to become the protector of the Balkan Orthodox Christians with the comprehensiveness of “Orthodox Christian brothers” officially became a reality with the Treaty

21 Meltem Begüm Saatçi, “Balkan Ulusçuluklarına Dair Bir Değerlendirme: Farklı Uluslar Farklı Usuller”, *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*, Vol. 6, No. 23, Fall 2009, p. 16.

of Küçük Kaynarca (1774) signed after the Turco-Russian War. Russia's gaining the right to represent the Orthodox Christians in the Balkans under the Ottoman Rule against the Ottoman Government (*Bab-ı Âli*) broke the Ottoman monopoly of power in this region and the Orthodox *millet* was exposed to the Russian impact.²² Briefly, the permanent contribution that Russia made to the Balkan nationalism need to be thought both in terms of making the Orthodox Christianity a political ideology in the Balkans and of mobilizing the Orthodox Christians against the Ottoman State by using this ideology. Thusly, the Balkans became the carrier of this special type of political administration, which aimed to establish nations by the national movements²³, which started towards the end of the 18th century, and became the region, which benefitted from this at the highest level.²⁴

For Greece, the late 18th century introduced two important incidents that mobilized the Greek society. The first one was the victory that Russians gained against the Ottomans in the Turco-Russian War between 1768 and 1774. With the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, which ended the war, the glory of the Ottomans, which once intimidated the Great European Powers, left its place to a weak empire. The Russian interventions in the east showed at the Greek front that their "wild" masters could be defeated, and thusly it provided hope to the Greek nation so that materializing freedom was no longer a possibility but it could become a reality. The French Revolution formed another aspect of this hope, which was slowly growing among the Greeks. The great French victories in obtaining their political freedoms

22 Karpat, *ibid*, pp. 31-32.

23 Many Balkan historians believe that the Serbian Rebellion of 1804 initiated the nationalist rebellions in the region. Three basic elements may be mentioned in the independence movements of the Serbs. The first one is the social and economic developments that led to the birth of the bourgeoisie in the Serbian society. The second one is the arbitrariness continuing in the Ottoman rule. The third one is the provocations of Austria, Russia and France. Austria and Russia maintained their propaganda especially from the religious aspect, and France maintained its propaganda from the nationalist and democratic aspect. In fact, the same elements may be considered for the Greeks in the Ottoman State. On the other hand, there are also some salient differences between the Serbian and Greek rebellions. The Serbian rebellion movement developed gradually and it started initially as a reaction against the oppression of the janissaries. However, the Morean Rebellion is a movement which was prepared earlier and was aiming independence from the beginning. Sina Akşin, "Siyasal Tarih (1789-1908)", *Türkiye Tarihi 3 Osmanlı Devleti 1600-1908*, ed. Sina Akşin, Cem Yay., İstanbul 1992, pp. 97, 102.

24 Karpat, *ibid*, p. 38.

domestically and spreading the principles of their revolution to the rest of Europe indicated the necessity of Enlightenment to all other nations, which were struggling for similar targets. Therefore, the intense impact of such events and processes, which had been taking place in Europe, revealed the necessity of the Greek Enlightenment among Greek intellectuals such as Rigas and Korais.

The Historical Background of the Morean Rebellion of 1821

In the late 18th century, two risks should not be ignored regarding the future of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan lands. The first one was the excitement for democracy and the doctrine of nationalism that the French Revolution created in the Ottoman State; and the second one was the Russian propaganda of Orthodoxy and Pan-Slavism, which aimed to disintegrate the Ottoman Empire.²⁵ Following the end of the Turco-Russian war between the years of 1787 and 1792, the Greeks understood that in fact, the Russian policies and promises were nothing but frustration.²⁶ The feeling that the Russians left the Greeks to their fate brought the French Revolution to the fore, which resonated powerfully among the Greek intellectuals. The excitement that the *liberté, égalité, fraternité* motto of the French Revolution created among the Greeks who supported the Enlightenment served as a catalyzer in emergence of a conscious, purposeful and orderly politics. The fundamental transformation that the French Revolution caused in the Greek politics and Greek social thought in the last decade of the 18th century was in essence

²⁵ Aksin, *ibid*, p. 83.

²⁶ In 1750 monk Theoklitos Polyidis, travelled different regions of Greece and collected various prophecies. He prepared a small booklet by adding his prophecies on top of the prophecies that he had collected and started to distribute the booklet titled *Heralding Angel* () in different settlements in Greece. The booklet stated that the Balkan Christians would get rid of the Ottoman rule in a short amount of time because the blonde race (ksantho genos) would come for help soon. Γιάννης Κορδάτος, *Ιστορία της Νεώτερης Ελλάδος [History of Modern Greece]*, Τόμος Α, Εκδόσεις 20ος αιώνας, Αθήνα 1957-58, pp. 202-203. At this point, it is an important problematic whether the booklet prepared by Polyidis was closely related to the Russian Mediterranean policy that they had been maintaining since the end of the 18th century in the Balkans against the Ottomans by using the traditional religious ties. In fact, during the Turco-Russian war of 1770, it is almost impossible for the rebellion started by the Greeks with the provocations of Russian General Kont Orlov in the Morea under the impact of the myth of “blonde race” which was perceived as the great savior (Orlov Rebellion/Orlofika). Νίκος Β. Ποτζόκος, *Εθναφύπνιση και Εθνογένεση. Ορλωφικά και Ελληνικά Ιστοριογραφία [Awakening and Birth of the Nation. Orlofika and Greek Historiography]*, Βιβλιόραμα, Αθήνα 2007, pp. 13-38.

closely related to the Enlightenment philosophy of Rigas of Velestin (1757 - 1798) who closely experienced the rural Greek society [Rigas was born and grew up in the village of Velestino of East Thessalia]. In the alternative that Rigas offered to all Balkan nations, there was the idea of reversing the existing conditions by a revolution to be started against the Sultan and making the transition to the republican type of regime. Indeed, in the 3rd Article of Rigas' declaration named "Human and Citizenship Rights" in his revolutionary manifesto, a definition was made regarding the equality of all peoples whether Christian or Muslim (Turkish).²⁷ Additionally, in his united map composed of twelve pages that he published in Vienna in 1796, the Balkan union attracted the attention rather than the borders of Greece. Those borders were also understood from his manifesto composed of four sections named *The New Political Rule of the Residents of Rumelia, Asia Minor, Aegean Islands and Moldavia and Wallachia*. On the other hand, the name of the new order to be established was determined as the "Hellenic Republic". This meant that there would be a new political order where the Greeks were dominant or had the final say in the administration, including all Balkan nations plus the Turks. The mentioned rule where the old and the new exchanged places would also radically restructure / transform the politics and society. Especially, Rigas's close relationship with the speakers and supporters of the revolutionary France and his participation into local politics after some time turned into a militant patriotism. The conception of fraternity among the Balkan nations constituted the ferment of this rebellion challenging the authority of the Sultan whom he perceived as "the despot". The Orthodox Christian belief was at the core of this Pan-Balkan fraternity conception.²⁸

In this manner, the Greek "national" awakening started to develop first in the 18th century with the political activities of Rigas of Velestin. Rigas would topple down the Ottoman rule and allow other Balkan nations along with the Greeks to achieve independence through revolution. Another supporter of Enlightenment who determined the necessary principles regarding the political and moral structuring of Greece in the process going towards independence was Adamantios Korais (1748-1833). The republicanism of

27 Θάνος Μ. Βερέμης, *21 Ερωτήσεις & Απαντήσεις Για το 21 [21 questions and answers regarding 1821]*, Μεταίχμιο, Αθήνα 2020, pp. 128-129.

28 Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *Aydınlanma ve Devrim Modern Yunanistan'ın Kuruluşu*, trans. Si-nem Güldal, Alfa Yay., İstanbul 2021, pp. 296-313.

Korais who was inspired by the ideals of republican classicism was more of a liberal republicanism and he believed that moderation would help the spread of liberal ideology. As Korais perceived the Republican rule as a moral and social reform tool, he believed that the needs of the Greek society had to be examined well. He never diverted to the harsh utopian projects that might endanger the Greek nation. For this reason, he accepted the moderate theoretical republicanism as the safest route going towards political change. Therefore, the revolution that Korais supported was a revolution of morals. According to him, the Enlightenment began when the dilemma of the people was overcome by consciousness and this was only possible by the return of the nation to its Antic Greek roots. The dialectic of culture and freedom that Korais built with the Antic Greece in a sense formed the roots of the Greek national movement. Because in Korais' world, it was only temporary to achieve independence without cultural structuring and he believed that without this configuration the infrastructure of the concept of freedom would not be built. Consequently, it was not possible for the Greek problem to become successful without cultural transformation. One of the most important matters that kept Korais busy, who was especially under the impact of the Enlightenment philosophers such as Montesquieu and John Locke was the struggle between civilization and barbarism in the history of mankind. At this point, he related the fall of the Greeks not with the character of the nation, but the conditions that were imposed on it.²⁹ Korais and the Greek supporters of the Enlightenment following Korais' school accepted the cultural transformation as the sections of a long-term strategy on the path of political freedom and independence.³⁰ According to Korais, there were three basic pillars in the end of the long time period -namely the national salvation- in which the Greeks experienced the Ottoman oppression. The first one was freedom, the second one was education and the third one was trade, which was regarded as the factor undermining the oppression of the kings.³¹

29 Βερέμης, *ibid*, p. 131

30 Kitromilides, *ibid*, pp. 394-395.

31 In fact, the Greek trading ships armed against the pirates were called to the Morea when the rebellion started and they were equipped with new weapons. Therefore, the Ottoman State encountered a rebellious fleet in the Aegean Sea suddenly in the first weeks of the rebellion. Those ships that eliminated security in the Eastern Mediterranean and increased in numbers displayed the necessary effort for the rebellion to spread in the islands. Meral Bayrak, *1821 Mora İsyanı ve Yunanistan'ın Bağımsızlığı*, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler

Today, in the Greek historiography, the names such as Rigas and Korais are regarded as the apostles³² of the Greek Enlightenment. Therefore, the role of the Enlightenment in the Greek independence struggle is highlighted by capital letters. Thanos Veremis, the Greek historian, relates the basic motivation in Greece's emergence as the nation-state with the struggles of the fighters of 1821 in the domestic fronts, the external assistance of Philiki Eteria and Philhellenes³³ and the idea of independence of the French Revolution that the Greek diaspora got to know due to trade. Veremis defines the Greek independence movement as the preliminary preparation of the resurrection of the new nation-state to be established with the French model in the Hellenic lands.³⁴ In the Greek historiography, the Morean Rebellion³⁵ is a nine-year armed freedom movement, which is composed of four different stages.

Its first stage was the conflicts that took place between the years of 1821 and 1823 in the Morea, Central Greece and the Aegean Islands.³⁶ The Greek

Enstitüsü, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, January 1999, p. 78.

32 Βερέμης, *ibid*, p. 127.

33 The idea that the basis of the legitimacy of a state was the rule of people summarizes the liberal ideology of the revolutions of the 18th and the 19th centuries. The concept of Philhellenism is generally associated with the elements of liberal ideology. The Italian radicals who longed for the Greek independence and Napoleon's past, the anti-monarchy groups in Great Britain, and German visionaries adopting the idea of a united Germany and the adventurers of the period all took place in the Greek struggle for independence. However, it may not be argued that all Philhellenes were active at the fronts during the war. Many of them were distinguished by the assistance that they provided from their homelands and others supported this movement by taking part in various commissions established for supporting the Greek struggle in the European capitals and other big cities. In the catalogue printed by Henri Fornezy in 1884, names of 421 Philhellenes were mentioned. Germans constituted the majority of the Philhellenes who came to support the rebellion from various European countries. For a detailed study about the subject matter, see: Esra Özşüer, "19. Yüzyıl Avrupa Romantiklerinin 1821 Mora İsyanı Üzerindeki Siyasi ve Kültürel Etkileri", *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 2016, pp. 325-344.

34 Βερέμης, *ibid*, p. 127.

35 In the Turkish historiography, the process, which is named as the Morean Rebellion of 1821, is expressed as a revolution or rebellion in the Greek historiography. The author remained loyal to the Greek terminology in the text taken from the Greek sources and used the expressions of Greek Revolution or Greek Rebellion (publisher's note).

36 The Morean Rebellion spread to Cyprus, Chios, Samos, Kos and Crete Islands in a short amount of time and the rebellion movements affected the shores of Western Anatolia. About the subject matter, see: Mübahat Kütükoğlu, Mübahat Kütükoğlu, "Yunan İsyanı Sırasında

rebels who wanted to oust the Ottomans and establish an independent state started an armed rebellion in 1821. The Philiki Eteria, which was established in Odessa in 1814 and the rebellion³⁷, which started in the Princedoms of Danube with the unsuccessful attempt of General Alexander Ypsilantis, who was the aide of Tsar Alexander I, later spread to the Morean Peninsula and became successful there. Alexander Ypsilantis who found an opportunity when the Ottomans started to struggle with Tepedelenli Ali Pasha started a rebellion in Moldavia and Wallachia (*Memleketeyn*); however, he was defeated by the Ottoman troops when he was unable to gather the necessary support from the Serbs, Bulgarians, Romanians and especially Russians. Undoubtedly, one of the most important reasons for the failure of Ypsilantis's rebellion was the fact that the support that he was expecting from Russia never came. On the other hand, when he was unable to gather support from the people of Moldavia and Wallachia, the Serbs and the Bulgarians, Ypsilantis' rebellion became unsuccessful. Although Russia, which wanted to expand towards the Balkans and get rid of the Ottomans, perceived the rebellion as a light of hope in its policy to reach İstanbul, which was heralded by Tsarina Catherine II, Russia acted with the purpose of saving Moldavia and Wallachia from the Greek princes (*Fenerliler*) and used its efforts in this regard more than fighting against the Ottoman forces. Therefore, this attempt failed because Russia was unable to provide the necessary support although it wanted the rebellion to succeed. On the other hand, the Russian Tsar Alexander I's attendance to Laibach Conference where the revolutionist movements in Italy and Spain were discussed in the period when the rebellion started in Moldavia and Wallachia and the Russian support was expected was another reason for Russia to fail to provide support. Prince Metternich, the Austrian Prime Minister, and the Tsar, by

Anadolu ve Adalar Rumlarının Tutumları ve Sonuçları”, *Üçüncü Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildiriler, Tarih Boyunca Türk-Yunan İlişkileri (20 Temmuz 1974'e Kadar)*, Genelkurmay ATASE Yay., Ankara 1986, pp. 133-161.

37 Ypsilantis was hesitant at the beginning regarding where to start the rebellion. However, majority of the members of Philiki Eteria preferred the Morea. However, according to Ypsilantis, Moldavia and Wallachia were more suitable for the rebellion. The biggest reason was that he wanted to mobilize the Balkan communities such as Romanians, Serbians, Bulgarians and Montenegrins and allow for the fast spread of the revolution in the Balkans. On the other hand, Ypsilantis believed that he would be able to gain support from Russia because Moldavia and Wallachia were at the Russian border. Moreover, in the event that a rebellion took place in Moldavia and Wallachia, the Ottoman State would not be able to send soldiers over the rebels without obtaining the approval of Russia. This would allow the rebels to gain time and would make it easier for them to rebel. Bayrak, *ibid*, p. 63.

the impact of the Holy Alliance, rejected to support the rebellion led by Ypsilantis and did not attempt anything to prevent the intervention of the Ottoman soldiers. In fact, in the Laibach Conference gathered to prevent revolutionary movements, the Philiki Eteria was regarded as an illegitimate rebellious organization just like the secret organization of the Carbonari.³⁸ The reason for the success of the Morean Rebellion, which started in the Peloponnesian Peninsula, was related to both the support given by Ali Pasha, the Notable of Ioannina and the support of Russia, Great Britain and France (Three Great Powers) for Greece. Therefore, the Morean Rebellion started as a *bona fide* social rebellion.³⁹ A great ethnic cleansing was carried out against the Turkish population during the Morean Rebellion and in summer of 1821, there were almost no Turks left in the region because more than twenty thousand Turks were massacred by the Greeks.⁴⁰

The second stage is the Greek Civil War between 1823 and 1825, which was silently avoided in the Greek official historiography. The Greek Civil War, which emerged as a power struggle for the new Greek State for the leadership of the revolution in the period when the rebellion was going on, was composed of two stages. The first stage arose due to the rivalry of the elite politicians and the army to take control of the state. In this internal power struggle which may be described as the power struggle within the Greek independence movement, two separate centers/governments arose, one led by Kolokotronis on one side, and the other led by Kunduriotis and Mavrokordatos, on the other side.⁴¹ In the first stage of the civil war, which lasted from the fall of 1823 until summer of 1824, there were intense political disagreements and in the second stage, which lasted from July of 1824 until January of 1825, there was the regional rivalry of Rumelia and Hydra against the Morea. Mavrokordatos, Kolletis and Georgios Kunturiotis, who were among the significant figures of the rebellion, formed a front against the Peloponnesian notables and Kolokotronis with the assistance of the notables of Rumelia.⁴² Afterwards, this local division ended by the election of Ioannis Kapodistrias as the first head of government of Greece (1828-1831).⁴³

38 *Cevdet Paşa Tarihinden Seçmeler*, Vol. II, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul 1973, p. 433.

39 Karpas, *ibid*, p. 42.

40 William St Clair, *That Greece Might Still Be Free the Philhellenes in the War of Independence*, Open Book Publishers, Cambridge 2008, p. 1.

41 Πέτρος Θ. Πιζάνιας, *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση 1821-1830 [Greek Revolution 1821-1830]*, Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστίας, Αθήνα 2021, p. 79.

42 Interior Greece at the north of the Morea and south of Epir and Teselia.

43 Βερέμης, *ibid*, p. 12.

The third stage was the political developments that took place between 1825 and 1827. In this period when the Greeks were in conflict with each other, Sultan Mahmud II made an agreement with Mehmet Ali Pasha of Kavala, the Governor of Egypt, and requested his assistance in quelling the rebellion. Sultan Mahmud II, who saw the weakness of the Ottoman Army after the capture of Ioannina attempted to ask for the assistance of the Governor of Egypt with a great unwillingness.⁴⁴ The success of the trained and regular army under the command of Mehmet Ali Pasha in quelling the rebellion that arose in Crete created an expression regarding that the Morean rebellion would also be quelled. Mehmet Ali Pasha stated that he would help quelling the rebellion with the condition that the Morean state would be fully independent and be given to his son, İbrahim Pasha. When the requests of the Governor of Egypt were accepted, the fleet under the command of İbrahim Pasha left Egypt in July 1824 and landed on Crete first, and on the Morea the next year. The rebellion in the Morea was quelled when the troops of İbrahim Pasha captured Mesolongi (1826) and Athens (1827).⁴⁵

The political developments between 1828 and 1832 determined the fourth and the last stage of the Morean Rebellion. Especially, the involvement of Mehmet Ali Pasha in the Greek affairs upset some balance of power politics in Europe. The death of Tsar Alexander (1825) and ascension of Nikola Pavlovich (Nikola I), who had military talent, to the Russian throne changed the dynamics of Russian politics. The new Tsar, who was hostile to the Holy Alliance and the Turks and sympathetic to the Greeks, put Russia's private interests above everything else, not the general interests of Europe. Therefore, just like the Great Britain, Tsar Nikola I also found it problematic for a powerful governor like Mehmet Ali Pasha settling in the Morea and Crete to become dominant in Eastern Mediterranean, because the determining role of France in the Egyptian Reforms would make the impact of France inevitable in the region. Such a situation was against the Russian interests. In fact, Nikola I, after ascending to the throne, acted to resolve the Greek problem for the favor of Russia. First, he made a direct diplomatic attack by sending an ultimatum to the Ottoman Government in 1826 indicating his opposition regarding execution of the Treaty of Bucharest of 1812. By the Treaty of Akkerman (October 7, 1826) Russia obtained great advantages in the Balkans and the Ottoman seas. The possibility of Russia to gain influence

44 Akşin, *ibid*, p. 103.

45 Rifat Uçarol, *Siyasi Tarih (1789-1994)*, Filiz Kitabevi, İstanbul 1995, p. 142.

in the Mediterranean through Greece worried Great Britain and caused it to take action. Great Britain, which signed the St. Petersburg Protocol with Russia on April 4, 1826, was not against establishment of a smaller Greece, which would be under its protection. According to the signed protocol, the Greeks would become an autonomous state under the authority of the Ottomans with a tax and all Turks would be taken out of Greece.⁴⁶

When the matter was perceived from the perspective of international diplomacy, the joint decision⁴⁷ of Great Britain and Russia, which they made with the St. Petersburg Protocol, was significant in terms of making the first step in the establishment of the Greek state, because Russia and Great Britain decided and acted for solving the Greek Problem according to their own wishes due to the protocol they signed. Russia and Great Britain which notified the Ottoman Government for applying the principles of the protocol was unable to realize what they wanted as the Ottoman Government perceived this as an intervention into their domestic affairs and rejected to apply it, in 1827. The negative response of the Ottoman Government resulted in the unification of the Great Powers in the Greek problem against the Ottomans. On the other hand, according to the London Protocol that Russia signed with France on July 6, 1827, it was decided to make Greece an independent state. Great Britain, Russia and France notified the decisions that they made in the St. Petersburg and London Protocols to the Ottoman Government again on August 16, 1827 and they requested the Ottomans to apply those principles. However, the Ottoman Government rejected those principles again by considering those principles very heavy as they meant the expulsion of the Turks from Greece and the disintegration of the empire. Afterwards, Great Britain, Russia and France attempted to cut the connection of the Morea with the Ottoman State by sieging the peninsula with their fleets. When the request of the allies was rejected for the Ottoman soldiers and fleet to leave Greece the fleets of three states entered into the Navarino Port and burned down the Ottoman fleet on October 20, 1827.

⁴⁶ Uçarol, *ibid*, p. 144.

⁴⁷ The Protocol was also submitted for the approval of other European states; however, Austria under Metternich's rule rejected to join the Protocol with the justification that the Protocol was not suitable for the Austrian domestic and international politics. In addition, Prussia did not approve the decisions of the Protocol under the influence of Austria.

The Navarino Incident, which meant the actual collapse of the Metternich System and the Holy Alliance, both lowered down the Ottomans to the status of a “naval empire without a fleet” and rendered the Turkish forces controlling the Morea defeated.⁴⁸ The Turco - Russian War, which took place later (1828 - 1829), led to the beginning of the rebellion in the Morea again. The Ottomans, who were fighting against the Russians in the Balkans and the Caucasians, also had to fight against the Greek rebellion. The European States, who were especially worried about the Russian successes against the Ottoman State, convened to terminate the war and signed a protocol (London Protocol) through their representatives who convened in London on March 22, 1829. According to this protocol, an independent Greek State composed of the Morea and the surrounding areas plus the Cyclades islands would be established. At a moment when the Turco – Russian war was going on, the protocol which was submitted to the Ottoman Government was initially rejected, however the Ottoman Government had to accept the protocol because Russia occupied Edirne. The Ottomans wanted to make peace with Russia and the Russian representatives signed the Treaty of Edirne on September 14, 1829. According to this Treaty, the agreement and protocol (10th Article) stipulating establishment of the Greek state and its independence was accepted by the Ottoman State. Due to the protocol which was signed on February 3, 1830 it was decided to establish a fully independent Greece. This decision, which was notified to the Ottoman Government by the Ambassadors of the Great Powers in İstanbul on April 8, 1830 was approved by the Ottoman State on April 24, 1830 and thusly the Greek State was officially established.⁴⁹

Greece which obtained its independence from the Ottoman State in the consequence of those rebellious movements that emerged in the Balkans transformed the Greek perception in the memory of the Turkish nation from “the loyal nation” [*millet-i sadıka*] to “the traitor nation” in terms of both initiating the losses of lands of the empire in Europe and becoming an example for the collapse of the Pax-Ottomana system. On the other hand, as the Balkans were the first region where the Ottomans started to lose lands for the first time, this created a huge trauma in the Turkish collective memory brought by the feeling of anger and betrayal. Against this trauma, an official tendency to forget the Balkans was adopted.⁵⁰

48 Uçarol, *ibid*, p. 147.

49 Uçarol, *ibid*, p. 152.

50 Tanıl Bora, “Turkish National Identity, Turkish Nationalism and the Balkan Problem”, *Bal-*

The Morean Rebellion in the Greek Official Historiography: March 25, 1821, A Myth or Reality?

Although the Morean Rebellion, which was described as the Greek Revolution / Rebellion (Elliniki Epanastasi / Ellinikos Ksesikomos) in the Greek historiography, started in spring⁵¹ of 1821, according to the narrative in the official historiography, the Rebellion started on March 25 in the Kalavrita village at the Peloponnesian Peninsula in the Agia Lavra Monastery when a priest named Paleon Patron Germanos raised the flag carrying the holy icon in the air. However, the information regarding the beginning of the rebellion on March 25 in the manner described above is ambiguous. For instance, the Morean Rebellion first started on February 24, 1821 by Alexander Ypsilantis in the city of Iasi (Yaş) of Moldavia and Wallachia with the manifesto of “*Our War For the Sake of Homeland and Religion*”.⁵² On the other hand, in his memoirs, Theodoros Kolokotronis, who was regarded as one of the prominent heroes of the Morean Rebellion wrote that the rebellion started in the cities of Patra and Kalamata in the Peloponnesian region on March 22.⁵³ Another important information regarding the Morean Rebellion was that the shoemaker Panagiotis Karatzas, who was the Patra representative of Philiki Eteria raised the flag of rebellion.⁵⁴ Both significant figures of the Greek national independence movement declared the start of the rebellion before March 25.

Another important detail regarding the ambiguity of the information stating that the Morean Rebellion started on March 25 lies in the information provided in the memoirs of Paleon Patron Germanos. In his memoirs, Paleon Patron Germanos wrote that he went to the Peloponnesian Peninsula as the representative of Philiki Eteria at the end of January of 1821 and met with the prominent clergy in the region. He also indicated that the notables of the region were hesitant against the Greek national hero Papaflessas who was very keen about the rebellion because the notables believed that the

kans A Mirror of the New International Order, eds. Günay Göksu Özdağan & Kemal Saybaşılı, Eren Yay., İstanbul 1995, p. 104.

51 Bayrak, *ibid*, p. 65.

52 Άρδην, Τεύχος 97, Ιανουάριος-Σεπτέμβριος 2014, p. 39.

53 *Απομνημονεύματα περί της Ελληνικής Επαναστάσεως του Φωτάκου [Fotakos's memoirs regarding the Greek Revolution]*, Πρώτου Υπασιστη του Θεοδώρου Κολοκοτρώνη, Τύπος και βιβλιοποιλείω Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, Αθήνησι 1858, p. 21.

54 Σπυρίδων Τρικούπης, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης [History of Greek Revolution]*, Τόμος Πρώτος, Εκδοτικός Οργανισμός Λιβάνη, Αθήνα 1993, pp. 82-84.

conditions for the rebellion had not matured yet. According to Germanos, the biggest reason for the differences of opinion regarding the rebellion among the rebels was the absence of a leader who would take control of the country after the rebellion. According to his personal statements, the Greeks who did not even know how to use forks and knives did not have the capacity to take control of the country after the rebellion.⁵⁵

In his memoirs that he penned down, it is clearly understood that Paleon Patron Germanos did not support the Morean Rebellion. On the other hand, another striking detail in his memoirs is that Paleon Patron Germanos wrote that he had been in Nezara, which is a village near Peloponnesian Peninsula on March 25.⁵⁶ Additionally, this village is not in a distance to the Agia Lavra Monastery where the flag of rebellion was raised that may be travelled in one day due to the absence of roads or making the travels by horses/donkeys. Therefore, it was impossible for him to reach the place where the rebellion started from the place where he was within the day. In this case, how did Paleon Patron Germanos raised the flag for the rebellion and initiated the rebellion despite the fact that he was not at the Agia Lavra Monastery on March 25? Furthermore, no information was provided regarding that he started the rebellion in his memoirs. It does not seem possible that he failed to mention the moment, which may be regarded as the most glorious moment in his life and in the national history of Greece.⁵⁷

In his book titled *History of the Greek Revolution*, historian George Finlay who was in Greece during the Morean Rebellion indicated that the information regarding that the rebellion started by Paleon Patron Germanos at the Agia Lavra Monastery was a national myth and it was not correct.⁵⁸ In the first volume of his book titled *History of the Greek Revolution* the Greek historian Spyridon Trikoupis also refuted the information regarding that the Morean Rebellion started with the flag raised by Paleon Patron Germanos at the Agia Lavra Monastery.⁵⁹ Also, another Greek historian Kremmydas explained that the March 25 was a national myth outside of reality with the following statements:

55 Παλαιών Πατρών Γερμανός, *Απομνημονεύματα [Memoirs]*, Εκ του τυπογραφείου Σπύρου Τσαγγάρη, Εν Αθήναις 1900, pp. 22-23.

56 Παλαιών Πατρών Γερμανός, *ibid*, p. 28.

57 Esra Özsüer, *Türkokratia. Avrupa'da Türk İmajı*, Kronik Yay., İstanbul 2018, pp. 259-262.

58 George Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolution*, Vol. I, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London 1861, pp. 180-181.

59 Τρικoupης, *ibid*, κεφάλαιο 4, σημείωση δ, p. 291.

Nothing, but nothing actually happened on March 25. That day just symbolizes the day when the Virgin Mary conceived Jesus. However, it was associated with the glad tidings of the birth of the Greek State so that it makes a connotation. The date of March 25 is the day chosen for evocation of two holy events. This selection is not an action which was performed independently or casually or by pure emotion. This connotation has the purpose to render functionality to the mechanism that serves the political, economic and church dominance creating the power of the state. The real rebellion started in contemporary Romania on February 22 and in Kalamata on March 23. However, the political, economic and church dominance was united with the Evangelismos tis Theotokou (Holiday of Good News to Virgin Mary) for uniting the independence holiday of the nation with the church. The date of March 25 is not a special day other than uniting the church and the national holiday.⁶⁰

As it is seen, neither the rebels who took part in the Morean Rebellion, nor the prominent historians of Greece provided the slightest information regarding that the rebellion started by the raising of the flag of rebellion at the Agia Lavra Monastery on March 25. However, how did people accept this important day, which is the symbol of independence of the nation in the official Greek historiography without any questioning? In 1824, the French traveler François Charles H. L. Pouqueville (1770-1838) wrote for the first time that the Morean Rebellion started when Paleon Patron Germanos raised the flag of rebellion at the Agia Lavra Monastery in his book titled *History of Greek Revolution*.⁶¹ The French traveler narrates the rebellion in a romantic language in his book under the impact of the current of Romanticism prevailing in Europe. Thusly, the assistance and support expected from Europe would grow fast like a snowball under the created emotional atmosphere. The origin of transforming the date of March 25 into a national myth arises from the only information in this regard mentioned in Pouqueville's book.

60 Βασιλῆς Κρεμμυδάς, “Η εθνική γιορτή στο σχολείο” [National holidays in schools], Η Εποχή, 31.10.2004; “Δεν χωράνε 5 αιώνες ιστορίας σε 130 σελίδες” [5 centuries do not fit into 130 pages], Έθνος της Κυριακής, 24.03.2007; “Η Εκκλησία στο Εικοσιένα. Μύθοι και Ιδεολογήματα” [Church, Myths and Ideologies in 1821], Τα Νέα, 22.03.2005; *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση του 1821 [Greek Revolution of 1821]*, Gutenberg, Αθήνα 2016.

61 François Charles Hugues Laurent Pouqueville, *Historia tēs Hellēnikēs Epanastaseōs, ētoi, Hē anagennēsis tēs Hellados: meta kallitechnikōn eikonōn kai meta parartēmatos, pe riechontos tēn historian, tēs Boumpoulinas, tēs Tzavella, tēs Kanarē, tēs Monarchidou, tēs Papalexopoulou, tēs Botsarē, kai tōn allōn hērōidōn Hellēnidōn, tou hierou agōnos*, (epimeleia Aristeidou N. Kyriakou), Ekdot. Graphieion V.K. Tsangarē, En Athēnais [1839?], pp. 26-29.

The basic reason for including the Agia Lavra Monastery into the national myth was the demand to bring the prominent clergy of the Greek Church into the forefront in the national struggle for independence. The purpose was to present the Greek Church and the Greek State as a whole for the perception of the people with the synthesis of Hellenism and Orthodoxy. The painting named “The Oath-taking in the Church of Agia Lavra” made by Theodoros Vryzakis in 1851 was a strong step towards recording this national myth in the visual memory of the people. Later, many other painters in Europe presented the painting in different compositions. Indeed, the attempt to perceive the Greek Church in a unity with the state after the Greek Church became autocephaly lies at the core of all of those attempts. In the Greek collective memory, the rebellion, which started against the Ottomans, did not just start for the motherland, but also for the religion. Therefore, the holy centers of the struggle were the churches and the holy guards of the struggle were the clergy. For instance, the explosion of the monastery at the Kougki Fortress by Monk Samuil, who did not surrender to Ali Pasha who sieged Souli on December 13, 1803, was another example indicating that the clergy was patriots who had “great devotion”⁶² for freedom and homeland.

The transformation of March 25 into a national holiday officially happened with the issuance of a royal decree by King Otto on March 15, 1838.

For all Greeks, the date of March 25 is a holy day when Virgin Mary gave the glad tidings of Jesus. Also, the day when the independence movement of the Greek nation started is also a holy and happy day. Due to these two reasons, it was decided to celebrate March 25 as a national holiday.”⁶³

The announcement of March 25 as a national holiday did not take place in the consequence of a deep historical research. In fact, no research was made regarding when the revolution exactly started. March 25 was a date which was created later on. According to the Christian tradition, the Archangel Gabriel told Virgin Mary that she would conceive Jesus, God’s son. The reception of the news by Virgin Mary that she would give birth to God’s son and the national announcement regarding the rebirth of the Greek nation are the two important elements in constructing the national myth of March 25.

62 Σπυρίδων Π. Αραβαντίνογ, *Ιστορία Αλή Πασά του Τεπελενλή [Story of Tepedelenli Ali Pasha]*, Εκ του τυπογραφείου των καταστημάτων Σπυρίδωνος Κουσουλίνου, Εν Αθηνάις 1895, p. 164.

63 Αθηνά, 23.03.1838, Αριθμός 518, p. 3.

Another important metaphor regarding March 25 was considering Virgin Mary in the same connotation as the concept of motherland. When the concepts of motherland and nation were considered as reflections of mother and family, Virgin Mary assumed the role of the homeland as the mother of the Greek nation, and the Greek nationalists assumed the role of Gabriel as the one who gave the glad tidings.⁶⁴ Even King Otto issued the Royal Decree by highlighting that the date of March 25 was a holy and bright day. If we pay close attention, we realize that the Royal Decree first mentions the *Evangelismos* (the day when Jesus was heralded) and later the national Independence Day. Shortly, this situation indicates the idea of “Jesus is coming into the world and the nation is also coming into the world” very clearly. Both symbols deeply intertwined so that March 25 has been celebrated enthusiastically in each national holiday even if it is known that March 25 is not the day when the rebellion started. Because belief and ethnicity are two indispensable elements strengthening each other in the social context.⁶⁵ The basic justification in having March 25 as the national holiday is a political purpose using religion in the affairs of the state.⁶⁶

The Morean Rebellion of 1821 in Its Two-Hundredth Year in the Greek Public Opinion: National Victories and Screams

According to Ernest Renan, nationalism relies on forgetting, not on remembrance and in order to unite the people, they have to forget. Renan explains the necessary condition of becoming a nation to leave the past in the past (leave history in the history) and to forget some memories. Because providing national unity may only be possible by forgetting as historical research reveal the incidents of violence at the beginning of all political formations.⁶⁷ On the other hand, in his book titled *National Identity*, Anthony D. Smith argued that a repertory needed to be created out of common values, symbols and traditions to establish social ties. For instance, the symbols such as the flag, anthem, monuments and celebrations remind

64 Ioannis N. Grigoriadis, *Kutsal Sentez Yunan ve Türk Milliyetçiliğine Dini Aşlamak*, trans. İdil Çetin, Koç Üniversitesi Yay., İstanbul 2014, p. 63.

65 Gellner, *ibid*, p. 97, 101.

66 Χριστίνα Κουλούρη, “Γιορτάζοντας το Έθνος: Εθνικές Επέτειο στην Ελλάδα του 19ου αιώνα” [National Celebration: National Celebrations in Greece in the 19th Century], *Αθέατες όψεις της ιστορίας [Invisible Face of History]*, επ. Δέσποινα Παπαδημητρίου & Σεραφείμ Σεφεριάδης, Ασίνη, Αθήνα 2012, p. 196.

67 Ernest Renan, *Ulus Nedir?*, trans. Gökçe Yavaş, Pinhan Yay., İstanbul 2019, p. 37.

the individuals of the community their common heritage and cultural affinity. Indeed, according to Smith it is also important to forget some historical moments as well as remembering them. However, forgetting is not the only condition for providing the common identity and the sense of belonging, sometimes it is necessary to remember.⁶⁸

In places where history becomes insufficient, it needs to be reconstructed and even “reinvented”. In both cases, the ethno-history is always selectively used. The ethno-history has always been used for both social and political purposes. The nationalists were not just interested in “their own” history, but also in the reinterpretation of a mythology regarding the past of “their own peoples” country. Especially by remembrance of the golden ages, the cultural legacy is politicized in a sense. The elaboration of poetic spaces means the description of a holy country/land, which historically belongs to the community and thusly blessed by the community.⁶⁹ In this regard, the Greek Revolution of 1821 (The Morean Rebellion), which the Greeks define as the national independence movement, is a historical victory that needed to be “remembered” in defining and reinforcing the national unity.

When it is considered that the nation is imagined as a community⁷⁰, the Greek nation claims that it has risen from its ashes again with the independent nation-state model in the second decade of the 19th century. As it was the case with the new nationalisms in Europe, they started to imagine themselves as waking up from a deep sleep one by one.⁷¹ Just as it happens in the “nation building” policy of the new states, they attempted to spread the nationalist ideology through mass communication, educational system, administrative arrangements and other similar means with a real and popular nationalist enthusiasm.⁷² For the Greek nation, the past is highly significant due to the tight relationship that it has with the Ancient Greece. It needs to be remembered altogether and it should not be forgotten. However, it is also necessary to erase the record of a period from the collective memory, which is expressed as the *periods of silence* in its own past. For this reason, the nation picks whatever moments it wants from its history (mostly those moments are the moments of victory) and evaded the unwanted ones as the periods of silence. For instance,

68 Anthony D. Smith, *Milli Kimlik*, trans. Bahadır Sina Şener, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 1994, p. 35.

69 Smith, *ibid*, p. 197.

70 Benedict Anderson, *Hayali Cemaatler Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması*, trans. İskender Savaşır, Metis Yay., İstanbul 2009, p. 22.

71 Anderson, *ibid*, p. 215.

72 Anderson, *ibid*, p. 129.

1821 has been continuously repeated as the glorious history when the national independence was achieved. Kolokotronis or Papaflessas were described in the same characteristic properties as Leonidas who was among the heroes of the Antic Greece. Because the umbilicus of the Greek nation was that kind of narratives proving that the Greek nation was born out of the Antic Greece.⁷³ The victory achieved against the Ottoman period which was defined as the foreign, “dark age” and “national other” was symbolized with the screams in the official historical narrative of the Greek Rebellion of 1821. Therefore, the most important symbol used in the definition of the national identity and national unity in Greece was the date of March 25 and its anniversaries.

In this manner, the year of 1921 for Greece was regarded as a symbolic year because it was the hundredth anniversary of the national war of independence which is perceived as the most important milestone in the recent history of Greece and for the first time, the Greek State planned a glorious celebration on the date of March 25, 1921. Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos and the Minister of Education Spyridon Lambrou, who decided to form a committee for preparing the celebrations for the hundredth anniversary, submitted a draft (numbered 1375) in the Greek Parliament on April 12, 1918 regarding “*establishment of the committee for celebrating the national independence*”.⁷⁴ Following the draft, “the Central Committee of the Hundredth Year” was appointed by the Royal Decree.⁷⁵ The symbol of the Committee of the Hundredth Year was “the phoenix”, which symbolized the independence of Greece. Themistoklis Sofoulis became the chairperson, Vice Admiral Pavlos Kountouriotis and the Metropolitan of Athens, Meletios and the Minister of Greek Fleet and Arm Commander Panagiotis Daglis became the vice chairpersons of the committee.⁷⁶ The main responsibility of the Central Committee of the Hundredth Year was to appoint special or local committees that would arrange artistic activities, publications and historical presentations. While all preparations in Greece were continuing for the hundredth year celebrations, the defeat of the Greek Army against the Turkish troops on March 1921 caused the indefinite delay of the celebrations by the Hundredth Year Central Executive Committee. The Central Committee of the Hundredth Year convened again for the preparations of the celebrations

73 Ernest Gellner, *Uluslar ve Ulusçuluk*, trans. Büşra Ersanlı Behar, Hil Yay., İstanbul 2008, p. 62.

74 ΦΕΚ Α 92/1918 – 28 Απριλίου 1918.

75 ΦΕΚ Α 106/1918 – 15 Μαΐου 1918.

76 A new committee with new members replaced this Committee, which was established in 1918, because Venizelos lost elections in November 1920 and the new government replaced the members in the committee and established a new one with anti-Venizelist members.

in December of 1928, however the organizations for celebrations were planned for the hundredth year of the Independence Protocol (London Protocol) signed on February 3, 1830 by the Guarantor Powers, not for the beginning of the Greek Revolution.⁷⁷ All media organs of the period paid a great deal of attention to the hundredth year celebrations of the Greek State and the prominent newspapers of Athens published the news regarding the significance of the day for their readers in their issues dated March 25, 1930. The hundredth year celebrations were performed with cheers in Greece with the expressions of “*the unprecedented struggle of freedom of a people who is determined to become free or die and the hundredth year of the free life afterwards*”



Source: Ακρόπολης, «Πώς έγινε η Ελλάς Κράτος, εις εκατόν ετη» [How was the Greek State created? In the hundredth year.], 25.03.1930, Έτος 2, Περίοδος 2, Αριθμός φύλλου: 416, p. 1.

77 Εμπρός, 25.03.1930, Έτος 34, Αριθμός φύλλου: 12.227, p.1.

“Today, Greece celebrates the hundredth year of its independence. Hundred years ago, in February of 1830 in London, the Guarantor Agreement was signed where Greece was announced as an independent state after the eight-year bloody struggle against its occupier.”

The image shows a page from the newspaper "ΕΜΠΡΟΣ" (Embros) dated March 25, 1930, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Greek War of Independence. The page features several portraits of national heroes: "Ο ΜΑΥΡΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΣΑΡΟΣ" (The Black Pirate) at the top left, "ΟΤΑΝ ΥΨΘΗ ΤΟ ΛΑΒΑΡΟΝ" (When the Flag is Raised) in the middle left, and "ΠΕΡΑΣΑΝ ΕΚΑΤΟ ΧΡΟΝΙΑ" (One Hundred Years Have Passed) at the top right. A central illustration shows a woman in traditional dress. The page is filled with columns of text and smaller portraits of other figures like "Ο ΜΑΥΡΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΣΑΡΟΣ" and "Ο ΜΑΥΡΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΣΑΡΟΣ".

Source: Εμπρός, 25.03.1930, Έτος 34, Αριθμός φύλλου: 12.227, p.1.

“Dark Pirate”

“When the flag is raised...”

“Hundred years have passed.”

At the headline of the Embros Daily, the national heroes of 1821 are displayed.

As it was not possible to make the hundredth year celebrations of the Greek independence struggle in a period when the Asia Minor Military Expedition was going on, the Greeks displayed a special double effort to cover a historical gap in the two hundredth year celebrations of the revolution. However, the measures taken worldwide due to the Covid-19 pandemic also put the matter of postponing the two hundredth celebration into the agenda. Despite this entire negative course of events, Greece announced to the public that it would celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the revolution with the following statement:

The hundredth anniversary of the revolution was not celebrated as it overlapped with the chaos of the Asia Minor Military Expedition. In addition, this year, the pandemic prevents the activities by which we want to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary. Despite all of these events, The Greece 21 Commission wants to honor the day when our ancestors lit the torch of freedom by six activities that it prepared for the anniversary of Marc 25 and to honor the sacrifices and struggles that they made for us by establishing a virtual dialogue with them. The Commission also wishes to display where Greece has come today within the two hundred-year process.⁷⁸

As it is seen, the Greek State did not want to compromise the celebrations of 2021 that it perceived as the symbolic year, it established a commission named “Greece 2021” [Ελλάδα 2021]. This commission made preparations regarding celebration activities just like the commissions that were previously established before it. The target of “Greece 2021” was to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the Greek Revolution and to coordinate a comprehensive activity program. The job description of the Commission was described as follows in the section titled purpose and scope located on the website of “Greece 2021”:

We are going to display our considerable amount of successes and heroisms and bring our potential into the forefront. We are going to remind and remember our close relationship with the struggles and concerns that define the modern age; however, we will also emphasize our weaknesses and mistakes. Our purpose is to display the respect that we have for our history, honor our people, promote our country, bring our country into the forefront and encourage many organizations to participate into the Greece 2021 program to plan our future.⁷⁹

78 <https://greece2021.gr/25martiou> [Date of Access: 19.03.2022]

79 <https://greece2021.gr/epitropi-ellada-2021/skopos.html> [Date of Access: 19.03.2022]

The first duty of the Commission was to create an agenda where all of the activities, which would be planned and performed by various organizations, universities, local governments and other organizations (private/public), will be recorded. The second duty, which was deemed as especially important, was to make plans for the actions to be offered to the appropriate organizations to realize those activities. For this purpose, the Greek Revolution was displayed on the buildings of 18 cities by projections, the documentary movie named *“I recognize you from your appearance”* carrying the same name with the Greek National Anthem was shown on the government channel named ERT in the evening of March 25, the biographies and pictures of all national heroes were displayed for the public in public places such as public transportation, airports, and train stations, commemorative coins were minted for the two hundredth year, a four-page commemorative booklet was prepared for publication as a newspaper appendix for the anniversary of the revolution, and a music recital was performed by Dionysis Savvopoulos on March 25.



Source: The image belongs to the author of the report.

In the projection that was reflected on the facade of the Greek Parliament for the two hundredth anniversary of 1821, the figures and scenes of the Greek Revolution were displayed. In front of the building of Parliament, a ten-minute video was regularly displayed between the hours of 21:00 and 23:00 for ten days. The video was taken from the figures in the wall decoration of the Eleftherios Venizelos Hall.

The electronic journal of the Greek Parliament “Epi tu... Peristyliu” [The Gate of Parliament] published a special issue with the title of “*What did the two hundredth year of 1821 bequeath for us?*”. In the journal, Gianna Angelopulu, the Chairperson of the “Greece 2021” Committee and eight professors from various universities of the country (Nikos Anastasopoulos, Thanos Veremis, Elpida Vogli, Maria Efthimiu, Antonis Klapsis, Christos Lukos, Spyridon Plumidis, Dimitris Stamatopoulos) penned down essays regarding their thoughts about the two hundredth anniversary of the revolution.⁸⁰ Additionally, various publishing houses in Greece published many history books (translations and originally written in Greek) with the subject matter of the Greek Rebellion for the anniversary of 1821 and distributed them to their readers. The books that were published about the Greek Rebellion of 1821 in Greece are as follows if we are to submit statistical information:

| Name of Book | Author | Publisher |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Byron's War | Beaton Roderick | Pataki |
| Greek Revolution and European Philhellenes | Bernd Sosemann | University Studio Press |
| 1453-1821 Greece: The Hidden Centuries | David Brewer | Pataki |
| Flame of Freedom 1821-1833 | David Brewer | Pataki |
| 1821 The Founding of Modern Greece | Athina Cacouri | Pataki |
| American Philhellenism The Impact of the 1821 Revolution in the USA | Maureen Connors-Santelli | Psychogios |
| Greek Struggle for Freedom and Philhellenism | Gunnar Hering | Panepistimiakes Ekdosis Kritis |
| Sun Myth of Revolution | Jean Starobinski | Kelefthos |
| Greek Revolution | Mark Mazower | Aleksandria |
| From Zagori to Zagori | Angeliki I. Angeli | Oselotos |
| Naval Battle of Navarino West's Repulse of the Ottomans | Arrigo Petacco | Okeanida |
| 1821 Revolution – Feminine Revolution | Giota Angelopulu | Angelaki |

⁸⁰ https://www.hellenicparliament.gr/userfiles/ebooks/periodiko_t039/4/index.html [Date of Access: 17.03.2022]

| | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Warriors of 1821 | Elena Davlamanu, Athanasia Eleftherudi | Grafima |
| “Did we live well under the authority of the Turks?” From the conquest of Istanbul to the Incidents of November | I. V. Athanasopulu | Pelasgos |
| 21 Disagreements in the Official History Regarding 1821 | Spyros Aleksiu | Topos |
| From the Khios Massacre to the Exit from Mesolongi, The Failures of the War and Their Impact | Nikolaos A. Anastasopoulos | Metechmio |
| Journal of Archiotaksio, Issue 23 | ASKI | Themelio |
| Pan-Hellenic Yearbook in the Hundredth Year of the National Struggle, 1821 - 1921 | Paschalis Valsamidis | Barbunaki |
| Dionysios Solomos | Angeliki Varella | Pataki |
| Adamantios Korais | Nikos Varmazis | Grafima |
| 1821: Formation of a Nation-State | Thanos Veremis, Giannis S. Koliopoulos, Iakovos D. Mihailidis | Metechmio |
| 21 Questions and Answers Regarding 1821 | Thanos Veremis | Metechmio |
| Ioannis Kapodistrias, “The Victim” of the Greek National Salvation | Thanos M. Veremis, Iakovos D. Mihailidis | Metechmio |
| 1821: Questions Only! | Maria Angelidu, Irini Voskopulu | Ikaros |
| Government of Ioannis Kapodistrias, Critical Approaches and Verifications | Giorgos Georgis | Kastanioti |
| Ioannis Kapodistrias in Russia | Grigori Ars | Asini |
| 1821: The Miracle of the Greek Revolution | Christos Gudis | Kaktos |
| Kapodistrias, The Foundation of the Greek Independence | Kristofer M. Guntchouz | Minoas |
| Philhellenism in the Greek Independence War | Kristofer M. Guntchouz | Minoas |
| What We Don't Know about the Revolution of 1821 and the Turkish Rule | Ioannis Gryntakis, Georgios Dalkos, Angelos Chortis, Ektoras Chortis | Metechmio |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| The Struggle of 1821 and Its Sabotage | Maria Delivoria | Agra |
| In the Revolutionary Years | Spyros Dermicakis | Grafima |
| Mesolongi in 1821 | Antonis Diakaris | Asini |
| Revolution of 1821 | Edited Volume | Elliniko İdryma Politismu |
| 1821 + Secret Missions | S. Elmazis, A. Karadas, Ch. Laski, M. Stukas | Archetypo |
| Attendance of Vodina and Surrounding Areas to the National Uprising of 1821 | Dimitris E. Evangelidis | Barbunaki |
| Roots and Foundations, Important Moments of the History of Hellenism | Maria Efthymiu | Pataki |
| 1821 – Greek Revolution | Thanos Veremis – Antonis Klapsis | Ellinika Grammata |
| 1821, Geopolitical and Historical Parameters of Foreign Protection | Ilias Iliopoulos | Pelasgos |
| First Two Hundred Years Were Difficult, Two Hundred Years of Mental Breakdown | Takis Theodoropoulos | Metechmio |
| 1814-1821, Preliminary Preparation of a Revolution, Main Actors, Events, Conditions | Stefanos Kavallierakis | Metechmio |
| 1821, Uncompleted Beginning | Athina Kakuri | Pataki |
| Revolution, crisis, revolution: Greece from 1821 until 2021 | Dimitris Kalchonis | Topos |
| Greek Dream, Interview with Kostas Giannakidis Regarding the Past and Future of Greece | Stathis Kalyvas | Metechmio |
| Rebellion of Females for Peace, SAPIENS 1821-2021 | Anna Karamanu | Armos |
| Petmeza Family, Multilayered Marks on the Time Gate | Anastasia Karastathi | Melissa |
| Turks and Turkish Rule | Sarantos I. Kargakos | Psychogios |
| Big Moments and Big Appearances of 1821 | Sarantos I. Kargakos | Psychogios |
| Memoirs of Makrygiannis Pasha, His Ideological Approach to his Arguments | Sofia Karymbali | Enastron |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| Greek Revolution of 1821 and Its Global Significance | Roderick Beaton | Eora |
| 1821: Women and Revolution, From the Ottoman World to the Independent Greek State | Vasiliki Lazu | Dioptra |
| ABC of the Modern Greek History: Revolution – Kapodistrias – Otto, 1821-1862 | Kakuri Athina | Kapon |
| Greek Revolution 1821-1830 | Petros Th. Pizanias | Vivliopolion tis Estias |
| 1821 From Revolution to State | K. Boçiu – S. Rizas | Papadopulos |
| 1821 Revolution of an Inexperienced Dare and Dream | Alkis Rigos | Papazisi |
| Organizing the Revolution of 1821 | Nikos Rocokos | Ekdosis Elliniku Aniktu Panepistimiu |
| Most Glorious Struggle: Greek Revolution of 1821 | Aristidis N. Chatzis | Papadopulos |
| Laskarina Bubulina, Female Leader of Greek Revolution | Kyriakos St. Chatzikiyriakidis | Metechmio |
| What was the Thought of Rigas? Return to the Origin | Dimitris Psarras | Polis |
| Tripolitsa – Mesolongi: Siege and Conquest In Regards to the Testimonies of Warriors | Thanos Veremis | Metechmio |
| Sword and Guns in Hand: Mesolongi under Siege | Nikolaos Kasomulis | Panepistimiakes Ekdosis Kritis |
| Memoirs from the Revolution of 1821 | Errikos Traimper | Kultura |
| Philhellenes of 1821 | Elena Davlamani, Athanasia Eleftherudi | Grafima |
| Philiki Eteria | İoannis Filimonas | Klidarithmos |
| Philiki Eteria, Revolutionary Action and Secret Associations in Modern Greece | Derleme Cilt | Asini |
| History of Greek Revolution, Volume 1 | George Finlay | Ellinika Grammata |
| Greek Nation | Georg Ludvich Fon Mauer | Oksi |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Greek Maritime 1700-1821 Golden Age Before the Revolution | Celina Charlafti – Katerina Papakonstantinou | Kedros |
| Revolution | Nikos Stathopoulos | Armos |
| 1821: Response for what is displayed on the TV (Volumes 1, 2, 3, 4) | Fotios Stavridis | Pelasgos |
| 1821 and Bourgeoisie Revolutions | Panos Garganas – Leandros Bolaris – Stavroula Panidu – Alex Callinicos – Chris Harman | Marksistiko Vivliopolio |
| Petrobey Mavromihalis, Mani Leader in Greek Revolution | Athanasios Syroplakis | Metechmio |
| Spyridon – Other Trikupis, 1788-1873 | Lyndia Triha | Polis |
| Warriors of 1821 After the Revolution | Elisavet Chakanika | Asini |
| 1821 and Reality | Giannis Skaribas | Kaktos |
| Cards | Giannis Skaribas | Kaktos |
| 1821 and Aristocracy | Giannis Skaribas | Kaktos |
| Ministers in the Special Tribunal | Nikolaos Soiletakis | Armos |
| Rigas Velestinlis, Revolution with Songs | Giannis Spandonis | Okeanida |
| Historical Voices, Revolution in Teselia in the Eyes of the Envoys in 1878 | Maria Spanu | Metechmio |
| By the Pen of the Morea's Elder, Responses Given for the Letters and Reports of the Peloponnesian Military Commander Theodoros Kolokotronis | Giannis Spandonis | Okeanida |
| 1821 in People's Pictures | Angelos G. Prokopiu | Angelaki |
| 1821 in the Media, 1911-1922 | Panagiotis Pyrpyris | Dodoni |
| Great Powers and Revolution from Laibach to Navarino | Sotiris Rizas | Metechmio |
| Spying Incidents During the Revolution of 1821 | Christos Reppas | En Plo |
| Greece of Dreams | Stelios Ramfos | Armos |
| Reading of the Iconography of 1821, Aesthetic Approach and Visual Reading | Panagiotis Pyrpyris | Dodoni |
| Unknowns | Nikos Panagiotopoulos | Pedio |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| Greek Maritime 1700-1821 | Celina Charlafti – Katerina Papakonstantinu | Kedros |
| Cheek of Virgin Mary, Autobiographic Assumption of G. Karaiskakis | Pantelis Bukalas | Agra |
| Reasoning Regarding Greece, From the Arrival of the King until the End of 1834 | Ioannis Persianis | Asini |
| What is Left From 1821 | Kostis Papagiorgis | Kastanioti |
| Greek Revolution of 1821, A European Incident | Edited Volume | Kedros |
| Greek Revolution from the Eyes of the Ottomans | Leonidas Miras | Topos |
| Greek Revolution and Rule of People Establishment of the Greek National State (1821-1832) | Simos Bozikis | Asini |
| Leadership Lessons from the Heroes of 1821 | Lukas Papazoglu, Dimitris Buradas | Psichogios |
| When Education and Poetry Meets in the Revolution | Panagiotis Burdaras | Armos |
| Megali Idea in the Greek Press | Katerina Mystakidu | Pataki |
| Two Princes in the Greek Revolution | Vasilis Panagiotopoulos | Asini |
| Konstantinos Kanaris Childhood and Heroism Years | Theodora Lufa-Coannu | Angyra |
| Laskarina Bubulina Childhood and Heroism Years | Anastasia D. Makri | Angyra |
| National Completion and Separation, Greek Case | Giorgos Th. Mavrogordatos | Pataki |
| Theodoros Kolokotronis | Iakovos D. Michailidis | Metechmio |
| Domestic Fights and Struggles During the Years of Struggle | Iakovos D. Michailidis | Metechmio |
| 1821, Tracing A Nation, State and Megali Idea | Giannis Milios | Aleksandria |
| Modern Greek Church: Services Performed by the Church for the Nation for A Hundred Years from 1821 until 1921 | Archimandritis Evgenios Kostaridis D. Th. | Barbunaki |
| 1821 Two Hundred Years of History | Antonis Liakos | Themelio |
| Reading the 1821 Through the Balkans | Andreas Lyberatos | Melissa |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Europe of Greeks, Model, Threat, Protection 1833-1857 | Lina Luvi | Aleksandria |
| Nikitaras Childhood and Heroism Years | Theodora Lufa-Coannu | Angyra |
| Andreas Miaulis. Childhood and Heroism Years | Theodora Lufa-Coannu | Angyra |
| Theodoros Kolokotronis. Childhood and Heroism Years | Theodora Lufa-Coannu | Angyra |
| Critical Dictionary of Greek Revolution | Paschalis M. Kitromilidis – Konstantinos Chukalas | Panepistiamikes Ekdosis Kritis |
| Miracle and Tragedy, 1821 From Homeros's World to Global Periphery | Giannis Kiurçakis | Pataki |
| Support of Gargalianon Region for the Revolution | Panagiotis Kaçivelas | Ellinika Grammata |
| Adventurous History of the Revolutionary Constitutions of 1821 | Ksenofon Kondiadis | Kastanioti |
| Greek Revolution and Kings, France and Greeks, 1797-1830 | Giannis Koçonis | Aleksandria |
| Evzon Foothills and Togas, Historical Memory and National Identity, 1821-1930 | Christina Kuluri | Aleksandria |

The year of 2021 was celebrated enthusiastically despite the pandemic conditions and in many activities the rebellion and the heroes of the rebellion were glorified or remembered. As it is understood from the article, the ethnic and religious value that was ascribed by Greece, which was established as a nation-state, to the date of March 25, 1821, was voiced by “screams” all over the year in the form of giving the glad tidings of a new nation and the rebirth of the phoenix arising from its ashes. However, as the “Greece 1821” Committee indicated, did the Greeks face with the dark galleries of their history in all of those activities? Alternatively, did they just silently evade the unpleasant parts of the history, as this was the case about the unpleasant parts of the history? Someone who attended the organized activities throughout the year may easily answer this question. However, as it is thought that the author did not have such a chance, the question would remain partially unanswered. In my opinion, I believe that this question may be answered in regards to the information in the book titled *War and Ethnic Cleansing* written by Greek scientist Tasos Kostopoulos. In his confrontation/confession book, which created a huge reaction in Greece and displayed

the panorama of the Greek atrocity, Kostopulos argued that the Greeks performed ethnic cleansing in the Morean Rebellion of 1821, during the Balkan Wars between 1912-1913 and the occupation of Anatolia between 1919 and 1922. Additionally, in his book titled *Death and Exile* historian Justin McCarthy clearly stated the atrocities that the Greeks committed against the Muslim Turkish population in Macedonia in their expansionist policy where Greece acted with the homogenous nation project. Therefore, while the date of 1821 is explained by freedom in the Greek history, it corresponds to ethnic cleansing committed against the Muslim Turkish population in the Turkish historiography.

The Covid-19 pandemic made the national solidarity significant and empowered the role of the state. The pandemic allowed rethinking the nation-states against globalization. Covid-19 pandemic served as a catalyzer in nationalization of all actors in the international system.⁸¹ Therefore, the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of 1821 has a different perspective that needs to be evaluated within the process of the pandemic. The importance of national solidarity not that of the global solidarity arose against a global crisis. Thusly, the motivations of nationalization in the new world order strengthened when compared to the past. When we have a look at the issue retrospectively, we see that the anniversaries of national independence are regarded as significant phenomena in the “us versus them” dialectic. In Greece, the celebrations of the two hundredth year of independence attempted to have a place in the public memory different from all other dates of “March 25”. It was almost considered as a citizenship duty for all of the activities organized both in the public and in private sector to serve for the national solidarity. At this point, a questionnaire conducted on the Greek people includes crucial information in terms of revealing what 1821 meant in the Greek collective memory. In the mentioned questionnaire conducted by the Liberal Studies Center – Markos Dragoumis (KEFIM) both the known repetitions and new findings were striking. For instance, the Revolution of 1821 was defined as a common reference point uniting the Greeks. Theodoros Kolokotronis was accepted as the most prominent hero of 1821 by a vote of 92.7%. Today, 1821 is not just a national revolution for the Greeks, it is also regarded as a social, liberal and religious revolutionary

81 Kamala, Valiyeva, “Covid-19 ile Ulus Devleti Yeniden Düşünmek”, *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Covid-19 Sosyal Bilimler Özel Sayısı*, Year: 19, No. 37, Spring (Special Addendum), pp. 390-403.

movement. The Greeks believe that the largest support first came from Russia, and later from France and Great Britain. The Greek people are divided in two regarding whether the rebellion started on March 25 at the Agia Lavra Monastery or not. Many Greeks still believe in the Myth of Secret School by thinking that the Ottomans banned education of Greeks and their language. In addition, seven out of ten Greeks believe that the matter of Revolution of 1821 is not sufficiently covered in the history classes in schools.⁸²

Conclusion

Consequently, the Turco-Greek History is one of the rare examples, which has different views on the two sides of a coin. Indeed, this contrast is not just limited to a single historical period. For instance, the most important year that creates a dualist perception in the Turco-Greek history is the year of 1922. While the year of 1922 represents the birth of the baby Republic on the Turkish lands saved from the occupation of the enemy for the Turkish society, the same year symbolizes the end of the Megali Idea, which is considered as the national cause almost for about hundred years, and the Asia Minor Catastrophe for the Greeks. Similarly, another example in the same pool of history is the year of 1821. While the year of 1821 is the symbol of liberation from the Ottoman dominance (*Tourkokratia*) perceived as a four hundred-year of enslavement for the Greeks, it is the first rebellion movement which started the domestic destruction by a subject which is called the loyal nation for the Turks. Therefore, the basic difficulty encountered by a Turkish historian doing research on Greece and a Greek historian doing research on Türkiye is the opposite terminology in both countries. In fact, the author addressed the subject matter by knowing the gap between the Morean Rebellion and Greek Revolution/Rebellion. Two different perceptions made Greece “scream” in the two hundredth year celebrations, and reminded the Turks the atrocities and ethnic cleansing performed by the Greeks two hundred years ago in the Turkish history. Whatever the glorious moments of history are, in my opinion, confrontation, reading a national independence that resulted with the destruction of a nation only through heroisms and celebrating it with enthusiastic feasts introduce a period to be criticized in the history of humanity.

82 «Πώς βλέπουν οι Έλληνες την Επανάσταση 1821. Ανάλυση» [How do Greeks perceive the Revolution of 1821?], Πανελλαδική Έρευνα ΚΕΦΙΜ-1821, Δεκέμβριος 2019, Κέντρο Φιλελευθέρων Μελετών-Μάρκος Δραγούμης, pp. 4-5.

Bibliography

Greek Official Gazette

ΦΕΚ Α 92/1918 – 28 Απριλίου 1918

ΦΕΚ Α 106/1918 – 15 Μαΐου 1918

Greek Newspapers

Αθηνά, 23.03.1838, Αριθμός 518.

Εμπρός, 25.03.1930, Έτος 34, Αριθμός φύλλου: 12.227.

Books, Journals and Articles

Βασίλης Κρεμμυδάς, “Η εθνική γιορτή στο σχολείο” [National holidays in schools], Η Εποχή, 31.10.2004 “Δεν χωράνε 5 αιώνες ιστορίας σε 130 σελίδες” [5 centuries do not fit into 130 pages], Έθνος της Κυριακής, 24.03.2007.

Βασίλης Κρεμμυδάς, “Η Εκκλησία στο Εικοσιένα Μύθοι και Ιδεολογήματα” [Church, Myths and Ideologies in 1821], Τα Νέα, 22.03.2005.

Βασίλης Κρεμμυδάς, “Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση του 1821” [Greek Revolution of 1821], Gutenberg, Αθήνα 2016.

«Πώς βλέπουν οι Έλληνες την Επανάσταση 1821. Ανάλυση» [How do Greeks perceive the Revolution of 1821?], Πανελλαδική Έρευνα ΚΕΦΙΜ-1821, Δεκέμβριος 2019, Κέντρο Φιλελεύθερων Μελετών-Μάρκος Δραγούμης.

Απομνημονεύματα περί της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως του Φωτάκου [Fotakos'un Yunan Devrimi hakkında Hatıraları], Πρώτου Υπασπιστή του Θεοδώρου Κολοκοτρώνη, Τύποις και βιβλιοπολείω Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, Αθήνησι 1858.

Άρδην, , Ιανουάριος-Σεπτέμβριος 2014.

Γιάνης Κορδάτος, *Ιστορία της Νεώτερης Ελλάδος [Modern Yunanistan Tarihi]*, Τόμος Α, Εκδόσεις 20ος αιώνας, Αθήνα 1957-58.

Θάνος Μ. Βερέμης, *21 Ερωτήσεις & Απαντήσεις Για το 21[1821 hakkında 21 soru-cevap]*, Μεταίχμιο, Αθήνα 2020.

Νίκος Β. Ροτζώκος, *Εθναφύπνιση και Εθνογένεση Ορλωφικά και Ελληνικά Ιστοριογραφία [Ulusun Uyanması ve Ulusun Doğuşu Orlofika ve Yunan Tarihyazımı]*, Βιβλιόραμα, Αθήνα 2007.

Παλαιών Πατρών Γερμανός, *Απομνημονεύματα [Hatıralar]*, Εκ του τυπογραφείου Σπύρου Τσαγγάρη, Εν Αθήναις 1900.

Πέτρος Θ. Πιζάνιας, *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση 1821-1830 [Yunan Devrimi 1821-1830]*, Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστίας, Αθήνα 2021.

Σπυρίδων Π. Αραβαντίνοσ, *Ιστορία Αλή Πασά του Τεπελενλή [Tepedenli Ali Paşa'nın Hikayesi]*, Εκ του τυπογραφείου των καταστημάτων Σπυρίδωνος Κουσουλίνου, Εν Αθηναίς 1895.

Σπυρίδων Τρικούπης, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επαναάστασης [Yunan Devrim Tarihi]*, Τόμος Πρώτος, Εκδοτικός Οργανισμός Λιβάνη, Αθήνα 1993.

Χριστίνα Κουλούρη, “Γιορτάζοντας το Έθνος: Εθνικές Επέτειο στην Ελλάδα του 19^{ου} αιώνα” [Ulusal Kutlama: 19. yy'da Yunanistan'da Ulusal Kutlamalar], *Αθέατες όψεις της ιστορίας [Tarihin Görünmeyen Yüzü]*, επ. Δέσποινα Παπαδημητρίου & Σεραφείμ Σεφεριάδης, σίνη, Αθήνα 2012, s. 181-210.

Akşın, Sina, “Siyasal Tarih (1789-1908)” (Political History 1789-1908), ed. Sina Akşın, *Türkiye Tarihi 3 Osmanlı Devleti 1600-1908*, Cem Yay., İstanbul 1992.

Anderson, Benedict, *Hayali Cemaatler Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması*, trans. İskender Savaşır, Metis Yay., İstanbul 2009.

Bayrak, Meral, *1821 Mora İsyanı ve Yunanistan'ın Bağımsızlığı*, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, January 1999.

Bora, Tanıl, “Turkish National Identity, Turkish Nationalism and the Balkan Problem”, *Balkans A Mirror of the New International Order*, eds. Günay Göksu Özdağan & Kemali Saybaşılı, Eren Yay., İstanbul 1995, pp. 101-120.

Cevdet Paşa Tarihinden Seçmeler, Vol. II, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul 1973.

D. Smith, Anthony, *Milli Kimlik*, trans. Bahadır Sina Şener, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 1994.

Erözden, Ozan, *Ulus-Devlet*, On İki Levha Yay., İstanbul 2013.

Finlay, George, *History of the Greek Revolution*, Vol. I, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London 1861.

- Gellner, Ernest, *Milliyetçiliğe Bakmak*, trans. Nalan Soyarı, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 2013.
- Gellner, Ernest, *Uluslar ve Ulusçuluk*, trans. Büşra Ersanlı Behar, Hil Yay., İstanbul 2008.
- Grigoriadis, İoannis N., *Kutsal Sentez. Yunan ve Türk Milliyetçiliğine Dini Açılmak*, trans. İdil Çetin, Koç Üniversitesi Yay., İstanbul 2014.
- Hall, Stuart, "The West and the Rest. Discourse and Power", *Formations of Modernity*, eds. Stuart Hall & Bram Gieben, Polity Press, Cambridge 1992 pp. 275-331.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, *Devrim Çağı 1789-1848*, trans. Bahadır Sina Şener, Dost Yay., Ankara 2013.
- Hroch, Miroslav, *Avrupa'da Milli Uyanış Toplumsal Koşulların ve Toplulukların Karşılaştırmalı Analizi*, trans. Ayşe Özdemir, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 2011.
- Hroch, Miroslav, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups Among the Smaller European Nations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1985.
- Jaskułowski, Krzysztof, "Western (civic) versus Eastern (ethnic) Nationalism. The Origins and Critique of the Dichotomy", *Polish Sociological Review*, 3/2010, Vol. 171, pp. 289-303.
- Karpat, Kemal, *Balkanlar'da Osmanlı Mirası ve Milliyetçilik*, Timaş Yay., İstanbul 2019.
- Kedourie, Elie, *Avrupa'da Milliyetçilik*, trans. Haluk Timurtaş, Köprü Kitap, İstanbul 2017.
- Kellas, James, *Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1991.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis M., *Aydınlanma ve Devrim Modern Yunanistan'ın Kuruluşu*, trans. Sinem Güldal, Alfa Yay., İstanbul 2021.
- Kohn, Hans, "Western and Eastern Nationalisms", *Nationalism*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1994, pp. 162-164.

Kütükoğlu, Mübahat, “Yunan İsyanı Sırasında Anadolu ve Adalar Rumlarının Tutumları ve Sonuçları”, *Üçüncü Askeri Tarih Semineri Bildiriler, Tarih Boyunca Türk-Yunan İlişkileri (20 Temmuz 1974’e Kadar)*, Genelkurmay ATASE Yay., Ankara 1986, pp. 133-161.

Offe, Claus, *Varieties of Transition: The East European and East German Experience*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1997.

Ortaylı, İlber, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Kronik Yay., İstanbul 2019.

Özsüer, Esra, “19. Yüzyıl Avrupa Romantiklerinin 1821 Mora İsyanı Üzerindeki Siyasi ve Kültürel Etkileri”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 2016, pp. 325-344.

Özsüer, Esra, *Türkokratia Avrupa’da Türk İmajı*, Kronik Yay., İstanbul 2018.

Pouqueville, François Charles Hugues Laurent, *Historia tēs Hellēnikēs Epanastaseōs, ētoi, Hē anagennēsis tēs Hellados: meta kallitechnikōn eikonōn kai meta parartēmatos, pe riechontos tēn historian, tēs Boumpoulinas, tēs Tzavella, tēs Kanarē, tēs Monarchidou, tēs Papalexopoulou, tēs Botsarē, kai tōn allōn hērōidōn Hellēnidōn, tou hierou agōnos*, (epimeleia Aristeidou N. Kyriakou), Ekdote. Grapheion V.K. Tsangarē, En Athēnais [1839?].

Renan, Ernest, *Ulus Nedir?*, trans. Gökçe Yavaş, Pinhan Yay., İstanbul 2019.

Saatçi, Meltem Begüm, “Balkan Ulusçuluklarına Dair Bir Değerlendirme: Farklı Uluslar Farklı Usuller”, *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*, Vol. 6, No. 23, Fall 2009, pp. 13-28.

St Clair, William, *That Greece Might Still Be Free the Philhellenes in the war of Independence*, Open Book Publishers, Cambridge 2008.

Todorova, Maria, *Balkanlar’ı Tahayyül Etmek*, İletişim Yay., İstanbul 2015.

Uçarol, Rıfat, *Siyasi Tarih (1789-1994)*, Filiz Kitabevi, İstanbul 1995.

Valiyeva, Kamala, “Covid-19 ile Ulus Devleti Yeniden Düşünmek”, *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Covid-19 Sosyal Bilimler Özel Sayısı*, Year: 19, No. 37, Spring (Special Addendum), pp. 390-403.

Internet Resources

<https://greece2021.gr/25martiou>

<https://greece2021.gr/epitropi-ellada-2021/skopos.html>

https://www.hellenicparliament.gr/userfiles/ebooks/periodiko_t039/4/index.html

