

«Gerçi Rum isek de Rumca bilmez Türkçe söyleriz»
THE ADVENTURE OF AN IDENTITY IN THE TRIPTYCH:
VATAN, RELIGION AND LANGUAGE¹

Evangelia BALTA**

ÖZET

Bu makale; Kapadokya'da Türkçe konuşan Ortodoks Hristiyanların kökeninin historiyoğrafik bir sorun olarak meydana çıkışını tespit edip bu sorunun çeşitli veçhelerini Osmanlı İmparatorluğu bağlamında bu toplulukların tanımı konusunda sistematik araştırmaların azlığı irdelenerek incelemektedir. XVIII. yüzyılın başından Lozan Antlaşmasına kadar geçen 200 yıllık süre içinde kullanılmış olan Karamanlı yayınları tahlil edilerek bu topluluğun kültürel ve ideolojik yapısı meydana çıkarılmıştır. Nihayet, basılı kaynaklar ve arşiv malzemeleri vasıtasıyla Türkçe konuşan Anadolu Rumlarının hüviyetlerini nasıl korudukları incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Küçük Asya, Karamanlı edebiyatı, Türkçe konuşan Ortodoks Hristiyanlar, Anadolu Rumları, Kapadokya, Ortodoks Kilisesi, Misyoner propagandası, Mülteciler.

«Gerçi rum isek de Rumca bilmez Türkçe söyleriz
Ne Türkçe yazar okuruz ne de Rumca söyleriz
Öyle bir mahludi hattı tarikatımız vardır
Hurufumuz Yonaniçe Türkçe meram eyleriz»¹

It was with this four-line verse that the Turcophone Greeks or Rums (*Romioi*), who are better known in the bibliography as "Karamanlidhes" (*Karamanlı*), defined themselves in the late nineteenth century. Kara-

¹ This paper is the extent version of the article published under the title: «Karamanlilar: The Turcophone Orthodox Population in Cappadocia», in *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, 2. Economy and Society, (ed. K. Çiçek), Ankara 2000, pp. 467-471.

** National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens -GREECE.

¹ 'Although we are Rums, we don't know Greek (*rumca*) and we speak Turkish. We don't write and we don't read Turkish (i.e. in Arabic lettering), and we don't speak Greek either. We are a mixture. Our alphabet is Greek and we speak Turkish'. This successful definition of the Karamanlidhes is given in the Karamanli book *Kaisareia mitropoliileri...* 1896. See S. Salaville-E. Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique des ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs* t. III, Athènes 1974, no 306.

manlidhes are the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians who wrote Turkish using the Greek alphabet, inhabitants of greater Cappadocia, a region with unstable borders that differed from period to period. Its boundaries in relation to the subject in hand are: to the North as far as Ankara, Yozgat and Hudavendigâr, to the South as far as Antalya and Adana, to the East as far as Kayseri and Sivas, and to the West as far as the borders of Aydin Province. Within this geographical area with a solid Muslim population, Turkish-speaking Orthodox communities existed along with Turkish-speaking Armenians and Turkish-speaking Protestants, as well as dispersed enclaves of Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians, until the Exchange of Populations in 1924. In 1864 the archaeologist Georges Perrot observed:

Dans presque tout l'intérieur de l'Asie Mineure, ni les Grecs ne savent le grec, ni l'Arméniens l'arménien; les uns comme les autres ne parlent que la langue de leurs maîtres, le turc, mais ils l'écrivent les uns avec les lettres grecques, les autres avec les lettres arméniennes².

The Historiographical Problem

For the Turcophone Rums the two most basic components of their group (communal) identity are contradictory. They were Orthodox and they spoke Turkish. It is in precisely this antithesis between the two parameters of nationalism, religion and language, that the key to the conten-

² Georges Perrot, *Souvenir d'un voyage en Asie Mineure*, Paris 1864, p. 114. Sir Edwin Pears' remarks on the Turcophones, both Armenians and Greeks of Anatolia, are extremely interesting. He noted that "there are many Armenian villages where only Turkish is spoken, and many Greek villages where the inhabitants have forgotten the speech of their race". A personal experience in about 1905 vividly illustrates the point. At a village near Iznik, the historic Greek-Byzantine city of Nicaea, Pears attended a Greek Orthodox service in the church. The service was, of course, in Greek. Then the congregation went outdoors, where the priest conducted a special prayer service for rain. The prayers were in Turkish, read by the priest from sheets of paper. Later the priest explained to Pears that "his flock could not understand Greek". This testimony is cited by R. Davison, who comments: "The Greek liturgy they knew, through long familiarity, but anything unusual had to be translated from Greek into Turkish so they could understand. Since Pears was himself a Greek scholar, rather Hellenophile and anti-Turkish, his testimony is even more significant", See R. Davison, «Nationalism as an Ottoman Problem and the Ottoman Response», in: *Nationalism in a non-National State. The Dissolution of the Ottoman Empire*, (ed. W. Haddad and W. Ochsenwald), Ohio State University Press 1977, pp. 25-56. The article is reprinted in: R. Davison, *Nineteenth Century Ottoman Diplomacy and Reforms*, Analecta Isisiana XXXIV, The Isis Press, Istanbul 1999, p. 391.

tion of one group of researchers concerning the problem of their origin lies³. And this because, since the concept of national identity is difficult to define, every attempt to do so always returns to language and religion, institutions which on the one hand ensured the community, while on the other, without reinforcement by the element of origin, could not be utilized as determinants of national identity. Within this framework, the following views have been promoted⁴:

a) That these populations are of Greek origin and became Turcophone as a result of their isolation and continual interaction with the Turkish tribes settled in central Asia Minor or, according to another view, became Turcophone under duress.

b) That these populations are descendants of Turks who migrated to and settled within the territory of Byzantium before the Ottoman conquest, or served as mercenaries in the Byzantine army, adopting the religion but not the language of their new masters.

Sp. Vryonis presents and comments on the various theories concerning the Turkish origin of the Karamanlidhes. In his opinion the most credible version is that these were Greek-speaking Byzantine populations

³ It is already well established that within the 19th century nationalist intellectual tradition language is considered an objective criterion of community. If language is taken as an objective criterion of national community then all its other historically important uses are eventually downplayed and with them all other "prenational" forms of community based on religion and locality also disappear.... The Greek national community was conceived as a community that shared specific cultural features, especially the use of the Greek language and adherence to Orthodox Christianity... It was in the late 19th century that definitions of the Greek national community not based on language first appeared, to proliferate rapidly in the early 20th century". See H. Exertzoglou, «Shifting boundaries: language, community, and the "non-Greek-speaking Greeks", *Historein* 1 (1999), pp. 75-92.

⁴ A. A. Papadopoulos, *Subject Hellenism of Asian Greece examined ethnically and linguistically* (in Greek), Athens 1919. A. Aigidis, *The Greekness of Asia Minor and the Fiction of the Turkish Orthodox* (in Greek), Athens 1922. C. Baykurt, *Osmanlı Ülkesinde Hristiyan Türkler*, Istanbul 1338 (1932). I. Voyatzidis, «Turcization and Islamization of the Greeks during the Middle Ages» (in Greek), *Epistimoniki Epetiris Filosofikis Scholis Aristoteleiou Panepistimiou Thessalonikis* 2 (1932), p. 95. T. Ergene, *Istiklâl Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları*, Istanbul 1951. G. Jaschke, «Die Türkische-Orthodoxe Kirche», *Der Islam* 39 (1964), pp. 95-129, and 44 (1969), pp. 317-323. E. I. Tsalikoglous, «When and how Cappadocia became Turkophone» (in Greek), *Mikrasiatika Chronika* 14 (1970), pp. 9-30. M. Eröz, *Hristiyanlaşan Türkler*, Ankara 1983, 28ff; Y. Aygıl, *Hristiyan Türkler'in Kısa Tarihi*, Istanbul 1995, pp. 62-68.

which became Turkish-speaking under the Seldjuk and Ottoman rule⁵. However, beyond the scientific theories and militant views expressed on this issue, study of the Karamanlidhes' origin always remains a desideratum for research. Possibly the situation was and is far more complicated than the sermons which, inspired by ethnic Manichaeism, use the designators "Greeks" and "Turks", for populations, old and new, of a region that was the melting-pot *par excellence* of the Mediterranean. Given the impasse into which studies of this kind have led, we consider that our priority should be to investigate the consciousness of the Turcophones themselves in their historical place and time, in Cappadocia in the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, and to study the facets and manifestations of this identity.

Clarification of the content of the terms "Karamanlis" (Karamanli) and "Turcophone Rum of Anatolia", which constitutes the starting point of our historical investigation, involves the confrontation of certain issues that are anything but self-evident. What is the content of the term *Karamanli* and its use, and how is this linked to the diffusion of the Turkish-speaking Greek population in the geographical region of Asia Minor? How do the Turkish-speaking Greeks define themselves? Are changes observed in their self-definition, and if so at what points in history? These are just some of the questions relating directly to the term Turcophone Rum or "Karamanlis". The answers to them firstly point out the complexity of the subject and the research required, and secondly lead to the realization that this population, perhaps more than others in the Ottoman Empire, was not something given, a structure or a form of continuity, as is maintained in the Asia Minor nationalist bibliography, the motive rationale of which is the continuity and unity of the nation. The Turcophone Orthodox community of Asia Minor constitutes a historical field of relations which is, first and foremost, linked directly with the millet system and the transformations this underwent during the nineteenth century⁶. It is linked also with the penetration of missionary organizations into Anatolia and their

⁵ Sp. Vryonis, «The Byzantine Legacy and the Ottoman Reforms», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23-24 (1969), pp. 304-305; idem, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (1971), 453ff. See also C. Kafadar-A. Kuyaş, «Ortaçağ Anadolu ve Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu Üzerine», *Cogito* 19 (Summer 1999), p. 67.

⁶ On the millet see the recent study by B. Braude, «The Strange History of the Millet System», in *Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilization*, II, (ed. K. Çiçek), Ankara 2000, pp. 409-418.

religious and educational propaganda. Above all, it is linked with the politics of Constantinople and Athens, the two national centres⁷, both of which in the late 19th century sought to include the Turcophone populations in the main national body.

From the mid-eighteenth century, the Turcophone Christian population of Cappadocia first attracted the attention of the Church authorities, which were anxious to protect it from conversion to Islam and the religious proselytism of other Churches, and second was discovered by intellectual circles in Constantinople who were involved with "mapping" the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire⁸. Furthermore, after the Tanzimat reforms and the law of 1869, which countered Ottoman citizenship to the *régime* of the millet, the importance of each ethnic group began automatically to be traced back to its numerical strength and to be measured in terms of minority and majority⁹. Of course, subsequent events and the series of laws published after 1909 attempted to abolish gradually the political and cultural autonomy of the communities and to exercise state control in sectors such as education, military service, associations etc.¹⁰ In its course towards the abolition of the millet system, the Turkish nation was, from the late nineteenth century, concurrently concerned with establishing its territory. The issue of the origin of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians re-emerged when the Turks had to validate their claim that Asia Minor had 'always' been their ethnic homeland and consequently its inhabitants were either of Turkish origin or conquerors. The case of the Greek Orthodox Turkish-speaking populations living there was considered as suiting their purpose. óemseddin Sami, one of the first to express the Turkish idea, insisted on the concept of the "Anatolian", that is the inhabitant of Anatolia, as the principal population substrate of the Turkish nation, and supported the racial continuity of the inhabitants of Anatolia, as this was expressed through the use of the Turkish language: "just

⁷ P. Kitromilidis, «The Greek State as National Centre», in: *Hellenism-Greekness, ideological and experiential axes of Modern Greek Society* (ed. D. G. Tsaousis), Athens 1983, pp. 143-164 (in Greek).

⁸ I. Anagnostakis-Evangelia Balta, *La découverte de la Cappadoce au dix-neuvième siècle*, traduit du grec par B. Dulibine, Istanbul, Eren 1994.

⁹ K. Karpat, «Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era», in: *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, (eds B. Braude and B. Lewis), New York, London 1982, pp. 163.

¹⁰ F. Ahmad, «Unionist relations with the Greek, Armenian and Jewish Communities of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1914», in: *Christians and Jews*, op. cit., pp. 410-414.

as every Muslim is not a Turk, so every Orthodox Christian is not a Greek. Religion is based on faith but ethnicity is based on the use of the language”¹¹.

After all, in the time of Kemal Atatürk, the idea of Anatolia as fatherland of the Turkish nation since antiquity was elevated to an official historical doctrine¹². In the early twentieth century, Asia Minor became “national land” which was claimed by Greeks and Turks alike. If the Greeks could appear as rightful beneficiaries and heirs to the ancient peoples of Asia Minor, by the same token, the present dominant Turkish majority could justly make the same claim. Consequently, the problem of the continuity and the legacy of the ancient cultures, and the issue of historical depth for the presence of each ethnic group, and primarily of singular communities, such as that of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians, proved critical in Asia Minor, especially in this perspective¹³.

In the same period, 1920, Papa Eftim Karahisaridis, a priest in Ke-skin¹⁴, was active in the cause of founding a Turkish Orthodox Church; at the instigation of supporters of Kemal Atatürk, he sought the independence of the Cappadocian flock from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It should be noted that the prestige of the Patriarchate had been seriously undermined in the region, on account of its involvement in politics and the disputes between Venizelists and Royalists, fired by the Asia Minor campaign. After Turkey's victory in the war, the Treaty of Lausanne was explicit about the Greek origin of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians. And for this reason they too were forced to abandon their homelands, like the inhabitants of the west coast and the Pontos, following the common destiny of all the Asia Minor Greeks.

¹¹ See D. Kushner, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism, 1876-1908*, London 1977, pp. 52-53. For K. Karpat, “A ‘Turk’ can be anyone who belonged to the Muslim millet during the Ottoman time ‘Greek’ means any Orthodox Christian including any Turkish-speaking Karamanli who regarded himself as Greek”, see K. Karpat, op. cit., pp. 165.

¹² E. Copeaux, *Espaces et temps de la nation turque. Analyse d'une historiographie nationaliste, 1931-1993*, CNRS éditions, Paris 1997.

¹³ B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Oxford, London 1967, pp. 349-361.

¹⁴ A. Alexandris, «The Attempt to establish a Turkish Orthodox Church in Cappadocia, 1921-1923», (in Greek), *Deltio Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon* 4 (1983), pp. 159-199. E. Cihangir, *Papa Eftim'in Muhturalari ve Bağımsız Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi*, Turan Yayıncılık, İstanbul 1996. See also Z. Türkmen, «XX. Yüzyıl Başlarında Osmanlı Devleti'nde Türkçe Konuşan Hristiyanlara Dair Bir Belge», *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi* 4 (2001), pp. 85-104.

The manifold aspects of the issue of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians and the approach to it, in most cases with judicial discourse and arbitrary implications, without employing historical method and the tools of historical scholarship, contributed to the creation of a political problem. As a direct consequence of such manipulations, the bibliography on the subject of the origin of this population of Asia Minor is polarized.

Aspects of the Historical Problem

Historiography has not dealt with the issue of defining the Turcophone Orthodox Christians in the milieu of the Ottoman Empire. There are no systematic studies on how they were characterized by their contemporaries. I do not mean just the references that might exist in texts of foreign travellers or reports of representatives of missionary groups, of Greek or foreign diplomats, or of teachers from Greece, the collection and systematic collation of which would be extremely useful. No research has been made into the Ottoman sources either. It is not enough to assume that basic characterization of the Turcophone Rums in the kadi codices of the provinces of Anatolia would be *gayr-i muslim*, *zimmi* or *reaya*. What is more important for us is whether it was the only characterization and whether it was kept throughout the centuries of coexistence of the Muslim and the other communities in the hinterland of Asia Minor. These are matters still begging research and which are fundamental to the historical approach to the subject. We further contend that systematic studies of the fiscal surveys (*Tapu Tahrir*) would surely shed light on the question of the ethnological composition of the populations in the regions of Anatolia where there were entrenched communities of Turcophone Rums in the eighteenth century. In a preliminary study by Irène Beldiceanu, she attempts to elicit the relationship between place names and the religious or national identity of the population on the basis of personal names. She demonstrates that a large number of towns and villages in Central Anatolia during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were populated partially or wholly by Christians, which fact explains the preservation of Hellenic, Latin and Hittite toponyms after the Ottoman Conquest, which were bequeathed to the Turkish language by Byzantine tradition¹⁵.

¹⁵ Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, «La géographie historique de l'Anatolie centrale d'après les registres ottomans», in: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, (juillet-octobre) 1982, pp. 443-503. See also, N. Beldiceanu and Irène Steinherr, «Recherches sur la province de Qaraman au XVI^e siècle», *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient* XI/part I (March 1968), pp. 1-129. A. Erdoğan, «Karaman Vilayet

What was the contemporary picture, however, the one created by the coexistence of various populations in this specific area of Asia Minor after the eighteenth century?

The dominant picture for the Karamanlidhes, as well as for Anatolians generally, in the first half of the nineteenth century, to judge from the testimonies published in subsequent years, is one of an Orthodox Christian population, the majority Turcophone and a small minority Grecophone, speaking ecclesiastical Greek. Apart from the factor of religion, the member of the Orthodox Christian population in no way differed from their Muslim neighbours. As far as we can tell from the archival material, the Cappadocian codices in the State Archives of Greece and the recordings of oral tradition -collected by Melpo Merlier¹⁶ and her collaborators already from 1930- in the Centre for Asia Minor Studies, the picture of the populations in Cappadocia was clear in the years of their coexistence. Subjection to the millet (ethnic-religious identity) was of itself sufficient to give each ethnic group identity in the multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. The Rum Orthodox communities in Central Anatolia were defined mainly on the basis of their religion: Ecumenical Orthodoxy was the principal source for constituting identity as well as for organizing social and spiritual life¹⁷. The dominant language of the Rums in Central Anatolia, Turkish, and the Karamanli script, coexisted alongside Greek, without the users of these languages feeling that language could be a criterion of differentiation. This feeling was not confined to the Asia Minor peninsula, but extended to Greece opposite. For how else can we explain the presence of the Anatolian from Caesaria in Cappadocia, in Dimitrios Vyzantios's play *Babylonia* (1836).¹⁸ The Kaiserli Savvas Hadji Mouratis, the Cretan, the Peloponne-

Kanunnâmeleri», *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi* 7 (1996), pp 45-97.

¹⁶ Merlier Melpo, *Présentation du Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, Etudes d'Éthnographie*, Athens 1951. Ioanna Petropoulou, «Center for Asia Minor Studies: an Anniversary» (in Greek), *Historica* 23 (1995), pp. 461-465. Idem, «The ideological development of Melpo Merlier, the Centre of Asia Minor Studies and the making of the Archive of Oral Tradition», in: A. Boutzouvi (ed.), *Martyries os pigi tis istorias* [Oral Testimonies as Historical Sources], Athens 1998, pp. 117-132. G. Yiannakopoulos, «The Reconstruction of a Destroyed Picture: The Oral History Archive of the Center for Asia Minor Studies», *Mediterranean Historical Review* 8/2 (1993), pp. 201-217.

¹⁷ R. Davison, op. cit., p. 391.

¹⁸ Dimitrios Vyzantios was the *nom de plume* of Dimitrios Hadji Konstanti Aslanis, who originated from Constantinople. There is interesting information on the performances of the play in Athens and Constantinople in the 19th century and its reception by the public, in K. Biris, *Babylonia by D.K. Vyzantios*, Athens 1948 (in Greek).

sian, the Chiots, the Ionian Islander, the Cypriot and others, all met in an inn in Nauplion to celebrate the defeat of İbrahim Paşa and to try to communicate with each other in their diverse Greek dialects, to sort out their differences and to understand the incomprehensible.

As is well known, in the late nineteenth century the Greek Orthodox communities were discovered by intellectual-literati circles in Constantinople, which applied themselves zealously to tracking down the “living monuments” of the ethnic Greek community in the Ottoman Empire. Their efforts were followed, somewhat dilatorily, by those of the other National Centre, Athens, which was intent on ‘Hellenizing’ the Turcophone Orthodox Christians, by replacing the dominant component of identity, Orthodoxy, with ethnic criteria. “It is time that the peoples in Anatolia also realized that they have a homeland and common interests”, wrote Koumoundouros in his instructions to the consuls in the Orient (22.5.1871)¹⁹. In the years that followed and up until the end of the nineteenth century, most of the historical-archaeological, geographical and linguistic studies about Cappadocia were written. Emphasis was placed on the publication of population statistics and data on religious and educational organization. In these tables, the expediency of which is obvious, the inhabitants are distinguished as Greeks, Turks and foreigners. The Turkish-speaking Christian communities are simply denoted by an asterisk. *Leitmotiv* in texts of the period referring to the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christian Cappadocians is that they were uncultured and sunk in the deep sleep of ignorance. The education, and indeed the Greek education, as well as the learning of the Greek language by the Turcophones, were perceived as tantamount to progress and civilization. What typifies the interest of contemporary intellectuals was the provision of knowledge to, the ‘enlightenment’ of the Cappadocians. Turcophone Christian Anatolia was not a subject of research for intellectual circles in Constantinople and Athens, since, by definition, it did not give arguments for Greekness; on the contrary, it undermined them. Such arguments were given only by the Greek-speaking villages, and these were discovered quite late on, shortly after the mid-nineteenth century. Consequently, in the give and take, the Turcophone Rums became –because it was demanded of them– recipients, and only recipients, of Greek, that is Grecophone, education, the ultimate aim of which was their ‘Hellenization’.

¹⁹ See *Society for the Dissemination of Greek Letters* (in Greek), ed. Ag. Papakosta, pp. 77-78.

The view has been expressed recently in the Greek bibliography that the transition from the millet to the nation, in relation to the degree and extent of the Hellenization of the *millet* (secular) institutional framework, that is with the changes effected at the level of religious organization (metropolises) and in the sector of education with the creation of schools in Turcophone Cappadocia, determined the process through which the Cappadocian communities signified a quasi Greek population, like that of the western coast of Asia Minor²⁰. We would agree entirely with this position if indeed what is meant was the claiming of lands or populations by the Centre, which planned on paper and diffused national identity to consciousness which served it. It is, however, anti-scientific to ignore the actual consciousness of the localness or of the singularity of the subjects, in this case the Karamanlidhes, which at some point were forced to follow or to submit to the historical events and whose very old Rum identity –albeit Turcophone– was of necessity equated with Athenocentric Hellenic identity. Just as, moreover, we would disagree with the gravitas attached to the “delayed Enlightenment” of Cappadocia by the two national centres, Constantinople and Athens, that is with the view that the founding of schools “Hellenized” the Turcophone Greeks²¹. When Athenocentric education came to Cappadocia, it found and was supported by a centuries-old identity and simply tried to “conform”, by putting in context, the Rum identity to Hellenic identity, on the basis of current secular criteria concerning the nation. The endeavour to disseminate the Greek language in the late nineteenth century, as well as the promulgation of Greek, Grecophone education in the same period, are reminders of the belated adjunct role of education in setting its seal on a given identity. And what better and more tangible evidence of the ethnic-cultural identity of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians is there than the Karamanli bibliography? In the century and a half that intervened until the Turcophone Orthodox communities were discovered by Constantinople and Athens, a Karamanli bibliography numbering several hundred titles had already been formed²².

²⁰ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Asia Minor 19th Century-1919. The Rum Orthodox communities. From the Rum Milleti to Greek Nation* (in Greek), Athens 1997, 37ff.

²¹ P. Kitromilidis uses the term in the introduction to *The Exodus. Testimonies from the Provinces of Central and Southern Asia Minor* (in Greek), vol. II, Athens 1982, xxxv-xxxvii.

²² S. Salaville-E. Dalleggio counted 333 titles, ending at 1900, in their three-volume work *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique des ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, Athènes, I (1958), II (1966), III (1974). In 1987, two volumes of Kara-

Karamanli Printed Works

We shall now present very briefly, by referring to book titles, reprints and periods of intensive publishing activity, comments and conclusions on the behaviour of the Turkish-speaking reading public²³. Historically, Karamanli book production began in 1718 with religious publications, which predominated for one hundred years until the mid-nineteenth century. The religious books were catechisms, psalters, *vitae* of saints etc., a pot-pourri corresponding to the books circulating in Greek for the Greek population of certain regions. Prevalent names encountered in these publications are Zacharias the Athonite (Hagiorite) and Seraphim of Pisidia²⁴, the latter a monk in the Kykkos monastery on Cyprus prior to becoming Metropolitan of Ankara. Generally speaking, the translators and publishers of the Karamanli books were clerics: metropolitans and monks. A pioneer in this effort was Neophytos Mavromatis²⁵, Metropolitan of Naupaktos and Arta, who in 1718 published the first Karamanli book. The objective of both the publishers and the translators of these religious books – as is stated time and again in the introductions to them – was to enlighten the Christians in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire, who, “since they have forgotten their Greek language, cannot understand what is read in Church and thus are led far from the way of God”²⁶. Therefore, the aim of the authors, or more correctly of the translators/compilers, was to teach the doctrine of the Orthodox Church and the religious duties of an Orthodox

manli bibliography were published, see Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika. Additions (1584-1900)*, Athènes 1987, which included 163 previously unknown titles printed before 1900. This served as an appendix to the work by Salaville-Dalleggio. The 138 titles of the second volume represent the bibliographical output of the 20th century, idem, *Karamanlidika. XXe siècle*, Athènes 1987. A third volume of addenda brought to light 122 titles, which covered the Karamanli bibliography from the 18th to the 20th century see idem, *Karamanlidika, Nouvelles additions et compléments, I*, Athènes 1997.

²³ I should make clear here that I do not see the relationship between publishers and readers of Karamanli books simply as a relationship of production-consumption, for the simple reason that there is no radical distinction between them. See Evangelia Balta, «Périodisation et typologie de la production des livres karamanlis», *Deltio tou Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon* XII, (1997-1998), pp. 129-153.

²⁴ D. E. Danieloglou, *Forerunners of the Renaissance of Letter in the East (particularly Asia Minor)*, Seraphim of Attaleia, Metropolitan of Ankara (in Greek), Constantinople 1865.

²⁵ G. G. Ladas, «The metropolitan of Naupaktos and Arta Neophytos Mavromatis and his contribution to the dissemination of religious and national consciousness to the Greeks of Asia Minor (in Greek)», *O Syllektis* 1 (1947), pp. 33-44.

²⁶ *Apanthisma tis hristianikis pisteos, yane Gülzari imani mesih... 1803*, 3 (see S. Salaville-E. Dalleggio, no 32).

Christian to the Christians of Asia Minor. The publications were intended to preserve the religious identity of the Orthodox Christian Turkish-speaking communities initially from Islamization and subsequently from missionary propaganda²⁷. A large proportion of religious books was published between 1826 and 1920 by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions²⁸. These books, which constitute 29% of the total of Karamanli books, most of them

²⁷ K. Lamprylos Hadjinikolaou, *Missionary Work and Protestantism in the East, namely the advent of Protestant missionaries to our lands, and to certain other lands of the earth. And on the relationship of Protestantism to the Mother of all Churches and the Greek race* (in Greek), Smyrna 1836; M[inas] D. Ch[amoundopoulos], «The Missionaries of Protestantism in the East» (in Greek), *Ekklesiastiki Alitheia*, 1 year (1880-1881), pp. 187-189, 199-201, 215-217, 231-234, 257-269, 283-286, 303-305, 323-325; V. A. Mystakidis, «Kappadokika» (in Greek), *Parnassos* 15 (1892), p. 602; Anonymous, «Contribution to the History of Protestantism in Asia Minor» (in Greek), *Xénophanis* 2 (1904-1905), pp. 353-363 and 3 (1905-1906), pp. 82-85; J. Paraskevaïdis, «Proselytism in Pisidia» (in Greek) *Xénophanis* 2 (1904-1905), pp. 223-229; A. Lévidis, «Contribution to the history of Proselytism in Asia Minor. On the activity of proselytizing organizations in Cappadocia» (in Greek), *Xénophanis* 3 (1905-1906), pp. 114-119, 145-150, 248-255, 343-351, 403-410. Kyriaki Mamoni, «Struggles of the Ecumenical Patriarchate against the Missionaries (Ecclesiastical Spiritual Commission, 1836-1838)» (in Greek), *Mnemosyne* 8 (1980-81), pp. 190-192.

²⁸ R. Clogg, «Notes on some Karamanli books printed before 1850 now in British Libraries with particular reference to the Bible translations of the British and Foreign Bible Society», *Mikrasiatika Chronika* 13 (1967), pp. 521-563; idem, «The Publication and Distribution of Karamanli Texts by the British and Foreign Bible Society before 1850: I, II», *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XIX/1-2 (1968), pp. 57-81 and pp. 171-193; idem, «The Foundation of the Smyrna Bible Society (1818)», *Mikrasiatika Chronika* 14 (1970), pp. 31-49; idem, «The Bible Society in Pontos. (A note concerning the activities of the British and Foreign Bible Society in the Eparchy of Khaldhia during the early nineteenth century)», *Archeion Pontou* 28 (1966-67), p. 62, note 1; idem, «Some Protestant Tracts Printed at the Press of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople: 1818-1820», *Eastern Churches Review* II/2 (1968), p. 152; idem, «The Publication and Distribution of Karamanli Texts, II», op. cit., pp. 186-187. R. Anderson, *History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches*, 2 vols, Boston 1872; P. E. Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches, 1820-1870*, Chicago 1937; G. Augustinos, *The Greeks of Asia Minor. Confession, Community, and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century*, Kent, The Kent State University Press 1992, pp. 114-122; idem, «Enlightened Christians and the Oriental Churches: Protestant Missions to the Greeks in Asia Minor, 1820-1860», *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 4/2 (October 1986), pp. 129-142; Constantia Kiskira, «The periodical *Missionary Herald*, an unidentified source on the Greeks of Asia Minor», *Deltio Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon* 11 (1995-1996), pp. 119-123; St. Anestidis, «American missionaries in Asia Minor. Bibliographical review (in Greek)», *Deltio Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon* 11 (1995-1996), 375-388. A. Özcan-T. Buzpinar, «Church Missionary Society İstanbul'da: Tanzimat, İslahat ve Misyonerlik 1858-1880», *İstanbul Araştırmaları* 1 (1997), pp. 63-79.

entirely of a religious nature but also including some schoolbooks with hymns and morally uplifting stories, circulated in a great number of copies (usually 5,000). They were distributed gratis through ecclesiastical organizations, schools and philanthropic institutions²⁹. In sum, from the early eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, the Karamanli printed works were virtually exclusively religious and the designator "Rum Othodox" was used for their Turkish-speaking readership.

The second period of Karamanli book production begins with the appearance of the Bible Society in Asia Minor, and ends in the second decade of the twentieth century, on the eve of the Asia Minor Catastrophe. After the Exchange of Populations and the settlement of the Asia Minor refugees in Greece, Karamanli books begin to be published in Thessaloniki, Athens and certain provincial towns in Greece. For about the first twenty years of this period, the Ecumenical Patriarchate continued to reprint religious books of the preceding period, in order to protect the Christians of Anatolia from the wave of Western religious propaganda. In time, other books joined the repertoire: religious poems such as those of Aziz Alexios; prayer books; histories of monasteries; biographies, including those of the metropolitans of Caesaria, which were actually local histories of the region of Cappadocia. The production of secular Karamanli works gathered momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century, and continued until the end of the Karamanli bibliography. The number of popular books increased. These included works on practical medicine, geonics, book-keeping and so on. Books on general education also appeared, as did literary works and novels, mostly translated from French authors such as X. de Montépin, E. Sue, Charles-Paul de Kock etc. Seventeen books by European novelists have been counted in the Karamanli bibliography, printed between 1882 and 1892, most of them from the presses of the Karamanli newspaper *Anatoli*, published by Evangelinos Misailidis³⁰. Bibliographical

²⁹ I. T. Pamboukis, "Peterimiz", *a few words on the contents of the religious books of Turkish-speaking Greek philology* (in Greek), Athens 1961, p. 22. The first Karamanli publications of the British and Foreign Bible Society date to 1826. The missionaries printed Karamanli books in Athens, Syros, London and especially in Constantinople, at Armenian presses (Aramian, Minasian, Bogatzian etc.).

³⁰ The earliest biography of Evangelinos Misailidis appeared in the fortnightly Karamanli periodical *Terakki*, iss. 1 (15 May 1888), pp. 53-56, and is signed by Ioannis Polybios. A second biography of Misailidis was written by Iordanis I. Limnidis, «Evangelos Misailidis», *Asia Minor Diary, Aster*, 1913, Constantinople 1913, pp. 170-172. The obituary of Misailidis and a brief curriculum vitae were published in *Ekklesiastike Aletheia* 10 (1890), pp. 4-5.

information exists to show that other novels were published too. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the best-known and most popular book of this genre was the *Temaşa-i Dünya*.³¹ Popular too, if we are to judge by the number of reprints, were the pamphlets of Kioroglou, Ashik Garip, Shah Ismail. We know from several testimonies of refugee informants, in the archival material of the Centre of Asia Minor Studies (Athens), that these circulated widely and were read avidly, which is affirmed also by the number of their editions. Also published in Karamanli during this period were 30 constitutions of organizations and associations established in Constantinople by natives of Cappadocia. This secular book category further includes 12 Ottoman law codes and legal interpretations, published between 1853 and 1891, which are transliterations into Karamanli of legislation passed after Tanzimat. This type of Karamanli publication resulted from the freedom given to non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Sultan by the Hatt-i Hümayun, and later by the Constitution of 1876.

So, in the second period, in addition to the stable presence of the religious book, there is also the secular. Judging from the number of editions, the Karamanli book that circulated and was read widely was either a traditional religious publication or a popular pamphlet. Those titles that appear only once were mainly books of practical information or general education. There was a proliferation of the latter after the reforms implemented in the Ottoman Empire, when more schools began to be built, and Turkish language newspapers and periodicals were published to disseminate knowledge, scientific discoveries, important events and the exploits of great per-

³¹ The *Temaşa-i Dünya* was originally published in serial form in the Turkish language newspaper *Anatoli*, and later in the Turkish language newspaper *Prosphygiki Phoni* (Refugee Voice) of K. Polatoglou in Athens in 1924-1926. The *Temaşa-i Dünya* was published transliterated into Turkish script: *Evangelinos Misailidis, Seyreyle Dünyayı (Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakâr ü Cefakeş)*, (eds) R. Anhegger, V. Günyol, Istanbul 1986, 1988. The Karamanli *Temaşa-i Dünya* was an adaptation of the novel by G. Palaiologos, *Ho Polymathis* (The Polymath). Penelope Stathi was the first to note this in her article «Faith and Knowledge» (in Greek), *To Vima*, 26 October 1988, and compared the Karamanli version with the original; idem, «The adventures of the Polymath of Gregory Palaiologos» (in Greek), *Mnemon* 17 (1995), pp. 131-145. See R. Anhegger, «Evangelinos Misailidis'in "Temaşa-i Dünya" Adlı Kitabı ve Türkçe Konuşan Ortodokslar Sorunu», *Beşinci Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi, Constantinople 23-28 Eylül 1985, Tebliğler, II. Türk Edebiyatı*, Istanbul 1985, I, 15-24; idem, «Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe Konuşan Dindaşları», *Tarih ve Toplum* 50 (February 1988) and 51 (March 1988), pp. 73-76 and pp. 175-177; T. Kut, «Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakâr u Cefakeş'in Yazarı Evangelinos Misailidis Efendi», *Tarih ve Toplum* 48 (1987), pp. 342-346.

sonalities, among other things. The books which continued to run through several editions during the second period were the Prayer Book (*İbadetname*), *Koroğlu*, *Jerusalem Ziyaretnamesi*, the Bible and the Gospels; the last two published together by the Bible Society. Constantinople was the centre of publishing activity, although a very small number of books was also published in Athens, Odessa, Smyrna, Samsun and, following the Exchange of Populations, Thessaloniki. The names of authors and translators increase during this period. Outstanding among them is that of Evangelinos Misailidis, with 92 publications to his credit: 30% of the total Karamanli output. Misailidis and his Karamanli newspaper³², *Anatoli*, attracted a coterie of intellectuals and of students who had mostly come from Anatolia to Constantinople in order to attend the city's schools and universities.

To summarize, we would say that the Karamanli book followed the historical course of the Turcophone population. At first it was exclusively religious; after Tanzimat, in parallel with the religious book there was an intense presence of the secular book, on the one hand works demonstrating the cultural mixing with the Muslim population, and on the other those promoting influences from the West and Greece.

The Self-definition of the Turcophone Rums

We now proceed to an analysis of the *status de discours*, of the vocabulary of terms by which the Rum Turcophone Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor defined themselves in relation to the multi-ethnic mosaic of the Ottoman Empire. Presented are the results of a precursory study of mine, which draws on the forewords of Karamanli books³³. This research, conducted some fifteen years ago, was based on the hypothesis that, in a given period, the reciprocal influence of linguistic, conceptual and emotive parameters determines specific manners of thought and expression, which in

³² A first catalogue of Karamanli newspapers and periodicals was published by I. Anagnostakis - Evangelia Balta, *La découverte de la Cappadoce au 19ème siècle*, Istanbul 1994, pp. 56-57.

³³ Evangelia Balta, Les avant-propos des livres karamanlis en tant que source pour l'étude de la "conscience ethnique" des populations orthodoxe turcophones, in: *Problèmes et approches de l'histoire ottomane. Une itinéraire scientifique de Kayseri à Eğriboz*, Isis, Istanbul 1997, pp. 245-56. (A Turkish translation: «Anadolu Türkofon Hristiyan Ortodoksların Ulusal Bilinçlerini Araştırmaya Yarayan Bir Kaynak Olarak Karamanlıca Kitapların Önsözleri», *Tarih ve Toplum* 13/74 (Şubat 1990), pp. 82-84.

their turn classify the cognitive patterns. It is a fact –if I may be permitted to repeat the obvious- that there is no human activity outside linguistic action. Consequently, emphasis should be placed on the linguistic modes and rhetorical expressions with which we follow the organizing and the presenting of the action. Correspondingly, the same attention should also be paid to whatever concerns the political implications or ramifications of verbal semantics. It is the historian's duty to restructure these representations, their uniqueness, without subjugating them to anachronistic categories, by approaching them through formulae and classifications of his/her day.

Of course the testimony used is literate, since it declares the relations of the authors and translators or publishers of Karamanli books specifically with their compatriots³⁴ and generally with the whole of the populations of the Ottoman Empire; indirectly however it also echoes opinions of the public at which it is directed. Consequently, the forewords of the Karamanli books can be considered as indicators of the mentalities prevailing during the course of Karamanli book production (1718-1935) in the area of the Turcophone populations of Asia Minor, since what is real is not, or better not only what a text presents, but the way in which it presents the reality within the conditions of production and the strategy of its writing.

The elements that interest us for the subject in hand are those that clarify and define the concepts of race (*genos*), nation (*ethnos*), the relations between them, as well as with the concept of religion. With regard to these issues, the forewords of the Karamanli books give indirect information that is extracted mainly from two points:

1. How the authors and translators address, that is name, their reading public, and how they define their relationship to this public.
2. The reasons given as stimulating the translation or the writing of a Karamanli book.

The overwhelming majority of the authors and the translators of Karamanli works call their reading public in their forewords "Christians", "Orthodox Christians", "Christians of Anatolia", "Orthodox Christians of

³⁴ This formulation in no way implies that I consider the relationship between author/translator/publisher and reader of the Karamanli book as simply a relationship of production-consumption, for the simple reasons that there is no radical distinction between them.

Anatolia"³⁵. Classification of these terms pointed out the historical turning points. The readers are called simply "Christians" or "Christians of Anatolia" during the early years of Karamanli book production, when the religious book covers 95%. When the activity of the Bible Society begins and its first publications appear around 1826, the term "Christians" is completed by the designator "Orthodox", and so continues throughout the duration of Karamanli book production.

Analytically the terms appear as follows:

Christians 1743-1918

Orthodox Christians: 1718-1884. These intensify after 1826, when the Bible Society appears.

Christians of the East: 1718-1883. These intensify from 1802 to 1846.

So religion quite clearly defines the community of the Turcophone Rums. It defines them within the total of the populations of the Ottoman Empire; Christians as opposed to Muslims, and Orthodox in contradistinction to Catholics and Protestants of Anatolia³⁶. And this because the reality of the Eastern Church itself in the Ottoman Empire could support the subsuming of the concept of religion to the concept of race and vice

³⁵ "Rum lisanından Anadolu'da bulunan ve Rumi lisanını bilmeyen Hıristiyan kardeşlerimiz", we read in the title of *Milleti Hıristiyanlığın ... 1835* (S. Salaville-E. Dalleggio, no 71). See also I. Valavanis, *Mikrasiatika*, (in Greek) Athens 1891, pp. 26-27 and D. E. Danieloglou, op. cit., pp. 21-23.

³⁶ "The point is, of course, that the parishioners called themselves Greek because they were of the Greek religion. Their church was the Greek Orthodox Church. In the Near East the traditional dividing lines among people were religious, not national. The millet, the religious community to which an individual belonged, was the determining factor in his self-identification and in his identification by others. If there was any 'nation' or 'nationality' to which an individual belonged, it was his millet", see R. Davison, op. cit., p. 391. Correspondingly, the self-identification of the Catholic Armenian of the Ottoman Empire was also religious. I cite a characteristic case that the same historian notes (p. 392), from the book by C. Oscanyan, who recounted the history of an Armenian from Ankara who went to Trieste, then to Hapsburg Austria, on business. "On arrival there, he was asked by the officer of the quarantine station what nation he belonged to. His unsophisticated, prompt reply was 'Catholic'. The officer, somewhat puzzled by this novel nationality, reminded him that they were also Catholics there, but called themselves Austrians or Italians - now what is your nation? Thereupon our worthy friend unflinchingly reiterated that he was a Catholic; nothing else but a Catholic; for they now had, through the intervention of the French ambassador, a Patriarch of their own, and were recognized as a nation!, meaning a community".

versa. It is characteristic, moreover, that whenever the publishers' relationship of affinity with their reading public is defined, in the overwhelming majority of cases the reference point for this blood relationship is religion. They address their public using phrases such as "coreligionists" and "our brother Christians". In the bilingual foreword to the *Ellino-turkiki dialogi... Rumice [Rumca] ve Türkçe mükâlemi [mükâleme]... 1859*, its publisher, Evangelinos Misailidis, declares in the Greek text that he wrote the book for the "arts-loving fellow Greeks" (*filomusus homogenis*), while in the Turkish text, the position of the word *homogenis* is occupied by *dındaş* = "coreligionist".

The content of the word *millet*, whenever it appears in the prefaces to Karamanli books, also seems to be religious. The *bizim millet* in the text "*Bu esnalarda mahsepsis Luterler'in oyunlarını ve tuzaklarını ve Şeytani niyetlerini duyunca bizim millete dolaşıp ebleh kardaşlarımızı yanıltmaya...*"³⁷ differentiates the Orthodox Christians from the Protestant Church, and in the second example "*ve Ortodoks Rumiyan milleti kilisesi ile Ortodoks Ermenian milleti kilisesi*"³⁸, the *Ortodoks Rumiyan milleti* is placed in contradistinction to the corresponding Armenian *millet*. The word *millet* is encountered in that point of the foreword where the authors or translators of the book explain the reasons why they decided to write or translate it. Thus we read *milletimize muhabetleri için*³⁹, *millet gayret* or *millet sevicilik*. Sometimes *millet sevici* (= loving one's race) occurs as an epithet and accompanies the name of the author⁴⁰. In 1811 Zacharias the Athonite (Hagiorite), author of the Turkish-Greek dictionary that went through many editions, is called in the foreword *filadelfos ve filogeni ve karındaş sevici*, that is, as "loving his race", with three adjectives having this meaning, two of which are Greek. From all these examples we deduce that the concept of the *millet* had not been liberated from the concept of the race/nation and is used in Karamanli texts for its religious and cultural content, with great frequency from 1718 until 1836 and sporadically or occasionally until 1869. It is characteristic that it is very rarely encountered after 1869, the period of the Hatt-i Hümayun.

³⁷ *Doğru dinin talimi ki tarihte 1765 Mosha mitropolutu faziletli malumatlu Platon'dan... 1839*, (S. Salaville – E. Dalleggio, no 97).

³⁸ *Ecvibe-i Diniye... Kokoniosoglu Samuil... 1864* (S. Salaville – E. Dalleggio, no 146).

³⁹ *Pahari heyat... Serafim... 1783* (See S. Salaville-E. Dalleggio, no 19).

⁴⁰ The translator of the book *Can helasliyi... Paisios... 1835* (See S. Salaville-E. Dalleggio, no 70) calls in his foreword Nikodemos Hagioreitis (the Athonite) *millet sevici*.

It is not fortuitous that after 1864 and until 1925, the authors call, in the introduction of their forewords, the Turcophone Rum compatriots, "compatriots of Anatolia", "Orthodox compatriots". Thus, when they explain their motives for writing the works, they declare that these stem from love of the fatherland. The Turkish words that are used in this case are *vatanlar* (=compatriots) and *vatan* (=fatherland). The first is used in the sense of being from the same place (*sintopitis*), the second however, like the Greek word *patris* which is encountered frequently in Karamanli books, is used in the sense of place of origin or domicile, with all the sentimental and other connotations of the English word fatherland. Moreover, from the second half of the nineteenth century, "our fatherland the Anatolia" is often mentioned, which rules out any confusion with the other fatherland across the sea, Greece. Also, however hard we search for the ethnic proonym "Greeks", we shall not find it anywhere. Whenever they are declared "ethnically", they are always declared as Rums, which alludes to the *Rum milleti*, and wherever the word "Greek" and its derivatives occur, they denote the language⁴¹. V. Mystakidis notes in 1920 that inhabitants of Asia Minor are called Rums of Anatolia, in contradistinction to the Greeks of Greece, "in order to avoid all policy of conflict towards the Greeks of the Kingdom (*Yunanî*)"⁴².

Noteworthy is the fact that whenever the Turcophone Rums are exhortated, through the forewords, to learn Greek, this is solely for religious reasons, at least until 1860-1870. The texts of the Christian Church are written in the Greek language and it is difficult if not impossible to translate them accurately into Turkish. After the penetration of Greek education into Asia Minor in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the Turcophone Rums were induced to learn Greek in order to participate in the common education of the Greek nation. On the contrary, when they were induced to learn Turkish (that is to read and write the Arabic alphabet) this must be because they wanted to live in fraternal harmony with the Ottomans or because they wanted to occupy public state positions, to have a political and legal career. Such hints, which occur after the Hatt-i Hümayun, are no more than expressions of the idea of Greco-Ottomanism,

⁴¹ The most frequent epithets for defining the Greek language are: *rumce lisani*, *lisan-i rumî*, *rumca* as well as *Yunan-i lisani*, the last used exclusively by the Bible Society.

⁴² V. Mystakidis, *Words: Hellenas, Graikos (Graikylos), Byzantinos, Romaios, (Graikoro-maios), Othomanos, (Helleno-othomanos), Muslim, Turk, Osmanli* (in Greek), Tübingen 1920.

the doctrine of the acceptance and the utilization of the reforms. And they should of course be seen in parallel with the silence or the inertia of the Turcophone Rums with regard to what was happening in the National Centre.

If the Turcophone Orthodox populations of Cappadocia were considered –and rightly so– as belonging to the great Greek family, this is due solely to the fact that they were Rum Ortodoks, and indeed of Anatolia, as they themselves clarified. It is no accident that the Turcophone Orthodox Christians of Cappadocia called themselves Rumiya Ortodoks, a term which in this period signifies the ecclesiastical/religious constitution of the Greek Orthodox community. Moreover, in both the archival material and the Karamanli book production, the absence of the ethnic meaning is observed not only in the actions and demands of the community but also in the projection of its own conception of its physiognomy. The position of religion in collective identities is dominant. Certainly the association made with Greek ethnic discourse after 1870, through the Cappadocian migrants living in the urban centres of the Ottoman Empire, influenced consciousnesses. But certainly not to such a degree that the Turcophone Rums espoused the ideology of irredentism, as a mythopoeic Greek bibliography that developed after the Exchange of Populations implies.

«Gerçi Rum isek de Rumca bilmez Türkçe söyleriz»

THE ADVENTURE OF AN IDENTITY IN THE TRIPTYCH: VATAN, RELIGION
AND LANGUAGE”

Abstract

The study traces the birth of the historiographic problem of the origin of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christian population of Cappadocia and examines some aspects of the historical problem, pointing out the lack of systematic research concerning the definition of this population within the context of the Ottoman Empire. The cultural and ideological physiognomy of this population, as expressed in Karamanli publications, books and press, which were used over two hundred years, from the early decades of the eighteenth century to the Treaty of Lausanne, is discussed. Further, the self-determination of the Turcophone Orthodox Rums of the Anatolia through Karamanli printed matter and archival material from their communities, is investigated.

Keywords

Asia Minor, Karamanli literature, Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians, Rums of Anatolia, Cappadocia, Orthodox Church, Missionary propaganda, refugees.

SETTLEMENTS AND POPULATION IN THE MOREA IN 1645

*Evangelia BALTA**

Our information on the Morea is clearly richer for the second period of Ottoman rule (1715-1821) than it is for the first covering the years 1460-1685. Vasilis Panayotopoulos had pointed out the lack of a synthetic study of the first Ottoman occupation of the Morea.¹ Without doubt our knowledge will continue to remain meagre and very patchy unless the extant Ottoman archival material is investigated. This will supply any attempted synthesis with the essential data, because it is not the synthesis which is lacking but basic information about the period.² In the last decade, doctoral dissertations based on Venetian archival material have enriched our knowledge of the seventeenth century.³ A doctoral

* National Hellenic Research Foundation

¹ V. Panayotopoulos, *Population and Settlements in the Peloponnese, 13th-18th century*, Historical Archive of the Commercial Bank of Greece, Athens 1985, 17 n. 3 (in Greek).

² The number of studies on the Peloponnese, based on Ottoman archival material relating to the first period of Ottoman rule is extremely small, see P. Asenova, R. Stoykov, T. Katsori, 'Selishni, litsni i familni imena ot severozapaden Peloponez prez sredata na XV vek', *Godishnik na Sofijskija Universitet* LXVIII/3 (1977), 244-295. J. Alexander, 'Two Ottoman registers of the Morea, 1460-1462', *Peloponnesiaka* Suppl. 5 (Proceedings of the I Conference of Messenian Studies), Athens 1978, 399-407 (in Greek); idem, *Toward a History of Post-byzantine Greece: the Ottoman Kanunnames for the Greek Lands, c. 1500-c. 1600*, Athens 1985. N. Beldiceanu - Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'Recherches sur la Morée', *Südost-Forschungen* 39 (1980), 17-74; idem, 'Corinthe et sa région en 1461 d'après le registre TT 10' *Südost-Forschungen* 45 (1986), 37-61. Evangelia Balta, 'The kanunnames for the Morea', *Istor* 6 (December 1993), 29-70 (in Greek).

³ Siroil Davies, *The Fiscal System of the Venetian Peloponnese: The Province of Romania 1688-1715* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Centre of Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, School of Antiquity, University of Birmingham), 1996. Idem, 'Tithe-collection in the Venetian Peloponnese 1696-1710', *Annual of the*

dissertation which processed data from the first census of the Peloponnese, that made by Mehmed the Conqueror as soon as he had captured the region, has also appeared.⁴

The theme of a conference in the Symposium of Monemvasia⁵ was the stimulus for me to deal with a register (MAD 561) that recorded the poll tax of the Morea in 1645, on the eve of the Cretan War, a time when the Ottoman Empire was sizing up its forces in order to confront the Venetians. The processing of this source proved to be an opportunity for us to form a picture of the settlement pattern and demography of the Peloponnese. The register from which I shall present data in due course is kept in the Section *Maliyeden Müdevver* of the Ottoman Prime Ministerial Archive in Istanbul. It is unpublished and numbers over 500 pages, half of which are dedicated to the census of the Morea, since it also includes the haraç levied from tax-payers in the sanjaks of Evripos (that is Euboea, Attica, Thebes, Livadia, Zitouni) and Nafpaktos, in western Central Greece, encompassing Nafpaktos, Karpenisi, Angelokastro, Santa Maura (= Lefkada). The census recorded in this source reached as far as the region of Arta. I have used data from this precious document in earlier studies referring to the population of Euboea and of Megara. As far as I know, no one has used the information concerning the Peloponnese.

The register begins with the head-tax census for the kazas of the Peloponnese. It is analytical, that is it records by village the names of those obliged to pay the tax. These taxable units, the hanes of the settlements, are identified with the number of families, that is they do not include more than one

British School at Athens 89 (1994), 433-455. A.M. Malliaris, *The Formation of Social Space in the NW Peloponnese in the Period of Venetian Domination (1687-1715). Migration and Installation of Population Groups in the Districts of Patras and Gastouni* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ionian University), Corfu 2001 (in Greek).

⁴ L. Kayapınar, *Osmanlı Klasik Dönemi Mora Tarihi* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ankara), Ankara 1999. The thesis is based primarily on the Byzantine chroniclers; presented in the third part, however, is the fragment of the census made by Mehmed the Conqueror (Tapu Tahrir 10), kept in the Ottoman Prime Ministerial Archive in Istanbul. As is well known, the other section of the census is in the Cyril and Methodius National Library of Sofia and has been published by P. Asenova, R. Stoykov, T. Katsöri, op. cit. We hope that we shall soon see the Turkish fragment published as well.

⁵ 16th Symposium of History and Art, "From the Despotate to the Regno: The Morea 1460-1685", Monemvasia, Kastro 5-7 July 2003.

family, as is the case elsewhere in this period. The hane (the original meaning of the word is 'house') corresponds to the family head, and their total corresponds to what was in Ottoman fiscal conception the active male Christian population. Even though our source is a fiscal document, it permits us to reconstruct, to a degree, the settlement pattern of the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century and suggests the population size of the settlements, while concurrently providing information on the administrative division of the Morea. The numerical data of the register, which in no way denote the actual magnitudes of population, allow us to extrapolate related magnitudes for the inhabited space, as well as to form an idea of the population of the Peloponnese in this period. It goes without saying that the Muslim population is not included; since it did not pay *cizye* it was not recorded in the tax register. Nor do we know the number of Ottoman soldiers garrisoned in the castles in the towns, although this can be found if research is conducted in salary registers of guardsmen (*mustahfizan*). Despite some inherent weaknesses, the source continues to constitute invaluable historical material in the existing gap of information on the history of the Morea in the first period of Ottoman rule. Furthermore, it calls for comparative studies in which these data will be combined with those of the later published Venetian censuses, and its exceptional material could be the canvas of a doctoral dissertation.

The photocopy in my possession covers nine vilayets of the Morea. I refer to them in order of entry: Chlomoutsi, Paliapatra, Methoni, Karytaina, Kalavryta, Argos, Corinth, Mystras and Koroni. The kaza of Navarino and the area of the Mani are missing. I should note that there is disorder in the pagination of the register, which is normal up to and including the vilayet of Mystras but on the pages where the last vilayet, that of Koroni, is recorded, numbers of preceding pages are repeated. The numbering of pages continues on the basis of this new sequence until the end of the register. The absence of the kaza of Navarino from my photocopy naturally raises the question of whether this is due to oversight in photocopying the source, on account of the aforesaid disorder in the numbering of pages, or to the fact that it does not exist in the original. A new 'autopsy' of the body of the source, which would resolve the problem, has not been possible due to a biopsy of another body, with feet of clay. This prevented me from travelling abroad at the time this article should have been handed in to go to press. So this clarification too, along with so

many others that ought to be seen to and I want to be seen to in this life, remains a desideratum. But the temporary uncertainty does not prevent us from expressing certain ascertainments concerning the population of the rest of the kazas of the Morea and attempting comparisons with the populations that the Venetian census-takers record correspondingly. It should be noted that with the new masters no significant changes were introduced in the administrative division of the Peloponnese. The *kaza* of the Ottomans was renamed *territorio* by the Venetians and in most cases the same borders were retained.⁶

The table depicts the administrative division of the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century; the villages are distributed in 9 *vilayets* and 23 *kazas*.

<i>Vilayets</i>	<i>Kazas</i>
Chlomoutsi	Chlomoutsi
	Argos
	Tripolitsá
	Thana
	Aghios Petros
	Anapli
Corinth	Corinth
	Phonias
	Megara
Paliapatra	Paliapatra
Kalavryta	Kalavryta
	Vostitza
Methoni	Methoni
	Androusa
	Arkadia
Karytaina	Karytaina
	Leontari
	Phanari
Mystras	Mystras
	Vardounia
	Monemvasia
Koroni	Koroni
	Kalamata

Table I Administrative Division of the Morea (1645)

⁶ K. Dokos - G. Panagopoulos, *The Venetian Cadaster of Vostitsa*, Agricultural Bank Cultural Institute, Athens 1993, XII (in Greek).

In the register, settled space is classed as towns (*nefs-i ...*), villages and 'çiftlik', the Byzantine '*zeugolateia*'. These çiftlik, in contrast to what we know about çiftlik in the nineteenth century, the large estates, constituted single territorial and settlement units that were created during the Ottoman occupation and belonged to one or more masters; they could exist autonomously or on the periphery of villages. All of them were small population ensembles. In Table 2, in which the settlements of each vilayet are classed by category, the çiftlik have been classed in two subcategories. The first includes villages which became çiftlik. This is indicated by the way in which they are recorded in the register, because they are entered with a toponym, which is in fact the name of the village before it became a çiftlik, followed by the name(s) of the Muslim owner(s). The second category includes those çiftlik characterized solely by the name of their overlord and located on the periphery of villages. The scribe notes them as follows: 'çiftlik of lord X, located on the borders of village Y'. I opted for this analytical classification of the çiftlik in order to facilitate following them up in the subsequent period of Venetian rule (1685-1715). On conquering the Morea, the Venetians confiscated and abolished the Muslim properties. In Grimani's census of 1700 we ascertain that, as a general rule, the çiftlik-villages of the first period of Ottoman rule appear as villages. This was a result of the transformations that the Venetian conquest brought in the manner of landownership. Furthermore, in the Venetian census of 1700, villages whose names derived from the names of Turkish masters, such as the villages of Derviş Çelebi (former name of Amaliada) or Suleiman aia (the modern village of Myrsini) in the *territorio* of Gastouni, refer to çiftlik of the previous Ottoman period. In the vilayet of Cholomoutsi, as the same area was named by the Ottomans, we can indeed identify çiftlik with the corresponding names, which are names of their Muslim owners. There is a long list of similar examples from other kazas of the Morea. It is interesting to study the process of creating settlements from çiftlik and to investigate the reasons why they lived on in the years of Venetian occupation. Just as it is extremely interesting to identify the *zeugolateia* which are noted in the Venetian censuses as 'uninhabited'. According to K. Dokos, the case of the deserted *zeugolateia* in the area of Vostitza is linked to a degree with the withdrawal of the Turks during the final phase of the Venetian-Turkish war.⁷ Alexis Malliaris ascertains in the *territorio* of Patras a large number of *zeugolateia* characterized as deserted and uncultivated in the Venetian period,

7 Ibidem, LXXIff.

since the retreating Turkish owners were followed willy-nilly by the cultivators too.⁸ The phenomenon of the desertion of settlements as well as of the creation of new ones dictated by the use of rural space are major issues of historiography, which surpass the limited Peloponnesian example.

Vilayets	Kazas	Villages	Vilages turned into çiftliks	Çiftliks	TOTAL
Chlomoutsi	Chlomoutsi	96 (48.5%)	55 (27.5%)	49 (24.5%)	200 (100%)
Argos	Argos	22 (22.5%)	-	77 (77.8)	99
	Tripolitsa	33 (94.3%)	2 (5.7%)	-	35
	Thana	19 (95%)	-	1 (5%)	20
	Agios Petros	8 (100%)	-	-	8
	Anapli	8 (42.1%)	6 (31.6%)	5 (26.3%)	19
Corinth	Corinth	98 (52.7%)	16 (8.6%)	50 (26.9%)	186
	Phonias	17 (100%)	-	-	17
	Megara	7 (100%)	-	-	7
Paliapatra	Paliapatra	101 (54.9)	2 (1,1%)	81 (44%)	164
Kalavryta	Kalavryta	108 (78.8%)	5 (3.7%)	24 (17.5%)	137
	Vostitza	31 (41.9%)	-	43 (58.1%)	74
Methoni	Methoni	15 (27.3%)	14 (25.4%)	26 (47.3%)	55
	Androusaş	53 (49,1)	-	55 (50.9%)	108
	Arkadia	92 (71.4%)	11 (8.5%)	26 (20.1%)	129
Karytaina	Karytaina	94 (60.6%)	10 (6.4%)	51 (33%)	155
	Leontari	34 (29.6%)	3 (2.6%)	78 (67.8%)	115
	Phanari	45 (55.6%)	-	36 (44.4%)	81
Mystras	Mystras	111 (79.9%)	2 (1.4%)	26 (18.7%)	139
	Vardounia	8 (100%)	-	-	8
	Monemvasia	7 (100%)	-	-	7
Koroni	Koroni	31 (41.3%)	6 (8%)	38 (50.7%)	75
	Kalamata	12 (34,3)	5 (14.3%)	18 (51.4%)	35
Total		1050 (56,1)	137 (7,34%)	684 (36,56%)	1871 (100%)

Table 2: Distribution of villages and çiftliks in the kazas of the Peloponnese (1645)

⁸ A. Malliaris, op. cit., 120.

How are the *çiftlik*s distributed within the Peloponnese? The testimony of the register shows the logical: *çiftlik*s exist in the plains. The majority of settlements in the lowland *kazas* of Argos, Anapli, Vostitza, Leontari, Methoni do indeed correspond to *çiftlik*s. In highland areas, such as that of Parnon, which belonged administratively in the *kaza* of Aghios Petros, there is no *çiftlik*. Very few *çiftlik*s are observed in the mountainous *kaza* of Tripolitsa, as we can see in Table 2. As K. Dokos and G. Panagopoulos have observed for the region of Vostitza Turkish *çiftlik*s covered almost all of the cultivated fields, those in the plains, along the coasts and river banks, which extend from the shores to the interior of the entire province. "Of course is a matter of that type of lands that the Turks usually took into their immediate possession when they had conquered a region".⁹

I shall now present very summarily some observations on population distribution.

1. As in the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, villages of small population predominate, even if we exclude the 684 *çiftlik*s existing on the periphery of villages, which, as is known, have a population of less than ten families. We note that the *çiftlik*s correspond to one third of the total of settlements in the Morea.¹⁰ So, if they are included in the group of villages - many of these moreover, as mentioned above, appear as villages in Venetian times - then we ascertain that over half (55%) of the Peloponnesian settlements are of no more than 10 families. However, the population living in them is less than 20% of the total population recorded in the 23 *kazas*. It would be interesting to study to what extent the population density correlates with the geographical location of the settlements. I mention, as an aside, that in an Ottoman census of *timars* in the northwest Peloponnese, dated to the mid-fifteenth century, the countryside appears to have been dominated more by small settlement concentrations than by medium-size ones. This is the fragment of the census made at the behest of Mehmed II, in which 193 villages are recorded, which has been published by Bulgarian historians.¹¹ The smallest villages, which constitute the overwhelming majority, 121 in all, are defined by a clan-based possession of

⁹ K. Dokos - G. Panagopoulos, *op. cit.*, LXXXII.

¹⁰ The nine *kazas* comprise 1050 villages, 137 villages created from *çiftlik*s and 684 *çiftlik*s. That is a total of 1871 settlements.

¹¹ P. Asenova - R. Stojkov - T. Katsori, *op. cit.*

territory, since this emerges from the toponymic which alludes to the Albanian settlement of the Morea in the preceding century. These place names also survive in the head-tax register of the mid-seventeenth century, studied here. Thus, there is demand for a study that will examine, after the passage of two centuries, the relation between the family names of tax-payers in the villages with place names that derive from names of Albanian clans. The challenges for research are, as we see, many and varied.

2. However, if the Morea, as I said above, was scattered with small population communities, it was not lacking in large urban concentrations either. In terms of size, the latter were as follows in 1645:

- Anapli (950 Christian + 28 Jewish families)
- Monemvasia (800 families)
- Paliapatra (480 + 250 Jewish families)¹²
- Kastanitsa, Tsakonia (500 families)
- Argos (428 families)
- Tripolitza (408 families)
- Kalamata (354 families)
- Zarnata (343 families)
- Mystras (120 Jewish + 140 Christian families)

In Patras and Mystras there were populous communities of Jews; whose presence in these towns dates back from Late Byzantine times.¹³ The

¹² In the register MAD 561 the tax-payers in the city of Patras are recorded in neighbourhoods. I note the names of the main neighbourhoods, as they appear in the source: Vlateros (40 families), Kato Aghios Yorgis (25 families), Kyro Apostoli (24 families), Apano Aghios Yorgis (35 families), Tourba (26 families), Aghia Triada (19 families), Aghios Konstantinos (43 families), Aghia Odigitria (36 families), Aghios Dimitris (46 families), Aghios Vasilis (17 families), Aghia Paraskevi (36 families), Kantriana (16 families), Aghios Nikolaos Santouka(?) (16 families), Aghia Anastasia (11 families), Aghioi Theodoroi (14 families), Aghios Andreas (40 families), Eglykada (39 families), TOTAL: 485 families. In addition, 250 Jewish families are recorded.

¹³ For the presence of Jews in the Peloponnese see Anna Lambropoulou, 'The Jews in the Peloponnese during the Late Byzantine period', *Proceedings of the Scientific Council Greek Jewry* (Athens, 3-4 April 1998), Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, Athens 1999, 33-63 (in Greek). For Patras in particular, see Afentra Moutzali, 'The Jewish community of Patras during Byzantine and Post-byzantine times', *The Jews in Greek Lands: issues of history in the longue durée. Proceedings of the I History Conference* (Thessaloniki, 23-24 November 1991), Society for Study of Greek Jewry, Athens 1995, 75-94 (in Greek). See also A. Malliaris, op. cit., 77, 81ff.

population of Mystras is divided into Christians and Jews. Jewish communities are also encountered at Anapli, Chlomoutsi and Koroni. The existence of Jewish communities in urban centres of the Morea in the seventeenth century should be associated with the mercantile and manufacturing specializations of some Peloponnesian towns in this period.

I would like to conclude the presentation of this important source with one further ascertainment which refers to population size in the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century, as and to the degree that the tax register reveals it to us. I repeat that this does not record the actual population but the males subject to poll tax. Entered in Table 3 are the tax-payers in each kazas and next to them the number of families that the Venetian census-takers recorded in the various *territorii* into which the Morea was divided. I should note *a priori* that the administrative division the two conquerors imposed undoubtedly differs. Thanks to the head-tax register we are in a position to know exactly the administrative dependence of the settlements and to make comparisons with the succeeding Venetian situation. I cite an example; while transcribing from the source the settlements in the kaza of Mystras, I noticed that the extent of the kaza corresponded to the area occupied by three *territorii*: the *territorio* of Mystras, of Chrysapha and of Elous.

And I reach the conclusion on the population of the Morea. The sum of the tax-payers in the 23 kazas and that of the families in the corresponding *territorii* do not deviate significantly. The Venetians in 1700 recorded 38,000 families and the Ottomans 50 years earlier had recorded 37,000 tax-payers. Of course fine processing of the data is required, but I consider it very important for us to know that *grosso modo* the population of the Morea, on the basis of the Ottoman and the Venetian sources, was in the second half of the seventeenth century (specifically 1645 and 1700) at more or less the same level.¹⁴

¹⁴ 'According to the population census of 1689 the Peloponnese, without the Mani and Corinthia, number 86,468 inhabitants, whereas according to the census by Grimani in

territory, since this emerges from the toponymic which alludes to the Albanian settlement of the Morea in the preceding century. These place names also survive in the head-tax register of the mid-seventeenth century, studied here. Thus, there is demand for a study that will examine, after the passage of two centuries, the relation between the family names of tax-payers in the villages with place names that derive from names of Albanian clans. The challenges for research are, as we see, many and varied.

2. However, if the Morea, as I said above, was scattered with small population communities, it was not lacking in large urban concentrations either. In terms of size, the latter were as follows in 1645:

Anapli (950 Christian + 28 Jewish families)

Monemvasia (800 families)

Paliapatra (480 + 250 Jewish families)¹²

Kastanitsa, Tsakonia (500 families)

Argos (428 families)

Tripolitza (408 families)

Kalamata (354 families)

Zarnata (343 families)

Mystras (120 Jewish + 140 Christian families)

In Patras and Mystras there were populous communities of Jews; whose presence in these towns dates back from Late Byzantine times.¹³ The

¹² In the register MAD 561 the tax-payers in the city of Patras are recorded in neighbourhoods. I note the names of the main neighbourhoods, as they appear in the source: Vlateros (40 families), Kato Aghios Yorgis (25 families), Kyro Apostoli (24 families), Apano Aghios Yorgis (35 families), Tourba (26 families), Aghia Triada (19 families), Aghios Konstantinos (43 families), Aghia Odigitria (36 families), Aghios Dimitris (46 families), Aghios Vasilis (17 families), Aghia Paraskevi (36 families), Kantriana (16 families), Aghios Nikolaos Santouka(?) (16 families), Aghia Anastasia (11 families), Aghioi Theodoroi (14 families), Aghios Andreas (40 families), Eglykada (39 families), TOTAL: 485 families. In addition, 250 Jewish families are recorded.

¹³ For the presence of Jews in the Peloponnese see Anna Lambropoulou, 'The Jews in the Peloponnese during the Late Byzantine period', *Proceedings of the Scientific Council Greek Jewry* (Athens, 3-4 April 1998), Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, Athens 1999, 33-63 (in Greek). For Patras in particular, see Afentra Moutzali, 'The Jewish community of Patras during Byzantine and Post-byzantine times', *The Jews in Greek Lands: issues of history in the longue durée. Proceedings of the I History Conference* (Thessaloniki, 23-24 November 1991), Society for Study of Greek Jewry, Athens 1995, 75-94 (in Greek). See also A. Malliaris, op. cit., 77, 81ff.

population of Mystras is divided into Christians and Jews. Jewish communities are also encountered at Anapli, Chlomoutsi and Koroni. The existence of Jewish communities in urban centres of the Morea in the seventeenth century should be associated with the mercantile and manufacturing specializations of some Peloponnesian towns in this period.

I would like to conclude the presentation of this important source with one further ascertainment which refers to population size in the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century, as and to the degree that the tax register reveals it to us. I repeat that this does not record the actual population but the males subject to poll tax. Entered in Table 3 are the tax-payers in each kazas and next to them the number of families that the Venetian census-takers recorded in the various *territorii* into which the Morea was divided. I should note *a priori* that the administrative division the two conquerors imposed undoubtedly differs. Thanks to the head-tax register we are in a position to know exactly the administrative dependence of the settlements and to make comparisons with the succeeding Venetian situation. I cite an example; while transcribing from the source the settlements in the kaza of Mystras, I noticed that the extent of the kaza corresponded to the area occupied by three *territorii*: the *territorio* of Mystras, of Chrysapha and of Elous.

And I reach the conclusion on the population of the Morea. The sum of the tax-payers in the 23 kazas and that of the families in the corresponding *territorii* do not deviate significantly. The Venetians in 1700 recorded 38,000 families and the Ottomans 50 years earlier had recorded 37,000 tax-payers. Of course fine processing of the data is required, but I consider it very important for us to know that *grosso modo* the population of the Morea, on the basis of the Ottoman and the Venetian sources, was in the second half of the seventeenth century (specifically 1645 and 1700) at more or less the same level.¹⁴

¹⁴ According to the population census of 1689 the Peloponnese, without the Mani and Corinthia, number 86,468 inhabitants, whereas according to the census by Grimani in

<i>Vilayets</i>	<i>Kazas</i>	<i>Villages in 1645</i>	<i>Villages in 1700</i>	<i>Tax-paying families to 1645</i>	<i>Tax-paying families to 1700</i>
Chlomoutsi	Chlomoutsi	200	162	970	3843
Argos	Argos	99	29	1200	957
	Tripolitza	35	61	1140	1507
	Thana ¹⁵	20		663	
	Agios Petros	8	12	353	847
Corinth	Anapli	8	29	1423 4770	821
	Corinth	186	110	2772	2219
	Phonias	17		441	
	Megara	7		484 3698	
	Paliapatra	184	100	2806	2642
Kalavryta	Kalavryta	137	124	2503 [2905]	3295
	Vostitza	74	33	523 [1127] 4036	879
Methoni	Methoni	55	52	625	654
	Androusa	108	69	1351	1427
	Arkadia	129	92	2145 4121	1943
Karytaina	Karytaina	155	121	2312 2312	2792
	Leontari	115	60	1302	1035
	Phanari	81	64	890 2192	1247
Mystras	Mystras	139	100	6509 ¹⁶	3379
	Vardounia	8	49	276	1922
	Monemvasia	7	18	1267 8053	2074
Koroni	Koroni	75	62	1031	1044
	Kalamata	35	22	1209 [2240]	1082

Table 3: Settlements and population of the Morea in the years of the Ottoman and Venetian conquest (mid and late 17th century)

1700 the total population had risen to 176,844 inhabitants', see Chrysa A. Maltezou, 'Data on the plague of 1687/1688 in the Peloponnese', in Charis Kalliga (ed.), *Morosini's Campaign and the "Regno di Morea"* (Monemvasiotan Group III Conference of History and Art, 20-22 July 1990), Hestia, Athens 1998, 167.

¹⁵ Thana belonged to the *territorio* of Tripolitza.

¹⁶ The kaza of Mystra includes the districts of Elous and Chrysapha. The *territorio* of Elous 16 villages with 721 families and of Chrysapha 53 villages with 1,928 families.

The example of the register I have presented shows, I believe, the possibilities offered to research on the early centuries -and not only- of Ottoman domination in the Peloponnese. Let us hope that the new generation of Ottoman specialists, who are beginning to appear, will contribute to this. We need sources and processing of information, we need production of knowledge and not pastiches of things already known or regurgitations of ill-digested theory. The gaps that must be filled are many and pressing.