

Bu tebliğ 1830'lardan günümüze uzanan dönemde Yunan tarih yazıcılığında Türkçe arşiv malzemelerinin kullanımını incelemektedir. Ayrıca modern Yunan tarihçiliğinin ilk devrelerini geçmişe dönük bir bakış açısıyla ele almak amaçlanırken II. Dünya Savaşı, tarih kavramının değişimi adına bir dönüm noktası olarak ortaya konulmaktadır. Yazar ideolojik yönelimlerin ve yenilikçi yaklaşımlar içeren yeni tarih araştırma metodlarının tarih yazımı ürünleri üzerindeki etkisini vurgulamaktadır. Bildiri birinci el kaynakların tarih yazımı açısından taşıdığı önemin ifade edilmesiyle sonuçlanmaktadır.

تعرض هذه المحاضرة موضوع استخدام المواد الأرشيفية التركية في تدوين التاريخ اليوناني في الفترة الممتدة من حدود 1830 إلى يومنا هذا. وهي تهدف كذلك إلى تناول الفترات الأولى للتأريخ اليوناني من منظور يعود إلى الماضي ويبرز أن الحرب العالمية الثانية كانت بمثابة منعطف في تغيير مفهوم التاريخ. ويكشف الكاتب أثر الميول الإيديولوجية ومناهج البحث التاريخي الجديدة ذات المقاربات التحديثية في مواد تدوين التاريخ. وتختتم المحاضرة ببيان أهمية المصادر الأصلية في تدوين التاريخ.

TURKISH ARCHIVAL MATERIAL IN GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY

“L’histoire est une lutte contre la mort”

Jacques Le Goff¹

In memory of Eftychia Kosmatou, Whom I knew only from what she wrote I was asked to contribute the International Symposium on “The Importance of the Turkish Archives for Regional and World History” and have decided to speak about the use of Turkish sources in Greek historiography from the founding of the Greek State to the present. I have been involved with the issue of the Ottoman archives and Ottoman Studies in Greece for a long time; some of my articles – the most recent – were republished in 2003 in a small collection entitled *Ottoman Studies and Archives in Greece*². I shall not, of course, repeat today what I said there. Nonetheless, I have to mention them for the completeness of my paper, the aim of which is to examine more generally the management of the Turkish archival material appertaining to “Greek space”, a geographical continuum which functions as the canvas on which the Greek populations were interwoven with time, with history. I assume that by choosing the term “Turkish Archives”, the organizers of the symposium wished to focus interest on sources written in the Turkish language, thus distinguishing these from the total of archival material generated in the linguistically and culturally pluralistic Ottoman Empire. And I presume that the choice was made precisely in order to remove any confusion that the definitive epithet “Ottoman” might cause with regard to the sources produced by other pre-national communities of the empire: Greek, Jewish, Arab, and so on.

The subject I have chosen imposes a watershed, which is articulated directly with the introduction of Ottoman Studies in Greece and their establishment in the 1980s as a new branch of historical studies, with all this entails in terms of methods, techniques and the manner in general of approaching the Ottoman past. Consequently, the negotiation of the subject will revolve around two axes: First, I shall present the fate of the Turkish sources in Modern Greek historiography dealing with the Ottoman period, which in the scheme of national history is called *Tourkokratia* (Turkish Domination)³, and second, I

¹ J. le Goff, “L’appétit de l’histoire”, in: Pierre Nora (ed.), *Essais d’ego-histoire*, Paris, Gallimard 1987, 236.

² Evangelia Balta, *Ottoman Studies and Archives in Greece*, *Analecta Isisiana* LXX, The Isis Press, Istanbul 2003 with relevant bibliography. See also I. Theocharides – Th. Stavrides, “The Course of Ottoman Studies in Greece (An Overview)”, in: Y. Halaçoğlu, H. Inalcik (eds), *The Turks*, t. 4, Ankara 2002, 714-719.

³ The term appears in 1834. See St. Koumanoudis, *Synagogi neon lexeon ypo ton logion plasteison apo tis aloseos mechri ton kath’imas chronon* (Collection of new words coined by men of letters from the Fall [of Constantinople] to the present), reprinted with prolegomena by K.Th. Dimaras, Athens 1980.

shall follow their confrontation and manipulation by the now international historical discipline of Ottoman Studies, which has existed institutionally in Greece since the early 1980s⁴; this deals virtually exclusively with Turkish archival material, which is a specifying element of its identity, sometimes creating a whole mythology around its value as a source. "Greek" Ottoman Studies proceeded alongside the historiographic production that was shaped after the restoration of democracy, which studies the Ottoman period in the light of the new conceptions on history, new methods and new thematic repertoires, which it incorporated from the transfer and the utilization of international models.

In order to understand better the evolution of these historiographic productions and the relationship that each one developed with the Turkish archival material, we should look retrospectively at the earlier Modern Greek historiographic production, in order to point out the process of transmutations of its structure in terms of the methods, the techniques and, primarily, the theory of History. It goes without saying that the critique of this through the prism of today's conceptions is alien to historical logic, since, as we know, the historian and his work are dependent on the dynamic developed by the conjunctures of the time.

I. Modern Greek Historiography and the Historiography of the Ottoman Period

Modern Greek historiography, which began to be compiled in the second half of the nineteenth century and is almost exclusively Hellenocentric, examines the long period of Ottoman rule primarily in the Greek regions and less in Asia Minor and the Balkans, or includes the latter in its narrative in the proportion that these re-signify the conceptual content of the Nation and offer arguments to its scientific documentation. *Terminus post quem* of this long period is the dissolution of the Byzantine Empire with the Fall of Constantinople in 1453, and *terminus ante quem* is the War of Independence in 1821, the years of the Balkan Wars with the acquisition of the New Territories, or lastly 1922, since it was considered that it was then that national integration was achieved, with Hellenism gathered together in the Greek Peninsula. So, the time-frame of Ottoman rule was dependent on a specific ideological-political conception about the writing of history, which is none other than to promote the meaning of the national struggles with regard to an overall historical course of the Nation.

⁴ Ottoman Studies as a discipline was introduced into higher education in 1985. N. Svoronos organized the institutional framework of Turkish Studies at the University of Crete, where Elizabeth Zachariadou and Vasilis Demetriades were appointed. They taught in the Department of History and Archaeology for some twenty years and concurrently organized research work in the Institute of Mediterranean Studies, through utilizing the Ottoman archives and organizing symposia on Turkish Studies. In 1985 Ottoman specialists were also engaged to teach the history of the period in the history departments of various Greek universities: I. Theodoridis at the University of Ioannina, John Alexander at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Evangelia Balta at the newly-founded Ionian University and, in 1986, P. Konortas.

Modern Greek historiography followed the paths of the national ideology, which were structured around the idea of the three-thousand-year continuity of Hellenism, through three separate pasts: Ancient Greek, Byzantine and Ottoman past. The historiographical inquiries and political and cultural deliberations of the Enlightenment introduced from very early on into Greek discourse the idea of the relationship with Greek Antiquity as the definitive element of the collective identity. This ideological parameter must, therefore, be taken into account when attempts are made to interpret the way in which the Ottoman past was negotiated. For the Ottoman, the living past, a policy of oblivion was followed⁵. It is not fortuitous that until the 1940s the Ottoman period was not studied in its own right, but merely as an overture to the 1821 War of Independence, since the insurrections against the conquerors constituted a privileged field of historiographic observation. Nor is it fortuitous that the discipline dealing with the period was – and still is – characterized as “Post-Byzantine Studies”⁶. The Second World War is the watershed date after which a differentiation in the national narrative of various nation states is observed at a global level, since, as we know, the wider changes in the geopolitical, economic and social status are related directly to developments in the Social Sciences and therefore to changes in the conception of History⁷.

I.i. The First Century: 1833-1939

Modern Greek historiography, which is conventionally defined as beginning with the founding of the Modern Greek State, stumbled until the 1940s between the rhetoric recruited to serve the national ideology and the documentation of national interests which were elevated to “historical rights”. Only in the early twentieth century, with the intervention of philologists and Byzantinists (S. Kougeas, K. Amantos), was it disengaged from the rambling rhetoric, which had no need of sources – and even less of Turkish sources – in order to develop its chosen discourse, since this historiography, under the guidance of S. Zambelios and primarily of K. Paparrigopoulos with his *History of the Greek Nation* (1853), treated the period of Ottoman rule as a Post-Byzantine

⁵ See the exceptionally interesting study by John Petropoulos, “The Modern Greek State and the Greek Past”, in: Speros Vryonis (ed.), *The “Past” in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, Malibu, Undena Publications 1978, (Byzantina kai Metabyzantina, vol. 1), 163-176, who examines Modern Greek society’s conception of the preceding periods and the political and social consequences of this.

⁶ See the comments on the conceptual content of the concept “Post-Byzantium”, S. Asdrachas, *Zitimata oikónomikis istorias tis Tourkokratias* (Issues of economic history in the Ottoman period), in: idem, *Zitimata Istorias* (Issues of History), Athens, Themelio, n.d., 27ff.

⁷ I. Wallerstein, “Some Reflections on the Future of Ottoman Studies”, in: B. Lewis, O. Pritsak, Gönül Tekin, Ö. Tekin, G. Veinstein (eds), *Raiyyet Rüşümü. Essays presented to Halil İnalcık on his Seventeenth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Journal of Turkish Studies, 11 (1987), 236. Most studies examine the historiographic production of Ottoman Studies since the Second World War. See more recently: F. Adanır, “Balkan historiography related to the Ottoman Empire since 1945”, in: K. H. Karpat (ed.), *Ottoman Past and Today’s Turkey*, E. J. Brill 2000, 236-252.

epilogue or a prologue to the National Revolution. Not even the Cappadocian P. Carolidis escaped the norm of the national historical school, which he opted to teach at the University of Athens. In the *History* by the Turcophone Carolidis, who also knew other oriental languages, there is total silence on the Ottoman past and in his prolix and convoluted footnotes there is not a single reference to an Ottoman source⁸. Essentially, during the first century of the Greek State's existence a history of events was produced, in which all are interdependent in teleological manner and document the need to create a state formation that refuted the terms of the Ottoman conquest⁹. The book *Tourkokratoumeni Ellas* (Turkish-occupied Greece) by K. Sathas was written in the same perspective; he was also the first to deal with original documentary material in order to enhance the "Attempts to liberate the Greeks from Turkish slavery", subtitle of the work, which also defines its identity¹⁰. It is obvious that the ideological orientations of the historiographic production of this period are far removed from the use of Turkish sources. An exception to the general climate is the case of S. Lambros, who from the beginning of his scholarly career was interested in collecting, preserving and enhancing archival material of all kinds. With his characteristic historicism, that is the enhancement of the sources, in the early twentieth century he published from the archives of Venice Ottoman documents written in Greek, following the example of F. Miklosich – J. Müller¹¹.

⁸ P. Carolidis, *Istoria tis Ellados met'eikonon, apo tis ypo ton Othomanon aloseos tis Constantinoupoleos* (1453) *mechri tis vaseileias tou Georgiou tou A'* (History of Greece with illustrations, from the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans (1453) until the reign of George I), Athens, Eleftheroudakis, 1925. For the Ottoman period he confined himself to using the most common narrative sources Gerlach, *Turcograecia*, Komninos Ypsilantis and the histories by Hertzberg, J. W. Zinkeisen). It is contended that in order to refute the Ottoman historical reality Carolidis musters and crams a host of footnotes, in which his delirious devotion to detail and anxious citations are consistent with the adulation of Antiquity and function in the direction of obfuscation. See Ioanna Petropoulou, "O ekdimokratismos tis graphis" (The democratization of writing), in: IV International Congress of History, *Historiography of Modern and Contemporary Greece*, vol. II, (eds) P. M. Kitromilides – T. E. Sklavenitis, Athens 2004, 641.

⁹ See the view of Ph. Iliou in the interview he gave together with S. Asdrachas to Angelos Elefantis (newspaper I Avgi, 27 October 2002). The interview was reprinted in the periodical *Ta Istorika*, iss. 37 (December 2002), 421-430, entitled: "Synecheies kai tomes: Synentefxi tou Sp. Asdracha – Ph. Iliou ston Angelo Elefantis" (Continuities and watersheds: Interview of S. Asdrachas – Ph. Iliou with Angelos Elefantis).

¹⁰ K. Sathas, *Tourkokratoumeni Ellas. Istorikon Dokimion peri ton pros anatinaxin tou othomanikou zygyou epanastaseon tou ellinikou ethnous* (1453-1821) (Turkish-occupied Greece. Historical Essay on the revolutions of the Greek Nation to cast off the Ottoman yoke, 1453-1821), Athens 1869.

¹¹ F. Miklosich-J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata Graeca*, vol. III, Vienna 1865, 309-359. S. Lambros, "Ellinika eggrapha en to archeio tis Venetias en ois kai eggrapha Tourkon archonton ellinisti meta kai parekdromis peri tou onomatos tou Moreos" (Greek documents in the archive of Venice, among which are documents of Turkish authorities in Greek in which there is, incidentally, the first mention of the name of the Morea), *Deltion Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etaireias* 4 (1892), 634-52; idem, "Ellinika dimosia grammata tou soultanou Bayazid II" (Greek public letters of Sultan Bayazid II), *Neos Ellinomnimon* 5 (1908), 155-189. Spyros Lambros's tradition was followed by A. Bombaci, "Nuovi firmani greci di Mahometto

Lambros himself, in his *History of Greece*, did not proceed beyond 1453. As advocate of historical positivism, he was conscious of the fact that to progress to a synthesis demands the collection of material¹².

It is also worth noting that “Greek” *Ottoman Histories* that circulated in 1874, one Greek, the other karamanli, were published outside the borders of the Greek State by Rum Ottoman subjects, as was another such work published by Tryphon Evangelidis from Trygleia¹³.

In the same period, many Turkish documents were published on the fringe of national historiography, included in studies about the history of monasteries, cities, islands etc. That is, they contributed as documentary material to the writing of local histories¹⁴. This is archival material in the possession of monasteries, metropolises, communities, documents granting privileges, permits for the repair of churches, receipts of payment of taxes, etc., the archival material produced by the machinery of local Ottoman administration, for example, kadi sicilleri or fiscal registers. After the liberation of the various Greek regions, material of this kind was repositied in the so-called

II”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954), 298-319 and Héléne Ahrweiler, “Une lettre en grec du sultan Bayezid II (1481-1512)”, *Turcica* 1 (1969), 150-160.

¹² Antonis Liakos, “Pros episkevin olomeleias kai enotitos. I domisi tou ethnou chronou” (Towards repair of plenum and unity. The structuring of national time), Symposium in memory of K.Th. Dimaras, Athens, Centre of Neohellenic Research, 1994, 191, n. 55.

¹³ Minas and Christos Chamoudopoulos mention in their book *Istoria tis Othomanikis Aftokratorias* (History of the Ottoman Empire), Smyrna 1874, the wars waged between the Byzantine Empire and the Turkish tribes, without deviating from the line of Paparrigopoulos and Zambelios. The Turcophone Nikolaos Soullidis in his karamanli *Tarih-i osmani...*, Dersaadet 1874 follows in the footsteps of J. von Hammer. Both works reach up to the events of the Fall of Constantinople, since their publication was not completed. For the presentation of both studies see Ioanna Petropoulou, “Istoriographikes prosengiseis tou othomanikou parelthontos stin Christianiki Anatoli, 19os aionas. Mia deigmatolipsia” (Historiographic approaches to the Ottoman past in the Christian East, 19th century. A sampling), *Mnimon* 23 (2001), 269-295. See also T. Evangelidis, *Istoria tis Othomanikis Aftokratorias* (History of the Ottoman Empire), 2 vols, Athens 1894.

¹⁴ I do not intend, nor is it feasible, to present an exhaustive bibliography in the footnotes. I simply cite selectively some titles as examples. See E. Pharmakidis, *I Larisa. Apo ton mythologikon chronon mechri tis prosartiseos aftis eis tin Ellada* (1881) (Larisa. From mythological times until its annexation to Greece:1881), Volos 1926. Included are Greek translations of the vakunames of Turhan Bey and his descendants Ömer and Hasan Bey, with which they dedicate in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries part of their property for the founding of mosques and charitable foundations in towns of Thessaly. (See also the recent publication by Stavros G. Gouloulis, *Ta aphierotiria ton Turahanidon* (I elliniki metaphrasi) (The documents of vakifs of the Turahan family (the Greek translation)), Larisa 2004). The study by D. Kambouroglou, *Mnimeia tis istorias ton Athinon* (Monuments of the History of Athens), vols I-III, Athens 1889-1890, is a similar example. With regard to the history of monasteries see G. Kremos, *Phokika. Istoria tis en Phokidi monis tou Osiou Louka* (Phocian miscellanea. History of the monastery of Hosios Loukas in Phocis), vol. III, Athens 1880. For the islands see D. Chaviaras. “Soultanika fermania peri ton pronomion tis nisou Symis kai ton loipon Notion Sporadon” (Firmans on the privileges of the island of Symi and the rest of the Southern Sporades), *Deltion Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etaireias Ellados* 6 (1902-1906), 321-350.

“Translation Bureaus” and until the early decades of the twentieth century, subject to the local legal services, served needs of state and citizens for elucidating issues relating to land-ownership claims¹⁵. Later, this material constituted the nuclei of the present Ottoman archives in Greece¹⁶.

The historical value of the Ottoman documents for local history was obvious to their publishers, as indicated by the brief note with which Epameinondas Stamatiadis, director of the bureau of the Principality of Samos, prefaces the publication of the translated firmans and miscellaneous Ottoman documents¹⁷. It is telling, however, that he includes them in the last volume of his work *Samiaka*, together with folklore material and mementoes, and does not incorporate them in his narrative on the history of the Ottoman period on the island or the years of the War of Independence. Only in the third volume, which is dedicated to the history of the Samian Principality, does he intersperse in the body of his text Ottoman documents from the Public Archive Office of the island. We should bear in mind, however, that this a period contemporary with him, in which he participates actively in the post of director of the bureau of the Principality. Essentially he presents his personal testimony, a valuable historical source today. The work of N. Stavrakis, former secretary to the general administration of Crete and former overseer of the Cretan customs houses can be considered a similar case, since he uses Ottoman censuses for compiling his *Statistics*¹⁸. P. Aravantinos uses the Ottoman census (*salname*) of 1845-1846 to record the place names of Epirus¹⁹.

¹⁵ In the absence of a National Cadastre, the Ottoman tax registers kept in the Historical Archive of Macedonia, in Thessaloniki, continue to be used to this day as evidence in cases of land claims and for resolving inheritance transfers.

¹⁶ For the content of the Ottoman archives in Greece, see V. Demetriades, “Ottoman Archive Materials in Greece” in : *Die Staaten Südosteuropas und die osmanen*, (ed.) Hans Georg Majer, München 1989, 179-185. See also Evangelia Balta, “Archives Ottomanes en Grèce. Perspectives de la recherche”, in : idem, *Problèmes et approches de l'histoire ottomane. Un itinéraire scientifique de Kayseri à Éérizboz*, *Analecta Isisiana XXVIII*, Les éditions Isis, Istanbul 1997, 259-275, with relevant bibliography.

¹⁷ “In the public archive office of the island, as well as in the monasteries there, are preserved all manner of firmans or decrees of sultans, buyurdia or commands of admirals and other such documents written in Turkish, which shed quite some light on the situation of things then and consequently have much to do with the history of Samos; thus according to our judgement, we present them translated from the Turkish in this chapter”. See E.I. Stamatiadis, *Samiaka, itoi Istoría tis nisou Samou apo ton panarchaion chronon mechri ton kath'imas* (Samian Miscellanea, that is History of the island of Samos from most ancient times to our days), vol. 5, Samos, Principality printing press 1887, 657-703.

¹⁸ N. Stavrakis, *Statistiki tou plithismou tis Kritis meta diaforon geografikon, istorikon, arhaiologikon, ekklesiastikon k.t.l. eidiseon peri tis nisou* (Statistics of the population of Crete with various geographical, historical, archaeological, ecclesiastical etc. information on the island), Athens, Paliggenesia Press I. Aggelopoulos, 1890 (reprinted Notis Karavias, 1978).

¹⁹ *Hronografia tis Ipeirou, syntetagmeni ypo P.A.P.* (Chronicle of Epirus, compiled by P.A.P.), 2 vols, Athens, from the printing house of S.K. Vlastos, 1856 (reprint, Athens, I. Rizos, 1969). On the work of P. Aravantinos see M. Kokolakis, “Dimographikes exelixeis stin Ipeiro, 1830-1910” (Demographic developments in Epirus, 1830-1910), *Istor* 6 (1993), 121-142 and idem, *To ystero yanniotiko pasaliki*.

In these same years, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, amateur historians with a knowledge of Turkish, realizing the importance of the Ottoman documents as a historical source, took measures to salvage, to translate and to publish them, in order to protect them from further destructions. One such case is Christos Mavropoulos, an interpreter in the Court of the First Instance on Chios in 1920, who wrote the following in the foreword to the publication: "During the happy liberation of Chios by the victorious Greek army, most of the manuscript Turkish Codices of the Kadi Court on the island were unfortunately stolen, thus significant historical documents disappeared – the publication of which would provide the future historian of Chios with irrefutable evidence of the political and social history of Chios under the Turkish Occupation –, only a very small part of these managed to be saved, pointed out by us, under the then military authority, were deposited in the archive of the Translation Bureau beside the Court of the First Instance here. Thinking that the publication of even the remnants of the said codices will be beneficial for those dealing with history in general and specifically of Chios, we proceeded ... to the translation of them ..."²⁰.

Ottoman documents were also published at this time by researchers into ecclesiastical history, in their studies on privileges of the Orthodox Church or administrative affairs, such as Manuel Gedeon²¹, megas chartophylax and chronicler of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He published berats of patriarchs and of metropolitans, and firmans to monasteries, ahtinames on the privileges of islands in the Aegean, etc., realizing, as I. Theocharidis maintains, that "one means of resistance to the Young Turks' efforts to abolish the privileges of the Patriarchate was to mobilize the Ottoman documents through which the peculiar status this occupied in the Ottoman Empire was pointed out"²², or, I add, in order to project the rights of the "Ecumenical Church" against the Bulgarian Exarchate.

Horos, dioikisi kai plithismos stin Tourkokratoumeni Ipeiro, 1820-1913 (The late pashalik of Ioannina. Space, administration, population in Epirus under Turkish Domination, 1820-1913), Athens, Centre of Neohellenic Studies, 2003.

²⁰ Ch.V. Mavropoulos, *Tourkika egrapha aforonta tin istorian tis Chiou, exedothisan dapani tou Dimou Chiou* (Turkish documents concerning the history of Chios, published at the expenses of the Municipality of Chios), Athens at the printing press of P.A. Petrakos, 1920, iii. Mavropoulos, who had an excellent knowledge of the Ottoman language, translated 231 Ottoman documents relating to the island's history.

²¹ M.I. Gedeon, *Episima grammata tourkika anapheromena eis ta ekklesiastical imon dikaia* (Official Turkish Letters Referring to Our Ecclesiastical Rights), Constantinople 1910. His narrative on the intellectual history of the Ottoman period is a history of the pre-national millet and is classed in this regard among the exceptions of Modern Greek production. See A. Liakos, "To zitima tis synecheias", op. cit., 62. Turkish documents on Mount Athos are also included in the work by G. Smyrnakis, *To Agion Oros* (The Holy Mountain), Athens 1903 (reprinted Karyes 1988).

²² I. Theocharidis, "I anptyxi ton tourkologikon spoudon stin Ellada" (The Development of Turkish Studies in Greece), *Dodoni. Epistemoniki Epeterida tou Tmimatos Istorias kai Archaialogias tis Philosophikis Scholis tou Panepistimiou Ioanninon* 17/1 (1988), 47-48.

With the annexation of Thessaly and of Arta to Greece in 1881, issues of redefining the customary land-holding relations in the former Ottoman *çiflik*s were raised, while concurrently the different conceptions concerning land ownership had to be compromised legislatively. The confrontation of this first and foremost practical matter became a pretext for investigating and publishing Ottoman archival material. From the study of this emerged, a few years later, the splendid historical treatise by the Thessalian D. Tsopotos²³, in which the rural relations before the annexation of the regions to the Greek State are examined. “Concerning the landownership and the various categories of land, concerning the personal situation of the farmers, the taxation burdens and the timar system of the earliest years of the Turkish Domination, there prevailed vagueness and contention between not only European but also Muslim men of letters. For this reason I preferred to support the discussion of these in the present essay on official documents (firmans and regulatory decrees), on reports of old, high-ranking economic civil servants of the Porte, and on decisions (*fetva*) of Sheikhu-l-Islams”, Tsopotos explains in his foreword. It is worth mentioning, as an aside, that in contrast to historians, lawyers in particular, but also economists, were interested in the Ottoman period and published articles relating to their subject²⁴.

The publications of Ottoman archival material in those years may not have met with the present canons of the disciplines of palaeography and diplomacy, nevertheless, thanks to them a precious material became accessible to the amateur historians and local literati, to whom these publications were primarily addressed, and the post hoc result is an enormous reservoir of information for the future historians. Indeed, in some cases the published Greek translation has saved the information, since the original documents have been lost in the vicissitudes of wars and other hardships. For example, until 30 years ago M. Gedeon’s published translation of the earliest firmans of the Prodrornos monastery at Serres (Mehtmet I, Mehtmet II) constituted a source, since the originals did not exist and

²³ [D. Tsopotos], “Soultanika diatagmata (fermania) kai ierodikastiki apophais (ilâm) aphoronta ktimatikas scheseis ton chorion tou Piliou Zagoras, Makryrachis kai Aniliou” (Sultanic decrees (firmans) and kadi decisions (ilâm) concerning land relations of the villages of Pilion Zagora, Makryrachi and Anilio), *Thessalika Chronika* 2 (1931), 220-233; idem, “To soultaniko firmanion kai of perivoitos torukikos kanonismos ton georgikon en Thessalia scheseon” (The firman and the infamous Turkish regulation of the farming relations in Thessaly), *Epetiris Philologikou Syllouou Parnassos* 10 (1914), 64-93; idem, *Gi kai georgoi tis Thessalias kata tin tourkokratian. Epi ti vasei istorikon pigon* (Land and farmers in Thessaly during the Turkish Occupation. On the basis of historical sources), Volos 1912 (Athens 21974). Translated Turkish documents concerning Thessaly and Magnesia were to be published later also by N. Pantazopoulos, “Koinotikos vios eis tin Thessalomagnesian epi Tourkokratias” (Community life in Thessaly and Magnesia under Ottoman rule), *Epistimoniki Epetiris Sxolis Nomikon – Oikonomikon Epistimon*, t. 14/3 (1967), 351-445.

²⁴ I mention indicatively N. G. Moschovakis, *To en Elladi dimosion dikaion epi tourkokratias* (Civil law in Greece during the Ottoman period), Athens 1882 (photo-reprint, Athens 1973). A. M. Andréades, “L’administration financière de la Grèce sous la domination turque”, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1910, extrait de *Revue des études grecques* XXIII/102 (1910).

the codex of the metropolis in which their translation had been entered “had been lost”; it was discovered many years later in the Ducev Institute in Bulgaria, along with other manuscripts and documents which were removed from monasteries, libraries and so on during the Bulgarian Occupation of East Macedonia and Thrace in the First World War²⁵.

Until the Second World War, the publication of Ottoman archival material – however this was done – was guided, with very few exceptions, by interest of local character and was utilized – and continues to be utilized – mainly in monographs on local history. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the published translations of Ottoman material were in certain cases the basis for the study of a particular subject, the starting point and the guideline for the subsequent discussion of the original testimony, and always, at least for those hooked on reading between the lines, the provisional grand terrain to which they resort for that first, anxious testing of the embryonic hypothesis.

The pioneers who contributed to this gathering of material, the majority translators and publishers of Ottoman archival material and very few authors of historical studies, were associated with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Phanariot world or employed in the Ottoman administrative machine²⁶. They had excellent knowledge of the Ottoman language and bureaucracy, with forefather Athanasios Komninos Ypsilantis²⁷ –part of his work was first published in 1870– and final representative the Constantinopolitan Avraam Papazoglou. The last, missing since 1941 in the tumult of the Second World War, was the first Greek to conduct research in the archives of Istanbul and published Greek translations of the documents from the Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi²⁸.

²⁵ See M. Gedeon, “Grammata peri monis Prodromou ellinika (1499-1614) kai tourkika (firmania tou Mehmet Porthitou) (Letters concerning the Prodromos monastery, Greek (1499-1614) and Turkish: firmans of Mehmet the Conqueror), Archeion Ekklisiastikis Istorias, vol. I, fasc. 3, Constantinople 1911, 388-397. Historical studies on the status of the Prodromos monastery in the Early Ottoman period were based on Gedeon’s translation, see Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, “Early Ottoman Documents of the Prodromos Monastery (Serres)”, *Südost-Forschungen* XXVIII (1969), 1-12 and Evangelia Balta, *Les vakıfs de Serrès et de sa région (XVe et XVIe s.)*, Athens 1995, 185ff., with relevant discussion on the translated documents and collected bibliography.

²⁶ The subject I am dealing with excludes a priori studies such as those by G. Polychroniadis, V. Mirmiroglou, N. Moschopoulou et alii, because they are not based on archival material but are syntheses from narrative or secondary sources.

²⁷ Athanasios Komninos Ypsilantis, *Ta meta tin Alosin, [1453-1788], ek cheirographou anekdotou tis Ieras Monis tou Sina ekdidontas Archimandritou Germanou Aphthonidou, Sinaïtou (After the Fall, [1453-1788], from an unpublished manuscript of the Holy Monastery of Sinai published by Archimandrite Germanos Aphthonidos, Sinaïte)*, Constantinople 1870.

²⁸ A. Papazoglou, “Deka eggrapha tou Othomanikou Archeiou” (Ten documents of the Ottoman Archives), *Ellinika* 11 (1939), 135-150; idem, “I Eptanisiaki Politeia sta Archeia tou othomanikou kratous” (The Septinsular Republic in the Archives of the Ottoman State), *Nea Estia* 25 (1939), 807-813. His archive has been deposited in ELIA (Athens), see Ismini Antonoula, “Archeio Avraam Papazoglou” (Avraam Papazoglou Archive), *Ta nea tou E.L.I.A.*, no. 50 (January-March 1998), 17-18.

I.ii. The Fertile Twenty Years: 1940-1960

The eve of the Second World War should be considered a watershed in Modern Greek historiography of the Ottoman period, because it was then that the demand for seeking a picture of the Ottoman past different from the one that had been painted in the previous century was formulated. Michael Sakellariou maintains in his thesis the necessity of the existence of “specialist scholars who will explore the *terra incognita* of our historical past during Ottoman rule”, essentially raising the issue of forming an autonomous historical field²⁹. His thesis, which concerned issues of social and economic history of the Ottoman Peloponnese in the eighteenth century, was rejected by the University of Athens, which was steadfastly devoted to the study of the revolutionary movements of the Greeks against the Turks.

After the Second World War the new national and wider historiographic issues demanded more positive, more precise and richer knowledge and more synthetic processing. So, of necessity the specifications of a stricter method of historical positivism were formed. Apostolos Bakalopoulos, who was to teach at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki until the 1970s, introduced the use of Ottoman sources in the writing of the history of this period. He was the first to make systematic use of the Ottoman archival material translated into Greek, in his magnum opus *History of Modern Hellenism*, in which he follows, with minimal deviations, the basic axes of Paparrigopoulos’s schema³⁰. For the needs of research in his individual studies he used unpublished documents too, seeking the help of persons proficient in the Ottoman language for reading them³¹. In dialogue with Western historiographic production as well as with that of the Balkan neighbours and the Turks, Vakalopoulos fits the history of the Ottoman period into the framework of the history of the Ottoman Empire. Nonetheless there are apparent

²⁹ See M.V. Sakellariou, *I Peloponnisos kata tin defteran Tourkokratian (1715-1821)* (The Peloponnese during the Second Period of Ottoman Rule, 1715-1821), Athens 1939, (photocopy reprint: Athens, Ermis, 1978). It is not fortuitous that this thesis “was discovered” and reprinted in 1978, when the timeliness of the problem coincided with the historiographic inquiries of the post-dictatorship years

³⁰ A. Vakalopoulos, “Apopseis gia tin istoria kai tin methodology tis. Prosopiki martyria” (Views on the history and its methodology. A personal testimony), *Synchrona Themata* 35-37 (Dec. 1988), 72-79; C. Hatzidimitriou, “From Paparrigopoulos to Vakalopoulos: Modern Greek Historiography on the Ottoman Period”, A. Lily Macrakis – P. N. Diamandouros (eds), *New Trends in Modern Greek Historiography*, Hanover, N.H 1982, 13-23. See also Eleni Belia, “Mnimi Apostolou Bakalopoulou. Prosopiki martyria” (Recollection of Apostolos Vakalopoulos. A personal testimony), *Deltio Kentou Ereunis tis Istorias tou Neoterou Ellinismou*, t. 2 (2000), 333-342.

³¹ A. Vakalopoulos, *Istoria tou Neou Ellinismou* (History of Modern Hellenism), Thessaloniki, E. Sphakianakis & Sons, 21974-1988. See also for example the study A.E. Bakalopoulos, *Thasos. Son histoire, son administration de 1453 à 1912*, Paris, E. de Boccard, 1953, in which are published 68 Ottoman documents which he discovered in communities on the island, as translated by L. Mamzoris, director of the Translation Bureau of Thessaloniki. Also his work *Istoria tis Makedonias, 1354-1833* (History of Macedonia), 5 vols, Thessaloniki 1969, is based on a host of published sources, Turkish, Bulgarian and Serbian among them.

shortcomings in his creative comprehension of the Balkan bibliography he cites. Essentially it is he who took Modern Greek historiography out of its introspection, which was largely dependent on and reinforced by the exclusive use of Greek sources. So, in the positivist conception of the traditional nationalist school which A. Vakalopoulos served, this fact constituted a transcendence.

At the same time, after the end of the Second World War and the Civil War, political expediencies in the politically sensitive region of northern Greece, with the upsurge of the Macedonian question, triggered off the translation and publication of Ottoman material deposited in archives of various cities in Macedonia. Co-ordinator of the task was Vasdravellis and executors were the Turkish-speakers G. Kanakis, A. Mamzoridis, Th. Symeonidis and S. Anagnostidis, Char. Emmanouilidis, employees of Translation Bureaus in Macedonia³². Aim of this endeavour, as declared in the forewords of the editor of the publications, I. Vasdravellis, was to find proof of the Greekness of the North: "From all these documents emerge more generally the following: a) the invincible strength and vitality of Macedonian Hellenism and the constant pulse towards national liberation, and b) that nowhere do Slavs appear in these documents"³³. The specific political expediencies and the ideological orientations of the period might have imposed the translation and publication of a particular archival material on Ottoman Macedonia, nevertheless the Greekness of Macedonia is not the only thing to emerge from the corpus of sources. Its enormous wealth undoubtedly supplied contemporary historians such as A. Vakalopoulos and N. Svoronos³⁴ with a stack of information, as well as later generations

³² Ioannis Vasdravellis, *Armatoloi kai kleftes eis ten Makedonian, Thessaloniki 1948* (The English translation: *Klephts, Armatoles and pirates in Macedonia during the rule of the Turks, 1627-1821*, Thessaloniki 1975); idem, *Oi Makedoneseis tous yper tes anexartesias agonas 1796-1832*, Thessaloniki 1940, 21952 (English translation by Photeine P. Bourboulis: *The Greek Struggle for Independence: The Macedonians in the revolution of 1821*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1968); idem, *Hoi Makedones eis tous hyper tes anexartesias agonas 1796-1832* (The Macedonians in the Struggle for Independence), 2nd edition, Thessaloniki 1950; *Istorika Archeia Makedonias, t. I, Archeion Thessalonikis, 1695-1912* (Historical Archives of Macedonia, vol. I, Archive of Thessaloniki 1695-1912), Thessaloniki 1952; *Istorika Archeia Makedonias, vol. II, Archeion Verroias - Naoussis, 1598-1886* (Historical Archives of Macedonia, vol. II, Archive of Veroia - Naousa), Thessaloniki 1954 (It includes 414 documents); *Istorika Archeia Makedonias, vol. III, Archeion Monis Vlatadon, 1466-1839* (Historical Archives of Macedonia, vol. III, Archive of the Vlatadon monastery), (ed. I. Vasdravellis), Thessaloniki 1955 (It includes 52 firmans); *Tourkika eggrapha peri tou Makedonikou Agonos* (Turkish Documents Concerning the Macedonian Struggle), Thessaloniki 1958. In addition to these works, I. Vasdravellis has published Ottoman archival material in a host of articles in periodicals, mainly of Thessaloniki. See also Pan. I Zepos, "Anekdotia eggrafa tis tourkokratias" (Unpublished documents of Ottoman period", *Archeion Idiotikou Dikaiou*, t. 11 (1944), 49-91.

³³ *Istorikon Archeion Verroias. Eklogai* (Historical Archive of Veroia. Selections), ed. I. Vasdravellis. Thessaloniki 1942, iii.

³⁴ N. Svoronos in the Appendix of his book *Le commerce de Salonique au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, PUF, 1956 included some Turkish documents published by I. Vasdravellis in 1952 and 1954. He wrote there: "Plusieurs publications parues entre temps ont apporté un riche matériel provenant des archives turques

who continue to find from it, or thanks to it, diverse material to document their inquiries, even though the publication of the sources does not correspond, as A. Tietze notes³⁵, to “the highest standards that one might expect to find in them”.

In Crete Nikolaos Stavriniadis already from the interwar years systematically studied the kadi registers of Candia (Herakleion). However, the publication of the translations was much delayed. It was not until 1975 that the responsible authorities were persuaded of their usefulness and agreed to fund their publication. Nonetheless, from 1947 Stavriniadis himself was publishing in Cretan periodicals studies on Ottoman Crete, drawing on material in the Turkish Archive of Herakleion³⁶.

The conclusion is that during the two decades 1940-1960, which according to the division into periods extends to the restoration of democracy – following the established concept of Greek history –, Modern Greek historiography began to use gradually and increasingly, in parallel with other sources, published Ottoman sources with the intermediation of the Turkish, Balkan and Western bibliography. Noteworthy too is the

de la Macédoine et de la Turquie, qui complète les données des consuls (français et vénitiens) sur lesquelles ce livre était basé à l'origine. Je n'ai pu utiliser ce matériel que dans les parties non encore imprimées au moment de la parution des publications mentionnées...”, see *ibid*, 369. See S.I. Asdrachas, “Ti einai i “Thessaloniki” tou Nikou Svoronou?” (What is Nikos Svoronos’s “Thessaloniki”?), in: *idem*, *Patridographimata (History of the Homeland)*, Introduction: S. Ch. Sklavenitis, Athens, *Etaireia Leukadikon Meleton* 2003, 277-297. See also Ch. Hadjiiosif, “To ergo tou Nikou Svoronou kai I elliniki istoriografia. Peninta xronia apokliseon kai sygliseon”, (The oeuvre of Nikos Svoronos and Greek historiography. Fifty years of divergences and convergences), *Synchrona Themata* 38 (May 1989), 24-33. Emilie Themopoulou also in her thesis on Thessaloniki with used some Turkish archival material from *Baḡbakanlik Osmanlı Arḡivi*. See, Emilie Themopoulou, *Salonique, 1800-1875: conjuncture économique et mouvement commercial*, 3 vols, Université de Paris I, 1994 (unpublished PhD thesis); *idem*, “L’approvisionnement d’ Istanbul en céréales et l’ évolution de la contribution de l’ ichtira au XVIIIe et au XIXe siècle”, *I kath’imas Anatoli* 3 (1996), 117-138.

³⁵ See A. Tietze, “The Balkans and Ottoman Sources-Ottoman Sources and the Balkans”, in: Henrik Birnbaum and Speros Vryonis Jr(eds), *Aspects of the Balkans. Continuity and Change. Contributions to the International Balkan Conference held at UCLA, October 23-28, 1969, The Hague - Paris Mouton* 1972, 290. His comment applies to all the contemporary publications of Ottoman archival material made in the various Balkan countries. On the quality of the publications of the translated Turkish documents in Greece, see also the comments by I. Theocharidis, “I anapryksi ton tourkologikon spoudon”, *op.cit.*, 52-54.

³⁶ I mention some of those published in this period: N. Stavriniadis, “Anekdotia egrapha tis tourkocratias en Kriti. Dyo egrapha rythmistika tou meta tin alosin tis Kritis phorologikou systematos” (Unpublished documents of the Ottoman period in Crete. Two documents regulating the taxation system after the fall of Crete), *Kritika Chronika* 1 (1947), 84-122. *Idem*, “Anekdotia egrapha tis tourkocratias en Kriti. Pente egrapha ton proton meta tin alosin chronon” (Unpublished documents of the Ottoman period in Crete. Five documents from the first years after the fall), *Kritika Chronika* 2 (1948), 153-166. *Idem*, “Anekdotia egrapha tis tourkocratias en Kriti ton eton 1684-1686” (Unpublished documents of the Ottoman period in Crete of the years 1684-1686), *op. cit.*, 320-348. *Idem*, “Symvoli eis tin istorian ton Sphakion, 1645-1770) (Contribution to the history of Sphakia (1645-1770), *Kritika Chronika* 9 (1956), 213-333.

interest observed in these years in certain Turkish narrative sources, such as the text of the travels of Evliya Çelebi³⁷.

II. Ottoman Studies

The period of the Turkish Occupation as introduction to the Greek War of Independence covered the ideological orientations of Modern Greek historiography, for as long as no other desiderata or political expediencies appeared. These emerged after the Second World War and are identified elsewhere, in the study of the Slav peoples of the Balkans. Recognition of the need to create Ottoman Studies in Greece, in the late 1950s or so, is linked with the maturing of scholarly demands. Historians such as K. Th Dimaras and D. A. Zakythinis were then working –each from his own standpoint- to create the preconditions that the specialization of the young scholars demanded. Dionysios Zakythinis, under the influence of N. Iorga³⁸, having focused his research on Post-Byzantine Hellenism, which was “without primary authority”, mapped out and ranked according to priority the specialities of which historical disciplines in Greece had need. And yet, he did not shift from the scheme of the original conception of Greek history as a continuum spanning three millenia.

We should not forget that in the post-war years too Modern Greek history continued to be cultivated mainly as an extension of the interests of Greek Byzantinists³⁹. For Zakythinis the *Turkokratia* – he considers the term invalid – does not constitute a historical period in its own right but an organic part of the overall historical course “during which the essential preconditions for the national renaissance and the formation of the modern state were prepared”. Telling is the epilogue of his foreword to the volume *Post-Byzantine and Modern Greek* (1978): “Moving inside the vast space of the Turkish State, submitting to the painful circumstances of servitude, advancing in their orbit the slow-moving mass of the peoples likewise in bondage and of the same religion, they shaped a supra-national value. The history of the Greeks of the Turkish Occupation presents all the characteristics of greater Hellenism, and for this reason I have no

³⁷ This is attested not only by the growing number of publications in this period, presenting in sections, by regions, the translated or paraphrased text of Evliya Çelebi's travels (See Dimitris Loupis, “To odoporoiko tou Evliya Çelebi i oi vivliographikes peripeteies mias perigisis” (The itinerary of Evliya Çelebi or the bibliographical adventures of a journey), *I kath'imas Anatoli* 3 (1996), 173-185), but is also confirmed by the fact that two of the three founders of Ottoman Studies in Greece chose this source as the subject of their doctoral dissertation. See P. Hidioglou, *Das religiöse Leben auf Kreta nach Ewlija Çelebi*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969 and Vasilis Dimitriadis, *I kentriki kai dytiki Makedonia kata ton Evliya Çelebi* (Central and Western Macedonia According to Evliya Çelebi) (Introduction –Translation –Commentary), Thessaloniki 1973.

³⁸ N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance. Contribution de l'histoire de la vie byzantine*, Bucarest, Institut d'Etudes Byzantines, 1935.

³⁹ D. A. Zakythinis, *Metavyzantina kai Nea Ellinika* (Post Byzantine and Modern Greek), Athens 1978, xii.

hesitation in including the period of the Turkish Occupation among the major periods in the history of the Greek Nation”⁴⁰.

Consequently, study of the period emerged as an immediate priority, in order to enhance these data, which must be sought in the sources. Already as Director of the General State Archives (1937-1946), Zakythinos had ascertained the necessity of preserving and inventorying the evidence of the Post-Byzantine past. He was to work for the realization of this vision as Director of the Centre of Byzantine Studies at the National Research Foundation (1958-1975), organizing missions to archives of major monasteries in Greece. So, you see how a Byzantinist, through Post-Byzantium, became essentially the protagonist for establishing Ottoman Studies in Greece⁴¹.

II.a. The Beginnings

The beginnings of Ottoman Studies are placed around 1960. The scientific needs of a National Research Foundation for cataloguing archives, and the succession in the direction of two large Ottoman archives, of Thessaloniki and of Herakleion, became the pretext for sending Elizabeth Zachariadou and Vasilis Demetriades to England and Pavlos Hidioglou and Basiliki Papoulia to Germany for Turkish Studies. The watershed had come, with the recognition in practice of the necessity of Ottoman Studies. It is worth underlining that the post-graduate training of three researchers was then connected with the cataloguing and organizing of the Ottoman archives of Greece. Elizabeth Zachariadou turned towards the study of the history of monasteries, such as of St John the Theologian on Patmos, Mount Athos, the Prodromos monastery at Serres, etc., from published and unpublished Ottoman material in Greek archives⁴². The study by P. Lemerle and P.

⁴⁰ This volume is a collection of relevant studies by him which were published in the postwar years, such as: D.A. Zakythinos, “Dyo istorika parallila: Romaiokratia kai tourkokratia” (Two historical parallels: Roman Occupation and Turkish Occupation), “Prodromoi morphai tis Tourkokratias” (Precursory forms of the Turkish Occupation). Zakythinos also wrote studies on the Turkish Occupation and more recent history. See D.A. Zakythinos, *I Tourkokratia. Eisagogi eis tin Neoteran Istorian tou Ellinismou* (The Turkish Occupation. Introduction to the Later History of Hellenism), Athens 1954 and *idem*, Oxford 1976.

⁴¹ I am grateful to this mentor for the prospects he opened up for me. In 1978, a few months after I began working in the Centre of Asia Minor Studies, of the Board of which he was a member, he asked to see me in his office at the Academy of Athens. There he informed me that Greece needed Ottomanists and that if this area of study interested me he was prepared to help me to pursue it. The following year the “Alexandros S. Onassis” Foundation announced a scholarship in Turkish Studies, thanks to the award of which by 1980 I was studying in Paris. I owe this opportunity to Dionysios Zakythinos, and I am indebted to him.

⁴² A selection of her early studies is reprinted in Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Romania and the Turks (c. 1300 – c. 1500)*, Variorum Reprints, London 1985. This subject was to remain a fixed pole of her interests in later years. See below. A large part of Elizabeth Zachariadou’s studies oriented towards research on the Ottoman chronicles and based primarily on narrative sources does not fall within the brief of the present paper, aim of which is to comment on archival research.

Wittek on the status of the Athonite monasteries under the Ottomans had already appeared⁴³.

P. Hidiroglou, when his studies were over, worked for many years in the Social Science Research Centre of Cyprus, cataloguing Ottoman sources on the island's history⁴⁴, a tradition that was to be continued conscientiously by Ioannis Theocharidis⁴⁵. However, the basic contributions to the historiography of Ottoman Cyprus, since the catalogued material was not utilized in synthetic studies, remain the earlier ones by H. Inalcik and, primarily, R.C. Jennings⁴⁶, who by processing *tapu tahrir* and *kadi sicilleri* presented important aspects of the island's history. I close here the parenthesis on Cypriot historiography, which is outside my brief but was opened of necessity because two of the very few Ottoman specialists of Greece worked on cataloguing the Ottoman material of Cyprus.

Vassilikii Papoulia, after her doctoral dissertation on *devishirme*⁴⁷, dealt with the philosophy of history and taught the "History of Balkan peoples" at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki until 2000.

Vasilis Demetriades was employed in the Historical Archive of Macedonia, based in Thessaloniki. Later, from 1977 to 1984, with the help of a team of young graduates and students of the Faculty of Letters of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, he classified and catalogued it⁴⁸. In the same year he published articles on subjects of the Ottoman

⁴³ P. Lemerle – P. Wittek, "Recherches sur l'histoire et le statut des monastères athonites sous la domination turque. Part I, Trois documents du monastère de Kutlumus", *Archives d'Histoire du Droit Oriental* 3 (1947), 411-472.

⁴⁴ P. Hidiroglou was not employed in the Turkish Archive of Herakleion, for which he was intended. This fact was denounced by N. Stavrinidis as proof of the local authorities' indifference to the fate of the precious archive that was under their administrative jurisdiction (see N. Stavrinidis, *op. cit.*, xii). Hidiroglou's employment at the Social Research Centre of Cyprus is surely not unrelated to the political game that had begun to be played on the island, by both sides. The sources on Ottoman Cyprus, which he published, were included in a volume together with other bibliographical contributions by him; see *idem*, *Symvoli stin Elliniki Tourkologia (Contribution to Greek Turkish Studies)*, vol. I, Athens, Irodotos, 1990.

⁴⁵ I. Theocharidis, *Katalogos othomanikon eggrafon tis Kyprou apo ta Archeia tis Ethnikis Vivliothikis tis Sofias, 1571-1878 (Catalogue of Ottoman documents on Cyprus, from the Archives of the National Library of Sofia, 1571-1878)*, Nicosia 1984; *idem*, *Othomanika eggrafa, 1572-1839. Archeio Ieras Monis Kykkou – I (Ottoman documents 1572-1839. Archive of the Holy Monastery of Kykkos I)*, 4 vols, Nicosia, Kentro Meleton Ieras Monis Kykkou, 1993; *idem*, *Othomanika eggrafa 1840-1912, Archeio Ieras Monis Kykkou – V (Ottoman documents 1572-1839. Archive of the Holy Monastery of Kykkos V)*, 2 vols, Nicosia, Kentro Meleton Ieras Monis Kykkou, 1999.

⁴⁶ R. C. Jennings, *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*, New York University Press, New York and London, 1993, with relevant bibliography.

⁴⁷ Basiliki D. Papoulia, *Ursprung und Wesen der "Knabenlese" im osmanischen Reich, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten* 59, Munich 1963.

⁴⁸ See V. Dimitriadis, "Ta tourkika archeia tou Istorikou Archeiou Makedonias kai I simasia tous ya tin istoria tis Tourkokratias" (The Turkish archives of the Historical Archive of Macedonia and their

history of Northern Greece from material in the archive⁴⁹. It should be noted, because it touches on the history of Ottoman Studies and is linked directly with their subsequent historiographic choices, that in Thessaloniki, in the newly-appeared Institute for Balkan Studies, aim of which was research on the history mainly of the Slav peoples of the Balkans, a “Department of Turkish Studies” also operated, teaching the Turkish language. It was there, during the dictatorship and the early years after the restoration of democracy, that some who were later to be involved with Ottoman archives and the study of the Ottoman period were taught (Sophie Tzortzakaki⁵⁰, Kostas Kambouridis⁵¹, Evangelia Balta, Eleni Karanastasi, Angeliki Georgiou⁵², Kirki Georgadi⁵³). In these same years (1967-1971), the *Bulletin of Turkish Bibliography* was published, which included not only briefing on the literature but also extensive summaries of selected contributions by Turkish historians, such as Ö. L. Barkan, M. Cezar, H. Inalcik, alongside likewise extensive summaries of propagandist Turkish books and articles from the periodical *Türk Kültürü*. This *Bulletin*, as well as the corresponding one for *Slavic and Bulgarian Bibliography*, of the Institute for Balkan Studies, and the post-dictatorship *Balkan*

importance for the history of the Turkish Occupation), in: A. Lily Makrakis, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros (eds), *New Trends in Modern Greek Historiography with an Introduction by W. McGrew*, The Modern Greek Studies Association (Occasional Papers 1), 1982, 26.

- ⁴⁹ V. Demetriades, “O kanunnâme kai oi christianou katoikoi tis Thessalonikis, gyro sta 1525” (The kanunnâme and the Christian inhabitants of Thessaloniki, circa 1525), *Makedonika* 19 (1979), 328-376. Idem, “Phorologikes katigories ton chorion tis Thessalonikis kata tin tourkokratia” (Taxation categories of the villages of Thessaloniki during the Ottoman period), *Makedonika* 20 (1980), 375-462. Idem, “Problems of land-owning and population in the area of Gazi Evrenos Bey’s wakf”, *Balkan Studies* 22/1 (1981), 43-57. Idem, “Ottoman Chalkidiki: an area in transition”, in: A. Bryer – H. Lowry (eds), *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, Birmingham – Dumbarton Oaks 1986, 39-50.
- ⁵⁰ Sophie Tzortzakaki-Tzaridou, “I leitourgia tou thesmou ton ‘christianikon vakufion’ epi Tourkokratias me vasi ta othomankia eggrapha tou archeiou tis monis Vlatadon” (The function of the institution of the ‘Christian vakufs’ under the Turkish Occupation, on the basis of the Ottoman documents in the archive of the Vlatadon monastery), *Christianiki Thessaloniki. Othomaniki periodos, 1430-1912* (Christian Thessaloniki, Ottoman period, 1430-1912), II, Thessaloniki 1994, 259-276.
- ⁵¹ Kostas Kambouridis, *Oi kodikes tou Ierodikeiou Larisas-Phanariou (Yenisehir-Fenar ton chronon 1073-89/1662-1678)* (The kadi sicills of Larisa-Phanari (Yenisehir-Fenar of the years 1073-89/1662-1678), Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2002 (unpublished doctoral thesis).
- ⁵² Eleni Karanastasi and Angeliki Georgiou have been working since the 1980s in the Historical Archive, continuing its classification and facilitating, with their sound knowledge, the researches of those studying the Ottoman archive. See Angeliki Georgiou – Eleni Karanastasi – Evangelia Balta, “Ambelones kai krasia stin Epanomi. I othomaniki apographi tou 1907” (Vineyards and wine at Epanomi. The Ottoman census of 1907), in the volume *Oion istoro III: T’ambelanthismata* (ed. G.A. Pikoulas), Athens, Yerovasilieou Estate- Epanomi Thessaloniki, 2004, 129-191.
- ⁵³ Kirki Georgiadi worked as an archivist in the Historical Archive of Macedonia, material from which was the basis of her study “To pyritidopoieio sto Gredmborio Thessalonikis” (The gunpowder factory at Grademborio, Thessaloniki), *Mnimon* 13 (1991), 103-120.

*Bibliography*⁵⁴, all imitating practices of the historical institutes in the Socialist states of the Balkans, opened up new horizons and for some sowed the seeds of their subsequent initiation into the enormous wealth of archival material in the Balkans and Turkey⁵⁵. In the meantime, in 1966 John C. Alexander was preparing his master's dissertation at Columbia University and immediately after the support of his doctoral thesis in 1974, which is the publication of taxation legislation relating to Greek regions in the sixteenth century, he came to work in post-dictatorship Greece⁵⁶.

From 1975, publication began of N. Stavriniadis's translations from the kadi codices of Herakleion, in which we discern his concern for the exact rendering of the administrative and fiscal terms. His choice of the material to be translated or published was directed by a totally different conception of history; moreover, his interest tended towards the socio-economic regime of the island and the everyday life of its inhabitants under the Ottomans⁵⁷. The last of the Mohicans, of a generation of Turkish-speaking civil servants of the Greek State, with studies in Ottoman schools of the time, Nikos Stavriniadis (1895-1987), from the village of Saip in Asia Minor Ionia, devoted his long life to studying the codices of the kadi of Candia. From 1931 he was an employee in the Translation Bureau of Herakleion and subsequently in the Vikelaia Municipal Library. In 1939, D. Zakythinos, then Director of the General State Archives, visited Herakleion on

⁵⁴ *Balkaniki Vivliographia – Balkan Bibliography*, (ed) K. A. Dimadis et alii, vols 1-6, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1974-1977.

⁵⁵ I believe that acknowledgement of the value of the publications of sources by the Balkan institutes and the History Foundation of Turkey, and the historiographic production based on these, which I got to know in the Institute of Balkan Studies and the Seminar of the old Faculty of Letters at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, when I was studying there, made me turn towards these type of researches. Ever since, the publication of sources has been one of my constant interests and is etched in my consciousness as a duty towards the discipline I serve. I believe that my involvement with the Ottoman Archive of Macedonia, already from my student days, was decisive for my persistence in archival research, which I would like to believe is not perceived as an end in itself.

⁵⁶ They circulated as books in 1985. See John C. Alexander, *Brigandage and Public Order in the Morea 1685-1806*, Athens 1985; idem, *Toward a History of Post-Byzantine Greece: The Ottoman Kanunnames for the Greek Lands, circa 1500-circa 1600*, Athens 1985. He also published: idem, "Dyo othomanika katasticha tou Moria, 1460-1463. Eidiseis ya ton nahiye tis Arkadias" (Two Ottoman registers of the Morea, 1460-1463. Information on the nahiye of Arkadia), I Conference of Messenian Studies, Kalamata 2-4 December 1977, Athens, Society of Peloponnesian Studies, 1978, 399-407; "The Monasteries of the Meteora during the first two Centuries of Ottoman Rule", *Akten ii/2: XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress: Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 32/2 (1982), 95-102. Also idem, "Some aspects of the strife among the Moreot Christian Notables, 1789-1816", *Epetiris Etaireias Stereoelladikon Meleton* 5 (1974-75), 473-504.

⁵⁷ I shall always remember, like a stage set, the untidy room in the Vikelaia Library, in Herakleion, brimful of kadi codices, the notebooks with his translations, the thousands of pieces of paper of all sizes and colours in the faded files with his studies, published and unpublished, written in his calligraphic script. The thousands of index cards tied with string, alongside the original editions of Seksir and other classic authors, and him, and old man in poor health, sitting at a table, caught up in the fever of production, and in our breaks asking me questions to learn what the "Franks" were doing lately for Turkish Studies.

one of his tours, and “having gone through the translations made, showed great interest”, as he himself writes. Stavriniadis, author of many studies on Ottoman Crete, left us not only five massive tomes with *in extenso* translations, but also summaries of Turkish documents and a host of other unpublished translations⁵⁸. Numerous other studies on the history of Ottoman Crete were based on his toil as a translator. To confine myself only to the monographs, I cite of the older ones those by V. Kremmydas and Yolanda Triantaphyllidou-Baladié, and the more recent one by Molly Green⁵⁹. I consider myself fortunate to have spent the summer of 1980 as an “apprentice” to this wise and militant “ustad” of Ottoman Studies, so full of self-denial for our work.

II.b. The Meeting of “New History” With Ottoman Studies

The post-dictatorship period in Greece, with the prevailing climate of doubting the establishment, swept along academic historiography in its wake. This doubting was surely exacerbated by the Marxist analyses of historians of the interwar years and the very deep social split of the period 1936-1974, which prepared the ground for the later historically processed hermeneutic approaches⁶⁰. With the restoration of democracy new

⁵⁸ N. Stavriniadis, *Metaphraseis tourkikon istorikon eggraphon aporonton eis tin istorian tis Kritis* (Translations of Turkish documents concerning the history of Crete), vol. I (H 1067-1082/1657-1672), Herakleion of Crete 1975; vol. II (H 1083-1105/1672-1694), 1976; vol. III (H 1105-1127/1694-1715), 1978; vol. IV (H 1127-1165/ 1715-1752), 1984; vol. V (H 1165-1179/1752-1765), 1985. Heart-rending is his testimony in the foreword to the first volume of his translations (p. xix), on the circumstances in which he worked and on the apathy of the local authorities to contribute financially to the publication of his translations, “unable by nature and position to assess the value of the surviving material”. A brief biography accompanied by his most important publications was written by Th.E. Detorakis, “Nikolaos Stavriniadis (1895-1987)”, *Kritika Chronika* 28-29 (1988-1989), 387-391.

⁵⁹ The monograph by V. Kremmydas, *Oi sapounopoiies tis Kritis sto 18o aiona* (The soap factories of Crete in the 18th century), Athens 1974, and that by Yolanda Triantaphyllidou-Baladié, *To emporio kai i oikonomia tis Kritis, 1645-1669* (The commerce and the economy of Crete, 1669-1795), Herakleion 1988 (published version of her doctoral thesis, submitted in the 1970s) were based on at that time unpublished translations by N. Stavriniadis, which fact is acknowledged in the forewords, where the authors express their due gratitude. Molly Green’s tactic of referring to the kadi sicills with no mention of the published form of the document by N. Stavriniadis, exemplifies what M. Laskaris would characterize as “bon pour l’Occident”. Stavriniadis’s publication of his translations of the kadi sicills is not even cited as information for the reader in the relevant place where there is commentary on the sources, but is merely pushed in as a common bibliographical reference in the Secondary Sources. See Molly Green, *A Shared World. Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2000.

⁶⁰ Spyros Asdrachas, interpreting the changes in historiography in the post-dictatorship period notes that the upsurge of interest in historical studies was a syndrome of two phenomena: political disenchantment and the historicizing of the Social Sciences. See S. Asdrachas, “Apo tin anagi tis istorias stin anagi diamorphosis istorikon: (From the need of history to the need of forming historians), *Synchrone Themata* iss. 35-37 (1988), 94. (The article was reprinted in: idem. *Scholia*, Athens, Alexandria, 1993, 15-24). I shall always remember a maxim of Gunnar Hering. It was after the fall of the Junta and I was on duty in the seminar room in the old Faculty of Letters at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Addressing me,

working hypotheses appeared, along with new groundbreaking research methods by historians with innovative conceptions and a different view of the past, who had studied during the years of the dictatorship in the milieu of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, under the influence of the historians of the *Annales*. The “New History” that they passed on with their return to Greece, for the subject which is of interest in this paper, examined the Greek populations in Ottoman times, through the prism of the economic and social relations that were formed by the conquest. It focused mainly on the mechanisms that regulated the economy in which the conquered participated as agents of production, either because they were involved directly in this or because they appropriated this as agents of the market⁶¹. With starting point and landmark the works by Spyros Asdrachas from the late 1970s, a turn is observed not so much towards new thematic fields as towards the method, the use of the document and the whole problematic. In his work *Mechanisms of the Rural Economy* -a title indicative of his thinking-, based on published fifteenth and sixteenth-century Ottoman registers, and in the inspired introduction to a collective volume of translated classical articles (Ö. L. Barkan⁶², H. Inalcik, T. Stojanovich) on the structure of the Ottoman Empire he expressed his position on how to investigate issues impinging on mechanisms of the rural economy, the settlement pattern and the demographic changes which the conquest created and its military and fiscal system perpetuated⁶³. Asdrachas, without having the know-how that approaching the Ottoman sources demands, grappled with the study of the published registers, even of those published in Turkish and in Balkan languages, for the needs of his research⁶⁴. His

who certainly had more need to hear it than the judicious Elli Skopetea, who was also present, he said that the doubting of traditional conceptions is the first step towards freedom. I hope I shall never forget that.

- ⁶¹ See S. Asdrachas et al., *Elliniki oikonomiki istoria, 15os-19os aionas* (Greek Economic History, 15th-19th century), vol. 1, Athens, Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, 2003, 21.
- ⁶² It should be noted that the Braudelian version of the *Annales*, obvious in the work of Ö. L. Barkan after the 1950s, not only influenced Turkish Ottoman Studies but also, through Barkan’s work, spread to and still has an influence in its own right on Ottoman Studies everywhere. For why this Braudelian tradition, because I do not refer to the late one which was formed in Fernard Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems and Civilizations (Binghamton University, State University of New York), did not find the continuation it deserves in Turkish Ottoman Studies, see what is mentioned in relation by H. Inalcik, “Türkiye’de Osmanlı arařtırmaları. I-Türkiye’de Modern Tarihçiliğin Kurucuları”, XIII-Türk Tarih Kongresi (Ankara, 4-8 Ekim 1999), Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler, I. Cilt, 143ff.
- ⁶³ S. Asdrachas, *Michanismois tis agrotikis istorias stin tourkokratia (15-17 aionas)* (Mechanisms of the rural history in the Ottoman period (15th-17th century)), Athens, Themelio, 1978; idem, *Oikonomiki domi ton Valkanikon choron (15os-19os aionas)* (Economic Structure of the Balkan Lands (15th-19th century)), introduction – selection of texts: Sp. Asdrachas, Athens, Melissa, 1979. His introduction to this volume translated into English: “Problems of Economic History of the Period of Ottoman Domination of Greece”, *Journal of Greek Diaspora* 6/2 (1979), 5-37.
- ⁶⁴ His deep knowledge of these sources and their underlying logic, as well as the sensitivity he has developed through dealing with them, very often leads him to point out mis-readings in the publication of the Ottoman text.

Mechanisms, like Vera Mutafchieva's *Rural relations*⁶⁵, were definitive readings, just as the seminars given by N. Svoronos in the Faculty of Letters at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki were definitive for the passage from the Byzantine to the Ottoman land-holding and taxation system. In these stimuli are detected the beginnings of my subsequent involvement with defterology⁶⁶. In the years 1980-1983, in my doctoral thesis, which is based on the first registers for Euboea, I tried to rearrange their data in order to make them capable of responding to the questions of an economic history as I understood these to be expressed in the seminars of the *Ecole* historians⁶⁷. The Ottoman fiscal register became a tool for investigating the hypothesis concerning the existence of clear incomes at the level of the direct producer and for ascertaining, in continuation with the help of numerical magnitudes, not the "real" magnitudes which constitute the surplus that had to be paid as tax to the sovereign conquering state and its mediators, but the mechanisms which governed its realization and distribution.

II.c. Compte Rendu of the First Twenty Years (1985-2005)

The historiographic production of Greek Ottoman Studies is of necessity limited, because this is a recent discipline which is served by an extremely small group of no more than twenty persons, even counting in the young ones who are preparing doctoral dissertations. The production of Greek Ottoman specialists is limited even more, since the use of Turkish sources is posited as *conditio sine qua non*. Consequently, the discussion includes only that which in the negotiation of a subject relied exclusively on primary sources or also on primary sources, or used published archival material without its mediation or processing by others. Thus, when in any case the subjects are determined by the choices that the historiographic interests of a small circle of individuals place, on an even more limited horizon, we cannot look for trends or directions; we simply record the contributions.

⁶⁵ Vera Mutafchieva, *Agramite otnoshenija v osmanskata imperija prez XV-XVIv.*, Sofia, Balgarska Akademija na naukite, 1962. The Greek translation is based on the English edition: Vera Mutafchieva, *Agrotikes scheseis stin othomaniki aftokratoria (15os-16os ai.) (Rural Relations in the Ottoman Empire (15th-16th c.))*, transl. Ourania Astrinaki, Evangelia Balta, foreword Evangelia Balta, Athens, Poreia, 1990.

⁶⁶ For the term "defterology", see Elizabeth A. Zachariadou's review of the book: A. Bryer – H. Lowry (eds), "Continuity and Change in late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society, Papers given at a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1982", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LII/1 (1989), 146.

⁶⁷ My management of the material and the research hypotheses to which I subjected it owe much to these seminars, at a time when Turkish Studies demanded with inflexible severity that I stick to the letter [in this case the number] of the source. Even if the source, as was proven in the end, said something more than what it showed on first reading. My thesis was published much later: *L'Eubée à la fin du XVe siècle. Économie et Population. Les registres de l'année 1474*, Athènes 1989.

The list of subjects from the past twenty years includes the following: populations and economy of Greek regions on the basis of the Ottoman registers, communities, history of towns and cities, taxation legislations, the regime of the Church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the reality of the new status quo, history of monasteries. The themes of the international symposia organized by the Turkish Studies Programme of the University of Crete, are also varied⁶⁸.

By grouping the subjects, I shall now try very briefly to present the work produced by the personal inquiries, the lonely wanderings of the Greek Ottomanists. I wish to point out, even though it is self-evident, that it is extremely difficult – almost impossible – to speak about things which have happened and are happening and in which one is personally involved, without interpolating the autobiographical element. It has after all crept into the previous pages on several occasions. So, fully aware of all the difficulties and the consequences, I have undertaken to speak about things that are close, contemporary, and not distant in historical time, to look at my craft, my esnaf or guild⁶⁹, myself, and to submit my testimony, my own narrative. And the way I have chosen to speak about the state of affairs in Greek Ottoman Studies is consciously different from that adopted by the sage Halil Inalcik when he referred to Turkish Ottoman Studies⁷⁰.

1- The regime of the orthodox church, the ecumenical patriarchate and the history of monastery complexes

In the past, the Orthodox Church and particularly the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and their relations with the Ottoman authority were examined on the basis mainly of sources from the Orthodox environment (Greek and Slavic) and Christian sources in general, which written after the Fall of Constantinople and focusing primarily on the privileges that the sultans granted to the patriarchs, pointed out the respect which the

⁶⁸ Five international symposia have been held so far and the proceedings of four have been published, with editor Elizabeth Zachariadou (ed.), *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I: Rethymnon, 11-13 January 1991*, Crete University Press, Rethymnon 1993; *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon, 9-11 January 1994*, Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996. Elizabeth Zachariadou (ed.), *Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Empire, Halcyon Days in Crete III, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon, 10-12 January 1997*, Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1999; *The Kapudan Pasha. His office and his Domain, Halcyon Days in Crete IV: Rethymnon 7-9 January 2000*, Crete University Press, Rethymnon 2002. *The Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire (Rethymnon, 10-12 January 2003)* (in press).

⁶⁹ Other colleagues choose other words to define it. H. Lowry, for example, in an analogous case, uses the Turkish word silsile (= genealogy, dynasty, succession). See Heath W. Lowry, "The State of the Field: A Retrospective Overview and Assessment of Ottoman Studies in the United States of America and Canada, 1949-1999", XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 4-8 Ekim 1999, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler, I. Cilt, Ankara 2002, 1-59.

⁷⁰ H. Inalcik. "Türkiye'de Osmanlı Araştırmaları. I. Türkiye'de Modern Tarihçiliğin Kurucuları", op. cit., 85-166.

Muslim conqueror showed towards the Great Church. However, the institution of the patriarch, who would act as head of the Orthodox Christian subjects of Mohamed II, was recognized on the basis of Islamic tradition and aimed at serving the Ottoman State. Consequently, the history of the institution during the course of Ottoman sovereignty, but principally the perspective of the Ottoman authority on the formation of its relations with the Church and its leaders, is followed mainly from the Turkish sources. Greek Ottoman Studies, following the tradition established in earlier studies by Ottomanists, approached this important chapter in the history of Modern Hellenism and showed on the basis of published *berats* and Turkish documents in monastery archives, that the Church, that is the monasteries, the metropolises and the patriarchate, were incorporated as bearers of incomes into the Ottoman fiscal organization, which fact favoured in practice the co-existence of Ottoman administration and ecclesiastical hierarchy on administrative and economic issues⁷¹. This is an important contribution to this field, which also promises the wonderful results of future researches in the *piskopos mukataa defterleri* of the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi.

The methods the Ottomans adopted in order to conquer the Balkans can also be traced from the Ottoman documents of Athonite and other historical monasteries in Macedonia,. The measures taken by the monasteries to safeguard the acquired economic privileges and their land property from the Ottoman sovereign, on the eve of the conquest, were consistent with his policy of penetrating the Balkans. Given the loose to non-existent Byzantine political authority, the large monasteries were the only political unities which existed and to a degree controlled the realm territorially, economically as well as politically; consequently it was with these that the Ottoman authority had dealings. The publication of various *firmans* from the archives of Athonite monasteries or the Prodromos monastery at Serres attests that these foundations were absolutely prepared for the imminent conquest. Their monasterial property, of course under a new land-ownership status, together with the inviolability and various tax exemptions, were secured by the timely declaration of submission to the Ottoman sultans. Thanks to their contribution to collecting and processing the source material, in parallel with a rich Greek

⁷¹ Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Deka tourkika eggrafa gia tin Megali Ekklisia, 1483-1567* (Ten Turkish Documents concerning the Great Church, 1483-1567), Athens, Institute for Byzantine Research, 1996. P. Konortas, *Othomanikes theoriseis ya to oikoumeniko Patriarcheio. Bertia ya tous prokathimenos tis Megalis Ekklisias (17os-arches 20ou aiona)* (Ottoman Views of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. *Berats* for the primates of the Great Church (17th-early 20th century)). Athens, Alexandria editions, 1998. See also the recent archival material published by G. Salakidis, *Ta soultanika eggrapha tis Dimotikis Vivliothikis tis Kozanis(1721-1909)* (The Sultanic Documents in the Muncipal Library of Kozani (1721-1909)), Kozani 2004.

bibliography existing from the old days, Greek Ottoman Studies progress alongside the corresponding important Balkan and other contributions in this sector⁷².

Last, from the study not of “high sultanic decrees” but of humble Turkish documents found in the archives, mainly of Athonite monasteries, in conjunction with the corresponding contemporary Greek ones, the material dimension of monastic life emerges, the other face of the “theoretical and inactive life”. The nature of the material necessarily orientates towards specification of the economic function of the monastery complexes⁷³, since almost the total of documents are no more than deeds of ownership, promissory notes, cadastres, registers of invoices, acquittance receipts, lease contracts and diverse judicial documents that reveal frequently violent clashes and long-standing enmity between neighbouring monasteries or between monasteries and the laicity living in the vicinity, over trivial land issues. To quote Christos Patrinelis, “The researcher’s first impression from these otherwise precious monastery archives is that he is delving into the archives of some centenarian agricultural and stock-raising enterprises”⁷⁴. The search for the traces of daily life on the Holy Mountain by Greek and Serb Ottomanists has already yielded the first studies on the history of certain monasteries, but it is certain that a systematic parallel research in the central archive, the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, will enrich and corroborate this information in multiple ways from various other sources⁷⁵.

⁷² For the bibliography of works by Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, see n. ; idem, “The Worrisome Wealth of the Celnik Radic”, in: *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, (eds) C. Heywood and C. Imber, The Isis Press, Istanbul 1994, 383-397. Evangelia Balta, *Les vakifs de Serrès et de sa région (XVe et XVIe s.)*, Un premier inventaire, traduit par Edith Karagiannis, Athènes, Centre de Recherches Néo-helléniques, 1995, 185-202. G. Salakides, *Sultansurkunden des Athos-Klosters Vatopedi aus der Zeit Bayezid II. und Selim I*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1995; John C. Alexander (Alexandropoulos), “The Lord giveth and the Lord taken away: Athos and the Confiscation Affair of 1568-1569”, *Mount Athos in the 14th-16th Centuries*, (Athonika Symmeikta 4), Athens (I.B.E./E.I.E.) 1997, 149-200; V. Demetriades, “Athonite Documents and the Ottoman Occupation”, *op. cit.*, 41-67. E. Kermeli, “The confiscation and repossession of monastic properties in Mount Athos and Patmos Monasteries, 1568-1570”, *Bulgarian Historian Review* 28/3-4 (2002), 39-53.

⁷³ Three doctoral theses at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki deal with such issues, under the supervision of Professor John C. Alexander (Alexandropoulos): Sophia N. Laiou, *I Samos kata tin othomaniki periodo. Ptyches tou koinonikou kai oikonomikou viou, 16os-18os ai.* (Samos During the Ottoman Period. Aspects of social and economic life, 16th-19th c.), Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, 2002. Ph.P. Kotzageorgis, *I athoniki moni Agiou Pavlou kata tin othomaniki periodo* (the Athonite monastery of St Paul during the Ottoman Period), Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, 2002. I.A. Kolovos, *Chorikoi kai monachoi stin othomaniki Chalkidiki, 15os-16os aiones. Opseis tis oikonomikis kai koinonikis zois stin ypaithro kai i moni Xiropotamou* (Peasants and monks in Ottoman Chalkidiki. Aspects of economic and social life in the countryside and the Xeropotamos monastery), 3 vols, Thessaloniki 2000 (unpublished).

⁷⁴ Ch. Patrinelis, “To Agion Oros ” (Mount Athos), *Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous*, t. 10, Athens Ekdotiki Athinon 1974, 143.

⁷⁵ I cite as an example the census of the land property of the Athonite monasteries, made in 1764, which was known of only from a copy written in 1808 in a codex of the Protaton, until the original was discovered in

2- Structure of the rural economy and populations in Greek regions

Since 1987, the “Rural History of the Greek Regions (15th-19th c.)” Project of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, under the direction of Spyros Asdrachas, has given us the opportunity of forming, through many examples from the mainland and the islands, an idea of the income limits in the rural economies. The Ottoman register was the basic tool for tracing, through local examples, the economic function of rural space and for investigating and recomposing the demographic magnitudes of the settlement pattern during the first centuries of Ottoman rule. Starting from the tax recorded in the source, we reconstructed the production, in order to proceed to the study of the structure of the rural economy in Greek regions. We demonstrated with measurements that, as a rule, the per caput presumptive incomes leave a surplus, after the subtraction of domestic consumption, seed and tax, or that the creation of the surplus is completed by other economic activities which bring the necessary money for payment of the total tax levy. Correlation of the monetary taxation income with the physical income indicated the framework within which the commercialization of production, that is the participation in the market for monetary gain, must move⁷⁶. At a time when involvement with the Ottoman registers stopped at the issue or the deposit of data, we created in the 1980s an analytical model which is only now being “discovered”⁷⁷. Our contribution to the sector of defterology lies in the fact that we approached the Ottoman registers with certain very simple questions to which we sought answers, believing that by following the logic of the registers these can, *grosso modo*, show us how the fiscal relationship of conqueror to conquered operated, because these sources illustrate an economic logic. With starting point a *problématique* which Sp. Asdrachas had already formulated in his major hypotheses of the 1970s, we showed the limits within which a surplus is created and the limit beyond which part of this surplus could remain in the hands of the farmer⁷⁸.

the Basbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi. See Evangelia Balta, “Landed Property of the Monasteries on Athos Peninsula and its Taxation in 1764” in : idem, *Peuple et Production. Pour une interprétation des sources ottomanes*. *Analecta Isisiana* XLI, Istanbul, Les éditions Isis 1999, 179-207.

⁷⁶ See S. Asdrachas et al., *Elliniki oikonomiki istoria, 15os-19os aionas* (Greek Economic History, 15th-19th century), vol. 1, Athens, Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, 2003, 289-356.

⁷⁷ See the works by Mehmet Öz, “XVI. Yüzyılda Anadolu’da Tarımda Verimlik Problemi”, XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 2002, 1643-1651; idem, “Agriculture in the Ottoman Classical Period”, in: (ed.) Kemal Çiçek, *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation* vol. II, Ankara, Yeni Türkiye, 2000, 32-40.

⁷⁸ Sp. I. Asdrachas, “Aux Balkans du XVe siècle: producteurs directs et marche”, *Etudes Balkaniques* 6/3 (1970), 36-69. Idem, “Gaioprosodos kai ypochreotikos exchrimatismos ton agrotikon oikonomion” (Land income and compulsory monetarization of the rural economies), in: idem, *Elliniki koinonia kai oikonomia 18os kai 19os ai. (Ypotheseis kai proseggiseis)* (Greek Society and Economy, 18th and 19th centuries (Hypotheses and Approaches)), Athens, Ermis, 21988, 79-144 (first publications in: *Annuaire* (1978/79) de l’Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, IVe Section, Paris 1978/1979, 433-438; *Annuaire* (1977/78), Paris 1978, 499-529 and idem, “Quelques aspects des économies villageoises au début du IXe siècle: fiscalité et rentes foncières”, *Epitheorisi Koinonikon Erevnon* (special issue: Aspects du changement social dans la campagne grecque), Athens 1981, 158-179. Idem, “Le surplus rural dans les régions de la Méditerranée

With multiple examples and cross-checks of data from contemporary Ottoman and Greek community registers⁷⁹, we demonstrated also that the Ottoman fiscal registers cannot be used autonomously as sources for demographic inquiries, because they are subject to the logic of the tax which they record each time and moreover to the logic of its distribution with the intermediation of the community authorities. In other words, we demonstrated that the Ottoman registers do not record the total of the potential taxable population⁸⁰ but that simultaneously they can be utilized in a perspective of historical demography, so that by enhancing classes of magnitudes a view of the settled space can

orientale: les mécanismes”, Actes du IIe Colloque International d’Histoire (Athènes, 18-25 septembre 1983), Économies méditerranéennes Équilibres et intercommunications, XIIIe-XIXe siècles, vol. II, Athènes, Fondation de la Recherche Scientifique, 1986, 29–57. See also Evangelia Balta, *L’Eubée*, op. cit. Corresponding researches in the “Rural Economy of Greek regions under Venetian and Ottoman domination (15th-19th c.)” Project, of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, revolved around the same axes.

⁷⁹ See e.g. relevant studies for some Aegean islands: Eftychia Liata, *I Seriphos kata tin Tourkokratia (17os-19os ai.)* (Seriphos during the Ottoman Period, 17th-19th c.), Athens 1987. S. I. Asdrachas, “Nisiotikes koinotites: oi phorologikes leitourgies” (Island communities: the taxation functions), *Ta Istorika* 8 (June 1988), 229-258 and 9 (December 1988), 229-258. Sevasti Lazari, *Économies et sociétés des îles de la mer Égée pendant l’occupation ottomane. Le cas de Mykonos*, Université Paris I, Paris 1989 (unpublished doctoral thesis). Evangelia Balta – Maria Spiliotopoulou, “Eggeia phorologia kai phorologiki apaitisi sti Santorini ton 17o aiona” (Taxation on land and taxation demand in Santorini in the 17th century), *Mnemon* 18 (1996), 109-142. D. Dimitropoulos, *I Mykonos ton 17o aiona. Gaioktitikes scheseis kai oikonomikes synallages* (Mykonos in the 17th century. Land-owning relations and economic transactions), Athens 1997. Aglaia Kasdagli, *Land and Marriage Settlements in the Aegean. A Case Study of Seventeenth-Century Naxos*, Venice 1999. Eleftheria Zei, *Paros dans l’Archipel grec, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles: les multiples visages de l’insularité*, Université Paris I, 2 vols, Paris 2001 (unpublished doctoral thesis). Maria Spiliotopoulou, *I Santorini stin tourkokratia. Koinonikes kai oikonomikes praktikes sto plaisio tis oikogeneias* (Santorini in the Ottoman Period. Social and economic practices in the context of the family), Faculty of Letters, University of Crete, Rethymnon 2005.

⁸⁰ Heath Lowry very rightly points out that the *tapu tahrir* registres are fiscal and not demographic sources, although his argumentation (see dictum 4) shows that he takes as given that the total of the taxable population is entered in them. See Heath W. Lowry, “The Ottoman *Tahrir Defterleri* as a Source for Social and Economic History: Pitfalls and Limitations”, in: *idem*, *Studies in Deftology. Ottoman Society in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, The Isis Press, Istanbul 1992, 12-13. However, there is evidence to the contrary. The observation that 30% of the tax-payers did not coincide in two synchronic registers of 1670 even though their total number was the same in two registers, *tapu tahrir* and *cizye*, attests *inter alia* that the potential taxable population of the island is larger than that which a fixed lump-sum tax (*maktu*) demands. See Evangelia Balta, “Le rôle de l’institution communautaire dans la repartition verticale de l’impôt: l’exemple de Santorin au XVIIIe siècle”, in the volume *Problèmes et approches de l’histoire ottomane. Un itinéraire scientifique de Kayseri à Eériboz*, Istanbul 1997, 97-109. So, the use of Ottoman tax registers for investigating the demographic magnitudes of settlements undoubtedly demands multiple cross-checks, but not only exclusively with like sources. The example of the Aegean islands where *tapu tahrir* registers and community registers have survived has shown that the co-examination of them leads to safer conclusions, and the same applies also to regions such as the Peloponnese, for which there is the possibility of comparing the Ottoman registers with the Venetian ones.

be formed and its economic function can be shown. Linda Darling's thesis⁸¹ came to confirm these ascertainments with examples from other parts of the empire too. It could be contended that Greek Ottoman Studies in the sector of defterology, in a pioneering scientific manner, are elevated above the local, the national history and contribute to the study of phenomena of Ottoman times. But whereas research has advanced, there are still studies⁸² that insist on considering the Ottoman fiscal registers as demographic sources, as if nothing had changed since Ö. L. Barkan's view in the 1950s. These develop, on the basis of the numbers entered in the registers, an argumentation concerning the increase and decrease in the population of the empire, which from the nature of the source cannot possibly be formulated. In order to detect the population movement additional approaches must intervene, in order to suggest, for example, the relation between tax-yielding ability and demographic situation.

Investigated furthermore was the role of the community as a political-economic structure within the dominant political regime, with the analysis of Ottoman tax registers and other registers of economic type which the function itself produced, because it is obvious that just as the tax register of the economic service of the empire is an Ottoman source, the community register is also an Ottoman source⁸³. So, the collaboration of Ottoman specialists with researchers processing Greek sources, or their parallel course, has pointed out the role that the community authorities played in fulfilling the economic-taxation obligations of the public, that is in managing the collective responsibility imposed by the central power. The Ottoman registers attest indirectly to the community practice of apportioning the tax among its members, in order to ensure its survival, through keeping balances⁸⁴.

⁸¹ Linda Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy. Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1996, 100-108.

⁸² Suraiya Faroqui, *Approaching Ottoman History. An Introduction to the Sources*, Cambridge University Press 1999, 90-91. See the long book review by Ehud. R. Toledano, "What Ottoman History and Ottomanist Historiography Are – Or, Rather, Are Not", *Middle Eastern Studies* 38/3 (July 2002), 195-207. This text is at the same time an extremely interesting study on Ottoman Studies.

⁸³ S. Asdrachas, "Phorologikes kai perioristikes leitourgies ton koinotiton stin Tourkokratia" (Taxation and restrictive functions of the communities in the Ottoman period), *Ta Istorika* 5 (June 1986), 45-62. Evangelia Balta, "Le rôle de l'institution communautaire", *op. cit.*

⁸⁴ The frequency of appearance of certain names in two registers of Samos, for the years 1632 and 1642, on the basis of which the taxable population of the settlements is classed in groups, leads to the hypothesis that the community authorities of the island shared out the head-tax dues that had to be paid to the Ottoman State among specific families, thus the common name. In those years, 14-15 families, possibly the most affluent, paid half the head tax of the island. See Evangelia Balta, "Sousami anoixe" (Open Sesame), *Samiakes Meletes* 3 (1997-1998), 118-119. Cf. also the example of Paros. A document of 1748 describes the apportionment of the island's lump-sum tax among 18 households, the wealthiest families on the island, see Eleftheria Zei, *op. cit.*, t. II, 408-409.

3- History of towns and cities

In this sector Greek Ottoman Studies have a rich output to their credit, which is based on Turkish archival material both in Greece and in Turkey and Bulgaria. It was pioneered by Vassilis Dimitriadis, with his researches on Thessaloniki⁸⁵, which was afterwards a popular subject for other studies too. Meropi Anastassiadou⁸⁶ based her doctoral thesis and a series of articles mainly on material from the Historical Archives of Macedonia, as did architects studying the urban plan and rebuilding of the city in the final years of Ottoman rule⁸⁷. The Historical Archive Thessaloniki has supplied and still supplies material for research on diverse subjects relating to the city's history, such as topography and history of monuments, demographic dynamic and population synthesis, social stratification, as indicated by the inventories of properties, distribution of trades and professions documented by the kadi sicills, the vakif registers, etc.

In recent years, several doctoral theses have dealt with aspects of the urban phenomenon in northern Greek regions. Starting point of these inquiries is the surviving archival material of the local Ottoman administration. Two dissertations focused on Karaferye (Veroia) and a series of articles issuing from these enhanced images of the local society and the economy of the area⁸⁸. A third dissertation, on Kozani⁸⁹, is classed

⁸⁵ V. Dimitriadis, *Topographia tis Thessalonikis kata tin epochi tis tourkokratias, 1430-1912* (Topography of Thessaloniki during the period of Turkish Rule, 1430-1912), Thessaloniki, Institute of Macedonian Studies, 1983. Idem, *I Thessaloniki tis parakmis. I elliniki koinotita tis Thessalonikis kata tin dekaetia tou 1830 me vasi ena othomaniko katasticho apographis plithysmou* (Thessaloniki in Decline. The Greek community of Thessaloniki in the 1830s, on the basis of an Ottoman population census register), Herakleion 1997.

⁸⁶ Meropi Anastassiadou, *Salonique 1830-1912. Une ville ottomane à l'âge des réformes*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1997; idem, "Yanni, Nikola, Lifter et des autres...Le profil démographique et socio-professionnel de la population orthodoxe de Salonique à la veille des Tanzimat", *Südost-Forschungen* 53(1994), 73-130; idem, "Les inventaires après-décès de Salonique à la fin du XIXe siècle: source pour l'étude d'une société au seuil de la modernisation", *Turcica* 25 (1993), 97-135; idem, "Artisans juifs à Salonique au début des Tanzimat", *Revue du Monde Musulman et de la Méditerranée* 66 (1992/4), 65-72.

⁸⁷ See e.g. V. Kolonas, *I ektos ton teichon epektasi tis Thessalonikis. Eikonographia tis synoikias Hamidie (1885-1912)* (The extra muros expansion of Thessaloniki. Iconography of the Hamidie quarter (1885-1912)), doctoral dissertation, School of Architecture, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1991.

⁸⁸ Antonis Anastasopoulos, *Imperial Institutions and Local Communities: Ottoman Karaferye, 1758-1774*, University of Cambridge 1998 (unpublished doctoral thesis). Idem, "Lighting the Flame of Disorder: Ayan infighting and State intervention in Ottoman Karaferye, 1758-59", *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 8 (2002), 73-88 and Antonis Anastasopoulos, Eleni Gara, "Othomanikes antilipseis peri englimatos kai timorias" (Ottoman conceptions on crime and punishment), *Mnimon* 21 (1999), 37-54. Eleni Gara, *Kara Ferye 1500-1650. Menschen, Lokalgasell Schaft und Verwaltung in einer Osmanischen Provinz*, Wien 2000; eadem, "Zuha for the Janissaries – Velence for the Poor: Competition for Raw Material and Workforce between Salonica and Veria, 1600-1650", in: Suraiya Faroqui, Randi Deguilhem (eds), *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East. Fashioning the Individual in the Muslim Mediterranean*, London, -New York, I.B. Tauris-European Science Foundation, 2005, 121-152.

⁸⁹ See K. Kambouridis, op. cit. For Kozani see also G. Salakidis, *Ta soultanika eggrapha*, op. cit.

among those studies which are essentially publications of material from kadi codices, as are the contributions of Kirki Georgiadou-Tsimino⁹⁰ for Thessaloniki, G. Salakidis for Larisa⁹¹ and Eleni Karantzikou and Penelope Photeinou from Herakleion, Crete⁹². These are infrastructure works which meet vital needs of Greek Ottoman Studies and Modern Greek historiography, not only because they provide documentary material for those who lack the linguistic and other technical knowledge that access to the Ottoman sources demands. However, it should be noted too that from the degree of participation of these publications in the historical deliberation which the published documents come to answer, the orientations of historiography and of publication practice, the methods and the prospects of both will depend.

Studies based on tahrir, cizye and vakif registers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries endeavoured to investigate the demography of certain cities, focusing on the population osmoses, part of which in the first two centuries of the conquest was due to the intervention of the political authority⁹³. They also followed the continuity of urban space from the pre-Ottoman to the Ottoman period and the changes that the conquest brought on the urban tissue of the city and on its economic role with the intermediation of the institution of vakifs⁹⁴.

The challenges of the subject “history of the Ottoman city” are many and the sources abundant and varied for constructing research hypotheses on the demographic status of cities in relation to the hinterland, the communications by land and water, the circulation of goods, the strategy of capital. Last, for those for whom the theoretical schemes of historical anthropology do not suffice, there is available material to support researches on the very life of the cities, with the constants of everyday life, the fears, the defences, the leading classes and its cultural identity as formed by the cohabitation of pre-national societies.

⁹⁰ Kirki Georgiadou-Tsimino, “Othomanikes Piges. Eggrapha apo to Istoriko Archeio Makedonias, teli 17ou aiona. Metaphrasi kai scholiasmos” (Ottoman Sources. Documents from the Historical Archive of Macedonia, late 17th century. Translation and commentary), *Istoria tis Epicheirimatikotitas stin Thessaloniki (History of Entrepreneurship in Thessaloniki)*, vol. II, Thessaloniki 2005, 308-391.

⁹¹ G. I. Salakidis, *Larisa (YeniŞehir) sta mesa tou 17ou aiona, Koinoniki kai oikonomiki istoria mias valkanikis polis kai tis periochis tos me vasi ta othomanika ierodikastika eggrapha ton eton 1050-1052 (1650-1652) (Larissa-YeniŞehir in the middle of the 17th Century. Social and Economic History of a Balkan Town and its Region based on the Ottoman Juridical Records of the Years 1050-1052/1650-1652)*, Thessaloniki, Ant. Stamoulis editions, 2004.

⁹² Eleni Karantzikou, Penelope Photeinou (eds), *Ierodikeio Irakleiou. Tritos kodikas 1669/73 – 1750/67 (Kadi sicill of Herakleion. Third codex: 1669/73 – 1750/67)*, Elizabeth A. Zachariadou (ed), Herakleion, Vikelaia Library, 2003.

⁹³ See indicatively the study by Stephanos Gerasimou, “Ellines tis Constantinoupolis sta mesa tou 16ou aiona” (Greeks of Constantinople in the mid-16th century), *I kath’imas Anatoli 2* (1994), 117-138.

⁹⁴ Evangelia Balta, *Les vakifs de Serrès...*, op. cit.

*
**

I have confined myself to the above three thematic units because in these I see distributed the small, for the present, production of Greek Ottoman Studies. This does not mean that other fields of application do not exist. For example, the spread of Bektashism in Thrace⁹⁵; the conflicts between the military corps and between these and the local Ottoman authorities which are still inscribed in part in the perspective of resistance against the sovereign power, even though the terms of this view have been overturned or differentiated⁹⁶; and last, tentatively, the approach to the Greek War of Independence from the Ottoman sources⁹⁷, an issue which post-dictatorship Modern Greek historiography continues to confront awkwardly⁹⁸, still unable to disengage from the constraining factors linked with the, until recently, intensive political and ideological exploitation of the Greek Revolution of 1821. The Ottoman sources shed light on the Greek Revolution from the side of the sovereign state and place it in the framework of Ottoman reality, a dimension that was of necessity lacking from the approaches of Modern Greek historiography, also on account of the exclusive use of Greek sources. On the other hand, these sources create the preconditions for the infrastructure of a **history of events**, which is necessary for developing an interpretation of historical problems of this kind, such as the study of behaviours and mentalities on both sides.

⁹⁵ E.Ch. Zeginis, *O bektasismos sti D. Thraki. Symvoli stin istoria tis diadoseos tou mousoulmanismou ston elladiko choro* (Bektashism in W. Thrace. Contribution to the history of the spread of Islam in Greece), Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1988.

⁹⁶ See J. Ch. Alexander, "The Klephts of the Morea: an Historical Essay", in: A. Lily Macrakis, P. N. Diamandouros (eds), *New Trends in Modern Greek Historiography*, The Modern Greek Studies Association in cooperation with Anatolia College, 1982, Occasional papers 1, 31-37; Idem, *Brigandage...*, op. cit. However, resistance to the conquerors, dominant issue in Modern Greek historiography, demands a new approach which will examine the *armataloi* also through the prism of an institution of the Ottoman State.

⁹⁷ See V. Dimitriadis, Dionysia Daskalou (eds), *O kodikas ton thysion. Onomata kai dimevmenes periousies ton christianon agoniston tis Anatolikas Kritis kata tin Epanastasin tou 1821* (The codex of sacrifices. Names and confiscated properties of the Christian freedom-fighters of East Crete during the 1821 Revolution), translation V. Dimitriadis, Eleni Karantzikou, Penelope Photeinou, Chrysoula Christodoulara, Herakleion, 2003. This invaluable source had been processed by N. Stavriniadis. He, consulting the material in the Herakleion archive, had investigated the revolutionary movements in Crete. See N. Stavriniadis, *O kapetan Michalis Korakas kai oi sympolemistes tou* (Captain Michalis Korakas and his fellow fighters), 3 vols, Herakleion 1971. Also Evangelia Balta, "I othomaniki martyria ya tin epanastatimeni Karysto" (The Ottoman testimony on Karystos in the War of Independence), *Archeio Evvoikon Meleton* 35 (2003-2004), 189-200.

⁹⁸ Ch. Loukos, "I Epanastasi tou 1821. Apo kyriarcho antikeimeno erevnas kai didaskalias, stin ypovathmisi kai siopi" (The 1821 Revolution. From dominant subject of research and teaching, to downgrading and silence), IV International Conference of History, *Historiography of Modern and Contemporary Greece, 1833-2002*, P.M. Kitromilidis, T.E. Sklavenitis (eds), vol. 1, Athens, Neohellenic Research Centre, 2004, 579-593.

The study of certain Greek regions, both by Greek and foreign Ottomanists⁹⁹, has undoubtedly enriched our knowledge with material. Mainly, however, it has provided another dimension to approaching the issues, by putting them in the context of the Ottoman reality. The study of the cultivation and circulation of Mediterranean produce, such as wine and olive oil, has opened up the horizons of Greek Ottoman Studies and transferred them to outside the frontiers of Greek territory by formalizing unofficial collaborations between Ottomanists¹⁰⁰.

In presenting the contribution of Greek Ottoman Studies to certain fields of knowledge, the silences of this twenty-year production are inferred too. Missing completely are the approach to the complex nineteenth century¹⁰¹ and the study of Asia Minor Hellenism from the Ottoman sources¹⁰², indicating indirectly that the historical deliberation of Greek Ottoman Studies for the present wells from or is at least linked by strong ties to the Greek viewpoint. I believe, however, and not because I am an optimist, that things will inevitably change, because those involved with Ottoman Studies are slowly but surely growing in number and as a consequence of this a richer range of subjects will be explored. So long, of course, as it does not stop at the superficial and is not lost in the discourse on it¹⁰³, because the merging of a strict conceptual processing and a penetrating historical analysis with knowledge of the primary sources is not simply a methodological ideal but an elementary precondition of a position that aims to offer knowledge.

⁹⁹ The examination of the historiographic output of international Ottoman Studies is for Greece a separate chapter which merits study in its own right. One of my future studies will focus on the categorizations of this historiographic production.

¹⁰⁰ The chapter on olive growing and olive harvesting in Ottoman times, in the book *Elia kai ladi stin Anatoliki Mesogeio. Apo tin proistoria sti viomichaniki epochi* (Olive Tree and Olive Oil in the Eastern Mediterranean. From prehistoric times to the industrial era) (publ. of the Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, in press), was written in collaboration with Turkish Ottoman specialists (Mehmet Çeç, Gülden Sariyildiz, Zeki Arıkan, Fikret Yılmaz, et alii).

¹⁰¹ See on this issue, Evangelia Balta, "Oi othomanikes spoudes sti neoelliniki istoriographia" (Ottoman Studies in Modern Greek Historiography), IV International Conference of History, *Historiography of Modern and Contemporary Greece, 1833-2002*, P.M. Kitromilidis, T.E. Sklavenitis (eds), vol. 1, Athens, Neohellenic Research Centre, 2004, 269-270.

¹⁰² Studies of Asia Minor Hellenism continue to focus on Greek and Western sources. Exception is the work by Sp. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley- Los Angeles- London, University of California Press, 1971, based on published Turkish, Arabic and Persian sources.

¹⁰³ Ph. Iliou remarks, on the occasion of the IV International Conference of Historiography: "What is missing is the dual access of the historian to the events per se and the thinking on the vents. These are two different levels which, if you do not study in common, if you do not explore jointly, you completely lose the historicity and the sense of the timeliness. From this viewpoint there is widening but also undermining of the historiographic field". See S. I. Asdrachas- Ph. Iliou, op. cit., 426.

