

OTTOMAN STUDIES IN MODERN GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY**

Evangelia BALTA*

I

I should clarify from the outset that I have chosen to use the term *Ottoman Studies* instead of the term *Turkology*, because the Turkology that emerged from Oriental Studies was not and is not an exclusively historical discipline. Its principal subject was the language and literature of Turkish and other Turkic tongues, in parallel with study of the culture of the peoples speaking these languages. Proof of this is the fact that in Turkish universities today, Turkology is part of the discipline of Linguistics. In universities and research foundations in Europe and America, the situation is rather more complex. Turkish/Ottoman Studies, being outside the body of the national history of the countries in these continents, constitute separate sections in the departments of 'Middle or Near Eastern Studies'.¹ There the study of Turkic languages coexists with the study of the history of the corresponding tribes and peoples, the history of the Ottoman Empire, of Atatürk's Turkey and of the Modern Turkish State.² Very often the aforesaid subjects are also co-examined by the political and social sciences, that is the said Departments or Studies Programmes are staffed by political scientists, international relations specialists, economists, anthropologists, ethno-linguists, art historians and so on, confirming what is known from the nineteenth century, that Turkological studies, as traditionally all Oriental Studies, are linked directly with political-strategic and economic interests.³

* National Hellenic Foundation for Scientific Research, Athens, Greece

¹ See the *Proceedings of the XIII Türk Tarih Kongresi* (1999), dedicated to Ottoman historiography, where Heath W. Lowry and Gilles Veinstein sketch respectively Ottoman Studies in North America and in France over the past fifty years. 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", in *XIII Türk Tarih Kongresi (Ankara, 4-8 Ekim 1999), Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, I Cilt, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara 2002, 1-59, and Gilles Veinstein. "Fifty Years of Ottoman Studies in France. An Essay of Thematic Bibliography", *op. cit.*, 61-84.

² In 1971, I. Yannopoulos envisaged a similar centre of Turkish Studies in Greece, implying that Ottoman Studies, being included in Faculties of Letters, should not be restricted to serving the needs of our national historiography: "Turkish Studies as such or Arabic Studies cannot flourish in the Faculties of Letters, which have another mission. Greece today needs a new university department or an independent university foundation, which will reconnect our country with the other peoples and in which the student will focus in his studies on the language and culture of his interest. Such institutions exist in many other countries, in which virtually all the languages of the world are taught", I.G. Yannopoulos, "The Development of Turkological Studies and the Need to Cultivate These in Greece", *Mnemon* 1 (1971), 5-22 (in Greek).

³ See indicatively the programme of papers presented on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of operation of the Institute of Turkish Studies in Washington (11-12 October 2002). Under the title 'The State of Research in

II

The purpose of the foregoing remarks on *Turkology*, *Turkish*, *Ottoman Studies* was to underline indirectly the specific differences in the content of the terms, their use and their perception in Modern Greek historiography. They describe an exclusively historical discipline which examines, as is ascertained, the period of Ottoman sovereignty in Greek lands,⁴ as these were inherited from the Byzantine Empire. It is precisely for this reason that I decided to use the term Ottoman Studies. In Greece, the terms *Turkology*, *Turkish*, *Ottoman Studies*, have a prescribed and prescriptive content. Here, Ottoman Studies deal with the period of Ottoman rule in the Hellenic world, primarily in Greece and to a lesser extent in Asia Minor and the Balkans. It is therefore no accident that the very few Ottoman specialists in Greece work in departments of Modern Greek history in universities and research foundations. This is due to the fact that the subject of these studies in Greece is a long period of the country's recent history, that which is referred to in the scheme of national history as the Ottoman Occupation (*Turkokratia*). There are various chronological *termini* for this period. The appearance of the first Turkic tribes in Asia Minor; the founding of the Ottoman Empire and, last, the break up of the Byzantine Empire with the Fall of Constantinople, which was adopted mainly by Balkan historiography, are considered *termini post quem* for the Ottoman period. Several watershed events are given as *termini ante quem* too: the Greek War of Independence in 1821, the annexation of the New Territories or the Asia Minor Catastrophe in 1922, which also brought national consolidation, mark the end of Ottoman rule in Greece. The constant and incontestable factor is that the Ottoman Empire 'is studied' exclusively in relation to the needs of investigating or devising the *ad hoc* narrative of Greek history and the *ad hoc* chronological limits of the Ottoman period constitute each time a conjunction of these needs.⁵

III

After this first elucidation, that Ottoman Studies in Greece are almost exclusively a historical discipline which was incorporated in the body of our national history, as and when it was incorporated - issues I have discussed elsewhere⁶ -, I pass to the second elucidation. I must clarify what Ottoman Studies I am talking about. And so I declare right away that I do not include in Ottoman Studies the total of Modern Greek historiography that has dealt with the Ottoman Empire or with the Ottoman period in Greek history. The Ottoman Studies that will concern us here do not derive from Kritoboulos, nor is their starting point K. Sathas's book '*Tourkokratoumeni Hellas*' (*Ottoman-held Greece*), since this, in terms of period at

Turkish Studies 1982-2002', the programme included papers on Ottoman art and architecture, history, archaeology, social sciences, language and anthropology.

⁴ For the term 'Greek lands' in the work of Paparrigopoulos, the geographical continuum that functions as a canvas for the romance between the Greek nation and time, see Spyros Karavas, "Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos and the national claims (1877-1885)", *O Politis*, iss. 104, October 2002, 19-23 (in Greek).

⁵ 'In Greek historiography, the Ottoman Empire and Turkey appear exclusively in articulation with the needs of narrating Greek history, and the turning points are counter-determined by those moments in the history of Hellenism that are considered marginally positive or disastrous for the Turks.' See Stephanos Pematzoglou, *Europe - Turkey. Reflections and Refractions. The Strategy of the Texts*, Book I, publ. Themelio - Foundation of Mediterranean Studies, Athens 1993, 91 (in Greek).

⁶ Evangelia Balta, "Ottoman Studies in Greece", *Ta Historika* 16/31 (Dec. 1999), 455-460 (in Greek). The English translation of this article was published in *XIII Türk Tarih Kongresi (Ankara, 4-8 Ekim 1999)*, op. cit., 243-248.

least, is inscribed in the historiography of recent and Modern Greece.⁷ It becomes apparent that the Ottoman Studies that concern us here were imported relatively recently from the West into the scholarship of Greece, instituting a new autonomous field in historical disciplines. Thus, I include in these Ottoman Studies, first the institution of the relevant undergraduate and postgraduate lecture courses or seminars that are organized in universities and scientific foundations, and second the historical knowledge produced by Ottoman specialists as well as historians who approach the Ottoman period with common problems and historiographic terms. In the last few decades there has been a rich historiographic output of high quality, which, drawing on already published Greek, Western, Balkan and Ottoman sources, studies new subjects or negotiates old ones by applying new methods and approaches generated in European historiography and in the sector of Ottoman Studies internationally. In order to explain exactly what I mean when I say that 'they approach the Ottoman period with common problems and historiographic terms', I shall give an example. I have argued elsewhere about the significance of the community registers as a source for understanding community solidarities, product *par excellence* of coercion in a conquered society in which there is collective responsibility for paying tax. It is clear that the community register is just as much an Ottoman source as is the fiscal register of the State Treasury. Thus the validity of an hypothesis on the manner of distribution of the taxes in the interior of the communities, based initially on study of two Ottoman registers of Santorini, of 1670, was confirmed subsequently by the testimony of a community register of Andros, of 1721.⁸ I cite the example of the Ottoman registers of Santorini and the community register of Andros, in order to show that the common problems considered and the common manner of approaching sources of more or less the same kind but in other languages, as well as the common methods and common tools employed, constitute the criteria which class in Ottoman Studies both the Ottoman specialist and the historian specialized in Modern Greek History. These same criteria designate as primary concern examination of the function of the community institution in the context of the conquering society, and as secondary the provenance and the language of the source, that is knowledge of the Turkish Ottoman language, Arab script and all the technical know-how surrounding this.

IV

The need to define the space and the content of Ottoman Studies in Modern Greek historiography has brought us to discussion of the essence of the subject, before touching on certain other issues.

- Ottoman Studies in Greece go back to the 1960s, a decade that was evidently crucial for Greek historiography. It was then that the first historians who are considered to represent

⁷ Ioannis Theocharides, "The Development of Turkological Studies in Greece", *Dodoni. Epistemonike Eperida tou Tmematos Historias kai Archeologias tes Philosophikis Scholes tou Panepistemiou Ioanninon* 17/1 (1988), 19-60 (in Greek). I. Theocharides - Th. Stavrides, "Yunanistan'daki Osmanlı çalışmalarının Gelişimi", in *Yeni Türkiye. Türkler* (eds) H.C. Güzel et alii, (director of editorial committee) Prof. Dr. Y. Halaçoğlu, (editorial adviser) Prof. Dr. H. Inalcık, Ankara 2002, vol. 15, 99-104.

⁸ 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 Eğriboz*, Istanbul 1997, 97-109. D. Dimitrakopoulos, "Family and fiscal registers in the Aegean islands during the Ottoman period", *Ta Historika* 14 (1997), 335-352 (in Greek).

Ottoman Studies in Greece studied in European universities,⁹ published their first articles or completed their doctoral dissertations, which were published in the following decade. It is not fortuitous that Ottoman Studies in Greece date back to the 1960s. It was in this decade that the Royal Research Foundation (today, National Hellenic Foundation for Scientific Research) was set up and scholarships were awarded for studies abroad, in sectors that did not yet exist in Greece and ought to be created. Recognition of the needs of research had preceded.

- However, in order to put aside the ideological constraints and to take the first steps towards creating the preconditions for Ottoman Studies in Greece, more than two decades had elapsed. In 1939, in the preface to his study on the Peloponnese, Michalis Sakellariou had defined the Ottoman Studies that historiographic inquiries demanded.¹⁰ And when he returned to this issue later, he stressed that 'lack of specialist knowledge burdened and burdens the historical synthesis of the Ottoman period, the study of which did not manage to acquire autonomy, but emerged from the disposition of introduction to the War of Independence'.¹¹ His underlining of the need to study the Ottoman period in its own right and not as a prelude to the 1821 War of Independence, that is his awareness of the need to organize a new field of scholarship, makes Sakellariou a precursor of Ottoman Studies. He had proved himself in his doctoral thesis on the Peloponnese. It is no coincidence that this thesis did not get the reception it deserved, but was only 'discovered' in 1978, when the timeliness of the problems considered coincided with the historiographic inquiries of the post-dictatorship years, and it was reprinted by Hermes Publications. 1939 was too early for acceptance of a thesis in which, in the author's words 'all the local data of production, taxation, landholdings, administration, self-government, population are investigated and exposed'. For at that time the sector of historiography of the Ottoman period was monopolized by studies on the revolutionary movements of the Greeks against the Turks.

I also include Apostolos Vakalopoulos among the forerunners of Ottoman Studies in Greece, because in the vertical juxtaposing of events, in his *'History of Modern Hellenism'*,¹² he uses systematically the existing international bibliography of Ottoman Studies, with special emphasis on the Balkan and Turkish. Concurrently, he utilizes Ottoman sources, published as well as unpublished, which Turkish-speakers translated for him. He is the first to draw

⁹ These are Elizabeth Zachariadou, Vasilis Dimitriadis and Pavlos Hidirolou. The first, a fellow at the Royal Research Foundation was awarded a scholarship to study Turkology in London, in order to cover the needs of the newly-instituted Foundation in this sector. V. Dimitriadis and P. Hidirolou were sent to Britain and Germany respectively, and after their studies were appointed directors of the Ottoman archives in Thessaloniki and Herakleion. It is indicative that Ottoman Studies were initiated with the aim of covering needs in the research sector. It is still too early to introduce this discipline into the curriculum of Greek universities.

¹⁰ 'Except the paramount need for the proliferation of specialist scholars who will undertake the very important task of exploring the *terra incognita* of our historical past - on the one hand the confrontation of theoretical, methodological and organizational problems, on the other the systematization and organization of the future work in a manner pertinent and efficacious, capable of leading more directly to the comprehensive conception of the history of our nation during the Ottoman period', see Michael V. Sakellariou, *The Peloponnese During the Second Period of Ottoman Rule (1715-1821)*, Athens 1939, v (photocopy reprint: Hermes Publ., Athens 1978) (in Greek).

¹¹ Michael Sakellariou considers that 'Paparrigopoulos simply shifted his view from the Fall of Byzantium to the Revolution of 1821, and saw the whole of the Ottoman period from the perspective of the War of Independence, and ordered the events of the Ottoman period in such a way as to answer a particular problem: how was the Revolution possible and successful?', see idem, "Modern Greek Studies. Historical and Critical Planning. Third Period", *Nea Hestia* 33 (1943), 438 (in Greek). Also, Antonis Liakos, "The structuring of national time in Greek historiography", *O Politis* 124 (1993), 30 (in Greek).

¹² A. Vakalopoulos, *History of Modern Hellenism*, E. Sfakianakis & Sons, Thessaloniki ²1974-1988. (in Greek).

methodically on the hitherto dormant translated Ottoman archival material. However, it should be noted that the translated Ottoman material for Northern Greece, which A. Vakalopoulos mainly processed, had been chosen for translation on the criterion of specific ideological directions, namely the quest for the identity of Hellenism. The tracing of Ottoman-held Macedonia in the scattered Ottoman sources of the various Greek state services was done with sole aim of finding proof of the 'Greekness' of the northern region.¹³ Nevertheless, we should acknowledge that in the positivist conception of national historiography, that A. Vakalopoulos served, this is the first time cracks can be discerned in the exclusivity of the use of Greek sources. The transcendence has, therefore, taken place.

Nikos Svoronos belongs without doubt among the ranks of precursors, as author of *Commerce de Salonique*¹⁴ and as protagonist in setting up the department of Oriental and African Studies at the University of Crete. In 1980, as President of the Board of that University, he organized the institutional framework of the department, in accordance with international models.¹⁵ Neither the visionary personality nor the choice of a newly founded university is fortuitous. Nikos Svoronos also tutored the group of young historians who were sent to study in France in the 1960s. There they opted to deal with subjects of the Ottoman period in their doctoral theses. Their personal inquiries, determined by *desiderata* of Modern Greek historiography, were fermented and formulated in the fertile climate of the currents of the *Annales* and the Braudelian tradition. They published studies, translated seminal articles into Greek, taught in university seminars in France, supervised dissertations of younger colleagues and when they returned to Greece after the fall of the Junta, they helped transfuse these new historiographic trends into the country.¹⁶ Their enormous contribution to expanding the historiographic horizon of Modern Greek and contemporary history with new subjects, new tools, new interpretative models, will surely be discussed at this conference. I do not want to give the erroneous impression that I confine this contribution only to the sector of Ottoman Studies. Nevertheless, it is an undeniable fact that the personal historiographic output of these scholars lies mainly in the domain concerning the enfranchisement of the mechanisms of the rural economy of the conquered, the organization of the settlement pattern, the demographic values and population movements in Greece during the years of foreign domination, the study of craft industry, trade and communications in the eighteenth and

¹³ This is expressed overtly time and again in the prefaces of published volumes of Ottoman sources: 'From all these documents emerge more generally the following: a) the incontestable strength and vitality of Macedonian Hellenism and the continuous propensity towards national liberation, and b) that nowhere do Slavs appear in these documents, see *Historical Archive of Veroia. Selections*, ed. I.K. Vasdravellis, Thessaloniki 1942, iii (in Greek), and *Historical Archives of Macedonia. I Archive of Thessaloniki 1699-1912*, ed. I.K. Vasdravellis, Thessaloniki 1942, I (in Greek). It is obvious that the Ottoman sources translated were chosen with the aim of showing first the participation of the northern Greek region in the 1821 War of Independence - therefore the Greek morale was as developed there as in 'Old Greece' - and second of supporting the absence of a Slav element - therefore to prove the Greekness of the region. I believe that inquiries of this type in the approach to the Ottoman sources demonstrate that the demands of the day were different and the ideological orientations of recent Greek historiography were robust, under the dictate of the political expediencies of the period.

¹⁴ N.G. Svoronos, *Le commerce de Salonique au XVIIIe siècle*, preface Ernest Labrousse, Editions PUF, Paris 1956.

¹⁵ Elisabeth Zachariadou and Vasilis Dimitriadis were engaged by the University of Crete, where they taught for about two decades.

¹⁶ They are Spyros Asdrachas, Vasilis Panayotopoulos and Philippos Iliou, representatives of the 'new history' in Modern Greek history, in the period after the restoration of Democracy (1974). Eleni Antoniadis-Bibikou, settled in Paris in the same period as N. Svoronos, also soon turned to the study of recent and Modern Greece, and through her seminars shaped a host of young historians specialized in Contemporary Greece.

nineteenth centuries, as well as of the War of Independence, and so on. Their personal output and the influences they exerted contributed the leaven to the study of economic and social history and the history of ideas during the Ottoman period, directing interest to those sectors in which there was *par excellence* the possibility of examining collective phenomena and behaviours.

V

Ottoman Studies in Greece acquired substance in the decades 1980-2000. It is difficult to speak about trends or directions when the historiographic output still derives from an extremely small group of specialists. The subjects are determined by the narrow choices of priorities placed each time by the historiographic interests and the equipment of specific persons. The list of subjects which concerned Ottoman Studies in these twenty years includes: populations and economy of regions of Greece with source the Ottoman registers, topography and history of towns, publication of legislation on fiscal issues, the status of the Church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the reality of the new society, the history of monasteries and convents, the study of Greek communities. The subjects of the international meetings organized by the Turkish Studies Programme of the University of Crete were also varied. Concurrently, some classic historiographic works were translated, translations of Ottoman chronicles with commentary were published, etc. Principal trait of the above is the destructuralist historiographic endeavour motivated, as I would like to believe, by the criterion of creating infrastructures for a future synthesis. This is one version. There is of course the other version, which is equally applicable, in conjunction with or independent of the previous one; the conscious choice to omit an overall view of Ottoman times as our history, as well as of the common Ottoman heritage in the Balkans.¹⁷ As far as I know, only the theory of the Intermediate Region was proposed in Modern Greek historiography, a scheme that, beginning from the existence of a common Greek-Turkish space in the Byzantine-Ottoman past, maintained that the Ottoman Empire was not only the cultural but also the political expression of Hellenism.¹⁸ In corresponding sectors, however, Balkan historians have distinguished and distinguish themselves with various 'explanatory schemes' that change depending on the political expediencies they serve.¹⁹ The above remarks do not constitute evaluations or are not intended as evaluations. Nonetheless, a conspectus of the twenty-year output of Ottoman Studies in Greece is bound to note certain characteristic points. To me the most basic of these is the absence of involvement with the Ottoman historical phenomenon. In

¹⁷ I consider the main reason for avoiding comprehensive reviews of our Ottoman past is the fact that the basic axes of the dominant national ideology concerned this period and that there were numerous ideological conflicts and contradictions around these. Thus, the observed 'silence' should perhaps be interpreted as a refusal to adopt myths and stereotypes of Modern Greek ideology. Moreover, it should be noted that Ottoman Studies in Greece were not required to serve political dictates of the state machine, which fact protected them from various 'hermeneutic schemes'. As I have pointed out elsewhere, Greece may have entered the arena of Ottoman Studies late, but it cannot be doubted that it entered it solely with scholarly *desiderata*.

¹⁸ The theory was postulated by Dimitris Kitsikis, *History of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1924*, Athens 1988 (in Greek).

¹⁹ Bulgaria is a case in point. After the collapse of the Zivkov regime, the theory of '*islamizatsia*' was rescinded and the '*vizroditelen protses*' was condemned as abhorrent. In '*islamizatsia*' the phenomenon of Islamization, forced or voluntary, had been mobilized to explain the existence of Moslems in modern Bulgaria and to support *a priori* their Bulgarian origin. The 'Renaissance' programme - which what '*vizroditelen protses*' means - is the name given to the political act of changing the Muslim names of the inhabitants of Bulgaria. See Maria Todorova, "Bulgarian Historical Writing on the Ottoman Empire", *New Perspectives on Turkey* 12 (Spring 1995), 97-118.

other words, after the oppression of Modern Greek historiography by ethnocentrism, dominant element in which was the quest for the Greek identity through its resistance during the whole of the Ottoman period, Ottoman Studies appear reluctant to grapple with fecund general assessments of a period that spans four, five or more centuries in some areas of Hellenism. Elli Skopetea's studies on the nineteenth century constitute an exception.²⁰ The fact that no systematic studies existed in this sector is an indirect indication of the strength and resilience of the dominant opinions. The exorcism by procrastinating, silencing and committing of subjects of this type to the Greek calends showed results when, in the 1990s, after the awakening of nationalisms in the Balkans, research and studies on ethnic groups and minorities in the Balkans were given precedence,²¹ making them a popular historiographic field, under the political commands of the European Union and American globalization. Subjects then associated with processes of forming national ideologies, political and ethnic conflicts of the Balkan states seek interpretations and evidential material of necessity in the Balkans' common Ottoman past. But the basic researches did not exist, nor had processing of schemes other than comments on and analyses of the Paparrigopoulou view been made, both in Greek historiography and in the wider context of international interest in Greek history. Furthermore, the methodological tools for the study of the subject had not been developed.²² So, in the absence of historiographic proposals, the political and social sciences undertook to handle the issue. Thus certain paradoxes are frequently observed, which could well be characterized also as anachronisms, since we observe issues of the present, which reflect very specific political-ideological problems, projected into the past. In the mayhem created by the awakening of Balkan ethnicity, the multinational Ottoman Empire emerges today as the paradise of religious tolerance, harmonious and peaceful coexistence of the Balkan peoples. Such views do not differ from that of the Ottomans' lenience towards the subject *millet*s, or correspondingly from that which systematically uses the characterization Ottoman minorities when referring to the *millet*s, and indeed for years before 1869, which are promoted in a Turkological bibliography.²³ The significations are obvious, yet I still believe that it is the historian's duty to underline anachronisms of this type, wherever and whenever he/she locates them.

So, the lacuna of the historiographic approach of Greece's Ottoman past occupies a manifoldly ahistorical conspectus with nonetheless scientific specifications. In the proposed analyses, the space or the economy predominates. Historical time is abolished, as is the

²⁰ Elli Skopetea summarized the romantic historiographic approach to the problem of the Ottoman legacy in her book *The Twilight of the East. Images from the end of the Ottoman Empire*, Athens 1992 (in Greek); idem, "Turks and Balkans", in *The Balkans Yesterday - Today* (21 and 22 February 2000), publ. Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education [Athens n.d.], 143-155 (in Greek).

²¹ Angeliki Konstantakopoulou described appositely the disturbance of the collective image and memory, as well as the metamorphoses in research and the production of historical memory in the Balkans after perestroika. See Angeliki Konstantakopoulou, "Postwar Balkan Historiography in the Present Turning Point", in *Septième Congrès International d'Etudes du Sud-Est Européen* (Thessalonique, 29 août - 4 septembre 1994), Athens 1994, 801-818; idem, "Balkan Historiography Yesterday - Today", in *The Balkans Yesterday - Today* (21 and 22 February 2000), publ. Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education [Athens n.d.], 107-141 (in Greek).

²² The interest in the last decade of the 19th century should be noted. A fertile example of the historiography of that period is the book by P. Matalas, *Nation and Orthodoxy: The adventures of a relationship. From the 'Helladic' to the Bulgarian schism*, Crete University Press, Herakleion 2002 (in Greek).

²³ S. R. Sonyel, "The Role of Christian Minorities in Efforts by the Great Powers to Dismember the Ottoman Empire", *Belleten* XLIX, 42, 657-665 and idem, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire*, publ. Turkish Historical Society, Ankara 1993.

institutional and human environment which constitutes the essential precondition for its constitution.²⁴ Last, studies of a new genre of historiographic discourse, grafted with post-modern approaches of synchronic character, which use - to cite and example once again - the term 'terrorism' for the liberation movements of peoples of the Ottoman Empire,²⁵ should be regarded more as a source or testimony for studies dealing with the embracing of history by politics, than as historiographic approaches *per se*.

The Ottoman Studies to which we have referred had made the transcendence in the historiographic data of the period by studying Hellenism in the framework of the Ottoman Empire.²⁶ Furthermore, the fields of Modern Greek historiography were widened with the appearance and the treatment of Ottoman documentary sources that were until recently unknown or inaccessible. Moreover, the new subjects and the new problems that arose and arise from the dialogue with an international bibliography - we should not forget the international character of Ottoman Studies - in which Greek scholarship is of necessity engaged, are gradually reforming the previous historiographic view of Ottoman times. In my view, the most important contributions of Ottoman Studies to Modern Greek historiography are the breaches caused to the prevailing ethnocentric irredentist view, which was concerned exclusively with studying Hellenism's resistance to the Ottomans, the doubts created in the until recently crystallized view of intransigent taxation oppression of the subjects by the Ottoman fiscal system, the debunking of the myth that insisted that with the Ottoman conquest the subject peoples sought refuge in the mountains.

24 E.g. G. Prévelakis, *Les Balkans. Cultures et géopolitique*, publ. Nathan, Paris 1994, 43. At the opposite end of this spectrum is Nikos Svoronos, who, without overlooking the important role of geography, bases his Marxist analysis of the ties of the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, on their historical dimension, see N. Svoronos, "The historical substrate of inter-Balkan relations", *Annals of Modern Greek History and Historiography*, Themelio, Athens 1982, 259-274 (in Greek).

25 J. J. Reid, 'Terrorism in the Ottoman Empire and Modern Greece 1821-1878', *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 12-13 (1995-1996), 57-93.

26 Again, I give some examples in order to make clear what I mean. The role of the Patriarchate is examined in the reality of the new society that was created after the Fall of Constantinople and not in the now outdated conception of the continuation of a Byzantine tradition. The economic situation of the Rums, which was determined by the *zimmi* regime to which they belonged, is examined in relation to the general conditions of economic life in the Ottoman Empire.