

IDENTITY ISSUES OF THE OTTOMAN GREEKS IN THE AGE OF NATIONALISM AS REFLECTED IN
THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY OF ISTANBUL (1895-1915)

by

KONSTANTIA A. SAMARA

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Sabancı University
Summer 2007

IDENTITY ISSUES OF THE OTTOMAN GREEKS IN THE AGE OF NATIONALISM AS REFLECTED IN
THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY OF ISTANBUL (1895-1915)

APPROVED BY

Assist. Prof. Dr. Selcuk Akşin Somel
(Dissertation Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Sabri Sayarı

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vangelis Kechriotis

DATE OF APPROVAL:

© Konstantia A. Samara 2007

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Akşin Somel for all the help and encouragement he provided me with, during the whole year. His comments were extremely valuable to me, as he tried to make me see things where I just saw blankness. I would like also, to thank Prof. Sabri Sayarı and Assistant Professor Vangelis Kechriotis, who both were in my committee, for all their valuable comments especially in the last stages of my thesis.

This thesis would not be complete if it were not for Metropolitan Philadelfeias Mellitton who helped me so much to have the permission to work in the Archive of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as well as in the Library of it. I would like to express special gratitude to the staff of both institutions for all the hospitality and help they offered me during my visit there.

Furthermore, I especially want to express my gratitude to Mr. Dimitrios Fragopoulos, without his valuable help and his comments the result of this thesis would have been definitely insufficient. The few hours I had the luck to spend talking to him were clearly one of the most important variables that contributed to the realization of my thesis.

Last but, certainly not least I would like to thank my family and especially my parents, because without their support and their belief in me nothing of this would have become real. Their faith in me always kept me strong and optimistic.

To my grandfather

ABSTRACT

IDENTITY ISSUES OF THE OTTOMAN GREEKS IN THE AGE OF NATIONALISM AS REFLECTED IN THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY OF ISTANBUL (1895-1915)

The subject of this thesis is the identity issues of the Ottoman Greeks during the last decade of the nineteenth and the first decades of the twentieth century. The particular research focuses on the educational policies which were applied in the Greek Orthodox schools by the Patriarchate and members of the educated elite of the Greek Orthodox community. The aim of this thesis is to trace back the process of nation building regarding the Greek orthodox community in the Ottoman Empire, especially through the application of the Greek language in the Greek Orthodox schools. The way the Greek language was used by the Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox community in order to Hellenize the Orthodox millet linguistically have been discussed as well as their attitudes and perceptions regarding the teaching of foreign languages in the Greek Orthodox schools and the functioning of the foreign missionary schools, in relation to the process of the linguistic homogenization of the Orthodox millet. Moreover, in order to explain the process of Hellenizing the Orthodox millet linguistically, the attitudes towards the puristic form of the Greek language-*Katharevousa*- have been discussed as well as the intensively classical orientation of the Greek orthodox education. Finally, the attempts of the Ottoman governments to integrate Greek Orthodox schools into the public educational system and the resistance of the Patriarchate to these attempts have been elaborated.

ÖZET

ULUSÇULUK ÇAĞINDA OSMANLI RUMLARININ KİMLİK SORUNLARI VE İSTANBUL RUM CEMAATİNİN EĞİTİM SİYASETİ (1895-1915)

Bu tez çalışmasının konusu Osmanlı Rumlarının 19. yüzyılın son on yılina ve 20. yüzyılın ilk on yılina yayılan süreçteki kimlik meseleleridir. Bu çalışma, Patrikhane ve Rum cemaatinin eğitimli elit sınıfının belirlediği ve Rum-Orthodox okullarında uygulanan eğitim politikaları üzerine odaklanmaktadır. Amaç, ulus inşa sürecini geriye doğru izleyerek ve bu süreçte Yunan dilinin Rum-Orthodox okullarında kullanımına özellikle dikkat ederek Osmanlı İmparatorluğu yönetimi altında bulunan Rum Ortodoks Cemaati'ni yeniden ele almaktır. Rum milletini dil bakımından Helenleştirmek için Patrikhane ve cemaatin Yunan dilini kullanış biçimlerinin tartışıldığı bu araştırmada aynı zamanda Rum milletinin dil bakımından homojenleştirilmesi bağlamında ortaya çıkan meselelere dair Patrikhanenin ve cemaatin tavır ve düşünceleri göz önüne alınmıştır. Söz konusu meseleler, Rum-Orthodox okullarında yabancı dil öğretimi ve misyoner okullarının işleyişi gibi konulardır. Ayrıca, Rum milletinin dil bakımından homojen bir yapıya kavuşturulması sürecinde Yunan dilinin öz haline – *Katharevousa*- yönelik yaklaşımlar ve Rum-Orthodox eğitim yapısında görülen aşırı klasik eğilim de irdelemiştir. Bütün bunlarla beraber Osmanlı yönetiminin Rum-Orthodox okullarını umumi maarif nizamı dahilinde sokma çabaları ve Patrikhanenin ise söz konusu çabalara karşı direnci ele alınmıştır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	9
2. The Patriarchal Central Educational Committee and the Educational Issues of the Greek Orthodox Community.....	18
3. Foreign Language Teaching in the Greek Orthodox Schools and Foreign Schools.....	38
4. The Language Issue. The conflict between the puristic form of language (katharevousa) and vernacular.....	57
5. The orientation of education and the role of the Greek language.....	73
6. Conclusion.....	92
7. Appendices	97
8. Bibliography	100

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to discuss the process of nation-building among the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul during the final decades of the Ottoman Empire. This study focuses on the educational aspect of this process through centering on the educational discussions within the community. The educational controversies, which revolved around issues such as the role of the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee (PCEC) as the main body of the Greek Orthodox education within the Empire, the position of laymen vis-à-vis clergy, the teaching of foreign languages at patriarchal schools and the debate concerning the *Katharevousa* form of the Greek language versus Demotic as language of instruction, all highlight those issues which were so central for the Hellenization of the Greek Orthodox community and the creation of a united identity based on language. For this study the hitherto unused document collection of the PCEC, located within the Archive of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, has been researched.

The Ottoman state defining itself as an Islamic power, considered non Muslim populations of Abrahamic religious tradition as protected people (*ehl-i zimma*). Thus, Greek Orthodox, Armenians and Jews constituted communities with a certain degree of cultural autonomy. Education was defined within this legal-religious framework. The Orthodox subjects were under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (*millet-i Rum*), the Armenians (*millet-i Ermeni*), were under the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople and the Jews (*millet-i Yahudi*).under the Great Rabbi.¹ The heads of each of those millets² were responsible for all the civil issues of their subjects, such as marriage, divorce, inheritance and education.

¹ However, the authority of the Great Rabbi in the Jewish millet was not in line with the authorities of the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Armenian one.

² For the millet system see Benjamin Braude, "Foundation Myths of the Millet System", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (Vol. I), edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982; Paris Konortas, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis gia to Oimoumeniko Patriarxeio, 17os aionas-arxes 20ou.*, (Ottoman authentications for the Ecumenical Patriarchate), Athens, Alexandreia, 1998.

Braude comments that the Ottoman State until the 19th century does not seem to have been using a particular administrative term regarding the non-Muslims of the Ottoman Empire, since the name refers to the non-Muslims varied. According to Braude, this fact demonstrates that there was possibly not a clear institutionalized policy of the Ottoman State towards the non Muslims until the 19th century and especially, before the *Tanzimat*- edict of 1839.³ At the same time, non-Muslim communities did not remain static throughout centuries. Konortas argues that crucial structural changes in the Orthodox millet occurred in the 18th century, as the central governmental mechanisms were declining and on the other hand powerful members of the Orthodox millet could influence the Sublime Porte financially.⁴

Nevertheless, it was with the declaration of the *Tanzimat* Reforms (*Hatt-i Şerif of Gülhane*) in 1839 that a reference on the status of the non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire as a whole was made. The protection of the life, liberty and property was declared for all subjects of the Ottoman Empire regardless of their religion. In addition, in 1856 Sultan Abdülmecid declared the Edict of Reform, the *Hatt-i Hümayun* edict (*Islahat Fermanı*) through which the equal treatment of all subjects was declared in matters such as educational opportunity, appointment to government posts, and administration of justice, taxation and military service.⁵ With this Edict, the Ottoman State specified the right of every non-Muslim community to establish its own schools provided that the Ottoman State would have the authority to supervise these schools.⁶

The above reforms' goal was to establish equality among the populations, to infuse a common Ottoman citizenship, to improve the life of the non-Muslim subjects as well as to secularize the communal administrations of the non Muslim millets. As a part of the *Islahat Fermanı*, a reorganization of the non-Muslim millets was initiated in 1860 by the Ottoman State. The National Regulations (*Ethnikoi or Genikoi Kanonismoi*) was issued in 1862 regarding the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Orthodox millet. The same procedure and

³ Benjamin Braude, "Foundation Myths of the Millet System", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, p.74.

⁴ Paris Konortas, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis*, p.367

⁵ For more on the Ottoman reforms of 19th century, see Findley V. Carter, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire. The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922*, Princeton, 1980; Niyazi Berkes, *The development of Secularism in Turkey*, London, Hurst and Company, 1998; Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, London: New York Oxford U.P., 1968; Eric Zurcher, *Turkey:A Modern History*, London, I.B. Tauris, 2004.

⁶ Aksin Somel, "Christian community schools during the Ottoman reform period", in *Late Ottoman Society; The Intellectual Legacy*, edited by Elizabeth Özdalga, London, Routledge Press, 2005, p.254-273.

similar regulations were realized among the other two non-Muslim millets, the Armenian in 1863 and the Jewish in 1865. The main goal of these regulations was the secularization of the non-Muslim millets, since the power of the clergy was decreased by permitting the participation of the lay members of the communities into the administration of the millets. However, the particular regulation was not welcomed by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The reason for that was that through the particular change the Ecumenical Patriarchate's absolute authority over the Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman Empire came to an end. Nonetheless, the Ecumenical Patriarchate had already been experiencing a decrease of its power after the national uprisings in the Balkans, which resulted in the emergence of an independent new Greek State and an autonomous Serbia.

In addition, the particular regulation and the changes it stipulated for the administration of the Orthodox millet triggered and revealed disputes between the clergy and laymen of the Greek Orthodox community, a relationship through which the process of secularization of the Orthodox millet as well as the alterations in the orientations of both clergymen and laymen can be revealed. The particular conflict will be analyzed in the first Chapter of this thesis.

Even so, the particular reforms and in extension the reorganization of the millets did not have the results which the Ottoman State had expected. The above reforms were put into effect by the Ottoman State, first in order to satisfy the European powers in terms of the protection of the non-Muslim minorities, and second to create a common Ottoman citizenship (*Osmanlilik*) among the citizens of the Ottoman Empire as well as to create secular bonds between the non-Muslim subjects and the State. However, what happened was that the opposite result of their intentions was materialized. The fact that the Ottoman State continued to use the notion of religion in order to differentiate among its citizens, that is to say the millet system, didn't help to infuse common consciousness among populations. On the contrary, through the reforms the structure of millet was reconfirmed as it was reformed as millet again.⁷ As Sia Anagnostopoulou points out, the Ottoman State reorganized itself through the reforms, however not as a whole but through the homogenization of its millets separately.⁸ In other words, the non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire continued to define themselves

⁷ Davison Roderic, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, Princeton, Gordian Press, 1963, p.131.

⁸ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia 1905-1919. Oi ellhnorthodoxes koinothes. Apo to Millet twn Rwmwn sto Ellhniko Ethnos*, (Asia Minor 19th-1919. The Greek Orthodox communities. From the Rum millet to the Greek nation), Athens, Ellhnika Grammata, 1998, p.271.

only through their millets. Augoustinos Gerasimos claims that the reforms of the Ottoman Empire did not bring a sense of unity in the populations, but on the contrary they defined an even clearer ethnic and religiously distinction among the subjects of the Sultan.⁹

In the case of educational issues, which constitute the main interest of this study, what we see is that despite the Ottoman aim to secularize education through the reforms, it in effect created different, separated secular educational systems for each of the millets.¹⁰ In the case of the Ottoman Muslim education, the nineteenth century reforms and especially the school reforms were mostly understood as a process of Westernizing the education.¹¹ Nevertheless, Akşin Somel stresses that in particular the aim of the education during the Hamidian Regime, was to create and provide the state with loyal subjects who could serve their country in the best possible way.¹² Additionally, Benjamin Fortna argues that the Ottoman Muslim orientation of education was more based on the competition with the West, with the neighboring states and with the minority groups. Furthermore, he stresses that an attempt of adopting the Western style of education took place, while at the same time Ottomanizing this process. The reason for that was the belief that only through this process the Empire could survive.¹³ It is certain that nineteenth century's reforms regarding the educational issues demonstrate the importance the Ottoman State attributed to education.

However, the Reforms after 1856 apparently created disadvantageous conditions for the Ottoman State. The impossibility of a homogenization of the Ottoman society became apparent, as the continuous structure of the millet-system prevented non Muslims from their successful integration into the Ottoman Empire. In addition, the European powers were able to interfere in a more effective way, by invoking their right of protecting the communities of the Ottoman Empire who were of the same religion. Because of the fact that the reforms preserved the division in terms of ethno-religious communities, it could be claimed that it even precipitated the arising of national sentiments among the non-Muslims subjects of the

⁹ Gerasimos Augoustinos, *The Greeks Of Asia Minor*, Kent:Kent State University, Press, 1992, p.189

¹⁰ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.290

¹¹ Selçuk Akşin Somel , *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire (1839-1908)*, Leiden, Brill, 2001, p.271

¹² Ibid, p.271.

¹³ Benjamin Fortna, *The Imperial Classroom. Islam, the State and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*, USA, Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 84-86.

Ottoman Empire.¹⁴ We could claim that the reforms in a long term perspective resulted in the strengthening of the ethnic character of the millets.

A final reform step in line with the Reform Edict of 1856 was the Regulation on Public Education (*Maarif-i Umumiye Nizamnamesi*) promulgated in 1869. This regulation envisaged the integration of the non-Muslim schools into a legal framework. Accordingly, all schools within the Ottoman Empire were organized in two types: state schools and private schools. The private schools, in turn, were divided into schools founded by individuals and schools founded by communities.¹⁵ According to Article 129 of the Regulation, the private schools were to be founded under certain preconditions such as the teacher's acquirement of a diploma from the Ministry of Education or the provincial educational administration, the approval of the text books either by the Ministry of Education or the provincial educational administration as well as the requirement of an official approval by the Ministry for the foundation of the school.¹⁶

Despite the fact that the Regulation of 1869 began to be applied only during the Hamidian Regime, even then its application was not very successful. The financial weakness of the Ottoman State to employ sufficient number of bureaucrats to control non-Muslim schools as well as the lack of inspectors with necessary language skills to supervise non-Muslim text books resulted in a merely superficial surveillance of the non-Muslims schools by the Ottoman State.¹⁷ The non-Muslim communities were in reality functioning independently in their educational issues, although there were occasional attempts by the Ottoman State to interfere in their administrative tasks, which were not fully materialized until the Young Turks Revolution.¹⁸

As Echsertzoglou mentions, it is during the second half of the nineteenth century when a series of Greek cultural associations were founded, which had as their main goal the establishment of an educational network for the Greek Orthodox millet. According to him, the reasons for this “boom” of associations as well as the development of the school network

¹⁴ Alexis Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and the Greek Turkish Relations (1918-1974)*, Athens, Center of Asia Minor Studies, 1992 p.24

¹⁵ Aksin Somel, *Das Grundschulwesen in den Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches während der Herrschaftsperiode Abdulhamid II (1876-1908)*, Egelsbach, Frankfurt(main), Washington, Hänsel-Hohenhausen, 1995, p.192.

¹⁶ Ibid, p.192.

¹⁷ Aksin Somel, “Christian community schools in the late Ottoman period”, p. 254-273.

¹⁸ The issue will be discussed in the following chapters.

were: the relatively high educational level of the Greek urban middle class of Ottoman towns, the economical wealth of the founders as well as a growing concern regarding the lack of education among the Greek popular masses. While discussing cultural associations, he claims that the progress of these networks should not be understood from the beginning as a reflection of a nation building process, as the context of their formation in the 1860s was rather different than from those of the later period.¹⁹

The thematic focus of this thesis i.e. the nationalizing process of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul emerged within the context of these late nineteenth century reforms. The Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul could not remain uninfluenced from the impact of nationalist thoughts especially when considering the existence of a Greek State, which played a significant role in the arising of national sentiments among the members of the Greek Orthodox community. The question is when and under which circumstances and processes did nationalism arose within the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and whether this nationalism was similar to the Greek nationalism of the Greek national state.

Taking this question into consideration, this study will consider the issue of language to be central, as language began to play a significant role in the formation of identity in the second half of 19th century. Until then religion was the dominant element in order to differentiate the subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Linguistic diversity was confined within the millets and nevertheless did not have a major political significance. On the other hand, the Greek language was central for the Orthodox millet and in particular for the Ecumenical Patriarchate, since it was the official language even though it was used in a religious and cultural context rather than political. Especially, after the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate and through the influence of the Greek State, the Hellenization of the Orthodox millet became more intensive than before. According to Benedict Anderson, one of the reasons of the transition to language-nationalisms was the development of printing and press which led the linguistic diversity to disappear.²⁰ However, looking at the particular case of the

¹⁹ Charis Echsertzoglou, *Ethnikh tautothta sthn Kwnstantinoupolh ton 19o aiwna. O Ellhnikos Filologikos Syllogos Kwnstantinoupolhs, 1861-1912*, (National identity of Istanbul in the 19th century), Athens, Nefeli, 1996, p.9-17.

²⁰ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origins and the spread of nationalism*, Verso, London-New York, 1991, p.9-36.

Greek language, it has to be mentioned that it was a lingua franca for urban centers of the Balkans as well as prestigious language of culture. In 1802 a Greek-Vlach-Bulgarian-Albanian dictionary was published by Daniel of Moschopolis in which the author invited the non-Greek speaking people to Hellenize themselves linguistically and culturally.²¹

However, Anderson neglects to consider a significant element in his argument; the power of religion, which remained very strong among the populations in the Balkans in terms of identifying oneself. According to that, Kemal Karpat suggests that the difference between the states in Europe and the states in Eastern Europe was that the latter claimed their independence and their national statehood by asserting their religious differences with regard to the role of the Muslim Sultan. That was the reason why religion became the foundation of their nationhood.²² One could even claim that it was the Ottoman millet system, which in fact acted as a ‘loom’ for most of the Balkan countries and in which religion preserved its powerful position.

It is exactly the issue of language which pinpoints us the momentum where religion as the ultimate parameter for political identity began to loose its predominant role. The growing political importance of language for the educated elites of the Greek Orthodox community and its reflection on Greek education has been discussed in this thesis. For that task, the records of the PCEC were chosen, as it was that particular Committee which after 1873 dealt with all the educational issues of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul. The records provided us with all the Committee’s discussions, the interactions, the disputes between the members of the Committee as well as their decisions on educational matters. Their debates are indeed enlightening, as they also demonstrate the educational and cultural level and horizon of the Committee’s members. The members, most of whom were neither teachers nor pedagogues, apparently were well informed on the pedagogical developments of their time and at the same time rather concerned on the future of the Greek Orthodox education. Other sources utilized in this thesis were the *Ecclesiastical Truth [Ekklesiastiki Alitheiia]*, the official gazette of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as well as correspondences of the Patriarchate.

²¹ Pasxalis Kitromilidis, “Imagined communities”, in *Modern Greece: Nation and Nationalism*, edited by Thanos Veremis and Martin Blinkhorn, Athens, SAGE-ELIAMEP, 1990, p.27

²² Kemal Karpat, “Millets and Nationalism. The roots of the incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (Vol.I), edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, p.144

A study of the records of the PCEC, the Patriarchate and the *Ecclesiastical Truth* makes it possible to comprehend the self perception of the Greek Orthodox community within the Ottoman system. By using these sources, issues such as identity orientation and attempts of identity construction through educational policies have been revealed to a certain extent throughout this study.

What we learn basically from the general educational and cultural attitude of the PCEC is that it appears to be a conservative body, which supported a classical oriented education in which the Greek language was central. The importance, attributed to Greek language, also stemmed from the concern to create a common ethnic consciousness among the Greek Orthodox students. Furthermore, the particular importance on the Greek language verifies the situation of the Orthodox millet regarding the knowledge of Greek, which was rather weak. At the same time the Committee paid major importance regarding the success of the education, as well as the curricula.

As Chapter One of this study will show, the major conflicts that had existed within the Greek Orthodox community, was between the clergy and laymen, which lasted throughout the nineteenth until the early twentieth century. These conflicts reflected the changes which took place at that time in the Ottoman Empire, regarding the secularization of the millets as well as the networks and the alliances within the Greek Orthodox community. The conflict between the clergy and the laymen also determined the character of the ethnic identity which members of the Greek Orthodox community would eventually assume.

Chapter Two discusses the policies and attitudes of the PCEC towards the foreign missionary schools which shows how much importance the Committee gave to the use of language in the elementary schools and how important language was regarded in the formation of the ethnic identity of the students. It also appears that the foreign schools were used as an example, so that the Greek Orthodox schools would be improved to make them more attractive than the foreign ones. Moreover, the reactions of the Greek Orthodox community towards the policies of the Ottoman State regarding the instruction of Turkish language at Greek Orthodox schools would be considered in this chapter. While discussing this issue the attempts of the regime of Abdülhamid II and then of the Ottoman Parliament of the Second Constitutional Period to eliminate the ‘privileges’ of the Greek Orthodox community will be elaborated as well as the difference of attitude between the two regimes.

Another issue which will be discussed in Chapter Three will be the dispute concerning the forms of language which had to be taught and used in the schools. In other words, whether it would be the puristic form of Greek, i.e. *Katharevousa* or the vernacular one, the Demotic. This particular dispute is important to enlighten the reader about the perceptions of the Greek Orthodox community towards language which demonstrates how language was transformed in a symbol of identity as well as a representative of a common ancestry. Moreover, the reactions of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul will be compared with the reactions of the Greek State regarding the Language Issue.

In reference to the Language Issue (*Glossiko Zitima*), the orientation of the Greek Orthodox education and its relation to the policy of Hellenizing the Orthodox millet will be elaborated in Chapter Four. Furthermore, the procedures which the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the educational elite of the Greek Orthodox community applied for the linguistical homogenization of the community will be stressed as well as the course leading to the final identification of the Greek Orthodox community and the Patriarchate with the Greek national state.

In conclusion, this study will try to demonstrate the policies which the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the educational elite of the Greek Orthodox community followed in the late 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, regarding its educational issues, and especially the application of the Greek language at schools. What do these policies tell us about their identity orientations as well as their effects of the process of nationalization? Moreover, because of the direct material available, a considerably good idea of the self perceptions of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul could be revealed through the particular study.

CHAPTER I

The Patriarchal Central Educational Committee and the Educational Issues of the Greek Orthodox Community

This chapter will concentrate on the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee, which played an immense role in shaping and modernizing the Greek communal schools of Istanbul and provinces after 1873. The study of the activities of the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee and of the internal committee discussions provides the researcher a profound view about the relationship between the Greek millet administration and the Greek schools as well as providing a perspective on the internal contradictions within the Greek Orthodox community, namely between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the laymen, who could be considered as representatives of the newly emerging wealthy urban Greek upper class.

In the second half of the 19th century and after the promulgation of the 1856 *Hatt-i Hümayun* which declared the equality of the citizens of the Ottoman Empire, steps were taken, to reorganize the millets in the Ottoman Empire. In this context the National Regulations (*Ethnikoi or Genikoi Kanonismoi*) was issued regarding the Orthodox millet in the years between 1860 1862. In these regulations the educational issues of the Orthodox millet were of central importance. One of the basic aims of the National Regulations, as will be analyzed further, was the elimination of the clerical control over the millets through the participation of the laymen in the administration of the millets.

At this point, a discussion of the National Regulations is necessary in order to understand the changes which took place in the second half of the 19th century regarding the Orthodox millet and its administrative status.²³ The National Regulations indicated a major change in the history of the Orthodox millet during the Ottoman rule, since a new framework of administration was established. Paris Konortas claims that before 1862, the Patriarchate was perceived as a part of the civil mechanisms of the Ottoman state, but with the promulgation of the National Regulations, the legal existence of the Patriarchate with its own economical and administrative activity was declared in official terms, but at the same time, without ceasing to be a part of the Ottoman governmental mechanisms. The status quo of the Patriarchate was no longer determined only by the *berats*²⁴, but also by the National Regulations, a legal document declared by the Orthodox Community, initiated by the Sublime Porte, validated by a Sultanic Edict, to become a law of the Ottoman State.²⁵ The National Regulations indicate a new period in the history of the Greek Orthodox millet²⁶, as the Regulations not only allowed the internal reorganization of the millet but stressed at the same time the fact that the Ottoman State was the source of the Orthodox millet's rights and freedom.²⁷

A significant alteration which took place with the acceptance of the National Regulations was the assignment of a certain amount of power to the laity. The Ottoman state strengthened the power of the laity in the administration of the Greek Orthodox millet at the expense of the power of the clergy.²⁸ One indication of that change was the actual establishment of the “Permanent National Mixed Council” (PNMC) [*Diarkes Ethniko Mikto Symboulio*]. The Council consisted of twelve members, four Metropolitans and eight lay people. The responsibilities of the Council were the surveillance of the well-conduct of the community schools, hospitals, and other public welfare institutions, the supervision of their

²³ For the National Regulations, see S. Ziogou-Karastergiou, *To Oikoumeniko Patriarxeio, I Othomaiki diikisi kai I ekpedeusi tou Genous. Keimena kai Piges 1830-1914* (The Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Ottoman State and the Education of the Nation. Documents and Sources 1830-1914), Athens, Afoi Kyriakidis, 1998, p.75; X.K Papastathis, *Oi kanonismoi ton orthodoxon ellinikon koinotiton tou othomanikou kratous kai tis diasporas*, (The Regulations of the Orthodox Greek communities of the Ottoman State and diasporas), Thessaloniki, Afoi Kyriakidi, 1984, p. 85; Dimitris Stamatopoulos, *Metarithimmisi kai Ekkosmikeui*, (Reformation and Secularization), Athens, Alexandreia, 2003, 160-219.

²⁴ Berats were the patents or warrants, issued by Ottoman sultans, which determined the status and rights of individuals as well as institutions within the imperial borders, including the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

²⁵ Paris Konortas, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis*, Athens, Alexandreia, 1998, p.359-360.

²⁶ The term “Greek” is used here, since during the timeframe, on which this thesis is focusing, Greeks constituted the majority of the people under the authority of the Patriarchate.

²⁷ Kemal Karpat, “Millets and Nationality”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (Vol.I), p.155.

²⁸ Charis Echsertzoglou, ‘To Pronomiako Zitima’, (The Privilege Issue), *Historica*, Melissa, no.16, June 1992, p. 76.

expenses and incomes as well as of those of the churches in Istanbul. Furthermore, the Council was responsible for all the non spiritual, secular cases which the Sublime Porte was indicting to the Patriarchate.²⁹

The issuing of the National Regulations is also of great political importance considering the developments within the Greek Orthodox millet. Sia Anagnostopoulou points out that in fact the Ottoman state with the establishment of the National Regulations redefined the context of the privileges of the Greek Orthodox millet and a secularization of the privileges started to occur, as the privileges were no longer exclusive for the religious leader but, were also put under the control of the laity.³⁰ Moreover, the regulation regarding the election of the Patriarch according to which the laity participated in this process and could determine the result, demonstrates the aggrandizement of the power of the laity within the circles of the Patriarchate.³¹ Furthermore, Dimitris Stamatopoulos argues that behind the promulgation of the National Regulation and the verification of the participation of the laity in the administration of the Patriarchate where two reasons which led to the promotion of these reforms: the effacement of the Russian foreign policy within the Patriarchate and the strengthening of the pro-Western circles who were supporting the reforms of the Ottoman Empire.³²

Nevertheless, Roderic Davison stresses that there were some particular reasons that the Ottoman State proceeded to the reorganization of the millets, as this step didn't only occur in the Orthodox Millet but also in the Armenian millet in 1863 and in the Jewish millet in 1865. According to Davison, the Ottoman State believed that with the decrease of the clerical power within the millets, the European influence, especially the Russian one, which was favoring the Greek Orthodox, would decrease within the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the Ottoman state desired to alleviate the financial tyranny of the clergy on their flock. Davison also, states that probably some of the Ottoman statesmen had in their minds, the ideology of applying a common Ottoman citizenship to all subjects of the Ottoman Empire (*Osmanlılık*), if the clerical control within the millets was eliminated.³³

²⁹ X.K. Papastathis, p.100 and S.Karastergiou, p.80 and Dimitris Stamatopoulos, p.121-23.

³⁰ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p. 288

³¹ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.289

³² Dimitris Stamatopoulos, *Metarithimisi*, p.378.

³³ Davison Roderic, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire.1856-1876*, Gordian Press, 1963,p.115.

However, it seems that the National Regulations, promulgated among different millets, had different results than those expected from the Ottoman state. The reason was the millets' reorganization, according to their existent status, that is to say as separate religious communities (*millets*) and not as a whole. Moreover, with the promulgation of the National Regulations, a secularist current started to strengthen itself within the millets especially concerning education; this act gave a new thrust in the national sentiments of the subjects of the millets.³⁴ Nonetheless, although the intention of the Ottoman State was to create a secular Ottoman education, the result was more of a creation of many parallel secular educations in the Ottoman Empire.³⁵

According to the spirit of the National Regulations, there was a considerable outbreak of associations founded by laymen. Particularly, in the decade of 1870 to 1880, 125 associations were established, a number which became twofold in the next years.³⁶ This dynamic increase of the associations demonstrated the growing involvement of the laity in the matters of public interest, something which was encouraged with the promulgation of the National Regulations. The goals of these associations were to cope with the illiteracy among the Greek Orthodox population as well as to protect the interests of the Greek Orthodox communities.³⁷ It is worth noting that these associations very often came into conflict with the ecclesiastical associations. As Charis Echsertzoglou argues, these conflicts occurred since the associations were more preoccupied with the promotion of a secular and ethnic "Greekness",³⁸ even though that perspective contradicted the religious and ecumenical character of the Patriarchate.³⁹ An association which played a significant role in the Greek Orthodox community and it was used as a prototype for further associations, founded in the course of the second half of the 19th century, was the Greek Literary Society (GLS) established in 1861.

The GLS in the beginning of its activities displayed clearly its opposition toward the Patriarchate, because this association aimed at realizing a Greek education which would not involve the conservative perceptions of the Church. Therefore, right on the beginning of its

³⁴ Ibid p.131.

³⁵ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.290.

³⁶ Ibid, p.293

³⁷ Charis Echsertzoglou, *Ethnikh tautothta sthn Kwnstantinoupolh ton 19o aiwna. O Ellhnikos Filologikos Syllogos Kwnstantinoupolhs, 1861-1912*, (National identity of Istanbul in the 19th century), Athens, Nefeli, 1996, p.93

³⁸ The issue of promoting the Greek language will be analyzed further in the following chapters.

³⁹ Ibid, p.92

foundation, the association entered into a conflict with the Patriarchate and refused to cooperate.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, both the GLS and the Patriarchate in the long term needed each other. Gradually, both sides took steps for mutual reconciliation, although different reasons triggered these reconciliation steps between the Patriarchate and the GLS.

A major reason which played a significant role in the cooperation of the Patriarchate with the GLS was the Privilege Issue. The issue of the privileges of the Patriarchate rises as a very crucial one in the history of the Orthodox millet. The dispute between the Patriarchate and the Ottoman state regarding the privileges of the former institute initiated two crises in 1883 and 1890, which caused the resignations of two Patriarchs, Joachim the III and Dionysius, respectively. The so called Privilege Issue [*Pronomiako Zitima*] occurred first in 1883, when a memorandum of Patriarch Joachim the III was published in the *Ecclesiastical Truth* protesting against the Ottoman state for the violation of the Orthodox millet's privileges. Joachim argued that the privileges were the ones Mehmet II (r.1451-1481) granted to the Orthodox millet and because of the long lasting nature of the privileges, they were unchangeable. The crisis was settled in the end when the Ottoman government recognized "the old status"⁴¹ of the Patriarchate.

The second crisis occurred in 1890, after the Sublime Porte declared an edict according to which the inviolability of the privileges of the Patriarchate was questioned. In that edict, the Ottoman State was showing the intention of interference in the appointment of the teachers and boards of the trustees (*mütevelli*) of the Greek Orthodox schools as well as to the curricula of the schools.⁴² Moreover, the issue of the teaching of the Turkish language became a central issue, as the Ottoman state wanted to make compulsory the teaching of the Turkish language in the Greek Orthodox schools. The Patriarchate, however, opposed the intention of the Ottoman state to make Turkish teaching compulsory. Although Turkish was instructed to a certain degree in the Greek Orthodox schools, they believed that the compulsory application of it was in the responsibility of the Patriarchate and not of the

⁴⁰ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.294-297

⁴¹ Charis Echsertzoglou, 'To Pronomiako Zitima', p.68.

⁴² Vangelis Kechriotis, "The Modernization of the Empire and the Communities 'Privileges': Greek Orthodox Responses to the Young Turks Policies", in, *The State and the Subaltern. Authoritarian Modernization in Turkey and Iran*, London-New York, edited by Turaj Atabaki, I.B.Tauris Press, 2007, p. 57

Ottoman state.⁴³ Again, the crisis was solved with the recognition of the privileges of the Patriarchate by the Ottoman State.

A third crisis took place following the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, when also, the gradual elimination of the privileges of the Patriarchate took place.⁴⁴ Moreover, those crises led to the cooperation of most of the elements of the Orthodox millet. That is to say, the clergy and the laity, facing the common threat that the Orthodox millet would lose some of the privileges, began to cooperate with each other. It was because those privileges determined not only the Patriarchate's status but also that of the Greek Orthodox community's. If the privileges were eliminated the power of the community would decrease as well, since the Patriarchate represented the rights of the Greek Orthodox community's. Furthermore, as Sia Anagnostopoulou claims, the fact that the legitimate status of the associations was also challenged by the Ottoman state during the crises of the Privilege Issue as well as the economical problems which the associations were facing brought about the final cooperation and compliance of the GLS with the Patriarchate. It has been stressed that eventually, the Patriarchate by cooperating with the GLS, the particular act had an unexpected impact upon the Patriarchate in terms of the elimination of its ecumenical character. That is to say that the promotion of the Greek education in the way the association understood it took place.⁴⁵

However, through the particular study, it could be claimed that besides the disputes and disagreements among the laymen and clergymen a considerable compromise took place between them regarding the educational issues, something which will be discussed further in the following chapters. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the clergymen themselves were different than those of previous years. That is to say a secularization of the clergymen themselves occurred through the years regarding their attitudes and perceptions, as they had integrated themselves into politics, something which would be discussed further.

However, because of the basic inconsistency between the ideologies of the Patriarchate and the associations in general, the Patriarchate, viewed these associations with a great deal of suspicion. At the same time, many of the clergy were important members of the

⁴³ Charis Echsertzoglou, 'To Pronomiako Zitima', p.69.

⁴⁴ The matter would be discussed further in a following chapter.

⁴⁵ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.297

associations. It could be claimed that the reason for their participation in these associations was the thought that through their participation they could keep the associations under their control as well as keeping a close eye on them. Kofos, states that the appearance of the educational society “Love Each Other” (*Agapate Allilous*), supported by the Patriarchate, demonstrates Patriarch Joachim III’s policy of weakening the cultural influence of another society, the “Association for the Distribution of the Greek Letters” (*Syllogos peri diadoseos ton ellinikon grammaton*), a secular Greek one, which was founded in the Greek State and due to that Joachim was able to keep its national orientation under control.⁴⁶

This example also reflects the ideological divergence between the Patriarchate and the Greek State as well as their conflict of interests concerning the Orthodox populations in the area of the Ottoman Empire. It could be argued that, at least in the second half of the nineteenth century and especially, during the regime of Abdülhamid II, the Patriarchate was not in line with the policies of the Greek State, as it still tried to maintain its ecumenical character. This particular divergence of interests between the Patriarchate and the Greek State has been very often neglected in the past and underestimated in the Greek historiography, as they stressed an identification of the policies of the Patriarchate with Greece more. This peculiar and at the same time controversial relationship will be analyzed in the next chapters.

Consistent with the spirit of the National Regulations, a mixed committee was established of both clergy and laymen, the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee (PCEC) in 1873, which was in charge for the educational issues of the Orthodox millet. The Committee was an institute of the Patriarchate, responsible for the educational issues of the Orthodox Christian people who were under the authority of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul.⁴⁷

Before the establishment of the PCEC the issues regarding education of the Orthodox Christians were under the direct authority of the Central Ecclesiastical Committee of the Patriarchate. Following the promulgation of the National Regulations in 1862, the PNMC was

⁴⁶ Kofos E., “Patriarch Ioachim 3rd (1878-1884) and the irredentist policy of the Greek State”, *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Athens, 1986.

⁴⁷ For the reforms of 1860-1862 and the National Regulations of 1862, see Richard Clogg, “The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, p.194-195, Dimitris Stamatopoulos, *Metarithimmi kai Ekkosmikeui*, (Reformation and Secularization), Athens, Alexandreia, 2003.

established; both institutions were the ones responsible for the educational issues of the Orthodox millet.

After a decade following the reforms of 1860-1862 the Patriarchate considered the functioning of the Central Ecclesiastical Committee and the PNMC concerning Greek education to be unsatisfactory; there arose the need for the formation of an institution which would concentrate only on the educational issues of the Orthodox millet. After a common meeting of the Holy Synod and the PNMC in 1873, it was decided to establish the PCEC.⁴⁸ However, the PNMC maintained some authority over the educational issues of the Orthodox millet. For example, disagreements between the PCEC and the parishes were to be settled by the PNMC (Regulation of the PCEC, article 8). Nevertheless, the fact that the authority over the educational issues of the Orthodox millet passed from the Central Ecclesiastical Committee to the PCEC demonstrates the fact that the Patriarchate stopped regarding education as a strictly ecclesiastical matter.⁴⁹ In other words, it can be stressed that secularization of education started to occur within the Orthodox millet. It could be said here that during the second half of the nineteenth century and especially after the promulgation of the Regulation of Public Education [*Maârif-i Umûmiyye Nizâmnâmesi*] of 1869, an understanding of secularizing the education started to occur within the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁰

According to the regulation of the Committee, the responsibilities with which it was ascribed were the supervision of all the orthodox schools of the Archbishopric of Istanbul (Article 1st)⁵¹. In general, the Committee's authorities were to supervise of all the Orthodox schools, their school-boards, the teachers of the schools, the curricula and the method of teaching. Explicitly, the Committee was responsible for everything regarding the functioning of the Orthodox schools in Istanbul in accordance with the General Regulations of 1862 and the National Code of 2nd of February 1891(22 *Cemaziyü'l'ahir* 1308)(Article 9).⁵²

As a consequence of the promulgation of the National Regulation, the role of the laity within the Greek Orthodox millet in deciding internal issues became crucial during the second

⁴⁸ See S. Ziogou-Karastergiou, *To Oikoumeniko Patriarxeio, I Othomaiki diikisi kai I ekpedeusi tou Genous. Keimena kai Piges 1830-1914*, ,(The Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Ottoman State and the Education of the Nation. Documents and Sources 1830-1914), Athens, Afoi Kyriakidis, 1998, p.125

⁴⁹ Ayşe Özil, “Education in the Greek Orthodox Community of Pera in the 19th century Istanbul”, (MA Thesis, Bogazici University, 2001), p.164.

⁵⁰ Akşin Somel, *Modernization*, p.2-3.

⁵¹ The articles of the Regulations come from the 1892's Regulations, see S. Ziogou-Karastergiou, p.168.

⁵² Ibid.

half of the 19th century. Moreover, the relationship between the clergy and the laity of those times can be characterized as of a smouldering conflict, a relationship which could be demonstrated in great deal through a study of the PCEC because the composition of its members.

The first regulation of the PCEC was issued in 1873 and revised in 1892, 1910 and 1914. The first regulation of 1873 consisted of thirty-one articles, the second one of 1892 was of twenty-one, as some alterations and even omissions occurred, but the basic reason for the decrease of the articles was the combination of two articles into one.⁵³ The changes between the first revisions and the later ones are analyzed in the following pages of the chapter.

The Committee consisted of seven members, who were elected by the Holy Synod (*Iera Synodos*)⁵⁴ and the PNMC. The members of the PCEC consisted of the President, who was one of the members of the Holy Synod, one member from the PNMC, two clergymen and three members from the laity, who were expected to have a very good education and be interested in educational issues (Article 2).⁵⁵ The fact that the Committee consisted of both members of clergy and laity was the reason why through this Committee we can have a better understanding of the relationships between the clergy and the laity of the Greek Orthodox millet.

Concerning the issue of the membership of the PCEC, one has to draw attention on a particular article of the regulations to understand the context of the time as well as the relationships between the clergy and the laity. According to the first regulations of 1873, Article 3 declared that two of the three lay members of the Committee absolutely had to be from the Orthodox members of the Greek Literary Society of Constantinople [*Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos Constantinoupoleos*.]⁵⁶ The particular article does not appear in the next revisions of the Committee's regulations. Taking into account the activities of this society the omission of the particular article cannot be overlooked or underestimated.

⁵³ S. Ziogou-Karastergiou, *To Oikoumeniko Patriarxeio*, p.125.

⁵⁴ The Holy Synod consists of 12 Metropolitans of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and it has the Patriarch as its President and it is the highest ranking collegiate authority of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. See Papastathis X.K., *Oi kanonismoi ton orthodokson ellinikon koinotiton tou othomanikou kratous kai tis diasporas* (The Regulations of the Orthodox Greek communities of the Ottoman State and diasporas), Thessaloniki, Afoi Kyriakidi, 1984, p.91.

⁵⁵ For regulation of the PCEC, see S.Ziogou-Karastergiou, p.125.

⁵⁶ Article 3 of the Regulations of the PCEC in 1873, cited in S.Ziogou-Karastergiou , p.120.

As it has been discussed previously, during the first decades of the second half of the nineteenth century, the relationship between the particular Society and the Patriarchate was intense and that is why the inclusion of such an article in the regulations of the PCEC makes the pursuit of it even more interesting. Thus, the insistence of including among the membership of the PCEC two members of the GLS can be explained as a result of a secularist resistance, as the Patriarchate was probably trying to impose its ideology upon them. However, in the later revisions of the regulations this article has been left out. Possible reasons for this omission could be as follows: it could be thought that the GLS was, at the time of the revisions, already consent with the Patriarchate's line, so that there was no reason of including a regulation of that kind, as the intentions of Article 3 had been fulfilled. Another reason could be the fact that at the time of the revision of the PCEC's regulation in 1892, the composition of the members of the GLS had been changed⁵⁷, as most of the radical and economically powerful members of the GLS had withdrawn from the Society. Thus, there wasn't any particular significance in including in the regulation of the Committee such an article. In addition, it is a fact that members of the GLS continued to be members of the PCEC, as it has been the case of Leonidas Limarakis who was for five terms the president of the GLS, and he also served as a member in the Committee in the years of 1910-12, an example which can also confirm the cooperation between the two institutions.⁵⁸

Another crucial issue regarding the composition of the Committee is the fact that it aimed keeping a balance between the clergy and the lay members. This policy could be possibly explained in accordance to the particular period of time, as after the establishment of the National Regulations – as it has been already mentioned – the power of the laity consecutively started to rise. In 1910, when the regulation was going to be revised attempts were made to change the membership composition of the PCEC, so as to create a predominance of the laymen over the clergy. Firstly, Limarakis suggested the increase of the number of the members from 7 to 9, and the final suggestion was to increase them to 10 members. The Committee, accordingly, would consist of the President, a member of the Holy Synod, one member from the PNMC, two clergy and 6 lay people, two teachers, one doctor, one lawyer, one architect and one person who would have at least two years experience as an

⁵⁷ More on the composition of the G.L.S. see Charis Echsertzoglou., *Ethniki Taytotita*, p.33-69.

⁵⁸ Reports of PCEC and *Ecclesiastical Truth*, September 1912, p.224.

inspector.⁵⁹ These suggestions were not put into practice, although we see that there was a strong pressure to increase the number of lay members in the Committee.

While revising the Committee's regulations in 1914, there was again an attempt to expand the membership of the Committee, from 7 to 9 members. This attempt was stopped again, with the explanation that it would be better to keep a balance between the lay members and the clergy.⁶⁰ Here, one should ask the question as to what reasons were there to keep a balance between the clergy and the laity. Were there any disagreements and contradictions between them? Was this insistence on keeping the balance an indication of the different perspectives which were occurring at that time within the Greek Orthodox community? As it will be examined in the further chapters of the thesis, the examined primary sources show that there were indeed a number of contradictions between the members of the Committee, as they often disagreed on several issues regarding the educational matters. This fact was expressed by a Committee member, who in a discussion in 1910 stressed the failure of the Committee to agree in one single subject.⁶¹

However, we should always keep in mind when dealing with the history of the Greek Orthodox millet of the late nineteenth century that even though, with the promulgation of the National Regulation in 1862, the laity gained the official right to participate in the administration of the Orthodox millet, they still were not powerful enough to neglect the clerical factor. In other words, even though we are talking about a process of secularizing the millet this does not mean that the clerical factor was neglected. As Dimitris Stamatopoulos argues there are some particular reasons for this; firstly it was the fact that the interests of the most progressive laymen derived from their alliances with the clergymen, secondly the Bulgarian issue was also detrimental, as the need for the Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox community to characterize it as an ecclesiastical one, strengthened the clerical factor as well as the double mediator character of the Patriarchate, that is to say its religious status towards its flock and also the representative character of the Orthodox people vis-à-vis the Ottoman state, are the most important ones.⁶² Nevertheless, most of the powerful members of the Greek Orthodox community in order to assure the materialization of their interests had to cooperate

⁵⁹ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 18th of May 1910 p.112-115.

⁶⁰ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1044, 18th of February 1914, p.111-112.

⁶¹ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 4th of April 1910, p.108

⁶² Dimitris Stamatopoulos, *Metarithimisi*, p.375-77.

with certain clerical circles of the Patriarchate.⁶³ Due to that, the intention of the Committee to keep a balance between the clergy and the lay members might be explained from a different aspect, since the Patriarchal circles remained strong and keeping their power within the Greek Orthodox community.

The regulation of the PCEC stipulated that the members of the Committee were serving for a two year term (article 19); they had to meet once every two weeks (article 6); and at least four members had to be present in order to proceed (article 3). Importantly, members of the Committee were not being paid and the participation in the assemblies was optional and not obligatory. Thus, in a speech which the Patriarch gave in one of the Committee's sessions, he suggested that the Committee's members should receive payment so that the Committee would have a better motivation for intensive work on the educational issues of the Greek Orthodox millet.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, looking at the discussions and actions of the Committee, one can see that the Committee was working in a very professional way for promoting education, and its efforts to improve the education of the Greek Orthodox millet displayed great motivation. Needless to say that, the fact that these people were not paid for their work and were not even obliged to spend their time and energy at the particular Committee, but nevertheless devoted themselves for it, illustrates the attitude of some of the members of the upper classes of the Greek Orthodox millet of Istanbul, towards the matters of public interest.

It seems, through the study of the records of the PCEC that education was a crucial matter for the Committee, because education was considered primarily as a means to form the ethnic identity of the children and secondly, as a medium to provide them with knowledge and skills to cope with the new economic and social circumstances. These attitudes will be extensively discussed and demonstrated in the chapter dealing with the classical orientation of the Greek Orthodox education.

The Committee, in addition, was responsible for the textbooks through which students were instructed. In fact the Committee gave a great importance to that issue. All books used in the Orthodox schools had to be approved by the Committee and have its seal of approval. Any textbook on religious, ethical or political issues which were not accepted by the

⁶³ Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, *Metarythmisi*, p.376.

⁶⁴ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 2nd of November 1911, p.345

Committee, were to be forbidden to be used for teaching. The Patriarchate was expected to publish every July a list of those books approved for instruction (Article 10). Furthermore, the Patriarchal newspaper *Ecclesiastical Truth* (*Ekklisiastiki Alithia*), from time to time published instructions regarding the way the textbooks should be written. The Committee seems to have been very serious and strict on that issue. One quick explanation could be that the Ottoman state, due to its right of surveillance to all schools, according to the Regulation of Public Education of 1869, could cause problems to the Greek Orthodox community regarding the books which were used.⁶⁵ An alternative reason could be the fact that books were used as a means to pass on the students the values desired, which formed an ethnic identity.

Furthermore, the Committee was the authority approving the appointment and dismissal of the teachers. The teachers could not teach without the approval of the Committee (Article 14). Additionally, all the schools which were under the authority of the Committee were obliged, at least two weeks before the beginning of each school year, to submit the school programs, the list of school books, the names of the teachers and the contracts between them and the parishes. In addition, no changes of the above issues were permitted without the Committee's permission (article 15). The fact that all schools of Istanbul were expected to strictly follow the regulations of the Committee caused a number of problems which the Committee had to solve. Furthermore, many disagreements did emerge between the members of the Committee. The following example highlights the importance which the Committee gave to the compliance of all schools with its regulations and also, the contradictions between the members of the Committee, that is to say, the clergy and the laity.

On the 14th of June 1902 a discussion took place regarding the status of the community of Pera and its educational issues. One lay member of the Committee, Solon Kazanovas, argued that the community of Pera was responsible for its own educational issues and that the PCEC had no right to interfere, because the community has a special status since 1804 (date of its establishment) given by the Patriarch Gregory V. According to Kazanovas, this special status, he continues, gave the right of self-government to the community which was redefined in 1876 and was validated by the two Assemblies (the Holy Synod and the PNMC). In

⁶⁵ Concerning the Ottoman Regulation of Public Education of 1869 and its stipulations dealing with non-Muslim schools, see Aksin Somel: *Das Grundschulwesen während der Herrschaftsperiode Abdülhamid II (1876-1908)* (Egelsbach; Frankfurt: Händel-Hohenhausen Verlag, 1995), p.202.

accordance to this status, he stated that the educational issues of the community could not be controlled or supervised by the Committee.⁶⁶

On the other hand Gregory Konstantinidis, a clergy, reacted to Solon Kazanova's argument. While he did not disagree with the special status of the Pera, he, on the other hand, suggested that the special status of the community of Pera was not of any value after the establishment and certification of the regulations of the Committee, which defined that every school which is located in the Archiepiscopacy of Istanbul is to be under the authority of the Committee. Due to that, all the previous regulations were to be declared invalid. The arguments regarding the validity of the special status of the community of Pera ended up on a specific subject, the status of the Zografeion School⁶⁷, which was one of the most important schools of the Greek Orthodox community⁶⁸. The main question for the Committee was whether the Zografeion School had the right to form its own program and in general to function as a school of the Greek Orthodox community without considering the decision of the Committee and taking its permission. The particular school and its status were questioned many times in the discussions of the Committee and will be further analyzed in the following chapters.

The community of Pera was one of the most powerful Greek Orthodox communities in Istanbul, perhaps the most powerful, because, many of the wealthiest Greek Orthodox people were living there. Since the 18th century an Orthodox bourgeoisie started to emerge, consisting of the Greek-speaking inhabitants of Istanbul, who had attained immense economical and social power. Furthermore, these people established close connections with both the Sublime Porte and the Patriarchate. The promulgation of the National Regulations of 1862 confirmed the augmentation of the power of this particular class, as they both managed to strengthen the position of the Church within the Ottoman state and to induce the Ottoman state to recognize a major role for the laity in the administration of the Church.⁶⁹

In fact, influential members of the Greek Orthodox community acquired through the years very important positions in the Ottoman state, especially in the diplomatic service. Even

⁶⁶ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 14th of June 1902, p.362.

⁶⁷ Zografeion was named in 1893, after the name of its founder Xristakis Zografos. Before it was functioning under the name “the school of Panagia in Staurodromi”(Ev Stayrodromiou Sxoleio tis Panagias).

⁶⁸ For more details regarding the specific school see, Ayse Ozil, “Education in the Greek Orthodox Community of Pera”.

⁶⁹Paris Konortas, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis*, p. 367

after the Greek War of Independence in 1821-1829, these people continued to keep important positions in the Ottoman government. These Greek elites together with other prominent members of the Greek Orthodox community engaged in commerce and banking, had very good connections with the Sublime Porte and at the same time they were concerned with their own community's issues. One example which demonstrates this argument is the position of Spyridon Maurogenis who was a close friend and the personal doctor of Abdülhamid II. As a prominent member of the Greek community, he was the first president of the Greek Philological Association and also elected senator in the first Ottoman Parliament in 1878.⁷⁰

Due to their material wealth and their political connections to the Ottoman state and as their power within their millet did increase after 1862; they were able to negotiate in order to gain more power vis-à-vis the Patriarchate. The discussion concerning the status of the community of Pera is one example. The Pera community desired to have autonomy to deal with its internal issues and to keep the institutions of the Patriarchate away. We should remember that the PCEC, which was officially an institution of the Patriarchate, had members from the community of Pera and even the principals of the Zografeion School, A.Zamarias, for example, was a member of the Committee in the 1900's⁷¹. Thus, we see the problematic relationship between the laity and the clergy expressed through the above example, as well as an intention of the Patriarchate to keep under its authority and supervision the actions of the laity by establishing a Committee composed of both elements.

Nevertheless, as already mentioned, there are no concrete clues within the primary sources displaying an open conflict between the Patriarchate and the associations, although different ideological orientations are noticeable. A similar situation can be testified for the relationship between the clergy and the laity in the Greek Orthodox millet, as there is not any obvious and open conflict between the clergy and the laity, because both sides needed each other. The Patriarchate was in need of donations made by wealthy members of the Greek Orthodox community in order to survive financially. On the other hand, the lay circles could legitimize their activities only through the legal presence of Patriarchate within the Ottoman state and that is how they could absorb their influence within the Greek Orthodox millet.

⁷⁰ See, Alexis Alexandris, 'The Greeks in the service of the Ottoman Empire 1850-1922', *Deltion Istorikis kai ethnologikis Etairias this Ellados*, Athens, 1980, page.375

⁷¹ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1044, 20th of April 1911, p. 258.

The Committee after the end of each year had to submit a document reporting all its actions to the Patriarch. This report was published in the Patriarchal gazette *Ecclesiastical Truth*. Moreover, all the principles of the schools had to submit every year a report to the Committee regarding the state of their schools (article 16 of the PCEC regulation).⁷²

Another issue, specified by the Committee Regulation was the selection of the Inspector of the Committee, a function aiming to inspect and control the community schools. It was specified that the Committee would nominate three clergymen, who should be well-known for their good education, to the 2 Assemblies (the Holy Synod and the PNMC). They would select one to be the Inspector of the schools, who would work under the control of the Committee. In the 1914's revision of the Committee's Regulations, lay members also acquired the right to be nominated to become Inspectors of the Committee. In that issue, a discussion took place questioning the reason as to why only clergy people were nominated to be inspectors and whether the inspector of the Committee should be a clergyman or a lay person. One answer to this question was given by a lay member, Mr. Odysseas Andreadis. He argued that it was because of systematic governmental reasons that clergymen were usually nominated for the position of the Inspector. It was more difficult for the Ottoman state to interfere and cause problems to clergymen than the laymen.⁷³

However, in taking into account the sensitive balances between the clergy and the laity, this explanation might not be satisfying as the position of the Inspector was of great importance. The Inspector was responsible for several issues, such as to visit frequently, all the Orthodox schools which were under the surveillance of the Committee to inspect their functioning and their compliance with the Regulations of the Committee. He was also expected to submit every two months a report to the Committee with his comments regarding the schools and his suggestions for improvement.⁷⁴ The Inspector's position was an important one as he was the one informing the Committee of the exact situation of the Greek Orthodox schools; according to his reports certain issues were discussed in the sessions. One example here could be the issue of the use of the vernacular tongue (Demotic form of Greek) in the Orthodox schools, when the Inspector was the one who put forward the issue for discussion

⁷² S.Ziogou-Karastergiou, p.125.

⁷³ Reports of the PCEC, code 1044, 11th of September 1913, p.460.

⁷⁴ Revision of the Regulations of the PCEC in the reports of it, Code 1044, 24th of April 1914, p.170-171.

after he had visited the schools.⁷⁵ Taking into account the strained relationship, as well as the disagreements between the clergy and the laity, the position of the Inspector could probably demonstrate their struggle to gain more power for themselves within the Committee. Furthermore, the fact that the position of the Inspector was occupied by clergy men can also reveal the intentions of the Patriarchate to alleviate the power of the laity within the millet.

Another interesting discussion which took place in the Committee's sessions when revising its regulations was the issue of the provincial schools and the authority of the Committee over these schools. As mentioned before, the 1st article of 1892 regulation, limited the authority of the Committee to the Orthodox schools of Istanbul. During the discussions in 1910, when the Committee aimed to revise its regulation, Leonidas Limarakis commented that the rules of 1892 limited the Committee's authority on the provincial schools. This discussion emerged due to the fact that the regulation of 1873 gave the Committee the responsibility of the surveillance and administration not only of the schools of Istanbul, but also of all the schools which were under the authority of the Ecumenical Throne, that is to say the provinces also.⁷⁶ Limarakis questioned the restriction of 1892 and suggested the examination of the minutes and reports of those discussions in order to understand the reasons and perceptions regarding the particular change.⁷⁷

Moreover, Limarakis stressed that they had to be careful with the phrasing of the article so that no problems with the provinces would occur. As he expressed characteristically, "the center has to act in such a way, so to diffuse its light towards all the acres but the acres have, also to bring to the center all their productivity in order for it to obtain a general knowledge"⁷⁸. The reason for the particular change was the fact that with the Sultanic Edict of 1891, the power and the control of the Patriarchate of Istanbul over its flock had become limited to the Archiepiscopate of Istanbul, as every program of the schools and textbooks as well as the diplomas of students and teachers had to be signed by the Patriarchate and the Metropolitans.⁷⁹ The particular Edict was issued within the context of the Privilege Issue while the Ottoman state tried to eliminate the power of the Patriarch and in general the clerical control within the Orthodox millet. However, during 1910, discussions took place at

⁷⁵ Chapter 3 will analyze the particular issue of the vernacular tongue.

⁷⁶ Regulations of the PCEC of 1873, in Karastergiou, p.122 article 16.

⁷⁷ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 18th of May 1910, p.112-115.

⁷⁸ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 18th of May 1910, p.112-115.

⁷⁹ S.Ziogou-Karastergiou, p.38

the Committee regarding the revision of the regulations but it seems that a revision was not submitted. Two years later, discussions restarted after a speech the Patriarch gave in 1911.

In detail, the discussion was initiated by the Patriarch through a speech he gave in one of the Committee's sessions, where he suggested that the Committee should encourage and eventually establish a better communication between the center and the provinces. The members of the Committee agreed with that suggestion and they commented that there was a need for a revision of the regulations to meet that purpose. However, although, a discussion on the alteration of the regulations had already taken place the previous year, it was not finalized. A new round of discussions for the revision of the regulations started only in June of 1913. The reason for this delay of discussions cannot be found in the available sources, but taking into account the general political situation of that time the delay of the revision could be understood. It was the time of the Balkan Wars, which led to major political turbulences within the Empire; in January 1913 the Committee of Union and Progress had staged a coup d'état and established a military dictatorship.

The particular discussions of 1913 concentrated on the issue of provinces and how the Committee would be effective on provincial schools. A clergyman, Archimandrite Dimitrios Georgiadis, commented that due to the power that the Committee had now acquired, its influence on the provincial schools could be easier established.⁸⁰ That particular comment demonstrates the fact that the Committee during the years had strengthened its power and authority. All members agreed that there was a need for a revision of the regulations so that an extension of the Committee's authority could be realized.⁸¹ Nonetheless, the desire to strengthen the power of the Committee over the provinces had an additional aim also, the strengthening of the Patriarchate over the provincial Metropolitans.

We see that there was a considerable interest in strengthening the authority and validity of the Committee during the years of 1913-1914. A major suggestion in this line was that in order for their decisions to be well implemented, Committee decisions had to be final, i.e. free from the interference of the PNMC. Eventually, a significant revision took place in 1914 in regard to the particular right of the PNMC to interfere in the decisions of the PCEC. Accordingly, a deadline of fifteen days was acknowledged to the PNMC to object the

⁸⁰ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1044, , June of 1913, p.334.

⁸¹ Ibid.

decisions of the PCEC. After fifteen days the decisions of the PCEC were considered to be final and irreversible.⁸²

In the same year, another crucial amendment in the Committee regulation took place. The article 9 of the 1892 regulation originally declared that the Committee was responsible for everything regarding the Orthodox schools of Istanbul in harmony with the National Regulations. The revision of this article in 1914 was an additional note which stated that all the articles of the National Regulations had to be quoted in a special page of the Committee's regulations instead of a bare reference to them.⁸³

The significance of this particular addition is related to the fact that during those years, the Greek Orthodox millet went through a difficult time referring to its privileges, as the Young Turk government was questioning these privileges and attempting to curtail them. These difficulties are reflected in numerous articles published in the *Ecclesiastical Truth*, where the Patriarchate tried to confirm the irrevocable character of its privileges by arguing that those privileges were long standing, given to the Patriarchate as early as 1453, after the fall of Constantinople, by Mehmet II. In other words, the Patriarchate at that time was trying, by providing regulations and official documents, to certify its privileged status and avoid any limitation of its current privileges.⁸⁴ In that case it could be claimed that the above alteration was done in order to verify in the best way the status and the authorities of the Committee vis-à-vis the Ottoman state.

The regulation of the Committee, first promulgated in 1873, was discussed and revised in 1892, 1910 and 1914. These particular dates have to be taken into account, in the context of the general political atmosphere and developments of those times. These were the dates where the Ottoman government took steps to curtail the privileges of the Greek Orthodox community. Therefore, the revisions were closely connected with the Privilege Issue. At the same time it is noticeable that in regard to the issue of the Greek Orthodox millet the educational issues proved to be central. Thus, the discussions and the revisions of the Committee in regard to the education of the Orthodox schools became very important.

⁸² Reports of the PCEC, Code 1044, 18th of February 1914, p.112-118.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ For more on the issue of the Patriarchate's reaction on the privilege issue, see Paris Konortas, "Ta 'ecclasiastika' beratia", (*The ecclesiastical verats*), *Historica*, no.9, Melissa, December 1988.

By demonstrating the responsibilities of the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee it can be understood how important the particular Committee was for the educational issues of the Greek Orthodox community. The Committee was the main institution of the Patriarchate which was dealing with all issues concerning the education of the Orthodox people who were under the Patriarchate's authority. Overall, it could be stressed that the PCEC was functioning as the Patriarchate's Ministry of Education. Moreover, the regulation of the Committee was rather comprehensive and dealt with nearly all aspects, in regard to the proper functioning of the schools. It could be said that the Greek Orthodox community took very seriously the role of education in the community and tried to organize and invigilate the schools for the better of the Greek Orthodox community.

The Patriarchal Central Educational Committee and its course is a good example in order to comprehend under which circumstances the education of the Greek Orthodox community was functioning. The composition of the Committee helps us to understand the internal relations within the Greek Orthodox millet as well as the transformations which occurred during those times. Moreover, as it will be stressed in the next chapters, the discussions within the Committee illuminate us in regard to the orientation of the Greek Orthodox community, their perceptions concerning the Greek language and its role in the formation of their identity as well as their relations and their attitudes toward the Greek State.

CHAPTER II

Foreign Language Teaching in the Greek Orthodox Schools and Foreign Schools.

This chapter aims to demonstrate the crucial issue of foreign language teaching in terms of the educational policies of the Greek Orthodox community. Late 19th century was a period where a variety of foreign educational networks were established within the Ottoman borders, which included Catholic order schools and Protestant associations. These networks were attractive for non-Muslim as well as Muslim students since they imparted modern Western languages such as French or/and English. In an age, where the Ottoman Empire had been largely incorporated into the world economy, the proficiency in one of these languages was an important professional asset for young individuals to enter job market. However, the growing popularity of foreign schools among non-Muslims and Muslims created worries among the Ottoman dignitaries as well as among non-Muslim community members, since these educational alternatives were perceived as a penetration of foreign cultural influence among the local youth.⁸⁵

Looking at the Greek Orthodox community in particular, the ruling elite of the community feared that the continuation of Greek Orthodox boys and girls at foreign schools would weaken their religious and ethnic identity. In this context the teaching of French at Greek Orthodox schools became a major subject of debate within the PCEC. On the one hand French seemed to be indispensable as a foreign language, since its instruction at Greek

⁸⁵ See Akşin Somel, *Grundschulwesen*, 199, 253-258

Orthodox schools could prevent students to choose foreign schools. On the other hand an overemphasis on the instruction of French was considered to be detrimental for the teaching of Greek language and for the inculcation of Greek ethnic identity among the Greek youth. The other foreign language in question was Ottoman Turkish, which was required to be taught according to the Regulation of Public Education of 1869.⁸⁶ This language, however, was considered to be crucial only for those intending to work in the public sector, and thus given lesser importance.⁸⁷

The study of the records of the PCEC shows that one of the crucial issues, which arose among the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul in the late 19th and early 20th century, was the issue of the teaching of foreign languages in the Greek Orthodox schools. The foreign languages which were referred to, in particular, were French and Turkish. Turkish was the official language of the Ottoman state, while French at that time was regarded as a very important language, due to its worldwide predominance in commerce and diplomacy. If we consider the status of the members of the Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire, many of whom were prominent and well-educated members and occupied significant positions in the Ottoman government but were, also, successfully engaged in commerce and banking, we can assume that the knowledge of French was an important skill for them. Of course, it has to be mentioned here that the teaching of foreign languages and especially French was something which preoccupied the inhabitants of the large centers of the Ottoman Empire, which had a sense of cosmopolitanism such as Istanbul or Izmir, than in the provinces those skills were not so much in need of.

Together with the issue of the teaching of foreign languages in the Greek Orthodox schools there was a significant concern about the impact of foreign missionary schools as well as about some private schools in which foreign languages were taught through a more intensive method than the Greek language. A good example which illustrates the antagonism towards the foreign missionary schools can be seen in the establishment of the School of Language and Commerce in Galata in 1909.⁸⁸ This venture aimed at stopping the impact of the foreign schools among the Greek Orthodox population of Istanbul. The Committee toward the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century – as it will be demonstrated in more

⁸⁶ Somel, *Grundschulwesen*, 200-202

⁸⁷ Somel, *Grundschulwesen*, 200-202

⁸⁸ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.300.

detail in the following chapter – regarded the Greek language as an important element for the formation of the Greek ethnic identity. The teaching of foreign languages and the augmentation of foreign schools was considered to be a threat for the future of the Greek nation and the unity of the Greek Orthodox community, because many linguistic differences existed within the Orthodox millet and the promotion of the Greek language was the primary concern. Therefore, the issue of teaching foreign languages in Greek Orthodox schools rose to a great importance for the Committee.

In order to understand the significance the Committee gave to the Greek language and its attitude towards the foreign languages there has to be an explanation of the situation regarding the linguistic differences within the Orthodox millet as well as the changes which occurred since the end of the 18th century, regarding the formation of the millet. In other words, language started to be considered gradually as a more important element to create ethnic consciousness among the people.

The millet system was a socio-cultural and communal framework based firstly on religion and secondly on ethnicity which in turn often reflected linguistic differences.⁸⁹ Moreover, before the 18th century, language was not playing an important role, but a secondary one, as people were mostly identifying themselves as Christians and not through the languages they were speaking. A good example demonstrating the spirit of that time is the following dialogue cited in Joachim Valaranes:

“If you ask a Christian even one speaking corrupted Greek: ‘What are you? A Christian’ he will unhesitatingly reply. ‘All right but other people are Christians, the Armenians, the Franks, and the Russians. I don’t know’ he will answer, ‘yes these people believe in Christ but I am a Christian. Perhaps you are a Greek? No, I am not anything. I’ve told you that I am a Christ and once again I say to you that I am a Christian’, he will reply to me impatiently.”⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Kemal Karpat, “Millets and Nationality”, p. 150.

⁹⁰ Richard Clogg, “A Millet within a Millet, the Karamanlides”, in *Ottoman Greeks in the age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitris Gondikas and Charles Issawi, USA, Darwin Press, 1999, p.117.

Richard Clogg cites some examples of the linguistic distinctions which occurred within the millets in the Ottoman Empire. In these examples, the hazy and complicated situation of identifying a group in reference to the language it spoke is revealed. According to Clogg, there were small groups of Armenians who used Greek characters to write in Nicaea, Nikomedia and Chalkedon, Greek-speaking Levantine Catholics who were writing Greek with Latin characters and even Greek speaking Jews writing Greek by using the Hebrew alphabet. There were also Turkish speaking Christians, who were using the Greek alphabet to write Turkish, the so called Karamanlides, of which publications also occurred.⁹¹ Through these examples, it is being understood that the differences among the populations were rather unclear and the classification of them very difficult. It seems considerably complicated to classify these groups according to the current understanding of sharing an identity through a single spoken language.

Until the end of the 18th century, language was more regarded as a means of communication and as an element of the linguistic differentiations within the millets. Until that time, the linguistic differences seemed to have very little, perhaps even no political significance, as the main and strongest element to determine one's own identity was the religious belief. When the Greek language started to be used as a way to Hellenize people, language started to acquire significance in terms of identifying oneself with a group.⁹² Greek language was seen as a superior one vis-à-vis other languages, since Greek was the official language of the Church and consequently, Greek speaking people had a great advantage in acquiring high ranking positions in the Church hierarchy. The domination of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by Greek speaking people was one of the arguments which the Slavic populations used in order to splinter and establish their own Churches, as it occurred with the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870. Moreover, it could be claimed that the national movements among the Balkan Christian populations were not only against the Ottoman rule but also against the Greek ecclesiastical and cultural oppression.⁹³

Nevertheless, it seems that during the 19th century a gradual transition took place from ethnic identities based on religion and culture to national identities, where language together

⁹¹ Richard Clogg, „A Millet”, p.117. On the publications in Karamanlidika, see Evangelia Balta, Karamanlidika: additions (1584-1900): bibliographie analytique. Athenes, Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987.

⁹² Kemal Karpat, “Millets and Nationality”, p.142.

⁹³ Richard Clogg, “The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (Vol.I), p. 188.

with territorial dimensions started to play an important role in the formation of the identity.⁹⁴ Therefore, in order to Hellenize the populations, the Church as well as prominent members of the Greek community made efforts to succeed in that, mainly through education. In these efforts the Greek Orthodox associations played a significant role. One good example is the Society of Asia Minor: The Orient (*Syllogos Mikrasiaton, I Anatoli*) which was supported by banks in Greece, by the municipality of Athens, the University of Athens and by Greek communities of Egypt. Their basic task was to send people with Anatolian origins to study at the University of Athens in order to become teachers, so they could go back to Anatolia and teach there the Greek language.⁹⁵

Another important contribution in the spread of the Greek language to the Christian populations was done also by the GLS, which was one of the most important associations of Istanbul. The primary interest of this Society was in the spreading of the Greek language and in the organization of the Greek Orthodox education among the Greek community. The Society even organized educational conferences in 1908-09 for the improvement of the Greek Orthodox education as well as contests with money awards. One example of such contests was the Zografeion contest which had as a goal the collection of the Greek dialects of the Greek-speaking people of the Ottoman Empire as well as the depiction of their cultural characteristics. Only one example from this transitory era which displays the difficulty to identify a group with the current understanding of identity was the fact that they didn't give any indication of the way or criterion of how they classified and considered a dialect as being of Greek origin⁹⁶. This fact therefore allows us to interpret these classifications as unreliable. Nevertheless, Charis Echsertzoglou informs us that the policy of the Society regarding the proliferation of the Greek language among the communities did vary in terms of the level of the usage of Greek among the people, a fact which could verify the volatility which occurred during those times concerning the formation of the ethnic consciousness.⁹⁷

The educational conferences of the GLS were discussing also the issue of the teaching of foreign languages in the Greek Orthodox schools. The views of the GLS members and the conference participants seemed to agree with the views of the Committee, since members of

⁹⁴ Peter Trudgill, "Greece and European Turkey:From Religious to Linguistic identity", in *Language and Nationalism*, edited by Stephen Bardour and Cathie Carmichel, , Oxford University Press, 2000, p.240.

⁹⁵Richard Clogg, "A Millet within a Millet:The Karamanlides", in Gondikas, p.128-129.

⁹⁶ Charis Echsertzoglou, *Ethniki Taytotita*, p.105

⁹⁷ Ibid, p.95

the Committee joined the conference too, such as Alexis Zamarias. The basic attitude and concern regarding the foreign languages was not whether they should be taught at schools but at which age they should start so that the ethnic formation of identity would not be disturbed. They all agreed to start the teaching of foreign languages after the first four years of elementary school. It seems that the Greek orthodox community perceived the teaching of foreign languages as a threat either when the local community did not have any knowledge of Greek or when Greek was not the native tongue of them.⁹⁸ This particular view demonstrates again the atmosphere of that time and the linguistic divisions within the Greek Orthodox community.

Because of the great linguistics differences and as language was considered to be a vital mean to create ethnic consciousness, the issue of the teaching of the foreign languages in the Greek Orthodox schools rose as one of great importance, because the teaching of foreign languages could create problems in the creation of a Greek-speaking identity. The discussion was concentrated mainly on the teaching of foreign languages at elementary schools, because in secondary schools French and Turkish were already being taught.

In a discussion which took place on the 8th of October 1899, a member of the Committee argued that the teaching of languages was an issue which didn't have to concern the elementary education. The member pointed out that the teaching of French in elementary schools was useless as it had been shown that only the 2%-3% of the graduates of these schools needed French for their future professions as the ones who were not continuing with their studies were engaged in professions in the market, where French was not being used. So, he concluded that it was not fair for a language which only the minority needed to augment the expenses of the school. As for Turkish, he continued that there were two aspects regarding this language, on the one hand people who would occupy higher rank positions in the government needed it, but nevertheless, they would learn it not in the elementary schools. On the other hand, there was the Turkish language of the street, which everyone could learn it without going to school, but just through interaction.⁹⁹

On the other hand there was an opposite opinion which stressed the social purposes of learning French and Turkish. The supporters of this opinion, however, were restricted to the

⁹⁸ Ibid, p.159

⁹⁹ Reports of the PCEC, code 324, 8th of October 1899, p.107.

large centers of the Ottoman Empire. There, factors such as the cosmopolitan atmosphere and the active engagement of the Greek Orthodox people in commerce and banking promoted the necessity of the learning of foreign languages. Another suggestion by a member of the Committee, E.Amaxopoulos was that the French language should be more supported in relation to Turkish, as French language was easier to learn than Turkish. Another member reacted to this suggestion, arguing that this could not happen since Turkish was the official language of the state, so that there had to be a parallel teaching of both languages.¹⁰⁰ Though rather diverse opinions were expressed among the members of the Committee, there was a considerable agreement in terms of establishing an education which would be in compliance with the current circumstances and demands and at the same time promote the education of Greek language.

In 1913, on the basis of the recommendations of some of the school-boards of the Greek Orthodox schools¹⁰¹, discussions took place whether French and Turkish should start being instructed from the 4th class of elementary schools, onwards, since until then foreign languages were taught in the two last classes of elementary schools, the fifth and the sixth class. We encounter a comment by a lay member Christos Pantazidis where he stated characteristically, that “if we had followed the principles of pedagogy we had to abolish the foreign languages entirely from the elementary education. As we cannot avoid the teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools, because of social circumstances, we shouldn’t accept the recommendations of the school-boards.” The Committee’s decision was to prohibit the teaching of French and Turkish at the 4th class of elementary schools.¹⁰²

The Committee believed that after the first four years of elementary school, French and Turkish could be taught as they assumed that until then the formation of the ethnic identity of Greek children would be completed, so that there was nothing to worry for the ethnic and religious interests of the Greek Orthodox community. Moreover, there was also a concern regarding the structure of the program of schools: in regard to the teaching of foreign languages, the Greek language should be boosted and taught through the ‘natural’ method (*mitriki methodos*).¹⁰³ Both the conferences of the GLS and the Committee manifested the

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, p. 110.

¹⁰¹ Every Greek orthodox school had a school board which was consisted of the teachers of the schools and some of the student’s parents.

¹⁰² Reports of the PCEC, code 1045, 30th of October 1913, p.28-29.

¹⁰³ Reports of the PCEC, code 1045, 30th of October 1913, p.28-29.

same perceptions regarding the issue of the teaching of foreign languages, which demonstrates the problems which occurred regarding the level of knowledge of Greek among the Greek Orthodox populations. Their main concern was to strengthen the knowledge of Greek and to spread it over the populations. Since this had not been done yet, they thought that they should be careful with the instruction of other languages at schools, so that the procedure of learning Greek would not be disturbed.

Despite the fact that the issue of the teaching of foreign languages was settled in 1899 for the elementary schools, the Committee still continued to discuss the subject several times afterwards and there were several occasions in which they discussed on whether the former settlement should change. It could be claimed that this attitude is indicating the circumstances of that time, as on the one hand the instruction of foreign languages was important for the good education of the children but, on the other hand, the teaching of foreign languages in Greek Orthodox schools together with the prospect of sending children to foreign missionary schools was considered as a danger to the ongoing attempt of Hellenizing the Orthodox people through the Greek language.

Following the settlement of the starting year for French and Turkish language teaching in 1899, the Committee was still preoccupied with the number of week hours in which children should be taught in French and Turkish. The general view was that the settlement of the hours of foreign languages should occur in accordance with the hours of teaching in Greek so that Greek will still be taught more hours than Turkish and French. A member of the Committee, A.Spatharis stressed that “our national language should be strengthened; otherwise this will harm our nation, as Turkish and French should be taught only 3 hours per week and even French should be taught more hours than Turkish”.¹⁰⁴ There was an opposite comment by Stamelos who underlined that 30 hours per week for the instruction of both languages was too insufficient and he suggested 24 hours a week only for French.

The decision was taken by the Committee after the comment of Leonidas Limarakis who stressed that the good learning of languages would occur firstly if the students were instructed well in these languages and secondly if they studied hard enough. The Committee,

¹⁰⁴ Reports of the PCEC, code 324, 15th of October 1899, p.114.

therefore, voted for 30 hours per week for both languages combined, 18 hours for the teaching of French and 12 hours for Turkish.¹⁰⁵ However, it seems through the discussions, that the teaching of French was preferred over Turkish. It is clear that as French was a language which was international and the knowledge of it gave the ability to interact with other European people, it was readily preferred. It should be also said that French was not possibly regarded as a language which could disturb the formation of the ethnic identity as might Turkish do. Furthermore, the preference towards French language might also be explained within the context of the rivalry with the foreign schools, as they had to be more competitive in order for parents to send their children to the Greek Orthodox schools. On the other hand, with the intensification of the teaching of French and because of the instruction of the *Katharevousa*¹⁰⁶ form of the Greek language in the Greek Orthodox schools, learning Greek became even more difficult, while Orthodox children ended up speaking French more satisfactorily than Greek and Turkish.¹⁰⁷

While the issue of the instruction of Greek language was emphasized so much by the educated elite of the Greek Orthodox community it should be kept in mind that there probably have been some reactions from within the Orthodox millet concerning the intensive teaching of Greek in the Greek Orthodox schools vis-à-vis the Turkish. There is a letter which was sent by an Ottoman Greek on the 17th of October in 1889 to the '*Tercüman-i Hakikat*' newspaper in which he was criticizing the Greek Orthodox schools. He was stressing the fact that Greeks constituted different language groups and that because of the educational network the Greeks of Anatolian origin were forced to learn Greek. Furthermore, he continued that the Greek Orthodox community was resisting any attempt to introduce the Ottoman Turkish language in the Greek Orthodox schools.¹⁰⁸ In this document, firstly the linguistically division of the Greek orthodox community is confirmed and secondly, the procedure which the Greek Orthodox community and the Patriarchate was following in order to Hellenize the populations through the intensive teaching of the Greek language, a procedure which as we see was not always welcomed by the members of the Greek orthodox community.

¹⁰⁵ Reports of the PCEC, code 323, 15th of October 1899, p.116

¹⁰⁶ Regarding the issue of *Katharevousa* see chapter 3.

¹⁰⁷ Richard Clogg, "A Millet within a Millet", p.130.

¹⁰⁸ Osman Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, (Vol.III-IV) (The History of the Turkish Education), Eser Matbaasi, Istanbul, 1977, p.1035-37.

Moreover, another great concern of the PCEC was the status of the foreign missionary schools. The Committee seems to have been concerned with the increasing number of these schools as well as with the fact of whether the Greek Orthodox parents were sending their children to these schools. More detailed, there was a comment in a session of the Committee on the 20th of April 1911 where Zamarias- the principal of Zografeion School- pointed out to the fact that many parents were taking their children from the Greek Orthodox elementary schools and sending them to foreign schools in order to learn French as well as other foreign commercial languages, because the current socioeconomic circumstances demanded it. That is why, he continued, the Committee had to put an end to these propagandistic foreign schools and an education should be established which would not lose its national character but, would be able to respond to the current demands of the time and eventually keep the students within the Greek Orthodox schools.¹⁰⁹

A similar concern can be seen in a Patriarchal circular of 1902, where the Patriarch stated his worries about foreign missionary schools. In the document it is mentioned that there was a considerable number of Orthodox students, who were sent to these foreign schools apparently for the learning of foreign languages. According to the document, the goal of these schools and their teachers was neither the scientific nor the ethical education of students, but the religious proselytism of students and their estrangement from the Orthodox belief. It concluded with the urge to parents to remove the children from these foreign schools, as foreign languages were also taught in the Greek Orthodox schools.¹¹⁰

In March 1909, the Patriarchate issued another document concerning missionary schools. There, it was again stated the fact that Greek Orthodox parents were sending their children to the foreign schools. The document disapproved of those actions, while it characterized those schools as fanatically propagandistic, which had the basic aim to proselytize the Orthodox children. The document gave also an example of the dangers which the Orthodox children could be faced up with in those schools, as it was happening in a college in the neighboring Galata. There, Orthodox children were forced to pray together with “heterodox” children in the “heterodox” dogma. The document concluded that those schools were threatening the national and religious consciousness of the Greek Orthodox millet and

¹⁰⁹ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 20th of April 1911, p.258

¹¹⁰ Correspondence of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, code A'74, Protocol number 5986, 20th of August 1902,p. 343-44.

parents should not send their children to these propagandistic foreign schools. It appears that this document regarded foreign schools as a danger for the formation of the national identity of the Greek Orthodox millet, as at the same time an importance was given to the element of religion. It was not only the different language in which these schools were instructing in, but the different dogma they preached. Although, in the document, it is being stressed that the main reason for parents to send their children to foreign schools was the learning of foreign languages and since the teaching in the Greek Orthodox schools was not satisfactory, the document recommended that other, safer ways should be introduced in order to solve the particular problem¹¹¹, the fact that it focused also on the different dogma of these schools demonstrates that religion was still playing a very important role in the formation of the ethnic identity.

We should not forget that, another element which might explain the antipathy of the PCEC towards the foreign missionary schools was the historical relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Latin Church. There has been a general antagonism between the two churches and a deeply rooted Orthodox prejudice against Latin Catholicism and vice versa. One explanation of this could be found in the Byzantine times before the fall of Constantinople, when the Latin Church in order to help the Byzantines against the Ottoman expansion, asked for the submission of the Eastern Church to the Latin. Characteristic of the hate among the two Churches is the known to be said phrase by a Byzantine high official that he would rather see in Constantinople the Turkish turban rather than the Latin mitre.¹¹² Nevertheless, regarding the struggle of the Eastern Church against the Latin, the reasons cannot be restricted only to the different theological dogmas but there were also social and psychological factors. Theodore Papadopoulos argues that the theological controversy between the Orthodox Church and the Latin Church is only a reflection of the particular struggle which entails more divergences than the theological ones.¹¹³ However, the particular issue cannot be explained or analyzed within this thesis, as it is a huge, long lasting and extremely complicated issue which has many constraints and parameters in order to analyze it.

¹¹¹ Correspondence of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, code A' 83, Protocol number 1716, March 1909, p.59-60.

¹¹² Richard Clogg, 'The Greek millet', p.191.

¹¹³ Theodore Papadopoulos, *The Greek Church and People Under the Turkish Domination*, Aldershot, Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum: Brookfield, Vt, USA: Gower Pub.Co, 1990, p.153

Nonetheless, it seems that together with the teaching of foreign languages, the Committee was worried about the foreign schools and it perceived them as a threat to the Greek Orthodox identity and a means of proselytizing. Taking into consideration the fact that the Greek community was divided in terms of languages and as until the 19th century language was a secondary element in order to identify a person with a group, we see that especially in the first decades of 20th century language was perceived as a powerful means to formulate the ethnic identity and consciousness of the populations. The Committee adopted this political attitude and through its policies tried to spread and to improve the knowledge of the Greek language among those populations, who apparently were considered to be Greeks even though they didn't speak Greek. Once more, the difficulty to apply the present day perceptions regarding the issue of sharing an identity becomes clear, as people were regarded Greeks in terms of culture and morals and not so much of language.

Another incident which demonstrates the importance the Committee gave to the status of the foreign schools as well as the teaching of foreign languages was the problem which arose concerning the Greek-French Girl's School in Pera, the *Ellinogalliko Parthenagwgeio*. The discussion took place in 1897 when the school asked permission from the Committee in order to include in its name the term *Orthodox*, so that it could be recognized as a parish school and not as a private one.¹¹⁴ The Committee vehemently reacted against the particular suggestion and severely prohibited the use of the name *Orthodox* as a part of the name of the school. We understand from the discussions of the Committee's session, regarding the above issue that the Committee didn't agree with the educational methodology the school was applying.

What happened was that, according to the Committee, the school in the first four years was teaching French as the mother tongue instead of Greek, something which was going against the Committee's educational approach. In a session of the Committee, members commented that the graduates of that particular school totally ignored the Greek language, which was something unacceptable. According to them, this was something which was changing the linguistic character of the Greek Orthodox schools and deviated from the basic

¹¹⁴ The difference when a school is recognized by the Committee and it is no longer a private one is that it is financed by the Patriarchate and that is the reason why private schools try to get the recognition from the Committee.

aim which was the hamper of the “heterodox” schools. They also expressed a concern regarding the fact that the particular school attracted students as well as teachers from other Greek Orthodox schools.¹¹⁵ The conclusion was that the school had to remain ‘private and the principals had to take over their own financial responsibilities and not to interfere in other issues than their own.’¹¹⁶

The incident with the particular school and its name demonstrates the importance of the teaching of Greek at schools as opposed to the French teaching. The Committee was very strict in this aspect and its procedures of recognition of schools seemed to be categorical. Nevertheless, we can claim that in the reaction of the PCEC members, a sense of exaggeration is also discernible as well as great suspiciousness towards foreign schools. Furthermore, we can claim that through the above event the Committee’s and the Patriarchate’s policies and intentions are clearly revealed. It seems that both wished to establish a unified education over the Greek Orthodox community and that was the reason why other schools with different curriculum, which attracted Greek Orthodox students, disturbed their policies, and therefore were perceived as a threat.

As it has been mentioned already, the Committee every year had to submit a report to the Patriarch through citing its discussions, decisions and the issues it was dealing with. This annual report was then published in the *Ecclesiastical Truth*. In one of these reports of 1909-10, a suggestion, proposed by the principal of a French school to the Committee was mentioned. It proposed to send French teachers to the Greek Orthodox schools and even to establish a teacher’s school in order for Greek teachers to learn French. Interesting enough is the attitude of the Committee which objected the suggestion stating the argument that an action like that would harm the national interests of the Greek millet.

Another interesting part of the report refers to a proposal of the Young Turk party, the Committee of Union and Progress, to open Young Turkish mixed ethnic schools. The measure of establishing mixed ethnic schools was a practice which the Young Turks tried to establish in accordance with their policy of Ottomanization of the populations.¹¹⁷ In this policy education played a significant role, while a unification of education was attempted. In general,

¹¹⁵ Reports of the PCEC, code 323, film 4, 16th of July 1897, p.230.

¹¹⁶ Kefalas speaking in the session, code 323, film 4, 16th of July 1897, p.230.

¹¹⁷ Concerning the Young Turk educational policies toward the Greek Orthodox schools, see O.N.Ergin, *Türk Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3-4, p.1455-1478.

the reaction of the Patriarchate towards these policies was unenthusiastic and in the particular issue the Committee's orientation seemed to be negative as it considered the particular schools as a new form of the already existing propagandistic schools which distorted the national and religious education of the Greek children.¹¹⁸

In the same report, on the other hand, the Committee quoted that it supported the strengthening of the teaching of Turkish history in the Greek Orthodox schools, as the Turkish history should be considered an integral part of the history of the Greek millet. Unfortunately, there is no data cited regarding what kind of Ottoman Turkish history they wished to taught in the Greek orthodox schools, nevertheless, these different attitudes, that is to say the rejection of the establishment of mixed ethnic schools, on the one hand and their consideration of Turkish history as a part of their own history, on the other, could be used as an example to demonstrate the rather complex policies of the Greek millet. The Greek millet could be seen as a segregated community in terms of its administration and functioning, but at the same time it was considering itself to be a part of the whole system, a part of the Ottoman State.

In regard to the Committee's discussions, it seems that the clergy in a sense did not support so vigorously the teaching of French and Turkish in elementary schools, as they perceived the instruction of these languages, firstly, as something dispensable, and secondly, as a practice which could jeopardize the ethnic orientation of the Greek children. On the other hand, the laity, as a social stratum more engaged with commerce and diplomacy – as we have said before the lay members were from the most prominent members of the Greek Orthodox millet – they were supporting the teaching of foreign languages much stronger, since for them foreign languages were important regarding the socio-economic demands of that time. However, both laity and clergy were supporting the predominance of the teaching of the Greek language in the Greek Orthodox schools.

A problem which continued from the 1890s until 1915 between the Greek Orthodox community and the Ottoman government was the issue of the instruction of the Ottoman Turkish language at Greek Orthodox schools. The year 1896 became crucial, since the Sublime Porte published an Instruction Concerning the Duties of Directors of Education of the Imperial Provinces (*Vilâyât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdârlelerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Tâlîmât*).

¹¹⁸ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 11th of February 1911, p.227.

Articles 35 and 36 of this instruction were clearly determining the compulsory teaching of the Turkish Ottoman language in all schools of the Ottoman Empire.¹¹⁹ Probably, in connection with that Instruction, we see a series of correspondences during 1896, sent from local Metropolises to the Patriarchate, which stress their concern regarding the pressure of the Ottoman State on the issue of the instruction of Ottoman Turkish language in the Greek Orthodox schools.

In more detail, some Metropolises questioned the right of the Ottoman State to insist on the teaching of the Ottoman Turkish language in their schools and underlined the ‘privileged’ status of the Patriarchate.¹²⁰ After 1896, when the compulsory teaching of Turkish was declared by the Instruction, the context of the correspondences changed but still there was a considerable resentment towards the Ottoman State. In other words, while they accepted the fact that Ottoman Turkish language was taught and that the Ottoman State was paying the salaries of the Turkish language instructors, they insisted that the paying of the instructors was the only thing on which the Ottoman State could interfere, while they highlighted the ‘privileged’ status of the Greek Orthodox schools.¹²¹ However, the Ottoman project of appointing Turkish instructors to Greek Orthodox schools was far from being successful. Even the Instruction of 1896 indicated that because of the lack of sufficient number of instructors the priority would be given firstly to the urban areas, then to be followed by appointments to the rural areas.¹²²

The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 brought the issue of the instruction of Turkish teaching again to the agenda. The Young Turk Revolution indicated a major change in the history of the Ottoman Empire as well as for the Greek Orthodox millet. The Young Turk politics had as its central aim to centralize the Ottoman Empire and to Ottomanize the populations of the Empire.¹²³ According to that aim, education was central as a means of imperial unification. The policy of the Young Turks towards education was not that they

¹¹⁹ Aksin Somel, ‘Das’, p.200-01.

¹²⁰ Correspondence of the Patriarchate, Code A’67, num. of protocol 6350, 6th November 1896, p.386, Code A’67, num of protocol 5961, 14th November 1896, p.395, code A’67, num. of protocol 6194, 22nd October 1896, p.368.

¹²¹ Correspondence of the Patriarchate, Code A’69, num. of protocol 5916, 20th November 1897, p.369, Code A’73, num. of protocol 5653, 2nd October 1901, p.335.

¹²² Aksin Somel, ‘Das.’ p.200-01.

¹²³ More on the Young Turks, see, Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks: The Committee of the Union and Progress in Turkish Politics 1908-1914*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969, Sükrü Hanioglu, *Preparation for Revolution. The Young Turks 1902-1908.*, New York, Oxford U.P., 2001, Sükrü Hanioglu, *The Young Turks in Opposition*, New York, Oxford, U.P., 1995.

abolished the community schools, as they continued to function; it was more the government's attempts to strengthen the economical and official control over them.¹²⁴ In addition, the particular period of the Young Turks was the beginning of the end of the privileges of the Patriarchate as certain measures were taken gradually, so that the privileges were to be eliminated. In particular, in 1910, the Law of Primary Education (*Tedrisât-ı İbtidâiye Kanunu*) was issued, according to which all non-Muslims schools were regarded as private schools. Furthermore, the particular law created a lot of reactions among the non-Muslim as it was enforcing the Ottoman Turkish language to primary education. Nonetheless, even this Law was not properly enforced, perhaps, because of the resistance of the Patriarchate.¹²⁵

During the Second Constitutional Period, the Ottoman Parliament declared certain legal measures concerning the Orthodox millet which indicated its intention to interfere and control the administrative issues of the Orthodox schools. Asking for the replacement of the foreign trustees with Ottoman citizens, the prohibition of foreign teachers in schools – this measure referred to the teachers who came from Greece in order to teach Greek in the Ottoman Empire – the convenience of the Turkish authorities when supervising the non Muslim schools, the alteration of financial issues, as the amount of money which the Ottoman State gave would not be given anymore to the Patriarchate but, directly to the councils of each community, the translation of the diplomas of the schools in Turkish if the graduates of non-Muslim schools wanted to get accepted into governmental schools, were some of the most important points of the Young Turks requirements.¹²⁶

However, the Patriarchate reacted harshly to these measures of the Young Turks. The Patriarchate considered that the attempt to eliminate their privileges would be eventually an elimination of the Patriarchate's power. The Patriarchate's main argument to justify the permanent validity of the privileges was to underline their antiquity-longevity, as they were dated from the Fall of Constantinople, in 1453. Another point which was stressed by the Patriarchate was the fact that 'as education is composed of several elements, such as educational, scientific, but also religious, social and ethical, and as all these elements differ among the Christians and the Muslims, that is why the State cannot undertake the education

¹²⁴ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.463

¹²⁵ Osman Ergin, *Turkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Eser Matbaasi, Istanbul, 1977, p.1302.

¹²⁶ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 4th December 1910

of the Christians.¹²⁷ The Patriarchate in its reaction was even characterizing the policies of the Young Turks as new way of a “mass kidnapping of children” (*paidomazoma*), i.e. the practice of Child Levy for manning the Janissary corps. In terms of the language, the fact that the Young Turks were imposing the Turkish language into non-Muslim schools was regarded as an attempt to Turkify the non-Muslim populations.¹²⁸ In other words, the Patriarchate was receiving the policies of the Young Turks as an attempt to assimilate the non-Muslim populations through language.

It could be claimed that the Young Turks tried to bring a sense of unity among the people of the Ottoman Empire. But this policy seemed to be rather impossible, since at that time, nationalistic ideologies within the elite members of the non-Muslim communities were already being established. However, despite the reactions of the Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox community during those times, gradually the privileges of the Patriarchate were eliminated, and in 1915 a law regarding the schools passed the parliament, known as the Regulation for Private Schools (*Mekâtib-i Husûsiyye Talîmâtınlâmesi*). Despite its title the law was mainly on the status of the non-Muslims schools. The particular law was a continuation of the Law of Primary Education of 1910, according to which all the non-Muslim schools were again declared as private ones and were taken under the control of the Ministry of Education.¹²⁹ However, it was the time when the Ottoman Empire entered in the 1st World War in 1914, that all capitulations were abolished. After that, much more pressure was put on the non-Muslim schools and the above-mentioned regulation was an example of that.¹³⁰

Despite all these government measures, it seems through the study of the records of the PCEC that the compulsory teaching of Ottoman Turkish language in the Greek Orthodox schools was not so successfully applied. There was a discussion, held in 1915, by the Committee, regarding the Girls schools and the introduction of the Turkish language, which could become an example of the situation regarding the issue. The Committee commented that there was a need to apply Turkish in the schools as the government has asked for the application of the compulsory teaching of Turkish and no more delay could take place because it might cause problems. Therefore, the Committee proceeded to introduce the teaching of Turkish as compulsory and to start from the 3rd class for 4 hours a week for the

¹²⁷ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 5th February 1911, ‘Educational Issue’, p.145.

¹²⁸ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 5th February 1911, ‘Educational Issue’, p.148.

¹²⁹ Osman Ergin, *Turkiye Maarif*, p.1316.

¹³⁰ Ibid, p.1476

elementary education and for the secondary education 2 hours a week.¹³¹ Additionally, in the education of girls, Turkish was not regarded as a necessary skill, and due to that reason it was not even taught at the girl's schools¹³² but, regardless of that the year 1915 seems to be rather late to introduce the compulsory teaching of it.

Looking superficially, one could observe the teaching of Turkish at the Greek Orthodox schools, as it was the official language and its knowledge was certainly significant. The question is as to which extent and according to which method Turkish was instructed. Through the discussions of the Committee, it could be claimed that although Turkish was taught, its teaching was limited and insignificant comparing to the teaching of Greek and even French. At certain occasions we see that the importance of Turkish was stressed, like in an article of *Ecclesiastical Truth* (June 1909), where it was pointed out that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was always promoting and applying Turkish in the schools because this was on the children's best interest as they were citizens of a country, whose official language was Turkish.¹³³ However, looking at the general picture, it seems that the teaching of Turkish was not seriously promoted in the Greek educational system. Despite this, we still see a major difference between the Hamidian regime and the Young Turk period in terms of the enforcement of the instruction of Ottoman Turkish at Greek Orthodox schools. In 1915, at least, Greek Orthodox schools for boys were regularly teaching that language.

Here a question which arises from the issue of the compulsory teaching of Ottoman Turkish is as to why the Young Turks were more successful in the application of it while the Hamidian Regime was not. A possible suggestion would be the differences in the policies which the two governments followed. Abdülhamid II was more trying to keep a balance in the Ottoman Empire and to have good relations with the non-Muslim elites; Christakis Zografas and Giannis Zarifis were for some time his bankers. However, this did not mean that during the Hamidian Regime there were no incidents with the Patriarchate; we should remember the two 'privilege' crises, already mentioned in Chapter One of this study. Furthermore, there is a letter by the Ministry of Education in 1895 to the Zografion School, in which it was asking for information regarding the progress of the students in the Ottoman Turkish language.¹³⁴

¹³¹ Reports of the PCEC, code 1044, 14th of October 1915, p.334-35.

¹³² More on the issue in Chapter 4.

¹³³ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 24th of June 1909, p.233.

¹³⁴ Correspondence of the Patriarchate, Code A'66, num. of protocol 4058, 31st August 1895, p.267-68.

Nevertheless, during the Second Constitutional Period the policies especially towards the communities of the Empire were much more radical and determined.

In conclusion it should be stressed that the issue of the instruction of language after the second half of the 19th century was perceived as a critical issue by the educated elites of the Greek Orthodox community. Greek orthodox schools tried to strengthen the teaching of Greek vis-à-vis foreign languages, so that the national identity of Orthodox children would become strong. In a not dissimilar way, the Young Turks tried to centralize the Ottoman Empire, again through utilizing education and by applying in a more intensive way the compulsory teaching of Turkish at all schools within the Ottoman Empire. It seems that language was at that time perceived as a strategic means of creating national consciousness among populations in which the linguistic distinctions were widespread.

CHAPTER III

The language issue (*glossiko zitima*): The conflict between the puristic form of language (katharevousa) and the vernacular.

The conflict between the puristic form of Greek, the *Katharevousa*, and the vernacular Demotic language has been a source of major cultural friction within the Greek society of Greece and also among the members of the Greek Orthodox community of the Ottoman Empire. This friction emerged few years after the independence of Greece and lasted until the second half of the 20th century. This conflict was one of the outcomes of secular Greek nationalism and the project of creating a New Greek nation which should have the ability to trace back its cultural antecedents to Ancient Greece. The promotion of the *Katharevousa* served also as a means to standardize spoken Greek language among the Greek Orthodox population within the Ottoman borders and thus to strengthen both Greek national identity as well as realizing linguistic unity within the community. The ruling elite of the Greek Orthodox community, worried about the linguistic diversity among the Greek population, considered Greek Orthodox schools as a necessary means to ensure linguistic homogeneity. The educational policies of the PCEC reflected these worries.

In the years of 1910-11 wide-ranging discussions took place in the Committee's sessions regarding the language issue (*Glossiko Zitima*). The PCEC was again concerned with the issue of the language. In this case, however, it meant the conflict about the use of the puristic form of the Greek language and the vernacular tongue for education. The fact that this particular issue also bothered the Greek State continuously makes the pursuit of the subject

even more interesting, creating the possibility of a comparison regarding the tactics which the Patriarchate and the Greek State applied concerning the issue. The discussions at the PCEC reveal us the perceptions which existed during those times in the Greek Orthodox community regarding the language issue. Also, the gazette of the Patriarchate, the *Ecclesiastical Truth*, provides us an insight about the tactics and the ways the Greek Orthodox community applied in regard to the language issue. However, in terms of generalizing, we should be reluctant as the particular study reflects mostly the official attitude of the Patriarchate regarding the use of *Katharevousa* form of the Greek language in the Greek orthodox education.

As it has been already mentioned, the Greek language in the course of the 19th century was becoming gradually a very important element at the creation of a national consciousness. At the same time, there was a need for a cohesive language to realize a standardized national education. The fact that innumerable different Greek dialects existed within the regions of the Ottoman Empire and even within the New Greek State created problems in the process and policy of Hellenizing the Orthodox millet of the Ottoman Empire and the populations inside the borders of Greece, linguistically. That is why the newly established Greek State, in particular, was in need of a unified language, which would have been able at the same time to express more complicated and elaborate ideas. The vernacular tongue in this case appeared to be insufficient to achieve these goals, since it was perceived as a very simple language. It was a puristic form of the Greek language, the *Katharevousa* which meant to be the linguistic means to Hellenize the populations. Also, for the Greek Orthodox community, as it will be analyzed, *Katharevousa* was the language which was connecting them to their glorious past, to their ancestors, whether they were the ancient Greeks or the Byzantines. But, in order to understand better the language issue and its inclinations there has to be an explanation of the terms puristic form and vernacular form.

When referring to the puristic form of the Greek language, the language which is meant is the *Katharevousa*. This language was created in the early 19th century by Adamantios Korais (1748-1833), a Greek intellectual and patriot. Korais wanted to create a new form of the Greek language in order to abolish the foreign elements which had entered the Greek language due to the long lasting interaction with other languages (Latin, Turkish, and Slavic). That is why he created a new form of the Greek language, in which the combination of the archaic forms of the ancient Greek occurred without the grammatical difficulties of it. Furthermore, the particular language was also called as the ‘*mesi odos*’,

meaning the middle line, because it was supporting a form of language which was between the ancient Greek and the vernacular tongue.¹³⁵

However, the reason which urged Korais to create a new form of Greek was the dispute between the ‘archaists’ and the ‘modernists’, that is to say the supporters of the archaic form of Greek and the supporters of the vernacular tongue. Korais proposed an alternative form which eventually dominated, as *Katharevousa* became in 1834 the official language of the Greek State. Nevertheless, *Katharevousa* was used in the bureaucratic life of the new state but, the people and especially the low classes continued to speak in the vernacular. The dispute, then of the language issue shifted between the *Katharevousa* and the vernacular, the demotic (*dimotiki*), which was also confined in the intellectual circles of that time (demotic was the language which was mostly used in poetry).

In 1888 with the publication of Ioannis Pscharis’s novel ‘My Journey’ [*To Taxidi mou*] which was written in demotic, the language issue was again commenced. Since then, the language issue became central as denominator for conflicting political and social tendencies. The publication of the Bible in 1901 in demotic, in the newspaper *Akropolis* by Alexandros Pallis, was perceived as an insult to the ecclesiastical tradition, as the translation of a ‘holy’ language was something unbearable for the Church’s circles, while the representation of the tragedy ‘*Orestis*’ by Aeschylus in 1903 in the demotic by the National Theatre, added more tensions. These two incidents caused severe reactions and conflicts, between the supporters of *Katharevousa* and demotic, and riots took place in both instants, during which eight people were killed in 1901 and one in 1903.¹³⁶ These events are being remembered as ‘*Evangelical*’ and ‘*Orestiaka*’ events, respectively.

Up until then, the issue of language was not connected to education, but in 1907 a discussion took place in the Greek Parliament regarding the legitimization of the *Katharevousa*, as the plan was to make the language in which the school textbooks would be written in, compulsory. In other words, they discussed whether *Katharevousa*, had to be it

¹³⁵ For more information on the subject of *Katharevousa*, see: Pasxalis Kitromilidis, *Neo Hellenic Enlightenment*, Edu.Institute of National Bank, Athens, 2000, Dimaras K.Th., *History of the Neohellenic Literature*, Ikaros, Athens, 1987, Anna Fragoudaki, *Language and Ideology*, Odysseas, Athens, 1987, Anna Fragoudaki, *Language and Nation*, Alexandreia, Athens, 2001, Adamantios Korais, *Prolegomena of the ancient Greek authors and his autobiography*, Educational Institute of the National Bamk, Athens, 1986.

¹³⁶ Peter Trudgill, “Greece and European Turkey:From Religious to Linguistic Identity”, p.250, also see, Rena Patrikiou-Stauridou, *Glossa, Ekipaideusi, Politiki*, (Language, Education, Politics), Athens, Olkos, 2004.

legalized in education, even though it was the form of language used in education. Nevertheless, at that time the Parliament did not pass the particular law, because it did not wish to take such a severe measure and create a compulsory language of education. However, in 1911, the legalization of *Katharevousa* in education took place and it became the official language of education, while any use of another form of Greek language became prohibited. According to the Greek Parliament, the reason why a legalization of *Katharevousa* in education was necessary was that the unity of the nation was at stake, something which does not actually explain the reason why in 1907 the particular regulation was avoided. Probably, the reasons were more of a political nature, since the political balance of the Greek government was unstable and it was more an act of political compromise.¹³⁷

As far as the attitude of the Greek State towards the language issue is concerned, it appears that the Patriarchate was clearly observing the developments in the Greek State regarding the legalization of *Katharevousa* in education and that this institution approved the tactics of the Greek government. An example which certifies this argument is the fact that Patriarch Joachim III sent a cyclical to the Greek Church in 1911, arguing that the Greek state should take measures against the expansion of the demotic, which constituted a threat for the national and ecclesiastical interests.¹³⁸ Nevertheless, there is a need of further analysis concerning the perceptions of the Patriarchate on the language issue.

It appears from the previous accounts that the language issue cannot be classified only as a literary issue but also as a political one, as the supporters of both languages were representing two different perceptions of the Greek society.¹³⁹ There existed a dispute between the traditionalist forces and the new social dynamics of that time. It could be claimed that the supporters of *Katharevousa* were the traditionalist forces, the more conservative ones, into which the Patriarchal circles were also included, as the supporters of demotic, on the other hand, were the new class of people who were living inside the social and economical development which the Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment¹⁴⁰ had created.

¹³⁷ Rena Patrikiou, *Glossa*, p.45.

¹³⁸ Ibid, p.172.

¹³⁹ Ibid, p.11

¹⁴⁰ More on the issue see Kitromilidis Pasxalis, *Neo-hellenic Enlightenment*, Educational Institution of National Bank, Athens, 2000.

The Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment was an intellectual movement which diffused the ideas of the French Enlightenment among the Greek speaking populations; a wave which was initiated by enlightened Greeks, some of them lived abroad. Several of the representatives of the Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment included Eygenios Voulgaris, Iosipos Moisiodakas, Adamantios Korais, Rigas Velestinlis. One of the issues with which they were preoccupied intensively was the language and education of the populations. Interestingly, the adherents of *Katharevousa* were regarding Demotic as the language of modernization, which simultaneously meant something foreign, that is to say something dangerous for the ethnic orientation of people. Nonetheless, Demotic was considered as an element which was undermining the ethics, had designs on religion and was considered a suspect of betrayal!¹⁴¹

One of the central arguments, which the adherents of the *Katharevousa* used against the Demotic language was that the use of it could degenerate the ‘glorious’ Greek language and its past and would eventually degenerate also the new generations. In a series of articles on the language issue, published in 1911 in the *Ecclesiastical Truth*, the following interesting comment was stated: “no one rejects the fact that if this banal language expands among the populations and if this language, created by the effluents of other languages, will become popular among the future Greek generation, they will speak a language which we don’t know and they would eventually become an Anatolian generation, without understanding any word of our mother language and our ancestors. The distance between us and our ancestors would be increased at such a level that the future ‘supposed’ Greeks wouldn’t be able to understand not even one word of the ancient Greek language.”¹⁴²

The above quotation demonstrates the importance which the Patriarchate drew to the language form which had to be used by the new generations in order to pursue their heritage, their past. According to the Patriarchate, the *Katharevousa* was the language which was connecting them to their past, which was certifying their superior culture in relation to the others. The Patriarchate was strictly supporting the *Katharevousa*, as it was closer to the ecclesiastical language which was used among the clergy. In an article of *Ecclesiastical Truth*, the author pointed out: “and if this supposed Greek language of the ‘vulgarizes’”

¹⁴¹ Rena Patrikiou, p.14

¹⁴² *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 12th February 1911, n.7, p.41-42.

(*ekxydaistes*¹⁴³) expands, what would the faithful people understand from the Church preachings and chantings?”.¹⁴⁴ The use of any other form of the Greek language other than *Katharevousa* could have as a result the distancing of people from the Orthodox faith, something which the Church had to avoid. The *Katharevousa* was supported by the Patriarchate because it was the language through which its archaic form could symbolize both the Orthodox faith and the glorious ancient Greek past, and these two elements could infuse a common national consciousness among the people. As far as it concerned the Patriarchate, *Katharevousa* was the language through which the continuation of the Greek nation could be guaranteed and the national and ecclesiastical interests of the Greek Orthodox millet could be protected.

The conflict regarding the language became also an issue within the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul, although there were certain differences in comparison to the Greek State. First of all, in the one case we see a sovereign state, and in the other one it was a community which was living in a Muslim country. For that reason, there were certain limitations for the second case in the way it could react to the issue, as it was functioning within a rather different framework. Nevertheless, there was a medium of the common language which was connecting the Greek State with the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and that is why that there were certain similarities concerning their perceptions.

As already mentioned, the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and the Patriarchal circles in general were observing the evolutions and developments regarding the language issue in Greece. In an article published in the *Ecclesiastical Truth* in 1911, one can encounter extensive references to the procedures which the Parliament of Greece adopted regarding the language issue. The Greek State’s decision to legalize *Katharevousa* in education was being extolled by the author in a very enthusiastic way, stressing that through the action of legalizing *Katharevousa* in education the ethnic unity and the future generations would be protected and safe from the dangers of demotic.¹⁴⁵

However, although the above series of articles applauded the legalization of *Katharevousa* in the education of the Greek State this didn’t mean that the authority

¹⁴³ A very harsh characterization of the supporters of demotic which means the ones who devastate the language even in ethical terms.

¹⁴⁴ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 19th February 1911, p.42

¹⁴⁵ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 12th March 1911.

responsible for the educational issues of the Greek orthodox community, the PCEC, was going to follow the exact example of Greece. In the Committee's discussions there was a certain concern regarding the above measure. To give more detail, in a session of the Committee in 1911, L. Limarakis stated that "the language issue can neither be solved through the Inspector's vague reports nor through prohibitions in law...we have to exchange opinions and decide. As far as I am concerned we neither should follow the example of Athens nor should we pass a law concerning the form of language which should be used. Everyone can have its own opinion regarding the language or the dialect that he speaks, but this is not the same when propaganda is taking place for demotic so that it can gain supporters. That is why some measures against any form of propaganda have to be taken".¹⁴⁶

The Committee gives the impression that it didn't want to proceed with such severe measures regarding language. On the other hand, it is apparent that the Greek Orthodox community was quite conservative regarding the use of language in education, sometimes even more conservative than Athens, an attitude which could create certain contradictions. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that we are talking about two institutions with different administrational frameworks and with different limitations in their actions regarding education. The Greek State was sovereign and had every right to organize its educational system as it wished, whereas the Greek Orthodox community, even though it was the one responsible for its educational affairs, its authority was emanating from the Ottoman State, which had every right to interfere whenever it considered it essential.

Also, the general political climate of the Ottoman Empire after the Young Turk Revolution has to be considered as well, as we are talking about the Second Constitutional Period. The times were extremely vague for the future of the Ottoman Empire and in particular for the Greek Orthodox community, as the Young Turk Regime had started to promote a policy of administrative unification of the empire, including the non-Muslim communities. That was the reason of the pressure they imposed on the non-Muslim communities regarding the elimination of their 'privileges'. Under these conditions, the PCEC was recommending caution regarding the issue of language, possibly in order to avoid larger conflicts within the community, something which could perhaps lead to the actual interference of the Ottoman State. Nevertheless, the fact that despite researching, no data could be found

¹⁴⁶ Reports of PCEC, Code 1043, 9th of March 1911, p.242.

concerning a concrete attitude of the Sublime Porte related to this issue, can lead us to the conclusion that the Ottoman State apparently did not play any role or was not interested in the language issue.

However, as it will be analyzed further, the fact that the PCEC was trying to keep issues such as the use of demotic in the Greek Orthodox schools confined within the Committee, can lead us to the speculation that the Committee wished to prevent further tensions more within the Greek Orthodox Community rather than with the Ottoman State.

It is interesting to note that, a series of discussions took place at the Committee along the years of 1910-11, regarding the language issue and in particular on the issue whether there were teachers and students in the Greek Orthodox schools, who were supporting and promoting the demotic. It is important to mention here that whenever there was a reference to the demotic in the Committee as well as in the publications of the *Ecclesiastical Truth*, they were using the name *malliari* language instead of demotic. That was a name which was used in an offensive way as well as to ridicule the use of demotic. Nonetheless, there wasn't any actual difference between *malliari* and demotic. There was a comment made by L.Limarakis in a session of the Committee stressing that the distinction which was done between the *malliarous* and the supporters of demotic was not valuable as there was a common aim; the abolishment of archaic grammatical forms and endings.¹⁴⁷ Actually, the use of the name *malliarismos*, meant the ideology of using the demotic, but in a more fanatic sense, as it was also indicating a propagandistic intention. It is important to stress that the name *malliaros*(adherent of *malliariki* language) was mostly used by the supporters of *Katharevousa* in order to affront the supporters of demotic, rather than by the supporters of demotic in order to identify themselves.

In the 1910-11 sessions of the Committee, there was a certain acceleration of interest concerning this issue, as in the beginning the discussion was initiated by a letter which the Committee received from the Holy Synod (date 5th of October, number of protocol 8960). Here it was stressed the fact that there was an apparent use of the demotic in the Patriarchal Academy (*Megali Sxoli tou Genous*) and in Zografeion School. The H.S. was urging the Committee to investigate the issue and to take the proper measures against it.¹⁴⁸ Because of

¹⁴⁷ Reports of PCEC, Code 1043, 22nd July 1911, p.353.

¹⁴⁸ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 22nd of October 1910, p.178.

the particular letter a discussion occurred in the Committee regarding the issue of demotic. Paulos Karatheodoris suggested measures to be taken by the Committee for the confrontation of demotic. He proposed firstly, that the books which were instructed in the schools should be checked closely and the ones which were written in demotic should be prohibited and secondly, the prohibition in instruction of any use of demotic spoken language. Other Committee members, however, suggested caution and stated that demotic should be only instructed in poetry and short stories. On the other hand, Al.Pantazis argued that in that case the prohibition of the teaching of poetry should take place in order to avoid bilingualism at schools. Moreover, P.Karatheodoris proposed the punishment of the teachers who would use the demotic language.¹⁴⁹

In a more compromised tone L.Limarakis replied to the above recommendations stressing that there was no need to regard the language issue as a very important one, as the only need was to inform the principals of the schools and to draw attention to the issue as well as to provide schools with the proper books in *Katharevousa*. Furthermore, the Inspector's reports had to be taken into an account as well as his observations regarding the use of demotic in Greek orthodox schools.¹⁵⁰

At that point the Inspector took the word and he commented that until now the Committee didn't give a lot of attention on this subject as it should, especially since he had in the past indicated teachers who were believed to be supporters of the demotic. He continued, saying that most of these teachers were acting rude to him and that was why he avoided making any comments to them. Nevertheless, he stressed that the Committee should take some action regarding the issue and it should punish them in order that disobedience would be suppressed.¹⁵¹

After the above session the Committee sent reports to the principals of the Greek orthodox schools¹⁵² in order to ask information on ‘whether there are any teachers in your schools who are *malliaroi* or they call themselves demotics, who use their position for the diffusion of these ideas to the students. Which actions of propaganda are taking place towards

¹⁴⁹ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 22th of October 1910, p.180.

¹⁵⁰ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 22th of October 1910, p.180.

¹⁵¹ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 22nd of October 1910, p.183.

¹⁵² Patriarchal Academy, Greek Commercial School of Halki, National School of Language and Commerce, National Greek-French School, Zografeion School, Zapeion Girl's School, Central Girl's School of Stayrodromi, Ioakeimeian Girl's School.

the students for this purpose inside or outside the schools, to what are they aiming for, who are the particular teachers and who are the students who adhere these ideas and how do they express these beliefs'.¹⁵³ It seems that no positive reply was received from the principals of the schools. Nevertheless, the Committee didn't consider the replies of the principals reliable and according to the Inspector's reports they called in some teachers¹⁵⁴ who were accused for using the demotic in their instructions, in order to defend themselves in the presence of the Committee's assembly.

The comments of the teachers were enlightening, especially because the complexity of the situation was revealed when it came to characterize someone as a supporter of demotic. Due to the fact that the accusations were posed even if the teachers had used only one word of demotic element in their instructions, a teacher replied with the coming comment: 'in the street all people are talking like that, are they going to be accused of being supporters of demotic?'¹⁵⁵ In another session a teacher, Nikos Sarris, was accused of using a word in demotic instead of *Katharevousa*. On this accusation, he commented that these distinctions were crazy and that in his teaching he was using the proper vocabulary according to his student's level of knowledge.¹⁵⁶ One teacher, Fotios Stamatiadis, who was expelled from teacher's profession, in the end, commented that although he supported the demotic and wrote in demotic, in his classes he was using the *Katharevousa* form, as he was expected to.¹⁵⁷ It is apparent that the teachers' replies were pacific; their behavior didn't include any provocations, as no clear attack on the use of *Katharevousa* occurred. Nonetheless, it has to be kept in mind that we are talking about teachers who were apologizing in front of their superiors, that is why they had to be careful with their words, so that they would not lose their positions.

Among the teachers who were accused of supporting the demotic, Alexis Zamarias, the principal of Zografeion School, was also a member of the Committee. Through the

¹⁵³ Reports of the PCEC, 9th March 1911, p.244.

¹⁵⁴ Teachers who were supporters of demotic: St.Stamatiadis from Stayrodromi, Ch.Deliannis, Dimtrios Damaskinos, G.Karatzas, F.Samanidis from Maraslio School, Naypliotis from the Boy's School in Mouxlio, Nikos Sarris, G.Papadopoulos, Xamoudopoulos from Diplokonio, I.Sfakianos from the Archigeneia, Strouthopoulos from the Bafoxwri(Resit Pasa), Al.Gerakopoulos, teachers who were accused of being supporters of demotic: Al.Zamarias from Zografeion, M.Aythentopoulos, A.Mazarakis from the Patriarchal Academy.

Reports of the PCEC, 13th July 1911, code 1043, p.334.

¹⁵⁵ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 29th of July 1911, p.278.

¹⁵⁶ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, film 15, 22nd of July 1911, p.353.

¹⁵⁷ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 8th of February 1912.

discussions, there emerged insinuations that a member of the Committee was an adherent of demotic, though no names were announced. However, during the hearings of the teachers accused of using demotic, Zamarias was also accused of being demotic friendly and that he and Dim.Sarros had edited the new program of the elementary schools in such a way that the demotic was apparent. In the hearing, Zamarias lucidly denied the accusations drawn on him, of being an adherent of demotic.

However, there is a comment made by him regarding the language which was spoken by people and the one which was written, stressing in a compact way the problem of the use of language during those times. He stated that: ‘the new language has many varieties and it is dexterous. In the written language we will never allow the use of types of this language (demotic), but in the spoken language this cannot be avoided.’ There was a reaction by the President of the Committee stating in a degradory way that this kind of language is a language of the village. However, Zamarias replied that: ‘this language which the President calls village language is the language which the people use when they talk. Not all people are *malliaroi*(adherents of demotic) for this reason’.¹⁵⁸ Nevertheless, the accusations on Zamarias were dropped as well as he continued to be a member of the Committee. On the other hand, the fate of the other teachers who were accused of using the demotic was different. Some of them were dismissed, some remained in their positions, others quit or others were transferred to other schools.¹⁵⁹

The above discussion as well as the comments made by the teachers when accused of using demotic in their instructions demonstrates the confusion which was prevailing concerning the form of language. As it has been mentioned before, the Greek orthodox millet was divided linguistically and that is why, as it is shown through the particular study, the Greek orthodox elite believed that there had to be a unified language in order to impose them a unified education and by extension a shared national consciousness. Nevertheless, we can claim that the teaching and the insistence on *Katharevousa* was at that time creating problems, firstly because it was a high complex language, difficult to learn and secondly, because the populations were preferring demotic in their verbal communication, since it was a more flexible language to be used. Because of this differentiation, between the spoken and the written language, it was difficult to confirm if someone was an adherent of demotic or not.

¹⁵⁸ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 17th August 1911, p.413-14.

¹⁵⁹ Reports of the PCEC, 8th February 1912, Code 1044, p.43.

Nonetheless, the fact that the Committee commenced these hearings shows that the form of language was an important issue for the Greek orthodox education. The preference for *Katharevousa* was connected with the classical orientation of the education in the Greek orthodox schools. This dedication to classicism and to linguistic archaism, displayed by the Greek orthodox community, seems to have been even stronger than in Athens. One example of this partisanship was the use of Homeric dialect on several inscriptions in Greek orthodox institutions, such as in the Church of Agia Triada. However, in order to demonstrate the complexity of the situation regarding the form of language, in a session of the Committee, there is a comment made by a teacher regarding the different types of *Katharevousa* which the newspapers of Istanbul and Athens were using as he stressed that: 'there are three types of *Katharevousa*; the archaic one, then the medium *Katharevousa*, which is used in the newspapers of Istanbul and then the complimentary *Katharevousa* which is used in the newspapers of Athens.¹⁶⁰

Nevertheless, the concentration on the linguistic archaism by the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul led to a stagnation of the development of contemporary literature and especially prosaic texts in the particular society.¹⁶¹ Moreover, the fact that the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul didn't provide a considerable number of literary men, as other Greek orthodox communities did, such as Alexandria, which embraced future prominent literary men, might be explained by the insistence of the Patriarchate and the Istanbul's community to *Katharevousa* and classical education.

Except of the above sessions of the Committee which dealt with the issue of language, we can also find a series of documents published in the *Ecclesiastical Truth*, in which the perceptions and attitudes of the Patriarchate and the community's leadership towards the language issue were demonstrated. First of all, there were several notifications of the Holy Synod, the PNMC, and the PCEC which declared their open hostility towards the use of the demotic in the Greek orthodox schools.¹⁶² In particular, on the 11th of June 1911, the PNMC published a circular in which it urged the principals of the orthodox schools to protect the students from the demotic language, as it also suggested a composition of a special committee

¹⁶⁰ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 29th July 1911, p.376.

¹⁶¹ Konstantinos Svolopoulos, *Constantinoupoli 1856-1922*, (Istanbul), Athens, Ekdotiki Athinon, 2006, p.62.

¹⁶² *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 16th October 1910, p.308.

which would deal with the protection of the students from the so called vulgar people. The PNMC even recommended a potential dismissal of the teachers who were supporters of the demotic language.¹⁶³

Additionally, the Patriarchate edited a circular in which it was urging the Metropolises to be careful with the diffusion of the demotic language as well as to take any measures possible against ‘‘vulgarism’’.¹⁶⁴ The language used in the particular circular was very harsh. This circular clearly reveals the connection between the language and religion which the Patriarchate was using in order to infuse national consciousness among the Orthodox millet. More detailed, it stressed that: ‘for our nation there is nothing more vital and honest than our common national language together with our faith, which constitute our bulwark of our national unity and existence’.¹⁶⁵ For the Patriarchate, these two elements were its ‘weapons’ in order to Hellenize the Orthodox millet, while *Katharevousa* was the most appropriate language to be used as it was more similar to the language of the scriptures and the church’s liturgies. Due to that, any attack to *Katharevousa* could be constructed as an attack on the Church.¹⁶⁶ That is the reason why in that circular it was stressed that the diffusion of the demotic could cause a significant damage to the ethnic and ecclesiastical interests.¹⁶⁷

In addition, Archimandrite Sofronios, the Inspector of schools by the P.C.E.C wrote a series of articles published under the title of ‘the Disaster of Vulgarism’ (*H Limi tou Chidaismou*). In these articles Arch. Sofronios attacked the demotic, the supporters of it as well as those intellectuals writers, like Ragkavis and Ioannis Psixaris who wrote at that time in demotic. Sofronios claimed that they were lacking any higher religious or national feeling and of which the only goal was the vulgarism of the language. He even, equalized the supporters of demotic with the Jesuits’ tactics as he stated that they followed the same means in order to proselytize people.¹⁶⁸ It is interesting to notice that the Patriarchal circles considered the promotion of demotic as of equal danger as the foreign schools and languages. As we have already seen, the teaching of foreign languages and the missionary schools were regarded as tactics of proselytizing which were jeopardizing the ethnic unity. The demotic

¹⁶³ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 11 of June 1911.

¹⁶⁴ Correspondence of Patriarchate, Code A’85, N.P.2600, 16th March 1911, p.129-30

¹⁶⁵ Correspondence of Patriarchate, Code A’85, N.P.2600, 16th March 1911, p.129-30.

¹⁶⁶ Peter Trudgill, “Greece and European Turkey:From Religious to linguistic identity”, p. 250.

¹⁶⁷ Correspondence of Patriarchate, Code A’85, N.P.2600, 16th March 1911, p.129-30.

¹⁶⁸ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 9th of October 1910, n.6, p.300-01.

language was similarly perceived as a threat to the national and religious unity as well as a cause for the linguistic vulgarism of the Greek language.¹⁶⁹

We have seen through the study that when comparing the attitudes and reactions of the Greek State to the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul regarding the language issue the conflict wasn't so open or severe. The violent riots regarding the language issue, such as the '*Evangelical*' or '*Oresteika*' events, which occurred in Athens weren't repeated in Istanbul. The fact that the Committee called in teachers to defend themselves on whether they were using the demotic shows that they were really concerned on the issue. Nevertheless, we see through the discussions that no immense disagreement occurred among them. Even when the teachers were admitting of being friendly towards the demotic they did not reject the use of *Katharevousa* in education.

The Committee considered the language issue an internal matter and there seems to be a tendency of compromise within the community as well as of keeping a low profile in order to solve the problem within the community without making it more public. Furthermore, taking into account the developments within the Ottoman Empire after the Revolution of the Young Turks in 1908 and the practices which they applied regarding the 'privileges' of the non-Muslim communities, it could be understood that the Greek orthodox community didn't want to cause additional tensions with the Ottoman State, but also within the Greek Orthodox community.

Moreover, the supporters of demotic did not seem to have a strong representation in the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul as they had in Greece. One reason for that might be the fact that the Greek orthodox community of Istanbul was a conservative one, even more conservative regarding *Katharevousa* and its use in education. *Katharevousa* was chosen to be the means to Hellenize the populations and as it has already been mentioned it was strongly identified with the Patriarchate as it was similar to the ecclesiastical language. Furthermore, the fact that the Greek orthodox millet was divided in terms of language could be a good explanation of the conservatism which characterized the Greek Orthodox community.

¹⁶⁹ *Ecclesiastical Truth*, 19th February 1911, n.8, p.49-50.

Moreover, we have seen through the study that both the Patriarchate and the Greek orthodox community were severely supporting the use of *Katharevousa* and were considering it a mean to unify the Greek orthodox millet as well as for the continuation of their nation, which comes into contradiction with Peter Trudgill's distinction between the terms *Hellenismos* and *Romiosini*. Peter Trudgill indicates two types of Greek national identity which prevailed, the Hellenic identity which was associated with the classical and ancient Greek past and which he connects it with the support of *Katharevousa* and the Romaic identity which stressed the Byzantine past, was connected with the Orthodox mysticism and supported demotic.¹⁷⁰ The Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox community were strongly linked with the Romaic identity, as they perceived themselves as the descendants of the Byzantines. Nevertheless, it seems through the particular study that the official policy of the Patriarchate as well as of the PCEC was opposed to the use of the demotic in an even more conservative way than the Greek State. Additionally, it seems precarious to draw such strict distinctions among so vague orientations such as *Hellenismos* and *Romiosini*, especially during those times when the overlapping of identities was something common.

Furthermore, the fact that the two centers of Hellenic identity, the Greek State and the Patriarchate, chose the particular language for their official language but also to be used in education is an action which shows the intention to homogenize a whole through a language even when the language is spoken by the few. According to Hobsbawm, when a resuscitation of dead languages or of almost extinct languages occurs which can lead to the invention of new ones, there is an evident politico ideological element in this process of the language construction,¹⁷¹ something which could be applied to the case of *Katharevousa* and the way it was perceived and used by the Patriarchate. Nevertheless, he argues that the linguistic nationalisms are most of the times in need of a state control or at least of a winning of an official recognition¹⁷², something which applies to the case of the Greek State. As far as it concerns the Greek orthodox community, it was actually the Patriarchate from which the predominance of the *Katharevousa* emanated. Nonetheless, the power of the two centers cannot be compared with each other, because of the different administrative status they had and maybe this is an explanation on the more vigorous conservatism of Istanbul.

¹⁷⁰ Peter Trudgill, p.248-49.

¹⁷¹ Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1992, p.111.

¹⁷² Idib, p.110.

Nonetheless, *Katharevousa* had a disadvantage as it was a difficult and rigid language but, on the other hand it was favored as it was considered to be the language of tradition and culture.¹⁷³ In addition, the insistence of the Greek orthodox community and in this case of the Committee on the use of *Katharevousa* in education has to be though together with the orientation of the Greek Orthodox education, which was a classical one.¹⁷⁴ Nevertheless, taking into account the linguistic confusion which prevailed during those times among the orthodox millet, the insistence on teaching in *Katharevousa* simply compounded it even more, as the swift from Turkish to Greek was becoming more difficult through the use of *Katharevousa*.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ Elli Skopetea, *Oi Hellines kai oi Exthroi tous*, H Katastasi tou Ethnous stis arces tou 20 ou aiona, (The Greeks and their enemies), (History of Greece 20th century), Athens, Vivliorama, 1999.

p. 26.

¹⁷⁴ See Chapter 4.

¹⁷⁵ Richard Clogg, ‘A Millet within a Millet’, p.130.

CHAPTER IV

The orientation of the education and the role of Greek language

As it has been already analyzed in Chapter 2, in which the issue of the teaching of foreign languages in Greek orthodox schools was discussed, the Greek orthodox community was giving major importance to the use of the Greek language at schools. All those strict policies, which were applied regarding the instruction of foreign languages and the Committee's hesitant attitude concerning this issue, is indicative for the perceived "weakness" of the Greek language among the members of the Greek millet. In other words, the insistence on teaching Greek demonstrated the state of linguistic division among the members of the Greek orthodox community as well as its political instrumentality for Hellenizing the community through education.

Furthermore, the Greek orthodox ruling elite in its effort to Hellenize the community linguistically was giving a priority to the teaching of Greek language and classical texts over other teaching subjects, such as practical and technical ones like natural sciences. Moreover, the Committee was trying to establish a unified education at all schools, a practice which demonstrates the intention of unifying the community through education. Lastly, the status of the Zografeion School and its program was becoming central through the years for the Committee, since this school had too much of a practical orientation than the Committee wished. Through the discussions regarding the Zografeion's program, the educational orientation which the Committee aimed to establish is clearly revealed.

We observe extensive discussions at the Committee regarding the status of elementary schools. In connection with the issue of the application of French and Turkish at elementary schools which has been already stressed, the Committee also discussed about the application of the Greek language, the mother tongue. There were concerns regarding the method and the hours of teaching, while the importance they gave to the teaching of Greek was stressed. A member of the Committee, Athanasios Spatharis in 1899 was stressing that “for the education of the character of the student the important element is the mother tongue, all the others are secondary vis-à-vis what you acquire through the learning of the mother tongue.”¹⁷⁶ The above comment confirms the predominant role which the Committee paid to the teaching of the Greek language at the schools.

Since the second half of the 19th century a transformation took place of the way language was perceived. In other words, language gradually became an essential mean to infuse the sense of identity and belonging to the people. In the case of the Greek Orthodox community the one who was to speak Greek would eventually feel that he/she belonged to the Greek Orthodox community. Due to this change of perception regarding the language, it was very important for the students to learn Greek very well. While the Committee stressed the significance of teaching Greek, this major emphasis at the same time confirmed that the Greek Orthodox millet was splintered off linguistically, so that there had to be certain efforts in order to achieve a linguistic homogenization.

In order to stress the linguistically critical situation of the community, members of the Committee used to make comparisons with the language conditions in Europe and often gave selective examples with the aim to underline the crucial differences between European nations and the Greek Orthodox millet or also in order to support their arguments. We can see this in the following comment of Chamuledas. Chamudelas, a lay member while discussing the teaching of the Greek language in elementary schools commented that: “the other nations have one language when they enter the schools, the French or the German, but the Greek has its own language in a distorted form, that is why he has to learn it.”¹⁷⁷ The above comment demonstrates firstly the fact that probably these people were aware of the historical evolutions in Europe which in turn shows their cultural and educational level in terms of their information and secondly, the realization of the differences which might exist between the

¹⁷⁶ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1041, 8th September 1899, p.103

¹⁷⁷ Reports of the PCEC, code, 8th September 1899, p.103.

European countries and the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, it could be claimed that the notion of an ideal Europe was mostly promulgated by European nation states, as it was accepted by non-European ones. In addition, the fact that the concern of the Committee regarding the situation of the Greek language within the Greek Orthodox community was stressed can also reveal the intention of using the European ideal prototype as a means to homogenize the Greek orthodox community in terms of language.

In 1910 a decision was taken by the Committee to revise the programs of the elementary schools and to edit a general program for the secondary schools for both boys' and girls'. For that purpose a special committee, which was composed of the principal of the Patriarchal Academy, Metropolitan Sardeon Michael Kleovoulos, the principal of Zografeion School, Alexis Zamarias, the principal of the Greek Commercial Schools of Chalki, Nikos Kapetanakis, the principal of Zappeion School, Efthalia Adam, the principal of Ioakeimion Girls' School, Erietta Konstantinidou and the principal of Central Girl' school, Smaragda Xatzi-Dai was constituted.¹⁷⁸

In the reports of that special committee it was stressed that for the edition of the programs of the schools the following points have to be taken into consideration: a) the teaching of the Greek language to the non-Greek speaking Greeks, b) the time of the application of ancient Greek and the method of teaching, c) the determination of the years of study in elementary and secondary schools, d) the consideration of the special needs of the provinces regarding education in order to apply in an easier way the common programs.¹⁷⁹

There are several important points in the above report which demonstrate the orientation of the Greek orthodox education. Firstly, by stressing the fact that the Committee had to focus on the teaching of Greek to the non-Greek speaking Greeks, it is verified that the element of language was not the first element in order to characterize someone as Greek. It was also the fact that after the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, the populations who remained under the Patriarchate's authority were considered 'Greeks' without any other criterion such as language.¹⁸⁰ Furthermore, by emphasizing the need to

¹⁷⁸ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 26th January 1910, p.76.

¹⁷⁹ Reports of the PCEC, code 1043, 9th March 1910, p.91.

¹⁸⁰ Paris Konortas, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis*, p.307

teach Greek to those who did not speak reveals the Patriarchate's and the Greek Orthodox community's policies of Hellenizing linguistically the Orthodox millet.

The linguistic sensitivity of the Patriarchate went hand in hand with the nationalist rivalry and hostility with the Bulgarian community in the Balkans. Following the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate there emerged a fierce struggle between the Greeks and the Bulgarians concerning the partitioning of Orthodox parishes of the rural Balkan regions. According to, the *firman* of 1870 concerning the foundation of the Exarchate the will of the two third of the Orthodox population of a *kaza* in the Balkans would suffice to change their church membership from the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate to the Exarchate. This stipulation was a major source for bloody confrontations among Greek and Bulgarian militant bands to secure the allegiance of the local Orthodox populations.¹⁸¹ In this context, we can comprehend the content of a correspondence between the Patriarchate and the Metropolis *Mesimvrias*, where *Mesimvrias* was stressing the need for Greek teachers in order to replace the Bulgarian instructors of a village named *Aspro* (*White*). It was also claimed that the Bulgarian instructors were preventing the children from the Orthodox Church and from their religious duties. The letter was sent in order to inform the Patriarchate for the situation and to take action.¹⁸² As we have already stressed the Bulgarian Issue was approached by the Patriarchate in ecclesiastical terms that is why we may see here again that the element of religion remains strong in the process of the formation of the ethnic identity.

This anxiety of the Metropolis regarding the Bulgarian instructors could be also explained when thinking the Ottoman State's policies regarding the Bulgarian Exarchate. In detail, on the 13th of December 1896 (8 *Receb* 1314) an instruction, the *Vilâyât-i Şâhâne Maârif Müdîrlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Tâlimât* was declared by the Ottoman State concerning the duties of the educational directors in the provinces. The article 14 was declaring that the founder of the non Muslim schools and the director could be only the person whose religion denomination had a majority in the local community.¹⁸³ The above instruction created a lot of reactions in the Patriarchate and certainly played a significant role in making language an important element of identity among the members of the Orthodox millet. This was a reason that the Patriarchate chose to diffuse the Greek language among the

¹⁸¹ See Fikret Adanır; *Die Makedonische Frage. Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung bis 1908*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, 1979, in Somel Aksin, *Modernization*.

¹⁸² Correspondence of the Patriarchate, Code A'73, num. of protocol 6214, 9th October 1901, p.352-53.

¹⁸³ Aksin Somel, 'Dans', p.197.

Orthodox populations in order to keep more people under its flock. Because of that we see that the teaching of Greek to non-speaking Greek was essential for the Committee and by extension for the Patriarchate.

Going back to the report of the special committee, it appears to be that the time of application and the teaching method of ancient Greek did concern the Committee to a considerable degree. Ancient Greek was the language which, they believed, was connecting them with the ancient and classical Greek past and that was the reason why they considered the knowledge of it very important in order to Hellenize the Orthodox millet. The last point of the committee's report was referring to the provinces. One of the most important issues which the Committee was discussing through the years was the application of a unified education in the Greek-Orthodox schools. In that aspect, there was a need to expand their activities to the provinces. In order to succeed they had to take into consideration the provincial conditions and needs so that the application of a unified education would be successful. The local Orthodox populations of the Balkans or Anatolia displayed varying needs which had to be satisfied by understanding the particular local conditions of the provincial areas.

The teaching of the Greek language was extremely important for the Committee and an example which demonstrates that was the issue of the National French-Greek School of *Vancelot*. The particular school had applied to the Committee for being supervised, but the Committee put forward certain preconditions which the school had to comply with in order to be able to be recognized. The Committee's concern was focused on the issue regarding the teaching of the French language vis-à-vis the teaching of the Greek language. Archimandrite Dimitrios Georgiadis commented that there ought to be a clarification as to whether the school was a French one, which was teaching also Greek or a Greek one teaching French. The Committee was very careful with the instruction of languages at schools, taking into consideration the amount of hours which were applied, as it expected a predomination of the Greek language in the schools in order for them to be recognized as Greek orthodox ones.¹⁸⁴

The Committee discussions concerning the National French-Greek School of *Vancelot* illustrate also the importance which was paid on the issue of classical education by the Greek elite. The Inspector of the Committee stated that: "in that particular school, students come

¹⁸⁴ Reports of the PCEC, code 1045, 6th November 1913, p.48

from technical schools, who could not succeed in being promoted in that schools. These students were accepted and promoted in that particular school which is a classical one. How do they promote students who lack in encyclopedic knowledge and who have no knowledge of the Latin language?”¹⁸⁵ The pragmatic and natural scientific orientation of schools seem to have been considered as inferior to the classical orientation since it lacked a certain type of humanistic knowledge which was considered to be essential. Moreover, the fact that a school didn’t instruct the Latin language was considered to be insufficient according to the Committee.

The classical orientation of the Greek orthodox schools can also be seen through the study of the school curricula, in which the teaching of Greek was unquestionably dominant. In the programs of the elementary boys’ schools of Istanbul of 1897¹⁸⁶, the weekly hours of instruction for Greek language and literature were seventy for all class levels while the mathematics were twenty, Geometry one, Commerce two, Religion sixteen, Turkish ten and a half and French ten and a half.¹⁸⁷

In the girls’ schools the situation was mostly the same; the most important difference appears to be the absence of the teaching of Turkish. Despite the fact that French was instructed at girls’ schools Turkish was not present. The reason for that might be the status of the Greek Orthodox women in the Ottoman society. Another factor is that the Greek Orthodox community did not regard the knowledge of Turkish as something important to be included in the curriculum of the elementary schools in a dominant way. The reason for that was that they believed that the knowledge of Turkish which was in need of for the students could be acquired through interaction in every day life. The fact that Turkish instruction was absent in girls’ schools might demonstrate the private life of Greek orthodox women. In other words, if women didn’t have public life they didn’t need Turkish. On the other hand, French was the language of the upper classes, the knowledge of it offered a higher level of status among the society and that was probably the reason why it was included in the curriculum of the Girls’ schools. In addition to the priority given to the teaching of French in the Girls’ schools it has to be mentioned that during the second half of the nineteenth century there was a debate in the Greek Orthodox community regarding the private-public dichotomy of the lives of men and

¹⁸⁵ Reports of the PCEC, code 1045, 6th November 1913, p.49

¹⁸⁶ The same program was verified also in 1907.

¹⁸⁷ For the analytical program see table 2

women, as the boundaries of the private life of the women were extended gradually.¹⁸⁸ Nevertheless, the education of the Greek orthodox women continued to be limited and partial on educating good wives and mothers, in the same aspect as Muslim women were educated in Istanbul during those times.¹⁸⁹

An important issue for the Committee which preoccupied it several times through the years was the Zografeion School and the status of it. The Zografeion School was a gymnasium in Pera and it was one of the most important Greek orthodox schools. The problem of the Committee was the educational orientation of the school which was a mainly pragmatic one, which stood in contrast to the classical education which the Committee was promoting.

In 1902, as it has been already mentioned previously, a discussion took place in the Committee about whether the community of Pera had the right to be autonomous and especially, in terms of its educational issues, following the establishment of the Committee. The argument of the side of the community of Pera was the fact that the Zografeion School had revised its program in 1892 without the approval of the Committee and continued to apply it until 1902, when the discussion took place. The main problem was not only the fact that this school was displaying disobedience towards the Committee as it didn't follow the proper procedures but also the fact that its curriculum was rather pragmatic and natural scientific and not so strict classical oriented. In the same Committee session, Metropolitan Michael Kleovoulos commented that in the Zografeion School course hours for religious instruction at the higher classes were insufficient and indeed even these hours were wasted due to the absence of teachers or celebrations. Therefore the Metropolitan suggested an increase of the course hours for religious instruction. As a result, the Committee recommended a close scrutiny of the curricula of Zografeion in order to decide whether the curriculum was needed to be revised.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ Charis Echsertzoglou, *The Cultural Uses Of Consumption; Negotiating Class, Gender and Nation in the Ottoman Urban Centers in the 19th Century*, Int.J. Middle East Studies 35, USA, 2003, p.85-89.

¹⁸⁹ For more, see: Fanny Davis, *The Ottoman Lady. A Social History From 1718 to 1918*, New York;Westport Conn.; London: Greenwood Press, 1986, p.45-60 and Berrak Burcak 'The Status of the Elite Muslim Women in Istanbul under the Reign of Sultan Abdülhamid 2nd (1876-1908), (Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara:Bilkent University, 1997), *Deconstructing images of "the Turkish Woman"*, ed. Zehra F. Arat, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

¹⁹⁰ Reports of the PCEC, 1st of July 1902, p.375.

In 1910, while the curricula of the Zografeion School was criticized anew by the Committee, the Inspector stressed that there was an indication of a decrease of the hours which were instructed in the Greek language and as he pointed out, there was also an attempt to omit the instruction of the archaic elements of the language. The Inspector even stated analytically the program and the hours of the curricula of all the classes, as well as the alterations which he claimed to be detrimental for classical education.¹⁹¹ Previously, another discussion occurred in 1908 concerning the same institution where it was stressed the fact that there wasn't any teaching of the Latin language while physics and mathematics were dominant.¹⁹² Needless to say that, the orientation of the program was perceived as unacceptable by the Committee.

The criticisms of the Committee concerning the Zografeion School reached a level, when in 1910 Alexis Pantazis cited the anarchy which supposedly existed in Zografeion concerning its educational orientation. He claimed that: "even if there isn't any difference in the program of Zografeion there is indeed great anarchy. For ten years until now the program of Stayrodromi has changed rapidly like an everyday cloth".¹⁹³ Through this comment, the member of the Committee displayed his anger about the fact that the community of Pera and in particular Zografeion was changing their educational orientations continually, without taking any permission from the Committee. At the same time there was real worry that rapid changes in the curricula of the Zografeion School could create problems in the cultural and national orientation of the students.

A comment, made by Reverend M. Katixitis, a member of the Committee, concerning the issue of pragmatic-natural scientific education demonstrates the concern of the Committee towards natural scientific and technical-oriented schools and the connection they established with the classically oriented schools. Katixidis's concern was that the increase of the schools with natural scientific and pragmatic education could put a check on the impetus of the classical education.¹⁹⁴ Pragmatic-oriented schools were regarded as a threat to the classical education and to the teaching of Greek language and of ancient Greek culture. The reason for this worry was the perception among some of the Committee members of the classical education as a mean to inculcate a common ethnic consciousness which the Greek orthodox

¹⁹¹ See Table 1, cited in the Reports of the PCEC, 17th December 1910, code 1043, p.213.

¹⁹² Reports of the PCEC 29th July 1908, code 1042, p.388.

¹⁹³ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 3rd of December 1910, p.211.

¹⁹⁴ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 20th April 1911, p.258

community was in need of. An important part of the Greek-Orthodox elite believed that a pragmatic orientation of education could not be harmonized with the main political goal of Hellenizing linguistically and culturally the orthodox millet.

However, there were also some Committee members, mostly laymen, who had a less categorical attitude concerning pragmatic-natural scientific education, and even underlined the importance of such an orientation. One among these laymen, Leonidas Limarakis, during a Committee session stressed that the programs of schools were normally organized according to the social circumstances and needs. He even supported his argument through statistics as he stated that in general even in Europe there were few students studying at classical gymnasiums and that for example in Istanbul from among 17.000 students only 2.000 were continuing at gymnasiums, as the rest were working. That was the reason why he stressed the need to include into the curricula of the Greek schools courses with practical knowledge so that students could be prepared in the course of their education for the contemporary socio-economic demands.¹⁹⁵

The particular comments and the concerns of the lay members regarding the social and economical circumstances could be understood as a conflict of interests and perceptions between the clergy and the laymen. The Zografeion School and in extension the community of Pera was representing the newly emerging bourgeois class of the Greek Orthodox community, consisting of merchants, bankers, lawyers, doctors, etc. As the social and economical level of the Greek orthodox community was rising, there emerged an increasing need of a more practical education in order to provide the market with the demanded professions. Due to these conditions, the classical education which was provided by most of the existing Greek Orthodox schools was considered to be unsatisfactory.

These discussions within the Committee reveal us the divergence of the opinions of the laymen and the clergy. It could be claimed that the clergy insisted on a more classical and religious oriented education as the laity on a more practical and natural scientific one. The Zografeion School was the main representative model of the lay's perceptions of modern education. That was the reason why that particular school received the above reactions from the Committee. It appears to be that the Patriarchate wished to establish a full control over the

¹⁹⁵ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 20th April 1911, p.258

particular school and the community as a whole, a goal which at that time seemed difficult, as the power of the laity had increased within the millet. However, it seems that the Patriarchate, eventually, was forced to comply with the educational orientation of the Zografeion School. One reason for the compliance might be that the Patriarchate was considering the existence of the Zografeion School as necessary for keeping students away from the missionary schools or other private ones, where they would not be able to control the students and the instructors of these institutions. Moreover, the clergymen could not stay uninfluenced in front of the social and economical evolutions and demands of those times and that is why sooner or latter they complied with the new perceptions and accepted the combination of the classical and pragmatical orientation of the Greek orthodox schools.

It appears clearly in this study that the Greek elite gave a great importance in the classical oriented education of the Greek Orthodox community. It was an education in which the Greek language would be dominant, through which the ethnic consciousness could be inculcated among the orthodox millet in a direct way, which it needed. The Patriarchate supported strongly the application of the Greek language in the schools in order to Hellenize the orthodox millet. This particular action could be straightforwardly regarded as an identification of the Patriarchate and of the Greek orthodox community with Greek nationalism. However, this quick assumption can be recognized as an easy and a rather superficial approach when taking into account the complicated era we are dealing with. The fact that the Patriarchate was supporting the use of the Greek language in education – and it was also its official language – does not in effect mean that it supported also the Greek nationalism, at least until some point of time and by going through certain procedures and alterations. In other words, the political scene of the time as well as the transformations which took place regarding the organization of the orthodox millet has to be taken into consideration.

Charis Echsertzoglou, favors the idea that the Patriarchate used the Greek language as a part of the orthodox tradition and not so much as an indication of its ethnic orientations.¹⁹⁶ Moreover, the Patriarchate was not actually fond of any ethnic orientations as nationalism, because it was nationalism which was undermining its ecumenical character. Besides, the European model of nation state was contradicting with the millet system, a system into which

¹⁹⁶ Charis Echsertzoglou, ‘To Pronomiako Zitima’, p.80

the Patriarchate was well integrated. Nevertheless it has to be mentioned that the above assumption could be accurate only until a certain time. Following the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, certain differentiations started to take place gradually within the Greek orthodox community. The practices of the Young Turks regarding the unification of the millets as well as the attempts of eliminating the ‘privileges’ of the Patriarchate initiated a change in the attitudes and eventually led the Greek orthodox community to turn towards the Greek State. It is also a confirming fact that during the elections of 1912 in the Ottoman Parliament, the Greek State interfered regarding the selection of the candidates, who were eventually submitted by the Patriarchate to the Young Turk government.¹⁹⁷

Another incident which initiated changes in the Orthodox millet and the way the Patriarchate was functioning was the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1860 and its recognition by the Patriarchate in 1872.¹⁹⁸ The fact that the Ottoman State approached the appearance of the Bulgarian Exarchate as a political issue and intentionally undermined the religious character of the issue, the particular attitude had as a result that the conflict would be perceived as one of ethnic character between Greek identity and the Bulgarian identity than a conflict between the two religious institutions of the Greek Patriarchate and the Exarchate.¹⁹⁹ Nevertheless, the Hellenization of the Orthodox millet was a long procedure which had started since the late 18th century, as the Greek elite which participated in the establishment of the Greek State in the beginning of the 19th century, was a product of this procedure. Moreover, even the Bulgarian nationalism has been received as a reaction toward the Hellenization of the Orthodox millet. However, the approach of the Ottoman State towards the issue of the Bulgarian Exarchate certainly played its role and it could be assumed that it urged the final identification of the Patriarchate with the Greeks.²⁰⁰

Furthermore, while the Ottoman Empire was loosing territories, the Patriarchate simultaneously was also loosing people from his flock. Due to this process and also due to the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the Patriarchate’s flock ended up to be consisted of mostly Greeks, something which initiated the Patriarchate to start connecting itself with the

¹⁹⁷ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.481, for more see Caterina Boura, *The Greek Millet in Turkish Politics: Greeks in the Ottoman Parliament(1908-1918)*, in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism* Dimitris Gondikas and Charles Issawi, , Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

¹⁹⁸ See Dimitrios Stamatopoulos, *Metarythmisi kai Ekkosmikeusi*, Alexandreia, Athens, 2003, Matalas Paraskevas, *Ethnos kai Orthodoxy*, (Nation and Orthodoxy), Irakleio, Publications of University of Crete, 2003.

¹⁹⁹ Charis Echsertzoglou, ‘To Pronomiako Zitima’, p.76-77.

²⁰⁰ Ibid, p.76-77

Greek identity. Additionally, the Bulgarians prefixed as an argument for their secession from the Patriarchate, the Hellenization of the Orthodox millet.

I think that the particular identification of the Patriarch with the Greek identity should be more thought in terms of cultural identification rather than a political one. One reason for that was that an identification of the Patriarchate with a certain nation was regarded as incompatible to its ecumenical character. As Paris Konortas also claims, the affiliation of the Patriarchate with the Greek culture and language was more in cultural terms rather than national ones. The Patriarchate had an ecumenical orientation which was difficult to coexist with the notion of nationalism. The nationalist movements in the Balkans were not perceived in an enthusiastically spirit by the Patriarchate and one example could be the attitude of the Patriarchate toward the Greek War of Independence in 1821, which was negative.²⁰¹ Nevertheless, there has to be always a reserve as the Patriarchate was a political institution and was acting according to circumstances. When the Bulgarian Exarchate was founded, the Patriarchate denounced this development as being nationalistic (*fyletismos*). The official denounce of the *fyletismos*, that is to say the distinction according to ethnicity, by the Patriarchate occurred in 1872 with the simultaneously denunciation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. Nevertheless, Paraskevas Matalas argues that the promulgation of the schism was more a symbolic action through which the character and the borders of the Hellenism were re determined.²⁰² It was through the total denounce of the Bulgarian Exarchate that a community was determined as well as its enemies.

On the other hand, the historian Theodore Papadopoulos stresses the fact that most of the high ranking clergy were Greeks due to the official language of the Church, which was Greek and not that the Patriarchate had a national Greek character.²⁰³ On the contrary, it is a fact in the long term that the Patriarchate started to be identified with the Greek nationalism. But even then the Patriarchate did not reject and forget its ecumenical character.²⁰⁴ For this gradual identification with Greek nationalism factors such as the now predominantly Greek-speaking flock, the existence of the Greek State, the promulgation of the National Regulations of 1860-62 which provided a gradual secularization of the communal administration, the

²⁰¹ Patriarch Gregorios V anathematized the Greek war of Independence in 1821.

²⁰² Paraskevas Matalas, *Ethnos kai Orthodoxia, Oi Peripeties mias Sxesis. Apo to 'Elladiko' sto Boulgariko Sxisma*, (Nation and Orthodoxy, The Adventures of A Relationship. From the 'Greek' to the Bulgarian Schism), Irakleio, Publications of the University of Crete, 2003, p.346.

²⁰³ Theodore Papadopoulos, *The Greek Church and the people*, p. 150.

²⁰⁴ Paris Konortas, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis*, p. 309-310

relationship between gradual secularization and ethnic nationalism as well as the policies of Young Turks played a significant role.

In this context the factor of the Greek State should be discussed more closely. In other words, the establishment of the Greek State has influenced the Greek orthodox community to a considerable extent. Following the foundation of the Greek State a strong relationship developed between the Greeks of the Greek State (*elladites*) and the Greek subjects of the Ottoman Empire. The fact that both centers, the Patriarchate and the Greek State, shared the same official language, the same religious creed as well as a common historical memory created a complex bond between them. However, this bond had a variety of traits, cooperative as well as antagonistic. It was rather the co-existence of these two qualitatively rather different centers, the Patriarchate as the head of a religious community or millet and the Greek State as the embodiment of the Greek nation which rendered the situation rather complex.²⁰⁵

It cannot be denied the fact that members of the Greek orthodox community were influenced by the national movements in the Balkans, as they lived so close to various Balkan nationalities and were aware of the Bulgarian and Serbian nationalist activities. Even more, the existence of a Greek State could not but awaken national feelings among the Greek population.²⁰⁶ The Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-1878 and the independence of Romania and Serbia as well as the foundation of the autonomous Bulgarian Principality only helped to intensify separatist aspirations among different Balkan populations. Despite these developments the final quarter of the 19th century and following the Young Turk Revolution in particular witnessed also the prevalence of different political ideas among the Greek orthodox community of the Ottoman Empire in addition to the identification with Greek nationalism. The historian Vangelis Kechriotis argues that there were rather two groups existing in the Greek orthodox community at those times, the one supporting the idea of identifying the nation with a state according to modern times' perceptions and the second one which supported a political antagonism between ethnicities within a state but without a need

²⁰⁵ Elli Skopetea, *Oi Ellines kai oi exthroi tous*, p. 16.

²⁰⁶ Gerasimos Augoustinos, *Consciousness and History: National critics of the Greek Society 1897-1914*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1977, p. 188.

to be a nation state.²⁰⁷ The second group described was the one supporting the idea of Greek Ottomanism.

Sia Anagnostopoulou points out that Greek Ottomanism included two dimensions, namely political and cultural. In political terms, Greek Ottomanism supported the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, as it was the one from which their power rose, and in cultural terms it was identifying itself with Greekness.²⁰⁸ We have to keep in mind that during those times, Athens was trying to increase its political influence within the Ottoman Empire through networks of education and associations, while the powerful middle class of the urban Greek Orthodox of Istanbul, despite trying to Hellenize the Orthodox millet, was confronting the nationalist tensions which the Greek state was creating within the borders of the Ottoman Empire.²⁰⁹

Due to the above mentioned factors it appears that the Greekness of the Greek Orthodox community wasn't identified so much with the Greek State but was regarded rather as a part of the Greek-Ottoman identity. According to Sia Anagnostopoulou, it was only after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 that the identification of the Greek Orthodox of Istanbul and the Patriarchate with the Greek State becomes stronger.²¹⁰

A crucial component of Greek Ottomanism was the worry concerning Balkan nationalist activities and the expansion Bulgarian political influence in Macedonia in particular. This worry expressed itself in the foundation of a secret organization; the Society of Constantinople (*Organosis Konstantinoupoleos*) founded by Athanasios Souliotis-Nikolaidis and Ion Dragoumis. The Society was established in 1906 and its original goal was the confrontation of the Bulgarian expansion in Macedonia and Thrace through the center of the Ottoman Empire, Istanbul. This 'secret' society was supported by some of the most powerful and prominent members of the Greek Orthodox community, which upheld the ideology of Greek Ottomanism. However, the way the Greek orthodox elites of Istanbul treated the founders of the SC was often becoming ambivalent, because of the perception that they were mostly promoting the interests of the Greek State.²¹¹ Following the Young Turk

²⁰⁷ Vangelis Kechriotis, 'Greek-Orthodox', p.70-71.

²⁰⁸ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p. 304

²⁰⁹ Ibid, p.305

²¹⁰ Ibid, p.305.

²¹¹ Vangelis Kechriotis, 'Greek-Orthodox',p.56.

Revolution and especially after 1910, this society became mainly identified with the idea of Greek Ottomanism, as many members of the Greek Orthodox of Istanbul cooperated with the S.C.²¹² However, the influence and power of the SC did not last long as eventually the Greek Orthodox members of Istanbul cooperated with the Greek state.

The existence of such an organization in Istanbul and the cooperation of the members of the Greek orthodox community with it could demonstrate the existence of a certain relationship which existed between the two centers of Hellenism, the Patriarchate and the Greek State. Nonetheless, Athanasios Souliotis the main founder of the S.C. supported the peaceful co-existence of the Greeks with the Turks which, as he believed, would result in the ‘Hellenization of the Ottoman Empire’.²¹³ The notion of the “Hellenization of the Ottoman Empire” emerged as a result of factors such as the general ambivalence of the political situation in the final decades of the empire and the uncertainty of the future of the Young Turk regime. Thus, the Greek orthodox of Ottoman Empire believed that they could Hellenize the Empire from inside. They believed that they were the only ones who could guarantee for a transformation of the Ottoman Empire to a Western State, because they considered themselves as the only authentic westerns within the Ottoman Empire.²¹⁴

However, in the long run the idea of Greek Ottomanism didn’t have any chance and in the end the Ottoman Empire was dissolved. Following the Revolution of 1908 the Greek orthodox and the non-Muslims in general believed that the Young Turks supported the ideology of providing equal rights to all citizens regardless of their religion (*isopoliteia*). However, the Young Turks following the Balkan Wars in particular, pursued a nationalistic policy toward the homogenization of the other ethnicities of the Ottoman Empire and the unification of them in a Turkish nation.²¹⁵

When dealing with this era it has to be kept in mind that this was a very complicated time where structural changes were rapid and the orientation of the people rather complex. The Greek Orthodox community seems to have been deeply divided in terms of political

²¹² Athanasios Souliotis-Nikolaidis, *Organosis Constantinoupoleos*, (Society of Istanbul), edited by Thanos Veremis and Katerina Boura, Athens-Ioannina, Dodoni, 1984, p.23

²¹³ Ibid., p.11.

²¹⁴ Elli Skopetea, ‘*Oi Ellines*’, p.28

²¹⁵ For more on the Young Turks policies, see Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks: The Committee of the Union and Progress in Turkish Politics 1908-1914*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969, Sükrü Hanioğlu, *Preparation for Revolution. The Young Turks 1902-1908.*, New York, Oxford U.P., 2001, Sükrü Hanioğlu, *The Young Turks in Opposition*, New York, Oxford, U.P., 1995.

perspectives. In addition to the ones who supported the notion of Greek Ottomanism, there were some members of the Greek Orthodox community who actually continued to support the CUP. They were Greek parliamentarians who took side with the Unionists in the 1912 elections.²¹⁶

In other words, the Greek Orthodox community experienced diverging political perceptions as well as an overlapping of identities.²¹⁷ A good example of the overlapping of identities is Paulos Karolidis, a history professor in the University of Athens and a parliamentarian of the Ottoman Parliament in 1909. He was of Ottoman origins, from Izmir but, at the same time his citizenship was Greek. Therefore, Feroz Ahmad's argument about the rather monolithic character of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul, which identified itself politically with Athens, appears to be unlikely.²¹⁸ On the contrary, at that time, it was sometimes becoming very difficult to determine in a clear way whether someone was a Greek or an Ottoman Greek. Besides ideological attitudes, it was also a matter of financial interests, as many Greek Orthodox people were shifting between Greek and Ottoman citizenships according to financial "necessities" to ensure tax exemptions.²¹⁹

However, coming back to the issue of the use of the Greek language in the Greek Orthodox schools and the significance it had to infuse among the people common ethnic consciousness a particular discussion has to be quoted. As already discussed in Chapter Three of this study, a major issue of intra-communal disagreement was on the use of *Katharevousa* and demotic at schools, where the Committee interrogated those teachers who were accused of using demotic during instruction. During those hearings a conversation occurred between a member of the Committee and a teacher, Fotios Sampanidis, of the community of Pera which reveal us the tactics of constructing the Greek Orthodox identity. During this interrogation, Sampanidis was not only accused for using the demotic in his classes but he was also accused that through his teaching, he was weakening the ethnic identity of his students. The Committee member, Paulos Karatheodoris, asked him if he was teaching the name 'Rum' as

²¹⁶ For more see, Catherine Boura, "The Greek Millet in Turkish Politics: Greeks in the Ottoman Parliament(1908-1918)", in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, edited by Dimitris Gondikas and Charles Issawi, , Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

²¹⁷ The term is used in Vangelis Kechriotis, *Greek Orthodox, Ottoman Greek or Just Greek? Theories of coexistence in the aftermath of the Young Turk Revolution.*

²¹⁸ Feroz Ahmad, "Unionist Relations with the Greek, Armenian and Jewish Communities of the Ottoman Empire 1908-1919" in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*.

²¹⁹ Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Mikra Asia*, p.312

an ethnic name instead of the name ‘Greek’. It is noteworthy to quote here the discussion in order to show the perceptions of that time towards ethnicity.²²⁰

After that accusation Sampanidis replied:” in my class I ask my students ‘which language are we using in our houses?’ three students reply ‘Rumca’ (Romeika), a fourth one replies ‘Greek’, so I impose this to the others and everyone repeats ‘in our houses we speak Greek’. Then I ask ‘the ones who speak Greek what are they?’ and the students reply ‘Rums’ but I say to them that they are Greeks and the students repeat after me ‘the ones speaking Greek are Greeks’. But, because in the class there are students from Asia Minor who speak Turkish I ask them: ‘what does Giannis speak?’ and they reply ‘Turkish’. I continue ‘the ones speaking Turkish what are they?’ they reply ‘Turks’. ‘But what is Giannis?’ I ask, they say ‘Greek’ and I give them the definition ‘the person who speaks Turkish and goes to mosques (“dzamis”) is a Turk but the one who goes to church is Greek. According to that I apply the same explanation to the Bulgarian speaking and to the Albanian speaking students.’²²¹

This conversation shows us the procedure of the construction of the Greek ethnic identity during the final decades of the Ottoman Empire. It in fact demonstrates a transition from the ethnic-religious identity to a national one. The name Rum was the name which the Ottoman State was using to refer to the Greek Orthodox people of the Ottoman Empire. The fact that in 1911, the educated elite of the Greek Orthodox community refused the use of that term and considered the name Greek to be their ethnic name shows the development of national sentiments among certain strata of the community at the eve of the Balkan Wars. This phenomenon, on the other hand, doesn’t mean necessarily that the community was identifying itself as a part of Greece. There were certainly such political tendencies among some community members, but the Patriarchate was trying, at least until the military coup d'état of the Committee of Union and Progress in January 1913, to dissociate itself from the Greek State, without meaning that they didn’t have any cooperation. Moreover, the above quotation reveals another fact, as religion continued to play a significant role for the formation of the ethnic identity. It could be claimed that in the case of the Greek Orthodox community the process of nationalizing was materialized through linguistic nationalism which was going hand and hand with religion.

²²⁰ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 29th of July 1911, p.375-78.

²²¹ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 29th of July 1911, p.375-78.

Anthony Smith argues that it is nationalism which engenders nations and not the other way round. Nationalism uses the proliferation of cultures and it transforms them. It is in this framework that dead languages can be revived and traditions invented.²²² In other words, Smith argues that nationalism derives from the existence of an ethnicity, of a living tradition of people which serve both to unify and to differentiate with the neighbors.²²³ In this context, it can be claimed that the Greek Orthodox community was going through this process, as it is seen that a selective group of people, educated upper class people, were trying to impose an ethnic consciousness to the Greek Orthodox millet through the revival of the Greek language. Education was an efficient way to succeed in this task. In addition to the policies and practices of the Committee regarding education, the increase of the cultural associations within the Greek Orthodox community also served considerably to the main goal of diffusing the Greek language in its *Katharevousa* form.

The Greek language was symbolizing for the Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox community the ancient and classical Greek past, that's to say it was used as a symbol. It was the "rediscovery" of the ethnic past which "brought back" memories, symbols and myths which are powerful elements to infuse national consciousness.²²⁴ Despite the fact that these memories can be transformed or even created, they are for the educated elite already existing traditions. The task with which the intelligentsia is preoccupied with is to infuse the particular traditions, symbols, myths to a larger population in order to create a national unity.

In this context, it can be stressed that the ruling elite of the Greek orthodox community chose to use the *Katharevousa*-form of the Greek language as a means to infuse national consciousness among the population. It should be noted that though the Greek State similarly instrumentalized the *Katharevousa*-form of the Greek language with the same political aim to demonstrate historical continuity between the ancient Greek past and the New Greek State, there was a particular difference between the approaches of the Greek State and the Greek Orthodox community. The latter one was connecting itself with the Byzantine times more than the Greek State did, as they were regarding themselves as their descendants. In a speech

²²² Antony Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 34.

²²³ Ibid, p.45.

²²⁴ Ibid, p.39.

which the Patriarch gave in 1911, he encouraged the increase of the teaching of Byzantine documents as well as authors in order to strengthen the ethnic identity of the students.²²⁵

Anderson argues that there is a particular characteristic of the nation states in the issue of the use of language. It is that the nation states use in a conscious way the need of language and that systematically impose it upon the population.²²⁶ In this spirit, it could be claimed that through the practices of the Committee a similar tactic occurred, that is to say a particular form of language was chosen to be applied in a conscious way in order to unify people under the influence of it. Unity as Smith argues is the one on which the powerful myth of a presumed common ancestry and shared historical past is based, something which the Greek orthodox community was trying to establish in the early 20th century through education.

²²⁵ Reports of the PCEC, Code 1043, 2nd November 1911.

²²⁶ Benedict Anderson , *Imagined Communities*, Verso, London, New York, 1991, p.42

CONCLUSION

Anderson argues that nation-ness as well as nationalism are cultural artifacts of a particular kind and in order to understand them we have to understand the way they came into historical being.²²⁷ If we take the quote as a valuable one, which can apply to the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul, we see that there is a particular problem, as Anderson assumes that there is no previous existence of a sense of ethnicity or identity and everything is being constructed. In the case of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and in particular regarding the educational policies of the community we see that an educated elite, which is aware of its orientation and identity in cultural terms, tries to create a transition of a cultural understanding of identity into a political one through the instrumentalization of the Greek language in the Greek Orthodox schools as a means of political identity. The particular problem rises in the fact that the question of the political orientation of the educated elite of the Greek Orthodox community, during those times, was a very complicated one; it was far from being cohesive and consistent, shifting from one identity to another as it could not stay uninfluenced by the political developments of those times.

From the second half of the 19th century until the first two decades of the 20th century, the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul experienced numerous transformations, which can be clearly observed by looking at the issue of education. As nationalist currents entered the scene in the Ottoman Empire the Greek Orthodox community did not remain immune to this development, as we know from the Greek War of Independence (1821-1829) and subsequent developments among the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire. In addition, the secularization process of the millets, initiated by the Ottoman state through the Reform Edict of 1856, played a significant role, as laymen had the right to participate in the administration of their

²²⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities*, p.4

millet. This study shows how laymen and clergy coexisted in these new circumstances. Nevertheless, it could be claimed that the transition to a secular administration of the Orthodox millet was not an easy one. The Ecumenical Patriarchate, which used to consider the ethno-religious system of Greek Orthodox millet as a main way of organizing the Orthodox populations of the Ottoman Empire as well as a source of her power, displayed reaction to the changes which were eliminating its power over its flock. It has been shown throughout this study that the course of secularization of the Orthodox millet was long and difficult one as the Patriarchate continued to be powerful and trying to keep the laymen under its control. At the same time, despite the fact that the relationship between the laymen and clergymen was characterized by a considerable tension, it appears that a compromise was necessary as both elements were going through a process of change and secularization, imposed by the Sublime Porte, as well as the need to support each other against the pressures of the Ottoman government.

Throughout this study the first fact which emerges as unquestionable is the importance attributed by the Greek Orthodox community and the Ecumenical Patriarchate on the development of education; the aim appears to have been to infuse a common ethnic consciousness to the Orthodox population. For that task, a strong emphasis on Greek language became central, which was utilized as a mean to Hellenize the population. This strong emphasis on the Greek language in schools, on the other hand, implied the existence of considerable linguistic divisions within the Greek Orthodox millet; such an insistence, otherwise, would not have been so pronounced.

Thus, the way the PCEC perceived the foreign missionary schools as well as the way it dealt with the instruction of French in the Greek Orthodox schools could be considered as an attitude of defense. That is to say, both the French language and foreign schools were understood as threats to the ethnic identity of the students and that was why they had to be so cautious about these two issues. However, the foreign schools, besides being regarded as threats, were also taken as examples in order to develop a better education for the Greek Orthodox students. Through the improvement of Greek Orthodox education they would be discouraged to continue at foreign schools.

When it came to the issue of the teaching of Turkish language in the Greek Orthodox schools, there were more issues which had to be considered. Although Ottoman Turkish was

the official language of the Ottoman Empire, the Greek Orthodox community did not give much importance to the teaching of it. This attitude could demonstrate the autonomous situation of the Greek Orthodox community within the Ottoman Empire and it could be even claimed that the Ottoman state had an attitude of tolerance or even aloofness towards the non-Muslims institutions. However, it was after the Young Turks Revolution of 1908 that the situation started to change due to the policies of the Young Turks towards the non-Muslim communities of the Ottoman Empire. The policy to homogenize the Ottoman populations and to realize a Turkish nation led to the elimination of the ‘privileges’ of the Patriarchate, which resulted in a complete nationalization of the Greek Orthodox community as well as its identification with the Greek state.

Looking at the Language Issue, the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and the Ecumenical Patriarchate seemed to have an even more conservative position than the Greek state itself. Language was the element which connected the two centers of the Hellenic identity, the Greek state and the Patriarchate; both regarded *Katharevousa* as the proper language which could infuse common consciousness to populations and eventually Hellenize them. *Katharevousa* was considered to be a symbol of the past because of its archaic form and its relative closeness with the ecclesiastical language which the Patriarchate was using. These were the main reasons why it was preferred over the new form of Demotic which was identified with something foreign and corrupted.

It can be stated that the Greek Orthodox community and the Ecumenical Patriarchate together in the late 19th century went through a procedure of nationalizing the Greek population through the intensive emphasis over the Greek language. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that this procedure of nationalizing was more in cultural terms rather than political. This particular process was rather gradual and it was basically during the years after the Young Turk Revolution that the Greek Orthodox community began to identify itself with Greek nationalism and the Greek state. Until then, despite the occasional cooperation of the Patriarchate with the Greek state and although there were certain Greek groups supporting the irredentist Great Idea (*Megali Idea*), the attitude which prevailed among the Greek Orthodox was the one of keeping their own distinct Ottoman identity. It was after the Young Turk Revolution that the Greek Orthodox community realized the futility of their presence within the Ottoman Empire as well as their insignificant role, and turned their attention and hopes to the Greek state.

Even though the importance which the Greek language acquired in the process of the formation of the ethnic identity of the Greek orthodox community is being revealed, it has still to be kept in mind that the element of religion continued its significance. We can observe through this study that language and religion went hand and hand in the process of Hellenizing the Orthodox millet.

Here, the question should be asked as to why Greek language, among other languages, prevailed within the Orthodox millet. For many centuries Greek language had been the language of the Church, and although it was spoken by few people, these people constituted the elite class of the community. In other words, it was mainly the clergy and a part of the educated upper class of the Orthodox millet, who spoke the Greek language. However, as Hobsbawm stresses, in order for a language to prevail over others does not always need to be spoken by the majority since it is spoken by the people who have a certain political weight²²⁸, something which can also be applied to the Greek case. Furthermore, as Greek was the language of the Church it was already important as a language in cultural terms. Anderson supports that it was through the development of printing press that certain languages attained a higher status. According to him, it was the printing technology which created the possibility of creating an imagined community.²²⁹ Looking at our case, the Greek language was a powerful language because firstly, it was spoken by people who had political and cultural power and secondly, it had through schooling the chance to be widespread and become ‘eternal’,²³⁰ especially because it was the language of education and church.

Hobsbawm, basing his argument on Anderson, stresses that it is the cultural or official languages of the rulers and elite which usually prevail *via* public education.²³¹ In the case of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul it is demonstrated that education played a significant role in order for the Greek language to prevail and to become a means to create common ethnic consciousness. However, despite the importance of language in the formation of the ethnic identity, religion still remained a very strong element in this process. It could be stressed that religion together with language, were the elements which formed the Greek Orthodox identity.

²²⁸ Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations*, p.60.

²²⁹ Benedict Anderson, p.46.

²³⁰ Eric Hobsbawm, p.61.

²³¹ Idib, p.62.

Linguistic nationalism, in order to be successful, needs in most cases state authority; however, in the case of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul, it was the Ecumenical Patriarchate which played the role of state, and the PCEC acted as an educational ministry. But the Patriarchate was not a sovereign power; being an institution of the Ottoman Empire, its function and autonomy came to an end with the dissolution of the sultanate and the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. After 1923, the Greek community became a minority and turned into an object of diplomatic negotiations between the Greek and the newly established Turkish state. This was another political framework into which the Greek community found itself subjected; much more difficult as well as painful.

APPENDIX I

The analytical program of Zografeion School regarding the teaching hours.

- A' Class:** **Greek 13 hours instead of 14**
 Religious teaching 23 instead of 24
- B' Class:** **History 0 instead of 1**
- C' Class:** **Greek 10 hours instead of 12**
 Religion 27 hours instead of 29
- D' Class:** **Religion**
 Greek 10 hours instead of 12
 French 3 hours instead of 0
- E' Class:** **Religion**
 Mathematics 3 instead of 4
 History 2 instead of 3
 Turkish 2 instead of 0
- F' Class:** **Greek 10 instead of 12**
 Geometry 1 instead of 2
 History
 French 3 instead of 0
 Turkish 4 instead of 3

APPENDIX II

HOURS OF TEACHING PER WEEK IN THE BOY'S ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

COURSES	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	HOURS PER WEEK
Religion	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	15
Greek	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	69
Object lesson	4	4						8
French					2	4	4	10
Turkish					2	3	5	10
Arithmetic	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	20
Geometry							1	1
History			2	2	2	2	2	10
Geography			2	2	2	2	2	10
Physiognomy			2	2	2	2	2	10
Commerce							2	2
Calligraphy			2	2	2	1		7
Sketching			2	2	2	1		7
Music	2	2	2	2	1	1		10
Gymnastics	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	15
Weekly hours of the classes	24	24	30	30	32	32	32	204

APPENDIX III

HOURS OF TEACHING IN GIRLS'S ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

COURSES	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	HOURS PER WEEK
Religion	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	15
Greek								
	12	12	10	10	8	8	8	68
French					3	4	5	12
Arithmetic	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	17
History			2	2	2	2	2	10
Geography			2	2	2	2	2	10
Physiognomy			2	2	3	2	2	11
Calligraphy	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	13
Sketching			1	1	1	1	1	5
Music			1	1	1	1	1	5
Gymnastics	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	11
Embroidery	6	6	6	6	4	5	4	37
Weekly hours of the classes	27	27	32	32	32	32	32	214

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Codes of the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee 1895-1915

Regulations of the Patriarchal Central Educational Committee 1873, 1892, 1910.

Ecclesiastical Truth (*Ekklesiastikh Alitheia*) 1895-1915.

Correspondance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (1895-1915).

Analytical Programs of the Boy's and Girls' elementary Schools(1897, 1907).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ahmad Feroz, *The Young Turks: The Committee of the Union and Progress in Turkish Politics 1908-1914*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969.

-----, 'Unionist Relations with the Greek, Armenian and Jewish Communities of the Ottoman Empire 1908-1919' in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*.

Alexandris Alexis: *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and the Greek Turkish relations (1918-1974)*, Athens, Center of Asia Minor Studies, 1992.

-----, *Oi Ellines stin yphresia ths Othomanikis Aytokratoria*, (The Greeks in The Service of the Ottoman Empire), Athens, D.I.E.E.E., 1980.

Anagnostopoulou Sia, *Mikra Asia 19os-1919. Oi ellhnorthodoxes koinothtes. Apo to Millet twn Rwmwn sto Ellhniko Ethnos*, (Asia Minor 19th-1919. The Greek Orthodox communities. From the Rum millet to the Greek nation), Athens, Ellhnikia Grammata, 1998.

-----, *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the nation states: a long and difficult process: the Greek case*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2004.

Anderson Benedict, *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origins and the spread of nationalism*, Verso, London-New York, 1991

Arat Zehra, *Deconstructing images of "the Turkish Woman"*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Augoustinos Gerasimos, *Consciousness and History: national critics of the Greek Society.1897-1914*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1977.

-----, *The Greeks of Asia Minor*, Kent: Kent State University Press, 1992.

Benjamin Braude, *Foundation Myths of the Millet System*, in Ben.Braude and B. Lewis, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, New York : Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982

Berkes Niyazi, *The development of Secularism in Turkey*, London, Hurst and Company, 1998

Boura Caterina, ‘The Greek Millet in Turkish Politics: Greeks in the Ottoman Parliament(1908-1918), in ‘Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism’, edited by D.Gondikas and C.Issawi, Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

Berrak Burcak ‘The Status of the Elite Muslim Women in Istanbul under the Reign of Sultan Abdulhamid 2nd (1876-1908). Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara:Bilkent University, 1997.

Clogg Richard, “ The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire”, in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*.

-----, "A Millet within a Millet:the Karamanlides", in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, by Dimitri Gondikas and Charles Issawi, USA, Darwin Press, 1999.

Davis Fanny, *The Ottoman Lady. A Social History From 1718 to 1918*, New York;Westport Conn.; London: Greenwood Press, 1986, p.45-60

Davison Roderic, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire.1856-1876*', Gordian Press, 1963.

-----, 'Essays in Ottoman and Turkish history 1774-1923: the impact of the West, Austin, University of Texas, 1990.

Deringil Selim, *The well-protected domains: ideology and the legitimization of power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1908*, London-New York, I.B.Tauris, 1998.

Echsertzoglu Xaris, 'to Pronomiako Zitima', (The Privilege Issue), *Historica*, no.16, Melissa, June 1992

-----, *Ethnikh tautothta sthn Kwnstantinoupolh ton 19o aiwna. O Ellhnikos Filologikos Syllogos Kwnstantinoupolhs, 1861-1912*, (National identity of Istanbul in the 19th century), Athens, Nefeli, 1996

-----, 'The cultural uses of consumption: negotiating class, gender and nation in the Ottoman Urban Centers during the 19th century', USA, Int.J.Milddle East Studies, 2003, p.77-101.

Ergin Osman, *Turkiye Maarif Tarihi*, (The History of the Turkish Education), Eser Matbaasi, Istanbul, 1977

Findley V. Carter, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire. The Sublime Porte, 1789-1922*, Princeton, 1980

Fortna Benjamin, *The Imperial Classroom. Islam, the State and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*, USA, Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hanoğlu Sükrü, *Preparation for Revolution. The Young Turks 1902-1908.*, New York, Oxford U.P., 2001
-----, *The Young Turks in Opposition*, New York, Oxford, U.P., 1995.

Hatzopoulos Konstantinos, *Greek schools during the period of Ottoman rule*”, “*Ta Ellhnika Sxoleia stin Periodo tis Othomanikis Kiriarkias 1453-1821*, Thessaloniki, Vanias, 1991.

Hobsbawm Eric, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Karpat Kemal, ‘Millets and Nationalism. The roots of the incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era’, in Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire.

Kechriotis Vangelis, *The Modernization of the Empire and the Communities ‘Privileges’: Greek Orthodox Responses to the Young Turks Policies*, in Turaj Atabaki, *The State and the Subaltern. Authoritarian Modernization in Turkey and Iran*, London-New York, I.B.Tauris Press, 2007.

-----, ‘Greek-Orthodox, Ottoman Greek or just Greek? Theories of coexistence in the aftermath of the Young Turk Revolution.’, Academie des sciences de Bulgarie institut d’etudes balkaniques, 2005, No1.

-----, ‘From Trauma to self-reflection:Greek Historiography meets the Young Turks ‘Bizarre’ Revolution’, unpublished article.

Kitromilidis Pasxalis, “Imagined communities”, in ‘Modern Greece:Nation and Nationalism’ edited by Thanos Veremis and Martin Blinkhorn, Athens, SAGE-ELIAMEP, 1990.

‘Neo-hellenic Enlightenment, *{Neoellinikos Diafwtismos}*’, Athens, Institution of National Bank, 2000.

Kofos E., Patriarch Ioachim 3rd (1878-1884) and the irredentist policy of the Greek State”, Journal of Modern Greek Studies, 1986.

Konortas Paris, *Oikoumenikes Theoriseis gia to Oimoumeniko Patriarxeio, 17os aionas-arkes 20ou.*, (Ottoman authentications for the Ecumenical Patriarchate), Athens, Alexandreia, 1998.
-----, "Ta 'ecclisiastika' beratia", (The ecclesiastical verats) , *Historica*, no.9, Melissa, December 1988.

Lewis Bernard and Benjamin Braude, "Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire", New York : Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982.

Lewis Bernard, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, London:New York Oxford U.P., 1968

Matalas Paraskevas, *Ethnos kai Orthodoxy, Oi Peripeteis mias Sxesis. Apo to "Elladiko" sto Boulgariko Sxisma*, (Nation and Orthodoxy, the Adventures of a relationship. From the "Greek" to the Bulgarian Sxisma), Irakleio, Publications of the University of Crete, 2003.

Özil, Ayşe, "Education in the Greek Orthodox Community of Pera in the 19th century Istanbul", MA Thesis, Bogazici University, 2001

Papadopoulos Theodoros, 'Papadopoulos Theodore, "The Greek Church and People Under the Turkish Domination", Aldershot, Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum: Brookfield, Vt, USA: Gower Pub.Co, 1990, p.153

Papastathis, X.K., *Oi kanonismoi ton orthodoxon ellinikon koinotiton tou othomanikou kratous kai tis diasporas*, (The Regulations of the Orthodox Greek communities of the Ottoman State and diasporas), Thessaloniki, Afoi Kyriakidi, 1984

Skopetea Elli, "The Greeks and their enemies", (Oi Helines kai oi exthroi tous.H katastasi tu Ethnous stis arxes tou 20ou aiwna), in *Istoria ths Ellados tou 20ou aiona*, (History of Greece 20th century), Athens, Vivliorama, 1999.

Smith D.Antony, *Nationalism and Modernism: a critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism*, Routledge, London-New York, 1998.

Somel, Akşin, *Das Grudschulwesen in den Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches während der Herrschaftsperiode Abdulhamid 2nd (1876-1908)*, Egelsbach;Frankfurt(main) Washington Hänsel-Hohenhausen, 1993.

-----, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire (1839-1908)*, Brill, Leiden, 2001.

-----, “Christian community schools during the Ottoman reform period”, in *Late Ottoman Society; The Intellectual Legacy*, edited by Elizabeth Oztalga, Routledge Press, London, 2005.

Souliotis-Nikolaidis Athanasios, Organosis Konstantinoupoleos, (Society of Istanbul), edited by Veremis Thanos and Boura Katerina, Dodoni, Athens-Ioannina, 1984.

Stamatopoulos Dimitris, *Metarithimmisi kai Ekkosmikeui*, (Reformation and Secularization), Athens, Alexandreia, 2003

Stayridi-Patrikiou Rena, *Glossa, Ekpadeusi, Politiki*, (Language, education and politics), Olkos, Athens, 2004.

Trudgill Peter, “Greece and European Turkey:From Religious to Linguistic identity”, in ‘Language and Nationalism’, Stephen Bardour and Cathie Carmichel, Oxford University Press, 2000.

S. Ziogou-Karastergiou, *To Oikoumeniko Patriarxeio, I Othomaiki diikisi kai I ekpedeusi tou Genous. Keimena kai Piges 1830-1914*, (The Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Ottoman State and the Education of the Nation. Documents and Sources 1830-1914), Athens, Afoi Kyriakidis, 1998.

Zurcher Eric, *Turkey:A Modern History*, London, I.B. Tauris, 2004.

