

The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 20, No 1 (2023)

The Historical Review / La Revue Historique

The **H**istorical Review
La Revue **H**istorique



VOLUME XX (2023)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

The Ottomanist And Byzantinist Ioannis P. Miliopoulos (1852–1929)

Evangelia Balta, Nikolaos Livanos

doi: [10.12681/hr.40070](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.40070)

Copyright © 2025



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Balta, E., & Livanos, N. (2025). The Ottomanist And Byzantinist Ioannis P. Miliopoulos (1852–1929). *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 20(1), 345–369. <https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.40070>

THE OTTOMANIST AND BYZANTINIST IOANNIS P. MILIOPOULOS
(1852–1929)

Evangelia Balta and Nikolaos Livanos

ABSTRACT: Ioannis P. Miliopoulos is an example of a prominent Ottoman Rum scholar who dedicated his life and work to both Ottoman and Byzantine studies. Born in Trebizond, he lived in Constantinople and in Athens, and witnessed the transformation of the Ottoman Empire from a multiethnic kingdom to a modern nation-state. This article pieces together aspects of his life in Ottoman Constantinople, as well as his work, which was initially characterised by an effort to help Ottoman Rums better integrate into the Ottoman Empire, but soon focused on the study of the Bithynian coast of Constantinople during Byzantine times.

On Saturday, 30 March 1929, the Istanbul newspaper *Ανεξάρτητος* published the death notice of the scholar Ioannis P. Miliopoulos:¹

Mr. and Mrs. Photios Miliopoulos and son, Mr. Georgios Miliopoulos, Mr. Nikandros Miliopoulos (Athens), widow Avrokomi Tsakalof, and other relatives are deeply saddened to announce the bitter demise of their beloved IOANNIS P. MILIOPOULOS, father, grandfather, brother and relative, who passed away yesterday, and kindly ask you to attend the funeral service that will take place today, at 16:00, at the church of the Holy Trinity at Pera. This is a private invitation. We thank you for not sending wreaths.

The following day, this entry appeared in the *Τὸ Φῶς* newspaper:²

IOANNIS MILIOPOULOS

Yesterday afternoon, at the church of the Holy Trinity at Pera, the funeral service of the late Ioannis Miliopoulos took place with grandeur. The large number of attendees bore witness to the undivided appreciation of society towards him. The funeral was attended by the Tritevon of the Patriarchates on behalf of His All Holiness [the Patriarch]. The demise of the elder Miliopoulos, a man of letters, an indefatigable medievalist, was announced with great sorrow. Hardworking and studious, he contributed to Byzantine studies, publishing works which were highly regarded abroad. For many years

¹ *Ανεξάρτητος*, 30 March 1929.

² *Τὸ Φῶς*, 31 March 1929.

the late scholar collaborated with our local journals. We express our heartfelt condolences to the grieving family and particularly to his son Mr. Ph[otios] Miliopoulos.

In the same year, the renowned intellectual Dimitrios Kambouroglou (1852–1942) would dedicate an article in memory of Miliopoulos in the Athenian periodical *Nέα Ἑστία*.³ He cited biographical data on Miliopoulos, as well as titles of his works, from information provided by the Constantinopolitan scholar Sophoklis Avraam Choudaverdoglou-Theodotos (1872–1956).⁴ The article also includes the only known photograph we have of the author. We learn from Kambouroglou that Ioannis, son of Petros Miliopoulos, descendant of a Phanariot family, was born in Trebizond in 1852 and graduated from the Phrontisterion, the renowned Greek school of Trebizond. In 1871, he moved to Istanbul, where he married Chrysi G. Velonas, a member of an upstanding family from Çengelköy. Judging from the signed prologues in his books, in which Çengelköy is frequently mentioned alongside the dates they were written, this is where the couple almost certainly settled following their marriage.⁵

Research at the Ottoman Archives of Istanbul (BOA) revealed details of his career as an Ottoman civil servant.⁶ He is listed as “Yanko Miliyopulo, son of Petros”. The names “Yankos Milyopulos” or “Yanko Miloğlu” also appear on the title pages of his books in Turkish, which also include his origin: “Trabzonlu.” Apart from his place and date of birth (Trebizond, 1268/1851–1852), his service record states that he was taught Greek, Turkish, French, mathematics, geography and philology at a Greek school, that he knew Turkish and French and that he was the author of the following three works:⁷ *Mükelamât-i Turkiyye-i*

³ Dimitrios Kambouroglou, “Ιωάννης Π. Μηλιόπουλος,” *Nέα Ἑστία* 6 (July–December 1929): 998–1000.

⁴ Sofoklis Avraam Choudaverdoglou-Theodotos, originally from Tyana (Develi), studied at the Phanar Greek Orthodox School and abroad. Upon returning to Istanbul, he worked at the Chemins de fer Orientaux and from 1900 onwards he was director of the Murrati company, which was active in the tobacco trade with Europe. After the population exchange he settled in Athens. We owe him the first record of Karamanlidika publications; see Sofoklis Avraam Choudaverdoglou-Theodotos, “Η τουρκόφωνος Ελληνική Φιλολογία, 1453–1924,” *Ἐπετηρίς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 7 (1930): 299–307.

⁵ See the prologues to his works *Ὄθωμανικὴ ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία* (1876) and *Λεξικὸν τουρκοελληνικὸν* (1894).

⁶ BOA, DH.SAİD.d. 12–71.

⁷ These books, as well as other works of his, are presented in detail below.

Rumiyye ve Rumiyye-i Türkiyye,⁸ *İraniyye bir seyâhat*⁹ and *Fezleke-i Târih-i Devlet-i Aliyye*.¹⁰

He began his career as a civil servant in the Ottoman state aged 20, in 1871, working at the printing house of the Medical School (Mekteb-i Tibbiye) with an initial monthly wage of 300 kuruş. The following table contains the information we acquired from the BOA document about Miliopoulos' employment and pay progression up until the year 1891.

Dates	Salary (kuruş)	Services where he worked
23 Cemaziye'l-evvel 1288 (10 August 1871)	300	Curator of publications at the Medical School printing house (Mekteb-i Tibbiye Mürettibliği)
12 Ramazan 1288 (25 November 1871)	350	ditto
15 Zi'l-hicce 1288 (25 February 1872)	450	ditto
1 Ramazan 1291 (13 October 1874)		Resigned
24 Rebiü'l-ahir 1294 (8 May 1877)	372	Police Inspector (<i>Zabıta Teftiş</i>)
8 Rebiü'l evvel 1297 (19 February 1880)		Resigned
13 Receb 1297 (21 June 1880)	500	Translation Office of the Customs Administration (Rüsumat Emaneti Tercüme Odası)

⁸ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, *Διάλογοι τουρκο-ελληνικοί και έλληνο-τουρκικοί*, 1st. ed. (Constantinople: Vivliopoleion G.A. Kopanari, 1875) and 2nd ed. (Constantinople: Vivliopoleion G. Kopanari, 1887).

⁹ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, *Περιοδεΐαι έν Περσίαι* (Constantinople: Typ. Grafikou Kosmou, 1881).

¹⁰ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, *Έπιτομή τής όθωμανικής ιστορίας* (Constantinople: Typ. K.A. Vretou, 1883).

1 Ramazan 1297 (7 August 1880)	600	ditto
Rebiü'l-ahir 1298 (March 1881)	480 [salary reduced by one-fifth]	ditto
4 Zi'l-hicce 1298 (28 October 1881)	500	ditto
11 Muharrem 1299 (3 December 1881)	500	ditto
18 Cemaziye'l-ahir 1305 (2 March 1888)	680	ditto
15 Şaban 1308 (26 March 1891)	1,000	City Customs (Dersaadet Emtia-yı Ecnebiye Gümrüğü Nezaretı)

His service record also lists the distinctions he received: in 1887–88 (H.1305) he was decorated by the Ottoman state (*beşinci rütbe Mecidi Nişanı*) and in 1892 by the German Empire with the Order of Merit of the Prussian Crown (Verdienstorden der Preußischen Krone), 4th class. The document with the Turkish translation of the German award, issued by the Ottoman Ministry for Foreign Affairs (8 October 1892), is housed in the BOA. There the award is noted as “Kron Dö Prus Nişanı”, the French name by which it was widely known in the Ottoman Empire.¹¹

Details on the identity of Miliopoulos, as well as information about his works, have been assembled and cross-referenced mainly from Kambouroglou’s article, the Ottoman archival material and the extant works themselves. He served as a civil servant in the Ottoman state, mostly as translator and censor in various departments, but also worked in the police, the taxation department and the Galata customs office. He was rewarded by the state for the exemplary execution of his duties as the censor responsible for publications entering the Galata customs. An Ottoman document states that Miliopoulos confiscated a publication of unknown origin entitled *Mey hanesi*, on the grounds that it was harmful to the morals of the inhabitants of the empire and notified the country’s post offices of the ban on its circulation.¹²

¹¹ BOA, HR.TO. 144/92.

¹² BOA, MF.MKT. 74–141 (13 Rebiyülahir 1299/20 Şubat 1297 [4 March 1882]).

Alongside his term as an employee of the Ottoman state, Miliopoulos wrote a relatively large number of schoolbooks and academic works. Initially, he focused on the production of textbooks for Rum students to learn the Turkish language and the history of the Ottoman Empire. However, around the turn of the twentieth century, his interests shifted to Byzantine archaeology, with a particular focus on the settlements and monuments of the Bithynian coast of Constantinople, and he published various papers in acclaimed journals of Byzantine studies as well as a small number of short monographs. His writing activity is presented and discussed in the following sections. Kambouroglou asserts that Miliopoulos also published articles in the press, such as the Istanbul Greek newspaper *Νεολόγος*, owned by Stavros Voutyras, which in November 1895 printed his study entitled “Ιστορικά και χωρογραφικά περί τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι ἀρχαίας μονῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὑπατίου”.¹³

Miliopoulos appears to have also been a fervent translator, yet we know very little about this genre of his work, having located translations of the *Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου, ἦτοι, Βίος τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ* in the Karamanlidika journal *Ἀνατὸλ Ἄχτερί*.¹⁴ Lastly, to determine his interests as a reader, we turned to the database of Greek book subscribers.¹⁵ We found that he had subscribed to and pre-purchased 11 books, the titles of which reveal a wide range of interests:

1. Jules Gérard. *Ὁ φονεὺς τῶν λεόντων ἢ Ὁ Ἰούλιος Γεράρδος*. Translated by Solon I. Vlastos. Ermoupoli: Typ. Renieri Printezi, 1872. Originally published as *Le Tueur des Lions*. Paris: J. Vermot, 1862.
2. Jules Verne. *Αἱ χάραι τῶν Μηλωτῶν: Ἑκτακτοὶ περιηγήσεις εἰς τὰς βορείους παγωμένας θαλάσσας*. Translated by anonymous. Published by Nikolaos and Periklis Rompotos. Constantinople: Typ. A. Zelitz and Sons, 1880. Originally published as *Le pays des Fourrures*. Paris: P.J. Hetzel, 1873.

¹³ *Νεολόγος*, 16–28 November 1895. Miliopoulos' articles in *Νεολόγος* are mentioned in Andreas Antonopoulos, *Οἱ Ἕλληνες τῆς οθωμανικῆς αυτοκρατορίας καὶ τὸ Ἀνατολικὸ Ζήτημα 1866–1881: Ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Νεολόγου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Athens: Tsoukatos, 2007), 74 and 566, where it is also stated that in 1896 Miliopoulos served as chief engineer in the railway company at Eskişehir. See *Νεολόγος*, 18 June 1896.

¹⁴ See “Τὲ βιλ γιάνι Λουκιανοσὶν μουδδὲτ-ι χαγιάτι,” *Ἀνατὸλ Ἄχτερί* 1 (1886–1887): 116, 131–32, 149–50, 164–65 and “Βαζιφεῖ σουκρανγιέτ-ι-φερζενδὲ δαῖρ,” *Ἀνατὸλ Ἄχτερί* 1 (1886–1887): 146–47, 352. On *Ἀνατὸλ Ἄχτερί*, see Stefo Benlisoy, “*Karamanlıca Haftalık Anatol Ahteri Dergisi: ‘Anatolda İlimin Terakkisi Kabil mi, Değil mi?’*,” *Toplumsal Tarih* 154 (2006): 56–60. Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead* and *The Dream*, as seen in the schedules of the Patriarchal Phanar Greek Orthodox College, were taught in the first class; see Tasos A. Gritsopoulos, *Πατριαρχική Μεγάλη τοῦ Γένους Σχολή*, vol. 2 (Athens: Filekpaideftiki Etaireia, 1971), 239.

¹⁵ This database is part of the Philippos Iliou Bibliology Workshop of the National Library of Greece. We would like to express our heartfelt thanks to Popi Polemi for her valuable support.

3. Titos G. Kyprianidis. *Γουσταῦος καὶ Γραζιέλλα: Δράμα πρωτότυπον εἰς πράξεις τέσσαρας*. Constantinople: Typ. Antoniou Maxouri, 1886.
4. *Ἡ δυστυχὴς Ἰουλία*. Translated by G. Parparias. Published by N. Vlasopoulos and Y. Kourtelis. Constantinople: Typ. E. Vasileiadou kai G. Georgakopoulou, 1905.
5. Paul Féval. *Ὁ ἰππότης τοῦ Κεραμοῦρ ἢ Ὁ καννάβινος δακτύλιος*. Translated by K.X. Published by N. Vlasopoulos and Y. Kourtelis. Constantinople: Typ. Theatrou, 1876. Originally published as *Le chevalier de Kéramour (La bague de Chanvre)*. Paris: E. Dentu, 1874.
6. *Ἡμερολόγιον τοῦ ἔτους 1899. Ὁ Ἑλλησποντος*. Constantinople: Typ. E. Souma, 1899.
7. Alexandros D. Velimezis. *Οἰκογενειακὸν ἡμερολόγιον Ὁ “Ταλαξίας” τοῦ ἔτους 1901: Συλλογὴ ποιημάτων καὶ διηγημάτων*. Constantinople: Emporikou Typ., 1900.
8. John Lubbock. *Ἡ χρῆσις τοῦ βίου*. Translated by Theodoros C. Floras, chief physician of the Chemins de Fer d’Anatolie. Constantinople: Typ. Adelfon Gerardon, 1900. Originally published as *The Use of Life*. London: Macmillan, 1894.
9. Panagiotis G. Makris. *Ἡράκλεια τοῦ Πόντου: Εἰδήσεις τοπογραφικαί, ἱστορικαί, στατιστικαί καὶ ἀρχαιολογικαί*. Athens: Typ. I Proodos, 1908.
10. Dimitrios C. Botsis. *Ἡμερολόγιον τοῦ ἔτους 1901: Ὁ πτωχὸς σπουδαστής*. Constantinople: Patriarchikou Typ., 1900.
11. Antonios A. Prokos, *Ἀνθοδέσμη, ἦτοι, Συλλογὴ διαφόρων διηγημάτων ποιημάτων, γνωμικῶν, ἀναλέκτων*. Constantinople: Typ. A. Koromila, 1901.

The full list of titles and genres of books that Miliopoulos read remains unknown, as do his relations with Ottoman intellectual circles of his time. It is, however, undeniably evident from his Greek-Ottoman publications that he remained closely acquainted with the Ottoman book production of his time and cited and used many of these publications in his works.

Greek-Ottoman Publications

The author of six publications intended mainly for the Rum Ottoman citizens of the empire, Miliopoulos as one of the Rum writers, teachers and employees of the Ottoman state who wrote textbooks after the teaching of the Turkish language became mandatory in 1869 in the non-Muslim schools of the empire.¹⁶ The

¹⁶ On the issue of Greek scholars who wrote works in Turkish and were part of the intellectual circles of Istanbul, the study by Johann Strauss remains unsurpassed, “The Millets and the Ottoman Language: The Contribution of Ottoman Greeks to Ottoman Letters (19th-

need for textbooks resulted in a profuse book production which continued at the same intense rate until the first decades of the following century. The teaching of Turkish in the schools of the various millets was intended to better establish the language within wider society with the aim to constitute a pan-Ottoman unity that would prevent the possible disintegration of the country. From the early nineteenth century onwards, the rise of nationalism inspired liberation movements among the various peoples that constituted the empire, resulting in a heavy loss of territory. The Edict of Gülhane (1839), which launched the Tanzimat period of reforms and assured full rights and equality to non-Muslims in the empire, solemnly promised equal opportunities for Christians and Muslims and in 1856 further reforms were implemented. It inspired the new ideology of Ottomanism (Osmanlılık), that is, of a common Ottoman citizenship and allegiance as the basis of political identity. They aspired to keep the non-Muslim people connected to the state and encouraged the use of the Turkish language in an attempt to create an “Ottoman identity”, relieve social tensions, ensure the easy functioning of and improve the employment of non-Muslim people in government agencies and allow for the inspection of non-Muslim schools.

The Ma‘ârif-i ‘Umûmiyye Nizâm-nâmesi (Ottoman Public Education Act) of 1869 is considered to be the first piece of legislation concerning state policy towards educational institutions run by non-Muslims. In a wider context, it encompassed the sole systematic educational administrative legislation in the Ottoman Empire and constituted a last attempt to restrict nationalism that was leading to the politicisation within the schools of diverse ethnic groups.¹⁷ Various studies detail the efforts and the methods used by the Ottoman state, especially during the reign of Abdulhamid II, to spread the use of Ottoman Turkish, by making Turkish language courses compulsory in non-Muslim schools, assigning Turkish-language teachers to non-Muslim schools, and rewarding non-Muslim students who were successful in the Turkish courses.¹⁸

20th Centuries),” *Die Welt des Islams*, n.s., 35, no. 2 (1995): 189–249. For an initial collection of titles published by the circle of Rum intellectuals, which, however, needs to be supplemented, see Pinelopi Stathis, “Dictionnaires et grammaires dans la bibliographie en karamanli,” in *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara: 22–26 Eylül 1986: Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994), 2055–63. The fact that they used the Greek alphabet in writing Turkish words and phrases prior to their being written in the Arabic alphabet contributed to their inclusion in the Karamanlidika bibliography.

¹⁷ Selçuk Akşın Somel, “Christian Community Schools during the Ottoman Reform Period,” in *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy*, ed. Elisabeth Özdalga (New York: Routledge, 2005), 257–76.

¹⁸ On the subject of the compulsory teaching of the Ottoman language, see Mutallip Şimşek, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Türkçe’nin Gayrimüslim Okullarında Mecburi Hale Getirilmesi

If, however, Turkish-Greek dictionaries, grammars and methods began to be systematically published within this framework after 1869, they had already existed in the field of Karamanlidika publications from the early nineteenth century, serving as a medium for the Turkish-speaking Orthodox to learn Greek. The *Λεξικὸν τουρκικὸν καὶ γραικικὸν* by Zacharias the Hagiorite had been published many times before 1839 and the Edict of Gülhane.¹⁹ There were also other Karamanlidika publications for Greek speakers who wanted to learn Turkish. In 1812 the physician Dimitris Alexandridis published the *Γραικοτουρκικὴ γραμματικὴ* and *Λεξικὸν γραικοτουρκικὸν* and in 1854 and 1859 Evangelinos Misailidis the *Ἑλληνοτουρκικοὺς διαλόγους*.²⁰ Yet the first person to advise his Rum compatriots of the need to learn the Turkish language was the Cappadocian Konstantinos Adosidis (1815–1895), later governor of Crete and Samos.²¹ In the preface to his work *Στοιχεῖα τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς γραμματικῆς*,²² published in 1850, he notes:

The education of the Greek Orthodox subjects of the Sultan must include learning the Ottoman language. The intelligent Greek children should demonstrate a willingness to learn this language equal to the willingness they demonstrate to learn the language of their ancestors; indeed, they should give priority to learning the Ottoman language over any other foreign language. A knowledge of Ancient Greek is

ve Uygulanması,” *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi* 43 (Spring 2018): 199–227; Betül Karıcı, “Gayrimüslim Mekteplerine Osmanlı Türkçesi’nin Öğretimini yaygınlaştırmak için Yapılan Bazı Çalışmalar (1874–1909),” *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi/Journal of Institute of Social Sciences* 10 (December 2019): 19–44.

¹⁹ Evangelia Balta, ed., *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique/Karamanlıca Kitaplar: Çözümlemeli Bibliyografya*, vol. 1, 1718–1839 (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2018): no. 1804:3, 1812:4, 1814:1, 1817:1, 1819:2, 1838:3.

²⁰ Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika: Nouvelles Additions et Compléments* (Athens: Centre d’Etudes d’Asie Mineure, 1997), no. 17; Sévérien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique d’ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, vol. 2, 1851–1865 (Athens: Institut Français d’Athènes, 1966), no. 132.

²¹ Strauss, “Millets and the Ottoman Language,” 224. For biographical details, but mainly information on Kostakis Adosidis’ term as Prince of Samos, see Kaan Doğan and Ahmet Çağrı Başkurt, “Kuruluşundan Karamanlı Kostaki Adosidis Paşa’nın Tayin ve Azline Sisam Beyliği Meselesi (1832–1885),” in *Following the Traces of Turkish-speaking Christians of Anatolia*, ed. Evangelia Balta (Cambridge: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2021), 265–304; Leonidas Moiras, “Konstantinos Adosidis: His Two Terms in the Office of Prince of Samos (1873–1874 and 1879–1885),” in Balta, *Following the Traces*, 305–23.

²² Sévérien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique d’ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, vol. 1, 1584–1850 (Athens: Centre d’Etudes d’Asie Mineure; Archives musicales de Folklore, 1958), no. 113.

necessary for the study of the writings of the ancient times and for the improvement of our modern language. Nevertheless, it is also necessary to learn the Ottoman language in order to strengthen our relations with the other nationalities that make up the large Ottoman family. It will help us defend our rights before the courts and advance our commercial and political affairs in a geographical area extending from the Persian Gulf to the Ionian Sea and from the waterfalls of the Nile to the Danube. Learning the language will also contribute to a mutual understanding between rulers and subjects. Yes, my fellow young Greeks, by learning the language of the Ottomans we learn of their morals, their dispositions, and we are thus able to live among them; we learn the innate virtues of this nation, virtues that many, how true, highly civilised nations are deprived of, and we are hence rid of many prejudices, many pedantic ideas, that harm no one else but ourselves...

Those involved with providing their Greek-speaking compatriots with the necessary tools for learning the Turkish language also include A.Th. Phardys, translator at the Ottoman embassy in Berlin, and his associate K.I. Photiadis, teacher of the Turkish language at the Phanar Greek Orthodox College, who in 1860 published the *Ἑλληνοτουρκικὸν Λεξικὸν* at the printing press of Evangelinos Misailidis' Turcophone newspaper *Ἀνατολή*. Another ardent supporter of the active participation of Rums in the affairs of the empire with a good knowledge of the Turkish language was Alexander Konstantinidis Pasha, who wrote a series of high-quality works for learning the language.²³ In the introduction of the *Θεωρητικὴ καὶ πρακτικὴ μέθοδος πρὸς ἐκμάθησιν τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς γλώσσης*,²⁴

²³ Alexander Konstantidis Pasha (?–Istanbul, 1890) was one of the most important Greek-Ottoman scholars of the nineteenth century. He served as judge, administrator in Thessaloniki, supervisor of Greek schools in Istanbul and member of the Hellenic Philological Association (1872). He was student of Fotiadis Pasha at the Translation Office in Istanbul (Tercüme Odası). He translated Michael Critobulus into Turkish and wrote the history of ancient Greece in Turkish (*Tarih-i Yunan-i Kadim*, 1869), as well as *Λεξικὸν ἀραβο-περσο-τουρκο-ἑλληνικὸν* (1873), *Ὄθωμανικὴ χρηστομάθεια* (1st ed., 1871, 2nd ed., 1874), *Ὄθωμανικὴ γραμματικὴ* (1874). Strauss refers to Konstantinidis as the greatest Ottoman scholar of the Greek community in the nineteenth century, noting that “his achievements do not seem to have won the recognition they deserved among his Greek compatriots”; see Johan Strauss, “The Greek Connection in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Intellectual History,” in *Greece and the Balkans. Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment*, ed. Dimitris Tziouvas (London: Routledge, 2017), 53–55.

²⁴ Alexandros Konstantinidis, *Usul-i tahsil-i lisan-i osmani*, *Θεωρητικὴ καὶ πρακτικὴ μέθοδος πρὸς ἐκμάθησιν τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς γλώσσης μετὰ γραμματικῆς, συντακτικοῦ, θεματογραφίας, ἐπιστολογραφίας* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie, 1873). The contents of the work are described in detail by Séverien Salaville and Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique*

he comments on the indifference shown by Greek students during the Turkish language classes at the few schools where it had been introduced as an optional subject. The following short excerpt attests to the state of education and culture in the Rum millet in the mid-nineteenth century and reflects his compatriots' ideological attitude to the dominant Turk and all he stood for:

The prevalent idea not only among the learning youth but also among most of our fellow nationals was that the Turkish language was totally useless. This is how everyone got to say "what am I to do with Turkish? Why would I need it?" as if we do not share one common homeland with the Ottomans, as if we were not bound by common interest, totally forgetting that our interests were identical to theirs, and that we did not live in a land thousands of leagues away. We acted thus, as if there was no bond, neither political nor commercial between us and them. But soon after things thankfully took a different turn ... Turkish ceased to be a strange foreign language to us; in our schools it is no more optional, but obligatory.²⁵

This was the general social framework in which Miliopoulos' Ottoman work can be integrated. It is presented in the next section, accompanied by brief comments. Note that Turkish titles are in Arabic script in the original.

*

1. *Mükalemat-ı Türkiye-i Rûmiye ve Rûmiye-i Türkiye*, eser, Yanko P. Milyopulos, *Διάλογοι τουρκο-έλληνικοί και έλληνο-τουρκικοί, υπό Ίωάννου Π. Μηλιόπουλου*, licensed by the Ministry of Public Education. Constantinople: Vivliopoleion G.A. Kopanari, 1875. Zindan kapı no. 6. In-8, 4ff + 216 p.

The second edition

Mükalemat-ı Türkiye-i Rûmiye ve Rûmiye-i Türkiye, eser, Yanko P. Milyopulos, 'an hülefa-yı kalem-i terceme-yi emanet-i rusumat, *Διάλογοι τουρκο-έλληνικοί και έλληνο-τουρκικοί, υπό Ίωάννου Π. Μηλιόπουλου, μέλους τοῦ μεταφραστικοῦ γραφείου ἐν τῇ Γεν. Διευθύνσει τῶν Ἐμμέσων φόρων*, 2nd rev. ed. Constantinople: Vivliopoleion G. Kopanari, 1887. Zindan kapı no. 4. In-8, 276 p.

d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs, vol. 3, 1866–1900 (Athens: Parnassos, 1974), no. 185. See also Johan Strauss, "Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th–20th Centuries)," *Middle Eastern Literatures* 6, no. 1 (2003): 54–55.

²⁵ Konstantinidis, *Usul-i tahsil-i lisan-i osmani*, 11.

In the preface, which remains the same in both editions, Miliopoulos, like a number of other Rums who were involved in compiling Turkish-language textbooks, points out how the teaching of the Turkish language created uniformity in a multinational and multilingual society. He also notes that his own edition had a dual purpose, that is, apart from the Rums' needs, to also assist Turkish speakers who wished to learn Greek. This is the reason why, as stated, he transliterated the Greek words into Arabic characters, comparing the corresponding Turkish words, transliterated into Greek and Arabic characters. This was the logic behind the compilation of the dictionary and the dialogues that compose the book,²⁶ which was printed at the printing press of Stavros Voutyras' newspaper *Νεολόγος*. Its publisher appears to have been the bookseller G. Kopanaris, who obviously also undertook its distribution. The first edition was dedicated to the grand vizier of Sultan Abdul Aziz, Huseyin Avni Pasha (1819–1876), and the second to Sultan Abdulhamid. The latter was supplemented and improved, as its title shows, but maintained the same structure and chapter arrangement as the first edition. Only one chapter was added that included terminology used by the various departments of the empire (political, religious, military), while the presentation of the contents was also different. In the first edition of 1875 the contents are divided into two sections. The Greek came first followed by the Turkish, while in the second edition they are placed on the same page in two columns for the convenience of the user.

*

2. Yanko P. Miloğlu [Ioannis P. Miliopoulos]. *Cevâmi'ul-Ulûm-i Osmaniye/Οθωμανική ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία*. Vol. 1. Licensed by the Ministry of Public Education. Constantinople: Typ. Voutyra, 1876. 160 p.

The book, an anthology of Turkish texts,²⁷ is dedicated to Georgios Zarifis, who most likely sponsored the edition. In his introductory note to Greek readers, Miliopoulos emphasises the need for those aspiring to a political or judicial career to learn the Ottoman language. He notes that his work would be published in two volumes. The first volume, the only one extant today, comprises various

²⁶ For the 1875 edition, see Salaville and Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika*, vol. 3, no. 193. And for the 1887 edition, see Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika: Additions (1584–1900)*. *Bibliographie analytique* (Athens: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987), no. 79.

²⁷ Kleanthis Charalampidis, Georgios Sofokleous and Alexandros Konstantinidis published corresponding Ottoman anthologies between 1873 and 1876, which were incorporated into the *Karamanlidika* bibliography; see Salaville and Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika*, vol. 3, nos. 182, 183, 185, 189 and 190.

Turkish translations of Greek texts printed in Arabic characters. The footnotes contain translations in Greek of the difficult Turkish words in the texts, which though, clearly so as to help the Greek reader, were transliterated into the Greek alphabet and accompanied by all the distinctive symbols so as to advise on the Turkish pronunciation.

The book consists of sections with the following titles: Sayings, Proverbs, Fables,²⁸ Virtues and Evils, Dialogues of the Dead,²⁹ Short Story (Robinson's Diary),³⁰ and ends with 15 texts that cover historical events from Greek antiquity (Battle of Marathon, Battle of Thermopylae, Battle of Salamis, etc.), as well as biographies of sultans (Mehmed II, Selim I, Mehmed III). Lastly there is a text on the Great Northern War (1700–1721), a conflict in which a coalition led by Tsar Peter the Great successfully contested the supremacy of the Swedish Empire in northern, central and eastern Europe. Most pages in the book contain texts from ancient Greek literature or history. In this endeavor, Miliopoulos' aim is clear; for him the learning of the Ottoman language by the Rums did not constitute, and should not constitute, assimilation. Hence the texts he chooses, the majority of which refer to the glorious ancient Greek past, to educate Rum students in the Turkish language through texts about the history of the Greek nation.

We located three documents in the BOA relating to this work. The first two, dated 19 and 25 January 1876, concern the issue of a license for the printing of the first volume, which was published in 1876 and given the aforementioned title. It was censored by Şahin Efendi and Marder Efendi (“Faziletli Şâhin Efendi tarafından mütâla‘a olunmuşdur – İzzetlü Marder Efendi tarafından

²⁸ The chapter contains 18 of Aesop's fables, works known to have been taught in Greek schools. In 1870, Ahmed Midhat Efendi translated into Turkish various fables by Aesop and François Fénelon. On the reception of Aesop's Fables and the Life of Aesop, see Evangelia Balta, ed., *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlıca ve Karamanlıca Yayınlarında Ezop'un Hayatı ve Masalları*, (Istanbul: Libra, 2019).

²⁹ He translated two *Dialogues of the Dead* by Lucian. One is the entertaining dialogue between Charon and Menippus.

³⁰ This is an excerpt from the novel *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe (1719), which had enjoyed great success in the Ottoman Empire. By 1876, the Karamanlidika edition by Evangelinos Misailidis (1853) had been published and in 1864 the Ottoman edition by Ahmed Lutfi Efendi, which had been reprinted five times (1866, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1874) by the time Miliopoulos' book was released; see Evangelia Balta, “Novels published in Karamanlidika,” in *Karamanlidika Legacies*, ed. Evangelia Balta (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2018), 54. Berberian mentions an Armenian-Turkish edition without reference though to the date it was released. See Haig Berberian, “La littérature arméno-turque,” in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, ed. Louiz Bazin et al., vol. 2 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1965), 816.

mütâlâ‘a olunmuşdur”).³¹ The third document concerns the publication of the second volume of the work, no copy of which has been located in any library in Greece or in large public libraries in Turkey. However, the second volume was submitted as a final manuscript to the Censorship Office at the Ministry of Public Education, and on 22 March 1877 it received temporary approval to be printed at the printing press of the newspaper *Neológos*, as stated in the relevant document. This is the only evidence of the second volume of the *Όθωμανική Έγκυκλοπαιδεία*, and it is unclear if it was ultimately printed.³²

*

3. I.P. Miliopoulos (authorised book reviewer at the Galata Customs). *Περιοδεΐαι έν Περσίᾳ, ήτοι, περιγραφή τών από Πετρούπολεως εις Τεχεράνην και έκειθεν διά Τραπεζούντος εις Κωνσταντινούπολιν χωρών*. Έκ ***. Constantinople: Τυρ. Grafikou Kosmou, 1881. In-4, 8 + 115 p.

The book contains two travel texts that were adapted and published in Greek. The first text (1–52) was selected, as Miliopoulos points out in his preface, from a book by Prince Alexey Saltykov (1806–1859) and is a description of his journey from Saint Petersburg to Teheran.³³ The second part was based on a text by Pierre Amédée

³¹ BOA, MF.MKT. 33/58 (22 Zilhicce 92 or 7 Kanûn-ı sani 91/19 January 1876) and MF. MKT. 32/97 (22 Zilkade 92 and 13 Kanûn-ı evvel 91/25 January 1875).

³² BOA, MF. MKT. 46/118: “Muvakkat Ruhsatnâme, Numero 3/Hâlid/Neologos Matba‘ası’nda müretteb Yanko Miyeloğlu’nun Rumca’dan Türkce’ye tercüme eylediği Cevâmi‘ü’l-ulûm-ı Osmaniyye nâm kitabın cüz’-i sânisinin tab‘ı için imtiyazlı ruhsatnâme istediginden ve bu misillü eserlerin tab‘ı için imtiyaz i‘tâsına hâcet olmayıp bu bâbda kendisine âid olan huhûku muhâfazaya nizâmnâme-i mahsûsî kâfil idüğünden her cüzünü Meclis’e irâe ile nazar-ı teftişden geçirilip tab‘ı için ruhsat aldıkdan sonra basdırmak ve mezkûr cüz’ün üzerine hangi din ve mezhebe veyâ hangi fenne müte‘alik olduđu yazılmak ve tayy olunan mahalleri ihrâc olunmak ve tab’ olunacak matba‘anın ism ve mahalliyle tâbî’nin ismi ve târih-i tab‘ı nüsha-i matbû‘asının üzerine yazılmak ve Ma‘ârif’in re’y ve tensibi veyâ takdîr ve tahsini gibi bir güne ibâre derc edilmeyip yalnız Ma‘ârif’in ruhsatıyla basıldı ibâresi yazılmak ve ba‘de’t-tab’ neşrinden evvel matbû‘ı iki adedinin zirini mühürleyerek Meclis-i Ma‘ârif e irâe ile nazar-ı teftişden geçirilip vech-i meşrûh üzre basıldığı ve bir güne ilâve vukû‘ bulmadığı anlaşıldıkdan ve iki cüzün bir cüzü Meclis’in mührüyle tasdik ile i‘âde ve diğeri tevkif kılınıp bundan başka üç adedini kütübhâne-i mahsûsalarında hıfz olunmak üzre verdikden sonra neşri için başkaca ruhsat almak şerâiti ve Meclis-i Ma‘ârifin kararıyla mezkûr risâlenin tab‘ı için işbû ruhsatnâme verilmişdir. Fî 7 Rebi ‘ül-evvel [12]94 ve fî 10 Mart [12]93” (25 December 1875).

³³ Alexis Soltykoff, *Voyage en Perse*, 3 vols. (Paris: L. Curmer and V. Lecou, 1850–51). Originally published as *Puteshestviye v Persiyu: Pisma* (Moscow: University Press, 1849).

Jaubert (1779–1847).³⁴ Based on the 39th chapter of Jaubert's book, it describes the return of the French traveler from Teheran to Constantinople via Trebizond. Miliopoulos, who dedicates the book to Georgios Kakoulidis, states in his preface that he published this book because Persia, as a country, was little known to the Greeks. He underlines his belief that they should get acquainted with the land, because in various periods, and particularly in ancient times, the Persians had contacts with the Greeks. He probably intended that *Περιοδεῖται ἐν Περσίᾳ* be used as teaching material in Greek schools as this publication contained many references to Herodotus, Aeschylus, Xenophon and information on the Persians and their relations with the Greeks from the time of Cyrus and Darius to Alexander the Great.

*

4. Ioannis P. Miliopoulos (member of the Translation and Book Review Office at the Imperial Ottoman Customs). *Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς ἱστορίας*. Constantinople: Typ. K.A. Vretou, 1883. In-16, 6 + η + 11 + 202 p.

The book was published under license no. 450 from the Ministry of Education, on 17 Seval 1300 (21 August 1883) with the approval of the Central Educational Committee of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate. For the name of the book, Miliopoulos adopted the title of Ahmet Vefik Pasha's work *Fezleke-i Tarih-i Osmani* (1869), one of the first examples of an Ottoman history textbook, together with Selim Sâbit Efendi's *Muhtasar Târîh-i Osmânî* (Istanbul 1291/1874–1875). In his preface, Miliopoulos notes that he was motivated to write the book so that his Rum compatriots would know the history that linked them to the Turks, with whom they had lived for centuries and had political, social, spiritual and economic ties. He underlined the need for teaching Ottoman history, as well as the compulsory teaching of the Ottoman language which had been enforced in 1869 with article 129 of the Ottoman Public Education Act in all non-Muslim schools of the empire. In presenting his history to his readers, he refers to all the works he had published up to that time:³⁵

The Middle and Modern Times testify to the benefits from the nation's history. Whoever ignores his nation's history cannot take a step further. A series of successive events, treaties, alliances, or hostilities

³⁴ Pierre-Amédée Jaubert, *Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, fait dans les années 1805 et 1806* (Paris: Pélicier and Nepveu, 1821).

³⁵ He also presents his books on the cover of: *Διάλογοι τουρκο-ἑλληνικοὶ καὶ ἑλληνο-τουρκοὶ* and *Cevâmi'ul-Ulûm-i Osmaniye/Ὄθωμανικὴ ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία* (listed as *Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία ὀθωμανικὴ μετὰ σημειώσεων τῶν κυριότερων ἀραβο-περσο-τουρρικῶν λέξεων καὶ φράσεων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν*).

against peoples of the Orient and Europe, kinship, intermarriages, or political and private institutions, all these have bound both of us, creating one body, a single homeland, the interest of which we look after. Like many of my fellow Greeks, I too wished to write firstly *Διάλογοι τουρκο-έλληνικοί και έλληνο-τουρκικοί* and encyclopaedias. I borrowed from the best Turkish and Greek texts, enriched with Arab, Persian and Turkish notes, etymologies and interpretations. Furthermore, in the *Διάλογοι* the new and proper method urges both Greek and Ottoman citizens to learn the language of each other.

For his history, he relied, as he states, on works by Byzantine, Greek, and Turkish writers, as well as translators of German and French works. He refrains from mentioning the names of any authors; only from his complimentary comments on the “Ottoman history written in the German language” can one understand that this is the history by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (*Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, vols. 1–9 [Pest: C.A. Hartleben, 1827–1835]).³⁶ Within this context, one question that arises is whether Miliopoulos, while preparing his work, considered the history published only two years previously (1299/1881) by Münif Mehmet Pasha (*Dâstan Al-i Osman*), which included the period from Osman Gazi to Sultan Abdulhamid. He appears to be familiar with the work of Münif Mehmet Pasha, as he incorporates parts of his texts into subsequent publications, as shown below.

Miliopoulos’ history book covers the period from the appearance of the first Turkish tribes until the reign of Abdulmedjid. Apart from the introduction on the origins of the Turks, the book is divided into chapters that describe the life and reign of the Ottoman sultans, a standard practice in shaping material used both in previous and subsequent books on Ottoman history.³⁷ Miliopoulos brings his book to a close with the following phrase: “Τηλικαύτη λοιπόν ή ιστορία τής όθωμανικής αύτοκρατορίας, άφ’ ής μέρος τής εύρωπαϊκής έξαρτάται, έξίσου δè ταύτης όφείλεται τής εύρωπαϊκής πολιτικής ή πρόοδος και αύξησης.” With this statement, he expresses his view concerning the important role that the Ottoman Empire had played and continued to play in the world at that time and that major European nations were greatly indebted to it for their progress.

³⁶ We look forward to a comparative study of all Ottoman history works written by writers belonging to various millets of the empire, as they serve as testimony to the formation of nationalism in each millet, along with issues concerning textual comparisons, influences, copies, etc.

³⁷ As can be seen, for example, in the work released in the following years by the censor Avraam Vaporiadis, *Επίτομος βιογραφική ιστορία τών σουλτάνων τής Όθωμανικής Αύτοκρατορίας προς χρήσιν τών σχολείων άμφοτέρων τών φύλων* (Istanbul: Τυρ. S.I. Voutyra, 1885).

In his study on the two-volume Karamanlidika *Tarih-i Osmani* (1874) by Fertekli Nikolaos Soullidis, Veli Hacı Aydın briefly refers to Miliopoulos' history in the chapter "Tanzimat Dönemi Tarih Yazıcılığı".³⁸ There, he discusses the books about the history of the Ottoman Empire that were published in the nineteenth century. Dimitris Stamatopoulos also refers to Miliopoulos' *Επιτομή τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς ἱστορίας*, along with corresponding works by the brothers Minas and Christos Chamoudopoulos (Smyrna, 1874) and Georgios Katselidis (Athens, 1882).³⁹

*

5. Yanko Milyopulos/Ioannis P. Miliopoulos (member of the Translation Office at the General Directorate of Indirect Taxes). *Γidayırûh/Πνευματική τροφή*. 3 vols. Vivliopoleion A.D. Sfyra. Constantinople: Typ. A. Koromila, 1890. In-8, 224 p.

This is an anthology of Turkish texts, which Miliopoulos dedicated to Christakis Zografos from Epirus, one of Greece's great benefactors, together with the Zosimas and Kaplanides families, also from Epirus. This three-volume work, with continuous page numbering, is essentially an augmented edition of *Cevâmi'ul-Ulûm-i Osmaniye/Όθωμανική ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία*, which had been published in 1876. *Πνευματική τροφή* reproduces complete chapters from the 1876 edition. For example, in the first volume, the chapters "Fables" and the texts from the novel *Robinson Crusoe* are reproduced intact. The second and third volumes of *Γidayırûh/Πνευματική τροφή* contain the same excerpts from Lucian's *The Dream* and *Dialogues of the Dead*. The footnotes that accompanied the Ottoman texts in the *Όθωμανική ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία* were transformed into a "Vocabulary" included at the end of each volume of *Πνευματική τροφή*. The texts added by Miliopoulos were gathered from works by contemporary Ottoman intellectuals and are accompanied by their names at the end of the excerpt. From Munif Pasha he chooses the chapter

³⁸ Veli Hacı Aydın, *Bir Karamanlıca Osmanlı Tarihi, Tarih-i Osmani (Osmanlı Devletinin Kuruluşundan Sultan Mehmet Çelebi Dönemine Kadar) Nikolaos Theologidis Soullidis* (Ankara: Abis Yayınları, 2014), 84–85.

³⁹ Dimitris Stamatopoulos, *Το Βυζάντιο μετά το έθνος: Το πρόβλημα της συνέχειας στις βαλκανικές ιστοριογραφίες* (Athens: Alexandria, 2009), 134–36. The chapter referring to Ottoman history written by Greeks from two national centres is somewhat insufficient, as it does not refer to an adequate number of extant titles, and this specific historiographical production is not portrayed in a way that would clearly make distinction between that of Greeks and that of Greek subjects of the Ottoman Empire.

“Socrates”,⁴⁰ also a long excerpt from the Turkish version of *Télémaque* by Yusuf Kâmil Pasha.⁴¹ Finally, in the chapter entitled “Historical texts”, Miliopoulos quotes a text by Tevfik Pasha about the reign of Mehmed II.⁴²

The texts included by Miliopoulos in his work aim to show the relations and interactions between intellectuals belonging to the various millets within the capital of the empire. They reveal the collaboration between a circle of educated members of a multinational, multilingual, multicultural society who coexist as writers in the publications of the era, writing and translating works that often deal with the same topics, shaping simultaneously both a common Ottoman cultural tradition and a distinct tradition within each confessional community. The study of this topic has just begun and it has great potential for assisting the historical understanding of Ottoman society. Miliopoulos’ Ottoman-Greek or Greek-Ottoman writings should be considered a case study in this field.

*

6. Ioannis P. Miliopoulos. *Λεξικὸν τουρκοελληνικόν, μετὰ προχείρου γεωγραφικοῦ λεξικοῦ*. Published by A. Koromilas and A.K. Gerardos. Constantinople: Typ. A.K. Gerardou, 1894. in-8, ια + 860 p.

A small format (20 x 13 cm) book, which, apart from the dictionary (1–834), also includes a “Πρόχειρον Γεωγραφικὸν Λεξικὸν” (835–60), in which Greek and Turkish, with Greek characters, are transliterated into Arabic writing. The Turkish words in the dictionary appear first in Arabic script and then in Greek, followed by their Greek language translation, which was edited by Ioakeim Valavanis (1858–1921).⁴³ The rendering of the Ottoman words with Greek characters was a criterion for the dictionary’s classification as a *Karamanlidika* publication.⁴⁴ In his preface Miliopoulos notes that he also included in his

⁴⁰ Ioannis Miliopoulos, *Πνευματικὴ τροφή*, vol. 3 (Istanbul: Typ. A. Koromila, 1890), 158–74. This is an article from his series of studies on Greek philosophers entitled “Tarih-i Hukemâ-yı Yunan” which was published in the journal *Mecmuâ-yı Fünûn*. On Münif Mehmed Pasha (1828–1910), see Strauss, “The Greek Connection,” 52–53.

⁴¹ Miliopoulos, *Πνευματικὴ τροφή*, vol. 3, 174–83. The Turkish version of Fénelon’s *Aventures de Télémaque* by Yusuf Kâmil Pasha was published in 1859.

⁴² Ioannis Miliopoulos, *Πνευματικὴ τροφή*, vol. 2 (Istanbul: Typ. A. Koromila, 1890), 98–107. An excerpt from the work by Tevfik Pasha, *Telhis-i Târih-i Osmânî* (Istanbul: Ceride-i ‘askeriye matba’ası, 1302/1884) introduced as a schoolbook.

⁴³ Ioakeim Valavanis is known for his work *Νεοελληνικὴ κιβωτὸς* (Constantinople: Typ. A.K. Gerardou, 1892).

⁴⁴ See Salaville and Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika*, vol. 3, no. 295.

dictionary scientific terms, for example from Nysten's medical dictionary.⁴⁵ He refers to the *Τουρκο-ελληνικόν λεξικόν* (1876) by Avraam Maliakas (1842–1914), which, as he states, served as a model, adding later that this dictionary had become scarce and expensive, and had become outdated, a judgement which should probably be considered biased and unfair.

Miliopoulos the Byzantinist

Today, despite his Greek-Ottoman work described above, Miliopoulos is mostly known as one of the first systematic researchers of the archaeology of the Bithynian coast of Constantinople. He was born in 1852, the year when the pioneer of Greek Byzantine studies, Spyridon Zambelios, published his first work on the history of Byzantium, *Μελέτη ιστορική περί μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ*,⁴⁶ and one year before Greece's "national historian" Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos published a first short version of the *Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους*, which he would later expand into the voluminous opus magnum of nineteenth-century Greek historiography. Although Byzantine studies were on the rise in other countries, such as Germany and Russia, they remained rather limited and never reached the level of classical studies. In Greece, however, Zambelios, Paparrigopoulos and the subsequent Greek historiography espoused an understanding of the Byzantine era as the Greek civilisation that bridged the "glorious" antiquity with the modern nation, in what was to be the main component of the ideology of national continuity of the new Greek state, and, consequently, Greek historical scholarship.⁴⁷

It is almost certain that this new national historical perception of Byzantium, which quickly infiltrated the communities of Rum scholars in the Ottoman

⁴⁵ This refers to the dictionary by Pierre-Hubert Nysten, *Dictionnaire de médecine, de chirurgie, de pharmacie, des sciences accessoires et de l'art vétérinaire* (Paris: Brosson, 1814) which had been translated into Turkish in 1873 as *Lugat-i Tibbiye* for use by the students at the Imperial Medical School. Ioannis Miliopoulos, as head of the Medical School's printing press since 1871, obviously knew the book from his time there.

⁴⁶ Spyridon Zambelios, *Ἄσματα δημοτικὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Corfu: Typ. Ermis, 1852). On Zambelios and the new Greek school of Byzantine studies, see Ioannis Koubourlis, *La formation de l'histoire nationale grecque: L'apport de Spyridon Zambelios, 1815–1881* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2005).

⁴⁷ Roxanne Argyropoulos, *Les intellectuels grecs a la recherche de Byzance* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2001); Paschalis Kitromilides, "Ὁρθοδοξία και συλλογική ταυτότητα στη Νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη," in *Βαλκάνια και Ανατολική Μεσόγειος (12ος–17ος αιώνας): Πρακτικά διεθνούς συμποσίου* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1998), 127.

Empire and Western Europe, had an impact on the young Miliopoulos, who, although born in Trebizond, moved to Istanbul shortly after his graduation from the famous Phrontisterion of Trebizond around 1870.⁴⁸ As we have seen, in his first works Miliopoulos appears to be mostly concerned with Ottoman Turkish and Greek – mostly school – textbooks, but he later developed a clear interest in archaeology, which eventually became his main research domain until his death in 1929. We may assume that in this he was also influenced by his older brother Photios, a schoolteacher, who had prepared an archaeological description of the Byzantine and Ottoman monuments of Istanbul to be used as a primary-school textbook, which, because of his untimely death at the age of 26, was published by Ioannis in 1877.⁴⁹ Moreover, his sister Avrokomi Tsakalof also demonstrated a personal interest in archaeological fieldwork, without, however, pursuing a noticeable career,⁵⁰ as did Avrokomi's niece Stamata Xenaki.⁵¹ It is quite evident that the entire family had cultivated an interest in archaeological fieldwork.

Miliopoulos' interest in archaeological fieldwork was not to be attested until 1896, when he published his oldest-known archaeological article about the city of Kōtyaion (Kütahya) in *Νέα Ἐφημερίς* in Constantinople.⁵² Two years later, he published his first article, “Ἐξέλεγκτις βυζαντινῶν τιῶν ἐπιγραφῶν καὶ προσθήκαι”, in an international journal, the acclaimed German Byzantine studies journal *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.⁵³ Writing from his then residence in what is today Fenerbahçe, which he referred to by its Byzantine name Hierēia, Miliopoulos renders an account of the inscriptions on the walls of the Heptapyrgion, as well as corrections to previous readings by Alexandros Paspatis.⁵⁴ During his lifetime,

⁴⁸ Kambouroglou, “Ἰωάννης Π. Μηλιόπουλος,” 998.

⁴⁹ Ioannis Miliopoulos, *Ἀρχαιολογικὰ ἀναγνώσματα πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν δημοτικῶν σχολείων* (Istanbul: Typ. A. Koromila, 1877).

⁵⁰ Avrokomi Tsakalof, “Βυζαντινὸν ναῖδριον παρὰ τὴν Τραπεζοῦντα,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19, no. 1 (1910): 119–21; Tsakalof, “Περὶ Σατύρου,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 22, no. 1 (1913): 122–26. Avrokomi is attested to have accompanied her brother Ioannis on field trips; see Ioannis Miliopoulos, “Μιά ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐκδρομὴ,” in *Ἐπετηρὶς πεντηκονταετίας τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Istanbul: Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos, 1921), 294–96.

⁵¹ Stamata Xenaki, “Βυζαντιακαὶ ἐξακριβώσεις,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19 (1910): 118.

⁵² Kambouroglou, “Ἰωάννης Π. Μηλιόπουλος,” 999. On *Νέα Ἐφημερίς*, see Nasi Balta, “Νέα Ἐφημερίς” in *Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Τύπου 1784–1974*, vol. 3, Α–Π, ed. Loukia Droulia and Gioula Koutsopanagou (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008), 256–57.

⁵³ Ioannis Miliopoulos, “Ἐξέλεγκτις βυζαντινῶν τιῶν ἐπιγραφῶν καὶ προσθήκαι,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7 (1898): 332–35.

⁵⁴ Alexandros Paspatis (Chios 1814–Athens 1891) was a physician and prominent nineteenth-century scholar who studied at the University of Pisa, Italy, and Amherst College,

Miliopoulos would publish a total of twelve articles in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, eleven in the *Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, three in *Νέος Ποιμὴν*, as well as two in the journal *Athenische Mitteilungen*, published by the German Archaeological Institute in Athens.⁵⁵

According to Kambouroglou, he also published articles in the journals *Λόγος*, *Φάρος τῆς Ἀνατολῆς*, *Οἱ Κομνηνοί*, *Φάρος*, *Σερβέτ* and other periodicals, the entire collection of which perished, as stated, during his last journey from Trebizond to Constantinople.⁵⁶ We also know that he published at least one article in the Constantinople daily newspaper *Ὁ Ταχυδρόμος* in 1909.⁵⁷ Apart from his journal publications, Miliopoulos printed four short, article-length monographs, or “pamphlets” (*φυλλάδια* or *τεύχη*, as they were dubbed) – two in 1921 and two in 1923 – mainly reprints of published articles.⁵⁸

The majority of Miliopoulos’ publications concerned the Bithynian coast of Constantinople, while a much smaller number concerned his native Trebizond, as well as other places, such as the peninsula of Mesothynia (Kocaeli Yarımadası) and Chele (Şile). Two of his studies, in 1908 and again in 1928, are on the prehistoric past of the area of Chalkedon (Kadıköy). His main focus was finding the exact position and ruins of various locations attested in Byzantine written sources, and thus devoted a large part of his free time to expeditions. This is fervently demonstrated in the titles of most of his articles which contain the phrases “Ποῦ ἔκειντο”, “Ἐξακριβώσεις τοποθεσιῶν”, “ἀρχαιολογικαὶ ζητήσεις” or “ἐπιστημονικαὶ ἐκδρομαί”.

USA. Together with his influential work on nosology, Paspatis was author of a few but important studies on Byzantine Constantinople as well. Here, Miliopoulos refers to various inscriptions published in his book *Βυζαντινὰ μελέται: Τοπογραφικὰ καὶ ἱστορικὰ μετὰ πλείστων εἰκόνων* (Constantinople: Τυρ. Α. Κορομίλα, 1877).

⁵⁵ On the *Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, see Giorgos A. Giannakopoulos, “Το περιοδικό του Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως: Συμβολὴ στὴν ἱστορία των ἐλληνικῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν περιοδικῶν,” in *Ἱστορία τῆς Πληροφορίας: Ἀπὸ τὸν πάπυρο στοὺς ηλεκτρονικὸ ἐγγραφο*, ed. Maria Kanellou-Boti (Athens: Nomiki Vivliothiki, 2014), 111–23. On *Νέος Ποιμὴν*, see Adamantios Anestidis, “Ὁ Νέος Ποιμὴν,” in Droulia Gioula Koutsopanagou, *Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια τοῦ ἐλληνικοῦ Τύπου*, 322.

⁵⁶ Kambouroglou, “Ioannis P. Miliopoulos,” 998. Many local journals of the time are today hard or impossible to locate.

⁵⁷ Xenaki, “Βυζαντιακαὶ ἔξακριβώσεις,” 116.

⁵⁸ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, *Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Τραπεζούντι ναϊδίου τῆς Ἁγίας Ἄννης καὶ τῆς Κοιμήσεως Ἰωακείμ τοῦ Προπάτορος* (Istanbul: Τυρ. P. Angelidi, 1921); Miliopoulos, *Ἀρχαιολογικαὶ ζητήσεις: Ὀνωράτου – Ρουφινιανῶν – Νικητιᾶτον* (Istanbul: Τυρ. P. Angelidi, 1921); Miliopoulos, *Ἡ μονὴ τῶν Ἁγίων Πέντε* (Istanbul: s.n., [1923]); Miliopoulos, *Περὶ τοῦ λωβοκομείου τοῦ Ἁγίου Ζωτικῶν* (Istanbul: Patriarchikou Τυρ., 1923).

What follows is a list of Miliopoulos' known works on Byzantine studies:

1. *Ἀρχαιολογικά ἀναγνώσματα πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν δημοτικῶν σχολείων.* Constantinople: Typ. A. Koromila, 1877.
2. "Τὸ Κοτύαιον." *Νέα Εφημερίς*, 1896.
3. "Ἐξέλεγκτις βυζαντινῶν τινῶν ἐπιγραφῶν καὶ προσθῆκαι." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7 (1898): 332–35.
4. "Βουνὸς Αὐξεντίου – Ρουφινιαναί – Ναὸς Ἀποστόλου Θωμᾶ ἐν τοῖς Βοραδίου." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 9 (1900): 68–71.
5. "Byzantinische Landschaften." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 9 (1900): 471–76.
6. "Μονὴ Γαλακρηνῶν." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 9 (1900): 664–67.
7. "Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἀνέκδοτοι." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 14 (1905): 73–74.
8. "Der alte Hafen von Chalkedon." *Athenische Mitteilungen* 31 (1906): 53–54.
9. "Βυζαντιακαὶ τοποθεσίαι." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 16 (1907): 555–61.
10. "Ἐξακρίβωσις νέων τοποθεσιῶν. Α' Προμῶτου ἢ Προμούντου, Β' Πρόοχθοι ἢ Βρόχθοι – Τὰ Βοραδίου – Βασίλεια ἐν Βρόχθοις – Μετάνοια Θεοδώρας – Αἱ Σοφιαναί – Χρυσοκέραμος." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 29 (1907): 222–31.
11. "Ποῦ ἔκειντο αἱ Ρουφινιαναί." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 29 (1907): 274–83.
12. "Νικητιάτον." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 29 (1907): 283–88.
13. "Σημειώσεις ἐκδρομῆς εἰς Χηλάς." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 29 (1907): 306–13.
14. "Προϊστορικαὶ μελέται περὶ Χαλκηδόνας." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 30 (1908): 145–54.
15. "Ποῦ ἔκειντο τὰ Ὀνωράτου." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 30 (1909): 215–17.
16. "Ἐξακρίβωσις βυζαντιακῶν τοποθεσιῶν." *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 31 (1910): 112–19.
17. "Περὶ Παντειχίου." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 22 (1913): 451–58.
18. "Prähistorische Bemerkungen." *Athenische Mitteilungen* 41 (1916): 427–28.
19. "Μιὰ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐκδρομὴ." *Ἰν Ἐπετηρὶς πεντηκονταετίας τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Istanbul: Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos, 1921).
20. *Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Τραπεζούντι ναϊδίου τῆς Ἁγίας Ἄννης καὶ τῆς Κοιμήσεως Ἰωακείμ τοῦ Προπάτορος.* Istanbul: Typ. P. Angelidi, 1921.
21. *Ἀρχαιολογικαὶ ζητήσεις: Ὀνωράτου – Ρουφινιαναί – Νικητιάτον.* Istanbul: Typ. P. Angelidi, 1921.

22. “Τραπεζουντιακά. Ναϊδριον τῆς Ἁγίας Ἄννης.” *Νέος Ποιμὴν* 3, no. 5 (1921): 264–85.
23. “Αρχαιολογικαὶ ζητήσεις. Α΄) Ὀνωράτου, Β΄) Ρουφινιαναί, Γ΄) Νικητιᾶτον, Δ΄) Ἄκριτας.” *Νέος Ποιμὴν* 3, no. 6 (1921): 335–54.
24. “Αρχαιολογικαὶ ζητήσεις. Μέρος Β΄.” *Νέος Ποιμὴν* 3, no. 8 (1921): 484–96.
25. “Περὶ τοῦ ὄρους Ὁξεία.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 24 (1923–1924): 88–95.
26. *Ἡ μονὴ τῶν Ἁγίων Πέντε*. Istanbul: Patriarchikou Typ., 1923.
27. *Περὶ τοῦ λωβοκομείου τοῦ Ἁγίου Ζωτικοῦ*. Istanbul: Patriarchikou Typ., 1923.
28. *Αρχαιολογικαὶ τοπογραφικαὶ ζητήσεις: Βουνὸς Αὔξεντίου – Χρυσοκέραμος – Ἐριβῶλος – Ρουφινιαναί – Σάτυρος – Παλεκᾶνον – Καρταλιμὴν – Μονὴ Ραίκτορος – Νικητιᾶτον – Λευκάτης*. Istanbul: Patriarchikou Typ., 1923.
29. “Ποῦ ἔκειντο τὰ Ἄνθεμιου καὶ τὰ Βοραδίου.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 26 (1926): 63–77.
30. “Περὶ Βρύαντος (Μάλτεπε).” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 27 (1927): 325–45.
31. “Ἡ Χρυσοκέραμος.” *Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 4 (1927): 205–10.
32. “Περὶ τῶν ἐν περιφερείᾳ Χαλκηδόνος βυζαντινῶν ναῶν.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 28 (1928): 324–31.
33. “Βυζαντιναὶ τοποθεσίαι.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929–1930): 245–47.
34. “Τραπεζουντιακά ἀρχαιολογήματα.” *Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 7 (1930): 70–78.
35. “Ἐξ μολυβδόβουλλα” [Kambouroglou claims this article was published in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19 (1910).⁵⁹ It is probable, though, that Kambouroglou had in mind the article by Stamata Xenaki, a relative of Miliopoulos, who published seven seals in this very issue of the journal that also cites other articles by Miliopoulos.]⁶⁰
36. “Μία ἐκδρομὴ εἰς Μεσοθυνίαν.” [Mentioned by Kambouroglou but not located]
37. “Ὁ κονδζές (Βιθυνικά).” [Mentioned by Kambouroglou but not located]
38. “Τὸ ἐν Τραπεζοῦντι σπήλαιον τοῦ Ἁγίου Εὐγενίου.” [Mentioned by Kambouroglou but not located]

Although Miliopoulos did not pursue higher studies, his publications did not pass unnoticed by prominent scholars and professors of his time, and those in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* and *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* were often cited by others. In his work, Miliopoulos demonstrates a strong grasp of literary sources, the thorough knowledge of which is paramount, as he always indicated, to conducting archaeological research.

⁵⁹ Kambouroglou, “Ioannis P. Miliopoulos,” 999.

⁶⁰ Stamata Xenaki, “Βυζαντιακαὶ ἐξακριβώσεις,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19 (1910): 115–18.

In his article on the location of the monastery of Galakrenon, published in 1900, he accused Manuel Gedeon, who had earlier published a relevant article, of not having read what the Byzantine historians wrote about it.⁶¹ Gedeon (1851–1943) was one of the most prominent Greek scholars of Constantinople at the time, who until his death had published an extraordinary number of studies on topics mostly concerning ecclesiastical history, Mount Athos and Byzantine archaeology and literature.⁶² Miliopoulos, however, did not hesitate to express his disagreement with Gedeon on the exact location of Cape Akritas in various works. In 1907, he implied that Gedeon based his position on irrelevant information, while the same year, in another article, he stated that he “understood nothing” from what Gedeon had written.⁶³ Again, in 1913 he expressed the opinion that Gedeon cited only a particular set of sources on this topic, and not the full range of what had been written by Byzantine authors.⁶⁴

Gedeon, however, was not the only scholar Miliopoulos referred to in his works. In a paper delivered in 1904 and published in 1908 about the location of Ta Onoratou, Miliopoulos builds on the work already published by Xenofon Sideridis (1851–1929), and answers to his comments concerning the reading of certain inscriptions.⁶⁵ Alexandros Paspatis was also in the crosshairs of his critique. As we witnessed earlier, in his first publication in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Miliopoulos openly expressed his disagreement with Paspatis’ readings of certain inscriptions,⁶⁶ while in his article in 1921 on the location of Oxeia and its relation to Mount Auxentios, he set out, together with his sister Avrokomi, to inspect the location suggested by Jules Pargoire (1872–1907), a French Assumptionist monk and scholar who was also involved, among others, in the research of the Bithynian coast of Constantinople, who had refuted the

⁶¹ “Ο κ. ὄμως Μ. Γεδεών παρορῶν πάντα τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν βυζαντινῶν ιστορικῶν γραφόμενα”; Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, “Μονὴ Γαλακρηνῶν,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 9 (1900): 664–67.

⁶² For Manuel Gedeon’s publications, see Christos Patrinelis, “Δημοσιεύματα Μανουὴλ Γεδεών: Ἀναλυτικὴ ἀναγραφὴ,” *Επετηρὶς τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου*, 19–20 (1969–1970): 5–115. On his ideological understanding of Byzantium, see Kostas Lappas, “Ο μεσαιωνικὸς Ἑλληνισμὸς στὶς ιστοριογραφικὲς ἀναζητήσεις τοῦ Μανουὴλ Γεδεών,” *Εγνατία* 15 (2011): 89–100.

⁶³ Miliopoulos, “Βυζαντιακά τοποθεσία,” 556; Miliopoulos, “Ἐξακριβῶσις ἀρχαίων βυζαντινῶν τοποθεσιῶν,” 113.

⁶⁴ Miliopoulos, “Περὶ Παντειχίου,” 452.

⁶⁵ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, “Ποῦ ἔκειντο τὰ Ὀνωράτου,” *Επετηρὶς τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 30 (1909): 215–17. On Sideridis and his work, see Etienne [Stephanos] Stephanou, “Xénophon Sidéridès,” *Échos d’Orient* 29 (1930): 79–83.

⁶⁶ Paspatis, *Βυζαντιναὶ μελέται*, 58–59.

one proposed earlier by Paspatis. Miliopoulos stated that he visited the area and found Pargoire's opinion to be more valid.⁶⁷

Pargoire, however, in his article on Chalcedon, had strongly criticised Miliopoulos on his views concerning the location of Rufiniana.⁶⁸ Much later, in 1923, and long after Pargoire's demise, Miliopoulos would return the criticism to Pargoire over his suggestions about the exact locations of various other places mentioned in Byzantine sources. In the pamphlet *Μονὴ τῶν Ἁγίων Πέντε* published in 1923, he considered Pargoire to have been incorrect about the location of the monastery of Agion Pente and Mount Auxentios.⁶⁹ He specifically stated that he had personal knowledge of the area, contrary to Pargoire, who had admitted that he had never visited the place.⁷⁰ The same year, in his treatise on the leprosarium of Saint Zotikos, Miliopoulos stated that Pargoire confused Kodinos with Kedrenos,⁷¹ and in another article, again in the same year, he found Pargoire to be wrong also about the location of Ta Voradiou.⁷²

Despite the scholarly disagreements and the criticism that he received from time to time, Miliopoulos was considered one of the most prominent researchers of the Bithynian coastline of his time. Today, although his work is one century old, he is still cited in reference to the location of various places of the Bithynian coast mentioned by Byzantine authors, as attested in the recent volume on the geography of Byzantine Bithynia of the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*, which offers citations of ten of his works.⁷³

Conclusion

Ioannis P. Miliopoulos was born in 1852 and died in 1929, a lifespan that corresponded to an age of radical transformation of the Ottoman Empire

⁶⁷ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, "Μιά ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐκδρομὴ," in *Ἐπετηρίς πενήτηκονταετίας τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, 294–96.

⁶⁸ Jean Pargoire, "Autour de Chalcedoine," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 11 (1902): 333–57. Joseph Van den Gheyn, in his review of Pargoire's article, apparently took sides with the author and criticised Miliopoulos for having, together with Gedeon, invented the connection of a certain Saint Makarios with Mount Auxentios. See Joseph Van den Gheyn, review of *Autour de Chalcedoine*, by Jean Pargoire, *Analecta Bollandiana* 22 (1903): 479.

⁶⁹ Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, *Ἡ Μονὴ τῶν Ἁγίων Πέντε* (Istanbul: Patriarchikou Typ., 1923), 10.

⁷⁰ Miliopoulos, *Ἡ Μονὴ τῶν Ἁγίων Πέντε*, 12.

⁷¹ Miliopoulos, *Περὶ τοῦ λωβοκομείου τοῦ Ἁγίου Ζωτικοῦ*, 6.

⁷² Ioannis P. Miliopoulos, "Ποῦ ἔκειντο τὰ Ἀνθεμίου καὶ Βοραδίου," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 26 (1926): 63.

⁷³ Klaus Belke, *Bithynien und Hellespont*, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* 13, no. 1 (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2020).

from a multiethnic empire to a national Turkish state. During his early years, Miliopoulos demonstrated an interest in bringing closer the ethnic Turkish and Rum Ottomans through language textbooks and dictionaries. This effort appears to have been motivated by a yearning to assist the integration of the Rum community into the Ottoman Empire, and to allow the ethnic Turkish people to get to know the Rums better by learning each other's language with a focus on bringing the two communities that had lived together for ages closer. His last such publication was in 1894. Around this time, he seems to have shifted his focus to Byzantine archaeological studies until his death.

We have no information from Miliopoulos on the reasons behind this shift. This may have been a personal change of interest, sparked on the one hand by the rapid development of Byzantine studies during that time and, on the other, by the untimely demise of his brother, who had developed an interest in the monuments of Istanbul, and whose book Ioannis had published shortly after his death in 1877. The *Λεξικὸν τουρκοελληνικόν, μετὰ προχείρου γεωγραφικοῦ λεξικοῦ* (1894) was his last Greek-Ottoman language publication and, as we attest from the list of his works, from 1896 he focused on Byzantine archaeological publications. The shift in his research focus likely concerned the censorship under Abdulhamid II (1876–1908), which contributed to the shaping of history-writing in the pre-1908 period by strengthening state control of history and thus ensuring what kind of history was published and what history was taught in schools.⁷⁴ However, we must also consider the slow but stable change of the multiethnic character of the Ottoman Empire and the beginning of its transformation into a nation-state where the former millets became minorities. The loss of the old background of the empire would better explain his wish to relocate to Athens before his death in 1929, something attested to by Kambouroglou.

Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

⁷⁴ İbrahim Caner Türk, *Osmanlı Devletinde Tarih Eğitimi (1839–1922)* (PhD diss., Atatürk University, 2006) and Ebru Boyar, *Ottomans, Turks, and Balkans: Empire Lost, Relations Altered* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 9–11.

