

*The Numbers and the Policy:
Greek Statistics on Ottoman Macedonia in the 19th century*

Dalibor JOVANOVSKI

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Faculty of Philosophy
Skopje, Macedonia

In his book on demographic and social features of the Ottoman population, the famous Turkish historian Kemal Karpat noted that the statistical data on the population in Macedonia, Anatolia and Thrace were the first weapons in the battle that would later be fought with guns and bullets (Karpat, 1982: 46). Karpat is right, even though for some people his statement may be unacceptable. This text, which examines the Greek statistics of Ottoman Macedonia in the XX century, in a way, confirms the statement written by the Turkish historian. Here I shall show several Greek statistical data which I think are not so well-known to the public, with the exception of the statistics prepared by Kleantis Nikolaidis in 1899. In addition, I would like to point out that all statistics that are presented in this text were prepared in the Kingdom of Greece.

Reading the books, brochures and articles written by the Greek intellectuals from the 19th century, I became interested in the statistical data they made about the Ottoman state, especially in regard to Macedonia. Thus, Saripolos, who wrote on the basis of his personal research, states that the total number of citizens that lived in Macedonia was 700,000, out of which 500,000 were Greeks, 120,000 Vlachs and Slavs, 100,000 Turks and 40,000 Jews (Saripolos, t.2, 1853: 12). As we can see, the total number of Slavs, Turks, Vlachs and Jews in Macedonia is almost twice smaller than the number of Greeks. Therefore, the goal of Saripolos is more than clear, to show that the Greek element was predominant in the Ottoman Macedonia.

The first more detailed statistical data I met during my research was published in the magazine “Pandora” in June 1869. Actually, this magazine

presented detailed statistics of the population in the Ottoman state that included Macedonia. According to these statistics, Macedonia was populated by Greeks, Greek-Albanians, Albanians, Vlachs, Slavs, Gypsies (Roma) and Jews. With reference to these statistics, for the purpose of naming the Ottoman administrative units, the authors used the following terminology: Rumelian principality to mark the region whose center is Bitola, satrapia Thessaloniki, satrapia Seres. (*Pandōra*, 15 June 1869, t.k. fil. 462). The Ottoman government did not use these terms. According to Dimitar Dimeski, Macedonia under the Ottoman rule during the 1860s, as a result of the administrative reforms within the Ottoman state, was included into two vilayets: Thessaloniki and Skopje vilayet. In 1869 with the new reform, the Debar sanjak was included in the Shkodër vilayet, whilst Thessaloniki, Bitola, Seres, Drama and the Skopje sanjaks were included in the Thessaloniki vilayet (Dimeski, 1982,65). To avoid confusion, in future I shall use the term district. According to these statistics, in the Bitola district, which corresponds to the territory of the later Bitola vilayet, there lived 27,900 Greeks, 15,000 Greek-Albanians, 20,000 Albanians, 50,000 Vlachs, 35,000 Slavs, 10,000 Romas, and 3,000 Jews. In the Thessaloniki district, there were 318,000 Greeks, 19,000 Albanians, 15,000 Vlachs, 17,000 Slavs, 12,000 Romas and 20,000 Jews. In the district of Seres, 202,000 Greeks, 8,000 Vlachs, 40,000 Slavs, 16,000 Romas, and 4,000 Jews lived (*Pandōra*, 15 iounio 1869,t.k.fil.462). According to the compilers of these statistics for Macedonia, the largest part of the population in the mentioned areas was of Greek origin and the number reached 799,000. These statistics had a clear target, at least we can assume, to show that the population in Macedonia that was composed of different ethnic groups had predominantly a Greek element. It is evident that these statistics do not mention the Turks. Be that as it may, these statistics are linked with a statement by Vasilis Platis. In his doctoral paper, he mentioned that during the 1860s in Greece some people became conscious of the fact that Greece needed Ottoman Macedonia. According to him, the Greek King George the First in September of 1869 received a letter from a very close associate, named Arvanitoyannis, who emphasized the great importance of Macedonia to Greece. (Platis, 2008: 290) The publication of these statistics did not indicate at all that during the next twenty years a small storm would appear in regard to the statistics for Macedonia and it was connected with turbulent political events in the region, attended by wars and changes of borders.

The events that happened during the 1860s and 1870s in Serbia, the Cretan Uprising, the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the beginning of the Eastern crisis with the uprisings in Bosnia and Herzegovina, etc., increased the interest among the European diplomats in regard to the Ottoman territories in Europe. The interest of the diplomats was followed by public interest and science. During this period, various ethnographic maps were published that referred to Ottoman Macedonia, such as those by Mackenzie and Irby, Petermann, Kiepert, Wilde etc. There also appeared some statistical data like those by Jiricek, Kanitz or the one by Synvet as a part of his geography book. The ethnic maps were forerunners of a real flood of statistics of all kinds in regard to the ethnic composition of the population of Macedonia (Mojsov, 1989: 148). Some of these maps were not in favor of the Greeks and their interests. Thus, their reaction does not surprise anybody. Here, I would like to elaborate on only one of their statistics from the beginning of 1878 published in the Parnassos monthly journal. This journal had great influence in Greece and it published the works by the most outstanding Greek intellectuals. These statistics probably compiled by several authors were issued as an addition to the four statistics that referred to European Turkey that means the ones prepared by Kiepert, Synvet, Edward Stanford and to Bianconi. The authors of these statistics in the foreword emphasized that the verification of the numbers of the population in Epirus, Thessaly and Macedonia was very important, so they happily can give the reader the precise information in regard to the composition of the population in these regions (Parnassos, t. 2, 1878: 224). Whether these data are true is another story. Here, we shall pay attention to the data in regard to Macedonia. The Skopje and Bitola vilayet, that are presented together, had a total of 1,314,000 inhabitants (Parnassos, t.2, 1878: 225). The largest part of the population was Christian – 934.000, followed by Muslims – 350.000, then Romas, Jews and others – 30.000. The statistics would not be complete if they do not contain data with regard to the ethnic structure of the population. Thus the Greeks and pro-Greek oriented Vlachs and Albanians reached the figure of 384,000, the Greeks who spoke Bulgarian were 350,000; Bulgarians that were attached to exarchate were 200,000; Muslims 350,000, and Romas, Jews and others – 30,000. In the sanjak of Seres lived 230,000 citizens out of which 56,000 were Muslims, 10,000 Romas and Circassians; 148,000 Greeks, Grecophones and Bulgarophones who recognized the Patriarchy; 15,000 Bulgarians that recognized the Exarchate and 1,000 Jews. (Parnassos, t. 2, 1878: 227) In the vilayet of Thessaloniki lived 521,000 citizens

of which the most numerous were Greeks and pro-Greek oriented ones that recognized the Patriarchate – 228,000; Bulgarians were 92,000, Muslims 146,000 and Jews 55,000 (Parnassos, t.2, 1878: 227-228). In the end, the statistics of Parnassos give data for the population of Drama, Kavala, Thasos as well as Xanthi that is not in Macedonia, but it is included in those statistics. Here Muslims dominate with 100,000, then the Christian Greeks with 50,000 and Jews with 1,000. Thus, according to the compilers of this statistic, in Ottoman Macedonia, which in this case includes the Thracian city of Xanthi, lived 2,216,000 citizens out of which 1,160,000 were Greeks and pro-Greek orientated Patriarchists, 662,000 Muslims, 87,000 Jews and 307,000 Bulgarians (*Parnassos*, t. 2, 1878: 224-229). These statistics are a good example of the extent that political events influence the explanations or naming. It is easy to notice the existence of parts of the population that recognize the Constantinople Patriarchate or the Bulgarian Exarchate. As a consequence of the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 the Patriarchate declared the schism in 1872 upon the Exarchate and the referendums held in Skopje and Ohrid exist in these statistics.

Therefore, according to the compilers of these statistics, Ottoman Macedonia, in which for this purpose was included the Thracian city of Xanthi had 2,216,000 citizens out of which 1,160,000 were Greeks and pro-Greek oriented patriarchists, 662,000 Muslims, 87,000 Jews and 307,000 Bulgarians (*Parnassos*, t. 2, 1878: 224-229). These statistics in a certain way were connected with Kiepert, the most famous German cartographer at that time. His first map on the ethnological situation on the Balkan Peninsula provoked great disappointment, disagreement, and indignation in Greece. With the purpose of correcting those things that Athens considered maleficent for the Greek interests, Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos was sent to Berlin, where he commenced discussions with the German scientist that lasted several months. Kiepert, surprisingly capitulated and agreed to changes that were close to the ones that Paparrigopoulos wanted, or more precisely the line below which the Greek population dominated in Ottoman Macedonia to be below the Razlog-Nevrokop-Melnik-Strumica-Edessa-Prespa line. Thus, immediately before the commencement of the Berlin congress, a brochure that contained a map was issued. This brochure was entitled “Explanatory Notes on Ethnographic Map of Greek, Slavic, Albanian and Rumanian Countries prepared by Henry Kiepert” (Jovanovski, 2010: 326-327). These statistics contain an interesting point. Giving the statistical data referring to the number

of the population in Ottoman Macedonia was sometimes accompanied with evident ignorance of the region and the names of the cities. It was noted in these statistics that beside the Turkish name of one Macedonian city named Kalkandelen, was also mentioned the name Tetovo, but as another city. It should be noted that Kalkandelen is the Turkish name for Tetovo. This in a way coincides with the notes given by Kofos. He, in one of his works, noted that Crete, Epirus and Thessaly had priority before Macedonia. He also considers that among the Greeks in Athens, in the middle of the 19th century, there was little knowledge of the basic facts about conditions in Macedonia and in the Balkans. (Kofos, 1980: 45)

The political events that occurred in the Balkans at the beginning of the great Eastern Crisis (1875-1881), among other things, led to reconsideration of the territorial appetite of Greece, in this case towards Ottoman Macedonia. During the time that the Berlin conference was held in 1880, when the new Greek-Ottoman border was discussed, Greece paid great attention to the situation in Macedonia and Thrace, where it was considered that the Greek interests were seriously jeopardized. According to the opinion of the famous Greek historian, Evangelos Kofos, Greece began to reconcile themselves with the fact that a Greek empire to the Shar Mountain and the Balkan Mountains was not acceptable to other Balkan nations (Kofos, 1982: 94). Beside this opinion that is not untrue, there is another reason that is more important in my opinion. Namely, in one of his articles in the London "Times" dated October 5th 1903, writing about demographics and the territorial expansion of the Greek population in Macedonia, Arthur Evans wrote "the late Trikupis, as far as I know, saw the facts more clearly. He calculated well that with the exception of one narrow edge in the South and several dispersed centers of no great importance in the interior of the province, the Greek element will not have a real influence upon Macedonia" (Anglijskiya, 1998: 272). For that reason, it became inevitable to change their behavior, or, more precisely to reduce Greek territorial aspirations in Ottoman Macedonia. In June 1880, the Greek foreign affairs minister Tricoupis, sent letters to the Greek consuls in Thessaloniki, Bitola and Plovdiv asking them to give various proposals with respect to the territorial reformation of Macedonia and other parts of the Ottoman state in accordance with the proposals of the Berlin Congress. (Vakalopoulos, 1983: 26) The Greek consul in Bitola, Logothetis, on July 2, 1880 answered Tricoupis and suggested the Southern part of Macedonia, which according to him was a Greek one, to

separate from the northern part following the line Krushevo-Prilep-Mariovo-Strumica-Demir Hisar-Seres-Drama. (Vakalopoulos, 1989: 77) He also suggested that the kazas and sanjaks be divided into more community districts that would have their own administration. The Thessaloniki consul, Vatikiotis, proposed that the Northern border of the districts in which, according to him, the Greek element dominated, should run from the Rhodope mountains to Kresna and Maleshevia, and would continue towards the point where the Crna reka joins the Vardar River and along the line Tikvesh-Bitola-Prespa-Ohrid ending near Korçë (Vakalopoulos, 1983: 27) Tricoupis accepted these suggestions and they were to be used in the preparation of a memorandum that was supposed to be sent to the representatives of the great powers in Athens and Constantinople (Istanbul).

On August 14, 1880, the Greek government submitted a memorandum to the ambassadors of the great powers that in fact was intended for the European Commission in charge of the reorganization of East Roumelia (Jovanovski, 2005: 197). In this memorandum, the Greek government asked that the principle of balance of the nationalities in Macedonia remain undisturbed, because it was very important for the balance of the Mediterranean. According to the authors of the memorandum, Macedonia was the key to the Aegean Sea and the connection point between Epirus and Thessaly on one side and Thrace on the other side; therefore Macedonia was of particular importance and needed the most serious attention from the commission for reforms. The balance, according to the Greek memorandum, on which the success of the reforms depended, could not be achieved without a demarcation in Macedonia that could put an end to the activities of the foreign agents. According to the Athenian government, the Slavs and the Greeks, before the start of the activities of the pan-slavonic agents, lived together very well and there were not very serious problems in mutual relations; however, now they had misunderstandings and there was a constant pressure against the Greek teachers. Therefore it was thought that it would be necessary to make a demarcation. Macedonia needed to be divided into two vilayets one of which would cover the South-Eastern and the other the North-Western part of the region. The demarcation line would commence from the Rhodope Mountains and would pass between Strumica and Radovis and then would continue to the point where the river Crna joins the river Vardar, including Tikvesh, and continue towards Bitola, leaving on the right the vicinity of Prilep and Ohrid and including the whole district of

Korçë and from there to connect with the new Greek border through Kolonia, Anselitsa and Grevena. The South-Eastern part would include – 1) The whole Thessaloniki vilayet except the kaza of Veles; 2) the nahiya Mariovo and the kazas Bitola, Florina, Korcha, Kolonia, Anselitsa, Kailari, Kozani and Servia from the Bitola vilayet; 3) The vicinity of Grevena that was a part of the Ioanina Vilayet. This memorandum would not be interesting for our topic if it did not contain statistical data for Ottoman Macedonia. Naturally, these data referred to the South-Eastern vilayet only. According to the data given in the memorandum, there lived: 380,000 pure Greeks; 75,000 Greco-Albanians, Greco-Vlachs and Albanians; 425,000 Bulgarians and Bulgarophones; 450,000 Muslims and 63,000 Jews and others or a total of 1,397,000 citizens. It is evident that this memorandum compared to the previous statistics, shows that the number of the Greeks is not predominant in regard to the other ethnic groups. This memorandum was a creation of Tricoupis, and we have already seen the statement by the English archaeologist Arthur Evans about his attitude with regard to the ethnological situation in Macedonia. When we are talking about these statistics of the Greek government, we can say that it is the first of its kind presented to the representatives of the great powers. In that manner European diplomacy officially received statistics that completely expressed the Greek views on the composition of the population in the Ottoman Macedonia. The European public did not have that pleasure, but it would happen by the end of the century.

On February 8th, 1884, the Greek consul in Thessaloniki, Petros Logothetis sent a memoir about Macedonia to the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Vakalopoulos, 1989: 30). The memoir was a plan for the expected division of Macedonia. According to the plan of Logothetis this Ottoman region was to be divided into two great parts: South and North. The Southern line of the Southern part commenced from the village Mavrioni, South-West from Grevena and ends at the mouth of the Struma river into the Aegean Sea. The Northern line of the Southern part commenced with the villages of Gorna and Dolna Belica and continues toward Struga-Demir Hisar- Brailovo-Pletvar-the point where the Crna Reka joins the Vardar river-Melnik-Nevrokop. The western line of the southern part commenced from the already mentioned village of Mavrioni and continued towards Samarina-Nikolitsa-Kamenitsa-Kulia-Lavderia-cuts the Devol river-the village Kyuks that is located on the Shkumba River. The Eastern line of the Southern zone commences from the village of Varutin and goes to Porto La-

gos. According to Logothetis, the Southern part can be divided also into two zones Northern and Southern. Dividing line of the Southern zone commences from Protopapa and goes towards the lake of Malik-Bapchor-Mokreni-Emporio-Katranica-Batalik-Boagrievo-the mountain of Pangaion and ends at the border with East Roumelia. According to the statistical data of Logothetis, the number of Christian population in the Southern part was 565,000 and all of them were Greeks, while in the Northern part the number of Greeks was 1,073,000. They outnumbered the rest of the communities and according to Logothetis, the number of Turks is 565,000, Bulgarians – 190,000, Uniates 20,000, Protestants 5,000, Roma speakers – 16,000 and 85,000 Jews. With respect to the Northern part of Macedonia in the memorandum by Logothetis, very little attention was noted, but that was to be expected, because he emphasized that there were small Greek communities only in Skopje and Veles.

In fact, the increased scientific interest among the Greeks concerning Macedonia appeared after the great Eastern Crisis in 1881 was over, when Greece obtained Thessaly and in that manner bordered with the region of Macedonia that was a part of the Ottoman Empire. Here the events that would happen in Plovdiv in 1885 should be mentioned, as well the unification of East Rumelia with Bulgaria and the crisis that would follow. In Greece, these events would not be regarded with sympathy. Greece did not gain anything from the crises, but new phenomena appeared – printing of books, which would show the Greek character of Macedonia or to a larger part of it. The roots of the Greek character would be searched in antiquity. The purpose of the printing these books was to acquaint the Greek public with Macedonia and the importance of this region to Greek interests. The book by Ioannis Kalostipis entitled “Macedonia” was one of the first ones that would inform the Greek public of the importance of Macedonia in the future of Greece. In his book, Kalostipis determines the geographic borders of Macedonia to the North to be the Shar Mountain (Kalostipis, 1886: 9-11) and he presents the history of this region as a Greek one. This intellectual man who for a certain period worked as a teacher in Seres, presents Macedonia from the geographic point of view in the manner that it was known and the people know it even today. However, when the Greek interest is drawn into question, his representation purposely is in line with the Greek interests, which is why it commenced close to Ohrid Lake, through Bitola, Strumica and ended in Nevrokop. Thus, when Kalostipis writes about the

education and the ethnological situation in Macedonia, he draws his attention to the territories that were included in the Bitola and Thessaloniki vilayet (Kalostipis 1886: 55-69). One should not doubt that Kalostipis promotes the Greek population as a majority in Macedonia. In this manner it was meant to confirm that the larger part of Macedonia should belong to Greece. Kalostipis even gives explanation why Greece should obtain Macedonia. According to him, Macedonia was the basis of the Greek unification and enlargement. Without Macedonia, this Greek intellectual considered that the existence of Greece would not be possible neither great nor small. Macedonia was the core of Hellenism (Kalostipis, 1886: 8). When Kalostipis wrote about the education and ethnological situation in Macedonia, Kalostipis draws his attention towards the territories that were included in the Bitola and Thessaloniki vilayets. According to his estimates, in Macedonia, or more precisely in the two vilayets mentioned, there were 957,000 Greek Macedonians, 467,000 Muslims, 182,000 Bulgarians, 69,500 Jews and 12,500 Vlach Romanians, or a total of 1,688,500 citizens (Kalostipis, 1886: 69).

Besides the total number of the population of Ottoman Macedonia, Kalostipis gives us data that refer to the Thessaloniki and Bitola vilayet separately. Thus in the Thessaloniki vilayet there were 745,500 inhabitants out of which the majority by 5% were Greeks. They were followed by the Muslims 215,000, then Bulgarians 75,000, Uniates 19,000, Protestants 4,500, Vlachs 4,500 and Jews with 65,000 (Kalostipis 1886: 68). In the Bitola vilayet there lived 419,500 inhabitants, the largest number of them again Greeks, pro-Greek oriented inhabitants, followed by Muslims 130,000, Bulgarians 66,000, pro-Rumanian oriented Vlachs 7,000, and Jews 4,500 (Kalostipis, 1886: 68). In the Servia-Kozani sanjak there were 285,000 inhabitants composed only of 225,000 Greeks and 60,000 Muslims (Kalostipis, 1886: 68). Kalostipis adds to Macedonia the Korçë sanjak, although as a geographical region it does not belong to Macedonia. In this sanjak lived a total population of 236,500 citizens out of which the Greeks and people with pro-Greek orientation "albanophones, vlachophones, bulgarophones" reach the number of 155,000, followed by 62,000 Muslims, 18,000 Bulgarians and 1,500 pro-Rumanian orientated Vlachs (Kalostipis, 1886: 69). In these separate statistics prepared by Kalostipis, one can easily note that the religious orientation is mixed with the ethnic one, thus here we can not see Turks but Muslims who in fact may not have been of Turkish ethnic origin. Further

on, only here I met the Uniates and the Protestants. They, also, could be of different ethnic origin.

Kalostipis' book on Macedonia was published in a second edition under the sponsorship of the nationalistic association *Ellenismos*. The second edition was not at all surprising. The arguments that had to show that Macedonia was Greek were more than necessary. Others were more and more interested in Macedonia. This edition is larger and more solid compared to the first one. In contrast to the 1886 edition, he now noted the existence of a Serbian element, using the book by Gopchevich dealing with Macedonia (*Makedonia*, 1896: 127-130). Of course, in contrast to Gopchevich, the Greek intellectual has a completely different opinion in regard to the extent of the Macedonian regions where Serbs lived, according to his observations. His observations of the Slav dialects spoken on the territory of Macedonia are very interesting. According to Kalostipis, they were Serbian and Bulgarian but in regard to the dialect of the Macedonian Slavs, as he had already expressed, further research was needed (*Makedonia*, 1896: 129). His statement was headed in a new direction of the consideration of the Slavic population in Greece that appeared at that time. This I shall discuss in my final conclusion statements of this text. The second edition of the book by Kalostipis also contains statistical data for Ottoman Macedonia which is different from that given in the first edition. According to the author's written comments the number of the population in Southern, Middle and Northern Macedonia reached the number of 1,991,420 citizens. Of the total number of citizens, 857,820 lived in the Thessaloniki vilayet, 347,290 in the Bitola vilayet, 510,000 in the Skopje vilayet, 194,310 in the Servia-Kozani sanjak (*Makedonia*, 1896: 171). As expected, Kalostipis made his own personal calculation of the numbers of the inhabitants on the ethnic basis. Thus, according to this estimation, the number of Greeks and those who were pro-Greek orientated was 846,011. As he wrote, the number of the Ottomans was 615,286, while the number of the Slavs whom he divided into Bulgarians and Serbs was 501,000. Here it should be noted that in comparison to the first edition of his book on Macedonia, in his new one, Kalostipis included the Serbs who were not mentioned in the previous edition. In this new survey, Jews were included and their number reached 80,000 (*Makedonia*, 1896: 171-172). The purpose of these statistics was the same as the others – to show the numerical superiority of Greeks with respect to other communities in Macedonia.

The Greek intellectual and journalist Kleantis Nikolaidis took a further step. He published a book in Berlin which in fact was the first Greek study on Macedonia issued in another European language (Gounaris, Michailidis 2003: 143). Nikolaidis included an ethnographic and linguistic map of Macedonia, and as he emphasized himself, that was based on the map by Kiepert of 1878 (Nikolaidis, 1899). This map attempted to show as predominant the Greek language and Greek population in the Macedonian region below the line Bitola-Demir Kapija- Strumitsa-Melnik-Nevrokop. This book was significant not only for the map. In the book the author attempted to demonstrate that Macedonia was connected to Greece from antiquity. Nikolaidis' book is also of interest to the topic we are elaborating on. It contains data for Ottoman Macedonia elaborated by the author himself. Although on the map Nikolaidis divides Macedonia into two parts, when the question refers to statistics, he presents data for the three vilayets that included the mentioned region. In Kosovo vilayet, or more precisely the Skopje sanjak, beside the Macedonian kazas, the kaza of Kachanik was added. According to Nikolaidis in this sanjak lived 276,008 citizens out of which 5,036 Greeks; Muslims 117,781; Bulgarians 137,134, Catholics 398, Jews 1,570 and Roma 4,208 (Nikolaidis, 1899: 25). With respect to the Bitola vilayet, Nikolaidis gives the composition of the population of the two sanjaks who lived in Ottoman Macedonia, the Bitola, and Serfidze-Kozani. Thus in Bitola sanjak there were totally 324,629 citizens out of which Greeks (orthodox) 169,030, Bulgarians (schismatic) 87,159, Muslims (Albanians and Turks) and Jews 5,000 (Nikolaidis, 1899: 26). Nikolaidis as well as Vatikiotis in 1884 and Kalostipis in 1885, included the sanjak of Korcha in Macedonia. Writing about the inclusion of some regions to Macedonia and elimination of some other parts from the same, Lazar Moysov noticed that it was intentionally done by the Greek interests with the purpose of presenting the number of the Greek population as a relative majority in Macedonia with a clear aim to show that Macedonia is Greek. (Mojsov, 1989: 145). The Serbia-Kozani sanjak had 100,181 citizen out of which 71,230 Greeks, 27,475 Turks, 1,275 Vlachs, 180 Romas, and 21 Jews (Nikolaidis, 1899: 26) With respect to the Thessaloniki vilayet, Nikolaidis, just as is the case with the Bitola vilayet, gives data according to which the Greek element prevails in all the sanjaks in the vilayet. Thus, in Thessaloniki sanjak lived 605,769 citizens out of which 232,621 were Greeks, 91,708 Bulgarians, 17,494 Vlachs, 180,735 Turks, 1,670 Romas, and 73,455 Jews (Nikolaidis, 1899: 26-27). In the sanjak of Ser lived 365,395 citizens out of which surprisingly the most

numerous were Turks who reached the number of 127,810, the second were the Greeks with 124,247, while Bulgarians reached the number of 108,143 citizens. The rest of 5,195 citizens, Nikolaidis registered in the column entitled "others" (Nikolaidis, 1899: 27). According to him even in the sanjak of Drama, Turks constituted the largest community. In fact, out of 153,400 citizens, 103,250 were Turks, 45,220 Greeks, 3,450 Bulgarians, 1680 Jews and 200 others (Nikolaidis, 1899: 27). When we calculate these figures, according to the Greek intellectual, in Macedonia, the Greeks were 1/3 of the population, i.e., the majority ethnic group. That, in fact, was the actual purpose of these statistics.

During the last year of the 19th century, we met one more statistical piece of data for Ottoman Macedonia. The famous Greek intellectual, a lawyer and professor from the University of Athens and president of the nationalistic association called Hellenismos, Neoklis Kazazis in one of his books describing the position of Hellenism in the Balkan Peninsula shows concise statistics of the composition of the population of Ottoman Macedonia. Kazazis wrote that the Thessaloniki vilayet had 1,200,000 citizens, while the Bitola vilayet had 600,000 citizens (Kazazis 1899: 336). In these two vilayets the majority of the population is composed of Greeks, who reached the total of 600,000 and Turks – 750,000, while the rest of the population composed Bulgarians, Serbs and Albanians. In the sanjak of Servia lived 150,000 out of which 70,000 were Greeks while the rest or 80,000 were Turks. This university professor gives us data for the Kosovo vilayet where there lived 750,000 persons, but he only mentioned that the majority of the population was composed by Serbs and Albanians. When the credibility of these statistics was called into question, Kazazis himself wrote, and this should correctly be noted, that the data is not the most precise in regard to the number of the Turks, and especially in regard to the number of Bulgarians whose number was larger than the one shown (Kazazis 1899: 337).

In the end, it is easy to conclude that the aim of these statistics was to show the Greek character of Ottoman Macedonia or to a great part of it. This particularly refers to statistics that were published during the last two decades of the 19th century. The figures that they contain are unreal and exaggerated. However, the statistical data presented by Bulgarians and Serbs were also slanted in their own favor, and so we can not say that during this period the Greeks were an exception. Politics and figures go side by side, as politics and war go together. The figures precede the weapons, as Karpat lu-

cidly notes. The statistics that I have presented include various ethnic and religious communities in Ottoman Macedonia. However, we have not evidenced the Macedonians. We can find them under the names that they were given, like Slavs, Serbs, Bulgarians, even under Uniates and Protestants. Why is that so? Beside the explanation of those who claim that there are not Macedonians, that the term Macedonian had only a geographical meaning, here we have to note that at the end of the century, the Greeks commenced to register them under a separate entity. Some Greek newspapers printed articles of discovery by some Russian scientists of a new Macedonian-Slavic nation in Ottoman Macedonia (Gounaris, 2007: 328). Very soon, even some Greek intellectuals wrote of Slavic Macedonians or only Macedonians. Thus, the already mentioned Neoklis Kazazis in Macedonia among the population, beside the Bulgarians and Serbs, recognized Slavophone Macedonians, while the officer of the Greek Army, Pavlos Melas, the man who organized the Greek armed action in Ottoman Macedonia, after the Ilinden Uprising in 1903, in his letters to his wife describing the local Slavic population uses the term Macedonian (Koliopoulos, 2003: 152). Other examples exist, but even these are sufficient for explanation.

Bibliography:

- Anglijskija pečat za Ilindensko-preobraženskoto vstanie*, Sofija, 1998
- DIMESKI Dimitar, *Makedonskoto nacionalnoosloboditelno dviženje vo Bitolskiot vilajt 1893-1903*, Studentski zbor, Skopje, 1982
- GOUNARIS Vasilis, Michailidis Iakovos, “Peroto i mečot: pregled na istoriografijata za makedonskoto prašanje”, in: *Vikor Roudometof (ed.), Makedonskoto prašanje*, Evro-Balkan press, Skopje, 2003, p.139-195
- GOUNARIS Vasilis, *Ta Valkania tōn Ellēnōn*, Thessalonikē, 2007
- JOVANOVSKI Dalibor, “Revizija na grčkite teritorijalni aspiracii vo osmanliska Makedonija”, *Godišen zbornik na Filozofskiot fakultet, br. 63*, Skopje, 2010, p.319-331
- JOVANOVSKI Dalibor, *Grčkata balkanska politika i Makedonija 1830-1881*, Ba-to&Divajn, Skopje, 2005
- KALOSTIPIS Ioannis, *Makedonia ētoi meletē oikonomologikē, geōgrafikē kai ethnologikē tēs Makedonias*, en Athēnis, 1886

- Makedonia ētoi meletē oikonomologikē, geōgrafikē kai ethnologikē tēs Makedonias*, en Athēnis, 1896
- KARPAT, Kemal, Ottoman population 1830-1914, University of Wisconsin Press, 1985
- KAZAZIS Neokles, *O ellēnismos en tē chersonēsō tou Aimou*, Athēnais, 1899
- KOFOS Evangelos, Dilemmas and orientations of Greek policy in Macedonia 1878-1896, *Balkan Studies*, 21, Institute for Balkan studies, Thessaloniki, 1980,
- KOFOS Evangelos, Greek-Serbian relations and the question of Macedonia 1879-1896, in: *Greek-Serbian cooperation 1830-1908*, Belgrade, 1982,
- KOLIPOULOS Ioannis, *Istoria tēs Ellados apo 1800*, Vaniias, Thessalonikē, 2000
- KOLIPOULOS Ioannis, *Peran Ellas kai "alloi" Ellēnes. To syghrono Elliniko ethnos kai eteroglōssoi synikoi*, Thessalonikē, 2003
- KOLIPOULOS Ioannis, "The shaping of the new Macedonia", in: *History of Macedonia*, Thessaloniki, 2007
- MOJSOV Lazar, Makedoncite vo Egejska Makedonija, Mislā, Skopje, 1989
- NICOLAIDES Cleanthes, *La Macedoine, la questioin macedonienne dans l'antique, au moyen-age et dans la politique actuelle*, Johannes Ræde, Berlin, 1899
- Pandōra*, t. 20, f.462, 15 iouniou 1869
- Parnassos*, t. 2, Athēnai, 1878
- PLATĒS Vasileios, *Istoriē geōgrafia kai ethnikes diekdikēseis tōn Ellēnōn ton 19 aiōna*. Didaktorikē diatrivē Filosofikē sholē APTh, Thessalonikē, 2008
- SARIPOLOS Nicolaos, *Pro Graecia*, t.2, Athenes, 1853
- VAKALOPOULOU K. O Voreios hellēnismos kata tēn prōimē fasē tou makedonikou agōna 1878-1894, IMXA, Thessalonikē, 1983
- VAKALOPOULOU K., *To makedoniko zētēma*, Parathērētēs, Thessalonikē, 1989