

POPULATION TRANSFERS IN MEDITERRANEAN HISTORY:
OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN THE FOURTEENTH - SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

Fatma Müge Göçek
University of Michigan
Sociology Department
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Population transferⁱ is the transportation of a group of people from one location to another under the authority of an organized body, almost exclusively the state. The earliest instances of population transfers in history often relate to warfare -- to the maintenance of territorial monopoly by the state. The neo-Assyrian emperor Sennacherib, when recounting his Judean campaign against Hezekiah in 701 B.C., refers to the "200,150 people great and small, male and female, horses, mules, asses, camels and sheep, without number," he transfers into his lands as spoil, a practice necessary for the domination of "the four rims of the earth (Oded 1979, pp. 1)." The themes of economic booty and political domination intersect as later empires attempt to coopt social groups through population transfers. Persian and Byzantine empires frequently deport large populations from within and outside their boundaries (Vryonis 1971); the Ottoman empire follows suit (Barkan 1949-51).

A normative element is introduced to population transfers with the emergence of Enlightenment and the diffusion of nationalism in the West. As European societies emphasize natural and political rights, they ethically condemn many social practices, including population transfers. This interpretation does not hinder their practice, however; the differential definition of "civilized" versus "uncivilized" societies enables European powers to qualify what comprises a right for whom. Population transfers occur in the European colonies; in 1905-11, for example, Dutch colonialists in Java encourage the transmigration from overpopulated residencies to new open lands for cultivation (Kingston 1987, p. 65). The ostensible economic reasons for these transfers often produce dependencies and indebtedness.

Population transfers also occur within Europe itself, East and West, during the same time period. In the Ottoman Empire, as nationalism undermines the delicate balance of the multi-ethnic empire by segmenting it into nation-states, emerging ethnic antagonisms are resolved through forced migrations; Greeks are moved to the Balkans and Turks to Asia Minor in the early decades of the twentieth century (Kitromilides and Alexandris 1984-5). The Soviets undertake one of the most massive population transfers during and after the Second World War; they deport Volga Germans, Karachai, Kalmyks, Chechen, Ingush, Balkars, Crimean Tatars and Meskhetians eastward for preventive measures against the approaching enemy or for strategic reasons against having these groups in border areas (Kreindler 1986, p. 391). The United States performs a similar population transfer on the Japanese during the Second World War, and on the Mexicans in the 1930's during the Great Depression (Hoffman 1972, p. 291). One may argue that states still indirectly practice population transfers; yet they now let the market forces justify the migration of large populations within and across their boundaries.

This article studies the social practice of Ottoman population transfers during the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries. It argues that three dimensions shape the Ottoman practice of populations transfers: specific historical conditions which set the parameters of the practice, social actors who interpret and execute it, and institutions which reproduce it across time and space. These dimensions bifurcate the practice of Ottoman population transfers into two phases. The first phase, encompassing the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, marks the constitution of the Ottoman practice. Byzantine, Turkic and Islamic traditions set the boundaries for the population transfer policy. The Ottoman state and the officials it empowers enact population transfers at the expense of peasants, urban dwellers, nomads, and conquered rulers and their retinues. Ottoman economic and military institutions utilize population transfers to maximize resources and political control. The second phase, containing the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, signal the transformation of the Ottoman practice: Population transfers become a punitive state regulation

specifically exercised on religious dissenters, errant officials, and nomads. Ottoman administrative and religious institutions explicitly employ the transfers to curtail religious heterodoxy and administrative breakdown. The article concludes with a note on the significance of contextualization in historical inquiry. It points out that the article could generate new insights on the social practice only through positioning Ottoman population transfers within Mediterranean history at large.

Phase I: The Constitution of Ottoman Population Transfers as a Practice, 14th-15th Centuries

The Ottoman state originated in Asia Minor in the late thirteenth century; it then expanded into Circassia, the Arabian peninsula, North Africa in the East and to the Balkans and Eastern Europe in the West during the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. Its rule over large parts of these regions dwindled until the demise of the state in 1922. Ottoman population transfers in the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries thus mark the formation and expansion of Ottoman rule.

Ottoman territorial expansion in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries set the parameters of the practice of Ottoman population transfers. When the Ottoman state, founded in 1299 in Western Asia Minor as a small principality, started to expand Westward against Byzantine territory during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it mostly employed population transfers to maintain its conquests in the Balkan peninsula. In mid-fifteenth century, Ottoman conquests rapidly expanded east and west against Byzantine lands and transformed the Ottoman state into a multi-ethnic, multi-religious empire. This change in Ottoman political rule also transformed the nature of Ottoman population transfers; the Ottoman state started to transfer population units throughout its lands in all directions to centralize and solidify imperial rule.

Historical Conditions: Byzantine, Steppe and Islamic Traditions The Ottoman practice of population transfers was structured around oral accumulation and transmissions of knowledge, i.e., around tradition. Three traditions in particular coalesced to form Ottoman population transfers. The Byzantine, Turkish and Islamic traditions set the parameters within which Ottoman population transfers were practiced.

The Byzantine state, which was the predecessor of the Ottoman state in Anatolia and the Balkans, inherited the practice of the transfer of populations from the Roman state (Charanis 1972, pp. 143, 145-7, 150-1). It then employed this practice frequently throughout its rule. Population transfers increased the economic prosperity of the Byzantine state as they enabled land previously untilled to be opened to cultivation; in 578, Emperor Tiberius removed ten thousand Armenians from their homes and settled them in Cyprus. During the reign of Constantine V (741-775) thousands of Armenians and Syrians gathered by the Byzantine army during their raids into Mara_ (Marasim) and Erzurum (Theodosipolis) were settled in Thrace (Charanis 1972, pp. 150-1). Vast regions and urban centers depopulated by frequent famines and wars were also repopulated through population transfers; one such urban center was Constantinople, the Byzantine capital. In 755, after a plague, Constantine V transferred a large number people to the city from Greece and the Aegean islands. Similarly in 1261, following the recovery of Constantinople from the Latins, Michael VIII brought large groups of Moreans to repeople it (Charanis 1972, pp. 141, 144, 149).

These transfers had political advantages as well. Byzantine emperors settled the nomadic incursions from the Balkans and from the East through population transplantations. Justinian I

(527-656) settled Vandals in Asia Minor, Bulgars in Thrace, and Boths in Bithynia; Justinian II (685-695, 705-711) seized multitudes of Slavs from the Balkans and settled them in Asia Minor (Charanis 1972, pp. 150-1). Often, the Byzantine state also used the transferred populations to supplement the ranks of the Byzantine army in the provinces. In 941, the Arab tribe of the Banu Habid, which migrated into Byzantine territories and embraced Christianity, was settled and enrolled in the Byzantine army (Charanis 1972, p. 15). Groups of Armenian soldiers were settled in various parts of Anatolia, mainly in the eastern regions; several thousand Persian soldiers who deserted to Byzantium in 834 were also settled throughout Asia Minor (Vryonis 1971, pp. 50-2). Michael VIII (1261-1282) settled a number of Turks who were the followers of the Seljuk sultan in Dobruja to fight off the enemies of the Byzantine emperor (Wittek 1952, pp. 657-68).

The emperors employed population transfers to procure the Byzantinization of certain regions and groups which were not ethnically or religiously integrated into the empire. Emperor Nicephorus I (802-811) ordered the transplantation of Christians from every province of the empire to the Sclavinias (Thessalonica) region which was inhabited predominantly by Slavs. Michael I (811-813) transferred a religious sect residing in Phrygia and Lycaonia to the Western provinces. Emperor Maurice (582-602) deported Armenians to Thrace; the Armenians removed by Basil II (867-886) were settled in Macedonia. When Byzantium annexed further Armenian territories in the tenth century, thousands of Armenians were settled in Cappadocia, Cilicia, and Northern Syria (Vryonis 1971).

Byzantine population transfers provided an organizational model to the successors of the Byzantine Empire, the Seljuk and Ottoman Turks, who had started raiding Asia Minor from the eleventh century on (Vryonis 1971, pp. 182-5, 217-8). The Turks initially returned to Persia after their raids, often carrying along many Byzantine subjects as booty. Later in the century, when the Turks started to settle in Asia Minor, they captured and transferred Christian populations into their regions in order to increase agricultural productivity. In 1137, the entire population of Adana was deported to Malatya (Melitene); the inhabitants of Kaisum and other regions were also taken away. During the Crusades, the Seljuk Turks recolonized their devastated lands with Greek, Armenian, and Syrian farmers, often deporting entire villages and towns from Byzantine and Armenian lands. The Seljuk sultan of Konya (Iconium) deported five thousand villages from Tantalus and Cania (Aphrodisias) in the Meander valley and resettled them about Ak_ehir (Philomelium); these villages were carefully registered before the deportation and then were given, in the deported region, seed, livestock, and a tax immunity for five years. The Byzantine state tried to arrest further Turkish encroachment by rebuilding its destroyed and deserted towns in Asia Minor through population transfers of Greeks, Armenians, Serbs, and Latins. When, in spite of these Byzantine efforts, Turkish principalities were firmly established in Anatolia at the end of the thirteenth century, population transfers had become a practice shared by the Byzantines and the Turks.

The Ottoman termⁱⁱ for population transfers, literally "driving a herd," connotes the role of the Turkish steppe tradition in this practice. The act of driving flocks, herds, related to stock breeding, was a Turkish nomadic activity. The Turks added another meaning to this activity as they extended its scope, by analogy, to cover the practice of driving people from one place to another. The Ottoman cognitive use of the Turkish steppe tradition in this manner is not an isolated instance. Ottoman historical sources frequently indicate how previous Turkic nomadic experiences continued, even after sedentarization, to shape the Ottoman interpretation of social practices. One late sixteenth-century account (Mustafa Nuri [1877], pp. 175, 325) portrays how

the nomadic distinction of seasons according to which the nomads attended to their flocks patterned Ottoman warfare:

(The Ottoman) Pasha fought continuously with the Austrian army...since "November time" had arrived both armies retired to their winter quarters...In those days, the year was divided into two halves... The November days, called "the day of the ramming season," started on the eighth of November and lasted until the sixth of May...That was when the ram mating with the sheep was undertaken.

Another aspect of the warfare which was patterned by the nomadic experience was the speed with which warfare was conducted. The pastoral activities carried on horseback enabled Ottomans to mobilize soldiers and strike rapidly.ⁱⁱⁱ One fifteenth century chronicle conveys this speed in describing the Ottoman raids in the Balkans (Edirneli Oruç [15th cent.], p. 81):

(Sultan Mahmud) campaigned to the Wallachian region. He crossed the Danube. He gave raids. He pillaged the Wallachian Region. They returned with great booty on the year (1422).

As the Ottomans expanded, their perceptions of newly conquered regions highlighted the attributes that would be significant for nomads -- the quality of the rivers, the state of the country's winter and summer pastures, and the fertility of the land. When describing a newly conquered territory, Morea, one fifteenth-century Ottoman account (Tursun Bey [1499], pp. 74-5) states:

(Morea) is a beautiful domain with great abundance. The sheep lamb twice a year. The quality of its rivers approach the Nile and Euphrates. It possesses summer and winter pastures; its air is pleasant and its water is cool. In all, it is a matchless country.

The social practices that the Ottomans engaged in upon their arrival in Asia Minor and later expansion to the Balkans were thus mapped out within the Byzantine tradition they encountered and the Turkic steppe tradition they brought with them.

When the Turks started to settle in Asia Minor in former Byzantine territories, they retained, in addition to their nomadic tradition, their Islamic religion. The Ottoman Turks fought in the name and under the guidance of Islam which rewarded its warriors in all possible outcomes: if they died, they reached Heaven; if they survived to be victorious, they illuminated the conquered lands with the light of Islam and enjoyed the booty that was God's gift to them. Success reconfirmed the righteousness of their activities; defeat, the dreaded outcome, did not occur frequently during this period of expansion to upset the ethos of Islamic conquest. Many poems narrate the role of religion in the Ottoman conquests; one, often quoted for its intense religious fervor, states (A_kpa_ao_lu [1476], p. 134):^{iv}

The banners were unfurled and the drums sounded
See how the warrior lords are eyeing one another
They marched resolved for Holy War
They met as they promised one another
The warriors for Islam performed the ritual prayer on horseback

The poem continues with the Sultan making many supplications to God, stating that his duty is to obey God to whom Islam belongs. God will then provide goodness and kindness if the sultan "is

drowning in the sea of rebellion." The description of the battle scene that follows the poem portrays how the sultan and his warriors then met the Infidels chanting "God is Great."

After the conquest, Islam also pervaded the social practices that followed. The Islamic tradition legitimized the population transfer of Muslims into the newly conquered lands, and, indirectly, the transfer of non-Muslims out of them. A conquered city in the Balkans was "Islamicized" first as the Ottoman warriors who wanted were settled and then Muslims from Asia Minor were transferred. The Christian slaves that were taken in the conquest were often moved and settled in Asia Minor among the Muslim population. One fifteenth-century account describes this population practice as structured by the Islamic tradition (A__kpa_ao_lu [1476], p. 249):

(In 1429) With God's permission (the Ottomans) conquered the castle (of Salonica)....And they took slaves....They gave the property of the houses (which became vacant) to those (soldiers) who chose the option of staying there. They also transferred the (Muslim) inhabitants of Vardar. They brought (and settled) these people in Salonica. In short, they made the dominion of Infidels the dominion of Islam.

The combination of the Byzantine organizational precedence, the nomadic rigor, and the Islamic zeal structured Ottoman population transfers and set the conceptual parameters for its interpretation and performance by the social actors, the transferring and the transferred.

Social Actors: The Ottoman State and the Transferred The Ottoman state decrees on population transfers carefully delineate the social actors engaged in the social practice. These actors fall into three categories, those social groups which, through their reports to the ruler, initiate the transfers, the state agents who oversee the transfers, and those social groups which are transferred.

The initiators of the population transfer are often Ottoman land surveyors who prepare lists of the regions where people have no land to cultivate or possess skills that are in shortage in the newly conquered places. They send these lists to the state administrators in the capital who, in order to increase economic productivity (and thus the tax base), decide which groups to transfer (mostly landless peasants, nomads or urban dwellers) and which areas to transfer these groups to (Barkan 1951, pp. 548-53). The population transfers are also initiated through the complaints of a settled group of people, often peasants or urban dwellers suffering from the activities of the nomads. A 1712 Ottoman population transfer decree (Ahmed Refik 1930, pp. 143-4) maps out one such instance where a group of disgruntled peasants traveled to the capital to have an audience with the sultan. They, as the sultan articulates in the decree "came to the gates of my center of greatness and complained about the ceaseless cruelties and transgressions of these nomads." These petitioners often stay in the capital until the petition is investigated and acted upon, a procedure rarely taking less than a few months. Having such large groups of petitioners not only strained the food provisions at the capital but also contributed to the urban unrest. The sultan issued many decrees urging such groups to send one or two representatives to the capital instead -- but, judging from the frequency of such decrees, without avail (Ahmed Refik 1930).

Once the sultan and his council of administrators decided to undertake a population transfer, an imperial edict was issued to execute it. This edict specified the agents that the state empowered to execute the transfer, comprising the governor and the district judges, janissary commanders, provincial notables, and the skilled men of the province. These parties were ordered specifically to mobilize and join the governor for the execution of the imperial edict. The 1712 transfer decree

mentioned above specifies this procedure -- it reads: "you who are the provincial judges will collect the janissary soldiers by means of their officers, and the provincial men capable of fighting situated in the seat of your districts from their dwellings. You who are the janissary commanders, together with all your soldiers, and you, who are the provincial notables and skilled men, together with the provincial men capable of fighting, should join the governor with speed." This group of state agents oversaw the execution of the transfer and, if the need arose, fought the resisters. The Ottoman state, by including the leaders and members of the local community in the execution of the transfer order, coopted their agency and made them a part of the state.

The participation of the local community occurred, however, under the strict supervision of the governor. The empowerment offered to the local community by the state through this population transfer was not permitted to happen at the expense of the state's monopoly over the practice. The state set rules as it attempted to withhold the power the community might have acquired through the execution of the transfer. "In dispatching the transfer," the 1712 decree reads, "act according to the sound judgement of the governor. Do not leave the side of the governor and perform your services to the utmost of your capacity under his judgement...If you do not consent to his judgement, and your disregard and your negligence becomes evident in the services required in my imperial decree, know with certainty that your apology and reply shall never be listened to and that you will be inflicted with severe punishment." So, the decree concludes with the sentence "act with caution and care in this matter." The rules guiding the population transfer thus emerged hand in hand with the constitution of the practice.

When the group to be transferred was not already specified, the district judges selected a certain number of peasants or urban dwellers to be transferred. The selection process was complex: The judges often chose no more than one household in every ten. Since these transfers were burdensome, villages and towns often tried to send those households which had disturbed the peace of the community by engaging in activities such as stealing or destroying property. Through the transfers, villages and towns retained their social harmony and the transferred households were perceived as being given another chance at a new region. The Ottoman state thus had the community to judge one another's social actions and endowed legitimacy to their judgement. By participating in this selection process, the local communities were also drawn into state policy.

Another factor that guaranteed state legitimacy was the utmost bureaucratic care with which the population transfer was executed. The Ottoman state clearly defined the power and authority of each participating agent. Once households to be transferred were selected, they sold their immovable property in an auction and took their movable goods, tools and domestic animals with them. The judges carefully registered the names of these households, their wards and all their possessions and sent a copy of the signed register to the capital. The sultan's representatives, who arrived from the capital with another copy of the transfer decree, accompanied, along with the provincial state agents, these households to their new settlement. These representatives received from the judges a copy of the register of the transferred and took it back to the capital with them when the transfer was completed -- thus ascertaining that the population transfer had taken place in good order. The transferred households were then exempted from taxes and all other obligations for a couple of years.

The Transferred Peasants, nomads, urban dwellers, and conquered rulers and their retinue comprised the four social groups which participated in the constitution of Ottoman population

transfers as "the other," i.e., the transferred. These groups all affected Ottoman territorial expansion in the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries.

The population transfer of peasants accompanied Ottoman territorial expansion from its inception at the end of the thirteenth century. By transferring Muslim peasants from Asia Minor to the conquered fertile provinces in the Balkans, the Ottoman state increased both economic productivity and the tax revenues accruing from it, and political security and legitimacy emanating from it. These transfers to the Balkans were made mainly from the nearby regions in Asia Minor such as Bal_kesir (Palaeocastro) and Manisa (Magnesia). The transferred peasants initially clustered around the settlements of Ottoman frontier lords to whom the sultan had delegated his authority over most of the conquered lands. Faced with the problem of cultivating these lands, the chiefs gave out portions of their lands to their relatives and retinue who summoned their families from Anatolia. The transferred peasants settled around this core population unit.

After the Ottoman sultan Murad I (1360-1389) transferred his court to the Balkans and proclaimed Edirne (Adrianople) his capital in 1365, the transfer of Muslim peasants from Asia Minor heightened to solidify the Ottoman rule in the Balkans. The succeeding sultan Bayazid I (1389-1401) attempted to set up a unified Ottoman empire around this capital in the Balkans. He complemented his conquests in Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Thessaly with massive transfers of peasants from Asia Minor. As a sixteenth-century anonymous Ottoman chronicle (Onalt_nc_As_rda [16th cent.], p. 96) recounts:

(The Sultan) collected his entire army and marched onto the Bulgarian King...He dispersed the Bulgarians...and he seized many castles and towns of Hungary...Then he took many people and Turkish families from Anatolia and passed them onto Rumeli to be settled in Üsküp (Skopje) and Bulgaria.

The large-scale transfer of settled people into the Balkans systematized Ottoman rule. A fresh exodus of Anatolian Turks into the Balkans following the Tatar leader Timur's invasions in Asia Minor further enhanced Ottoman power. The transferred Muslim peasant population often integrated with the local community to gradually Ottomanize and Islamize these regions. These peasants were settled along the routes of Ottoman expansion to supply labor and provisions to the Ottoman army whenever necessary. Their presence also contributed to maintaining the communication between the Ottoman army and the capital intact. The Ottoman army could thus afford to move further and further into enemy lands and make new conquests.

Whereas peasants preserved agricultural productivity and enabled the reproduction of Ottoman rule in the rural areas, the transfer of another population unit, urban dwellers, was significant in maintaining economic productivity within urban centers. This productivity became particularly crucial after the Ottoman state took the form of an empire, a political form that relied on the concentration of power in urban centers. Population transfers to cities were especially significant in terms of generating administrative power for the Ottoman state. Cities were "power containers" in so far as they permitted a concentration of resources (Giddens 1985, p. 13). Hence population transfers to the cities enhanced state power and enabled its political transformation into an empire.

This transformation started in the reign of Sultan Mehmed II, who, among all the Ottoman sultans, authorized and executed the largest number of population transfers of urban dwellers in the fifteenth century to repopulate his newly conquered capital, Constantinople. He sent decrees to all

the Ottoman provinces in Asia Minor stating that he would give houses, vineyards, and gardens to all those Muslims who came to Constantinople. When there was an insufficient response, the sultan decreed that abundant households be transferred to his capital from every Ottoman province (A_kpa_ao_lu [1476], p. 193). In addition, he systematically transported the Triballi, Paeonians, and Moesians he conquered in the Balkans to the suburbs of Constantinople. Many of the Peloponnesians who were better than the rest in their knowledge of trades were settled inside the city; the rest were placed in the surrounding region in villages to engage in agriculture (Kritovulos [1460], pp. 36, 39). The repopulation of Istanbul was later continued by Selim II (1512-1520) and Süleyman II (1520-1566) who made population transfers of urban dwellers, particularly artisans, from Tabriz and Belgrade (Haydar Çelebi [1520], p. 146; Mustafa Nuri [1877], p. 93).

The most significant group that was transferred to consolidate this Ottoman territorial and structural expansion were the ruling groups and their retinue. By transferring these administratively skilled groups rather than destroying them, the Ottoman state coopted their skills. Mehmed II, for example, continually transferred the Anatolian ruling elite to the Balkans and the Christian elite in the Balkans to Anatolia, thus centralizing Ottoman rule throughout. He gave the conquered Balkan elites important Ottoman administrative posts in Anatolia. The lower Balkan aristocracy such as the Voynuks and the Martoleses were also transferred into Ottoman army units in the Anatolian provinces. Hence the Ottoman state deconstructed a conquered ruling body by transferring parts of it to separate regions, and then capitalized on their administrative skills by assigning them to Ottoman posts.

The Ottoman population transfers in the Black Sea region of Trabzon (Trebizond), last vestige of the Byzantine empire, demonstrate this practice, among others, in detail. The conquered Byzantine emperor was moved, together with all the members of his family, his officers, and other notables, to Constantinople. Some 800 young men were also sent to the capital to be trained for service in the Ottoman janissary corps, and the same number of women joined the sultan's household (Lowry 1977). The lower level warriors were sent to the Balkans and, in return, Albanian cavalymen were transferred to Trabzon. Ottoman land grant registers reveal the presence of these Albanian cavalymen; around 1483, among the 207 land grants in the city, 25 belonged to old Christian cavalymen from Albania (Barkan 1949-1951, pp. 214-22). In a similar mode, conquered Muslim leaders of Asia Minor were exiled to the Balkans with significant governorships. One Muslim leader who had surrendered Sinob in Asia Minor by his own will was given the governorship of Filibe (Plovdiv, Philipopolis) in the Balkans (Edirneli Oruç [15th cent.], pp. 119).

Nomads comprised the other frequently transferred group, often aiding the Ottoman colonization of the newly conquered regions in the Balkans. One of the earliest accounts of Ottoman settlement there revolved around a small fort, Çimpe (Tzympe) that the Ottomans captured to use as a base for their attacks into the surrounding regions. They transferred nomads to this stronghold among enemy territories to aid them in their quick surprise raids, as described by a fifteenth-century chronicle (A_kpa_ao_lu [1476], p. 124):

(Süleyman Pasa) sent a message to his father Orhan Ghazi which stated..."many muslim men are needed to be inhabited in the forts conquered on this side...send people who will both settle here and also serve as brave fighting comrades..." Arab nomads had arrived to the Karasi province. They moved these nomads and passed them to Rum Eli (Rumelia)...

Since the nomads were constantly on horseback, they easily adapted to the difficult life of an Ottoman frontier soldier. The tribal leaders, once integrated into the Ottoman administrative system through appointments, held strategic positions in the Ottoman frontier offense and defense systems. The Ottoman army was often supplemented by special military units made up of male members of the nomads. They were also employed in ship building and provision of tools, in the defense and maintenance of roads and bridges, in mines, in the building and repair of castles, and in tracing bandits.

An additional reason for these transfers was the inability of the Ottoman state to control the activities of nomads. Unable to regulate these activities or preempt them, the state transferred the nomads instead. A Tatar tribe was moved to the Filibe region in the Balkans for failing to join the Ottoman campaigns (A_kpa_ao_lu [1476], pp. 152-3):

The Sultan...(seeing) many Tatar houses in (Iskilib)...(said) "These (Tatars) visit each other and do not show up in my campaigns. They must be transferred." All these Tatars were brought together, forwarded to the Filibe region and settled in the vicinity of the Konu_ fort.

Similarly, for not obeying the salt prohibition enforced by the Ottoman state, the nomads in Saruhan, a province in Asia Minor, were settled in the same Filibe region (Ne_ri [1492], p. 339).

The population transfer of the nomads occurred frequently throughout Ottoman history^v because their mode of life kept conflicting with the Ottoman state regulations which assumed a sedentary existence and continued allegiance to the sultan. As the inflow of nomadic tribes from the East into Asia Minor persisted until the eighteenth century, the Ottoman state tried to control this volatile force through population transfers. When the sedentarized Ottoman subjects, whose productivity was indispensable for Ottoman tax revenues, complained about the nomads, the sultans solved the problem by deporting the nomads with their households. Yet the nomads did not accept these population transfers without resistance; their resistance, expressed through overt submission and covert opposition, persisted over long periods. A 1712 Ottoman transfer decree narrates the activities of the transferred nomads from the perspective of the state (Ahmed Refik 1930, pp. 143-4):

When soldiers, viziers, and the provincial governor were sent onto them, they repented and reverted to their residences. Thereafter, the officials prevented their transgression and aggressions by threatening them or by taking hostages from them. Yet, never holding their promises, these nomads reverted to their former behavior and dared to commit various villainies and mischief whenever they found the opportunity. This time again they inflicted pain and grief onto the provincial population, assaulted widows, women, and boys, tore open their hostilities, and murdered people.

Although the Ottoman state discourse powerfully justified the population transfer order by narrating the villainies committed by the nomads, it did not address the pressures placed on nomads which led them to engage in such activities. The encroachment of settled populations into the grazing lands of the nomads confined their range of activities. Their subsistence was further threatened as the Ottoman state took measures such as taking captives from among them to prevent their attacks on sedentarized groups.

Institutions: Military and Economic In constituting a social practice, the human agency extends beyond the activities of the social actors and is reproduced by the organizations these actors form. As these organizations reproduce, they transform into institutions. The constitution of Ottoman population transfers interacted at length with two Ottoman institutions, the military and the economic.

Ottoman territorial expansion necessitated labor, in terms of both warriors and suppliers. Population transfers, especially those of the nomads and conquered soldiers, provided the skilled manpower for the Ottoman military expansion. The Ottoman military organization, once formed, was able to execute further population transfers. The maintenance and reproduction of Ottoman rule was based on economic productivity and a large tax base ensuing from it. Population transfers enhanced agricultural and urban productivity through the frequent transfers of peasants and urban dwellers. The Ottoman economic institutions, highly dependent on a stable tax base, necessitated frequent population transfers to eradicate the imbalances among different provinces in terms of tax yield.

Population transfers also interacted with the Ottoman political and administrative institutions. Each population transfer severed a group from its power base and put it at the service of the Ottoman state. The Ottoman state was also able to retain their administrative skills. The transfers thus enhanced the political and administrative power of the Ottoman state.

Phase II: Transformation of Ottoman Population Transfers, 16th-17th Centuries

Historical conditions, social actors and institutions constituted the Ottoman social practice of population transfers and imbued them with a multiplicity of meanings. These meanings were reconstituted upon the reproduction of the practice. The Ottoman state reproduced its rule as it distributed, through population transfers, military, economic and political resources among rivals, subjects and agents. It then used the resulting administrative monopoly to generate and enforce laws and regulations (Levi 1981, p. 447). What was originally interpreted in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a resource colonization for the Ottoman state and a rule legitimated by tradition for the social groups become, by the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a punitive regulation for the Ottoman state. The composition of the transferred groups changed as religious dissenters and errant Ottoman officials replaced peasants, urban dwellers and conquered rulers as the transferred. The transfer of nomads continued at a slower pace.

Historical Conditions: Imperial Reproduction The practice of population transfers changed in late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with the gradual cessation of Ottoman territorial expansion and the establishment of an Ottoman imperial administration. As the empire established and solidified its boundaries through wars with other emerging empires in the East and the West, the flow of social groups into the Ottoman empire from the East dwindled. The subsequent focus on the reproduction of Ottoman rule within the boundaries of the empire brought internal administrative problems to the forefront. The Ottoman state reinterpreted the practice of transfers within this historical framework; it reproduced itself and its territorial boundaries through the transfer of social groups indigenous to the empire. The state started to cite religious heterodoxy and administrative breakdown as the two leading reasons for the continuing practice of population transfers. Religious dissenters and errant Ottoman administrators along with their households thus became the new transferred social groups.

Social Actors: The New Transferred In the seventeenth century, religious heterodoxy within Islam became a significant problem undermining state legitimacy. The Ottoman state had formed the non-Islamic groups of the empire, namely the Jews and the Christians, into autonomous religious communities with no participation privileges in state governance. Dissent among those who could participate in governance often mobilized around various interpretations of an ideology which had an organizational capacity as strong as the state: Islam. The Ottoman state, careful to extinguish this dissent through its own orthodox interpretation of religion, had its religious scholars label the dissenters heterodox practitioners of Islam. Since the ideology of the Ottoman state was founded on the principles of orthodox Islam, these dissenters immediately became political insurgents attempting to undermine the legitimacy of the Ottoman state. This dissent, which could either take form within the empire or be instigated by forces from without, was then pacified through population transfers.

The Eastern border of the Ottoman state with the Persian empire contained population segments, Alewites, who espoused to a different sect within Islam. In the eyes of the Ottoman state, these comprised a potentially dangerous social group. When conflict developed between the Persian and Ottoman states, these groups were perceived as either fostering conflict or fighting against the Ottoman state. Ottoman population transfers were undertaken to pacify these groups. They were often transported away from the region to remote underpopulated areas in the Ottoman empire where they could not spread their influence. A 1577 Ottoman deportation edict ordered the removal of the K_z_lba_, a sect related to the Alewites, to Cyprus; it declared (Ahmed Refik 1930, pp. 229-30):

Upon the arrival of this decree, cut the connections of the K_z_lba_ with their households; they have swerved from the true direction (of Islam) and resorted to heresy...Set them in the company of the fort guards, and punish these enemy agents (of the Persians) by transferring them to Cyprus.

These religious groups continued to be a problem for the Ottoman state as the Persian ruler tried to spread dissent in Anatolia through recruiting them for his army. In retaliation, the Ottoman state transferred all the Alewites in the Eastern provinces to Moton in the Balkans, thereby getting them out of the reach of Shah Ismail (Hoca Sadeddin [1590], p. 345):

The Persian Shah (Ismail), who has made a habit of straying (from religious truth), collected thousands of fools from Rum...The (Ottoman) state therefore decided to transfer the disciples and friends of Ali living in these lands to Moton and its neighborhood...As a consequence, that filthy crowd was confined within the Ottoman Empire.^{vi}

The terms used to define the transferred religious groups reflect the stigma the discourse of the Ottoman state attached to them. These groups became dehumanized for opposing state legitimacy and were often referred to as rebels, fools or selfish fanatics.

The Ottoman state started to use population transfers to dissipate other movements which also challenged its religious orthodoxy. As one fifteenth-century chronicle recounts (A_kpa_ao_lu [1476], p. 249):

In the reign of Sultan Bayazid, the Erdebil fanatics were deported to Rumelia...The reason was that the Ottoman religious officials decreed their practices to be blasphemous. The Sultan

placed his wrath upon them. They were transferred to Rumelia. These were selfish fanatics; they were the disciples of Sheik Safi...

Although this movement had originated in the provinces in the empire, the dissent of religious groups in the urban centers against the state was as significant. The leaders of such opposition were either religious men in the urban centers or Ottoman administrative officials. When the sermons of the religious scholars established in the urban centers, particularly in the capital Constantinople, contradicted Ottoman state policies, they were often deported with their households to the Aegean islands. Many such transfers^{vii} occurred around the years 1650 to 1694, often connected to one religious movement (the Kad_zadeli's) which gained momentum in 1656 in the capital, Constantinople. The leaders of this movement were religious scholars who preached a new fundamentalist interpretation of Islam in the mosques during Friday sermons or in the discussions of the religious circles. They developed a following among Ottoman officials and members of the imperial palace, thus indirectly gaining access to important administrative posts and to the official state ideology encompassing them. The Kad_zadeli's lost, however, after a large political confrontation, to the orthodox interpretation and were deported to the island of Cyprus (Uzunçar__1_ 1972, pp. 363-374).

Provincial opponents of the Ottoman state were also deported to distant regions in the guise of an administrative appointment whenever it proved difficult to pacify their activities. The sultan would first issue a decree pardoning these people and then assign them, with their retainues, to administrative posts in remote Ottoman provinces. In the seventeenth century, the leader of a popular revolt was transferred in this manner (Mustafa Nuri [1877], p. 185):

(The brigand) Deli Hasan requested the pardon of his crimes on the condition that he pass the rest of his life with Holy War. In order to do away with his mischiefery, he was given the governorship of Bosnia. Greatly harming the inhabitants on his route with his strangely dressed mob (retinue) of eight or ten thousand, he went to his duty in the Balkans.

The elements making trouble within the empire were dissolved through these "appointmental" transfers. Once under the control of the Ottoman state and devoid of local support, the problems these popular leaders generated for the state were reduced to manageable proportions.

In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Ottoman officials comprised a new social group that was frequently transferred by the state. As the candidates for office in the Ottoman administration started to outnumber the number of available posts, the competition among the officials intensified. These officials, with their households and retainues often reaching a thousand members, used social networks, ethnic and regional identification to redraw their boundaries and exclude others from the competition. They denounced one another to the sultan who then had these claims investigated. If the allegations were true, the sultan sent decrees to the errant officials, assigned other officials who were often the friends of the errant ones to execute the transfer order. When the errant officials arrived in the location they were transferred to, they and their households were assigned a dwelling; sometimes, they even held small administrative posts in the region. If the locations did not agree with them for reasons of health, distance from their families, or if they incited unrest at these locations, these officials were often transferred to another location. They could also petition to be forgiven on grounds of repentance, old age, or family problems; their friends and other officials could also ask for their pardon in absentia. Very rarely were these transferred administrators executed.

One such member of the Ottoman administration, a high-ranking military officer, was dismissed from office when he lost in a conflict with another group and transferred to an island. As a chronicle recounts (Defterdar Sar_ Mehmed, [1715]: III, 8):

(In 1689-1690) in the battle of Ni_ (Nissa)...the futile disputes between the commander in chief and Recep A_a, an officer of the janissary corps, caused some unsuitable situations. Therefore, Recep A_a (was) discharged from office (and then) sent to the island of Limni (Lemnos).

The Aegean islands and the Balkans were the popular regions for these administrative population transfers. In 1580, a grand vizier and in 1649 a pasha were exiled to Malkara (Malgara); in 1680 a vizier was banished to Kavala (Kavalla) (Mustafa Nuri, [1877]: 116, 251). Similar population transfers were made to the island of Rodos (Rhodes) - in 1674 the head provision officer of the Palace, in 1680 the head provision officer of the palace school, in 1686 an old grandvizier, in 1867 a chief military judge, and in 1688 the chief officer of the Palace Guards were exiled, often with their households, to this island. In 1677 an old chief black eunuch of the Palace and in 1688 the chief official for finance, and in 1690 a chief military officer were banished to the island of Limni (Lemnos) (Defterdar Sar_ Mehmed, [1715]: I, 111, 169-70; II, 37, 49-50, 126, 129, 136). These transfers created social mobility; the incoming members often attained the posts of those transferred to the Balkans or the Aegean islands.

There was a lot of variation in the execution of these transfers as well. They could either occur with full salary compensation and with the accompaniment of their household or with no recompense at all. The reasons most frequently cited by the state for these transfers centered around the abuse of state coercion or opposition to state legitimacy. They contained citations of misuse of office, administrative incompetence, immoral behavior, taking bribes, mistreating the populace or defying the administration, disrupting the order, or inciting rebellions (Uluçay, 1951).

Institutions: Administrative and Religious The increasing Ottoman military confrontations with Europe and Persia and the subsequent halt to expansion altered the spatial boundaries of the Ottoman state. As these boundaries became fixed, population transfers no longer meant a move to new space, a new life. They acquired a negative meaning and were practiced, more and more often, to reproduce the legitimacy of the Ottoman state within its boundaries. The Ottoman state's definition of legitimacy hinged on an orthodox interpretation of the Islamic tradition which trusted authority in governing institutions. Heterodox interpretations of Islam which challenged such authority undermined Ottoman state legitimacy; they subverted the Ottoman religious institution that was structured around the orthodox interpretation. The Ottoman religious institution affected the practice of population transfers by defining what comprised religious heterodoxy and who practiced it -- thereby deciding who to transfer.

The structure of Ottoman rule concentrated political power in the person of the sultan who administered and reproduced this power through his household. The sultan's household, which contained the family, economic production and political rule, provided the model for the organization of the Ottoman administrative institution. The sultan's officials formed their own households after this model. All social groups in Ottoman society aligned themselves within the context of these households along religious, ethnic and administrative lines. The competition among these social groups for administrative posts increased when the Ottoman state stopped

expanding its territorial boundaries. The groups mobilized economic production and ties, political positions, and social networks to attain these posts. The sultan, however, often practiced population transfers against these social groups to retain his domination over the distribution of Ottoman administrative posts.

Conclusion

The contextualization of Ottoman population transfers as a social practice within Mediterranean history reveals its metamorphosis. Formed through the interaction historical conditions, social actors, and institutions, the social practice of these transfers commence as a resource colonization measure and end up as a punitive state regulation. The historicity of the population transfers, their application before and beyond the Ottoman empire, provides new insights into a social practice hitherto studied only within the specific context of Ottoman history. Only by expanding analytical boundaries beyond those of nation-states and empires to whole regions, such as the Mediterranean, can one observe new patterns, new themes that join the human experience and imbue it with new meanings.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed Refik
1930Anadolu'da Türk A iretleri (Turkish Tribes in Anatolia), Istanbul.
- Aktepe, Münir
1951"XIV. ve XV. As_rlarda Rumeli'nin Türkler Taraf_ndan Iskan_na Dair (On the Settlement of Rumelia by the Turks in the 14th and 15th Centuries)," Türkiyat Mecmuas X:299-312.
- A__kpa_ao_lu A__ki
[1476]Osmanl_ Tarihleri: Tevarih-i Al-i Osman (Ottoman Historical Chronicles), trans. by N. Ats_z, 1949 edition, Istanbul.
- Barkan, O. Lütfi
1949-51"Osmanl_ imparatorlu_unda Bir _skan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler (Population Deportations as a Method of Settlement and Colonization in the Ottoman Empire)," Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakütesi Mecmuas XI:524-516; XIII:56-78; XV:209-236.
- Charanis, Peter
1972Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire: Collected Studies, London.
- Defterdar Sar_ Mehmed Pa_a
[ca. 1717]Zübde-i Vekaiyat (The Meaning of Historical Events), vol.I: 1656-1684; vol. II: 1684-1689; vol. III: 1689 -1694; trans. by H. Uçman, 1977 edition, Istanbul.
- Edirneli Oruç Be_
[15th cent.]Oruç Be_ Tarihi (Historical Chronicle of Oruç Bey), trans. by N. Ats_z, 1972 edition, Istanbul.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1985.
The Nation-State and Violence, volume II of A Contemporary Critique Historical Materialism. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glass, David V.
1967Population: Policies and Movements in Europe London.
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib
1957Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlad- fatihan (Yuruks, Tatars and Evlad-i Fatihan in Rumelia), Istanbul.
- Haydar Çelebi
[ca. 1520]Haydar Çelebi Ruznamesi (The Historical Account of Haydar Çelebi), trans. by Y. Senemo_lu, 1977 edition, Istanbul.
- Hoca Sadeddin Efendi
[ca.1590]Tacü't Tevarih (The Crown of Histories), vols. 3 and 4, trans. by I. Parmaks_zo_lu, 1979 edition, Istanbul.
- Hoffman, Abraham
1972"Mexican Repatriation Statistics: Some Suggested Alternatives to Carey McWilliams." The Western Historical Quarterly 3: 391-404.
- Kingston, Jeffrey Burke
1987The Manipulation of Tradition in Java's Shadow: Transmigration, Decentralization and the Ethical Policy in Colonial Lampung. Ph.D. Dissertation, New York, Columbia University.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis M. and Alexis Alexandris
1984-5"Ethnic Survival, Nationalism and Forced Migration: The Historical

- Demography of the Greek Community of Asia Minor at the Close of the Ottoman Era." Bulletin of the Center of Asia Minor Studies 5: 9-44.
- Kreindler, Isabelle
1986 "The Soviet Deported Nationalities: A Summary and An Update." Soviet Studies XXXVIII/3: 387-405.
- Kritovoulos
[ca. 1460] History of Mehmed the Conqueror, trans. by C. Riggs, 1954 edition
Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.
- Levi, Margaret. 1981.
"The Predatory Theory of Rule." Politics and Society 10/4:431-65.
- Lowry, Heath
1977 The Ottoman Tahrir Defters as a Source for Urban Demographic History: The Case Study of Trabzon (ca. 1486-1583). Ph.D. Dissertation, Los Angeles, University of California.
- Mehmed Halife
1656 Tarih-i G İmani (Historical Chronicle of G İmani), trans. by O. Karayumak, 1974 edition, Istanbul.
- Müneccimba__ Ahmet Dede
[ca. 1695] Sahaif-ül Ahbar fi Vekayi-ül A'sar (Pages of News in the Events of Centuries), trans. by I. Erünsal, Istanbul.
- Mustafa Nuri Pa_a
[1877] Netayüic ül Vukuat (The Consequences of Historical Events), vols. I and II, trans. by N. Ca_atay, 1979 edition, Ankara.
- Ne_ri, Mehmed
[1492] Kitab- Cihannüma (The History of the World), vols. I-II, trans. by F.R. Unat and M.A. Köymen, 1949 edition, Ankara.
Onalt nc As rda Yaz İm Grekçe Anonim Osmanlı Tarihi: 1373-1512
[16th cent.](An Anonymous Greek Account of Sixteenth Century Greek History), trans. by S. Bastav, 1973 edition, Ankara.
- Oded, Bustenay
1979 Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire Ludwig Reichert Verlag: Wiesbaden.
- Orhonlu, Cengiz
1963 Osmanlı İmparatorlu unda A iretleri Iskan Te ebbüsü (1691-1696) (On the Attempts to Settle Tribal Populations in the Ottoman Empire, 1691-96), Istanbul.
- Redhouse Lexicon
1890 Turkish and English Lexicon, ed. by Sir. J.W. Redhouse, Constantinople.
- Schechtman, Joseph B.
1962 Postwar Population Transfers in Europe, 1945-1955 Philadelphia.
- Schechtman, Joseph B.
1946 European Population Transfers, 1939-1945 New York.
- Tursun Bey
[ca. 1499] Tarih-i Ebü'l Feth (The History of the Conquest (of Constantinople)), trans. by M. Tulum, 1977 edition, Istanbul.
- Uluçay, M. Ça_atay

- 1951 "Sürgünler (Population Transfers (to Manisa))," Belleten XV:507-592.
- Uzunçar 1, I. Hakk
[1972] Osmanlı Tarihi (Ottoman History), Ankara.
- Vryonis, Speros
1971 The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Centuries, Los Angeles.
- Wittek, Paul
1952 "Yazijioghlu 'Ali on the Christian Turks of Dobruja," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies XVI:639-668.

ENDNOTES

- i. Forced population transfers are often alluded to as forced migration, mass deportation or displacement; those which do not employ such force are referred to as population exchange or transmigration.
- ii. The etymology of the Ottoman term for population transfer is as follows (Redhouse 1890, pp. 1089-1091): (Turkish) sürü: s. 1) a drove, a flock, a herd 2) a crowd, a multitude of people; sürmek: v.t.i. 1) to drive before one 2) to drive away 3) to banish 4) to push along, to propel, impel 5) to push forward, advance; sürgün: 1) an act of driving or chasing 2) banishment, exile 3) an exile.
- iii. See also the references in Kritovulos ([1460], p. 179), Ne_ri ([1492], p. 607), Hoca Sadeddin ([1590], p. 71), Mehmed Halife ([1656], p. 188), and Defterdar Sar_ Mehmed ([1715], part I, p. 72).
- iv. For other similar accounts, see A__kpa_ao_lu ([1476], pp. 173, 175) and Defterdar Sar_ Mehmed ([1715], part I, p. 23).
- v. See, for example, A__kpa_ao_lu ([1476], p. 153), Ahmed Refik (1930, pp. 2, 4, 12, 14-15), Gökbilgin (1957), and Orhonlu (1963) for other records of population transfers of nomads.
- vi. Also refer to Müneccimba__ ([1695], p. 417) for another account.
- vii. See, for example, Defterdar Sar_ Mehmed ([1715], part III, pp. 126, 161-2, 189) and Mustafa Nuri ([1877], pp. 253-5).