

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
I. The historicity of the “national” terms. 16th century — beginning of the 20th c.	
1. “Tyranny” and “Despotism” as National and Historical Terms in Greek Historiography (Kristina Koulouri (edit.), <i>Clio in the Balkans</i> , Thessaloniki, 2002, pp. 81-90)	11
2. L'historicité des termes: Les Grecs et la domination ottomane XVI ^e -XIX ^e siècles (in Y. Ioannou — Fr. Metral (éd.), <i>Méditerranée: Ruptures et Continuités</i> , sous presse, pp. 18)	21
3. The terms millet, genos (“Christian orthodox race”), ethnos (nation), oikoumenikotita (Ecumenicity), alytrotismos (irredentism) in Greek historiography (<i>Modern and Contemporary Greek Historiography</i> , Athens, forthcoming, pp. 19)	37
II. From the imperial framework to the national frameworks, 19th century — beginning of the 20th century	
1. Église Œcuménique, Église Nationale. Le problème de rapports entre religion et nation dans les Balkans, 19 ^e siècle-début 20 ^e siècle (Contribution aux <i>Actes du VIII^e Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Études du Sud-Est Européen</i> , Bucarest 20-28/8/1998, pp. 19).	57
2. The process of defining İzmir's “historical national mission” in the 19 th century-1919 (Conference at the New York University, Department of Middle East Studies and Department of Hellenic Studies, 25 November 2000).	75

III. Cyprus. From the Imperial frameworks to the “Cypriot” framework.

1. Les rapports de l'Église Orthodoxe avec le Kapudan Pacha (fin du XVIII^e début XIX^e siècle) (*The Kapudan Pasha, His Office and His Domain*, Crete University Press, Rethymnon, 2002, pp. 265-289). 103
2. Chypre de l'ère ottomane à l'ère britannique (1839-1914). Le rôle de l'Église orthodoxe chypriote (*Études Balkaniques*, 5-1998, pp. 143-183). 131
3. Le processus de la formation de la mémoire nationale grecque chez les Chypriotes Grecs (fin XIX^e — début XX^e s.) (Y. Ioannou, Fr. Metral (éd.) *Chypre et la Méditerranée Orientale*, Lyon, 1999, pp. 175-184). 163
4. The Church of Cyprus and its «ethnarchic» role : 1878-1960 (*Sygrona Themata*, April 1998, pp. 198-228), trans. from Greek. 179

INTRODUCTION

In this book, which is made up of a collection of articles written at various times, two main questions are posed; what are proposed, through the articles, are not, of course, answers to these, but various ways of approaching and analysing them. The first question concerns the complexity of the relation between the religious and the national within the context of a composite historical reality — the reality of the transition to modernity, that is, the transition from the Ottoman Empire to nation-states. More specifically, the first question concerns the relation between religion and nation in a space — the Ottoman space — from which, by stages, the various nation-states emerged. The second question has to do with the complicated process of the formation of the new national realities in a whole region — the former Ottoman region. More specifically, the second question has to do with the assimilation, within the framework of a process of formation of the new national realities, of certain traditional Ottoman practices and institutions which were transcribed into modernity, but also transcribed it, in such a way that modernity within the space of the former Ottoman Empire proved to be a very difficult, but also very interesting process. The period which is of particular concern to me is that between the nineteenth century (Tanzimat period) and the end of the first half of the twentieth — 1960, when the Republic of Cyprus was set up.

The historical example on which, *par excellence*, the articles concentrate is the 'Greek historical example'. Nevertheless, this 'Greek example' is not analysed as a particular national case within the framework of an 'age-long national history', as is usually the approach, but within the context of a long process which is defined, to begin with, in relation to the Ottoman space and also in relation to the Ottoman system of authority. As to the first question, that of the relations between religion and nation, the 'Greek historical example' is one of those in which the complicated relation between religion and the nation and the complexity of the process of the formation of the 'Greek national reality' in relation to the dominant Ottoman reality are particularly brought out. The relation of religion with the nation in the Greek instance is studied chiefly in two periods: (a) at the time of the foundation of the Greek state and the creation of the Greek autocephalous church, and thus at

a period of conflict with the Ottoman political power, but also with the religious authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople; (b) at the period of irredentism and of the *Megali Idéa*, and so at a time of the assimilation and 'nationalisation' of Ottoman traditional features and institutions, such as those of the Patriarchate, within the Greek national framework, in such a way that Greek irredentism acquired a historical legitimation through time.

As to the second question, the 'Greek historical example' also brings out the complex process of transition of the Ottoman space to modernity. Through this historical example, it is more the particularities of an 'Ottoman process of modernity' which involves the whole region which are highlighted; it is not the example as a historical particularity to which attention is drawn. The approach through these articles to each 'national example of modernity' in relation to the wider Ottoman environment from which they emerged has as its purpose to clarify certain difficult problems which took shape at that period (the second half of the nineteenth century), some of which are constantly reproduced. Up to now, the various national historical examples have been studied in relation only to themselves, in relation, that is, only with a diachronic and unshakeable national reality in which modernity is a stage in the age-long national process, whose bounds are set, almost always, outside the Ottoman reality and in conflict — and only in conflict, and, moreover, in on-going conflict — with it. The results of this are: (a) the various cases of the nations — the Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, even the Turkish cases — are studied as *sui generis* instances, unique and not comparable with any other case; (b) the complexity, the reciprocity of the problems of a whole region and its history during its transition to modernity are discounted, and, moreover, the individual national cases are isolated from their composite historical environment to such a degree that national realities are produced and reproduced constantly as separate and particular, even today, outside their space itself, outside the historical time, in the context of a non-historical, timeless time, a 'national time'; (c) the real historical particularities of the various national cases are also discounted. That is to say, there is a discounting of those particularities which highlight the way in which each national case, depending upon its historical needs, transcribed its Ottoman past, or some features and institutions from that Ottoman past, into modernity, while at the same time it 'nationalised' that past within the framework of modernity.

The 'Greek historical example' in relation with modernity and the Ottoman past is studied in three articles. Of these, two concern the historicity of the terms 'Ottoman tyranny', 'Ottoman despotism' in the Greek case, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. The third deals with the case of Smyrna, between the nineteenth century and 1919, and with how that city, within the framework of the process of Ottoman modernity, but also of the *Megali Idéa* of the Greek state, was elevated into a symbol of two opposing nations: the Greek and the Turkish. It is in Smyrna at that period that I believe all the complexity of Ottoman modernity and of the 'nationalisation-Hellenisation' of Ottoman features in the context of Greek irredentist modernity is recorded.

The two questions which predominate in the different articles in the book are both accentuated in the most vivid manner in the case of Cyprus: both the problem of the relations between religion and nation and the problem of the transition from 'Ottoman modernity' to 'national modernities' and the issues which to a large degree are aspects of a single problem — that known as the 'Cyprus problem'. In spite of the fact that in most studies Cyprus's history is studied in the light of the 'Cyprus problem', in these articles a first attempt is made to study the Cyprus problem in the light of Cyprus's history. That is to say, it is studied in the context of a difficult and complex historical process, in which, because of colonialism and because of a slow social transformation, the two questions which are basically posed in all the articles are further complicated.

In the series of articles which concern Cyprus, what is studied first and foremost is the relation between the Orthodox Church of Cyprus and Ottoman authority — the Church of Cyprus, therefore, in the framework of the Ottoman system of power, as an Ottoman institution. It is then studied in the context of Ottoman modernity as an 'an institution of Ottoman modernity', and as a 'Greek national institution' in the process of taking shape. Nevertheless, the Church of Cyprus is also studied in the colonial context, as an agent of modernity, a Greek modernity, in the framework of which any concept having to do with the nation was sanctified. The sanctity of both national and anti-colonial concepts is depicted in a single slogan: *Enosis*. It is through this complex role of the Church of Cyprus that a difficult problem begins gradually to emerge: the Cyprus problem, in which the complexities and contradictions of the shaping of a double, conflicting 'Cyprus modernity', the 'Greek' and the 'Turkish', are condensed.

This book, as can easily be concluded from the above description of the issues with which its constituent articles deal, is divided into three parts. However, this does not mean that the three parts are autonomously independent of one another. On the contrary, all the articles are linked to one another, since the two questions posed at the beginning are analysed in varying ways throughout the book.