ISSN 1301-2746

ADALYA

23 2020

AKMED
KOÇ UNIVERSITY
Suna & İnan Kıraç
Research Center for
Mediterranean Civilizations

23 2020 ISSN 1301-2746

ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Center for Mediterranean Civilizations

(OFFPRINT)

AKMED
KOÇ UNIVERSITY
Suna & İnan Kıraç
Research Center for
Mediterranean Civilizations

ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Center for Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED)

Adalya, a peer reviewed publication, is indexed in the A&HCI (Arts & Humanities Citation Index) and CC/A&H (Current Contents / Arts & Humanities)
Adalya is also indexed in the Social Sciences and Humanities Database of TÜBİTAK/ULAKBİM TR index and EBSCO.

Mode of publication Worldwide periodical
Publisher certificate number 18318
ISSN 1301-2746
Publisher management Koç University
Rumelifeneri Yolu, 34450 Sarıyer / İstanbul
Publisher Umran Savaş İnan, President, on behalf of Koç University
Editor-in-chief Oğuz Tekin
Editors Tarkan Kahya and Arif Yacı
English copyediting Mark Wilson

Production Zero Production Ltd.
Abdullah Sok. No. 17 Taksim 34433 İstanbul
Tel: +90 (212) 244 75 21 • Fax: +90 (212) 244 32 09
info@zerobooksonline.com; www.zerobooksonline.com
Printing Fotokitap Fotoğraf Ürünleri Paz. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti.
Oruç Reis Mah. Tekstilkent B-5 Blok No: 10-AH111
Esenler - İstanbul / Turkey
Certificate number: 47448

Mailing address Barbaros Mah. Kocatepe Sok. No. 22
Kaleiçi 07100 Antalya - TURKEY
Tel: +90 (242) 243 42 74 • Fax: +90 (242) 243 80 13
https://akmed.ku.edu.tr
E-mail address adalya@ku.edu.tr

KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

AKMED
KOÇ UNIVERSITY
Suna & İnan Kıraç
Research Center for
Mediterranean Civilizations

Contents

ADALYA 23, 2020

A Traveller in One's Homeland: Local Interest in Archaeology and Travel Writing in the Ottoman Greek World in 19th Century Anatolia

AYŞE OZİL*

Abstract

This article examines local scholarly interest in archaeology and travel writing in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century. It concentrates on the work of an Ottoman Greek intellectual from the provinces, i.e. a travelogue entitled *Periegesis eis tin Pamphylian* ("Travels in Pamphylia") written by Dimitri E. Danieloğlu, who belonged to one of the leading Greek families of Antalya in southern Anatolia. By examining this work and focusing on the profile of an Ottoman Greek writer in the provinces, this essay explores the practical meanings and outcomes of modernization, intertwined with a civilizational discourse and modes of local Orientalism. Particularly, the essay dwells on what was possibly local and Greek in this story and aims to situate *Periegesis* in a broader historical context. It discusses the connection of *Periegesis* to the European travelogue genre, the emergence of an investigative attention to ancient remains and contemporary society among the educated classes of the empire, and developments in the Ottoman Greek intellectual milieu in the 19th century.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, 19th century travel writing, archaeology, Greek, Anatolia

Öz

Bu makale, 19. yüzyılda Osmanlı ileri gelenleri ve okumuş kesimleri arasında arkeolojiye yönelik ilginin neden ve nasıl doğduğunu ve bu kesimlerden bazı kişilerin seyahatname yazarlığına nasıl yöneldiğini incelemekte ve bu ilgiyi tarihsel bağlamına yerleştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Söz konusu gelişme, 1850 yılında Dimitri E. Danieloğlu tarafından Antalya'da kaleme alınmış olan *Bir Pamfilya Seyahati* adlı çalışma üzerinden takip edilerek hem devlet dışı hem de İstanbul dışı, yerel ve toplumsal bir aktör üzerinden araştırılacaktır. Batılı seyyahların kaleminden çıkan çalışmaların tipik özelliklerini taşıyan bu seyahatname aynı zamanda yerel özelliklere vurgu yapmasıyla dikkat çekmektedir. Buna bağlı olarak bu makalede bir yandan Batılılık, yerellik ve bu iki konum arasındaki ilişki ele alınırken diğer yandan da bu konumların arka planında yer alan modernleşme meseleleri üzerinde durulacak, seyahatname özellikle uygarlaşma, bilimsellik ve sınıfsal ayrımların kesişim noktasında incelenecektir. Ayrıca Danieloğlu'nun bir Osmanlı Rumu olması ve seyahatnamenin İstanbul'da dönemin etkin bir Rum matbaası olan Anatoli'de basılması da değerlendirilecek ve çalışma bir yandan Osmanlı Rum entelektüel dünyası içine yerleştirilirken diğer yandan da yine modernleşme ile ilgili gelişmelere bağlanacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, 19. yüzyıl seyahatnameleri, arkeoloji, Rum, Anadolu

* Asst. Prof. Ayşe Ozil, Sabancı Üniversitesi, Sanat ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Orhanlı, Tuzla 34956 İstanbul, Türkiye. E-mail: ayseozil@sabanciuniv.edu ; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2082-7964

I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their insightful and helpful comments and the editorial office at AKMED in the preparation of this article for publication.

Introduction

This article examines local scholarly interest in archaeology and travel writing in the Ottoman Empire in the mid-19th century. It will trace how an investigative attention to ancient remains and contemporary society began to take shape among the educated classes of the empire at this time. It will follow this development by examining a travelogue entitled *Periegesis eis tin Pamphylian* ("Travels in Pamphylia") written by Dimitri E. Danieloğlu,[1] who belonged to one of the leading Greek families of Antalya. By examining this work and focusing on the profile of an Ottoman Greek writer in the provinces, this essay explores the practical meanings and outcomes of modernization, intertwined with modes of local Orientalism. It discusses the development of a modern scientific interest in the production of social and human knowledge coupled with a focus on the ancient heritage.

The relationship between archaeology and travel writing has not always been obvious. It is rather a product of the 19th century when archaeology emerged as a distinct academic discipline.[2] While provincial societies throughout the centuries forged various forms of connections to ancient remains and frequently made use of them in different ways,[3] the evolution of scholarly interest in the ancient legacy combined with an attention to the contemporary situation of ancient lands was a phenomenon of the late Ottoman world. A number of scholars have contributed to an understanding of this development and delineated diverse aspects of late Ottoman perceptions and practices in relation to the ancient past, antiquities, and archaeology.[4] This body of work reflects an engagement with wider issues, such as the relationship between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, Orientalism, and self-Orientalism.[5]

Local scholarly interest in ancient remains and the lands and people of the Ottoman territories followed on much older European patterns of travel and interaction with the Ottomans which were connected to colonialism and Orientalism. European interest in the empire as it was shaped in the early modern and modern eras has to be viewed within the context of the dynamics of European domination of the eastern lands. Analogously, the emergence of local scholarly interest in the Ottoman world can also be discussed in terms of Ottoman or local forms of colonialism and Orientalism,[6] as they were shaped primarily in the capital city of Istanbul towards the eastern regions of the empire.

In the 19th century, the simultaneous presence of European and Ottoman scholarly interest in the same archaeological remains and travel writing with a focus on the same lands

---

1 Danieloglou 1855. A Turkish edition of the book was published with my translation in 2010. I would like to thank Kayhan Dörtlük, the founding director of AKMED for drawing my attention to this volume and for his insightful editorship. We were able to locate two copies of this work, one in the Gotha Research Library at the University of Erfurt and the other in the Gennadius Library at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. In this article, references are to the Greek edition of the book (1855) unless otherwise indicated; the English translations of the quotations are mine. Regarding the personal and family names which appear in the main body of the article, I mostly use the versions of these names which do not include Greek declensions. I also use the Turkish versions of names which have Turkish origins or endings such as Danieloğlu. With regard to names from AKMS, I mostly follow the Greek orthography as it appears in this archive to make the references easily accessible to researchers.

2 Bahrani et al. 2011, 16-22; Hamilakis 2011, 51.

3 Hamilakis 2011; Anderson 2015, 450-60.

4 Ogan 1943; Arık 1953; Çal 1997; Şimşek and Dinç 2009; Muşmal 2009; Eldem 2011a; Çelik 2011, 2016; TTK 2013; Uslu 2017, ch. 2; Yaşayanlar 2018, among others.

5 For a discussion of Orientalism and self-Orientalism, see particularly Eldem 2011b; Çelik 2011, 2016. For a discussion of Orientalism and self-Orientalism regarding the Ottoman Greek elite in particular, see Exertzoglou 2015.

6 Makdisi 2002; Deringil 1998, 2003.

created a multi-layered reality in the empire.[7] The emergence of modern, educated Muslim scholars (or, more precisely, scholars from the Muslim world)[8] and the growth of parallel modes of Orientalism or the injection of local forms in the institutionalization of the preservation of ancient remains[9] were key components of this multi-dimensionality and demonstrate the challenges associated with a pattern of thinking in terms of a clearly defined East-West binary.[10] Indeed, for historians such dichotomies are no longer useful tools in understanding the 19th century Ottoman world, regardless of whether certain local scholars or administrators at the time adopted or professed to emulate and embrace "Western" ways in the "East".[11] The worlds in which they ultimately lived and which they shaped went beyond this binary.

The case of Danieloğlu, the subject of this study, provides a window into these issues, but also reveals additional layers and specificity to this already complex 19th-century phenomenon. First of all, Danieloğlu takes us away from the state-centered figures often studied in scholarship[12] and conveys experience from society itself. His case extends the discussion in terms of what the provincial context meant at this time and the relationship of local scholars to the wider empire and beyond. Furthermore, Danieloğlu's profile as an Ottoman Greek complicates the simple binary of the Western Christian and the local Muslim traveller/scholar. Yet, without presupposing that he should be any different, it is worth inquiring whether and, if so, in what ways being Greek mattered.

In addition to complicating the relationship between Ottomans and Europeans and showing its multi-dimensionality as lived, practiced, and understood by a local Greek writer in the late Ottoman period, this article also demonstrates how these dimensions attained their meaning within the contexts and circumstances specific to the 19th century. Of particular significance is the development of modern institutional and social forms, including the rise of schooling and literacy, the increasing use of the printing press, the evolution of national languages, and the proliferation of intra-imperial and international intellectual connections in the Ottoman world in general and the Ottoman Greek world in particular.

Danieloğlu, his Excursion, and the World of Travellers

Dimitri Efraim Danieloğlu, or Hacı Dimitri Ağa Efraim Danieloğlu, belonged to a large landowning family from Antalya. The family business, which concentrated on agriculture, was lucrative, and the Danieloğlus acquired considerable wealth over time. The business was established by Dimitri Danieloğlu, the grandfather and the namesake of the author, and his brother Kiryako Danieloğlu when they migrated to Antalya from the Dodecanese Islands in the late 18th century.[13] Dimitri Danieloğlu acquired large agricultural estates in the Düden area at this time, and his son Hacı Evren Ağa, the father of the author, inherited and improved the business and extended it into forestry and the timber trade. Hacı Evren Ağa, along with his cousin

7 For the Ottoman Empire as both an object and an active player in the world of archaeology, see Bahrani et al. 2011, 13, 16, 28, 32, 35.

8 With regard to travel writing, see Motika and Herzog 2000. For a specific example, see Kayra 2001. With regard to the interest in ancient civilizations, see Uslu 2017, ch. 2.

9 Shaw 2003.

10 Eldem 2011b; Çelik 2008.

11 Findley 1999.

12 The major and dominating example is Osman Hamdi; see Rona 1993; Cezar 1995; Eldem 2011b. For other members of the Ottoman state elite, see Çelik 2016.

13 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:131, 134, 136.

Hacı Strati Ağa (the son of Kiryako Danieloğlu), became prominent landowners in the town.[14] In due course the estate passed on to his sons, the author and his brother Pantel Ağa.[15]

The historical trajectory of the Danieloğlu family is a good example of the wealth-owning and modernizing classes which emerged in the 19th century, particularly among non-Muslims in the empire. Starting out among a wave of middle-class migration from provincial settings to port towns, which was common among the Greek-speaking population of the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th century onwards,[16] the Danieloğlus became one of the leading families of the Antalya district in southern Anatolia. Members of what may be termed an Ottoman bourgeoisie,[17] these families became leading forces in the late Ottoman economy and society.

True to form, some of the members of these families were also engaged in a variety of intellectual endeavours, which encompassed a number of areas in the emerging social sciences and humanities including history and archaeology.[18] Dimitri Efraim Danieloğlu was one of these individuals who, upon leaving the family business to his brother, devoted himself to the study of letters, specifically the investigation of the recent and ancient past of the Antalya region.[19] This investigative interest was accompanied by a literary drive which eventually resulted in the compilation of a book of travel writing - *Travels in Pamphylia*.[20] The book narrates an excursion undertaken by Danieloğlu and his companions in the Antalya region including visits to the ancient sites of Perge, Selge, and Aspendos. It presents archaeological observations from these ancient sites combined with a firsthand experience of the condition of contemporary society. The book has a sizeable appendix which includes a piece on the description and characteristics of the current town of Antalya drawn from Danieloğlu's research on different topics from agriculture and commerce to administration, religion, and culture.[21]

At the beginning of the book, the author relates how he and his friends decided to visit some of the most renowned ancient cities of the area[22] and, in fact, of Anatolia more broadly. They lament their ignorance of the classical cities and feel embarrassed that they have to learn about such neighboring places from British and French scholars "who travelled all the way" from Europe to visit and study the remains.[23] Such self-criticisms were not uncommon among

---

14 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:132, 134, 136.

15 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:135.

16 Zarifis 2002, chs. 1 and 2. Anagnostopoulou 1998, 107-20; Dinç 2017, 458, 461.

17 For a discussion of this term, see Exertzoglou 1999; Eldem 2014.

18 A good example of this interest can be found in the activities of one of the largest and most influential educational and cultural associations of the late Ottoman period, the Greek Literary Society (Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos) which was active from 1861 to 1922. For the involvement of the leading figures of the late Ottoman world in the Society, see the minutes of their meetings in the periodical of the Society, Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos 1864, no. 7, 45-46, no. 8-9, 102-3. Their interest in historical and archaeological studies informs, among others, a tract on Roman history by K.A. Karatheodoris, Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos 1865, nos. 10-11, 149-71. See also the tracts on Byzantine land walls, the inscriptions on the walls, and the gates of the walls, Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos 1865, nos. 10-11, 171-221.

19 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:135.

20 He also published another book in 1865 entitled *Prodromoi tis Anagenniseos ton Grammaton en ti Anatoli* ["Forerunners of Enlightenment in Anatolia"] which was about Serapheim of Antalya who later became the metropolitan bishop of Ankara; see Pehlivanidis 1989, 1:140-41. Serapheim was known for translating Greek works into Turkish with Greek characters; see Gedeon 1932, 14.

21 Danieloglou 1855, 147-89.

22 Danieloglou 1855, 1.

23 Danieloglou 1855, 1-2.

Ottoman and Greek intellectuals of the time.[24] In fact, the idea of lagging behind in comparison to the "civilized" countries of Europe led to a variety of modes of writing which debated diverse aspects of the matter. While this outlook is mostly expressed in essays, tracts, newspaper articles, and similar types of writing, Danieloğlu rather exceptionally strove to identify some remedy to this shortcoming by producing a travelogue.

The book early on positions itself in the world of European travellers. The introduction to the book begins by addressing William Henry Waddington, the British-French politician and archaeologist who researched and published inscriptions and numismatic material from Anatolia.[25] Here Danieloğlu writes about his encounter with Waddington when the latter travelled to Anatolia, and how they remained in contact during the following four years, mostly exchanging information about ancient remains. By setting the tone of his book with this reference, Danieloğlu declares how deeply he was inspired by Waddington to undertake his travels in Pamphylia and how he wishes for Waddington not to forget him.[26]

The author emphasizes Western connections throughout the text. In addition to Waddington, there are many references to Charles Fellows and Colonel Leake,[27] who were among the leading travellers in the region. In the travelogue Danieloğlu and his fellow travellers visit the sites of Pamphylia with European travelogues in hand[28] and engage in discussions with European travellers, comparing and contrasting information.[29] On a more symbolic and identity-making level, engagement with European scholarship serves to present the author and his companions as members of the European community of travellers. The practice of visiting ancient sites using other travelogues and conversing with their authors is itself a well-established pattern of European travel writing[30] and furthers the goal of positioning the book in the same genre. Danieloğlu also makes sure to include words and phrases that derive from European languages and punctuates his text with italics.[31] With regard to certain practical matters, he incorporates further European references including the binoculars he bought in Paris and a modern tent, among others.[32] Finally, the Danieloğlu company follows the practice of European travellers by reenacting scenes from Greek mythology as they gather in the evenings.[33]

Danieloğlu not only followed the pattern of European travel writing by entering into a conversation with other travelogues, but more importantly, he opted to frame the text in the European travelogue genre. Each chapter is about a particular district and an ancient site. The content of each chapter is duly provided at the opening of the chapter in a detailed manner, highlighting not only the sites visited but also other points of interest, including the main events and individuals encountered in that part of the excursion.[34] When describing ancient

---

24 Hanioğlu 1995, ch. 2; Exertzoglou 2015, ch. 2.

25 Danieloğlu 1855 [2010], 3.

26 Danieloglou 1855, Introduction.

27 Danieloglou 1855, 9; Leake 1824, chs. 4-5; Fellows 1839, ch. 7.

28 Danieloglou 1855, 9, 17.

29 Danieloglou 1855, 9, 90-92, 109.

30 See, for example, Leake referring to Captain Beaufort; see Leake 1824, 171.

31 For example, he refers to the tent they use as "comfortable" (Danieloglou 1855, 90); to one of their suppers with the local people as "un plaisir absolu" (Danieloglou 1855, 61); and he gives a quotation from Lamartine (Danieloglou 1855, 26).

32 Danieloglou 1855, 77.

33 Danieloglou 1855, 40-41.

34 See, for example, Ainsworth 1842.

sites, Danieloğlu is careful to tell us how they were reached, i.e. through the establishment of necessary contacts and the presentation of references to the landlords or the headmen of the districts they visited.[35] According to form, the travellers also copy ancient inscriptions, and Danieloğlu includes them in the book.[36] In addition to quoting from ancient Greek literature like Homer,[37] he also refers to a group of villagemen as Achilleses and Nestors based on the characteristics of these individuals[38] and uses the ancient name Byzantion instead of Constantinople.[39]

While an association with ancient Greece, regardless of the question of its accuracy for modern Greeks, might be the broader motive underlying his interest in antiquities in the first place, the text itself does not provide many explicit indications to support this view. Other than some references such as "our Strabon", there is no substantial evidence of a special link to Antiquity.[40] Danieloğlu's attention to the classical Greek civilization seems more to be the corollary of his Westernist stance and the desire to be part of the current leading civilization.

In response to a letter criticizing his book, Danieloğlu himself underlines that he is following the format of the European travel writing genre. As it emerges that this reader was not fond of the (rather unnecessary and redundant) embellishments that the author uses in the text,[41] Danieloğlu in his defense says that all travellers do so.[42] Indeed European travel writing regularly includes interesting anecdotes and entertaining scenes, often narrated in an engaging language.[43] These books were compiled not only for the archaeological and other scientific observations that they make, but also to provide good reading.

Danieloğlu not only writes but also acts as if he were a European traveller. This is apparent from the early pages of the book when he and his fellow travellers visit the Düden waterfalls, located very close to their native Antalya. When they hear a roaring sound, the author asks "What is this noise that we are hearing?"[44] It is unlikely that he would not have known about the waterfalls, particularly since the agricultural estates of the Danieloğlu family were in that district.[45] Yet their encounter with the Düden falls progresses as if they were seeing them for the first time. This dissociation of the self from the local environment that Danieloğlu attempts is also suggestive of a desire to keep a distance or to be "objective" in scientific endeavours. He clearly differentiates his scientific knowledge from the villagers' interpretations of ancient sites and objects.[46] For example, when the coin sellers in Manavgat offer him historical information, he criticizes but refrains from ridiculing them, viewing the scene with an

35 See, for example, Danieloglou 1855, 97.

36 Danieloglou 1855, 136.

37 Danieloglou 1855, 67, 92.

38 Danieloglou 1855, 78.

39 Danieloglou 1855, 148.

40 For a parallel suggestion for Theodor Makridi also, see Eldem 2017, 163.

41 For further details on this reader, see below the section "Greek Intellectual Networks".

42 Danieloglou 1855, 149.

43 From the Ottoman world, Evliya Çelebi's *Seyahatname* is a good example of the entertainment component; see İnalcık 2009, 14-15.

44 Danieloglou 1855, 5.

45 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:137.

46 See below the section "The Turkish-speaking Orthodox people, a rift in social class, and the civilizational drive"; Anderson 2015, 453.

anthropological gaze.[47] Likewise, when he encounters the astrologer of Side, he remarks to himself how unscientific the astrologer's knowledge is. At the same time, he endeavours not to disregard local sensitivities, and Danieloğlu finds a middle ground by proposing a scientific explanation for the role of the astrologer's prophecies in political and social life.[48]

Danieloğlu and the Local World

While Danieloğlu situates himself in the world of European travellers and prioritizes ancient remains, the travelogue is animated by interest in and sensitivity to the local world. Indeed, while the general discourse in the book is about acting like a European in the East, a closer analysis of the text reveals elements of a local connection. This connection can be observed in tangible terms. As the group travels in the Selge region, the author mentions that he knows and admires the head of one of the villages they visit; likewise, he encounters his acquaintances in another village.[49] On another occasion, as the group approaches the Side region, they worry about producing passports which they do not have. What they have, though, is a local connection through the people they know and whom they aim to consult in place of presenting identity papers.[50] The administrator at the group's destination in Side had business connections with the author's father and so their meeting was set up by the author himself.[51] On another occasion, Danieloğlu recounts the characteristics of the Aksu River which the group passes on their way to an ancient site. As he provides information about the seasonal cycles and yearly changes of the river, he states that by visiting the site and seeing it for themselves they corroborated the local information that they had.[52]

While references to contemporary society are not uncommon in European travelogues, Danieloğlu's text draws on a more direct and engaged description of local society. Of particular interest are the issues of migration, the heterogeneity of the population, and the Greek connection of the region which Danieloğlu is keen to describe on various occasions throughout the text. For example, once in a *yörük* village[53] they are served by a man from Kos who was a fugitive from the Ottoman military, and who worked as a shepherd and a laborer and, occasionally, as an imam in the villages.[54] Since the man was from a Greek-speaking island, the author describes him as someone who "knows our language very well" and posits a connection between the travellers and the villager due to the commonality of their language.[55]

This and other encounters highlight a significant characteristic of the region in terms of attracting migrants/refugees. An early instance of migration for this time period was after the Napoleonic invasions of Egypt at the turn of the 19th century when migrants from North Africa arrived in Antalya.[56] The fact that Egypt was a trading partner of Antalya[57] might have played a

47 Danieloglou 1855, 140-41.
48 Danieloglou 1855, 128-29.
49 Danieloglou 1855, 75.
50 Danieloglou 1855, 113.
51 Danieloglou 1855, 120.
52 Danieloglou 1855, 71-72.
53 Danieloglou 1855, 11-12.
54 Danieloglou 1855, 16-17.
55 Danieloglou 1855, 16.
56 Danieloglou 1855, 154, 165.
57 Danieloglou 1855, 175.

role in the choice of destination, even though Antalya was not the only place which received migration at this time. A few decades later, when the Greek War of Independence in 1821 created a Muslim exodus from the Peloponnese, Antalya once again received a large number of refugees/migrants.[58] The Greek revolution also produced Greek slaves who were captives of Ottomans and who later found their way to Antalya. One of these people was a man from the island of Chios who converted to Islam and served as the clerk of the headman of Side.[59] Likewise, there were other migrants who ended up in Antalya for economic and other reasons.[60]

While Danieloğlu's descriptions of Antalya involve various population groups, an attentiveness to the Greek connections to the region is also noticeable. A close interest in contemporary society with a focus on its Greek community is likewise reflected in the appendices to the book, where Danieloğlu incorporates the findings of research that he carried out on the characteristics of the town of Antalya in general and of its local Greek community in particular. This last part of the book, which is essentially separate research juxtaposed with the text, provides basic information about the economic, social, cultural, etc. features of the region.[61] Such local histories would turn into a genre produced by the Greek-educated elite in both the late Ottoman period and the aftermath of the Greco-Turkish Population Exchange of 1923, and demonstrate a strong local and communal connection to Greek homelands in Anatolia.[62]

While these local effects are significant, they do not belie Danieloğlu's Westernizing tendencies. There are a number of instances in the text when the "local" and the "more global" overlap. For example, Danieloğlu is often familiar with the village heads and has acquaintances throughout the region. Yet he does not refrain from producing a letter of recommendation, in the style of European travelogues, when he does not directly know the people there.[63] At the same time, he describes the Muslim judgeship (*kadılık*) as if this were a totally foreign institution to him,[64] while we learn that one of the *kadı*s they visited knew his father personally, and that the latter had previously visited the *kadı* on one of the Muslim feasts.[65]

Greek Intellectual Networks

Travels in Pamphylia is written in Greek. Greek was not necessarily the natural or the most obvious language one could use, speak, or write in for Orthodox Christians in Anatolia at this time. Turkish was the mother tongue of many Orthodox Christian communities, and there was

58 Dayar 2018, 24-33.

59 Danieloglou 1855, 126.

60 AKMS, Oral Archives, Pamphylia, Attaleia, PM1. Among the inhabitants of Antalya, Evanthia Konstantinidou's father-in-law was Morean (Biographical account of E. Konstantinidou, n.d.). The parents of Pantelis Arappantelis, who was born in 1900 in Antalya, came from Haifa as migrants (Biographical account of P. Arappantelis, n.d.). Antonios Paslis, who was born in 1878 in Antalya, stated that his grandfather was Cypriot (Biographical account of A. Paslis, 1948). According to the oral account of Eustratios Toustzoglou (28/1/1964), there were a number of Greeks who migrated to Antalya from Cyprus after the latter's occupation by the British.

61 Danieloglou 1855, 147-89.

62 Pehlivanidis 1989, quoted in this article, is a good example of this genre. For other Greek connections in the book, see the references to Kos and Chios in nn. 54 and 59 respectively.

63 Danieloglou 1855, 95.

64 Danieloglou 1855, 115-16.

65 Danieloglou 1855, 117.

a particular written form of it known as Karamanlidika.[66] The fact that the book was composed in Greek is reflective of a number of characteristics about the position of the book and the ambitions of its author in the intellectual and social landscape of his time. While available evidence does not provide much information about the life and upbringing of the author, the use of the Greek language seems to be compatible with his profile as a member of the local educated elite. As far as we can discern from *Travels in Pamphylia*, he acknowledged and supported the dissemination of the Greek language and the elite culture that formed around it. The use of the Greek language is also intertwined with the Western-oriented composition and structure of the work and the ways in which the author envisions the book in relation to the influential European travel writing genre. The perception of Greek as a language of civilization at this time and the concomitant use of it as the basis of the new scientific language might explain why it is employed in the book. More generally, since Greek civilization, which includes not only the language but also the ancient civilization that Danieloğlu investigates, was seen in European intellectual circles as a core component of European culture, it would make sense for him to compose the travelogue in Greek.

The promotion of the Greek language can also be regarded as a response, or a remedy, to the self-Orientalizing tendencies generated around the book. Danieloğlu expressly mentions that he intends the book to be a guide in Greek.[67] By this statement, not only does he imply that he conceives of the book as a Greek specimen of (European) travelogues, but also he suggests that writing the book in Greek addresses the concern that local intellectuals did not bother to study their own lands and that there was a deficiency of self-generated knowledge about globally significant local sites. As such, the travelogue in Greek was designed to be both a part of European scholarship and a national tract.

Indeed, what makes this book of further historical interest is that its target audience seems to have been the Greek intellectual milieu and that it was written at a time when this milieu, or rather the educated classes, were expanding and diversifying. This was the time period when learned Greek society extended beyond their usual confines of the upper clergy and the narrow intellectual circles. Along with the landowning bourgeois class and business circles, the newly emerging professional groups of medical doctors, lawyers, teachers, architects, etc. were increasingly participating in this educated community, while a proliferation of cultural and educational associations contributed to its creation and development.[68]

One of the main actors who contributed to the formation of this intellectual circle was Evangelinos Misailidis (1820-1890) who published *Travels in Pamphylia* at Anatoli, his influential and prolific publishing house. Indeed, the publication and dissemination of *Travels in Pamphylia* would not have been possible without the presence and concomitant growth of the publishing industry in Istanbul and other major cities of the empire. Misailidis contributed immensely to the development of the publishing industry in the Ottoman Empire.[69] He first began working in Izmir for the leading Greek paper *Amaltheia*. Then in the mid-19th century he moved to Istanbul where he ran a successful publishing house for about forty years until his death.[70] In Istanbul he established himself as the owner of a series of influential newspapers

66 See below the section "The Turkish-speaking Orthodox people, a rift in social class, and the civilizational drive".

67 Danieloglou 1855, 147.

68 For an examination of this educated class, see Exertzoglou 1996.

69 Tarinas 1996.

70 Gedeon 1932, 13.

such as *Anatoli*,[71] where Danieloğlu published articles about the history of Antalya, Byzantine mosaics, and other subjects.[72] At *Anatoli*, Misailidis collaborated with Manouil Gedeon, who served as the editor of the paper. Gedeon was the patriarchal *chartophylax* [chancellor and archivist] and one of the leading intellectuals of the Ottoman Greek world in the late period.[73] The paper *Anatoli* could be found in Antalya, among other important newspapers of the time, which were published in Ottoman Turkish, Greek, and English, which suggested close intellectual interaction.[74]

Before entering the publishing world, Misailidis served as a teacher in the newly established Greek secondary school of Isparta, working for the Turkish-speaking Christian children of the town.[75] Like Danieloğlu, he was also interested in travelling during his youth. He accompanied the French archaeologist Philippe le Bas (1794-1860) during the latter's travels on the southern coasts of Anatolia, including Antalya and its hinterlands where they visited Kula, Misailidis's birthplace.[76] Overall, Misailidis was a highly significant figure for the education of Orthodox Christians and the development of letters in the Ottoman Greek world. As part of his activities in the publishing world, Misailidis worked on Karamanlidika novels among other literary and educational production.[77] He was particularly influential in the acculturation of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox masses through his publications in Karamanlidika and his other efforts for linguistic and cultural Hellenization.[78]

As for Danieloğlu, his *Travels in Pamphylia* was the product of a researcher who aspired to be a part of this educated community. In its appendices, the book refers to one of its readers in Istanbul. This gentleman, who had read the book, engages in a conversation with Danieloğlu about the content of the *Travels*,[79] which implies an intellectual exchange concerning the work. Danieloğlu mentions that this person received a copy through an acquaintance of Danieloğlu,[80] which suggests the involvement of a number of individuals as the audience of the book.

The Turkish-Speaking Orthodox People, a Rift in Social Class, and the Civilizational Drive

While Danieloğlu's contribution to the development of modern Greek letters was a significant project in itself, there was also an educational reason for composing the *Travels*. In Misailidis's foreword to the travelogue, he argues for the need to illuminate the people. He begins by depicting a "wall of ignorance" facing the Greek people that denigrates them and deprives them of the capacity to differentiate right from wrong.[81] The remedy, according to him, is to

71 Balta 2010, part 2; Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2014a; Tarinas 2007, 34-35.

72 Danieloglou 1855, 144, 154, 164.

73 Gedeon 1932, 12-13.

74 Danieloglou 1855, 181.

75 Misailidis 1983, 1-2.

76 Gedeon 1932, 12, 14; Misailidis 1983, 1-2; Balta 2009.

77 Kut 1987; Anhegger 1988a; Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2014b.

78 Gedeon 1932, 14; Anhegger 1988b.

79 Danieloglou 1855, 148-49.

80 Danieloglou 1855, 148.

81 Danieloglou 1855, "Preface by E. Misailidis", i.

follow the model of Europe by keeping up with developments in the sciences and investing in research that will allow them to tackle problems in education. In this scheme, Danieloğlu emerges as a figure whose role is to contribute to the mission of enlightening the Greek nation.[82] This outlook is corroborated by a piece of information provided in the appendices to the book, where Danieloğlu presents a letter that congratulates him and the publisher as they herald the emergence of a new generation of "enlightened writers/leaders".[83] The letter also underlines the necessity and significance of taking up the task of transmitting education, civilization, and culture, particularly to the inner provinces.

Indeed, this depiction of Danieloğlu raises the issue of the education of the masses, more specifically of the largely provincial Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christian people and peasantry who inhabited the inner and/or most of the non-western parts of Anatolia.[84] The presence of large concentrations of Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christian populations had already led to the birth of a highly specialized publishing field in the Turkish language written with Greek characters (Karamanlidika).[85] Publications in Karamanlidika emerged mostly as religious instruction in the early modern period. Only scattered examples exist from before the 19th century when there was a proliferation and diversification in religious and secular writing, and various kinds of educational and fictional texts began to emerge.[86] Misailidis was a leading actor in this field. Not only did he himself compose works in Karamanlidika, but his publishing house also sponsored the production of a great number of publications in this language. This meant that they reached the masses in their mother tongue, which was Turkish, while encouraging the use of the Greek alphabet.[87]

Even though the aforementioned review congratulates Danieloğlu on his services towards the enlightenment of the provinces, Danieloğlu did not do this in the Turkish language, the mother tongue of his fellow townsmen in Antalya. Danieloğlu wrote in Greek in a Turcophone town.[88] There thus seems to be a rift between the local scholar and the place where he wrote his book. The audience of the *Travels* was not the common people of Antalya but the educated Greek-speaking people in the area. And it encouraged those who were not well versed in Greek to develop their language skills and to contribute more broadly to modern schooling in Antalya.

At the time the book was compiled, Antalya had a considerable Orthodox population concentrated in the eastern and southern parts of the town.[89] While Muslims formed the majority of the town's total population of about 8,500, the Greek Orthodox community numbered

---

82 Misailidis also refers to the role of the Greek language in this educational drive and the importance of carrying the language from the past to the future. He also emphasizes that the Greek nation inhabits the eastern lands, Danieloglou 1855, "Preface by E. Misailidis", i-iii.

83 Danieloglou 1855, 148.

84 For the education of *Karamanlis*, see Benlisoy 2010, 2019.

85 This language is named after the Karaman region owing to the well-known Turcophone communities there that used this language, even though Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians inhabited large parts of Anatolia.

86 Balta 2010, 2015, are among her other works on *Karamanli*s.

87 Gedeon 1932, 14.

88 Joseph Wolff on Turcophone Christians in Antalya in 1831, quoted in Sönmez 2013, 235; AKMS, PM1. According to the oral account of E. Toustzoglou (28/1/1964), the mother tongue of the Orthodox Christian inhabitants of Antalya was Turkish. For individual members of this population, see AKMS, PM1. According to the biographical information (28/1/1964) on E. Toustzoglou (b. 1888), his family was Turkish speaking. According to the biographical information (27/5/1968) on Anastasios Hatzikonstantinou (b. 1877), he was Turkish speaking.

89 Pehlivanidis 1989, Map of Antalya, n.p.

around 2,500 people, making them 28-30% of the total population.[90] As an active port town trading with the major regions in the eastern Mediterranean,[91] Antalya attracted in-migration which contributed to the growth of its Orthodox population throughout the 19th century.[92] Similar to most of the towns of the southern Anatolian coast,[93] let alone the inner regions, Antalya's Greek Christians were Turkish-speaking. One can cite many examples showing that the inhabitants of the town were unfamiliar with the Greek language. Danieloğlu, for example, refers to women of the town who, because they were Turcophone, were not fond of priests who recited the Bible in Greek.[94] Ioannis Bourgontzoglou, a musician, was illiterate and knew very little Greek, while his wife did not speak the language at all.[95] Likewise, Antonios Paslis, a bricklayer, spoke only Turkish.[96] Anastasios Hatzikonstantinou, born in 1877, never went to school and had almost no knowledge of the Greek language.[97] While it was not only the lower classes whose mother tongue was Turkish,[98] the development of Greek-language modern formal education began to produce a differentiation in social class, or (at least) generated a gap between the educated and the uneducated classes.

Throughout his *Travels*, Danieloğlu provides ample evidence of his opinion of villagers. He clearly portrays himself and his fellow travellers as endowed with scientific knowledge about ancient sites, while lamenting the state of ignorance among the people who inhabited those sites and were in contact with the monuments on a daily basis. Yet he does not differentiate or privilege Greeks or any particular community. For him, the difference was between the educated and the uneducated. In Perge, for example, he writes that a Greek stone mason had removed and destroyed an ancient statue of a woman,[99] while the region was full of treasure hunters in search of ancient valuables.[100] Likewise, the ancient theater and the forum had become a site for grazing animals,[101] and the hippodrome had become a field where the locals grew barley.[102] The acropolis, as a secure area, was also being used for agriculture and animal husbandry.[103] Drawing a sharp contrast between the ancient civilizations that inhabited the site

90 Dinç 2017, 458-63. Kechriotis 2010. Available information on population from the later decades suggests that these percentages were maintained throughout the decades. See Baykara 2007, 12-15; Çimrin 2018, 9; AKMS, PM1. According to the oral account of E. Toustzoglou, Antalya had 12.000 Orthodox Christian and 20.000 Muslim inhabitants in the last decades of the Ottoman Empire (28/1/1964).

91 AKMS, PM1, the oral account of E. Toustzoglou (28/1/1964).

92 See above the section "Danieloğlu and the Local World".

93 AKMS; see for example Anamur (KL10, Ch. Konstantinidis, 24/10/1962), Silifke (KL8, A. Etzeoglou, 17/4/1963), Alanya (PM2-3, P. Sarafidis, 13/2/1964).

94 Danieloglou 1855, 169. It is significant that Danieloglou mentions women since some, though not all, of the men of the town - who had more contact with the outside world and had a better chance of getting an education - knew some more languages in addition to the mother tongue of the town.

95 AKMS, PM1, biographical information on Ioannis Bourgontzoglou (n.d.). See also biographical information on Anna Vaseiliou (n.d.).

96 AKMS, PM1, biographical information on Antonis Paslis (1948).

97 AKMS, PM1, biographical information on Anastasios Hatzikonstantinou (27/5/1968).

98 As knowledge of a second language was a question of need, those who were not directly engaged with Greek networks did not speak the language. Yankos Karadenizli, for example, an important merchant and landowner who ran grocery stores and inns and was engaged in animal husbandry, knew little Greek; AKMS, PM1, Biographical Information on Yankos Karadenizli (n.d.).

99 Danieloglou 1855, 29.

100 Danieloglou 1855, 45.

101 Danieloglou 1855, 20.

102 Danieloglou 1855, 31.

103 Danieloglou 1855, 48, 51.

with the contemporary setting, at one moment in the book Danieloğlu sits on the steps of the ruined theater and imagines the ancient Greek tragedies that would have played there.[104]

When he directly encounters the villagers of Selge and Aspendos, he differentiates himself from them by portraying himself as an educated townsman or urban dweller. He finds it difficult to bear the various stories that the villagers have made up about the history of the site,[105] even though the existence of these stories is itself a sign of interest, however unscientific, on the part of the locals. Danieloğlu does, however, find a person who speaks his scientific language - the (Muslim) landlord of Side.[106] Referring to him as a "light in the desert",[107] he sits down to teach the landlord and his retinue, upon their demand, how to calculate the correspondence between the Islamic and Christian calendars. While he does occasionally discover such people with whom he can converse, they are rather exceptional figures.

Danieloğlu's attitude to the practice of religion, whether Christian or Muslim, parallels his civilizational outlook. He is critical of Muslim judges who, in his view, are ignorant and uncritically follow orders.[108] Likewise, he disapproves of Orthodox priests who are accustomed to abuse the religious sentiment of the people and collect money from them.[109] The civilizing emphasis seems to override communal differences. In the above example about the Greek-speaking Muslim from the island of Kos, Danieloğlu is concerned about the future prospects of this promising man and is perplexed by his choice to remain in the mountains.[110]

The discursive and ideological nature of this attitude becomes more apparent when viewed in contrast with certain features in the local description of Antalya located in the appendices. While in the main body of the book he is critical of the practice of religion and the position of women, the local information about his hometown outside the confines of the travelogue is suggestive of a milder and more accepting view. Even though his discursive attitude towards religion is in line with the enlightenment discourse, he depicts religion in a more favorable light as a feature of respectable people.[111] With regard to the situation of the women, in contrast to his ideological attitude towards women's position, he writes approvingly of how local practice deemed it inappropriate for ladies to come into close proximity with guests, and how a family was considered fortunate if their house had separate quarters for men and women.[112]

Charity: Civilizational Drive in Practice

Outside the text, Danieloğlu was more directly engaged in responding to what he saw as the ignorance of the lower classes, to whom he related through charity. Because of his economic position, he was highly influential in the local social and cultural milieu, particularly through philanthropic work. The Danieloğlu family, more broadly, can be regarded as one of the chief drivers of the changes in charity and patterns of social engagement in Antalya in the modern period.

---

104 Danieloglou 1855, 52.

105 Danieloglou 1855, 94, 101, 107.

106 Danieloglou 1855, 125.

107 Danieloglou 1855, 142.

108 Danieloglou 1855, 115-16.

109 Danieloglou 1855, 169.

110 Danieloglou 1855, 16.

111 Danieloglou 1855, 169.

112 Danieloglou 1855, 174.

The family's philanthropic activities began with Dimitri Danieloğlu, the grandfather of the author and founder of the family estate. Dimitri supported the Greek community of Antalya by making donations for churches, schools, and philanthropic institutions.[113] His son Hacı Strati, the author's uncle, was the benefactor of, among others, the church of Agios Panteleimonas and the school for boys, which had seven classes in the primary and secondary levels.[114] The author, Dimitri, followed in his family's tradition by contributing to the fund for the establishment of the Church of Agios Alipios in 1844.[115]

While charity was an old tradition, the way in which it developed at this time in the Ottoman Empire exhibited certain modern developments. It emerged not only as a mechanism for the social and cultural expression of the new well-to-do and educated classes, but as part of a broader civilizational and mobilizational discourse. This discourse underlined and reproduced differences in socio-economic status. It also aimed to transform the lower and lower-middle classes into a modern community with unified social and cultural characteristics.[116] All communal institutions - local churches, schools, and philanthropic associations - emerged, each in their own way, as key actors in this discourse.

Secularization was a salient aspect of the civilizational discourse, and local churches became a part of modern transformations, mainly through the involvement of laymen in the management of communal institutions. Church organizations of the 19th century increasingly included lay leaders in their decision-making and administrative systems. The Danieloğlu family was involved in this transformation, as they filled many administrative positions in the management of communal affairs.[117] Danieloğlu and his father were members of the Greek communal administration of Antalya,[118] while his brother Pantel Ağa also served at the Ottoman town council and was in charge of the collection of state taxes from his community.[119] As secularization evolved into a central ingredient of the civilizational discourse, it emerged in local reality through tangible administrative change.

A critical characteristic of the civilizational discourse and, more specifically, the secularizing and nationalizing agenda was education in general and the school system in particular. The modern school, which Danieloğlu supported and - when it did not function - lamented, was also closely linked to the dissemination of Greek language and culture. Danieloğlu believed that people would learn things if they were guided and instructed properly.[120] Along with his efforts to promote the Greek language with his book, which he labeled a travel guide to the province in the Greek language, the main pillar of this project was a school system where the language of instruction was Greek.[121]

---

113 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:134.

114 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:132. Danieloglou 1855, 170. AKMS, PM1, the oral account of Pantelis Arappantelis (18/2/1964).

115 See the inscription at the gate of the Agios Alipios Church, which is written in Greek and Karamanlidika. I would like to thank Kayhan Dörtlük for drawing my attention to this inscription.

116 For a study of philanthropy in the Ottoman Greek world, see Kanner 2004.

117 Pehlivanidis 1989; AKMS, PM1. According to the oral account of Eustratios Toustzoglou (28/1/1964), Pantel Ağa was in the Ottoman administrative council of the town, and Iordanis Danieloğlu was an officer in the police corps of the city.

118 For the inscription at the gate of the Agios Alipios Church, see Pehlivanidis 1989, 1:301.

119 Pehlivanidis 1989, 2:137.

120 Danieloglou 1855, 183.

121 Danieloglou 1855, 180.

Therefore, while the mother tongue of the Greek inhabitants of Antalya was Turkish, some of the residents of the town began to learn Greek in the later decades of the empire through schooling. Eustratios Toustzoglou, for example, went to the Greek middle school in Antalya and then received a high school diploma in Chios, a trading partner of Antalya.[122] Likewise, Eleni Karadenizli finished the girls school in Antalya and worked as a teacher, which implied knowledge of the Greek language,[123] as did Maria Bakirtzoglou who went to school and knew Greek.[124] Moving up the social hierarchy, there were individuals like Dimitrios Avgerinos who was a middleman in the grain trade and then worked for the Hellenic consular agency in Antalya as a translator. He either knew Greek from his childhood on the island of Syros or learnt it when he attended school for five years. Not only did he know Greek, but he was also interested in reading ancient Greek authors.[125] A good command of the Greek language opened new avenues for these individuals such as a job at the Hellenic consular agency or the Greek school of the town. While not all individuals familiar with Greek went into such sectors, they nevertheless were connected, or potentially connected, to the Greek cultural environment.

In Lieu of a Conclusion

Focusing on the archaeological remains and contemporary society in the Antalya region, Danieloğlu's writing on the one hand informs us about the concerns, preoccupations, and aspirations of an educated member of the local Greek elite regarding scientific research and civilizational development. At the same time, it provides us with an understanding of the context and circumstances in which this individual wrote, lived, and related to society in the Anatolian Greek world in particular and the Ottoman Empire in general.

By composing the text in the European travelogue genre and paying close attention to the conventions followed by European travellers, Danieloğlu aimed to take part in a more universal drive for compiling scientific information about the past and present of the Anatolian lands in the 19th century. Likewise, his work shows a strong interest in ancient history, coupled with a civilizational aim, that strongly parallels the aims of some of the Ottoman state or state-affiliated intellectuals as they viewed the provinces from Istanbul, the center of the empire. Danieloğlu's engagement with the classical world seems to have been more a result of his elitism and Westernism than the fact that he saw himself as a Greek.

With the compilation of this travelogue, Danieloğlu not only strove to become part of the world of archaeology and travel writing, but also turned himself into a producer of that world in the Ottoman Empire. Considering the time period in which he wrote, i.e. the mid-19th century, the text precedes the more concrete manifestation of Ottoman imperial interest in travel and archaeology that occurred in the second half of the century. At the same time Danieloğlu's text is not chronologically far removed from the development of a scientific interest in antiquities among European travellers, whom he relates to and references in the book. In this sense, and regardless of the question of the originality of his archaeological examinations, he was part of the latest leanings in the science and humanities of his time, and possibly a local pioneer.

---

122 AKMS, PM1, Biographical information on Eustratios Toustzoglou (28/1/1964).

123 AKMS, PM1, Biographical information on Eleni Karadenizli (n.d.).

124 AKMS, PM1, Biographical information on Maria Bakırtzoglou (n.d.).

125 AKMS, PM1, Biographical information on Dimitrios Avgerinos (n.d.).

The book combines a Westernist stance with a heightened interest in local lands. That Danieloğlu chose to compile this travelogue as a local researcher and writer is itself historically significant. Inquiring about the places he was from, showing interest in the history of these lands, and considering these inquiries to be a worthwhile endeavour are all novelties of the book. He displays a direct connection to local society, which he describes rather extensively, and shows a particular social sensitivity as a local researcher and an attentiveness to the present situation of his homeland. The local references in the text are to tangible, practical matters, and while there is a focus on the Greeks of the region, his work embraces a much wider segment of the population.

Danieloğlu's descriptions of local society are often followed by an Orientalist critique coupled with an engagement that aims to overcome their perceived shortcomings. As an educated local intellectual from one of the leading families of Antalya, Danieloğlu projects a civilizational and educational drive towards the population of the region in general and the Greek community in particular. The fact that he specifically intended the book to serve as a travel guide in the Greek language indicates both a civilizing and an Orientalizing attitude. Compiled in a Turcophone Orthodox Christian town, the book is in practice aimed at a readership in the local and wider-educated elite Greek community. The direct and practical goal seems to have been more about educating the educators or reaching out to the local leading figures in the Orthodox world rather than connecting to the masses, a task which was often carried out at the time through the use of the Turkish language written with Greek characters. The book is also firmly rooted in the newly proliferating Greek publishing sector, which shared the same outlook on enlightenment and progress. At the same time, it is also related to the Danieloğlu family's philanthropic activities and their communal administrative engagement in Antalya. Ultimately, Danieloğlu appears to be situated in between the Greek upper elite in Istanbul and the largely Turkish-speaking common Greek townsmen and villagers of the Antalya region.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ainsworth, W.F. 1842. *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia*. 2 vols. London: John Parker.

AKMS (Archeia tou Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon), Oral Archives: Pamphylia, Attaleia (Antalya) PM1; Alaia (Alanya) PM2-3; Kilikia, Seleukia (Silifke) KL8; Anamur KL10.

Danieloglou, D.E. 1855. *Periegesis eis tin Pamphylian kata to 1850*. Istanbul: Typographeion Anatoli.

Danieloğlu, D.E. 1855 [2010]. *1850 Yılında Yapılan Bir Pamphylia Seyahati*, edited by K. Dörtlük. Translated by A. Ozil. Antalya: AKMED. Original edition in Greek, *Periegesis eis tin Pamphylian kato to 1850*. Istanbul: Typographeion Anatoli, 1855.

Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos. 1864. *Periodikon*. Vol. 2. Istanbul: Byzantis.

Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos. 1865. *Periodikon*. Vol. 2. Istanbul: Byzantis.

Fellows, C. 1839. *A Journal Written during an Excursion in Asia Minor*. London: John Murray.

Leake, W.M. 1824. *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor*. London: John Murray.

Modern Works

Anagnostopoulou, S. 1998. *Mikra Asia, 19os ai - 1919: Oi Ellinorthodokses Koinoites*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Anderson, B. 2015. "'An Alternative Discourse': Local Interpreters of Antiquities in the Ottoman Empire." *JFA* 40.4:450-60.

Anhegger, R. 1988a. "Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe Konuşan Dindaşları." *Tarih ve Toplum* 50:9-12.

Anhegger, R. 1988b. "Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe Konuşan Dindaşları." *Tarih ve Toplum* 51:47-49.

Arık, R.O. 1953. *Türk Müzeciliğine Bir Bakış*. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Bahrani, Z., Z. Çelik, and E. Eldem, eds. 2011. *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753-1914*. Istanbul: Salt.

Balta, E. 2009. "Evangelinos Misailidis'in Yunanca ve Karamanlıca Yayınlarına Osmanlı Kaynaklarının Tanıklığı." *Toplumsal Tarih* 188:24-30.

Balta, E. 2010. *Beyond the Language Frontier: Studies on the Karamanlis and the Karamanlidika Printing*. Analecta Isisiana 110. Istanbul: The Isis Press.

Balta, E., ed. 2015. *Karamanlıca Kitaplar: Çözümlemeli Bibliyografya*. Vol. 1, *1718-1839*. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Baykara, T. 2007. "XX. Yüzyıl Başlarında Antalya." In *20. Yüzyılda Antalya Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, edited by M. Oral, 11-22. Antalya: Akdeniz Üniversitesi.

Benlisoy, S. 2010. "Education in the Turcophone Orthodox Communities of Anatolia during the Nineteenth Century." Ph.D. diss., Boğaziçi University.

Benlisoy, S. 2019. "Karamanlıca Terakki Dergisi: 'Anatolluları Dalmış Oldukları Uykudan Uyandırmak'." *Kebikeç* 47:337-66.

Cezar, M. 1995. *Sanatta Batı'ya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi*. 2 vols. Istanbul: Erol Kerim Aksoy Vakfı.

Çal, H. 1997. "Osmanlı Devletinde Âsâr-ı Atîka Nizamnâmeleri." *Vakıflar Dergisi* 26:391-400.

Çelik, Z. 2008. *Empire, Architecture, and the City: French-Ottoman Encounters, 1830-1914*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Çelik, Z. 2011. "Defining Empire's Patrimony: Late Ottoman Perceptions of Antiquities." In *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753-1914*, edited by Z. Bahrani, Z. Çelik, and E. Eldem, 443-77. Istanbul: Salt.

Çelik, Z. 2016. *About Antiquities: Politics of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Çimrin, H. 2018. *Antalya Kaleiçi*. Antalya: ATO.

Dayar, E. 2018. "19. Yüzyıl Antalya'sında Mora Göçmeni bir Aile: Moraviler." *Toplumsal Tarih* 292:24-33.

Deringil, S. 1998. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Deringil, S. 2003. "'They Live in a State of Nomadism and Savagery': The Late Ottoman Empire and the Post-Colonial Debate." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45.2:311-42.

Dinç, G. 2017. "The Social and Economic Status of the Rum (Greeks) of Antalya in the First Half of the 19th Century." *Adalya* 20:449-90.

Eldem, E. 2011a. "From Blissful Indifference to Anguished Concern: Ottoman Perceptions of Antiquities, 1799-1869." In *Scramble for the Past*: *A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire*, *1753-1914*, edited by Z. Bahrani, Z. Çelik, and E. Eldem, 281-329. Istanbul: Salt.

Eldem, E. 2011b. "An Ottoman Traveler to the Orient: Osman Hamdi Bey." In *Poetics and Politics of Place: Ottoman Istanbul and British Orientalism,* edited by Z. İnankur, R. Lewis, and M. Roberts, 182-95. Pera Müzesi Yayınları 1. Symposium Series 46. Istanbul: Pera Museum Publications.

Eldem, E. 2014. "(A Quest for) the Bourgeoisie of Istanbul: Identities, Roles and Conflicts." In *Urban Governance Under the Ottomans: Between Cosmopolitanism and Conflict*, edited by U. Freitag and N. Lafi, 159-86. London/New York: Routledge.

Eldem, E. 2017. "Theodor Makridi Bey ve 1907 Boğazköy Kazısı." In *The Discovery of an Anatolian Empire/Bir Anadolu İmparatorluğu'nun Keşfi, A Colloquium to Commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the Decipherment of the Hittite Language (November 14th and 15th, 2015; Istanbul Archaeological Museum - Library)*, edited by M. Doğan-Alparslan, A. Schachner, and M. Alparslan, 159-92. Istanbul: Türk Eskiçağ Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Exertzoglou, H. 1996. *Ethniki Tautotita stin Konstantinoupoli ton 19o ai*. Athens: Nefeli.

Exertzoglou, H. 1999. "The Development of a Greek Ottoman Bourgeoisie: Investment Patterns in the Ottoman Empire, 1850-1914." In *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, *Politics, Economy, and Society in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by D. Gondicas and C. Issawi, 89-114. Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press.

Exertzoglou, H. 2015. *Ek Dysmon to Fos? Eksellinismos kai Orientalismos stin Othomaniki Autokratoria, mesa 19ou - arches 20ou ai*. Athens: Ekdoseis tou Eikostou Protou.

Findley, C. 1999. *Ahmed Mithat Efendi Avrupa'da*. Translated by A. Anadol. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Gedeon, M. 1932. *Aposimeiomata Chronografou 1800-1913*. Athens: Foinikos.

Hamilakis, Y. 2011. "Indigenous Archaeologies in Ottoman Greece." In *Scramble for the Past*: *A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire*, *1753-1914*, edited by Z. Bahrani, Z. Çelik, and E. Eldem, 49-69. Istanbul: Salt.

Hanioğlu, M.Ş. 1995. *The Young Turks in Opposition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

İnalcık, H. 2009. "Açış Konuşması." In *Çağının Sıradışı Yazarı, Evliya Çelebi*, edited by N. Tezcan, 13-17. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Kanner, E. 2004. *Phtocheia kai Philanthropia stin Orthodoksi Koinotita tis Konstantinoupolis 1753-1912*. Athens: Katarti.

Kayra, C., trans. 2001. *Bir Osmanlı Doktorunun Anıları: Yüzyıl Önce Anadolu ve Suriye. Dr. Şerafeddin Mağmumi*. Istanbul: Büke Yayınları.

Kechriotis, V. 2010. "20. Yüzyılın Başında Antalya'daki Rumlar." *Toplumsal Tarih* 201:42-51.

Kut, T. 1987. "Evangelinos Misailidis Efendi." *Tarih ve Toplum* 48:22-26.

Makdisi, U. 2002. "Ottoman Orientalism." *AHR* 107.3:768-96.

Misailidis, P. 1983. "Evangelinos M. Misailidis." *Prosfigikos Kosmos* (4 April 1983):1-10.

Motika, R., and C. Herzog. 2000. "Orientalism 'alla turca': Late 19th / Early 20th Century Ottoman Voyages into the Muslim 'Outback'." *Die Welt des Islams* 40.2:139-95.

Muşmal, H. 2009. *Osmanlı Devletinin Eski Eser Politikası: Konya Vilayeti Örneği (1876-1914)*. Konya: Kömen.

Ogan, A. 1943. "Türkiye'de Müzenin Kuruluşu." *İstanbul* 2. https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/24582

Pehlivanidis, G. 1989. *Attaleia kai Attaleiotes*. 2 vols. Athens: Atlantis.

Rona, Z., ed. 1993. *Osman Hamdi Bey ve Dönemi. Sempozyum 17-18 Aralık 1992*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Shaw, W.M.K. 2003. *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sönmez, C.C. 2013. *Antalya, 1765-1898*. Istanbul: Mimarlık Vakfı İktisadi İşletmesi.

Şimşek, F., and G. Dinç. 2009. "XIX. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Eski Eser Anlayışının Doğuşu ve Bu Alanda Uygulanan Politikalar." *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 10.16:101-27.

Şişmanoğlu Şimşek, Ş. 2014a. "Karamanlidika Literary Production at the End of the 19th Century as Reflected in the Pages of *Anatoli*." In *Cultural Encounters in the Turkish-Speaking Communities of the Late Ottoman Empire,* edited by E. Balta and M. Ölmez, 429-47. Istanbul: The Isis Press.

Şişmanoğlu Şimşek, Ş. 2014b. "Evangelinos Misailidis'in Karamanlıca Başyapıtı: Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar u Cefakeş ya da 'İki Kelise Arasında Binamaz' Olmak." In *Tanzimat ve Edebiyat*, edited by M.F. Uslu and F. Altuğ, 193-230. Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Tarinas, S. 1996. "Evangelinos Misailidis: To Ekdotiko Ergo, Proti Anagrafi Autotelon Dimosieumaton tou." *Kath' Imas Anatoli* 3:299-350.

Tarinas, S. 2007. *O Ellinikos Typos tis Polis*. Istanbul: İho.

TTK. 2013. *Halil Edhem Hâtıra Kitabı, Cilt I-II / In Memoriem Halil Edhem, Vol I-II*. Ankara: TTK. Original edition, Ankara: TTK, 1947-1948.

Uslu, G. 2017. *Homer, Troy and the Turks. Heritage and Identity in the Late Ottoman Empire, 1870-1915*. Heritage and Memory Studies. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Yaşayanlar, İ. 2018. "Devlet, Arkeoloji ve Âsâr-ı Atîka: Bir Vilayet Müzeciliği Örneği Olarak Müze-i Hümâyûn Bursa Şubesi." *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 19.35:555-85.

Zarifis, G. 2002. *Oi Anamniseis Mou*. Athens: Trohalia.

Makale Geliş / Received : 09.12.2019

Makale Kabul / Accepted : 05.03.2020