

# ARMENIAN RURAL MIGRATION TO ISTANBUL IN THE 1890s: A MIGRANT PROFILE

Jelle Verheij

## 1. Introduction

In their ancient homeland, rural Armenians were almost exclusively settled agriculturalists. Even transhumance (moving to nearby highlands in the summer), common among their Kurdish neighbours, seems to have been rare among them. One would not generally expect, therefore, to see Armenian peasants as migrants. However, poor economic and security conditions in their homeland forced many to seek their fortunes elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> In the second half of the 19th century, more than regional centres, it was the big cities of the Empire (notably Istanbul and Haleb/Aleppo) that were destinations of these migrants.<sup>2</sup> In Istanbul, Armenians competed with migrants from all over the Ottoman Empire. As the administrative and unrivalled commercial centre of the Empire, Istanbul was a kind of migrant capital. Indeed, it needed migration to sustain its economic functions.

Armenian rural migration to Istanbul often took the form of seasonal migration; peasants worked in their villages in the summer and in the capital in winter. Many walked to Trabzon and took one of the many steamboats to Istanbul, while others walked twice a year the enormous distance from East to West, a journey that took some 6-7 weeks. Others settled permanently or semi-permanently, only to return to their native villages in old age.<sup>3</sup> Towards the end of the 19th century even migration to other countries took off, particularly to the United States, and, for various reasons, in particular from the province of Mamuretülaziz, present-day Elazığ.<sup>4</sup> Through this migration, the already existing Armenian diaspora expanded. Altogether, a large proportion of the Armenian and Muslim populations from the Eastern portion of Anatolia migrated at one time or another, either on a seasonal basis or for a longer period.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Christopher Clay, "Labour, Migration and Economic Conditions in Nineteenth-Century Anatolia," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34/4 (1998): 1-4.

<sup>2</sup> Haleb was a traditional destination for migrants from the Southeast of Anatolia (Clay, "Labour, Migration," 4). For the extensive seasonal migration from the Sasun area to Haleb, see Vahram L. Shemmassian, 'The Sasun *Pandukhts* in Nineteenth-Century Aleppo', in *Armenian Baghesh/Bitlis and Taron/Mush*, ed. Richard G. Hovannisian (Costa Mesa CA: Mazda Publishers, 2001): 175-189. Although for centuries an obvious destination for migrants from all over the Empire, Istanbul became only more attractive for migrants from the East after 1860 (Clay, "Labour, Migration," 4-6).

<sup>3</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 6-9, 11.

<sup>4</sup> Ottoman Armenians from the Harput area 'had established regular patterns of migration to America in the 1860s' (Halil İnalcık, Suraiya Faroqhi and Donald Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997): 792. Towards the end of the 19th century, emigration to the United States had become quite voluminous. Between mid-1891 and mid-1892 alone, according to American statistics, a total of 2,728 people arrived in the US 'from provinces inhabited by Armenians' (another term for the so-called 'six vilayets', Bitlis, Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Mamuretülaziz, Van, and Sivas) (Report of the Ottoman Ambassador to Washington, 3/4/1893, in: Şimşir, Bilal N. *Documents diplomatiques ottomans. Affaires arméniennes* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1985, 4 vols) vol. 2, doc 223. A large part of the migrants consisted of Armenians and other Christians, though there was also a surprisingly high number of Muslims among them.

<sup>5</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 10.

As with the socio-economic history of the late Ottoman Empire in general, studies on the subject are relatively scarce. The phenomenon of Armenian seasonal and permanent migration is relatively little known. However, a large part of the population of Istanbul appears to have consisted of migrants, and many of them were Armenian. The little research that has been done suggests that the peak of migration from the Eastern provinces to Istanbul was in the 1860s and 70s,<sup>6</sup> but the phenomenon continued to be strong until WWI.

## 2. The source and its context

In this article, I will share an analysis of the data from one source only, but that source is indeed a remarkable one. It dates from 1895, the year of the Hamidian massacres. On September 30, members of the Huntchak party marched to the Porte, the office of the Ottoman Grand Vizier, to present a petition in support of reforms for the benefit of Armenians. The demonstration was blocked by the police, and a gun fight ensued in which some dozens of people died, both demonstrators and police. Soon after, at various spots in the city, police and Muslim civilians armed with clubs and sticks started to attack ordinary Armenians and other Christians.<sup>7</sup> Panic-struck Armenians fled to churches for safety. In six churches (the patriarchal church in Kumkapı, and churches in Pera, Galata, Hasköy, Üsküdar and Pangaltı) a total of 2,414 Armenians hid for more than a week, afraid that they would be attacked when leaving. Police blockaded the churches, and representatives of foreign embassies mediated to resolve the crisis, arranging a safe exit for those taking refuge – the refugees, as they will be referred to – with the Ottoman authorities. In connection with this mediation, some industrious officials, most probably clerks of the British Embassy working in cooperation with the Armenian Patriarchate, drew up lists of all the people who had taken refuge in the churches.

It was quite by chance, while working on another subject in the National Archives in London, that I came across one of these lists. It is the list of the church where most refugees stayed, the Armenian church of the Holy Trinity in Pera.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 21.

<sup>7</sup> On the demonstration: Great Britain, Parliamentary Papers, *Turkey no. 2. Correspondence Relative to the Armenian Question and Reports from Her Majesty's Consular Officers in Asiatic Turkey* (London, Harrison & Sons: 1896): doc. 36 (petition text in inclosure 2), for the Ottoman version of events: Şimşir, "*Documents Diplomatiques*," vol.3 doc. 7, annex. On the Armenians hiding in the churches and the efforts of the Embassies and Patriarchate to solve this crisis: op. cit.: docs 51, 54, 56, 61, 66, 70, 86 and particularly 86, inclosure (*Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch*).

<sup>8</sup> Unpublished, archival document *Liste des Armeniens refugies a'église de Saint Trinité de Pera*, National Archives London, FO 195-1907.

Arshak Saberdjian	Salus Teerouk	Stamboul	
Agop Krikorian	.. ..	.. ..	écolier
Agop Sarkissian	Péra Dolahdéré	Césarée	badigeonneur
Artak Chapikian	Cassim Pacha	Sivas	(Femme)
Aghavni Balaghian	.. ..	..	..
Agop Chaghoyan	Péra Yéni Chéhir	Nittis	serviteur
Agop Hachian	..	Van	serviteur
Artin Yushachian	Panostia	Stamboul	écolier
Agop Avakian	Galata	Keghi	chartonnier
Artin Sarafian	Stamboul Ali Pacha Han	Césarée	marbrier
Arakel Krikorian	Cassim Pacha	Hanous	cordonnier
Agop Der Ohannessian	Stamboul	Tchamachguszek	
Agop Himmian	Yéni Kapou	Stamboul	cordonnier
Artine Mesrobian	Cassim Pacha	Carpas	
Avak Luledjian	Péra Chichli	Erzindjan	Mécanicien
Artin Varianian	Caraguenurak	Keghi	
Atom Artin	.. ..	..	écolier
Aghavni Artin	.. ..	..	(Villette)
Agop Ohannessian	Galata	..	marbrier
Agop Asandourian	Cassim Pacha	Kissan	serviteur
Artine Ohannessian	Péra Chichli	Hanous	
Agop Kiretchian	Caraguenurak	Diarrékir	
Artin Arzoumanian	Péra	Gurine	
Agop Ohougassian	Zindan Capou	Césarée	Kvérék Marchand d'œuf
Artine Higuirian	Pancaldi		peintre
Artine Zibayan	Cassim Pacha	Sivas	forgeron
Anna Zibayan	.. ..	..	(Femme)

Fig. 1. Fragment of the list of refugees in the Church of the Holy Trinity in Pera

### 3. Data in the source

For each of the 1,009 refugees in the Pera church, the following data were recorded:

- (a) Name
- (b) Surname
- (c) Place of residence in Istanbul
- (d) Place of origin
- (e) Profession

(f) Sex and age -status (minor or adult).

These data offer an excellent opportunity to profile the socio-economic characteristics of the refugees and thus of Armenian migrants in Istanbul in the 1890s in general. Because only a tiny 5.5 % declared themselves as having originated from Istanbul, the others, I think, must have come from various other places in the Empire (see below).

Regarding the methodology, I entered all the data into a database, to enable more elaborate statistical analysis. Then, I analysed the data from the perspectives of profession, residence in Istanbul and place of origin, with the further addition of interconnection between these. Before presentation of the findings, however, a caveat for mitigating factors concerning the representativeness of the sample should be mentioned.

#### **4. Do the church refugees constitute a representative sample?**

Before discussion of the results of the analysis, we should briefly consider the degree to which the list offers us a representative sample of Ottoman Armenians and, more specifically, the Armenian migrants in Istanbul.

Some groups may have been over- or under-represented:

- *Women and children* seem underrepresented. Only 7.9% of the refugees were female and 2.5% minors. From other sources<sup>9</sup>, it is known that migrants were usually men who came to Istanbul without their families: thus, the high occurrence of males. Women and children may still have been undercounted, however, insofar as they were less likely to be in the city centre than men, and less likely to be caught out and about when the violence erupted and thus needing the sanctuary of a church.
- Presumably, *Istanbul Armenians* and more affluent people were also under-represented, although it is impossible to say to what degree. We may suppose that Istanbul Armenians would have generally sought refuge in their own homes, if they were nearby, rather than a church. There, they would presumably have felt safer as well as more comfortable, especially with the protection of their community if they lived in an Armenian area, and surely, moreover, concerned to reach and be with their families during the dangerous period. This may have been even more likely for richer people, who may have had servants to help protect them and would not have desired to suffer in cramped conditions with workers.
- Finally, it may be assumed that *politically engaged Armenians* (i.e. Huntchak supporters) were somewhat overrepresented. Clearly the Huntchak party saw the refuge in the churches more as a political demonstration than as an act of despair. Consequently, party supporters were perhaps more inclined than others to seek sanctuary in the churches. Indeed, the British representative noted the presence in the church of people who urged the refugees to stay on and not accept the mediation; these were most probably members of the Huntchak

---

<sup>9</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 10

movement.<sup>10</sup> In terms of percentages, however, one would expect them to represent only a small part of the total number of people.

## RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

### 5. Profession

Among the people in the church there were 25 children, comprising, rather remarkably, 24 girls and only one boy. Since there were also female teachers among the refugees, one may hazard that one or more Armenian girl school classes fled into the church. In the remainder of the analysis (below) the minors will not be included.

There were 80 women in the church. The majority of them (90%) declared no profession. The remaining 10% consisted of just three categories: teachers at primary schools (3), students (2) and laundry women (3). While the primary teachers were all from Istanbul, the students and laundry women originated from eastern provinces – Erzurum, Van and Sivas.

The 904 adult men declared 92 different professions, some of them now extinct or difficult to understand. I have grouped these professions into 13 categories (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Profession according to category

	Category	Number	Percentage
0	No profession, unclassifiable	125	13.8
1	<b>Peasants, workers</b> (farmer, worker, cattle breeder, <i>rencher</i> [someone who lives from the soil], miller)	78	8.6
2	<b>Artisans: metallurgy</b> (smith, blacksmith, coppersmith, tinsmith, moulder, nail-maker, stove-maker)	54	6.2
3	<b>Artisans: construction sector</b> (painter, mason, marble mason, plasterer)	85	8.1
4	<b>Artisans: clothing sector</b> (cloth-cutter, cap-maker, fez-maker, furrier, tailor, mohair maker, weaver)	28	3.2

<sup>10</sup> See the report of the British Embassy official who was in charge of the evacuation of the refugees (Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch: *Turkey no. 2*, op. cit.: doc. 86, inclosure 1.). Marinitch noted: 'The next day, we reached the church at Pera at 9 o'clock in the morning, and having at once resumed proceedings, succeeded within five hours in inducing all the refugees to leave the church, not, however, without fresh difficulties created by certain individuals who may be looked upon as the instigators of the recent events'. In the Galata church, Marinitch discovered 'two flags made with black paper, which were hanging in the form of a cross on the wall of the staircase, and over the chair of the President of the Council, bearing the following inscription: "Vivent les dévoués Hintchakistes!" [Long live the devoted Huntchakists!]. These flags were removed at our request' (op. cit.: p. 52). Elsewhere, it is stated that about 12% of the Armenian refugees carried arms (*Turkey no. 2*, op. cit.: doc. 66), which perhaps might be used as an indication of the number of Huntchak militants among the refugees.

	Category	Number	Percentage
5	<b>Artisans: others</b> (carpenter, shoemaker, slipper maker, watchmaker, printer, saddle-maker, locksmith)	98	10.5
6	<b>Food sector</b> (cook, baker, <i>pastırma</i> maker, <i>pide</i> maker)	47	5.3
7	<b>Service sector</b> (barber, road-sweeper, watchman, custodian ( <i>odabaşı</i> ), servant, porter, middle man, wrecker ( <i>bozmacı</i> ), porter ( <i>hamal</i> ))	219	24.4
8	<b>Tradesmen, shop owners</b> (shopkeeper, chemist, jeweller, coalman, greengrocer, wood-seller, lime-seller, haberdasher ( <i>tuhafiyeci</i> ), ragman ( <i>pestimalcı</i> ), water-seller)	80	10.1
9	<b>Restaurant and cafe owners</b> (coffee-house owner ( <i>kafeci</i> ), restaurant owner)	56	6.0
10	<b>In official service</b> (worker at Régie, cashier, municipal worker, fireman, clerk)	10	1.1
11	<b>Education sector and professional</b> (teacher, architect)	2	0.2
12	<b>Students</b>	22	2.4

This classification somewhat obscures the fact that certain professions were relatively common among the Armenians in the church. In fact, the ten most common professions together constitute more than half (53.6 %) of all the professions counted (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Ten most common professions

	profession	percentage
1	servant	17,6%
2	farmer (" <i>rencher</i> ")	6,8%
3	coffee maker, coffee house owner	4,9%
4	carpenter	4,3%
5	shoemaker	4%
6	cook	3,4%
7	coalman	3,3%
8	smith	3,3%
9	mason	3,2%
10	painter	2,7%

It can easily be concluded that the refugees in the Pera church were relatively poor people, workers and lower middle class. There were few tradesmen, and they were petty tradesmen apart from a few pharmacists and a single moneychanger (*sarraf*). Over half of the tradesmen were coalmen (30), followed by lime sellers (10), tobacco sellers (8), and haberdashers (*tuhafiyeci*) (6). There is thus no trace of affluence in our sample. Strikingly, there were also very few people with regular salaries, and only ten people (1.1%) were in some sort of official service. The overwhelming majority of the Armenians in the sample were self-employed. This is all entirely compatible with the idea that they were primarily migrants.

## 6. Residence in Istanbul

The clerks drawing up the lists asked the refugees to declare the neighbourhood in Istanbul where they resided. Some of the neighbourhood and street names have changed (*Tartavla* neighbourhood to Kurtuluş, *Karnavoula* street to Karakurum by example)) and others some do not exist anymore (such as *Tekirdağ İskeleyi* [Quay] – since there are no steamers to Tekirdağ nowadays, it is difficult to know where the Istanbul departure/arrival point for boats making that journey was situated). Nevertheless, most of the neighbourhoods can be found relatively easily on a modern map.

In total some 100 different locations are mentioned. Nearly all of them can be classified as (roughly) equivalent to one of the districts (*ilçe*) of modern İstanbul. Table 3 lists these, along with the numbers and proportions of the

**Table 3.** Place of residence in Istanbul

	District	Number	Percentage
	Not given/not found	31	3.2
1	Bakırköy	1	0.1
2	Beşiktaş	19	1.9
3	Beykoz	8	0.8
4	Beyoğlu	644	65.4
5	Eyüp	9	0.9
6	Fatih	222	22.6
7	Gaziosmanpaşa	6	0.6
8	Kadıköy	6	0.6
9	Şişli	22	2.2
10	Sarıyer	7	0.7
11	Üsküdar	9	0.9

Predictably, a large majority (almost two thirds) of the refugees lived – or were staying – in Beyoğlu, where the church was located, although a surprisingly high number were settled in the Muslim-dominated Fatih district on the other side of the Golden Horn.

As with the professions, the classification – here, district – obscures the fact that certain neighbourhoods scored much more highly than others. An extraordinary high number of the refugees lived in just three quarters in Beyoğlu: Kasımpaşa (378 people, 38.4% of the total), Pera (122 people, 12.4%) and Galata (59 people, 6%). This further supports the perception of the refugees as primarily migrants, since it would make perfect sense if most of these people lived in the crowded hostels in those areas, the so-called '*bekarevleri*' (houses for the unmarried).

## 7. Origin/Place of birth

Among the most interesting data found in this research concerns the place of birth of the refugees. Only 54 persons (a tiny 5.5%) gave Istanbul as their place of origin. Almost all the refugees came from places in Anatolia. We should note that we cannot know for sure what 'place of origin' meant to these people, whether it was the place where they born or where their fathers or even forefathers were from. Nowadays, it is certainly usual in Turkey to give one's father's or paternal grandfather's home area as place of origin; in fact, it is this that is formally recorded on people's official IDs. My guess in this case, however, is that they were mostly (also) born in these places themselves, in part because the number of males so outnumbered that of women, which would be expected of a large migrant population caught out in the violence and thus unable to return home, unwilling to risk return to vulnerable lodgings and not having anyone else (family members) to think about. In other words it appears likely that a large proportion of these men were migrants and gave their own home areas as place of origin.

Most people gave an area as place of origin, rather than a specific town, as is usual in Turkey today, although they were more inclined to give their district (*kaza*) than the province (*vilayet*), since provinces were much larger in Ottoman times. Most of the places mentioned can be identified, although locating them is more difficult than in the case of (most of) the neighbourhoods in Istanbul. Some people declared really old fashioned *memlekets* (home areas) – like İspayirt, a former beylik between Hizan and Müküs/Moks (present-day Bahçesaray) in Bitlis, that even in the 1890s had already been defunct for some 60 or more years.<sup>11</sup>

As with the neighbourhoods, I reassigned all the places to modern geographical units, one of the 81 provinces of Turkey today. As Table 4 shows, twelve refugees did not declare their place of origin and I was unable to identify a further two, thus giving provinces for 970 of the 984 adults listed.

**Table 4.** Place of Origin

Province	Number
Unspecified	12
Unidentified	2
Adana	2
Adıyaman	1

<sup>11</sup> Sinan Hakan, *Müküs Kürt Mirleri tarihi* (Istanbul, Pêrî, 2002): 6



Amasya	5
Ankara	1
Bayburt	11
Bilecik	1
Bingöl	233
Bitlis	178
Bursa	3
Çanakkale	1
Çorlu	1
Diyarbakır	17
Elazığ	15
Erzincan	60
Erzurum	35
Giresun	11
Istanbul	54
Izmir	1
Kahramanmaraş	2
Kayseri	104
Kocaeli	6
Malatya	16
Muş	23
Niğde	1
Sakarya	1
Siirt	4
Sivas	88
Tekirdağ	7
Tokat	1
Trabzon	1
Tunceli	4
Van	71
Yalova	5
Yozgat	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>984</b>

These results are striking in various ways:

- A large majority of the refugees – the mostly migrants, as I deduce them to have been – came from just a few provinces – Bingöl, Bitlis, Erzincan, Kayseri, Sivas and Van – and more than half originated from only three of these – Bingöl, Bitlis and Kayseri.
- Most of the migrants originated from the eastern provinces. That was of course the Armenian ‘heartland’, where the majority of rural Armenians lived, but still, the predominance of the easterners is somewhat surprising giving the enormous distance from Istanbul to the East. This is in line, however, with the observations of contemporary inhabitants of Istanbul who were astounded at the high numbers of migrants from the east in the city.<sup>12</sup> As mentioned (above), we know that many of these people worked seasonally in the city, walking all the way from the east to Istanbul twice a year, or going via the port of

<sup>12</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 6.

Trabzon after walking there – generally after the harvest and before the weather turned cold, so particularly in September (i.e. in the month leading up to the events that resulted in the church refuge).

Since the men generally left their families at home and the journey was arduous, this migration must have been first and foremost a reaction to difficult economic conditions at home. It has been computed that the money the migrants sent or brought home constituted one of the main pillars of the economy in the Eastern provinces. These remittances were primarily used to pay government taxes.<sup>13</sup> Knowing that a large part of the taxes the government collected in the east was used for expenditure in the capital, and that that is, in fact, where also a significant portion was earned in the first place, one realises what an extremely centralist environment it was in which the Ottoman citizens were caught up.

- Interesting also is the almost complete absence in the sample of Armenians from the current south and southeast of Anatolia – provinces like Adana, Maraş, Antep, Urfa and Diyarbakır. I think this should be ascribed to the attraction of both Halep and the Çukurova (around Adana) as places to work. It is known, for example, that Armenians from Sasun, traditionally worked in Halep, usually on a seasonal basis and particularly as servants in restaurants.<sup>14</sup>
- Some relatively small districts figured extraordinarily highly among the places of origin. Notably among these, all 233 migrants from Bingöl came from the district of Kiğı; therefore, people from this one district in the east of Anatolia make up nearly a quarter of our entire migrant sample, which is quite staggering, really. And this figure may have been even higher, since Kiğı was in the late 19th century part of the *vilayet* of Erzurum, and some may have declared Erzurum as their place of origin rather than Kiğı. I have little to hazard by way of speculation as to why this should have been the case. It appears to indicate a very high migration from Kiğı in particular, but geographically and economically this district appears no different than the adjacent districts; it was predominantly agricultural with hot summers and cold winters. It might be possible that Istanbul attracted a relatively high number of migrants from Kiğı because the district was especially far away from any other regional centre with employment possibilities, or perhaps there were some specific political factors at work (tension with local Kurdish tribes, for example).

## 8. Two correlations

Many different interconnections can be established among the data in the list. Just two of these are presented here, which both enable interesting conclusions.

### a) Place of origin versus place of residence

If we look to the place of origin of the refugees according to their residence in İstanbul, it turns out that to a high degree people from one place lived together in Istanbul. For example, 64% of the Armenian migrants in Beşiktaş, came from one province, Bayburt. Similarly, 71 % of those living in Beykoz originated in Bitlis, and 39% of those living in Galata came from Kiğı, while the Kasımpaşa

---

<sup>13</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 27.

<sup>14</sup> Shemmassian, op. cit.; the Çukurova developed as a migrant destination in the late 19th century (Clay, "Labour, Migration," 12).

neighbourhood is the most remarkable of all, insofar as not only did 40% of all the migrants in our sample live here, but 40% of them came from the above mentioned district of Kiğı.

The results of the match of place of origin and place of residence point to the phenomenon referred to in migration studies as chain migration.<sup>15</sup> People were members of tightly knit, place-based social networks, and almost no-one settled alone, at somewhere of his (or her) own choice. In the *gurbet* (journey from home, migration), people stayed together. Yet more detailed data would probably have revealed that certain villages even (from, for example, Kiğı) were over-represented, and that the people of these villages even stayed together in Istanbul in the same streets. Indeed, that is how migrants from Anatolia still largely live in migrant cities, both in Turkey and Europe. Migration may be an individual choice but only in the context of a group behaviour. Rural Armenians in the late nineteenth century were no exception to that pattern.

#### b) Place of origin versus profession

Combining the place of origin with profession also produces interesting results. Just a few examples: nine out of the 10 lime sellers were from Bitlis, 10 of the 15 nail-makers were from Diyarbakır, 19 of 24 painters and all nine *pastırmacı* came from Kayseri, and all four stablemen were from Sivas.

These examples attest to a considerable specialisation in certain professions among people from specific localities.<sup>16</sup> This as well is an expression of a strong communal orientation of the migrants. In the case of professions that required a high degree of experience and learning (skill acquisition), it seems more likely that this specialisation was traditional and brought to Istanbul from Anatolia. It is also, one should add, again something that to a certain extent endures. Kayseri, for example, continues to maintain its reputation as the country's centre for *pastırma*.

### 9. Conclusion

This is just a short introduction to a potentially very rich subject; certainly, this short piece has certainly not explored all the possibilities that the raw data of the list of church sanctuary-seekers suggests.

One should bear in mind that the refugee profile offered here is a reflection of the situation in a specific year. This was obviously subject to variations and developments over time and probably changed quite radically soon afterwards, in fact. After 1894, and particularly following the Ottoman Bank attack by Dashnak militants in 1896, which again prompted a violent backlash against Armenian citizens all over Istanbul, the Ottoman government took measures to curb the flow of Armenian

---

<sup>15</sup> This term was coined in the 1960's by MacDonald and MacDonald (John S. MacDonald and Leatrice D. MacDonald, 'Chain migration, ethnic neighborhood formation and social networks', *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 42- 1 (1964): 82-97

<sup>16</sup> This phenomenon has been recognised by social-economic historians who study this period (İnalçik et al., "History of..". 787).

migrants to the capital.<sup>17</sup> Reportedly, thousands of Armenian migrants were also sent back to the eastern provinces at this time.<sup>18</sup> According to social-economic historian Quataert, after the crisis of 1895-96, Armenian porters (*hamals*) were largely replaced by Kurdish migrants.<sup>19</sup> At the other hand, rural Armenians were probably inclined even more to seek their fortune in Istanbul, because of the extensive damage wrought to the local economy and Armenian businesses in particular with the 1895 massacres.

Returning to the source, this list may be useful not only for students in social-economic history but also for those focusing on the political history of the period. Given the evident involvement of the Huntchak movement in the church refuge, for example, the data might also be used to explore the geographical distribution of Huntchak supporters, both in Istanbul and in the Armenian homeland in the East, and the particular reasons that prompted that support. Finally, it should be remarked, the list constitutes a rare and interesting resource for genealogical research.

---

<sup>17</sup> There seem to have been extra restrictions in place since at least 1894. It is unclear whether these were connected to the Sasun massacre of 1894 or, perhaps, to the earthquake in Istanbul in the same year (Clay, "Labour, Migration," 9, 23).

<sup>18</sup> Clay, "Labour, Migration," 24.

<sup>19</sup> Also Clay, "Labour, Migration," 11.