

# One script, two languages: Garabed Panosian his Armeno-Turkish newspapers in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire

Masayuki Ueno

To cite this article: Masayuki Ueno (2016) One script, two languages: Garabed Panosian his Armeno-Turkish newspapers in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 52:4, 605-622, DOI: [10.1080/00263206.2016.1175345](https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2016.1175345)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2016.1175345>



Published online: 27 May 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=fmes20>

## One script, two languages: Garabed Panosian and his Armeno-Turkish newspapers in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire

Masayuki Ueno

Department of Asian History, Graduate School of Literature and Human Sciences, Osaka City University, Osaka, Japan

Armeno-Turkish, or Turkish written in Armenian script, has attracted scholarship highlighting the inter-communal relations of the multireligious and multilingual Ottoman society.<sup>1</sup> However, although its main readership comprised Armenians, its importance in the historiography of Armenian people has only been marginal. In writing the history of modern times when Armeno-Turkish printed materials were widely circulated, researchers have been inclined to focus on the indications of national awakening rather than such a hybrid linguistic culture.<sup>2</sup> Interestingly, however, a memorandum of an American Protestant missionary written in the early 1870s states that *Manzume-i Efkâr* (*Row of Thoughts*) – a newspaper mainly written in Armeno-Turkish – was the ‘most influential’ newspaper among Armenians.<sup>3</sup> The assertion that the Armeno-Turkish newspaper gained greater influence than Armenian ones suggests that it is fruitful to inquire into the extent of readership of this underestimated newspaper and, more generally, its hybrid means of expression; this in turn leads to reconsidering the historiography of Ottoman Armenians. Therefore, this paper elucidates the career of Garabed Panosian (1826 or 1828–1905) – under whose strong leadership as editor *Manzume-i Efkâr* was published for 30 years. Moreover, it examines his Armeno-Turkish publications and considers the linguistic, social, and political circumstances in which they were read. It specifically focuses on the 1860s and 1870s – the period when Panosian enjoyed his greatest popularity.

Panosian and his publications attracted considerable attention from his contemporaries. Ottoman Armenians as well as the American Protestant missionary quoted above considered him to be an influential journalist. For example, Hagop Baronian – the famous writer – felt that Panosian qualified for his serial writings on ‘national bigwigs’. Despite his satirical tone, Baronian highly regarded Panosian’s popularity among the general Armenian public.<sup>4</sup> A letter to the editor published in an Armenian newspaper in 1869 also praised his popularity and likened his critical writings to those of the influential contemporary French newspaper, *L’Opinion nationale*.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, his fame extended to non-Armenians. Ahmet İhsan Tokgöz, a Muslim journalist and bureaucrat, recollected that he read *Manzume-i Efkâr* during his school days. Ahmet Midhat – a Muslim writer and journalist – used Panosian’s name for an Armeno-Turkish writer in his novel.<sup>6</sup> Teodor Kasap – the

Orthodox Christian publicist who shared the hometown with Panosian – mentioned Panosian several times in his satirical Ottoman Turkish periodical, *Diyojen (Diogenes)*.<sup>7</sup> The fact that Teodor Kasap published a caricatured image of Panosian, one of the earliest examples of a cartoon in an Ottoman Turkish periodical,<sup>8</sup> suggests that the readers of *Diyojen* had a certain amount of knowledge about him. Panosian also received a decoration from the Qajar Shah Nasser al-Din after his visit to Istanbul on the way back from Europe in 1873.<sup>9</sup>

Considering his contemporary fame, Garabed Panosian has attracted only relatively modest interest from modern researchers. Although many made a passing reference to Panosian's name and his newspapers,<sup>10</sup> his writings have seldom been used as a source to examine Ottoman and Armenian history.<sup>11</sup> One reason for this negligence is researchers' strong preference for literary materials and translations while examining Armeno-Turkish materials, whose cultural influence forms a major concern. Thus, they have focused less on newspapers, which were politically as well as socially significant media in the late Ottoman society. Another reason is the nationalistic anachronism, extensively criticized in the field of Ottoman studies, which assumes that Armeno-Turkish materials were relevant only to Turkish monolingual Armenians – a non-mainstream population in national history.<sup>12</sup>

Nevertheless, some researchers have focused on Panosian and his writings. They attempted to get him into the framework of Armenian national history and construct an image of him as a journalist who supported the rebellion against the Ottoman Empire of the Armenians of Zeytun region in 1862 and, more generally, the Armenian national liberation movement.<sup>13</sup> This image gave an impression that Panosian was not concerned about non-Armenian audiences and, more importantly, the censorship of the Ottoman government.

In fact, Panosian is precisely the sort of person who should have found his place in the early history of Armenian national awakening, although not the way modern researchers expected. A shallow acquaintance with his writings indicates that Panosian, who did not hesitate to call himself a 'lover of his nation' (*azkasēr*), was among the most ardent advocates of Armenian national feeling and zealously promoted the notion of the nation (*millet/azk*) among Ottoman Armenians.<sup>14</sup> These facts and the historiographical evaluation about Panosian naturally invite questions on his stance toward the linguistic situation of the Armenians and his attitude toward the Ottoman Empire. This paper tackles these questions and challenges the above-mentioned assumptions. To do so, it focuses on the extent of readership of his publications. We argue first that among Armenians, Panosian obtained a wide readership extending from Turkish monolingual Armenians to Armenian-Turkish bilingual Armenians. Second, we argue that Panosian had in mind a non-Armenian readership as well, and he used his publications to show the allegiance of Armenians to the Ottoman Empire.

The comparison with the case of Orthodox Christians highlights the importance of these arguments. It is widely known that Orthodox Christians in inland Anatolia were Turcophone, and Turkish was written in Greek script for them.<sup>15</sup> Similar to the circulation of Armeno-Turkish materials, printed materials as well as periodicals written in Greco-Turkish began to widely circulate in the nineteenth century.<sup>16</sup> According to the researchers, however, the readership of Greco-Turkish materials was mostly limited to Turkish monolingual Orthodox Christians, and there were fewer publications than those of Armeno-Turkish.<sup>17</sup> Thus, the investigation of Armeno-Turkish readership elucidates the peculiarity of the

Armeno-Turkish and Armenian community as well as the pluralistic society of the late Ottoman Empire.

In the nineteenth century, Armenians were scattered throughout the Ottoman heartland. The majority of them lived in the eastern Ottoman provinces, whereas others formed relatively small groups in western and central Anatolia. The largest concentration of Armenians was in Istanbul – the cosmopolitan capital of the empire. The great majority of Armenians belonged to the Armenian Church, some also belonging to the Catholic or Protestant Churches. In terms of the Armenians belonging to the Armenian Church, the patriarchate of Istanbul and its clergymen officially oversaw their religious and social lives and loosely connected the provincially scattered groups of their coreligionists through the network of the church hierarchy. It was the second largest non-Muslim community in the Ottoman Empire, after the Orthodox Christians.<sup>18</sup>

Although it is widely accepted that Armenians speaking Turkish were numerous,<sup>19</sup> the extent of their usage of Turkish, including the extent of their bilingualism, has not been adequately elucidated.<sup>20</sup> Reports sent home by American Protestant missionaries provide important clues for the spoken language of Armenians in the nineteenth century. In their early stage of propagation in the Ottoman heartland, Protestant missionaries decided to target not Muslims, who were not inclined to hear them, but non-Muslims and especially Armenians, many of whom showed interest in the missionaries' activities.<sup>21</sup> Thus missionaries focused on the linguistic situation of the Armenians due to their aim to proselytize people in their own language. The Protestant missionaries shared their preliminary knowledge of the linguistic situation of Ottoman Armenians in their annual meeting held in 1842. Its report categorized Ottoman Armenians into three groups: Armenians speaking only Turkish, Armenians speaking only Armenian, and Armenians speaking both languages.<sup>22</sup>

The 1842 report agrees with those written later as well as Armenian sources that most Armenians in central and western Anatolia, or from Bursa to Kayseri and Ayntab, exclusively spoke the Turkish language.<sup>23</sup> For example, a missionary report on Ankara mentions that 'the language used in Angora is wholly Turkish. Greeks as well as Armenians there speak only Turkish: the same is true in nearly all the villages in that region'.<sup>24</sup> Armenians in Kayseri and the villages around it, the biggest Armenian group in these regions, understood only Turkish, thus, 'Wherever the gospel is preached in the Cesarea [Kayseri] field, it must be preached in Turkish, or it will not be understood'.<sup>25</sup> Over these regions Armenians scattered and mingled with people from other religious groups. During this time, Turkish became a common language, whereas the ability to use Armenian was lost. According to the census conducted in the late nineteenth century, Armenians in these regions were one-sixth of the total Ottoman Armenian population.<sup>26</sup>

While the 1842 report notes that Armenians in the eastern Ottoman provinces used Armenian exclusively, later reports indicate that Armenians in this region used Turkish as their second (or third) language as well.<sup>27</sup> In Sivas, we know from missionary reports that Armenians used Armenian as their first language while understanding Turkish well.<sup>28</sup> As for Van and Diyarbakır, missionaries suggested that Armenian men in both cities understood Turkish, whereas women and those residing in the villages attached to them did not.<sup>29</sup>

The 1842 report categorized the Armenians of Istanbul, İzmir, Tekirdağ, İzmit and its environs, and some cities in western Anatolia as bilinguals. Missionary reports in the

1850s and 1860s note that the main language varied. Armenians mainly used Armenian although their Turkish-speaking skills were sufficiently high in Istanbul, İzmit, and its environs, whereas Turkish was the main language for the Armenians in İzmir and other cities.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, the Armenian language used by Ottoman Armenians included numerous Turkish loanwords. The amount of these loanwords was much greater among bilingual Armenians in Istanbul and İzmir than in the eastern provinces.<sup>31</sup> Overall, the missionary reports suggest that while there was a certain number of Armenians monolingual in Turkish, bilingualism was also common among the urban male population. This was especially true for Armenians in Istanbul, which was one of the largest centres of the Armenian publication movement of the nineteenth century as well as the place where Panosian published periodicals and pamphlets.

It is fruitful to consider the educational situation of Ottoman Armenians to understand reading languages. Beginning with the end of the eighteenth century, modern school education gradually spread among Ottoman Armenians, first in Istanbul and subsequently to provinces nearby in the first half of the nineteenth century, reaching the eastern provinces in its second half.<sup>32</sup> Thus, when Panosian began publishing in 1859, he had a ready audience in the first generation of school-educated Armenians in the provinces to match what was likely the second in Istanbul.

A reform plan of Armenian schools in 1873 shows that the official language of instruction in schools was Armenian, although it is likely that Turkish was also employed in western and central Anatolia. Greater importance was attached to the education of Classical Armenian (*krapar*), whereas the study of modern Armenian was relatively neglected. Only a limited amount of time was allotted to instruction of the Turkish language, which was taught in Arabic script.<sup>33</sup> Thus, Ottoman Armenians needed to be somewhat self-taught to read Armeno-Turkish, after they learned the Armenian alphabet through the study of Classical Armenian.

Garabed Panosian was born in 1826 or 1828 in Kayseri.<sup>34</sup> The location of his birthplace suggests that his first language was Turkish, while he learned Armenian at schools in his hometown and in a monastery close to it. In the early 1840s, Panosian went to live with his uncle in Istanbul. His father sent him there for higher education. He was apprenticed to a moneylender in Istanbul, Sarkis Kasbarian, for financial reasons. Fortunately, Kasbarian was kind enough to employ a tutor to teach Ottoman Turkish to Panosian.

After twenty months of apprenticeship, Panosian moved to İzmir, the port city located on the Aegean coast of western Anatolia. In the 1840s, İzmir was ahead of Istanbul in terms of Armenian education and publication. In İzmir, Panosian attended the Mesrobian School, one of the highly regarded Armenian educational institutions at that time. It is highly likely that he read or at least saw *Arshaloys Araradean (Daybreak of Ararat)*, the first Armenian newspaper of long duration published in the Ottoman domains. It had begun in İzmir as a fortnightly newspaper in 1840.<sup>35</sup>

After returning to Istanbul, Panosian attended the imperial schools of medicine and agriculture in the late 1840s. He left both schools after less than a year due to financial concerns. In the 1850s, Panosian occupied himself with several jobs. In Istanbul, he witnessed the period of the emergence of Armenian periodicals. In 1846, the Armenian patriarchate of Istanbul began publishing the first long-running Armenian periodical in Istanbul, which was followed by several Armenian periodicals in the 1850s. Meanwhile,

Armenians belonging to the Catholic Church started an Armeno-Turkish newspaper named *Mecmua-i Havadis (News Magazine)* in 1852.<sup>36</sup>

Early Armenian periodicals were divided into mainly three sections: foreign, internal, and 'national' (*azkayin*). The first dealt with news of foreign countries, the second, with those of the Ottoman state, and the third, with topics related to the Armenian community. It should be noted that the periodicals were more devoted to delivering news rather than arguing or criticizing politics of both Ottoman state and Armenian community. When the Armenian patriarchate petitioned the government for permission to publish a newspaper in 1846, it did so promising not to discuss state politics. Government officials saw this condition as reasonable and imposed censorship.<sup>37</sup> It is highly likely that Armenian newspaper editors of this period shared a tacit understanding not to judge or criticize state politics. Indeed, the columns devoted to state topics simply delivered mostly news.

While state politics was out of reach for Armenian periodicals, *Meghu (Bee)* – a satirical Armenian periodical founded in 1856 – made open political criticisms related to the Armenian community. This corresponds to the period when the Armenian elites of Istanbul became politically active. In response to the Reform Edict of 1856, fundamental reforms in the community administration, which had been controlled by a limited number of lay elites and high clergymen, were discussed. The movement created a regulation stipulating the organizational structure of the community administration, particularly the communal assembly. The regulation, which the Ottoman government approved in 1863, was called the 'Armenian national constitution'.<sup>38</sup> Due to the creation of the assembly, the politics of the Armenian community became open to the public and was made visible through minutes published by the Armenian patriarchate as well as reports published in Armenian newspapers. It was at this period of change that Panosian entered the publication business, the period when Istanbul Armenians were discussing their community politics in newspapers.

In 1859, Panosian founded the Armeno-Turkish periodical *Münadi-yi Erciyas (Herald of Argeus)*. According to Baronian, a coffeehouse in Vezir Hanı of central Istanbul functioned as the editorial office.<sup>39</sup> The periodical first had merely 70 subscribers and was 5000–6000 *kuru* in the red in the first year.<sup>40</sup> It is hard to believe that Panosian was able to cover the deficit on his own. In the first issue of *Münadi-yi Erciyas*, he mentioned that his fellow countrymen, namely, Armenians from Kayseri encouraged him to start the newspaper.<sup>41</sup> It is likely that Kayseri Armenians living in Istanbul, speaking not Armenian but Turkish, financially supported the publication of the Armeno-Turkish periodical, whose name was derived from the name of a mountain located south of Kayseri. Indeed, in a pamphlet published in 1864, Panosian mentioned that Kayseri Armenians living in the Mustafapaşa caravanserai contributed 1000 *kuruş* towards the cost of its publication.<sup>42</sup> In his newspapers, Panosian sometimes addressed Kayseri Armenians as his target readership. According to Baronian, Panosian lived in the Gedikpaşa district of Istanbul, many of whose Armenian residents came from Kayseri.<sup>43</sup> His hometown ties enabled him to enter the publication business.

*Münadi-yi Erciyas* first appeared as a semi-monthly magazine to introduce new ideas and products and soon became a newspaper delivering news on foreign, state, and community topics as well as discussing politics in the Armenian community, acquiring a readership extending beyond Kayseri Armenians. In 1862, however, its articles on the Armenians in Zeytun region provoked its closure by the Ottoman government.<sup>44</sup> Until he

was able to obtain permission to begin another newspaper in 1866, Panosian published his ideas on the contemporary situation of the Armenian community through pamphlets and contributions to another Armeno-Turkish newspaper, *Varaka-i Havadis* (*The News Paper*).<sup>45</sup> Meanwhile, Panosian was chosen to be a deputy to the community assembly in 1863.<sup>46</sup> He first endeavoured to contribute his reformist voice to community politics from the inside but soon resigned in favour of doing so from the outside, namely, through journalism.

After receiving permission from the government, Panosian founded a new Armeno-Turkish newspaper *Manzume-i Efkar* in 1866. It likewise carried news on foreign, state, and community topics and was published six times a week. Such a frequency of publication was remarkable at a time when the other Armenian newspapers were published weekly to thrice weekly. Its number of subscribers indicates its popularity. A letter to the editor published in another Armenian newspaper – *Ararad* (*Ararat*) – mentions that in 1869, the subscribers of *Manzume-i Efkar* were 1300 whereas those of another well-known Armenian newspaper of the period – *Masis* (*Ararat*) – were 300.<sup>47</sup> Such numbers may seem relatively modest to us. However, we consider the facts that newspapers were read aloud and passed around in places such as coffeehouses and public reading rooms; furthermore, one of the most widely read Ottoman Turkish newspapers with a much greater population of potential readers had a circulation of 10,000 in the early 1870s.<sup>48</sup> In 1868, Panosian wrote that his newspaper sold sufficiently well to cover his expenses.<sup>49</sup> In a period when newspapers, regardless of language, generally stopped publication after only a few years, Panosian managed to continue publishing *Manzume-i Efkar* for 30 years until he retired due to health reasons.

Panosian's newspapers are notable for their variety of articles on the Armenian community. He preferred to deliver the news on communal politics, education, and especially the situation of provincial Armenians. As a provincial, Panosian was among the first to ardently take up the plight of Armenians in the provinces, repeatedly appealing to Istanbul Armenians about the need for reforms from the early 1860s. This encouraged Istanbul Armenians to recognize the situation of provincial Armenians as a problem, which in turn led to the surfacing of the Armenian Problem as an international problem in 1878.<sup>50</sup>

The peculiarity of *Manzume-i Efkar* is its severely critical tone in discussing the Armenian community and its criticism of the Armenian patriarchate and those involved in community administration.<sup>51</sup> Calling himself a true lover of his nation, Panosian frequently accused others of being parlour lover of their nation who did not act adequately against conversion, or for the spread of education, nor worked for the improvement of the situation of provincials. Other targets of criticism were Armenian Catholics and Protestants, whom he considered as a menace to the integrity of the Armenian nation.<sup>52</sup> Thus, Panosian frequently entered into controversy with other Armenian newspapers, such as the patriarchate's semi-official organ *Masis* and the Catholics' Armeno-Turkish newspaper *Mecmua-i Havadis*. His writings indicate that Panosian, whose main concern was to improve the situation of the Armenian nation, needed to compete with other Armenians.

The Armenian patriarchate sought support from the Ottoman government to fight against Panosian. The patriarchate and clergymen repeatedly petitioned the government to suspend the publication of *Manzume-i Efkar* and sometimes succeeded. For example, the government suspended its publication for three months from May 1868 and two months from January 1869 in response to the requests of the patriarchate.<sup>53</sup> During these



periods, however, Panosian did not stop writing. He published his ideas in newspapers whose permission for publication was obtained by others, sending them to *Manzume-i Efkar* subscribers.<sup>54</sup>

The main language of Panosian's publication was Turkish, his first language and that of his target readership in his early years in the publication business. In comparison with other Armenian and Armeno-Turkish periodicals, Panosian's language is remarkable in its colloquial character, which is especially remarkable in the editorials placed in the 'national' section. Frequently utilizing a first-person plural narrative, he directly addressed his Armenian readers. This suggests that when a contemporary Armenian called Panosian's writing comprehensible to the people,<sup>55</sup> the reason for this was not that it was Turkish but because of its simple style. It is likely that bilingual Istanbul Armenians preferred Panosian's newspapers to Armenian ones because of the closeness to their speech. Meanwhile, letters to the editor reproduced in *Manzume-i Efkar* shows that its readership extended widely all over the empire (and sometimes beyond). Letters from Van, Erzurum and Diyarbakır suggest that Armenians in the eastern Ottoman provinces, whose main language was Armenian and probably had sufficient knowledge of Turkish, read *Manzume-i Efkar*, not to mention Turkish monolingual Armenians in central and eastern Anatolia.<sup>56</sup>

Importantly, Armeno-Turkish was not the only language of Panosian's newspapers. Although they were often limited to the section on 'national' topics, articles in modern Armenian language were frequent in *Manzume-i Efkar*. Some of these were written for this newspaper and others were reprints from other Armenian newspapers. Letters to the editor were printed in their original languages, sometimes appearing in Turkish and sometimes in Armenian. The number of Armenian articles was sufficient to impel some readers to send complaints to the editor and demand Turkish translations<sup>57</sup>; however, it was rare that Armeno-Turkish translations of previously published Armenian articles appeared in Panosian's newspapers.<sup>58</sup> Meanwhile, Armenian words such as constitution (*sahmanatru-t'iwñ*), association (*engerut'iwñ*), patriarchate (*badriark'aran*), and Armenian (*Hay*) were frequently utilized in the Armeno-Turkish articles of *Manzume-i Efkar*.<sup>59</sup> Sometimes, Panosian would insert Armenian sentences into Armeno-Turkish articles. A remarkable example of such bilingualism can be found in an advertisement written in Armenian for a French primer written in Turkish, stating 'an easy method to learn French for those who know how to read Turkish'.<sup>60</sup> Through such clues, we can deduce that readers of Panosian's newspapers were expected to understand both Turkish and Armenian, as many Istanbul Armenians did. Indeed, the large number of letters to the editor written in Armenian shows that at least some readers were literate in Armenian.<sup>61</sup> Although immigrants in Istanbul from central and western Anatolia were Turkish monolinguals, we can imagine the communicative circumstances of Ottoman Empire's newspaper reading in which they read Panosian's newspapers together with bilingual Armenians and the latter translating Armenian articles for the former in coffeehouses and public reading rooms. The frequency of controversies that Panosian had with Armenian newspapers indicates that his newspapers were read in the translingual sphere of reading.

In contrast, the readership of Greco-Turkish is considered to be limited. According to researchers, there was a clear social divide between Grecophones and Turcophones in the Orthodox Christian community. The former were not inclined to read Greco-Turkish and looked down on the latter. Thus, Orthodox Christians developed terms to distinguish those who exclusively spoke Turkish, Karamanlides/Karamanlı, and the Turkish language



used by them, Karamanlidika/Karamanlica, expressing disdain for them.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, Turcophone Orthodox Christians who acquired adequate skill in Greek, Ottoman Turkish, or French found it unnecessary to read Greco-Turkish materials.<sup>63</sup> Unlike Armenians, Orthodox Christians were known for their lack of interest in learning the Turkish language. It was less attractive for those whose patriarch enjoyed the privilege of speaking their own prestigious language in front of the Sultan himself and who had greater opportunities in banking and commerce, in which knowledge of Greek was preferred, than could be found by entering the Ottoman bureaucracy, in which good knowledge of Turkish was advantageous.<sup>64</sup> Greco-Turkish was merely a means of expression to reach out to 'ignorant' Orthodox Christians most of the time.

Armenians, whose language did not enjoy any established prestige outside of their community, did not seem to share this negative attitude toward the use of Turkish. For Ottoman Armenians, learning Turkish and entering the Ottoman bureaucracy was an appealing path after Orthodox Christians achieved dominance in commerce and banking in the mid-nineteenth century. From this viewpoint, Panosian claimed the necessity for Armenian schools to give more importance to teaching Ottoman Turkish and for Armenians to learn it, calling it 'our state language'.<sup>65</sup> He stated that in general 'it is among the extreme necessities in any case for a man to learn first his own language and second also the state language if he is a subject of a state whose language is different [from his own]'.<sup>66</sup> In another article, he wrote,

We announced the necessity of Turkish language [*lisan-ı türkî*] for our nation two years ago, and still today, in any case, we prefer to learn Turkish, second to our own language, more than any other language. We suppose we are not going wrong with this idea, since our nation has a deeper relation with the Ottomans [*Osmanlılar*, i.e. Muslims<sup>67</sup>] than any other nation in any place. Until now, it is obvious that it [the Armenian nation] has felt the necessity of Turkish language for the occupation of state positions and likewise from now on, as the principle of equality will be naturally be established more and more firmly in the Exalted [Ottoman] Sovereignty, many from our nation will enjoy enormous benefit by knowing Turkish...<sup>68</sup>

Indeed, some examples of Armenians who entered the state services in the first half of the nineteenth century are known, and more Armenians entered the bureaucracy than members of other non-Muslim communities after the Ottoman government began to officially accept non-Muslims to the bureaucracy in 1856.<sup>69</sup> A recent study on Armenian officials in the late Ottoman Empire reveals that the great majority of Armenian officials claimed their skills in Ottoman Turkish and the proportion of its knowledge rose with the passage of time.<sup>70</sup>

Thus, learning Turkish appropriately was important for Ottoman Armenians. *Manzume-i Efkâr* published a letter to the editor expressing the expectation for Armeno-Turkish newspapers to improve the level of Turkish used by Armenians. The letter mentioned that those who read *Manzume-i Efkâr* and *Mecmua-i Havadis* imitated the 'language of newspapers' (*gazeta lisanları*) when they spoke. Thus, these newspapers were expected to spell Turkish words in the 'customary way' (*usul-u cariye*) and correct misuse by Armenians.<sup>71</sup> An article published in 1876 aimed to correct some examples of incorrect pronunciation and collocation used by Armenians.<sup>72</sup> A positive attitude toward Turkish must be one of the reasons *Manzume-i Efkâr* in particular and Armeno-Turkish in general was not neglected but read by Armenophone Armenians. The resulting wider readership was likely a reason why a greater number of Armeno-Turkish publications appeared than the

number of publications in Greco-Turkish. Besides, unlike the cases of Orthodox Christians, no social divide emerged between Armenophone and Turcophone Armenians, nor special terms for those who exclusively spoke the Turkish language.

Nevertheless, Panosian did not claim that Turkish monolinguals should remain ignorant of the Armenian language; in fact, he prioritized the Armenian language. He spoke of a view among Armenians problematizing publication in Armeno-Turkish because of the loss of zeal among Armenians to learn Armenian. Panosian refuted this argument claiming that if anything, it worked the other way around. According to his argument, Armenians who did not know Armenian would learn what they were deprived of by reading 'diverse advices' in the language they understood. Thus, Armeno-Turkish publications would encourage Turkish monolinguals to assist their children in learning Armenian.<sup>73</sup> This argument suggests that Panosian intentionally mixed Armenian words, sentences, and articles in the language of his Armeno-Turkish newspaper. Indeed, Panosian in early writings explained that he intentionally inserted Armenian articles to engender zeal among Turkish monolingual Armenians to learn the Armenian language and teach it to their children.<sup>74</sup>

Panosian's idea of education illustrates his gendered view of Armenians' usage of Turkish. Panosian was assigned the administration of a girls' school in 1869 and opened a boys' school in 1871. In both schools, he decided that the language of instruction would be Armenian, attaching greater importance to the use of this language. Panosian gave second place to Turkish in the boys' school, whereas he thought it unnecessary for Armenian girls to learn Turkish.<sup>75</sup> Meanwhile, in his writing on the significance of girls' education, Panosian mentioned that the language used by women was important because children learn their first language from their mother.<sup>76</sup>

Thus, what type of 'advice' did his newspapers include in terms of language? Panosian discussed the notion of the 'nation' to his Armenian readers on many occasions, claiming that more than ninety per cent of 'our nation' did not know what this word meant. He emphasized the importance of language and religion as the ties of nations in general and cautioned Armenian readers that they were in crisis in terms of both language and religion. He further threatened them by saying that they were losing not only their language and religion but also forgetting their nationality. He claimed that Armenians knew neither Armenian nor Turkish properly.<sup>77</sup>

The emphasis that Panosian placed on 'nation' exhibits a striking contrast to the case of Greco-Turkish materials, in which religious affiliation was usually foregrounded.<sup>78</sup> Panosian felt the need to stress national affiliation since the Armenian nation was divided along denominational lines between the Armenian, Armenian Catholic, and Protestant Churches. Thus, he saw the conversion of Armenians to Catholicism and Protestantism as a crisis in terms of religion, calling it 'the most profound ignorance'.<sup>79</sup> Panosian problematized the tendency of some Armenians in İzmir and Istanbul who sent their children to missionary schools.<sup>80</sup> This might be the reason for his selection as the administrator of the newly opened girls' school in the Samatya district, where Armenian girls had been obliged to go to a Catholic school because of the absence of Armenian one.<sup>81</sup>

It is likely that Panosian's views on conversion were related to his choice of publication language. In the nineteenth century, the large majority of Armenian Catholics were known to be Turkish monolinguals,<sup>82</sup> publishing a newspaper in Armeno-Turkish, *Mecmua-i Havadis*. According to another Armeno-Turkish newspaper, however, eighty per cent of the readers of *Mecmua-i Havadis* belonged not to the Catholic Church but to the Armenian

Church.<sup>83</sup> The titles of Armeno-Turkish newspapers were limited and the only choices that continued for a long time were *Mecmua-i Havadis* and those published by Panosian. Thus, he considered it necessary to counter the influence of the newspaper of the Armenian Catholics, which he frequently harshly criticized. His love for his nation was one of the factors that necessitated him to continue publishing in Armeno-Turkish.

In previous studies, Panosian has been labelled a supporter of rebellions against the Ottoman state. This was derived from the fact that the Ottoman government closed *Münadi-yi Erciyas* because of its articles on a disturbance caused by the Armenians of Zeytun, a region in south central Anatolia, in 1862.

Indeed, in the numbers that the government saw as particularly problematic, Panosian expressed his compassion for the Zeytun Armenians who, according to him, were in a difficult situation surrounded by rebellious groups of Kozanoğlu, Afshars, and Kurds and in necessity to arm and defend themselves.<sup>84</sup> The article has the same tone with his other articles regarding the plight of provincial Armenians. Isolated by a natural mountainous barrier, Zeytun Armenians formed a semi-autonomous community, whereas south central Anatolia was in the hands of several local rulers, among whom was the Kozanoğlu family. In 1865, the Ottoman government extended its direct control to the south central Anatolia by removing them.<sup>85</sup>

However, it would be difficult to tell that Panosian supported the Zeytun Armenians by attending to his writing alone. In the summer of 1862, disputes between Armenian and Muslim villages culminated in an attack of Zeytun Armenians on the Muslim village of Ketman. In response, Aziz Pasha, the governor of Maraş, attacked the Armenian village of Alabaş.<sup>86</sup> In his report on this incident, Panosian wrote about rumours of acts of violence supposedly conducted by Aziz Pasha, such as the killing of 200 people, plundering, burning of a church, and assault on an Armenian monastery nearby. The report continued to state that he moved to a plain at two hours distance from Zeytun and urged the Armenians there to surrender.<sup>87</sup> In another article, Panosian decried Aziz Pasha's brutal acts. Nevertheless, he also wrote that the Zeytun Armenians deserved to be punished according to the law for attacking a Muslim village.<sup>88</sup> In relation to Panosian's writings, a state document accused him not of supporting the rebellion but of spreading 'false news' against the just policy of the Ottoman state, proposing to punish him according to the penal code.<sup>89</sup>

Interestingly, a state document dated from 1891 evaluated Panosian in an opposite way to modern researchers. During the reign of Abdülhamit II (1876–1909), the popularity of *Manzume-i Efkâr* gradually diminished. Panosian petitioned the government to ask for subsidies for the continuation of the newspaper.<sup>90</sup> In response to his petition, the document created by the press office of the ministry of the internal affairs said,

[Panosian] has published a great many articles in accordance with the benefit of state and country [*menâfi-i mülk ü memlekete muvafık*]. He is among the Exalted [Ottoman] Sovereignty's faithful subjects who held a distinguished place in truly exceptional way among the examples of the display of allegiance, especially by the articles that he inserted and published [in *Manzume-i Efkâr*] during the Berlin Congress on the Armenian problem [*Ermeni meselesi*]

and proposed to offer him a monthly stipend of 30 liras.<sup>91</sup>

Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to discover any publication of Panosian's relating to the Berlin Congress. Nevertheless, it is possible to confirm Panosian's 'examples

of the display of allegiance' from other issues. He advocated allegiance to the Ottoman Empire several times among his Armenian readers as being in their best interest. For example, he refuted an article appearing in *Levant Herald*, an English newspaper published in Istanbul, which stated that nations under the Ottoman rule, including the Armenians, would awaken to nationalism and pursue independence. To this, Panosian argued that he could not agree that the whole Armenian nation hoped for independence even if he acknowledged that he could not claim that no single person of the nation did.<sup>92</sup> With respect to the policy of the European great powers, Panosian argued that they intervened in the Ottoman politics considering only their own interests and not those of the nations under Ottoman rule, as in the Balkans. He further claimed that Armenians were in a favourable position because the situation of the Balkans occupied the interest of the great powers while they neglected the Armenians in Anatolia, who mingled with Muslims. Thus, Armenians must search for their names in the 'allegiance register [*sadakat defteri*] of the sublime [Ottoman] state'. He claimed that Armenians were 'among the most loyal, most gentle, most harmless, most industrious, and most useful subjects of the sublime state'.<sup>93</sup>

Note that Panosian probably had non-Armenian readers as well in mind in writing these words. As mentioned, some researchers have already indicated the possibility that Armeno-Turkish materials, unlike those of Greco-Turkish, obtained a certain amount of Muslim readers. This was also the case for *Manzume-i Efkar*, in spite of its linguistically mixed component of Armeno-Turkish and Armenian. Among the letters to the editor published in this newspaper, we can find a few examples of letters from Muslim and Orthodox Christian readers.<sup>94</sup> A letter to the editor from an Armenian living in Hasköy, which is known to have had a large Jewish population, mentions that 'a respectable portion of those from other nationalities' (*aylazkinerēn baduawor mas mē*) in that district 'have felt deep sympathy' toward *Manzume-i Efkar* and learned Armenian script to read it in a coffeehouse.<sup>95</sup> Around 1870, Panosian reproduced dozens of pictures from European newspapers on *Manzume-i Efkar*. The fact that he inserted three times articles in Turkish in Arabic script to explain pictures suggests that the newspaper had non-Armenian readers who understood Turkish in Arabic script better, or at least he could expect that non-Armenian readers would see it.<sup>96</sup>

In an editorial that appeared in the 'national' section entitled 'invitation to Muslim gentlemen', Panosian invited such readers to the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Armenian national constitution.<sup>97</sup> In this article, Panosian effectively employed phrases such as '[Muslims and Armenians] are the children of the same fatherland' (*ayni vatanın evladları olub*) and 'long live the Sultan'. It is likely that he wrote this article and others aiming to give a good image to non-Armenians, especially those in government circles, of Armenians in general and of himself in particular. Recent scholarship has shown that non-Muslims in the late Ottoman Empire were concerned with gaining favourable attention from the Ottoman government, relative to other non-Muslim communities.<sup>98</sup> Panosian was conscious of this necessity in relation with the rivalry with Armenian Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, he needed support from the government, which imposed censorship on periodicals, in his rivalry with the Armenian patriarchate.

However, Panosian's professions of loyalty were often tempered. We must not neglect that Panosian added conditions in reference to Armenian allegiance to the Ottoman Empire. For example, in his refutation of the *Levant Herald*, he wrote that, 'if we [Armenians] are honored to adequately enjoy justice, equality, equity, freedom, and public and

private rights, there is no better possibility of prosperity, felicity, and happiness than that for us'.<sup>99</sup> In the 'invitation to Muslim gentlemen', he emphatically asserted that 'justice and equality are established every day and every hour' (*adalet ve müsavat her gün ve her saat vaz idilmekde*). He probably intended to remind state officials of the necessity of continuing the ongoing policy, favourable to non-Muslims.

Panosian's analysis of the world situation and the place Armenians were able to occupy in it indicates that his display of allegiance was more than flattery. During the turmoil in the Balkans in 1876, a rumour circulated among Istanbul Armenians. According to that rumour, Armenians in the Caucasus would rise up against the Russian rule. Young Armenians in Istanbul insisted on joining the revolt. To stop them from the political action that might invite negative attention from the Ottoman government, Panosian wrote,

We are not a political nation [*politika millet*]. It is appropriate to consider that intervening in state politics would be for us a blunder.... We are not a political nation. Neither are we obliged anytime to think or wish to be that way, because the way of the world is different now. We cannot find a small-scale ruler in every province or places smaller than a province, as in the past. Now the world has progressed and is progressing, and the great powers and nations will rule the world.<sup>100</sup>

Thus, Panosian held that Armenians would be able to continue their existence not by achieving independence but only under the protection of the Ottoman Empire in this time of imperialism. His argument indicates that this idea did not contradict his love for the Armenian nation. Rather, he valued the freedom that non-Muslims enjoyed under the Ottoman rule, saying that 'thanks to the [Ottoman state], every nation can freely maintain their own religion, language, and nationality [*milliyet*] and this is the most brilliant sign of civilization'.<sup>101</sup>

In writing the above-mentioned articles, Panosian must have been aware of the ongoing state policy to merge multireligious subjects into a single Ottoman nation under the principle of equality.<sup>102</sup> In the Armenian newspaper to which he contributed during the suspension of *Manzume-i Efkar* in 1868, Oksen Khojasarian wrote a series of articles on the future of the Armenian nation.<sup>103</sup> Khojasarian was a journalist who contributed many Armenian articles to *Manzume-i Efkar*. In this series of articles, he responded negatively to the question of whether the creation of 'a new Ottoman nationality' (*Ösmanean nor azku-t'ıwn*) would cause the loss of the 'old [Armenian] one'. According to his argument, the Ottoman government would pursue the policy of giving equal rights to non-Muslims, which would lead to the creation of a new Ottoman nationality. Thus, Armenians were politically accepted as equal compatriots. Meanwhile, the old Armenian nationality was maintained due to two main factors. The first was that Armenians enjoyed the right to teach their own history and language since both were strongly connected to their religion, and the Ottoman government recognized their religious rights. The second was that Ottoman Muslims would not accept the freedom of intermarriage because marriage was religious. Thus, Khojasarian shared the idea of 'the duality of state and community', which enabled the Armenian elites in Istanbul to 'reconcile their particularism with Ottoman patriotism'.<sup>104</sup>

The context given for examining Armeno-Turkish materials has been literal and cultural, and is separate from the mainstream historiography of Ottoman Armenians. This paper incorporates the history of Armeno-Turkish into the general history of Ottoman Armenians

by investigating political and social media, that is, the newspapers published by Garabed Panosian.

Investigation indicates that the readership of Panosian's publications was not limited to Armenians monolingual in Turkish. The composition of his newspapers strongly suggests that the readers were expected to be or become bilingual in Armenian and Turkish; it was read in communicative circumstances that accompanied translingual and interactive dialogue as well. Thus, Panosian's newspapers were not limited to being a tool to reach out to Turkish monolinguals, but were firmly embedded in the Armenian society of nineteenth-century Istanbul in general, and probably in Armenian societies in the provinces. They were products of a culture of bilingualism in which Istanbul Armenians lived and which supported the flourishing of Armeno-Turkish publications.

Owing to their rich contents, Armeno-Turkish materials and Panosian's newspapers as well gained non-Armenian readers. Thus, he was able to employ his newspapers to showcase Armenian allegiance to the Ottoman Empire, aiming to obtain a favourable judgement from government circles, creating harmonious relation between Armenians and Muslims. Relations with the government were quite important for Panosian, who was occupied with the affairs of Armenians and needed support from it in his rivalry with other Armenian actors.

Noting that active publication in Armeno-Turkish was largely a nineteenth-century phenomenon, Stepanyan argues that the heyday of Armeno-Turkish periodicals extended from the 1850s to the beginning of 1890s. According to Strauss, there was a noticeable tendency among Turkish monolingual Armenians to acquire the knowledge of Armenian owing to the development of a new literary language based on the vernacular in the nineteenth century, which led to a 'visible decline of Armeno-Turkish publications at the beginning of the twentieth century'.<sup>105</sup> In spite of its diminishing popularity during the reign of Abdülhamit II, Panosian continued to work for *Manzume-i Efkar* until 1896 when he retired for health reasons. The permission to publish *Manzume-i Efkar* was transferred to his fellow countryman from Kayseri, Hovhannes Ferit. He restarted the newspaper in 1901 in the Armenian language, without changing its Turkish name.<sup>106</sup>

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Funding

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI [grant number 15K16846]. Dates in the Hijri, Rumi, and Julian calendars have been converted to the Gregorian calendar. Eastern Armenian and Western Armenian were transliterated according to the Library of Congress transliteration system. Armeno-Turkish was transliterated according to the same rule to offer bibliographic information, while in the text, I employed a slightly modified rule for the readability.

## Notes

1. A. Tietze, 'Ethnicity and Change in Ottoman Intellectual History', *Turcica*, Vol.23 (1991), pp.385–95; J. Strauss, 'Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th–20th Centuries)?', *Arabic Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol.6, No.1 (2003), pp.39–76; B. Sagaster, 'The Role of Turcophone



- Armenians as Literary Innovators and Mediators of Culture in the Early Days of Modern Turkish Literature', in E. Balta and M. Ölmez (eds.), *Between Religion and Language: Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews, and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire* (Istanbul: Eren, 2011), pp.101–10; L. Mignon, 'Lost in Transliteration: A Few Remarks on the Armeno-Turkish Novel and Turkish Literary Historiography', in *ibid.*, 111–23; M. Cankara, 'Rethinking Ottoman Cross-Cultural Encounters: Turks and the Armenian Alphabet', *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.51, No.1 (2015), pp.1–16.
2. V. Oshagan, 'Modern Armenian Literature and Intellectual History from 1700 to 1915', in R.G. Hovannisian (ed.), *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*, Vol.2: *Foreign Dominion to Statehood: The Fifteenth Century to the Twentieth Century* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), Chap.5; H. Barsoumian, 'The Eastern Question and the Tanzimat Era', in *ibid.*, Chap.6; K.B. Bardakjian, *A Reference Guide to Modern Armenian Literature, 1500–1920: With an Introductory History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2000); B.L. Zekiyani, 'The Armenian Way to Enlightenment: The Diaspora and Its Role', in R.G. Hovannisian and D.N. Myers (eds.), *Enlightenment and Diaspora: The Armenian and Jewish Cases* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), Chap.2; R. Panossian, *The Armenians: From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars* (London: Hurst & Company, 2006); Chap.4; M. Nicheanian, *Âges et usages de la langue arménienne* (Paris: Editions Entente, 1989); H. Acharyan, *Hayots' Lezvi Patmut'yun*, Vol.2 (Erevan: Erevan Petakan Hamalsarani Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1951); T.S. Shahbazyan, *Arevmtahay Ashkharhabari Arajats'umê* (Erevan: Hayastani Petakan Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1963); V.L. Achemyan, *Grakan Arevmtahayereni Dzevavorumê* (Erevan: HSSH GA Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1971).
  3. Papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Unit 5 (ABCFM), Reel 584, No.317, Memorandum concerning the newspapers of Constantinople. The document does not contain the date but inserted in a file of the early 1870s.
  4. H. Paronyan, *Erkeri Zhoghovatsu*, Vol.2 (Erevan: Haykakan SSR GA Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1964), pp.85–95.
  5. *Ararad*, No.10 (19 Oct. 1869).
  6. A.İ. Tokgöz (A. Kabacalı, ed.), *Matbuat Hatıralarım* (Istanbul: İletişim, 1993), p.35; Ahmet Midhat (N. Birinci, ed.), *Müşahedat* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2000), p.42.
  7. *Diyojen*, Nos. 23+1 [sic] (17 June 1871), 74 (5 Dec. 1871), 77 (22 Nov. 1871 [sic]).
  8. T. Çeviker, *Gelişim Sürecinde Türk Karikatürü I: Tanzimat ve İstibdat Dönemi (1867–1878/1878–1908)* (Istanbul: Adam Yayınları, 1986), pp.21–4; H. Özdiş, *Osmanlı Mizah Basınında Batılılaşma ve Siyaset (1870–1877): Diyojen ve Çaylak Üzerinde Bir Araştırma* (Istanbul: Libra, 2010), pp.85–91; J. Strauss, 'Is Karamanli Literature Part of a "Christian-Turkish (Turco-Christian) Literature"?' in E. Balta and M. Kappler (eds.), *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia, 11th–13th September 2008)* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2010), p.189.
  9. *Masis*, No.1459 (20 Nov. 1873).
  10. For example, R. Koptaş, 'Ermeni Harfleriyle Türkçe', in O. Köker (ed.), *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metinler* (Istanbul: Aras, 2002), pp.xx, xxii; Mignon, 'Lost in Transliteration', p.121; Cankara, 'Rethinking Ottoman Cross-Cultural Encounters', p.10; J. Strauss, 'Linguistic Diversity and Everyday Life in the Ottoman Cities of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans (Late 19th–Early 20th Century)', *History of the Family*, Vol.16, No.2 (2011), pp.126–7; H. Step'anyan, *Hayatař Turk'eren Grakanut'yunê: Aghbyuragitakan Hetazotut'yun* (Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakch'ut'yun), pp.106, 123, 154, 174, 176, 195.
  11. Among few exceptions are A. Kharatyan, *Arevmtahay Parberakan Mamulê ev Grak'nnut'yunê Ôsmanyan Turk'iyayum* (Erevan: Haykakan KhSH GA Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1989); G. Step'anyan, 'Hayatař Turk'eren Hay Mamulê', in A.B. Karinyan (ed.), *Hay Parberakan Mamuli Patmut'yunits* (Erevan: Haykakan SSR GA Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1963), pp.239–74; M. Ueno, "For the Fatherland and the State": Armenians Negotiate the Tanzimat Reforms', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.45, No.1 (2013), pp.93–109.
  12. Another reason of negligence is probably the availability of Armeno-Turkish newspapers. H.A. Stepanyan, *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Kitaplar ve Süreli Yayınlar Bibliyografyası (1727–1968)* (Istanbul: Turkuaz, 2005).



13. Khaṛatyan, *Arevmtahay Parberakan Mamulë*, pp.39–40, 94–6; Step'anyan, 'Hayatar T'urk'eren Hay Mamulë', 248–57.
14. *Miwnadiyi Ēriyas*, Nos.15 (13 Jan. 1860), 31 (6 Aug. 1860), 66 (3 April 1861); G. P'anosean, *Asarë Kaysëriyë* (Istanbul: T' Divit'jean T'abkhanësi, 1864), pp.1–7; *Manzumëi Ēfk'ear*, No.2315 (11 Oct. 1873).
15. Modern researchers usually call Turkish written in Greek script Karamanlica or Karamanlidika. Recent research pointed out these expressions originally accompanied disdain for Turcophone Orthodox Christians. F. Benlisoy and S. Benlisoy, "'Karamanlılar,'" "Anadolu Ahalisi" ve "Aşağı Tabakalar": Türkdilli Anadolu Ortodokslarında Kimlik Algısı', *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, Vol.11 (2010), pp.7–22.
16. Although periodicals had attracted less attention likewise in the study of Greco-Turkish, recent studies on the most important Greco-Turkish periodical, *Anatoli*, are filling this lacuna. Similar to the case of Panosian, this newspaper continued for decades under the strong initiative of a single person, Evangelinos Misailidis. E. Balta, 'Karamanlidika Press (Smyrna 1845–Athens 1926)', in *Beyond the Language Frontier: Studies on the Karamanlis and the Karamanlidika Printing* (Istanbul: Isis, 2010), pp.107–21; F. Benlisoy and S. Benlisoy, 'Reading the Identity of "Karamanlı" through the Pages of *Anatoli*', in *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books*, pp.93–108; S. Benlisoy, '*Anatoli* ve *Vatan* Kavgazı: 19. Yüzyıl Ortasında Osmanlı'da "Sorumlu" Gazetecilik Tartışması', *Toplumsal Tarih*, Vol.236 (2013), pp.48–55; idem, 'Osmanlı Rumları ve "Şark Meselesi": Müsavat-ı Sahih ve Vatan-ı Umumi Arayışında', *Toplumsal Tarih*, Vol.250 (2014), pp.38–45.
17. Benlisoy and Benlisoy, 'Reading the Identity of "Karamanlı"'; E. Balta, 'Karamanlica Kitapların Dönemlere Göre İncelenmesi ve Konularına Göre Sınıflandırılması', *Müteferrika*, Vol.13 (1998), pp.3–19; idem, '«Gerçi Rum İsek de Rumca Bilmez Türkçe Söyleriz» The Adventure of an Identity in the Triptych: *Vatan*, Religion and Language', *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, Vol.8 (2003), pp.25–44; Strauss, 'Who Read What', p.53; Strauss, 'Is Karamanli Literature', p.154.
18. K.H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830–1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), pp.148–9; Ueno, "For the Fatherland and the State", pp.94–5.
19. For example, Tietze, 'Ethnicity and Change', p.393; G. Shrikian, 'Armenians under the Ottoman Empire and the American Mission's Influence on their Intellectual and Social Renaissance' (PhD thesis, Concordia Seminary in Exile, 1977), p.120; S.A. Somel, 'Osmanlı Ermenilerinde Kültür Modernleşmesi, Cemaat Okulları ve Abdülhamid Rejimi', *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, Vol.5 (2007), pp.81–2; N. Lessersohn, "Provincial Cosmopolitanism" in Late Ottoman Anatolia: An Armenian Shoemaker's Memoir', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol.57, No.2 (2015), pp.543–5.
20. Adjarian's study on Armenian dialects provides us the basic knowledge on Armenians' linguistic situation, while it does not offer information for understanding Armenians' bilingualism or trilingualism. H. Adjarian, *Classification des dialectes arméniens* (Paris: H. Champion, 1909), pp.12–3.
21. U. Kocabaşoğlu, *Anadolu'daki Amerika: Kendi Belgeleriyle 19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki Amerikan Misyoner Okulları* (1989; repr., Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2000), Chap.1.
22. ABCFM, Reel 517, doc.59, Report presented at the General Meeting of the Mission in Turkey held at Smyrna, April 1842.
23. ABCFM Reel 586, doc.283, J.N. Parsons to Rev. N.G. Clark, Nicomedia, 28 Jan. 1868; Reel 532, doc.481, H. White to R. Anderson, 23 July 1857; *Gilighia*, No.32 (20 Aug. 1864); *Manzumëi Ēfk'ear*, No.838 (6 Jan. 1869).
24. ABCFM Reel 642, doc.380, [T.C. Trowbridge] to Rev. Dr Anderson, Constantinople, 20 April 1866.
25. ABCFM Reel 582, doc.111, Report of Cesarea station 1871 by L. Bertlett.
26. Karpat, *Ottoman Population*, pp.122–49. Number of Armenians belonging to the Armenian Church was calculated. They presumably consisted ninety per cent of Ottoman Armenians. The category employed in this census was religion and not ethnicity and it did not distinguish Armenian Catholics and Protestants from their non-Armenian coreligionists.
27. Some sources suggest that Armenians also used Kurdish in the eastern provinces. *Gilighia*, No.27 (14 July 1864); B. Nat'anean, *Ardōsr Hayasani gam Deghegakir Paluay, K'apertu*,

- Ch'arsanjaki, Jabaghchuri, ew Erzngayu* (Istanbul: s.n. [1878]), p.158; ABCFM Reel 531, doc.243, A. Smith to Rev. R. Anderson, Diarbekr, 30 Jan. 1851. Armenians in Siirt were known to be Kurdish monolinguals. *Masis*, No.970 (18 May 1870); D.M. Dikranean, *Ayppenaran K'iwrderēn ew Hay-erēn* (Istanbul: Dbaran H. Miwhēndisean, 1860).
28. ABCFM Reel 526, doc.17, G.W. Dummore to Rev. R. Anderson, Diarbekr, 28 March 1853; Reel 523, doc.90, Sivas Station Report, May 1858; Reel 528, doc.28, F. Jewett to Rev. R. Anderson, Sivas, 20 Feb. 1857.
  29. ABCFM Reel 679, doc.620, W.F. Williams to N.G. Coark, Mardin, 30 June 1866; Reel 526, doc.17, G.W. Dummore to Rev. R. Anderson, Diarbekr, 28 March 1853; Reel 532, doc.291, Notes of a Tour in Armenia by T.C. Trowbridge from 7 July 1857.
  30. ABCFM Reel 516, doc.72, Visit to Adabazar, 8 Nov. 1841; Reel 516, doc.78, Journal of a tour through the Armenian villages on the Lake of Nice, June and July 1843; Reel 522, doc.106, To Rev. R. Anderson, Constantinople, 21 June 1854; Reel 527, doc.163, W. Goodell to the Secretaries of the A.B.C.F.M, Constantinople, 24 Aug. 1856; Reel 528, doc.151, D. Ladd to Rev. R. Anderson, Pera, Constantinople, 21 June 1852; Reel 528, doc.157, D. Ladd to Rev. R. Anderson, Smyrna, 23 Jan. 1855; Reel 528, doc.161, D. Ladd to Rev. S.L. Pomroy, Smyrna, 6 Nov. 1855.
  31. Shahbazyan, *Arevmtahay Ashkharhabari Arajats'umē*, pp.54–6.
  32. M. Ueno, '19 Seiki Osuman Teikoku no Arumenia Kyodotai ni okeru Gakko Kyoiku no Fukyu Katei' (Spread of Schooling in the Armenian Community under the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire), *Annals of the Japan Association for Middle East Studies*, Vol.25, No.1 (2009), pp.141–64.
  33. *Hrahank Paregarkut'ean Azkayin Varzharanats'* (Istanbul: Dbaran H. Miwhēndisean, 1873), pp.6–12.
  34. On his life and career, the necrology written by A. Alboyajian offers detailed information. *Piwzantion* Nos.2567–617 (23 April 1905–18 May 1905). See also, A. Alböyajejan, *Badmut'iwn Hay Gesarioy: Deghakragan, Badmagan, ew Azkakragan Usumnasirut'iwn* (Cairo: Hradaragut'iwn Gesarioy ew Shrchagayits' Hayrenagts'agan Miut'ean Kahirei Varch'ut'ean, 1937), pp.2068–70; *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.6860 (2 Dec. 1893).
  35. On *Arshaloys Araradean*, see, A. Kharatyan, *Hasarakakan Mitkē Zmyurniayi Hay Parberakan Mamulum (1840–1900)* (Erevan: HH GAA Gitut'yun Hratarakch'ut'yun, 1995).
  36. V. Artinian, *The Armenian Constitutional System in the Ottoman Empire 1839–1863: A Study of Its Historical Development* (Istanbul: s.n., 1988), p.69.
  37. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA) İrade Mesail-i Mühimme (İ.MSM) 936 (28 April 1846). The fact that censors were appointed at this time to inspect newspapers not only in Armenian but also in French, English, and Greek suggests that censorship was being imposed on newspapers, regardless of language. Newspapers in Ottoman Turkish were limited to official or semi-official ones at this period.
  38. Artinian, *The Armenian Constitutional System*; M. Ueno, 'The First Draft of the Armenian Millet Constitution', *Annals of Japan Association for Middle East Studies*, Vol.23, No.1 (2007), pp.213–51.
  39. Paronyan, *Erkeri Zhoghovatsu*, Vol.2, p.87.
  40. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.609 (14 March 1868).
  41. *Miwnadiyi Ērjiyas*, No.1 (13 June 1859).
  42. P'anosean, *Asarē Kaysēriyē*, pp.iv–v.
  43. H. Baronyan (H.T. Babek tr.), *İstanbul Mahallelerinde Bir Gezinti* (Istanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları, 2014), p.68.
  44. BOA. İrade Meclis-i Vala (İ.MVL) 21426 (11 Sep. 1862).
  45. The pamphlets I could confirm are as follows: G. P'anosean, *Asarē Kaysēriyē*; idem (Hay Eridasart mē tr.), *Garewor Paregarkut'iwnk'* (Istanbul: Dbaran H. Miwhēndisean, 1864); idem, *İmt'ihanē Bēyannamē* (Istanbul: H. Miwhēndisean T'abkhanēsi, 1864); idem, *Miww'eafat'* (Istanbul: H. Miwhēndisean T'abkhanēsi, 1864).
  46. *Deghegakir Kordzatir Hantsnazhoghovoy Azkayin Sahmanatrut'ean* (Istanbul: Dbakrut'iwn Hovhannu Miwhēndisean, 1863), pp.70, 72.
  47. *Ararad*, No.10.

48. Cankara, 'Rethinking Ottoman Cross-Cultural Encounters', pp.14–5.
49. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.609.
50. Ueno, "For the Fatherland and the State".
51. For example, *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.1735 (1 Nov. 1871), 2315.
52. For example, *Miwnadiyi Ērjijas*, Nos.61 (27 Feb. 1861), 65 (27 March 1861); *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.2281 (22 Aug. 1873).
53. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.716 (15 Aug. 1868), 870 (24 March 1869).
54. *Ōrakir Dziln Awarayrioy*, No.1 (4 June 1868); *Dziadzan*, No.1 (6 Feb. 1869). During the suspensions, Panosian continued to number *Manzume-i Efkar* without publishing it. Thus, for example, the numbers from 1039 to 1064 of *Manzume-i Efkar* do not exist but they correspond with the numbers from 1 to 26 of *Ararad*, which was delivered to the subscribers of *Manzume-i Efkar*.
55. Paronyan, *Erkeri Zhoghovatsu*, Vol.2, p.87.
56. For example, *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.43 (11 May 1866), 132 (6 Sep. 1866), 948 (24 June 1869), 957 (5 July 1869), 3215 (19 Aug. 1876).
57. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.173 (25 Oct. 1866), 176 (27 Oct. 1866).
58. For example, *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.503 (8 Nov. 1867), 580 (7 Feb. 1868), 2178 (5 May 1873).
59. Panosian used both Turkish and Armenian words (*Ermeni/Hay*) as the equivalents of Armenian.
60. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.572 (29 Jan. 1868).
61. For example, *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.885 (8 April 1869), 2308 (22 Sept. 1873), 3206 (11 Aug. 1876).
62. Benlisoy and Benlisoy, "Karamanlılar," "Anadolu Ahalisi" ve "Aşağı Tabakalar".
63. Benlisoy and Benlisoy, 'Reading the Identity of "Karamanli"'; Balta, «Gerçi Rum İsek de Rumca Bilmez Türkçe Söyleriz».
64. Strauss, 'Who Read What', pp.54–5; *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.988 (10 Aug. 1869); D. Stamatopoulos, 'From Millets to Minorities in the 19th-Century Ottoman Empire: An Ambiguous Modernization', in S.G. Ellis, G. Hålfdanarson, and A.K. Isaacs (eds.), *Citizenship in Historical Perspective* (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2006), pp.253–73.
65. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.823 (19 Dec. 1868), 2194 (21 May 1873).
66. *Miwnadiyi Ērjijas*, No.15.
67. In the Tanzimat period, Ottoman non-Muslims in general used 'Ottoman' synonymous with 'Muslim'. J. Strauss, 'Ottomanisme et "Ottomanité": Le témoignage linguistique', in H.L. Kieser (ed.), *Aspects of the Political Language in Turkey (19th–20th Centuries)* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2002), pp.15, 19–20.
68. *Miwnadiyi Ērjijas*, No.138 (13 Feb. 1862).
69. Y.G. Çark, *Türk Devleti Hizmetinde Ermeniler 1453–1953* (Istanbul: Yeni Matbaa, 1953); G. Saryıldız, *Sicill-i Ahvâl Komisyonu'nun Kuruluşu ve İşlevi (1879–1909)* (Istanbul: Der Yayınları, 2004), pp.151–63.
70. M. Ueno, 'Arumeniajin Osuman Kanryo no Kyoikuteki Haikei' (Educational Background of Ottoman Armenian Officials), in J. Akiba and N. Hashimoto (eds.), *Kindai Isuramu no Kyoiku Syakaisi: Osuman Teikoku karano Tenbo* (Kyoto: Showado, 2014), pp.138–64.
71. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.434 (24 Aug. 1867).
72. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.2320 (4 Oct. 1873).
73. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.1514 (14 March 1871).
74. *Miwnadiyi Ērjijas*, No.139 (15 Feb. 1862).
75. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.841 (9 Jan. 1869), 1417 (7 Dec. 1870), 1647 (2 Aug. 1871), 1704 (30 Sep. 1871).
76. *Miwnadiyi Ērjijas*, No.10 (27 Oct. 1859).
77. *Miwnadiyi Ērjijas*, Nos.15, 31, 66; P'anosean, *Asarē Kaysēriyē*, pp.1–7; *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.2315.
78. Balta, «Gerçi Rum İsek de Rumca Bilmez Türkçe Söyleriz», pp.40–2.
79. *Ōrakir Dziln Awarayrioy*, No.9 (12 June 1868).
80. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.2281.
81. *Masis*, No.884 (30 Jan. 1869).

82. ABCFM Reel 528, doc.151; Strauss, 'Linguistic Diversity and Everyday Life', p.130; *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.721 (20 Aug. 1868).
83. *Varakayē Havadis*, No.75 (11 March 1864). *Varaka-yı Havadis* was the newspaper to which Panosian contributed after the closure of *Münadi-yi Erciyas*.
84. *Münadi-yi Ērciyas*, No.215 (30 Aug. 1862). The Ottoman government saw problematic and collected the last three numbers of *Münadi-yi Erciyas*. We can find them in the State Archives of the Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey. BOA. İ.MVL 21426.
85. A.G. Gould, 'Lords or Bandits? The Derebeys of Cilicia', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.7, No.4 (1976), pp.485–506; L. Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties through the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp.67–78; E. İter, "Ermeni Mes'eleşi"nin Perspektifi ve Zeytûn İsyânları (1780–1880) (Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1988), pp.107–19.
86. Nalbandian, *The Armenian Revolutionary Movement*, pp.70–4.
87. *Münadi-yi Ērciyas*, No.213 (26 Aug. 1862).
88. *Münadi-yi Ērciyas*, No.214 (28 Aug. 1862).
89. BOA. İ.MVL 21426.
90. BOA. Dahiliye Nezareti Mektubi Kalemi (DH.MKT) 1796-140 (1 Jan. 1891).
91. BOA. DH.MKT 1796-140.
92. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.181 (3 Nov. 1866).
93. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.164 (13 Oct. 1866).
94. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.428 (17 Aug. 1867), 614 (21 March 1868).
95. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.3206.
96. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, Nos.1221 (7 May 1870), 1223 (10 May 1870), 1228 (14 May 1870). Probably, Panosian wanted to extend the sales of *Manzume-i Efk'ar* to non-Armenian readers by selling numbers with pictures.
97. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.1244 (3 June 1870).
98. J.P. Cohen, *Becoming Ottomans: Sephardi Jews and Imperial Citizenship in the Modern Era* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp.26–30; M. Ueno, 'Urban Politics in 19th-Century Istanbul: The Case of the Armenian Cemetery in Beyoğlu', in H. Kuroki (ed.), *Human Mobility and Multiethnic Coexistence in Middle Eastern Urban Societies 1: Tehran, Aleppo, Istanbul, and Beirut* (Tokyo: ILCAA, 2015), pp.85–102.
99. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.181.
100. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.3200 (5 Aug. 1876).
101. *Manzumēi Ēfk'ear*, No.1241 (30 May 1870).
102. R. Safrastjan, 'Ottomanism in Turkey in the Epoch of Reforms in XIX C.: Ideology and Policy. I', *Etudes balkaniques*, Vol.24 (1988), pp.72–86; idem, 'Ottomanism in Turkey in the Epoch of Reforms in XIX C.: Ideology and Policy. II', *Etudes balkaniques*, Vol.25 (1989), pp.34–44; S.A. Somel, 'Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlılık Düşüncesi (1839–1913)', in M.Ö. Alkan (ed.), *Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), pp.88–116.
103. *Örakir Dzilh Awarayrioy*, Nos.16 (20 June 1868), 17 (22 June 1868), 18 (23 June 1868).
104. Ueno, "For the Fatherland and the State", pp.101, 104.
105. Step'anyan, 'Hayatař T'urk'eren Hay Mamulê', p.239; Strauss, 'İs Karamanli Literature', pp.175, 177.
106. Teotig (S. Malhasyan and A. İncidüzen trs.), *Baskı ve Harf: Ermeni Matbaacılık Tarihi* (İstanbul: Birzamanlar Yayıncılık, 2012), pp.152–3.