

*Kemal H. Karpat*

## OTTOMAN POPULATION RECORDS AND THE CENSUS OF 1881/82-1893

### I. INTRODUCTION

Population movements have always played a dynamic role in the transformation of human society throughout history. Indeed, there is not a single phase of history anywhere in the world which has not been related in some way to low or high rates of birth and mortality, to migration and settlement and to their social, cultural, economic, and political effects. The history of the Middle East supplies excellent examples to support this contention. The Muslim calendar begins with an act of migration, that is the *hejira* of A.D. 622. Migrants going from the countryside to urban centers or fleeing from areas hostile to Islam have always exerted a crucial influence upon the social and political destiny of Muslim countries. The refugees from Spain to North Africa in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the forced migration of Muslims from Russia (the Caucasus and Crimea) in the eighteenth to twentieth centuries, the shift of population in India, Pakistan, and Palestine in the 1940s, to cite just a few examples, have been major factors accounting, at least in part, for the social transformation of the Muslim world in general, and of the Middle East in particular.

The sociopolitical and economic history of the Middle East in the nineteenth century was in large measure the consequence of major population movements which produced increased social mobility, changed rates of birth and mortality, intensified rural migration, and generated a variety of related changes. Yet, despite their obvious importance, population movements in the Middle East have not been studied yet within a broad historical and conceptual framework. The few existing studies deal essentially with isolated demographic problems ignoring conveniently their broader historical, political, and regional dimensions. Few scholars nowadays seem to have the time and patience to pore over hundreds of documents for months on end in dusty archives to extract information that can be condensed in a few pages and may remain long unnoticed or unappreciated. It is understandable, therefore, that considerable ingenuity and imagination have been invested in devising 'concepts', 'theories', and 'models' to explain in a few pages the entire history and transformation of a society. In some cases these 'theorists' have made sweeping false assertions while interpreting certain Middle East situations based on preconceived Western concepts or on scattered impres-

I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to Hayri Mutlucag, Eric Bingen, and Hulya Sowerwine whose assistance was instrumental in preparing this study.

sions regardless of limitations imposed by culture, historical experience, and goals on the range of their applicability. Yet, paradoxical as it may sound, a major shortcoming of Middle East social studies in general and of population studies in particular derives from the lack of concepts and theories capable of expressing the social and historical experience of the Middle East within its own value system and patterns of change and acculturation. One should add immediately that the development of such concepts and theories depends first on the accumulation of suitable empirical data. Anyone attempting to study population problems in the Middle East, especially with relation to more precise topics such as the rate of fertility, mortality, or family size in a given period of history or region, is faced with insufficient data on the size of population, and knowledge about procedures for registering births and deaths. Indeed, the studies on the history of population in the Middle East, besides failing to apply methods and techniques adapted to its own sociocultural conditions, suffer also from lack of information on the size of its population, census, and population registration methods. The archives in the area, especially those in Istanbul and Ankara, contain a large body of materials dealing with the size of the population and its registration systems. But little, if any, of this material has been sorted out and used to study specific demographic problems.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the first task facing the scholars interested in the social history and the transformation of the Middle East, southeast Europe, and North Africa is to assemble, systematize, and analyze the population data available in the Turkish archives and other places and to study also the procedures used in gathering these data. This is particularly true for the nineteenth century when population movements influenced more than ever the social and political transformation of the Ottoman state, that is, of the Middle East and the Balkans, and knowledge about the size of its population became a vital administrative necessity for the government.

There is no dearth of writings concerning the population of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century, but most of these are ethnographic works. It

<sup>1</sup> There are exceptions to this statement. In addition to O. L. Barkan's works mentioned later, see M. A. Cook, *Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia: 1450-1600* (London, 1971); Ronald J. Jennings, 'Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon, and Erzurum', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7, 1 (Jan. 1976), 21-57; Wolf-Dieter Hütteroth and Kamal Abdulfattah, *Historical Geography of Palestine, Transjordan and Southern Syria in the Late 16th Century* (Erlanger 1977). A survey of the bibliography on Ottoman population in the nineteenth century is in Engin Akarli, 'The Ottoman Population in the Nineteenth Century', M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin (Madison, 1970). See also Marc Pinson, 'Demographic Warfare: An Aspect of Ottoman and Russian Policy, 1854-1866', Ph.D. diss. (Harvard, 1970). Source material concerning population figures in the nineteenth century can be found in special statistics published by the Ottoman government in its Yearbooks, *Devletî Aliye Salnameleri*, or *Salname* for short, 68 vols., 1847-1918. For further bibliographical information see Kemal H. Karpat, *The Geceköndü, Rural Migration and Urbanization* (New York, 1976), and *idem*, 'Ottoman Immigration Policies and Settlement in Palestine', *Settler Regimes in Africa and the Arab World*, I. Abu-Lughod and B. Abu-Laban, eds. (Wilmette, Ill., 1974), pp. 57-72. For a general survey of current population studies, see Georges Sabagh, 'The Demography of the Middle East', *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin* 4, 2 (15 May, 1970), 1-19.

is true that these are, in a way, indispensable to any study dealing with the population of the Ottoman state in the nineteenth century. The value of most of them, however, is undermined by at least three shortcomings. First, only a few of these studies are based on reliable statistical information stemming from actual counts of population. Second, they often were undertaken by Western observers to advocate the case of certain ethnic or religious groups and, besides demonstrating an appalling lack of information on practically every aspect of Muslim life, they reflected the political biases of the scholars involved or of their informants. Third, most of them dealt with the European part of the Ottoman state and often left Anatolia and the Arab-speaking countries unaccounted for. In fact, after most of the Balkans became independent in 1878, thus achieving the hidden purpose behind the manipulation of some population statistics, the number of studies on the Ottoman population dropped spectacularly.

The best examples illustrating the above points are found in the monumental five-volume bibliographical work by Nicholas V. Michoff.<sup>2</sup> The essence of this work is in the first volume. The rest comprise additional titles omitted in the first. The fifth and last volume deals with Russian works dedicated to population problems in the Ottoman state. Michoff's study was undertaken in part to justify the Bulgarian claims to nationhood and, indirectly, to advance the Bulgarian claims to Macedonia, and to refute the Greek and Serbian efforts to regard the Bulgarians as part of their own groups. Though a permanent historical source and a monument to Michoff's dedication to industrious scholarship, the work has basic weaknesses. The first four volumes include the titles of 3,050 books and articles together with extracts containing statistics and information on Bulgarian history and society. These titles include 1,126 citations from the German, 1,123 from French, 731 from English, 63 from Italian, and the rest from other European languages, but absolutely none from Turkish. The work includes practically no direct quotations from the official Ottoman censuses, except a reference to Salahaddin Bey's figures, although Michoff refers to writings and figures given by Western authors who used Ottoman statistics, such as David Urquhart, A. Ubicini, and A. Boué, and to statisticians and demographers such as E. G. Ravenstein and H. Kutschera. It is interesting to note that Michoff finds the scarcity of official censuses in the Ottoman state a normal occurrence since even Europe itself did not begin to conduct regular and systematic censuses until early in the nineteenth century. Michoff notes that many of the authors he cited estimated the Ottoman population according to their own subjective judgements or false information supplied by natives. As an example, Michoff cites the fact that travelers estimated the total number of Bulgarians in 1800-78 as varying between 500,000 and 8 million people. A similar misrepresentation had been noted earlier by W. Eton who dismissed the claim by the Greeks that they numbered 8 million people at the

<sup>2</sup> Nicholas (Nicolas) V. Michoff (Mikhov), *Naselenieto na Turtsiia i Bulgarii, prez XVIII-XIX, La Population de la Turquie et de la Bulgarie au XVIII<sup>e</sup> et au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècles*, 5 vols. (Sofia, 1915, 1924, 1923, 1935, 1968).

end of the eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Many of these inflated figures were put out in order to back the claims of these ethnic groups to nationhood. V. Teplov, for instance, who undertook a study of the Balkan population under the auspices of the Russian government, used in addition to the *Salnames* issued by the Ottoman government, information supplied by churches and native informants. On the basis of such materials, he concluded arbitrarily that a Muslim family had 5 members while the non-Muslim family had 6–9.37 members.<sup>4</sup> The fallacy of these estimates is clearly shown in an actual count of family members undertaken by W. L. Stoney in the Philippopoli (Plovdiv) area of Bulgaria in 1877. To answer the request of some Englishmen demanding accurate information on family size in Bulgaria, Stoney, a British consular official, surveyed 50,622 people or 10,110 families, in 55 villages having a predominantly Bulgarian population and arrived at the conclusion that each had an average of 5,007 members.<sup>5</sup>

In view of the questionable statistical bases of these ethnographic studies it is absolutely necessary to go to the basic sources on the Ottoman population in the nineteenth century. The *Salnames* contained official population figures, but these derived from more complete census figures which were seldom made fully public. These Ottoman censuses provide by far the most reliable figures available concerning the population of the Middle East and the Balkans in the nineteenth century. There is no question that they had shortcomings. The first censuses were based on counts of individual *hanes* or families which in a number of cases were households composed of several nuclear families. At times, only the taxable males or those able to perform military service were included in censuses. Some of the early counts, especially of non-Muslims, were taken from information of varying accuracy supplied by communal heads or local officials. Yet, despite all these shortcomings, the official Ottoman censuses still supply useful data because their margin of error was far less than the figures given by observers, travellers, and biased informants, as shown by various comparative tables. There are several arguments that sustain the value of these censuses. As indicated later, they had to be accurate and complete since they provided the only factual basis available to the government for levying taxes and conscripting men into the army. The government itself constantly tried to improve its census results by introducing new methods, seeking the advice of outside experts, and using European models.

The purpose of the present article, part of an extensive research project on Ottoman population movements and their sociopolitical effects, is to study briefly the Ottoman census, the evolution of its methods, and the establishment of a permanent registration system, and to put forth the most reliable results of all this effort: statistical tables of the Ottoman population in 1893. These tables are based on a census which began in 1881/82, and include extensive quantitative

<sup>3</sup> W. Eton, *A Survey of the Turkish Empire* (London, 1799). For another effort to show the Armenian Catholics as more numerous than their actual number, see n. 49.

<sup>4</sup> V. Teplov, *Materialy Dlya Statistiki Bolgarii, Trakii i Makedonii* (St. Petersburg, 1877).

<sup>5</sup> Great Britain, *House of Commons, Accounts and Papers*, vol. 92 (1877), p. 14.

information concerning the population of the Balkans, Anatolia, the Middle East, and, somewhat less, North Africa. The value of this census becomes self-evident when its figures are contrasted and compared with the random estimates and the plain guessing that formed the basis of most studies made on the Ottoman population in the nineteenth century.

## II. PLACE AND FUNCTION OF CENSUSES AND POPULATION REGISTERS IN THE MODERNIZATION OF THE OTTOMAN GOVERNMENT

Population censuses, land surveys, and eventually the permanent population register system were of vital importance for the Ottoman government in the nineteenth century. Centralization forced it to assume new administrative responsibilities which depended on an accurate knowledge of the empire's human and financial resources. Indeed, the recruitment of a modern army and its organization into active and reserve units relied on accurate information concerning the number and age of the male population. The conscription system introduced by Mahmut II in 1838 for Muslims, and then the general conscription introduced in 1855 but never applied to Christians, and finally the division of the male Muslim population into four service groups could have been carried out only if assisted by a sound registration system.

Muslim males were divided into four age groups, and their military obligations were defined accordingly. The first was the *muazzaf*, or the active duty group, whose obligations began at the age of twenty and lasted for four years; the second was the *ihkiyat*, or active reserve group, under duty for two years; the third was the *redif*, or inactive reserve group, which was under obligation to serve for fourteen years; and the fourth was the *mustahfiz*, or territorial or local militia group, kept for four years.<sup>6</sup> A male Muslim thus was under some sort of military obligation for twenty-four years. It is quite understandable, therefore, that the military was the first to show keen interest in population records and to put major pressure on the sultan and the government to undertake censuses and establish a regular population registration system. In fact, army officers took active roles in the Ottoman censuses and kept their own registers for the Muslims and cooperated closely with civilian population officials throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The importance of conducting new population censuses and establishing a modern register stemmed also from the need to find new sources of revenue to finance the modern army and a variety of new administrative functions assumed by the government. This was particularly true in the case of the non-Muslims who paid the *jizye* (head tax) which was converted in 1857 into the *bedelat-i askeriye* (tax instead of military service). Many non-Muslim communities used old records to show their numbers as low as possible so as to pay the least pos-

<sup>6</sup> The service duration of the last two categories was seven and eight years respectively when the system was first introduced in 1848. See Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel K. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol. II (New York, 1977), p. 100.

sible tax. The government, therefore, became keenly interested in updating its records of the non-Muslim population by using its own personnel rather than relying on the figures given by communal heads.<sup>7</sup> This issue acquired special urgency after a series of old taxes were abolished by Mahmut II and the tax revenues showed a sharp drop.

The knowledge of the size and change in the composition of the population became important also for administrative reasons, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century, as roads, railways, bridges, irrigation schemes, and a variety of professional schools were planned in accordance with population density.

The growing importance attached to accurate population censuses and statistics comes clearly out of a report by the Şuray-ı Devlet (Council of State) concerning the census of 1881/82.<sup>8</sup> The Council stated:

It is a duty to mention before everything else that the interest of a government in compilation of systematic population statistics does not stem solely from military considerations. To know the exact number of its own population is a great achievement in matters of order and regularity for a government interested in law, property safeguards, financial stability, and municipal order and security. The European States attach great and continuous care to the collection and distribution of information on the [entire] population. It is imperative, urgent, and essential for us to accomplish this important task [census and registration] in a perfect fashion.<sup>9</sup>

This keen interest of the Ottoman government in the adoption of modern statistical methods was shown also during a reception given for the American ambassador in 1886, when he spoke about a recently concluded census in the United States and was asked for assistance.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> These communities often paid less than their number would warrant. The number of non-Muslims once established remained unchanged for long periods for lack of proper registers to follow population changes. For instance, Rev. William Jowett mentions the fact that the population of Mount Athos consisted of about 6,000 people but 'they pay to the Turks as for three thousands' (Richard Clogg, 'Two Accounts of the Academy of Ayvalek [Kydonies] in 1818-1919', *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, 10, 4 [1972], 652).

<sup>8</sup> The correspondence referred to in this article took place between the Mabeyni Humayun (Secretariat of the Imperial Palace) and the Sadaret, the Premier's office, or Porte. Reports and regulations on population were issued by the Şuray-ı Devlet, the Council of State, either through its Tanzimat Bureau or its General Council (Şuray-ı Devlet Umumi Heyeti). The references to correspondence are henceforth shortened as M to S or vice versa, that is, from the Palace to the Prime Minister (Mabeyni Humayun'dan Sadarete), followed by the date of communication, the archival reference, such as Başve-kâlet Arşivi (BA), and the latter's respective section and number. Although most of the documents used in this study have both the *hijri* (H) and *mali* or *rumi* (R) years (about one or two years difference between them) we shall give only the *hijri* data followed by the *miladi*, or solar calendar date (A.D.).

<sup>9</sup> Report of Şuray-ı Devlet, Tanzimat Dairesi, No. 438, 21 Cemaziyulevvel 1248 (21 April 1881), BA, Irade, Şuray-ı Devlet, 3148.

<sup>10</sup> During the reception, Ambassador S. S. Cox, who replaced General Lewis Wallace, the author of *Ben Hur*, mentioned that the United States had compiled new population statistics which were of great use to his country and suggested that such statistics would be useful also to the Ottoman government. He was told that an actual census (the one

III. THE OTTOMAN CENSUSES AND POPULATION ADMINISTRATION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The topic of this study is the census of 1881/82-1893. Since this census and the population registration system developed at this date represent the culmination of an evolutionary process, it is necessary to trace their development from the beginning. Census taking was a well-established Ottoman tradition. The early Ottoman governments took censuses and conducted property surveys after each new territory was conquered, and repeated the process regularly at thirty-year intervals.<sup>11</sup> This tradition was apparently abandoned in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, although there is some evidence to the contrary.<sup>12</sup> Yet it is basic to remember that until the nineteenth century the Ottoman

under discussion in this article) was being conducted. The sultan asked the ambassador to send him a statistical review found in the American Embassy. Eventually, the ambassador sent with the interpreter of the Embassy two volumes of the review for translation into Turkish. The sultan told the ambassador that he was very interested in such works and pointed out that it was his high hope to compile a complete and systematic statistical record of the entire population in his realm and that he had issued an order to this effect (M to S, Letter by the sultan's private secretary, Sureyya, of 21 Cemaziyulevvel 1303 (Feb. 25, 1886), BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 77419).

All this is confirmed by the American Ambassador, Samuel S. Cox, who, as the Chairman of the Census Committee, was instrumental in passing the census legislation in the U.S. Congress. In his memoirs he writes: 'In some meetings which I had with the Sultan, and in reply to his curiosity as to the miraculous growth of our own land in population and resources, I told him that the only way in which he could possibly understand our advancement would be to take the salient points out of our Census reports, and especially the Tenth Census (1880), have them suitably translated, and apply them to his own land. He would thus see what an advertisement a good census would be of the vast resources of his own empire.'

According to Cox the sultan was presented later with census data and concluded that 'with such data for administrative policies we [Americans] could not be other than prosperous'. Cox continues: 'The Sultan with intelligent grasp, comprehends their [census data] utility, and the need of their application to his own country. Then he reminds me of our conversation about a census for his own country, and said that he had directed his Grand Vizier, Kiamil Pasha, to organize a commission to begin the work. He was anxious as to its costs. . . . He asked me if I would aid it by my advice, when the commission was formed. To which I responded that, consistent with my duties to my country and health, I would do so, if the President did not object. The law, the instructions to superintendents, enumerators, and blanks for returns, and the *modus operandi* of special experts, were fully detailed by the printed papers in the envelopes which were in the box. These envelopes he sealed with his own hand, and gave them direction at once. So that probably Turkey may, if peace prevail, have a census of her own' (S. S. Cox, *Diversions of a Diplomat in Turkey* [New York, 1887], pp. 37, 44).

<sup>11</sup> The Ottoman censuses of population and surveys of the land in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are known from O. L. Barkan's pioneering works: 'Tarihi Demografi Araştırmaları ve Osmanlı Tarihi', *Tarih Mecmuası*, 10 (1953); 'Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'Empire Ottoman au XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles', *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, I, 1 (Aug. 1957), 9-21; and 'Research on the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, M. A. Cook, ed. (London, 1970), pp. 163-171. See also Leila Erder, 'The Measurement of Preindustrial Population Changes: The Ottoman Empire from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century', *Middle Eastern Studies*, 11 (3 Oct. 1975), 284-301.

<sup>12</sup> I believe that further research in the Ottoman archives may yield substantial infor-

government never developed a regular population registration system to record births, deaths, and migrations, as was done in some parish registers in Western Europe and England. The birth, death, and marriage registers supposedly kept by some Ottoman non-Muslim communities, to my knowledge, have never been unearthed.

The first Ottoman government census in the nineteenth century took place in 1831–38 but it covered only certain parts of the empire and was based on a count of households, not individuals.<sup>13</sup> At this time, individuals were given a *mürür tezkeresi* (travel certificate) in order to prevent mass migration and to keep track of substantial increases which were taking place in the population. After the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict in 1839, a second, but partial, census was conducted in 1844, despite considerable popular opposition, in an effort to provide statistical information on population, land, and revenue as a basis for the forthcoming reforms.<sup>14</sup> This census has not been published in its entirety, but much of it is known in piecemeal form from the works of A. Ubicini and Eugene Boré who, while questioning its total accuracy, were convinced that its figures were essentially correct but made their own adjustments of the final results.<sup>15</sup> It is important to note that Ubicini, Urquhart, Boré, and other European observers who knew the language and were familiar with conditions in the Ottoman Empire and its bureaucracy accepted as reliable the figures given by the Ottoman officials. Actually, the census that was started in 1844 continued well beyond this date as the government tried also to count the nomadic tribes, as indicated by the appointment of census officials in the vilayets of Aydın and Menteşe, in 1851,<sup>16</sup> and by some other efforts to expand further the census taken in Cyprus in 1857.<sup>17</sup>

mation on population figures, even for the later centuries. The existing records on taxation and the distribution of *miri* (state) land to cultivators could yield excellent figures on the Ottoman population in the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. For instance, the *yoklamas*, censuses of the timars in 1596, 1606, 1672, 1691, 1694, 1698, and 1715 indicate that the tradition was not abandoned altogether. These surveys show a continuous preoccupation with the size of cultivable lands, at least with those given as fiefs to the *sipahis*, and with their revenue. See V. P. Mutafchieva-Str. Dimitrov, *Sur l'état du système des timars des XVII<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Sofia, 1968).

<sup>13</sup> Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İlk Nüfus Sayımı, 1831* (Ankara, 1943).

<sup>14</sup> 'Traduction d'un memorandum de la Sublime-Porte, adressé aux missions étrangères à Constantinople, et relatif au recensement général décrété par S. Hautesse', *Le Moniteur Universel*, 248 (4 Sept. 1844).

<sup>15</sup> A. Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie* (Paris, 1853). Eugene Boré, *Almanach de l'Empire ottoman pour l'année 1849 et 1850* (Constantinople, 1849–1850).

<sup>16</sup> The census of the nomadic tribes in these two provinces was carried out by army officers belonging to the units stationed in the area (S to M, Letter of 7 Sefer 1268 [2 Dec. 1851], BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 14855). See also F. Kanitz, *Donau-Bulgarien und der Balkan*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1875); *idem*, *La Bulgarie danubienne et le Balkan: Etudes de voyages, 1860–1880* (Paris, 1882).

<sup>17</sup> It appears from official correspondence that the census of the Muslim population in Cyprus was concluded by 1861, and that a census of the non-Muslim population was ordered in 1862, with the purpose of reforming the tax system. The census of the non-Muslims in Cyprus was carried out by four teams, each consisting of one Muslim and one

The next Ottoman census, decreed by Mithat Paşa, and carried out between 1866 and 1873, provides an even better insight into the evolution of the Ottoman censuses. It was taken only for the Danube province, which comprised most of Bulgaria of today, and part Iraq, and was not published in its entirety, although the *Salnames* (yearbooks issued by the government for the entire realm beginning in 1846, and sporadically for various vilayets) published most of its contents. The census was taken by using multiple registers which were eventually reduced to a single one. Officials went from house to house to note the number of people in a household, their age, marital status, occupation, and real estate properties.<sup>18</sup> Special lists indicated the number of household heads together with their real estate wealth and the rent derived from it, their occupation, and income. All these findings were summarized in a fourth category of lists which indicated the actual number of the taxable population and its ethnic composition, the number of dwellings, the total income of the population, the total value of real estate, and the tax collected.<sup>19</sup> The information in this census material is so ample and unique as to make it a permanent source of information for studying the social and demographic history of the European possessions of the Ottoman state. Professor N. Todorov, a member of the Bulgarian Academy, who was the first to use, in detail, this census material in conducting his study of the Balkan towns and their social structure, has acknowledged explicitly their value and reliability.<sup>20</sup>

One of the purposes of the census of 1866 was to issue to all Ottoman subjects a *tezkeresi-i osmaniye*, or Ottoman identity card, and then to use it to register changes in the individual's status. Preparations were made to print and distribute 5 million cards in the Tuna (Danube) vilayet and, in anticipation of a country-wide census, another 15 million for the rest of the realm.<sup>21</sup>

Concomitant with this interest in population matters, the government appointed after 1839: *nüfus nazırı*s (inspector–ministers of population) in the *eyalets* (provinces), *nüfus memurs* (population officials) in *sanjaks* and *kazas*, and *mukayyids* (registrars) to record births and deaths and to periodically compile

Christian official plus a secretary. It was expected that the census of the non-Muslims living in villages and towns would take 4–5 months. The Porte debated at length whether the expenses of the census should be covered from the general treasury or from a levy of a tax of one *kuruş* on each Muslim and non-Muslim or deducted from the annual tax collected from Cyprus (S to M, correspondence of 28 Sefer 1279 [25 Aug. 1862], BA, Irade, Meclis-i Vala, 21366).

<sup>18</sup> This material, under the serial number PC 79/8, is found in the oriental section of the National Library of Bulgaria in Sofia. For further details see Nicola(i) Todorov, 'The Balkan Town in the Second Half of the 19th Century', *Etudes Balkaniques*, 2 (1969), 31–50.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 3.

<sup>20</sup> N. Todorov, *Balkanskiat Grad XV–XIX-vek* (Balkan Towns in the XV–XIX Centuries) (Sofia, 1972). An English translation of this book is to be published by University of Washington Press, Seattle.

<sup>21</sup> The *tezkeres* for the Tuna/Danube province were to be printed by Boyacıoğlu Agop at a cost of 1,250,000 *kurush*. Actually, the printing of various forms associated with the census and population registration provided good financial stimulus for the burgeoning printing business in the Ottoman Empire. See S to M, communication of 9 Rebiulahir 1282 (1 Sept. 1865) BA, Irade, Meclis-i Vala, 24167.

*cedvels* (lists) indicating the total number of people in each district. These officials were attached to the Ceride-i Nüfus Nezareti (Ministry of Population Registers) in the capital.<sup>22</sup> Owing to a variety of internal causes, this ministry was abolished soon afterward and the provincial population offices were placed under the Tahiri Emlāk Idaresi (Office of Property Surveys) and then, for a short period, under the Military Affairs Office. During this period, the maintenance of the registers deteriorated until a new interest in population censuses began to emerge in the late 1860s.<sup>23</sup> After the Şuray-ı Devlet (Council of State) was established in 1867, it assumed jurisdiction on all population matters. In 1874, the Council introduced a series of measures for taking a census and establishing a registration system. In 1881/82 it secured the establishment of a General Population Administration (Nüfus-u Umumi Idaresi) attached to the Ministry of Interior, where it remained until the end of the empire. Later in the 1880s, a statistical office attached to the Ministry of Trade and Construction (later reorganized into the Ministry of Trade and Agriculture) was established; it issued population statistics on the basis of information supplied by the Population Administration.

#### IV. THE FIRST ATTEMPTS AT ESTABLISHING A MODERN POPULATION REGISTRATION SYSTEM, 1874

It is important to stress that after 1870, census taking and the establishment of an accurate, permanent registration system became a matter of priority both for the sultan and for the Office of the Prime Minister, as attested by their frequent orders to the concerned offices. It should be repeated that the *nüfus defters*, or permanent population registers, were established first in the 1830s to follow up the *tahrir* (census) and were charged with the registration of births, deaths, and migrations. These registers, however, became useless for want of proper care and maintenance and especially because of the influx of millions of migrants into the empire. Between 1862 and 1870, close to two million Muslims fled from the Caucasus into the Ottoman Empire, forced out of their ancestral homes by Russian pressures for conversion to Christianity, service in the army, and settlement in the unhealthy plains of the north Caucasus. Moreover, the urbanization that followed the increase of trade and economic relations with Europe after 1856 produced a shift of population from the rural interior toward the coastal towns. Finally, the establishment of new provinces, through the vilayet law of 1864 and its amendment in 1871, led to the abolition of the positions

<sup>22</sup> The name *ceride* given originally to some of the land and population registers came later to mean 'newspaper'. The name *ceride-i nüfus* (population register) was changed later to *nüfus sicilli* and *nüfus kütüğü* in order to show its role as the source of all population information.

<sup>23</sup> Some information on the history of population administration is found in the reports of the Şuray-ı Devlet, number 438 of 21 Cemaziyülevvel 1298 (21 April 1881) BA, Irade, Şuray-ı Devlet, 3148; S to M, communication of 7 Sefer 1268 (2 Dec. 1851), BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 14855.

assigned to population officials and to the allocation of the funds for their salaries to other purposes. All these events produced further disorder in the deteriorating situation of the population registers and undermined the collection of taxes and conscription of Muslims into the army. Consequently, the Şuray-ı Devlet appointed a special committee to study the possibility of taking a new census and of establishing a new register system. In effect, this committee reported that the synchronization, updating, and correction of the existing population *defters* would take a very long time; that the influx of the *ecnebi* (bona fide foreigners) and the rapid increase in the number of the *mahmi* (Ottoman-born non-Muslims obtaining passports from European powers to become native protégés serving foreign interests) aggravated further the registration process. Consequently, the committee recommended and the Council of State agreed that the best solution was to conduct a new census and to establish new *defters* to cover the entire country, except for Hejaz and Yemen.<sup>24</sup> In 1874, Şuray-ı Devlet issued an order and three regulations to carry out a new census and to establish a new registration system. The first regulation concerned the census methods, the second dealt with the establishment of a registration system based on three types of *defters* or registers, and the third dealt with the appointment of population officials. These will be studied briefly in that order.

The census was to be taken by a committee established in each *kaymakamlık* (*kaza* or district). It consisted of one government official, a Muslim, one non-Muslim chosen from among community leaders, a secretary, and his assistant.<sup>25</sup> It was instructed to use the old population registers when possible but to conduct the census mainly by going to each village and *mahalle*, or town district, in its respective area. All male inhabitants, including children living in the locality, had to appear before this committee and the village *ihtiyar meclisi* (council of elders) and register their age, *künye* (nickname), color of eyes and skin complexion, and special physical disabilities 'which will not fade with age'. The census committee were instructed to see even newborn babies 'with their own eyes', study each claim to exemption from military service, and see to it that nobody remained 'hidden' and unregistered.<sup>26</sup> Each family had to be registered as a unit. The roster of the resulting village census was approved by the elders' council and a copy of it was given to the population office at the *kaza* center. The *kaza* official in turn would send a cumulative list of the number of males in his district to the superior administrative unit, which would convey the lists to the ultimate authority at the center, the Defteri Hākāni (Ministry of Property Records). Officials in each *kaza* were obliged to send copies of the registers of Muslim males to the regional army offices and to be the repository of all village

<sup>24</sup> Report of the Şuray-ı Devlet, number 695 of 29 Zilhice 1290 (17 Feb. 1874), BA, Irade, Meclis-i Mahsus, 2086. All these reports concerning the census of 1874 are found in one folio.

<sup>25</sup> See report of the Şuray-ı Devlet, *Tahriri Nüfusun Suret-i İcraiyesini Mutzammin Talimattır* (Instructions Concerning the Conduct of Population Census), S to M of 1 Rebiyülevvel 1291 (18 April 1874), BA, Irade, Meclis-i Mahsus, 2089.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, art. 2.

population registers. The census committee was empowered to use force to bring before the registration officials those who refused to appear, although it was instructed to act with tolerance and respect toward villagers, and to refuse anything offered by individuals.<sup>27</sup> The census instructions contained a series of provisions concerning the registration of those absent from the locality, of the foreigners, and of 'protected' people, the latter two being registered in special registers.

In 1874, the Şuray-ı Devlet envisaged the establishment of census systems based on three types of registers.<sup>28</sup> The *esas defter*, or the basic register, was to include all males living in a village and in a *mahalle* or town quarter (the vilayet law of 1871 defined a *mahalle* as a cluster of at least fifty houses), by numbering consecutively in the first column the number of the individuals and in the second, the families and their respective members. The register to be kept by the official in the *kaza* center included columns for registering the individual's age and changes in his military and personal status. The second register, *icmal* (summary), contained the total number of people found in the villages and towns within a *kaza*, and it was compiled on the basis of information derived from the village and *mahalle* registers. One column in the summary registers divided the subjects according to their *millet* (religious and ethnic affiliation) into Muslims, Greeks, Bulgarians, Armenians, Jews, and others. A third register, *yevmiye vukuat* (daily events), kept in the *kaza*, registered new births, deaths, and changes in the individual's military status as reported by *mukayyid* (registrars), the *muhtar* (village head), and the elders' council. Every six months, the total number of births and deaths was added or subtracted from the *icmal* register. Models for each one of the *defters* were drafted by the Şuray-ı Devlet.

The administrative structure of the census and register system planned in 1874 consisted of a *nüfus nazırı* (population minister-inspector) at the provincial level, a *mukayyid* (registering official) at the *kaza* level, and two secretaries for each official.<sup>29</sup> These officials registered all births, deaths, migrations, and changes in the status of males in their district based on the information supplied by the *imam* (religious head), *muhtar*, and the village elders' council who filled this information in a special *ilmuhaber* (information certificate) supplied by the government. The population officials were obliged to take trips into the country-

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, art. 8-10. Boys under the age of three, the sick, and others who had valid excuses could be registered by proxy.

<sup>28</sup> See report of the Şuray-ı Devlet; *Tahrir-i Nüfus İçin İttihaz Olunacak Üç Türli Defterin Suret-i İstimalini Mübeyyin Tarifnamedir* (Information [Description] Concerning the Use of the Three Registers To Be Created for Conducting the Population Census), S to M of 1 Rebiyulevvel 1291 (18 Aug. 1874), BA, Irade, Meclis-i Mahsus, 2089.

<sup>29</sup> See report of the Şuray-ı Devlet, *Memaliki Mahsusa-i Şahanede Tahrir-i Nüfus İcra Kılınan Mahallerde İstihdam Olunacak Nüfus Nazırları ve Kâtipleri ile Mukayyiterlinin Suret-i Tertip ve Tayinleri ile Vazifeleri Hakkında Talimattir* (Instructions Concerning the Organizations, Appointment, and Responsibilities of the Population Inspectors, Secretaries, and Registers To Be Appointed in the Localities of the Realm Where Census Has Been Conducted), S to M of 1 Rebiyulevvel 1291 (18 April 1874) BA, Irade, Meclis-i Mahsus, 2089.

side to study the situation on the spot and to report all changes to their superiors and, eventually, to the Defter-i Hākāni Nezareti (the new name acquired by the old Defterhane in 1871) in the capital. A copy of the registers kept in areas inhabited by Muslims was to be sent to the proper military authorities. Those failing to report births, deaths, and changes in personal status were subjected to various penalties.

All these instructions were submitted by Premier Hüseyin Avni Paşa to the sultan who approved them and issued a special order for their execution.<sup>30</sup> Preparations were made, but the census and registration system devised in 1874 could not be carried out. There were several reasons. Revolts in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1875, the abdication and suicide of Sultan Abdulaziz, the proclamation of a constitution, and accession to the throne of Sultan Abdulhamit II in 1876, and, especially, the disastrous war with Russia in 1877/78 and the resulting loss of territory substantially upset Ottoman internal order. In addition, the influx of large numbers of Muslim refugees from the Balkans in 1877/78 and thereafter, and the need to settle them, created new demographic problems not foreseen in 1874. Delay therefore resulted until they could be worked out.

#### V. THE CENSUS AND REGISTRATION SYSTEM OF 1881/82

As soon as the political situation stabilized, the sultan issued an order for carrying out a new census. The sultan complained through his secretary that the country did not possess registers indicating the exact number of male subjects and therefore could not estimate the exact number of soldiers available for active and reserve duties, nor could it carry out a planned reorganization of the army. Consequently, in 1881, the Palace charged the War Ministry with the duty of counting Muslim males, whereas officials in the Ministry of Interior counted the non-Muslims.<sup>31</sup> As usual, the issue was referred to the Şuray-ı Devlet. This modern-minded office, eager to adopt advanced techniques of organization, debated the issue and came out with a series of recommendations which were based in large measure on the 1874 regulations.

These recommendations and the resulting regulations became, in effect, the basis for the census and registration system used after 1881.<sup>32</sup> They were broader in scope and different in essence from the sultan's directives. The Şuray-ı Devlet acknowledged that the census of 1874 could not be carried out because of internal reasons, although the knowledge gained in devising it was very useful in planning the new one. It agreed with the military authorities that the division of the Muslim population into age groups was a matter of vital practical importance. It stressed also the necessity of providing each Ottoman citizen with a *tezkere*,

<sup>30</sup> See correspondence S to M of 8, 9 Rebiyulahir 1291 (May 25, 26, 1874), BA, Irade, Meclis-i Mahsus, 2089.

<sup>31</sup> M to S, order of 15 Recep 1297 (June 23, 1880), BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 65276.

<sup>32</sup> S to M, Şuray-ı Devlet, Tanzimat Dairesi, Communication Number 438 of 21 Cemaziyülevvel 1298 (21 April 1881), BA, Irade, Şuray-ı Devlet, 3148.

identity card, to be used in the increasingly frequent contacts taking place between the government and individuals.

The council emphasized the fact that population statistics were useful for administrative as well as for military purposes. This was particularly true in the case of the non-Muslims, who paid the *bedelat-ı askeriye* (tax instead of military service). The tax had been levied in the past on entire communities without ascertaining the exact number of its members. Since the number of non-Muslims was higher than that indicated in the tax rolls, there was a significant loss of revenue. All this necessitated a new census. The Council, however, pointed out that a 'census showed the size of the population at a given moment. The population changes being continuous and . . . natural, it was necessary to devise a sound basis, a new system which would record all [population] changes and thus derive the utmost benefit from a census.'<sup>33</sup> In other words, the Şuray-ı Devlet regarded the census not as a goal in itself as in previous times but as a means for compiling population statistics and establishing a register of population. It emphasized the importance of statistics. Indeed, beginning roughly in 1878 the Ottoman government showed increasing interest in modern statistics, beginning to publish some and eventually establishing a statistical office.<sup>34</sup> It worked in collaboration with the General Administration of Population and came to be headed largely by professionals, many of whom were non-Muslims or foreigners.<sup>35</sup>

The Council affirmed boldly that in order to conduct a proper census and compile accurate population statistics it was necessary to look at the practices of other countries in Europe and America and to take them as models. It proposed to unify and consolidate all the elements involved in population matters, including census taking, population registration, and administrative organization. Different from the past centuries when *tahrir* or *yoklama* (census taking) was regarded as the chief goal of the endeavour, the Şuray-ı Devlet defined the census only as a provisional measure necessary to establish the statistical foundation for a permanent register system which would record continuously

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> The Ottoman government began to compile regular statistics concerning foreign trade beginning in 1294 (1878). The statistics for 1878–1900 are available in their entirety. The statistics for 1900–13 are sporadic. See *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Ticaret Muvazenesi, 1878–1913*, No. 123–73, General Directorate of Statistics (Ankara, 1939).

<sup>35</sup> I tried to find the names of the individuals who directed the statistical office of the Ottoman Empire. Continuity of directors and their ranks could indicate the degree of professionalism and the importance attached to, and hence, the quality of the statistics. A search through the *Salnames* of 1310 (1892) to 1334 (1916) with the exception of 1911–1914, when no *Salnames* were issued, showed that the office of statistics was headed by high-ranking non-Muslim officials and foreigners for about thirteen years out of a total of nineteen for which precise information is available, as shown in the table opposite. It is also interesting to note the effort of the Ottoman officials to disseminate information on statistics. A statistical publication prepared by Mehmet Behiç, showing the demographic economic, financial, and other characteristics of the Ottoman state in 1310 (1894) begins with a general introduction discussing the meaning and importance of statistics. See *Sicill-i Nüfus Idare-i Umumiyesi, Yevmiye Kâtibi Mehmet Behiç Tarafından Tenzim Olunan İstatistik Defteri*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kitaplığı, Türkçe Yazmalar, 9075.

all births and deaths and provide general statistical information on the entire population. Consequently, all the previous provisions concerning the census and and registration system were combined into one single regulation, Sicilli Nüfus Nizamnamesi (Regulation for Population Registers).<sup>36</sup> These Regulations were debated and approved by the General Committee of the Şuray-ı Devlet, and promulgated by the sultan in 1881.<sup>37</sup>

*Officers of the Ottoman Empire's Directorate of Statistics*

Years			General Director of Statistics	Assistant to the General Director
Hijri	Rumi or Mali	A.D.		
1310	1308	1892	Nuri Bey	
1311	1309	1893	Fethi Bey <sup>a</sup>	
1312	1310	1894	" "	
1313	1311	1895	Fethi Franko Bey	
1314	1312	1896	" "	
1315	1313	1897	Migirdiç Sinabyan Efendi <sup>b</sup>	
1316	1314	1898	" " "	Mehmet Behiç Bey
1317	1315	1899	" " "	" " "
1318	1316	1900	" " "	" " "
1319	1317	1901	" " "	" " "
1320	1318	1902	" " "	" " "
1321	1319	1903	Rober Efendi <sup>c</sup>	" " "
1322	1320	1904	" " "	" " "
1323	1321	1905	" " "	" " "
1324	1322	1906	" " "	" " "
1325	1323	1907	" " "	" " "
1326	1324	1908	Mehmet Behiç Bey <sup>d</sup>	" " "
1327	1325	1909	" " "	
1328	1326	1910 <sup>e</sup>	" " "	
1329	1327	1911	" " "	
1330	1328	1912	" " "	
1331	1329	1913	" " "	
1332	1330	1914	" " "	
1333	1331	1915	" " "	
1334	1332	1916	" " "	

<sup>a</sup> Fethi Bey apparently was Jewish.

<sup>b</sup> Migirdiç Efendi, an Armenian, was Assistant Director of Trade in 1892-96, and after 1902 became Assistant Minister of Trade.

<sup>c</sup> Rober (Robert) Efendi was apparently an American employed as Director General of Statistics because of his expertise.

<sup>d</sup> Mehmet Behiç produced several works on statistics. He evidenced talent, and while Assistant to the General Director of Statistics became an equally good statistician.

<sup>e</sup> In 1910 the Trade Ministry was detached from the Construction Ministry and combined with the Agriculture Ministry, and the Statistical General Directorate was placed under its jurisdiction.

<sup>36</sup> See *Sicill-i Nüfus Nizamnamesi* of 8 Şaban 1298 (5 July 1881), BA, Irade, Şuray-ı Devlet, 3148. All reports and correspondence concerning the census of 1881/82 are in one folio.

<sup>37</sup> See Şuray-ı Devlet, Umumi Heyeti Mazbatası, of 8 Şaban 1298 (5 July 1881), BA, Irade, Şuray-ı Devlet, 3148. Of the twenty people who participated in the debate only two voted against the proposal. All the three non-Muslims, Yanko, Constantin, and Nuryan, voted for it.

The Regulations consisted of fifty articles, divided into nine sections. The first thirty-eight articles, comprising eight sections, were devoted to the organization of the register system while the last twelve, assembled under the heading *ahkâm-ı muvvakate* (provisional regulation), dealt with the census itself. Following its own reasoning, the Council considered the census as an ad hoc project while its by-product, the register system, was a permanent one. We shall study the census first.

The census consisted essentially of registration in the *sicil*, or register. It was carried out by committees established in each *kaza*. Each committee had one member from the *kaza* administration council, another from the municipal council, the population official, and a *redif* (reserve military officer). In the *kazas* that had different religious groups, one additional member was selected from the most numerous non-Muslim group. A population secretary and his assistant accompanied the committee (art. 39-40). The registration included the respondent's name and nickname, his or her father's name, and the address, age, religion, occupation and profession, electoral status, physical disabilities, and civil status. The non-Muslims supplied the same information, but were registered in a different register so as to facilitate the tax levy. The information was supplied directly by the person involved, but exceptions were recognized in legitimate cases when a third person accompanied by two witnesses over the age of twenty-one provided it for an absent party. (This provision apparently was intended to excuse women from appearing before the census committee since for the first time women were also counted and registered.) At the end of the census of a village or *mahalle* (town district), the accuracy, completeness, and authenticity of the census results were certified by the *imam*, *muhtar*, and the community councils.<sup>38</sup> The *kaza* population official was obliged to compile, within three months after the end of the census, a list of all inhabitants in his district and send it to the province capital, which sent it ultimately to the Nüfus-u Umumiye İdaresi (General Administration of Population).

Compliance with the census registration was insured by a rather compelling measure. Each registered individual was issued an official *nüfus tezkeresi* (population bulletin or identity card) which contained all the relevant information about the bearer in the register. This card came to be known later as *nüfus cüzdamı* (population book). Each individual had to show it to the authorities before buying, selling, or inheriting property, before being accepted in an occupation or profession, for obtaining travel documents, or for conducting other official business. Those without such cards, besides unable to conduct official business, were punished by stiff fines and jail terms ranging from twenty-four

<sup>38</sup> During the debates in the Şuray-ı Devlet, the General Committee suggested that since some non-Muslim community leaders could not speak Turkish and consequently faced difficulty in filing the birth certificates, the population officers sent to these areas should be selected from those who spoke the native languages. In other words, instead of compelling the citizens to learn Turkish, the language of the administration, the Ottoman government sought at this date to teach its own officials the regional languages, a custom long in practice.

hours to one month if they failed to present an acceptable excuse before the court (art. 5). Those failing to register in order to avoid military service were to be immediately conscripted.

The Population Administration consisted of a central administration with a Director General and a Secretariat attached to the Dahiliye (Interior) Ministry. Each *kaza* had a population official, while the special districts had a *nüfus nazırı*, both of whom were assisted by a population secretary and his assistant. Births, deaths, migration, and marriages occurring in the villages and *mahalles* after the census were recorded by the local officials (the *muhtars*) in one of four types of standard *ilmuhaber* (information certificate) in accordance with the instructions issued by the population official in the *kaza* (art. 11, 12). The latter in turn was obliged to forward the annual *icmal* (summary) of the village and *mahalle* population reports, after due inspection and approval by the *kaza* administrative council, to the superior offices not later than April 1. Eventually, the reports from all the vilayets reached the General Administration of Population in the Ministry of Interior: 'The copies of the registrations [births, deaths] reaching the Ministry of Interior would provide the General Administration of Population with [statistical data] necessary to compile the annual general statistics [of the population] and would be preserved intact. A list of people reaching military age together with the [description] of their identity will be compiled and forwarded to the Military Administration' (art. 14).

The Regulations issued by the Şuray-ı Devlet contained other detailed instructions concerning the registration of births (art. 15–22), marriages (art. 23–26), deaths (art. 27–29), and migration (art. 30–31). They also contained a special section (art. 32–39) establishing procedures for the control and supervision of population registers, assuring a constant upward flow of information from villages to the superior population authorities, for registering those who might have failed to do so during the original census, and for correcting the registers' shortcomings, if any. The Regulations dealt with the financing of the register system by charging small sums for registering births and issuing travel certificates. All these proposals were accepted by the sultan who ordered their implementation as soon as possible.<sup>39</sup> It is important to stress the fact that the registration system, the *nüfus tezkeresi* (identity card), and the administrative organization established in 1881/82 were implemented, with certain expansions and modifications, throughout the remainder of the Ottoman Empire and have survived in a variety of forms in Turkey and other places in the Middle East right to the present day. A law issued in 1318 (1900/1) broadened considerably the registration provisions of the Regulations of 1881/82. Another law and the accompanying regulations issued in 1320 (1902/3) superseded the law of 1318 and brought further clarification concerning census taking and registration. Another census based on this law was apparently started in 1321 (1903/4).

<sup>39</sup> See exchange of letters between the Prime Minister's office and the Palace, and the latter's Irade (Orders) of 7 Şevval 1298 (1 Sept. 1881) and 8 Şevval 1898 (2 Sept. 1881), BA, Irade, Şuray-ı Devlet, 3148.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POPULATION CENSUS AND REGISTRATION IN 1881/82

The time needed for preparations did not permit the census and registration committees established at *kaza* level to begin their work until sometime in 1882. The census itself, that is, the registration of all the inhabitants in villages and *mahalles*, and the issuance of the *nüfus tezkeresi*, took far longer than expected because of the physical difficulties involved, such as lack of transportation and bad weather. The first results from the more accessible areas came in 1884/85. Some of these preliminary statistical results were published in a variety of places, including the *Salnames*, but have been used by just a few writers, and only recently.<sup>40</sup> Many other *vilayets* do not appear to have completed their

TABLE 1 *Population of Istanbul in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*

Year	Muslims	Non-Muslims	Total
H 1260 (1844)	102,532	111,160	213,692 (males only)
H 1273 (1857)	112,162	124,162	236,092 (males only)
H 1298 (1882) <sup>a</sup>	118,535	101,410	381,376 (219,945 males; 161,431 females)
H 1302 (1885)	384,410	488,655	873,565 <sup>b</sup>
H 1314 (1896)	520,194	510,040	1,030,234
R 1330 (1914)	520,434	389,553	909,987

<sup>a</sup> Incomplete census.

<sup>b</sup> The figures indicating the population of Istanbul in 1893 are identical with the figures given earlier by the Ministry of Interior in 1885. The minister informed the premier's office that the population of Istanbul consisted of 384,910 Muslims, 359,412 non-Muslims, and 129,243 foreigners, or a total of 873,565 people. The Ministry reported that soldiers and a number of unregistered people were not included in the statistics. It seems that the compiler of the general statistics for 1893 used the old figure obtained in 1885, but updated the figures three years later. See prime minister's letter to the Palace, 28 Ramazan 1302 (11 July 1885), and the interior minister's communication number 393 of 26 Ramazan 1302 (9 July 1885), BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 73538. It is interesting to note also that the census statistics for Istanbul in 1844 and 1857 indicated that a total of 75,748 and 94,119 people, respectively, residing in Istanbul were *bekâr* (single outsiders) or males who had come from the countryside to the city for commercial purposes. Approximately 43,000 outsiders in 1844, and 55,000 outsiders in 1857, were non-Muslims, indicating that the non-Muslim population was moving into urban areas to become involved in the expanding commercial activities. This trend was reversed toward the end of the century owing to an influx of Muslims from abroad and to the rise of a Muslim middle class. The latter tried to engage in the commercial activities monopolized by non-Muslims, and in the process the brewing nationality conflict acquired a new economic and political dimension. The Istanbul census for 1896 indicated the presence of 30,680 migrants (*muhacir*) in the city, of whom only 144 were Jews and all the rest Muslims. The head of the population census committee, Esseyit Mustafa Tevfik, reported that the increase of the Muslim population was due to migration, while the non-Muslims flocked into the city for commercial purposes. The census indicated also the presence of 5,560 students in the medrese.

<sup>40</sup> For a general reference, see Vedat Eldem, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İktisadi Şartları Hakkında Bir Tetkik* (n.p., 1970), pp. 49-65. Eldem used some of the figures published in the official publication cited in n. 48. He does mention the fact that the

census or to have established their register systems until 1886/87. For instance, even the city of Istanbul, which conducted five censuses in the century and was given priority, barely completed its census by 1885.<sup>41</sup> Thus, the population of Istanbul in the nineteenth century (the city included the *dersaadet* [old city], the *bilad-ı selase* [the “three boroughs,” originally Eyup, Galata, and Uskudar], and Beyoglu, which was added in 1894/95), is shown in Table 1.

One of the chief difficulties faced by the census committees in 1881/82, and especially by the population officials, was the double task of conducting the census in villages and of keeping up to date the registers of districts whose censuses were already completed. This difficulty was compounded by the fact that the population officials had to report every year the total number of people in their respective districts. Consequently, the census progressed rather slowly. In order to expedite the work, new census teams, called *kol*, were later formed in the vilayets.<sup>42</sup> As the work in some vilayets appeared to near completion, the government decided late in 1885 to send specially qualified teams of inspectors to control the census results, to compile general population statistics, and to take whatever measures seemed necessary to insure a continuous and accurate registration of all population changes.<sup>43</sup> The vilayets chosen for inspection were Hüdavendigâr (Bursa), Edirne, Trabzon, Cezayiribahriselit (Aegean Islands), Adana, Sivas, and Karesi (Balıkesir). Some time afterward, Trabzon informed the government that it had completed its census and, therefore, it was placed in the category of the first-class vilayets.<sup>44</sup> The Palace showed constant interest in the matter and issued deadlines for its completion and the drafting of empire-wide population statistics.<sup>45</sup> It is safe to assume that the censuses of most of the Otto-

Ottoman government took a census in 1882–84 but does not elaborate further. Vital Cuinet also seems to have relied on the same source. See *Syrie, Liban et Palestine: géographie administrative, statistique, descriptive et raisonnée* (Paris, 1896). For some information on the population of Palestine, see also Moshe Ma'oz, ed., *Studies on Palestine during the Ottoman Period* (Jerusalem, 1975).

<sup>41</sup> A report by the head of the census committee (*nüfus tahrir komisyonu*) giving some estimates for 1882, indicated that this was the fifth census of the city but could not find the lists for the first two censuses. It appears from the existing information that the government empowered the Ihtisab, later Zaptiye (Interior) ministry, in 1265 (1848) to maintain population lists to be completed every year according to the deaths and births occurring in the country. The measure was abandoned and then revived after the Crimean war when population was given the first *nüfus tezkeresi* (identity card). See reports in Istanbul Üniversitesi Kitaplığı, *Türkçe Yazmalar*, Number 8949. Other sources are in BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 24, 402. My detailed study of Istanbul's transformation in the nineteenth century, presented originally at a conference organized by AISEE and UNESCO in 1973, will appear elsewhere.

<sup>42</sup> The orders for establishing new census teams were issued on 3 Nov. 1884, approximately three years after the census began.

<sup>43</sup> Letter from Premier's office, 20 Zilkade 1302 (31 Aug. 1885), BA, Irade, Dahiliye 76006.

<sup>44</sup> Palace (Yıldız) letter of 9 Rebiyulahir 1304 (5 Jan. 1886) BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 80019.

<sup>45</sup> For instance, in 1886, the vilayet of Halep (Aleppo) demanded at least nine more months to finish its census. Indications are that it completed its census much later than that. See correspondence S to M of 19 Cemaziulevvel 1303 and 25 Cemaziulahir 1303 (23 Feb. 1886, and 31 March 1886), BA, Irade, Dahiliye, 77419.

man territories in the Balkans, Anatolia, and Syria (inclusive of Jordan, most of Lebanon, and Palestine) were almost completed by 1888/89. There still remained a few people not registered even in the areas where the census was declared to be completed. In a few inaccessible areas, populations, particularly the nomadic tribes, were not counted at all, but were estimated on the basis of information supplied by tribal leaders and local officials.

The Ottoman census and registration that began in 1881/82 represented a continuous endeavour. Consequently, it is extremely difficult at this stage of our ongoing research to state precisely when they ended, if they ended at all. One can, however, state that the population records issued in 1893 represent the most complete and reliable Ottoman population figures compiled in the nineteenth century.

On 5 Sefer 1311 (17 August 1893) Premier Cevat Paşa submitted them in a bound manuscript to the sultan who had consistently pressed for their completion and accuracy.<sup>46</sup> Different from a variety of earlier general population statistics, these gave precise and detailed information on the population of all areas and noted the districts and regions where the census was not completed, while providing estimates for the people in these areas—mostly women and tribesmen—not subjected to individual census and registration.<sup>47</sup> The figures in these statistics were considered definitive and reliable and, therefore, were used as a basis for official statistics concerning the Ottoman population and for subsequent administrative measures.

The final question to be asked concerns the margin of error, which means unregistered people (mostly women), in the statistical tables presented below. It is impossible to provide a definitive answer to this question. My own view on this matter, stemming in part from the insight one gains by working with such materials, is that the margin of error in established communities located in the relatively developed areas with reasonably good communication was low, possibly between 2 and 5 percent. The practical need for every individual to possess a *nüfus tezkeresi* used in all dealings with the government forced practically everyone to register. The margin of error in remote areas probably increased to 6–10 percent.<sup>48</sup> Even here, the need for personnel in the army, and taxes, forced

<sup>46</sup> The letter states that the *defter* (register) submitted to the sultan was prepared by the Population Administration following the sultan's orders and that it included the number of the Muslim and non-Muslim population (*cemaat-i muhtelifi*), and of the foreigners. Bab-ı Ali, Daireyi Sadaret, Amedi Divan-ı Humayun, 333, BA, Yıldız, Perakende, 11S 311, Number 215.

<sup>47</sup> See *Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniye'nin 1313 Senesine Mahsus İstatistik-i Umumiyesi* (General Statistics of the Ottoman State for the Year 1313 [1895]), Ministry of Trade and Construction, Istanbul 1316 (1898). This latter publication was compiled by the Statistical office on the basis of information supplied by the Population Administration.

<sup>48</sup> The validity of the census results obtained in 1893 can be tested against some other reliable estimates. Fortunately, we have a number of estimates on the population of various important vilayets in Anatolia and Rumili. For instance, the British Consulate put together eight different population estimates for the population of Sivas. One of the estimates was issued by the Armenian Patriarch whose figures were grossly wrong both for Muslims and non-Muslims. The remaining seven estimates made by the Armenian

the government to be as thorough as possible. It is my considered opinion that these statistics represent a reliable source for the study of Ottoman population at the end of the nineteenth century.

*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

bishop in Sivas, by foreigners and Ottoman officials acquainted with the local situation, show the population of Sivas in 1881 as varying between 708,550 and 895,682 people; the Muslim-Christian ratio as varying between 3.4-5.01, exclusive of 50,000 Circasians. The differences between these informed estimates does not differ greatly from

*Statistics of Population of Sivas Vilayet compiled by the British*

Source of statistics	Christians	Christian-Muslim ratio	Muslims	Total
Supplied by the Armenian Patriarch to Her Majesty's Ambassador	62,000	1-1.3	80,000	142,000
Supplied by the Armenian Bishop of Sivas to Lieutenant-Colonel Wilson, Jan. 1880	201,245	1-3.4	694,437	895,682
Supplied by the Armenian Bishop of Sivas to Lieutenant Chermside, Aug. 1880	201,245	1-3.4	694,431	895,676
Supplied by Abédine Pasha to Lieutenant-Colonel Wilson, Jan 1880; statistics obtained by doubling the males	143,174	1-4.0	584,604	727,778
Supplied by unknown to Lieutenant-Colonel Wilson, Jan. 1880; statistics obtained by doubling the males	136,432	1-4.2	578,166	714,598
Supplied by Government to Lieutenant Chermside, Aug. 1880; statistics obtained by doubling the males	143,176	1-5.1	729,872	873,048
Sivas Almanac for 1878; statistics obtained by doubling the males	181,586	1-3.9	711,264	892,850
According to Baker Pasha; statistics obtained by doubling the males	140,732	1-4.0	567,818	708,550

SOURCE: Great Britain, House of Commons, *Accounts and Papers*, vol. 100 (1881), No. 6, p. 99. Patriarch Hassoun's inflated estimates of the number of Armenian Catholics appears in the same source.

the figures obtained in 1893. The latter including new births since 1880 placed the total population of Sivas at 926,671 people of whom 766,558 were Muslims and 160,113 Christians. It is noteworthy that the Armenian Catholic Patriarch Hassoun IX in a letter to the British showed the Armenian Catholics of Sivas as numbering 10,000. The Ottoman census of 1893 showed the number of Catholic Armenians in Sivas province as 3,052 people, almost evenly divided between men and women. Other vilayets show more or less the same pattern.









Administrative unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latins		Monophysites		Non-Muslim groups		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
<b>BEYRUT PROVINCE*</b>																									
Beyrut Sanjak	10969	11693	6473	6821	32	54			7927	7468	582	615	153	189	145	97					25391	26937	54328		
Beyrut Central Kaza									2352	2714	277	297	64	82	21	16					19330	20406	39756		
Sayda									1938	2072			59	57		1					13191	12946	26137		
Sur	16570	17215	66	82					892	899			426	441							9751	9323	19274		
Mercurum	6697	6281	1826	1992					12219	13153	859	912	693	769	166	114					67083	69812	137495		
Total Beyrut Sanjak	45207	45845	8597	8965	32	54																			
Akkat Sanjak (Acre)	9686	10228	1369	1545					1510	1793	62	61	60	70	104	112					12791	13819	26610		
Akkat Central Kaza	6592	7243	220	232					86	749	212	291	3	10	59	65					7704	8990	19394		
Hafra									491	633	94	99	139	149	663	692					6178	6149	14407		
Nabata	3403	3395	1460	1433					80	48	408	391									3018	3161	6179		
Tubarsan	4995	5088	44	42					3129	3660	776	842	204	229	829	876					36604	39278	75882		
Total Akkat Sanjak	28352	30288	3114	3383																					
Lanzkiye Sanjak	17634	19754	879	982					266	270											18770	21006	39776		
Lazkiye Central Kaza	10351	8297							463	572											19351	8297	18648		
Cebelle	14851	13761	1179	1215					2	2											16493	15548	32041		
Merkap	12006	13864	487	645					731	844											12405	14511	27006		
Sakyun	54842	53576	2536	2842																	58109	59302	117471		
Total Lazkiye Sanjak																									
Tmbusgam Sanjak	15749	16781	3320	4237					1487	2038	31	32	15	23	5	8					20787	23139	43926		
Tmbus Central Kaza	6198	6340	3109	4610					2031	2854											11538	13807	23345		
Aklar	13593	13783	884	1179					78	124											14555	15086	29641		
Safita	7686	7978	3336	3517					152	251											11104	11746	22940		
Hamulekrat	43226	44882	11969	13543					3728	5487	31	32	15	26	5	8					58074	63778	121832		
Total Tmbusgam Sanjak																									
Balka Sanjak	13804	16982	283	367					13	22	41	42	112	134	98	130					14353	17977	32820		
Nablia Kaza	14903	19368	6	6																	14903	16714	31687		
Nemnap	9637	16443									3										9837	11446	21281		
Cemnin	9876	16453	155	158									13	14	79	77					13850	16862	30718		
Total Balka Sanjak	32213	61393	446	571					13	22	41	48	125	148	177	207					53015	62209	115314		
<b>TOTAL BEYRUT PROVINCE</b>	222040	237994	25672	29304	32	54			19820	22666	1707	1834	1937	1172	1177	1205					273485	294229	568014		
<b>BITLIS PROVINCE*</b>																									
Bitlis Central Sanjak	18817	23650			12051	18394			10	16			239	322					96	165	31213	44547	75760		
Siirt	22181	26914			5457	6514			1058	1388			202	233					755	965	20653	30614	65607		
Mus	19789	22858			25698	28078			1102	1373			195	307					70	89	46855	57293	99560*		
Genç	12536	18399			2375	2791															14911	21100	36811		
<b>TOTAL BITLIS PROVINCE</b>	71323	93731			45581	53777			2171	2777			656	862					851	1130	122632	154366	276998		
<b>*BIGA SPECIAL DISTRICT</b>																									
Cankale Kaza	4093	4235	2512	2407	432	512					766	729	19	27							125	167	7067	8087	16054
Ezine	13826	14693	2094	2332	195	274			114	126											16229	17425	33054		
Ayvacik	7668	8634	612	1059																			8288	9718	18006
Biga	16735	19897	1447	1713	144	136																	18326	21656	39982
Lipöku	4797	5080	335	570	8	20	180	222															5230	5909	11139
<b>TOTAL BIGA SPECIAL DISTRICT</b>	47029	53439	7020	8081	779	962	180	222			886	875	19	27							133	189	56040	62795	118835

Administrative Unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latinas		Monophysites		Non-Muslim gypsies		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M		
	CEZAYIR-I BAHR-I SEFIT PROVINCE' (AEGEAN ISLANDS)																									
Rhodes Sanjak (Rhodes)																										
Rhodes Kaza	3024	3443	9537	11174	2		1				1316	1374									344	394	14224	16385	36669	
Sembeki "	15	21	2691	3185								3		3							2	3	2768	3260	5912	
Uzra "	110	115	2053	2352																	25	32	2777	3073	5849	
Kas "			822	829																	778	781	1500	1568	3068	
Kavut "	22		802	809																	1149	1213	23959	27116	51075	
Total Rhodes Sanjak	3149	3661	18339	20932	2		1				1319	1377														
Sakia Sanjak																										
Sakia Central Kaza	792	916	16527	18579	9	5					80	99			14	18					1597	1486	18929	21103	40032	
Itanankly "	1202	1237	5116	5343							32	35														
Kallimios "	18	46	4666	4816																						
Lerna "	6	12	3674	2949								4		4												
Kalyot "	4	17	3968	4197							2	2		2												
Ipsara "	5	4	501	418							2	2		2												
Total Sakia Sanjak	2027	2232	34482	36302	9	5					110	140			14	18					1652	1644	38300	40321	78621	
Midilli Sanjak																										
Midilli Central Kaza	2261	2133	12864	17231	8	24																				
Mulva "	3922	4570	13220	17777	12	12																				
Pilmar "	301	358	9218	9506																						
Yunda "	39	50	2059	2328																						
Total Midilli Sanjak	5623	7511	42461	42832	20	36																				
Limni Sanjak																										
Limni Central Kaza	944	1048	9539	10101																						
Imroza "	46	53	4663	4754																						
Bloxanada "	639	618	1163	1316	3	3																				
Total Limni Sanjak	1619	1719	15395	16171	3	3																				
TOTAL CEZAYIR-I SEFIT PROVINCE																										
	12418	15063	110587	116230	34	44	1				1435	1517			14	18					2991	3238	127480	131610	265390	
CATALCA SPECIAL DISTRICT																										
Caetla Central Kaza	3903	3510	4997	5438			604	756																		
Silvri "	1690	2131	4526	4915	439	439					444	321														
Biyukkehmece "	2071	2396	7522	8540	11	13						1														
Total CATALCA SPECIAL DISTRICT	6854	8237	16925	18893	447	452	2639	2957																		
HALEP PROVINCE' (ALEPPO)																										
Haiep Central Sanjak	228413	226148	3562	3988	10100	11595			7722	7758	4697	4639	2371	2521	84	109	1225	1361								
Hama "	54267	61413			9508	11311			1903	2025	677	1791	1781	1891	189	109										
Ullas "	50227	57531			2	4149	3937		244	244	177	182	321	367												
Total HALEP PROVINCE	339997	345992	3562	3990	23754	28653			9869	10067	4981	4932	4393	4689	273	218	1744	1990								



Administrative unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latins		Monophysites		Non-Muslim Egyptians		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
	<b>*DIYARBEKİR PROVINCE</b>																								
Diyarbekir Sanjak	22280	20388	80	112	5772	6311			1194	1366	132	153	473	510			1969	2077	25	28	31925	30945	62870		
Diyarbekir Central Kaza	13514	14057			726	675			50	21	70	39	112	101			261	187			14723	15086	30713		
Siverek	8795	10284			2171	2476			74	88			143	148			348	444			11447	13324	24799		
Diçe	4544	4822			128	175			66	81			92	98			249	321			8645	9344	18018		
Siirt	5486	6182			84	109			1387	1558	202	192	821	858			2825	3044	25	28	71613	76104	147717		
Total Diyarbekir Sanjak	34289	37680	158	196	11866	13148																			
<b>Mardin Sanjak</b>																									
Mardin Central Kaza	11266	11202							1994	2232			218	214			1646	1913			13124	15622	30776		
Midyat	9742	11784			24	29			93	118			146	200			1614	2043			11619	14174	25793		
Care	3168	3867							790	791	85	64	36	36			103	94			4170	3821	8022		
Avniye	10112	11788							51	70			63	79			206	318			10486	12255	22741		
Nusaybin	2849	2286							154		154	107	154	107			1279	1210			4282	3606	7888		
Total Mardin Sanjak	37137	40020			24	29			2028	3212	239	171	451	529			4902	5578			45081	49320	93220		
<b>Maden Sanjak (Ezram)</b>																									
Maden Central Kaza	18976	20023	372	440	1739	2250	7	7	165	132			27	23					39	33	21028	22038	44246		
Çemişçelik	13182	15025			1318	1614			200	211	128	119	477	429							11182	12172	23354		
Falu	17922	20288			6104	6720							164	202							23323	27128	50849		
Total Maden Sanjak	47061	50004	372	440	10163	11593	7	7	365	343	128	119	668	654					57	53	58854	67213	126027		
TOTAL DIYARBEKİR PROVINCE	138487	151104	530	616	22053	24770	7	7	4680	5113	569	482	1940	2041			7767	8622	82	81	176108	192826	368964		
<b>Zor Sanjak</b>																									
Deyr Kaza	7801	7464			28	55			125	175			2	1							7925	7697	15623		
Arsare	5334	5170																			5334	5170	10504		
Retülhân	4152	3942																			4152	3942	8094		
Total Zor Sanjak	17287	16576			28	55			125	175			2	1							17441	16809	34250		
<b>SURİYE PROVINCE (SYRIA)</b>																									
<b>Şam Sanjak (Hama) (Hama)</b>																									
Hama Central Kaza	53925	44686	1901	2260	96	103			2240	2525	3088	3177	32	29	43	47	6				61424	52813	114277		
Dima	31182	29227	81	107					71	112											21323	21140	42462		
Hama	2662	2927			1571				422	468	5	7	152	162							4050	5288	9038		
Rasay	1535	1093	760	583					269	321			0	13							2682	3210	5792		
Vadiliacem	17110	17077	784	1033					153	187											18047	18207	35244		
Baalbek	6241	6765	489	733					1693	2253											8423	9751	18174		
Beika	5990	6633	1064	1347					2298	2044			5	2							9366	10426	20292		
Nebek	15228	15762	768	969					1480	1927			22	29							18098	18717	36815		
Total Şam Sanjak	124498	116921	7364	8905	96	103			8639	10780	3993	3184	22	25	43	47	6				143923	140181	284134		
<b>Hama Sanjak</b>																									
Hama Central Kaza	22262	20875	2692	3231					205	246			13	11	2	2					25274	24265	49939		
Şemniye	1158	172							202	296			102	121							158	172	330		
Hamah	4237	20154			262	378			202	296			102	121							2613	2628	52401		
Hama	1826	1860			168	200			20	20											604	604	1208		
Total Hama Sanjak	39398	47114	3744	4738					2329	3192			115	132	2	2					58788	57826	116614		
TOTAL SURİYE PROVINCE	174806	164023	23108	16201	96	103			11168	13972	3903	3184	335	367	45	49	6				202741	198207	400748		





Administrative unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latvians		Monophyrites		Non-Muslims Gypsies		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M		
<b>TRABZON PROVINCE</b>																										
Trabzon Sanjak																										
Trabzon Central Kaza	37091	42038	13027	14561	4440	5106			588	621			41	51									55187	62377	117564	
Ordu	39596	40173	4702	5696	3386	3966							146	142									4830	49979	98009	
Giresun	27877	28927	5118	6251	610	629																	31865	35787	69391	
Tirebolu	16621	17607	2659	3213	232	281																	19513	21101	40014	
Çörebte	14384	14889	331	377	99	82																	15914	15346	30361	
Vahtifkebir	9680	9395			20	27																	9190	9332	18441	
Aksakabir	19682	19742	1838	1997	1397	1591																	22267	23330	45597	
Çarşamba	5853	6239	2319	2624																			6487	6879	13666	
Gürmeze	10165	20697			71	107																	39514	39142	66637	
Total Trabzon Sanjak	209978	223286	39395	35165	10434	11789			588	621			187	193								250653	271954	521706		
Canik Sanjak (Samann)																										
Canik Central Kaza	15502	17917	15297	17628	454	709			41	23			5	25	23								31319	36305	67624	
Çarşamba	22684	24913	1497	1617	4670	5105							193	224									29044	31859	60903	
Ünye	21348	21960	1781	1914	1662	1973																	24791	25847	50638	
Fatsa	13739	14156	706	946	354	448																		14801	15557	30358
Terme	9685	9953	203	223	793	878																		10053	11054	21107
İspir	10200	10730	11068	11766	406	546																		30734	32043	62782
Total Canik Sanjak	101558	108635	39354	34094	8300	9059			41	23			5	218	247									140744	150790	293412
Lazistan Sanjak																										
Lazistan Central Kaza	31595	41154	308	333																				31993	41487	73390
Pazarçın	17246	16192			20	22																		17266	16514	33480
İzpa	15046	14393			52	5																		15048	14362	29410
Total Lazistan Sanjak	63887	71651	308	385	22	27																		64217	72063	136380
Gümüşhane Sanjak																										
Gümüşhane Central Kaza	10200	11756	2666	2793	514	638																		12380	15187	28367
Torul	9001	10457	8000	8679																				17901	19136	36137
Kelkit	11059	12191	163	141	58	55																		12180	12387	23067
Siran	7115	7406	834	892	100	121																		8049	8419	16468
Total Gümüşhane Sanjak	37375	41810	11063	12295	672	814																		49710	55729	104639
TOTAL TRABZON PROVINCE	411898	445382	72890	82140	19497	22289			659	644			5	405	440									505311	559916	1095637

Administrative unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latins		Monophysites		Non-Muslim Egyptians		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total			
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M				
<b>*KASTAMONU PROVINCE</b>																												
Kastamonu Sanjak																												
Kastamonu Central Kaza	28107	26688	813	782	261	300																			29181	27370	56551	
Inebolu "	29678	29004	730	758	9	8																				30426	29770	60196
Safranbolu "	24070	23127	1638	1668																						25728	25795	51523
Tosya "	16288	16731	236	223																						16544	16980	33520
Taşköprü "	19264	20075	300	296	86	96																				19804	20371	40235
Daday "	20724	19714	6	4																						20686	19814	40500
Çarşamba "	15698	17253																								15858	17414	33272
Çideci "	19431	19338																								19431	19338	38769
Total Kastamonu Sanjak "	172730	172730	3772	3763	356	404																				177884	177897	355781
Bolu Sanjak																												
Bolu Central Kaza	21612	21034		17	307	428																				22020	21492	43512
Bartın "	24284	23533	200	180	95	100			13																	24570	23815	50394
Ereğli "	15926	17981	363	372		7			23																	16280	18333	34612
(K. Deniz) "	20174	19130	27	97		7																				20201	19437	39638
Gerede "	8377	7762	2	9		52																				8379	7771	16150
Göynük "	14497	16015	22	28	13	52			2																	14532	16148	30680
Düzce "	13241	13148				102																				13241	13148	26389
Niğde "	21390	28231				102																				21390	28231	49621
Hamidiye "	139020	148836	614	733	667	779			36																	140991	150387	291288
Total Bolu Sanjak "																												
Sinop Sanjak																												
Sinop Central Kaza	10510	20715	2028	2015	123	150																				21720	22026	44656
Bozbat "	20132	22540	22	62																						20154	22602	42756
Ayancık "	13960	14620	575	618		150																				14335	15267	29602
Total Sinop Sanjak "	53611	57013	2625	2715	123	150																				57273	61740	119022
Cankiri Sanjak																												
Cankiri Central Kaza	41100	42917	368	390	155	143																				41713	43450	85163
Cerkes "	26937	27320																								26937	27320	54257
İnkilap "	20724	22517				143																				20724	22517	43241
Total Cankiri Sanjak "	88871	92693	368	390	155	143																				89394	93480	182870
TOTAL KASTAMONU PROVINCE																												
	455838	472442	7390	7601	1301	1476			2																	461452	483250	948981

Administrative unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latins		Monophytes		Non-Muslim gypsies		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total		
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M			
<b>KOSOVA PROVINCE<sup>1</sup></b>																											
Ukup Sanjak (Shqipte)																											
Ukup Central Kaza	19469	20787	3219	3436			10839	11668			308	416													33825	39245	70170
Ukup	11437	12729	11	24			8131	9444			206	250													19688	22423	42451
Kamova	2193	2139					9399	10249																	1823	1242	3385
Rudriqe	4968	6341					3341	3883																	1573	1242	3385
Katrine	9335	10613	12	75			1591	1887																	10530	12702	41896
Planica	10683	11553	171	217			8674	10321																	10088	10372	41896
Kerava	10683	11553	24	40			15807	17323																	20688	20772	41896
Total Ukup Sanjak	55429	60429	3447	3801			70262	77586			568	666													120750	144381	273331
Pristine Sanjak																											
Pristine Central Kaza	24634	27080					7371	7097			152	153													32821	36999	69820
Vilcitrin	6759	14193					811	2116																	7570	16309	23879
Metrovce	1033	3401					512	3398																	1545	6799	8344
Gilan	14288	18450					9643	9660																	22649	29010	51659
Preuva	7770	8168					12179	13868																	19949	22030	41985
Total Pristine Sanjak	34484	71192					30418	37939			152	153													80534	111153	197087
Yenipazar Sanjak																											
Yenipazar Central Kaza	5285	7148					1697	4063			5	7													6187	11618	20805
Yenipazar	9144	9938					7386	7790			78	72													16690	17820	34431
Abova	6168	7372					2217	2416																	8185	9688	10873
Yenivaraz	680	668					3449	3594			2	3													4131	4255	8386
Asaglikolan	2472	2472					554	554																	4131	3020	3020
Total Yenipazar Sanjak	21478	27068					16749	18423			85	82													38312	46413	84725
Tajlic Sanjak																											
Tajlic Central Kaza	6155	7789	2592	4545																					8747	12334	21081
Prepol	3097	3514	4850	5168																					7497	8682	16659
Total Tajlic Sanjak	9252	11303	7442	9713																					10694	21016	37710
Ipek Sanjak																											
Ipek Central Kaza	8114						4348																			12836	12836
Yenova	9266						88																			10911	10911
Terapite	6626						58																			1283	1283
Iberane	650						1640																			2266	2266
Gonane	2329						356																			2633	2633
Total Ipek Sanjak	25320						7186																			34059	34059
Prizren Sanjak																											
Prizren Central Kaza	35492						7100																			43552	43552
Lume	7011						9830																			7011	7011
Kallenditen	29212						16930																			44032	44032
Total Prizren Sanjak	71715						16930																			94593	94593
<b>TOTAL KOSOVA PROVINCE</b>	<b>140643</b>	<b>268867</b>	<b>10889</b>	<b>18304</b>			<b>117429</b>	<b>157364</b>			<b>805</b>	<b>901</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1481</b>	<b>4107</b>									<b>271200</b>	<b>449797</b>	<b>721087</b>





Administrative unit	Muslims		Greeks		Armenians		Bulgarians		Catholics		Jews		Protestants		Latins		Monophysites		Non-Muslim expatriates		Foreign citizens		Total		Grand total						
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M							
<b>*YANYA PROVINCE (JANINA)</b>																															
Yanya Sanjak																															
Yanya Central Kaza	2124	2615	37694	39564									1531	1893							93	114	41442	44116	85558						
Aydonat "	1681	2310	4843	5748																	5	5	6590	8063	14592						
Filat "	4581	5358	6878	7154	18	20															8	32	11478	12732	24210						
Nevva "			2336	2723																			3344	2755	5099						
Lezkovik "	2219	2328	6585	6976																			8804	9597	18311						
Konije "	614	815	7173	7965																			7797	8783	16570						
Yedigöller "	4413	5460	10160	9943	4	12																	10577	10405	20972						
Pazar " "	871	9714	5031	5268	2	1																	12770	15965	28725						
Total Yanya Sanjak	20386	23966	80790	83933	1535	1842															106	151	102722	111560	214288						
<b>Ergiri Sanjak</b>																															
Ergiri Central Kaza	5767	6024	9458	9139																					15225	15464	30689				
Delvine "	2810	3975	6571	7154																					150	230	9531	10460	19991		
Tepedelen "	9111	10456	3113	3135																					12324	13591	25915				
Kurvetas "	5495	5241	2523	2635																					7828	7876	15704				
Total Ergiri Sanjak	23083	24796	21675	22363																					150	231	44908	47391	92299		
<b>Berat Sanjak</b>																															
Berat Central Kaza	34023	38119	16895	18791																							59030	59913	107843		
Çoçuc " "	3597	3954	86	176																							3683	4132	7815		
Alonya " "	11376	13614	1916	2395					35	48																	13339	16276	29615		
Çelebi " "	5456	6396	156	163																							6119	6413	12532		
Total Berat Sanjak	54456	61937	19953	21727					35	48																	73358	82434	155992		
<b>Prevese Sanjak</b>																															
Prevese Central Kaza	754	887	4213	5422																							45	154	5092	6195	11687
Loros "	381	785	7179	7862																							7574	8681	16255		
Margiliç "	6533	7821	4956	5481																							45	116	11534	13422	24956
Total Prevese Sanjak	7679	9493	16368	18765																							90	270	24200	28968	53188
<b>TOTAL YANYA PROVINCE</b>																															
ISTANBUL CITY AND GREATER ISTANBUL	195589	119826	137796	148368					35	48	1642	2035															346	652	245208	271069	516477
<b>ISTANBUL PROVINCE</b>																															
ISTANBUL CITY AND GREATER ISTANBUL	183771	201339	60937	91804	63720	83870	400	3977	3209	3233	3209	21967	22394	331	488	554	528									28238	101205	364751	368814	873965	

\* Census completed except for the Çalici tribe.  
 \* Census completed only for Düz Sanjak, dependent Kaza, and centrally dependent Akpazar Kaza.  
 \* Omittas are excluded from the census, and the census of the mutasir is not yet completed.  
 \* Census completed except for Hakkari Sanjak.  
 \* Census has not yet been completed.  
 \* Census has been completed except for the Sporato islands.  
 \* Except tribal population.  
 \* Tribes not included.  
 \* Census completed except for Havran Sanjak which was excluded from the census, as were a few tribes.  
 \* Census completed except for Frazin, Ipek, and Topuzlar Sanjaks.  
 \* Districts not included.  
 \* Tribes not included.  
 \* Census completed except for Debre and İhsan Sanjaks.  
 \* Census completed except for Hakkari Sanjak.

