
The Mariupol Greeks: Tsarist Treatment of an Ethnic Minority ca. 1778-1859

VYRON KARIDIS

THE COMMANDING IMPORTANCE OF MIGRATION in modern Greek history has been generally recognized. It is not an exaggeration to suggest that the Greeks who during the period of Ottoman rule in Southeastern Europe set forth from their lands and homes to other countries and continents decisively changed the probable course of Greece as a modern national state. Each of them is the true subject in the history of the Greek Diaspora, for behind the historic 'causes' or 'factors' or 'forces,' was a family or a person who had to make an individual choice to move, and then carry it through to the ultimate destination.¹ This article is a contribution in that saga of movement and deals with a land where many thousands of Greeks came to seek their fortunes.

About twenty-five years ago Greeks in the Soviet Union numbered 310,000 of whom 42% regarded Greek as their mother tongue. They were divided into two distinct groups; firstly 94,000 living mostly along the north and northeastern shores of the Sea of Azov, especially in and

This article originated from a paper which I gave in the ninth International Symposium organized by the Modern Greek Studies Association of America (Columbus, Ohio, 7-10 November 1985).

¹There exists a vast literature on the diaspora Greek communities during the *Turkokratia*. For detailed references, maps of migration patterns, routes and settlements, as well as for a thorough bibliography see Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού* (Thessaloniki, 1964) 2, pp. 466-86, and vol. 4, (Thessaloniki, 1973), pp. 157-236, 457-63, 586-90, 736-37; for a brief overview of the subject see D. A. Zakythinos, *The Making of Modern Greece*, trans. K. H. Johnstone (Oxford, 1976), pp. 115-39; for a marxist interpretation see Nikos Psyrroukis, *Τὸ Νεοελληνικὸ Παροικιακὸ Φαινόμενο* (Athens, 1974); and the excellent analysis by Konstantinos Tsoukalas, *Ἐξάρτηση καὶ Ἀναπαραγωγή* (Athens, 1976), pp. 269-371.

around the town of Zhdanov — formerly Mariupol — of whom 89% used Russian as their everyday languages; and secondly 150,000 living in Transcaucasia and some parts of the Northern Caucasus, many of whom were Turkish speaking as most were descendant from the Greek emigrants who came from Asiatic Turkey (Pontic Greeks).²

But except for statistical investigation the story of the Greek communities in Russia has not received the attention it merits.³ The valuable work of sociologists and economists has been handicapped by the lack of historic perspective which they rightfully expect of the historian. This article attempts to provide a comprehensive analysis of the policies of the Russian Imperial government in relation to the Greek settlement in Mariupol.⁴ It is primarily an account of the formulation and implementation of government policy. If the treatment suggests a 'school' it is that of the American historian Marcus Lee Hansen who conceived the immigrant as a person who exchanged societies and had to synthesize two cultures in so doing. My debt to Hansen is deep although he has not supplied a single citation.⁵

The area with which this article is principally concerned is that part of South Russia called by contemporaries New Russia. Catherine the Great (1762-96) was not only responsible for initiating the rapid expansion of Russian possessions along the Black Sea but also for establishing their administration. In 1764 she created the new province or *guberniia* of New Russia (*Novorusskaia guberniia*; *Novorossiiskaia guberniia* after 1796).⁶ It was located along what was the then Turkish

²S. V. Utechin, *Everyman's Concise Encyclopaedia on Russia* (London and New York, 1961), p. 210; see also V. Kubijovyč, ed., *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia* (Toronto, 1961), p. 233. Conquest claims that the Greek population of the USSR was 285,000 in 1940 see Robert Conquest, *The Nation Killers: The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities* (London, 1970), p. 111. According to the Soviet census of the year 1970, Greeks in the Soviet Union numbered 336,869; see Tsentral'noe statisticheskoe upravlenie pri soвете ministrov SSSR. *Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1970 goda* (Moscow, 1973) 4, p. 10.

³The works of D. Metaxas — Laskaratos, *Ἑλληνικαὶ Παροικίαι Ρωσσίας καὶ Ρουμανίας* (Braila, 1900); Th. Panagiotidis, *Ὁ ἐν Ρωσσίᾳ Ἑλληνισμός* (Athens, 1919); E. Pavlidis, *Ὁ Ἑλληνισμός τῆς Ρωσσίας καὶ τὰ τριαντατρία χρόνια τοῦ ἐν Ἀθῆναις σωματείου τῶν ἐκ Ρωσσίας Ἑλλήνων* (Athens, 1953) are useful; on the Greek emigration movement in Russia see G. L. Arsh, "Greches-Kaia emigratsiia v Rossii v Kontse XVIII — nachale XIX v." *Sovetskaia Ethnografiia*, 3 (1963) 85-95.

⁴On the Greek community in Mariupol see F. A. Braun, "Mariupol'ski greki," *Zhivnaia Starina*, 1 (1890) 78-92; and I. I. Sokolov, "Mariupol'skie greki," *Trydy instituta slavianovedeniia AN SSSR*, 1 (1932) pp. 297-317; see also Anonymous, "Περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῆς μεσημβρινῆς Ρωσσίας," *Πανδώρα*, 4, (1853-54) pp. 80-2, 100-07; *ibid* 16 (1866) 533-38.

⁵Marcus L. Hansen, *The Atlantic Migration 1607-1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940).

⁶See the decrees in *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii* (first series), hereafter cited as *PSZ*, 16, 297-99, no. 11861; 657-67, no. 12099; 795-99, no. 12180; see also N. D. Polonska-Vasylenko, *The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine, 1750-75* (New York, 1955), pp. 183-90.

frontier, about 180 miles south-east of Kiev and the Dnieper river. Thereafter under the able direction of Gregory Potemkin (1775-91) a policy of the rapid development of the newly acquired lands was undertaken. Early in 1775 he journeyed to New Russia to direct personally the economic transformation of the area.⁷ In June the Governor — General of New Russia — for such was Potemkin's new title — ordered the Zaporozhian Sech on the Don to be disbanded. The Sech, the 'Mother of Cossackdom,' was taken by military force with little regard given for its services to the Russian state in the recent Russo-Turkish war (1768-74); its land was included within the jurisdiction of New Russia.⁸ Simultaneously a vast building programme was set in motion. Towns were established on previously empty plains; ports, harbours and wharves were constructed and the foundation of the Black Sea fleet laid. The new 'Romanov' towns — Elizavetgrad, Ekaterinoslav, Pavlograd, Alexandrovsk and Konstantinograd — were located in the northern part of New Russia on the old steppe frontier, but they were economically oriented southward along the rivers of the newly established ports of Kherson, Nikolaev and Odessa.⁹

A relatively stable administration for the new lands was not achieved until October 8, 1802, when by an *ukaz* or decree of Alexander I (1801-25), New Russia was permanently divided into three provinces: Ekaterinoslav, Nikolaev (later Kherson) and Taurida, formed mainly from the Crimean Khanate.¹⁰ It should be noted however, that after 1802 the term New Russia did not correspond to any officially recognized territorial division of the Russian Empire, although the name continued to be widely used by contemporaries. Bessarabia acquired by the Treaty of Bucharest (May 18, 1812), was an *oblast* (district), the chief administrative official of which was a *namestnik* (vice-gerent). This office was also filled by the Governor-General. M. S. Vorontsov's official title was, for example, *General Gubernator i Namestnik Bessarabskoi oblasti*.¹¹ Because of this administrative association,

⁷Th. Adamczuk, *Fürst G. A. Potemkin. Untersuchungen zu seiner Lebensgeschichte* (Emsdetten, 1936), pp. 78 ff; also on Potemkin's role in New Russia see E. A. Zagorovsky, *Organizatsiia upravleniia Novorossii pri Potemkine* (Odessa, 1913), and *Ekonomicheskaiia politika Potemkina v Novorossii* (Odessa, 1926).

⁸*PSZ* 20, 53-55, no. 14251; 190-93, no. 14354; see also Adamczuk, pp. 72-78; H. Auerbach, *Die Besiedelung der Südukraine in der Jahren 1774-78* (Wiesbaden, 1965), pp. 55-62; and P. L. Longworth, *The Cossacks* (London, 1969), pp. 228-29.

⁹Soviet scholarship has produced important works on the development of South Russia. See in particular E. J. Druzhinina, *Severnoe prichernomor'e, 1775-1806* (Moscow, 1959); and by the same author, *Iuzhnaia Ukraina v period Krizisa feodalizma, 1825-1860* (Moscow, 1981).

¹⁰*PSZ*, 27, 272-90, no. 20449.

¹¹E. I. Indova, *Krepostnoe Khoziaistvo v nachale XIX veka po materialiam votchinogo arkhiva Vorontsovskikh* (Moscow, 1955), p. 34.

Bessarabia too came to be considered as part of New Russia.

The salient physical feature of the New Russian steppes was size and emptiness. They amounted to about 93,400 square miles — roughly the size of England, Wales and Scotland.¹² New Russia was characterized also by a very low ratio of population to available lands. As late as 1789 there were still less than 100,000 Christians and about 100,000 Tatars living in the whole of the New Russian lands.¹³ Therefore, during the second half of the eighteenth and early years of the nineteenth centuries the successive Russian governments is an attempt to fill and exploit uninhabited territory, mainly in the south provinces of the empire, introduced the deliberate settlement of foreign immigrants in the border areas of European Russia.¹⁴

The systematic settlement of foreigners — the creation of *nashi kolonii* (our colonies) — began with Catherine's manifestos of December 4, 1762, and of July 22, 1763, which set the stage for mass immigration into Russia during her reign.¹⁵ Far more important was the legislation governing the settlement of Russian subjects and individual foreigners in the southern areas of the empire. In the decree of March 22, 1764, including the 'Plan' concerning the distribution of state lands in the New Russian Province for their settlement,¹⁶ the general principles were enunciated which, with alterations, were later supplied

¹²E. Olberg, ed., *Statistische Tabelle* (Berlin, 1859), p. 37. The size and emptiness of the New Russian Steppes impressed most of the contemporaries. As the German traveller J. G. Kohl put it: 'On crossing the Dnieper we soon became sensible that we had entered a new country, as indeed, a traveller mostly does after crossing a large river. Nothing like a wood of the least extent was any longer to be seen, but only here and there on the distant horizon groups of small trees, and after passing Yelisabethgrad (*sic*) the complete naked steppe lay spread out before us in all its dreariness and desolation. . .'; see J. G. Kohl, *Russia, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkoff, Riga, Odessa, the German Provinces on the Baltic, the Steppes, and the Interior of the Empire* (London, 1842), p. 406.

¹³Duc de Richelieu, 'Memoire sur la Nouvelle Russie,' Shornick Imperatorskago Russkago Istoricheskago Obshchestva (hereafter cited as *SIRIO*), 54, 290; idem, "Mémoire sur Odessa," *SIRIO*, 54, 369. According to another observer, in the year 1793, when a census was taken throughout the Russian empire, there were in the whole district of Taurida, no more than 85,805 males and 71,328 females, together 157,133 persons, including all ages; see P. S. Pallas, *Travels through the Southern Provinces of the Russian Empire in the Years 1793 and 1794* (London, 1812) 2, p. 343.

¹⁴On the colonization policy of New Russia see the excellent study of Roger P. Bartlett, *Human Capital. The Settlement of Foreigners in Russia, 1762-1804* (Cambridge, 1979); see also D. I. Bagaley, 'Kolonizatsiia Novorossiiskogo Kraia i pervye shagi ego po puti kul'tury, *Kievskaiia Starina*, 25-26 (April, 1889) 27-55; (May-June 1889) 438-85; (July 1889) 110-48; and V. M. Kabuzan, *Zaselenie Novorossii (Ekaterinoslavskoi i Khersonskoi gubernii v XVIII — pervoi polovine XIX v.)* (Moscow, 1979).

¹⁵*PSZ*, 16, 126-27, no. 11720; 313-16, no. 11880; see a summary of 1763 manifesto in W. Tooke, *View of the Russian Empire* (London, 1799), 2, pp. 243 ff.

to the vast areas of virtually unpopulated land in South Russia.¹⁶

Chapter 6 of the Plan on commerce and industry took full account of New Russia's border position and military character. Trade was to be fostered with the Crimea and with Turkey. Merchants and craftsmen were invited to settle in the main cities and towns of the province. Skilled tradesmen and entrepreneurs opening workshops received special privileges, including in some cases the right to acquire serfs. Those establishing workshops and factories that would serve the needs of the armed forces on which represented infant industries, had the right to receive lands and in some cases state loans at 6% per annum. Foreign artisans could also claim help in equipping themselves, depending on the value of their craft to the community. The most extensive privileges, however, went to those who set up silk farms, vineyards, and tobacco factories.¹⁷

Several factors determined the new policy. Firstly, the eighteenth century was a period of 'populationism.' Political theory and government practice placed great emphasis on the principle that the wealth and strength of state depend upon the size of its population.¹⁸ Catherine was a confirmed adherent of 'populationist' views and well aware of their applicability to Russia.¹⁹ In Article 265 of her Instruction to the Legislative Commission of 1767-68 she declared:

Russia is not only greatly deficient in the number of her Inhabitants; but at the same Time, extends her Dominion over immense Tracts of land; which are neither peopled nor improved. And therefore, in a Country so circumstanced, too much Encouragement can never be given to the Propagation of the human Species.²⁰

A second more specific consideration for encouraging immigration was

¹⁶*PSZ*, 16, 657-76, no. 12099; there is an excellent analysis of the Plan in Bartlett, pp. 111 ff; see also J. A. Duran, "Catherine II, Potemkin, and Colonization Policy in Southern Russia," *Russian Review*, 28 (January, 1969) 23-26.

¹⁷Bartlett, pp. 114-15.

¹⁸The first principle which presents itself, wrote Frederic the Great of Prussia in his Political Testament in 1768, 'the most general and the most true, is that the real strength of the state consists of the number of its subjects'; quoted in E. N. Williams, *The Ancient Regime in Europe. Government and Society in the Major States 1648-1789* (London, Sydney and Toronto, 1970), p. 354.

¹⁹No price in modern times has ever made the subject of population so intimate a concern of government as the late empress, claimed William Tooke; see Tooke, 2, p. 241.

²⁰W. F. Reddaway, ed., *Documents of Catherine the Great. The Correspondence with Voltaire and the Instruction of 1767 in the English Text of 1768* (Cambridge, 1931), p. 257.

the huge extend of underdeveloped land in the empire awaiting exploitation — Catherine's belief in the importance of agricultural colonization was strengthened by her acceptance of physiocratic economic doctrines emphasizing agriculture as the source of wealth. In Article 294 of her Instruction she wrote: 'There can be neither skilful Handicraftsmen, nor a firmly-established Commerce, where Agriculture is neglected or carried with Supineness and Negligence.' She stressed that cultivation of the lands was more important economically than livestock raising because 'they furnish development for a much greater Number of People.' Very critical of the heavy exactions of the landlords and of the government, she pointed out that her empire 'will, in length of Time, be deserted by Its Inhabitants,' because the people 'can with utmost Difficulty find means for procuring a bare subsistence.' When depopulation resulted 'from some internal Defect in the Constitution, and a bad Administration' she felt that a policy must be urgently pursued in settling farmers on those lands left fallow and uncultivated.²¹

In the early nineteenth century some of the advocates of the new immigration policy saw in immigration primarily a means to bring into Russia new skills and techniques. Emperor Alexander could on the one hand appeal to the manifestos of Catherine and on the other hand learn much from previous experience. His manifesto of February 20, 1804, contained fundamental additions and changes. The most important was the settlement of empty lands by a limited number of immigrants which could serve as models for agricultural occupations and handicrafts.²² The lawgiver was therefore, less concerned with the quantity than the quality of the immigrants; he was not interested in a large number, but in capable settlers. European immigration continued until 1819, when it was severely restricted by a 'temporary' suspension; in 1833 the government decided that it should be finally discontinued.²³ Non-European settlers, principally from the Balkans, were unaffected by this legislation. Some considerable immigration took place later in the century, but it had a basis somewhat different from that created by Catherine II.²⁴

²¹Idem, pp. 258-60; concerning Catherine's economic ideas see B. Dmytryshyn, "The Economic Content of the 1767 Nakaz of Catherine 2," *ASEER* 19 (1960) 1-9.

²²*PSZ*, 28, 137-40, no. 21163; see also the instructions received by the ministers and the foreign Courts in K. Stumpp, *The German Russians. Two Centuries of Pioneering* (Bonn and New York, 1967), p. 11.

²³*PSZ*, 36, 325, no. 27912; *PSZ* (Second Series), 8, 396-97, no. 6298.

²⁴Armenians were valued both as merchants and as producers and workers for the sick; Bulgarians were welcomed as skilled horticulturists; and Greeks from Turkey as co-religionists and as victims of Turkish oppression. For a brief sketch see Bartlett's introduction to the 1972 reprint of A. A. Klaus, *Nashi Kolonii. Opyty i materialy po istorii i statistike inostrannykh Kolonizatsii v Rossii*, vypusk 1 (St. Petersburg 1869, reprinted Cambridge 1972).

The colonists who responded to the invitation of the Tsarist governments were of varied origin and nationality. The terms were generous and the response large, as not only those attracted by economic opportunity but religious minorities and political fugitives from the French revolution came mainly to South Russia as colonists.²⁵ Most of the European settlers came from Germany, the great hunting ground of all colonial powers. The emigration movement from Hessen and Rhineland to the Volga territory during the years 1763-68 assumed frightening proportions.²⁶ One of the most important groups were the German Mennonites. Long established in West Prussia and on the Rhineland, this religious sect, which acquired that its members made their living by agriculture and agriculture only, faced a shortage of land by the late eighteenth century. From 1783 onwards, they started emigrating to South Russia.²⁷ There were Frenchmen and Italiens on the Volga; as well as Italians, Spanish, Maltese, Swedes and Swiss in the South Ukraine.²⁸ In common Russian usage most of those minority groups were counted together with the Germans, so that the term 'German Colonies' came to designate all European settlements.

The second largest immigrant grouping likewise received the name of its principal constituent body the Bulgarians. These settlers mainly coming from the other side of the Danube, were called Zadunaytsy and included many Turkish-speaking, but Christian, people from Bulgaria known as Gagauzy. As early as 1790 a considerable number of Bulgarian families were moved to the Bug.²⁹ Five years later the government allocated 15,000 *desiatinas* (1 *desiatina* = 2.7 acres) of suitable land

²⁵The most famous of these was the Duc de Richelieu who, as Governor-General of New Russia (1803-14), promoted the region's economic growth; see L. Pingaud, *Le Duc de Richelieu en Russie* (Paris, 1882).

²⁶Stumpp, p. 12; Bartlett, pp. 57 ff. For further information on the German Russians see the valuable work of A. A. Klaus, *Nashi Kolonii* (St. Petersburg, 1869); and K. Stumpp, *The Emigration from Germany to Russia in the Years 1763-1862* (Tübingen), n.d. [1972] see also an extensive bibliography in K. Stumpp, *Das schrifttum über das Deutschum in Russland. Eine Bibliographie* (Tübingen, 1971).

²⁷A. von Haxthausen, *The Russian Empire. Its People, Institutions and Resources* (2 vols, London, 1856) 1, pp. 421 ff. The first charter to the Mennonites was issued in 1788 and a group of Danzig Mennonites left for Russia in that year; see A. Ehrh, *Das Mennonitentum in Russland* (Langeusala, 1932), chaps 1 and 2; see also P. M. Friesen, *Die Alt-Evangelische Mennonitische Bruderschaft in Russland, 1789-1910* (Halbstadt, 1911).

²⁸On all these colonists see G. G. Pisarevsky, *Iz istorii Kolonizatsii v Rossii vo 2 — oy 1/2 e XVIII V.* (Moscow, 1909) pp. 221 ff; see also Druzhinina, Severnoe Prichernomor'e, pp. 68, 159-60, 164-66, 193; for further details on the Swiss colonists in Russia see W. Kirchner, "Emigration to Russia," *AHR*, 55 (April, 1950) 552-66.

²⁹A. A. Skalkovskii, *Bolgarskii Kolonii v Bessarabii i Novorossiiskom Krae* (Odessa, 1848), pp. 6 ff; see also Pisarevsky, pp. 338-39.

for a Greek settlement just outside Odessa.³⁰ In 1807 very considerable sums of money were expended by the authorities in establishing Balkan colonists in New Russia. Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, Moldavians and Wallachians, and even Turks, were brought into groups and at government expense, given large tracts of land, furnished with necessary materials and supplies, granted extensive political, religious and legal privileges, and given exemption from certain taxes and military obligations.³¹

The active colonization policy adopted in the South Russian lands from 1762-63 onwards with the regard to foreign immigration enjoyed a certain measure of success. The case of Etanerinoslav, which was the province that Mariupol belonged, may serve as an example for the whole of New Russia. In the mid 1770's the total population of the area had been estimated at approximately 262,920 individuals. In 1787 the figures of a special census totalled 724,678; an increase in thirteen years of 461,758 persons. In 1793 the population had increased by another 95,053 for a total accession in approximately twenty years of more than 555,000.³² So effective were the various policies permitting and encouraging migration that by 1813 the population of New Russia increased to 1,600,000 and ten years later it was over 2,000,000.³³

The Greek emigration to New Russia, which followed the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74,³⁴ coincided with the emigration of the Crimean Greeks to the northern shores of the Sea of Azov.³⁵ Unfortunately we know very little about the origin of the Crimean Greeks. It is well known that there were Greek colonies on the northern shores of the Black Sea since the seventh century B.C. Tyras on the mouth of the Dniester, Olbia in the estuary of the Bug, Chersonesus, Theodosia and Panticapaeum in the Crimea, Tanais at the mouth of the Don and

³⁰PSZ, 23, 686-88, no. 17320; see also V. Karidis, 'A Greek Mercantile *Paroikia* Odessa 1794-1829,' in Richard Clogg, ed., *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence* (London, 1981), pp. 111-28.

³¹Ch. Sicard, "Notice sur onze années de la vie du duc de Richelieu a Odessa pour servir a l'histoire de sa vie," *SIRIO*, 54, 226.

³²Druzhinina, Severnoe Prichernomor'e, pp. 69, 199-200; see also V. M. Kabuzan, *Narodonaselenie Rossii v XVIII Pervoi Polovine XX Veka* (Moscow, 1963), p. 164.

³³Haxthausen, 2, pp. 319-20.

³⁴On the Greek emigration to New Russia after the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74 see Arsh, "Grecheskaia emigratsiia," pp. 85-87.

³⁵On the migration of the Crimean Greeks to Russia see A. Gavriil, "Pereselenie grekov iz Kryma v Azovskaia guberniia," *Zapiski Odesskogo Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostei* (hereafter cited as *ZOOID*), 1 (1844) 197-204; N. Murzakevich, "Otvod zemli grekam v 1780 g. pereseliavshimsia iz Kpyma K azovskomu moriu," *ZOOID*, 4 (1860) 359-63; and S. Serafimov, *Krymskie Khristiane (Greki) na severnykh beregakh Azovskago Moria* (Cherson, 1862).

Phanagoria by the estuary of Kuban, played a major role in the economic and cultural history of the ancient world.³⁶ By the end of the antiquity most of these North Pontic cities had gradually fallen before invaders and lost their importance. Two of them, however, Chersonesus and Panticapaeum, survived into the medieval period. As early as the fourth century A.D. three Christian bishoprics were established in the Crimea; the sees of Cherson, Bosporus and Gothia.³⁷ By the second half of the eighth century the Greek Orthodox church of Sougdaia was a bishopric as well.³⁸ In the ninth century the Byzantines created the Theme of Cherson.³⁹ During the thirteenth century, as Byzantium's internal institutions had fallen into rapid decay and her sea power dwindled, the Genoese and to a lesser extent, other Italian city-states founded or developed their own colonies around the Black Sea.⁴⁰ By 1475 all the Christian colonies of the Crimea were absorbed by Tatar and Turkish conquests.⁴¹ For a period of about three hundred years the Crimean peninsula was to be under the rule of the Ciray dynasty.

During the Tatar-Ottoman rule, as in the rest of the Ottoman Empire, the Orthodox hierarchy had a considerable power over the Orthodox Christians of the Crimean Khanate. In July 1678, the bishopric of Gothia was united with that of Caffa (Kefe). In 1680 the Metropolitan of Gothia was Neophytos and in 1707 Makarios. From 1710 to 1721 the Metropolitan of Gothia and Caffa was Parthenios. This title of the hierarchs of Gothia survived down to the end of their eparchy. From 1725 to 1779 the Metropolitan of Gothia was Gedeon, whose seat was in Mariampol, a suburb of Bahcesaray, the residence of the Crimean Khans. His rule was interrupted in 1750, when for some reason, probably political, he was exiled by Patriarch Cyril V to the Varlaam

³⁶J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas: The Archaeology of Their Early Colonies and Trade* (London, 1973), pp. 232-54. For further reading see the fundamental studies of E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913), and M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* (Oxford, 1922).

³⁷A. A. Vasiliev, *The Goths in the Crimea* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 4 ff.

³⁸M. G. Nystazopoulou, 'H ἐν τῇ Ταυρικῇ χερσονήσῳ πόλις Σουγδαία ἀπὸ τοῦ ΙΓ' μέχρι τοῦ ΙΕ' αἰῶνος. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τῆς Νοτίου Ρωσίας (Athens, 1965), p. 82.

³⁹A. Petrusi, ed., *Constantino Porfirogenito de Thematis* (Vaticano, 1952), pp. 98-99, 182-83; D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (London, 1971), pp. 175-76.

⁴⁰M. G. Nystazopoulou, "Venice et la Mer Noire du XI^e au XV^e siècle," *Thisaurismata*, 7 (1970) 15-51; see also G. T. Bratianu, *Recherches sur le commerce genois dans la Mer Noire au XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1929), pp. 197 ff.

⁴¹F. E. de la Primaudaie, *Histoire du commerce de la Mer Noire et des colonies Genoises de la Krimee* (Paris, 1848), pp. 198-204; W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge* (2 vols. Leipzig, 1923) 2, pp. 365ff; see also Vasiliev, pp. 235 ff.

monastery of Meteora in Thessaly; but after ten years of exile, in 1760, he returned to the Crimea and again became Metropolitan of Gothia. In 1759 a special *firman* (decree) was issued by the Sultan Mustafa III in which he commands that Gedeon shall rule as Metropolitan 'over the Christians dwelling in Caffa, Mankup, Balaclava, and Azov, according to former example, old customs, and their law.'⁴²

It is likely that the Christians had adopted all but the faith of Crimean Muslim culture. According to M. de Peyssonnel, the French consul in the Crimea, there were eight Christian churches in Caffa in 1756;⁴³ the same observer found that Orthodox Greeks were concentrated with the non-Muslim population of the Khanate, mainly in the southern part of the peninsula.⁴⁴ By that time, according to W. Eton, a contemporary writer and for many years resident in Turkey and in Russia:

The Christians and Jews paid a capitation tax as in Turkey, to the beys of mursas; but they were infinitely less vexed than in Turkey, enjoyed more protection, and were treated with less insolence and indignity.

As in the rest of the Eastern Mediterranean world Armenians and Greeks operated most of the productive industry and commerce of the Khanate and it seems that together with the Karaim Jews they maintained their own law courts on the basis of their traditional law.⁴⁶

By the late 1770s the Russians, probably in an attempt to weaken the theoretically independent Crimean Khanate, encouraged a great part of its non-Muslim population (Christian Armenians, Georgians, Vlachs and Crimean Greeks) to emigrate to the steppes of Azov. The first indication of the Russian intention is in a report from General Prozorovskii to Potemkin in January 1778. Prozorovskii expressed his disapproval of the idea because he felt that these Christians would be needed in the Crimea if and when it was annexed to Russia. Empress Catherine II also had not yet come to the conclusion that such a drastic action as the immigration of the Christians was in her interests and ordered

⁴²F. A. Khartakhai, *Khristianstvo v Krymu* (Symferopol, 1864), pp. 37-8; Vasiliev, p. 279.

⁴³M. de Peyssonnel, *Traité sur le commerce de la Mer Noire* (2 vols. Paris, 1787) 2, p. 322.

⁴⁴Ibid., 1, pp. 12 ff.

⁴⁵W. Eton, *A Survey of the Turkish Empire* (London, 1799), p. 328.

⁴⁶F. de Tott, *Memoires du Baron de Tott sur les Turcs et les Tartares* (4 vols. Amsterdam, 1784) 2, p. 129.

Prozorovskii to protect the Crimean Christians from Tatar reprisals.⁴⁷ General Paul Rumiantsev, however, overriding Prozorovskii's disapproval, and without prior orders from St Petersburg, instructed Prozorovskii to begin "to persuade the Christians, who would be left unprotected by the evacuating Russian soldiers, to leave with them, and to resettle in one of Russia's southern provinces." At this point Catherine agreed to the idea and asked Rumiantsev and Potemkin to prepare the way for the exodus.⁴⁸

In June 1778, Ignatios, the last Metropolitan of Gothia and Caffa, presented a formal petition to Rumiantsev asking Russian permission for his flock to settle in Russia.⁴⁹ There is good reason to suspect that this was not a spontaneous and enthusiastic request from the whole of the Crimean Christians, but one written solely by the Metropolitan. Archbishop Gavriel indicates that although the idea of moving from a Muslim land to an Orthodox Christian one was an important factor, the main force behind the Christian emigration was the activity of Ignatios.⁵⁰ The Karaim Rabbi Azar'ia Iliia suggests that a good portion of the Christians did not feel themselves threatened by the Muslims and were not anxious to leave their homes for a strange place in the north.⁵¹ Even the Khan himself, Sahin Giray fought vigorously against the departure of the Christians. His main argument was that the Christians' taxes made up such a large percentage of the Khan's income that their loss would bring the Crimean government to a virtual collapse.⁵² Nevertheless, Catherine persisted in the idea of removing the Christians from the Crimea.

The exodus started in July 1778. To Alexander Suvorov's report, who played a leading part in the Christian emigration, 'Greeks, Georgians and Vlachs,' left from 68 various parts of the Crimean peninsula 'with tears in their eyes because they had to leave their immovable

⁴⁷N. F. Dubrovin, ed., *Prisoedinenie Kryma K Rossii: reskripty, pis'ma, reliatsii, doneseniia* (4 vols., St. Petersburg, 1885-89) 2, pp. 98 and 225.

⁴⁸Idem, 2, pp. 296 and 317-18; see also B. Nolde, *La Formation de l' Empire Russe* (2 vols. Paris, 1952-53) 2, pp. 141-42.

⁴⁹The Metropolitan's presentation is partly translated by Nolde, 2, pp. 143-44.

⁵⁰Gavriil, "Pereselenie grekov" p. 197.

⁵¹Karaim Rabbi Azar'ia Iliia, "Sobytiia Sluchivshiasia v Krymu u tsartvovanie Shagin Gereia Khana," *Vremennik Imperatorskago Moskovskago Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiiskikh*, 24 (1854) 127.

⁵²Nolde, 2, p. 142; A. Fisher is of the opinion that the real reason why Sahin Giray was against the mass movement of his Christian subjects was that they were "the only group upon whom he could count as loyal subjects of himself"; see A. W. Fisher, *The Russian annexation of the Crimea 1772-1783* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 102.

families (ancestors) behind.⁵³ By September 1778, a total of about 31,000 males, at an initial cost of 130,000 rubles had set out for the Azov province, some with high hopes and many with serious misgivings.⁵⁴ It is likely that the whole operation was very ill organized. On the way the migrants suffered from Tatar reprisals and in Azov their lot was largely misery and death. W. Eton describes the event as follows:

While I was in the quarantine at the Russian frontier, in September 1778, there passed 75,000 Christians obliged by the Russians to emigrate from Crimea (35,769 males) . . . These people were sent to inhabit the country abandoned by the Nogai Tatars near the west coast of the sea of Azof (Palus Maeotis) but the winter coming on before the houses built for them were ready, a great part of them had no other shelter from the cold than what was afforded (sic) them by holes dug in the ground, covered with what they could procure: they were people who all came from comfortable houses, and the greater part perished; seven thousand only were alive a few years ago.⁵⁵

Finally in May 1779, due mainly to Ignatios' efforts, the immigrants were given considerable privileges, including exemption from all taxes

⁵³See "Pis'ma Suvorova K Kniazii Potemkinu" in *Arkhiy Kniazia Vorontsova*, 24 (1880) 291; and K. P. M. (Kalogeras), "Περὶ Μαρτιανουπόλεως," *Πανδώρα*, 16 (1865-66) 534-35. In 1783, according to Metropolitan Ignatios, the Crimean Greeks emigrated from the following towns and villages of the Crimean peninsula: towns Bakhchisarai, Balaklava, Kozlov, Karasu, Ialta (Yalta), Eski-Krym; Kafa (Caffa); villages Marium, Ulakly, Mangush, Beshev, Stilia, Laka, Kermenchik, Kubush, Ulusala, Biiasala, Usypy, Kaskalia, Laspa, Alsua, Kamara, Korsan', Inkerman, Belbektoi, Cherkeskermen', Marmara, Bogatyr', Albat'skoi, Argii-Karakuba, Cherdakly, Barnykoi, Karakuba, Bilsus, Maliy Enisol', (Elisalo), Sartana, Chermalyk, Aslama, Diurpmen, Uluni, Chilarkoi, Aian, Salgir-bashi, Enisala, Demerzhi, Kuruuzen', Uluuzen', Kuchuk-Uzen', Nuzhniaia Autka, Verkhaia Autka, Marsanda, Magarach, Nikita, Urzuf, Kizie'tash, Dekremenskoii, Bol'shaia Lampada, Malaia Lampada, Alushta, Imeret, Khukoi, Ortalan, Tarsan: see T. N. Chernysheva, *Novogrecheskii gorod sel primorskogo (Ursufa) i Ialty, pervomaiskogo raiona, Stalinskoi oblasti. Istoricheskie ocherk i morfologiya glagola* (Kiev, 1958), p. 29.

⁵⁴Nolde claims that the Crimean Greeks numbered about 18,000 persons, the rest were Armenians; see Nolde, 2, p. 148. Only 288 Crimean Christians remained behind; see "Pis'ma Suvorova," p. 294.

⁵⁵Eton, A. Survey, p. 337. The traveller E. D. Clarke gives us this picture of the Christian emigration: "At that time [1778], the most opulent Armenian mechanics and merchants, upon whence the whole of the productive industry and commerce of the peninsula depended, left the Crimea late in the Autumnal season. The Empress ordered proper buildings and accommodations to be prepared for their reception upon the Don; but the Russian commissaries took special care to convey into their own pockets the money allowed to complete the work according to the intentions of their Sovereign. When the Armenian colony arrived, they found nothing but a parcel of miserable huts, constructed in the most expeditious and wretched manner"; see E. D. Clarke, *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa — Part I: Russia, Tartary and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1810), p. 312.

for ten years, freedom from conscription and the right of self-government.⁵⁶ By that time the Armenians had established on the banks of the Don, in the heart of the country of Cossacks, the colony of Nakhichevan. Simultaneously the Crimean Greeks founded a town named Mariupol and about 23 colonial villages most of them on the banks of the river Kalmius and almost every one of them called by the old names of the settlements formerly established in the Crimea.⁵⁷ Ignatios, the real founder of Mariupol, established his seat there and in his new country continued to bear the title of Metropolitan of Gothia and Caffa. After his death in February 1786, the eparchy of Gothia and Caffa ceased to exist. The community of Crimean emigrants was ascribed to the "Slavonic" eparchy of that time, which later took the name of Ekaterinoslav.⁵⁸

The basis for the Tsarist policy towards the Mariupol Greeks was provided by Catherine's *ukaz* of May 21, 1779, which was implemented by additional decrees in the following years. The conditions of the Greek settlement were stated with great precision and the main points of greatest importance for the subsequent history of the Greek community in Mariupol were: freedom from military and civil service; offer of land and almost unlimited possibilities for land purchase; remission of taxes for a period of ten years; self administration and complete freedom in the sphere of religion. All these privileges were granted to both the immigrants and their descendants, while free exit from the country was guaranteed to them at any time, on the condition however, that they would be obliged to pay to the Treasury a portion of the assets they had acquired in Russia.⁵⁹

According to the map approved by Catherine and attached to the decree of 1779 the total land which was granted to the Crimean Greeks was immense. At the time it was estimated to be more than 1,200,000 *desiatinas*. Initially the Greeks in Mariupol received 30 *desiatinas* each, plus 12,000 *desiatinas* as common pasturage and a further 6,000 *desiatinas* for their fishing trade. The remaining vast space of land was

⁵⁶PSZ, 20, 821, no. 14,879; Catherine's decree is translated in Greek by K. P. M. (Kalogeras), 'Chrysouvolon Aikaterinis,' *Pandora*, 17 (1866-67) 491-92.

⁵⁷Archbishop Gavriil enumerates the following villages: Kermenchik', Salgir'-Enisala, Kamara, Bogatyr', Konstantinopol' (Constantinople), Zhindren', Chermalyk', Karan', Stilia, Ignat'evka, Beshev', Laspi, Karakoba, Sartana, Cherdakly, Malaia-Enisala, Mangush', Urzuf', Ialta, Staryi-Krym' Novyi-Kermenchik', Novaia-Kara, Koba, Bugasy (Volnovakha); see Gavriil, 'Pereselenie grekov', p. 201 and KPM (Kalogeras), 'Περὶ Μαρτιανουπόλεως,' p. 534.

⁵⁸Gavriil, 'Pereselenie grekov,' p. 203.

⁵⁹PSZ, 20, 821, no. 14, 879; see also Gavriil, 'Pereselenie grekov', pp. 198-200.

reserved on the map because it was not yet known how many Greeks would be able to settle in Southeastern Russia.⁶⁰ For sure the Russians expected more immigrants to arrive and they felt it necessary to assign as much land as possible. Clearly the authorities supervising the colonization of the New Russian lands did not want the lack of space to prevent the resettlement of the Crimean Greeks.

However, in the case of Mariupol they were wrong in their expectations. The town and its surroundings developed slowly. In 1793, when the German naturalist Peter Pallas visited the place only 881 males and 884 females lived in the town itself. It consisted of two churches, a good market place and of 305 dwelling houses chiefly built of free-stone. As for the colonial villages around Mariupol they amounted to 2,526 houses inhabited by 6,456 males and 5,647 females.⁶¹ Twenty years later the prosperity of the town had by no means kept pace with that of its sister colony in Nakhichevan. According to Robert Walpole, another traveller, it seemed to have declined even more since the visit of professor Pallas. The houses resembled those of Nakhichevan but they were dirty and in bad repair. The wooden bazar was ruinous and deserted.⁶²

Furthermore, by that time, the period of privileges and facilities granted to the first Greek settlers had expired.⁶³ In 1816 two Greek deputies arrived in St. Petersburg and complained to the Tsar Alexander I that the rights granted to their community were violated by taking away their surplus land and by increasing their taxes. The two deputies underlined the fact that according to the decree of 1779 the land was granted to the Greek settlers in Mariupol on a permanent basis. They stated that if the remaining surplus land was taken away, the danger would be so great, that the whole community would become impoverished. Their churches and other important buildings would have to be transferred; their live-stock might suffer; or even brought to ruin and eventually they would have to accept the settlement of foreign elements in their community. All these arguments were in support of their demand that the spare land should be left untouched and that they should be released from the payment of additional taxes.⁶⁴

⁶⁰See the report of the Minister of Finance in *PSZ*, 34, 308 f, no. 26, 863.

⁶¹Pallas, 1, pp. 512-14.

⁶²R. Walpole, *Travels in various countries of the East* (2 vols. London, 1820) 2, p. 464.

⁶³The Greeks of Kerch, for instance, in 1805, lost their privileges given to them thirty years earlier. They were sub-divided into 12 merchants and 453 artisans and pedlars; the latter, who belonged to the lower middle class, according to the laws of the Russian Empire, were liable to be conscripted; see Arsh, "Grecheskaia emigratsiia," p. 92.

⁶⁴*PSZ*, 33, 904, no. 26,319.

Alexander after receiving a report from the Treasury, negative to the requests of the Mariupol Greeks, handed the whole matter for consideration to the Governor of Taganrog Major-General Papkov. In his report to Count Arakcheyev, who was responsible for the military colonies in Russia, Major-General Papkov suggested to leave to the Greeks the land they received in 1779 and to dispose the surplus land by selling it either to Greek settlers or to anybody else willing to pay. The money obtained could be used for the restoration of Peter the Great's port in the city of Taganrog, thus relieving the inhabitants of Mariupol from paying any additional taxes.⁶⁵

Arakcheyev was sceptical and suggested to the Emperor to form a committee in order to examine in detail the case of Mariupol Greeks. Indeed Alexander asked the Minister of Finance and the Governor of Taganrog jointly to appoint a committee at the Ministry of State Domains. Invited to sit in the committee were the State Councillors Lanskoy and Opochinin, deputies from Mariupol, and most important for the Greeks, the Secretary of State John Kapodistrias.⁶⁶

By April 1817, the members of the newly appointed committee submitted to Alexander their memorandum. The Councillors of the State were of the opinion that the taxes paid by the Greeks in Mariupol should be increased in order to bring them to parity with the taxes paid by the rest of the population in New Russia. At the time in the *guberniia* of Ekaterinolsav it was expected that merchants should pay to the Treasury 4.75% of their annual profits, shopkeepers, artisans and craftsmen 8 rubles per household and the peasantry 8 rubles as quit-rent and 3 rubles as poll-tax. During the same period the Mariupol Greeks were paying: merchants 4.5% of their profits, urban shopkeepers and artisans 5 rubles and the peasants only 1 ruble and 68 kopecks per household.⁶⁷ As for the surplus land which was estimated to be about 900,000 *desiatinas*, Councillors Lanskoy and Opochinin suggested that it should be taken by the Treasury and sold in a public auction.⁶⁸

John Kapodistrias had a different opinion. He proposed at once all the remaining land to be sold to the highest bidder on the condition however that the buyer will undertake to colonize it only with Greek colonists. Alternatively the Secretary of State suggested that it was to the Crown's benefit if the surplus land was to be sold to the settlers already in Mariupol at a very low price. In that case the community

⁶⁵See the proposals of the Governor of Taganrog in *PSZ*, 34, 308-09, no. 26,863.

⁶⁶Cf. *PSZ* 33, 904, no. 26,319; *PSZ*, 34, 307-08, no. 26,863.

⁶⁷*PSZ*, 311, no. 26, 863.

⁶⁸*Ibid.* p. 310.

was going to enter upon the obligation in a given period of time to invite new Greek settlers in the area. In order to aid the new colonists Kapodistrias suggested that a fund should be formed out of the money that the Mariupol Greeks were prepared to pay for the surplus land.⁶⁹

Indeed the deputies of the Greek community in Mariupol declared to the committee in writing that the Greek colonists were prepared to buy all the land which the Treasury proposed to take over as state property. Their offer was 500,000 rubles paid in ten yearly instalments of 50,000 rubles each.

At this point the Minister of Finance observed that by the decree of 1779 it was not assumed that the land should be given to the Greeks unconditionally and without regard to the size of their population. He rightly noticed that nearly thirty years after the establishment of the Crimean Greeks on the west coast of the Sea of Azov there were in the region of Mariupol only 10,000 colonists and the available land was more than 1,200,000 *desiatinas*. This theoretically meant 120 *desiatinas* per each Greek settler at a time when Russian natives possessed only 15 *desiatinas*.⁷⁰

Alexander, having examined the committee's memorandum, by his ukaz of May, 1817, granted 30 *desiatinas* of land to each peasant household established on the banks of the Kalmius. In addition 12,000 *desiatinas* as pasture land and 6,000 as fisheries were assigned to the urban settlers of Mariupol. All this land was to be allocated according to the plan submitted by the Governor of Taganrog. Out of the remaining surplus land 150,000 *desiatinas* were left to the Greek community. This land was to be divided into allotments for the benefit of new Greek settlers. Eventually all of it was to be let to the newcomers at an annual quit-rent five kopecks per *desiatina*. The rest of the surplus land was to be taken away by the Ministry of State Domains. As state property this land was to be sold by the Ministry of Finance and the Mariupol Greeks were given the opportunity, if they wished, to buy part or even all of it. Regarding tax concessions the request of the Mariupol deputies for a tax reduction was not accepted.⁷¹

The policy adopted in the west coast of the sea of Azov with regard to the Greek immigration enjoyed very little success. Mariupol as a commercial port it was slow to develop. Its population which was less than 7,000 in 1856 remained largely Greek but in numerical terms was insig-

⁶⁹Ibid. p. 308.

⁷⁰Ibid. p. 309-10.

⁷¹Ibid. p. 307-8.

nificant.⁷² In relation to the general tempo and character of colonization and mass settlement in New Russia the Tsarist policy was somewhat misconceived. The contribution of the Mariupol Greeks in the economic sphere was more important than their number, but still not a crucial factor in the overall picture, although they played a very important role in some areas of industry and commerce or in such spheres as the politics of Russo-Turkish relations.⁷³ And even when they were of good quality, Greek colonists cost the state far more than did native settlers, in terms both of cash and of administration, and they were usually slower to adapt themselves to local conditions. Realization of these facts became increasingly widespread and in the case of the Greeks found in the Mariupol their expression in the new rules of 1859.⁷⁴

At that time the autonomy which the Mariupol Greeks enjoyed within the boundaries of the Russian Empire was lost. Thereafter we witness a vigorous policy of Russification which prevailed until the beginning of the twentieth century.⁷⁵ In the 1860s and 1870s all the privileges originally granted to the Greeks from the Crimea were withdrawn. In 1869 it was announced that the Mariupol Greeks had to fulfill, as the rest of the population, their *zemstvo* responsibilities. That meant loss of their privilege to conduct their own affairs according to their traditional law and more taxes to the Crown. Five years later, in 1874, they were made liable for military service.⁷⁶ Without legal territory or an unequivocal racial commitment the Mariupol Greeks hung on tenaciously to their language and culture as their only irrefutable criterion of corporate identity. Linguistic "Russification" of the Mariupol Greeks was an almost complete failure.⁷⁷

When the Soviets came in power about 250,000 Greeks were living in South Russia. The great majority were in the regions of Mariupol and Rostov; about 150,000. According to M. S. Sergievskii, an emi-

⁷²T. S. Fedor, *Patterns of urban growth in the Russian Empire during the nineteenth century* (Chicago, 1975), p. 186; for population figures see also BPP (British Parliamentary Papers), 54 (1862) 235, 53 (1865) 589.

⁷³D. M. Laskaratos, p. 40. It seems that during the nineteenth century many Pontic Greeks from Turkey have taken refuge in Mariupol; see Paulidis, pp. 232-34.

⁷⁴Chernysheva, p. 35; see also the proposals of the Senate of the year 1852 in PSZ (second series), 27, 751-52, no. 26,838.

⁷⁵On the Russification policy in general see R. Pearson, *National Minorities in Eastern Europe, 1848-1945* (London, 1983), pp. 75-83; on the effects which this policy had in Mariupol see Laskaratos, p. 39.

⁷⁶Chernysheva, p. 36.

⁷⁷On the dialect of the Mariupol Greeks see G. A. Delopoulos, "Τὸ βόρειο ἰδίωμα στὴ Μεσημβρινὴ Ρωσία" *Δεύτερο Συμπόσιο Γλωσσολογίας τοῦ Βορειοελλαδικοῦ Χώρου* (13-15 April 1983) (Thessaloniki, 1983) 263 ff; see also A. Karpozilos, "Οἱ Ἑλληνες τῆς Μαριανουπόλεως καὶ ἡ διάλεκτός τους," *Ἀρχαῖον Πόντου*, 40 (1985) 97-111.

nent Russian linguist, the Mariupol Greeks numbered about 97,000 of whom 82,000 were Greek speakers.⁷⁸ The Soviet regime, contrary to the Russification policy of the late tsarist period, encouraged to a great extent the Hellenization of the Greek colonists in Mariupol. At least this was the case until the mid 1930s. Schools were founded, classed in demotic Greek was introduced, Greek newspapers and books were published.⁷⁹ Of course the tendency was to educate a peasant population in the communist dogma, but in a way this policy on the whole was beneficial to the majority of the Mariupol Greeks. Within the boundaries of the Soviet Union they did retain their singularity as a separate group through the preservation of the language. Today their language and culture remain to be studied. All the evidence suggests that we have to deal with a very interesting case indeed.

⁷⁸M. V. Sergievskii, "Mariupol'skie grecheskie govory," *Izvestiia AN SSSR, Otdelenie obshchetvennykh nauk* (Moscow 1934) 533 ff.

⁷⁹A. Karpozilos, "Οἱ Ἕλληνες τῆς Μαριανουπόλεως," pp. 105-08; see also the useful article by the same author "Ῥωσο-Ποντιακά," *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου*, 38 (1983).

The Allied Opponent: France Versus Greece in Asia Minor

VICTORIA SOLOMONIDIS

DURING THE COURSE OF THE GREAT WAR France proved to be the strongest exponent of Greek participation in the Entente. Political expediency of the day dictated the unconditional backing of Venizelos and his liberal party to the extent of creating a national schism and an undeclared civil war in Greece. With the creation of the Venizelist provisional government in Thessaloniki, the French legitimized the presence of their military forces on the Macedonian front and participated in the Allied breakthrough which resulted in the capitulation of Bulgaria and Austria — Hungary in September 1918. With the promise of assistance in the vindication of Greek claims in Asia Minor at the forthcoming Peace Conference, French President Clemenceau convinced Venizelos to contribute Greek forces for the ill-fated Ukraine expedition of December 1918, resulting not only in the compromise of Greek interests but, what was more, in the uprooting of the long-established Greek communities of the Black Sea.

Despite French promises to assist with the realization of the *Megali Idea* once the Great War was at an end, French opposition to nearly all the Greek claims from the time of September 1922, seemed only second to that of the Turkish nationalists. Although France — together with Italy, the U. S. and Great Britain — had formally requested Greece to land troops at Smyrna to reestablish law and order, a consistently unfriendly policy was implemented not only by the Quai d'Orsay but also by the press, the military and the financiers. The pressure exercised by the latter in conjunction with the unfavorable military situation in Turkey after the conclusion of the Mudros Armistice, seemed to constitute the dominant factors in determining the policy of the successive French governments with regard to Greece's presence in Asia Minor.