

“Living off others’ aid”: The Socioeconomic Structure of Salonica’s Jews in the Mid-Nineteenth Century

DİLEK AKYALÇIN KAYA

Izmir, Turkey

E-mail: dilekakyalcin@yahoo.com

Abstract Through an analysis of data compiled in the Ottoman income and property registers (*temettuat*) of 1844–45, this article explores the socioeconomic and demographic structures of Salonica’s Jews in order to understand the extent of Jewish poverty in Salonica in the mid-nineteenth century and its causal matrix. It examines the socioeconomic hierarchies within the Jewish community, as well as the position of Jews within broader urban social structures composed mainly of Jews, Muslims, and Christians. It also analyzes the mechanisms that Jews employed to deal with this poverty. Finally, it argues that community-based reasons alone cannot explain the existence of widespread severe poverty among Salonica’s Jews in this period; broad fluctuations in the Ottoman economy had a significant impact on all the inhabitants of Salonica and must also be taken into account.

Keywords Salonica · Ottoman Jews · Socioeconomic structures · Demography · Urban economy · Household · Occupations · Poll tax · Income and property registers · Poverty

In 1844–45, the reformist Ottoman government compiled income and property registers (*temettuat*) in Salonica in preparation for launching a new income and property tax. The registers listed one in five Salonican Jewish heads of household as “living off others’ aid” (*şunun bunun ianesiyle geçinmekde oldugu*), indicating that they had neither occupational income nor income-generating property. Moreover, the total annual incomes of more than half of all Jewish heads of household (54 percent) was lower than the city’s average of 274 piastres.¹ These data seem to suggest that Salonica’s Jews lived in fairly miserable economic conditions in the mid-nineteenth century.

This article aims to analyze the socioeconomic structure of the Salonican Jewish community in this period in order to understand more clearly the social and economic dynamics of the city in general, and the dynamics of Jewish poverty in particular. The historiography of Ottoman Jews, and especially that of Salonican Jews, portrays this period as one of total economic and

¹For the calculation of this average, see Dilek Akyalçin Kaya, “Les sabbatéens salonicains (1845–1912): Des individus pluriels dans une société urbaine en transition” (PhD diss., École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, 2013), 34–104.

social regression.² According to Avigdor Levy, Ottoman Jewish history can be divided into three main periods, with an era of “stagnation” between two “golden ages.” The first golden age of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries began with the expulsion of Iberian Jews from Spain and Portugal and their subsequent flight to the Ottoman Empire. These Sephardic Jews included “a wealthy entrepreneurial class” and “physicians, experts and advisors who served the Ottoman court.”³ They brought with them both knowledge of European sciences and links with international trade networks. In Salonica, they made profound contributions to the development of international trade and textile manufacturing, exercising particular influence in the wool industry.⁴

Next, according to this model, came the “decline” of Ottoman Jews, beginning around the second half of the seventeenth century and lasting until the middle of the nineteenth century. This period was marked by the end of European Jewish migration into the Ottoman lands and thus the end of technology transfer and the collapse of trade networks.⁵ The decline of Salonica’s Jews in this period is often traced to a confluence of economic and religious factors. Fluctuations in cloth prices after the arrival of European cloth on the Ottoman market coincided with the disruption caused by the Sabbatean movement, from which the Jews were not able to recover spiritually.⁶ Both

²See, e.g., the portrayal of the Istanbul Jewish community in Ilan Karmi, *The Jewish Community of Istanbul in the Nineteenth Century: Social, Legal, and Administrative Transformations* (Istanbul, 1996).

³Avigdor Levy, *The Sephardim in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, NJ, 1992), 75–83, quote on 75. This periodization fits well with the traditional Ottoman decline narrative. Until the 1980s, the historiography of the Ottoman Empire tended to analyze the period between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as an era of decline during which the Ottoman administration was completely disorganized and corrupt. Since then, however, Ottoman historians have underlined the flexibility of the Ottoman administration and its capacity to adapt to new situations. See Ariel Salzman, “An Ancien Régime Revisited: ‘Privatisation’ and Political Economy in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire,” *Politics and Society* 21 (1993): 393–423; Ariel Salzman, *Tocqueville in the Ottoman Empire: Rival Paths to the Modern State* (Leiden, 2004); Linda Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560–1660* (Leiden, 1996); Şevket Pamuk, “Institutional Change and the Longevity of the Ottoman Empire,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 35 (2004): 225–47.

⁴Levy, *Sephardim*, 25–26. For the development of the wool industry in Salonica, see I. S. Emmanuel, *Histoire de l’industrie des tissus des Israélites de Salonique* (Paris, 1935); Gilles Veinstein, “Sur la draperie juive de Salonique (XVIe–XVIIe s.),” *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 66 (1992): 55–64.

⁵Levy, *Sephardim*, 78. For an analysis of the role that Ottoman policies played in creating the deteriorating conditions experienced by the Jews of Istanbul in the seventeenth century, see Marc David Baer, “17. yüzyılda Yahudilerin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’ndaki Nüfuz ve Mevkilerini Yitirmeleri,” *Toplum ve Bilim* 83 (1999/2000): 202–23.

⁶On cloth price fluctuations, see Minna Rozen, “La vie économique des Juifs du bassin méditerranéen de l’expulsion d’Espagne (1492) à la fin du XVIIIe siècle,” in *La société juive*

contemporaries and historians of nineteenth-century Salonica have remarked on the miserable condition of the city's Jewish inhabitants before the mid-nineteenth century, describing it as stagnant or deteriorating.⁷

Finally, this decline was arrested by the Tanzimat reforms of 1839, which led to the social and economic transformation of both the Ottoman Empire and Ottoman Jewry. During this period the Salonican Jewish community was especially influenced by the Francos, Italian Jews who began arriving in Salonica in the early eighteenth century.⁸ According to Levy, "their wealth, culture and sheer presence contributed to slow down the decline and reinvigorate the established communities."⁹

This periodization of the history of both the broader Ottoman Jewish community and Salonica's Jews in particular has three main problems. First, golden ages have been designated solely on the basis of elite economic activity. Yet, as Haim Gerber points out, there were very few Jewish elites.¹⁰ Even if they played a role in aiding the poor or financing communal institutions, the concrete repercussions of their decline for other strata of the Jewish community must be explicated and clarified. Second, the well-being or financial distress of the Jewish elites that did exist has been projected and generalized across Ottoman Jewish communities in general, regardless of their temporal and spatial locations. This kind of generalization has impeded our understanding of both the socioeconomic functioning of specific Ottoman Jewish communities and the changes that different communities experienced across all three periods. Third, this narrative of Ottoman Jewry has overemphasized the general phenomenon of decline in the late seventeenth through

à travers l'histoire, vol. 3, *Le passage d'Israël*, ed. Shmuel Trigano (Paris, 1993), 307–10. On the Sabbatean movement, see Joseph Nehama, *Histoire des Israélites de Salonique*, vol. 5, *Période de stagnation—La tourmente sabbatéenne (1593–1669)* (Salonica, 1959).

⁷Such statements can be found in missionary reports; see, e.g., "Letters from Mr. Dodd, July 7 and 16, 1850: Signs of Progress," *The Missionary Herald / American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* 46 (1850): 385. Contemporary Jewish inhabitants of the city made similar remarks. One of them was Dr. Moïse Allatini, a Salonican Jew of Livornian origin and a member of the most influential Jewish family in the city. See the translation of his letter on the history of Salonican Jews in P. Beaton, *The Jews in the East* (London, 1859), 1:188–96. See also P. Risal, *La ville convoitée Salonique* (Istanbul, 2001), 98; Rena Molho, "Le renouveau de la communauté juive de Salonique entre 1856 et 1919," in *Salonica and Istanbul: Social, Political, and Cultural Aspects of Jewish Life* (Istanbul, 2005), 89.

⁸Joseph Nehama, "La protection consulaire," in *Histoire des Israélites*, 6:240–84. These Italian Jews were also present in other important Ottoman port cities, including Izmir and Istanbul. See Aron Rodrigue, "The Beginnings of Westernization and Community Reform among Istanbul's Jewry, 1854–65," in *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Avigdor Levy (Princeton, NJ, 1994), 439–40.

⁹Levy, *Sephardim*, 83.

¹⁰Haim Gerber, *Crossing Borders: Jews and Muslims in Ottoman Law, Economy, and Society* (Istanbul, 2008), 15.

the early nineteenth centuries at the expense of examining the details of specific cases.¹¹ In Salonica, this tendency has been further encouraged by the predominance of studies that view the city's history from the standpoint of the late nineteenth century. Not surprisingly, historians' emphasis on this period of resurgence has led to a rather reductive view of the previous era as a uniform period of decline, creating the impression that the Jews of Salonica were a static, undifferentiated mass before the impact of the late nineteenth-century transformations. This sort of analysis, implying that Ottoman Jewish populations were passive in the face of external changes, entirely neglects the internal dynamics of Ottoman society.

This article will examine the functioning of the Ottoman port city of Salonica in the mid-nineteenth century and the economic and social structures of its Jewish community. The existence of the income and property registers from 1844–45 makes it possible to conduct a macro-level analysis of the socioeconomic structure of Salonica's Jews at that time—the very end of what is normally considered the period of decline—and pinpoint the conditions experienced by both elite and poor Salonican Jews. As the social, economic, and demographic characteristics of the population are intrinsically interrelated, this article will analyze them together. It will avoid concentrating too heavily on elite activity, attempting to generate a better understanding of broad socioeconomic hierarchies within the Jewish community and a clearer picture of Jewish poverty and its causal matrix. It will also examine the position of Jews within the broader social structures of Salonica, emphasizing that the Jewish community did not constitute “a separate enclave governed by its own laws” but was part of the larger social and economic whole of the city.¹²

The Survey Registers

The registers this article draws upon, “Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income” (Emlak, arazi, hayvanat ve temettuat tahrir defterleri), were produced in 1844–45 as a direct result of the 1839 Tanzimat reforms. Aiming to eliminate existing privileges in favor of a universal income and property tax, the Ottoman administration undertook a survey of property and income to establish a basis for the new tax.¹³ The surveys were executed

¹¹Gerber, *Crossing Borders*, 14–15.

¹²Gerber, *Crossing Borders*, 9.

¹³In 1840 the Ottoman administration undertook a survey of properties and incomes, which it intended to form the basis of this new tax, but the resistance of privileged groups from the ancien régime (tax farmers, bankers, local notables, etc.) and the antifiscal resistance of or-

by local provincial councils, which largely entrusted the process to quarter and village headmen (*muhtar*), Muslim religious leaders (*imam*), and local religious representatives of non-Muslim communities;¹⁴ hence the quarter became the basic unit of the survey in urban environments.

The Prime Ministerial Archives in Istanbul hold twenty-seven survey registers (*defter*) for Salonica. Most contain the records of a single quarter, but because the records of some quarters were later bound together in registers, the twenty-seven Salonican registers contain the records of seventy-three urban quarters.¹⁵ For each household, the registers note the quarter in which the head of household lived; his name, occupation, and annual income; any income-generating properties he possessed (gardens, vineyards, livestock, shops, houses) and their annual yields; the taxes (*vergi-i mahsusa*) imposed the previous year; and, for non-Muslims, the poll tax (*cizye*).

The registers offer a basis for analyzing socioeconomic hierarchies in the Salonican Jewish community and for comparing the community's overall situation with that of the city's Muslim and Christian populations. Their significance for social and economic history notwithstanding, the registers do have some disadvantages. They constitute a unique set of data, which "becomes both a superiority and deficiency."¹⁶ There are no registers of similar volume and content covering other periods, rendering a rigorous comparative analysis of transformations observed in Salonica difficult. Moreover, the incomes noted in the registers should not be taken at face value, although they can

dinary people were so strong that it withdrew its project. In 1845, though, after placating the privileged resisters, the administration was able to introduce more moderate fiscal reforms. The Ottoman archives preserve around 18,000 survey registers compiled in 1844–45. Several projects have used these registers to investigate Ottoman urban Jews. See, e.g., Feridun Emeçen, *Unutulmuş bir cemaat: Manisa Yahudileri* (Istanbul, 1997), 91–97; Nurşen Gök, "19. yüzyıl ortalarında Ankara Yahudilerinin sosyal-iktisadi durumu" [The social and economic life of the Jewish community residing in Ankara center in the first half of the 19th century], *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi* 26 (2009): 117–39.

¹⁴Alp Yücel Kaya, "Les villes ottomanes sous tension fiscale: Les enjeux de l'évaluation cadastrale au 19e siècle," in *La mesure cadastrale: Estimer la valeur du foncier*, ed. Florence Bourillon and Nadine Vivier (Rennes, 2012), 43–60.

¹⁵"Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income," Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry (henceforth OA), Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT, 11464, 11466, 11470, 11487, 11536, 11537, 11546, 11566, 11577, 11587, 11604, 11609, 11620, 11621, 11635, 11654, 11655, 11671, 11679, 11682, 11699, 11719, 11725, 11726, 11758, 11761, 17652.

¹⁶Tevfik Güran, introduction to *The Ottoman State and Societies in Change: A Study of the Nineteenth Century Temettuat Registers*, ed. Hayashi Kayoko and Mahir Aydın (London, 2004), 3–14.

certainly be used to analyze the relative positions of different ethnic/religious groups and economic strata.¹⁷

Spatial Organization and Demographic Characteristics

On the subject of the geographic distribution of Jews in the city, the data contained in the registers are consistent with the secondary literature. Jewish quarters were concentrated near the sea and the port and were particularly dense around the marketplace. They bordered Muslim quarters in the north and Christian quarters in the east. To be sure, the ethnic/religious composition of the city was far more complicated, encompassing Muslim and non-Muslim Gypsies (*kıbtıyan*), foreigners (*müste'mins*), and Sabbateans as well. Since the registers were organized according to ethnic/religious affiliations, we can see that both Sabbateans and Gypsies (Muslim and non-Muslim) lived and were registered in Muslim quarters.¹⁸ But the fact that Christian Gypsies lived in ostensibly Muslim quarters that bordered on Christian quarters suggests that the limits of quarters were largely administrative, while actual living situations and practices were more mixed. Prior research on the ethnic/religious composition of neighborhoods has shown that coexistence of ethnic and religious groups was quite widespread, though group separation did exist on a micro level—often involving only a few streets or even just several blocks of houses.¹⁹ For the Jews of Salonica, coexistence seems to have been relatively limited; they lived together with the Muslims only in the

¹⁷For an analysis of the process of compiling the registers, see Alp Yücel Kaya, "Politique de l'enregistrement de la richesse économique: Les enquêtes fiscales et agricoles de l'Empire ottoman et de la France au milieu du XIXe siècle" (PhD diss., École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, 2005).

¹⁸The presence of Gypsies in Salonica at the beginning of the nineteenth century is mentioned in John Galt, *Voyages and Travels in the Years 1809, 1810, and 1811, Containing Commercial and Miscellaneous Observations on Gibraltar, Sardinia, Sicily, Malta, Serigo, and Turkey* (London, 1812), 227. For an analysis of the perception of Gypsies by the local authorities, see Eyal Ginio, "Neither Muslims nor Zimmis: The Gypsies (Roma) in the Ottoman State," *Romani Studies* 5, no. 14 (2004): 117–44. Sabbateans, descendants of the followers of Shabbetai Zevi, were also present in Salonica in the mid-nineteenth century, but they lived in the Muslim community and were not registered separately. For their lives in nineteenth-century Salonica, see Gershom Scholem, "La Secte Crypto-juive des Dunmeh de Turquie," in *Le messianisme juif: Essais sur la spiritualité du Judaïsme* (Paris, 1974), 219–47; Marc David Baer, *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks* (Stanford, CA, 2010).

¹⁹Robert Ilbert, *Alexandrie 1830–1930: Histoire d'une communauté citadine*, 2 vols. (Le Caire, 1996), 1:406.

Ayasofya quarter (southeast of Salonica).²⁰ Even here, although there were Muslim residents, the Jewish population was far larger. Since the Ayasofya quarter bordered some Muslim quarters, it is likely that its Muslim residents would have lived near those borders. Unfortunately, the mid-nineteenth century registers do not provide exact locations of individual houses, so it is not possible to describe living circumstances precisely at an individual level.

Of the seventy-three quarters registered in 1844–45, Jews lived in thirteen, Muslims in forty-eight, and Christians in nine.²¹ In three other quarters only foreigners were registered.²² Gypsies lived only in Muslim quarters. The registers recorded Jewish residents in the quarters of Baru, Aguda, Pulya, Yeni Havlu, Tophane, Fındık, Rogos, Kadı, Salhane, Malta, Kaldırgöç, Ayasofya, and Leviye.²³ Census registers dating from the same period list three others: Etz-Hayim, Kulhan, and Bedaron.²⁴ It seems likely that the inhabitants of these quarters were either included in the records of nearby Jewish areas or that the separate registers of these quarters remain undiscovered in the archives.

If we take Vardar Street (Egnatia), from Vardar Porte in the west to Kelemeriye Porte in the east, as the city's principal axis and reference point, nearly all "Jewish" quarters in 1844–45 were situated in the south. (Rogos, a Jewish quarter in the city center, was an exception just to the north of the street.) Conversely, nearly all of the city's "Muslim" quarters (except Akçe Mescid,

²⁰Other analyses of Jews demonstrate that coexistence between Jews and other groups was common and well known, however. See Emecen, *Unutulmuş bir cemaat*, 91; Mübahat Kütükoğlu, "İzmir nüfusu üzerine bazı tespitler," in *İzmir tarihinden kesitler*, ed. Mübahat Kütükoğlu (Izmir, 2000), 16.

²¹The word used in the registers is "reaya." In the Ottoman Empire, this word designated people who paid tax, in contrast to soldiers and religious men, who were exempt. In the nineteenth century it was generally used for non-Muslim Ottomans (i.e., Christians) who paid tax. See Mehmed Öz, "Reaya," *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 2007), 34:490–93.

²²*Müste'min* was a temporary status given to foreigners who conducted business in the empire or who worked in the consulates (in positions such as dragomans) in order to ensure their protection. Because the status was associated with numerous economic privileges, many non-Muslim Ottomans tried very hard to obtain this status. See Gilles Veinstein, "Statut de *musta'min*, entre droit et politique," in *The Ottoman Empire: Myths, Realities, and 'Black Holes'*; *Contributions in Honor of Colin Imber*, ed. Evangelia Kermeli and Oktay Özel (Istanbul, 2006), 189–201. The *müste'mins* in Salonica were all Christians. Since no Jews were registered as *müste'mins*, Allatini and other Francos were not recorded in these registers. However, a contemporary census mentions that they were present, scattered throughout the city's Jewish quarters. It is probable that they opposed registration for fiscal reasons, like the "foreigners" of the same period in Izmir. See Kaya, "Les villes ottomans," 43–60. For the census registers, see OA, NFS.d 4974 [1259/1843–4].

²³For the Jewish quarters of the city, see Vassilis Demetriadis, *Topografia tes Thessalonikes kata ten epoche toirkokratias: 1430–1912* (Thessaloniki, 1983).

²⁴OA, NFS.d 4974 [1259/1843–4].

Sulu Paşa, Timurtaş, and Debbag Hayreddin) were located north of Vardar Street. Christians lived primarily southeast of this street, and there were foreigners (*müste`mins*) in all but one (Çavuş Manastırı) of the “Christian” quarters. There were also some further divisions: *perakende reaya*, for example, lived only in Yanık Manastır quarter.²⁵ Gypsies (both Muslim and Christian) resided within two “Muslim” quarters of the city. These two quarters, İştira and Agora, were in the commercial center of the city and were surrounded by “Jewish” quarters.

If we instead analyze the zones of habitation of each group in the city, we see that Salonica’s Jews resided in the center and south of the city, primarily in sectors where they constituted significant majorities. Indeed, “Jewish” sectors were almost exclusively Jewish. Muslims were more dispersed than Jews, residing in all sectors outside the Jewish ones. At the same time, it is important to note that the northwest and center-north parts of the city were exclusively Muslim. Muslims constituted majorities in the northeast and center-west, and they were in the minority in the center-east and center-south. Christians, residing primarily in the center and east of Salonica, constituted a majority only in the center-east.

It is difficult to trace the demography of Salonica across the centuries, but it is clear that several important events during the first half of the nineteenth century strongly affected the demographic composition of the city. During the 1830s, many Orthodox Christians left Salonica for the newly established Greek state.²⁶ The city was simultaneously ravaged by plague, which killed around six thousand people—quite a significant fraction of its population.²⁷ The results of the first Ottoman census, which was carried out in 1831 and covered only the adult male population, are summarized in table 1. If we assume that the female population was of a similar magnitude, the total adult population in 1831 was probably between 25,000 and 30,000, or just five times the plague casualties.²⁸

²⁵*Perakende reaya* were Christians who did not live in Salonica but were present there temporarily. Because they were listed with a household number, I have considered them Salonican residents and have included them within the Christian community of the city. This situation is the reverse of that found by Svetlana Ianeva in the Balkan town of Samokov: there immigrant Christians were not registered with a household number, and hence she considered them temporary residents of the city. Svetlana Ianeva, “Samokov: An Ottoman Balkan City in the Age of Reforms,” in Kayoko and Aydın, *Ottoman State and Societies*, 47–76.

²⁶Meropi Anastassiadou, *Salonique, 1830–1912: Une ville ottomane à l’âge des Réformes* (Leiden, 1997), 62.

²⁷Daniel Panzac, *La peste dans l’empire ottoman 1700–1850* (Leuven, 1985), 359.

²⁸Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda İlk Nüfus Sayımı 1831* (Ankara, 1943) cited in Bülent Özdemir, *Ottoman Reforms and Social Life: Reflections from Salonica, 1830–1850* (Istanbul, 2003), 75.

Table 1. Ethnic/religious distribution of Salonica's adult male population, 1831

Ethnic/religious affiliation	Adult male population	Percentage
Jewish	5667	44.55
Muslim	4294	33.76
Orthodox Christian	2759	21.69
Total	12720	100.00

Source: Ottoman census of 1831, cited in Bülent Özdemir, *Ottoman Reforms and Social Life: Reflections from Salonica, 1830–1850* (Istanbul, 2003), 75.

The 1844–45 survey registers were compiled primarily with fiscal aims in mind and were organized strictly on the basis of households; therefore, it is difficult to use them to generalize about demography. However, it is possible to determine whether these registers covered a significant portion of contemporary Salonican residents by comparing these data with the figures in the census registers of 1831. The 1844–45 survey registers covered 6282 households (table 2).²⁹ If an average household contained five people, the total population would have been about 31,410.³⁰ That estimate is comparable to the population figures in the 1831 census, and it can serve as a workable basis for an analysis of the ethnic/religious composition of mid-nineteenth-century Salonica. It is clear that Jews represented the largest such group. Moreover, their areas of the city were the most densely populated. On average, each quarter in the city comprised eighty-six households. Assuming that each quarter was roughly the same size, Christian quarters had an average of 164 houses per quarter, while the average in Jewish quarters was 194. Muslim quarters, in contrast, exhibited much lower population density, with an average of forty-two households per quarter.

Because the Ottoman administration's tax was to be imposed on the basis of each household's property and income, the 1844–45 survey generally included members of the household other than the head only if they held income-generating property or were employed. When the wife of a household head owned a shop, for example, her name was recorded along with her annual income. Likewise, when a male other than the household head was employed, his occupation and annual income were recorded. Such cases were relatively uncommon and thus do not yield much information regarding

²⁹These registers have also been used by Mehmet Ali Gökaçtı in "1845 yılında Selanik," *Tarih ve Toplum* 28 (1997): 15–22. He considers all registered individuals as household heads and concludes that there were 6,924. However, non-Muslim children of age ten and over were also registered for poll tax purposes even though they were not heads of households, rendering his statistical analysis problematic.

³⁰This is the coefficient used in Kayoko and Aydın, *Ottoman State and Societies*.

Table 2. Ethnic/religious distribution of Salonican households, 1844–45

Ethnic/religious affiliation	Number of households	Percentage	Number of people (presumed)
Jewish	2683	42.7	13415
Muslim	2034	32.4	10170
Christian	1342	21.4	6710
<i>Müste'min</i>	145	2.3	725
Gypsy	78	1.2	390
Total	6282	100.0	31410

Source: "Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income," 1844–45, Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT.

Table 3. Jewish and Christian household composition in Salonica, 1844–45

	Number of households	Number (%) of households with more than one male registered	Number of males registered
Jewish	2683	685 (25.5)	3608
Christian	1342	92 (6.9)	1452

Source: "Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income," 1844–45, Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT.

household composition. However, registry entries for Jewish and Christian households also included all male inhabitants who paid poll tax, enabling us to compare the composition of at least Christian and Jewish households (table 3). A quarter of Jewish households registered at least one male other than the household head. In Christian households, the rate was much lower: multiple men lived in only 6.9 percent of those households. Although this finding confirms the assumption that Jews often lived in large families or even in groups of multiple families, it is important to examine household composition more closely to gain a better understanding of the dynamics of household size.

Of the 685 Jewish households with more than one male member, 539 (78.7 percent) included one or more sons, 128 (18.6 percent) included one or more brothers, 10 (1.5 percent) included fathers, 6 included both son(s) and brother(s), and 2 included sons-in-law of the household head. In total, 742 sons, 152 brothers, 10 fathers, 2 sons-in-law, and 19 apparently unrelated males were registered in these Jewish households. In contrast, almost all of the additional males registered in the 92 such Christian households were sons; they were brothers in just 2 households and unrelated males in 4 households. A total of 104 sons, 2 brothers, and 4 other males were registered in

Christian households. We should keep in mind that the males in question were counted simply because they had to pay the poll tax, which means that not all were of working age.³¹ Indeed, none of the sons registered in Christian households worked at that time, nor did the sons in 93 percent of the Jewish households that included sons. The 7 percent of Jewish sons who did work apparently were unable to establish their own households but may have had families of their own, so that multiple families may have resided within individual households; this provides a partial explanation for the larger size of Jewish households. This explanation is reinforced by a similar situation involving households that included brothers: there were no working brothers in Christian households in this category, but the brothers did have occupations in 27 percent of such Jewish households. As with the sons, these brothers may have had families but were unable to establish separate households despite having an occupational income, augmenting the prevalence of multifamily living.³²

Occupational Tendencies and Income Levels

Mid-nineteenth-century Salonica was a commercial city par excellence, marked by strong occupational diversification, a large number of economic sectors, and a multitude of occupations in each sector. Traders enjoyed a significant presence in this port city, but a wide variety of other industries were represented as well. An examination of the full spectrum of these economic domains can enrich our image of Salonica's commercial life and clarify the complex functioning of its urban space.

The strong artisanal sector, which encompassed a variety of occupations, is especially indicative of the diversity of productive forces in Salonica. Large numbers of residents employed in the transportation sector further attest to the city's economic vitality. Agriculturalists also played a vital role in the urban environment despite their limited numbers, mostly because of the predominance of agricultural exports. Many other residents were employed as workmen, with no capital beyond their own labor. Finally, a significant number of household heads were registered as holding no occupation, a designation that may help elucidate the changing dynamics of urban poverty at a time

³¹In the Salonica census registers of 1843–44, non-Muslim males were subject to poll tax beginning at age ten. See OA, NFS.d 4974 [1259/1843–4].

³²This preliminary analysis is also confirmed by the census registers of 1843–44, which show that the average number of children per household was 1.23 in Jewish households but only 0.68 in Christian households. See Dilek Akyalçın Kaya, "Les conditions économiques et les caractéristiques démographiques des juifs saloniens au milieu du XIXe siècle," in *Salonique, ville juive, ville ottomane, ville grecque*, ed. Esther Benbassa (Paris, 2014), 19–46.

Table 4. Economic sector distribution of Salonican household heads, 1844–45

Sector	Number of total households	% of total households	Number of Jewish households	% of Jewish households	% of Jewish households within sector
Artisan	2221	35.4	539	20.1	24.3
Commerce	1315	21.0	932	34.7	70.8
Assisted	702	11.2	517	19.3	73.6
Manual labor	696	11.0	198	7.4	28.4
Transportation	377	6.0	282	10.5	74.8
Agriculture	183	3.0	–	–	–
Administration	109	1.7	19	0.7	17.4
Religious	71	1.1	7	0.3	9.8
Military	43	0.6	–	–	–
Education	27	0.4	3	0.1	11.1
Rentier	20	0.3	7	0.3	35.0
Not recorded	272	4.3	119	4.4	43.8
Other	246	4.0	60	2.2	24.0
Total	6282	100.0	2683	100.0	

Source: “Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income,” 1844–45, Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT.

when Salonica was undergoing an unprecedented economic expansion.³³ It is important to understand the dynamic relationships between these diverse economic groups in order to understand the full complexity of economic activity in mid-nineteenth-century Salonica.

The Jews of Salonica were represented to varying degrees in almost every sector of the economy (tables 4 and 5).³⁴ Perhaps the most striking aspect of this data is the high percentage of Jewish households among those categorized as assisted, or “living off others’ aid”—that is, without any annual income of their own. Overall, approximately one in ten Salonican households was said to be assisted, and nearly three-quarters of those households,

³³Two studies have examined Salonican occupations in earlier years: Vassilis Dimitriadis uses the 1831 census registers (which listed the occupations of the Christian population) as well as the 1861 registers of corporations (in the court registers [*sijills*] of the city); Meropi Anastassiadou uses pious foundation (*vakf*) and market dues (*ihitisab*) registers from the 1830s. Vassilis Dimitriadis, “The Esnaf System and Professions in Nineteenth-Century Thessaloniki,” *Archivum Ottomanicum mélanges en l’honneur d’Elizabeth A. Zachariadou* 23 (2005/6): 131–41; Meropi Anastassiadou, *Salonique*, and “Artisans juifs à Salonique au début des Tanzimat,” *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 66 (1992): 65–72. None of the registers used by these two researchers included information on occupational income, however.

³⁴For an analysis of the occupational tendencies of Jews and the economic structure of the community in the Ottoman Empire in an earlier period, see Rozen, “La vie économique des juifs,” 296–350.

with no occupation and no income-generating property, were Jewish. Why were there so many assisted households in the Jewish community? It is likely that the phenomenon was related at least partly to the disappearance from Salonica of traditional broadcloth (*çuka*) production.³⁵ The local industry originated in the late fifteenth century with the arrival of Iberian Jews, who began producing fabric for the Janissaries' uniforms in lieu of tax payments. By the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, Ottoman economic fluctuations, combined with the arrival of European textiles, had undermined the broadcloth industry and the livelihoods of the Jews who dominated it. As I. S. Emmanuel has pointed out, the abolition of the Janissary corps in 1826 also decreased opportunities for Jewish textile work.³⁶ It seems likely that those listed without occupation in the survey registers had lost their jobs after 1826, as no Jewish household heads were recorded as occupied in the broadcloth industry.

In contrast, the Jewish presence and even dominance in the commercial and transportation sectors highlights the important role Jews played in the economic functioning of Salonica. Nineteenth-century travelers often described Salonica as a commercial city—not surprisingly, given its geographical characteristics.³⁷ Its hinterland offered not only a significant capacity to produce agricultural commodities for export but also a considerable market for imported goods. Both increased substantially during the nineteenth century. Moreover, the city played an important role as a center of transit between Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Salonica's Jews were regarded as the principal actors in the commercial sector, and the registers of 1844–45 confirm their predominance.³⁸ At the same time, however, Muslims and Christians also played non-negligible roles in Salonican commerce. Of the 1,315 Salonican men registered as merchants, 932 (71 percent) were Jewish, 205 (17 percent) were Muslim, and 161 (12 percent) were Christian.³⁹

After the expulsion of Iberian Jews from Spain and Portugal and their arrival in Ottoman port cities—including Salonica—during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they became indispensable agents of Ottoman international trade. The transformation of global economic structures over the

³⁵For the broadcloth industry in Salonica, see Veinstein, “Sur la draperie juive,” 55–64; Emmanuel, *Histoire de l'industrie*.

³⁶Emmanuel, *Histoire de l'industrie*, 59.

³⁷Edward Daniel Clarke, *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa, Part the Second: Greece, Egypt, and the Holy Land* (London, 1816), 364–66; Felix Beaujour, *View of the Commerce of Greece Formed after an Annual Average, from 1787 to 1797* (London, 1800); Henry Holland, *Travels in the Ionian Isles, Albania, Thessaly, Macedonia, etc. during the Years 1812 and 1813* (London, 1815), 323–32.

³⁸Nehama, *Histoire des israélites*, 6:570.

³⁹Sixteen *müste`mins* and one Gypsy worked in this sector.

Table 5. Occupations practiced by more than ten household heads in Salonica, 1844–45

Christians	Jews	Muslims			
Shoemaker	83	Porter	244	Servant	339
Coarse wool cloth maker	75	Servant	192	Tanner	171
Bread maker	75	Occasional merchant	180	Farm owner	104
Farm laborer	70	Peddler	171	Barber	92
Servant	63	Tailor	105	Hosier	71
Carpenter	58	Draper	101	Clerk	60
Innkeeper	52	Broker	100	Occasional merchant	60
Grocer	46	Butcher	50	Farrier	59
Herbalist	41	Secondhand dealer	45	Loincloth maker	51
Boatman	41	Grocer	40	Goat fur weaver	37
Liner	33	Fisher	39	Tinsmith	36
Furrier	32	Boatman	37	Farm steward	33
Tailor	28	Lemon seller	31	Lumberman	29
Shoe repairer	27	Fig seller	27	Broker	26
Multicolored cloth maker	24	Silkman	26	Imam	26
Groom	21	Cotton seller	26	Carpenter	25
Printed cloth maker	19	Scrap dealer	22	Saddler	21
Grape seller	18	Whitewasher	21	Artilleryman	21
Cook	17	Poultry seller	19	Shoemaker	20
Dyer	17	Broker in retail commerce	18	Halva maker	19
Secondhand dealer	16	Itinerant vendor	17	Broker in retail commerce	17
Big merchant	14	Tobacco merchant	17	Tobacco pipe maker	15
House servant	14	Matchmaker	16	Cotton cloth maker	14
Jeweler	13	Greengrocer	16	Boatman	13
Packsaddle maker	13	Physician	15	Roasted chickpeas maker	13
Gardener	12	Tinsmith	15	Secondhand dealer	12
Baker	12	Itinerant female garment vendor	14	Tax farmer	12
Coachman	11	Dyer	14	Chair maker	12
Cobbler	10	Locksmith	14	Rentier	12
Butcher	10	Sherbet maker	14	Thin-soled shoe maker	11
		Herbalist	13	Muezzin	11
		Clerk	13	Soldier	10
		Fruit seller	13	Chimney sweep	10
		Nail maker	13	Quilt maker	10
		Twister	12		
		Merchant	12		
		Rawhide sandal maker	11		
		Thin-soled shoe maker	11		
		Winder	10		

Source: "Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income," 1844–45, Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT.

following centuries also transformed the role of Ottoman Jewish merchants, however. As Jewish migration slowed and Jewish networks and knowledge of European languages began to diminish in the latter half of the seventeenth century, Ottoman Jews began to lose their commercial advantage. Similar trends continued into the nineteenth century, and the survey of 1844–45 offers a basis for analyzing the results of those trends both for the international commercial position of the Salonican Jewish community and economic hierarchies within the community.

It is interesting that the foreign Jewish merchants known as Francos are completely absent from the survey registers, despite the fact that they had begun settling in Salonica in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The existence of a separate register of foreign Christians suggests the possibility that a register of foreign Jews in Salonica remains to be found in the Ottoman archives.⁴⁰ It is also possible that the Francos were able to negotiate with the Ottoman administration to avoid registration.⁴¹ In any case, it is important to note that foreign Jewish merchants who were present in the city in the mid-nineteenth century do not appear in the following analysis of Salonican commerce.

Strikingly, the survey registers reveal that only two of the twenty-six substantial Salonican merchants (*bazergan*) engaged in international trade were Jewish. To these two we should probably add three Jewish broadcloth merchants, whose very high occupational incomes would seem to indicate involvement in international trade. Nonetheless, the registers confirm that by the mid-nineteenth century Salonica's Jews had largely relinquished their predominance in international trade to Christians and foreigners.

However, the registers indicate that the Salonican merchant (*tüccar*) class was dominated by Jews, corroborating Nehama's argument that Salonica's Jews controlled internal trade.⁴² According to the registers, 84 percent of tobacco, cotton, and silk merchants were Jewish, indicating that most transactions involving the agricultural production of Salonica's hinterland were in Jewish hands. Yet despite their domination of this sphere, local and regional merchants earned modest incomes compared to their international counterparts. This is somewhat unexpected, as consular reports and travelers' descriptions indicate that local agricultural products were Salonica's most important exports.⁴³ The moderate income level of these merchants may indicate that they engaged primarily in small-scale local and regional commerce

⁴⁰The register included 149 households of foreign Christians: OA, ML.VRD.TMT.d 11464.

⁴¹For a similar case in Izmir, see Alp Yücel Kaya, "19. yüzyıl İzmir'inde Tüccarlar ve Esnaflar veya Hacıagalar, Beyler ve Frenkler," in *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Esnaf ve Ticaret*, ed. Fatmagül Demirel (Istanbul, 2012), 92.

⁴²Nehama, *Histoire des israélites*, 6:223–24.

⁴³Henry A. S. Dearborn, *A Memoir on the Commerce and Navigation of the Black Sea, and the Trade and Maritime Geography of Turkey and Egypt* (Boston, 1819), 219–27.

or that they functioned as intermediaries, buying hinterland products for sale to the big international merchants.

Most Jewish merchants involved in local trade were either intermediaries or engaged in small-scale retail commerce. In fact, about 70 percent of all intermediaries in mid-nineteenth-century Salonica were Jewish (the rest being Muslim). In general, their incomes were very low. Because of the diversity and volume of commercial activity in Salonica, the city had several different sorts of intermediary occupations, including commissioners (*komisyoncu*), brokers (*simsar* and *dellal*), brokers specialized in retail commerce (*perakende simsar*) and itinerant brokers (*ayak dellalı*). All of the *komisyoncu* and *perakende simsars* were Jewish and all of the *ayak dellals* were Muslims. Unfortunately, the registers provide no information about the exact nature of these occupations. The distinction between the occupations of *simsar* and *dellal* is even more confusing. Both terms referred to brokers; they were used interchangeably, and nineteenth-century dictionaries described them as synonyms.⁴⁴ However, the 1844–45 income registers give the impression that these terms denoted different specializations associated with different ethnic/religious groups, since all *dellals* were Muslims and nearly all *simsars* were Jewish (except for two Christians and one Muslim).

Of all commercial occupations, Jews most commonly engaged in small retail commerce, which generated far less income than other commercial activities. In fact, around 66 percent of Jewish merchants engaged in small retail activities, primarily as shopkeepers or itinerant merchants. While some Jewish shopkeepers, primarily herbalists (*attar*) and grocers (*bakkal*), did relatively well compared to the average city occupational income of 218 piastres, the majority of shopkeepers and itinerant merchants—including fruit, lemon, and raisin sellers, occasional merchants (*zuhurat tüccarı*), peddlers (*çerci*), secondhand dealers (*eskici*), itinerant vendors (*tablakar*), itinerant female garment vendors (*bohçacı*), and market vendors (*bazarıcı*)—had very low annual incomes.

Other traditional Jewish occupations outside commerce were the related professions of pharmacists and physicians. Both were distinguished from other artisanal occupations in terms of income, coming closer to high-income commercial activities. The 1844–45 registers recorded nineteen physicians, fifteen of whom were Jewish; the other four were foreigners (*müste`mins*). Of the eleven pharmacists recorded, nine were Jewish, one was Christian, and one was foreign.

As artisans, Salonican Jews worked in every field of craft, including textiles (141 Jews), food production (126), construction (33), the production of

⁴⁴Şemseddin Sami, *Kamus-ı Fransevi: Fransızcadan Türkçeye lugat / Dictionnaire Français-Turc* (Istanbul, 1882/1299), 496, 595.

household wares (52), metals (38), and leather (22), as well as in the service sector (35). Although some individual Jews in these artisanal occupations recorded decent incomes, most earned very modest amounts similar to the incomes of porters and unskilled workers.

In port cities like Salonica, transportation-sector employees were vital to economic functioning. In mid-nineteenth-century Salonica, porters and boatmen dominated the transportation service sector. The 377 people listed as working in transportation included 249 porters and 93 boatmen. Jews dominated the first of these occupations (244)⁴⁵ and constituted an important presence (37) in the second. Both were associated with very low incomes, relegating Jewish transport workers to the lowest socioeconomic levels of the urban hierarchy.

Individuals classified as manual laborers also played an integral role in the mid-nineteenth-century Salonican economy. According to the survey registers, 696 household heads worked as servants, laborers, or domestics who could be broadly classified as manual laborers. About half (49.4 percent) were Muslim, 28.4 percent were Jewish, and 21.8 percent were Christian; 2 individuals were *müste`mins*. Most manual laborers were characterized as “servants” (*hizmetkar*), but the registers do not explicitly lay out the nature of their work. A few entries do specify servants’ workplaces, so we have records of “innkeepers’ servants” (*hancı hizmetkari*) and “grocers’ servants” (*bakkal hizmetkari*), among others. Although the dearth of detail in the registers makes it difficult to generalize, it seems probable that the designation “servant” often simply referred to unskilled urban workers. In his monograph on nineteenth-century Ottoman agriculture, Tevfik Güran mentions that “servants” were usually agricultural workers,⁴⁶ but in Salonica’s urban environment it seems more likely that this term was used for laborers in Salonican artisans’ workshops. The majority of servants (57 percent) were Muslim, while another 32 percent were Jewish and 11 percent were Christian. Their economic conditions were similar to those of porters, with whom they shared the bottom rung of the local socioeconomic hierarchy.

What is the significance of this snapshot of mid-nineteenth-century Jewish occupations? Most important, the majority of Salonicans without specified occupations were Jewish. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, as Nehama mentions, the broadcloth industry, run primarily by Jews, provided a significant source of Jewish employment.⁴⁷ Some of those rendered unemployed by the disappearance of that industry may have been unable to adapt

⁴⁵For the internal organization of porters, see Donald Quataert, “The Industrial Working Class of Salonica, 1850–1912,” in *Jews, Turks, Ottomans: A Shared History, Fifteenth through Twentieth Century*, ed. Avigdor Lévy (New York, 2002), 196–97.

⁴⁶Tevfik Güran, *19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı tarımı* (Istanbul, 1998), 164.

⁴⁷Nehama, *Histoire des israélites*, 6:221.

Table 6. Distributions of annual occupational incomes of household heads within ethnic/religious groups, 1844–45

Annual occupational incomes (piastres)	Jewish households (%)	Muslim households (%)	Christian households (%)
0	24	17	15
1–218	54	58	31
219–999	20	24	50
≥ 1000	2	1	4

Source: “Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income,” 1844–45, Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT.

Note: The average annual occupational income across all Salonican households was 218 piastres. Dilek Akyalçin Kaya, “Les sabbatéens saloniciens (1845–1912): Des individus pluriels dans une société urbaine en transition” (PhD diss., École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, 2013), 34–104.

to the new economic conditions. They may have been those who in 1844–45 were registered as “living off others’ aid,” implying that they had neither an occupation nor any income-generating property and hence were dependent on communal assistance.

It is also important to note that the survey registers reveal much more widespread severe poverty in the Jewish community, affecting both unemployed Jews and those with low-income occupations. An analysis of table 5 shows that most of the occupations held by more than ten Jews in Salonica involved unskilled labor and/or commercial activities that generated low incomes. Porters, servants, occasional merchants, peddlers, and secondhand dealers neither required nor generated any sort of professionalization. In many ways, the situation of Salonica’s Jews in this respect was similar to that of local Muslims; Christians in Salonica performed more artisanal labor in addition to unskilled labor. This pattern is further verified by an analysis of communal occupational incomes, which clearly indicate similar economic conditions in the Jewish and Muslim communities and a different situation among Salonican Christians (table 6).

Income variations within and between confessional groups allow us to explore both the broader structure of socioeconomic differentiation in Salonica and the situation of Jews within that structure. It is clear that in the mid-nineteenth century, Jewish and Muslim annual household occupational income distributions followed pyramidal patterns with very large bases comprising incomes of less than 219 piastres and small apexes comprising incomes of 1000 piastres or more. Christian household occupational incomes, in contrast, were more evenly distributed, and a larger percentage of the Christian population was in the highest income category. Confessional differences in income among those in the same occupation are also revealing.

In some predominantly Muslim and Jewish occupations, particularly the category comprising merchants of various kinds, Jews earned more than their Muslim counterparts. Similar disparities were present among intermediaries, principally because Jews tended to predominate in more highly compensated intermediary occupations. The average annual earnings of Jews working as commissioners (467 piastres), *simsar* (362 piastres), and *perakende simsar* (285 piastres) were significantly higher than those of Muslims working as *dellal* (171 piastres) and itinerant brokers (156 piastres). Such disparities were characteristic of commercial occupations in Salonica in general: Jews typically earned more in such occupations than did Muslims.

However, in noncommercial occupations, including both administrative occupations (such as clerks) and artisanal occupations (such as makers of thin-soled shoes), Muslims earned more on average than their Jewish counterparts. This suggests that there was no consistent wage disparity between the aggregate Muslim and Jewish populations of Salonica. Christians, however, present a different case. In all occupations practiced by both Jews and Christians, Christians earned more than Jews. This observation applies equally to candy sellers (among whom Jews earned an average of 271 piastres and Christians 639 piastres) and to grocers (Jews earned 233 piastres and Christians 492 piastres on average), as well as to such diverse occupations as sherbet makers and sellers, dyers, makers of rawhide sandals, watchmakers, butchers, and tailors. In occupations practiced by members of all three groups, Christians earned the most by significant margins. On average, Jews earned very slightly more than Muslims in such occupations. For example, in the case of tobacco merchants, Christian earned an average of 433 piastres per year, Jews 224, and Muslims 221. Similar patterns can be observed among boatmen and secondhand dealers. It is thus important to note that relative poverty was not limited to Salonica's Jews, but rather was shared by the city's Muslim population. This suggests that the economic condition of Jews in mid-nineteenth-century Salonica cannot be explained by factors affecting the Jewish community in isolation from the larger society. Rather, their socio-economic circumstances can be understood only when juxtaposed with the circumstances of other components of Salonican society and contextualized within the general economic situation of the city.

Another Indicator of Wealth: Poll Tax⁴⁸

Theoretically, the amount of poll tax levied on non-Muslim males over the age of ten was determined by the economic situation of the head of house-

⁴⁸For the transformation of poll tax in the nineteenth century, see Zafer Gölen, "1267 (1851) Cizye nizamnamesi," *Belgeler: Türk Tarih Belgeleri Dergisi* 24 (2003): 41–51.

Table 7. Distribution of poll tax paid by non-Muslim Salonicans, 1831

	Assessed at high income level (%)	Assessed at middle income level (%)	Assessed at low income level (%)	Total
Christians	11.5	58.5	30.0	2175
Jews	5.6	20.0	74.4	–

Source: Vassilis Dimitriadis, “The Esnaf System and Professions in Nineteenth-Century Thessaloniki,” *Archivum Ottomanicum mélanges en l’honneur d’Elizabeth A. Zachariadou* 23 (2005/6): 131–41.

hold.⁴⁹ In 1844–45, poll tax was levied on 4,737 non-Muslim males in Salonica.⁵⁰ In order to determine the levy, the income level of each household was assessed as either high (*ala*), medium (*evsat*), or low (*edna*).⁵¹ We have access to three quantitative accounts of the poll tax in Salonica between 1831 and 1845 with which to explore both the number of people subject to poll tax and the amounts they paid: the 1831 census, an 1835 Salonican court register (*sijil*), and the survey data from 1844–45 (tables 7, 8 and 9). Both of these earlier documents have been analyzed previously: the 1831 census by Vassilis Demetriades and the 1835 register by Bülent Özdemir.⁵²

A comparison of these tables shows that the proportions of the taxable population in these communities remained relatively constant between 1831 and 1835. However, the population fell considerably in the decade between 1835 and 1845: nearly a quarter of the taxable population (1,460 people, or 24 percent) disappeared from the registers, primarily owing to plague and the political repercussions of the Greek revolution.

An analysis of the changes in poll tax levies that the Christian and Jewish communities in Salonica experienced in the period from 1831 to 1845 reveals a decrease across both populations in the proportions of those paying poll taxes at the high and middle income levels and an increase in the proportion paying at the low level. These trends were more pronounced among

⁴⁹According to Halil Inalcık, “in conformity with the precise prescriptions of the shari’a, the Ottoman government always exempted children, women, the disabled, the blind, and the poor without resources from the poll tax.” Halil Inalcık, “Djizya: Période ottomane,” in *Encyclopédie de l’Islam*, new ed. (Leiden, 1977), 2:576–80. See also the explication of the poll tax in n. 31 above.

⁵⁰There were 5145 non-Muslims registered in Salonica altogether, but 408 of these were exempt from poll tax due to old age or illness.

⁵¹In 1834, the amount paid at each level of tax was 60, 30 and 15 piastres respectively. Halil Inalcık, “Djizya,” 578.

⁵²Dimitriadis, “The Esnaf System,” 131–41; *Sijil* of Salonica 229: 110, 3 şevval 1250 [February 2, 1835], cited in Özdemir, *Ottoman Reforms*, 81.

Table 8. Distribution of poll tax paid by non-Muslim Salonicans, 1835

	Number (%) assessed at high income level	Number (%) assessed at middle income level	Number (%) assessed at low income level	Total
Christians	250 (11.5)	1280 (58.5)	655 (30)	2185
Jews	205 (5)	862 (22)	2840 (73)	3907
Total	455	2142	3495	6092

Source: Bülent Özdemir, *Ottoman Reforms and Social Life: Reflections from Salonica, 1830–1850* (Istanbul, 2003), 81.

Table 9. Distribution of poll tax paid by non-Muslim Salonicans, 1845

	Number (%) assessed at high income level	Number (%) assessed at middle income level	Number (%) assessed at low income level	Number (%) exempt	Total
Christians	100 (7)	750 (52)	470 (32)	132 (9)	1452
Jews	65 (1.8)	340 (9.4)	2928 (81.2)	275 (7.6)	3608
Gypsies	30 (35.3)	46 (54.1)	8 (9.4)	1 (1.2)	85
Total	195 (3.8)	1136 (22.1)	3406 (66.2)	408 (7.9)	5145

Source: "Survey Registers of Real Estate, Land, Animals, and Income," 1844–45, Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, Istanbul, ML.VRD.TMT.

Salonica's Jews than they were among the Christian population.⁵³ The distribution of the three poll tax levels among each non-Muslim population in the 1844–45 survey records can further contribute to our understanding of the relative economic conditions of these populations in mid-nineteenth century Salonica. As shown in table 9, the burden of the poll tax in the Christian community was predominantly assumed by those at the middle-income level. In contrast, of the Jews who paid the poll tax in Salonica in 1844–45, 81.2 percent paid the lowest rate. Compared to the Christian community, this proportion was very high. It is true that the tax levels were always open to

⁵³A. E. Vacalopoulos mentions that "the Sultan rescinded the old tax regulations according to which the Greeks, on account of their greater prosperity and their greater numbers before the rebellion, paid two thirds of the total taxes and the Jews one third," citing an 1825 firman. He states that "the Jews were clearly four or five times more numerous than the Greek rayas, they have become rich and exceedingly well-to-do and are obviously in a position to pay the taxes." A. E. Vacalopoulos, *History of Macedonia, 1354–1833*, trans. Peter Megann (Thessaloniki, 1973), 651–52. However, the income registers of 1844–45 demonstrate that the situation of the Jews was not nearly as positive as Vacalopoulos suggests. Moreover, it seems that the Greek population was able to recover economically, if not necessarily numerically, from the political and economic crises resulting from the Greek insurrection fifteen years earlier.

Table 10. Distribution of poll tax paid by other Jewish communities, 1831

	Assessed at high income level (%)	Assessed at middle income level (%)	Assessed at low income level (%)
Bursa households	17.9	50.7	31.4
Edirne households	7.6	64.2	28.2
Izmir households	2.6	34.4	63.0

Source: Daniel Panzac, *La peste dans l'empire ottoman 1700–1850* (Leuven, 1985), 359.

negotiation with administration officials, but these differences nonetheless provide clues as to the general economic conditions of the two communities. Though there were far more Jews than Christians in Salonica, the Jewish community paid less tax overall than did the Christians, indicating that the Jewish community as a whole earned less than the Christian community. This conclusion is consistent with the previous analysis of occupational income levels, as well as with the large number of Salonica's Jews that were listed as having no occupation.

Table 10 shows the distribution of poll tax rates in 1831 in three other Ottoman Jewish communities—those of Bursa, Edirne, and Izmir. If we compare these rates with those paid in the same year by Jews in Salonica, it becomes clear that the situation of Salonica's Jews was not only worse than that of the Christians in the city: it was also worse than the situations of other Jewish communities in Ottoman cities that had considerable Jewish populations.

How Did Salonica's Jews Deal with Poverty?

Both occupational income levels and poll taxes indicate the broad extent of Salonican Jewish poverty and the economic fragility of the community in the mid-nineteenth century. A minority of Jewish household heads managed to offset this economic fragility to some extent through other sources of income, such as real estate rents and the occupational incomes of sons and brothers. As much of this additional income as possible was contributed to the well-being of Salonican Jewish families.

Occupational income constituted on average only 78.5 percent of the total income of Salonican Jewish households, so other sources of income contributed significantly to ameliorating household economic conditions. This was also true of Salonican Muslims, for whom occupational incomes constituted on average 72 percent of household incomes. Salonican Christians

were again outliers in this respect; occupational income comprised on average 87 percent of their total income. The sources of the outside income that all these groups received can provide important insights into both patterns of investment and living practices in mid-nineteenth-century Salonica.

For both Muslims and Christians in Salonica, most external income was derived from rents on workplaces such as shops and stores. Such rents provided 49 percent of external income for Muslims and 36 percent for Christians. The incomes of working sons and brothers contributed a further 29 percent of non-occupational income for Muslims and 28 percent for Christians. Some household heads also rented out residential property, a practice that provided 11 percent of Muslim and 25 percent of Christian outside income. To a more limited extent, members of both communities leased rural real estate, collecting rent on gardens, vineyards, and other properties, a practice that provided 11 percent of Muslim and 11 percent of Christian external income. The fact that Christians and Muslims primarily invested in income-generating properties indicates that they had access to the capital necessary to purchase such investments.

The extra-occupational incomes of Salonica's Jews came from very different sources. By far the bulk of external Jewish income (60 percent) came from rents on residential property. A further 20 percent was derived from renting out workplaces like shops and stores. Brothers' and sons' working incomes contributed 18 percent, and just 2 percent came from rents on rural real estate, especially vineyards.

The fact that 60 percent of Jewish extra-occupational income derived from residential rents should not be read to suggest that Salonica's Jews invested capital in multiple houses. On the contrary, most Jews with rental income rented rooms in their own houses. Instead of indicating investments, then, such rents should be seen as a survival strategy and a means of avoiding—as much as possible—poverty.

To a limited extent, communal living practices in the Salonican Jewish community can also be seen as a way of raising household income. That is, although married sons remained in their fathers' households primarily because they could not afford to establish their own households, their presence also served to contribute to the total household income.

Conclusion

In addition to offering a snapshot of the socioeconomic conditions of Salonica's Jews in the mid-nineteenth century, this analysis of the 1844–45 survey registers illustrates an important turning point for the community. In the first half of the nineteenth century, Salonica's Jews felt the impact of broad

Ottoman economic fluctuations strongly. A comparison of the data in the survey registers with poll tax data from earlier years enables us to observe how such changes had affected the lives of Salonicans in general, and Salonican Jews in particular. Many of Salonica's Jews had no income except for the aid they received from others. Even those who did work generally had low annual incomes and struggled to satisfy household needs.

The economic and social transformation that Salonica underwent in the latter half of the nineteenth century, which included an unprecedented increase in the pace of commerce, large-scale industrial development, and the building of new transportation facilities such as the port and the railroad, profoundly affected the socioeconomic conditions of the city's inhabitants.⁵⁴ These changes created the need for a qualified workforce, prompting the Ottoman administration, in conjunction with all three ethnic/religious communities as well as foreign interests, to pursue educational reform.⁵⁵ Salonica's Jews were educated in the French schools of the Alliance Israélite Universelle with the explicit aim of meeting the new need for white-collar employees. At the same time, emerging industries began employing unskilled laborers in large numbers. Salonica's Jews were disproportionately affected by both of these developments, both because of their numerical dominance in the city and because of their economic condition in the mid-nineteenth century. As heretofore jobless and/or unqualified workers, they constituted an important source for both the emerging white-collar occupations and the urban proletariat in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Acknowledgments I would like to thank the participants in the international workshop "The Jews of Salonica in the Modern Period, 1492–1950," organized by the International Hellenic University in June 2012, for their very helpful feedback.

⁵⁴For the socioeconomic structure of the Jewish community of Salonica in the second half of the nineteenth century, see Paul Dumont, "Social Structure of the Jewish Community of Salonica at the End of the Nineteenth Century," *Southeastern Europe / L'Europe du sud-est* 5, no. 2 (1979): 33–72; Esther Benbassa and Aron Rodrigue, "Artisanat juif en Turquie à la fin du XIXe siècle: L'Alliance israélite universelle et ses oeuvres d'apprentissage," *Turcica: Revue d'études turques* 18 (1985): 113–26.

⁵⁵For the impact of the schools of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in the Ottoman Empire, see Aron Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews: The Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Politics of Jewish Schooling in Turkey, 1860–1925* (Bloomington, IN, 1990).