

PAPA EFTİM AND THE FOUNDATION
OF THE TURKISH ORTHODOX
CHURCH

FOTİ BENLİSOY

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2002

PAPA EFTIM AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE TURKISH ORTHODOX
CHURCH

Dissertation submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
History

By
Foti Benlisoy

Boğaziçi University

2002

The peculiar type of identity of the Turcophone Anatolian Orthodox (*Karamanlılar*) communities arose a controversy between the Greek and the Turkish nationalisms in the early 20th century on whether they were Turcicised Greeks or whether they were Christian Turks. The controversy was related with the attempt of founding a Turkish Orthodox Church during the Greek-Turkish war of 1919-1922. The aim of the attempt was to provide a separate church for the *Karamanlı* by identifying them with the Turkish nationalist movement. By supporting the "Turkish Orthodox Church" project Ankara sought to weaken and counter the Greek and foreign propaganda on the "Turkish atrocities" towards the Anatolian non-Muslims. This was also a way of countering the Greek territorial claims on Anatolia since the Turkish national church was demonstrating that there were no "unredeemed Greeks" in Anatolia but Christian Turks. The creation of an independent Anatolian Turkish Church was not a mere ecclesiastic or religious affair. The separation from the body of the Orthodox Church meant in fact for the *Karamanlı* Christians their separation from the Greek national body since the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greek-Orthodox religion were seen as the primary link of union between the "free" and the "unredeemed" Greeks. The main indicator of the Greekness of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia was their attachment to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. On the other hand the relation between the theories regarding the Turkishness of Anatolian Christians and the emerging Turkish nationalism was contradictory, since Islam in the early 1920's, was defined as an integral part of the Turkish national identity. For that reason, the attempt to found a Turkish national church and the theories on the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians was contradictory to the general trend of the National Struggle. Hence, despite the growing belief that the *Karamanlı* Christians were of Turkish origin they were eventually included to the population exchange.

Türkdil Anadolu Ortodokslarının (Karamanlılar) kendilerine mahsus kimlik biçimleri, Yunan ve Türk milliyetçilikleri arasında erken 20. yüzyılda bunların Türkleşmiş Yunanlılar mı, yoksa Hristiyan Türkler mi oldukları hakkında bir tartışma doğurdu. Tartışma 1919-1922 Yunan-Türk savaşı sırasında bir Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi kurulması girişimi ile ilgiliydi. Girişimin amacı Karamanlıları Türk milliyetçi hareketiyle özdeşleştirerek onlara ayrı bir kilise sağlamaktı. Ankara, "Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi" projesini destekleyerek Anadolu gayrimüslimlerine yönelik "Türk mezalimi" hakkındaki Yunan ve yabancı propagandayı zayıflatmaya ve karşılamaya çalıştı. Bu, ayrıca, Yunanlıların Anadolu üzerindeki toprak iddialarına karşı çıkmamanın da bir yoluydu çünkü Türk ulusal kilisesi Anadolu'da "kurtarılmamış Yunanlılar" değil, Hristiyan Türkler olduğunu gösteriyordu. Bağımsız bir Anadolu Türk Kilisesi yaratılması yalnızca dinî ya da kiliseye ilişkin mesele değildi. Ortodoks Kilisesinin bünyesinden ayrılmak Karamanlı Hristiyanlar için Yunan ulusal bütününden ayrılmak anlamını taşıyordu, zira Ekümenik Patrikhaneye Rum-Ortodoks dinî "hür" ve "kurtarılmamış" Yunanlılar arasında esas birleşme bağı olarak görülüyordu. Anadolu Türkçe konuşan Ortodoks Hristiyanların Yunanlılığının ana göstergesi onların Ekümenik Patrikhaneye bağlı olmalarıydı. Öte yandan, Anadolu Hristiyanlarının Türklüğü hakkındaki teorilerle doğmakta olan Türk milliyetçiliği arasındaki ilişki çelişkiliydi. Zira İslam, erken 1920'lerde Türk ulusal kimliğinin ayrılmaz bir parçası olarak tanımlanıyordu. Bu nedenle, bir Türk ulusal kilisesi kurma girişimi ve Anadolu Hristiyanlarının Türklüğü üzerine teoriler Milli Mücadelenin genel eğilimine ters idi. Böylece, Karamanlı Hristiyanlarının Türk kökenli oldukları hakkındaki büyüyen inanca rağmen nihayetinde bunlar nüfus mübadelesine dahil edildiler.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
i. Outline	9
2. The Foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church	13
i. Papa Eftim Efendi	13
ii. The Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Orthodox of the Interior	18
iii. The Press, the telegrams	25
iv. The Nationalization of the Orthodox Church	34
v. "Turkish Atrocities" and the Turkish Orthodox	42
vi. The Election of Meletios	55
vii. Minorities	59
viii. Eftim's Tour in Cappadocia	64
ix. The Three Prelates	68
x. Eftim in Action	74
xi. The Turkish Orthodox Ecclesiastical Congress	84
xii. Propaganda	103
xiii. The Exchange of Populations and the "Exodus"	109
3. Eftim in İstanbul	119
4. The "Christian Turks"	126
i. The Hellenization of Cappadocia	137
ii. The Turkish Heartland	148
iii. The "Muslim Greeks"	153
iv. Turanians and Mercenaries	158
v. The "Myth" of the Turkish Orthodox	180
vi. The Millet of the Ottoman Muslims and the Christian Turks	184
vii. Secularism and Non-Muslim Turks: the Case of Gagauz	191
5. Conclusion	199
Sources – Bibliography	203

INTRODUCTION

It is well known that a large proportion of the Orthodox Christian population of Anatolia (the so-called *Karamanlı*) was Turcophone. The prevalence of Turkish among the Orthodox communities of the interior Asia Minor in the 19th century is clearly illustrated in the data collected by the Center for Asia Minor Studies. In Cappadocia forty-nine communities out of a total of eighty-one were Turkish-speaking. In Pisidia all six Orthodox communities and in Phrygia fourteen out of nineteen were entirely Turcophone. In Pamphylia six out of seven communities were Turkish-speaking. The linguistic picture of the Anatolian Orthodox communities was in fact more complicated. According to the same source, in Bithynia and in the region of the Euphrates River thirteen and five communities respectively were Armenian speaking. In Cilicia two Orthodox villages spoke Arabic, while in the Asiatic coast of Dardanelles there were three Bulgarian-speaking villages. In the region of Tigris there was a Kurdish and a Syriac speaking village.¹

Such linguistic "peculiarities" were in no way exceptional cases limited to the Orthodox communities of the Empire and the phenomenon of the *Karamanlı* was not a unique and isolated one in the Ottoman world. There were also Turkish-speaking Armenians which also used the Armenian script to write Turkish. In the Balkans there existed Slav populations that were Turcophone and used Cyrillic characters to write Turkish. The "*Frangolevantinoi*", i.e. the Greek-speaking Catholics were writing Greek in Latin (*frangohiotika*). Also there were the Greek-speaking Jews of Istanbul

¹ The data of the CAMS are arranged according to the Roman administrative division. P. Kitromilides - A. Alexandris, "Ethnic Survival, Nationalism and Forced Migration", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 5, 1984-1985, pp. 18-20.

(*Romanioles*) who used Hebrew to write Greek. There were also Orthodox Christians residing in the Jewish quarters of İstanbul, like Hasköy, who spoke *Ladino*.²

In a world and an epoch where language was not a criterion of determining the collective identity of people, linguistic diversity had no political or even religious importance. The language of the political power or of the church was not rival but coexisting with the local languages. The tendency according to which the official and the liturgical languages were distinct and separate from the vernacular was in fact a general feature of the agrarian or pre-modern societies. In the Orthodox tradition as well, differences in language (various languages or dialects) had no importance since they were not influencing that one of the church; to belong to the Orthodox community was not a matter of using a specific language. In fact, an agrarian or pre-modern society is defined by terms of cultural differentiation rather than homogeneity. The state and the ruling elite are not interested in promoting cultural homogeneity and lateral communication between their subject communities. Moreover, such societies do not possess the means for incorporating the masses into a common culture.³ It is for these reasons that the phenomenon of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians of Anatolia should not be approached as a unique case at all.

The case of *Karamanlılar/Karamanlides* has been mostly seen as an example of linguistic and cultural heterogeneity, a result of the mixture of peoples and faiths in the Ottoman Empire. Their special type of writing (*Karamanlıca/Karamanlidika*: Turkish with Greek script) and the relatively large bibliography which uses this script has been studied by Greek, Turkish and European scholars. However, the relation between the growing nationalisms of the 19th and early 20th centuries and the

² Richard Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız: the Turkish-speaking Greeks of Asia Minor", in *Neohellenism*, ed. John Burke and Stathis Gauntlett, Humanities Research Centre, Monograph 5, Canberra Australian National University, 1992, pp. 67-8.

Karamanlı population of Asia Minor has not been explored in depth. Only recently, the works of a number of Greek scholars investigate the effects of Greek irredentism on the communal organization and the collective self-awareness of the Anatolian Orthodox communities.⁴

The 'linguistic Turkishness' of the Anatolian Orthodox communities and their peculiar type of identity acquired importance from the second half of the 19th century, when cultural homogenisation and ethnic origins became the concern of rival nationalisms. This whole issue arose a controversy between the Greek and the Turkish nationalistic discourses. For the Greek scholars *Καραμανλήδες* (*Karamanlides*) were Turcised Greeks. They were of Greek origin and had adopted Turkish by force and as a result of their isolation from the Greek speaking Orthodox communities of the coastal regions. On the other hand, for the Turkish scholars *Karamanlılar* were Christian Turks. According to this theory, the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were descendants of Turkish tribes who had settled in Asia Minor in the ancient times. Specifically, the *Karamanlı* were descendants of the autochthonous Turanian inhabitants of Asia Minor who had lived in the peninsula some 4,000 years ago. These Turanian people adopted Christianity under Byzantine rule but retained their language. According to another version of this theory, the Christian Turks were the heirs of the Turkish mercenaries or peasant-warriors who served the Byzantine armies and adopted Christianity. They have always performed the Orthodox ritual in the Turkish language and their traditions and popular culture were essentially Turkish.

The question concerning the 'true' origins of the *Karamanlı* is beyond the scope of this study. I do not intend to deal with this problem ; whether the *Karamanlı*

³ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1983), pp. 10-2

⁴ Gerasimos Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları*, (Ankara: Ayraç Yayınları, 1997). Sia Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία 19ος αιώνας-1919 Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες*, (Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 1997).

were Greeks or Turks. In fact, the question itself is biased since a view based on a national lineage which extends in centuries and adopts a historical approach according to which nations are the main actor is anachronistic. The main topic that I am going to explore is the antagonism between rival nationalistic claims regarding the origin of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians. Turkish and Greek national discourses sought to define in national terms the peculiar identity of the *Karamanlı* Christians. For both nationalisms this peculiarity was an accidental and degenerated condition that should be altered by the help of the national elites. *Karamanlılar* were identified both as a pure instance of the national culture and as a corrupted version of it. In fact, it was the nationalist elite that decided and choose the elements of the Turcophone Christians' popular culture, which should represent the national culture. I believe that this case constitutes an indicative example in our attempt to explore the plasticity of nationalism and the discursive strategies which are mobilized by it.

According to the Greek nationalists the ancient people of Cappadocia were Hellenised during the Hellenistic period and their language was replaced gradually by Greek. Accordingly, after the spread of Christianity the Greek language and culture prevailed both in urban centres and in rural areas. However, the Turkish invasions reversed this situation and the brutality of the invasion, the long coexistence with the Turks and the isolation from the Greek-speaking communities of the coastal regions caused the gradual disappearance of Greek.

On the other hand, the Turkish nationalists begun to claim the Turkishness of the Anatolian Turcophone Christians at a rather late stage in relation to their Greek counterparts. The belief of the Turkishness of Anatolian Christians was closely related to the concept of an essentially Turkish Anatolia. For the Turkish nationalists, the Turkishness of the *Karamanlılar* was an important proof of the Turkishness of

Anatolia and a counter argument to the Greek territorial claims on it. The connection between this theory and the political circumstances that threatened Anatolia to be politically divided is obvious. In fact, this theory became popular immediately after the armistice, when the partition of Anatolia seemed imminent. The stress that Anatolia was essentially Turkish and did not belong to any other nation brought about the claim that the Christians living there had Turkish origins. The existence of Christian Turks was indicating that Anatolia was not a recently populated by the Turks area but it had very deep rooted historical ties with them.

Therefore, the theories regarding the Turkishness of the Anatolian Turcophone Christians could only be understood in their specific historical context. During the Greek-Turkish war of 1919-1922 Papa Eftim, an Orthodox priest from Akdağmağden, sought to establish a Turkish Orthodox Church. His aim was to provide a separate church for the *Karamanlı* by identifying them with the Turkish nationalist movement. Some from the local clergy and from the community leaders supported Eftim's movement. Papa Eftim insisted on a complete break with the Patriarchate. For him the Phanar was subject to a foreign power and only by severing themselves from the Patriarchate the Orthodox Christians would live in peace in Asia Minor. Especially, during 1921-22 when the Greek army was in Asia Minor the issue became crucial for the Ankara Government. By supporting Papa Eftim and the "Turkish Orthodox Church" project Ankara sought to weaken and counter the Greek and foreign propaganda on the "Turkish atrocities" towards the Anatolian non-Muslims. It was also a way of countering the Greek territorial claims on Anatolia since the Turkish national church was demonstrating that there were no "unredeemed Greeks" in Anatolia but Christian Turks.

The question is whether the whole issue was a spontaneous manifestation of

Turkish national feeling among the Orthodox Christians or was it the result of official pressure. Actually, it is not clear what the *Karamanlı* Christians thought of themselves in national terms. Surely, the most important criterion in defining their collective self-awareness was religion. However, in the second half of the 19th century efforts were made to Hellenise or "re-Hellenise" the Turcophone Orthodox Christians. Schools, educational and literary societies, libraries, reading rooms and clubs with the support of the Greek state were engaged in this effort to inculcate to the Anatolian Orthodox Christians a sense of Greek national identity. In the case of *Karamanlı* these activities did not always meet with success in the learning of Greek from the Turcophones.

It is interesting that the controversy on the ethnic origin of the *Karamanlı* Christians was not a unique phenomenon of the era. After the end of the Great War, rival nationalisms sought to redefine Asia Minor on ethnic terms. In order to legitimise their territorial claims on Anatolia before the western public opinion, the nationalists largely relied on demographical, ethnological and historical arguments. For instance, the Greek propaganda in order to demonstrate that the Turks did not constitute the majority in Asia Minor stated that many Muslims who officially were counted as Turks were in fact of Greek-Christian origin. Accordingly, the contemporary number of the Turks in Anatolia was basically an unnatural phenomenon achieved only by means such as forced Islamization, deportations and massacres. It was the brutality of the Turkish conquest and its oppressive sovereignty that had changed radically the demographical condition of Anatolia. Therefore, the Muslims of Anatolia were in fact of Christian origin and more important many of them had retained a sense of Greekness. It was also claimed that these "Muslim Greeks" saw the dissolution of the Turkish sovereignty as their eventual emancipation. These claims, just like the ones regarding the *Karamanlı* Christians

were aimed to redefine the heterogeneous ethnic and linguistic reality of Anatolia in culturally homogenised national terms.

I also intend to deal with the relationship between religion and the development of nationalism in comparison to the Balkan cases, in which the formation of national identity went hand in hand with the ecclesiastical separation from the Ecumenical Patriarchate (i.e. the independence from the religious institutions of the ancien régime and the nationalization of the church). It is generally accepted that religion is incompatible with nationalism and that national movements were developed contrary to the religious or ecclesiastic authorities. Contrary to this model, which presupposes a conflict between the national and the religious centre, I would argue that the national communities emerged from the “nationalization” of the religious communities.⁵ I will examine the Turkish Orthodox Church project as a case study of this process of nationalization of the *millets*.

The attempt to form a Turkish Orthodox Church must be seen in relation to the general transition from the ecumenical community of Orthodoxy to the world of culturally homogenised modern nations in the Balkan Peninsula. Before the “age of nationalisms”, the Balkan society was politically and culturally unified under the Ottoman sovereignty and the Orthodox Church respectively. The growth of national movements in the 19th century divided this religious community into separate national/religious ones. The conflict was not between the ecumenical Orthodox community and the modern national community but between different nationalized religious communities. Thus, the division within the Orthodox community went hand in hand with the redefinition of the religious community; as a result there emerged a Greek, Bulgarian and even a Turkish Orthodoxy.

⁵ Paraskevas Matalas, *Έθνος και Ορθοδοξία*, (Herakleion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 2002).

For the Greek side, the "unredeemed Greeks" were in fact the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire who was tied to the Orthodox Church. The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greek-Orthodox religion were seen as the primary link of union between the "free" and the "unredeemed" Greeks. Since other components of nationality such as race and language were not suitable, religion was regarded as a more accurate criterion in determining national affiliation. The main indicator of the Greekness of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia was therefore their attachment to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Hence, the creation of an independent Anatolian Turkish Church was by no means a mere ecclesiastic or religious affair. The separation from the body of the Orthodox Church with its centre in Constantinople meant in fact for the *Karamanlı* Christians their separation from the Greek national body. In fact this was what had happened in all the Balkan cases. For instance, the distinction between a Greek and a Bulgar was decided on the base of their religious affiliation to the Ecumenical Patriarchate or to the Bulgarian Exarchate respectively. Even the distinction between a Greek and a Turk was defined on religious terms. The compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey is an affirmation of such an assumption. The only criterion of the exchangeability of a person was his/her religion. A Greek-speaking Muslim of Tonya or a Greek-speaking Muslim of Crete was defined as Turk whereas a Turkish-speaking Christian of Niğde was defined as Greek.

The case of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians is also important in investigating the secular and ethnic limits of Turkish nationalism. The attempt of founding a Turkish church should not be regarded as a mere tactical movement of the Ankara Government. The theories regarding the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians were in fact a part of the process of the construction of the Turkish national

identity. The acceptance of the Turkishness of the *Karamanlı* would have certain implications on the definition of Turkishness. In fact, Turkish nationalism emerged from the nationalization of the Ottoman Muslim *millet* and for that reason Islam, at least in the early 1920's, was defined as an integral part of the Turkish national identity. For that reason, the attempt to found a Turkish national church and the theories regarding the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians seem to be contradictory to the general trend of the National Struggle. The prevailing *Gökalpian* definition of the nation was promoting culture (*hars*) in determining one's nationality and the racial criterion was regarded as secondary. Religion as an ethical-normative system was seen as an important ingredient of the cultural unity that constituted the nation. Moreover, Islam was the base of the Turkish national movement that enabled its leadership to ally themselves with different ethnic groups and with the conservatives. Hence, despite the growing belief that the *Karamanlı* Christians were of Turkish origin they were eventually included to the population exchange.

Outline

In the first chapter, I attempted to review the history of the founding of the "Turkish Orthodox Church". Since this history is directly related to the life of its founder Papa Eftim Karahissaridis or Karahisarlıoğlu, I focused on his personality. For doing this, I mostly used the oral tradition archives of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies. This archive possesses invaluable material from the Orthodox community of Keskin, which amply illustrates the activities of Eftim. Then, I tried to place Papa Eftim and his community in Keskin into the broader context of the Anatolian Orthodox Christian communities of the early 1920's. For that purpose I concentrated

on the developments of the centre of "the unredeemed Greeks", i.e. the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The line of action of Phanar after the armistice and, later on, the Greek occupation brought the Orthodox communities of the interior Asia Minor in a difficult position. In fact, they were left in the middle of the two quarrelling sides.

In this context, I concentrate on the ways that the Orthodox communities exhibited their support to the Turkish nationalists. For this purpose, I largely used the Turkish press of the era. I also sought to demonstrate the importance of that support for the Kemalists in order to counter the western propaganda. For that purpose, I dealt with the main themes of the Greek propaganda. In that way, I sought to answer the question of to what extent the support of the Christians was heartfelt. I then proceed to the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church. I contrasted this process to the one of the Balkan national churches, since the government of Ankara itself sought to legitimise its intervention through these examples. I also questioned the role of these examples in the attempt to establish a Turkish national church. Thus, I tried to place the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church in the broader context of the nationalization of the Orthodox Church.

Then, I focused on the activities of Papa Eftim, the plans of the government and most important, the controversies among the Orthodox Christians. The role of the high-ranking Orthodox prelates that had remained in Anatolia was crucial. It was them who countered the plans of Eftim and sought to delay the process as much as possible. The Turkish Orthodox Church Congress in Kayseri, which summoned in the summer of 1922, became an arena of these contesting approaches. For that purpose, I mainly used Greek sources and most importantly the manuscripts from the archives of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies of those who had personally joined the congress. The organ of the congress *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* was a very important

source in this respect. The reactions of the Patriarchate, the relations of Eftim with the western churches and the assessments of the foreign observers constituted another part of my research. For these, I used the official journal of the Patriarchate, *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, the journal of the Anglican Church regarding the eastern Christendom, *The Christian East* and several accounts of western journalists.

The first chapter ends with the compulsory population exchange that took place between Greece and Turkey and which deprived the newly founded Turkish Orthodox Church from its flock. I intended to seek the reasons of the Turkish government for including the Anatolian Orthodox Christians in the population exchange. I also focused on the reactions of Papa Eftim to the governmental decision and his efforts to maintain the Orthodox Christians in their fatherland.

Between the first and the third chapter, there is a shorter one in which I dealt briefly with the activities of Eftim in İstanbul. Since this part of the history of the Turkish Orthodox Church is mostly related to the history of the Greek minority of İstanbul and to the Patriarchate in the Republican era, which are beyond the scope of this study, I did not attempt to present it in detail.

In the second chapter, I tried to place the debate on the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians into the broader context of the formation of the Turkish national identity. Initially, I questioned the place and the meaning of Cappadocia and the *Karamanlı* Christians in the formation of the Greek nationalist discourse. For this purpose, I relied on the ethnological literature of the Cappadocian intelligentsia. Secondly, I questioned the extent to which the Orthodox Christians perceived themselves as Greeks. Then, I mentioned some early examples of the claims regarding the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians in order to demonstrate that these arguments had their roots in the development of the Turkish nationalism.

12

One of my objects is to demonstrate that the case of the "Christian Turks" was not exceptional. The post-war political conditions in Anatolia enabled rival nationalistic discourses to claim that different groups in fact belonged to their national entities. Accordingly, every nationalism sought to homogenise a heterogeneous social reality in national terms and to claim its superiority. In order to demonstrate this, I largely used the Greek propaganda literature of the era and its claim regarding the "Muslim Greeks", i.e. those Muslim groups that were supposed to have Greek origins.

Further on, I focused on the Turkish authors who dealt with the issue and I discussed their arguments in the context of the Turkish nationalism. I contrasted these arguments with the prevailing definition of Turkish national identity and the assumptions on nationalism according to which religion had a key role. In doing so, I distanced myself from the Greek authors who generally regard the attempt to found a Turkish church and the claims on the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians as mere tactical manoeuvres of the Kemalists. In contrast, I regarded these claims and theories as a part of the emerging Turkish national discourse.

I sought to demonstrate that the inclusion of the Turkish-speaking Anatolian Christians to the population exchange was in accordance with the prevailing assumptions of nationalism. I also intended to trace the persistence of these assumptions in time and for that reason I exemplified some authors who dealt with the issue in the 1930' and 1940's. Lastly, I concentrated on the case of the Gagauz in order to prove that certain religious characteristics of national identity continued to be influential even in an era when a more secular form of Turkish national identity had prevailed.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE TURKISH ORTHODOX CHURCH

In this chapter I will focus on the process of the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church. The Turkish Orthodox Church came into existence during the Greek-Turkish confrontation and can only be understood within this context. During this period the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians outside the Greek occupation zone faced the growing suspicion of their Muslim compatriots and felt the necessity to take immediate action to demonstrate their loyalty to the Turkish government. The nationalists in order to counter the propaganda on the "Turkish atrocities" and to gain the support of the western public opinion sought to benefit from the Turkish-speaking Christians. The conjunction of the needs of both sides made such an attempt possible and for a while between 1922 and 1923 it seemed that the Christians of Anatolia will separate themselves from the Ecumenical Patriarchate and will form a national church in the line of the independent national churches of the Balkan Peninsula.

Papa Eftim Efendi

The foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church is closely related with the personality of its founder, Papa Eftim. Eftim's secular name was Pavlos Karahisaridis or Karahisarlioğlu and he was born in 1884 in Akdağmağden⁶ of the province of

⁶ Various sources provide us with an array of information about Akdağmağden. According to the journal *Xenophanis* (III, p. 476) there were 2500 Greeks, 1000 Turks and 600 *foreigners* in Akdağmağden. Dawkins, *Modern Greek In Asia Minor*, 1916, p. 6 According to I. Sarantides Archelaos, Akdağmaden was a Greek-speaking community. I. Archelaos, *Sinasos*, (Athens: 1899). A. Papadopoulos also indicates that in Akdağmağden a Pontic dialect was spoken. Papadopoulos, *Ο Υπόδουλος Ελληνισμός της Ασιατικής Ελλάδος Ο Ελληνισμός της Ασιατικής Ελλάδος Εθνικός και Γλωσσικός Εξεταζόμενος* (The Unredeemed Greeks of Asiatic Hellas. An Ethnic and Linguistic Research), (Athens: Βιβλιοπωλείον Ιωαν. Ν. Σιδέρη, 1919), p. 76. The presence of Pontic Greek communities like Akdağmağden in Cappadocia was basically the result of the migration of Pontic mining communities to places suitable for mining activities. These communities were coming mainly from the region of Gümüşhane (Argiroupolis), i.e. the diocese of Chaldea. (See Kitromilides-Alexandris, "Ethnic Survival, Nationalism and Forced Migration", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 5, Athens, 1984-85, pp. 15-6). Kontogiannis mentions that Akdağmağden was founded

14

Yozgat, which ecclesiastically depended on the Diocese of Chaldea.⁷ Both his birthplace and his family name indicate that his origin was from Pontos, Karahisar.⁸ He first attended the local Greek school but later continued in a Muslim school. According to Ergene, Eftim studied at a *Rüşdiye* where he developed a close relationship with his teacher Şevki Efendi. In 1911-12, he attended lessons at the commerce high school in Ankara, and then opened a drapery shop. However, when the Great War erupted, his enterprise, like many others, failed. For a while, he worked for an important fabric trader named Çömlekçoğlu. In 1914 he left Ankara in order to avoid being conscripted in a period of general mobilization. With the help of a governmental official, and family friend, Bahri⁹ (later deputy of Yozgat) he returned to Akdağmağden where he managed not to be conscripted. In 1915, as the situation got worse, he requested from the Metropolitan of Kayseri Nikolaos Sakkopoulos¹⁰ to

by Greek miners at the end of the 18th century. Kontogiannis, *Γεωγραφία της Μικράς Ασίας* (Geography of Asia Minor)(Athens: 1921), p. 135.

⁷ According to Ergene, Eftim was born in 1300 in the neighbourhood of İstanbulluoğlu of Akdağmağden. His father was a tradesman. Teoman Ergene, *İstiklâl Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları*, (İstanbul: İ. P. Neşriyat, 1951), p. 5. Harry Psomiades (The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Republic: The First Ten Years, *Balkan Studies* 2, 1961, p. 51) claims that the *İstiklâl Harbi'nde Türk Ortodoksları*, a mixture of biography and novel, is most probably written by Papa Eftim himself. Such an assumption seems likely since the book's writing has many similarities to Papa Eftim's previous and later works. The book has become the most important source of the Turkish literature on this issue. There are even books that fully rely on it and reproduce it word by word. See for instance: Erol Cihangir, *Papa Eftim'in Muhturaları ve Bağımsız Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi*, (İstanbul: Turan Yayıncılık, 1996); also Süleyman Yeşilyurt, *Atatürkten Bugüne Bilinmeyen Yönleriyle Türk Hristiyanlarının Patrikhanesi*, (Ankara: 1995). Hasan İzzettin Dinamo also has a chapter in his *Kutsal İsyan* (vol. 5, İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1990) with the title "Papa Eftim Ulusal Orkestrada", which also repeats Teoman Ergene.

⁸ Hikmet Yavuz Ercan, "Fener ve Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi", *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, vol. 5, no. 8-9, 1967, p. 417.

⁹ Yusuf Bahri Bey (Tatlıoğlu) was born in 1878 in Akdağmağden. He was the son of a big landowning family. After 1908 he joined the Committee of Union and Progress. Between 1916 and 1918 he was an official of the Reji Administration. He participated in the Congress of Sivas as Yozgat's representative. He was elected as a deputy of Yozgat in the elections for the Ottoman Parliament. After the occupation of İstanbul he came to Ankara where he joined the Grand National Assembly. In 1925 he was accused of planning to overthrow the government. He was judged in the Court of Independence (*İstiklâl Mahkemesi*) of Ankara but in 1926 he was released. Bahri Bey died in 1957. See *Türk Parlamento Tarihi Milli Mücadele ve TBMM I. Dönem 1919-1923*, vol. III, Fahri Çoker (ed.), (Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1995), pp. 979-80.

15
be anointed a priest. After his ordination he took the name Eftim.¹¹ However, only in 1918 did he manage to find a seat, replacing the priest of Keskin, Panagiotis Papadopoulos, who had left for Constantinople for a medical operation.¹² In taking the post of the assistant prelatric trustee (*anaplirotis arhieratikos epitropos*) he was helped by his cousin Pandelis Karahisaridis who was at the time the director of the urban (*astiki*) school in Akdağmağden.¹³ Ergene offers a partly different version of the story. According to him, in 1908 Eftim went to Ankara where he became a fabric trader. He got married in 1911, in 1912 (long before the World War starts) the Metropolitan of Kayseri Nikolaos anointed him deacon and in 1915 he returned to Akdağmağden as a priest. Consequently, in March 1918 he went to Keskin as deputy Metropolitan (*metropolit vekili*).¹⁴

Based on an interview made with G. Pantelidis, the director of the local school in Keskin between 1914-15, Alexandris claims that immediately after the armistice Papa Eftim supported the local nationalist society "*Phtani o İpnos*" and participated in the joint proclamation of the local Orthodox and Armenians. The proclamation was demanding the Patriarchate to mediate for the protection of the local Christians from

¹⁰ Nikolaos Sakkopoulos was born in 1862 in Sinop. He was Metropolit of Maroneia (1902-14), Kayseri (1914-27) and Chaelcedon. He became two times, in 1919 and 1921, locum tenens of the Patriarchal throne. He died in 1927 in Constantinople.

¹¹ According to Mavropoulos, during the World War Eftim avoided being conscripted and found refuge in the monastery of Zincidere, where he became a cleric in 1918 before the armistice. See also I. Hacilias, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/336-7.

¹² K. Georgiadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/327-8.

¹³ A. Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας Τουρκορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας στην Καππαδοκία 1921-1923" (The attempt to found a Turkish Orthodox Church in Cappadocia), *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 4, Athens 1983, pp. 168-70. According to Fotiadis, it was Eftim's uncle who arranged the job near Çömlekçoğlu. However after a while Eftim lost the job and his uncle in order to provide a living to his cousin decided to make Eftim a priest. Fotiadis, Στο Κεσκίν Μάδεν με τον Πατριάρχη του Ρασπουτίν του Ελληνισμού της Μικράς Ασίας (In Keskinmaden with Papa Eftim, the Rasputin of the Hellenism of Asia Minor), (Athens: Εκδοτικός Οίκος Γνώσεις, 1982), p. 105.

¹⁴ Ergene, pp. 5-6.

the Turkish bands by English and French forces.¹⁵ However, when the nationalist movement started to gain control over the region, Papa Eftim re-examined the situation and changed his attitude. Keskin was located between Sivas and Ankara, both of them important centres of the nationalist movement. Eftim taking advantage of this coincidence started communicating with important figures from among the nationalists.¹⁶ He forced the notables of Keskin to contribute financially to the nationalist efforts and plans¹⁷ and sought to persuade the Orthodox community to demonstrate openly their loyalty to the Turkish Government.¹⁸

It seems that during this period, a controversy arose within the community of Keskin, which led Eftim to challenge the Patriarchate openly. When the regular priest Panagiotis Papadopoulos returned to Keskin, the notables of the community asked Eftim to resign, claiming that he had used the financial sources of the community for his personal purposes and good. Eftim did not resign after all as he was supported by the majority of the community.¹⁹ As the news about Eftim's activities reached Constantinople and the controversy within the community culminated, the Patriarchate sent to Keskin as a mediator Papa Theodoros Mavropoulos, who supported Papa Panagiotis. This decision of the Patriarchate's commissioner might

¹⁵ According to Alexandris, such a paper does not exist neither in the archives of Foreign Office nor in the archives of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Fotiadis states that Eftim in the Theofania festival of winter 1919 arranged a celebration with the Greek flag and national hymn. Fotiadis, pp. 73-6.

¹⁶ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks Ahaliye Müracaatı ve Patrikhaneye Karşı Müdafaaanemesi*, (İstanbul: 1924), p. 18. "Keskin Sivas ile Ankara'nın arasındadır. Orda birleşen 4 caddelerin merkezi istasyondur. Bu münasebetle oradan geçen ve geceleri kalan büyük hükümet memurları ve zabıterini hüsn-ü kabul ve haklarında iltifatkârane bulunduk, bu tarkle bunların hüsn-ü himaye ve teveccühlerini kazandık."

¹⁷ Alexandris, "*Η απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...*", p. 170; also Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks...*, p. 18; and Minas Minaidis, "*Ο παπα-Ευθύμ*", *Θρακική Επετηρίδα* tom. 4, (Komotini: 1983), pp. 341-2.

¹⁸ Fotiadis, pp. 77-8.

¹⁹ K. Georgiadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/327-8.

have led Papa Eftim to make his opposition towards the Patriarchate more apparent.²⁰

The fact is that by that time Papa Eftim was very popular in the community of Keskin.

It seems that thanks to his connections to some Turkish officials he had managed to save his community from the deportations and from the raids of Turkish bands.²¹

There is evidence indicating that Eftim helped also the Orthodox who had been exiled from the western regions to the interior. For instance, the women and children of Simav were deported to Keskinmaden. According to Eleni Paulidou and Pipina Psaltaki from Simav, Papa Eftim helped them very much in Keskin. When the population exchange was decided he gave money the women from Simav and sent them with train to İstanbul.²² These accomplishments made him very popular not only in Keskin but also in the wider region.²³

²⁰ A. Silvestriadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/325.

²¹ It is a matter of dispute, whether whose band raided Keskin. I. Hacilyadis claims that it was the band of Topal Osman (Keskinmaden 1, Γ 3/334-5). According to Ioannis Papadopoulos it was the band of Çerkez Ethem with 2000 cavalymen that raided Keskin (Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/321-2). Mavropoulos is of the same aspect. Mavropoulos, *Πατριαρχικά Σελίδες Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον από 1878-1949* (Patriarchal Notes The Ecumenical Patriarchate from 1878 to 1949), (Athens: 1960), p. 270. However according to Fotiadis the band belonged to Topal Osman (Fotiadis, πρ. 81-7) In the *Black Book*, which was published by the Patriarchate, the raid of Ethem's band against Yozgat is described as following: "On 25th of May 1920 about thousand Circassien entered Yosgat and kept it for 14 days. But on the 21th of June when the town was occupied again by the kemalist troops, these began first to plunder them to massacre all the Greeks and Armenians under the supervision of Edhem Bey, their commander. The slaughter took place in the market place so no one could be saved. Many girls were violated, many houses set to fire and many wounded. (...) On the 8th of Septembre the regular Kemalist army under the leadership of the famous in cruelties officer Djemil entered the village of Otsoglou, two hours distant from Yosgat, and caused all the villagers 280 in number and all Greek, to be gathered in the church and then after having violated beastly all the women and girls in the presence of their fathers, husbands and brothers, killed first them and then all the male population not excepting the small babies (...) From this terrible slaughter only 24 people could escape having run away before the arrival of the troops. As the kemalist army had intention to invade and massacre all the surrounding villages, the poor inhabitants were obliged to live their homes and to go to the mountains where many of them perished." *The Black Book*, (Constantinople: The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1920), pp. 73-5.

²² *Η Εξοδος Μαρτυρίες από τις Επαρχίες της Κεντρικής και Νότιας Μικρασίας* (Exodus, Memoires from Central and South Asia Minor), vol. 2, (Athens: Center of Asia Minor Studies, 1982), pp. 421-3. Pipina Psaltaki: "I know that they accuse Papa Eftim. However he supported us very much. If he was not I do not know whether I could have stayed alive", p. 423.

²³ "Papa Eftim's Christianity saved many people. They could not slaughter Keskin thanks to him" (I. Hacilyadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ 3/334-5). "I wish that all of us could be as good Christians as him" (Konstantinos Georgiadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ 3/323-4). "Papa Eftim was an excellent man and a first class priest. The Christians of Keskin owe him their lives" (A. Silvestriadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/331). "He saved both us and the Armenians from the deportations" (D. Azariadis, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/330).

Ergene tells a different story concerning the beginning of the tension between Eftim and the Patriarchate. According to this version, at the end of 1918, the Patriarchate, sent a circular to Papa Eftim as the deputy of the Metropolitan in Keskin, stating that Turkey had been ceded to Greece and therefore there was no need neither to obey the Turkish authorities nor to remain an Ottoman subject. He was particularly ordered not to take part in the coming elections. When Eftim did not obey these orders, in December 1918, the Patriarchate asked the *Sadrizam* to arrest Eftim and send him to İstanbul. However, the *Kaymakam* of Keskin, Avni Bey overlooked this order and saved Eftim.²⁴ According to Elöve who quotes an interview with Papa Eftim himself, it was the governor of Ankara Muhiddin Paşa who did not act in conformity with the orders from İstanbul.²⁵

The Patriarchate in Constantinople and the Orthodox of the Interior

Meanwhile, drastic changes took place in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which affected dramatically the condition of the Orthodox Christian communities in the interior Asia Minor. After the signing of the Mudros Armistice, a strong campaign against the Patriarch Germanos V (Kavakopoulos)²⁶ started. The Patriarch was

See also Aleksandris, "*Η Απόπειρα Δημοουργίας...*", pp. 171-2; and Fotiadis, pp. 36-9 and 77. According to Fotiadis if Eftim was not so power thirsty he would had been very useful to his community (p. 61). Eftim also claims that he gathered many orphans and gave the administration of the orphanage of Kayseri to the Americans. Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi 'nin Ortodoks...*, pp. 20.

²⁴ Ergene, p. 9; also Şahin, *Fener Patrikhânesi ve Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 1980), p. 189.

²⁵ Mustafa Emil Elöve, "Türkiyede Din İmtiyazları I. Kısım", *AÜ Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, c. 10, no: 1-4, 1953, p. 363.

²⁶ Georgios Kavakopoulos was born in Balat in 1840. He studied in Jerusalem, Athens and in the Theological School of Chalki. In 1863 he became a cleric and took the name Germanos. In 1864 he became archidiaconos of the Patriarch Sophronios. He was elected Metropolitan of Ko (1867), Rodos (1876-1888), Herakleia (1888-1897) and Chalkeidon (1897-1913). On the 28th of January 1913 he was elected Ecumenical Patriarch. He was criticized of not reacting properly to the persecutions of Greeks during the Great War and was forced to resign. He died in 1920 and was buried in Chaelcedon. Valsamis, *Οι Πατριάρχες του Γένους* (The Patriarchs of the Nation), (Volos: Εκκλησιαστική Βιβλιοθήκη Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Δημητριάδος, 1995), pp. 131-2.

accused of having compromised with the Young Turks and not having defended the Ottoman Greeks actively in the years of the World War. Also a number of financial scandals added to the discredit of Germanos. The campaign ended with the resignation of the Patriarch on the 25th of October 1918. From this moment until the 8th of December 1921 when the new Patriarch Meletios Metaxakis was elected, the Patriarchal throne remained empty, a unique case in the entire period of Ottoman rule. On October 28th, the Patriarchal Mixed Council was replaced by a new one, which consisted of politically more active members.²⁷

The new council postponed the Patriarchal election until a definite peace settlement would be concluded and elected the Metropolitan of Bursa Dorotheos (Mammelis)²⁸ as *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal throne. Athens played an important role in the postponement of the election. According to the Venizelos government if a new Patriarch was elected, its result should also be approved by the Sublime Porte according to the Organic Laws of the Orthodox Church. This procedure would surely strengthen the position of the Ottoman Government since such an action would mean that the Greeks of Thrace and Asia Minor, as well as the Patriarchate were still subject to the Ottoman state. For Greece these settlements represented the conditions before the Great War. The object of both the Greek Government and of the officials of the Patriarchate was to open the matters out until a definite peace settlement was reached and the future of Asia Minor and especially of Constantinople decided. Therefore the

²⁷ Alexis Alexandris, "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor During the Greco-Turkish Confrontation of 1919-1922", *Byzantine & Modern Greek Studies* 8, 1983, pp. 142-3.

²⁸ Dorotheos Mammelis was born in Sigi in Propontida. He studied in the Theological School of Chalki and then became the archidiakon of the Diocese of Chalcidion. In 1892 he was elected bishop of Kallioupoli. In 1895 he became Metropolitan of Grevena and in 1901 of Nicopolis and Preveza. In 1908 he was elected Metropolitan of Bursa and in 1912 he became the head of the Mixed Council. In October 1918, after the resignation of Patriarch Germanos V he became *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical Throne. He died on the 18th of March 1921 while he was in London. *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 13 March 1921, No. 10.

Patriarchal election was strictly connected to the greater issue of the status that the Peace Conference would grant for the Greeks of the Ottoman lands. That was the reason for the delay of the Patriarchal election, which would be realised only after the end of the peace conference.²⁹ Another justification to the delay of the election was the difficulty of deciding whether the metropolitans of the dioceses outside Ottoman territory could participate to it. The Ottoman Government, in contrast to the Patriarchate, was against to their participation.³⁰

The conditions after the armistice led the Patriarchate to completely abandon its traditional policy of conciliation with the Ottoman Government. The Phanar started playing the role of a national centre, supporting openly the emancipation of the unredeemed Greeks. Thus, the Patriarchate was put under the protection of a Greek-Cretan regiment from November 1918. The Patriarchate abolished the teaching of the Turkish language in Greek schools on January 21, 1919. On March 16, the Greek churches of Constantinople resolved upon uniting with the Greek state: "The Greeks of Constantinople and the neighbourhood assembled today in their churches ... and proclaimed their unshakable wish to obtain complete national re-establishment. They regard Union with the mother-country Greece as the only firm basis for natural development in the future... and entrust the Ecumenical Patriarchate, their supreme national authority, with the task of transmitting the present resolution to the representatives of England, France, the United States, Italy and Greece at the Peace Conference." In this way, the Ottoman Greeks were released from their civic responsibilities as citizens of the Ottoman state and the Patriarchate assumed

²⁹ Nanakis, *Η Χηρεία του Οικουμενικού Θρόνου και η Εκλογή του Μελέτιου Μεταξάκη 1918-1922* (The Vacancy of the Ecumenical Throne and the Election of Meletios Metaxakis), (Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο της Θεσσαλονίκης, 1991), pp. 30-1.

³⁰ Sonyel, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire*, (Ankara: Publications of Turkish Historical Society, 1993), p. 362.

21

complete sovereignty over the Ottoman Greek-Orthodox population.³¹ The Patriarchate, claiming that the Ottoman Government was not able to govern the country, refused to communicate directly with the Porte from March 1919. On January 1919, the Patriarchate requested from the Greek ministers, senators, deputies and civil servants in the Ottoman administration to resign from their posts. The Greeks were also urged to abstain from municipal or general elections. According to Alexandris "The Greek decision to refrain from participation in the general elections of November/December 1919 coupled with the March proclamation of releasing the Ottoman Greeks from their Ottoman civil responsibilities, mark perhaps the formal demise of the *Rum Milleti*".³²

This new line of action of the Patriarchate, along with the occupation of Smyrna by the Greek army³³ made the situation worse for the Orthodox Christians who were still under Turkish control. Especially the Greek occupation had provoked a storm of protest and the Muslim Turkish feeling was agitated all over Anatolia. In consequence, retaliation and reprisals by the Turks in the interior were feared.³⁴ W. S. Edmonds from the British Foreign Office commented this situation as follows: "The Greeks, who are scattered by handfuls all over Anatolia, are likely to pay a heavy price for this acquisition of territory."³⁵ Especially when the nationalists started to

³¹ Alexandris, "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor...", p. 145.

³² *ibid*, p. 146.

³³ The Patriarchate addressed an official communique on 24 May 1919 expressing "gratitude for the occupation of Smyrna".

³⁴ According to the *Black Book*, on the 27th of July 1920 a letter was thrown into some Christian houses and the Cathedral of Konia. The letter was as follows: "Coursed goad. Fanatic infidel. You have been fed with Turkish bread, and in return you spread poison in this country. It is known that for your sake the mean Armenians have been killed with women and children. Now they ask refuge to England but seen unsuccessful they complain to Europe through their representation in Constantinople, but all in vain! You will be killed by our knives. Don't believe that Djemal Pacha is dead, His partners are present. We see that you prepare to found your own state here. It estimate that your two thousand christian die. Don't lose your time because your end is near." The *Black Book*, pp. 76-7.

gain control in the interior and when the Greek army expanded the occupation zone, many members of the Orthodox communities deported to the inland.³⁶ Even Eftim found himself in danger. His cousin Pantelis Karahisarlıdis in Akdağmaden was accused of being involved in the separatist movement of Pontos, and this made the authorities suspicious of Eftim. He was arrested and imprisoned in Ankara in order to be judged by the Court of Independence (*İstiklâl Mahkemesi*). However, thanks to his connections with the deputy of Edirne Şeref Bey³⁷ he succeeded to be freed.³⁸ Papa Eftim referred to the incident of his cousin on July 1922 in a circular where he countered the claims of the Patriarchate regarding the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church. The Patriarchate in a declaration had referred to the execution of Eftim's cousin in order to illustrate that the "Turkish Orthodox" movement was manipulated by the government and the Orthodox were forced to enrol in it.³⁹ However, according to Eftim, the responsible for the fate of his cousin was not the Independence Court, but the Patriarchate, which deceived the Anatolian Orthodox Christians. In order to accomplish its aims, the Patriarchate sent money to the Orthodox communities to strengthen the separatist Pontic movement and ordered the Christians not to take part in the elections. Eftim claimed that he warned many times the community of Akdağmaden, but that the local priest Papa Yorgi ignored his warnings. Many from the community of Akdağmaden, including Papa Yorgi and his

³⁵ Sonyel, p. 356.

³⁶ Raptopoulos, Προκόπιος Λαζαρίδης Μητροπολίτης Ικονίου, Λυκαονίας και Β. Καππαδοκίας (Prokopios Lazaridis Metropolitan of Konya, Likaonias and N. Cappadocia), manuscript 394, Lykaonia 8, pp. 49-57. See also Έξοδος vol. II.

³⁷ Mehmet Şerafettin Bey (Aykut) was born in 1874 in Edirne. He studied in the School of Law in İstanbul. He made his career as a journalist. He was among the founders of the *Trakya ve Paşaeli Müdafaa-ı Hukuk Cemiyeti*. He was elected deputy of Edirne in November 1919. After the occupation he was sent to Malta. He was released one year later and he joined the Grand National Assembly. He died in 1939. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, pp. 321-2.

³⁸ Mavropoulos, pp. 270-1

cousin, started to take part in politics and joined the Pontos movement. Eventually these people were punished for their acts by the Independence Court, while the innocents faced no problem. So for Eftim, one should not blame the court, which had acted according to the existing laws but Papa Yorgi and the Patriarchate who used these innocent people for their political intrigues.⁴⁰ Interestingly enough, in a later pamphlet, Papa Eftim does not mention his cousin's activities. For him, it was only his activities to protect the Christians which made some "fanatical Turks" suspicious of him. He admits nevertheless that it was thanks to some "good recommendations" that the judge decided to release him after three days in prison and save him from a "certain death".⁴¹

This new situation made Papa Eftim act more openly in his policy. He appointed a new council of elders in Keskin and in December 1919 he persuaded the Christians of Ankara to participate in the Ottoman elections and he played a vital role for the election of Keskinli Rıza⁴² deputy of Kırşehir.⁴³ Eftim, in Elöve, claims also that he personally participated in the elections as *müntehib-i sani*.⁴⁴ According to Eftim, it was natural that the developments in Phanar and İstanbul would cause anger

³⁹ "Meletyos Rüesa-i Ruhaniyeyi İtham Ediyor", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 25 June 1922.

⁴⁰ "Fener Patrikhanesi Bunlara Ne diyecek?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 2 July 1922 and "Baba Eftim'in Yeni Bir Beyannamesi", *Vakit*, 10 July 1338/1922.

⁴¹ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks...*, pp. 18-9.

⁴² Mehmet Rıza Bey (Keskinli Rıza) was born in Kırşehir in 1877. He studied in the *Rüştiye* of Kırşehir and engaged in trade. After 1908 he joined the Committee of Union and Progress. He was charged with participating in the Armenian massacre during the armistice. In late 1919, he organized the *Kuva-yı Milliye* in the region of Keskin. He was elected as deputy of Kırşehir in the elections of 1919 of the Ottoman Parliament. After the occupation of Constantinople he came to Ankara. In 1924 he was accused of organizing a revolt in Kırşehir to overthrow the Republican Government. He was arrested on the 13th of May 1924 and judged in the *İstiklal Mahkemesi* of Ankara. He was hung on the 10th of January 1926. See *Türk Parlamento Tarihi* vol. III, pp. 654-5.

⁴³ A. Silvestriadis, KMS Oral Tradition Archive, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/325. Papa Eftim and Rıza had good relations and supported each other (I. Papadopoulos, KMS Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/321-2). It also seems that Rıza had good relations with the local Christians and helped them. (I. Hacıliadis, KMS Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/315 and A. Silvestriadis, KMS Oral Tradition Archive, Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/317). See also Alexandris, 1983, p. 173. According to Fotiadis Rıza's mother was Christian. Fotiadis, p. 18.

among the Turks towards the Orthodox Christians. He criticizes that the prelates in Phanar did not consider the position of the Anatolian Christians and provoked the Turks. For him the aim of the Patriarchate was to force the Turks to retaliation and therefore to make the Europeans intervene.⁴⁵

According to Turgut Erenerol, the son of Eftim, his father was actively supporting the organization of the nationalist forces. Once, Eftim met with the commander of *Kuva-yı Seyyare* of the region, Çolak İbrahim, in Keskin. Eftim helped Çolak to collect from his community the horses, food and clothes he needed for his men. Turgut Erenerol also claims that Papa Eftim met many times with Çerkez Ethem and cooperated with the *kaymakam* of Keskin for the material support of the armed forces.⁴⁶ It seems that the nationalists used Eftim also to pacify the Greek bands. According to Ergene, Eftim received the mission to deal with the bands in the mountains near Akdağmağden. He sent there a committee of four, including two priests. The attempt met with success and the brigands gave up their arms. Some of them were forgiven and some others were allowed to leave the country. Eftim also wanted to go alongside with Fethi Bey, to suppress the Greek bands in Pontos. But, for Ergene, the government worrying for Eftim's security rejected his wish.⁴⁷ Papa Eftim continued to call the armed Orthodox Christians to surrender. For example, on the 6th of January 1922, *İleri* published a declaration of Eftim in which he was calling his "deceived co religions" to give up their arms and to descend from the mountains.

⁴⁴ Elöve, p. 363.

⁴⁵ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks...*, pp. 15-6.

⁴⁶ Ekincikli, *Türk Ortodoksları*, (Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1998), pp. 182-3. Erenerol also claims that Papa Eftim founded a hospital with 200 beds in Keskin for the needs of the army.

⁴⁷ Ergene, p. 15. A. Silvestridis from Keskin claims that Eftim helped the authorities to arrest a local brigand called Sivilsi (Keskinmaden 1, Γ3/314).

He also stressed that this was the last proposal of the government and their last chance.⁴⁸

The Press, the telegrams

In fact, the support of Papa Eftim and the community of Keskin to the national movement was not an exceptional case. Many letters and telegrams from Christian communities, which manifested the support of the Christians to the Ankara government, had been published in the newspapers from 1919 onwards. The telegrams from the Christian communities insisted on showing that they were living in peace and tranquillity among the Muslims. This point was important for the Turkish side, since the terms of the Mudros Armistice had made clear that the allied forces had the right to intervene and occupy the places where there was turmoil or disorder. For example *İkdam* on the 22st of October 1919 published a telegram of the Armenian and Greek communities of Erbaa disclaiming the statements that their lives and properties were in danger.⁴⁹ On the 18th of November the same daily published a telegram sent by the Orthodox community of Salihli stating that the region had never been more secure and that this was thanks to the *Kuva-yı Milliye*.⁵⁰ On the 18th of October 1919, the Greeks and Armenians of Vezirköprü in the *vilayet* of Sivas sent another telegram to the Ministry of Interior, disclaiming the joint declaration of the Armenian Patriarch and Greek Patriarchal *locum tenens* that the Christians of Anatolia were threatened of being massacred.⁵¹

⁴⁸ "Anadolunun Dagi ve Bagi Rumlarına Yine Müessir Bir Beyanname", *İleri*, 6 January 1338/1922.

⁴⁹ Tayyib Gökbiçgin, *Millî Mücadele Başlarken* vol. II, (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1965), pp. 98-9.

⁵⁰ *ibid*, p. 236.

⁵¹ *Ekincikli*, p. 161.

By 1921, the number of these telegrams increased and, more importantly, they started referring to the same wish, the foundation of a "Turkish Orthodox Church". An indicative example of these telegrams was from the Orthodox community of Safranbolu, and it was published in the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on the 1st of May 1921. Eleven notables and the local priest⁵², in the name of the 2749 Orthodox residents of Safranbolu, sent a petition to Ankara asking for the foundation of a Turkish Orthodox Church in a proper locality of Anatolia. The Christian notables of Safranbolu stated that they were Turks in their language, tradition and origins; but because they were under the pressure of the Patriarchate that served Pan-Hellenic ideals, they could not express in public their real nationality (*milliyet-i asliyemiz*). As they were realizing that the Patriarchate was drawing them towards disaster, they eventually decided to declare that they would no longer have any relation with the Patriarchate in Constantinople. The telegram was followed with an editorial informing that many such telegrams had reached Ankara and that it was obvious that the Anatolian Greeks (*Anadolu Rumları*) wished to break off with the Patriarchate. The reason of this was clear for *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*; it was because the Anatolian Orthodox Christians were Turks and because of the interference of the Patriarchate with politics and its treason. The newspaper also stated that the Christians of Anatolia had expressed their wish to found a Turkish Church during the Great War, under the auspices of the government, but that the attempt did not met with success. The editorial concluded with the wish that this time the attempt would be successful.⁵³

⁵² Kırımlıoğlu Hristo, the muhtar of the village of Bazi Yorgi, the muhtar of Kilise mahallesi Dimitri, the priest Yermanos, Dimitri Kemikçioğlu Hristo from the church council, the muhtar of Hanyar mahallesi Vasil, Çilbıroğlu Stavri from the notables of the town, the muhtar of Kırkakan mahallesi Ekmekçioğlu Anastas, the muhtar of Dolambas mahallesi Vasil, Kıratoğlu Hacı Yovan, Ekmekçioğlu Yovan, Şerketçioğlu Mihail.

⁵³ "Anadolu Rumları ve İstanbul Patrikliği", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 1 May 1921/23 Şaban 1339.

From May 1921 onwards, many telegrams from the Orthodox communities of Anatolia referring to the foundation of an independent Turkish Church were published. *İkdam* on the 3rd of May informed that many Anatolian *Rum* communities were sending telegrams to Mustafa Kemal Paşa, to the Ministry of Justice and to the authorities declaring their wish to found an independent church, since they had Turkish origin. *İkdam* gives many examples of these telegrams. The one from the community of Isparta (signed by Papa Nikola, Papa Yovakim, Papa İstitati etc.) claimed that even the priests of the town were from the region and thus they had no connection or relation to the Patriarchate. The bishop of Havza Aristas declared that they disavowed the Patriarchate because it had made the government and their Muslim compatriots suspicious towards the Christians. The priests of Gümüşhacıköy Petre and Dimitri indicated that “the *Rum* who live in Anatolia for many centuries originally come from the Seljuks and they are pure Turks who have become Christians”. The two telegrams from Kayseri underlined that with the foundation of such a Patriarchate; the European powers would not be able to use the Turkish Christians. The *Rums* from Tosya were demanding from the authorities to take immediate action and complete the foundation of the church. The newspaper also declared that these requests were taken under serious consideration by the Council of Ministers (*Heyet-i Vekile*) and that the Ministry of Justice was preparing a special law (*kamun-u mahsus*) on this issue.⁵⁴

İkdam on the 26th of May announced, “based on the testimony of the travellers coming from Anatolia”, that the Metropolitans of Samsun, Trabzon, Giresun and Kayseri declared their attachment to the national government and denounced the line of action of the Patriarchate and declared that they abandoned every relation with it.

⁵⁴ “Anadolu Rumları Ayrı Patrik İstiyorlar”, *İkdam*, 3 May 1921/1337.

The newspaper also informed that the National Assembly was intending to discuss the foundation of the Orthodox Church after the end of the deliberations on the budget.⁵⁵ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on May 20 published a telegram of the Orthodox community of Trabzon addressing Mustafa Kemal Pasha and declaring their wish to found a Turkish Orthodox Church.⁵⁶ *Sada-yı Hak* (İzmir) on the 28th of May 1921, basing its information on the Anatolian Agency, repeated the information that the Orthodox community of Trabzon had sent a telegram to Ankara declaring that it was in favor of the foundation of a Turkish Orthodox Church.⁵⁷ On May 26 *İstikbal* (Trabzon) published a telegram from the Orthodox community of Maçka demanding the foundation of a new patriarchate in Anatolia. *İstikbal* continued to publish the telegrams of the Orthodox communities of Samsun, Çorum, Mecidözü, Torul etc. allk expressing the same wishes.⁵⁸ On April 11, the governor of Kastamonu S. Sami informed Ankara of a petition coming from the *Rum* of Taşköprü demanding the foundation of a Turkish Orthodox Church.⁵⁹

Such telegrams continued to be sent. On the 13th of January 1922, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published a telegram of Papa Atanas in the name of the Orthodox community of Samsun. Papa Atanas underlined that in Anatolia no Greek minority existed and that the authority to protect the rights (*müdafa-i hukuk selahiyeti*) of the "Turkish Orthodox" belonged only to the government of the Grand Assembly and not to the

⁵⁵ "Anadolu Metropolitleri İstanbul Patrikhanesi ile Kat-ı Münasebet Ettiler", *İkdam*, 26 May 1921.

⁵⁶ Mesut Çapa, *Pontus Meselesi*, (Trabzon : Serander Yayınları, 2001), p. 40.

⁵⁷ Zeki Arıkan, *Mütareke ve İşgal Dönemi İzmir Basını (30 Ekim 1918-8 Eylül 1922)*, (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1918), p. 114; also Sabahattin Özel, *Millî Mücadelede Trabzon*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991), pp. 227-8.

⁵⁸ Çapa, pp. 40-1.

⁵⁹ Mahmut Goloğlu, *Anadolu'nun Millî Devleti Pontos*, (Ankara: Kalite Matbaası, 1973), p. 252.

Patriarchate.⁶⁰ On January 14, *Yeni Şark* published a telegram of the Orthodox Christians of Maçka sent to the Grand Assembly and to the Ministries of the Interior, Foreign Relations and Justice. It expressed the belief that in Anatolia there was no Greek nation (*Rum Elenik*) and that the Christians of the region were Turkish Orthodox Rum (*Türk Ortodoks Rumlar - Türk Rumları*) who denounced the Patriarchate.⁶¹

We do not know exactly whether these letters of support to the government and the later ones which referred to the establishment of the Turkish Church, represent the real wishes and commitments of the Anatolian Christian communities, or whether they were in a way made up by forcing the Orthodox communities to express such opinions. It is obvious that the Turkish-speaking Orthodox communities were in a difficult position. According to Fernan, it was very normal for the *Karamanlı*, when they faced with both Greek and Turkish nationalisms to fall into a conflict of loyalty (*loyalitätskonflikt*). They were a tiny minority among the Turks and the only thing they could do, in order not to provoke their anger, was to separate themselves from the line of action of the Patriarchate.⁶² It is sure that the Christians, fearing of repercussions, especially after the occupation of İzmir, must have adopted such tactics in order to protect themselves.⁶³ For example, in Kastamonu on the 22nd

⁶⁰ "Türk Ortodokslar", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 13 January 1922, no. 404.

⁶¹ Özel, *Millî Mücadelede Trabzon*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991), p. 238.

⁶² Friedrich-Wilhelm Fernan, *Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn Gegenwart und Tradition des Orthodoxen Orients*, (Opladen: C. W. Leske Verlag, 1967), p. 106. K. Yüst informs us, that the Turkish press of Anatolia had showed an aggressive attitude towards the *Rum*. It was criticizing the brutalities of the Greek army taking place against the Muslim population in the occupied territories, and was calling the government to implement the same measures against the *Rum*. K. Yüst, *Kemalist Anadolu Basını*, Orhan Koloğlu (ed.), (Ankara: ÇGD Yayınları, 1995), p. 165.

⁶³ The Orthodox Christians feared mostly of the deportations. The measure of deportation was largely employed during the Great War and after and many Christians had been exiled to the interior of Asia Minor. In February 1922 Sir Samuel Hoare noted that "the Nationalists are still using conscription, namely the forcing of Christians into serving in labour battalions, as the most effective method for exterminating the Christian populations. Conscription is not an old institution in Turkey. Indeed it was

of April 1921 a big gathering took place protesting against the violent acts of the Greek army in the occupied zone. After the gathering, the notables of the city sent a telegram to Ankara declaring the hatred of the local people towards the Greek atrocities. The telegram called the Greek army to stop these atrocities which were contrary to the law and to the principles of civilization. If they did not behave themselves, the telegram concluded, Greece and the countries that support it would be the only ones responsible for the reactions these actions would bring about. Two days later, on the 24th of April 1921, a telegram from the local Orthodox community addressing the Grand Assembly was published in the local newspaper *Açıksöz*. The telegram also passed judgements upon the atrocities of the Greek occupation army. Certainly, there was a relation between the former telegram concluding with the mention of a "reaction" two days earlier, and that of the Orthodox community. The Christians of Kastamonu most probably took this line of action in order to prevent a Turkish reaction.⁶⁴

Alexandris questions even the authenticity of the majority of these letters. For instance, *İkdam* on 30 December, 1921 published a letter from the Metropolitan of Zonguldak Germanos, according to which the Orthodox of his region were supporting the nationalist cause. Alexandris informs that in fact, not only was there no prelate with this name in the region, but also, Zonguldak was not even a Metropolitan diocese of the Orthodox Church.⁶⁵

only introduced by Enver and the Young Turks. It has been consistently used as the best instrument for destroying the Christian male population. As long as the Turks conscribe Christians and draw them where they will, there is little hope for the Christians communities." Signor Tuozi, the Italian agent in Ankara also pointed out that "the deportations were continous and that he saw numerous gangs of Christians formed into labour battalions going up into the interior." Kritikos, "Motives For The Compulsory Exchange", *Δελτίον Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* vol. 13, Athens, 1999-2000, p. 219.

⁶⁴ Eski, *Kastamonu Basımında Milli mücadele'nin Yankıları*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995), pp. 30-33.

The Patriarchate on the other hand, declared many times that these manifestations of support to the Turkish nationalists were counterfeit. In the *Black Book*, (a famous propaganda book published by the Patriarchate) for example it is claimed that "about the middle of October of the same year (1919), the 3rd Army Corps had recommended telegraphically to the Municipal President of Ordou to try and persuade some of the Greeks, to sign a document refuting all crimes committed by the Turks against the Christians, and stating that in the interior of that district there is perfect loyalty and tranquillity."⁶⁶

The contemporary observer Arnold Toynbee was cautious about such manifestations of support from both sides. In the Near East, he explains, the "rulers are shameless in forging testimonials from their victims." He gives the example of the Turkish villages surrounding Aydin which had suffered from outrages by the Greek troops in the summer of 1919, at the beginning of the occupation. "Many of them had been 'shot up' and burnt; but when I visited Aidin in February 1921, the Greek authorities showed me an 'original' document -duly written in Turkish and sealed by dozens of Turkish mukhtars (village headmen) from this very district- petitioning for the perpetuation of Greek rule! (...) The seals were the seals of the mukhtars, but the voice was the voice of an examinee in universal history, and there is the same suspicious erudition about the thesis attributed to Papa Eftim."⁶⁷ Also for the Soviet journalist K. Yust who between 1920-22 observed the Turkish press under the Ankara Government, these letters were mostly fake.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 174. The essential subdivision of the hierarchical structure of the Orthodox Church was the Metropolitan dioceses. In fact a Metropolitan is an archbishop. He is under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch and he has under his immediate jurisdiction bishops to each of whom is assigned a section of the diocese.

⁶⁶ *The Black Book*, pp. 38-9.

⁶⁷ Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*, (New York: 1970), pp. 192-3.

⁶⁸ K. Yust, p. 48.

What seems of great importance is that these telegrams, spontaneous or not, expressing the genuine will of the Christians or not, had in fact accelerated the process of the foundation of the Turkish church. On the 1st of May 1921 the Council of Ministers (*İcra Vekilleri Heyeti*) took the decision to establish a Turkish Church.⁶⁹ Also on the 5th of May it requested the Minister of Justice Celalettin Arif Bey to inform them if the foundation of such a church, for the emancipation of the Christians who were of Turkish origin, was possible.⁷⁰

İkdam in an editorial published on the 7th of May 1921, mentioned that the Anatolian Orthodox Christians were asking to be emancipated from the rule of the Patriarchate. They were also supporting the foundation of a new church, which would be in conformity with their national aspirations. The newspaper concluded by characterising the movement of the Anatolian Orthodox as a national action (*hareket-i milliye*). It was also referring to the Bulgarian case by presenting it as totally similar to the case of the Anatolian Orthodox. As the Bulgarians had sought to gain their independence from the Phanar that was serving Greek national interests, so the Anatolian Orthodox wanted to establish their own national church. *İkdam* concluded that the issue was in no way a purely religious or ecclesiastical one and from that perspective, whichever initiative taken by the Government regarding the issue would be natural. When the Bulgarian Church was founded the Ottoman Government had been actively involved to the issue and this had been judged as very normal by the Christian public opinion. The Bulgarian example, as we will see, would become a common point of reference of the discussion. The editorial concluded with the wish

⁶⁹ Adnan Sofuoğlu, *Fener Rum Patrikhanesi ve Siyasi Faaliyetleri*, (İstanbul: Turan Yayıncılık, 1996), p. 146; also Hakan Alkan, *Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi (Anadolu Patrikhanesi)*, (Ankara: Günce Yayıncılık, 2000), p. 39.

⁷⁰ Alkan, p. 63.

that this national and religious attempt (*dava-yı milli ve dini*) would meet with success and that the new church would be acknowledged by the Christian world.⁷¹

On May 10, *İkdam* repeated its information that the National Assembly was going to prepare a law concerning the foundation of a Turkish Church.⁷² The draft of the law was prepared by Baha Bey who had been for a long time the director of religious affairs in the Ministry of Justice (*Adliye Nezareti Mezahip Müdürlüğü*) in Constantinople and he was requested by the Ankara Government to deal with the issue as an expert.⁷³ On June 1, the francophone Constantinopolitan newspaper, *Le Bosphore*, published the draft together with the announcement of the Minister of Justice Hafız Mehmet⁷⁴ regarding the issue. The draft eloquently presented the aim of the Government as an attempt to abandon the traditional ecclesiastical and religious privilege system, since the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, as Turks had no need for such a special system of privilege. According to the sketch of the law the head of the church (*reis- i ruhani*) would be elected by the Government from among three candidates who would meet the conditions determined by the Government. The Government would also elect the bishops among the candidates and would have the responsibility of cancelling the appointment of prelates who acted against the interests of the nation and the state. The prelates would have no judicial privileges. The authorities of the religious committee of the church would be confined to religious

⁷¹ "Anadolu Ortodokslarının Milli Kilise Davası", *İkdam*, 7 May 1921/1337.

⁷² *İkdam*, 10 May 1337/1921.

⁷³ Alkan, p. 73. Baha Bey also served as an expert regarding the Patriarchate in the Lausanne Peace Conference. According to Rıza Nur he was an outdated (*mostralık*) and reactionary man, defending the old millet and privilege system. Rıza Nur, *Hayat ve Hatıratım* vol II, (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 1992), pp. 271-2.

⁷⁴ (Hafız) Mehmet Bey was born in 1874 in Trabzon, Sürmene. He studied law in İstanbul and became a judge. In 1912 he was elected deputy of Trabzon. In September 1920 he participated to the Congress of the Eastern People in Bakou. In 1921 he joined the Grand National Assembly. He served as Minister of Justice and as Minister of Interior for short periods. He joined the Second Group in the Assembly. In

affairs only. Hafiz Mehmet, the Minister of Justice, referred to the causes of the foundation of the Russian, Bulgarian and Serbian churches, which sought to gain their independence from the Patriarchate as an act of reaction to the Patriarchate's policies of assimilation and Hellenization. Thus, it was natural that the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia would also imitate these examples and found their own national church. As the Bulgarians and Serbs reacted to the Hellenic Patriarchate and sought to perform their religious services in their own language, so the Orthodox flock of Anatolia, whose native language was Turkish, had the right to do the same.⁷⁵

The nationalization of the Orthodox Church

The examples of the Balkan national churches and especially that of the Bulgarian Exarchate became crucial in the controversy about the Turkish national church. Indeed, the attempt to form an independent Turkish Orthodox Church must be seen in relation to the general transition from the ecumenical community of Orthodoxy and *millet*s defined in religious terms to the world of culturally homogenised nations in the Balkan Peninsula. Before the "age of nationalisms" the Orthodox Christian population of the Balkans was unified politically under Ottoman sovereignty and culturally under the Orthodox Church with its center in Constantinople. The growth of national ideals in the 19th century brought about a conflict between "the imagined community of religion and the imagined community of nation." The Ecumenical Patriarchate as an Ottoman institution was basically a supranational organization. However, in the 19th century the separatist tendencies and the "nationalization" of the churches, as previously mentioned, provoked national

1926, he was accused of participating in the suicide of Mustafa Kemal in İzmir and hanged. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, p. 939-40.

conflicts within the Orthodox Church. The various nationalist movements and newly founded nation states in the Balkan Peninsula sought to solidify their newly acquired status through the proclamation of the independence of their national churches. The Orthodox Churches in Greece (1833), Romania (1865), Bulgaria (1870) and Albania (1922-37) declared their independence or autocephaly unilaterally and this brought about many ecclesiastical and canonical controversies. Especially in the Bulgarian case, the ecclesiastical debate coincided with the violent conflicts over Macedonia between Greeks and Bulgarians. The issue came to an end only in 1945 when the Patriarchate approved the independence of the Bulgarian Church.⁷⁶

The Patriarchate reacted to this new situation and to these policies and ideologies by condemning nationalism with acts and pronouncements of its Holy Synod. The most ardent manifestation of this opposition was shown against the Bulgarian "schism".⁷⁷ In August 1872 the Ecumenical Patriarch together with the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch as well as with the Archbishop of Cyprus convened a synod in which they declared the Bulgarian Exarchate "schismatic" and condemned nationalism (*phyletismos*): "The question of what basis racism—that is, discriminating on the basis of different racial origins and language and the claiming of exercising of exclusive rights by persons or groups of persons exclusively of one country or group—can have in secular states lies beyond the scope

⁷⁵ Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche", *Der Islam* 39, 1964, pp. 105-6; also Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", pp. 177-8.

⁷⁶ Kitromilides, "Imagined Communities and the origins of the national question in the Balkans", *European History Quarterly* 19, no. 2, Sage Publications, London, 1989, pp. 177-180. The Church of Serbia because of its long tradition and older religious institutions acceded autocephaly in 1849 in a canonical procedure, i.e. by the approval of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

⁷⁷ For the ecclesiastical conflict between the Ecumenical Patriarchal and the Bulgarian Exarchate see Evangelos Kofos, "Attempts At Mending The Greek-Bulgarian Ecclesiastical Schism (1875-1902)", *Balkan Studies*, vol. 25, 1984. Christos D. Kardaras, *Το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και ο Αλλότροπος Ελληνισμός της Μακεδονίας Θράκης – Ηπείρου* (The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Unredeemed Greeks of Macedonia Thrace – Epirus), (Athens: Επικαιρότητα, 1996).

of our inquiry. But in the Christian Church, which is a spiritual communion, predestined by its Leader and Founder to contain all nations in one brotherhood in Christ, racism is alien and quite unthinkable. Indeed, if it is taken to mean the formation of special racial churches, each accepting all the members of its particular race, excluding all aliens and governed exclusively by pastors of its own race, as its adherents demand, racism is unheard of and unprecedented... All the Christian churches founded in the early years of the faith were local and contained the Christians of a specific town or a specific locality, without racial distinction. They were thus usually named after the town or the country, not after the ethnic origin of their people. (...) We renounce, censure and condemn racism, that is, racial discrimination, ethnic feuds, hatreds and dissensions within the Church of Christ, as contrary to the teaching of the Gospel and the holy canons of our blessed fathers which support the holy Church and the entire Christian world, embellish it and lead it to divine godliness."⁷⁸

However, despite this condemnation of "phyletism", the Patriarchate too, could not turn its back to the challenge of nationalism. In the struggle with the Bulgarian Exarchate for the control over the dioceses in Macedonia and Thrace, the Patriarchate found itself allying with the Greek Kingdom, which was also feeling threatened by Pan-Slavist expansion. According to article 10 of the *ferman* of 1870 which recognized the Exarchate, the residents of any locality, two-thirds of the total population of which would choose the Exarchate could adhere to it. In order to obtain the control of the dioceses the prelates sought the support of the Greek or Bulgarian governments respectively. In this particular issue, Greek and Patriarchal interests coincided and the Patriarchal prelates took increasingly national stands. The borders

⁷⁸ Kitromilides, "Imagined Communities...", pp. 181-2.

between the Greek and the Bulgarian national identity in Macedonia and Thrace identified with the administrative borders of the Patriarchate and the Exarchate.⁷⁹

Increasingly the metropolitans went under the control of the Greek consulates. The reports of the latter became important in promoting or in removing the former. Also the Greek governments financed directly the prelates that were supposed to be ardent nationalists. Although the Patriarchate sought to resist to the interventions of the Greek governments in time the interests of the two intersected. Moreover the prelates sought to guarantee the support of the Greek government in their rivalries.⁸⁰ A new generation of bishops, such as Chrysostom of Drama and Germanos of Kastoria who were ardent supporters of Greek nationalism, began to predominate in the Phanar, and in time dismissed the traditional policy of accommodation with the Ottoman State. Thus the process of nationalization of even the "ecumenical" centre of the Orthodoxy, "the imagined community of Orthodox Christianity, which since the conquest had determined the common identity of the Orthodox Christian subjects of the sultan, was destroyed. It was gradually replaced by the new sense of community cultivated by the national states, which, after administratively and linguistically homogenizing their societies, found in religion a powerful additional support for their national unity and external aspirations."⁸¹

The Greek language was an important factor that eased this metamorphosis of the religious imagined community to the national one. According to Benedict Anderson the religious imagined community is constituted around a sacred language

⁷⁹ The following words of Patriarch Joachim III are indicative: "It is a necessity to clarify what we mean for Macedonian Hellenism. If we mean only the pure Greeks we have lost. As the situation is this, the Hellenism of Macedonia should include all those who remain faithful to the Orthodox Church." Kardaras, p. 216.

⁸⁰ Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία 19^{ος} αι. - 1919 Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες* (Asia Minor 19th Century-1919 The Greek-Orthodox Communities), (Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 1997), pp. 429-32.

⁸¹ Kitromilides, "Imagined Communities...", pp. 182-4.

or a "truth-language" that is distinct from the vernacular, as the Latin of Catholic Christendom. However for Anderson the case of the Greek language was somehow peculiar since it was continued to be spoken.⁸² According to Matalas, this dual structure of the Greek language made possible the adoption of the sacred language also as national language. In that respect the modern Greek national identity was not obliged to conflict with the pre-national Orthodox identity. In contrast it was possible for the Greek national identity to present itself as the continuation and completion of the latter.⁸³

Another important aspect was that the newly founded national churches were strictly related to and dependent on their national states. From that standpoint, when we compare the case of the "Turkish Orthodox Church", to the general atmosphere of the period, Papa Efim was not alone in acting in accordance with the government's orientation. Moreover, the establishment of a national church without the traditional privileges was not an exceptional case in the wider region. "One of the first moves that each government made was to attempt to separate its ecclesiastical organization from the Constantinople Patriarchate. Although it was obvious that the churches could not remain under the jurisdiction of a hierarchy closely associated with the Ottoman Empire, the move also was to the benefit of the state. What occurred at this point was not a separation of church and state, as happened in liberal Western Europe, but the subordination of the religious to the secular authorities. The government took over those aspects of life that had formerly been under millet jurisdiction, including not only matters such as education and social welfare, but also to an extent the moral guidance of the population. (...) The new national churches were to be run by synods

⁸² Anderson, *Hayali Cemaatler Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1993), pp. 26-33.

whose members were often political appointees; their main concerns were often not to center on purely ecclesiastical problems.”⁸⁴

The question is to what extent this process of the “nationalization of the Orthodox Church” inspired the attempt to found a national Turkish church. There are some indications that the ecclesiastical schism in Macedonia had its repercussions in the minds of the Ottomans. The Young Turk newspaper *Osmanlı*, published in Geneva, published an anonymous letter on the 1st of January 1898. Its author who was said to be from Albania, complained that the Ottomans did not counter properly Bulgarian and Greek national aims. Among the methods that the writer proposed was the foundation of a national Ottoman church in which the religious services would be performed in Turkish. *Osmanlı* rejected this proposal with the argument that it had no intention to interfere in anybody’s language or nationality.⁸⁵

Another anonymous letter addressed to Sultan Abdülhamid dated 20 November 1903 with the symbolic signature of “a Turk” is also interesting in this respect. The anonymous author addressed the Sultan on the issue of the creation of a Turkish church. The letter reminded that behind the ecclesiastical conflict in Macedonia, one could see the struggle between the Greeks and Bulgarians. This was an indication that in order to achieve national unity, religious unity was also necessary. The Greek Church, by including the Albanians, the Arab Christians and the Turkish Christians in

⁸³ Matalas, *Έθνος και Ορθοδοξία* (Nation and Orthodoxy), (Herakleion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Ηρακλείου, 2002), p. 19.

⁸⁴ Jelavich, *History of the Balkans* vol. I, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 237. See also Kitromilides: “Politically, the issue of ecclesiastical independence turned into a confrontation between the proponents of a nationalized state church reproducing Protestant models, and the zealots of the ecumenicity of a supranational Orthodox ecclesiastical community.” This process of the nationalization of the church of Athens “culminated despite the re-establishment of canonical communion between Constantinople and Athens in 1850, with the eventual total conversion of the Church of Greece to the secular values of Greek nationalism and its transformation into an official arm of the civil state.” Kitromilides, “Imagined Communities...”, p. 166.

⁸⁵ Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994), p. 157.

its flock was trying to Hellenize them. The same was done by the Armenians, Bulgarians etc. But it was a fact that except for the coastal regions of Anatolia the majority of Christians of Anatolia were Turkish-speaking. Turkish presence in Anatolia was not a recent phenomena, it dated back to three thousand years, which proved that the Christians of Anatolia had Turkish origins. But because they were under the control of the Greek and Armenian churches, there was a constant effort to Hellenize or Armenize them. There were also Christian Turks in the Balkans. To the anonymous author, it was of vital importance to admit that these people were of Turkish origin and to counter the propaganda made by the Greek, Armenian, Bulgarian etc. churches. He also supported the idea that in the Arab lands an Arabic and in the Balkans an Albanian church should be established. And most important of all, the foundation of a Turkish national church was a necessity.⁸⁶

It seems that the Government of Ankara was not only informed on the ecclesiastical affairs of the Balkans, but that it also sought to use these conflicts in favour of its own aims. Thus the deputy of Bolu Cevat Abbas⁸⁷ who was in Sofia informed his government that the Bulgarians were pleased with the news about the foundation of a Turkish Church since something like that would eventually weaken the position of the Phanar. On the other hand, the Bulgarians were suspicious of the consequences that such an action could have among the Turkish Christians of the Balkan Peninsula. These, according always to Cevat Abbas, were the Gagauz and

⁸⁶ Bülent Atalay, "Türk Ortodoksları'nın Kendi Kiliselerini Kurmak İçin Verdikleri Mücadele", *Türk Kültürü*, No 462, November 2001, pp. 676-80

⁸⁷ Mehmet Cevat Abbas Bey (Gürer) was born in 1887 in Niş. He studied in the *Askeri İdadî* of Manastır and then in the *Harbiye Mektebi* of Manastır where he joined the Committee of Union and Progress. In 1916 he became captain and aide of the Commander of the 16th Army Corps Mustafa Kemal Paşa. In May 1919 he came to Anatolia together with Mustafa Kemal. He was appointed as General Secretary (*Başkatip*) of the *Heyet-i Temsiliye* after the Congress of Sivas. He was elected deputy of Bolu in the elections for the Ottoman Parliament. After the occupation of İstanbul he came to Ankara and joined the Grand Assembly. On the 20th of October 1920 he was sent to Sophia with

Sorguç Christian Turks who numbered more than 600,000. The Bulgarians feared that such a church could and would exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction over these people.⁸⁸

Arnold Toynbee also observed that nationalism had brought about an important crisis in the Orthodox Church by the early 20th century. "The almost complete triumph of political nationalism in the remnants of the Ottoman Empire between 1912 and 1920 portends the final extinction of an ecclesiastical institution which, however accomodating, is in the last resort incompatible with the national principle." Toynbee was sure that the Orthodox Christian inhabitants of the newly - after 1912- acquired provinces in the Balkans by Greece, provinces which formerly belonged to the Ottoman Empire, were bound to be transferred from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate to that of the autocephalous church at Athens. And this because "the traditional relations of Church and State in the Near Eastern world require that the boundaries of ecclesiastical and political jurisdiction shall coincide. When this inevitable event occurs (...) the Oecumenical Patriarch will be left with no flock except the Greek-speaking Orthodox population of Constantinople and its immediate neighbourhood and the minorities in Anatolia. It is therefore to be expected that the Patriarchate will fight even harder to retain the Anatolians than the Bulgarians."⁸⁹

It would be proper to have a glance at the reactions of the Patriarchate to the coming news regarding the "Turkish Orthodox Church". The reactions of the Phanar was expressed in an editorial full of irony of *Ekklisiastiki Alithia*, the official weekly journal of the Patriarchate, on the 15th of May 1921. According to *Ekklisiastiki*

special mision. He stayed there until late 1921. In February 1922 he rejoined the Assembly. He was a parliament until 1939. He died on the 4th of July 1943 in Yalova. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, pp. 191-2:

⁸⁸ Alkan, pp. 64-7.

⁸⁹ Toynbee, p. 195.

Alithia the National Assembly in Ankara, having solved every problem, had eventually touched upon the ecclesiastical problems of the Christians. The Assembly had already replaced the *raso* with the stamboulin and the *kalimmaho* with the black fes. The journal was sure that this reform movement of Ankara would not stop there and it was waiting for new decisions and attempts at solving other religious and ecclesiastical matters, such as fasts, liturgies, divorces, the marriage of clerics etc.⁹⁰ Another editorial on the issue was published on the 22nd of May 1921. It explained that the authorities of Ankara were seeking to "strangle" the Christians of Asia Minor and that the Phanar would accept the news for an independent church only if it was about a comedy. But unfortunately, it went on, the reality was closer to tragedy, and the protection of the Christians of Asia Minor was not a political but a humanitarian issue.⁹¹

On the 15th of May 1921 *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* announced that the Patriarchate was in a mood of panic and that the Holy Synod had been summoned to discuss the issue, but that no decision had been taken.⁹² According to *Sada-yı Hak* (İzmir) of the 21st of May, the Patriarchate had decided to protest against the "foundation of a Patriarchate in Ankara" before Europe, America and the Society of Nations.⁹³ Its main point of criticism was that a political and a non-Christian organization i.e., the Grand National Assembly, was acting like an ecclesiastical synod. The interference of the Ankara Government with Christian ecclesiastical and religious affairs was regarded as a scandal by the Patriarchate. To counter this kind of criticism the Turkish officials and the press, as we have earlier seen, used the examples of other Balkan cases. In

⁸⁹ "Ο Νέος Μόσχος", Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια, 15 May 1921, vol. 19.

⁹¹ "Ο Κύκλος", Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια, 22 May 1921, vol. 20.

⁹² "Fener Patrikhanesinin Telaşı", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 15 May 1921, no. 185.

accordance with these examples, they could claim for instance, that the interference of the Sublime Porte on the Bulgarian case was affirmed by the Patriarchate itself.

"Turkish atrocities" and the Turkish Orthodox

The person who formulated the idea about the formation of an independent Turkish church and proposed Papa Eftim to take its leadership is a matter of controversy. Raptopoulos stated that it was Şeref Bey who proposed for the first time to Eftim the foundation of a Turkish Church totally independent from the Ecumenical Patriarchate.⁹⁴ According to Fotiadis, it was Keskinli Rıza Bey who with the approval of Mustafa Kemal Paşa proposed to Papa Eftim to declare the foundation of a Turkish Orthodox Church and to become its archpriest (*başpapaz*).⁹⁵ According to Minaidis however, it was the French who proposed the foundation of a national church. The idea was propagated by the Catholic priests who were among the deputation of M. Franklin-Bouillon.⁹⁶ Eftim, however, claims that the initiative for the creation of a "new independent Orthodox Church" was taken by the Christian communities themselves and that he was called upon by the government ("by the recommendation of some "elders"-*"büyükler"*) to implement this decision.⁹⁷ According to Ergene, Papa Eftim had started to struggle for the honour of the Turkish nation even before

⁹³ Ankan, p. 114.

⁹⁴ Raptopoulos, p. 74 ; also Mavropoulos, p. 271.

⁹⁵ Fotiadis, pp. 18-9.

⁹⁶ Minaidis, p. 343. M. Franklin-Bouillon was the president of the French Senate foreign relations committee. He came to Ankara in June 1921 on an unofficial mission. The mission of Bouillon open the way for the French-Turkish agreement (the Treaty of Ankara) of October 1921.

⁹⁷ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks...*, p. 19

Mustafa Kemal arrived to Anatolia. Hence, his actions were in no way the consequence of some influence and encouragement.⁹⁸

Whatever really happened and whoever imposed or inspired to Eftim this idea, it is clear that from the point of view of the nationalists the foundation of a Turkish Church was important, first of all for external consumption. To understand this we need to open a parenthesis here and explore western and especially Greek propaganda as well as the efforts made from the Turkish side in order to counter this propaganda.

After the World War, Turkey found herself in a difficult position in front of the western public opinion. She was held responsible for the Armenian massacres and the deportations of Ottoman Greeks. Moreover, the dissolution of the multiethnic empires and the national self-determination were regarded as the basic principles that would guarantee peace in post-war Europe. According to the famous principles of American President Woodrow Wilson, the satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the nations was crucial for determining the peace terms.⁹⁹ Thus it was considered that one of the primary duties of the victorious Entente was to save the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Naturally, Greek territorial claims in Asia Minor largely rested upon this assumption.¹⁰⁰

Venizelos' Greece undertook a vast propaganda campaign to support the Greek territorial claims at the Peace Conference of Paris. In relation to the Greek claims on Asia Minor it was crucial to show that these claims were historically and demographically legitimate; that Asia Minor was historically Greek and that the majority or at least an important part of its population was Greek. The Turkish

⁹⁸ Ergene, introduction.

⁹⁹ Konstantinos Svolopoulos, *Η Ελληνική Εξωτερική Πολιτική 1900-1945* (The Greek Foreign Policy), (Athens: Βιβλιοποιείον της Εστίας, 1994), pp. 139-41.

presence in Asia Minor was presented as a superficial and accidental phenomenon. The civilization of Asia Minor was essentially Greek and the Turkish occupation had brought nothing to it except catastrophes.¹⁰¹ In accordance with this, it was also important to demonstrate that while the Turks were deteriorating in economic, social, political and demographic terms, Greeks were in complete advance in Asia Minor. In contrast with the Turks, Greeks were prosperous, progressive and strong. It was underlined that a greater Greece might play a civilizing role in Asia Minor: "Hellenism is today to be considered as the greatest factor of civilisation in this part of the world, the outpost of the world."¹⁰² Whereas the Greeks were a civilizing factor in Asia Minor, the Turks had contributed only to the devastation of the country. It was underlined that Greek Asia Minor had played an important role in shaping Western civilization and throughout centuries the Greeks had defended this civilization against the barbarians.¹⁰³ The Greek propaganda campaign also concentrated on the theme that the backward Turkish *race* could not rule Greeks and Christians in general. The Turks were unable to make any progress in trade, industry, culture and arts. Their only ability was to be warriors.¹⁰⁴ An indication of this cultural backwardness was the

¹⁰⁰ The Greek claims were laid down before the Paris Peace Conference by the official memorandum of Venizelos in 30 December 1918. See Svolopoulos, p. 142.

¹⁰¹ According to Evangelidis the Turks had come to Anatolia as nomads and had remained and had lived in their tents for seven centuries as foreigners, like in a military camp ready to leave the country anytime. M. Evangelidis, *Υπόμνημα περί των δικαιωμάτων και παθημάτων των εσπών του πολιτισμού Μικράς Ασίας και Θράκης* (Memorandum on the rights and sufferings of the hearths of civilization of Asia Minor and Thrace), (Athens: 1918), p. 109.

¹⁰² Zervos, *Hellenism in Pontos*, (Athens: Printing Office "Hestia", 1920), p. 4. "Wonderful indeed is the vitality of this race which has survived the persecutions of centuries of Turkish rule, and which is even now the most advanced in civilisation of all the other races in European or Asiatic Turkey. But for these persecutions it is permissible to think that the numerical superiority of the Greeks over the Turks and all the other races in those regions would be to-day far greater than it is, and that the resulting gain to the cause of humanity and civilisation would have been very considerable." *The Liberation of the Greek People in Turkey*, The London Committee of Unredeemed Greeks, (Manchester and London: Norbury, Natzio & Co. Ltd., 1919), p. 9.

¹⁰³ Evangelidis, pp. 11-8.

persecutions, deportations and the massacres the Christians of Asia Minor had suffered, especially during the World War. It was underlined that the Christians of Anatolia, despite the armistice, were still in danger since the Turkish people were determined to extinguish them.¹⁰⁵ Under such circumstances, the need for action was urgent.¹⁰⁶ For those purposes a mass of books, pamphlets, ethnological maps, articles in newspapers and journals were published.¹⁰⁷

Religion was an important element in the Greek propaganda for her territorial claims. Especially in England, there was a continuous effort to gain the support of the Christian public opinion and of the Anglican Church. For this purpose, on 26 November 1918, the London Anglican and Eastern Association organized a prayer for the salvation of the Eastern Christians from the Muslim yoke in the cathedral of Saint

¹⁰⁴ An illustrative example of this view is the title of a chapter of Evangelidis' book: "The Turk, daemon of catastrophe unable to progress" (*O Tourkos daimon katastrophis anikanos pros proodou*). Evangelidis, p. 100.

¹⁰⁵ "The Turks who, as soon as the Russians withdrew [from Pontos], resumed with redoubled rage the extermination of the Greeks, as a long matured plan to follow that of the Armenians at the instigation of the Germans and in accordance with the German scheme for clearing western Asia Minor of the Greeks and Armenians. After the Russian retreat, the persecution was carried out with increased fury by the very Turks who had received protection and all sorts of benefits at the hands of the Greeks during the Russian occupation. This is a patent example of Turkish mentality and Turkish policy and affords of itself a reply to those political men and journalists in Western Europe who think that it is possible for Christians to enjoy peace and security of life and property under Turkish rule." Zervos, p. 11.

¹⁰⁶ The London Committee of Unredeemed Greeks issued an appeal in 1919 and underlined the urgency of an intervention on behalf of the Greek population of Asia Minor: "Let it be noted that not even the signing of the Armistice has arrested the hand of the Turk. A telegram published in the Times of the 10th December 1918, characterise 'the situation in Asia Minor as precarious for the peaceful Greek element. The Turks, grown bold again after their defeat, are persecuting and maltreating the Greeks.' Let us in conclusion quote the closing words of the Morning Post's special correspondent at Constantinople, whose long telegram was published on December 11th, 1918: 'To sum up, four hundred and fifty thousand Greeks are known to have been deported and are dead; one hundred and fifty thousand were placed in labour battalions and are dead; two hundred and fifty thousand fled from Asia Minor and Thrace to Greece; and three hundred and fifty thousand were deported after the Balkan War and before the Great War. And these tragic events, in spite of the Armistice, are still happening' (...) It is inconceivable that the end of the great war, which was fought and won for the cause of freedom and the principle of nationalities, should leave such a very large number of intelligent, industrious, cultured, and freedom-loving Christians under the brutal power of the Turk." *The Liberation*, pp. 9-10.

¹⁰⁷ Kitsikis, *Yunan Propagandasi*, (İstanbul: Meydan Neşriyat); also Svolopoulos, pp. 142-50. Kitsikis informs that on the 24th of January 1919 a certain Committee of Anatolia was formed. The committee had seven members. One of them was Sophoklis Houdaverdioglou-Theodotos, who went to Paris and

Paul. On 23 January 1919 the *Société pour l'union des Eglises Chrétiennes* organized a demonstration for the rights of the Christians of Asia Minor. The fate of Saint Sophia was also a matter of discussion and concern, and led to the foundation of the Saint Sophia Redemption Committee. The Committee was founded with the encouragement of the Archbishop of Canterbury R. T. Davison; it was very active and organized demonstrations and conferences. The secretary of the Committee, J. A. Douglas printed a pamphlet called "The Redemption of Saint Sophia" and held two conferences on the issue. Also on the 12th of March 1920 he held a conference in the cathedral of Southwark, which was published and distributed as a pamphlet with the title "Death's Ride in Anatolia".¹⁰⁸

The Patriarchate also tried to influence the western public opinion throughout this period. A delegation of the Patriarchate consisting of the *locum tenens* Dorotheos, the Metropolitan of Trabzon Chrysanthos and the Patriarchal Counsellor Alexander Pappas arrived in Paris early in March 1919 to attend the Peace Conference. On 20 March, the delegation submitted a memorandum. The aim of the delegation was explained by Dorotheos to the French press in the following words "to draw the attention of the Peace Conference to the sufferings inflicted by the Turks on the Greek populations in the Turkish Empire."¹⁰⁹ Dorotheos also sought the support of the Anglican Church and he tried to promote the union of the churches. Such a union with the Anglican Church would have important political implications and would guarantee British support.¹¹⁰ Dorotheos corresponded with the Anglican Church from

London between March and April 1919 to inform the western public opinion on the conditions of the Orthodox population in the interior Asia Minor and to gain support. See Kitsikis, p. 319.

¹⁰⁸ Kitsikis, pp. 348-56.

¹⁰⁹ Alexandris, "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor...", p. 149.

¹¹⁰ In fact the union with the Anglican Church was not a new issue. The relations and the talks on ecclesiastic union between the Orthodox and Anglican churches had begun in the 1870's. The Patriarchate's aim was to gain the support of the Anglican church during the Bulgarian conflict.

1918 to 1921, and the negotiations for the union with the Anglican Church continued in the 1920's.¹¹¹ Alexandris quotes a characteristic appeal which demonstrates the political benefits that Dorotheos had in mind from this relation: "We pray you to fortify in energetic fashion the Government of Britain... in their efforts to drive out the Turks (from Istanbul). By this complete and final expulsion, though by no other means, can the resurrection of Christianity in the Near East and the restoration of the Church of St. Sophia be secured."¹¹²

On the 1st of March 1921, a Patriarchal delegation consisting of Dorotheos and the Patriarchal Counsellors Angelos Ioannidis and Paul Karatheodoris and Dorotheos' secretary Germanos Athanasiadis arrived in London to watch the conference, which met on February-March 1921 and had as object the modification of the Treaty of Sevres. With the help of the Archbishop of Canterbury the delegation met the King on 11 March 1921. Dorotheos also had a private talk with Lord Curzon. The contacts did not meet with success and more importantly, Dorotheos died on 18 March from a

According to Matalas these talks were related with a reorientation of Greek Orthodoxy against the "pan-Slavic" threat and the attempt to identify the interests of Greek Orthodoxy with those of the western world. Paraskevas Matalas, pp. 313-6.

¹¹¹ The *Christian East* in 1922 was very optimistic about the union: "It would be difficult to conceive a more psychological moment than the present in which to open negotiations for union with the Eastern-Orthodox. Everything is propitious. Canterbury has never had a quarrel with Constantinople. Before 1914 the relations of the two Churches were most cordial. In the past five years they have become very close. The War Alliance with Great Britain has created a favourable disposition towards the English Church among the mass of Greeks, Russians, Serbs and Roumans. Personal contact has produced friendships and even spiritual intimacies between the rulers as well as between the rank and file of the two Churches. The hearts of the Orthodox nations have been won by the practical sympathy and support of the Anglican clergy and laity, and especially by the generous and fearless courage with which, in the simple name of humanity, the Archbishop of Canterbury, as spokesman of all the Anglican Churchers, has again and again stepped forward splendidly and effectively to stand between the Christian remnant of Asia Minor and Kemalist cruelty, or to stem the brutal Bolshevik persecution of the Russian clergy. Moreover, apart from the mutual attraction of the two Churches, the quasi-political attack upon Eastern-Orthodoxy, now said to developed all along the line by Roman propaganda, gives them a strong impulse of common interest towards each other." "The E.C.U. Declaration", *The Christian East*, July 1922, vol. III, no. 2, p. 49.

¹¹² Alexandris, "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor...", p. 151. According to the Greek Foreign Minister Politis, the struggle carried out by the Archbishop of Canterbury, "for the complete dissolution of Turkish rule in Constantinople, excites the admiration and gratitude of the entire body of the Hellenic Church." Cited in Sonyel, p. 367.

heart failure. In place of Dorotheos the Metropolitan of Kaisareia Nikolaos, who had ordained Eftim, became *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal throne in his place.¹¹³

To inform the Western public opinion of the conditions of the Greeks of Asia Minor, the Ecumenical Patriarchate had published many books and pamphlets. The most influential among them was the Black Book (*I Mavri Vivlos*). The first Black Book was published in April 1919 and described "the sufferings and the persecutions endured by the Greek people of Turkey from the time of the Balkan War to the day of the Armistice."¹¹⁴ In 1920, a second *Black Book* was published covering the period from the armistice to the end of 1920.¹¹⁵ The second book's central argument was that the conditions of the Christians of Asia Minor had not changed since the Armistice. "After the conclusion of the Armistice, the Christian world of the Orient had believed that its sufferings were at an end, that the tyrant's hands and feet were at last fettered for ever, that the murderous dagger and the horrid scimitar of the criminal had been put into the scabbard, that Christian life, honour and property had been secured, in a word that a breeze of real liberty would caress every brow. But it was mistaken! It had forgotten for a moment that the mode of life and the general character of a nation, formed and crystallized through several centuries, cannot be

¹¹³ Alexandris, "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor...", p. 156-7 also Nanakis, p. 48.

¹¹⁴ The Black Book was prepared by a commission of the Patriarchal Central Committee for the Deported Greek Populations (*Patriarhiki Kentriki Epitropi iper ton Metatopisthendon Ellinikon Plithismon*) which was formed on the 14th of November 1918, for the repatriation of the deported Greek-Orthodox populations during the Great War. It was based on the reports of the Metropolitans about the sufferings of the Orthodox Christians in their dioceses. The book was translated into English and French and it was distributed in Europe, America and Japan. *H Perithalpsis kai Eγκατάστασις των εν Τουρκία Προσφύγων του Ευρωπαϊκού Πολέμου 1918-1921* (The Care and Settlement of the Refugees of the European War in Turkey), (Constantinople: Τυπογραφείο Κ. Μακρίδου και Ι. Αλευροπούλου, 1921), pp. 11-5.

¹¹⁵ For the claims and views of the Patriarchate regarding the situation of the Greeks in Asia Minor see also *Mémoires Du Patriarcat Ecuménique Relatifs à la Situation Des Chrétiens D'Anatolie*, Bulletin Du Bureau de la Presse Patriarcal Au Sujet de la Même Question, Constantinople 1922. *Statistique des Expulsions des Populations Greques de la Turquie Durant les Guerres Balkaniques et Européenne*, Patriarcat Oecuménique, Constantinople 1920. Also see *Les Persécutions Des Chrétiens, l' Archevêque-Metropolitain de Smyrne Mgr. Chrysostomos*, 1919.

changed so abruptly. The Turkish nation had again remained the same what it was before the Armistice, and what it shall yet continue to be for a long time. The proof of this assertion lies in the horrible atrocities which the Turks whether private citizens or government officials, have committed from the time of the Armistice to this day, by plundering, torturing, mutilating, burning alive and massacring women and children and aged people, and changing into wast cemeteries communities of Christians which but yesterday were flourishing and prosperous. And they committed these criminal acts respecting neither their signature on the document of the Armistice, nor the presence of the Allied troops, and the universal outcry of the whole civilized world against them."¹¹⁶

According to the Black Book, the conditions in the interior of Anatolia were even worse: "Especially, by taking in consideration the fact that owing to the interruption of communications with the interior of Asia Minor, the Bishops and Communities under the Kemalist authorities could not inform the Patriarchate of the sufferings of the Christians, the reader will doubtless justify the anxiety of our National Central Authority, in its fears for the worst over the fate of the Christians still living in Anatolia."¹¹⁷ All these leads to the simple conclusion "that the Turkish people, inspired as it is by such savage instincts and having a character well known to all, can not by any means open to itself the road to advancement, and can much less be a teacher and leader to others."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ *The Black Book*, p. 1.

¹¹⁷ "The condition of the Christians living outside the Greek zone of occupation is continually critical owing the oppressive measures of all kinds taken against them by the 'nationalist organization'. *The Black Book*, p. 91. According to the statistics of the Patriarchate, which were published in the Black Book, 343 Orthodox Christians had been killed by the Turkish nationalist forces or the brigands and the chetes in the dioceses of Kesareia, Ikonion and Angora. *The Black Book*, p. 173.

¹¹⁸ *The Black Book*, pp. 1-2. "The nationalist movement of Moustafa Kemal has inspired to the Turks hate and fanaticism against everything that is Christian and Greek especially, so these poor people fearing to be one day massacred escape danger by emigrating other countries." *The Black Book*, p. 78. The

In conclusion, it was crucial for the Turkish side, both for İstanbul and Ankara, to counter the propaganda that oppression was being exercised on the Christians and to show that there was no minority or ethnic problem in Turkey. The İstanbul Government and the liberals propagated the idea that the excesses and violations of the Great War were the acts of just a tiny minority, i.e. of the Committee of Union Progress, not of the whole nation.¹¹⁹ The Kemalists also, sought on the one hand, to disconnect themselves from the Committee of Union and Progress and, on the other, to demonstrate that in fact the Muslim population was living in absolute harmony with the non-Muslim minorities and that there was no unrest in the interior Anatolia. According to Mustafa Kemal, writing in 1927, "an essential part of the plan which our united enemies were endeavouring to carry through consisted in showing to the world by material proofs and facts that unrest was prevailing in the interior of the country and that the Christian elements were the object of constant attacks, pretending that all this was the work of national forces."¹²⁰ On the 26th of May 1921 *İkdam*

Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal throne, Nicolaos addressed to the Society of Nations on 13/26 November 1921: "Excellence, Quelque lourd qu'ait été le joug turc au cours des siècles, jamais les chrétiens de Turquie n'ont été exposés à de plus grands dangers, à plus de souffrances que sous le régime insurrectionnel de Moustafa Kémal. Les procédés dont use ce régime à l'égard des populations chrétiennes qu'il fait égorger sans distinction d'âge ou de sexe et dont les terres sont changées en déserts ne témoignent que continuent depuis l'armistice l'œuvre entreprise pendant la guerre de turciser le pays en y supprimant les éléments ethniques appartenant aux diverses confessions chrétiennes si importants aussi bien par leur nombre que par leur supériorité intellectuelle et sociale. On en tend leur faire payer les vœux dont ils accompagnaient les Alliés pendant la lutte et les acclamations avec lesquelles ils les ont accueillis après la victoire. Les Turcs d'aujourd'hui tentent de réaliser par les dévastations, les massacres et les conversions forcées, le programme nationaliste que leurs ancêtres du XVI^e siècle n'ont pas osé exécuter. Leur audace augmente à mesure que le territoire qu'ils occupent diminue et leur parti pris d'y accumuler des ruines avant d'être refoulés plus loin encore devient d'autant plus inquiétant que leur mentalité de barbares voit un encouragement dans l'impunité dont ils jouissent depuis l'armistice." *Mémoires Du Patriarcat Ecuménique Relatifs à la Situation Des Chrétiens d'Anatolie*, Bulletin Du Bureau de la Presse Patriarcal Au Sujet de la Même Question, (Constantinople: 1922), pp. 1-2.

¹¹⁹ "Nous protestons énergiquement contre ces agissements au nom du malheureux peuple turc, qui est innocent de la guerre dans laquelle une bande de criminels seuls, protégés de l'Allemagne a entraîné son pays et qui est demeuré, au cours même du conflit, fidèle à ses sentiments traditionnels que beaucoup ont payés même de leur vie." *Les Turcs et Les Revendications Grecques*, (Paris : Imprimerie A. G. L' Hoir, 1919), p. 5.

¹²⁰ Atatürk, *A Speech delivered by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk 1927*, (İstanbul : Ministry of Education Printing Plant, 1963), p. 267.

announced that Mustafa Kemal was doing in Anatolia the opposite of what the Greeks did. The paper informed that Mustafa Kemal had ordered the local authorities to protect the Christians in contrast to the Greeks who were constantly oppressing the Muslim population in the occupied zone. According always to *İkdam*, Mustafa Kemal also threatened the local officials, that the *kaymakams* and *mutasarrıfs* who, contrary to the orders, would exercise pressure on the Christians would be dismissed.¹²¹

It was also important to demonstrate that the Christians of Anatolia were supporting the national movement and taking actively part in it. Thus, Mustafa Kemal on 22 and 26 October 1919 revealed to *İkdam* that the different elements in Anatolia lived in total peace and harmony. Moreover, he stated that the Christian population of Anatolia supported the national movement. According to him, the Christians of Haymana, Amasya, Tokat and of several other places had declared this with the telegrams they had sent to the Ministry of Interior as well as to the representatives of the foreign powers.¹²² Kara Vasıf Bey, a member of *Heyet-i Temsiliye*, announced on the 30th of October 1919 that the Christians of Anatolia were in favour of the national movement.¹²³

For the Turkish side, the traditional Ottoman policy towards the non-Muslim minorities was characterized by absolute tolerance. The non-Muslim minorities had enjoyed the rights of their Muslim compatriots and, moreover, they had enjoyed

¹²¹ "Mustafa Kemal Paşa ve Anadolu Hristiyanları", *İkdam*, 26 May 1921. Mustafa Kemal in his interviews with foreign journalists always underlined the tolerant vision of his government regarding the non-muslims: "I am only carrying on our traditional tolerance to all religions The Roman Catholics and all Christians, as well as the Jews, have always had full religious freedom in our country. (...) You are free to go anywhere you like in Anatolia; talk to the Greeks, talk to the Armenians. If there is any cause of complaint, we will see that it is removed at once. We want the Christians to be happy in our country. We have given them full religious liberty, and equal rights with Moslems: can we do more?" Grace Ellison, *An Englishwoman in Angora*, (New York: 1923), p. 245.

¹²² See Gökbilgin, pp. 99-100. For the manifestation of support of the notables and muhtars of the Orthodox villages in Develi to the nationalist forces against the French and Armenians see Mehmet Özdemir, *Millî Mücadele'de Develi*, (Ankara: 1973), p. 94.

special privileges. In fact the so-called minority problem in Turkey had arose mainly due to foreign political intervention and provocations.¹²⁴ The western literature on the "Turkish atrocities" was one-sided and full of biases and exaggerations.¹²⁵ The creation of a Turkish Orthodox Church must be seen in this context since Papa Eftim's movement served certain propaganda goals of the Ankara Government.¹²⁶ There is a consensus among the nationalist Turkish literature on the issue. For Ekincikli, the activities of the Turkish Orthodox contributed to counter the propaganda of the Entente powers regarding the "protection of the rights of the minorities".¹²⁷ According

¹²³ See Jaeschke, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı Kronolojisi (30 Ekim 1918-11 Ekim 1922)*, (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1989), p. 74.

¹²⁴ "L'attestation de l'histoire démontre ainsi incontestablement que les droits des minorités qu'on cherche à assurer au vingtième siècle sous la garantie de la Société des Nations se trouvaient être spontanément accordés aux éléments non-musulmans de l'Empire Ottoman. (...) Ces événements tirent en premier lieu leur origine des provocations extérieures qui avaient pour objectif de préparer l'écroulement d'un grand empire que les attaques incessantes de voisins malveillants avaient déjà sensiblement affaibli." *Les Droits des Minorités en Turquie*, Bureau de Presse de la Délégation Turque, Lausanne : Imprimerie Henri Held, 1922), p. 5.

¹²⁵ "Malgré cet état de choses, qui correspond indiscutablement à la réalité, la fausse croyance enracinée en Europe, d'après laquelle les chrétiens sont privés de tout droit et se trouvent dans l'état des esclaves à l'époque romaine, subsiste encore. Rien n'est plus faux. Cette conception donna naissance à l'intervention européenne en Turquie, en faveur des minorités chrétiennes et au détriment de la population musulmane. Ces interventions sont souvent injustifiées et se produisent dans un sentiment, on est obligé de le dire, purement religieux et contraire pourtant à l'esprit du christianisme. Il s'agit souvent de protéger les exigences injustes de ces minorités, afin qu'elles puissent opprimer, écraser la malheureuse majorité non chrétienne. (...) La protection et les interventions de l'Europe ont gâté ces chrétiens de l'Orient à tel point que, même après avoir acquis leur indépendance, ils continuent à se plaindre." *Les Minorités en Turquie*, Turc-Yourdou de Lausanne, Lausanne : Dr. A. Bovard - Giddey Imprimeur, 1920), p. 5.

¹²⁶ The "Turkish Christians" can be compared to the attitudes of the Jewish community during these years. Jews had always supported the Ottoman sovereignty in the regions where they lived. As they preferred the Ottoman rule in Salonica to the Greeks, they also supported the Turkish side during the Greek-Turkish confrontation in Asia Minor. Especially the chief rabbi (*hahambaşı*) Haim Nahum manifested openly his support and adherence to the Turks and made contacts in the name of the national government in the United States and Europe even after his resignation. Thus, like the movement of Papa Eftim, they contributed to the Turkish propaganda campaign before the western powers. Sometimes this support exhibited together: The head of the Jewish community of Ankara Yusuf Ruso and the head of the "Turkish Orthodox Christians" in Ankara Papa Apostol by addressing a joint announcement rejected the claims of the American Near East Relief that the minorities in Turkey were under pressure. Zeki Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü IV*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1996), p. 450. Eftim compares the attitude of the Jews and the Patriarchate. According to him the Jews were lucky, since their religious center, the archrabbi, was wise enough to maintain good relations with the Turks: "Hükümete karşı ferasetle hareket ederek milleti ve ekklesiayı muhik bir gazap cereyanına kaptırmamak için Hahambaşı kadar alal sahibi değilmişsiniz." Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks...*, p. 28.

to Atalay too; the importance of Papa Eftim lays in the propaganda against those voices talking about the "massacres of Anatolian Christians".¹²⁸

The newspapers of the era were filled with of news presenting the satisfaction of the Christians with the Ankara Government and the condemnation of the news about the "Turkish atrocities" in Anatolia. For example, on 16 June 1921 *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published a telegram which was sent to the "Foreign Ministries of the European and American states" by Papa Nikola as the representative of the Turkish Orthodox of Konya. The telegram underlined that the Orthodox Christians of Konya had been living for seven centuries under Turkish sovereignty in total peace, harmony and happiness, and that the government had never intervened in the religious and social affairs of the Christians. Thus, the community was denouncing the claims laid down by the Patriarchate, Greece and some European states that the Christians of Anatolia were subjected to Turkish brutality. The aim of such claims was, according to the telegram, to spoil the peaceful and harmonious relations between Muslims and Christians. It indicated also that if they had been unsatisfied with the Turkish Government they would have gone to another country before the World War or even now, since the government would not prevent such an action. The community declared that they had never complained or applied either to the Patriarchate, to the Greek or to any European state and that nobody except the Government of Turkey had the right to represent the Christians of Anatolia.¹²⁹

On the 13th of January 1922, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published a telegram under the title of the "Turkish Orthodox community of Samsun" and signed by Papa Atanas.

¹²⁷ Ekincikli, p. 173.

¹²⁸ Atalay, *Fener Rum Ortodoks Patrikhanesi'nin Siyasi Faaliyetleri (1908 – 1923)*, (İstanbul : Tarih ve Tabiat Vakfı, 2001), p. 191.

¹²⁹ "Ortodokslar Memnuniyetlerini İlan Ediyorlar", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 16 June 1921.

The telegram claimed that there was no minority in Anatolia under the name of *Rum* but only Christian Turks. It also declared that the Orthodox Church of Samsun had decided that the authority of protecting the rights (*müdafa-i hukuk selahiyeti*) of the Christian Turks rested with the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. It also underlined that they had no relation with Greece and its instrument, the Patriarchate, and that they regarded them as enemies. The telegram concluded with the announcement that the Orthodox Christians of Samsun appointed Papa Eftim Efendi for the establishment of their spiritual center (*merci-i ruhanimizin tesisi*).¹³⁰

The election of Meletios

Although the Turkish press continued to be involved in the issue, the Government took no official action until the end of 1921. As a result, the British commissioner in Constantinople Sir Horace Rumbold informed the Foreign Office on 22 November that nothing had been heard about the "Kemalist plan" to create a Patriarchate in Anatolia.¹³¹ It was only after the election of Meletios Metaxakis¹³² to the Ecumenical throne on the 8th of December 1921,¹³³ that the Ankara Government

¹³⁰ "Türk Ortodokslar", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 13 Kanunusani 1922.

¹³¹ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 178. It seems that the British thought that Ankara was going extremely slow with the issue and that it would not take any definite decision regarding the ecclesiastical organization since its only aim was to use the "Turkish Orthodox" movement for its own political purposes. For instance, G. W. Rendel from the Foreign Office reported in September 1922: "The Turks are not likely to allow the new 'Turkish Christian Church' to develop into a serious body, even if this were possible. It is obvious that they are merely using it as a means to an end, and for purposes of propaganda." Cited in Sonyel, p. 381.

¹³² Emmanuil Metaxakis was born in 1871 in Crete. In 1891 he became a clerical and adopted the name Meletios. He studied in the Theological School of Jerusalem. He became general secretary of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in 1903. In 1910 he became Metropolitan of Kitiou of Cyprus and after in 1918 Metropolitan of Athens. In November 1920 when Venizelos was overthrown and the Royalists took power, he was forced to resign since he was known to be from the Venizelist fraction and went to America. In November 25 he was elected Ecumenical Patriarchate After the Treaty of Lausanne, on the 10th of July 1923 he went to Mount Anthos from where he declared his resignation in September. He was elected Patriarch of Alexandria in 1926 where he died in 1935. Valsamis, pp. 132-6.

¹³³ For the details of the election see *Echos d' Orient*, No: 125, Janvier-Mars 1922; also *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 25 November 1921, no. 47-8.

concentrated seriously on the issue. The election of Meletios put an end to the long period of vacancy of the Patriarchal throne. We have already seen that after the resignation of Germanos, Greece did not want the election of a new Patriarch, fearing that such an action would reinforce the position of the Ottoman Government. Following the elections of November 1920, which put an end to Venizelos' government, Athens continued to press for the postponement of the Patriarchal elections. This time, Athens feared that the election would bring a Venizelist Patriarch since in Constantinople Venizelism was still dominant. However, there was a growing dissatisfaction in Constantinople with Greek policies regarding the issue, since many people believed that under such difficult circumstances, a strong personality in the Patriarchal throne was necessary. Especially after the Battle of the Sakarya, the call for the election of a Patriarch prevailed. Despite the objections of Athens, the Venizelist organization *Amina* (Defence) and this time even Venizelos himself urged for the election of a Patriarch and especially for the election of Meletios Metaxakis.

The Ankara Government reacted immediately to the election of Meletios and declared that it did not recognize the election since according to the existing laws and regulations it was impossible to elect as Patriarch someone who was not an Ottoman subject. It declared that all the documents which would be sent by the Patriarchate would be considered null and void. It also prohibited to hymn the name of the new Patriarch in the liturgies.¹³⁴ The Government forbade any relation of the Turkish Orthodox communities with the Ecumenical Patriarchate as a "betrayal of the fatherland".¹³⁵ The Government of İstanbul as well announced, through a declaration of the General Press Bureau (*Matbuat Umum Müdürlüğü*), that it did not recognize the Patriarchal election and it declared that since the Patriarchal election had been

¹³⁴ Mavropoulos, p. 275; *Echos d'Orient*, No: 125, Janvier-Mars 1922, p. 106

held in an illegal manner, the election was null and void, and it would not give any effect to documents coming from the Patriarchate.¹³⁶

The British High Commissioner Sir Horace Rumbold reported to Curzon that this decision of the Government would not bring any essential change in the situation of the relations between the Porte and the Patriarchate, since the latter had long before broken off relations with the former. The only change was that it made the rupture become definite.¹³⁷ *Echos d' Orient*, after informing that the Ottoman Government did not approve the election of Meletios, underlined that this situation would cause trouble for the Patriarchate, since the war would not last forever and the Patriarchate would therefore have to reach an agreement with the government.¹³⁸ The issue became more complicated when the Constantinist government of Athens also declared that it did not recognize the election.

According to Raptopoulos, the election of Meletios as Patriarch was a big mistake. The enthronement of Meletios, in whom the Turks saw a political persona, an enemy, and not a moderate person, made the situation of the Greeks of Asia Minor worse.¹³⁹ It is obvious that Papa Eftim made immediate use of the election of Meletios and of the general attitude of the Patriarchate. In a long pamphlet he wrote after his arrival in İstanbul in 1923, Eftim presented a detailed critique of the Patriarchate's policy and of its actions during this period. According to Eftim, the Orthodox Christians were brought under the Turkish rule by the will of God and for

¹³⁵ Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe...", p. 111.

¹³⁶ Sarihan, p. 189 and 197.

¹³⁷ Sonyel, pp. 377-8.

¹³⁸ *Echos d' Orient*, no. 125, Janvier-Mars 1922, p. 106.

¹³⁹ Raptopoulos, pp. 77-8.

500 years the Christians had lived in peace and harmony with their Turkish compatriots. To prove this, he quoted Saint Paulos who made clear that every government was founded by the will of God and that therefore to obey the government was a religious duty. For him, the great fault of the Patriarchate was that it saw in the defeat of the Ottomans in the World War, the total dissolution of Turkish sovereignty in Asia Minor. The "great heroes" of the Patriarchate believed that Turkey would disappear in 24 hours and that perhaps the Phanar would become the center of the new political establishment. Eftim seems to have been very critical of the abolition of the traditional conciliatory policy. As we have already mentioned, after the abdication of Germanos, the new Holy Synod had interrupted its relations with the Ottoman Government. For Eftim, this line of action, which even Venizelos had criticized, meant the betrayal of the Christian flock. The dissolution of the Ottoman Government did not mean the dissolution of the Turkish race. Since the Turks constituted the majority, it would have been wise to keep harmonious relations with them. In contrast, the Patriarchate, with its pompous acts, such as sending the *locum tenens* Dorotheos to the Peace Conference or declaring its independence from the Ottoman Government, worsened the situation of the Christians. Thus, the Christians were now seen by the Turks as traitors. Moreover, the high ranking prelates in Pontos had provoked the local Christians and caused the total extinction of the existing communities. For example, the Metropolitan of Amaseia Karavangelos had created armed bands and thus provoked a Turkish reaction. Papa Eftim concluded that the line of action he adopted in Anatolia, namely the traditional conciliatory policy towards the government, was the only way to save the Christians from total extermination.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi 'nin Ortodoks...*, pp. 3-11. The pamphlet appeared also in Greek: *Ekklisis Pros ton Orthodoxon Laon kai Apologia tou Papa Euthim*. Gothard Jacshke also believes that if the Greeks of Pontos had acted "wise" like the Karamanli and had avoid the "suicidal" policy of the

It is interesting to note that in this pamphlet no claims were made on the origins of Anatolian Christians. Eftim's discourse appears to be in conformity with the traditional Phanariotic policy, which can be characterized as conciliation with and pacification of the government. The words of Eftim referring to the idea that Turkish rule was ordained by the will of God echoes the famous *Didaskalia Patriki* (1798) of the Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem or Ecumenical Patriarch Gregorios V, in which Ottoman rule is presented as being approved by the will of God and any attempt against it rejected as evil. According to the *Didaskalia Patriki*, the Ottoman Empire was set up by God to protect and save Orthodox Christianity from the contamination of the heresies of the Latins.¹⁴¹

Minorities

In a declaration published after the election of Meletios, Papa Eftim attacked the Ecumenical Patriarchate and denounced the claims that the Christians in Anatolia were under pressure. According to him, the Patriarchate mixed religion and nationality and sought to propagate Greek nationalism to the Anatolian Christians who were in fact Turks. The aim of the Patriarchate was, according to Eftim, to

Patriarchate, they would have been saved. See Jacshke, *Kurtuluş Savaşı ile İlgili İngiliz Belgeleri*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991, p. 59.

¹⁴¹ For the *Didaskalia Patriki*, see Clogg, Richard. "The 'Dhidhaskalia Patriki' (1798): an Orthodox Reaction to French Revolutionary Propaganda". *Middle Eastern Studies* 5, London, 1969, pp. 87-115. "See how clearly our Lord, boundless in mercy and all-wise, has undertaken to guard once more the unsullied Holy and Orthodox faith of us, the pious, and to save all mankind. He raised out of nothing this powerful empire of the Ottomans, in the place of our Roman Empire which had begun, in a certain way, to cause to deviate from the beliefs of the Orthodox faith, and He raised up the empire of the Ottomans higher than any other kingdom so as to show without doubt that it came about by divine will, and not by the power of man (...) The all-mighty Lord, then, has placed over us this high kingdom, 'for there is no power but of God', so as to be to the people of the West a bridle, to us to the people of the East a means of salvation. For this reason He puts in to the heart of the Sultan of these Ottomans an inclination to keep free the religious beliefs of our Orthodox faith and, as a work of supererogation, to protect them ..." (p. 104). Forty years later Papa Eftim would continue to express his belief that the Byzantine Empire had collapsed because the unbelief and the immorality of it had caused the Divine rage. See Papa Eftim, *Türk Ortodoksları Ruhani Reisi Papa Eftim'in Kıbrıs Hakkındaki Görüşleri*, (İstanbul: 1958), p. 2.

pretend being the protector of Anatolian Christians according to the minority law. He underlined the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians in an interesting way: He contrasted the attitude of the Anatolian Christians towards women to the one of Greeks. The fact that the Anatolian women were veiled and secluded from men was a proof of their belonging to the Turkish race. Eftim also declared that neither the Patriarchate, nor any European state had the right to represent the Turkish Orthodox Christians. The only legitimate representative was the elected Turkish Government. Since there was no minority in Turkey, but only Muslim and Christian Turks, there was neither a need for a minority right or law nor for the intervention of the Society of Nations or of European states.¹⁴²

Eftim claims that, immediately after the Patriarchal election, he informed the Christian communities on the formation of an independent church, and all of them replied that they approved his initiative and that they recognized him, by the circulars (*mazbata*) they sent to Ankara, as their general representative (*umumî murahhas*) with the Ankara Government.¹⁴³ Mavropoulos also claims that after the Patriarchal elections, Eftim declared himself as the General Representative of the Turkish Orthodox Christians (*Türk Ortodoks Hristiyanlarının Vekil-i Umumisi*) and called all the communities to send representatives to Kayseri for a congress.¹⁴⁴

On 27 December, *Anadolu Ajansı* published the official announcement of the Minister of Justice Refik Şevket (İnce)¹⁴⁵ concerning the formation of a Turkish

¹⁴² "Ortodoks Kiliselerine bir Tamim", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 30 Teşrinisani 1921.

¹⁴³ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks...*, p. 19.

¹⁴⁴ Mavropoulos, p. 276.

¹⁴⁵ Mehmet Refik Şevket Bey (İnce) was born in Midilli in 1885. He studied in the Law School in Thessaloniki. Immediately after the occupation of İzmir he joined the national movement. He joined the Grand National Assembly as deputy of Saruhan. On the 21st of September he became the head of Kastamonu *İstiklâl Mahkemesi*. On the 19th of May 1921 he became Minister of Justice. He resigned on the 8th of July 1922. After the war he was reelected as deputy of Manisa many times. In 1945 he joined

Church. The Minister indicated that this attempt was in accordance with the principle of religious freedom and also underlined that there was no matter of racial distinction between the Anatolian Muslims and Christians.¹⁴⁶ On the same day, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* informed that the general representative of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians Papa Eftim applied to the Ministry of Justice and conveyed the wishes of the Christians for the foundation of an independent and absolutely non-political church. Accordingly, Papa Eftim stated that the government should act immediately since the Christians were facing difficulties in performing their religious duties. The newspaper also mentioned that the Ministry of Justice took under serious consideration the applications of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians, prepared a law and presented it to the Council of Ministers.¹⁴⁷ The press also published many telegrams from the Orthodox Christian communities which vested Papa Eftim with the authority of founding a new church as well as representing their rights. The telegrams stressed that the Christians of Anatolia did not recognize any other authority than the Grand Assembly. They also rejected the claims for minority rights (*ekalliyet hukuku*) since they were pure Turks and had no relation to Greeks or to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.¹⁴⁸

On the 28th of December 1921 *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published an interview with the Minister of Justice Refik Şevket Bey. The minister confirmed that the Council of Ministers had a sketch of law regarding the issue and he emphasized that

the Democrat Party. He became Minister of National Defence and State Minister after 1950. He died on the 24th of April 1955. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi...*, pp. 837-8.

¹⁴⁶ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 180.

¹⁴⁷ "Anadoluda Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 27 December 1921; see also "Rumların Anadoluda Bir Patrikleri Olacak", *İkdam*, 30 December 1337/1921.

¹⁴⁸ For the telegrams from Çorum, Kayseri, Kermir, Yozgat, Isparta and Ankara see *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 27 December 1921, *İkdam*, 30 December 1337/1921. For the telegram of the Orthodox community of Trabzon published in *İstikbal*, see Çapa, p. 40.

as soon as the Assembly would accept the law the new Patriarchate would be founded. To the question concerning the meaning and aim of such an action he replied that the main objection were:

- 1- the freedom of religion (*hürriyet-i mezhebiye*)
- 2- the wishes of the Turkish Orthodox for emancipation from the political intrigues of the Patriarchate and;
- 3- the need to counter the claims of the Europeans that there were minorities in Anatolia.

To the question of whether this action would solve the minority problem, he answered that these claims would certainly continue. But he underlined that since those who were presented as Greeks insisted on their Turkishness and continued to reject any foreign intervention, any claims about minorities would be meaningless. Refik Şevket Bey also underlined that the foundation of such a Patriarchate was not contrary to the canons of Christianity. He indicated the examples of the Romanians, Bulgarians and Serbians who naturally did not lose their religion when they founded their own national church. According to Refik Şevket, the worst the Patriarchate of Phanar could do would be to excommunicate the Anatolian Christians, an act, which would only harm the Christianity. The minister also underlined that the majority of the Orthodox Christian communities in Turkey, including their metropolitans, priests and notables were in favor of the foundation of such a Patriarchate.¹⁴⁹

At the same date *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* presented the information that Papa Eftim had transmitted about his interview with the representative of the *New-York Times* Clair Price. Eftim, had underlined during this interview that the Christians of

Anatolia were of Turkish origin. He explained to Price that, although the Patriarchate of İstanbul had united the Orthodox Christians, when it started to interfere with politics, the Bulgarians and other Balkan nations had left the Patriarchate. Their situation, according to Eftim, was very similar, since their opposition to the Patriarchate was of political and not religious nature. He stated that the political intrigues of the Patriarchate had distracted it from its religious duties. Since the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia had no hope left in the Patriarchate, anymore they sought to found a new church. The Orthodox Christians of İstanbul claimed to be Greeks whereas they were claiming that they were Turks and this was the main difference. Papa Eftim also insisted that the whole issue was not the consequence of a political intervention. On the contrary, the movement had emerged before the national government had been formed.¹⁵⁰

On 30 December, *Akşam* informed about circulating rumors that Papa Eftim had been elected Patriarch by the Council of Ministers.¹⁵¹ There were also rumours

¹⁴⁹ "Anadolu Patrikhanesi ve Adliye Vekaleti", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 28 December 1921. See also "Adliye Vekilinin Beyanâtı", *Tevhid-i Efkar*, 8 January 1338/1922.

¹⁵⁰ "Papa Eftim Efendi Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 28 December 1921. Clair Price first encountered with Papa Eftim during his stay in Ankara when Eftim and Celal Nuri Bey visited him. Price quotes the following dialogue:

Self (to Papa Eftim): Are you a Turk?

Djelal Noury (smiling): He is of the Turkish race.

Self (to Papa Eftim): Are you of Turkish blood?

Djelal Noury (smiling cordially): The Turkish Orthodox Church was his own idea. He organized it himself.

Self (to Papa Eftim): Do you speak Turkish?

Djelal Noury (still smiling cordially): He wants to go to the League of Nations at Geneva. He asks do you think he ought to go?

Self (to Papa Eftim): Are you a Turk?

Djelal Noury (smiling still more cordially): He asks whether you may be a Protestant. He says if you are, you and he are the same for neither of you recognize the Pope."

After this "carefully staged interview", when people asked his impressions about Eftim he answered that he "had formed the highest opportunity of his charepone but had had no opportunity to form any opinion of Eftim himself." During the next day Eftim, this time alone, visited Price and they had an interview or two hours. "As he went out, he stopped in the door-way and this is what he said: 'This is our country and the Turks are our own people. How can we forsake our country when it needs us?'" See Price, *The Rebirth of Turkey*, 1923, pp. 151-2.

¹⁵¹ Sarihan, p. 211. In fact the press, foreign or Turkish, many times referred to Papa Eftim as the strongest candidate for the new Patriarchal throne. Later he stated that he could had been easily

that the Bolsheviks had taken part in the foundation of the new church and that they had agreed also to place the Orthodox Church in Russia under the authority of the new Patriarchate(!). According to the British high commissioner in İstanbul Horace Rumbold, this was extremely unlikely and there were no reliable news regarding the establishment of a separate church in Anatolia.¹⁵² According to *Le Bosphore* of the 3rd of January 1922, the Council of Ministers had inaugurated the talks on the foundation of the national church. Although *Echo de l'Islam* declared on 24 February that these talks ended, Jaeschke informs that such a session on the discussion about the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church does not exist in the proceedings of the National Grand Assembly.¹⁵³

According to *Echos d' Orient* the Ecumenical Patriarchate founded a committee on 13 January to investigate the issue and to inform the Holy Synod. The committee consisted of the Metropolitan of Çatalca and two lay advisors. According to the newspaper, although the Patriarchate seemed to despise the attempt, the coming news about the Turkish church were stressing it. *Echos d' Orient* also noted that, although many things were said about the foundation of an independent Orthodox Church in 1921, there was no official action taken. However, the journal underlined that if the Greek-Turkish conflict would not be solved peacefully the plan would possibly be put into action. It also informed that there were news that the Minister of Justice in Ankara had prepared a draft law regarding the issue.¹⁵⁴

Patriarch when he was in Anatolia, but since he was a modest man he did not act this way. See, Papa Eftim, *Atenagoras'ın Organı Elefteri Foni Gazetesine Cevabım ve Fener Patrikhanesi ile Rumluğun İcyüzü*, (İstanbul: Ata'nın Yurdu Yayınları, 1959), pp. 6-7.

¹⁵² Sonyel, p. 381.

¹⁵³ Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe ...", p. 111.

¹⁵⁴ *Echos d' Orient*, no. 125, Janvier-Mars 1922, pp. 110-1.

Eftim's tour in Cappadocia

In January 1922, Papa Eftim visited the Cappadocian Orthodox communities and propagated that they would be in absolute security only if they would cut off the relations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate.¹⁵⁵ During this tour Papa Eftim met with the local clergy and the notables and got personally involved in the affairs of the communities, seeking to gain their support. He also tried to obtain financial support from the communities for the foundation of the new church. In Nevşehir, he managed to reconcile the local Christians with the Muslims and to diminish the suspicions of the authorities towards the Christians.¹⁵⁶ In İncesu he dismissed the local priest who, in his opinion, was propagating hate and suspicion towards the Muslims.¹⁵⁷ According to Serafeim N. Rizos from Sinasos¹⁵⁸, when Eftim arrived to Ürgüp (Prokopi)¹⁵⁹, the

¹⁵⁵ Eftim was very critical towards those prelates who had left their dioceses in order to found asylum in Constantinople. For Eftim, these prelates had betrayed their flock. İlias M. Kesanopoulos from the Orthodox community of Ankara, heard Papa Eftim himself preaching in Turkish. Eftim anathemized especially the bishop of Ankara who had left Ankara. Kesanopoulos remembers that Papa Eftim used the words "*siktirdiler gittiler*" for these prelates. Raptopoulos, pp. 231-3.

¹⁵⁶ Ergene, pp. 17-8. Sophronia Georgiadou from Nevşehir remembers that they had learned that Papa Eftim was making a tour to the villages and was helping the people. She says that they were waiting for him "like a God". At that time 50 men from the local community had been sent to exile. Two days after his arrival Eftim managed to bring back the exiled people. "For us Papa Eftim was a very good man." Nevşehir KII 146.

¹⁵⁷ Ergene, pp. 19-21.

¹⁵⁸ Serafeim N. Rizos was from the family of Rizos that was among the notables of Sinasos. His grandfather Serafeim Rizos (1799-1879) was a tradesman and had largely supported the educational activities of his community (I. Sarantidis Archelaos characterises him as "the father of the community"). His father was Nikolaos S. Rizos (1838-1893) the author of the well known book "*Kappadokika*" which inaugurated the studies on Cappadocia. Serafeim N. Rizos was born in 1882. He studied at the Theological School of Kayseri, at the Megali tou Genous Sholi in Constantinople and in the lycee of Galatasaray. From the beginning of the First World War up to the time of the population exchange he served as a teacher in his community. Since he was an important member of the community of Sinasos he represented it in the congress of the Turkish Orthodox Church. After the population exchange he settled in Nea Sinanos and cooperated with the Centre for Asia Minor Studies. His many works remain unpublished. He died in 1969. See Stavros Anestidis, "*Η Οικογένεια Ρίζου*" (The Family of Rizos), in *Η Συνασός της Καππαδοκίας* (Sinasos of Cappadocia), Εφτά Ημέρες 27 May 2001, p. 16.

¹⁵⁹ According to Evthimios Sofoulis from Ürgüp, when Eftim reached the village, he summoned the council of elders and claimed that he was a schoolmate of Mustafa Kemal in Constantinople and thanks

council of the elder of Sinasos decided to invite him to their village. They had heard that Eftim was collecting money for the foundation of a Turkish Patriarchate. In order to avoid any problems, they decided to give him 300 liras. The community sent Serafeim Rizos to meet with Eftim and deliver him the sum.¹⁶⁰ In Ürgüp, Serafeim had the chance to listen to Eftim in the church. Papa Eftim called upon the people to emancipate from the Phanar¹⁶¹ and he strongly expressed his belief that very soon Mustafa Kemal would crush the Greeks ("*Yunanlı Palikarya*"). He also declared that the Turkish Orthodox Christians decided to denounce the Ecumenical Patriarchate and to found their own Turkish Patriarchate in Ankara. He invited them to participate in the congress which would be held in the monastery of Zincidere. Serafeim Rizos also mentions that after Eftim's speech he asked Eftim privately whether he really believed those things he had just said. Papa Eftim's answer was very interesting: "the aim is to pass the bridge" (*Maksat, Serafım Efendi, köprüyü geçelim*).¹⁶²

According to Raptopoulos, Eftim reached Kayseri on the 22nd of January 1922 with many companions and the Christian community there welcomed him with a great ceremony.¹⁶³ According to Ergene, Eftim managed to persuade the authorities to disengage some thirty local Christians and managed to get back from exile in Erzurum some 1500 Christians. Ergene indicates that these accomplishments

to this connection he managed to save the community of Keskin from the deportations. E. Sofoulis, *Keskinmaden 1*, Γ3/338-41.

¹⁶⁰ Among the community documents of Prokopi in the Centre for Asia Minor Studies, there is one in which the prominent tradesman of Prokopi Hacı Eftim Isaakidis gives an order to his agency in Kayseri to pay 300 liras to Papa Eftim. According to Kouroupou-Balta, the document must be dated after 1921. M. Kouroupou-E. Balta, *Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες της Καππαδοκίας Ι. Περιφέρεια Προκοπίου* (Greek-Orthodox Communities of Cappadocia I. The Region of Prokopi), (Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 2001), p. 69.

¹⁶¹ According to Serafeim Rizos, Papa Eftim used the word "*ibneler*" to describe the prelates of the Patriarchate.

¹⁶² Serafeim Rizos, *Η Συνασός. Οι Δάσκαλοι Μας* (Sinassos Our Teachers), manuscript no. 445, pp. 56-67.

increased his popularity among the local Christians.¹⁶⁴ He also gave his word that he would bring back from exile every Christian and that no more deportations would take place.¹⁶⁵ While he was in Kayseri, Eftim delivered in the ecclesiastical assembly the bill of the Government regarding the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church.

The bill ensured that the new church would be independent and would include the bishopries of İstanbul (Constantinople), İzmir (Smyrna), Ankara (Angira), İznik (Nicaea), İzmit (Nicomedia), Alaşehir (Philadelphia), Vize (Vizii), Bursa (Prousa), Çeşme (Krini), Diyarbakir (Amedia), Kuşadası (Ephesos), Kapıdağı (Kizikos), Trabzon (Trapezunda), Mardin, Mürefte (Miriophito), Çorlu (Tiroloi), Aydın (İlioupoli), Edirne (Andrianoupoli), Ereğli (Heraklio), Amasya (Amasia), Üsküdar (Hrisoupoli), Antalya (Attalia), Enez (Enou), Güzelhisar, Edremit, Tire (Thira), Çatalca (Metro), Halep (Alepo), Kars, Konya (İkonio), Gümüşhane (Argiroupoli), Kilitli, Niksar (Neokaisaria), and Tekfurdağ (Redestos). The ecclesiastical center of the new church would be in Kayseri. It was made clear by the draft law that the newly founded church would be under the supervision of the government. The supreme spiritual leader would be elected from among three candidates proposed by the government. The candidates should be Turkish citizens and should have served the last five years in the above mentioned dioceses. The bishops also should be Turkish citizens and should be able to write and read in Turkish. Those bishops who would betray the state and who would take part in politics would be dismissed from the office by the government. Also, the clerics would be judged in ordinary courts and would have no privileges at all. The rights and duties of the Holy Synod would

¹⁶³ Rappthopoulos, p. 86.

¹⁶⁴ Ergene, pp. 23-4. Thomas Milkoglou from Kayseri remembers that Papa Eftim "had saved many people". Kaisareia, KΠ147.

¹⁶⁵ Rappthopoulos, pp. 100-1.

concern only religious and ecclesiastical affairs. Eftim asked the community in Kayseri to submit to him their opinions about the bill within twenty days.¹⁶⁶

The justification (*esbab-ı mucibe*) of the draft law, which had been prepared by Baha Bey, stressed the assumption that the Patriarchate sought to Hellenize the Bulgarian, Serbian and Turkish Orthodox Christians. In the past, when the rights of the nations (*hukuk-u milliye*) were not known, those people had not been able to react this policy. Only when they saw that their national existence was in danger did they stand against it. The Bulgarian national church was an eloquent example of this process. According always to the "justification", the Turkishness of the Turkish-speaking Christians of Anatolia was beyond doubt. These people had immigrated before the spread of Islam from the east to the west and had become Christian and remained under the jurisdiction of the Greek Orthodox Church. Their language, traditions and way of life were a strong indication of this fact. However, during the last two centuries these people were exposed by the Patriarchate to a process of Hellenization. This was also due to the Government's negligence and the belated development of national feelings in the country. It was underlined that the Christian Turks were forced to learn Greek language, literature, history, and art in church schools. The Turkish Christians were forced to acquire Greek culture and many of them artificially became Greeks. Nevertheless, very recently, the Turkish Christians, no longer able to stand these conditions, applied to the Grand Assembly and to the Ministry of Justice, demanding their separation from the Greek Church, and thus acquired ecclesiastical independence. The Government took under serious

¹⁶⁶ Raptopoulos, pp. 88-97; also Alkan, pp. 75-7.

consideration the issue of the emancipation of the Christian Turks from the yoke of the Patriarchate and prepared this law.¹⁶⁷

The three prelates

Eftim returned to Ankara in February,¹⁶⁸ where he met with the Minister of Justice Refik Şevket Bey and informed him about the situation. The Minister announced that the Government did not want to interfere in the ecclesiastical and religious affairs of the Christians. He also declared that the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia could found their church wherever they wanted.¹⁶⁹ Eftim also gave an interview to the correspondent of *Tevhid-i Efkâr* and announced that, in the name of the Turkish Orthodox of Anatolia, he did not recognize the election of Meletios Metaxakis to the Patriarchal throne. He explained that he officially represented (*vekalet-i umumiye*) the Turkish Orthodox for the foundation of a new Patriarchate in Kayseri. He also explained that he had informed the Orthodox communities during his visits of the draft law on the new Patriarchate. Eftim informed the correspondent that the Greek language was abolished from the community schools and that these schools would be united with the Turkish ones.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ Alkan, pp. 78-80.

¹⁶⁸ *Tevhid-i Efkâr* informed on 1 February that the arrival of Papa Eftim to Ankara after his visits to Niğde and Kayseri was expected. The paper also informed that the elections for the Patriarchal throne of the Orthodox of Anatolia had begun. "Anadolu'da Patrik İntihabı Başladı", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 1 February 1338/1922.

¹⁶⁹ "Türk Ortodoks Patrikliğinin Teşkili", *İleri*, 2 February 1338/1922. According to Schliklin, for Refik Şevket Bey, the existence of Orthodox Christians, who were ethnically Turks was a historical fact. However for him, the issue of the ecclesiastical independence of the Anatolian Orthodox was purely a religious issue and should not bother the government and the Grand National Assembly. Refik Şevket also claimed to Schliklin that the government was totally impartial and did not make any propaganda on the issue and made clear that the establishment of a Turkish Patriarchate was possible only on the condition that all communities would agree upon it. Schliklin, *Angora... L'aube de la Turquie Nouvelle (1919-1922)*, (Paris: Berger-Levrault Editeurs, 1922), pp. 180-2.

¹⁷⁰ "Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Muhabirimize Beyanâtı", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 13 February 1338/1922.

Late in February, Papa Eftim once again applied to the Ministry of Justice. He demanded from the Minister the immediate foundation of the church. He also requested that the government announce the names of the three candidates for the election of the spiritual leader of the Turkish Orthodox Christians.¹⁷¹ He also laid down that the election would take place as soon as the draft law on the Patriarchate would be prepared. Şevket İnce assured that the draft was under preparation and that everything, including the patriarchal election, could be arranged after that. According to *İkdam*, Eftim had informed his community of the draft proposal. The new church would be called Archbishopric (*Başpiskoposluk*) and not Patriarchate, the religious services would be held in Turkish and the ecclesiastical authority of the church would include the whole of Turkey within the borders laid down in the national pact (*misak-ı milli dahilinde bütün Türkiye*).¹⁷² On the same issue, *İleri* claimed that Eftim requested from the minister the postponement of the publication of the draft.¹⁷³ In Ankara, Eftim organized an office for conducting the affairs that concerned the Christians.¹⁷⁴

In fact, it was not possible for Papa Eftim alone to establish an autocephalous church. According to the ecclesiastical canons and regulations, the approval and participation of some high ranking prelates was necessary. Eftim claims that after winning over the consensus of the Orthodox communities, he informed the Government that for the foundation of a new church the will of three bishops was a

¹⁷¹ "Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Adliye Vekaletine İstidası", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 21 February 1338/1922. The paper also informed that a building had been prepared for the new Patriarchal seat.

¹⁷² "Patriklik mi Yoksa Başpiskoposluk mu ?", *İkdam*, 22 February 1922.

¹⁷³ "Papa Eftim Efendinin Adliye Vekaletinden Ricası", *İleri*, 28 February 1338/1922.

¹⁷⁴ Raptopoulos, p. 87; also Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 181.

sine qua non and that immediately, Gervasios of Sivas, Meletios of Patara and the Metropolitan of Konya were invited to Ankara.¹⁷⁵

However, according to Raptopoulos, it was Baha Bey, the expert and advisor of the Ankara Government on religious and ecclesiastical affairs, who informed the government that the foundation of a national church required the support of some high ranking prelates. Baha was informed about the example of the Bulgarian Exarchate which was founded after the initiative of Bulgarian prelates. For him, only with the ordination of new bishops without the approval of Phanar, would the relations with the Patriarchate stop and the Turkish national church emerge. Thus the Ankara Government on January 1922, ordered the local authorities to send the prelates to Kayseri.¹⁷⁶ Eftim also telegraphed to Prokopios, Meletios and Gervasios and invited them to Kayseri. As the general representative of the Orthodox Christians, he ordained Prokopios Metropolitan of Chaldea, Meletios Metropolitan of Kayseri and Gervasios Metropolitan of Ankara.¹⁷⁷

During the Greek-Turkish conflict, the prelates who had remained outside Constantinople and the Greek occupation zone faced the suspicion of the Turkish authorities. Many of them were deported or put in jail.¹⁷⁸ In 1919, in the non-occupied territories of Asia Minor, there were the Metropolitan of Konya Prokopios¹⁷⁹, the Metropolitan of Rodopolis Kirillos, the Metropolitan of Chaldea Lavrentios and the

¹⁷⁵ Papa Eftim, *Papa Eftim Efendi 'nin Ortodoks...*, p. 19.

¹⁷⁶ Raptopoulos, p. 82 ; also Mavropoulos, pp. 276-7.

¹⁷⁷ Raptopoulos, p. 84.

¹⁷⁸ "Η Κραυγή της Οδύνης", *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 19 June 1921, no. 24.

¹⁷⁹ Prokopios Lazaridis was born in 1859 in the village of Denei in Konya. He studied in the Theological School of Chalki. He became archdeacon in the Patriarchate and afterwards he served in the archbishopry of Nicaea and Nicomedia. In 1894 he became prelatie principal (*arhieratikos proistamenos*) in the district of Vlanga in Constantinople. In 1894 he became responsible (*Patriarhikos Eksarchos*) of the monasteries in Macedonia of Hagia Anastasia and of Theotokou Kossifinissas. In

Bishops (*Episkopos*) of Apolloniada Ioakeim, of Zilon Efthimios, the Bishop of Patara Meletios¹⁸⁰ and Sivas Gervasios¹⁸¹. Two of them, the Bishop of Apolloniada Ioakeim fearing from the men of Topal Osman, and the Metropolitan of Chaldea Lavrentios went to Constantinople and remained there. The Kemalists, after crushing the revolt of Mehmet Delibaş in Konya, arrested the Metropolitan of Konya Prokopios claiming that he had participated in it.¹⁸² He was judged and sentenced to exile by the martial court (28 October-6 November 1920) and was sent to Erzurum in November.¹⁸³ On the road to Kayseri Prokopios was robbed. He reached Sivas via Niğde – İncesu – Kayseri – Sarımsaklı – Sultanhan – Gömerek, where the American Red Cross and the priest of the Armenian Catholic Church came to his help. He finally reached Erzurum via Suşehir and Erzincan.¹⁸⁴ He stayed for nine months in a

1899 he was elected Metropolitan of Dirrahion and Elvasan and in 1906 Metropolitan of Philadelphia. In 1911 he became Metropolitan of Iconium. Raptopopulos, pp. 1-31.

¹⁸⁰ Meletios Hristidis was born in 1880 in Isparta. He studied in the Theological School of Chalki. In 1905 he became Exarchos in Mersin and in 1910 assistant Episkopos of the Metropolitan of Pisidia and later assistant Episkopos in the diocese of Herakleia. He also served in Uzunkopru as prelatice representative (*archieratikos antiprosopos*). In 1919 he came back to Antalya and in 1920 he was exiled to Malatya. Later the Ankara Government sent him to Kayseri and he got involved to the issue of the Turkish Orthodox Church. After the population exchange he went to Greece where he continued to serve the Orthodox Church. He died in 1967. *ibid*, pp. 250-63.

¹⁸¹ Gervasios Soumelidis was born in the Pontic village of Kromni in 1882. He studied in the Theological Schools of Kayseri and later of Chalki. In 1907 he became prelatice church warden (*arhieratikos epitropos*) in the diocese of Didimotikhon. In 1914 he was captured by the Bulgarians and sent to Bulgaria. After he got released, he came to Constantinople and became Episkopos of Sevasteia. In 1920 he was sent on exile in Karahisar-i Şarki (Nikopolis). Then he was called to Kayseri to join the process of founding a Turkish Church. In the population exchange he was ordered to collect and transfer the local ecclesiastical relics. Gervasios left Kayseri in October 1923 and became arhieratikos proistamenos in the refugee district of Pireus, Kokkinia. In 1934 he became Metropolitan of Grevena. Gervasios died on the 16th of April 1944. *ibid*, pp. 266-71.

¹⁸² There are signs that Prokopios was in connection with the Greek officials in Smyrna. According to his cousin Athanasios Lazaridis, who was a Greek officer in Smyrna, Prokopios visited the city in June 1919 where he came in touch with Stergiadis, whom he informed about the Italian forces. *ibid*, pp. 201-2.

¹⁸³ See Ahmet Uçar, *Milli Mücadele'den 12 Mart'a Konya'da Siyasi Sürgünler*, (İstanbul: Tez Yayınları, 2001), pp. 86-7.

¹⁸⁴ In a report on the condition of the Greeks in Anatolia, issued by the Holy Synod on the 23rd of October 1921, it was reported that Prokopios was in exile in Erzurum while Gervasios' situation was unknown. "Εκθεσις περί των Χριστιανών Ελλήνων εν Ανατολή", *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 23 October 1921, vol. 42.

khan because there were no other Orthodox Christian in the city except a man called Yeorgios Hatzimanos from Stromniça in Macedonia, who had also been exiled to Erzurum. By the time new exiles and refugees came to the city, the number of Christians increased and Procopios helped them in their religious services.¹⁸⁵

While Procopios was in exile, the Bishop of Sivas Gervasios was in Karahisar-ı Şarki (Nicopolis), the Bishop of Patara Meletios in Antalya and the Metropolitan of Rodoupolis Kirillos in Maçka. The Bishop of Zilon Efthimios who was assisting the Metropolitan of Amasya was arrested on the 4th of February 1921 with the claim that he was helping the Pontos separatist movement. Efthimios died in prison.¹⁸⁶

In 1919, the Bishop of Patara Meletios was assisting in Antalya the Metropolitan of Pisidia Gerasimos who was in Constantinople. Meletios was charged of being in connection with the Greek officials in Constantinople and Smyrna and also with the Metropolitan of İzmir Chrysostomos. He was sent before the *İstiklâl Mahkemesi* and sent to exile. On 9 January 1921 he was sent from Antalya to the prison of Burdur. It was planned to sent him from Burdur to the Turkish village of Tefenni but due to his bad health the plan was cancelled. When he was on the road to Rhodes and Italy, Bekir Sami Bey was informed on the situation of Meletios and ordered the officials to release him. From then on and until 18 May, Meletios stayed at the house of the priest Konstantinos Ioakimiadis. When the deportation of Christians, between the age of 20-60, of Isparta, Burdur, Makri and Konya to the interior of Asia Minor was ordered, Meletios reached Aksaray on 25 June 1921. Then, he came to Gerveli where he stayed until 15 October 1921. Then, via Kayseri and Sivas, he reached Malatya. Meanwhile, the Metropolitan of İzmir, with the mediation

¹⁸⁵ Raptopoulos, pp. 43-50.

¹⁸⁶ Mavropoulos, pp. 268-70; also Stefanos Yerasimos, "Pontus Meselesi (1919-1923)", in S. Yerasimos, *Milliyetler ve Sınırlar*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994), p. 417.

of the Greek Red Cross and Red Crescent, applied to the Ministry of Interior of the Ankara Government in order to get information about the fate of Meletios. The Ministry ordered the Mutasarrıf of Malatya to determine the conditions of Meletios. Meletios was then informed that he was free to communicate with the Christians of Malatya and to perform his religious duties. Thus, Meletios commanded the liturgies of Christmas and new year.¹⁸⁷

It was the Bishop of Patara Meletios, in exile in Malatya from January 1921, who reached Kayseri first.¹⁸⁸ Prokopios tried to delay his arrival to Kayseri as much as possible. He stayed for a month in Sivas on his way from Erzurum and asked the Government the permission to visit Ankara and to meet personally with the authorities to discuss the issue. The Government not only accepted the demand but also helped him to reach Ankara. In Ankara, Prokopios met with Eftim and asked him to cease his harsh attacks against the Patriarchate.¹⁸⁹ Raptopoulos claims that Prokopios met with Mustafa Kemal in Ankara. According to the same source, Prokopios told M. Kemal not to involve him in this issue because he was very old. However Mustafa Kemal insisted that he should take action and thus serve his flock.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁷ Mavropoulos, pp. 272-3.

¹⁸⁸ Raptopoulos, p. 99; "Meletyos Ordumuzun Zaferi İçin Dua Ediyor", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 25 May 1922.

¹⁸⁹ According to Ergene it was Eftim who arranged the appointment of Prokopios with the Turkish authorities. Ergene, p. 30. Mavropoulos claims that when Papa Eftim came before Prokopios with civilian garment, Prokopios did not accept him unless he would be properly dressed. Mavropoulos, p. 279.

Eftim in action

In the meantime, on the 1st of March 1922, Papa Eftim closed down 68 community schools and forced the Christian children to continue to Turkish ones.¹⁹¹ He declared that the high ranking prelates of the church should know Turkish, be Turkish subjects and have served for the past five years in Turkey, and not have been involved in politics. He also prohibited the priests to circulate in public in their religious outfit.¹⁹²

Papa Eftim also sought support for the Turkish Orthodox movement from the Western churches. He tried to communicate with the Vatican and Arthur Boutwood mediated between Eftim and the Anglican Church.¹⁹³ Boutwood, in the name of the Anglican Church, addressed six questions to Papa Eftim with the mediation of the Ministry of Justice. The questions were: 1) The number of churches and bishops of the Turkish Church and whether the bishops and the priests had been properly ordained. 2) What were the considerations of the new church regarding the bishoprics? 3) When did Keskin become a seat of bishopric? 4) Whether the new church would implement reforms in ecclesiastical and religious affairs. 5) How would

¹⁹⁰ Raptopoulos, pp. 101-4.

¹⁹¹ Price, p. 185. In fact the community schools of the region had not functioned regularly from 1918. However there were some schools which continued to function until 1923. According to the report of the village council of Zincidere the incomes of the schools between December 1922 and February 1923 were 23,725 *kurus*, while the expenditures were 23,502 *kurus*. The community in the report was referred as "Turkish orthodox". See Emmanouil Tsalikoglou, *Ελληνικά Εκπαιδευτήρια και Ελληνορθόδοξοι Κοινότητες της Περιφέρειας Καισαρείας* (Greek Schools and Greek-Orthodox Communities of the Region of Kayseri), (Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1976), p. 45. According to the Patriarchate it was the Turkish government that closed the community schools and prohibited the education of Greek. Accordingly the government had even forbidden conversation in Greek. *Les Atrocités Kémalistes dans les régions du Pont et dans le reste de l'Anatolie*, (Constantinople: Patriarcat Oecumenique, 1922), p. 74.

¹⁹² Alexandris, "η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", pp. 181-2. Eftim himself used secular garments and wore the *kalpak* of the nationalists. Ergene, pp. 31-2; also Serafeim Rizos, p. 64. İkdâm on the 20th of May 1921 quoted the Greek newspaper of Constantinople Proodos, that the Orthodox priests in Anatolia from then on would wear stamboulî and long black fes. See İkdâm, 20 May 1921 Friday. According to Rizos, Eftim was claiming that his *kalpak* was a present from Mustafa Kemal himself.

the liturgy be translated to Turkish? 6) Whether the church would include Christians from outside Turkey and from İstanbul. Papa Eftim's answers were published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*. According to Eftim there were 200 churches apart from the monasteries and the village churches in Anatolia. In addition, except for those bishops who had joined the Greeks and had escaped from Anatolia, there were four bishops under the jurisdiction of the Turkish Orthodox Church. The priests and bishops had been properly ordained. The "Eastern Orthodox Church" (*Şark Ortodoks Kilisesi*) would have a Saint Synod consisting of 12 bishops and the people would elect an archbishop. He also underlined that Keskin was not a Metropolitan seat and that the seat of the archbishopric would be in Kayseri. Reform for the new church would mean the retreat to the word of the Bible (*İncil-i Şerif'in ahkâmına rücu eylemek*) and the abandonment of those practices that did not conform to this. Eftim also explained that the Turkish liturgy had been translated from the book called "*Oholo*" which was prepared by the Patriarchate of Phanar. Finally, he concluded that the church would include all Christians of Turkish origin within the borders of the National Pact (*misak-ı milli*) and that İstanbul would be under the supervision of Anatolia. Eftim also informed the newspaper that there was no post of Patriarch in Christendom and for that reason there would be no such title. He underlined that the new church would develop in accordance to the spirit of the people.¹⁹⁴

The Reverend Dr. A. Wigram submitted a report on the issue to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the 10th of May 1922, in which he suggested caution. It was obvious that the "Turkish Church" was a subtle instrument of Kemalist propaganda. "If your Grace should recognize the new body, you are giving just cause

¹⁹³ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 182. Arthur Boutwood was a specialist in eastern ecclesiastical affairs and between 1921 and 1924 was in Asia Minor. At that time he was in constant communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury.

on offence to Constantinople. On the other hand... if you refuse Papa Eftim's overtures too brusquely, it is not at all unlikely that the unfortunate man may be shot... My advice then... is that your Grace 'play for time'. Ask through Mr. Boutwood for further information. If Angora were to be reconciled with Constantinople, the whole base of the position of the Turkish Church would be altered... The Christians, who are not of Greek blood, are not satisfied with the purely Greek Government of the Orthodox Church, or with the use of it as an instrument for pan-Hellenic propaganda."¹⁹⁵

Hakluyt Egerton, from *The Christian East*, received a letter from Papa Eftim and he informed the Archbishop of Canterbury at Eftim's request.¹⁹⁶ Egerton wrote that he had sent a letter to Papa Eftim but that he had not yet received a reply. He also informed them that a member of the Kemalist authority told to him that the Vatican was actively in communication with the new church.¹⁹⁷ According to the *Christian East*, the aim of the Vatican was the destruction of the solidarity among the Orthodox Christians and "the persuasion or compulsion of local congregations, and even autocephalous Churches, to become Uniate." The journal underlined that the conditions in Turkey and Russia provided "this Uniate policy with a favourable field

¹⁹⁴ "Anadolu Patrikliği", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 21 February 1922.

¹⁹⁵ Sonyel, pp. 380-1.

¹⁹⁶ Egerton quotes two paragraphs from this letter:

"I. There exist in Asia Minor 200 Turkish Orthodox Churches (parish churches are not included in this number). The priests who perform their spiritual duties number 500. The bishops, who fled - succumbing to the aims of the Greeks and the Phanar Patriarchate - were not members of the Turkish Orthodox Church. Four priests, endowed with the power of canonically ordaining the bishops, are performing the Episcopal duties. These bishops having been canonically ordained, the Patriarchate in Constantinople does not enjoy any spiritual influence over them. Henceforth, bishops, to be elected from among the priests, will be ordained by the Turkish Orthodox Church.

II. The new Church will fall back upon the teachings of the Bible, and the bad precedents that have nothing to do with Christianity will be cancelled."

¹⁹⁷ Hakluyt Egerton, "The 'Turkish' Orthodox Church", *The Christian East*, July 1922, vol. III no. 2.

and with abundant, if strange and contrasted, instruments."¹⁹⁸ The Patriarchate however, according to *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, disapproved these actions with telegrams to the Christian world and declared that the Christians in Anatolia were in danger.¹⁹⁹

It seems that Papa Eftim had become very popular in Ankara. In addition to those many interviews made with him, another indication of his influence was the public speech he made during the celebrations for the anniversary of the 2nd victory of İnönü.²⁰⁰ The gathering had taken place in front of the Grand National Assembly and according to Jean Schlicklin; there were some 50,000 people. Eftim declared that those nations who pretended to be civilized sought to diminish the Turkish nation and for this purpose used the Patriarchate and the Government of Damat Ferit Pasha. He thanked God for having saved the Turkish nation from the Patriarchate, Damat Ferit and every other despotic power. Eftim also stated that he saved many innocent people from the precipice of the Patriarchate and put out the light of the Phanar. He explained that Anatolia had given him the power, which no Patriarchate had exercised. He expressed his wish to fulfil this duty in accordance with the interests of the Turkish nation. He underlined that the enemies had underestimated their power, but that the nation had won this battle not with the power of guns, but with justice, honesty and

¹⁹⁸ "The E.C.U. Declaration", *The Christian East*, July 1922, vol. III, no. 2, p. 49. Although the Uniate Churches do not differ in religious methods and procedures, they accept the Papal overlordship. It seems that the Catholic clerics in Anatolia were critical towards the Greek-Orthodox and Armenian churches. The words of the head of the Armenian Catholic community of Ankara Father Babadjanian to Grace Ellison are indicative: "Tell the Holy Father... that we are perfectly happy with the Turks... We have been told by the Grand National Assembly that we shall have exactly the same rights as the Moslems -no more, no less. What more can we expect or desire? Tell His Holiness to inform Europe and America... that it is useless to try and protect disloyal Christian minorities here... We know very well, and events have proved it, that so long as we remain loyal to the Turkish Government, all will be well. All the trouble that has come to us has arisen from the disloyalty and political intrigues of the Orthodox Armenians and Greeks, and, above all from outsid propaganda. Ellison, pp. 246-7.

¹⁹⁹ "Patrikhanenin telaşı", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 3 April 1922.

²⁰⁰ "Anadoluda vahdet-i milliyeyi gösteren bir levha", *İleri*, 13 April 1338/1922.

honour. He also stated that God was with their right cause and that the Turkish nation had proved its right to independence.²⁰¹

Such was the influence of Eftim and his movement that it even inspired other non-Muslims to act in a similar way. The Armenian community of Ankara declared that they would supported the attempt of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians to found a Turkish national church. They also, according to *İleri*, stated that the success of Papa Eftim and the support he had received encouraged them to act in the same way. They underlined that the Gregorian population of Anatolia had in fact no relation with the Armenians. They also quoted Rıza Nur who had stated that the majority of those who were called Armenians in Anatolia were from the Turkish race. Accordingly, the language that the Anatolian Gregorian Christians used in and outside the church was Turkish. Their traditions and life style did not differ from those of Muslims. Moreover they had no problems with the Muslims until the committees encouraged by Russia spread hatred between Christians and Muslims. For the community of Ankara, religion and nationality were different things in this age of nations (*milliyet asrı*). The English people, despite the fact that they were from different religions, were united as members of the English nation. So the Anatolians as well, being from one language and race, ought to be united regardless of their religious affiliations. The paper also informed that the Gregorian Christians of Ankara as well sought to establish their own Turkish church following the example of the Orthodox, and that they believed that

²⁰¹ "Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Vatanperverane Bir Nutku", *Vakit*, 23 April 1338/1922. See also Schlicklin, pp. 175-7. "Je vois bien aujourd'hui que, grâce à Dieu, je n'ai pas à rougir de ce que j'ai fait. Je vois avec une grande satisfaction que Dieu a permis la constitution du Gouvernement national que j'avais tant souhaité et qu'il a délivré la nation turque du pouvoir despotique et des vexations que lui faisait subir le gouvernement de Damad Ferid et de ceux qui avaient été empoisonnés par le patriarcat du Phanar. Ces gens qui étaient irrémédiablement corrompus ont trouvé les châtiments qu'ils avaient bien mérités. Quant aux innocents qui restaient en Anatolie, le Bon Dieu m'a prêté son secours et j'ai pu leur faire entendre la vérité. Je suis parvenu à combler les abîmes creusés par le patriarcat du Phanar, je l'ai ébranlé dans ses racines et j'ai éteint sa lumière. Je l'ai laissé dans ses ténèbres et dans son cachot. Aujourd'hui, l'Anatolie m'a accordé les pouvoirs que jamais elle n'avait donnés au patriarcat du

this line of action would eventually bring national unity (*vahdet-i milliye*) to Anatolia.²⁰²

Meanwhile the opponents of the Kemalists sometimes satirized Papa Eftim. For instance, the journal *Aydede* of Constantinople announced that there were rumours according to which the nominee to the Patriarchal throne of Anatolia Papa Eftim would go to Diyarbakır to take lessons of Turkish philology from Ziya Gökalp for two months.²⁰³ A later example of this is the satirical poem of Halid Nihad (Boztepe, 1880-1949) *Kaside-i Vatan* written in 1923. In this poem Halid Nihad criticized the policies of the Ankara Government, like the declaration of the republic, and the transformation of Ankara into a capital city. He also satirized many figures of the era, such as Halide Edip, Yunus Nadi, Yakup Kadri, Falih Rıfkı, Yusuf Akçura etc. He also referred to Papa Eftim, saying that his passionate speeches would not be enough to build churches in Ankara.²⁰⁴

According to Ahmed Emin in *Vakit* an important product of the national struggle was the movement of the Turkish Orthodox. For him, it was natural that many people who were distant from Anatolia should think that this movement was controlled and directed by the Turkish Government. However, he underlined that the government in Anatolia had never encouraged this movement and instead it had used its influence to delay the foundation of a Turkish church. The reason for that was to make it clear that the Turkish government did not intervene in the religious life and

Phanar. Et moi aussi, je me suis chargé de mener à bien cette sainte tâche. Je me suis résigné à travailler de toutes mes forces en vue de la réalisation de notre cause nationale. "

²⁰² "Türk Gregoryen Cemaati", İleri, 12 April 1338/1922.

²⁰³ "Ders Alınacak!", *Aydede*, 16 February 1922, no. 14.

²⁰⁴ "Papa Eftim ne kadar vecd ile nutuk etse dahi
Olamaz Ankara Şehrinde kilisa-yi vatan
Türkü incitmedi evlad-ı Ben-i İsrail
Bence yaptırılmalıdır onlara havra-yı vatan."

organization of the Christians. Also, always according to Ahmed Emin, the government wanted to observe the natural development of this spontaneous movement in order to see if the whole issue was rotten and artificial or not. If this were the case, the movement would have already disappeared. However, Ahmed Emin stated, the movement of the Turkish Orthodox had passed this test and it had proved that it rested on real needs and strong principles. Instead of weakening, the movement had been strengthened and broadened its influence. Ahmed Emin also mentioned his interview with Papa Eftim. According to him, Eftim was a very smart and sincere man. Eftim had explained to him that the Anatolian Christians had always performed their religious services in Turkish.²⁰⁵ But the Patriarchate had always treated them as foreigners and had not offered the opportunity of promotion in the ecclesiastical hierarchy to them. Thus, the immediate result of the foundation of an Anatolian church would be that the Anatolian Christians would acquire their own religious organization and perform their religious duties more passionately. Ahmed

See Mustafa Apaydın, Halid Nihad Boztepe'nin Ankara Yaranını Hicveden Kaside-i Vatan Adlı Şiiri.

²⁰⁵ According to Richard Clogg, the liturgical language of the Anatolian Turkish-speaking Orthodox remained Greek. Even where a community was totally Turcophone, the liturgical language was Greek, even the priest could only chant the text without understanding its meaning. Throughout Anatolia the Gospel and Epistle were read in Turkish as well as Greek. The priest or local schoolmaster sometimes was explaining or translating the passages read in Greek. Although there were many foreign travellers who mentioned that the worship was performed in Turkish, according to Clogg it is probable that these foreign observers could have difficulties in distinguishing those passages that were indeed read in Turkish and those in Greek parroted by priests who had no knowledge of their meaning. For Clogg, although some parts of the liturgy undoubtedly were celebrated in Turkish it is unlikely that the liturgy totally was celebrated in Turkish. It is important that although some of the service books like the Psalter and the Gospels were translated into Karamanlidika, there did not exist a book, printed or not, reproducing the whole liturgy in Turkish. There was also the belief that the translation into Turkish the deepest mysteries of Orthodoxy was a blasphemy. A passage in the anonymous *Apanthisma tis Hristianikis Pisteos yani Gölzarı İmanı Mesihi* is an example for this belief: 'If you ask why these morning and evening prayers are written solely in Greek, you should know that the mysteries and rites of our religion may not be translated into Turkish... these prayers are written in Greek only, so that the Christian who reads them does not blaspheme against God'. Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", pp. 71-3. The contemporary observer Arnold J. Toynbee also rejects the thesis that the Christians of Anatolia "have always read the Bible and performed the Orthodox ritual in the Turkish language." According to him, on the contrary, they generally employed Greek for liturgical purposes like their Greek-speaking co-religionists "and the Turkish Bible in Greek characters was a Protestant gift from the American missionaries, at which Orthodox prelates at first look askance." Toynbee, p. 194.

Emin was sure that with the foundation of the Patriarchate in Kayseri in the monastery of Zincidere, something that as Eftim had informed him would take place soon; those who had disregarded it would understand how serious and essential the movement was.²⁰⁶

On 21 May 1922 the publisher of *İkdam* Ahmet Cevdet Bey wrote a long article on the topic. He underlined that the line of action of the Patriarchate was in fact against the legality of Christendom itself and that it harmed mostly the Christians. It was the political aspirations and intrigues of the Patriarchate that had made the Muslims suspicious of the Christians and had created hostilities. According to Ahmed Cevdet Bey, the privileged status of the Patriarchate, which was respected by the Ottomans, required the obedience and loyalty of the Patriarchate towards the Government. Ahmed Cevdet Bey stressed that it was the Phanar that had destroyed this coexistence. By favouring Athens and Venizelos openly, the Patriarchate had violated its official position and betrayed its flock. The only condition for the Patriarchate to restore its former position was to denounce openly its previous illegitimate decisions and to dismiss all secular or religious officials who had acted in this way. It was against this state of affairs that the Anatolian Orthodox had reacted. Since they had realized that the line of action of the Patriarchate would harm their religious and social conditions, they sought to found a new Patriarchate, which would not serve foreign interests. This attitude obviously would guarantee them a strong position in Anatolia. The Muslims would trust the Christians and these elements would be bound with ties of sincere citizenship. A real brotherhood (*uhuvvet-i hakikiye*) would prevail and the suspicions that were based on religious differences would disappear. Ahmed Cevdet Bey also compared the movement of the Turkish

²⁰⁶ Ahmet Emin, "Anadolu Ortodoksları", *Vakit*, 22 February 1922.

Orthodox with the ecclesiastical and religious reform movement of the West. Accordingly, in the West, the Christians had sought to prevent the misuse of religious authority and the interference of clerics in politics, and had thus established free churches (*serbest kiliseler*). It was clear that the Patriarchate needed such an intense reform movement.²⁰⁷

Meanwhile, on the 6th of May 1922, the ex-director of the Harput branch of the American Near East Relief²⁰⁸ F. D. Yowell, claimed in the *Times* that the Christians in Anatolia, and especially in Pontos were being oppressed.²⁰⁹ On 15 May, the British ambassador in Washington proposed the US Government to found a joint committee to inspect the situation of the non-Muslims of Anatolia. The Americans and the French agreed for the creation of an Entente committee that would inspect both the condition of the Muslims in the Greek zone and of the non-Muslims in the Turkish zone.²¹⁰ These developments caused a new flow of telegrams from the Christian communities of Anatolia condemning claims of atrocities.²¹¹ The Orthodox Christians

²⁰⁷ Ahmet Cevdet, "Anadoluda Ortodoks Patrikliği", *İkdam*, 21 May 1338/1922, no. 8688. The newspaper of İzmir *Sada-yı Hak* quoted on 28 May the article published in the Greek newspaper *Kozmos* that countered the claims of Ahmet Cevdet. Arıkan, p. 114.

²⁰⁸ For the activities of the Near East Relief in Anatolia between 1919 and 1922 see James L. Barton, *Story of Near East Relief (1915-1930) An Interpretation*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), pp. 138-160.

²⁰⁹ The claims on the Turkish atrocities were mainly concerning the Pontos issue. Upon the military measures taken against the Pontic movement the Patriarchate and the Greek Government made intensive applications and protests in the face of the Western Powers and the League of Nations. See for example, *Συνοπτική Έκθεσις των Διωγμών και Σφαγών του Πόντου 1914-1922* (Concise Report on the Deportations and Massacres of Pontos), (Constantinople: Τύποις Π. Αγγελίδου, 1922).

²¹⁰ Sarihan, p. 436. On the news regarding the formation of the committee the Ecumenical Patriarchate published a detailed survey about the current situation of the Orthodox communities in Anatolia in order to demonstrate the sufferings of the Christians and to help the work of the committee. (Les atrocités kémalistes dans les régions du Pont et dans le reste de l'Anatolie, Patriarcat Oecumenique, Constantinople 1922). The book included a detailed list of the executions, deportations and other oppressive practices of the overnment towards the Orthodox of the interior. According the book the condition of the Orthodox Christians of the diocese of Kayseri were more humain relatively to Pontos and other regions. *Les atrocités Kemalistes...*, p. 73.

²¹¹ The issue caused harsh dicussions in the Grand Assembly. On the 18th of June 1922, many deputies criticized the Minister of Interior Fethi Bey because he had let many Greek notables from Pontos to go to İstanbul. According to them, those Greeks had propagated against the Ankara Government and

in Kayseri together with Meletios gathered and denied these claims, saying that their own existence was a proof that Yowell's claims were groundless. They also stated that the deportations were for their own safety and underlined that they were born and lived as Turks and that they wanted to die as Turks. Meletios also sent a telegram to Mustafa Kemal Paşa and thanked him in the name of the Christians for their peaceful and safe existence.²¹²

Papa Eftim also denounced the claims about atrocities.²¹³ The Orthodox community of İncesu sent a telegram and protested against the claims as well.²¹⁴ The deputy of the Metropolitan of Antalya, Baba Hrisantos, in the name of the Orthodox of Antalya, sent a telegram to the officials, to the press and to the foreign representatives, denouncing the claims that Turks were oppressing the Anatolian Christians. He also stressed that the only legitimate representative of their rights was the Government of Ankara. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published the official answer of the Afghan consul Ahmed Khan to this telegram. Ahmed Khan expressed his satisfaction with the telegram of Hrisantos and underlined that the issue of the Investigation Committee was promoted by the Western powers in order to secure their own interests. He also urged the people of Anatolia, Muslim or Christian, to unite and

initiated the foreign propaganda campaign against Turkey. Fethi Bey was criticized that he had not understood the conditions of this propaganda war. See TBMM Gizli Celse Zabıtları, vol. 3, p. 377-83. On the 18th of June, the deputies this time attacked the Foreign Minister Yusuf Kemal Bey that he did not take the necessary measures against the foreign propaganda. See TBMM Gizli Celse Zabıtları, vol. 3, pp. 452-481. These discussions are very interesting, since they illustrate how the nationalists were aware of contemporary propaganda affairs. The deficiencies of the Turkish propaganda were criticized many times by the press and generally it was admitted that the Greek propaganda machinery was more effective than the Turkish one. See Yahya Akyüz, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Fransız Kamuoyu (1919-1922)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1975), pp. 20-31. For the official announcement of the Anatolian Agency regarding the claims of the Times see "Anadolu Hristiyanları", *Akşam*, 18 May 1338/1922.

²¹² İkdâm, 25 May 1922, no. 9049; "Meletyos Ordumuzun Zaferi İçin Dua Ediyor", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 25 May 1922; "Ekalliyetler Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 2 June 1922.

²¹³ "Hristiyanlara Mezalim Yapıldığı Yalandır", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 25 May 1922.

²¹⁴ "Ekalliyetler Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 2 June 1922.

counter together Western propaganda.²¹⁵ Hakimiyet-i Milliye on May 5 published the declarations of Gervasios and of the representatives of the Armenian, Syrian Catholic, Armenian Catholic and Jewish communities disclaiming the assertions that the minorities in Turkey were oppressed²¹⁶ and on May 11 it published the declarations of the representatives of the Orthodox communities of Samsun and Safranbolu.²¹⁷ *İstikbal* on May 28 published the telegram of the Orthodox of Maçka protesting the claims of Yowell.²¹⁸

The Turkish Orthodox Ecclesiastical Congress

The Metropolitan of Konya Prokopios continued trying to delay the procedure and his arrival to Kayseri. His aim was to prevent a definite break with the Patriarchate. However, Papa Eftim took the initiative of quickening the procedures and in the summer of 1922, a transitory executive commission was summoned in Kayseri, in the monastery of Ioannis Prodromos of Zincidere.²¹⁹ Its president was the Bishop of Patara Meletios and it also included Philip Efendi from Antalya as its vice president (*reis vekili*) and Pulluoglu Istamat Zihni as its general secretary (*katib-i umumi*). The commission formed a congress, which, according to Raptopoulos, consisted of 80

²¹⁵ "Afgan Sefiri Hazretlerinden Baba Hrisantos'a", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 20 June 1922.

²¹⁶ "Hristiyanlar Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 5 June 1922.

²¹⁷ "Hristiyanlar Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 11 June 1922. See also "Rumlar ve Ermeniler Nefret Ediyoruz Diyolar", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 31 May 1922.

²¹⁸ Çapa, p. 38.

²¹⁹ The monastery of Ioannis Prodromos in Zincidere (Flaviana) was built by the Metropolit of Kayseri Neophytos in 1728. The monastery in the second half of the 19th century had become one of the major educational and cultural centres of Asia Minor. The complex of the monastery included a primary school, a girls's school, two orphanages and most important the Theological School of Zincidere (İ en Kaisareia Rodokanakeios İeratiki Scholi). This school was founded in 1882 with the sponsorship of the merchant Theodoros Emmanuil Rodokanakios living in Marseille. The monastery also had the big church of Hagios Ioannis o Prodromos and two chapels of Hagios Charalambos and Hagios Pantaleimon. There were also offices of the Metropolitan seat, a dining hall, a dormitory and some 200

notables of Kayseri, 16 clerics and 8 others who were in exile in Kayseri.²²⁰ According to Mavropoulos, the congress consisted of 40 men. The majority were people from different communities of Asia Minor who had been sent into exile.²²¹ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* informed its readers about the congress on 25 June.²²²

One of the delegates who joined the council was Serafeim N. Rizos from Sinasos. He and Evstathios Evlavios were the two delegates of Sinasos. They were called to Kayseri for the congress. Rizos and Evlavios met in Zincidere with Nikolaos Romanidis from Aravisos and Prodromos Kenan from Nevsehir and the four decided to support Papa Eftim, since it seemed to them that the whole movement aimed to get through these difficult times.²²³

The congress prepared and accepted regulations for its functioning and gave the *Mutasarrıf* of Kayseri Muammer Bey a copy of the regulations and informed him

rooms. See Ioannis Ioannidis, *Kaisareia Mitropolitleri ve Malumat-ı Mütenevva*, (Dersaadet: Alexandros Nomismatidis Matbaası, 1896), pp. 12-5 and 56-61.

²²⁰ Raptopoulos gives some names from the members of the council (p. 119-20): Bodosaki Efendi Terzioglu (Silifke), Kozma Boyacioglu (Kayseri), Theodoros Durmusoglu (Kayseri), Gavril Anastasiadis Haci Aga (Kayseri), Philippos Nikolaidis (Isparta), Istamat Zihni, Kostis Sahinidis/Fehmi, Georgios Biberoglu (Antalya), Georgios Kirmizioglu (Antalya), Simeon Bacoglu (Amasya) and Neofitos Ayanoglu.

²²¹ Mavropoulos, pp. 279-80.

²²² "Anadolu'da Türk Ortodoks Kongresi", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 25 June 1922. The exact date of the inauguration of the congress is a matter of controversy. According to the information that we derive from the Turkish newspapers it is the 19th of June (see Sarihan, p. 484). Meanwhile according to Raptopoulos and Mavropoulos the congress summoned in May. Alexandris based on the records of the Greek Foreign Office claims that the congress was formed on May 28. Indeed, *İkdam* on May 25 informed his readers about a meeting in Kayseri of the "general representatives of the Turkish Orthodox community" ("*Umum Türk Ortodoks cemaati murahasları Kayseri'de bir içtima aktetmişler...*") However, the official newspaper of the congress *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* dates the first session of the congress on July 16: "*3 ve 16 Temmuz 1922 Pazar günü sabah saat iki raddelerinde Zincidere Manastırı'nda Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi'ne Tabi Umum Anadolu Türk Ortodoksları Kongresi'nin Birinci İçtimaı Umumi aktolunmuştur.*" Önder, *Kayseri Basın Tarihi*, (Ankara: 1972), pp. 45-6.

²²³ Serafeim Rizos, p. 72-80. Rizos refers to some other persons who participated to the congress: Filippaki lawyer from Antalya, a lawyer from Bodrum whose name he does not remember (Istamat Zihni), lawyer Yanni Hristoforidis from Silli, lawyer Georgakis Ourailoglou, Hatziaga from Kayseri. According to Rizos there were many other from Talas, Kayseri, Germere, Incesu, Tavlusun, Nigde, Konya etc. who he did not know. In another manuscript Rizos gives also the name of Papatheodoro

on the issue. According to the first article of the regulations, the aim of the council was to emancipate the Anatolian Orthodox Christians from the yoke of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and to inform the Western public opinion on the real conditions of the Anatolian Orthodox communities. The second article stated that the head of the council was Meletios, and the third that the decisions of the council would be published in the press. The fourth article pointed out that each community would pay 1-5 liras per month. According to the fifth article, each month the balance sheet would be controlled by the General Trustee (Papa Eftim). The sixth and last article declared that the property of the council would pass to the Turkish Orthodox Church immediately after its foundation.²²⁴

On July 16, the congress officially announced that since the Patriarchate in Phanar had been transformed into a political organ, the Turkish Orthodox Christians have decided to cut every ecclesiastical and religious relation with it and declared its decision to found an independent Turkish Orthodox Church in Anatolia. The congress called the government to take immediate action for the foundation of the new church. It also took the decision to translate the ecclesiastical books into Turkish²²⁵, to publish a weekly newspaper, *Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadasi* and to invite Prokopios and Gervasios to Kayseri.²²⁶

from Bursa. See Serafeim Rizos, *Kappadokiki Dimokratia – Kapadokya Cumhuriyeti*, KMS manuscript 426, Cappadocia 93, p. 6a-7a.

²²⁴ Mavropoulos, p. 280.

²²⁵ "Türk Ortodokslarının Mühim Kararları", *İkdam*, 16 August 1338/1922. The Government proposed that the liturgical language must be Turkish. But the council insisted that the Orthodox community had no enough philologists to conclude such an enormous work and it explained that at the moment, only the Bible could be read in Turkish. See Alexandris, 1983, p. 185. Beginning from the 5th issue *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* published in its second page the translation of the Bible. Patriarch Meletios reacted to this news and declared that the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were forced by the government of Ankara to adopt Turkish in the liturgies. Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe...", p. 113.

²²⁶ Rapptopoulos, p. 106-9 and Alexandris, 1983, p. 183-5. Rapptopoulos and Alexandris refer to this newspaper as *Türk Ortodoksluk Sadasi*.

The first issue of *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* was published on July 22.²²⁷

The fact that it was not published in *Karamanlidika* but in Ottoman was not a matter of coincidence. Eftim and his supporters must have thought that a newspaper in Greek script would cause suspicion. The newspaper was published in Kayseri, in the printing house of the *Liva* of Kayseri. Its offices were located in the monastery of Zincidere. The publisher of the newspaper was Pulluoğlu İstamat Zihni²²⁸, while the editor-in-chief was the lawyer Antalyalı Çekeoğlu Philip. At the beginning, the newspaper was distributed for free (*meccanen*), but from the 11th issue on, it was sold for five kuruş (*fiyatı beş kuruştur*). Its last issue appeared on the 8th of April 1923.²²⁹

The newspaper published the decision taken by the council concerning the denouncement of the Patriarchate. The decision underlined that the Ecumenical Patriarchate had become an instrument in the hands of the Greek state and that it drove the Turkish Orthodox Christians to a catastrophe. In reaction, the

²²⁷ The Soviet journalist K. Yust, who was in Anatolia between 1920-2 to examine the "Kemalist press", informs that according to the latest news (April 1922) Papa Eftim ("the Anatolian Rum opportunist who is known as Papa Eftim") was preparing a newspaper similar to the *Faros tis Anatonis*. According to Yust, Eftim had been seeking the material support of the Anatolian Christians. See K. Yust, p. 186.

²²⁸ Pulluoğlu/Puloğlu İstamat Zihni (Özdamar) was born in 1879 in Bodrum. He was a member of the court of Denizli when he joined the Turkish Orthodox movement. He became the general secretary (*Umumi Katip*) of the Turkish Orthodox Congress. He was exempted from the compulsory population exchange with Papa Eftim. In the 1930's he was appointed by the government as trustee (*tek müteveli*) to the Hospital of Balıklı. In 1935 he became deputy of Eskişehir and until 1946 he remained as a deputy.

²²⁹ Salih Özkan, "Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası Gazetesi", *III. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2000), pp. 363-78; Önder, pp. 45-8. Both authors confuse the dates of the appearance of the newspaper since it used the old Orthodox calendar. During the Turkish-Greek War, there were other Greek newspapers that continued to be published in Anatolia. *Diogenis* that was published in Samsun was one of them. It closed down in April 1921 when its redactors were deported. The paper was published in Karamanlidika and "it was used as a propaganda mean against Greece by the Turkish authorities." According to Yust it published editorial articles with titles like "The duty of the *Rums* is to help motherland Turkey against the tyrannical Greeks" or "We must show our punch to Athens". It called many times the wealthy community members to support the Red Crescent and the Turkish army. *Faros Tis Anatonis* that was published in Trabzon also was a "docile weapon in the hands of Turkish authorities". According to K. Yust, *Faros Tis Anatonis* was an opportunist paper, which first supported the Committee of Progress and Union and later was controlled by the Kemalists. It was critical towards the Greek army and Pontist movement. Another newspaper of Trabzon was *Epochi*, which was a more

representatives of the Turkish Ortodox had decided to denounce the Patriarchate and declared that they would found an independent and non-political church in Anatolia.²³⁰

According to *Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası*, the reason for the foundation of a new church and the breaking off with the Patriarchate was due to the Patriarchate's own line of action. During the last century the Ecumenical Patriarchate had mixed religious affairs with politics. Especially in the last years the Patriarchate had acted along with the enemies of the Turkish nation, and had been transformed into a political center, which tried to absorb the Anatolian Turkish Orthodox. Thus, it was a natural and rightful reaction of the Turkish Christians to oppose the political aspirations of the Phanar.²³¹

In *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, Meletios announced that he was appointed as Metropolitan of Kayseri by the grace of God and the will of the Government. He called upon the Orthodox to obey and respect the government and he recommended that the priests continue to pray regularly for the Head of the Grand Assembly Mustafa Kemal Paşa, for the success of the Grand Assembly and for the victory of the army.²³²

nationalist paper. It closed in 1921. Two of its redactors and two other correspondents were judged and hanged in Amasya. See K. Yust, 1995, pp. 185-9.

²³⁰ "Kayseri Kilise Konferansının Birinci İhtimamının Birinci Kararı", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 29 July 1922. The newspaper also announced some of the names of the representatives who signed this decision: The vice president Çekeoğlu Filip (Antalya), general secretary Bodrumî Pulluoğlu İstamat Zihni (Zonguldak), Kostaki Fehmi (Keskinmaden), Durmuşoğlu Todorî (Kayseri), Bacoğlu Simeonaki (Konya), İsakidis oğlu Yovan (Silifke), Boyacıoğlu Kozma (Develi), Hacı Pavli (Hamidbünyan), Konstantioğlu Hacı Yani (Fethiye), Rizo (Sinason), Kasifalaoğlu Miltiyadi (Samsun), İsakoğlu Vasilaki (Niğde), Yosifaki (Kastamonu), Miltiyadi Palidi (Trabzon), Yorgi Tanailoğlu (Alaiye), Yovanaki (Tosya), Hacı Gavril (İncesu), Garboğlu Vasilaki (Akşehir), Niyofidos Ayanoğlu (Talas), Derkemecioğlu Vasilaki (Tavlasun), Karolioğlu Anargiros (Nevşehir), Hacı Eftimoğlu (Ürgüp), Üstünoğlu Mihail (Endürlük), Boriorloğan (Karahisar-ı Şarki), Yovanaki (Sili), Mihalaki Çömlekçioğlu (İnebolu), Bodosaki Kefencioğlu (Gümüşhanıköy), Papa Dimitri (Arapsun). Although the newspaper announced that it would continue to publish the names of the other members of the council, such a publication never appeared.

²³¹ "Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 29 July 1922.

²³² "Kayseri Metropolidi Meletios Efendi Hazretlerinin Beyannamesi", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 29 July 1922.

Prokopios and Gervasios who were in Ankara, strongly reacted to the news regarding the congress. They declared that this congress had no right to decide on its own on ecclesiastical matters and that its actions were therefore totally anticanonical. After this reaction, the congress postponed its works and invited again the two prelates to Kayseri to join the process.²³³ The Ankara Government forced Prokopios and Gervasios to go to Kayseri. According to Ergene, the Minister of Justice asked from the two prelates to go immediately to Kayseri in order to participate in the congress. Prokopios refused the proposal since the ecclesiastical issues were under the authority of the clergy and hence there was no need for such a congress. But when the Ministry of Interior pressed them to go to Kayseri, they could no longer resist.²³⁴ On the 30th of June, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* congratulated Papa Eftim for his contributions on the separation of the Orthodox of Anatolia from the Patriarchate and warned the prelates not to delay anymore this issue.²³⁵

Thus, the two prelates reached the monastery of Zincidere and met there with Meletios.²³⁶ According to Ergen, Papa Eftim, in order to impress Prokopios and Gervasios, arranged a great ceremony for their arrival.²³⁷ In Zincidere, Prokopios, with the help of Meletios and Gervasios, sought again to delay as much as possible the foundation of an independent church. But they faced the growing dissatisfaction of the local community and of the exiled Christians who were concentrated in Kayseri. These believed that if they would not act in accordance to the wishes of the Ankara Government the pressure of the government would increase and the

²³³ Rapptopoulos, pp. 109-10; see also Ergene, p. 29.

²³⁴ *ibid*, pp. 33-5.

²³⁵ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργείας...", p. 186.

²³⁶ Rapptopoulos, pp. 110-13.

²³⁷ Ergene, p. 30 and 38-41.

deportations would start again. Thus, The Metropolitan of Konya Prokopios and the Bishops of Patara Meletios and of Sivas Gervasios were faced a hard dilemma: to oppose the Ankara Government and put at risk the Christian communities and themselves or to accept the proposal and betray the Patriarchate. They were also in a difficult position also because they could not get in direct contact with the Phanar so as to receive information and instructions from their ecclesiastical superiors.²³⁸

Meanwhile, the Patriarchate declared in a circular that the Orthodox prelates in Anatolia were oppressed by the authorities and that they were forced to announce publicly their support to the Turkish government. Accordingly Gervasios was shaved and tortured by the men of Topal Osman Ağa; Prokopios was exiled to Erzurum and Sivas; and Meletios was exiled and tortured as well. According to Phanar, these facts were reminders of the condition of the religious freedom in Turkey.²³⁹ Papa Eftim disclaimed with a circular the Patriarchate's arguments that the prelates in Anatolia were oppressed. The three prelates had been properly treated by the government and they were free to perform their religious and ecclesiastical duties. Gervasios had become metropolitan. Prokopios was exiled because of the events in Konya but he was treated in conformity to his position and had come back. Finally, Meletios' visit to Malatya had nothing to do with official pressure and he was also back to his position.²⁴⁰ In *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* Meletios disavowed the claims that he was in jail and stated that he was treated with the respect due to his position.²⁴¹

The three prelates in Zincidere asked Ankara to inform them about its exact plans, i.e. the regulations which Baha Bey had prepared for the Turkish Church, in

²³⁸ Raptopoulos; also Mavropoulos, p. 277.

²³⁹ "Meletios Rüesa-i Ruhaniyei İtham Ediyor", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 25 June 1922.

²⁴⁰ "Fener Patrikhanesi Bunlara Ne Diyecek?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 2 July 1922 and "Baba Eftim'in Yeni Bir Beyannamesi", *Vakit*, 10 July 1338/1922.

order to buy some additional time. They also wanted to study the regulations of other autocephalous churches. Papa Eftim himself went to Ankara to inform the government of the prelates' plans.²⁴² While Eftim was in Ankara, an official from the Department of Religious Affairs of the Ministry of Justice met in Moutalaski with the prelates and gave them a regulation for the foundation of the Turkish Church. The official stressed that the Government was anxious regarding the foundation of the church and that further delay would harm the Christians themselves. He also asked the prelates to ordain a new bishop without the approval of the Phanar so as to prove the independence of the new church. Back in Kayseri, the prelates studied the proposal. The regulations was clear in that the new church would not enjoy any privileges like those of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The Turkish Orthodox Church would be under the control of the Ministry of Justice.²⁴³ Prokopios and Gervasios were against the proposal, whereas Papa Eftim, the congress, and even Meletios were urging for the acceptance of the Government's proposal.²⁴⁴

On the 26th of August 1922, *Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası* informed that Papa Eftim had been elected as *Megas Oikonomos* with special authority concerning the relations between Ankara and the Christian communities.²⁴⁵ On 18 August 1922, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* informed that the congress of the Turkish Orthodox in Kayseri

²⁴¹ *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 19 August 1922.

²⁴² Mavropoulos, p. 284.

²⁴³ According to Mavropoulos, Baha Bey who had prepared the regulation had followed the example of the Church of Greece, which also was under state supervision. Mavropoulos, p. 285. In fact the argument that the Greek example had paved the way for state supervision over the church, had been used largely during the ecclesiastical conflict with the Bulgarian Exarchate. It was underlined that the example of the unilateral autocephality of the Greek Church had given motives to the Bulgarians. See Matalas, 2002.

²⁴⁴ Ergene refers to the tension between Meletios and Gervasios with Prokopios and explains how Eftim managed to "persuade" the prelates under the threat of exploding the whole monastery with a bomb. Ergene, pp. 42-9.

²⁴⁵ Alexandris, 1983, p. 188 ; also Ergene, p. 49.

had decided to announce that those prelates who had left their flock and joined the Phanar had no right to continue to use their titles. Since the Christians of Anatolia had cut off their relations with the Patriarchate of Phanar, they did not acknowledge those who were acting in the name of the Phanar as their spiritual leader. The congress demanded from these prelates to use before their titles the word "former". Since these prelates had no right to represent the Anatolian Christians, the congress also demanded, "in the name of Christianity" that these prelates did not act in their name. These prelates were the Metropolitans of Kayseri Nikolaos, of Chaelcedon Grigorios, of İznik Vasilios, of İzmit Alexandros, of Antalya Yerasimos, of Amasya Yermanos, of Trabzon Chrisanthos, of Ankara Gervasios, of Niksar Polikarpos and of Gümüşhane Lavrentios. According to *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, the congress also declared that for those dioceses (*devair-i ruhaniyeler*) where the Orthodox people had not elected their metropolitan yet, the congress would appoint temporarily an appropriate cleric. Moreover, the newspaper announced that the congress had called all the priests to prepare a budget and a balance sheet in order to arrange the revenues and expenditures of their churches and prevent misuses.²⁴⁶ It seems that these developments made the Ankara Government soften its pressure on this particular issue.²⁴⁷

On 13 August, Meletios and İstamat Zihni, in the name of the "Independent Church Congress of all the Anatolian Turkish Orthodox" (*Umum Anadolu Türk Ortodoks Müstakil Kilise Kongresi*), sent a telegram to the General Townshend²⁴⁸ declaring that they were absolutely satisfied with the government and that the claims

²⁴⁶ "Türk Ortodoksları İş Başında", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 18 August 1338/1922 ; also *İkdam*, 27 August 1338/1922.

²⁴⁷ Rappapoulos, p. 120.

for atrocities and oppression were groundless.²⁴⁹ On 29 August, *İkdam* published an interview with Papa Eftim²⁵⁰. According to the paper, Eftim stated that faith was not a dividing line within a nation. He also underlined that they rejected the title of "minority" since they formed an integral part of the Turkish nation. The Christians of Anatolia were living in peace and all the claims about atrocities were misleading. Eftim claimed that he was preparing to go to Europe to explain the truth that the Christians of Anatolia were protected by the government of the National Assembly.²⁵¹

It seems that the tension between Prokopios and Eftim remained. The former did not approve of the new title of the latter and asked him to apologize for financial matters, especially for the sum Eftim had collected from the Orthodox communities.²⁵² According to Ergene, from the beginning of the congress Prokopios had not been in favor of Eftim's title as general representative of the Orthodox communities in Anatolia. However, the pressure of the members of the congress and the representatives of the communities forced Prokopios to give up.²⁵³

Prokopios also sought to find a proper way for the relations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He accepted to disavow Patriarch Meletios, but not the Patriarchate as a whole. The reason for the disavowal of the person of the Patriarch was the involvement of Meletios Metaxakis in politics and the fact that he was not an Ottoman subject and that therefore his election was not in conformity to the existing

²⁴⁸ General Townshend visited Ankara on the 27th of July 1922 and met with Mustafa Kemal in Konya. His visit To Anatolia was not approved by the British Government and had no official character.

²⁴⁹ "Türk Ortodokslarının Telgrafı", *Vakit*, 15 August 1338/1922.

²⁵⁰ The title of Eftim is referred as "Baba". Many newspapers used Baba instead of Papa, while it seems that Mustafa Kemal as well call Eftim "Baba".

²⁵¹ "Baba Eftim Efendi", *İkdam*, 29 August 1338/1922.

²⁵² Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 188.

²⁵³ Ergene, pp. 41-2.

regulations.²⁵⁴ Thus, according to this formula, the Cappadocian Orthodox Christians although denouncing Meletios, would remain within the ecclesiastical boundaries of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. However, Ankara did not approve of the plans of Prokopios and increased its pressure for the total application of its program for the foundation of the Turkish Church. This program included the election of new bishops independently from the Patriarchate, the introduction of Turkish in religious services and schools, the abolition of the old privilege system and the practice of the state law in the personal relations, i.e. weddings, divorces etc. These were presented to the council by the vice Minister of Justice Tevfik Bey who came to Kayseri. Tevfik also gave them an eight day extension to accept the plan.²⁵⁵

The former Minister of Justice and deputy of Saruhan Refik Şevket Bey informed the government with a memorandum dated 26th of July. The memorandum is illustrative of the aims of the Government on the issue. Şevket underlined that if the Patriarchate would continue to have any authority on the Christians of Anatolia, western powers would continue to intervene in the internal affairs of the country. However, according to Refik Şevket, one of the main principles of the national movement was the rejection of such a minority problem. From this point of view, Refik Şevket underlined that the foundation of a Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate would decrease the power of the Phanar and at the same time would demonstrate that there was no minority issue in Anatolia. Refik Şevket also informed that the Anglican and Catholic Churches were sympathetic towards the attempt. He explained that he acted in his period of ministry in accordance to the information provided by Baha Bey. The

²⁵⁴ *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* on 9 September published an open letter to the Patriarch Meletios written by İstamat Zihni. Zihni questioned Meletios how he acts in the name of the Anatolian Christians, since he had never been asked from them to represent them. He also underlined that the election and enthronement of Meletios were contrary to the ecclesiastic and public laws and asked to Meletios how he dare to occupy illegally the Patriarchal throne. İstamat Zihni, "Fener'de Patriklik Makamının Gasıbı Meletyos Efendi Cenaplarına", *Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 9 September 1922.

law and regulation prepared by Baha were still at the ministry. He admitted that his resignation prevented the foundation of the Turkish Church; however, he insisted on the issue's urgent nature and underlined his belief that the issue should be terminated before the peace process would begin.²⁵⁶

Papa Eftim, like Refik Şevket Bey, was in favour of a total break with the Patriarchate. To him, only the nations who were united could protect themselves from different threats. Therefore, the enemies of a nation sought to create divisions in it. It was for this purpose that Venizelos and Meletios had sought to separate the Christian Turks from the unity of the Turkish nation. However, the fact was that the Orthodox Christians living in every place of Anatolia, according to their race, customs and feelings were Turks. Their only difference from their Muslim compatriots was their religion. Their songs, quatrains, musical instruments were the same. Thus, the claims of the Patriarchate that the Christians of Anatolia were under its supervision were ridiculous. The Turkish Orthodox population united had disclaimed the propaganda of the enemies and especially of the Patriarchate and they found peace and tranquillity not in foreign propaganda but in the unity of the Turkish nation.²⁵⁷

The crucial part of the Government plan regarding the Turkish Church was the election of new bishops without the approval of the Phanar. The Ankara Government regarded such an action as an indication of the will of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians to break all ties with the Patriarchate. The Government also implied that it wished the election of Eftim as the third Bishop (*Episkopos*) in Cappadocia.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 189.

²⁵⁶ Alkan, pp. 72-3.

²⁵⁷ "Umum Anadolu Türk Ortodoksları Murahhas-ı Umumileri Papa Eftim Efendi Hazretleri'nin 'Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi' Unvanlı İkinci Kitapta Münderic Beyannameleri", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 21 October 1922, no. 11.

²⁵⁸ Raptopoulos, pp. 149-50.

However, the prelates were still resisting. Prokopios insisted that the issue had important theological and ecclesiastical implications and therefore he wanted two months to study the issue in detail.²⁵⁹ But this line of action faced the reaction of the members of the local Orthodox community who were fearing possible retaliations that could take place if they would not accept the plan of Ankara. The *mutasarrıf* of Kayseri Muammer Bey²⁶⁰, summoned the notables of Kayseri and also the members of the congress and informed them that if they did not accept the terms of the Government they would face difficulties. Thus, they increased their pressure on Prokopios. First of all, they sought to get the prelates to Kayseri from the monastery of Zincidere where they could control their actions. They prevented Meletios, who had come to Kayseri for a religious festival, to return to Zincidere. Later, Prokopios came to Kayseri due to health problems and the notables prevented his departure as well. Lastly, they invited Gervasios to come to Kayseri. Although Gervasios did not accept at first, he later changed his attitude since it was impossible to resist.²⁶¹ Demonstrations also took place in front of the Archbishopry. Such was the pressure that Prokopios left the Archbishopry and found asylum in the house of Bodosaki

²⁵⁹ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 190.

²⁶⁰ Muammer Bey was born in 1874 in İstanbul. He started his career in the public administration as *kaymakam* of Kangal in 1902. He served as *kaymakam* in Niksar, Aziziye and Vodina. He was a member of the Committee of Union and Progress. In 1909 he became the *mutasarrıf* of Kayseri. Two years later Muammer Bey was appointed to Adana as governor. He became governor of Konya in 1912 and of Sivas in 1913. After the armistice, he was arrested with the charge that he had joined to the Armenian massacre and he was exiled to Malta. In September 1919 Muammer Bay managed to escape from the island and in April 1922 he once again became the *mutasarrıf* of Kayseri. In 1923 he was elected deputy of Sivas. Muammer Bey died in 1928 from tuberculosis. See Zübeyir Kars, "Kayseri Mutasarrıfı, Adana, Konya ve Sivas Valisi Ahmet Muammer Bey'in Kayseri'nin Çağdaşlaşmasına Katkıları", III. *Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2000), pp. 269-97. It seems that Muammer Bey had actively involved with the foundation of the Turkish Church. His picture was published in *Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası* on the 26th of August 1922 with the subtitle: "Kongremizin Hamisi Muhterem Mutasarrıfımız Muammer Beyefendi Hazretleri". According to Thomas Milkoglou from Kayseri, although Muammer Bey hated the Armenians he was good towards the Orthodox. Milkoglou mentions that Muammer Bey had saved the local Orthodox ("mas esose"). Exodos vol. 2, p. 40.

²⁶¹ Mavropoulos, pp. 285-6.

Terzioğlu.²⁶² Meanwhile, the Turkish army won a decisive victory on the western front against the Greeks. The news of the victory must have led Prokopios to lose any hope of the cancellation or at least of the postponement of the foundation of the church.²⁶³

Finally, Prokopios could not resist anymore and the congress declared the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate on the 4th of October 1922. The congress elected Çeneoğlu Filip, Boyacioğlu Kozma, Kostaki, Fehmi, Yorgi Orogas, Teofilos, Ayanoğlu Totor, Çömlekçioğlu Mihalaki and Bulluoğlu İstamat Zihni to form together with Prokopios, Meletios and Gervasios the Constant Mixed Council (*daimî meclis-i muhtelite*). Prokopios was elected *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal throne (*patrik kaymakamı*) until the conditions become suitable for the Patriarchal elections.²⁶⁴ Moreover the congress entitled Papa Eftim as "Megas

²⁶² Raphtopoulos, pp. 150-5. Bodosaki Terzioğlu was the father of V. Raphtopoulos and he was a prominent figure of the Orthodox community of Konya. He was public treasurer between 1877-1895. From 1895 on he served as translator in the Russian Consulate of Konya. When the war begun he had been exiled as war prisoner to Kayseri. After the war he returned to Konya, from where he was once more sent to Kayseri. There he joined the council as representative of Silifke. He became the head of the population exchange comission in Konya. Raphtopoulos, p. 156-8. It is indicative that his son uses the Greek version of his surname.

²⁶³ According to *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, the Orthodox community of Kayseri summoned in the church to celebrate the victory of the Turkish army. *Mutasarrıf* Muammer Bey and *Miralay* Abdullah Bey also participated to the meeting. İstamat Zihni made a speech in the church and called the people to pray for the final victory of the Turkish armies over the Greeks ("*alçak Yunan sürüleri*"). Then, the people prayed for Mustafa Kemal Paşa, the members of the Grand National Assembly and the victorious army. *Mutasarrıf* Muammer Bey spoke also and he expressed his gratefulness to see the Muslim Turks praying in the mosques and the Christian Turks in the churches for the same purpose, for the happiness of the nation. "Büyük Zaferimiz Türk Ortodoks Kiliselerinde Meserretlerle Kutlandı", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 23 September 1922. The paper also announced that the congress of the Turkish Orthodox had decided to send a declaration to the Foreign Offices of the American and European states with the mediation of the *Matbuat ve İstihbarat Müdüriyet-i Umumiyesi*. "Sekizinci İçtima-i Umumi", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 23 September 1922. *Misak-ı Milli* on 18 September informed that the victory of the Turkish army was celebrated in the Turkish Orthodox Churches. See Jaeschke, 1989, p. 195. For the congratulation telegram of the Turkish Orthodox community of Antalya to the Grand Assembly see *TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, Cilt: 22 Devre: 1, TBMM Matbaası, Ankara 1958, p. 483.

²⁶⁴ Ergene, pp. 24-6; Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch - Orthodoxe...", pp. 112-4; Sarıhan, p. 692; Ekincikli, pp. 187-8. The date of the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church is referred in many sources as September 21, which I think is according to the old Orthodox calendar. Alexandris based on the records of the Greek Foreign Office claims that Prokopios approved on the 18th of January 1923 the declaration of the autocephality of the Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate and that the congress elected him

Oikónomos".²⁶⁵ Prokopios also ordained the reverend father of the Monastery of Taxiarchon Konstantinos²⁶⁶ as the Episkopos of Ankara.²⁶⁷ The ecclesiastical formula with which the prelates ordained Konstantinos was that under war conditions, when Christian communities were isolated from their ecclesiastical centre such an appointment of bishops without the approval of the Patriarchate was not anti-canonical, since it was a need for the Christian flock.²⁶⁸

It is important to note that Prokopios did not accept Papa Eftim to become a bishop. Moreover, when the three prelates returned to Zincidere they cut every connection with Papa Eftim, declaring that they did not need anymore his assistance.²⁶⁹ According to Mavropoulos, the role of the three prelates was crucial in preventing Papa Eftim's plans. They tried to prevent the foundation of a Turkish Church by delaying it in conformity to the traditional Phanariotic policy. The mistake of Papa Eftim, for Mavropoulos, was that he overestimated his power and ignored the abilities of the prelates. He thought that these would be forced by the authorities to come to terms with him and serve as his puppets.²⁷⁰ In contrast, Ergene claims that the propaganda of the Phanar caused the Government become suspicious of the newly founded Patriarchate in Kayseri. There were rumours that the aim of Papa Eftim was to reestablish the Patriarchate, which the Government wanted to ruin, in Kayseri.

Metropolitan of Kayseri, Gervasios Metropolitan of Pontos and Meletios Metropolitan of Konya. See Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας..." p. 191.

²⁶⁵ Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch - Orthodoxe...", p. 113.

²⁶⁶ Konstantinos Papadopoulos was born in Kayseri in 1854. He studied in the Holy Monastery of Taxiarchon and in the Theological School in Zincidere. He was a teacher since 1893 when he became a cleric. He was the reverend father of the monastery of Taxiarchon when he became Episkopos of Ankara. After the population exchange he moved to Greece. The Patriarchate accepted his bishopry but it changed it from Ankara to Amphipoleos. He died in Pireas in 1933. Raptopoulos, p. 272-9.

²⁶⁷ *ibid*, pp. 167-9. According to Raptopoulos the liturgy of the ordination was made on December 18.

²⁶⁸ Mavropoulos, p. 288.

²⁶⁹ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 191.

These rumours forced Eftim to go to Ankara and to leave the church in "incapable hands".²⁷¹ According to Ercan, when Eftim left Kayseri for Ankara, the newly established church threatened to be re-dominated by the Phanar.²⁷²

After the foundation of the new church and the ordination of Konstantinos, the pressure exercised by the Government ceased. In addition, after the fall of the western front, the issue of the Turkish Church lost its actual importance and the interest of the Government concentrated on the Peace Conference; thus, the council withered away.²⁷³

Meanwhile, the congress sought to reorganize the communal organization. On 11 November, *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* expressed the need for founding a printing house in order to continue the publication of the newspaper.²⁷⁴ The congress also sought to support the orphanage of the Zincidere Monastery by asking the communities for donations.²⁷⁵ The Turkish Orthodox Congress also decided to found a Turkish Orthodox Theological School (*Türk Ortodoksları Ruhban Mektebi*) in the Monastery of Zincidere in order to educate prelates who would "enlighten the Anatolian Turkish Orthodox". The aim of the school was defined as to educate prelates who would be able to preach and interpret the Bible in Turkish. Therefore, Turkish philology would have a central role in the program of the school. It was aimed at gradually turkifying the language of education. The school would be free and

²⁷⁰ Mavropoulos, p. 267 and 271.

²⁷¹ Ergene, p. 55.

²⁷² Ercan, p. 422; also Şahin, p. 192.

²⁷³ Raptopoulos, p. 191; also Alexandris "Η Αλόπειρα Δημιουργία...", p. 192.

²⁷⁴ *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 11 November 1922.

²⁷⁵ Kouroupou and Balta refer to the circular of the Turkish Orthodox Congress to the Orthodox community of Ürgüp, dated on 8 September 1922 and signed by Meletios and İstamat Zihni. Kouroupou - Balta, p. 69.

boarding. The program of the school would be in conformity with the European Theology Schools. Those who would graduate first would be sent to European Universities in order to further continue their studies. According to the congress with the foundation of such a school, the Anatolian Turkish Orthodox would be 44444emancipated from illiterate priests and would acquire civilized, wise and learned preachers and priests.²⁷⁶

Patriarch Meletios IV declared at that time (*Times*, 7 February 1923) that the Patriarchate was unwilling to take immediate disciplinary action as it was fearing that the prelates might have been coerced into schismatical behavior by the Ankara Government. He explained that the Patriarchate was willing to meet the issue by establishing a special ecclesiastical province in which the liturgical language would be the Turkish. This province would be autonomous but subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate.²⁷⁷ The new ecclesiastical order, according to Meletios, would be based on the model of the Albanian Church, which was an autonomous Albanophone church. However Meletios underlined that the autonomous Cappadocian church would not be autocephalous, i.e. it would obey its center, the Ecumenical Patriarchate.²⁷⁸

²⁷⁶ Zübeyir Kars, "Kayseri Eğitim Tarihi üzerine Bir Deneme", *I. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1998), p. 188-9.

²⁷⁷ Psomiades, *The Eastern Question The Last Phase*, (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1968), p. 91.

²⁷⁸ Alexandris, "Ἡ Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας..." p. 192. The disorder in the Albanian dioceses was another problem which the Patriarchate faced during this period. When in 1921 Albania became independent, the issue of the Albanian Church arosed. There was already a movement for ecclesiastical independence from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Its main figure was Fan Noli, who was a priest in the Albanian diaspora in Amerca. Fan Noli from 1908 had started to translate the liturgical books and to preech in Albanian. However, at first the Albanian Orthodox sought to reach an understanding with the Patriarchate. The Patriarchate also seemed wishfull to declare the autonomy of the local church in Albania. However radicals, such as Fan Noli, Vasilios Markos and Evangelos Tsamtsis, who sought total independency from the Patriarchate prevailed and in September 1922 a council declared the unilateral autocephality of the Albanian Church. The main argument of the Patriarchate against the autocephality of the Albanian Church was that the autocephality of a church was possible only if the

The Metropolitan of Kizikos Kallinikos in his pamphlet on the privileges of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (*Ta Dikaia tou Oikoumenikou Patriarheiou en Tourkia* – 1922), also stated that the Orthodox Church was the only obstacle against the Panturkist and Panislamist policies of the Young Turks aiming at exterminating the Christians of Turkey because the church linked the Christians with their religious and national past and traditions. The new example of this policy, according to Kallinikos, was the creation of a Turkish church which would eventually lead to the disappearance of the Christian population of Asia Minor. It was also interesting that Kallinikos referred to Papa Eftim not as a traitor but as a “terrified victim”.²⁷⁹

It seems that the Patriarchate facing such a sensitive political condition sought to find a way of compliance. For the contemporary observer Arnold Toynbee, a conciliatory and “expectant” attitude was necessary for both the Patriarchate and the Ankara Government, since “it is certain that the Patriarchate cannot coerce them into preserving nor the Angora Government into abandoning their old ecclesiastical affiliations against their own wishes. At this stage it is impossible to say whether common-sense and ties of neighbourhood or sentimentality and contrariness will prevail with them. But pressure from either of the interested parties will only drive them into the arms of the other. Both the Patriarchate and the Angora Government will therefore be wise to maintain a passive and ‘expectant’ attitude, for each has great interests at stake –the Patriarchate, possibly, its existence, and the Nationalists

country was an Orthodox Christian one. Thus, from this point of view in Albania and Turkey where the Orthodox population constituted a minority the autocephality was not possible. Thus, the Patriarchate proposed to recognize the autonomy of the regional Albanian Church. The problem was solved only in April 1937, when the Patriarchate recognized the autocephality of the Albanian Church. See Apostolos Glavinas, *Η Ορθόδοξη Αυτοκέφαλη Εκκλησία της Αλβανίας* (The Orthodox Autocephalous Church of Albania), Thessaloniki 1985, pp. 13-73. Toynbee also contrasted Fan Noli and Papa Eftim and stated that only time would prove if the Turkish Orthodox movement was genuine like the Albanian one. Toynbee, p. 195.

²⁷⁹ Kallinikos, *Ta Dikaia tou Oikoumenikou Patriarheiou en Tourkia Μελέται* (The Rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Turkey), (Constantinople: 1922), pp. 111-3, 130.

the crowning of their endeavours, for a Turkish nation cannot live and flourish in Anatolia until the Christian minorities as well as the Muslim majority in the country have given it their voluntary allegiance."²⁸⁰

However, according to Mavropoulos, the Patriarch Meletios was not sympathetic to the actions of the prelates. According to Mavropoulos, the policy of the Patriarchate had disastrous implications on the Orthodox Christians of the regions that were controlled by Turkish forces. For Mavropoulos, Prokopios was also very dissatisfied with the Phanar, which continued showing no interest in their difficult position.²⁸¹

The new Bishop of Ankara Konstantinos left Kayseri for Ankara in January 1923.²⁸² Prokopios and Gervasios went back to Zincidere. Prokopios died on May 30 1923. His funeral took place in the Cathedral of Hagios Nikolaos in Kayseri.²⁸³

Propaganda

It is not easy to evaluate on how succesful the advent of creating a Turkish Orthodox Church was in the sphere of propaganda. The claims on the origins of Anatolian Christians and the news about the creation of a Turkish Church in Anatolia reached to some extent the western public sphere,²⁸⁴ but were mostly viewed with

²⁸⁰ Toynbee, p. 176.

²⁸¹ Mavropoulos, p. 293. He also claims that the last words of Prokopios were "*mas adikisan*" meaning the Phanar.

²⁸² Raphtopoulos, p. 277.

²⁸³ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 193; Jaeschke, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı Kronolojisi II*, p. 31. Mavropoulos writes that Prokopios died on May 12/25, *ibid*, pp. 292-3.

²⁸⁴ "A Moslem document lies before me, which describes the movement as a movement among the Karamanlis. Is is said that these are spread over a large part of Asia Minor, and they—or a similar people—are to be found in Thrace and Constantinople also. According to Moslem informers they are the descendants of heathen Turks who served in the Byzantine armies and were baptized—and provided with a Turkish Bible and Liturgy—by the Greek Church. It is thought that they number about half a

suspicion and sometimes with irony by Western observers. J. Lacombe, writing in the *Echos D'Orient*, interpreted the claims on the origins of the Anatolian Christians as a "sensational invention". He stated that there was also the antithesis that many Muslims of Anatolia were in fact Christians who had been forced to convert. He also admitted that genuine or not, the whole issue was to the benefit of Ankara.²⁸⁵

For *The Christian East*, which represented the views of the Anglican Church, the movement of Papa Eftim was erected and used by the Kemalists and in this respect it was similar to the "Living Church" of the Bolsheviks.²⁸⁶ The aim of the Kemalists was to prevent any Western intervention on behalf of the Christians of Asia Minor. "The political objective of this action is clear, being to dis sever as much of Asia Minor as possible from the Constantinople Patriarchate, and to place the future of the Christians of the hinterland in the hands of a nominee of Mustapha Kemal. If that can be done, and the Sevres Treaty is revised according to the Kemalist programme, there can be no claim for European protection of the Christian minority."²⁸⁷ Hakluyt Egerton, from *The Christian East* repeated the reports of *The Morning Post* "that the Kemalist nominee to the Archbishopric of Caesarea... was

million. They have broken away from the Patriarch because the Patriarchate is Greek, and they propose to establish a new Patriarchate at Caesarea." *The Christian East*, vol. III, no. 2, July 1922, p. 93.

²⁸⁵ "On vient même de faire une découverte sensationnelle à propos des chrétiens de langue turque en Anatolie (il est vrai qu' en Orient il faut s' attendre à toutes les surprises). Un certain papas Eftyme, de Kesline, un des plus fervents partisans du patriarcat anatolien et probablement un des candidats éventuels, a découvert que les orthodoxes turcophones sont de même race que les conquérants. Ils seraient venus un siècle avant les Seldjoucides et auraient embrassé le christianisme sous l' injoction des empereurs byzantins (...) Jusqu'à présent, on était plutôt porté à prendre le contrepied de cette théorie et à affirmer que la majorité des musulmans de l'Asie Mineure sont les descendants des chrétiens qui ont embrassé la religion de Mahomet de gré ou de force. (...) Cet état d'esprit, qu'il soit spontané ou inspire, profite aux kémalistes." *Echos d' Orient*, no. 125, Janvier-Mars 1922, p. 111.

²⁸⁶ "The Oecumenical Patriarchate", *The Christian East*, February 1924, vol. V, no. 1, p. 188. "The whole affair bears a suspicious resemblance to the recent mushroom growth in Russia, self-styled "The Living Church" and bolstered up by Soviet violence." p. 165.

²⁸⁷ "The 'Turkish' National Church", *The Christian East*, March 1923, vol. IV, no. 1, p. 28.

only installed after being three years in prison" and, "that the nominee to the Angora See accepted office only after being several times beaten."²⁸⁸

J. A. Douglas, writing in the same journal, was also very critical about the news that the *Karamanli* Christians had established a national church: "To-day, Kemal rejoices to assure us, that sad fantasy is dissipated. Like men who awake from an evil dream, the Orthodox of his dominion have been stirred by the stimulus of his beneficent rule to rediscover their true nationality and proper position in the scheme of the things. Thus they hate the very name of Greek, realize the infamy of their intriguing priests and Bishops, revile their Patriarch, admit that their relatives who have been done to death with indescribable outrage and torture suffered a righteous punishment for their sins against their Nation, abominate Great Britain and the Allies, and long to expiate their crimes by a proper traditional helotage to the pleasures and profit of their Moslem brother Turks and masters. Therefore they have fashioned themselves -let it be carefully noted, altogether of their own free will- into an independent autocephalous and purely Turkish Church. If they cannot get Bishops in any other way, they will become Uniate. No one shall stop them from renouncing once and for all any connection with that abominable, rebellious, Oecumenical Patriarchate which has dared to claim that a Christian man has a right to be free or a Christian girl a right to weep on being taken into a Moslem harem. For their part, they are proud to be the *rayah*, the cattle of the Khalif and his Moslem subjects! They desire passionately to feed them with their flesh and to clothe them with their wool. If their property, their service, their womenkind are required by them, they rejoice to be the ministers of their pleasure or their need."

²⁸⁸ Hakluyt Egerton, "The 'Turkish' Orthodox Church", *The Christian East*, July 1922, vol. III, no. 2.

For Douglas, since the traditional means of massacre and deportation did not seem convenient at that moment, the establishment of a national church seemed to be a proper way of diminishing the *millet* system. "The scheme of his (Kemal's) Turkish Church will be worked as follows: He will solemnly assure the Peace Conference that he has no objection to the existence of native Christians in Turkey. On the contrary, he rejoices in it —provided they be good Turkish compatriots. The one thing he will not tolerate is the Oecumenical or Armenian Patriarchate. These criminally welcomed the Allies to Constantinople and betrayed Turkey to them. (...) As for their people, those who wish to purge themselves of their guilt will do so by repudiating them utterly. Let them enrol themselves in the Turkish National Church. That will be the acid test of their repentance." According to Douglas even if the Turks will grant amnesty to the Christians and subscribe guarantees for their protection it is most probable that "a Turkish accident would wipe them out". Therefore the remaining Greeks and Armenians of Turkey should escape and the Patriarchate should take refuge in Mount Athos or in another safe place. If this does not happen Papa Eftim "will in that case take possession of the Phanar, and usurp the jurisdiction of the Throne of St. Chrysostom and St. Gregory. New Rome will be destitute of Christians, except for those Greeks and Armenians who may trust to escape the risk of remaining by renouncing the Church of their fathers and accepting him as their Patriarch. As members of the Turkish National Church, however, they will be Turks, and, according to international law, their fate will be no proper concern of anyone except their new nation.²⁸⁹,"

²⁸⁹ Douglas, "The Turkish National Churches", *The Christian East*, vol III no 3, October 1922, p. 125-9. As a clear example of the Turkish intentions and plans, Douglas quotes an article ("Papa Eftein and the Greeks of Constantinople") from the *London Muslim Standard*: "Latest despatches from the Near East bring the welcome news that they have broken all the relations with the self-made Archbishop of Greek Church in Constantinople, Meletios V, and have sent a long prayer to Papa Eftein, head of the Turkish National Church in Anatolyia, for affiliation to his fold. In order to remove all doubts about

Arnold Toynbee also questioned the sincerity and spontaneity of the affiliation of Anatolian Orthodox Christians to the Turkish nationalist cause. Although he admitted that this line of action was advantageous for them since it was "evident to any outside observer that their very existence depends on a good understanding with their Moslem neighbours, with whom they do possess the important link of a common vernacular language", as we have seen before, he was curious if the whole movement owed anything to official pressure.²⁹⁰ Arnold Toynbee also, together with A. Boutwood and H. Pirie Gordon presented a report to the Foreign Office and the Anglican Church on the issue on 10 May 1922 and underlined that the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were joining the Turkish Orthodox movement to avoid the deportations.²⁹¹

There were however some contemporary observers who saw in the Turkish Orthodox movement great potential. For example, for the American journalist Clair Price, Papa Eftim should "be approached with all caution for he may yet develop into a phase of the new Turkey more important for Christendom than Kemal himself." According to Price, the importance of Eftim's movement "lies in the fact that he has destroyed the old basis of Christian solidarity and has opened up the possibility of a quite new basis. The old solidarity, whether rightly or wrongly, has levied a fearful

their intentions they have despatched a copy of the prayer to the Government of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, in which they particularly point out that they sever their connection for ever from the religious or secular heads of the Greek State. (...) It cannot be denied that Greeks' share in the guilt of the Allied enormities in Constantinople, contrary to the Articles of the Armistice, is easily the largest, yhose of the Armenians and other Levantine half-castes who infest Constantinople, coming as the second worst, and there could be no better expiation of their crimes than an immediatedisavowal of their relations with the self-styled priests and patriarchs of the Greek Church. But if they are merely thinking to escape the penalty of their past misdeeds by making this profession and donning a fez, to throw up both at the first favourable opportunity, then we will advise the authorities of the Nationalist Government to beware of these jackals. Turks have suffered long and cruelly chiefly owing to the treacheries of their non-Muslim fellow-subjects, and no crocodile tears should now be permitted to blur the only way of dealing with these pests." See Douglas, pp. 130.

²⁹⁰ Toynbee, pp. 192-3.

²⁹¹ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 178.

toll upon Turks, Greeks and Armenians alike during these last few years. But it is just possible that Papa Eftim has given us the prospect of a new solidarity upon a purely religious basis. It is a prospect to be approached with all reserve, for it suggests a new Western attitude toward the Near and Middle East whose benefits both to Christendom and to Islam may prove to be incalculable. Time will develop Papa Eftim's full significance. Unless hostility to the Turk is an article of the Christian creed, his is the most meaningful figure in Turkey today." The decision to give up their schools and send their children to the government's schools, to give up their right to administer Orthodox civil law and put the personal affairs of the Orthodox under the jurisdiction of Turkish courts under the Ministry of Justice were, for Price, in conformity with the spirit of the Young Turks' revolution of 1908 which sought to give all races an equal position as Ottoman citizens. Thus, as Kemal was fighting against the Muslim reaction, Eftim also was struggling against the Orthodox reaction, namely the Patriarchate, "the stronghold of Easternism". Price was sure of Eftim's sincerity in his adherence to the Turkish nationalist cause. "I have no means of knowing who put this strangely Western idea into Papa Eftim's head originally. Certainly it was not that stronghold of Easternism, the Oecumenical Patriarchate. Wherever it did come from, I believe there is not the slightest question of the sincerity with which Papa Eftim holds it today. His is the almost fanatical sincerity of a minority which feels itself misunderstood."²⁹²

According to Jean Schliklin, Eftim was a person in the service of the Christians of Asia Minor. For Schliklin, the Christians of Asia Minor were living in harmony with their Muslim compatriots and had no problems with the tolerant Turkish government, until some of them sought to oppose the government. These

²⁹² Price, pp. 147-53.

people caused many problems to their coreligioners and this was bound to create a reaction among the Christians. Papa Eftim was for Schliklin the embodiment of this reaction.²⁹³ Eftim was claiming that the Orthodox living in Asia Minor were pure Turks, that they had come to Asia Minor even before the Seljuks. According to Eftim, the fact that they were Orthodox in religion did not mean that they were also Greeks.. For Eftim, when the Phanar became a center of political conspiracy the Serbs and Bulgarians reacted to the Patriarchate. The time had come for the Orthodox Turks who had also opposed the Patriarchate and sought to gain their ecclesiastical independence. The Patriarchate, for Eftim, was a Greek institution and for that reason the Orthodox Turks sought to establish their own Patriarchate.²⁹⁴

For Paul Gentizon, who had come as the representative of *Le Temps* in Turkey in 1922, Papa Eftim's manifestations of Turkish nationalism were genuine. Being a member of a Christian community living for centuries in Asia Minor side by side with the Turks, Eftim had come to the point of sharing the same national feelings and aspirations as them.²⁹⁵

The exchange of populations and the "exodus"

At the end of the Greek-Turkish war, a population exchange between Greece and Turkey was felt as necessary by both sides. As the news of the Conference reached Turkey, the Orthodox Christians started fearing that they would also be included in the compulsory population exchange.²⁹⁶ The general secretary of the

²⁹³ Schliklin, pp. 173-5.

²⁹⁴ *ibid*, pp. 177-9.

²⁹⁵ Paul Gentizon, *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu*, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1994), p. 208.

²⁹⁶ Anastasia-Manousaki underlines that rumors were circulating among the Orthodox Christians long before the official decision was announced to them. Sophia Anastasia-Manousaki, *Μνήμες*

congress, İstamat Zihni, expressed his conviction that the Turkish Orthodox would not be exchanged. He underlined that the Anatolian Christians could not be compared to the Ottoman subject Greeks. First of all, long before the Peace Conference in Lausanne, they had reacted to the Greek occupation and to the Patriarchate. Secondly, they were from the Turkish race and from the point of view of language and culture, they were Turks. According always to İstamat Zihni, they did not have any relation with the minorities. The Turkish Christians, he underlined, chose to live in their motherland with their Muslim compatriots, and for these people, it was impossible to leave their motherland and go to totally foreign and different lands. İstamat Zihni was sure that the Government would take these facts under serious consideration. The Turkish Orthodox were tied materially and spiritually to the Turkish nation. For that reason he was hoping that those who did not belong to and betrayed the Turkish nation would go, while the Turkish Orthodox would remain in Turkey.²⁹⁷

It seems that the rumours that the population exchange would be compulsory and that it would include the Anatolian Orthodox continued to circulate and İstamat Zihni was obliged to write again in *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* that the Turkish Orthodox preferred to live in their homeland with their Muslim Turks brothers. He was sure that the Christians who would remain in Turkey, should be loyal to the country, should think and feel in the same way as Muslim Turks. He assured that the Turkish Orthodox would never threaten the Turkish motherland. He reminded his people that if they remained faithful to these principles and loyal to the Government

Καππαδοκία (Memoires of Cappadocia), (Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 2002), pp. 279-80. See also *Exodos* vol. II.

²⁹⁷ İstamat Zihni, "Anadoluda halis ve hakiki Türk Ortodoksu olarak yaşamak isteyen milletdaşlarıma", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 11 November 1922

and attached to Turkishness (*Türklik*), they would live in peace and comfort in the country.²⁹⁸

In fact, it appeared for a while that the Turkish speaking Orthodox Christians were to be exempted from the compulsory population exchange agreement. On 12 December 1922, Lord Curzon, the British foreign secretary, declared at Lausanne that the exchange of populations would result in the almost complete disappearance of the Greeks from Asia Minor, "though there will, I suppose, remain the reconciled Ottoman Greeks numbered at about 50,000 persons." The next day, İsmet Paşa explained that the Orthodox Turks had "never asked for treatment differing in any respect from that enjoyed by their Muslim compatriots, and it is most improbable that they would ever make such a request. Venizelos also agreed with Lord Curzon and İsmet Paşa that "50,000 Turkish-speaking persons of the Orthodox faith would stay (in Asia Minor) in any case."²⁹⁹

However, the Convention on the compulsory exchange of populations eventually included the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia. The exchange was based upon religious affiliation rather than upon racial or linguistic considerations.³⁰⁰ The first article of the Convention laid this principle openly: "As from 1st May 1923, there shall take place a compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox

²⁹⁸ İstamat Zihni, "Anadoluda mecburi mübadelenin Türk Ortodokslara şumülü var mıdır?", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 11 February 1923.

²⁹⁹ İsmet Paşa: "Quant aux Turcs orthodoxes, ils n'ont jamais demandé à être, en quoi que ce soit, l'objet d'un traitement distinct de celui dont jouissent leurs compatriotes musulmans et il n'y a aucune probabilité qu'ils formulent jamais une demande pareille." Venizelos: "50,000 Orthodoxes turcophones resteraient en tout cas." Psomiades, 1968, p. 92; Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", p. 65 and Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe...", pp. 114-5.

³⁰⁰ "At first sight this exchange seems a clear indication of the prevalence on both sides of nationalistic and patriotic ideas, and of the desire to give greater unity and cohesion to the nation and the fatherland. Yet on closer examination of what actually took place, it begins to appear that other ideas and other loyalties were still at work. (...) What took place was not an exchange of Greek Orthodox Christians and Ottoman Muslims. A Western observer, accustomed to a different system of social and national classification, might even conclude that this was no repatriation at all, but two deportations into exile –

religion established in Turkish territory and of Greek nationals of the Moslem religion established in Greek territory. These persons shall not return to live in Turkey or Greece respectively without the authorisation of the Turkish or the Greek Government respectively."³⁰¹

Although religion was seen as a safe criterion in determining those who would be included in the population exchange, the interpretation of the term "the Greek Orthodox religion" gave rise to new controversies that eventually led to the official recognition of the ecclesiastical borders of the Phanar as the borders of Greekness. When the case of the Christian Arabs of Cilicia was discussed in the Mixed Council, the Turkish delegation stated that the term comprised all Orthodox Christians. Accordingly Serbs, Russians, Rumanians and Christian Arabs who were Turkish citizens would be included in the population exchange. The Greek delegation opposed this proposal and stated that the term meant those who were Orthodox as well as Greek. The Mixed Commission decided in December 1927 that the term "Greek Orthodox religion" comprises those who were tied to the Ecumenical Patriarchate and that the term could not be applied to the Patriarchates other than Phanar (Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria) and to the autocephalous and independent churches (the Church of Cyprus, the Rumanian Church, the Serbian church, the Montenegrin Church, the Russian Church, the Albanian Church, the Bulgarian Exarchate etc.). Being a member of the Orthodox Church of Constantinople was seen as an indication of having a Greek consciousness. Thus, the Protestant and Catholic Greeks, by not recognizing the Phanar as their religious centre, were not regarded as forming a part

of Christian Turks to Greece, and of Muslim Greeks to Turkey." Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 348-9.

³⁰¹ Giorgos Kritikos, "Motives For The Compulsory Exchange", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 13, 1999-2000, p. 211; see also J. A. Petropoulos, "The Compulsory Exchange of

of the national entity. The Catholic and Protestant Greeks of Turkey were not only excluded from the population exchange, but they were also refused to be included to Greekness.³⁰² It is important to note that the "Turkish Orthodox Church" was not referred among the independent churches. Even the Turkish side did not claim the existence of this church as an exception to the exchange. The Turkish side preferred the inclusion of the Anatolian Christians in the exchange and therefore did not claim the existence of the Turkish Orthodox Church as the ecclesiastic centre of a non-Greek Orthodox population. Thus, since the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians were regarded as being tied to the Ecumenical Patriarchate they were supposed to have acquired Greek consciousness.³⁰³

Papa Eftim and his collaborators tried, unsuccessfully, until September not to be included in the population exchange, at least for the Orthodox Christians of Kayseri and Konya, but with no success.³⁰⁴ According to Iakovidis Minas from Axos,

Populations: Greek-Turkish Peacemaking 1922-1930", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2, 1976, pp. 137-8.

³⁰² Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), pp. 377-84.

³⁰³ During the discussions in the Grand Assembly on March 2 1923 about the peace terms, the deputy of Bolu Tunalı Hilmi Bey asked Rıza Nur Bey whether the Turkish Orthodox would be included to the population exchange. Rıza Nur Bey replied that since there was no a specific note regarding the Turkish Orthodox in the agreement, the Turkish side was totally free to act in whichever way it wants. ("İsterseniz mübadele edersiniz, istemezseniz size tabidir"). See *TBMM Gizli Celse Zabıtları* Cilt: 4, p. 12.

³⁰⁴ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 196. In an interview made by Eftim's second son, Selçuk Erenerol, he told that when his father asked İsmet about the exchange terms, İsmet's answer was that since it would be difficult to control Christian minorities spreaded in Anatolia they should be concentrated in a vilayet, in İstanbul. (Diyanet, November 1995, no. 59, p. 10-16) According to Aktar, the Kemalists sought to gather all remaining non-Muslims after the Treaty of Lausanne, in İstanbul. The transplantation of the Anatolian Armenians and the Jews of Thrace to İstanbul in the Republican era was examples of this policy. See Ayhan Aktar, *Varlık Vergisi ve Türkleştirme Politikaları*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2001, p. 88-9. Selçuk Erenerol in the same interview explained also that with this decision they themselves gave to the Greeks "real Turks", and in return got gypsies. Oran claims that Papa Eftim told that Atatürk sent the Anatolian Christian Turks and brought Greece's and of islands' Muslim non-Turks. See Baskın Oran, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme*, (Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 1988), p. 131. According to the members of the community of Sazaltza (Taşkışla) the Muslim residents of their village told them while they were leaving: "We sent Turks and received *gavurs*". *Exodos* vol. II, p. 236. It seems that the local Muslims were generally against the exodus of

Papa Eftim tried to convince the Orthodox communities to remain in Turkey. But there was a widespread suspicion that the Turks would massacre the Christians.³⁰⁵ Fotiadis also claims that Papa Eftim tried to persuade the Orthodox to remain in their homeland but that the latter chose to emigrate.³⁰⁶ According to Evstathios Hacievthimis from Ürgüp, Papa Eftim was imposing to call themselves "Turkish Orthodox" in order not to be included to the population exchange. Eftim went to Ürgüp and tried to convince the local people, and he also took some 300 liras for the expenditures of his trip. According to the same source, there was a small group that shared Papa Eftim's views.³⁰⁷ Eftim expressed his bitterness, claiming that the exclusion of the Greeks of İstanbul from the population exchange and the inclusion of the loyal Orthodox of Anatolia was incomprehensible.³⁰⁸ The news for the compulsory exchange reached many Cappadocian communities late in 1923. The "exodus" of the Orthodox Christians from the interior of Asia Minor was carried out peacefully, in contrast to those of western Anatolia who found themselves in the middle of the Turkish offensive in the early weeks of the autumn of 1922. The uprooting of the *Karamanlı* was completed in 1924.³⁰⁹

the Christians and that they were also suspicious the newcomer Muslims from Greece. See *Exodus* vol. II.

³⁰⁵ Iakovidis Minas, *Αυτοβιογραφία Πως Έζησα το Δράμα Μας* (Autobiography How I lived Our Drama), KMS manuscript 404, Cappadocia 83, p. 9. According to Eleni Paulidou, the exile women of Simav asked Eftim what to do. Papa Eftim replied them that he was going to stay with his community, but he advised the women to leave. *Exodos* vol. II, p. 422.

³⁰⁶ Fotiadis, pp. 106-8. Hacıefendi, a Muslim friend of Serafeim Rizos from Sinasos, told him that if they would have follow Papa Eftim this might not happen. *Exodos* vol. II, p. 300.

³⁰⁷ *ibid*, p. 283. According to Evdoxia Ioannidou from Skobi near Kayseri, the council of the village sent to Mustafa Kemal a telegram asking to exclude them from the population exchange. Ioannidou claims that Mustafa Kemal answered that this was not possible since there was an agreement. *ibid*, p. 108.

³⁰⁸ "Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Beyanati", *İkdam*, 26 September 1339/1923.

³⁰⁹ See *Exodus* vol II. It is very difficult to determine how many Orthodox Christians were living in Cappadocia in the beginnings of 1920's and how many people found refugee in Greece. In the Lausanne Peace Conference every side spoke about fifty thousand people. There is always a difficulty

According to Jaeschke, the decisive factor that eventually made the Turkish side decide to include the *Karamanlı* in the compulsory exchange agreement, was the decision held in the Peace Conference for the maintenance of the Patriarchate in Constantinople.³¹⁰ Although there was a growing belief that the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians were actually Turks, the government was suspicious of the clerics. For example, the priest of the Ankara community Çopuroğlu İstatyos, was sentenced to exile to Erzurum by the Independence Court because he was making propaganda for the Pontic cause.³¹¹ Thus, since the Patriarchate would remain in Turkey, the remaining Christians would always be a subject of Greek propaganda promoted by the Patriarchate and its prelates.³¹²

to determine demographic data in the Ottoman Empire since many religious or social group tended to avoid registering in the official records in order to minimise its tax burden and avoid military conscription. Thus the population numbers that we have lacks accuracy. The Patriarchal statistics also face similar problems. Alexandris proposes another survey carried out by the Greek consular authorities in cooperation with the Greek ecclesiastical authorities between 1910 and 1912. According to this census there were 93,991 Greek Orthodox in the sancaks of Niğde which was part of the vilâyet of Konya, Kayseri and Nevşehir which were part of the vilâyet of Ankara and their surroundings. See Alexandris, 1999, p. 61. According to Arnold Toynbee, Arhtur Boutwood and H. Pirie Gordon, the experts on the Anatolian matters of the British government, the Turcophone Orthodox population in 1922 was around 500,000. (Alexandris, p. 167) According to Manolis Triantafyllidis, following the 1928 census returns the number of Turkophone Orthodox of Asia Minor in the 1930's was 103,642. Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", p. 84.

³¹⁰ The Turkish delegation at the Peace Conference requested officially the removal of the Patriarchate from Turkey. The delegation stated that the Patriarchate had adopted a very hostile attitude towards Turkey during the last war and actually had become a political organisation. Moreover the delegation underlined that Turkey with the abolishment of the Caliphate and the establishment of the republic had suppressed the privileges that had been granted during the Ottoman era to the non-muslim communities and to their religious centers. However the Turkish request was unanimously rejected. This opposition made İsmet Paşa, on the 10th of January 1923 to gave a verbal promise that his government would retain the Patriarchate in the case that it would confine its activities within the limits of ecclesiastical and religious affairs. Psomiades, 1961, p. 47-9. According to Peker, during the peace negotiations in Lausanne, Papa Eftim had presented a report on the Patriarchate to the Government. Nureddin Peker, "Türk Dostu Değil, Türk Oğlu Türk Papa Eftim'in Arkasından", *Tarih Konuşuyor* vol. 8, no. 52, May 1968, p. 3691.

³¹¹ Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe...", pp. 114-7; see also Fernan, 1967, p. 108.

³¹² Jaeschke, "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe...", pp. 116-8. Despite the population exchange the distrustfulness towards the Patriarchate and the belief that it was a machinery of propaganda in the hands of the Greek state continued to exist. A. Rüstem Bey in 1925 stated that the only way to put an end to the political intrigues of the Patriarchate was to banish it from Turkish soil. "The entire orientation of Greek foreign policy demonstrates that Greek imperialism has not disarmed, at least in relation to Constantinople and the narrow stretch of territory which still separates it from the Kingdom of Hellas. And that the maintenance of Constantinople as the seat of the Patriarchate, in unwilling

Despite the beliefs on the origins of the Karamanlı and their positive attitude towards the Government of Ankara during the Greek-Turkish war, the nationalists were very suspicious towards Christian minorities.³¹³ We already saw that they regarded the non-Muslim minorities as a pretext for the intervention of foreign powers.³¹⁴ According to Tuoizzi, the Italian agent in Ankara, the nationalists "regarded the minorities as having been the cause of unending trouble in the past, and have decided that the best way to prevent the recurrence of this trouble is to put an end to the existence of the minorities."³¹⁵ The nationalists also admitted this. The diplomatic representative of the Government of the Grand Assembly Hamid Bey, who was empowered by the government to conduct the negotiations on the population exchange, underlined that the Turkish sovereignty had always been infringed upon by foreign interference based on humanitarian interventions for the protection of Christian minorities in Turkey. He also stressed that this would not be acceptable anymore since his government had no intention of accepting any foreign intervention

response by Turkey to the passionate insistence of Greece supported by the Allies and the United States at Lausanne, was intended to serve the cause of Hellenic expansion, is irresistibly suggested by the circumstances. Manifestly, the underlying motive of the effort to ensure the survival of the Patriarchate in Constantinople was the intention to use this institution, in the future as in the past, as a bulwark of Hellenic influence in the heart of the coveted place itself as an agent of the policy pursued by the Greek Government at the expense of Turkey." A. Rüstem, "The Future of the Oecumenical Patriarchate", *Foreign Affairs* 3, 1925, p. 607.

³¹³ An interesting example of this suspicion towards the non-Muslims is exhibited in the manuscript "Kappadokiki Dimokratia – Kapadokya Cumhuriyeti" of Serafeim N. Rizos in which he explains how the members of the Orthodox community of Sinasos were accused of participating in the "Committee of the Cappadocian Republic". However, the story has a happy end and despite the interrogations and the trial of a person from the community in İstiklâl Mahkemesi, the community was finally found innocent. Rizos clearly illustrates the continuous fear of the Christians of being deported. Serafeim N. Rizos, *Kappadokiki Dimokratia – Kapadokya Cumhuriyeti*, manuscript 426, Cappadocia 93.

³¹⁴ Halide Edip, in a letter to Mustafa Kemal during the war clearly illustrates this suspicion towards the Christians: "Whatever the (peace) terms may be, the Christian minorities will still remain. They will enjoy the privileges of Ottoman subjects, and, relying on foreign countries –on some European powers, they will always make trouble. This will continually provide a pretext for foreign interference, and year by year we shall lose a certain degree of our independence in favor of these minorities." A Speech, p. 77. According to Eröz, if Papa Eftim would had start this movement before the Great War, the Christian Turks would had fight against the enemy together with their Muslim co-nationals, and this would had prevent the suspicion of the Muslims towards the Christians and the eventual population exchange. See Mehmet Eröz, *Hristiyanlaşan Türkler*, (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1983), p. 48.

in the matter.³¹⁶ For Ismet Paşa, "the best way -for a minority in Turkey- to enjoy all the rights of a Turkish citizen was to have no compromising relations with a foreign country and to keep aloof from all foreigners."³¹⁷

The Turkish side insisted that the minority problem had arose from foreign intervention to Turkey and a new settlement on the issue could be reached only with the exclusion of further possibilities of "foreign provocations". The population exchange between Turkey and Greece was important from this point of view. In other words, for the Turkish side, it was a way of preventing foreign intervention by excluding people who were seen as attached to another country. And those non-Muslims who would remain in Turkey would not lose their privileges and would enjoy the rights of the Turkish citizens.³¹⁸ Although Papa Efim had declared many times that Turkish Orthodox Christians should not be treated as a minority since they were Turks, the *Karamanlı* also shared the suspicion of the Turkish nationalists towards the non-Muslims.³¹⁹ Richard Clogg believes that "the Turkish Orthodox

³¹⁵ Kritikos, p. 219.

³¹⁶ *ibid*, p. 220.

³¹⁷ *ibid*, p. 221.

³¹⁸ "Pour résumer, la Délégation de la Grande Assemblée Nationale de Turquie est d'avis:

- 1- Que l'amélioration du sort des minorités de Turquie dépend avant tout de l'exclusion de toute espèce d'intervention étrangère et de possibilité de provocation venant du dehors.
- 2- Que ce but ne peut être atteint qu'en procédant avant tout à un échange de population turques et grecques de certaines régions de la Turquie et de la Grèce.
- 3- Que les meilleures garanties pour la sécurité et le libre développement des minorités restées en dehors de l'application des mesures d'échange réciproque, seraient celles fournies, tant par les ;ois du pays, que la politique libérale de la Turquie à l'égard de toute communauté don't les membres ne se sont pas départis de leur devoir de citoyen turc." *Les Droits des Minorités ...*, p. 24.

³¹⁹ It seems that even in the case of a Greek victory it was quite sure that the *Karamanlı* would emigrate from their lands. In the Paris Peace Conference Venizelos had claimed that some 800.000 Greeks would remain in Asia Minor outside the Greek zone. For Venizelos the peace treaty must include a voluntary and mutual migration of Greeks from outside the Greek territory and Turks from within the Greek zone). Venizelos' aim with this population exchange was to create quite homogenous and thus defensible Greek territory in Asia Minor. According to Llewellyn Smith although Venizelos had insisted that such an exchange would be voluntary (he repeated this proposal in a letter to Lloyd George on 27 October 1919) he was determined that nothing should prevent such an exchange. Llewellyn Smith, *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor, 1919-1922*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), p. 71 and 115.

solution, if promoted more sensitively, might conceivably have provided an answer to the problem of Karamanlides."³²⁰

According to many Greek authors, the theories about the Turkish origin of the Anatolian Christians were buried with the treaty of the compulsory population exchange. By including the *Karamanlı* Christians in the compulsory population exchange the Turkish representatives admitted that even they themselves had not believed in these arguments. With the agreement, it was as if the Turkish side admitted the Greek origin of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox people of Anatolia.³²¹ For Psomiades, the Karamanlides were easily assimilated in Greece because they considered themselves as Greeks.³²²

Papa Eftim and his family were exempted from the compulsory exchange of population by a decision of the Council of Ministers in regard of his "services" to the national struggle.³²³ The reason of the decision not to include Papa Eftim in the population exchange, was perhaps due to Ankara's need to control or balance the power of the Patriarchate since it was to remain in Constantinople. Nevertheless, since the population exchange had deprived the newly founded Turkish Orthodox Church from popular support, Papa Eftim concentrated his efforts on the Ecumenical Patriarchate and on the Greek minority that remained in İstanbul.

³²⁰ Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", p. 83.

³²¹ Tsalikoglou, 1970, p. 28-9; also Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 196.

³²² Psomiades, *The Eastern Question...*, p. 92. According to Cappadocian Tsalikoglou, they never believed Eftim's words. If the Cappadocians would have preferred to be Turks they would remain in their homeland and retain their properties. However, they choose to live even poorly in Greece as Greeks, since they never perceived of themselves as Seljuks but as Greeks. See E. I. Tsalikoglou, *Αυτοβιογραφία και Ιστορικοί Αναμνήσεις Β' Μέρους* (Autobiography and Historical Memoires), KMS manuscript 184, Cilicia 3B, pp. 425, 429-30.

³²³ The words of Mustafa Kemal on the gravestone of Papa Eftim in the Orthodox cemetery of Şişli is an indication of the importance of his services: "Father Eftim have served this country as much as an army" (*Baba Eftim bu memlekete bir ordu kadar hizmet etmiştir*).

EFTİM IN İSTANBUL

The activity of Eftim in İstanbul after the population exchange is beyond the scope of this inquiry. In fact this period constitutes a part of the history of the Greek minority of İstanbul and of the Patriarchate in the republican era. However in order to give a fuller picture, we will shortly mention this period. From 1923 until the 1930's, Papa Eftim sought to gain control over the Patriarchate. Initially it seemed that he was going to succeed. However, with the improvement of Greek-Turkish relations, the Patriarchate managed to counter effectively this threat and Papa Eftim gradually lost his importance in the ecclesiastic and communal affairs of the Greek minority of İstanbul.

After the Greek defeat in Anatolia, there was a growing dissatisfaction with the policies of Patriarch Meletios in Constantinople. Many people regarded the anti-Turk attitude of Meletios as imprudent, since now that the Ankara Government was victorious there was a fear of Turkish retaliation. Thus the anti-Meletios faction intensified their campaign for his resignation. They also hoped that such a campaign would enjoy the encouragement and the support of the Turkish authorities. The most outspoken member of this faction was Damianos Damianidis, a trustee (*epitropos*) of the Galata district and the general secretary of the Panagia Kaphatiani church in Galata. Damianidis was a militant Royalist and for that reason he was an enemy of the Venizelist faction of Constantinople to which Patriarch Meletios belonged.³²⁴ Damianidis enjoyed the support of some dissatisfied prelates in the Phanar³²⁵ and according to Mavropoulos, he also asked the support of the Turkish authorities and

³²⁴ Mavropoulos, *Πατριαρχικά Σελίδες Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον από 1878-1949* (Patriarchal Notes The Ecumenical Patriarchate from 1878 to 1949), (Athens: 1960), pp. 186-7.

took their consent.³²⁶ On the 1st of June 1923, a crowd led by Damianos Damianidis attacked the Phanar and demanded the immediate abdication of Meletios. Upon his refusal he was beaten and injured. The Turkish police did not intervene, claiming that the dispute was an internal affair of the Orthodox community. Meletios was only rescued with the intervention of an Allied police force.³²⁷

After those events, the pressure on Meletios to abdicate intensified and even Venizelos urged him to resign as soon as possible. His abdication was regarded as necessary for the rehabilitation of the Patriarchate in Turkey. Meletios announced his departure from Constantinople on 27 June. However, instead of resigning, he declared his wish to go abroad for reasons of health and appointed the Metropolitan of Kayseri Nicolaos as *locum tenens*. He eventually left Turkey on the 10th of July.³²⁸

Despite the departure of Meletios, Damianidis continued his campaign, which was supported by Papa Eftim, against the Phanar. It seems that Eftim was in contact with Damianidis and according to Alexandris, "the whole movement of Damianidis, who was also of *Karamanlı* origin, can be seen as an attempt to publicize in İstanbul the concept of a nationalist Turkish Orthodox church."³²⁹ According to *Echos d'*

³²⁵ Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of İstanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974*, (Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 1983), pp. 145-6.

³²⁶ Mavropoulos, p. 188.

³²⁷ For the details of the events see *Echos d' Orient*, Juillet-Septembre 1923, no. 131, p. 368-70; also Paul Gentizon, "La Grande Pitié du Phanar", *L'Illustration*, 21 Février 1925, no. 4277, p. 177.

³²⁸ Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, pp. 148-9; Harry Psomiades, "The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Republic: The First Ten Years", *Balkan Studies* 2, 1961, p. 55.

³²⁹ Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, p. 152. The followers of Eftim at the beginning sought to establish ties with the *Karamanlı* communities in İstanbul, especially in Samatya and Kumkapı. However they met with limited success, since the *Karamanlı* Christians of the city had been largely assimilated into the body of the Greek community of İstanbul. *Akşam* on 18 September informed that many Constantinopolitan Greeks sent a letter to Eftim declaring that they oppose Meletios and that they acknowledge him as their patriarch. The letter was also sent to the Grand Assembly. "İstanbul Rumları", *Akşam*, 18 September 1338/1922.

Orient, Damianidis was being encouraged by the government in order to gain support in İstanbul for the Anatolian Turkish Orthodox Church.³³⁰

Papa Eftim came to İstanbul on September 21, accompanied by Saffet (Ankan) who was an inspector of the department of public order and took up residence at the Tokatlıyan Hotel in Pera. According to Ergene, the Prime Minister Fethi Bey had asked him in the name of his government to go to İstanbul and announce the demands of Ankara to the Patriarchate and to impose on it the will of the government.³³¹ He got in touch with the Phanar and met with the *locum tenens* Nicholaos on 26 September. During this meeting Eftim claimed that the aim of his visit was to restore the Orthodox Church to its former place of honour. He proposed the election of a patriarch agreeable to Ankara. Most important, he asked the immediate resignation of Meletios and the dismissal of six members of the Holy Synod whose dioceses were outside Turkey.³³²

Although the Phanar initially gave a cordial welcome to Eftim, it soon changed its attitude, claiming that Eftim was not sent officially by Ankara to İstanbul.³³³ On 28 September, the Holy Synod broke off every relation with Papa Eftim. On 2 October, Eftim, accompanied by the Turkish police and some of his supporters, seized the Holy Synod and presented an ultimatum, giving them ten minutes to declare Meletios deposed. The declaration was voted and six of the eight

³³⁰ *Echos d'Orient*, Juillet-Septembre 1923, no. 131, p. 370.

³³¹ Ergene, *İstiklâl Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları*, (İstanbul: İ. P. Neşriyat Servisi, 1951), pp. 59-60. According to Eftim, writing in 1959, he was sent to İstanbul by the government to prevent the "massacre" of the Greek minority when the Turkish army reached the city. It was thought that if in the head of the Patriarchate was Papa Eftim, the temperament of the Turkish people would decrease. See Papa Eftim, *Atenagoras'ın Organı Elefteri Foni Gazetesine Cevabım ve Fener Patrikhanesi ile Rumluğun İçyüzü*, (İstanbul: Ata'nın Yurdu Yayınları, 1959), p. 13.

³³² Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, pp. 152-3; Psomiades, "The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under...", pp. 55-6; Ergene, pp. 61-4.

³³³ *Echos d'Orient*, Juillet-Septembre 1923, no. 131, p. 499; Papa Eftim, pp. 21-2.

members of the Holy Synod whose sees were outside Turkey were expelled from the Patriarchate. Then, Papa Eftim declared that he would remain at the Phanar until seven members nominated by him were admitted to the Holy Synod and a new Patriarch agreeable to Ankara was elected. Except the election of a new Patriarch his demands were met and he returned to Ankara as the "official representative" of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.³³⁴

However, the government refused to accept Eftim as an official representative of the Patriarchate, since the Phanar, as a purely religious institution, had no right of formal representation in Ankara. Moreover, the government disapproved of, and expressed its displeasure with Eftim's violent actions.³³⁵

On 12 October Meletios announced his resignation. On 6 December 1923, the Metropolitan of Chaelcedon Grigorios³³⁶ was elected Patriarch and despite the opposition of Papa Eftim, he was enthroned as Grigorios VII on 13 December. For Eftim, the Greek state had intervened in the election, and the elected patriarch was an agent of the Greek foreign office. Before the enthronement of Grigorios, on 7 December, Eftim occupied once again the Phanar and declared that as "general representative of all the Orthodox communities" he had taken over the Holy Synod and would continue to occupy the once again Phanar until a new election took

³³⁴ Paul Gentizon, *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu*, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayinevi, 1994), p. 177; *Echos d' Orient*, 1923, pp. 499-50; Ergene, pp. 66-70.

³³⁵ Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, p. 154; Psomiades, *The Eastern Question The Last Phase*, (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1968), p. 95.

³³⁶ He was born in Sifnos in 1850. His surname was Zervoudakis or Papastavrianos. He studied in the Theological School of Chalki and in Europe. He became protosingelos of Rodos and bishop of Mireon in 1887. In 1892 he became metropolitan of Serres and he remained at this post for 17 years. Later he was elected metropolitan of Kizikos (1909) and Chaelcedon (1913). He became Ecumenical Patriarchate on the 6th of December 1923 until he died on the 17th of November 1924. See Valsamis, *Οι Πατριάρχες του Γένους* (The Patriarchs of the Nation), (Volos: Εκκλησιαστική Βιβλιοθήκη Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Δημητριάδος, 1995), p. 136.

place.³³⁷ But two days later, the police expelled Papa Eftim and his supporters from the Patriarchate. It seems that Eftim's excesses were regarded by the Government as actions, which would make an unfavourable impression on the world opinion. Thus the Minister of Justice declared in the Grand National Assembly that the Patriarchate was a religious institution and that the election of Gregorios had the approval of the Turkish Government. Moreover Mustafa Kemal sent a telegram to the newly elected patriarch thanking him for his favourable sentiments towards the Republic.³³⁸

After his second unsuccessful attempt to take over the Patriarchate, Eftim understood that such action would not be tolerated by the government. According to Ergene, the Minister of Justice himself told Eftim that the government could not do anything officially. However he expressed that they would support him unofficially in his efforts to pacify the intrigues of the Patriarchate.³³⁹ Thus on 12 February 1924, Papa Eftim occupied the Church of Panagia Kaphatiani in Galata and later he transferred the Turkish Orthodox Church there. Although the Patriarchate reacted to these actions and asked the intervention of the authorities, the officials announced that they would not interfere with the issue, since it was an intercommunal issue of the Orthodox.³⁴⁰ Papa Eftim also took over the Christ Church of Galata in May 1926 and he also intervened in the election of the administration of the communal property (*mütevelli heyeti*) of Pera and with the help of the police his two followers were elected.³⁴¹ Also, in 1935, Eftim's collaborator İstamat Zihni Özdamar (Pulluoğlu) was

³³⁷ Psomiades, *The Eastern Question...*, p. 96; Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, pp. 155-6; Ergene, pp. 91-8.

³³⁸ Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, p. 156.

³³⁹ Ergene, pp. 85-6.

³⁴⁰ Alexandris, *The Greek Minority...*, p. 157.

³⁴¹ *ibid*, pp. 169-70.

appointed by the government as sole trustee (*tek müteveli*) of the Balıklı Hospital until 1937.

Between 1923 and 1924, the future of the Patriarchate remained in complete uncertainty, and for a while it appeared that the Patriarchate would be reconstituted in such a fashion that its composition and direction would be identical with Eftim's Turkish Orthodox Church.³⁴² But it seems that the Turkish Government changed its attitude towards the Patriarchate. As the British ambassador in Turkey Sir Ronald Lindsay observed in 1925: "Angora no longer wants to uproot the Patriarchate altogether. It has been realised that its continuance here may provide Turkish policy with certain levers which could be lost if the institution was completely suppressed. The present intention of Angora is, therefore, to keep the Patriarchate here, but in such a reduced state that it would be mockery of its former self and a ready tool in Turkish hands."³⁴³ From 1925 on, the Greek-Turkish relations normalized. In 1928, Venizelos returned to power in Greece and he sought to improve the relations with Turkey. This process culminated with the Greek-Turkish Treaty of Friendship of 31 October 1930 and the Patriarchate was allowed to operate on a freer basis. In May 1931, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk himself assured Venizelos that he would keep Papa Eftim out of the affairs of the Patriarchate.³⁴⁴

This new situation limited seriously the impact of Papa Eftim. Already, after 1925 he had been alienated from the Greek community of İstanbul. Unable to obtain the support of the government, he entered after 1930 a period of obscurity which lasted until the second half of the 1950's when the Cyprus issue made the position of the Patriarchate difficult. According to Psomiades, it was certain that Papa Eftim "was

³⁴² Psomiades, *The Eastern Question*..., p. 94.

³⁴³ Alexandris, *The Greek minority*..., p. 346.

merely another pawn in the hands of the Turkish diplomats at Lausanne and after. As soon as the major differences between Greece and Turkey were resolved, the project for a Turkish Orthodox Church sank into oblivion and Papa Efthim was no longer posed as a threat to Phanar."³⁴⁵

³⁴⁴ Psomiades, "The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under...", p. 68.

³⁴⁵ *ibid*, p. 63

THE "CHRISTIAN TURKS"

In the first chapter, we examined in detail the attempt of founding a Turkish national church. Apparently, such an attempt was closely related to the political needs of both the nationalists and the Anatolian Orthodox Christians. As we have seen, the former sought to counter western propaganda on the "Turkish atrocities" and to guarantee the support of the Anatolian Christians, while the latter sought to defend their existence in Anatolia in a time of political and social instability and turmoil. We also saw that the foundation of a Turkish church went hand in hand with the assumption that the Turkish-speaking Christians of Anatolia were essentially Turks. In this chapter we are going to detect the elaboration of this assumption that was formed in a time when the Turkish national identity was under construction. Naturally, the thesis regarding the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians was an integral part of this constructive process. Therefore, it would be misleading to regard this thesis as a mere tactical manoeuvre of the Kemalists in order to legitimise the founding of the Turkish Orthodox Church. In fact, the debate on the origin of the Anatolian Christians was directly related to the efforts of defining the Turkish nation and its homeland. We will see that the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians was an important argument in defining Anatolia as the Turkish fatherland and in countering the threat of other nations' claims on it. However, in order to shed light to this argument, we must first ask two important questions. The first one is closely related to the place and the meaning of Cappadocia and the *Karamanli* Christians in the formation of the Greek nationalist discourse. The second one deals with the extent to which the Orthodox Christians perceived themselves as Greeks.

Until the second half of the 19th century, Cappadocia was mainly known in Greece as an important historical centre of Orthodox Christendom. This was the land where the Orthodox faith had found its more able adherents, most importantly Saint Basil. References in the Greek written sources of the period that describe Cappadocia as part of the Greek world are very limited. For example in the *Geographia Neoteriki* (1791) of Daniel Filippidis and Grigorios Konstantas, Cappadocia is referred to as a part of Greece. In Dimitrios Vizantios' famous theatrical work *Vavilonia* (1836) where he illustrates the diversity of the Greek world by putting together people from different parts of it, Savvas Hacı Muratis from Kayseri, is among the Greeks who celebrate the victory over Ibrahim's forces. Hacı Savvas introduces himself as coming from the land of Saint Basil.³⁴⁶ It seems that Cappadocia was not a totally foreign region for the newly emerging secular Greek-speaking intelligentsia. Nevertheless, and although an increasing interest for the region was manifest among European geographers and travellers, the philologists and historians of the newly emerged Greek State lacked such a kind of interest. The Metropolitan of Konya, Kirillos, who later became Ecumenical Patriarch, was the first to deal with Cappadocia in the 19th century. He published a historical description of his diocese in 1815.³⁴⁷ A work of exceptional importance is, at the same period, the work of Hatzı Iordanis from İncesu. After serving in the army of the Greek Kingdom for nine years, Iordanis returned in 1848 to his homeland. Meanwhile, he wrote two essays, in 1842 and 1843, on the topography and history of his homeland. He notes that his aim for writing them was to

³⁴⁶ Anagnostakis-Balta, *Η Καππαδοκία των Ζώντων Μνημείων* 'Η Ανακάλυψη της Πρώτης Πατρίδος της Ελληνικής Φυλής' (The Cappadocia of the "Living Monuments" The Invention of the "First Heartland of the Greek Race"), (Athens: Πορεία, 1990), p. 13-7; also Karathanasis, *Καππαδοκίας Τύχαι* (The Fate of Cappadocia), (Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης, 2000), p. 13.

³⁴⁷ Karathanasis, p. 14.

honour his fatherland and to prove its Greek origin.³⁴⁸ Despite these few examples, we must wait until the second half of the 19th century for a more coherent, synthetical and serious study of the region.

Until the second half of the 19th century the Orthodox Church was the main social and cultural actor in the interior of Asia Minor. The Orthodox clergy, long before the foundation of the Greek Kingdom, had been working in order to strengthen the Christian religious feelings in the region. Under the threat of assimilation by the surrounding Muslim majority and the increasing efforts of the missionaries to proselytise the local people, the Orthodox Church sought to defend the religious integrity of its flock. During this period, many religious books had been written or translated into Turkish with Greek script to counter the efforts of the missionaries. The Metropolitan of Kayseri Paisios in 1839 ordered the local clergy to prevent parents from giving "Turcoman, Persian or other barbarian nation's names" to their children.³⁴⁹ The church also made efforts to maintain the liturgical use of Greek among the Orthodox communities in Asia Minor. For instance during the Patriarchate of Jeremias III (1716-26; 1732-33) arrangements were made for young Orthodox Christians from Kayseri to study in Istanbul so that they would be able to read the Holy Scriptures and the liturgical books.³⁵⁰

In those ways, the church sought to vitalise the cultural life of the region and intensively cultivated the religious feeling against linguistic Turkification and the missionaries.³⁵¹ The Orthodox clerics were giving great emphasis to educational

³⁴⁸ See K. K. Papoulides, "Manuscripts 167 and 168 from the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople", *Balkan Studies* 20, 1979, pp. 133-40.

³⁴⁹ Petropoulou, "Ο Εξελληνισμός – Εξαρχαϊσμός των Ονομάτων στην Καππαδοκία τον δέκατο ένατο αιώνα", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 7, 1988-1989, pp. 168-9.

³⁵⁰ Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", p. 72.

³⁵¹ The role of the Orthodox Church in educational and cultural activities of the Cappadocian communities is illustrated in the important contributions of the three metropolitans of Kayseri in the

activities as the primary mean to counter these threats. But as was the case in the Balkans, from the second half of the 19th century, the Church was obliged to rearticulate its discourse and its views vis a vis the Greek state and its national ideology and thus to propagate the Greek letters and education in order to counter these threats.³⁵² Therefore, it would be misleading to think that the Orthodox Church and clergy were replaced by the Greek State and a nationalist lay intelligentsia. The Orthodox Church continued to play an important role in the social and cultural spheres.

In order to understand the place of Cappadocia in the Greek national consciousness we have to focus on the literature on Cappadocia of the second half of the century. This corpus of work was produced by a group of local literate laymen who started to appear in the context of the secularisation of the cultural sphere in the 19th century. Among this group were those who eventually made their career in Greece, like the historian Pavlos Karolidis and the linguist Dimitrios Mavrofydis. But the majority were men who, after studying in Athens or Constantinople, returned to their homeland, such as Serapheim Rizos, Anastasios Angelidis, Anastasios Levidis, Philippos Aristovoulos, Archangelos Gavriel etc. The latter wrote generally in Greek and rarely in Turkish. Their literary work was in conformity with the intellectual trends of Greece: folklore, ethnography, local history and archaeology. Thus, in the second half of the century, there emerged a literature on Cappadocia that concentrated on the restoration of historical continuity and the link with antiquity.³⁵³

19th century. These metropolitans who contributed greatly to the development of education in Cappadocia were Paisios (1832-1871), Evstathios Kleovoulos (1871-1876) and Ioannis Anastasiadis (1878-1903). The three men were "enlightened" clerics who gave great emphasis to the development of education and they were dedicated to the ideals of the cultural and spiritual revitalisation of Cappadocia. Petropoulou, "Cultural and Intellectual Life in 19th Century Cappadocia a Sketch", p. 43.

³⁵² *ibid*, p. 43-4.

Apart from their literary output, there were also other activities undertaken by the educated people in the interior Anatolia, activities that demonstrate the shift in the definition of their collective self-awareness. An increased interest in coin collections, folk tales, fables and folk songs, ancient inscriptions was giving the pace. Some among the educated ones formed personal libraries and wrote articles for newspapers and journals concerning the origin of their village name, seeing in it an ancient or Byzantine root. They were many who changed their own names, which had previously Turkish endings to names inspired by ancient Greek history or mythology.³⁵⁴

N. Rizos' *Kappadokika* (1856) was a book of great importance in introducing Cappadocia to the Greek-speaking public. It was the first of a series of ethnological and linguistic works written by authors of Cappadocian origin. Rizos was from Sinasos, which was among the Greek speaking communities of the region. In fact, until the 19th century, the whole region was known as totally Turcophone and the importance of the book was that it was the first to show that in certain places of Cappadocia Greek was spoken. Rizos also quoted two folk songs in Greek; the first published folk songs from Cappadocia. He stated that the traditions of Cappadocians were based on those of the ancient Greeks. According always to Rizos, the people of the Greek-speaking villages Aksos, Limnos and Dilos were from the Greek isles that beared the same name. For him, a commander of Mithridatos, a certain Arkhelaos had

³⁵³ *ibid*, p. 44-7. Some of the important works of Cappadocian writers were: Rizos Elephteriadis' *Sinassos itoi Meleti epi Ithon kai Ethimon Avtis* (Constantinople 1879); Pavlos Karolidis' *Glossarion Sinkritikon ton Ellinokappadokikon Lexion*, Smyrna 1885; Anastasios Levidis' *Istorikon Dokimion, A' Ekklesiastiki Istoría* (Athens 1885) and *Ai en Monolithois Monai tis Kappadokias kai Likaonias* (Constantinople 1889); Simeon Farasopoulos' *Ta Silata* (Athens 1895); I. Sarantiðis Archelaos' *Sinasos* (Athens 1899); Valavanis' *Mikrasiatika* (Athens 1891).

³⁵⁴ *ibid*, p. 47. The trend towards ancient names was not a new phenomenon. In fact it came from Renaissance Europe. The westernized Greek elites started to acquire ancient names before the revolt in 1821, i.e. during the "Greek Enlightenment". With this act they sought to underline their link with the

brought them to the region. In conformity with the general mood of the era, he equated the learning of Greek with the acquisition of civilization. This book marked the beginning of a new period regarding the literature on Cappadocia. Its basic feature, which in the years to come will become the mainstream, was the effort to prove the essential Hellenic character of the region.³⁵⁵

An interesting discussion that took place in 1863 in the salons of the Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople (*Ellinikos Philologikos Sillogos Konstantinoupoleos*) is indicative of the contemporary assumptions on Cappadocia. The discussion was on A. D. Mordtmann's research, *Die Troglodyten von Kappadokien* (1861). The debate had raised the problem of what the language of Cappadocian Christian communities had been before Turkish. For Mordtmann and many others like Texier, the contemporary Cappadocians had nothing to do with Greeks; they belonged to the Irano-armenic race and there had been no period of Hellenization in language or in culture between the ancient Cappadocian and contemporary Turkish periods. Of course these arguments raised many objections. Despite some simplistic arguments on "ancient Greek colonies" in Cappadocia, the main argument of Greek intellectuals was based on the assumption that the Cappadocians were Hellenised during the Hellenistic period. The still existing Greek-speaking communities of Cappadocia were regarded as a clear indication and proof that a cultural Hellenization took place and that it was followed by a process of forgetting or not using the Greek language after the Turkish conquest.³⁵⁶

Socrates Krinopoulos' ethnological and philological essay on his Greek-speaking homeland (Fertek) is a typical instance of the thesis of cultural

ancient world and the enlightened Europe. Also by rejecting their Christian names they countered the Orthodox Church.

³⁵⁵ Anagnostakis and Balta, pp. 21-3; also Karathanasis, pp. 14-5.

Hellenization. According to him, the ancient Cappadocian language was replaced gradually by Greek after the conquests of Alexander the Great. For a long period, both languages were spoken in the region and for that reason the people were called semi-barbarians or bilinguals (*mixovarvaroi* – *diglossoi*). However, after the spread of Christianity Greek prevailed not only in the urban centres but also in the rural areas. Between the 4th and 5th century Greek became the one and only language of the region. However, the Turkish migrations and invasions reversed this situation and Greek started to decline. The brutality of the invasion and conquest, the long period of coexistence with the Turks and the absence of proper schools caused the gradual disappearance of Greek.³⁵⁷

Indeed, the Greek authors, when explaining the dominance of Turkish in the interior Asia Minor, were invoking the harsh and brutal character of the Turkish invasion. Ioakeim Valavanis for instance, in his *Mikrasiatika* (Athens 1891) quoted the Anatolian beliefs on the loss of the Greek language. According to the latter, when the Turks invaded Asia Minor they threatened the local population with cutting off their tongues if they would speak Greek. So, the Greeks were forced to dismiss their mother language and to adopt Turkish. Greek was saved and retained only in the liturgical services. For Valavanis, although the Turkish-speaking Greeks did not understand anything in religious services, they continued going regularly to church in order to hear their past lost language.³⁵⁸

The Greek dialects of Cappadocia were considered as important because it was supposed that they had retained remnants of ancient and Medieval Greek. Because of

³⁵⁶ *ibid*, p. 25-7; also Karathanasis, p. 16-7.

³⁵⁷ Krinopoulos, *Τα Φερταίκενα Υπο Εθνολογικήν και Φιλολογικήν Αποψη Εξεταζόμενα* (An Ethnological and Philological Research on Ferteke), (Athens: 1889), pp. 9-17.

³⁵⁸ Valavanis, *Μικρασιατικά*, (Athens: Τύποις Αδελφών Πέρρη, 1891), pp. 9-14.

the isolation of the local Orthodox communities after the Turkish conquest, it was considered that the communities had retained a purer form of Greek with certain characteristics of older forms. This "purity" of Cappadocian and also Pontic dialects were signs of the linguistic and therefore national continuity of the Anatolian Greeks. In fact, as in the debate on Fallmerayer's thesis, ethnological studies on the traditions, rituals, language, folk songs and dances of the people were regarded as important as long as they could be related to the ancient Greek world. Greek ethnology had been born out of the reaction to the theories of Fallmerayer on the origins of the Greeks. According to Jacop Philipp Fallmerayer, the Greeks living in contemporary Greece were in no way descendants of the ancient Greeks as they were claiming. In fact, they represented a mixture of Slavic and Albanic people who had migrated and invaded Greece in the Middle Ages. Fallmerayer's influential work (*Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea Während des Mittelalters* -1830) was actually an attack to the foundations of the Modern Greek state that defined itself as the heir of the ancient Greece.³⁵⁹ The aim of Greek ethnology was therefore to prove that the traces of the ancient Greek world were ever alive, that between the cultural forms of modern and ancient Greeks there existed a direct continuity-relation. The main aim of the ethnological work was to demonstrate the continuity between the old and the contemporary; in other words the continuity of the Greek national spirit. Therefore, the daily life of Greeks (especially of the "pure" rural communities) was important for ethnologists since it demonstrated similarities with the ancient world.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁹ For the debate on Fallmerayer see: Elli Skopetea, *Fallmerayer Τεχνάσματα του Αντίπαλου Δέους*, (Athens: 1999) and also Georgios Veloudis, *Ο Jacop Philipp Fallmerayer και η Γένεση του Ελληνικού Ιστορισμού* (Fallmerayer and the Genesis of Grek Historicism), (Athens : E.M.N.E.-Μνήμων, 1982).

³⁶⁰ Kiriakidu-Nestoros, *Η Θεωρία της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας. Κριτική Ανάλυση* (The Theory of Greek Laography. A Critical Analysis), (Athens: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας, 1977), pp. 24-5; Herzfeld, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*, (New York: Pella, 1986), pp. 79-80. The Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople organized from the 1870's a competition on the ethnological and philological collections on language

For instance, according to Krinopoulos the games of Ferteke had remained the same from the Homeric period. After explaining the traditions about weddings, births, funerals and festivals, he concludes with the following question: "Don't we find these rituals and traditions also in Theophrastos, Aristoteles, Plutarkhos and Theokritos?"³⁶¹ Rizos Elephtheriadis, who in 1879 published *Sinasos, itoi meleti epi ton ithon kai ton ethimon avtis*, was also enthusiastic to claim that in Sinasos appear scenes of the Homeric period. He was the second, after N. Rizos, who had published Cappadocian folk songs. For Elephtheriadis, some songs of Sinasos, from a philological point of view, were very close to the cleptic songs of the Epirus and to the tragedies of Euripides or Sophokles.³⁶² In the book published by the İstanbul branch of the school board (*ephoria*) of Nevşehir for its centenary celebrations in 1920, there is the same assumption that the customs of Cappadocians were very similar to those of the ancient times and also to those which were still practised in the Greek-speaking world. This similarity, according to the book, was a proof of the racial unity of the local people with the ancient and modern Greeks. For instance, the superstition of distributing 33 *kuruş* after the death of someone as "custom money" was probably taken from the Greek myth on Charon. Or the practices and rituals of the night before the Theofania festival was akin to the ancient Greek festival called "Pianepsi".³⁶³

and local rituals and traditions of the Greek Orthodox communities of the Empire. The competition was called "Living Monuments" (*Zonta Mnimeia*) meaning that the linguistic forms and local traditions of the communities of Asia Minor were deeply connected with the antiquity and Greek history. The competition was an institution which served the local dialects and rituals to be included and reinterpreted within the national culture. See Haris Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19^ο Αιώνα. Ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως 1861-1912* (National Identity in Constantinople in the 19th c. The Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople), (Athens: Εκδόσεις Νεφέλη, 1996), pp. 121-31.

³⁶¹ Krinopoulos, p. 29 and 32.

³⁶² Rizos Elephtheriadis, *Συνασός ήτοι Μελέτη επί των Ηθών και Εθίμων Αυτής* (A Study on the traditions and rituals of Sinasos), (Athens: Τύποις Ελληνικής Ανεξαρτησίας, 1879), pp. 15-17.

³⁶³ *Nevşehir Mekteplerinin Dersaadet Eforiasının Yüzüncü Sene-i Devriyesi 1820-1920*, (Dersaadet: "Anatoli" Matbaası, 1920), p. 108-111. For the similarities between the ancient and contemporary

Valavanis supported the assumption that the Greek spoken by the few communities of Anatolia (one of them was Aravanion, the birthplace of Valavanis) had retained some traces of the ancient Greek. For him, it was important that the Greeks who had had no way except adopting the language of the conqueror, sought to distort it sometimes by using Greek roots or sometimes by using Greek prefixes. For example instead of “*yaptırım*” or “*kestirim*”, they said “*yaptirdizo*” or “*kestirdizo*”. According to Valavanis these were forms of resistance to the cultural dominance of the conqueror. Valavanis also interpreted the *Karamanli* script as a way of reacting to Turkish domination.³⁶⁴

With the publication of the medieval epic poem “Digenis Akritas” in 1875 by C. Sathas and E. Legrand and also with the publication of many *acritic* songs, the ethnological and philological focus moved to the Middle Ages and geographically to Cappadocia and to the region near Ephratis. It was Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus who indicated that the acritic songs were not Pontic in origin but Cappadocian and naturally had nothing to do with the Slavs.³⁶⁵ In this way, Kerameus managed to unite the trends of Greek anti-Fallmerayerian ethnography with the studies of medieval Asia Minor. For him the acritic epic had been born in Cappadocia

Cappadocian funerary rituals see also Papadopoulos, *Ο Υπόδουλος Ελληνισμός της Ασιατικής Ελλάδος Ο Ελληνισμός της Ασιατικής Ελλάδος Εθνικός και Γλωσσικός Εξεταζόμενος* (The Unredeemed Greeks of Asiatic Hellas. An ethnic and linguistic research), (Athens: Βιβλιοπωλείον Ιωάν. Ν. Σιδέρη, 1919), p. 131.

³⁶⁴ Valavanis, pp. 28-9 and 66. Greek authors generally regarded the usage of Greek alphabet by the Turkish-speaking Orthodox of Cappadocia as a way of preserving their national culture. See for example Papadopoulos, p. 69. Hudaverdoglou-Theodotos to explain this, gives the example of the Greeks of Syria and Palaistina who after the Arab invasions not only lost their language but also lost their alphabet and practised the church services in Arabic. Thus, they lost any connection with their national language and national culture. Houdaverdoglou-Theodotos, “*Ἡ Τουρκόφωνος Ἑλληνική Φιλολογία*”, *Επετίρη Εταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, Etos Z, Athens 1930, p. 301.

³⁶⁵ Karathanasis, p. 17; also Anagnostakis-Balta, pp. 33-6.

from where it had been transferred to Trabzon and the Crimea and only then was it translated into Slavic.³⁶⁶

The studies on Cappadocia increased further with the foundation of the Society of those from Asia Minor "Anatoli" (*Sillogos Mikrasiaton Anatoli*) in 1891 and the publication of the journal *Xenophanis* (1896) in which many studies on Cappadocia were published. Already Papadopoulos-Kerameus in his speech in the anniversary ceremony of the Literary Society of Constantinople in 1882, underlined that the ethnological material from the Epirus, Thessaly and Thrace were enough to counter Fallmerayerian thesis, whereas those from the interior of Asia Minor were still missing. This invitation had its repercussions, since in the catalogues of the Society of 1884 there were seven studies for Asia Minor of which four were about Cappadocia.³⁶⁷

It seems that at the beginning of the 20th century Cappadocia had become a part of Greek national consciousness. In 1906, during the ceremonies and festivities for the Olympic Games, a musical program consisting of Cappadocian songs amazed the Athenians. Again in 1906, the "father" of Greek ethnology Nikolaos Politis, in his major work underlined that the origin of the akritic epos was Cappadocia, in Asia Minor, "the land which today hopefully waits the nation". He concluded that the borders of Hellas had to be identified with the place where the acritic poem was born.³⁶⁸

It is important that in this whole effort and process of ethnological research for providing proofs of the Hellenic character of Cappadocia, the Turcophone Orthodox population was to be only receivers. Naturally, they were unable to provide material

³⁶⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 40-1.

³⁶⁷ *ibid.*, pp. 36-7.

to that purpose. In contrast with the Greek-speaking population of Cappadocia, whose culture was regarded as part of the Greek national identity, the oral tradition (folk songs, tales etc.) of the Turcophones was regarded as signs of submission to a foreign power. The Turcophones were seen as people whom the Greek intelligentsia should enlighten and force into a process of civilization. Until the late 19th century the local cultural output of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians remained mainly intact. In the cases when it was studied, their oral tradition was disregarded, since it had nothing to do with what was being defined as Greekness. In the demonstration of their local culture, those parts that were supposed to be part of the general Orthodox tradition were underlined, whereas the ones that were believed to be results of the Muslim-Turkish influence were left out.³⁶⁹

The hellenization of Cappadocia

The new awareness of Cappadocian Hellenism had its counterpart in the increasing efforts to spread Greek letters and culture in the region. During the 19th century the economic, social and political developments enabled the inhabitants of the region to increase their connections with the other parts of the Ottoman Empire. From the beginning of the 19th century considerable effort was undertaken by the centres of the Greek Orthodox community to strengthen their ties with this region. This effort went hand in hand with attempts for inculcating in the Cappadocian Orthodox communities, an awareness that they were part of the greater national community of Greeks. In this effort educational activities played a major role. Education was considered to be the instrument to spread the national consciousness through the intermediary of the Greek language. Especially after the establishment of the Greek

³⁶⁹ Karathanasis, pp. 18-9; also Anagnostakis-Balta, pp. 47-8.

state and from the second half of the 19th century efforts were made to Hellenize the Anatolian Turcophone Orthodox communities. Schools, educational and literary societies, libraries and clubs with the support of the Greek state were engaged in these efforts to inculcate the Turcophone "unredeemed Greeks" of Anatolia a sense of Greek national identity.

In this process the role played by those who emigrated from Cappadocia to the western commercial cities was of extreme importance. The rapid social and economic transformation of the port cities in the 19th century created a vast need for manpower. Like other Greek-Orthodox populations from different regions, the *Karamanli* Christians migrated to these urban centres from the second half of the 19th century. These immigrants founded guilds, associations and societies and reproduced their "communities" in the places where they migrated. "The former inhabitants of a village would gather together in the same district, go to the same church, maybe even build one of their own, have their own priest and a certain place in the market, reproducing the archetypal pattern of life in their homeland."³⁷⁰ When the immigrants were returning to their homeland, they were inculcating in their compatriots the values and ideas that were the product of the urban centres' culture. As for those who never went back and their number was gradually increasing, stayed in touch with their fatherland. Through their associations in Istanbul, these migrants, concentrated on the social and cultural improvement of their local community mainly by supporting the establishment and maintenance of schools.³⁷¹ In this way they contributed to the urbanization and "Hellenization" of their communities by using the community as a mechanism of spreading Greek education. The phenomenon of migration, in the short

³⁶⁹ *ibid*, p. 49 and 55.

³⁷⁰ Petropoulou, "Cultural and Intellectual Life...", p. 40.

run, enabled the local Orthodox communities to become more prosperous and, as a result, to meet with "modern" social activities. However on the long run those communities lost their connection with their geographical environment and became dependent to Constantinople. Most of the Cappadocian communities witnessed in the second half of the 19th century an educational development and an increase in the number of schools which in some cases seems contrary to the economic state of the local community and can only be explained by the role played by the immigrants.³⁷²

In fact, a *Karamanlı* community in İstanbul existed already from the 15th century. After the migrations of the 19th century the Karamanli population of the city increased. Many *Karamanlı* moved to the districts where Greeks were living. This movement augmented the interconnections between the *Karamanlı* inhabitants of the city and the local Greeks. There were many rich *Karamanlı* families, mainly occupied in the trade of food and clothing, such as Şişmanoglu, Siniosoglu, Portokaloglu, Seferoglu and the famous Bodosaki Athanasiadis. More important, the *Karamanlı*, who had the advantage of being bilingual increasingly acted as mediators between the Ottoman Government and the Greek community. People such as Konstantinos Vayannis, Konstantinos Adosidis Paşa, Aristidis Yorgancoglu Paşa became very influential in the Ottoman administration. It was also important that many of the Greek deputies in the Ottoman Parliament after 1908 were *Karamanlı* in origin. We can therefore say that by the second half of the century there emerged a strong *Karamanlı* community in İstanbul that played a major role in the process of

³⁷¹ *ibid*, pp. 40-2.

³⁷² Anagnostopoulou, *Μικρά Ασία 19^{ος} αϊ. – 1919 Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες* (Asia Minor 19th Century-1919 The Greek-Orthodox Communities), (Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 1997), pp. 362-9.

incorporating the Turcophone Orthodox communities into the Greek national identity.³⁷³

It is not easy to know to what extent the Turcophone Orthodox Christians perceived themselves as Greek. According to Ioakeim Valavanis, the Orthodox of the interior of Anatolia was completely ignorant of the name of the race to which he/she belonged. "For if today you ask a Christian, even one speaking a corrupted Greek: 'What are you?' 'A Christian', he will unhesitatingly reply. 'All right, but other people are Christians, the Armenians, the Franks, the Russians...' 'I don't know', he will answer, 'yes these people believe in Christ but I'm a Christian' he will reply to you impatiently".³⁷⁴ This dialogue, according to Valavanis, indicates how much related was nationality and religion for the Anatolian people. The wishes and dreams of the Anatolian Greeks were not about Greece, Athens or Parthenon but they were related to Byzantium and Hagia Sophia. For example, the Anatolian Greeks were superstitious about Tuesday. Tuesday was believed to be an unlucky day. On Tuesdays, as well as in May no weddings were carried out. Although they could not explain the reason for this belief, according to Valavanis it was sure that this was related to the common belief of the Greeks about this day and month. They see them as inauspicious because these were the day and the month of the fall of Constantinople.³⁷⁵ Krinopoulos also referred to the Anatolian Christian mothers who

³⁷³ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας Τουρκορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας στην Καππαδοκία 1921-1923" (The attempt to found a Turkish Orthodox Church in Cappadocia), *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 4, Athens 1983, pp. 162-4; see also Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız: the Turkish-speaking Greeks of Asia Minor", *Neohellenism*, ed. John Burke and Stathis Gauntlett, (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, Monograph 5, Canberra Australian National University, 1992), p. 69.

³⁷⁴ Valavanis, p. 30.

³⁷⁵ *ibid*, pp. 30-1.

even though sing only Turkish songs to their children, they call them "*Aya Sofya'nın bülbülü*"³⁷⁶

For Valavanis, one should not blame the Greeks of interior Asia Minor for their ignorance of their national identity, since they were isolated in a region distanced from Greece and the civilized world. Nevertheless, he underlines that the Greeks of Asia Minor still possess a sense of the glorious past of their nation. Popular myths and legends about Byzantium and Constantinople were widespread. Because of this sense of a glorified and distinct past, they distinguish themselves from Armenians and they regard themselves superior to the latter and Jews. Thus, he concludes by calling the Greeks to help their compatriots of the interior Asia Minor to establish schools and to create an educational system, which will cultivate the national consciousness.³⁷⁷

Many observers had witnessed the apathy about Greek national feelings and aspirations among the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia. The Reverend Henry Tozer in 1879 toured Anatolia where he met with the Orthodox communities of Cappadocia and Pontus. Although among them pro-Russian feelings were pronounced, he did not record any trace of attachment to the Greek Kingdom. In June 1901 and in October 1902 the Consul General of Greece in Smyrna S. Antonopoulos toured western and central Asia Minor and "he was repeatedly dismayed by the absence of feelings of attachment to Greece and by the political unawareness and ambivalence of local Greeks, especially the community leaders with whom he came into contact."³⁷⁸

It is interesting that in the *Karamanlı* literature the Turcophone Orthodox are seldomly referred as *Rumlar*. They were mostly referred as Christians, Orthodox

³⁷⁶ Krinopoulos, p. 27.

³⁷⁷ Valavanis, pp. 26-7 and 45-7.

³⁷⁸ Kitromilides, "Imagined Communities and the origins of the national question in the Balkans", *European History Quarterly* 19, no. 2, Sage Publications, London, 1989, pp. 174-5.

Christians, Anatolian Christians, Orthodox Christians of Anatolia etc. (*Anadolu Hristiyan karındaşlarımız, Anadoludan olan Ortodoks dindar Hristiyanlar, Anadolulu Ortodoks Hristiyanlar, Yunani lisani/Rumi lisanını bilmeyen Anadoludaki Hristiyanlar* or as *Anadolular*). From an analysis of the introductions of the *Karamanlı* books, Evangelia Balta concludes that the dominant factor in shaping the collective identity of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians was religion. The usage of the term "*millet*" was based on religion, i.e. a religious community. Also the term "*vatan*" was used only to describe the birthplace, fatherland in the strict sense.³⁷⁹ The translation of Aristotle's *Physiognomonica* into Turkish by Anastasios Karakioulaphis of Kayseri (1819) was one of the very rare examples of an awareness of the ancient Greek heritage in the Karamanli literature. The aim of Karakioulaphis was to offer a small gift to the "heteroglot sons" of the "most beloved Motherland, Greece".³⁸⁰

R. M. Dawkins published a ballad on the Patriarch Grigorios V in *karamanlidika*, from a collection of folk songs made by A. M. Levidis. It was about the execution of Patriarch Grigorios in 1821 in reprisal for the outbreak of the Greek revolt. However, according to Dawkins "there is no suggestion of national freedom for Greece and the Greeks" in the ballad and it is basically the Jews and Armenians who are held responsible for the Patriarch's fate. The Sultan is referred to as "*padişahımız*" and although the execution is seen as a terrible event, it is also accepted as a part of the holy and immutable order of things.³⁸¹ It is also interesting that the *Karamanlı* had a sense of distinctness as it is revealed in this literature. Thus,

³⁷⁹ Balta, "Οι Πρόλογοι των Καραμανλήδικων βιβλίων για την Μελέτη της Εθνικής Συνείδησης των Τουρκόφωνων Πληθυσμών της Μικράς Ασίας" (The Prefaces of the Karamanli books for the study of the national consciousness of the Turcophone populations of Asia Minor), *Μνήμων* 11, 1987, pp. 228-32; also Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", p. 78.

³⁸⁰ Clogg, "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız...", p. 75.

when the writers or translators identified the Turcophone Orthodox as Rum, they usually used *Anadolu* as an adjective (*Anadolu Rumları, Anadolulu Rumlar* etc.)³⁸²

It is not until the beginning of the 20th century that this situation started to change and the cases manifesting an affiliation with the Greek nation increased. For instance, I. Ioannidis in 1913 calls his compatriots to pay more attention to the national education (*terbiye-i milliye*) to which he refers as Greek national formation (*Elliniki Ethniki Morfosis*). He explains and underlines the role of the Greek civilization (*Medeniyet-i Yunaniye*) in shaping world history and concludes that they must be proud of it. He also refers to the Greek language (*Ellinika*) as their national language (*lisan-ı milli*). Thus, Ioannidis not only stresses his affiliation to the Greek Nation, but also uses the term "*millet*" as the synonym of nation.³⁸³ The centennial of the schools of Nevşehir, which was published in 1920 in İstanbul while the Greek army was advancing in Asia Minor, concludes with the hope and belief that the difficult days of the Young Turk era had eventually came to an end and that a new era was beginning: "the dawn of freedom enlightens the horizon of Anatolia"³⁸⁴

For Kitromilides the introduction of Greek nationalism among the Orthodox communities of Cappadocia reversed the well-advanced process of integration of the Turkish-speaking Christians to the dominant Muslim society. In the 1870's when the foundation and spread of Modern Greek schools had begun, "not only had the language ceased to be a barrier, but also popular religion with its traditional syncretism provided an element of psychological integration at the basis of Christian

³⁸¹ *ibid*, p. 78.

³⁸² Balta, p. 232.

³⁸³ I. Ioannidis, "Terbiye-i Milliye", in *İmerologion Astir* 1914, pp. 17-8.

³⁸⁴ "Maetteessüf yeniden tulu eden şafak-ı hürriyet ve milletin ihyası hususunda ufukta beliren ümidler memleketimizi henüz en merdud zulmün kelepçe ve zincirleri ile bağlı buluyor. (...) Şafak-ı hürriyet

and Muslim communal life –an element that bridged instead of reinforcing ethnic separateness.” Greek nationalism stopped and reversed this process of social integration and created a sense of Greek national identity and feeling among the younger generations.³⁸⁵ According to Alexandris, at the beginning of the 20th century, the *Karamanlı* had become a part of the collective Greek body and they were ready to pursue the ideology of irredentism.³⁸⁶

However, it is not clear whether the process of Hellenization among the *Karamanlı* met with absolute success. According to Dawkins for example, despite the efforts made by the schools and the societies, in many places of Cappadocia, Turkish was still threatening the Greek language altogether. He cites many examples of this: “Two other villages have quite recently given up Greek in favour of Turkish; these are Andaval, not far from Semendere and near the road from Nigde to Misti, and Limna or Limnos a little way east of Axo. Andaval is a village of some 2000 inhabitants, all Christian; Karolidhis says that Greek was recently spoken but had then (1884) almost disappeared. Limna is recorded by Rizos (1856) as a Greek speaking village, but the language is now said to be understood by a few old people only.” Or in Uluğaç “the Greek is in an extremely corrupt condition, and is bound shortly to disappear as a vernacular in favour of Turkish. I have even heard women talking Turkish to their children, a sure sign of the approaching extinction of the Greek dialect.”³⁸⁷ According to the Greek consulate in Konya in 1916, the Orthodox Christians of Cappadocia were ignorant, vulgar and rude. They were in a state of national degeneration since

Anatolin ufkunu tenvir ve zulm içinde kemal-i sabr-u metanetle bekleyen kardeşlerimizin kalplerinde en tatlı çarpıntılar hasıl ediyor...” Nevşehir Mekteplerinin, pp. 75-7.

³⁸⁵ Kitromilides, “Greek Irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus”, *Middle Eastern Studies* 26, no. 1, 1990, pp. 5-6.

³⁸⁶ Alexandris, “Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...”, p. 167.

³⁸⁷ Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. (Cambridge: 1916), p. 11 and 18.

although they had Greek origins they were like the Turks.³⁸⁸ Ioannis Ioannidis, in the preface of the *Imerologion* 1914 of the Society of Papa Georgios of Nevşehir, questions how many members of the community know sufficiently Greek. For him the number of those who do not know any Greek is still very high. He is also pessimistic whether those who graduate from the community schools could preserve the Greek they had learned. For those reasons he concludes that the publishing activities in Turkish had to be continued for some time.³⁸⁹ In 1920, the authors of the centennial of the schools of Nevşehir confessed that Turkish was still the language used among the people. But they were hopeful that in the future with the help of the local schools, Greek would prevail in the houses at least.³⁹⁰

Krinopoulos is also among those who believe that there was a danger of the total abolition of Greek in central Asia Minor; for example, he mentions that many national folk songs had been replaced by Turkish ones. Also Protestant missionaries were another cause of danger for the national identity of local Greeks. The proselytising activities of the Protestant missionaries were generally regarded as a threat to the national identity of the Greeks. Since the Greekness of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians was derived from their attachment to the Greek-Orthodox Church, any change in their religious affiliation would also lead to their departure from the Greek national body. According to Krinopoulos, in order to counter those threats and develop the national consciousness of the Turcophone Orthodox, schools should be founded and ethnological and philological works on Cappadocian Greeks should be supported.³⁹¹

³⁸⁸ Anagnostopoulou, p. 543.

³⁸⁹ Astir *Imerologion* 1914, p. 15.

³⁹⁰ Nevşehir Mekteplerinin..., 1920, pp. 106-7.

On the contrary, there were also some favourable statements and observations about the success of educational institutions and consequently about the "re-acquisition" of Greek among the Turcophones of Asia Minor. For instance, Poole states "even the elite of the Greek society of Broussa thirty years ago had lost the use of their mother-tongue, replacing it by broken Turkish. Since then, the introduction of schools has been the means of restoring the use of their own language to the great majority of the people". Even "the inhabitants of the surrounding villages, in all of which Greek schools have now been established, have learnt their national language".³⁹² According to Ramsay the Greeks of Kayseri, Niğde and Bor had forgot Greek "until the revivification of the western spirit in the last generation produced a revival of the language".³⁹³ Frederick Burnaby who visited Yozgat in 1876 observed that the Greeks and Armenians of the city were Turkish-speaking. However, thanks to the newly established schools the Greeks were learning the "language of their ancestors" and "the present generation of children can most of them speak as well as write, in the language of their ancestors."³⁹⁴

For Kontogiannis also, writing in 1918, Turks were declining both demographically and socio-economically and Greek language was becoming predominant in all Asia Minor. In fact, this was a common theme of the Greek propaganda of these years. While he focuses on Western Anatolia (the *vilayets* of Aydın and Bursa), he gives the examples of Nazilli, Alaşehir, Manisa and Akhisar that were Turkish-speaking in the past, but eventually "regained the language of their

³⁹¹ Krinopoulos, pp. 15-7.

³⁹² Poole, *The People of Turkey: Twenty Years' Residence Among the Bulgarians, Greeks, Albanians, Turks and Armenians*, vol. 2, ed. by (London: John Murray, 1878), p. 188.

³⁹³ Ramsay, *Impressions of Turkey During Twelve Years' Wanderings*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897), p. 240.

³⁹⁴ Burnaby, *On Horseback Through Asia Minor*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 104-5.

ancestors".³⁹⁵ According to Kontogiannis, the claim that the spread of the Greek language in Asia Minor was due to the Greek propaganda was false. For him, the Turcophones of Asia Minor sought to learn "the language of their forefathers" by themselves, because they saw Turkish as a sign of their subversion to the Turks and of degradation. In contrast, the spread of Greek was a sign of the national affiliation of the Asia Minor Greeks. He quotes Deschamps who visited Isparta and met the indigenous Greek population, who told him that they felt ashamed of not knowing Greek and of speaking only Turkish. He also quotes Perrot who visited Kütahya in 1861 and met with the *çorbaci* of the town, a certain Tsouloglou. According to Perrot, Tsouloglou was completely unaware that a Greek Kingdom existed and knew only Turkish like his compatriots. However, there was a Greek school in the village with a teacher from Bursa. The most important is that the son of Tsouloglou who was able to speak some Greek, was preparing to go to İzmir in order to continue his studies. According always to Kontogiannis, the fact that Tsouloglou's community had a Greek school and that Tsouloglou himself, a prominent figure of his community, who did not know anything about Greece, sent his son to study and learn Greek in Smyrna, was a clear indication that the spread of Greek had nothing to do with Greek propaganda. Such a phenomenon could only be explained by the passion of Greeks to acquire their national language.³⁹⁶

In conclusion, we can say that despite substantial efforts for the cultural hellenization of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians, Greek language did not prevail. Even at the beginning of the 20th century, the Greek Kingdom was still too distant to the Orthodox communities of Cappadocia. In fact, the ecclesiastical

³⁹⁵ Kontogiannis, *Η Ελληνικότης των νομών Προβόσης και Σμύρνης* (The Greekness of the vilayets Bursa and İzmir), (Athens: Viciopoleion Ioannou N. Sideri, 1919), pp. 124-5, 127, 131 and 136

³⁹⁶ *ibid*, pp. 159-61.

hierarchy and even Russia as the protector power of the Orthodox Christians, and not Greece, remained as central reference points for the Orthodox of the interior.³⁹⁷ However, the important thing is that in the second half of the 19th century there emerged in Anatolia a local intelligentsia with Greek national consciousness, which joined the efforts of Hellenization voluntarily. Moreover, the local clergy, the notables and the prominent figures of the community in the urban centres who played a determinant role in communal affairs, were all integrated to the national discourse. Therefore, on the eve of the armistice, the Orthodox communities of the interior of Anatolia and especially their secular or religious notables had acquired a sense of national identity that would become decisive in shaping the fate of the Turkish Orthodox Church.

The Turkish heartland

The Turks, on the other hand, incorporated the *Karamanlı* among their conational relatively very late and this was deeply related to the occurrence of a crucial shift in the meaning of Anatolia. The concept of Anatolia as the Turkish heartland is relatively new. Namık Kemal was the first to introduce and popularise the concept of motherland (*vatan*), but what he perceived as motherland was the whole Ottoman country and not specifically Anatolia. The spread of separatist nationalism and the loss of vast areas of the empire and particularly the loss of the Balkans, together with the fear of further disintegration, brought together a new and different approach regarding Asia Minor. The stress that Anatolia was essentially Turkish and did not belong to any other nation became important. According to Kushner, "Anatolia had come, by the end of the Hamidian period, to be closely identified with a

³⁹⁷ Anagnostopoulou, p. 498.

concept of a Turkish homeland."³⁹⁸ However, despite the increasing interest on Anatolia, its acceptance as the homeland of the Turks became possible only after the Great War, when the Pan-Islamist and Pan-Turkist aspirations concluded with total disillusionment. Even in June 1918, at the General Congress of the *Türk Ocağı*, the proposal to limit the concern of the society to Anatolia and exclude the affairs of the "outside Turks" at least for a while met with opposition and was rejected.³⁹⁹ Anatolia as the homeland of the Turks was so new that it even lacked a name. The Young Turks used "*Türkistan*", and Mehmed Emin "*Türkeli*". It was during the Young Turk period that the name "*Türkiye*" became popular. But it was adopted officially only by the Kemalists in the constitution of 1921. However, the name was so alien and bizarre that for a while the authorities hesitated between different spellings of it.⁴⁰⁰

The acceptance of Anatolia as the Turkish heartland was related to the efforts of proving its historical Turkishness. Many works on Turkish history dated the migration of the Turkish populations in Anatolia to very early times, concluding that the Turks must have settled in Asia Minor since then. Therefore, Anatolia was not an area recently populated by Turks, but had deep rooted historical ties with them. For example, the linguistic findings of Arminius Vambéry, writing in *İkdam* ("*Anadolu ve Türklerin Kudem-i Temekkünü*", 20 June 1900), that there existed Turkish words written in Anatolia already in the fifth century, have led him to believe that Turkish immigration in Asia Minor took place much earlier than what was commonly

³⁹⁸ Kushner, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism 1876-1908*, (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1977), p. 54.

³⁹⁹ Füsün Üstel, "Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Anadolu Metaforu", *Tarih ve Toplum*, vol. 19, no. 109, 1993, pp. 51-2.

⁴⁰⁰ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 347-8.

believed. Therefore, the Seljuks could not have been the first Turkish people who settled in Asia Minor.⁴⁰¹

The claims on the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians emerged in this context. Şemseddin Sami in his *Kamüs-ül-A'lam* declares that according to their race, besides the Christian population of the commercial ports like İzmir and the islands surrounding Asia Minor, the Christians of Anatolia have Turkish origin and belonged to the great family of Western Turks.⁴⁰² However, for him, "it is a pity that, since some of them belong to the Armenian Church and some to the Greek Church, they forget that their forefathers had no relations with either the Greeks or the Armenians, particularly the former, and they are tempted to be caught up by the cause of Hellenism or Armenianism."⁴⁰³ Sami underlines the role played by the Greek school and societies in hellenizing these people: "Recently in these past few years, with the encouragement of so-called scientific societies they (the Christians) have been abandoning the official language of state, and have begun learning Greek and Armenian. This had led to the strange spectacle of fathers who do not speak a word of Greek or Armenian but who have sons who do not understand a word of Turkish!"⁴⁰⁴

An article from *İkdam* dating from 20 March 1899 claimed the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians: "It is almost proven that the more than half a million Orthodox population which lives in Anatolia, having absolutely no relationship with

⁴⁰¹ Kushner, p. 53.

⁴⁰² "It can be said that Anatolia is entirely a land of Turks, and the majority of its population are Muslims. Even most of the Christians are ethnic Turks (*Hristiyanların kım-i azamı dahi yine Türk cinsine mensubdurlar*). In the aforesaid Anatolian peninsula, with the exception of a few Christians in the ports, the only difference between the Muslim Turks and their Christian compatriots (*vatandaşları*) is religion. It would therefore be quite correct to call these latter "Christian Turks". Cited in Deringil, "From Ottoman to Turk: Self-Image and Social Engineering in Turkey", *Making Majorities Constituting the Nation in Japan, Korea, China, Malaysia, Fiji, Turkey and the United States*, Dru C. Gladney (ed.), (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), p. 218.

⁴⁰³ Kushner, p. 52.

⁴⁰⁴ Şemseddin Sami cited in Deringil, pp. 218-9.

the Greeks, and speaking nothing but Turkish, have arisen from the mixture of the ancient inhabitants of Anatolia with the Turkmens... They should therefore not be regarded as Greeks. Just as every Muslim is not a Turk, an Orthodox Christian is not necessarily a Greek. Faith stands on belief, and nationality on language."⁴⁰⁵ Also the Greek schools were attacked for ignoring Turkish, thus trying to make many "Christian Turks" forget their mother tongue.⁴⁰⁶ Hüseyin Cahid also dealt with the issue in *Tanin*, and called the *Karamanlı* to left the Patriarchate. The Greek newspaper *Konstantinopolis* accused Hüseyin Cahid of provocation. Accordingly the aim of Cahid was to raise a conflict between the *Karamanlı* and their Greek-speaking conational. However, the answer to this provocation should have been the strengthening of the ties between the national centre, i.e. the Patriarchate and the nation.⁴⁰⁷

An interesting reference to the debate on the origins of the Anatolian Christians is made in the "*Salname/İmerologion*" of 1914 published in Turkish with Greek script by the Society of Papa Georgios of Nevşehir (*Nevşehirililerin "Papa Georgios" Cemiyeti*). In the article by Dimosthenis Danielidis called "*A letter from my father*" (*Babamın Bir Mektubu*), we read the letter of a father to his son who is a student in İstanbul. The father advises his son, who wishes to spend his summer

⁴⁰⁵ Kushner, p. 53. The diversity of the Orthodox population of Asia Minor and the differences between those who live in the west and the others who live in the east have been observed by many travellers. For example, W. M. Ramsay indicates that it would be vain and self-contradictory to try to describe the general type and national characteristics of the Greeks in Turkey. "Those who are called Greeks are a religion, not a nation. They have nothing in common except the creed and ceremonial of the Orthodox Church. They have not the tie of common blood, but are the direct descendants of the most diverse races, Cappadocians, Pisidians, Isaurians, Pamphylia, men of Pontus, and so on. Their outward look and their superficial character (for I do not pretend to have seen more deeply) are often markedly divergent. They are divided by difference of language: some use Greek alone, many are bilingual." Dawkins, 1897, p. 240.

⁴⁰⁶ Kushner, pp. 93-4.

⁴⁰⁷ "Οι Καραμανλήδες και ο Ελληνισμός" (Karamanlı and the Hellenism), *Κωνσταντινούπολης*, 20 June 1909, no. 97. Cited in Talât Tekin, "Grek Alfabetiyle Türkçe", *Tarih ve Toplum*, vol. 3, March 1984, p. 23.

holiday in Romania, to come and travel in Asia Minor so as to learn about his own homeland and help his own people. So the son decides to travel in Anatolia. When he reaches Konya, he meets the governor of the city. While they talk on the socio-economic problems of the region, the governor says that he is pleased with the local people, since "both Muslim Turks and Christian Turks" are hardworking. The son asks the governor who are these "Christian Turks" and the governor replies that they are the local Christians who do not differ in anything, and especially in language, from their Muslim compatriots. The son replies that he is also part of these people and that he is not a Turk but a *Rum*. He explains that they are descendants of Alexander the Great and the Byzantines. After the Turkish migration some of them lost their language, but these are only a small part. The ones who lost their native language were from the cities but most of the rural communities retained their language and whether Turkish-speaking or not they retained their religion and nationality. The article concludes by saying that every nation that loses its own language ceases to exist, and therefore it is a duty to seek to regain the national language.⁴⁰⁸ The probably fictitious dialogue, which was published in *Karamanlidika* and therefore certainly had a wider circulation among the *Karamanli*, illustrates that the debate on the origins of Anatolian Christians was not unknown to the local intelligentsia of Anatolian origin and that they were anxious to reply to and counter it.

The "Muslim Greeks"

Despite these earlier references, the assumption that the Christians of Anatolia had a Turkish origin became widespread after the Great War, when the Turkish sovereignty on Anatolia became disputable. As we are going to see the assertion that

⁴⁰⁸ Astir, 1914, pp. 53-63.

the Christians of Anatolia were Turks was directly related with the claims of rival nationalisms over Asia Minor. In order to legitimize their territorial claims in the eyes of the western public opinion the Greek and Armenians relied on two arguments. The first one was demography, namely that they constituted a substantial portion of the total population. The second one was about the "historical rights", i.e. that a certain region historically belonged to a certain group. Thus, it became crucial to demonstrate which group was in fact the autochthonous people of Anatolia or which was the group that had shaped the history of it. The Greeks had an important advantage regarding this issue. The ancient Greek colonies and the Byzantine Empire were seen as proofs of the historical Greekness of Anatolia. In contrast the Turks were regarded as occupants since their presence in Anatolia relatively to the Greek and the Armenian one was very new. Even if it was accepted that the Turks were the majority in Anatolia, it was the brutality of the conquest that had changed radically the demographical condition. Therefore, for the Greek authors of the propaganda literature even the Turkishness of the Anatolian Muslims was disputable. In fact, even in places where the Muslims seemed to form the majority many Muslims were of Greek-Christian origin.

An indicative example of this assumption is the work of Konstantinos G. Lameras, the General Secretary of the Committee of the Unredeemed Greeks. In his book published in 1918, he claimed that the number of the Turks who had invaded Asia Minor was actually some 50,000. Therefore, the contemporary number of the Muslim Turks in Asia Minor was basically an unnatural phenomenon reached only with means such as: forced Islamization, *devşirme*, deportations and massacres. It was natural that there was a large population that officially was counted among the Turks, but was essentially Greek in origin, and more important many of them had retained to

a certain degree their Greek character. Lameras gives a detailed account of these people:

-	The Sannoi-Tsanoi	305,000
-	The Yörük (Tahtacı, Çepni, Çomaklı)	1,150,000
-	The Kızılbaş	350,000
-	People from Pontos (Of, Tonya, Matzouka, Kromni, Stavri)	150,000

According to Lameras the number of these people amounts to 1,935,000. Lameras in order to prove the Greekness of these people exemplifies their traditions, names and religious affiliation, their attitude towards Turks and Greeks. But most importantly, he resorts to the testimony of Western scholars and travellers. He quotes J. Perrot who says that the *Yörük* women looked like Greek women and that the villages of the *Yörük* were called by the Turks as "*Yunanköy*" (Greek village)⁴⁰⁹; E. Reclus claiming that the Mesohaldeans were descendants of the Greeks which were mixed with the Laz; V. Cuinet who claims that the *Kızılbaş* are Christians pretending being Turks⁴¹⁰ and also that the people of Kromni are descendants of the *thousand* (*mirion* of Xenophon) etc. According always to Lameras, these people's belief

⁴⁰⁹ Although Kontogiannis does not refer to the Greekness of *Yörüks* or *Kızılbaş*, he also indicates that the villages of *Yörük* in Karya are identified by the Turks as "*Yunanköy*" (Greek villages). Kontogiannis, *Η Γεωγραφία της...*, p. 59.

⁴¹⁰ The ethnic origins of the *Türkmen* tribes and of the *Alevi* were also concerns of the Turkish nationalists. From 1913, the Committee of Union and Progress organized ethnological researches concerning the different groups living in Anatolia. The *Türkmen* and *Alevi* tribes and communities were among the important subjects of these researches. Baha Sait Bey played an important role in these ethnological researches. He worked between 1915 and 1916 on the *Alevi* and *Bektaşî*, and he underlined that the *Alevi* were Turks who had retained the ancient forms of Turkish culture and religion. Baha Sait himself claims that he started working on the *Alevi* of Anatolia when he was informed that in the statistics of the Protestant missionaries they were regarded as former Christians who had been converted. See Baha Sait Bey, *İttihat - Terakki'nin Alevilik Bektaşîlik Araştırması*, Nejat

systems, language, traditions, character and feelings were essentially Greek, and they saw the dissolution of the Turkish yoke as their eventual emancipation.⁴¹¹

A. Papadopoulos, the author of the "*O Ypodoulos Ellinismos tis Asiatikis Ellados*" repeats that the Turks have gained the majority in Asia Minor only by violent means. Therefore, it was sure that among those who were counted as Turks, many were Greeks. These were mainly concentrated in the western, north western and northern coastal areas. He especially focuses on Pontos, where he claims that the majority of the Muslims are essentially Greeks. He gives the examples of the Greek-speaking Muslim communities in Tonya and Of, and refers to the rituals, traditions, and physiognomy and, most importantly, to the fact that many Muslim communities in the region retain an idiomatic Greek. He refers to Greek village names such as Alithios, Gorgora, Mesohori, Saraho, Okelos, Zesino etc. and also to Greek family names such as Papazoğlu, Mandanis, Mercanis, Keşişoğlu etc. The important thing for him is that these people themselves admit that they have Greek origins. He also cites the example of the crypto-Christians, who although officially were regarded as Muslims, they had essentially retained their forefather's religion and performed their religious services secretly.⁴¹² For Papadopoulos, the Turkish-speaking Christians and the Greek-speaking Muslims of the "Asiatic Hellas" were all Greeks. According to him, the basic criterion in determining the ethnic origin of a population were its rituals, traditions, the characteristics of daily life, and not language or religion. The

Birdoğan (ed.), (İstanbul: Berfin Yayınları, 1994), pp. 7-12. Also Fuat Dündar, "İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Araştırmaları", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 91, July 2001, pp. 43-50.

⁴¹¹ K. G. Lamas, *To Mikrasiaτικόν Πρόβλημα* (The Asia Minor Question), (Athens: 1918), pp. 30-41.

⁴¹² A. A. Papadopoulos, *O Ypodoulos Ellinismos tis Asiatikis Ellados O Ellinismos tis Asiatikis Ellados Ethnikos kai Glwssikos Eξεταζόμενος* (The Unredeemed Greeks of Asiatic Hellas. An ethnic and linguistic research), (Athens: Βιβλιοπωλείον Ιωάν. Ν. Σιδέρη, 1919), p. 36-50. According to Kontogiannis the Greekness of the inhabitants of Of was out of question. He also improves his

latter changed relatively easy, but in contrast the former remained. Therefore, he underlines, although the Greeks of the interior Asia Minor have lost their national language they have retained their national characteristics; and although the Pontic Greek-speaking Muslims have lost the religion of their forefathers, they retain nevertheless their national traditions and habits.⁴¹³

The head of the Asia Minor Society "Anatoli" and of the Common Committee of the Unredeemed Greeks Margaritis Evangelidis is also among the Greek authors who relied on the assumption that many Anatolian Muslims had Greek origins. He adopts the same assumption that the Turks who invaded Asia Minor were few, and that the Turkification of Anatolia became possible only with forced Islamization. Therefore, he concludes, the Turks of Asia Minor have 80% Greek blood.⁴¹⁴

Kontogiannis also claimed that only a minority of the Muslim population living in Anatolia was the direct ancestor of the Seljuks and of the Ottomans. A great number of Turks in the eastern regions had Armenian origins, while in the western regions they had Greek ones. The latter were still preserving Greek traditions; they were worshipping Orthodox saints and had Greek physiognomy and type.⁴¹⁵ He gives the example of the Muslims of Denizli who admit that some 250 years ago they were forced to convert under fierce pressure and become Muslim. He also quotes Philipson who describes the Turks of Caria and Lykia as having a "Greek type". For Philipson

argument on the basis of the language (which is purer than the other Pontic), the names of the villages and the family names. Kontogiannis, *Η Γεωγραφία της...*, p. 60.

⁴¹³ Papadopoulos, pp. 137-8.

⁴¹⁴ Evangelidis, *Υπόμνημα περί των δικαιωμάτων και παθημάτων των εστών του πολιτισμού Μικράς Ασίας και Θράκης* (Memorandum on the rights and sufferings of the hearths of civilization of Asia Minor and Thrace), (Athens: 1918), pp. 25-7.

⁴¹⁵ Kontogiannis, *Η Ελληνικότης των...*, p. 13-4; also Kontogiannis, *Η Γεωγραφία της...*, p. 56-7.

157
the region is full of Greek place names and this is a clear indication that the Muslims of the region were originally Greek, who were forced to embrace Islam.⁴¹⁶

For Zervos, a large percentage of the Muslim population of Pontos "is of Greek origin, having turned Moslems to save their lives. A noteworthy example of this is offered "by the *Stavriotes*, called Klosti in the Pontic idiom, from "*klotho*", to spin, to become renegade. Most of them were Islamised by force during the 17th century, and after the Crimean War, part of them returned to the old faith. But there are still thousands and tens of thousands of Musulmans in the Pontos Regions, who are sure to return to the faith of their forefathers and to their national ideals as soon as liberty is bestowed on their country in whatever form."⁴¹⁷

The assumption that many Anatolian Muslims were of Greek origin had two implications regarding Asia Minor. First, that Anatolia historically belonged to Greeks, and second that the number of the Turks in Anatolia was much lesser than what it was generally assumed. So it was natural that these claims were to be totally rejected by the Turkish side. For instance, according to a pamphlet of the "Pro-Entente Turkish Congress" these claims were dismissed as mere phantasies.⁴¹⁸

In fact, the claims on the ethnic origin of the population of Asia Minor were not an exceptional case regarding exclusively the Greek-Turkish confrontation. For instance, in Cilicia, local Turkish and Armenian communities were seeking to prove their superiority in the region, by using demographic and historical arguments. An anonymous pamphlet called "A Summary of the History of the Vilayet of Adana"

⁴¹⁶ *Η Ελληνικότης των...*, p. 138 and 84-5; also Kontogiannis, *Η Γεωγραφία της...*, p. 57.

⁴¹⁷ Zervos, p. 10.

⁴¹⁸ "Toutes les convoitises grecques qui sont de nature à entraver notre vie nationale et à nous réduire à un esclavage politique et économique sont inspirées de la pompeuse devise panhellénique: '*I megalí idea*'. Dans l'ivresse que suscite la réalisation de leur programme impérialiste, les panhellènes poussent leur inconscience jusqu'à prétendre à prouver que 'les turcs ne sont que des Grecs

136

(*Adana Vilayetinin Tarihinin Bir Özeti* - 1919) was claiming that the Heteans who settled in Cilicia between the 15th and 20th centuries BC from philological and ethnographic points of view were the ancestors of the present day Turks. Furthermore, Armenians and Greek-Orthodox of the region were Turcophones and their traditions were very similar to the ones of the Turks. Therefore, the people of Cilicia, Muslim or not, had the same origin and they all shared a common culture which was essentially Turkish.⁴¹⁹ According to Gökbilgin, during the elections of 1919, an Armenian newspaper of İstanbul claimed that there existed only 50,000 Turks in Adana in comparison to the 100,000 Armenians. Moreover, there were some 50-60,000 nomadic people in the *vilayet* who were neither Muslim nor Christian and most important they were historically attached to the Armenian culture.⁴²⁰

Turanians and mercenaries

Despite those references to the debate about ethnic origins, it was the case of the Turkish-speaking Anatolian Orthodox Christians that gained further implications. We have already seen that even before the armistice, there were already certain arguments on their Turkishness. Moreover, the political conditions of the period and the foundation of the Orthodox Church led many Turkish authors to concentrate further on the issue. In the lines, which will follow, we are going to focus on the Turkish authors who dealt with the issue and we will discuss the arguments laid down by them in the broader context of the Turkish nationalism.

musulmans' (sic)" *Les Turcs et Les Revendications Greques*, (Paris : Imprimerie A. G. L'Hoir, 1919), p. 15.

⁴¹⁹ Kaplan, "Ortadoğu'ya Tutulan Fransız Aynaları: Ermeni ve Türk Belgelerinde Kilikya", in *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası*, ed. Esra Özyürek, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), pp. 41-4.

⁴²⁰ Gökbilgin, *Milli Mücadele Başlarken* vol. II, (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1965), pp. 82-3.

Obviously one of the most influential studies of the period on the "Christian Turks" was that of Cami Bey⁴²¹. Cami published a series of articles in Smyrna in 1918, concerning the "Christian Turks" of Anatolia. Later, these articles were republished in the Constantinopolitan newspaper *Söz* and in 1922, with some supplementary material, they were published as a book. The book reappeared in 1932 with additions and some revisions.

Cami Bey, like Şemseddin Sami, repeats and stresses the distinction between *Karamanlı* Orthodox Christians and the ones who live in the Balkans or the western coasts of Anatolia. Those who live in the interior speak Turkish, and their Turkish is purer than the one spoken by the Muslim Turks. They pray in Turkish and although they have Christian names, they have preserved their Turkish family names (Çakıroğulları, Çınaroğulları, Aslanoğulları etc.), something that the Muslim Turks have lost.⁴²² Their customs, family lives and manners were the same as those of the Muslim Turks. The patriarchal social organisation of the Muslim Turk peasants, inherited from their nomadic-pastoral past, was common to these Christians.⁴²³

⁴²¹ Abdülkadir Cami Bey (Baykurt) was born in 1877 in İstanbul. He studied in the *Harbiye Mektebi*. In 1908, he was elected as deputy of Fizan. Cami was among the founders of the left wing of the Committee of Union and Progress, "*Hizb-i Terakki*". He was obliged to resign from the Committee because of his disagreement with the leadership. In 1912, he was elected once more deputy of Fizan. He founded the "*Milli Meşrutiyet Fırkası*" but when the party dissolved in a short period, he left politics. After the armistice he organized the *İzmir Müdafı-i Hukuk Cemiyeti* and *Redd-i İlhak Cemiyeti*. He was also among the founders of *Sulh ve Selamet Fırkası* and *Milli Ahrar Fırkası*. He was elected deputy of Aydın in 1919. After the occupation of İstanbul on 16 March 1920 he went to Ankara and joined the Grand National Assembly. For a short time between March and July 1920 he became Minister of Interior. In September 1920, he was sent to Rome as the representative of Ankara. When in 1921 the Ankara Government called him back he refused to obey. After the war he came back to Turkey but stayed away from politics. In 1945, he started writing articles to the socialist journals *Dikmen* and *Görüşler* and also to the oppositional newspaper *Tan*. He published a journal, *Yeni Dünya*, for only five volumes. His attempt also to found the *Türkiye Emekçi Köylü Sosyalist Partisi* failed. Cami Bey died on 4 November 1949 in İstanbul. *Türk Parlamento Tarihi Milli Mücadele ve TBMM I. Dönem 1919-1923*, vol. III, Fahri Çoker (ed.), (Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1995), pp.127-9.

⁴²² For the Greek side these names were the remnants of a long and violent occupation. For example, in the centenary of Nevşehir, quoted before, it is said with gratitude that these names that were remnants of the captivity are going to disappear and in Nevşehir at least these names do not appear anymore. *Nevşehir Mekteplerinin...*, p. 121.

According always to Cami, the only thing in which *Karamanlı* differed from their Muslim compatriots was their religion. For him, the thesis claiming that these people were Greek in origin but had lost their mother tongue because of the Turkish yoke was groundless. This argument was not reliable since in other regions, which have also been conquered by the Turks, including for example Morea, the Greeks were for centuries under Turkish sovereignty but retained their language.⁴²⁴

Cami underlines the difference between Greek and *Rum*; the *Karamanlı* were called *Rum* (i.e. Byzantine) and not Greek. According to him, it is misleading to regard every *Rum* as Greek, since *Rum* is not a national term but a religious one. The Byzantine Empire, like the Ottoman one, was not based on national or racial terms. In the same way that such a thing as the Ottoman race did not exist, a Byzantine or a *Rum* race or nationality did not exist either. In both empires, the political unity between the various people from different ethnic background was achieved in religious and not national terms. The comparison between the Byzantines and the Ottomans was important for Cami, since it was this factor of religious affiliation that determined the social and political position of different populations. Both empires did not seek to assimilate different ethnic groups and the latter did manage to maintain their language and their specific cultural identity. Cami stressed that the Turks, not only in the Byzantine Empire, but everywhere have maintained their language. The fact that historical and strong languages such as Greek and Arabic had not assimilated the Turkish language was a proof of its strength. This fact is also evident in the case of the Christian Turks of Anatolia.⁴²⁵

⁴²³ Cami refers to a Christian from Alaşehir who informed him that in their community they bring up horses and that they play horse games and *cirit*.

⁴²⁴ Cami, *Osmanlı Ülkesinde Hristiyan Türkler*, İstanbul: Sanayiinefise Matbaası, 1932, pp. 5-9.

⁴²⁵ *ibid*, pp. 9-15.

It is important for Cami that the Turkish states have always been based on national and not religious association. Therefore, religious differences among Turks were a secondary factor in shaping collective self-awareness. He gives the example of the Hazars, in which Jewish, Christian and Muslim Turks were united by their common national conscience (*millî vicdan*). Turks have always been tolerant regarding religious affairs and they have been cautious not to mix religion with administration and public affairs. Thus, people with different beliefs could freely take place in the administration. This was also true of the Ottomans, at least at the beginning. The fact that there were many Christians in the Ottoman Empire fighting against the Byzantines is a clear indication of this. For instance, Köse Mihâl was not of Greek origin but was a Christian Turk and only this explains his affiliation to the Ottomans. It was only later that the Ottomans appropriated the Byzantine and Arabic concepts of administration and that religious unity became the base of the political system of the empire. Then the Christian Turks had then been excluded from the state administration and alienated from the "national family". They were excluded from the administration and the army and were put under the supervision of the Orthodox Patriarchate. Under these conditions, it was almost natural that these people would lose gradually their national consciousness and eventually become hostile towards their Muslim conational. The Greek propaganda of the Orthodox clergy was decisive in this process. However, the enormous efforts made by the "Panhellenistic" propaganda did not meet with much success. The infiltration of the Greek language by the church and then by the schools met with the resistance of the "racial character" of the Christian Turks. Thus, despite this vast propaganda, the Turkish language remained the mother tongue of these people. Only those who lived in the urban centres, like İstanbul and İzmir, where the Christian Turks were merged with the local

Greeks adopted Greek. Marriages with Greeks, and the effort to gain a proper place in the Orthodox community forced these people to become Hellenised. This Hellenisation was all the more important since in the Greek communities of the urban centres being a *Karamanlı* meant to be peasant. They even changed their Turkish names and appropriated Greek ones. Thus "Yağcıoğlu became Ladopulos, Çakıroğulları became Galanakis, Boyacıoğlu became Vafiadis, and Çınaroğulları became Platanidis. There were also some who half-translated their names, like Aslanidis." In contrast, in Anatolia the Christian Turks did not merge with the Greeks and retained their blood purity and mother tongue.⁴²⁶

Another evidence of the Turkishness of the *Karamanlı* population was their alphabet. In this script no such Greek letters as *delta*, *theta*, *ksi*, *psi* and *omega*, which did not fit in Turkish, exist. Also, letters, which did not exist in Greek but did in Turkish, had been added. These were *b*, *d*, *ş*, *k*, *ö* and *ü*. By putting a dot on the *pi* a *b* was made, a dot on the *sigma* made *ş*, a dot on the *taf* made *d* etc. According to Cami, if these people were really Greeks they would not have felt the need to make these additions to the Greek alphabet. We saw that the Greeks used the same argument regarding the script of the *Karamanlı*, turned upside down. For the Greek authors, this script was a form of the cultural resistance of the Greeks to the Turkish sovereignty. Cami further stated that the claim that the Turkish administration forced these people to forget the Greek language was also false since it was impossible to think that such a militantly nationalistic administration that would prevent every foreign other language, would ever permit to retain a different script.⁴²⁷

In order to explain historically the existence of Christian Turks in Anatolia Cami focused on the Byzantine period. As we have seen for Cami the Byzantine

⁴²⁶ *ibid*, pp. 15-24.

Empire was a mixture of different peoples where Orthodox Christendom had a vital role in securing the social cohesion. Within this mixture of different peoples Turks had an important role. Turkish tribes had invaded and immigrated to Byzantine lands several times and they played a key role in the Byzantine army. According to Cami, the presence of Christian Turks in Anatolia is related to the border defence system of the Byzantine Empire. In the 10th century when Cappadocia and the region of the Euphrates River became a border zone between the Arabs and the Byzantines, the latter settled there Turkish people as peasant warriors (*askerî çiftçi müsta'mirler*) in order to protect this zone. The *Karamanlı* were descendants of these peasant-warriors who accepted Christianity in time.⁴²⁸

İzzet Ulvi published a series of articles regarding the issue in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*. His contribution to the debate is important since his views on the issue were somehow different from those of Cami. We saw that Cami based his theory on the Turkish mercenaries and tribes who had settled in Anatolia during the Byzantine period. However, İzzet Ulvi focused on a more distant past. According to him, it was a pity that many Turks adhered to the foreign theories that the Turkish presence in Anatolia was very recent and that there were only a few real Turks in Anatolia since the rest of the Muslim population consisted of converted Christians. This, for Ulvi, was because the ancient history of Anatolia had been neglected. The Turkish national history was regarded within the narrow borders of Ottoman history. However, according always to Ulvi, the Turkish race was present in Anatolia "since the oldest and unknown times". He quoted Maspero and De Morgan to indicate that the first inhabitants of Anatolia were from the Turanian race and that the Turkish presence in

⁴²⁷ *ibid*, pp. 24-26.

⁴²⁸ *ibid*, pp. 115-23.

Anatolia went back to at least 4,000 years. Ulvi admitted that neither the Seljuks came to Anatolia with a huge population nor did they found a nation there from the converted people. The fact was that the Seljuks took over the administration of the already existing Turkish nation in Anatolia. In fact the Seljuks were not the first Turkish sovereign in Anatolia. The Hittites⁴²⁹, *Urartu*, *Kumans* and *Kumuks* were other Turkish governments in the history of Anatolia. Ulvi also underlined that the Greek and Armenian presence in Anatolia was relatively new. The Greeks had arrived in Anatolia 3,500 years ago, at a time when the Hittites were weak and they built colonies on the western coasts. In times when the Turanian people had started losing their power, the Greeks continued to attack and invade Anatolia. They also converted the autochthonous Turanian people to their religion. The Armenians did the same. However, the Turks of Anatolia, although forced to change their religion and respect the conqueror's faith, did retain their national language.

What is interesting in this argument is to see how historical arguments were used by both sides. We have seen that the Greek historical narrative on Asia Minor also rested on the assumption that a conquest made the autochthonous people to lose their language and be assimilated to some extent by the conquerors. In this version however, the conquerors were the Turks while the Greeks were those who had been defeated but they had retained their religion as an indication of their nationality. İzzet Ulvi in order to prove the authenticity of the Turkish existence in Anatolia uses the

⁴²⁹ The Hittites would become the favourite "ancestor" of the Turkish historiography of the 1930's. The curiosity about the Hittites had started from the early 20th century. The excavation of the Deutsch-Orient Gesellschaft in Boğazköy had begun in 1906. However, the language of the Hittites would remain unknown to such a degree so as not to be possible to classify it. The Turkish historiography would take advantage of this blank space and would claim that the Hittites were Turks who had immigrated to Anatolia. This was a real blessing for the Turkish historiography, since it made possible to prove the existence of the Turkish people in Anatolia from the very early ages. See Copeaux, *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk İslam Sentezine*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998), pp. 31-2.

argument of conquest and turns it upside down by identifying the Turks as the conquered ones and the Greeks and the Armenians as the conquerors.⁴³⁰

In an article about the Pontos issue, İzzet Ulvi referred again to the ancient presence of the Turks in Anatolia. For him, the historical rights of the Turks in Pontos were not restricted to those of the conquest. The Pontos was essentially Turkish; Mehmed II did not conquer a Greek land but took back a Turkish one. Ulvi stressed once again that the ancient people of Anatolia were the Turanians. The Turks in Pontos came from the *Bozok* branch of the proto-Uygurs. The Greeks built colonies later in the region and only in the Roman period they settled in the interior and assimilated the Turks who accepted Orthodox Christianity. But this was not a smooth evolutionary process since the Turks did resist to Greek-Roman sovereignty. Ulvi also expressed that the original name of the region was *Hunit* deriving from the Huns and that later it had been translated by the Greeks as *Ponit – Pontos*.⁴³¹

İzzet Ulvi also made use of physiognomic criteria. A Karaman Turk's body with large bones and huge shoulders, his face with thick black eyebrows, a thick moustache and calm attitude had no difference from an Oghuz or Turkmen. The difference between a *Karamanlı* and a clamorous and charlatan real *Rum*, was apparent.⁴³²

For İzzet Ulvi, the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians was not only a matter of racial origin. He sought to lay down proofs from their social character, spirit and culture. According to the information he provided, his belief that the Anatolian Christians were Turks was a result of his ethnological (*halkiyat*) researches in

⁴³⁰ İzzet Ulvi, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler I", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 18 Teşrinisani 1921. İzzet Ulvi also claimed that the Christian Turks asked to the Byzantine emperor to let them pray in Turkish and the emperor accepted and thus they gained a somehow cultural autonomy.

⁴³¹ İzzet Ulvi, "Türk Tarihinde Pontus", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 18 January 1338/1922

Anatolia nine or ten years earlier. The many similarities between the Christians and the Muslims that he had observed persuaded him that they had both the same origins. The influence of the environment was not enough, according to İzzet Ulvi, to explain this sameness, since the Christians' faces, bodies, tastes, traditions, foods, the forms of their thoughts, assumptions and convictions were identical with those of the Muslims. İzzet Ulvi also underlined the importance of the language. He stressed that the Anatolian Christians do not only speak Turkish but at the same time they cannot speak any Greek. Those few, who could speak it, did so very badly and did not enjoy it. İzzet Ulvi underlined that although the Turkish-speaking Christians were according to their traditions, life style, spirit and character Turks, they were not aware of it. The Christians of Anatolia had retained their nationality with their language, thus they had remained loyal to their Turkishness unconsciously. Ulvi also cited examples from the Christian popular poets and folk singers. In accordance with the assumption that the popular art and the oral tradition represented the spirit of the nation, these examples were further proofs of the Turkishness of the Christians.⁴³³

In fact, the arguments of İzzet Ulvi on the ancientness of Turkish presence in Anatolia were in absolute conformity with the Turkish Historical Thesis (*Türk Tarih Tezi*) of the 1930's, which had as principal aim to demonstrate that Turkish presence in Anatolia was very old and that the Turks were a historical nation with a great civilization that had played a decisive role in the making of world history.⁴³⁴ We can claim that İzzet Ulvi's articles were an early instance of this theory. At the same period, Ziya Gökalp also in *Yeni Mecmua*, reckoned the Hittites, the Sumerians and

⁴³² İzzet Ulvi, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler I", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 18 Teşrinisani 1921.

⁴³³ İzzet Ulvi, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler II-III", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 12 December 1921 and 5 January 1922.

the Scythians among the ancient Turks; although sometimes he admitted that the Turkishness of these peoples lacked proper proof.⁴³⁵ Similar views appeared during the Greek –Turkish war in a book called *Pontus Meselesi*, which was published by the General Directorship of Press (*Matbuat Müdüriyet-i Umumiyesi*) in Ankara in 1922.⁴³⁶ The book begins with the statement that Greece is deceiving the world public opinion by claiming that certain places of Anatolia are historically Greek and thus seeks to legitimate its assault on Turkey. However, the book, whose author is not named, states that Anatolia was Turkish from the ancient times. The assumption that dates the Turkish presence in Anatolia from the time of the Seljuks is misleading. The first residents of the region, namely the Hittites and the Sumerians were Turanians and the Greek and Armenian presence in Anatolia is relatively recent. Although many states have been established in Anatolia, the people of it essentially remained the same. The book repeats the assumption that contrary to the Greeks of the western coast and the Armenians in regions like Van and Bitlis, the Anatolian Christians are of Turkish origin. They descend from the ancient Turks who have been the first to settle in Anatolia.⁴³⁷

We find similar views in *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* where it was underlined that the Turkish settlement in Anatolia was older than other nationalities, and that in fact the Turanians, i.e. the Turks, were the autochthonous population of

⁴³⁴ See Copeaux, p. 32-53; also Aydın, *Modernleşme ve Milliyetçilik*, (Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları, 1993), pp. 227-33.

⁴³⁵ Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: Luzac & Company Ltd. and The Harvill Press Ltd., 1950), pp. 112-3.

⁴³⁶ Tunçay, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek-Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması (1923-1931)*, (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1981), p. 300; also Aydın, p. 229.

⁴³⁷ *Pontus Meselesi*, Yılmaz Kurt (ed.), TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, Ankara 1995, p. 3-12. *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası* in its 12th, 13th, and 14th issues published a chapter of the book on the life of the Christians under Turkish administration, which stressed the tolerant governance of the Turks towards the non-Muslims. "Türk İdaresinde Hristiyanlar", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 11 November 1922 – 30 November 1922 – 7 January 1923.

Anatolia. The Turkish Orthodox residents of Anatolia were descendants of these ancient Turks. So the Anatolian Christians had nothing to do with minority rights or with the population exchange.⁴³⁸

The assumption that the Turkish presence in Anatolia goes back to ancient times was represented in other propaganda documents of the era. For instance in the pamphlet which was published by the *Association Nationale Ottomane Pour la Société des Nations* in 1922, we find a reference to two western scholars' work (the first one is Edmond About, the second's name is missing), which are against the Greek thesis that the Greeks are the autochthonous people of Asia Minor. The reference to About claimed that when the Seljuks came in Asia Minor they found there a heterogeneous population in which there were also Orthodox Turks who had been serving the Byzantine Empire as mercenaries. The other anonymous quotation demonstrates that the autochthonous population of Anatolia had mostly Asiatic origins. Although this people became "politically" Greeks and later Romans, they retained their character and morphology. Thus, when the Turks came to Anatolia they actually found their race brothers and many among those who are claimed to be Greeks have in fact Asiatic and Turkish blood.⁴³⁹

Among those who wrote on the issue was also Köprülüzade Mehmet Fuat.⁴⁴⁰ Mehmed Fuad asks whether the *Karamanlı* Christians were Turkified Greeks who had forgotten their mother tongue or racial Turks who had been assimilated by the Greeks. He admitted that it was yet impossible to say something definite on the issue, since

⁴³⁸ "Anadolu Türktür", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 7 January 1923.

⁴³⁹ "Je crois tout à fait qu'une partie de ces euvahisseurs ont retrouvé, dans la plupart des habitants qui peuplaient les colonies grecques de l'Asie antérieure, des frères de race. (...) La Grèce n'aura donc pas lieu de s'étonner si dans les veines de ses ressortissants, il coule une forte proportion de sang asiatique, de sang turc." *Aide-Mémoire sur les Droits des Minorités en Turquie Présenté aux Représants des Membres de la Société des Nations*, *Association Nationale Ottomane Pour La Société Des Nations*, Constantinople 1922, pp. 24-6.

⁴⁴⁰ Köprülüzade Mehmet Fuat, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler", *İkdam*, 19 June 1338/1922.

there was not enough ethnographic and historical research and that the research that already had done was dogmatic and politically biased. The claim that these people were Greeks who had forgotten their language was groundless since, first of all the Greek language was not a primitive one that could be easily forgotten. In fact, since they were ecclesiastically tied to the Patriarchate in İstanbul, the Anatolian Christians had been subjected to Greek propaganda. They were forced to learn Greek and to attend Greek schools. However, despite all this efforts made by the Patriarchate, the most active instrument of Greek propaganda, the Orthodox of Anatolia did not abandon Turkish for Greek. Secondly, although they were a minority among the Muslims, the Turkish-speaking Christians of Anatolia were so densely populated that they were able to retain their own language. Köprülü also repeats the argument that the Turks had never forced the people they subjected to quit their language. If this were the case, there would be no Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians in the whole region of Anatolia and of the Balkan Peninsula. All these, according always to Mehmet Fuat, shows that the Turkish-speaking Anatolian Orthodox were not Greek.

Köprülüzade disregards the argument that the *Karamanlı* came from the Seljuks and became Christians after their arrival in Anatolia. According to him, it is impossible to admit that the Seljuks adopted the religion of the people they defeated. Although Byzantium and Christianity as a religion indeed influenced the Seljuks, such a massive conversion never took place. According to Köprülüzade, these people descended from the Christian Turks, who were among the Oghuz Turks who invaded Anatolia. He uses examples from Ebureyhan Birunî and some other Arab authors to demonstrate that among the Oghuz Turks there were many Christians. When the tribes of Oghuz Turks invaded Anatolia they found there settled Christian Turks. These were from the Kumans, Pecheneks and Uz who had served the Byzantine

Empire. The Turkish warriors who were in the army of Romanos Diogenes are an indication of the existence of Christian Turks in Byzantium. Thus, for Köprülüzade, the Turcophone Anatolian Orthodox Christians had two origins: one part came from the Christian Turks (*Kuman*, *Pechenek* and *Uz*) who were already in Byzantium and another one derived from the Christian Turks who were among the Seljuks. In that way and although Köprülüzade uses the argument of Cami that there were already Christian Turks in Anatolia when the Seljuks arrived, he also underlines the existence of Christians among the Seljuks.

However, Köprülüzade is very doubtful whether the Anatolian Christians regard themselves as Turks. Although he seems to trust the scientific evidence provided at least for the moment he writes, which demonstrates that the Turcophone Anatolian Christians belong to the Turkish race, whether these people would *feel* as Turks or not remained a questionable fact.

As we examined in the first chapter, in contrast to Köprülüzade Mehmet Fuat, Ahmed Emin was sure that the movement of the Turkish Orthodox was genuine. Emin pointed that the Christians of Anatolia belonged to the Turkish culture (*hars*) and were nothing else but Turks. According to him, from a linguistic point of view, the Turkishness of these people was beyond any doubt. Never before in the eastern world did a change of the language of a certain community take place to such a degree. Moreover, the Turkish of the Christians bore no sign of influence of either Greek or any other language. From this point of view, the Turkish spoken by the Christians of Anatolia was purer and older even than the Turkish of Muslim Turks, whose language have influences from Arabic and Persian. Clear indications of this were the poems of Christian folk poets.⁴⁴¹ It is interesting that both Greek and Turkish

⁴⁴¹ Ahmed Emin, "Anadolu Ortodoksları", *Vakit*, 22 February 1338/1922.

authors regarded the Anatolian Christians as their true and authentic co-nationals. On the one hand, for the Greeks, the Greek dialects of the interior of Asia Minor were seen as purer forms of medieval and ancient Greek. On the other, for the Turks the Turkish spoken by the Anatolian Christians was also pure from the point of view that it remained intact from Arabic or Persian influences.

Ahmed Cevdet Bey reproduced Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad, in claiming that the Anatolian Christians were descendants of both the Christian Turks who were already in Anatolia when the Seljuks came and the Turks who had accepted Christianity in Central Asia. Since the Turks never showed religious fanaticism, the Christian and Muslim Turks had lived in absolute harmony for centuries. It was foreign diplomacy and intervention, that had created tensions between Christians and Muslims in Anatolia. Ahmed Cevdet also blamed the authorities for not being interested in the Christian Turks and for leaving them of the mercy of foreign propaganda. For instance, instead of letting Greek teachers and doctors propagate Greek ideals to the Christians of Anatolia, they could have acted so as to raise teachers and doctors among the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia.⁴⁴²

In the newspaper of the Society for the Defence of the Rights of the Vilayet of Trabzon (*Trabzon Vilayeti Müdafa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti*), *İstikbal*, there appeared also some articles claiming that no Greek or minority problem existed in the vilayet of Trabzon. The local "Greeks" were Turks who had become Christians. There appeared also some letters from local Christians addressed to Ankara claiming that they had Turkish origins and declaring their loyalty to the government.⁴⁴³ For example, the paper on the 8th of December 1921, published a telegram signed by Papa Nikola in the

⁴⁴² Ahmed Cevdet, "Anadolu'da Ortodoks Patrikliği", *İkdam*, 21 May 1338/1922, no. 8688.

⁴⁴³ See Yüst, *Kemalist Anadolu Basını*, Orhan Koloğlu (ed.), (Ankara: ÇGD Yayınları, 1995), p. 48.

name of the Orthodox of Çorum. The telegram claimed that the Orthodox of Anatolia were from the Turanian people who had settled in the region thousands years ago.⁴⁴⁴

In *Açıksöz*, which was published in Kastamonu, İsmail Habib (Sevük) dealt with the issue in a series of articles (*Rumluk Meselesi*) in which he questioned the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians. İsmail Habib like his predecessors, points out that there are two different *Rumluk*, that of the coast and that of the interior (*sahildeki Rumlar – dahilî Rumlar*). For him, this difference is apparent in their respective social characteristics. Those who live in the coastal areas were akin to Greeks, whereas the ones who live in the interior of Anatolia were more eastern (*Şarklı*) and therefore similar to Turks. However, İsmail Habib is cautious in admitting "Efîm's thesis", that this difference of character was also a difference of nationality, that the *Rums* of the interior were pure Turks. For İsmail Habib, to have the same language or the same traditions is not enough and is not the only determinant of being a Turk. Turkishness is not an issue of race, it is an issue of nation, and for that reason loyalty to the nation is more important than, for example, a common language. Thus the actual difference between those two *Rumluk* is not between the "Rums of the Phanar" and the "Turkish Rums"; but of "Phanarist Rums" and "Turkist Rums".⁴⁴⁵

İsmail Habib is in the same line as İzzet Ulvi in claiming that the origins of Turkish Christians went back to the prehistoric times. He quotes De Morgan, Guinyes and Maspero to prove that a long time ago in Anatolia, there existed Turks and Turanian peoples like the Hittites, *Kumuks*, *Urartu* and *Kumans*. Therefore, Anatolia was Turkish not only before the Ottomans but also before the Seljuks. He underlines

⁴⁴⁴ Mesut Çapa, *Pontus Meselesi*, (Trabzon : Serander Yayınları, 2001), p. 41.

⁴⁴⁵ İsmail Habib, "İki Nev'i Rumluk", *Açıksöz*, 27 November 1921, no: 345, in İsmail Habib Sevük, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda Yunanlılar ve Anadolu Rumları Üzerine Makaleler*, Mustafa Eski (ed.), (Ankara : Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999), pp. 87-90.

that Anatolia was the old and essential motherland of the Turks and that the Greeks came later to this area. The *Karamanlı*, that is the *Rum* of the interior, were the descendants of these people of Turkish origin. For him, language was not the only proof of their Turkish origin. Their physiognomy and character differed largely from that of the Greeks and that constituted a further proof.

İsmail Habib makes a distinction between race and nation; although he is sure that the *Karamanlı* belonged to the Turkish race, he thinks that they still did not belong to the Turkish nation. The fact is that Turkishness and Islam have become intermixed (*tev'em olmuştur*). The two are deeply interrelated. If not all Muslims are Turks, at least all Turks are Muslims. He cites the examples of Magyars and Bulgars who even if they were Turks had lost their national identity as soon as they accepted Christianity. Many peoples who did not belong to the Turkish race by accepting Islam also became Turk. That is why people like the *Karamanlı* who were racially Turks, remained separate from the national body. Thus, he concludes that the Turkishness of the *Karamanlı* must be considered as mere historical facts. İsmail Habib claims that language, religion and feelings played a more decisive role in forging a nation than race. Those who united in language, religion and national feelings belonged to the Turkish nation. Whoever is Muslim, speaks Turkish, has been raised with Turkish culture, and the same way with the nation in sadness and disaster, is a real Turk. According to him, only if the Christians of Turkish origin developed national conscience would they undermine the religious factor.⁴⁴⁶

Since İsmail Habib does not regard the "Turkish Orthodox Christians" as members of the Turkish nation, he is supporting the idea of supplementing a special

⁴⁴⁶ İsmail Habib, "*Dahili Rumlar Irk ile Milliyetin Farkı*", *Açıksöz*, 30 November 1921, no. 348, *ibid*, pp. 96-101.

minority law (*ekalliyet hukuku*), despite Eftim's statements that the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia did not want such a practice.⁴⁴⁷ İsmail Habib also deals with the issue of the foundation of the Turkish Patriarchate. According to him, this Patriarchate should deal only with the Anatolian Christians and have no ties with the Greeks. It must also remain aloof from politics. And most importantly, the Anatolian Christians and their church must cut off any connection with Greece.⁴⁴⁸ İsmail Habib's articles are of great significance, since he openly stated that the argument about the ethnic origins of the Christians of Anatolia was not adequate for him to conclude that these people were a part of the Turkish nation. We can say that İsmail Habib, like Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad, is in conformity with Gökalp's definition of nation, which promotes common culture and feelings, rather than common racial background.⁴⁴⁹ Moreover for Habib, Islam and Turkishness were in no way contradictory but two entities that complemented each other.⁴⁵⁰

The thesis on the origins of Anatolian Christians was also echoed in a series of essays on the social geography of Turkey (*Türkiye'nin Sıhî ve İctimaî Coğrafyası*) published by the Ministry of Health and Social Care (*Sıhhiye ve İctimaî Muavenet Vekaleti*). For instance, in the study on Niğde which was written by Dr. Mehmet Hayri, (*Türkiye'nin Sıhî ve İctimaî Coğrafyası Niğde Sancağı, Ankara 1922*), it is underlined that the local Orthodox did not know any Greek. Only those who have travelled to the coastal regions and those who have studied in the schools were capable to speak some Greek. That the native language of those people is Turkish,

⁴⁴⁷ İsmail Habib, "Anadolu Patrikliği", Açıksöz, 3 December 1921, no. 350. *ibid*, pp. 102-6.

⁴⁴⁸ İsmail Habib, "Yunan Unutulmalıdır", Açıksöz, 4 December 1921, no. 351, *ibid*, pp. 107-12.

⁴⁴⁹ İsmail Habib, "Milliyetin manası", Yeni Gün (probably December 1922), in İsmail Habib, *O Zamanlar 1920-1923*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1937), pp. 206-9.

according to Mehmet Hayri, clearly illustrated that "our Orthodox has no racial relation with *Rumluk* or Greekness (...) those are Turks who before the spread of Islam here, became and remained Christians." For Mehmet Hayri, the assumption that the Turks forced the local Greeks to forget their language is false. Since, to change a nation's language, religion must also be changed. As their religion remained, their language also remained intact. He also explains that no minority has ever been forced to change its language by the Turks. He condemns the Greek propaganda made by the priests, teachers and doctors sent by Greece. That the native language of the Christians is Turkish and that the Greek spread only with Greek propaganda of the last years is a common theme of many other surveys (Kayseri, Ankara, Zonguldak, Kırşehir etc.) Furthermore, it is underlined that, despite many efforts undertaken by Greece, the propaganda campaign in fact was a failure.⁴⁵¹

Ali Kemal, the ardent opponent of the nationalists, wrote on the issue on February 26 and 28, 1922 in *Peyam-ı Sabah*. For him to claim that the Anadolu *Rums* were Orthodox Turks was another indication that the nationalists were not serious in public affairs, just like their predecessors the Unionists. In replying a letter about the existence of Christian Turks in Anatolia, he stated that those who were separated by religion could not be united in nationality.⁴⁵²

At a conference ("*Milliyet Düsturları*") held in *Erkek Muallim Mektebi*, in 1923, Hamdullah Suphi discussed different approaches to the principles of nationality (language, religion etc.) According to him, in the Western political culture, language was regarded as a more important element of nationality (*milliyet unsuru*) than

⁴⁵⁰ "Milletle din yekdiğerini ikmal eden iki camiadır ki, aralarında husus ve umum vardır; her müslüman Türk değilse de her Türk müslümandır: Merkezleri müttehîd ve içiçe konmuş iki daire gibi." İsmail Habib, "Din ve Milliyet", *Yeni Gün* (probably December 1922), *ibid.*, pp. 210-2.

⁴⁵¹ Kars, *Milli Mücadele'de Kayseri*, (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999), pp. 136-41.

religion. In the East however, religion played a preponderant role in defining nationality. The example of the Muslims who were forced to leave Crete because of Greek pressure was an example of this. If, for Hamdullah Suphi, the Cretan Muslims were taxonomized according to their language, they would have been considered as Greeks. Nevertheless, eventually they came to Anatolia because they were Muslims. The Turkish-speaking Christians who eventually settled in Greece is another example.

Hamdullah Suphi remembered that in Antalya, the Turkish-speaking Christian women were dressed exactly in the Anatolian fashion. He also remembered the songs these women sung to their children in Turkish. These songs' language was a pure form of Turkish; he also added that he learned from those Christian women many old Turkish words. For him, these women, according to their language, were Turks, but according to their religion they were *Rum*. In fact the Turcophone Christians of Anatolia were definitely Turks. They had the same customs, the same proverbs, tales, poems, prejudices, the same arts and especially music with the Muslim Turks. Hamdullah Suphi claims that if language was an important indicator of national affiliation as in the Western world, they would not have been deceived by the Greek nationalist propaganda supported by the Church and the Greek schools and all the catastrophes of the recent years would had been avoided. He blames himself and his compatriots for leaving these people in the hands of foreign propaganda.⁴⁵³

In order to give a historical explanation to the existence of Christian Turks in Anatolia Hamdullah Suphi makes use of both the theses of Cami and İzzet Ulvi. On the one hand he states that it is necessary to take into account the older invasions and migrations of the Turks to Anatolia. He remarks that in the Western literature, some

⁴⁵² Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü IV*, (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1996), pp. 296 and 298.

⁴⁵³ Hamdullah Suphi, *Dağ Yolu* (Birinci Kitap), (İstanbul: Türk Ocakları Hars Hey'eti Neşriyatı, 1929), pp. 180-1.

new theories, according to which the first Turkish migration goes back to around 3000 BC, have been presented. He also demonstrates the thesis of Cami, that Turkish tribes served the Byzantines as mercenaries and in time settled in Anatolia and adopted Christianity. This explains the existence of Christian Turkish warriors among the Ottomans, such as Gazi Mihal or Evrenos.

Suphi explains the prevalence of the Turkish language among the Anatolian Christian Turks with the strength of Turkish culture. He compares the Germans with the Turks. These two nations, both of which shaped the history through their migrations and invasions, have an important difference. Whereas the German language could not prevail in the whole area in which the migrations took place, in the Turkish case wherever Turkish people settled they retained their language. This was a proof of the strength of the Turkish language and culture. Turks in their long history adopted many religions, from Buddhism and Confucianism to Christianity and Islam, but in no case did they give up their language. For Hamdullah Suphi, this meant that the Turks protected their national character and never assimilated.⁴⁵⁴

According to Hamdullah Suphi, the Patriarchate played a major role in assimilating the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire. Bulgars, Albanians, Vlahes and Turks were Hellenised by the Orthodox Church organization. The Ottomans were unable to prevent such actions and movements since for them religion was equal to nationality. Thus, what was Turkish according to Western criteria was Greek by Eastern standards. In the Balkan Peninsula the ecclesiastic resistance against the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which were imposing Greek as the liturgical language, constituted one of the first steps in the history of these nationalisms. According to

⁴⁵⁴ *ibid*, pp. 182-7.

him, if these national movements had not challenged Greek superiority, the Patriarchate and the Ottomans would have created a new Byzantine Empire.⁴⁵⁵

Although Hamdullah Suphi is totally convinced about the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians, and even though he interprets it as a mistake to leave these people in the hands first of the Patriarchate and then of Greece, he also accepts that what has been done is done, and that it is unrealistic to regain them. He does not underestimate the fact that religion plays an important role and that language is not the only element in defining nationality. Religion had an equally vital role in shaping national unity. He gives as an example the role of Catholicism in the making of the Spanish national identity. The Polish resisted against the Russians and the Irish against the English based on their religion. Religion also played a major role in shaping the external policies of the states. The Russians pretended to be the protectors of the Orthodox world; the Austrians brought together with the help of Catholicism the Hungarians, the Croats and the Czechs. Therefore, he concludes, nationality and religion, even though they seemed to be contradictory, were actually complementing each other. Afterwards, in explaining the role of language and religion in the shaping of national identity, he proceeded by asking the question "Who is a Turk?"; he offered the answer himself by saying that "One who speaks Turkish, is a Muslim and loves Turkishness is Turk. We expect from him unity in language, unity in religion and unity in wishes."⁴⁵⁶

It seems that Hamdullah Suphi regarded later the expulsion of the *Karamanlı* Christians from Turkey as a mistake. In an interview he made with the British ambassador in İstanbul on the 12th of April 1928, he underlined that the Turcophone

⁴⁵⁵ *ibid*, pp. 188-9.

⁴⁵⁶ *ibid*, pp. 190-4. "Türkçe konuşan, müslüman olan ve Türklük sevgisini taşıyan Türktür. Biz onda dil birliği, din birliği, ve dilek birliği arıyoruz."

Greek Orthodox Christians of Anatolia were "the purest blooded Turkish group in Anatolia" and that they were "uncontaminated by Greek propaganda." Thus, for him, their inclusion into the compulsory population exchange was "a mistake of first magnitude" to which he was "strongly opposed". Turkey had lost "thousands of the best Turkish speaking elements in Anatolia" in return for the Muslims of Crete "who were Greek in everything but religion". However, Suphi admitted that if the Christians had remained in Anatolia they would have constituted "a perpetual target of Greek propaganda".⁴⁵⁷ Hamdullah Suphi in his memoirs recalls a conversation with Celal Bayar on the Christian Turks. Celal Bayar once had explained to him that one thing that made Mustafa Kemal sad was that he had sent thousands of Christian Turks away from Turkey. Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver also claims that he had warned Mustafa Kemal about this mistaken policy and that he had sent him many books on this theme, but that Kemal had insisted on his decision saying that he wanted "absolutely to close this Greek issue."⁴⁵⁸

The "myth" of the Turkish Orthodox

The Greek reaction to the theories regarding the "Turkishness" of the *Karamanlı* population is illustrated in a pamphlet written by Ar. I. Aigidis in 1922. In fact, the pamphlet was based on a conference held in Constantinople, at the Charitable Society of Tatavla (*Filoptohos Adelfotis Tatavlon*) on 6 March 1922.⁴⁵⁹ It seems that the conference attracted some attention and met with success, so that another conference was held in Makrihori (Makriköy). The proceedings of the conference

⁴⁵⁷ Alexandris, "Η Απόπειρα Δημιουργίας...", p. 194.

⁴⁵⁸ Baydar, *Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver ve Anıları*, (İstanbul: 1968), pp. 154-57.

⁴⁵⁹ Aigidis is aware of Cami Bey's book and it seems that the latter constituted the main target of his argument. Aigidis, *Η Ελληνικότης της Μικράς Ασίας και το Μύθευμα των Τουρκορθοδόξων* (The

were printed in Athens under the title "The Greekness of Asia Minor and the Myth of the Turkish Orthodox".

Aigidis reminds that until the time of the Medians Asia Minor was subjected to many invasions and migrations and demographically consisted of a mixture of different ethnic groups. But with the development of Greek colonies along the coastal areas and their gradual penetration into the mainland, the Greek presence and superiority in Asia Minor became clear. Aigidis quoted ancient and contemporary authors (such as Herodotus and Strabon as well as Charles Texier) and he came to two conclusions: a) that the Greekness of Western Asia Minor was undisputable not only in the historical but even in the prehistorical periods, and b) that there were no signs of the presence of Turkish tribes either in prehistoric, or in historic times.⁴⁶⁰

The situation is more complicated, he admits, in the case of the eastern side of the Kızılırmak (*Alios*). This situation confused many Greeks and made them believe some roughly outlined and superficial arguments; perhaps even Papa Eftim was also a victim of those "theories" and not a traitor. The indeed complicated history of the area gave rise to the assumption that the so-called Turkish-speaking Christians are closer to the Turks than to the Greeks. Aigidis underlines that according to this line of thinking, language was the determinant factor. However, for him, the political turmoils of the last decade in the Balkan Peninsula had shown that language, (like religion which for a long time had stopped to be considered as an indicator of nationality) especially in the Orient, was not possible to be a criterion determining

Greekness of Asia Minor and the Myth of the Turkish Orthodox), (Athens: Τύποις Δημητριάδου, 1922), pp. 24-5.

⁴⁶⁰ *ibid*, pp. 11-4.

national identity.⁴⁶¹ For him the safest indicators of nationality were the popular culture and the features of daily life.

It was important to Aigidis that most of the names of the agricultural tools and many terms of the shepherds, even among the Turks in the region were Greek and these names were seen in Hesiodos and Theophrastos. Further proof of the Greekness of these peoples was their customs, proverbs, prejudices, dances –especially the cyclical dance- and their folk songs. He referred to the Cappadocian Greek folk song collection of Georgios Pahtikos who in the prolegomena of this collection explained that even the songs in Turkish, Armenian and Arabic were, from the viewpoint of their meaning and symbolism, purely Greek and reflected the Greek soul.⁴⁶²

In fact Aigidis' pamphlet was a repetition of the "cultural Hellenisation" thesis that we have already examined. For him, even though in ancient times Cappadocia had been ethnically and linguistically mixed, the predominance of Greek culture and language after Alexander the Great i.e. from the 4th century B.C had changed the landscape. Those many communities in central Asia Minor who have retained their native tongue were the remnants of this cultural Hellenisation.

For the dominance of the Turkish language he quoted Ioakim Valavanis who referred to the tradition that the Turkish yoke cut off the tongues ("*glossektomi*") of the Greeks and for that reason, their children lost the opportunity to learn the language of their ancestors and were forced to adopt Turkish. Aigidis claimed that this story was widely known among the Turkish-speaking Greeks of Anatolia and that even this popularity alone was a proof of its truth.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶¹ *ibid.*, pp. 14-5.

⁴⁶² *ibid.*, pp. 17-24.

⁴⁶³ *ibid.*, pp. 26. The Cappadocian Emmanuil Tsalikoglou, writing in 1958, underlines also how widespread was this belief. This indicates for him that there was a historical truth beyond this belief.

Aigidis underlined that the Turkish invasions had had disastrous effects on Asia Minor and for him the fact that the Greek civilization continued to exist despite these atrocities, turmoils the tyranny was an indication of the resilience of Greek culture; it also confirmed the fact that Greeks were deeply rooted in Anatolian soil. Another sign of the vitality of Greek culture in Asia Minor was the 1,800 churches and 1,400 schools with 60,000 students of the one million Greeks of Pontos and Cappadocia who cohabited with the Turkish Muslim population, without any state support. The comparison with the Turkish uneducated population alone, which lived in full ignorance, was enough proof to reject the absurd Turkish historical and ethnological theories. Aigidis was absolutely sure that Greeks would not subscribe to these theories. Even the Europeans or the Americans, despite their pragmatic, egoist and self-seeking character were not going to seriously consider these absurdities.

Indeed, many western observers disregarded the theories concerning the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians. According to Douglas, from the *Christian East*, it may have been true that, in the Byzantine period some Turkish mercenaries had embraced Christianity and settled down. "But such cases can only have been small drops in a big bucket. The grim fact is that when the Moslem Turk began to stamp with his foot upon the life of Asia Minor, it was altogether Byzantine 'Roman' -i.e., Greek- in national consciousness, and Orthodox in religion. (...But) the great majority of the people of Asia Minor succumbed to inexorable, unbearable oppression, apostized to Islam, were denationalised, and became Turks. Incidentally, that is why to 'camouflage' themselves the relatively few who were true to the reproach of the Cross in their ignorance and misery forgot the Greek tongue, and their

Also, he stated that as the Turks in the republican era were forcing the Greeks of Constantinople to adopt Turkish it could be very possible that their ancestors had done the same. Emmanuil I. Tsalikoglou, *Avtoviographia kai Istorikai Anamnesis Meros B'*, KMS manuscript 184, Kilikia 3B, p. 418.

scant remnant to-day speak Turkish. That is why all over the full area of that sad land you will find villages where the folk are called Turks and Moslems in public, but in secret assure themselves that they are Christians and Greeks. Only in Smyrna, Giaour Smyrna, and in Ionia and Pontus was the Christian and Greek tradition strong enough to remain dominant. The indisputable fact is not that the Greek Orthodox of Asia Minor are Turks by race, but that the large majority of Turks are Greeks."⁴⁶⁴

For Toynbee, the "myth" that the Turcophone Christians of Anatolia descended from Turkish tribes who had emigrated to Asia Minor earlier than the Seljuks was arbitrary. "The Turkish origin of these Turkish-speaking Christians in Anatolia is betrayed by the identity of the name 'Rum' by which they are known in Turkish, with that of 'Romyi' (Romaioi, or East Romans), which the Greek-speaking Christians of Constantinople and Athens still apply to themselves in their everyday vernacular. The transitional stage -half-way from Greek to Turkish - through which the language of the Cappadocian 'Rum' is passing at present illustrates the process by which others, like the Karamanly, have become entirely Turkish-speaking."⁴⁶⁵ However, Toynbee believed that historical truth would not be so much important if Papa Eftim "make his flock believe, to the legend. In politics, what Plato calls 'Noble Lies' are often beneficial, and this one could be grafted on to the Tree of Knowledge so as almost to counterfeit the nature."⁴⁶⁶

⁴⁶⁴ Douglas, "The Turkish National Churches", *The Christian East*, vol III no 3, October 1922.

⁴⁶⁵ However, for Toynbee, there were "real" Christian Turks living in the Balkan Peninsula. These are the Gagauz Orthodox Christians of Dobruja and Eastern Thrace. But the Gagauz unlike the Anatolian Orthodox not only are Turcophone but they also preserve their Turkish tribal name. Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*, (New York: 1970), p. 194.

⁴⁶⁶ *ibid*, p. 194.

The millet of the Ottoman Muslims and the Christian Turks

We saw that although Hamdullah Suphi, İsmail Habip and Köprülüzade Fuad recognized the racial Turkishness of the Christian Turks; they excluded them from the Turkish nation, which was defined not in racial but in cultural terms. Their assumption on nationality echoes the definition of the Turkish nation as expressed by Ziya Gökalp. Gökalp, who was probably the most influential intellectual figure of the era, opposed the racial and ethnic definitions of the nation. According to him, race had nothing to do with social characteristics and therefore could not be regarded as a determining factor of one's nationality. Gökalp rejected the assumption that a nation was based on ethnic purity. Since social qualities and characteristics were acquired by a process of acculturation, the definition of the nation should be based on unity/partnership in culture, manners and feelings. "Nation is not a racial, ethnic, geographical, political, or voluntary group or association. Nation is a group composed of men and women who have gone through the same education, who have received the same acquisitions in language, religion, morality, aesthetics."⁴⁶⁷ For Ziya Gökalp the essential factor in determining one's nationality was his/her culture (*hars*), in which religion as an ethical-normative system had a key role. For him the important thing was not theology, but the social function of religion, namely providing unity and solidarity within society.⁴⁶⁸ In this Gökalp was not alone, since the role of religion in providing social unity and cohesion was accepted by almost all Turkist intellectuals of the period such as Gaspıralı İsmail, Ahmet Ağaoğlu and Yusuf Akçura.⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁷ Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990), p. 22; the translation is from Lewis, p. 317.

⁴⁶⁸ Taha Parla, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999), pp. 72-80.

There was a close relationship between religious and linguistic affiliation in Gökalp's thesis. Language, according to him, was the carrier and transmitter of culture. Those who spoke the same language shared the same consciousness, feelings and aspirations. For him, the common tie of language naturally led people to acquire a common belief system. "Individuals thus sharing common and homogeneous sentiments are also naturally prone to profess the same faith. (...) Historical events show that peoples of the same language groups do tend to embrace the same faith. Thus, the Latins have been inclined to Roman Catholicism, the Germanic peoples to Protestantism, and the Slavonic peoples to Eastern Orthodoxy. Of the Ural-Altai group, the Mongols adopted Buddhism, the Manchurians Confucianism, and the Finno-Ugrians Christianity. Various sections of the Turks, in the beginning, had accepted Buddhism, Manichaeism, Judaism, and Christianity; but with the conversion of the majority to Islam, all became Muslims with the exception of the Shamanist Yakuts."⁴⁷⁰

It seems that Gökalp disregarded altogether the possibility of the existence of Christian Turks in Anatolia. For him being a Muslim was among the preconditions of becoming a Turk. The Turks who were non-Muslims were prone eventually to lose their national identity. The Shamanist Yakuts for him, would either embrace Islam and remain Turks or would accept Christianity and be Russified. "As language plays a part in deciding religious affiliation, so religion plays a part in determining membership in a nationality. The Protestant French became Germanised when they were expelled from France and settled in Germany. The Turkish aristocracy of the old

⁴⁶⁹ Zürcher, "Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* vol. 2 *Kemalizm* (ed. Ahmet İnsel), (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 47.

⁴⁷⁰ Gökalp, *Türkleşmek İslamlaşmak...*, p. 51; the translation is from Berkes (ed.), *Ziya Gökalp, Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1959), p. 80.

Bulgars became slavized following their conversion to Christianity. And today, the non-Turkish Muslims migrating to Turkey in a scattered way are becoming turkified because of their religious affiliation."⁴⁷¹ The cultural/social nationalism of Gökâlp was based on a Turkish-Muslim identity that enabled different Muslim groups (Albanians, Bosnians, Kurds, Circassians etc.) to be included *a priori* into the Turkish nation.⁴⁷² For Gökâlp, the ancestors of those who had immigrated to Turkey from Albania, Arabia etc., who had grown up with the Turkish language and had appropriated the Turkish ideal (*Türk mefkûresi*) ought to be regarded as Turks.⁴⁷³ Therefore, and always according to Gökâlp, the Turkish national identity was open to Muslims from different ethnic origins who would acquire Turkish culture.⁴⁷⁴

It was this *Gökâlpian* definition of national identity that dominated during the National Struggle (*Millî Mücadele*). In fact, concepts such as "Turkishness" or "Turkish nationalism" were absent from the official political discourse of the era. For example, in the declarations of the Congress of Erzurum and Sivas there were no references to the Turkish nation. The declarations referred to the Muslims in terms such as "the Muslim majority" (*ekseriyet-i İslamiye*), "Muslim elements" (*anâsır-ı İslâmiye*), "Ottoman society" (*camia-i Osmaniye*). It was stated that every Muslim citizen was a natural member of the Union for the Defence of the Rights of Anadolu and Rumeli (*Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafâ-i Hukuk Cemiyeti*). The National Pact (*Misak-ı Millî*) also talks about the majority of Ottoman Muslims who consist of

⁴⁷¹ Gökâlp, *türkleşmek İslamlaşmak...*, p. 51; the translation is from Berkes, pp. 80-1.

⁴⁷² Tanıl Bora, "Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik ve Azınlıklar", *Birikim* vol. 71-2, March-April 1995, pp. 36-7.

⁴⁷³ Ziya Gökâlp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, pp. 17-23.

⁴⁷⁴ "The Pomaks (Bulgarian Muslims) now speaking Bulgarian and the Cretan Muslims now speaking Bulgarian and the Cretan Muslims now speaking Greek may learn Turkish in the future and cease to be Bulgarian- or Greek- speaking peoples. This means that nationality is not determined by language alone but also by religion." Ziya Gökâlp, *Türkleşmek İslamlaşmak...*, p. 47. The translation is from Berkes(ed.), p. 78.

different elements.⁴⁷⁵ In the texts of the Union for the Defence of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia, in the declaration of Amasya, in the laws, circulars and decisions of the Grand Assembly the group that was addressed was the Muslim *millet* of the Ottoman State with the exception of Arabs.⁴⁷⁶ In these texts, terms like Turkishness, the Turkish nation, and Turkish nationalism were never used and the national community was described in religious terms.

Moreover, there was a consensus that this Muslim majority was not monolithic and homogeneous and that it consisted of different elements that were bound together with ties of "brotherhood", "mutual respect and self-sacrifice" and "partnership in happiness and in disaster". It was also underlined that these elements would respect each other's racial and social rights (*hukuk-u ırkıye ve içtimaîye*) and the conditions of their environment (*şerait-i muhitiye*). Even when the concept of "Turk" was used, it meant the Muslim population of Anatolia and the ethnological, linguistic and historical meaning of the term was disregarded. Thus, we can say that the identity of the nation was based on an ethnic pluralism defined on religious unity. According to Ahmet Yıldız, all concepts of the period related to the notions of "nation" and "nationalism" (*millî mücadele, millî hareket, kuva-yı millîye, hakimiyet-i millîye*) were two faced thanks to the meaning of the word "millî", which could mean both "religious" and "national".⁴⁷⁷ Moreover, during this period Mustafa Kemal and his companions used a religious terminology.⁴⁷⁸ Examples like the law for the prohibition

⁴⁷⁵ Ergun Özbudun, "Millî Mücadele ve Cumhuriyetin Resmî Belgelerinde Yurttaşlık ve Kimlik Sorunu", in *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi ve Kimlik* (ed. Nuri Bilgin), Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul 1997, pp. 63-4.

⁴⁷⁶ Sevan Nişanyan, "Kemalist Düşücede Türk Milleti Kavramı", *Türkiye Günlüğü*, vol. 33, March-April 1995.

⁴⁷⁷ Yıldız, "Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene" *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919-1938)*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 191; see also Feroz Ahmad, *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*, (İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, 1995), p. 73.

of alcohol drinkings (*men-i müskirat*), shows that the state oriented secular trend of the late Ottoman period was interrupted during this period.⁴⁷⁹ There was no non-Muslim deputy in the Grand Assembly and this was also a departure from the tradition of the Tanzimat period.

The use of a religious terminology in defining national unity was aimed to mobilizing the people since for the majority of the Muslim population the dominant factor in determining collective self-awareness was religion. Another point was to bring together different ethnic groups. The only way for guaranteeing the support of the Kurds, Circassians etc. and of the conservatives was to underline the common ties, i.e. Islam. The use of a religious based terminology made possible the coalition of different ethnic groups under the banner of the Muslim/Turkish *millet* against the common enemy. Yıldız calls this coalition policy, "necessary pluralism" (*zoraki çoğulculuk*).⁴⁸⁰

⁴⁷⁸ Mustafa Kemal himself quotes a circular sent out by him on the 21st of April 1920 that "constitutes a document that will show how far we were obliged to adapt ourselves to the sentiments and views prevailing at this time": "On Friday, 23rd April, after prayer, the Grand National Assembly, if od be willing, will be opened. As the duties of the National Assembly will be of a vital description and of the utmost importance (...) as it will be opened on a Friday, the solemn character of this day will be acknowledged by offering solemn prayer, before the opening, in the Hacıbayram Mosque. All the honourable deputies will take part in this prayer, in te course of which the light of the Koran and the call to prayer will be poured forth over all the believers. When the prayer is over, we shall move to the place of meting especially decorated with the sacred flag and the holy relic. Before entering the building, a prayer of thanksgiving will be said and sheep will be sacrificed in thanksgiving. (...) In order to emphasise the sacred character of this day, the reading of the Koran and the Buhari containing the tradition of the Prophet will begin at the chief town in the province under the supervision of the Vali of the Vilâyet, and the last portions will be read for the devotion of the people in front of the building where the Assembly will meet when the Friday prayer is over. In every part of our sacred, suffering country the reading of the Koran and the Buhari will begin from to-day onward, and before Friday before the solemn call to prayer is to be intoned from the minarets. (...) The reading of the Koran being finished at the end of the Friday prayer, sermons will be delivered on the importance and sacred character of the national endeavours which aim at the liberation of the seat of the Caliph and Sultan and every part of our country. (...) We pray God to grant that we may be succésful." ATATÜRK, Mustafa Kemal, *A Speech delivered by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk 1927*, (İstanbul : Ministry of Education Printing Plant, 1963), pp. 374-6.

⁴⁷⁹ Baskın Oran, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme*, (Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 1988), pp. 101-2; also Yıldız, pp. 100-1.

⁴⁸⁰ Yıldız, pp. 98-102; Oran, pp. 98-101; Tanör, *Kurtuluş Üzerine 10 Konferans (Türkiye 1918-1923)*, (İstanbul: Yenigün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1997), p. 50; Özbudun, pp. 65-6.

However, it would be misleading to regard this movement only as a tactic to mobilize the Muslim peasants of Anatolia. In fact, this collective conscience that was based on Islam was inherited from the tensions between the Christians and Muslims of the post-Tanzimat period. Ögün calls this collective conscience, "the syndrome or reflex of the sovereign (*hakim*) *millet*".⁴⁸¹ The Muslim population and intelligentsia of the Empire regarded non-Muslims as among the main causes of the decline and disintegration of the Empire. The Ottoman Muslims during the 19th century felt that they were deteriorating economically and socially while the non-Muslims were improving and overtaking their positions. According to Akçam, this feeling led to an "Islamic racism".⁴⁸² Zürcher also claims that the *müdafa-i hukuk* was the movement of Ottoman Muslims who wanted to remain independent within the structure of the Ottoman Empire. It was between 1923 and 1925 that a radical faction (Turkish nationalist and adherent of a secular state) under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal took over the movement.⁴⁸³

The nationalist discourse of the period was shaped in conformity with the needs of the National Struggle. The National Struggle was based on the coalition of the bureaucrat and military elites with the Muslim traders and landlords. This coalition was formed in opposition to the non-Muslim middle classes. On the one hand, the aim of the bureaucracy was to retain its control and hegemony over the society. On the other hand, the Muslim traders entered in this coalition in order to preserve their newly acquired status and wealth through the elimination of the non-Muslim middle classes. Thus, the leadership of the National Struggle obtained its

⁴⁸¹ Ögün, "Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Hakim Millet Kodunun Dönüşümü", *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi, Kimlik*, Nuri Bilgin (ed.), (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1997), pp. 228-9.

⁴⁸² Akçam, *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Oluşumu ve Ermeni Sorunu*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1992), 57-66.

support from Muslim traders and local notables through the distribution of the material gains obtained by the elimination of the Ottoman Greek and Armenians.⁴⁸⁴

According to Nişanyan, towards the proclamation of the Republic, the name of the Muslim population of the country became definite as "Turkish nation".⁴⁸⁵ But still, the content of the Turkish nation was defined in religious terms and the Turkish nation meant the Muslim population of Anatolia and Rumelia. We saw in the first chapter that the compulsory exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey was in conformity to this religious-based definition of the Turkish nation.

It was after 1924, that the Turkishness acquired a more political-voluntary definition and a secular profile. Everybody who was a Turkish citizen, who accepted the Turkish culture and language and the Kemalist ideal could be characterized and accepted as Turk. In the constitution of 1924 the Turkish citizens are described as the people of Turkey regardless creed and race. In the 1930's, elements based on ethnic affiliation supplemented to this definition. However, the secular ingredient of the Turkish national identity remained intact.⁴⁸⁶ The secular tendency of Kemalist nationalism after 1923-4 was a break with the tradition of Gökâlp, Gaspıralı, Ağaoğlu and Akçura who regarded Islam as an integral part of the national identity and an important factor providing social unity.⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸³ Zürcher, *Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık*, (İstanbul : Bağlam Yayınları, 1995), p. 10.

⁴⁸⁴ Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991), p. 115; Akçam, p. 136.

⁴⁸⁵ Nişanyan, p. 131.

⁴⁸⁶ Yıldız, pp. 124-6.

⁴⁸⁷ Zürcher, *Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı...*, p. 50.

Secularism and non-Muslim Turks: the case of the Gagauz

The shift towards a secular and ethnic based national identity eased the acceptance of the non-Muslim Turks to the national community at least at a conceptual level. If religion had no place in the definition of the national identity, then there was no reason to exclude the Christian Turks from this definition. Moreover the Turkish Historical Thesis that was based on the assertion that the autochthonous people of Anatolia were Turks presupposed that there were already Turks in Asia Minor who were most probably Christian before the invasions of the Seljuks. Indeed, from the 1930's on the issue of the Christian Turks became an element of historical inquiry. It will be convenient to see some examples of the works that deals with the Christian Turks that period.

Hasan Fehmi (Turgal), in conformity with the Turkish Historical Thesis, stated that when the Oghuz came into Anatolia they found their co-nationals living there. A forced Turkification of Anatolia never took place, since an important part of the existing population of Anatolia were already Turks but of different religion. In the research he made in Ottoman court records, he concluded that many Anatolian Christians (Orthodox or Gregorian) had Turkish names; like Çakmak, Yahşi, Yağmur, Kaplan, Hatun, Hıdır, Tanrıverdi, Hüdaverdi, Turgut etc. However, these names disappeared in time, because those who remained as Christians acquired Greek or Armenian names, and those who became Muslim acquired Arab ones.⁴⁸⁸

Fehmi Aksu, writing in the journal of Isparta Halkevi *Ün* in 1938, underlined the predominance of the Turkish people and culture in Anatolia from the time of the Hittites and concluded that the many invasions that took place in Anatolia have never changed its essential Turkish character. He, like Hasan Fehmi, tried to show and

⁴⁸⁸ Hasan Fehmi, "Anadolu'da Gregoriyen ve Ortodoks Türkler", *Ülkü* tom. 4, vol. 22, 1934-1935, pp. 173-6.

prove the Turkishness of Anatolian Christians with the help of some gravestones and especially by the Ottoman court records from Isparta. He gave the examples of place names like *Homat*, *Yuvaçça*, *Kasca*, *Kuman*, *Peçenek*, *Kayı*, *Bayat*, *Afşar*, *Danişment*, *Yağbasan*; and also Turkish names like Aka, Aslan, Ören, Emre, Balı, Demir, Doğan, Turgut, Temel, Satı, and Durmuş. For him, the Christians in Isparta were Turks from the point of view of their language, their traditions, customs and their costumes.⁴⁸⁹

Avram Galanti in his well-known pamphlet *Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş* (1928) dealt also with the Turkish speaking Christians of Anatolia. Like Cami Bey, in order to explain the existence of these people he underlined the role of the divisions in the Byzantine army that was constituted by Turks (Τουρκοπόλοι).⁴⁹⁰

F. Psalty, in the 2nd Turkish Historical Congress in 1937, focused on the Christian Turks of Central Asia. He concluded that Christianity was wide spread among the Turks before the spread of Islam and quoted A. Mingana claiming that "by a curious irony of the facts, the word "Türk" has come to be synonymous with Muslim in almost all the dictionaries of modern European languages. In reality, many forefathers even of the Ottoman Türk of Constantinople and the Anatolia, were zealous Christians before Muhammed was born."⁴⁹¹

Yaşar Nabi, in his book *"Balkanlar ve Türkler"* (1936) claims that if Mehmet the Conqueror instead of preserving the Greek Patriarchate had founded a Turkish church, not only the national affiliation of the Turkish Christians would have been

⁴⁸⁹ Aksu, 1938, pp. 643-6. See also: M. Mesud Koman, *Anadolu Hristiyanlarında İslam ve Türk Adları*, Konya Halkevi Dergisi no. 3, İkinciteşrin 1936; Ragıp Önen, *Bor "Halil Nuri bey Kütüphanesi"ndeki Mahkeme-i Şer'îye Sicilleri ve Bunlarda Görülen Türkçe Kişi ve Köy İsimleri*, Türk Etnografya Dergisi no. III, 1958 and H. Ongan, *Şer'îye sicillerinde geçen türkçe kişi adları*, Türk Etnografya Dergisi I, 1956.

⁴⁹⁰ Galanti, *Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş*, (Ankara: Kebikeç Yayınları, 2000.), pp. 10-3.

⁴⁹¹ F. Psalty, "Türkelide Hristiyanlık", *II. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1943), pp. 887-95. In contrast to Psalty, according to Zeki Velidi the Oghuz in Turkistan and

maintained but also different foreign elements would possibly have been assimilated by the Turks.⁴⁹² According to Yaşar Nabi the assumption that the Orthodox Christians who had immigrated to Greece with the compulsory population exchange were mainly Turks was without doubt. In fact, these people were unaware of their Turkishness, like the fish that are also unaware of the existence of water. When they were forced to quit their homeland, they realized their Turkishness and they resisted to the efforts of making them forget their nationality. Yaşar Nabi also stated that consciousness, just as language, was a determining factor of nationality. The Cretan Muslims who were Greek-speaking could not be regarded as Greeks since they consciously chose to live in Turkey. However, he believes that an important amount among the Christian Turks who had migrated to Greece, would sought in the first opportunity to come back to their fatherland to live together with their racial brothers. If these people had this opportunity, their affiliation to the Turkishness would surely be stronger and they would become the most ardent advocates of the Turkish nationalism. However, Yaşar Nabi admits that for the moment this was only a dream.⁴⁹³

Barkın also was among those writers who concentrated on the Christian Turks. In the militantly nationalistic journal *Çınaraltı*, he stated that the Turkish presence in Anatolia goes back to the 7th century and many of those were Christian Turks. The Turks, according to Barkın, Christian or Muslim, always have retained their national character, racial features and the feeling of unity. Those who were called Greeks in Anatolia had nothing to do with today's Greeks. They were as Turks as their Muslim

of river basin İdil had no relation with Christianity. See Başkardistanlı Zeki Velidi, „Oğuzların Hristiyanlığı Meselesine Dair“, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* II, İstanbul 1928.

⁴⁹² Yaşar Nabi, *Balkanlar ve Türklük*, (Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1936), pp. 27-9.

⁴⁹³ *ibid*, p. 229-31.

neighbours. The relations between these two elements were totally peaceful before the intervention of the imperialist powers. It was the provocations of the foreigners that caused the uprooting of the Christian Turks from Anatolia.⁴⁹⁴ In a second article, he opposed the efforts made by western authors to identify many significant Turks in the history as racially Greek or Iranian. He rejected the assumption that every convert or *devşirme* was non-Turk. He gave the examples of two important architects of Turkish history, namely Keluk or Kөлük of the Seljuks and Sinan of the Ottomans. Both were initially Christians. But this, according always to Barkan, did not imply that these two were also non-Turks. The article concludes with an effort to prove the Turkishness of those two.⁴⁹⁵ Çınaraltı continued to deal with the issue. For example, M. Fahreddin Çelik wrote an article about the non-muslim Turks of the southwestern Caucasus. He underlined that there was no much effort undertaken "even today" to investigate the non-Muslim Turks.⁴⁹⁶

Those few examples indicate that the existence of the Christian Turks was recognized at least in the intellectual circles. However the use of the term "Christian Turks" remained restricted to the academic jargon. Despite the prevalence of a secular and ethnic based definition of nationality, the idea that equals non-Muslim and non-Turk persisted both in official and popular levels. To speak of a Christian Turk was in fact seen as "an absurdity and a contradiction in terms".⁴⁹⁷ The migration policy of the Republican era is a clear illustration of this. We already saw that the Muslims from the Balkan Peninsula were welcomed and easily accepted to the country as Turks.

⁴⁹⁴ Barkın, "Anadolu'daki Hristiyan Türklere Ait Araştırmalar I", Çınaraltı no. 19, 13 December 1941, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁹⁵ Barkın, "Anadolu'daki Hristiyan Türklere Ait Araştırmalar II", Çınaraltı no. 20, 20 January 1942, pp. 7-8. See also R. Melül Meriç, "Mimar Sinan'ın Hayatı", Ülkü, vol. 11, no. 63, May 1938, pp. 195-206.

⁴⁹⁶ M. Fahreddin Çelik, "Ahıska'da Musevi Türkler", Çınaraltı no. 26, 31 January 1942, pp. 5-6

However, a large-scale migration to Turkey of the non-Muslim Turks like the Gagauz of Romania and Bulgaria was rejected. Indeed, the case of the Gagauz is a good example for indicating the persistence of the definition of the Turkish national identity that excluded non-Muslims.

The Gagauz became widely known in Turkey during the 1930's. When Hamdullah Suphi became ambassador in Bucharest in 1931, he concentrated his efforts on the conditions of the Turkish minority in Romania. His main concern was to spread the Turkish national feeling to the Turkish-speaking Christians of Besarabya, the Gagauz. He sought to improve the relations between the Muslim Turks and the Gagauz. He chose the local personal of the Consulate from among the Gagauz. He also organized the mission of Turkish teachers to the region.⁴⁹⁸ He was propagating and trying to promote the immigration of the Gagauz to Turkey. According to Mustafa Baydar, Hamdullah Suphi's aim was to recover the fault of sending the Christian Turks away from Anatolia, by a mass immigration of the Gagauz from Romania to Turkey. He planned to send some Christian Turks to Turkey, specifically to Marmara river basin. Turgut (Yorgi) Erenerol, the son of Papa Eftim, who became Patriarch as Papa Eftim II after his father's death in 1968, in an interview claimed that Hamdullah Suphi promised to his father to bring some 250,000 Christian Turks from Romania. However, the 2nd World War and the occupation of Besarabya in 1940 by the Red Army forbade him to realize his plans. He just managed to send only some 70 students in 1935, which in time became Muslim.⁴⁹⁹

Yaşar Nabi also was interested in a probable mass migration of the Gagauz. According to him, that the Gagauz were Turks was obvious. Their name came from

⁴⁹⁷ Lewis, p. 15.

⁴⁹⁸ Necip Hablemitoğlu, "Kemal'in Öğretmenleri".

the words "*Gök-Oğuz*". He cites examples from their language and different traditions in order to demonstrate their Turkishness. Yaşar Nabi also refers to the Greek argument that these people were Greeks who were forced to adopt Turkish. According to this theory, when the authorities compelled them not to speak Greek they were saying "*Gagan uz olsun*" and their name comes from this saying. He fiercely rejects this "childish" theory with the argument that the Ottomans had never forced their Christian subjects to change their language and that in the Ottoman era there did not exist such an impetuous nationalist movement.⁵⁰⁰ Turks, according to Yaşar Nabi, had never forced foreign people to speak their language. If Turks had really wanted this, they could have applied this policy not only in Anatolia or in Gagauz but also in İstanbul or Greece. He underlined that it was not at all scientific to claim that those Greeks who had lived for centuries in Turkey but still spoke the Turkish in the most corrupt form were from the same origin with those who only today since they were in Greece started to learn Greek but would always speak Greek with a corrupt Turkish accent.⁵⁰¹

According to Yaşar Nabi, the only way to prevent the Gagauz of being assimilated by the Bulgarians or Romanians was to bring them in Turkey. In fact Yaşar Nabi believes that the Turkish minorities of the Balkan Peninsula should immigrate to Turkey, both for the preservation of their national identity and for the economic and social improvement of Turkey. Yaşar Nabi puts forward the question whether the local Muslim people would consider the Christian Gagauz as strange and

⁴⁹⁹ Baydar, pp. 157-61; also Balcıgil, "Fener Patrikhanesine karşı bir Ortodoks", *Hürgün* (14 Ekim - 19 Ekim 1985).

⁵⁰⁰ According to S. Kiriakidis (*i Ditiiki Thraki kai Oi Voulgaroi*, Athens 1919), the Turkish-speaking Christians of Thrace, the so-called Gagauz were of Greek origin. Originally they were from Asia Minor and their rituals and traditions did not differ from other Greeks. He gives the example of the village Bulatköy near Gümülcine where the Turkish-speaking Christians called themselves "Karamanlı". See I. Iordanoglou, "*Oi Gagaouzoï*", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 5, pp. 401-2.

different. He concludes that this is impossible, since the Muslim Turks of Anatolia had always been tolerant towards the Christians. Moreover, the ties of the same language were superior to religious differences. This was more valid in the modern secular Turkey, where religion had lost its social importance. Moreover, the Gagauz in Turkey should be bound to a Turkish religious leader and not to the Patriarchate of Istanbul. For Nabi, the Patriarchate in fact had lost its supranational character and it had become the religious centre of the Greeks. So there was no fear that the Gagauz would be under the supervision of the Patriarchate. Christian or Muslim, the religiousness of Turks was superficial and not fanatical. Thus, Gagauz who had been far from bigotry, like the Muslim Turks of that period's secular Turkey, would acknowledge the state as their sacred being and would become secular citizens who would adore the state.⁵⁰² Giving so much importance to religion, according always to Nabi, was a bad habit inherited by the religious policy of the Ottoman State. The history shows that those states that overestimate the religious unity and disregard nationalism are determined to dissolve.⁵⁰³

Atanas Manof's ethnological research "Gagauzlar" was translated and published in 1939 with the subtitle "*Hristiyan Türkler*"⁵⁰⁴. Manof's aim was to prove with historical and ethnological arguments that the Gagauz were from the Oghuz Turks of *Kumans*, *Pechenegs* and *Uz* who crossed Danube and spread to the Balkan Peninsula. Yaşar Nabi in the preface of the book repeated his wish for the migration

⁵⁰¹ Yaşar Nabi, pp. 86-9 and 100-2.

⁵⁰² "Dini hiçbir zaman hayati bir ihtiyaç halinde hissetmemiş olan Gagauzlar, her türlü taassup propagandasına sınıksız kapalı laik Türkiye'de bugünkü müslüman elemanlar gibi, devleti en kutsal bir varlık tanıyan ve ona tapan lâik vatandaşlar haline geleceklerdir." *ibid*, p. 109.

⁵⁰³ *ibid*, pp. 106-10. For Yaşar Nabi, the Gagauz represent the model peasant that would be an example to the Anatolian peasants ("*Gagauzlar bizim aradığımız ve beklediğimiz ideal köylülerdir*"). He regards them as hardworking, energetic, enlightened, and as people who appreciate culture and good living. The Christian Turks of Gagauz are the European peasants for Yaşar Nabi.

of the Gagauz to Turkey, since, he stressed, Turkey needed more population and the clever, hardworking, civilized and cultured Gagauz were suitable for that purpose.⁵⁰⁵

Despite the efforts of Hamdullah Suphi and Yaşar Nabi and the wishes of the Gagauz, their migration never occurred. On the contrary, Muslim non-Turk people from the Balkan Peninsula, such as Bosnians and Pomaks although did not speak Turkish managed to migrate to Turkey.⁵⁰⁶ In fact, the policies of migration of Turkey shows that religious affiliation continued to play a major role in the definition of the Turkish national identity. The non-Turk Muslims of the broader Ottoman geography, were regarded as people who could easily acquire Turkish national consciousness in contrast with the Christian Turks.⁵⁰⁷ This was also evident in the definition of the minorities. The minorities had been defined in the Lausanne Peace Treaty in religious terms. Thus the Greek-speaking Muslim inhabitants of Of and the Armenian-speaking habitants of Hemşin were defined as Turks, whereas the Turkish-speaking Christians were exchanged. These examples illustrates that the assumption that equals Muslim with Turk and Christian with non-Turk continued to exist in official level. The Kemalist nationalism although was placed upon a secular basis after 1924 implicitly accepted this assumption and implemented it in its migration and minority policies.⁵⁰⁸

⁵⁰⁴ Atanas Manof, *Gagauzlar (Hristiyan Türkler)*, (Ankara: Varlık Neşriyatı, 1939).

⁵⁰⁵ Nabi in Manof, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁰⁶ Kemal Karpat, *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Afa Yayınları, 1996), p. 71.

⁵⁰⁷ Nişanyan, p. 131.

⁵⁰⁸ Yıldız, "Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene" *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919-1938)*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), pp. 135-7.

CONCLUSION

Thodor Nicoloff of the village of Hascovo in Bulgaria claimed before the Mixed Commission, which was formed according to the Convention concerning Reciprocal Emigration between Greece and Bulgaria of November 27, 1919, that he had "Greek consciousness" and that he wished to live in Greece. His claim was opposed by the Bulgarian member on the ground that he was attached to the Bulgarian nation by both language and blood. The Greek member however, underlined that Nicoloff had celebrated his marriage with a Greek woman and had baptized his children in the Greek-Orthodox church. According to the Greek member this was the best proof that Nicoloff had ceased to have a "Bulgarian consciousness" and had adopted the Greek one. The commission eventually adopted the view of the Greek member.⁵⁰⁹ According to Ladas, although the Convention had employed three criteria (race, language and religion) for defining the persons having the right to emigrate it was also admitted that the religious criterion was the surest indicator of nationality.⁵¹⁰

The first chapter of this thesis, which is basically a narrative of the process of the foundation of a Turkish national church, ends with another convention. This one was on the compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey. This time the agreement was openly based on the assumption that the safest indicator of ones national affiliation was his/her religion. Hence, the agreement assured that the Greek minority of Turkey was in fact the *millet-i Rum*, that religious-administrative body, headed by the Ecumenical Patriarch. In this respect, a Greek was defined the one who

⁵⁰⁹ Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), p. 78.

⁵¹⁰ *ibid*, p. 378.

was attached to the Orthodox Church with its centre in Istanbul. A Greek-speaking Muslim, or even a Catholic or a Protestant was not included to the Greek national body. Moreover, those who were tied to Orthodox churches other than the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople were excluded from the population exchange. Being a Greek was first of all related with the membership to the church of St. Andreas. Language and race were secondary criteria.

In fact, the "unredeemed Greeks" (*αλύτρωτος Ελληνισμός* – *gayrimüstahlis Rumlar*) were defined by the Greek Kingdom itself as the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire who was ecclesiastically tied to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. The latter was regarded as the primary link of union between the "free" and the "unredeemed" Greeks. Since other criterions of nationality such as race or language were not preferable in many cases religion became the surest criterion in determining ones nationality. We saw that, the distinction between a Greek and a Bulgar was in the first place related to the attachment to the Ecumenical Patriarchate or the Bulgarian Exarchate and not to language or ethnic origin. According to Patriarch Joachim III for instance, it was a necessity to clarify the meaning of Macedonian Hellenism. "If we mean only the pure Greeks we have lost. As the situation is this, the Hellenism of Macedonia should include all those who remain faithful to the Orthodox Church".⁵¹¹

So, the matter of to which ecclesiastical hierarchy the Turkish-speaking Orthodox communities would be attached was in the first place a matter of nationality. Papa Efim himself had underlined many times that the controversy of the Turkish Orthodox with the Phanar was of political nature. In fact the essential indicator of the Greekness of the Turcophone Orthodox Christians of Anatolia was

their attachment to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It was the Orthodox Church that had saved the Greeks of Asia Minor from total dissolution. The church was regarded by the Greek nationalists as the institution that had preserved and protected Greek culture and language and had prevented the Turkification of the Greeks of Anatolia. Therefore, the separation of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians from the ecclesiastical community of the Patriarchate meant also their separation from the Greek national body.

In that respect, the case of the "Turkish Orthodox" was in conformity with the earlier examples of ecclesiastical separation and national formation of the Balkan Peninsula. Like in the Balkan cases, the inclusion of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians to the Turkish nation presupposed the formation of a Turkish Orthodox *millet* first. However, the peculiarity of the case of the *Karamanli* is that Turkish nationalism was also defined with regard to religious affiliation. In the early 1920's the notion "Turk" meant the Ottoman Muslim population of Anatolia and Rumeli and the specific historical and linguistic meaning of the term was disregarded. Islam as an ethical-normative system was seen as an important ingredient of the cultural unity that constituted the Turkish nation. A Turk was defined as "the one who speaks in Turkish, the one who is Muslim and loves Turkishness."⁵¹² For the Muslim population of Anatolia the dominant factor determining collective self-awareness was still religion. Moreover, the complex alliance system of the National Struggle was based on Islam as a specific identity. The only way for guaranteeing the support of different ethnic groups and of the conservatives to the national struggle was to

⁵¹¹ Kardaras, *To Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και ο Αλύτρωτος Ελληνισμός της Μακεδονίας Θράκης – Ηπείρου Μετά το Συνέδριο του Βερολίνου* (The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Unredeemed Greeks of Macedonia Thrace – Epirus After the Congress of Berlin) (Athens: Εμπροσθέν, 1996), p. 216.

⁵¹² Hamdullah Suphi, *Dağ Yolu* (Birinci Kitap), (İstanbul: Türk Ocakları Hars Hey'eti Neşriyatı, 1929), p. 194; İsmail Habib, *O Zamanlar 1920 – 1923*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1937), pp. 206-7.

underline the common ties, i.e. Islam. Therefore, we can say that the nationalization of the religious community of the Anatolian Orthodox Christians was in contrast to the nationalization of the Muslim *millet* of Anatolia and Rumeli. The inclusion of the *Karamanlı* Christians to the population exchange can only be understood with regard to this prevailing assumption about nationality during the National Struggle.

The shift towards a more secular definition of Turkishness after 1924-5 would have eased the acceptance of the *Karamanlı* Christians to the Turkish nation. The Turkish Historical Thesis, which sought to underline the ancient history of the Turks and at the same time to undermine the Muslim/Ottoman past of the Turkish nation, eased also the acceptance at a conceptual level of the notion of Christian or non-Muslim Turks. In fact, the Turkish Historical Thesis was an integral part of the redefinition of the Turkish national identity in secular terms. The fact that the earlier references to the assumption that the Turks were the autochthonous population of Anatolia, which would become the basic proposition of the Turkish Historical Thesis of the 1930's, were made in relation to the claims on the Turkishness of the Anatolian Christians was not a coincidence. Nevertheless, even in the 1930's the "Christian Turks" were not accepted to the national unity. The example of the Gagauz constitutes a clear indication of the persistence of the religious criterion in defining the Turkish national identity.

SOURCES - BIBLIOGRAPHY

Center for Asia Minor Studies Oral Tradition Archive:

Keskinmaden 1, Γ3.
Nevşehir ΚΠ 146.
Kaisareia, ΚΠ 47.

Center for Asia Minor Studies Manuscripts:

IAKOVIDIS, Minas. *Αυτοβιογραφία Πως Έζησα το Δράμα Μας* (Autobiography How I lived Our Drama), manuscript 404, Cappadocia 83.

RAPHTOPOULOS, Vasos P. *Προκόπιος Λαζαρίδης Μητροπολίτης Ικονίου, Λυκαονίας και Β. Καππαδοκίας* (Prokopios Lazaridis Metropolitan of Konya, Likaonias and N. Cappadocia), manuscript 394, Lykaonia 8.

RIZOS, Serafeim N. *Η Συνασός. Οι Δάσκαλοι Μας* (Sinassos Our Teachers), manuscript no. 445.

RIZOS, Serafeim. *Καππαδοκική Δημοκρατία – Karadokya Cumhuriyeti* manuscript 426, Cappadocia 93.

TSALIKOGLU, E. I. *Αυτοβιογραφία και Ιστορικά Αναμνήσεις* (Autobiography and Historical Memoirs), B Μέρος, manuscript 184, Cilicia 3B.

Periodicals :

“Adliye Vekilinin Beyanatı”, *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 8 January 1338/1922.

“Afgan Sefiri Hazretlerinden Baba Hrisantos’a”, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 20 June 1922.

Ahmet Cevdet, “Anadoluda Ortodoks Patrikliği”, *İkdam*, 21 May 1338/1922.

Ahmet Emin, “Anadolu Ortodoksları”, *Vakit*, 22 February 1922.

“Anadolunun Dagi ve Bagi Rumlarına Yine Müessir Bir Beyanname“, *İleri*, 6 January 1338/1922.

“Anadolu Hıristiyanları”, *Akşam*, 18 May 1338/1922.

“Anadolu Metropolitleri İstanbul Patrikhanesi ile Kat-ı Münasebet Ettiler”, *İkdam*, 26 May 1921.

- "Anadolu Rumları Ayrı Patrik İstiyorlar", İkdâm, 3 May 1921/1337.
- "Anadolu Ortodokslarının Millî Kilise Davası", İkdâm, 7 May 1921/1337.
- "Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası", Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası, 29 July 1922.
- "Anadolu'da Patrik İntihabı Başladı", Tevhid-i Efkar, 1 February 1338/1922.
- "Anadolu Patrikhanesi ve Adliye Vekaleti", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 28 December 1921.
- "Anadolu Patrikliği", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 21 February 1922.
- "Anadolu Rumları ve İstanbul Patrikliği", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 1 May 1921/23 Şaban 1339.
- "Anadolu'da Türk Ortodoks Kongresi", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 25 June 1922.
- "Anadoluda Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 27 December 1921.
- "Anadolu Türktür", Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası, no. 14
- "Anadoluda vahdet-i milliyeyi gösteren bir levha", İleri, 13 April 1338/1922.
- "Baba Eftim Efendi", İkdâm, 29 August 1338/1922.
- "Baba Eftim'in Yeni Bir Beyannamesi", Vakıf, 10 July 1338/1922.
- "Baba Eftim'in Yeni Bir Beyannamesi", Vakıf, 10 July 1338/1922.
- "Büyük Zaferimiz Türk Ortodoks Kiliselerinde Meserretlerle Kutlandı", Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası, 23 September 1922.
- "Ders Alınacak!", Aydede, 16 February 1922, no. 14.
- Douglas, "The Turkish National Churches", The Christian East, vol III no 3, October 1922, p. 125-9.
- "Ekalliyetler Ne Diyor?", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 2 June 1922.
- "Ekalliyetler Ne Diyor?", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 2 June 1922.
- "Εκθεσις περί των Χριστιανών Ελλήνων εν Ανατολή", Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια, 23 October 1921, vol. 42, p. 321-2.
- "Fener Patrikhanesi Bunlara Ne Diyecek?", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 2 July 1922.
- "Fener Patrikhanesinin Telaşı", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 15 May 1921.
- Hakluyt Egerton, "The 'Turkish' Orthodox Church", The Christian East, July 1922, vol. III no. 2.

"Hristiyanlara Mezalim Yapıldığı Yalandır", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 25 May 1922.

"Hristiyanlar Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 5 June 1922.

"Hristiyanlar Ne Diyor?", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 11 June 1922.

"Η Κραυγή της Οδύνης", *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 19 June 1921, no. 24, p. 185-7.

"Η Εκλογή του Μελέτιου Μεταξάκη", *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 25 November 1921, no. 47-8.

İstamat Zihni, "Fener'de Patriklik Makamının Gasıbı Meletyos Efendi Cenaplarına", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 9 September 1922.

İstamat Zihni, "Anadoluda halis ve hakiki Türk Ortodoksu olarak yaşamak isteyen milletdaşlarıma", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 11 November 1338/1922, no. 12.

İstamat Zihni, "Anadoluda mecburi mübadelenin Türk Ortodokslara şumülü var mıdır?", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 11 February 1339/1923, no. 15.

"İstanbul Rumları", *Akşam*, 18 September 1338/1922.

İzzet Ulvi, "Türk Tarihinde Pontus", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 18 January 1338/1922

İzzet Ulvi, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler I", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 18 Teşrinisani 1921.

İzzet Ulvi, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler II", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 12 December 1921.

İzzet Ulvi, "Anadolu'da Hristiyan Türkler III", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 5 January 1922.

"Kayseri Kilise Konferansının Birinci İçtimasının Birinci Kararı", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 29 July 1922.

"Kayseri Metropolitdi Meletios Efendi Hazretlerinin Beyannamesi", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, 29 July 1922.

"Les scènes du 1er Juin – Attaques contre le patriarche", *Echos d' Orient*, no. 131, Juillet-Septembre 1923.

"Meletyos Ordumuzun Zaferi İçin Dua Ediyor", *Tevhid-i Efkâr*, 25 May 1922.

"Meletios Rüesa-i Ruhaniyeyi İtham Ediyor", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 25 June 1922.

"Mustafa Kemal Paşa ve Anadolu Hristiyanları", *İkdam*, 26 May 1921.

"Ο Νέος Μόσχος", *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 15 May 1921, vol. 19.

"Ο Κύκλος", Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια, 22 May 1921, vol. 20.

"Ortodoks Kiliselerine bir Tamim", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 30 Teşrinisani 1921.

"Ortodokslar Memnuniyetlerini İlan Ediyorlar", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 16 June 1921.

"Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Adliye Vekaletine İstidası", Tevhid-i Efkâr, 21 February 1338/1922.

"Papa Eftim Efendinin Adliye Vekaletinden Ricası", İleri, 28 February 1338/1922.

"Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Muhabirimize Beyanatı", Tevhid-i Efkâr, 13 February 1338/1922.

"Papa Eftim Efendi Ne Diyor?", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 28 December 1921.

"Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Vatanperverane Bir Nutku", Vakıf, 23 April 1338/1922.

"Patriarcat grec de Constantinople", Echos D'Orient, no. 125, Januier-Mars 1922.

"Patrikhanenin telaşı", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 3 April 1922.

"Patriklik mi Yoksa Başpiskoposluk mu ?", İkdâm, 22 February 1922.

Paul Gentizon, "La Grande Pitié du Phanar", L'Illustration 21 Février 1925, no. 4277.

"Rumların Anadolu'da Bir Patrikleri Olacak", İkdâm, 30 December 1337/1921.

"Rumlar ve Ermeniler Nefret Ediyoruz Diyorlar", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 31 May 1922.

"Sekizinci İctima-i Umumî", Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası, 23 September 1922.
Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası, 11 November 1922.

"The E.C.U. Declaration", The Christian East, July 1922, vol. III, no. 2.

"The Oecumenical Patriarchate", The Christian East, February 1924, vol. V, no. 1, p. 188.

"The 'Turkish' National Church", The Christian East, March 1923, vol. IV, no. 1, p. 28.

"Türk Gregoryen Cemaati", İleri, 12 April 1338/1922, no. 1537.

"Türk İdaresinde Hıristiyanlar", Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası, 11 November 1922 – 30 November 1922.

"Türk Ortodokslar", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 13 January 1922.

"Türk Ortodoksları İş Başında", Hakimiyet-i Milliye, 18 August 1338/1922.

"Türk Ortodokslarının Mühim Kararları", İkdam, 16 August 1338/1922.

"Türk Ortodoks Patrikliğinin Teşkili", İleri, 2 February 1338/1922.

"Türk Ortodokslarının Telgrafi", Vakıf, 15 August 1338/1922.

"Umum Anadolu Türk Ortodoksları Murahhas-ı Umumileri Papa Eftim Efendi Hazretleri'nin 'Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi' Unvanlı İkinci Kitapta Münderic Beyannameleri", Anadolu Ortodoksluk Sırası, 21 November 1922, no. 11.

d. Bibliography

Aide-Mémoire sur les Droits des Minorités en Turquie Présenté aux Représentants des Membres de la Société des Nations, Association Nationale Ottomane Pour La Société Des Nations, (Constantinople: Société Anonyme de Papeterie et d'Imprimerie 1922).

AIGIDIS, Ar. I. *H Ελληνικότης της Μικράς Ασίας και το Μύθευμα των Τουρκορθοδόξων* (The Greekness of Asia Minor and the Myth of the Turkish Orthodox), (Athens: Τύποις Δημητριάδου, 1922).

AHMAD, Feroz. *Modern Türkiye'nin Oluşumu*, (İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, 1995).

AKÇAM, Taner. *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Oluşumu ve Ermeni Sorunu*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1992).

AKTAR, Ayhan. *Varlık Vergisi ve Türkleştirme Politikaları*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001).

AKYÜZ, Yahya. *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Fransız Kamuoyu (1919-1922)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1975).

ALEXANDRIS, Alexios. "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor During the Greco-Turkish Confrontation of 1919-1922", *Byzantine & Modern Greek Studies* 8, 1983.

ALEXANDRIS, Alexios. "Η Απόπειρά Δημιουργίας Τουρκορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας στην Καππαδοκία 1921-1923" (The attempt to found a Turkish Orthodox Church in Cappadocia), *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 4, Athens 1983.

ALEXANDRIS, Alexios. *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974*, (Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 1983).

ALKAN, Hakan. *Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi (Anadolu Patrikhanesi)*, (Ankara: Günce Yayıncılık, 2000).

- ANAGNOSTAKIS .I. – BALTA E. *Η Καππαδοκία των 'Ζώντων Μνημείων' Η Ανακάλυψη 'της Πρώτης Πατρίδος της Ελληνικής Φυλής' (The Cappadocia of the 'Living Monuments' The Invention of the 'First Heartland of the Greek Race')*, (Athens: Πορεία, 1990).
- ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, Sia. *Μικρά Ασία 19^{ος} αι. – 1919 Οι Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες* (Asia Minor 19th Century-1919 The Greek-Orthodox Communities), (Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 1997).
- ANASTASIA - MANOUSAKI, S. *Μνήμες Καππαδοκίας* (Memoires of Cappadocia), (Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 2002).
- ANDERSON, Benedict. *Hayali Cemaatler Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması*, (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1993).
- ANESTIDIS, Stavros. "Η Οικογένεια Ρίζου" (The Family of Rizos), *Η Συνασός της Καππαδοκίας* (Sinassos of Cappadocia), *Επτά Ημέρες*, (27 May 2001).
- APAYDIN, Mustafa. "Halid Nihad Boztepe'nin Ankara Yaranını Hicveden Kaside-i Vatan Adlı Şiiri".
- A. RÜSTEM. "The Future of the Oecumenical Patriarchate", *Foreign Affairs* 3, 1925.
- ARCHELAOS, I. *Συνασός* (Sinassos), (Athens: 1899).
- ARIKAN, Zeki. *Mütareke ve İşgal Dönemi İzmir Basını (30 Ekim 1918-8 Eylül 1922)*, (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1918).
- ATALAY, Bülent. *Fener Rum Ortodoks Patrikhanesi'nin Siyasi Faaliyetleri (1908 – 1923)*, (İstanbul : Tarih ve Tabiat Vakfı, 2001).
- ATALAY, Bülent. "Türk Ortodoksları'nın Kendi Kiliselerini Kurmak İçin Verdikleri Mücadele", *Türk Kültürü*, no. 462, (November 2001).
- ATATÜRK, Mustafa Kemal. *A Speech delivered by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk 1927*, (İstanbul : Ministry of Education Printing Plant, 1963).
- AYDIN, Suavi. *Modernleşme ve Milliyetçilik*, (Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları, 1993).
- BAHA Sait Bey, *İttihat-Terakki'nin Alevilik Bektaşilik Araştırması*, Nejat Birdoğan (ed.), (İstanbul: Berfin Yayınları, 1994).
- BALCIGİL, Osman. "Fener Patrikhanesine karşı bir Ortodoks", *Hürgün* (14 Ekim – 19 Ekim 1985).
- BALTA, Evangelia. "Οι Πρόλογοι των Καραμανλήδικων βιβλίων για την Μελέτη της Εθνικής Συνείδησης των Τουρκόφωνων Πληθυσμών της Μικράς Ασίας" (The Prefaces of the Karamanli books for the study of the national consciousness of the Turcophone populations of Asia Minor), *Μνήμων* 11, 1987.

- BARKIN. "Anadolu'daki Hristiyan Türklere Ait Araştırmalar I", *Çınaraltı* no. 19, 13 December 1941.
- BARKIN. "Anadolu'daki Hristiyan Türklere Ait Araştırmalar II", *Çınaraltı* no. 20, 20 January 1942.
- BAŞKIRDİSTANLI ZEKİ VELİDİ. "Oğuzların Hristiyanlığı Meselesine Dair", *Türkiyat Mecmuası* II, İstanbul, 1928.
- BARTON, James L. *Story of Near East Relief (1915-1930) An Interpretation*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930).
- BAYDAR, Mustafa. *Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver ve Anıları*, (İstanbul: 1968).
- BERKES, Niyazi (ed.). *Ziya Gökalp, Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1959).
- BORA, Tanıl. "Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik ve Azınlıklar", *Birikim* vol. 71-2, March-April 1995.
- BURNABY, Capt. Frederick. *On Horseback Through Asia Minor*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- CAMİ. *Osmanlı Ülkesinde Hristiyan Türkler*, İstanbul: Sanayiinefise Matbaası, 1932.
- CIHANGİR, Erol. *Papa Efim'in Muhtıraları ve Bağımsız Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi*, İstanbul: Turan Yayıncılık, 1996.
- CLOGG, Richard. "Anadolu Hristiyan Karındaşlarımız: the Turkish-speaking Greeks of Asia Minor", *Neohellenism*, ed. John Burke and Stathis Gauntlett, (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, Monograph 5, Canberra Australian National University, 1992).
- CLOGG, Richard. "The 'Dhidhaskalia Patriki' (1798): an Orthodox Reaction to French Revolutionary Propaganda". *Middle Eastern Studies* 5. London, 1969, pp. 87-115.
- COPEAUX, Etienne. *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk İslam Sentezine*, (İstanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998).
- ÇAPA, Mesut. *Pontus Meselesi*, (Trabzon : Serander Yayınları, 2001).
- ÇELİK, M. Fahreddin. "Ahıska'da Musevi Türkler", *Çınaraltı* no. 26, 31 January 1942.
- DAWKINS, R. M. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. (Cambridge: 1916).

- DANIELIDIS, Dimosthenis. "Παπαμὴν πρὸς Μεκδουπού" (A Letter of my Father), *Μικρασιατικὸν Ἡμερολόγιον ὁ Ἀστὴρ 1914*, Protopapa and Sas, Constantinople 1913, pp. 53-63.
- DERİNGİL, Selim. "From Ottoman to Turk: Self-Image and Social Engineering in Turkey", *Making Majorities Constituting the Nation in Japan, Korea, China, Malaysia, Fiji, Turkey and the United States*, Dru C. Gladney (ed.), (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).
- DİNAMO, Hasan İzzettin. *Kutsal İsyân* vol. 5, (İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1990).
- DÜNDAR, Fuat. "İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Araştırmaları", *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 91, July 2001, pp. 43-50.
- ELEPHTERIADIS, Rizos. *Συνασός ἡτοι Μελέτη ἐπὶ των Ἡθῶν καὶ Εθίμων Αὐτῆς* (A Study on the traditions and rituals of Sinasos), (Athens: Τύποις Ἑλληνικῆς Ἀνεξαρτησίας, 1879).
- ELLISON, Grace. *An Englishwoman in Angora*, (New York: 1923).
- EKİNCİKLİ, Mustafa. *Türk Ortodoksları*, (Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1998).
- ELÖVE, Mustafa Emil. "Türkiyede Din İmtiyazları I. Kısım", *AÜ Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, c. 10, no: 1-4, 1953.
- ERCAN, Hikmet Yavuz. "Fener ve Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi", *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*. tom. 5, vol. 8-9, 1967, pp. 411-438.
- ERGENE, Teoman. *İstiklâl Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları*, (İstanbul: İ. P. Neşriyat Servisi, 1951).
- ERÖZ, Mehmet. *Hristiyanlaşan Türkler*, (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1983).
- ESKİ, Mustafa. *Kastamonu Basınında Millî mücadele'nin Yankıları*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995).
- EXERTZOGLU, Haris. *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη τον 19^ο αιώνα, Ο Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως 1861-1912* (Ethnic Identity in Constantinople in 19th c. The Hellenic Literary Society of Constantinople), (Athens: Νεφέλη, 1996).
- EVANGELIDIS, M. *Υπόμνημα περί των δικαιωμάτων και παθημάτων των εστίων του πολιτισμού Μικράς Ασίας και Θράκης* (Memorandum on the rights and sufferings of the hearths of civilization of Asia Minor and Thrace), (Athens: 1918).
- FERNAN, Friedrich-Wilhelm. *Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn Gegenwart und Tradition des Orthodoxen Orients*, (Opladen: C. W. Leske Verlag, 1967).

FOTIADIS, Nikos. Στο Κεσκίν Μάδεν με τον Παπαεφύμ το Ρασπουτίν του Ελληνισμού της Μικράς Ασίας (In Keskinmaden with Papa Efim, the Rasputin of the Hellenism of Asia Minor), (Athens: Εκδοτικός Οίκος Γνώσεις, 1982).

GALANTI, Avram. *Vatandaş Türkçe Komuş*, (Ankara: Kebikeç Yayınları, 2000).

GENTIZON, Paul. *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu*, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1994).

GLAVINAS, Apostolos. *Η Ορθόδοξη Αυτοκέφαλη Εκκλησία της Αλβανίας* (The Orthodox Autocephalous Church of Albania), (Thessaloniki: 1985).

GOLOĞLU, Mahmut. *Anadolu'nun Milli Devleti Pontos*, (Ankara: Kalite Matbaası, 1973).

GÖKALP, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990).

GÖKALP, Ziya. *Türkleşmek İslamlaşmak Muasırlaşmak*, (Ankara: Serdengeçti Neşriyatı, 1963).

GÖKBİLGİN, Tayyib. *Millî Mücadele Başlarken* vol. II, (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1965).

HAMDULLAH ŞÜPHİ. *Dağ Yolu* (Birinci Kitap), (İstanbul: Türk Ocakları Hars Hey'eti Neşriyatı, 1929).

HASAN FEHMİ. "Anadolu'da Gregoriyen ve Ortodoks Türkler", *Ülkü* tom. 4, vol. 22, 1934-1935, pp. 173-182.

HERZFELD, Michael. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*, (New York: Pella, 1986).

HEYD, Uriel. *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, (London: Luzac & Company Ltd. and The Harvill Press Ltd., 1950).

HOUDAVERDOGLOU-THEODOTOS. "Η Τουρκόφωνος Ελληνική Φιλολογία" (The Turcophone Greek Philology), *Επετηρίς Εταιρεία Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, Ετος Z, Athens, 1930.

İSMAİL HABİB. *O Zamanlar 1920 – 1923*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1937).

İSMAİL HABİB. *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda Yunanlılar ve Anadolu Rumları Üzerine Makaleler*, Mustafa Eski (ed.), (Ankara : Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999).

IOANNIDIS, Ioannis. *Kaisareia Mitropolitleri ve Malumat-ı Mütenevva*, (Dersaadet: Alexandros Nomismatidis Matbaası, 1896).

Η Εξοδος Μαρτυρίες από τις Επαρχίες της Κεντρικής ανδ Νότιας Μικρασίας (Exodus, Memoires from Central and South Asia Minor), vol. 2, (Athens: Center of Asia Minor Studies, 1982).

Η Περίθαλψις και Εγκατάστασις των εν Τουρκία Προσφύγων του Ευρωπαϊκού Πολέμου 1918-1921 (The Care and Settlement of the Refugees of the European War in Turkey), (Constantinople: Τυπογραφείο Κ. Μακρίδου και Ι. Αλευροπούλου, 1921).

JAESCHKE, Gotthard. "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche", *Der Islam* 39, 1964, pp. 95 - 129.

JAESCHKE, Gotthard. "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche (Nachträge)", *Der Islam* 45, 1969, pp. 317-323.

JAESCHKE, Gotthard. *Kurtuluş Savaşı İle İlgili İngiliz Belgeleri*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991).

JAESCHKE, Gotthard. *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı Kronolojisi (30 Ekim 1918-11 Ekim 1922)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1989).

JAESCHKE, Gotthard. *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı Kronolojisi II (11 Ekim 1922-31 Aralık 1923)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1989).

JELAVICH, Barbara. *History of the Balkans* vol. I, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

KALLINIKOS. *Τα Δίκαια του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου εν Τουρκία Μελέται* (The Rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Turkey), (Constantinople: 1922).

KAPLAN, Sam. "Ortadoğu'ya Tutulan Fransız Aynaları: Ermeni ve Türk Belgelerinde Kilikya", in *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası*, ed. Esra Özyürek, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001).

KARATHANASIS, Athanasios E. *Καππαδοκίας Τόχαι* (The Fate of Cappadocia), (Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης, 2000).

KARDARAS, Hristos D. *Το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και ο Αλύτρωτος Ελληνισμός της Μακεδονίας θράκης - Ηπείρου Μετά το Συνέδριο του Βερολίνου* (The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Unredeemed Greeks of Macedonia Thrace - Epirus After the Congress of Berlin) (Athens: Επικαιρότητα, 1996).

KARPAT, Kemal. *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Afa Yayınları, 1996).

KARS, Zübeyir. *Millî Mücadele'de Kayseri*, (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1999).

KARS, Zübeyir. "Kayseri Eğitim Tarihi üzerine Bir Deneme", *I. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1998).

KARS, Zübeyir "Kayseri Mutasarrıfı, Adana, Konya ve Sivas Valisi Ahmet Muammer Bey'in Kayseri'nin Çağdaşlaşmasına Katkıları", *III. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2000).

KITROMILIDES P. – ALEXANDRIS A. "Ethnic Survival, Nationalism and Forced Migration", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 5, Athens, 1984-1985.

KITROMILIDES, P. "Imagined Communities and the origins of the national question in the Balkans", *European History Quarterly* 19, no. 2, Sage Publications, London, 1989.

KITROMILIDES, P. "Greek Irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus", *Middle Eastern Studies* 26, no. 1, 1990.

KITSIKIS, Dimitri. *Yunan Propagandası*, (İstanbul : Meydan Neşriyat).

KIRYAKIDOU-NESTOROS, Alki. *Η Θεωρία της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας. Κριτική Ανάλυση* (The Theory of Greek Laography. A Critical Analysis), (Athens: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας, 1977).

KOFOS, Evangelos. "Attempts At Mending The Greek-Bulgarian Ecclesiastical Schism (1875-1902)", *Balkan Studies*, Vol. 25, 1984.

KOMAN, M. Mesud. "Anadolu Hristiyanlarında İslam ve Türk Adları", *Konya Halkevi Dergisi* no. 3, (İkinciteşrin 1936).

KONTOGIANNIS, P. M. *Η Ελληνικότης των νομών Προύσης και Σμύρνης* (The Greekness of the vilayets Bursa and İzmir), (Athens: Viciopoleion Ioannou N. Sideri, 1919).

KONTOGIANNIS, P. M., *Γεωγραφία της Μικράς Ασίας* (Geography of Asia Minor), (Athens: 1921).

KRINOPOULOS, Sokratis. *Τα Φερταίκενα Υπο Εθνολογικήν και Φιλολογικήν Άποψη Εξεταζόμενα* (An Ethnological and Philological Research on Ferteke), (Athens: 1889).

KRITIKOS, Giorgos. "Motives For The Compulsory Exchange", *Δελτίον Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* vol. 13, Athens, 1999-2000.

KOUROUPOU, M. – BALTA, E. *Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες της Καππαδοκίας Περιφέρεια Προκοπίου*, (Athens: Center for Asia Minor Studies, 2001).

KUSHNER, David. *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism 1876-1908*, (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1977).

LADAS, Stephen P. *The Exchange of Minorities Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932).

LAMERAS, K. G. *Το Μικρασιατικόν Πρόβλημα* (The Asia Minor Question), (Athens: 1918).

Les Atrocités Kémalistes dans les régions du Pont et dans le reste de l'Anatolie, (Constantinople: Patriarcat Oecumenique, 1922).

Les Droits des Minorités en Turquie, Bureau de Presse de la Délégation Turquie, (Lausanne : Imprimerie Henri Held, 1922).

Les Minorités en Turquie, Turc-Yourdou de Lausanne, (Lausanne: Dr. A. Bovard – Giddey Imprimeur, 1920).

Les Persécutions Des Chrétiens, L'Archevêque-Metropolitain de Smyrne Mgr. Chrysostome, 1919.

Les Turcs et Les Revendications Greques, (Paris : Imprimerie A. G. L'Hoir, 1919).

LEWIS, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

MANOF, Atanas. *Gagauzlar (Hristiyan Türkler)*, (Ankara: Varlık Neşriyatı, 1939).

MATALAS, Paraskevas. *Εθνος και Ορθοδοξία* (Nation and Orthodoxy), (Herakleion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Ηρακλείου, 2002).

MARDİN, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994).

MAVROPOULOS, Dimitrios. *Πατριαρχικά Σελίδες Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον από 1878-1949* (Patriarchal Notes The Ecumenical Patriarchate from 1878 to 1949), (Athens: 1960).

Mémoires Du Patriarcat Ecuménique Relatifs a la Situation Des Chrétiens D'Anatolie, Bulletin Du Bureau de la Presse Patriarcal Au Sujet de la Même Question, (Constantinople: 1922).

MERİÇ, R. Melûl. "Mimar Sinan'ın Hayatı", *Ülkü*, vol. 11, no. 63, May 1938, pp. 195-206.

MINAS, Minaidis. "Ο παπα-Ευθύμ", *Θρακική Επετηρίδα*, tom. 4, Komotini 1983.

NANAKIS, Andreas. *Η Χηρεία του Οικουμενικού Θρόνου και η εκλογή του Μελέτιου Μεταξάκη* (The vacancy of the Ecumenical Throne and the election of Meletios Metaxakis), 1918-1922, (Thessaloniki: 1991).

Nevşehir Mekteplerinin Dersaadet Eforiasının Yüzüncü Sene-i Devriyesi 1820-1920, (Dersaadet: "Anatoli" Matbaası, 1920).

- NİŞANYAN, Sevan. "Kemalist Düşücede Türk Milleti Kavramı", *Türkiye Günlüğü*, vol. 33, March-April 1995.
- ONGAN, H. "Şer'îye sicillerinde geçen türkçe kişi adları", *Türk Etnografya Dergisi* I, 1956.
- ORAN, Baskın. *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme*, (Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 1988).
- ÖZEL, Sabahattin. *Millî Mücadelede Trabzon*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991).
- ÖNDER, Ali Rıza. *Kayseri Basın Tarihi*, (Ankara: 1972).
- ÖNEN, Ragıp. "Bor Halil Nuri bey Kütüphanesindeki Mahkeme-I Şer'îye Sicilleri ve Bunlarda Görülen Türkçe Kişi ve Köy İsimleri", *Türk Etnografya Dergisi* no. III, 1958.
- ÖĞÜN, Süleyman Seyfi. "Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Hakim Millet Kodunun Dönüşümü", *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi, Kimlik*, Nuri Bilgin (ed.), (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1997).
- ÖZBUDUN, Ergun. Millî "Mücadele ve Cumhuriyetin Resmî Belgelerinde Yurttaşlık ve Kimlik Sorunu", in *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi ve Kimlik* (ed. Nuri Bilgin), (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1997).
- ÖZDEMİR, Mehmet. *Millî Mücadele'de Develi*, (Ankara: 1973).
- ÖZKAN, Salih. "Anadolu'da Ortodoksluk Sadası Gazetesi", *III. Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Kayseri ve Yöresi Tarih Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2000).
- PAPADOPOULOS, A. A. *Ο Υπόδουλος Ελληνισμός της Ασιατικής Ελλάδος Ο Ελληνισμός της Ασιατικής Ελλάδος Εθνικός και Γλωσσικός Εξεταζόμενος* (The Unredeemed Greeks of Asiatic Hellas. An ethnic and linguistic research), (Athens: Βιβλιοπωλείον Ιωάν. Ν. Σιδέρη, 1919).
- PAPA EFTİM. *Papa Eftim Efendi'nin Ortodoks Ahaliye Müracaatı ve Patrikhaneye Karşı Müdafaaanemesi*, (İstanbul: 1924).
- PAPA EFTİM. *Türk Ortodoksları Ruhanî Reisi Papa Eftim'in Kıbrıs Hakkındaki Görüşleri*, (İstanbul: 1958).
- PAPA EFTİM. *Atenagoras'ın Organı Elefteri Foni Gazetesine Cevabım ve Fener Patrikhanesi ile Rumluğun İçyüzü*, (İstanbul: Ata'nın Yurdu Yayınları, 1959).
- PAPOULIDES, K. K. "Manuscripts 167 and 168 from the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople", *Balkan Studies* 20, 1979, pp.133-40.

PARLA, Taha. *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999).

PEKER, Nureddin. "Türk Dostu Değil, Türk Oğlu Türk Papa Eftim'in Arkasından", *Tarih Konuşuyor* vol. 8, no. 52, May 1968.

PETROPOULOS, J. A. "The Compulsory Exchange of Populations: Greek-Turkish Peacemaking 1922-1930", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2, 1976.

PETROPOULOU, Ioanna. "Cultural and Intellectual Life in 19th Century Cappadocia a Sketch".

PETROPOULOU, Ioanna. "Ο Εξελληνισμός – Εξαρχαϊσμός των Ονομάτων στην Καππαδοκία τον δέκατο ένατο αιώνα", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*, vol. 7, 1988-1989.

Pontus Meselesi, Yılmaz Kurt (ed.), (Ankara: TBMM Kültür, Sanat ve Yayın Kurulu Yayınları, 1995).

POOLE Stanley Lane (ed.). *The People of Turkey: Twenty Years' Residence Among the Bulgarians, Greeks, Albanians, Turks and Armenians*, vol. 2, ed. by (London: John Murray, 1878).

PRICE, Clair. *The Rebirth of Turkey*, 1923.

PSALTY, F. "Türkelide Hristiyanlık", *II. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1943).

PSOMIADES, Harry. *The Eastern Question The Last Phase*, (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1968).

PSOMIADES, Harry. "The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Republic: The First Ten Years", *Balkan Studies* 2, 1961.

RAMSAY, W. M. *Impressions of Turkey During Twelve Years' Wonderings*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897).

RIZA NUR. *Hayat ve Hatıratım* vol II, (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 1992).

SARIHAN, Zeki. *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü IV*, (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1996).

SCHLICKLIN, Jean. *Angora... L'aube de la Turquie Nouvelle (1919-1922)*, (Paris: Berger-Levrault Editeurs, 1922).

Συνοπτική Έκθεση των Διωγμών και Σφαγών του Πόντου 1914-1922 (Concise Report on the Deportations and Massacres of Pontos), (Constantinople: Τύποις Π.Αγγελίδου, 1922).

SKOPETEA, Elli. *Fallmerayer Τεχνάσματα του Αντίπαλου Δέους*, (Athens: Θεμέλιο, 1999).

SMITH, Michael Llewelyn, *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor, 1919-1922*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998)

SOFUOĞLU, Adnan. *Fener Rum Patrikhanesi ve Siyasi Faaliyetleri*, (İstanbul: Turan Yayıncılık, 1996).

SONYEL, Salâhi R. *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire*, (Ankara: Publications of Turkish Historical Society, 1993).

SVOLOPOULOS, Konstantinos. *Η Ελληνική Εξωτερική Πολιτική 1900-1945* (Greek Foreign Policy), (Athens: Εστία, 1994).

Statistique des Expulsions des Populations Greques de la Turquie Durant les Guerres Balkaniques et Européenne, (Constantinople: Patriarcat Oecuménique, 1920).

ŞAHİN, M. Süreyya. *Fener Patrikhânesi ve Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 1980).

TANÖR, Bülent. *Kurtuluş Üzerine 10 Konferans (Türkiye 1918-1923)*, (İstanbul: Yenigün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1997).

TBMM Gizli Celse Zabıtları, III and IV, (Ankara : TBMM Basımevi, 1980).

TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, Cilt: 22 Devre: 1, (Ankara: TBMM Matbaası, 1958).

TEKİN, Talât. "Grek Alfabetiyle Türkçe", *Tarih ve Toplum*, vol. 3, March 1984.

The Black Book, The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1920.

The Liberation of the Greek People in Turkey, The London Committee of Unredeemed Greeks, (Manchester and London: Norbury, Natzio & Co. Ltd., 1919).

TOYNBEE, Arnold J. *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*, (New York: 1970).

TSALIKOĞLOU, Emmanouil. *Ελληνικά Εκπαιδευτήρια και Ελληνορθόδοξες Κοινότητες της περιφέρειας Καισαρείας* (The Greek schools and Greek Orthodox communities of the region of Kayseri), (Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies, 1976).

TUNÇAY, Mete. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek-Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması (1923-1931)*, (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1981).

"Türk Ortodoks Patriği Erenerol: „Bizler Ortaasya'dan gelen Selçuklularız", *Diyanet*, November 1995, no. 59, pp. 10-16.

Türk Parlamento Tarihi Milli Mücadele ve TBMM I. Dönem 1919-1923, vol. III, Fahri Çoker (ed.), (Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, 1995).