

**CLASH OF IDENTITY MYTHS  
IN THE HYBRID PRESENCE OF THE KARAMANLIS**

By

Gulen Gokturk

Submitted to

Central European University

Nationalism Studies Program

In Partial Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Advisor: Associate Professor Nadia Al-Bagdadi

Budapest, Hungary

2009

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my my supervisor Nadia Al-Bagdadi for her recommendations and criticisms, and to Onur Yıldırım for his guidance and encouragement in every step I took on my academic path. I feel particularly indebted to my parents Meral and Halim Göktürk as well as my brother Güven Göktürk who always support me to the end and who respect my choices at all times. This thesis is dedicated to them.

I offer special thanks to my friends in Nationalism Studies for the every single gathering we enjoyed all together throughout the year. I also would like to thank my neighbors at the residence center. We spent priceless moments together, in the kitchen, in the study room and in the garden when we got bored, especially in the thesis writing process. A huge thanks is reserved for Seda Saluk, Özde Çeliktemel, and Erdem Ceydilek for their care and friendship. They substituted my parents during my first long term experience abroad. I also would like to express my gratitude to Martin Thomen who spent his valuable time to edit my thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	i
CHAPTER 1 .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Methodology: Problematization of Sources.....	7
Literature Review: Critical Analysis of the scholarly debate about the Karamanlis... 9	
CHAPTER 2 .....	16
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND .....	16
CHAPTER 3 .....	21
THE KARAMANLIS IN BETWEEN .....	21
‘Incongruity’ of a language and a religion.....	21
Greek Nationalism and Hellenization attempts of the Greek Kingdom in Asia Minor .....	24
Turkish Nationalism and the perception of the Karamanlis in early nationalist discourse in Turkey .....	34
The Lausanne Peace Convention and the debates about the Karamanlis during the settlement.....	42
CHAPTER 4 .....	48
THE SELF-UNDERSTANDING OF THE KARAMANLIS .....	48
CHAPTER 5 .....	54
CONCLUSION .....	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	59

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

An established theorist working on nationalism asked me whether I had been to Greece when I was telling him my enthusiasm about the Turkish – Greek related subjects. I told him that I had spent the previous summer in Greece. He seemed surprised and asked me how I had been treated by Greeks as a Turk. For me that was an unexpected question. He was unaware that while politicians and nationalists use antagonism to further their own causes, the people on both sides of the Aegean Sea share much in common, and when they come together realize how much they have in common. However, it seems that this aspect of Turkish – Greek relations is not visible from other parts of the world. Since antagonism fits well to the framework of nationalism, enmity rather than amity is chosen to be advertised by the nationalists. As a response to this point of view, I chose to study the Turkish speaking Greek Orthodox Christian community, namely the Karamanlis<sup>1</sup>, whom I see as a product of mutual life of Turks and Greeks in Asia Minor for centuries.

In classical nationalist theory, identity seems to be based on mutually exclusive and totalizing definitions and essences, that can not be overcome. If you are a Serb, you can not be a Croat.<sup>2</sup> If you are a Turk, you can not be a Greek, and vice versa. In practice, however, life is not only composed of blacks and whites and of opposites. There are also grey domains where differences cannot easily be discerned. Especially in the Near East, which contemporary Turkey belongs in, it is almost impossible to find concrete borders between communities. Accordingly, nation builders often got lost in these grey domains in the recent

---

<sup>1</sup> *Karamanli* in Turkish. One can also use the word *Karamanlilar* for its plural form. The suffix *-lar* denotes plurality in Turkish. Greek speakers name the same group as *Karamanlidhes* and the suffix *-des* makes the word plural. In the course of the thesis *the Karamanli* for the singular form and *the Karamanlis* for the plural form will be used in order to make the usage of the word easier for English speakers.

<sup>2</sup> Kathryn Woodward, ed., *Identity and difference* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 9.

past and as a result, they tried to infuse the ‘model nation’ that they had in mind to the hybrid communities of the region.

Before nationalism created nations and disunited people in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the lands of the Ottoman Empire, the subjects of the sultans in all levels and in all occupational groups were interwoven. For example, the Turkish novelist Halit Ziya attended a Catholic school founded by Spanish priests. There he was assigned a geography book written in Turkish with Armenian letters.<sup>3</sup> Moreover in different regions of the empire, there were communities which seem extraordinary from the perspective of contemporary nationalisms. In Anatolia, there were many Turkophone Armenians. In European Turkey, some of the Slavic populations were Turkish speaking and used Cyrillic characters to write Turkish. In the largely Jewish quarter of Hasköy in Constantinople, there were Greeks who spoke Ladino.<sup>4</sup> In Crete, almost all of the Muslims were Greek speaking. In the places like Nicaea (İzник), Nicomedia, and Chalcedon (Kadıköy), there were Armenian speaking Greeks who used Greek characters to write Armenian.<sup>5</sup> It is also known that some Levantine Catholics were writing Greek in Latin characters.<sup>6</sup> And in interior Anatolia, there were Turkish speaking Orthodox Christian communities, namely the Karamanlis, who wrote Turkish in Greek script,<sup>7</sup> which constitute the subject matter of this thesis.

The German traveler Hans Dernschwam who visited Istanbul and Anatolia between the years 1553-1555 was the first person to record the existence of the Karamanlis. He noted that

---

<sup>3</sup> Halit Ziya quoted in Reşat Kasaba “Greek and Turkish nationalism in formation: Western Anatolia 1919-1922,” EUI Working Paper RSC No. 2002/17, Badia Fiesolana, San Domenico (FI), 5.

<sup>4</sup> Richard Clogg, “A millet within a millet: Karamanlides,” eds. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Isaawi, *The Ottoman Greeks in the age of nationalism: politics, economy, and society in nineteenth century* (Princeton, New Jersey: The Darwin Press, c1999), 118.

<sup>5</sup> Richard Clogg, “The Greek *Millet* in the Ottoman Empire,” eds. Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis, vol. 1 of *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the functioning of a plural society* (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), 186.

<sup>6</sup> Richard Clogg, A millet within a millet: Karamanlides, 118.

<sup>7</sup> The exercise of writing Turkish with Greek script is known as *Karamanlica* in Turkish and as *Καραμανλήδικα* (Karamanlidika) in Greek.

there dwelt in Constantinople, near ‘Giedicula’ (i.e. Yedikule), Turkish speaking Christians who were called *Caramanos* and who came from *Caramania*.<sup>8</sup>

Karaman was the name of an Ottoman province which includes today five provinces according to the contemporary Turkish administrative structure. These provinces are Konya, Niğde, Kayseri, Nevşehir and Kırşehir. The Karaman province was replaced by Konya in 1864, in accordance with the new administrative regulation called *Teşkil-i Vilayet Nizamnamesi* (i.e. Provincial Redistricting Act) in Ottoman Turkish. The same region was an old Roman province and known as Cappadocia<sup>9</sup> or Greater Cappadocia, a region with unstable borders that differed from period to period. Its boundaries in accordance with the Karamanli settlements: to the north as far as Ankara, Yozgat and Hüdavendigâr; to the south Antalya and Adana; to the east Kayseri and Sivas; and to the west as far as the borders of Aydın province.<sup>10</sup> What is known as Cappadocia today is restricted to the Nevşehir province of Turkey. Besides Greater Cappadocia, there were also small Karamanli communities living in Istanbul, Thessaly, Bessarabia, Macedonia, Mariupol, and Odessa.<sup>11</sup> In the archival documents remaining from the Ottoman Empire, the Karamanlis were referred as *Zimmiyân-i Karaman* [*zimmis/dhimmis* (non-Muslims according to Islamic law) from Karaman] or *Karamaniyân*.<sup>12</sup> According to Spyros Vryonis, although the Karamanlis were living in various parts of Anatolia, they were concentrated in the lands where the *Beylik* of *Karamanoğulları* (i.e. the Karamanid Dynasty) prevailed from 13<sup>th</sup> century to 1487. Thus, they were named as

---

<sup>8</sup> ‘*ein cristen volkh, nent man Caramanos, aus dem landt Caramania, an Persia gelegen, seind cristen, haben den krichischen glauben. Und ire mes (i.e. mass) halitten sy auff krichisch und vorstehen doch nicht krichisch. Ir sprach ist turkisch.*’ F. Babinger, ed. *Hans Dernschwam’s Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553-1555)*. (Munich, 1923): 52, quoted in Richard Clogg, *Kath’ imas Anatoli: Studies in Ottoman Greek history*. (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2004), 352.

<sup>9</sup> Foti Benlisoy, “Türk milliyetçiliğinde katedilmemiş yol: Hıristiyan Türkler,” eds. Murat Gültekinil and Tanıl Bora, *Milliyetçilik* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 925.

<sup>10</sup> Evangelia Balta, “The adventure of identity in the triptych: vatan, religion and language,” *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 8 (Istanbul, 2003):26.

<sup>11</sup> Robert Anhegger, “Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe konuşan dindaşları,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, vol. XXXV, No. 209 (May 2001): 290.

<sup>12</sup> Mustafa Ekincikli, *Türk Ortodoksları*. (Ankara: Siyasal Yayınevi, 1998), 117.

Karamanlis.<sup>13</sup> Earlier, the word was used to identify the peoples of Karaman region without considering race, language and religion. In time, it started to be employed to define Greek Orthodox Christians in the region.<sup>14</sup> Here it is important to note that, during the reign of Karamanid ruler Mehmet Bey (?-1280), Turkish language was made the official language of the state (1277).<sup>15</sup>

It is difficult to estimate the exact number of Karamanli population. The Lausanne Conference (20 November 1922- 24 July 1923) proceedings and official reports revealed that there were 150,000 Karamanlis.<sup>16</sup> Triantaphyllides (1938) took the results of the 1928 census in Greece and pointed out 103,642 Turkish speaking Greeks of Anatolian origin.<sup>17</sup> As for the earlier years, church records and *kadi* codices may reveal numbers. However, because of the fact that in the Ottoman Empire, the state did not concentrate on recording demographic data until the 19<sup>th</sup> century; and after then everything was based on religion not on language; there is unfortunately no solid data about the number of Karamanlis.<sup>18</sup> For Clogg, there were as many as 300,000 Karamanli people who were included in the Population Exchange alongside their Greek speaking co-religionists.<sup>19</sup> During the negotiations of the Lausanne Convention, Lord Curzon, on the debate about Karamanlis mentioned about 50.000 reconciled Ottoman Greeks.<sup>20</sup> Venizelos also made the same assumption that, ‘50.000 Turkish speaking persons of the Orthodox faith would stay [in Anatolia] in any case.’<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Spyros Vryonis quoted in Yonca Anzerlioğlu, *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler*. (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2003), 109.

<sup>14</sup> H. De Ziegler quoted in Evangelia Balta, “Karamanlıca kitapların dönemlerine göre incelenmesi ve konularına göre sınıflandırılması,” *Müteferrika Dergisi*, vol.1 (1998): 4.

<sup>15</sup> Cengiz Tosun, “Dil zenginliği yozlaşma ve Türkçe,” *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*1, no.2 (October 2005): 148.

<sup>16</sup> Richard Clogg, ‘A millet within a millet: Karamanlides, 133.

<sup>17</sup> Triantaphyllides quoted in Richard Clogg. A millet within a millet, 133.

<sup>18</sup> Elif R. Özdemir, “Borders of Belonging in the ‘Exchanged’ Generations of Karamanlis” (master’s thesis, Koç University, 2006), 11.

<sup>19</sup> Richard Clogg, A millet within a millet, 115.

<sup>20</sup> Bruce Clark, *Twice a stranger: How mass expulsion forged modern Greece and Turkey*. (London: Granta Books, 2006), 103.

<sup>21</sup> Venizelos quoted in Bruce Clark, 104.



The map indicates the settlements where the Karamanlis were concentrated before the Exchange

[Hale Soysü, 1993]

In the Ottoman Empire, affairs of the subjects were run under the framework of *millet*. Whether that was a well-established system or not has been a long debate but these discussions are not relevant for the subject at hand. The *millet* was a socio-cultural and communal framework based on religion which sanctified the commonality of the belief system. The *millets* had hierarchy of authority culminating in the chief prelate, that is the patriarch of each millet and ultimately in the sultan.<sup>22</sup> The Greek Orthodox *millet*<sup>23</sup> was established in 1454 and the Orthodox Christians were brought together under a single religious authority.<sup>24</sup> The patriarch was a respected member of the sultan's bureaucracy having administrative power over his followers.<sup>25</sup> The Karamanlis, as having the same faith, were a part of the Greek Orthodox *millet*. The cultural, linguistic, and religious autonomy that *millet* structure brought was operable only before the emergence of nationalism. The *millet* scheme

<sup>22</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and political History: Selected Articles and Essays*. (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 142.

<sup>23</sup> The Greek *millet* (*Millet-i Rum*) consisted of all the Orthodox dyophysites, Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbians, Albanians, Wallachians, Moldovians, Rutherians, Croatians, Caramanians, Syrians, Melkites, and Arabs. *Ibid.*, 146.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.



decayed during the 19<sup>th</sup> century because such limited autonomy could not satisfy the nationalist demands.<sup>26</sup>

The economic and social developments towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century affected the way of life among the Karamanlis. A migration flow to big coastal cities such as Istanbul, Izmir, and Mersin had already existed among the Karamanli men. However, through the end of the century migration movements increased and not only men but also their families started to migrate. There were also movements from Cappadocian villages to Beirut, Izmir, Adana, Odessa, Constanta, Athens, Cairo, and Alexandria and even to America. These people who left their home towns strived to enter the Greek communities in big cities and faced identity question,<sup>27</sup> which is regarded significant for the subject matter of this thesis.

The purpose of this study is to discuss neither the current identity question of the Karamanlis, nor to find an answer to their long debated matter of origin, but to show how they became an “object of rivalry<sup>28</sup>” between the Greek and Turkish nationalisms. The study also aims to look at how they have been portrayed in the works of Turkish and Greek scholars. Moreover the self-perception of the Karamanlis in their historical time and space will be addressed against the background of the ongoing arguments about their ethnic origins. The identification of a group of people by external actors can only provide ‘legitimacy’ to political or national interests of the identifiers and a discussion of outsiders about the identity question of a community excludes the community itself. This is what has been observed during the study. In fact, the Karamanlis were most of the time treated as ‘objects’, not as ‘subjects’ in nationalist endeavors and in scholarly works about their origins.

With the aim of constructing a framework for the subject at hand, in the second chapter a theoretical background is given. The main argument of this chapter is how nationalism creates nations and how nations are the constructs of the nationalist elites. In the third chapter,

---

<sup>26</sup> Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 112.

<sup>27</sup> Yonca Anzerlioğlu, *op. cit.*, 165-166.

<sup>28</sup> This phrase was used by Elif R. Özdemir.

the ‘incongruity’ of language and religion in the presence of the Karamanlis is discussed. Moreover, the approaches of the nationalist intelligentsia both from Greece and Turkey towards the Karamanlis and the Hellenization attempts of the Greek Kingdom through the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century are examined in light of Greek and Turkish nationalisms and the process of their establishments. The last part of this chapter concerns the Population Exchange talks during the Lausanne Peace Conference (20 November 1922- 24 July 1923) and the reasons behind the deportation of the Karamanlis for Greece with their coreligionists. In the subsequent chapter, the self-understanding of the Karamanlis is sketched against the discussions about their origins. The conclusion chapter reviews the debates over the ‘Greekness’ and ‘Turkishness’ of the Karamanlis and the reasons behind their deportation for Greece during the Exchange of Populations. Additionally, against the clash of identity myths in the hybrid presence of Karamanlis, the importance of scholarly concern about self-understanding of the Karamanlis is stated.

### ***Methodology: Problematization of Sources***

Mainly secondary sources were obtained in order to establish a discussion about the Karamanlis. For the theoretical part, literature about nation, nationalism, ethnicity, identity, and rootedness was perused. The long debated question of origins of the Karamanlis is not the focus. Instead, the attitudes of the developing nationalisms of Greece and Turkey to the identity *problematique* of the Karamanlis towards the end of the nineteenth century is the matter of concern. Studies and works which had been conducted on the subject in Greece, Turkey and elsewhere were examined. The formation of Greek nationalism and the Greek side of the debate about the Karamanlis were explored by using works of Greek scholars which are available in translation either in English or in Turkish. For the development of Turkish nationalism, the task was easier because Turkish books and articles were easily reached as well as the materials written in English.

The thesis project aims at enlightening the rivalry between the Greek and Turkish nationalist intelligentsia in the last years of a decaying empire and the ongoing debates among scholars even today about the origins of the Karamanlis. During the study, the Karamanlis were treated in their historical time and space. Accordingly, the memories of the first generation Karamanlis, most of whom might have passed away, were regarded as valuable for the question of self-understanding. Therefore, Yonca Anzerlioğlu's book which includes interviews with first generation of the Karamanlis who moved to Greece after the Lausanne Settlement (24 July 1924) was useful for the study. Moreover, the articles, which involved information about the magazines published by the Karamanlis themselves and the impacts of education activities in Cappadocia; and which could be found in journals like *Tarih ve Toplum*, *Toplumsal Tarih* and *Belleten* provide necessary information about self-understanding of the Karamanlis. The self-definition of the Karamanlis in their publications were also discovered from Evangelia Balta's work that she carried out by counting the identifying concepts which the Karamanli publishers and writers used when they were referring to their reading public.

The observations of the travellers about the usage of the Turkish language in religious services by the Karamanlis were used in order to show the 'incongruity' of religion and language in manifestation of the Karamanlis from the perspective of 'others.' However, travellers' accounts were approached cautiously because most of them were missionaries and their explanations were sometimes found over subjective.

To sum up, the usage of secondary sources sometimes created pitfalls. In fact, information, that was found in a source, was refuted by another one. For instance, concerning the number of the Karamanlis, different sources revealed different numbers. As a result, some acquirements were listed without any personal comments and the data remained vague.

## ***Literature Review: Critical Analysis of the scholarly debate about the Karamanlis***

*When history is presented from a perspective that seeks to justify a point of view, it produces a distorted picture that cannot do justice to the actual record of events.*<sup>29</sup>

Without a shadow of doubt, this approach should be adopted by anybody who is writing about a historical community, in our case: the Karamanlis. The origins of the Karamanlis has been debated for a long time. Greek nationalist intellectuals have approached them as ignorant Greeks; on the other hand, Turkish nationalist intelligentsia has regarded them as Christianized Turks. At this point, it is relevant to ask what makes a person, an ethnic Greek or an ethnic Turk. In order to answer this question, the literature about the formation of Greek and Turkish nationalisms has been examined. For the analysis of the Turkish nationalism, some works of Çağlar Keyder, Eric Jan Zürcher, Kemal H. Karpat, Bernard Lewis and Feroz Ahmad have been perused. Concerning the development Greek nationalism, studies of Richard Clogg, Pachalis Kitromilides, Vangelis Kechriotis, Stephen G. Xydis, and Dimitris Kitsikis have been used. As for the comparison of both nationalisms, the book ‘Tormented by History,’ written by Umut Özkırımlı and Spyros A. Sofos, was used. When Turkish nationalism was newly influenced by Jacobin understanding of a nation in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century; Greek nationalism for the most part, had already shaped by the Great Idea (*Megali Idea*) starting from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Hence the Greek interests in the Turkophone communities of interior Anatolia had started long before in comparison with those of the Turks. In the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, educational propaganda employed by the Greek Kingdom aimed at injecting the Karamanlis with a sense of Greek ancestry. Greek educational missions in the region and the schooling activities of the the Karamanli societies, which were established in big cities, have been discovered under the light of the literature provided by Foti and Stefo Benlisoy, Gerasimos Augustinos, Yonca Anzerlioğlu, Richard

---

<sup>29</sup> Reşat Kasaba, *op.cit.*, 15.

Clogg and Robert Anhegger. Moreover, the studies of Evangelia Balta provided comprehensive knowledge about the features and the quantity of the Karamanli publications.

The Turkish intellectuals started to write about the Karamanlis through the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In various newspapers such as *İkdam*, *Söz*, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, articles about Turkishness of the Turkophone Orthodox Christians were discussed. However, the Turkish official interest in the Karamanlis appeared in the Lausanne Peace Conference (11 November 1922- 24 July 1923). Turkish delegation's intention was not to deport the Karamanlis because they were regarded as ethnic Turks by the Turkish statesmen. Concerning the Lausanne proceedings about the debates about the Karamanlis, 'Diplomacy and Displacement' by Onur Yıldırım and Bruce Clark's book 'Twice a Stranger' are employed.

The earliest book about the Karamanlis in Turkish literature was written by Cami Baykurt in 1930s. According to Baykurt, the Karamanlis were living among the Muslim Turks in Anatolia for more than nine centuries, since the occupation of Asia Minor by Seljuk Turks.<sup>30</sup> He described the Karamanlis as such: 'They do not speak Greek but know a pure dialect of Turkish (even purer than that of the Muslim Turks), they worship in Turkish and their priests preach in Turkish. They even carry Turkish family names which are no longer used by Muslim Turks and they have no difference in their life style than that of the Muslim families.'<sup>31</sup> Baykurt tried to refute the Greek point of view concerning the Karamanlis: 'They say that this community is originally Greek and lost their national vernacular under the oppression of Turks. However, the old lands of Romans including the main Greek country were ruled by the same government (Ottoman) for centuries. Even under these conditions, in the coasts of Asia Minor and in islands many people remained without speaking Turkish.'<sup>32</sup> He also claimed that language is perennial by giving Seljuk Turks as an example: 'Seljuks changed their religion three times in two centuries from ninth century to eleventh century.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cami Baykurt, *Osmanlı ülkesinde Hıristiyan Türkler*. (İstanbul: Sanayiinefise Matbaası, 1932), 5.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

They first changed their religion from Shamanism to Nestorian Christianity and later to Islam. However, they never changed their language.’<sup>33</sup> He asserted that the main factor which kept the Byzantine Empire united was the Orthodox Christianity<sup>34</sup> and among the communities living under the Byzantine rule, the Turks also worked for the Byzantine army from sixth century to midst fifteenth century.<sup>35</sup> Many Turkish scholars like Mustafa Ekincikli and Yonca Anzerlioğlu regarded Baykurt’s books as one of the major sources about the Karamanlis and adopted similar ideas. Anzerlioğlu, in her book, indicated the existence of *Tourkopoloi/Türkopolles* whom she defined as Anatolian Turks working for the Byzantine Empire. She also listed the Turkish names which were widespread among the Karamanlis. A study of oral history with the first generation of Karamanlis who moved to Greece as a result of the Population Exchange (1923) was her further contribution to studies on the Turkophone Orthodox Christians. Teoman Ergene, on the other hand, did not discuss origins of the Karamanlis in his book; he rather appreciated the support of Papa Eftim movement for the benefit of Turkish cause in the Turkish-Greek war (1919-1922). For Richard Clogg, Papa Eftim wrote this book himself under the name of Teoman Ergene.<sup>36</sup> Papa Eftim was a priest from Keskin (near Ankara). During the war he tried to mobilize the Turkish-speaking Christians of the interior Anatolia for supporting the Turkish side. He later established the Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate. A detailed information about his movement will be given in the third chapter. To sum up, in the works of Turkish nationalist intelligentsia about the Karamanlis, ethnolinguistic nationhood was taken seriously, if not it was the essence of their arguments.

Concerning the approaches of the Greek scholars to the Karamanlis, Gerasimos Augustinos, Speros Vryonis, Alexis Alexandris and Vaso Stelakou seem to be closer to the

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 104.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 114.

<sup>36</sup> Richard Clogg, *A millet with in a millet*, 142.

view that the Karamanlis were ethnic Greeks. Speros Vryonis claims that there was no presence of the Turks in Anatolia before the conquests. Therefore, the Karamanlis could not be the grandchildren of the Turks who served for the Byzantine army. Alexis Alexandris wrote that the Orthodox communities of interior Anatolia whether Greek or Turkish speaking were the descendants from the Byzantine rule over the region. Throughout the centuries, Turkish presence in the region spared the Christians through physical extinction or cultural absorption by Islamization. Moreover, the adoption of the language of their rulers was a mechanism of survival for the Christians.<sup>37</sup> Vaso Stelakou affirms that the Church for the Turkish-speaking Christian populations remained as a symbol of their distinctiveness from the Muslims. For her, one of the main reasons for adopting Turkish for Karamanlis was because large number of them migrated to major cities where there were many local dialects so the lingua franca was Turkish.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, in his works, Gerasimos Augustinos preferred to call the Karamanlis Turkophone Greeks.

Scholars like Evangelia Balta, Stefo Benlisoy, Foti Benlisoy, Elif Renk Özdemir and Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu seem to be more careful to call the Karamanlis, ethnic Greeks or ethnic Turks. They rather, criticize such approaches and recommend to consider self-understanding of the Karamanlis. For Balta, the situation is much more complicated than the sermons which were inspired by ethnic Manichaeism. Since the region was one of the melting pots of Mediterranean, the priority should be to investigate the consciousness of the Turkophone communities themselves in their historical time and place.<sup>39</sup> Similarly, Özdemir claims that the Karamanlis became an object of rivalry between Turkish and Greek official discourse and

---

<sup>37</sup> Alexis Alexandris, 'The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910-1912): A contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography,' eds. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi. *Ottoman Greeks in the age of nationalism: politics, economy and society in the nineteenth century*. (Princeton, N.J.: Darwin Press, 1999), 60-61.

<sup>38</sup> Vaso Stelakou, 'Space, place, and identity: memory and religion in two Cappadocian Greek settlements,' ed. Renée Hirschon. *Crossing the Aegean: an appraisal of the 1923 compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey*. (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), 182.

<sup>39</sup> Evangelia Balta, *The Adventure of identity*, 28.

historiographies.<sup>40</sup> According to Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu, language, religion and origin should not be the criteria to categorize a group of people. For him, the self-definition of a group is more important.<sup>41</sup>

Concerning the debate about Karamanlis, not only Turkish and Greek scholars but also scholars like Richard Clogg and Robert Anhegger made crucial contributions. For example, according to Anhegger, the Karamanlis had two different origins: (I) they were either the Christianized Turks remaining from the Byzantine Empire or; (II) the Turkified Christians. For him, in regions like Aksaray, Niğde, Kayseri, Christian Turks were living in the 16<sup>th</sup> century; among them there were also *Yörüks* (i.e. Nomadic Turks). He also agrees that some Christians gradually took on Turkish as a result of their interaction with the Turks who were the majority in the lands they were living.<sup>42</sup>

When the Karamanlis is a matter of concern, it is important to assess the Karamanlica/Karmanlidika inscriptions found in fountains, gates, churches, schools and gravestones of interior Anatolia and elsewhere. Among the many other scholars writing about Karamanli inscriptions, Semavi Eyice also made important contributions. Moreover, Richard Clogg has works about the Karamanli inscriptions.

The articles written about the Karamanlis by Foti Benlisoy, Stefo Benlisoy, Semavi Eyice, Robert Anhegger, Merih Erol, Teyfur Erdoğan, and Evangelia Balta can be found in the journals like *Tarih ve Toplum*, *Toplumsal Tarih* and *Belleten*.

Besides the literature provided by scholars, there were also the literature written in Karamanlica/Karamanlidika and published by the Karamanlis themselves. Karamanlica/Karamanlidika was a medium for the peoples of Anatolian peninsula to get

---

<sup>40</sup> Elif R. Özdemir, *op.cit.*, 4.

<sup>41</sup> Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu, "Karamanlı Rumlar ve kimlik köken tartışmaları," *Azınlıkça* 39 (August 2008): 35.

<sup>42</sup> Robert Anhegger, "Evangelinos Misailidis'in Temaşa-i Dünya adlı kitabı ve Türkçe Konuşan Ortodokslar Sorunu," (The Fifth International Congress of Turkology, September 23-28, 1985), 16.



blended from 1718 until 1930s.<sup>43</sup> The first known text in Karamanlidika is the pages explaining the Orthodox faith to the Sultan Mehmed II. It was presented by the Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios to the Sultan (1444-46; 1451-81) and could be found in *Turcograciae libri octo* of Martin Crusius.<sup>44</sup> Concerning the contents of the Karamanlica books, it is observed that in the 18<sup>th</sup> century most of the books were about the holy book. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there was a cultural awakening and there were also the books about grammar, literature, history, geography and medicine; and the books of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were narrating the dramatic events of the era such as the First World War, the Population Exchange and the endeavor of the Turkophone communities to be accepted by their Greek speaking coreligionists in Greece after the Exchange (1923).<sup>45</sup> Sévérin Salaville, Eugène Dalleggio, and Evangelia Balta have compiled the books which had been published in Karamanlidika. The first three compilation were finished by Sévérin Salaville, Eugène Dalleggio in 1958, 1966, 1974. Balta published her compilation in 1987. In the same year, she published a new compilation with other materials belonging to the 20th century.<sup>46</sup> It seems that further effort is needed to complete this job. Among the books published by the Karamanlis themselves, 30% of input was made by publisher and novelist Evangelinos Misiliadis.<sup>47</sup> His book *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-u Cefakeş* is the first novel written in Turkish. In Turkey, there are two novels known as the first Turkish novels: *Hasan Mellah* and *Hüseyin Fellağ* of Ahmet Mithat Efendi. These were published in 1875. However Misiliadis's book was published in 1872. As it was written in Greek script, Turkish readers could not read the book until 1986 when it was published in Latin characters. The book aims at giving moral lessons through experienced or

<sup>43</sup> Teyfur A. Erdoğan, "Diğer bir Nevşehir Salnamesi: Rum Harfleriyle Türkçe," *Tarih ve Toplum Dergisi* 145 (1996): 47.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>46</sup> Sévérin Salaville&Eugène Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie Analytique D'ouvrages en Langue Turque Imprimés en Caractère (1584-1850). Grecs*.vol.1-2. (Athenes: 1958). Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque en caractères grecs. Additions (1584-1900)*, (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987). Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque en caractères grecs. XXe siècle*. (Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987).

<sup>47</sup> Merih Erol, "19. Yüzyılda basılan Karamanlica Eserler," *Toplumsal Tarih Dergisi* 128 (August, 2004):66.

fabricated stories to Turkophone Greek communities who are ignorant to the culture of their ancestors.<sup>48</sup> Misiliadis published a newspaper called *Anatoli* in 1851. There is no precise information about until when it continued to be published.<sup>49</sup> Toward the end of nineteenth century, some French novels were translated into Karamanlica/Karamanlidika such as Dumas's *The Count of Monte Cristo* (Constantinople, 1882) and Xavier de Montepin's *Less Filles de Bronze* (Constantinople, 1891).<sup>50</sup> There were also Karamanlica/Karamanlidika books published in 19th century by foreign missionary organizations such as British and Foreign Bible Society, Church Missionary Society, London Missionary Society, Prayer Book and Homily Society, Religious Tract Society, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission and Internationale Tractgesellschaft. The books published by these organizations were mostly religious and were distributed for free in large quantities (up to 5000) by missionary schools in Asia Minor.<sup>51</sup> For Evangelia Balta, these books should not be considered as a part of the Karamanli literature. Because they were published without any contribution of the Karamanlis themselves.<sup>52</sup>

Besides the scholars mentioned in this part, there are many other scholarly contributions to the subject matter of the Karamanlis. This study attempts to include most of them. Unfortunately, the books and articles provided by the Greek scholars were restricted to translations and the works of them published either in English or in Turkish.

---

<sup>48</sup> Vedat Günyol, "Önsöz" in Evangelinos Misailidis, *Seyreyle Dünyayı (Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-u Cefakeş)*, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınları, 1986), VIII.

<sup>49</sup> Robert Anhegger, Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe konuşan dindaşları, 291.

<sup>50</sup> Richard Clogg, *A millet within a millet.*, 126.

<sup>51</sup> Evangelia Balta, Karamanlıca kitapların dönemlerine göre incelenmesi ve konularına göre sınıflandırılması, 8.

<sup>52</sup> Evangelia Balta, "Karamanlıca Basılı Eserler," *Tarih ve Toplum* 62 (1989): 122.

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

To explore the the hitherto unprecedented conflict of nationalisms of Greece and Turkey which were the products of 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries respectively, and to clarify what is meant by nationalism, nation, ethnicity, and identity throughout the thesis as it pertains to the community in the intersection zone of Turkishness and Greekness, a theoretical background is required. Gellner affirms that nationalist theory is what crafts a nation and not vice versa. Nationalism compiles historical events, pre-existing cultures and cultural wealth selectively; and even alters them drastically for its own benefit.<sup>53</sup> The analysis of the subject at hand leads us to the same conclusion.

Nationalists, traditionally, perceive the nations as primordial or at as least perennial. For the primordialists, nations did exist since the human presence and they are not creations of history but of nature. Kinship, common genes and ethnicity are the bases of a nation and nationalism flourishes through realization of a particular nation.<sup>54</sup> As Gellner affirms, the nationalist theory postulates the presence of nations since the existence of human kind and a national awakening are needed to stimulate the nations and to satisfy human fulfillment which requires national consciousness.<sup>55</sup> For the perennialists, on the other hand, nations are the products of history not nature and some of the nations do exist for ages and some others appeared recently.<sup>56</sup>

In order to form a sense of nationalism, the role of elites is crucial. Specific groups of people like bureaucrats portray themselves as representing ‘national interests’ but their

---

<sup>53</sup> Ernest Gellner, *Nations and nationalism*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 54.

<sup>54</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and memories of the nation*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 4.

<sup>55</sup> Ernest Gellner, *Nationalism*. (London : Phoenix, 1998), 8.

<sup>56</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *op.cit.*,5.

nationalism not always offers true claims.<sup>57</sup> Nationalism can be seen as ‘political archaeology’ and the nationalist intellectuals are the archaeologists of this kind.<sup>58</sup> Their job is digging into history, discovering roots in ancient cultures and selectively exhibiting the discovered material. Nationalism seeks for a community’s unique cultural identity. It may be formed on the myth of an ancestral homeland, a victorious event from past or a heroic figure.<sup>59</sup> The nation, as something beyond the individuals and institutions, has been worshipped by nationalists everywhere.<sup>60</sup> It, in the hands of elites, can be exploited for social change, for mobilizing people, for claiming a ‘homeland’ and redrawing the map accordingly, and for destroying local ties for the interests of the center and the whole community.<sup>61</sup>

Actually, nationalism is one of the phenomenon of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and it was a product of Western Europe. By saying so, we don’t mean that it existed as a consequence or as a requirement for industrial and capitalist modernity. Such an understanding is not sufficient to comprehend different types of nationalisms. However, the role of modernity and technology should not be underestimated in diffusion of nationalism. Nationalism diverges from region to region and in accordance with what material elites have in their hands. For example, for Balkan nationalisms, religion was the major constituent and more dominant than language, territory and any other element.<sup>62</sup> Nationalism in Balkans has been ethnonreligious but it may be ethnolinguistic or based on territory in somewhere else. However it is also important to note that like the modernist theory, Weberian understanding which takes solely religion, language and territory as the bases of a nation can not explain the complicated phenomenon of nationalism.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Haris Exertoglou, “Shifting boundaries: language, community and the ‘non Greek speaking Greeks,” *Historiein I*, (Athens 1999):76.

<sup>58</sup> Antony Smith, *Myths and memories of the nation*, 12.

<sup>59</sup> Antony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, ideology, history*. (Cambridge : Polity, 2001), 33.

<sup>60</sup> Boyd C. Shafer, *Nationalism: myth and reality*. (New York : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1955), 6.

<sup>61</sup> Antony D. Smith, *Myths and memories of the nation.*, 61.

<sup>62</sup> Fikret Adanir, “The formation of a ‘Muslim’ nation in Bosnia-Herzegovina: a historiographic discussion,” eds. Fikret Adanir and Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottomans and the Balkans*. (Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2002), 303.

<sup>63</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, 11.

Nationalism is not universal and it does not provide systematic explanations to worldwide existent questions. For example, no person other than a Serb can appreciate why Serbia is worth dying for.<sup>64</sup> Loyalty, patriotism and national consciousness are the major elements of nationalism. People intrinsically feel attached to the place in which they live. However in pre-modern times, when they had no chance to see the rest of the country, they could not love the whole country.<sup>65</sup> Therefore, as the technological developments of industrialism became widespread and modernity brought us such inventions as photography, the printing press and so on, these elements became influential in the formation of national consciousness, the creation of loyalty and the emergence of the feeling of *patrie*. Anderson emphasizes the critical role of language as the cultural condition of nationhood. For him, nations did not emerge as a result of realization of long standing traditions of linguistic commonality, but print technology and capitalism provided languages' effectiveness. The coalition of nationalism and print-capitalism generated administrative vernaculars, (e.g. *katharevousa* in Greece) which helped to create national consciousness.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, with the help of education as well as the printing press, language can be employed to nationalize a raw community like the Karamanlis. Since languages are easily adopted, in one or two generations, the vernacular of a community may be left to change.<sup>67</sup>

Benedict Anderson defines the concept of nation as an 'imagined political community.' For him, it is imagined because members of a nation can barely know a few of their fellow-members and this situation occurs even in the smallest nations. Therefore, they can only have the image of their communion in their minds.<sup>68</sup> Smith, on the other hand, defines the nation as a named human community who has common myths, a shared history, a common public

---

<sup>64</sup> William Pfaff, *The wrath of nations*. (New York : Simon & Schuster, c1993), 15.

<sup>65</sup> Boyd C. Shafer, *op.cit.*, 33.

<sup>66</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. (London: Verso, 1991), 37-46.

<sup>67</sup> Rogers Brubaker, lecture notes.

<sup>68</sup> Benedict Anderson, *op.cit.*, 6.

culture, a single economy, and common rights and duties for all members. Ethnic, on the other hand, is a named human community with a homeland, common myths of ancestry, shared memories, shared culture, and a measure of solidarity at least among the elites.<sup>69</sup> As Calhoun affirms, converting ethnicity into nationalism is partly a matter of transforming the cultural traditions of everyday life into more specific historical claims.<sup>70</sup> In truth, every modern nation has a mixed ancestry. Common environments did exist long before modern nations appeared.<sup>71</sup> Accordingly, in the formation of a nation, the role of the elite which seeks ways to indicate common features of community members and uniqueness of a community, is significant. It should be also noted that there is no objective criteria for the formation of a nation. It was distinguished on the basis of material interests or idiomatic notions of identity other than ethnicity.<sup>72</sup>

Throughout the thesis, the identity *problematique* of a community from the external eyes and their self-understanding against the debates going on about them are examined. Concerning the fact that the introduction of the concept of identity into social sciences occurred in 1960s,<sup>73</sup> an argument about identity of a historical community could only be possible through the lenses of today. In this study, the concern is not individual identities rather collective identity of a group. The ingredients of collective identity of a community could be cultural elements such as castes, ethnic communities, religious sects, nations; or classes and regions which provide loose bonds and function like a interest group. Memories, values, symbols, myths and traditions have strengthening effect in the development of a collective identity.<sup>74</sup> National identity, as a form of collective identity is relatively a recent

---

<sup>69</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, 13.

<sup>70</sup> Craig Calhoun, "Nationalism and ethnicity," *Annual Review of Sociology* 19 (1993):224.

<sup>71</sup> Boyd C. Shafer, *op. cit.*, 16.

<sup>72</sup> Anastasia N. Karakasidou, *Fields of wheat, hills of blood: Passages to nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*. (Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), 19.

<sup>73</sup> Rogers Brubaker & Cooper Frederick. *Beyond "Identity," Theory and Society* 29 [1] (2000): 3.

<sup>74</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, 19.

concept and it has replaced terms like national characteristic and national consciousness.<sup>75</sup> According to Brubaker and Cooper, there are strong and weak approaches to identity. National identity seems to be strong and strong understandings of collective identity most of the time seeks for boundedness and homogeneity. In everyday experience of people and in political practice, many false assumptions are made concerning collective identity. Some people claims that all groups have or should have ethnic, racial or national identity. Another approach regards identity as something that people can have without understanding it.<sup>76</sup> All of these assumptions are problematic and have been encountered during the study.

Identity and self-understanding was used interchangeably when the perception of the community about themselves was discussed. We know that identity and self-understanding are not the same. The latter excludes other's opinions. Moreover, self-understanding does not have a semantic connection with sameness and difference. It is purely subjective. This subjectivity was sought while analysing a historical community's genuine stance against the endeavour to develop an identity for them by external actors.<sup>77</sup> However, it should be kept in mind that, being aware of this difference, both of the concepts were employed to evoke the same meaning during the study.

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.,17.

<sup>76</sup> Brubaker, Rogers. & Frederick Cooper., *op.cit.*, 20.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.,33.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE KARAMANLIS IN BETWEEN

#### *'Incongruity' of a language and a religion*

As a Turkish speaking Orthodox Christian Community, the position of the Karamanlis was problematic from the eyes of people whose minds were shaped by the 19<sup>th</sup> century nationalistic ideals which regarded language and religion as the bases of a nation. The Karamanlis were in fact in the grey domain between the frontiers of the Turkish and Greek nations which were yet to be formed. Unlike the Greeks of coastal regions, they were different from their Muslim neighbors neither with regard to their occupation, class, nor in their appearance, but only in religion.<sup>78</sup> They never experienced any kind of violence like the ones in the Black Sea region and the Aegean parts of Anatolia during the Great War (1914-1918) and the succeeding Turkish- Greek War (1919-1922). They had always good relations with their Muslim neighbors.

In the villages where the community consisted of Turkish speaking Christians, the liturgy was celebrated in Greek even if the priest did not speak Greek;<sup>79</sup> or it was sometimes read completely in Turkish. It is also known that throughout Asia Minor, Turkish was partially employed when the liturgy was sung.<sup>80</sup> This information was provided from the reports of travellers and British and Foreign Bible Society agents who visited Asia Minor before and during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Their observations should be approached suspiciously because their stance was usually not neutral and they frequently used biased phrases to describe Muslims. On the other hand, the reports and observations of the travellers are important in the sense that they provided an image of Anatolia which could not be obtained otherwise. W. M. Leake, in his travel book about Asia Minor, reported that, 'at Kónia (i.e.

---

<sup>78</sup> Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Ioanian vision: Greece in Asia Minor, 1919-1922*. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, c1998), 27.

<sup>79</sup> Richard Clogg, *A millet within a millet*, 120.

<sup>80</sup> Richard Clogg, *I kath' imas anatoli*, 343.



Konya) we are comfortably accommodated in the house of a Christian belonging to the Greek church, but who is ignorant of the language, which is not even used in the church service: they have the four gospels and the prayers in Turkish.’<sup>81</sup> Moreover, R. M. Dawkins reported his observations with these words: ‘The Liturgical language of the Orthodox Church was everywhere Greek, even where people did not understand the language at all. Sermons were preached, — I have heard one myself at Fertek in Cappadocia, — in Turkish, but statements of some travellers that the actual liturgy was in Turkish are, I believe, not correct.’<sup>82</sup> It seems that the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate was aware of this situation as early as 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Patriarch Hieremias III (1716-26; 1732-33) made arrangements for the young Christians from Kayseri to study at the *Megalē tou Genous Scholē* (i.e. Great School of the [Greek] Nation) at Kuruçeşme in Constantinople for four to five years to read and understand the Holy Scriptures and the liturgical books.<sup>83</sup>



A Karamanli church in Küçükköy, Niğde [Image: Gulen Gokturk]

Turkish written in Greek script is called *Καραμανλήδικα* (*Karamanlidika*) in Greek and *Karamanlıca* in Turkish. Hundreds of books were published in this language between the

<sup>81</sup> William Martin Leake, *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor with comparative remarks on the ancient and modern geography of that country*. (London: John Murray, 1824), 46.

<sup>82</sup> Richard M. Dawkins, ‘The recent study of folklore in Greece,’ in *Jubilee Congress of the Folk-lore society*. (London: Folklore Society, 1930), 132.

<sup>83</sup> N. S. Rizos quoted in Richard Clogg, *A millet within a millet*, 122.

years 1718-1929.<sup>84</sup> Among these, the first printed book in Turkish language<sup>85</sup> (1718) and the first novel written in Turkish vernacular (Evangelinos Misailidis's *Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-ü Cefakeş*, 1872)<sup>86</sup> exist. The Karamanlis also beautified their houses, churches, schools, fountains and gravestones with *Karamanlica/Karamanlidika* inscriptions.

Why did the Karamanlis use the Greek script, if they could not understand Greek? This has been explained with reference to the fact that, most of the Turkish speaking Armenians of Anatolia, either Gregorian or Uniate, were celebrating the Liturgy in Armenian when the preaching was performed in Turkish.<sup>87</sup> Pinkerton (1780-1859), an agent of British and Foreign Bible Society<sup>88</sup>, reported what he learned from the Armenian Mekhitarist monks in Vienna, some of whom were from 'Caramania'. According to his report, although Armenians and Greeks were speaking Turkish there, they were keeping information from Turks by using either the Armenian or Greek alphabet of their Liturgy.<sup>89</sup> Pinkerton did not travel in Asia Minor<sup>90</sup> so his quotation is much more questionable than those of the travellers mentioned above. It is not possible to make a precise statement but a reason behind their adoption of Greek lettering likely to be it was being the alphabet of the language of the Church.

The 'incongruity' of language and religion is not unique to the Karamanlis. The Greek speaking Cretan Muslims were writing Greek with Arabic lettering.<sup>91</sup> Moreover, the migrant Arabic speaking Greek Orthodox community who came from Hatay, a Turkish city near the Syrian border, to Istanbul still find it difficult to become a part of Greek community in their

---

<sup>84</sup> Evangelia Balta, *Karamanlica Basılı Eserler*, 57.

<sup>85</sup> The first printed Turkish book in Arabic script was dated to 1729.

<sup>86</sup> The first Turkish novel in Arabic lettering was *Hasan Mellah and Hüseyin Fellah* of Ahmet Mithat Efendi which was published in 1875.

<sup>87</sup> H. Berberian quoted in Richard Clogg *I kath' imas anatoli*, 356.

<sup>88</sup> Wayne Detzler, 'Robert Pinkerton: Principal agent of the BFBS in the kingdoms of Germany', eds. Stephen Batalden, Kathleen Cann & John Dean, *Sowing the word: the cultural impact of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1804-2004*. (Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2004), 268.

<sup>89</sup> Pinkerton quoted in Richard Clogg, *I kath' imas anatoli*, 358.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 358.

<sup>91</sup> Evangelia Balta, "Karamanli Press (Smyrna 1845-Athens 1926)," eds. Oktay Belli, Yücel Dağlı and M. Sinan Genim, *İzzet Günadağ Kayaoğlu Hatıra Kitabı Makaleler*. (İstanbul: Türkiye Anıt Çevre Turizm Değerlerini Koruma Vakfı, 2005), 28.

new home. There are no Arabic speaking minority schools in Turkey. Therefore, the Arabic speaking Greeks have to adapt the Greek language for schooling and it seems that the Greek community of Istanbul needs time to accept Arabic speaking Greeks into their community.<sup>92</sup> The Arabic speaking Greeks can be seen as the new Karamanlis. Their position also constitutes an imbroglio and their hybrid presence in terms of their ‘incongruent’ religion and language give rise to an identity question outside their realm, among the Greek community in Turkey and the Turkish majority. Why are a particular religion and a particular language regarded as incongruent? Why is a Greek speaking Muslim or a Turkish speaking Christian treated as abnormal? If people are supposed to speak the language of their Church, the Persian speaking Muslims and the Hungarian speaking Catholics would be abnormal as well. Such a narrow-minded understanding could only be possible from the perspective of the nationalists who try to shape ‘model nations’. Therefore, the incongruity of a religion and a language can only be seen as possible from a blind nationalist perspective.

For the Greek nationalist intelligentsia, the Karamanlis were regarded as raw material waiting to be forged and they could easily be Hellenized through education. The Turkish nationalist intelligentsia, on the other hand, tried to prove the Turkishness of the Karamanlis on ethnolinguistic basis. Both views will be dealt in the following parts.

### ***Greek Nationalism and Hellenization attempts of the Greek Kingdom in Asia Minor***

The development of the sense of the Greek nation, and the spreading of irredentist claims among the leading statesmen and intelligentsia under the name of *Megali Idea* (Great Idea) after the formation of the Greek State (1830) will be dealt in this chapter. Against this background, the perspective of the Greek cause towards the Turkophone communities of Asia Minor and the Hellenization attempts through education will be the focal points.

---

<sup>92</sup> Ceren Zeynep Ak, “Antakyalı Ortodox Azınlığın Günümüzdeki Durumu,” *Azınlıkça* 43 (January 2009):24-26.

From the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the developments in the West influenced the *Région Intermédiaire*,<sup>93</sup> namely the Russian and Ottoman Empires, which were geographically the closest. The trading activities provided bourgeoisie in this part of the world connections with the West besides huge material accumulation. The bourgeoisie in the Ottoman Empire was mostly composed of non-Muslims. Greeks, having a big share in commerce which was carried out in the Ottoman Empire, and was the first community to be influenced by the idea of Westernization.<sup>94</sup> Elie Kedourie describes Greek nationalism as the first nationalism emerged outside Western civilization, among a community which is ruled by non-Christians and itself fiercely hostile to all Western ideas until that time.<sup>95</sup>

The 18<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the emergence of a revolutionary national consciousness among the Greek intelligentsia. The Russo-Ottoman wars of 1711, 1735-1739, 1768-1774 and 1787-1792 were felt most severely among the peoples of Southeastern Europe, including the Greeks. The tension between the Russians and the Ottomans raised hopes among the Greeks to get rid of the Ottoman 'yoke' through the intervention of the Russians in the east.<sup>96</sup> Particular confidence was attributed to the legend of the *xanthon genos*, a fair haired race of liberators from the north, namely the Russians.<sup>97</sup> This approach in Greek political thought can be identified as 'Russian Expectation.'<sup>98</sup> If the wars of Peter the Great provided an initial step to the discovery of international relations in Greek culture, the wars repeated in the reign of Catherine II determined the context of Greek historical and political thought of the time.<sup>99</sup> Greek expectations from the Russian Empire were also related to the notion of seeing the Russians as a fellow Orthodox nation. However, the 'Russian Expectation' came to an end

---

<sup>93</sup> A term used by Kitsikis to define the region that both has the features of the West and the East in Eurasia. Dimitri Kitsikis, *Türk-Yunan İmparatorluğu*. (Istanbul: İletişim, 1996), 23.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 116.

<sup>95</sup> Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*. (London: Frank Cass, c1971), 42.

<sup>96</sup> Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *Enlightenment, nationalism, orthodoxy: studies in the culture and political thought of south-eastern Europe*. (Hampshire: Variorum, 1994), 354.

<sup>97</sup> Richard Clogg, *A concise history of Greece*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 17.

<sup>98</sup> Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *Enlightenment, nationalism, orthodoxy: studies in the culture and political thought of south-eastern Europe*, 354.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 357.

with the realization of the false promises of the Russian Empire and a sense of self-reliance against all misleading expectations in foreign aid was gradually developed among the Greek political thinkers.<sup>100</sup>

Highly influenced by the ideas spread by the French Revolution (1789) and Jacobinism, the Greek bourgeois Rigas Velestinlis (1757-1798) wrote articles, which expected primarily a social and political and secondly a national bourgeoisie revolution.<sup>101</sup> In his *Δημοκρατική Προκήρυξη* (Democratic Proclamation, 1796) and *Νέα Πολιτική Διοίκησης των κατοίκων της Ρούμελης, της Μικράς Ασίας, των Μεσογείων Νήσων καί της Βλαχομπογδανίας* (New Political Constitution of the Inhabitants of Roumeli, Asia Minor, the Archipelago, and the Danubian Principalities, 1797), Rhigas presented a constitutional draft inspired by the French Constitution of 1793, which aimed to replace the Ottoman administration with a new system which carried the principles of equality, freedom of religion, and the rule of law for all, including Muslims.<sup>102</sup> He also published a map of the Balkans and of the coast of Asia Minor embellished with replicas of ancient Greek coins and with a portrait of Alexander the Great. According to Xydis, this reveals Rhigas's classically clothed revolutionary intentions and demonstrates his leading role not only of the Balkan Federation, but also of the *Megali Idea* (Great Idea)<sup>103</sup> and for Kechriotis, his stance could be regarded as a Greek version of Ottomanism.<sup>104</sup> Kitsikis, on the other hand, argued that Rigas had never proposed a multinational federation for the salvation of peoples of the Ottoman Empire. For him, Rigas

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 365.

<sup>101</sup> Dimitris Kitsikis, *op. cit.*, 167.

<sup>102</sup> Mazower quoted in Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *Tormented by history: nationalism in Greece and Turkey*. (London: Hurst & Company, 2008), 19.

<sup>103</sup> Stephen G. Xydis, 'Modern Greek Nationalism', eds. Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer, *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, (Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, 1969), 228.

<sup>104</sup> Vangelis Kechriotis, "Greek-Orthodox, Ottoman Greeks or just Greeks? Theories of coexistence in the aftermath of the Young Turk revolution," *Académie des Sciences de Bulgarie Institut D'études Balkaniques études Balkaniques I*(2005): 67.

desired a republican structure for the State. However as Kitsikis affirms, for the multinational Ottoman Empire, his militant theory was sentenced to failure from the beginning.<sup>105</sup>

The Greek merchants who had connections with the West or who were already living in European centers were responsible for the intellectual revival of the last three decades of the eighteenth and the first two decades of the nineteenth century.<sup>106</sup> The revolutionary ideas spread among the Greek Diaspora of central and Eastern Europe, France, Italy and southern Russia were the first threat against the integrity of the Greek *millet*. The intellectual ferment that set the fire of the independence movement in 1821 was flourished by the attempts of the *Philiki Etairia* or ‘Friendly Society’ which was founded in Odessa in 1814 by three impoverished immigrant Greeks<sup>107</sup> so as to organize and to prepare the Greeks for an uprising.<sup>108</sup> The *Etairia* very soon lost control of the revolution but the leaders of the revolt and their endeavors during the uprising became the symbols of the Greek nation in the end.<sup>109</sup> The nationalist consciousness before and during the independence movement developed on the basis of Greek rather than Orthodox Christian identity.<sup>110</sup> Gradually the classical and pagan term ‘Hellene’ was adopted by the Greeks, which symbolized the growing secularism and nationalism. In the Byzantine and post-Byzantine era, a Greek called himself *Rhomios* or Roman and under the Ottoman rule, he was called *Rum*, a term that had a pungent religious connotation. ‘Hellene,’ on the other hand, was implying paganism.<sup>111</sup>

As mentioned above, the desire to break ties with the past and to welcome Western modernity went hand in hand with the renewed interest in the heritage of antiquity and was largely promoted by neoclassicist and romantic intellectuals of the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. This in the end created an understanding that glorifies the connection of modern Greeks with

---

<sup>105</sup> Dimitris Kitsikis, *op. cit.*, 168-169.

<sup>106</sup> Richard Clogg, *A concise history of Greece*, 27.

<sup>107</sup> Richard Clogg, *The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire*, 192. *Philiki Etaria* was founded by Nikolaos Skoufas, Athanasios Tsakaloff, and Emmanouil Xanthos.

<sup>108</sup> Stephen G. Xydis, *op.cit.*, 232.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 233.

<sup>110</sup> Richard Clogg, *A concise history of Greece*, 27.

<sup>111</sup> Stephen G. Xydis, *op.cit.*, 211.

the classical era actors and emphasized ‘cultural superiority’ of Modern Greeks vis-à-vis the ‘oriental’ Ottomans.<sup>112</sup> After Greek nationalism attained its first objective of creating a state in territory freed from the Ottoman administration in 1830, until almost a century later, it adopted an irredentist, expansionist semblance which was symbolized in *Megali Idea* (Great Idea).<sup>113</sup> The Great idea followed a path that aimed at ‘liberating the enslaved brothers.’<sup>114</sup> The first political actor talking about the Great Idea was Ioannes Kolettes who during the revolution had served as Secretary of the Interior and then in other posts. Early in 1844, in the primary meeting of the first constitutional government, he addressed the parliament with these words:

*The Kingdom of Greece is not Greece; it is only a part, the smallest and poorest, of Greece. A Greek is not only one who lives in the kingdom but also he who lives in Yannina, or Thessaloniki, or Serres, or Adrianople, or Constantinople, or Trapizond, or Crete, or Samos, or in whatever country is historically Greek, or whoever is of the Greek race...*<sup>115</sup>

The Great Idea inherently employed a cultural mission of ‘Hellenization’ of peoples living in the southern Balkans, in the Black Sea region and on both sides of the Aegean. In its most extreme form, it aimed at reviving the Byzantine Empire with Constantinople as the capital of a multinational, Greek Orthodox, and Hellenic state.<sup>116</sup> In fact, from 1830 up until 1922, fervent nationalists pursued an objective to expand the boundaries of their kingdom to the classical boundaries of Hellenic civilization. Such a state would have included peoples who were Greek Orthodox but did not speak Greek; Greek speakers who did not have Greek Orthodox rite; and people who were neither Greek Orthodox nor spoke Greek.<sup>117</sup> Throughout approximately one hundred years of its life, the Great Idea underwent several changes and

---

<sup>112</sup> Umut Özkırmılı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*, 22-23.

<sup>113</sup> Stephen G. Xydis, *op.cit.*, 235.

<sup>114</sup> Vangelis Kechriotis, *op. cit.*, 60.

<sup>115</sup> The speech is taken from E. Driault and M. Lhéritier, *Historie diplomatique de la Grèce de 1821 à nos jours*, in Stephen G. Xydis, *op. cit.*, 237.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 238.

<sup>117</sup> Stephen G. Xydis quoted in Paul R. Brass, *Ethnicity and nationalism: theory and comparison*. (New Delhi, London, Newbury: Sage Publications, 1991), 32.

adopted different policies,<sup>118</sup> however, ‘Hellenization’ attempts via educating the ‘unredeemed’ Greeks of the Ottoman Empire continued.

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, a scholarly debate started in Greece concerning the importance of language to define a national community. Many of the intellectuals of the time united in the idea that language is not a sign to define a nation or at least, it has secondary importance, especially in the east. In time, language as a dividing line lost all of its importance and as Exertoglou detects correctly, this direction can only be understood by looking at the emerging concepts of Greek national interests and political claims from the Ottoman Empire. In other words, the dislocation of language from its main position in the formation of national identity was a response to the ‘discovery’ of non-Greek speaking Christian communities and the need to locate them within the boundaries of the Greek national community.<sup>119</sup> Accordingly, the Greek Kingdom followed a policy of erecting a national culture and consciousness among the Greeks who were living in Ottoman territories, and especially among those who did not speak Greek. The Karamanlis belong to those non-Greek speaking ‘Greek’ communities. As links were created between the Greek Kingdom and the (Greek) Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Empire, a larger audience was influenced through informal and official channels. Greeks of the Hellenic state who dealt with commerce in the major cities of the empire founded subgroups within the Hellenic communities. Both the Greeks coming from the Kingdom and the local Greeks formed societies and educational institutions that fulfilled their needs.<sup>120</sup> The prime minister of the day, Alexandros Koumoundos stated that the re-Hellenization of ‘our brethren’ in Asia Minor as being ‘our chief and most feasible duty’ in a letter dated May 22, 1871 which was circulated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Greek

---

<sup>118</sup> Stephen G. Xydis, *op. cit.*, 241.

<sup>119</sup> Haris Exertoglou, *Shifting boundaries: language, community, and the ‘non-Greek speaking Greeks,’* 76.

<sup>120</sup> Gerasimos Augustinos, *The Greeks of Asia Minor: confession, community, and ethnicity in the nineteenth century.* (Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1992), 151.



consuls in East.<sup>121</sup> As part of the project, the University of Athens was founded in 1837 as a power house for the effort to ‘(re-)Hellenize’ the unredeemed Greek residents of the Ottoman Empire. The graduates of the university returned to their hometowns and spread the gospel of Hellenism. Until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century when the Ottoman authorities restricted educational propaganda, this endeavor continued.<sup>122</sup> Moreover, learning and church had always been closely linked to each other in Asia Minor and the teachers were often Orthodox clerics.<sup>123</sup> Although senior prelates opposed, the *Rum* (i.e. Greek) Orthodox church gradually converted to nationalism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This was partly a result of the rise of new generation prelates who embraced the interests and aspirations of the Greek nation state. Accordingly, use of any language other than Greek was prohibited in Churches. As a reaction to this approach, the Bulgarian Orthodox church declared its independence and the Bulgarian Exarchate was founded in 1872 by the firman of Sultan Abdülaziz (1861-1876).<sup>124</sup> As a consequence of nationalization of the Orthodox Church, the Orthodox communities of Cappadocia found themselves led by nationalist bishops as well as the nationalist teachers.<sup>125</sup> Another response to this attempt came from the Karamanlis who were living in the Kumkapı and Langa quarters of Istanbul. They gathered in *Aya Kiriaki* church and defended the use of Turkish in their church services and demanded appointment of a Turkish speaking metropolitan bishop to Kayseri.<sup>126</sup> Involvement of church in nationalization activities had another reason behind. It was also aimed at protecting Orthodox Christianity against the propaganda activities of Catholic and Protestant missionaries in the region.<sup>127</sup>

In the towns and the villages located in the triangle formed by the three cities of Kayseri, Nevşehir and Niğde which are part of Greater Cappadocia, most of the Orthodox

<sup>121</sup> Richard Clogg, *A millet within a millet: the Karamanlides*, 129.

<sup>122</sup> Richard Clogg, *A concise history of Greece*, 50.

<sup>123</sup> Gerasimos Augustinos, *op.cit.*, 153.

<sup>124</sup> Mustafa Ekincikli, *op.cit.*, 117.

<sup>125</sup> Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “Greek irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 26, (No.10: 11.

<sup>126</sup> Robert Anhegger, Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe konuşan dindaşları, 294.

<sup>127</sup> Evangelia Balta, *Karmanlıca Basılı Eserler*, 59.

communities were Turkish speaking. In those places, the educational activities were tied to social and economic conditions. As financial resources permitted, schools were founded.<sup>128</sup>

The schools run by the Greek communities themselves or by the prosperous citizens of the Kingdom in Cappadocia or elsewhere in Asia Minor aimed to teach Greek to Turkish speaking youths. At first, the objective was to ease for them the reading of religious books of Orthodoxy. Paisios, the metropolitan bishop of Kayseri, reports the situation in 1839:

*The Christian populace left using the language of Christianity (Greek) because they are living among the foreign communities. These people are even incapable of understanding what is being said in church.*<sup>129</sup>

Later in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the aim of educating the people was to Hellenize them. Most of the historical archeological, geographical and linguistic studies about Cappadocia were written in this period. Moreover, the belief was that the Greek language would awaken the Turkophone communities from their deep sleep and provide them progress and civilization.<sup>130</sup> Or at least as Augustinos claims, the adoption of Greek by youngsters through education satisfied the ecclesiastical needs and helped keep individuals within the ethnic group. However, success was not always obtained. As a result of these attempts, some of the Turkophone people adopted Greek as their vernacular but there were also people who resisted. This resistance could be explained by habitual opposition to what is new and by an instinct to protect the tradition. Whatever the reason was, in the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, rivalry and factions emerged within the community.<sup>131</sup> For example, in the province of Nevşehir (Neapolis) where most of the population was the Turkish speaking Karamanlis, the usage of Turkish was defended in the almanac of the “Papa Yeorgios” Society in 1913:

---

<sup>128</sup> Gerasimos Augustinos, *op.cit.*, 164.

<sup>129</sup> Hıristiyan nüfus, yabancı milletler arasında bulunduğu için Hıristiyan dilini kullanmayı bıraktı. Halk, kilisede dillendirilen kilise kelamını anlamaktan aciz durumdadır. Translated by Gulen Gokturk. Yoanna Petropulu quoted in Foti Benlisoy and Stefo Benlisoy, “19. Yüzyılda Karamanlılar ve eğitim: Nevşehir Mektepleri,” *Toplumsal Tarih* 74 (February 2000):28.

<sup>130</sup> Evangelia Balta, *The adventure of an identity ib the triptych: vatan, religion, language*, 33.

<sup>131</sup> Gerasimos Augustinos, *op.cit.*, 164.

*Our fellow townsmen advise us to leave our Anatolian vernacular (Turkish) and publish this almanac in Greek. We respond to their demand with a question: what is the percentage of the people who are competent in Greek and who are not competent in Greek? In order to understand a work like this, we need to have a good knowledge of Greek. How many of us who were taught Greek in our schools consider this?*<sup>132</sup>

At this point, it is important to note that education activities did already exist in Cappadocia among the Christian communities before the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century when public schools emerged. Prior to that date, the ones who were wealthy enough would hire private teachers. Sometimes a priest could be employed as a teacher. The pupils were taught how to read and write; and they would learn religious texts, prayers and sometimes basic arithmetic. They would rarely learn Greek other than memorizing the religious texts.<sup>133</sup> Among the schools which were opened in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were also kindergartens. The kindergartens were crucial in teaching Greek to Turkophone children.

The education activities which targeted the formation of a Greek national identity were only partially successful because some of the Turkophone people resited to embrace it. Among the Karamanlis, who took on Greek as their vernacular, the adoption of Ancient Greek names<sup>134</sup> which symbolize a secular Greek nation was common. Those who adopted a new form of identity also developed a notion of nationness.<sup>135</sup> A letter written by a grandfather to his grandson Daniilidis in Ürgüp in 1910 reveals the situation mentioned above:

*...Come my child, and we'll do it again. Gather the people around you and give lessons about our religion and our nation. Go again to church and cry for the poor Christians who are obliged to read the gospel in Turkish. Comfort the spirit of those Rums who without understanding anything, with fear of God, prayed in the church, standing for hours...*<sup>136</sup>

<sup>132</sup> “Hemşehrilerimizin bazıları Anadolu dilini (Türkçe) terk etmemiz ve bu salnameyi Yunanca yayımlamamızı tavsiye ediyor. Onlara şu soruyla cevap veriyoruz: Yunancayı yeterince bilenler yüzde kaçtır, bilmeyenler yüzde kaç? Bu türden bir eseri anlamak içinse iyi Yunanca bilmek gerekir. Vaktiyle okullarımızda Yunanca öğrenmiş olanların hangisinin aklındadır bunlar?” Translated by Gulen Gokturk. Anhegger quoted in Foti Benlisoy & Stefo Benlisoy, *op. cit.*, 29.

<sup>133</sup> Eleni Karaca quoted in Foti Benlisoy & Stefo Benlisoy, 25.

<sup>134</sup> The names ending in the Turkish suffix *-oğlu* (son of) were common among the Karamanlis.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>136</sup> Quoted in Evangelia Balta, *Προκόπι, Ürgüp: photographs from the archive of the Center for Minor Asia Studies*. (Athens: Center for Minor Asia Studies, 2004), 144.

In conclusion, the intellectual or the Neohellenic revival appeared among the Greek intelligentsia as a result of international events like Russo-Turkish wars, the French revolution and the interaction of Greek merchants with the West through commerce. These incidents opened the way to independence and created a secular mode of historical consciousness. The classical past was rediscovered and glorified. As a result of this, the role of the church in formation of religious identity diminished but its function intensified in adoption of Greek national consciousness by the endeavors of the clerics. After the establishment of the Hellenic state (1832), as early as 1840s, an irredentist approach was employed in the name of the Great Idea. There were economic benefits, force and logic in the vision of the freeing of the land and of compatriots from an 'illegitimate' foreign sovereign in the name of ethnic justice and progress.<sup>137</sup> This ideal experienced several changes but the objective of Hellenizing the 'ignorant Greeks' of the Ottoman Empire continued. In this endeavour, the Turkophone Karamanlis of interior Anatolia had weight because for most of the intellectuals, the Karamanlis were cut off from mainstream Greek life in the shores of Asia Minor and as a result remained ignorant of their ethnic origins. A national feeling should have been erected among these people through education. The most important impact of the Greek form of education in Asia Minor was the spread of Greek language among the young generations. Thus, language was replacing religion as the primary ingredient of nationness in the new epoch.<sup>138</sup> However, these attempts of Hellenization were only partially successful. Some people adopted a new form of secular Greek identity and took ancient Greek names but some resisted to it and sometimes in the end a rivalry appeared within a group. Accordingly, some of the Karamanlis supported the Greek irredentist claims in Western Anatolia during the Turkish-Greek war (1919-1922), however, most of them remained neutral. A few of them assisted the Turkish cause, which will be discussed below. Smith argues that although the

---

<sup>137</sup> Gerasimos Augustinos, *op.cit.*, 200.

<sup>138</sup> Paschalis M. Kitromilides, *Greek irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus*, 7.

educated Greeks in Asia Minor sympathized with Greece's nationalist desires in theory, such sympathy did not create a solid demand for union with Greece.<sup>139</sup> Consequently, the defeat of the Greek army in Asia Minor by Mustafa Kemal's soldiers terminated the long standing Great Idea and the population exchange (1923) and unmixing of peoples abrogated the need for Hellenization. The Turkophone communities gradually gave up the Turkish language when they moved to Greece as a result of the Convention concerning the Exchange of Populations (30 January 1923).

### *Turkish Nationalism and the perception of the Karamanlis in early nationalist discourse in Turkey*

Nationalism did not find support for a long time among the populations of Anatolia, either Muslim or non-Muslim and identity of belonging to a state had never been primarily founded on ethnicity.<sup>140</sup> Most of the Greeks would identify themselves simply as Christians, or as *Rhomoï* (Rums) which meant people who had a tradition of Orthodox Christianity even before nationalist fervor had already started to be spread by the elites in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. For Muslims, the realization of their Turkishness appeared much later than nationalist revival of the Greeks. In fact, even during the Turkish-Greek war (1919-1922), many Turks regarded themselves as people of Islam. This situation was indicated very well in the conversation taken from a Turkish novel which described the loneliness of a Kemalist (nationalist) intellectual who went to Anatolia in order to save the *patrie* during the war:

*Peasant — I know sir, you are one of those.*

*Kemalist intellectual — who are you talking about?*

*Peasant— the ones who support Kemal Pasha...*

*Kemalist intellectual— If one is Turk, how come he does not support him?*

*Peasant— we are not Turks sir.*

*Kemalist intellectual—Then what are you?*

*Peasant—we are Muslims elhamdulillah...<sup>141</sup>*

<sup>139</sup> Michael Llewellyn Smith, *op.cit.*, 29.

<sup>140</sup> Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*, 27.

<sup>141</sup> A conversation from Yakup Kadri's novel, *Yaban* quoted in Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi: 1838'den 1995'e*, cilt 3: *Devrimin yapısı ve kurtuluştan sonra Türkiye*. (Istanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1985-1988), 911. Translated by Gulen Gokturk.

Religion was the main determinant of identity for the ordinary Muslims even until the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is possible to make the same argument for Christian populations as well. In fact, I. Valavanis in his book *Mikrasyatika* (1891) described the self-perception of Turkophone Christians as such: ‘Greeks of Anatolia do not even know the name of their nation. Today, if you ask a Christian what you are, he would say ‘a Christian’ without thinking and if you insist by claiming that the Russians, the Franks and the Armenians are also Christians then what you are, he would say that he does not know and would continue that they also believe in Jesus Christ but he is a Christian. If you tell him that he may be a Greek, he would persist by saying that he is a Christian.’<sup>142</sup> Therefore, as for Greek and Turkish nationalism, the process of nation formation developed slowly because the populations were unenthusiastic to be able to be labeled ethnically as either a ‘Greek’ or a ‘Turk’.<sup>143</sup>

Concerning the process of nation formation in the Ottoman Empire, until the 1830s, there was no Ottoman nation; rather the Empire was composed of communities which had their own collective identity shaped by their distinguishing cultural and religious features and personal identity that was shaped by being part of a community rather than being part of the state. For Muslims, religion was still dominant to define an identity in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>144</sup> The idea of Ottomanism as a Young Ottoman program, aimed at replacing members of communities with citizens, appeared through the midst of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In other words, Ottomanism intended to create an Ottoman patriotism and constitutional government which grants full citizenship rights to the non-Muslims; and curbs the arbitrary

<sup>142</sup> I. Valvanis quoted in Evangelia Balta, “Karamanlıca kitapların önsözleri,” *Tarih ve Toplum* 74, (1990): 20. Foti Benlisoy and Stefo Benlisoy quoted I. Valvanis from her article. See Foti Benlisoy & Stefo Benlisoy, 32.

<sup>143</sup> Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*, 2.

<sup>144</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlıda değişim, modernleşme ve uluslaşma*. (Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, 2006), 428.

power of the sultan.<sup>145</sup> However, it was too late because the Balkan nations had already started to demand their independence starting from the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Consequently, Ottomanism was adopted only by Muslims; and Islamism and Ottomanism were regarded as the same.<sup>146</sup> However, Ottomanism could hardly keep the Arabic populations committed to Istanbul until the end of 1916.<sup>147</sup> In fact, Arab nationalism, like nationalism in the Christian communities, developed as a reaction to Ottoman Turkish rule and the repressive and centralist policies of the Young Turks from 1908 onwards.<sup>148</sup> The Young Turks were the successors of the Young Ottomans. Their movement embraced everybody who intended to overthrow the despotic regime of Sultan Abdülhamit II, including Liberals and Unionists. As a fraction of the Young Turks, the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) was secretly founded in 1889 in order to bring back the shelved constitution by the Unionists.<sup>149</sup> The CUP ruled the country from the 1908 Young Turk Revolution to the defeat of Ottoman Army in 1918. This period is known as second constitutional period in Ottoman history.

Zürcher claims that the policies adopted by CUP before and during the First World War indicated that the Unionist ideology sought for an Ottoman Muslim state. They considered every means in order to make the existing Ottoman state the Muslims' own and after 1918 they fought to preserve what remained of that Ottoman Muslim State and to prevent it from being divided.<sup>150</sup> Enver Bey, a leading figure in CUP circles, explain the CUP nationalism with these words:

*This society is not only open to Turks, but to all Muslim Ottomans. Arabs and Albanians may also join provided they are supporters of freedom and the constitutional regime.*<sup>151</sup>

<sup>145</sup> Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*, 28.

<sup>146</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlıda değişim, modernleşme ve uluslaşma*, 431.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 435.

<sup>148</sup> Bernard Lewis, *The emergence of modern Turkey*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 219.

<sup>149</sup> Feroz Ahmad, *The making of modern Turkey*. (London: Routledge, 1993), 33-34.

<sup>150</sup> Erik, J. Zürcher, "Young Turks, 'Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists,'" ed. Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Past and Today's Turkey*. (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2000), 173

<sup>151</sup> See Karabekir quoted in Zürcher, 174.

Therefore, ‘their nationalism was only consisting of Ottoman Muslims, not that of all of the Ottomans, not only that of the Turks and certainly not that of the Muslims of the world.’<sup>152</sup> Thus, the nationalist program of the CUP was based on ethnicity which was determined by religious confession. The fact that Muslim Arabs and Albanians were mentioned explicitly in Enver Bey’s definition, while Greeks, Bulgarians, Macedonians, and Armenians were left out confirms the religious base of the nationalism.<sup>153</sup> However, Arabs and Albanians were also excluded as a result of their abandonment of Ottoman cause.

It is important to point out that nationalism, either in the name of Ottomanism or in the name of Turkism, which emerged later as a response to the conditions of the time, appeared in order to save a decaying empire. Moreover language, a crucial determinant of a nation in modern times, was gradually employed by the leading political figures to shape a nation in the Ottoman Empire<sup>154</sup> and the Turkish language was imposed on Arabs and Albanians as well as non-Muslims from 1908 onwards.<sup>155</sup> In fact, the Turkish nationalist fervor derived both from religion and language based ethnicity.<sup>156</sup> However, Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935), a modernist theorist of nationalism and the first person talking about Turkism as a political program, expressed the situation with these words: ‘the formation of ethnicity based nationalism is quite recent...I don’t think that there are followers of this idea in places other than Istanbul in the Ottoman Empire.’<sup>157</sup> A paragraph from the bestselling book ‘Birds Without Wings’ (2004) narrates the atmosphere described in Akçura’s words and expresses the realization of ‘Turkish’ identity by the ordinary people in a striking way:

*...They (Christians) would call us ‘Turks’ in order to insult us, at the time we called ourselves ‘Ottomans’ or ‘Osmanlis’. Later on it turned out that we really are ‘Turks’, and we became proud of it, as one does of new boots that are uncomfortable at first,*

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 173.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>154</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlıda değişim, modernleşme ve uluslaşma*, 435.

<sup>155</sup> Bernard Lewis, *op.cit.*, 219.

<sup>156</sup> Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlıda değişim, modernleşme ve uluslaşma*, 439.

<sup>157</sup> Yusuf Akçura quoted in Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*, 27.



*but then settle into the feet and look exceedingly smart. (From the prologue of Iskander the potter)*<sup>158</sup>

The other founding father of Turkism was Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) whose solution to the identity imbroglio was a blend of Turkism-Islamism-Modernism as it is in the wording of the slogan: 'To be the Turkish nation, of the Islamic religion, and of European civilization.'<sup>159</sup> Gökalp was a member and a major *idéologue* of CUP in the second constitutional period (1908-1922).<sup>160</sup> The Young Turks (later members of CUP) who achieved power in 1908 adopted homogenization policy as a consequence of the nationalist fervent which is based on religion and language based ethnicity. The young Turkish Republic also followed the same path. Between the years 1912-1922, the most important four major political issues were the desire to nationalize the economy, the deportation of Christians during the First World War, the struggle for independence and the population exchange of 1923-1924.<sup>161</sup> All these events are related to each other and are consequences of the project to create a nation state.

As discussed before, Greek nationalism appeared as a result of the interaction with the West and impacts of the international events. Greek nationalism consequently sought for independence and salvation of the Diaspora Greeks who were living under 'backward' Ottoman administration. On the other hand, Turkish nationalism either in the framework of Ottomanism and Islamism or Turkism tried to save the collapsing empire.<sup>162</sup> As Özkırımlı and Sofos stated 'their (Turkish intelligentsia) relationship to nationalism was instrumental; it was only when the reforms failed and the non-Muslim and non-Turkish elements opted for independence that they turned to a nationalism of their own.'<sup>163</sup> Turkish nationalism in the form of religion and language based ethnicity was the last nationalism among the nationalisms

---

<sup>158</sup> Louis de Bernières, *Birds without wings*. (London: Vintage, 2004), 5.

<sup>159</sup> Gökalp quoted in Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*, 34.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 36. First constitutional period was between the years 1896-1878.

<sup>161</sup> Zücher, E. J, *op. cit.*,158.

<sup>162</sup> Umut Özkırımlı & Spyros A. Sofos, *op.cit.*,39.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

of other communities in the Ottoman Empire and in the end it looked for a homogeneous state.

What about the Karamanlis? What could be the place of a Turkophone Christian community in this model of nationalism? As they were Christians, one may assume that the Karamanlis were not regarded as a part of Turkish nation. However, debates concerning the origins of Turkophone Christians indicated the reverse. The attention of Turkish nationalism to the Karamanlis started much later than that of Greek nationalism. From 1899 to 1923, discussions concerning the origins of the Karamanlis took place in Turkish press. Şemsettin Sami wrote that ‘just as every Muslim is not a Turk, so every Orthodox Christian is not a Greek.’<sup>164</sup> Therefore, for him, the Turkophone Orthodox Christians could not be regarded as Greeks; they were definitely Turks.<sup>165</sup> For İzzet Ulvi, who was writing in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper, Turkish speaking Christians were the descendants of the Turks who moved to Anatolia in the early ages and they adopted Christianity during the spread of this religion in the region. Moreover, in *Açıkgöz*, a newspaper published in Kastamonu and in *İstiklal*, a local paper of Trabzon, articles were published claiming that the Christians of these regions were originally Turks. The same argument was continuously repeated in daily *İkdam* as well. As mentioned above, the first book about the Karamanlis published in Turkey belonged to Cami Baykurt. Before that, he wrote a number of articles concerning the Karamanlis which were published in İzmir in 1918. Later the same articles were printed in the *Söz* newspaper in Istanbul.<sup>166</sup>

The later perception of the Karamanlis in Turkish nationalism was shaped in a considerable extent by the Papa Eftim movement during the occupation years (1919-1922). Papa Eftim (Efthymios Karahissaridis) was a deputy metropolitan bishop from Keskin.

---

<sup>164</sup> Şemsettin Sami quoted in Evangelia Balta, *The adventure of an identity in the triptych: vatan, religion, language*, 30.

<sup>165</sup> Richard Clogg, *The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire*, 185.

<sup>166</sup> Foti Benlisoy, *Türk milliyetçiliğinde katedilmemiş yol: Hristiyan Türkler*, 927.

During the Greek invasion he published a declaration claiming that the Christians of Anatolia were suffering not less than the Muslims in this war and he accused the Phanar Orthodox Patriarchate of being responsible for this tragedy and of endeavoring to make Anatolian Christians forget their Turkishness.<sup>167</sup> During the war, on his way to Kayseri he visited various towns in interior Anatolia and tried to mobilize the Christians against the Patriarchate in Istanbul and against Greek irredentism. His main aim was to establish the Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate in Kayseri.<sup>168</sup> A congress was convened in Kayseri on 16<sup>th</sup> of July 1922; and on 21<sup>st</sup> of September, the establishment of the Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate was declared.<sup>169</sup> After the retreat of the Greek Army from Asia Minor, the congress lost its effect and during the population exchange Papa Eftim and his family, consisting of approximately sixty people, were exempted from mass displacement.<sup>170</sup> Papa Eftim's movement was important in the sense that his stance during the war was showed as an indicator of Turkishness of the Karamanlis. The belief seated in the nationalist discourse affirming that these people even supported the Turkish cause so their Turkishness is indisputable. This notion was defended in Lausanne Conference during the negotiations concerning the exchange of populations, which is the subject matter of next chapter. It is known that the Papa Eftim movement was not that popular among Turkophone Christians. As mentioned before, some of them remained neutral and some of them believed in the Greek cause. Efstathios Hadjiefthymiadis, a Turkophone Christian from Kayseri expressed his memory with Papa Eftim as such:

*...Then Papa Efthym (Eftim) appeared. He wanted us to make Kayseri a patriarchate and for us to declare ourselves Orthodox Christian Turks in order to avoid the*

<sup>167</sup> Papa Eftim quoted in Teoman Ergene, *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları*. (İstanbul: İ. P. Neşriyat Servisi, 1951), 7-8. For Richard Clogg, Papa Eftim wrote this book himself under the name of Teoman Ergene.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>170</sup> Yonca Anzerlioğlu, *op.cit.*, 296.

*Exchange. To say that we are Orthodox Christians but of Turkish origin. He forced us to give him 300 sovereigns for his travelling expenses...*<sup>171</sup>

The commitment of Turkish nationalists to prove Turkish origins of the Karamanlis can be explained with the sense of rootedness. What does rootedness mean? 'It is the awareness of having one's place (root) in the world by giving specific references to past.'<sup>172</sup> The debate concerning the origins of Anatolian Christians intensified during the occupation years. This, according to Benlisoy, was not a coincidence because the future of the lands of the decaying Ottoman Empire was clouded at that time. Moreover, the territories of the Ottoman Empire were far from being homogeneous but conflicting nationalisms struggled for homogenization, at least in discourse.<sup>173</sup> Concerning the Turkish side of the issue, there was a need to prove the rootedness of the Turkish nation in these lands. This could be possible through the attribution of a sense of nationness to communities which seems to look like 'them.'<sup>174</sup> In this endeavor of proving rootedness in a land, the continuity and legacy of ancient cultures and their historical depth was regarded as important for the nationalists who claimed to be descendants of them.<sup>175</sup> This situation was not only true for Turkish nationalism but also for the Greek nationalism which had irredentist claims in Asia Minor in those years. The proof of Turkishness or Greekness of the Karamanlis who were regarded as the grandchildren of an ancient community could provide nationalists from both sides legitimacy for their cause which was seeking to declare that Asia Minor is their motherland.

In the first years of the Republican era (1923-1950) an ethno linguistic nationalism was adopted<sup>176</sup> and religion lost its importance in defining Turkish nation. At this point it is important to note that, this type of ethnicist nationalism in Turkey should be considered in

---

<sup>171</sup> Quoted in Evangelia Balta, *Προκόπ, Ürgüp: photographs from the archive of the Center for Minor Asia Studies*, 22.

<sup>172</sup> Malgorzata Melchior, "Rootedness in place, rootedness in memory as exemplified by Polish-Jewish identity," *Nationalities Affairs* 31 (2007): 71.

<sup>173</sup> Foti Benlisoy, *Türk milliyetçiliğinde katedilmemiş yol: Hristiyan Türkler*, 930.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 930.

<sup>175</sup> Evangelia Balta, *The adventure of an identity in the triptych: vatan, religion, language*, 30.

<sup>176</sup> Kemal Karpat, *Osmanlıda değişim, modernleşme ve uluslaşma*, 442.

accordance with the conjuncture of the world at that time. In fact, in Italy, in Germany, in Greece and later in Spain, fascist regimes were prevailing. The Turkish statesmen must have been influenced by blood and race based nationalist ideas behind these regimes. At that era, President Atatürk himself made speeches which emphasized the uniqueness of ‘Turkish race’ and ‘Turkish blood’.<sup>177</sup> In any case, this was too late for the Karamanlis who already moved to Greece. In the 1930s, ancient cultures of Anatolia were rediscovered and texts about ‘Sumerian Turks’ and ‘Hittite Turks’ entered school books. This theory was later known as ‘Turkish-history thesis’ which according to Keyder was significant for the claim of ethnicist nationalism.<sup>178</sup> The endeavor to attest that Anatolia is the historical *patrie* of the Turkish nation in 1930s, resembles the discussions about the origins of the Karamanlis a decade ago.

Briefly, the Turkish nationalism, either under the name of Ottomanism, Islamism or Turkism, can be seen as a struggle to rescue the ship which was about to sink. Ottomanism and Islamism gradually lost their effect as a result of separatist movements of the non-Muslims as well as Arabs and Albanians. During the CUP rule, homogeneization and Turkification were adopted as policies. Concerning the Karamanlis, when Turkish nationalism excluding all the non-Muslims, it approached the Karamanlis exceptionally on ethnolinguistic basis and regarded them as Turks. This positive attitude intensified during the Turkish-Greek war (1919-1922) as a result of Papa Eftim movement and was indicated during the talks about the minorities in Lausanne Peace Conference (20 November 1922 – 24 July 1923).

### *The Lausanne Peace Convention and the debates about the Karamanlis during the settlement*

Following the devastating war between Turkey and Greece (1919-1922), on the 20<sup>th</sup> of November 1922, the representatives of the Allied Powers, Turkey and Greece convened in

<sup>177</sup> Cemil Koçak, “Kemalist milliyetçiliğin bulanık suları,” eds. Murat Gültekingil and Tanıl Bora, *Milliyetçilik*. (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 40.

<sup>178</sup> Çağlar Keyder, ‘A history and geography of Turkish nationalism,’ eds. Faruk Birtek & Thalia Dragonas, *Citizenship and the nation state in Greece and Turkey*. (Oxon, New York: Routledge, 2005), 7.

Lausanne. The conference was interrupted several times until the midst of the next year and the second phase of the conference began on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April 1923 and continued until the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 1923. Various problems were discussed and concluded during the Convention such as territorial issues, Ottoman public debts, the abolishment of capitulations, the status of the straits and the protection of the minorities. On the one hand, the treaty offered vast requirements in favor of the non-Muslims in Turkey and Muslims in Greece on a basis of reciprocity, but on the other hand, the Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations ended up with the unmixing of peoples and deportation of them from their homelands, which could be regarded as inhumane. Accordingly, for the minority issue, a big contradiction appeared with the realization of the Lausanne Settlement.

The Lausanne Peace Treaty (24 July 1923) was the culminating point of an armed conflict for the distribution of territorial legacy of an empire. During the negotiations in the convention, the idea of moving large numbers of people across the Aegean Sea, with the approval of the international community, was supported by the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, Eleftherios Venizelos; by the leader of newly founded Republic of Turkey Mustafa Kemal and his military commander Ismet; by the British Foreign Affairs Minister Lord Curzon; and by Fridtjof Nansen, a High Commissioner in the League of Nations.<sup>179</sup> The unmixing of peoples in accordance with the Population Exchange Protocol was the first experience of this kind in human history and it was signed on 30<sup>th</sup> of January 1923.<sup>180</sup>

According to the first two articles of the convention:

*As from the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, 1923, there shall take place a compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion established in Turkish territory, and of Greek nationals of the Moslem religion established in Greek territory.*

*The following persons shall not be included in the exchange provided for in Article I:  
(a) The Greek inhabitants of Constantinople.*

<sup>179</sup> Bruce Clark, *Twice a stranger: How mass expulsion forged modern Greece and Turkey* (London: Granta Books, 2006), 44.

<sup>180</sup> Onur Yıldırım, *Diplomacy and displacement: reconsidering the Turco-Greek exchange of populations, 1922-1934*. (New York: Routledge, 2006), 8.

*(b) The Moslem inhabitants of Western Thrace.*<sup>181</sup>

For the Turkish side, in the aftermath of war (1919-1922), the exchange of religious minorities came on the agenda which would enable Turkish nationalists having a leading role on the establishment of the young Turkish Republic being in turmoil and struggling for a national gathering. According to the discourse of nationalists, Turkish people would no longer be a haphazard conglomeration of men but united by a common national ideal. Throughout the hectic early years of nation building, fervent nationalistic attempts considered every means to build the wished-for Turkish nation, including homogenising the nation and nationalizing the economy through deportation of the non-Muslims.

In Greece, after the defeat in Asia Minor, the public opinion was no longer for 'Greater Greece' but for an ethnically homogeneous Greece. Having more or less the same concerns as their Turkish counterparts, and the difficulties faced by the government with the increasing number of incoming refugees from Asia Minor right after the Turkish-Greek war (1919-1922), expelling the Muslim minority was an attractive idea for the leading statesmen in Greece. In fact, before the first World War the Greek prime minister Eleftherios Venizelos, who was in office between the years 1910-1915, initiated negotiations with the Porte for a voluntary exchange of the Greek speaking inhabitants of Turkish Thrace and the Aydin *Vilayet* (province) in Asia Minor for the Muslim populations of Greek Macedonia and Epirus in order to solve Turkish-Greek problems peacefully. Since the Great War broke out, the agreement was never ratified.<sup>182</sup>

In accordance with the 'Exchange of Populations Agreement' attached to the Lausanne Treaty, the first, but not the last, compulsory mass expulsion movement of the human history

---

<sup>181</sup> *Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations and Protocol, signed at Lausanne, January 30, 1923*, ed. Renée Hirschon. *Crossing the Aegean* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003), 282.

<sup>182</sup> Michael Llewellyn Smith, *op.cit.*, 33. See also Bruce Clark, *op. cit.*, 53-54.

took place.<sup>183</sup> As a result of it, more than 1.2 million people having Greek Orthodox faith being moved to Greece from Turkey, and 400.000 Muslims being moved to Turkey from Greece.<sup>184</sup> Before the Convention gathered approximately one million Orthodox Christian and one hundred thousand Muslims had already left their homes during and after the war. After the convention signed by the authorities, no hope was left for the refugees to come back their birthplaces.<sup>185</sup>

Before Lausanne Conference convened, a consensus was reached in the parliament in Ankara to expel all non-Muslim groups in Turkey. Before and during the negotiations in Lausanne, the deputies in the Ankara parliament frequently declared that not only were Greeks and Armenians in Istanbul and Anatolia to be deported but also Jews. They advocated their reason by the claim of disruptive affairs of non-Muslims during the wars.<sup>186</sup> The early telegraphs of the Turkish side show that the desire was to expel all Greeks in Anatolia except the ones in interior, namely the Karamanlis.<sup>187</sup> They were considered as ‘Turks’ and may have been given minority rights in the long run.<sup>188</sup> In December 12, 1922, İsmet Pasha, the head of the Turkish delegation in Lausanne, made a speech in which he emphasized that the minorities may turn to destructive weapons with the interference of foreign forces. He added that he cannot take any risk which can harm the Turkish state and its national sovereignty. His speech gave clues about the stance of Turkish state about the minority question. There was no room for Christians in Turkey except the Karamanlis.<sup>189</sup> The status of the Karamanlis was important for the Turkish-Greek settlement, especially for the future of Turkey which sought

---

<sup>183</sup> After its defeat in First World War, Bulgaria was forced to retreat from Western Thrace. And a small scale voluntary exchange (which later turned to be a forced one) of populations took place in the region in 1919. See Bruce Clark, *op. cit.*, 53.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, Xii.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>186</sup> Onur, Yıldırım, *op.cit.*, 64.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>189</sup> İsmet İnönü quoted in Onur Yıldırım, 69



to show the peaceful co-existence of Islam and Christianity.<sup>190</sup>In fact, the Karamanli Christians had always lived peacefully with their Muslim neighbors and they would have provided this opportunity to the Turkish state. At first, the stay of the Karamanlis was confirmed by Venizelos. On behalf of Turkey, İsmet Pasha was happy to declare that the community in hand had never demanded a privileged position and they do not seem to do so in the future. The Turkish side was confident in the beginning of the convention that the Cappadocian Christians would stay.<sup>191</sup>During the Greek occupation in Western Anatolia, most of the Karamanlis remained ignorant or at least neutral. Their presence was seen as harmless to the ‘Turkish nation’ which was to be created. In fact, they were Turkish in their vernacular and their life style was not different than their Muslim neighbors. Moreover, the Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate had already been established by Papa Eftim (1922). Therefore, leading statesmen intended to separate the Cappadocian Christians from the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate and eventually get rid of it with its Greek flock.<sup>192</sup> However, the deal concerning the status of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Phanar and the Greek residents of Istanbul subverted the agreement on the Karamanlis.

During the negotiations in Lausanne, the Greek side insisted that the Greeks of Istanbul should stay. In return for their stay, the Turkish delegation proposed that the Patriarchate was to be removed from Istanbul.<sup>193</sup> Turkish side had two reasons for this claim. When the Ottoman system was working well, the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate had administrative and tax collecting powers. In return of its share from taxes, it was supposed to provide the loyalty of its flock to the sultan. But for the founder fathers of the new Turkish state, there was no need for the Patriarchate which had been working like a state within a state because in the new republic the minorities would be treated not different than other citizens. Phanar also had

---

<sup>190</sup> Bruce Clark, *op.cit.*, 101.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, 102-103.

<sup>193</sup> Onur Yıldırım, *op. cit.*, 75.

bad fame because of its support for Greek cause during the war. The Patriarch Meletios IV, a friend of Venizelos, worked hard to sustain material and moral assistance for the Greeks of Asia Minor during the war. In accordance with the above mentioned reasons the Turkish delegation insisted to remove the Patriarch and his post.<sup>194</sup> The Turks saw the Greek desire for the Patriarchate to remain in Istanbul as a part of the long term plan to make it the leader of Orthodox world.<sup>195</sup> For the Greek representatives in Lausanne, the Turkish claim was unacceptable. Consequently, as a result of the American and British pressure, the Turkish delegation could no longer resist and accepted the stay of the Patriarchate.<sup>196</sup> Lord Curzon suggested annulling the political and administrative functions of the Patriarchate<sup>197</sup> and Venizelos convinced the Turkish side that it would just be a spiritual body for divine services of the Greek minority.<sup>198</sup> As a gesture to stay of the more than 100.000 Greeks in Istanbul, the Greek side suggested the stay of Muslims inhabitants of Western Thrace in Greece.

As a result of the practical entanglement, the position of the Karamanlis changed. For the Turkish authorities, the Karamanli Christians could no longer be tolerable if they remain the flock of politically powerful Greek Orthodox Patriarchate.<sup>199</sup> For the Greek side, if Cappadocian Christians were taken under the influence of Papa Eftim, this may curb the power of the Greek Patriarchate and even overthrow it. Therefore, it seemed like a better strategy to bring the Karamanlis to Greece.<sup>200</sup> As a consequence of trade off politics the Karamanlis were expelled eventually as the last group of people who were subject to mass deportation.

---

<sup>194</sup> Bruce Clark, *op.cit.*, 95-96.

<sup>195</sup> Onur Yıldırım, *op. cit.*, 76.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

<sup>197</sup> Bruce Clark, *op. cit.*, 97.

<sup>198</sup> Onur Yıldırım, *op. cit.*, 76.

<sup>199</sup> Bruce Clark, *op. cit.*, 102.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE SELF-UNDERSTANDING OF THE KARAMANLIS

As discussed in previous chapters, concerning the origins of the Karamanlis, two views seem to be embraced by scholars: (I) The Karamanlis were the descendants of Turks who immigrated to Anatolia before the continuous conquests starting from 11<sup>th</sup> century or they were Turkish soldiers who were employed as mercenaries in the Byzantine army. They adopted the religion but not the language of their rulers; (II) these populations are of Greek origins; but as they began living among the Turkish masses, they were Turkified in their vernacular language but not in their religion. The debates about origins of the Karamanlis remains unsolved and seem to continue without any answer because of lack of primary sources remaining from the Byzantine, Seljuk and Karamanid rule over the region where the Karamanlis were concentrated. Both of the above mentioned views may have some sort of truth in it. However, our concern should not be origins of the Karamanlis but their sense of identity from in their own understanding. Whatever origin has a person, his or her identity is shaped by the conditions of the time and space in which he or she lives. When the conditions change, one's identity may also change or remain stable. But certainly the perception of origin is not sufficient alone to define one's identity. As Augustinos Gerasimos states, by the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Greeks living in Asia Minor expressed their identity in various ways. Among these, religion, place of origin, place of residence, culture and language; or their difference from the Muslims; and sometimes race and nation were included.<sup>201</sup> It seems that the Karamanlis formed their identity either on the basis of religion to indicate their difference from Muslims or on the basis of language to distinguish themselves from the Greek speaking Orthodox Christians. Their attitude changed from time to time according to conditions.

---

<sup>201</sup> Gerasimos Augustinos, *op.cit.*, 190-191.

In the formation of identity, others' views are also important. As an example, for many Greeks living in coastal regions, the Karamanlis were not true Christians because they were ignorant of the language of the Church.

*The people speak merely Turkish. Is it a fault? Of course not. But the Greek speakers living in Istanbul, Izmir and Europe do not think so. In their eyes an Anatolian is half Christian. They don't deserve the name 'Greek'; 'Karamanli' is the proper word to define them. A person coming from Karaman or elsewhere and speaking Turkish cannot be a perfect Christian. He/She has kara (i.e. black) religion; he/she is a Karamanli.*<sup>202</sup>

The Karamanlis had lower status among the Ottoman Greek Orthodox (*Rum*) Community because of 'incongruity' of their language with their religion. Ioannis Gavrilidis, a reader of *Anatol Ahteri*, a weekly magazine published in *Karamanlica/Karamanlidika*, expressed his resentment in his congratulatory letter to the magazine in this way: '...Some of our coreligionists whose only merit is speaking Greek, are laughing at us and trying to insult us by calling us Karamanlilar...'<sup>203</sup> In order to emphasize their difference and insult them, Greek speaking *Rums* (i.e. Greek Orthodox people) preferred to use the word 'Karamanlis' to name Turkophone Christians of interior Anatolia. Since it had a negative connotation, the Karamanlis did not identify themselves with that word. The novelist and publisher Evangelinos Misailidis was also opposed calling Turkophone Christians Karamanlis.<sup>204</sup>

In the book *Kaisareia Metropolitleri* (i.e. the Metropolitan Bishops of Kayseri) which was published in 1896, the Karamanlis defined themselves as such:

*Although we are Rums, we don't know Greek (Rumca) and we speak Turkish. We don't write and we don't read Turkish (i.e. in Arabic lettering), and we don't speak Greek either. We are a mixture. Our alphabet is Greek, we speak Turkish.*<sup>205</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> Constantis o Paroritès quoted in Evangelia Balta, Karamanlica kitapların dönemlerine göre incelenmesi ve konularına göre sınıflandırılması,4.

<sup>203</sup> From *Anatol Ahteri*, October 1, 1886, vol.5. Quoted in Stefo Benlisoy, "Karamanlica haftalık Anatol Ahteri Dergisi: 'Anatolda ilmin terakkisi kabil mi değil mi?'" *Toplumsal Tarih 154* (October, 2006): 59.

<sup>204</sup> Misailidis quoted in Anhegger, Evengelinos Misailidis'in Temaşa-i Dünya.15.

<sup>205</sup> Gerçi Rum isek de Rumca bilmez Türkçe söyleriz. Ne Türkçe yazar okur, ne Rumca söyleriz. Öyle bir mahludi hattı tarikatımız vardır. Hurufumuz Yonaniçe, Türkçe meram eyleriz. Quoted in Evangelia Balta, *The adventure of identity*, 25.

In this definition, the Karamanlis expressed their hybridity in the intersection zone of Greekness and Turkishness.

For a Christian, it was almost impossible to be seen as a Turk in the eyes of Muslims without changing their religion to Islam. Even if they had good relations with their Muslim neighbors and even though they spoke the same language, the religious difference was regarded as a significant dividing line both for Christians and Muslims.<sup>206</sup> As Balta affirms, in the Near East the segregation lines were based on religion, not on nation and nationality. The *millet*, the religious community to which one belonged, was the determining factor of one's sense of nation, nationality or identity.<sup>207</sup>

Interviews conducted by Yonca Anzerlioğlu in various parts of Greece with the first generation of Karamanlis who settled in Greece after the Exchange of Populations in 1924, reveal that differentiation was based on religion. Serafi Papadopoulos described his village in Cappadocia as such: 'There were 185 households. All belonged to Rums (Greek Orthodox people), there were no Turks.'<sup>208</sup> Anastasios Apostolidis makes the same differentiation: 'There were no Turks among us, the village was not mixed.'<sup>209</sup> The people who had Islamic faith, for them, were either Turks or the Muslims. Even if they spoke the same language, and had the same life style, the Muslims were regarded as different in the eyes of Christians and vice versa. Only if one converted to Islam, he or she could have been regarded as a Turk. A Muslim could not convert to Christianity in principle, so the reverse was not possible.

In order to develop an idea about the self-understanding of the Karamanlis, Evangelia Balta, conducted research on the Karamanli publications which were published for the Karamanli readers by the Karamanlis themselves. In that research, the elements which were used to define race (*genos*), nation (*ethnos*) and religion and relations between them were

---

<sup>206</sup> Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu, *op. cit.*, 35.

<sup>207</sup> Evangelia Balta, *The Adventure of identity*, 41.

<sup>208</sup> Mihail Papadopoulos quoted in Yonca Anzerlioğlu, *op.cit.*, 138.

<sup>209</sup> Anastasios Apostolidis quoted in Yonca Anzerlioğlu, 139.

analysed. Two points were considered in this endeavour: (I) how the writers and translators addressed the readers and how they reflect their connection to them, and (II) the reasons provided behind releasing a translation or writing a book. In accordance with this study, ‘Christians’, ‘Christians of Anatolia’, ‘Orthodox Christians of Anatolia’ were the ones most frequently employed. The use of these terms was also changing over time. ‘Christians’ or ‘Christians of Anatolia’ were complemented with ‘Orthodox’ as a signifier when the activity of the Bible Society began and Missionary activities started to be seen as a threat to their religion by the Karamanlis.<sup>210</sup> The reading Karamanli public was also referred to as ‘coreligionists’, ‘our Christian brethren’,<sup>211</sup> ‘pious Orthodox Christians from Anatolia’, ‘Eastern Christians who do not know Greek language’, and ‘Anatolians’.<sup>212</sup> Balta also states that, the term ‘Greek’ was not used to denote ethnicity in Karamanli publications. When they wanted to emphasize ‘ethnicity’, they employed the word *Rum* which means Greek Orthodox. Moreover, wherever the word ‘Greek’ was used, it indicated the language.<sup>213</sup> They would describe Turkish as ‘(our) Anatolian vernacular’ in their publications.<sup>214</sup>

Towards the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, with the changing social and economic conditions, the self-understanding of the Karamanlis started to change. A new form of identity was developed among the educated ones and among the emigrees. From the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century until the Population Exchange, it is possible to talk about three types of identity among the Karamanlis: the Athenocentric Hellenic<sup>215</sup>, the traditional Greek Orthodox, and the Turkish identity fomented by Papa Eftim during the Turkish-Greek War (1919-1923). The last one was embraced by few people. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Ottoman Empire was facing new economic and social developments. This change was extensively felt especially in the

<sup>210</sup> Evangelia Balta, *The Adventure of identity*, 40-41.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>212</sup> Richard Clogg, *A millet within a millet*, 127.

<sup>213</sup> Evangelia Balta, *The Adventure of identity*, 43.

<sup>214</sup> See footnote number 102. See also Stefo Benlisoy, Karamanlıca haftalık Anatol Ahteri Dergisi: ‘Anatolda ilmin terakkisi kabil mi değil mi?’, 57. ‘...zira bu gibi bi roman zannımıza göre Anatol lisanında görülmedi.’ (we think that a novel like this has never been witnessed in our Anatolian vernacular.)

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

seaboard cities. Throughout the century, a migration flow was seen among the Turkophone communities from interior Anatolia to cities like Istanbul, Izmir, and Mersin. Most of them were employed as unskilled workers and some of them dealt with commerce. The emigres in encountered an identity problem in their new spaces. They reproduced and reified their identity in big cities by founding societies with their townsmen and through this manner they assisted their home towns in various ways such as by establishing society schools.<sup>216</sup> In their new homes, many of them were Hellenized as a result of their endeavour to be part of the local Greek community. Moreover, the pupils educated in society schools and in the ones built with the aid of the Greek Kingdom embraced a sort of Hellenic identity as mentioned previously. Some of them even took classical Greek names to indicate their Greekness.<sup>217</sup> However, it would be wrong to say that these attempts were all successful. In fact, many people remained ignorant and maintained their traditional Greek Orthodox (*Rum*) identity and continued to speak Turkish. According to R. M. Dawkins, Greek dialects of Cappadocia remained weak in opposition to Turkish and the bookish Greek of the schools (i.e. *katharevousa*).<sup>218</sup> In fact even in formerly Greek speaking communities, Turkish was adopted and Greek was only known by elderly people as late as 1880s.<sup>219</sup> At this point, it is important to note that not speaking Greek is not a sufficient sign for not adopting Greek identity but it is also crucial to note that during the Turkish-Greek war, Cappadocian Christians in general remained ignorant to Greek irredentism. The reason behind their ignorance may be their isolation and the distance of their spaces from Western Anatolia or it may be related to their lack of concern in the Greek national cause.

As mentioned before, a few of them identified themselves with the Turkish cause during the war and followed the way initiated by Papa Eftim who emphasized the Turkishness

<sup>216</sup> Foti Benlisoy & Stefo Benlisoy, *Nevşehir Mektepleri*, 26.

<sup>217</sup> Petropulu quoted in Foti Benlisoy & Stefo Benlisoy, 29.

<sup>218</sup> Richard M. Dawkins, "Turko-Christian Songs," 185-186, quoted in Richard Clogg, *A millet within a millet*, 131.

<sup>219</sup> See observations of Paulos Karolidēs, Henri Grégoire and N. S. Rizos in Richard Clogg, 131.

of the Karamanlis and who was fighting fiercely against the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Phanar.

It is not easy to make a concluding remark about the self-understanding of the Karamanlis with the sources in hand. At least we do know that they did not see themselves as Turks because the Islamic religion was regarded as the main component of Turkishness and for most of them, the terms Turk and Muslim evoked the same meaning. We also know that until the Hellenization attempts, the Greek Orthodox religion was the main signifier of their identity



**Door plate of a school in Aravan (School in the Place of Aravan = Built with the honourable assistance of the Society, 1891 May 1)<sup>220</sup> [Image: Gulen Gokturk]**

---

<sup>220</sup> Today Kumluca, a village located in Niğde. The contemporary owner of the house where this plate was found above the exit door claimed that the house was owned by a priest before 1923. The village Aravan was inhabited by Turkophone Christians. The script in this plate is Greek. The house might have been owned by a priest who at the same time was responsible for education and the school may have been assisted by the 'Society' founded by the emigrants living in big cities. The inscription is translated by Nikos Agiotis.



## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

The Christian villages of Cappadocia were deserted by the Karamanlis as a result of the Exchange of Populations (1923-1924). Their expulsion as well as the deportation of the Greek speaking Muslims of Crete during the mass displacement proved once again religion's determining effect on boundaries of belonging for certain groups of people in the eyes of 'others'.

For a Turkophone Christian Community whose religion and language are 'incongruent' from the perspective of the nationalists, a debate about their identity *problematic* was inevitable at the age of nationalism. In fact, after the establishment of the Greek State in 1830, the 'salvation' of the 'enslaved brothers' came on the agenda of the Greek statesmen. The Karamanlis, in their eyes were basically 'ignorant' Greeks. They must have adopted Turkish as their vernacular either as a result of their isolation from the coastal regions, which could be seen as the heart of Greek life, or they must have forgotten their Greek among the Turkish speaking Muslim masses. Their former claim seems questionable because in Cappadocia, there were also Christian settlements (e.g. Sinasos) where the inhabitants were Greek speaking. If isolation was the reason, why would some Cappadocians have remained Greek speaking? The latter argument, on the other hand, is quite possible. As a result of their interaction with their Muslim neighbors, some people may have left their vernacular language. Moreover, the language of the ruling authority was Turkish. Accordingly, in their relationship to the state, they had to use Turkish. According to Greek statesmen, whatever the reason was, the Karamanlis were Orthodox Christians and they could be Hellenized through schooling. Before the attempts of the Greek Kingdom, the Patriarchate in Istanbul was already anxious about the Karamanlis because in most of the Cappadocia villages, the Liturgy was sung in Turkish and the use of Turkish in the Greek Orthodox Church was regarded

problematic in itself. When a secular Hellenic identity was embraced by the Kingdom, this also affected the Church. The role of the Church in determining a religious identity diminished and its role on realization of a national identity increased. In other words, the Greek Orthodox Church converted to nationalism. This, in the end caused the establishment of an independent Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 and initiated complaints among the Turkish speaking Orthodox community in Istanbul. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Greek Kingdom appointed teachers to schools in various settlements of Asia Minor. Moreover, as a result of the economic and social vivacity in major Ottoman cities, a new migration movement appeared from Cappadocian towns to big cities. The Karamanlis, in their new homes faced the identity question. To be part of the local Greek communities, most of them were Hellenized in their vernacular and took on Greek national cause. They also established societies with their fellow townsmen in big cities and helped their hometowns by building schools and churches. The interest of the Greek state on the Turkophone Orthodox Christians was a part of the irredentist project called *Megali Idea*. The Kingdom, for the Greek statesmen, was just a small part of 'Greater Greece'. In fact, until the defeat of Greek armies in Asia Minor (1922), the irredentist project was still prevailing.

Turkish nationalism, on the other hand, either in the form of Ottomanism, Islamism or in the form of Turkism was targeted saving the decaying empire. However, the communities in the empire had already started to be nationalized. The attempts of creating Ottoman patriotism remained futile. Ottomanism was embraced only by Muslims; and Islamism and Ottomanism evoked the same meaning. During the CUP rule (1908-1919), ethnicity and religion based nationalism was invoked. Accordingly, a Turkification policy was employed and the Turkish language was imposed on non-Turkish speaking communities either Muslim or non-Muslim. As a result, Arabs and Albanians also left the Ottoman cause. Under these conditions, what could be the approach of Turkish nationalists towards Turkish speaking

Orthodox community? From 1899 to 1923, in various newspaper, articles which were claiming the ‘Turkishness’ of the Karamanlis were published. However, the solid attitude of the Turkish nationalists to the Turkophone Christians emerged parallel with Papa Eftim who fought against the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Phanar during the occupation years and mobilized the Turkophone Christians to support the Turkish cause. His movement provided the Turkish nationalists a ‘proof’ of ‘Turkishness’ of the Karamanlis, which is still the dominant idea among the Turkish scholars studying on this topic. What has been meant by ‘Turkishness’ is still vague. Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu raises this question and asks: ‘What kind of Turkishness we mean here (about the Karamanlis): Turkishness based on an ethnic group; Turkishness based on the nation of Turkish Republic; or Turkishness based on a multinational pan-Turkist group?’<sup>221</sup> This question deserves to be emphasized.

During the Lausanne talks, (November 1922- July 1923) the Turkish delegation defended the stay of the Karamanlis. However, the discussions about the Patriarchate in Istanbul changed the picture. The Turkish statesmen fiercely opposed the idea of existence of the Patriarchate. For them, under the Turkish Republic, everybody would be treated the same before laws either Muslim or non-Muslim. There was no need for the Patriarchate which worked as an administrative body responsible for the affairs of the Greek Orthodox subjects of the sultan. Moreover, during the war, the Patriarchate supported the Greek movement. The Turkish statesmen also regarded its existence as a part of a long term plan to make it the center of Orthodox Christianity. In the end, all the administrative powers of the Patriarchate were dissolved and it remained only responsible for the religious ceremonies of the Greek Orthodox flock. Under these conditions, as a large group of Orthodox Christians, the stay of the Karamanlis loyal to the Patriarchate was seen risky for the Turkish state by the statesmen. The Greek side, on the other hand, preferred to bring the Karamanlis to Greece because Papa

---

<sup>221</sup> Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu, *op. cit.*, 34.

Eftim and his Turkish Orthodox Patriarchate may have weakened the power of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate with a large Cappadocian flock. Consequently, as a result of trade off politics, the Karamanlis left their hometowns as the last group of people who were exposed to the mass deportation.

The debate over Turkishness or Greekness of the Karamanlis is a part of the endeavor to prove that Anatolia is the natural homeland of the Turks or Greeks. It is the claim of rootedness in a land. Whoever demonstrates that the Karamanlis were the descendants of ethnic Turks or ethnic Greeks, would be able to say that Anatolia is their *patrie*. However, the Karamanlis were in the intersection zone of Turkishness and Greekness. They were the products of the centuries of mutual life. They were in the grey domain. As a result of concerns over high politics, they were deported from their home together with hundred of thousands of their coreligionists and Muslims. The debates concerning the origins of the Karamanlis were exploited for the sake of legitimizing nationalist causes. In fact, the clash of ‘identity myths’—neatly tailored by Turkish and Greek States—came into being in the hybrid presence of Karamanlis. At the end, everybody believed their own constructs. The self-understanding of the Karamanlis, however, should be the concern.

As repeated above, this study never aimed to show self-understanding of the Karamanlis in their new spaces in Greece. Throughout the thesis, the Karamanlis were treated as a group of people with long lasting lineage in their old hometowns in interior Asia Minor before their expulsion. To be regarded as a Turk, Islam was the first and foremost requirement, therefore, the Karamanlis never saw themselves as Turks. Until the Hellenization attempts towards the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, they did not see themselves as Greeks either. Since religion was the main identifier of one’s identity in the lands of Ottoman Empire, they were simply the Greek Orthodox Christians (i.e. *Rums*). After the nationalist fervent spread in Anatolia, some of them become Greeks. Some of them remained Greek Orthodox

Christians and a few of them become Turks. As Pfaff says, being a French, being a Greek or being a Turk is something political and cultural.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>222</sup> William Pfaff, *op. cit.*, 20.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adanir, Fikret. 'The formation of a 'Muslim' nation in Bosnia-Hercegovina: a historiographic Discussison.' Eds. Fikret Adanır and Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottomans and the Balkans*. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2002.
- Ahmad, Feroz. *The making of modern Turkey*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Ak, C. Zeynep. "Antakyalı Ortodox Azınlığın Günümüzdeki Durumu." *Azınlıkça* 43 (January 2009): 24-26.
- Alexandris, Alexis. 'The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910-1912): A contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography.' Eds. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi. *Ottoman Greeks in the age of nationalism: politics, economy and society in the nineteenth century*. Princeton, N.J.: Darwin Press, 1999.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Anhegger, Robert. "Evangelinos Misailidis ve Türkçe konuşan dindaşları." *Tarih ve Toplum*, Vol. XXXV, No. 209 (May 2001):290-298.
- Anhegger, Robert. "Evangelinos Misailidis'in Temaşa-i Dünya adlı kitabı ve Türkçe Konuşan Ortodokslar Sorunu." The Fifth International Congress of Turkology, September 23-28, 1985.
- Anzerlioğlu, Yonca. *Karamanlı Ortodoks Türkler*. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2003.
- Augustinos, Gerasimos. *The Greeks of Asia Minor: confession, community, and ethnicity in the nineteenth century*. Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1992.
- Avcıoğlu, Doğan. *Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi: 1838'den 1995'e, cilt 3: Devrimin yapısı ve kurtuluştan sonra Türkiye*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1985-1988.
- Balta, Evangelia. *Προκόπι, Ürgüp: photographs from the archive of the Center for Minor Asia Studies*. Athens: Center for Minor Asia Studies, 2004.

----- *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque en caractères grecs. XXe siècle.* Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure, 1987.

----- "Karamanli Press (Smyrna 1845-Athens 1926)." Eds. Oktay Belli, Yücel Dağlı and M. Sinan Genim, *İzzet Günadağ Kayaoğlu Hatıra Kitabı Makaleler.* İstanbul: Türkiye Anıt Çevre Turizm Değerlerini Koruma Vakfı, 2005.

----- "Karamanlıca kitapların dönemlerine göre incelenmesi ve konularına göre sınıflandırılması." *Müteferrika Dergisi, vol.18* (1998): 3-19.

----- "The adventure of identity in the triptych: vatan, religion and language." *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi 8* (İstanbul, 2003): 25-44.

----- "Karamanlıca Basılı Eserler." *Tarih ve Toplum 62* (1989): 121-123.

Baykurt, Cami. *Osmanlı ülkesinde Hıristiyan Türkler.* İstanbul: Sanayiinefise Matbaası, 1932.

Benlisoy, Foti, and Benlisoy, Stefo. "19. Yüzyılda Karamanlılar ve eğitim: Nevşehir Mektepleri." *Toplumsal Tarih 74* (February 2000): 24-33.

Benlisoy, Foti. "Türk milliyetçiliğinde katedilmemiş yol: Hıristiyan Türkler." Eds. Murat Gültekingil and Tanıl Bora, *Milliyetçilik.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Benlisoy, Stefo. "Karamanlıca haftalık Anatol Ahteri Dergisi: 'Anatolda ilmin terakkisi kabil mi değil mi?'" *Toplumsal Tarih 154* (October, 2006): 56-60.

Brass, R. Paul. *Ethnicity and nationalism: theory and comparison.* New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1991.

Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick, Cooper. *Beyond "Identity."* *Theory and Society 29* [1] (2000): 1-47.

Calhoun, Craig. "Nationalism and ethnicity." *Annual Review of Sociology 19* (1993): 211-239.

Clark, Bruce. *Twice a stranger: How mass expulsion forged modern Greece and Turkey.* London: Granta Books, 2006.

Clogg, Richard. "A millet within a millet: Karamanlides." Eds. Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Isaawi, *The Ottoman Greeks in the Age of nationalism: politics, economy, and society in nineteenth century*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Darwin Press, c1999.

----- "The Greek *Millet* in the Ottoman Empire." Eds. Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis, vol. 1 of *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the functioning of a plural society*. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982.

----- *A concise history of Greece*. Cambridge, New York, Victoria: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

----- *Kath' imas Anatoli: Studies in Ottoman Greek History*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2004.

Dawkins, M. Richard. 'The recent study of folklore in Greece.' in *Jubilee Congress of the Folk-lore society*. London: Folklore Society, 1930.

De Bernières, Louis. *Birds without wings*. London: Vintage, 2004.

Detzler, Wayne. 'Robert Pinkerton: Principal agent of the BFBS in the kingdoms of Germany.' Eds. Stephen Batalden, Kathleen Cann & John Dean, *Sowing the word: the cultural impact of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1804-2004*. Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2004.

Ekincikli, Mustafa. *Türk Ortodokslar*. Ankara: Siyasal Yayınevi, 1998.

Erdoğan, A. Teyfur. "Diğer bir Nevşehir Salnamesi: Rum Harfleriyle Türkçe." *Tarih ve Toplum Dergisi* 145 (1996): 47-50.

Ergene, Teoman. *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları*. İstanbul: İ. P. Neşriyat Servisi, 1951.

Erol, Merih. "19. Yüzyılda basılan Karamanlıca Eserler." *Toplumsal Tarih Dergisi* 128 (August, 2004): 66-71.

Exertoglou, Haris. "Shifting boundaries: language, community and the 'non Greek speaking Greek.'" *Historein* 1, (Athens 1999):75-92.



Eyice, Semavi. “Anadolu’da ‘Karamanlıca Kitabeler: Grek Harfleriyle Türkçe Kitabeler.”

*Belleten XXXIX 153 (1975): 25-48.*

----- “Anadolu’da ‘Karamanlıca Kitabeler: Grek Harfleriyle Türkçe Kitabeler II.”

*Belleten XLIV 173-176 (1980): 683-696.*

Gellner, Ernest. *Nationalism*. London : Phoenix, 1998.

----- *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

Günyol, Vedat. “Önsöz” in Evangelinos Misailidis, *Seyreyle Dünyayı (Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakar-u Cefakeş)*. İstanbul: Cem Yayinlari, 1986.

Hirschon, Renée. *Crossing the Aegean*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003.

Karakasidou, N. Anastasia. *Fields of wheat, hills of blood: Passages to nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Karpat, H. Kemal. *Osmanlıda değişim, modernleşme ve uluslaşma*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, 2006.

Karpat, H. Kemal. *Studies on Ottoman Social and political History: Selected Articles and Essays*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Kasaba, Reşat. “Greek and Turkish Nationalism in Formation: Western Anatolia 1919-1922.”  
EUI Working Paper RSC No. 2002/17, Badia Fiesolana, San Domenico (FI).

Kechriotis, Vangelis. “Greek-Orthodox, Ottoman Greeks or just Greeks? Theories of coexistence in the aftermath of the Young Turk revolution.” *Académie des Sciences de Bulgarie Institut D’études Balkaniques études Balkaniques I(2005): 51-71.*

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*. London: Frank Cass, c1971.

----- *Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Keyder, Çağlar. ‘A history and geography of Turkish nationalism.’ Eds. Faruk Birtek &Thalia Dragonas, *Citizenship and the nation state in Greece and Turkey*. Oxon, New York: Routledge, 2005.

Kitromilides, M. Paschalis. *Enlightenment, nationalism, orthodoxy: studies in the culture and political thought of south-eastern Europe*. Hampshire: Variorum, 1994.

----- “Greek irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 26, (No. 1): 3-17.

Kitsikis, Dimitri. *Türk-Yunan İmparatorluğu*. Istanbul: İletişim, 1996.

Koçak, Cemil. “Kemalist milliyetçiliğin bulanık suları.” Eds. Murat Gültekingil and Tanıl Bora, *Milliyetçilik*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Leake, M. William. *Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor with comparative remarks on the ancient and modern geography of that country*. London: John Murray, 1824.

Lewis, Bernard. *The emergence of modern Turkey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Melchior, Malgorzata . “Rootedness in place, rootedness in memory as exemplified by Polish-Jewish identity.” *Nationalities Affairs* 31 (2007): 71-80.

Özdemir, R. Elif. “Borders of Belonging in the ‘Exchanged’ Generations of Karamanlis.” Master’s thesis, Koç University, 2006.

Özkırımlı, Umut, and Sofos, A. Spyros. *Tormented by history: nationalism in Greece and Turkey*. London: Hurst & Company, 2008.

Pfaff, William. *The wrath of nations*. New York : Simon & Schuster, c1993.

Salaville, Sévérien and Dalleggio, Eugène. *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie Analytique D’ouvrages en Lingue Turque Imprimés en Caractere (1584-1850). Grecs vol.1-2*. Athenes: 1958.

Shafer, C. Boyd. *Nationalism: myth and reality*. New York : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1955.

Smith, D. Anthony. *Myths and memories of the nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

----- *Nationalism: Theory, ideology, history*. Cambridge : Polity, 2001.

- Smith, L. Michael. *Ioanian vision: Greece in Asia Minor, 1919-1922*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, c1998.
- Soysü, Hale. *Kavimler Kapısı-1*. Istanbul: Kaynal Yayınları, 1993.
- Stelakou, Vasso. 'Space, place, and identity: memory and religion in two Cappadocian Greek Settlements.' Ed. Renée Hirschon. *Crossing the Aegean: an appraisal of the 1923 compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2003.
- Tosun, Cengiz. "Dil zenginliği yozlaşma ve Türkçe." *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 1, no.2 (October 2005): 136-154.
- Woodward, Kathryn. Ed. *Identity and Difference*. London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Xydis, G. Stephen. 'Modern Greek Nationalism.' Eds. Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer, *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, 1969.
- Yağcıoğlu, Dimostenis. "Karamanlı Rumlar ve kimlik köken tartışmaları." *Azınlıkça* 39 (August 2008): 34-35.
- Yıldırım, Onur. *Diplomacy and displacement: reconsidering the Turco-Greek exchange of populations, 1922-1934*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Zürcher, J. Erik. "Young Turks, 'Ottoman Muslims and Turkish Nationalists.'" Ed. Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Past and Today's Turkey*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2000.