



Περίληψη :

The attempt to establish a Turkish national church for the Turkish-speaking Orthodox populations of the inner Asia Minor took place during the Greek-Turkish confrontation in 1919-1922. Eftymios Karachisaridis, known as Papa Eftim, played a leading part in the establishment of an independent Turkish-Orthodox Church, with the support of the Turkish state. In essence, the Turkish-Orthodox Church ended up being a family affair for the appropriation of the real estate of the community of Galata.

Χρονολόγηση

1921-

Γεωγραφικός εντοπισμός

Constantinople (Istanbul)

1. Papa Eftim and the Turkish Orthodox Church

The Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate played a determining role in forming the relations between the Patriarchate and the Turkish state as well as influencing the occasional governmental politics against the Greek-Orthodox minority of Constantinople.

The attempt to establish a Turkish national church for the Turkish-speaking [Orthodox populations](#) of the inner Asia Minor took place during the Greek-Turkish confrontation in 1919-1922.¹ The government of [Ankara](#) introduced a bill for the establishment of an independent Turkish-Orthodox Church and it took action to effectuate this scheme, especially after the election of Meletios Metaxakis in the Patriarchal throne in the end of 1921. [Eftymios Karachissaridis](#), known as Papa Eftim, the representative of the metropolitan in the community of Keskinmeden, played a leading part in this scheme. Thanks to his association with important personalities of the Turkish national movement, he came to the fore in the establishment of a Turkish Orthodox Church.

Eftim tried to persuade all the Orthodox communities outside the areas under Greek occupation that cooperating with Ankara would turn to their advantage. Furthermore, through his various actions and mediations, he assisted the communities against the threat of exile and retaliations inflicted by the Turks. Eftim accused the Patriarchate of treason and of trying to Hellenise the Orthodox populations of Asia Minor, who, according to him, were in fact of Turkish ethnic origin.² In the summer of 1922, he took the initiative to convene the Turkish-Orthodox Ecclesiastical Congress³ in [Kaisareia](#) (Kayseri). In the autumn of the same year the Congress proclaimed the foundation of the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate.⁴

According to the prevalent notion in the Greek historiography, the establishment of a Turkish-Orthodox Church was just a tactical manoeuvre on behalf of the government of Ankara. Of course, the whole matter favoured Ankara so as to counter the outcry and propaganda of the West against the suppression of the Christians in Asia Minor. On the other hand, the relevant Turkish bibliography presents a scheme according to which the Turkish-Orthodox Church was the outcome of the spontaneous national revival of the Turkish-speaking Christians in Asia Minor.⁵ Surely, the establishment of a Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate cannot be seen as an expression of the Turkish national sentiment on behalf of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox and it is certain that Ankara had put pressure on the Orthodox. However, by turning the official Turkish position down, the Greek bibliography diminishes the importance of this attempt interpreting it as just a tactical manoeuvre of Kemalists.

In contrast to this approach, we can treat the attempt to establish an independent Church as a response to the specific needs of the Orthodox being outside the Greek areas. The Orthodox of the inland got into an awkward position due to the total identification of the Patriarchate of Constantinople with Greek irredentism after the armistice, and to the abolition of the [Orthodox millet](#) of the Ottoman Empire.⁶ Their existence in Turkish territory could not be anymore legitimized by their integration in the Orthodox [millet](#), as the millet



and the [Patriarchate](#) had abandoned Ottoman law. As a result, it was reasonable that the [Orthodox of the inland](#) kept their distance from the Patriarchate's positions and that they pursued a different legitimizing framework within the Turkish territory.⁷

The theories about the Turkish origin of the Turkish-speaking Christians played a decisive role in the whole matter.⁸ Except for their propagandist overtones, these theories constituted an essential element in constructing Turkish national identity. The acceptance of the Turkish origin of the Turcophone Christians was based on a different version of national history and constituted a distinctive attempt for the construction of a national imagined community.⁹

2. The Turkish-Orthodox Church after the Asia Minor Catastrophe

After the collapse of the front, the Turkish-Orthodox movement lost its significance. During the conference in Lausanne there had been indications that the Turcophone Orthodox of the inland could be exempted from the population exchange,¹⁰ but they were eventually included too.¹¹ In fact, after the [population exchange](#), the initiative of the Turkish-Orthodox Church lost its potential flock.¹² According to the decision of Ministry Council, Papa Eftim and some of his collaborators were exempted from the population exchange.

After the exchange, Papa Eftim took action in [Constantinople](#) (Istanbul) trying to control the [Greek community](#) and the [Patriarchate](#). His attempt was favoured by the perturbation in the Patriarchate after the Greek defeat. Ankara's government had not recognised the election of Meletios in the Patriarchal throne. Thus, immediately after the Greek defeat, his abdication was on the agenda, even for some members of the community, principally Damianos Damianidis, representative for the [Galata](#) community.¹³ On 1st January 1923, Damianidis played a leading part in a demonstration against the Patriarch. The crowd demanded his immediate dethronement, while he was badly maltreated.¹⁴ It seemed that Eftim was in contact with Damianidis and the whole matter was an attempt to promote the undertaking of the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople.¹⁵

On 21st September, Eftim arrived in Constantinople.¹⁶ He met the locum tenens (*topotiritis*) of the Patriarchal throne and, on 26th of the same month, he demanded the retirement of Meletios and the election of a new Patriarch agreeable to Ankara.¹⁷ While initially the Patriarchate had entered into negotiations with Eftim, it changed position arguing that Eftim had no official assignment and, on 28th September it broke off any contact with him.¹⁸ On 2nd October, Eftim accompanied by his supporters and the Turkish police, occupied the Patriarchate and he commanded the Holy Synod to dethrone the Patriarch Meletios. The Holy Synod conformed to Eftim's demands and 6 of its members, whose dioceses were outside the Turkish borders, were dismissed. After having nominated new members in the Holy Synod, Eftim returned to Ankara as representative of the Patriarchate.¹⁹

However, the government did not accept him as delegate of the Patriarchate on the grounds that the Patriarchate was a religious institution, so there was no reason to have an official delegate in Ankara.²⁰ On 6th December 1923, Grigorios, [metropolitan of Chalkedon](#), was elected Patriarch despite papa-Eftim's objections, who argued that Grigorios was an instrument of the Greek state. Thus, on 7th December, Eftim occupied the Patriarchate once again announcing that he would stay there until new elections were held.²¹ However, two days later, the police cleared the Patriarchate from Eftim's adherents. It seemed that the government considered his activities as dangerous. Ankara thereupon recognised Grigorios' election.²²

On 12th February 1924, Eftim occupied the [Church of the Virgin \(Panagia\) Kaphatiani](#) in Galata, where he transferred the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate.²³ On 19th February he was dethroned by the Church. In 1926, he also occupied the Church of the Saviour Christ in Galata and thereupon was excommunicated. In April 1928, papa-Eftim managed that two of his fellows got elected in the communal elections in [Pera](#), with the involvement of the Turkish authorities too.²⁴

3. The Greek-Turkish agreements and the new course of the Turkish Church

During the period 1923-1924, the future of the Ecumenical Patriarchate remained doubtful, while it was possible to take a form similar



to the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate.²⁵ However, this specific possibility was excluded due to Ankara's reorientation in this issue. Since the second half of the 20s, especially after the Greek-Turkish agreements in 1930, the relations of the two countries had entered into a better course. The new situation helped the Patriarchate function under better conditions. In the context of the Greek-Turkish rapprochement, Eftim gradually lost the freedom of action he had immediately after the [Asia Minor Catastrophe](#).²⁶ It could be said that after this period his action depended in a great extent on the course of the Greek-Turkish relations. From that moment on, the "Turkish-Orthodox Church" would be an instrument of the official Turkish politics sometimes used against the Patriarchate.

During the '30s, despite the good Greek-Turkish relations, Eftim continued his activities.²⁷ He played a leading part in the establishment of the "Association of lay Christian Turks".²⁸ This organisation was established in 1935 by Armenians and Greeks (mostly Eftim's adherents) for the purpose of Turkifying and totally integrating the minority communities into the Turkish society.²⁹ In 1938, special commissars were charged with directing the [religious foundations of minorities](#) (*βακούφια, evkaf* or *vakiflar*). These commissars were nominated by the Department of Religious Foundations leaving no room for self-government to communities. Thus, papa-Eftim's collaborator İstamat Zihni Özdamar³⁰ was appointed as governor of Baloukli and remained in this post until 1946.³¹

In 1949, after the election and the arrival of Athinagoras as Patriarch, Eftim sent him a message of congratulation declaring that he would recognise him.³² This telegram showed that in the framework of the improved Greek-Turkish relations in the beginning of the Cold War, papa-Eftim had lost any hope for claims against the Patriarchate.

4. The Cyprus Question and the propagandist return of the Turkish Church

However, Eftim made his comeback during the deterioration of the Greek-Turkish relations because of the Cyprus Question.³³ From 1955 onwards, it was at the core of public opinion and a nationalistic campaign was launched targeting at the Patriarchate and the Greek-Orthodox minority³⁴ and leading to the [events of September 6-7](#). Under these circumstances, Eftim was backed up by the Turkish press and the nationalistic organisations that presented him as an expert in ecclesiastical affairs. Eftim made a lot of statements accusing the Patriarchate of collaborating with Makarios in Cyprus.

The shock caused by the events of September 6-7³⁵ and the improvement in Greek-Turkish relations resulted in pushing Eftim and his Church in the margin once again. In August 1959, the two diplomats Zeki Kunalalp and Dimitrios Bitsios prepared a report for the problems of the minorities of both countries, in which they concluded that Eftim must abandon every last Church he had occupied, and the Patriarchate must give him a salary for life.³⁶

5. The course of the Turkish Church from the coup d' état of 1960 to nowadays

After the *coup d' état* of 1960, the colonel AlparsalanTürkeş, member of the National Unity Council, discussed a plan for enhancing the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate with Eftim's sons, Turgut and Selçuk. The developments and frictions within the Turkish junta did not allow the implementation of this plan. Türkeş and 13 of his collaborators were exiled by the other members of the junta.³⁷

In 1960, Eftim's health deteriorated. Already bedridden, he was succeeded by his son Turgut under the title Eftim II. He died in 1968.³⁸ After 1963, as the Cyprus Question revived, Eftim's adherents attacked once again in 1965 occupying two Orthodox Churches in Galata (Saint John and Saint Nicholas).³⁹

In 1991, after Turgut's death, his brother Selçuk succeeded him. Selçuk died in 2002. Since then the "Patriarchal throne" of the Turkish-Orthodox Church has remained without successor. His daughter Sevgi Erenerol has undertaken the administrative duties.

Since the middle of the '20s, Ankara's governments have sometimes supported the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate using it against the Ecumenical Patriarchate, without guaranteeing it an ecclesiastical structure, even just a rudimentary one. In essence, the Turkish-Orthodox Church ended up being a family affair for the appropriation of the real estate of the community of Galata.



1. In the middle of 1921 many telegrams arrived from the Orthodox communities of Asia Minor requesting that the government establish a new Orthodox Church independent from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Indicatively see: "Anadolu Rumları ve İstanbul Partikliği", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, Mai 1st 1921/23 Şaban 1339. "Anadolu Rumları Ayrı Patrik İstiyorlar", *İkdam*, Mai 3rd 1921/1337. "Türk Ortodokslar", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, January 13th 1922, no 404. Of course, the authenticity of these messages and telegrams remains an open question. See: Αλεξανδρή, Α., «Η απόπειρα δημιουργίας τουρκορθόδοξης εκκλησίας στην Καππαδοκία 1921-1923», *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 4 (1983), p. 174.
2. For example see: "Ortodoks Kiliselerine bir Tamim", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 30 Teşrinisani 1921.
3. The conference took place in the monastery of Ioannis the Precursor in Zincidere and was chaired by Meletios, the archbishop of Patara. The conference decided to break off ecclesiastical relations with the Patriarchate and passed the Charter of the new Church. A weekly newspaper was also published under the title *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*. See: Αλεξανδρή, Α., «Η απόπειρα δημιουργίας τουρκορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας στην Καππαδοκία 1921-1923», *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 4 (1983), pp. 183-192; Ραφτόπουλος, Δ., *Προκόπιος Λαζαρίδης Μητροπολίτης Ικονίου, Λυκαονίας και Β. Καππαδοκίας*, Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών, manuscript 394, Λυκαονία 8, pp. 106-120; Μαυρόπουλος, Δ., *Πατριαρχικά Σελίδες. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον από 1878-1949* (Αθήνα 1960), pp. 277-288. See also: "Kayseri Kilise Konferansının Birinci İçtımının Birinci Kararı", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, July 29th 1922, and "Umum Anadolu Türk Ortodoksları Murahhas-ı Umumileri Papa Eftim Efendi Hazretleri'nin 'Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi' Unvanlı İkinci Kitapta Münderic Beyannameleri" *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, November 21st 1922, no 11.
4. Of course, Eftim could not establish an autocephalous Church on his own. According to canon law, it was necessary that at least some of the prelates participate. For that reason, with Ankara's aid, he pressed the three prelates, who had remained in Asia Minor in that period: Gervasios of Sevasteia, Meletios of Patara and Prokopios, the Archbishop of Ikonio.
5. On the Turkish bibliography which adopts an oversimplifying and propagandist approach, see: Ergene, T., *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* (Istanbul 1951); Cihangir, E., *Papa Eftim' in Muhıralatı ve Bağımız Türk Ortodoks Patrihanesi* (Istanbul 1996); Ekincikli, M., *Türk Ortodoksları* (Ankara 1998).
6. Alexandris, A., "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor During the Greco-Turkish Confrontation of 1919-1922", *Byzantine & Modern Greek Studies* 8 (1983), pp. 145-146.
7. According to Fernau, it was reasonable that the Karamanlides (Turkish-speaking Orthodox of Asia Minor) faced a conflict of loyalty (*Loyalitätskonflikt*) as they were the apple of discord between two conflicting nationalisms. See: Fernau, F.W., *Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn Gegenwart und Tradition des Orthodoxen Orients* (Opladen 1967), p. 106.
8. It would be mistake to consider this argument as a sudden discovery of Kemalists in order to promote their propagandist effort during the Greek-Turkish confrontation. The question of the Turkishness of the Turcophone Christians had been posed long before the Greek-Turkish confrontation of 1919-1922, but it took an institutional and political expression in the circumstances formed after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Second World War, that is when the Ottoman/Turkish domination in the East came directly into question.
9. For these theories see: Cami, B., *Osmanlı Ülkesinde Hıristiyan Türkler* (Istanbul 1932). The theory for the Turkish origin of the Christians of the East and their possible integration into the Turkish nation was in contradiction to the dominant tendency of Turkish nationalism, according to which Islam was the determinant of the Turkish national identity. We can assume that this antithesis in the theory of the dominant tendency of the Turkish nationalism concerning the Turkishness (Turkish origin, Turkish identity) of the Christians of the East was an important factor in the final decision to include the Turcophone Orthodox of the inland in the exchange of populations.
10. Psomiades, H., *The Eastern Question. The Last Phase* (Thessaloniki 1968), pp. 92; Clogg, R., "Anadolu Hıristiyan Karındaşlarımız: The Turcophone Greeks of Asia Minor", in: Burke, J., - Gauntlett, S. (eds.), *Neohellenism* (Humanities Research Centre, Monograph 5, Canberra Australian National University 1992), p. 65, and Jaeschke, G., "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche", *Der Islam* 39 (1964), pp. 114-115.
11. It seems that Eftim and his collaborators tried in vain to exclude the Turcophone Orthodox of the inland from the exchange. On this issue many articles were published in *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*. See: Zihni, I., "Anadoluda halis ve hakiki Türk Ortodoksu olarak yaşamak isteyen milletdaşlarımıza", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, November 11th 1338/1922, n. 12; Zihni, I., "Anadoluda mecburi mübadelenin Türk Ortodokslara şümüli var mıdır?" *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, February 11th 1339/1923, n. 15.
12. Although the position that the Turcophone Orthodox were of Turkish origin had an almost universal support from the Kemalist circles, Ankara believed that if the Patriarchate remained, these populations would be a target group for the Greek propaganda. Jaeschke, G., "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche", *Der Islam* 39 (1964), pp. 114-115.



13. Damianidis was a royalist and therefore against Venizelos. Patriarch Meletios was the main advocate of the Venizelist Party in Constantinople. Μαυρόπουλος, Δ., *Πατριαρχικοί Σελίδες. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον από 1878-1949* (Athens 1960), pp. 186-187.
14. For the details of the events see: *Echos d' Orient*, July-September 1923, n. 131, pp. 368-370, also: Gentizon, P., "La Grande Pitié du Phanar", *L' Illustration*, February 21st 1925, n. 4277, p. 177.
15. It seems that Eftim tried to come in contact with Karamanlides communities in Constantinople, such as in Psamatia and in Kumkapi. On 18th September the Turkish newspaper *Akşam* announced that many Istanbul Greeks had sent Papa Eftim a letter declaring that they were against Meletios and they wished to have Eftim as Patriarch in his place. See: "İstanbul Rumları" *Akşam*, September 18th, 1338/1922. According to *Echos d' Orient*, Ankara supported Damianides in order to promote the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople. *Echos d' Orient*, July-September 1923, n. 131, p. 370.
16. According to Ergene, Fethi, the Prime Minister himself, had asked Eftim to go to Constantinople to make the Patriarchate conform to the demands of Ankara. Ergene, T., *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* (Istanbul 1951), pp. 59-60.
17. Alexandris, A., *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens 1983), pp. 55-56; Ergene, T., *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* (Istanbul 1951), pp. 61-64.
18. *Echos d' Orient*, July-September 1923, n. 131, p. 499.
19. Gentizon, P., *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu* (Istanbul 1994), p. 177; *Echos d' Orient* (1923), pp. 499-450; Ergene, T., *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* (Istanbul 1951), pp. 66-70.
20. Alexandris, A., *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens 1983), p. 154; Psomiades, H., *The Eastern Question. The Last Phase* (Thessaloniki 1968), p. 95.
21. Psomiades, H., *The Eastern Question. The Last Phase* (Thessaloniki 1968), p. 96; Alexandris, A., *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens 1983), pp. 155-156; Ergene, T., *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* (Istanbul 1951), pp. 91-98.
22. Alexandris, A., *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens 1983), p. 156. According to Ergene, the Minister of Justice himself had told Eftim that they could do nothing officially and only unofficially could they support his struggle against the Patriarchate's "intrigues". Ergene, T., *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları* (Istanbul 1951), pp. 85-86.
23. Alexandris, A., *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens 1983), p. 157.
24. Alexandris, A., *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918-1974* (Athens 1983), pp. 169-170.
25. Psomiades, H., *The Eastern Question. The Last Phase* (Thessaloniki 1968), p. 94.
26. In May 1931, Mustafa Kemal reassured Venizelos that he would not allow Eftim to interfere in the Patriarchate's affairs. Psomiades, H., "The Ecumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Republic. The First Ten Years", *Balkan Studies* 2 (1961), p. 68.
27. When Hamdullah Suphi, one of the "fathers" of the Turkish nationalism, became ambassador in Bucharest in 1931, he tried to persuade the Gagauz, the Turcophone Orthodox of Bessarabia, to immigrate to Turkey. Eftim's son Turgut (Georgios) Erenerol contended that Suphi had promised his father to bring him a flock of 250.000 Gagauz. However, the outbreak of the war did not allow the realisation of this ambitious plan and the majority of the 70 students, who immigrated to Turkey in 1935, embraced Islam. See: Baydar, M., *Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver ve Anıları* (Istanbul 1968), pp. 157-161; also: Balcıgil, O., "Fener Patrikhanesine karşı bir Ortodoks", *Hürgün*, October 14th -19th 1985.
28. Laik Türk Hristiyanları Birliği.
29. The organisation propagandised the abolition of minority schools and the perfect learning and use of the Turkish language. Macar, E., *Cumhuriyet Döneminde İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi* (Istanbul 2003), pp. 163-164.



30. Pulluoğlu or Puloğlu İstamat Zihni (Özdamar) was born in 1879. He was member of the court of law in Denizli, when he joined the movement of the Turkish-Orthodox Church. He was the general secretary of the Turkish-Orthodox Congress. He was exempted from the exchange with the aid of Eftim. In 1935 was elected a Member of Parliament as a representative of Eskişehir.
31. Σιδηρόπουλος, Φ., *Τα εθνικά φιλανθρωπικά καταστήματα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη. Σχόλια σε ένα ανέκδοτο κείμενο. Η πορεία τους στον εικοστό αιώνα.* (Athens 1999), p. 353.
32. Macar, E., *Cumhuriyet Döneminde İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi* (Istanbul 2003), p. 214.
33. On papa-Eftim's position for Cyprus see: *Türk Ortodoksları Ruhani Reisi Papa Eftim 'in Kıbrıs Hakkındaki Görüşleri* (Istanbul 1958); *Atenagorasın Organi Elefteri Foni Gazetesine Cevabım ve Fener Patrikhanesi ile Rumluğun iç yüzü* (Istanbul 1959).
34. On this campaign see: Benlisoy, F., "6-7 Eylül Olaylan Öncesinde Basında Rumlar", *Toplumsal Tarih* 81, September 2000.
35. On the events of September 6th-7th see: Γκιουβέν, Ν., *Εθνικισμός. Κοινωνικές μεταβολές και μειονότητες. Τα επεισόδια εναντίον των μη μουσουλμάνων της Τουρκίας (6/7 Σεπτεμβρίου 1955)* (Athens 2006).
36. On this report see: Akgönül, S., *Türkiye Rumları Ulus-Devlet Çağından Küreselleşme Çağına Bir Azınlığın Yok Oluş Süreci* (Istanbul 2007), pp. 231-246.
37. Macar, E., *Cumhuriyet Döneminde İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi* (Istanbul 2003), pp. 217-218. Later on, Türkeş became the founder and leader of the Turkish Fascist Party MHP.
38. Initially, the Patriarchate refused to bury Eftim in the Orthodox cemetery of Şişli, but, finally it consented under the authorities' pressure. In Eftim's grave there has been carved the words of Mustafa Kemal: "Papa-Eftim has offered our country as much as an army" (*Baba Eftim bu memlekete bir ordu kadar hizmet etmiştir*).
39. Benlisoy, S., "Galata' daki iki kilisenin Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi tarafından ele geçirilmesi: Kilise ihtilafı", *Tarih ve Toplum*, forthcoming. After long-lasting procedures, in 1973 both churches were ceded to the Turkish-Orthodox Patriarchate.

Βιβλιογραφία :

	Μαυρόπουλος Δ. , <i>Πατριαρχικά Σελίδες. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον από 1878-1949</i> , Αθήνα 1960
	Alexandris A. , <i>The Greek Minority in Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations, 1918-1974</i> , Center for Asia Minor Studies, Athens 1983
	Αλεξανδρής Α. , "Η απόπειρα δημιουργίας τουρκορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας στην Καππαδοκία, 1921-1923", <i>Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών</i> , 4, 1983, 159-210
	Gentizon P. , <i>Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu</i> , İstanbul 1994
	Ergene T. , <i>İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortodoksları</i> , İstanbul 1951
	Cihangir E. , <i>Papa Eftim'in Muhtıraları ve Bağımsız Türk Ortodoks Patrikhanesi</i> , İstanbul 1996
	Ekincikli M. , <i>Türk Ortodoksları</i> , Ankara 1998
	Alexandris A. , "The Constantinopolitan Greek Factor During the Greco-Turkish Confrontation of 1919-1922", <i>Byzantine & Modern Greek Studies</i> , 8, 1983, 137-167



	Fernan F.W. , <i>Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn Gegenwarty und Tradition des Orthodoxen Orients</i> , Opladen 1967
	Cami B. , <i>Osmanlı Ülkesinde Hristiyan Türkler (1932)</i> , İstanbul 1932
	Psomiades H. , <i>The Eastern Question. The Last Phase. A study in Greek-Turkish Diplomacy</i> , New York 2000
	Jaeschke G. , "Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche", <i>Der Islam</i> , 39, 1964, 95-129
	Macar E. , <i>Cumhuriyet Döneminde İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi</i> , İstanbul 2003
	Baydar M. , <i>Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver ve Anıları</i> , İstanbul 1968
	Σιδηρόπουλος Φ. , <i>Τα εθνικά φιλανθρωπικά καταστήματα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη. Νοσοκομείο Βαλουκλή, Ίδρυμα Μείζονος Ελληνισμού</i> , Αθήνα 1999
	Γκιουβέν Ν. , <i>Εθνικισμός. Κοινωνικές μεταβολές και μειονότητες. Τα επεισόδια εναντίον των μη μουσουλμάνων της Τουρκίας (6/7 Σεπτεμβρίου 1955)</i> , Αθήνα 2006, Αυγερινού, Σ. (μτφρ.)
	Akgönül S. , <i>Türkiye Rumları Ulus-Devlet Çağından Küreselleşme Çağına Bir Azınlığın Yok Oluş Süreci</i> , İstanbul 2007

Γλωσσάριο :

	millet
--	---------------

The millet system was based on the division of the Ottoman subjects according to religion. The millets were the central communal institutions for the members of the respective ethno-religious groups, in particular for the non-Muslim subjects of the Empire. The millets had its own institutions and functions concerning self-administration, religion, education, justice, and social coherence. Although the division of the subjects according to their religion had always been fundamental in the Empire, the millets in their fully organized form originate in the end of the 18th century. In the 19th century, in particular during the period of the tanzimat reforms, the millets became the main institutions through which the non-Muslim subjects were incorporated in the Ottoman Empire.

Πηγές

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

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

"Anadolu Rumları Ayır Patrik İstiyorlar", *İkdam*, May 3rd 1921/1337.

"Türk Ortodokslar", *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, January 13th 1922, n. 404.

Ραφτόπουλος, Δ., *Προκόπιος Λαζαρίδης Μητροπολίτης Ικονίου, Λυκαονίας και Β. Καππαδοκίας*, Archive of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies, manusc. 394, Λυκαονία 8, pp. 106-120.

"Kayseri Kilise Konferansının Birinci İctimainın Birinci Kararı", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, July 29th 1922.

"Umum Anadolu Türk Ortodoksları Murahhas-ı Umumileri Papa Eftim Efendi Hazretleri'nin 'Türk Ortodoks Kilisesi' Unvanlı İkinci Kitapta Münderic Beyannameleri", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, November 21st 1922, n. 11.

Zihni, İ., "Anadoluda halis ve hakiki Türk Ortodoksu olarak yaşamak isteyen milletdaşlarıma", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*,



November 11st 1338/1922, n. 12.

Zihni, İ., "Anadoluda mecburi mübadelenin Türk Ortodokslara şumülü var mıdır?", *Anadoluda Ortodoksluk Sadası*, February 11st 1339/1923, n. 15.

Echos d'Orient, July-September 1923, n. 131, pp. 368-370.

Gentizon, P., "La Grande Pitié du Phanar", *L'Illustration*, February 21st 1925, n. 4277, p. 177.

"İstanbul Rumları", *Akşam*, September 18th 1338/1922.

Balcıgil, O., "Fener Patrikhanesine karşı bir Ortodoks", *Hürgün*, 14 -19 October 1985.

Benlisoy, F., "6-7 Eylül Olayları Öncesinde Basında Rumlar", *Toplumsal Tarih*, September 2000, n. 81.