

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE OTTOMAN CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION AND THE
GREEK ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATES OF ANTIOCH, JERUSALEM AND
ALEXANDRIA: 16TH-18TH CENTURIES
by

HASAN ÇOLAK

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies
Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity
College of Arts and Law
The University of Birmingham
2012

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation seeks to understand the relations between the Ottoman central administration and the Eastern Patriarchates. Against the current literature submitting these patriarchates to the authority of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs in the period following the Ottoman conquest, we suggest that such exclusive focus on the role of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate prevents one from seeing the true networks of power in which the Eastern Patriarchates were engaged. To that end, in addition to the major patriarchal and missionary sources a large corpus of unpublished and unused Ottoman archival documentation has been consulted. During the first centuries of the Ottoman rule the Eastern Patriarchs benefited largely from the local Ottoman legal and administrative bodies, semi-autonomous provincial rulers, and foreign courts. In early 18th century, alongside the rise of Catholic missions among the Orthodox flock and hierarchy, and of a wealthy and powerful lay class supported by the central administration, a patriarchal elite class with close affinities to Istanbul began to interact with the Eastern Patriarchates. Getting closer to the offers of the central administration, in both administrative and economic terms, these patriarchates' relations which were formerly dependent on local and foreign dynamics were largely replaced by the new networks supported by the central administration.

to Ayşegül for her never-ending love

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have come into existence without the help and support of many people. First and foremost, I should like to thank my supervisor Dr. Rhoads Murphey, who was ready to offer help during every single stage of this dissertation. I benefited largely from his expert knowledge in Ottoman palaeography and institutional history. Dr. Ruth Macrides who co-supervised the dissertation helped not only with her knowledge of Byzantine and post-Byzantine Greek documents but also with her attention to minute detail. I am truly indebted and thankful to my examiners Dr. Christine Woodhead and Prof. David Thomas from the Universities of Durham and Birmingham respectively. Without their suggestions this dissertation would have been of much lesser readability. It also gives me immense pleasure to thank every single member in the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies (CBOMGS) for providing a unique academic environment to conduct a comparative study such as mine and many others’.

I would like to offer my special thanks to the staff at the Prime Ministerial Ottoman Archives and Archive of Topkapı Palace Museum, and Süleymaniye Manuscript Library in Istanbul, National Archives at Kew, Special Collections and ITSEE Office at the University of Birmingham, British Library in London, the D.A. Zakythinos Library of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, the Libraries of the National and Capodistrian University of Athens and Gennadius Library in Athens.

This dissertation was made financially possible thanks to the generous support provided in different stages of my PhD program by the following: Overseas Research Students Awards Scheme and University of Birmingham’s Top-Up Fees, and Turkish Historical Society. In case of the latter, I should particularly thank the ex-president Prof. Ali Birinci. I was also a fellow of the Turkish Cultural Foundation and Alexander Onassis Public Benefit Foundation during the academic years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 respectively.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Eugenia Kermeli who supervised my Master's thesis at Bilkent University for the continuing support and encouragement that she has provided so far. Dr. Slim Suad of Balamand University and Dr. May Davie, the editor of *Chronos*, kindly provided some recent publications from Balamand University Press, to which I did not have access. I would also like to pay my gratitude to Prof. Paschalis Kitromilides for his useful suggestions with regard to my bibliography. My friend Elif Bayraktar Tellan not only shared her expertise on the history of the Patriarchate of Constantinople but also proved to be a real friend in my tough times in writing this dissertation. I should also thank my friends Yaman Dalanay and Özden Mercan who provided publications from Oxford and Harvard University Libraries respectively.

In CBOMGS I was lucky to have such good friends as Ourania Bessi, Frouke Schrijver, Athanasia Stavrou, and Elli Tzavella. Among my friends in Birmingham I should also thank Dilara Dal, Ali Mıynat, Seyit Özkutlu, Halil Ruso, and Ali Kemal Yenidünya for their collaboration in keeping our study-table constantly open in the library. Without such good friends, my wife and I would not have remembered Birmingham as one of the most beautiful places to live on earth. Likewise, our friends Meltem and Giorgos, Yelda and Andeas, and Ilias and Afroditi made us feel at home in Athens.

It gives me great pleasure to thank my family for their support during all the stages of my long student life and to tell them that it is over now. No one including myself has suffered more from the demands of carrying out this research than my beloved wife Ayşegül. She sacrificed her time and energy—often at the expense of her own research—to make me believe that I can finish this dissertation. It is to her that I dedicate it with my sincere belief that she will produce a work of much better quality, even though she now probably knows more on the issues of the Eastern Patriarchates than the 12th-century English court.

TRANSLITERATION

Ottoman Turkish

| | |
|---|------------------|
| ا | â |
| آ | a, e, â |
| ب | b |
| پ | p |
| ت | t |
| ث | s |
| ج | c |
| چ | ç |
| ح | h |
| خ | h |
| د | d |
| ذ | z |
| ر | r |
| ز | z |
| س | j |
| ش | s |
| ص | ş |
| ض | s |
| ط | z, d |
| ظ | t |
| ع | z |
| ف | ‘ |
| ق | g, ğ |
| ك | f |
| گ | k |
| ك | k, g, ğ |
| ل | l |
| م | m |
| ن | n |
| و | v, o, ö, u, ü, û |
| ه | h, a, e |
| ی | y, ı, î, î |

Greek

| | |
|-------|------|
| Α α | a |
| Β β | v |
| Γ γ | g |
| Δ δ | d |
| Ε ε | e |
| Ζ ζ | z |
| Η η | i |
| Θ θ | th |
| Ι ι | i |
| Κ κ | k |
| Λ λ | l |
| Μ μ | m |
| Ν ν | n |
| Ξ ξ | x |
| Ο ο | o |
| Π π | p |
| Ρ ρ | r |
| Σ σ,ς | s |
| Τ τ | t |
| Υ υ | y, u |
| Φ φ | f |
| Χ χ | ch |
| Ψ ψ | ps |
| Ω ω | o |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Current Historiography | 2 |
| Pioneer Works in the Field | 2 |
| Runciman's paradigm: union of the Orthodox ecclesiastical and Ottoman historiographies | 9 |
| Views from Ottoman provinces | 18 |
| Recent Historiography on the Eastern Patriarchates | 21 |
| Primary Sources | 24 |
| Ottoman Sources | 24 |
| Greek Sources | 27 |
| French Sources | 29 |
| English Sources | 30 |
| Arabic Sources | 31 |
| Contents of the Dissertation | 32 |
| CHAPTER 1. EASTERN PATRIARCHATES AND OTTOMAN ADMINISTRATION: 16TH-17TH CENTURIES | |
| Eastern Patriarchates prior to Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt | 36 |
| Ottoman Policies in the Period of Transition | 46 |
| The <i>Ferman</i> Given by Selim I to the Patriarch of Jerusalem | 53 |
| In search of the initial <i>fermans</i> for the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria | 54 |
| Eastern Patriarchates in the local and central arena during the 16 th and 17 th centuries | 60 |
| Eastern Patriarchates in the International Arena: Foreign Courts | 69 |
| Eastern Patriarchates and the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia | 80 |
| Authority of the Eastern Patriarchates and Its Limits on the eve of Centralisation | 85 |
| Competition for Antiochian throne between Kyrillos and Athanasios | 90 |
| Competition for Alexandrian throne between Samouil and Kosmas | 96 |
| Other correspondence between the Patriarchate of Alexandria and the central administration | 101 |
| Patriarchate of Jerusalem | 104 |
| Conclusion | 108 |
| CHAPTER 2. COMING OF THE 18TH CENTURY: CENTRALISATION IN AN AGE OF DECENTRALISATION | |
| Catholic Infiltration in the Ottoman Levant | 113 |
| Origins and Development | 113 |
| Historical Sketch | 116 |
| Catholic Missionaries in the Levant under Scrutiny: | |
| Profiles of the Catholic Missionaries in the Ottoman Levant | 121 |
| Missionary views of Ottoman Christians | 124 |
| Ottoman Christian Views of Missionaries | 126 |
| Catholic Methods of Conversion Told by Missionaries | 127 |
| Factors behind the Success of the Catholic Missions in the Ottoman Levant | 131 |
| Role of French Ambassadors and Consuls | 131 |
| Role of Local Ecclesiastical Organisations | 132 |
| Role of Local Ottoman administrators | 133 |
| Results of Catholic Infiltration among Ottoman Christians | 135 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Great Church and Phanariots in the 18 th Century | 138 |
| CHAPTER 3. POLITICS IN THE EASTERN PATRIARCHATES IN THE AGE OF CENTRALISATION | 148 |
| Making of the Patriarchal Elite | 149 |
| Rapprochement between the Eastern Patriarchates and Constantinople, and the Ottoman Administration | 149 |
| Patriarchal <i>berats</i> of investiture at the turn of the 18 th century | 158 |
| Transformation in the <i>berats</i> of the Patriarchate of Antioch | 158 |
| Transformation in the <i>berats</i> of the Patriarchate of Alexandria | 162 |
| Transformation in the <i>berats</i> of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem | 165 |
| Comparison between three <i>berats</i> of the Patriarchal Elites in the 18 th century: Silvestros (1724-1766), Matthaïos (1746-1766), and Parthenios (1737-1766) | 169 |
| Conclusion | 171 |
| From Periphery to Centre: Case Study of the Tenure of Silvestros of Antioch (1724-1766) | 173 |
| Chronological Introduction | 173 |
| Silvestros' Appointment and Early Years | 180 |
| Silvestros' First Encounter with Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas | 184 |
| Ottoman administration vis-à-vis the Antiochian Schism | 195 |
| Aleppo between Orthodox and Catholic Parties (1732-1750) | 197 |
| Silvestros' Second Encounter with Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas | 203 |
| Expansion of Silvestros' control over Antiochian metropolitanates | 205 |
| Struggle against the metropolitan of Gümüşhane (Argyropolis) | 210 |
| Conclusion | 212 |
| CHAPTER 4. ECONOMIC POWER BEHIND POLITICS: NETWORKS OF LAY AND ECCLESIASTICAL POWER IN THE 18 TH CENTURY OTTOMAN EMPIRE | 215 |
| Introduction | 215 |
| Nature of the activities of the monks collecting alms from the Orthodox people | 219 |
| Incomes of church <i>vakfs</i> | 220 |
| <i>Ziteia/tasadduk</i> | 222 |
| Inheritance of Orthodox testators | 224 |
| Patriarchal <i>berats</i> of investiture and the economic activities of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem outside Palestine | 225 |
| 'Expansion' of Jerusalemite Patriarchate outside Palestine: places, problems, and solutions | 226 |
| Types of properties dedicated to 'the poor monks of Jerusalem' | 238 |
| Aftermath of the Problem..... | 240 |
| Practice of alms collection by the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria | 241 |
| Conclusion | 245 |
| CONCLUSION | 249 |
| APPENDIX I. Gerasimos of Alexandria's <i>berat</i> in transliteration | 257 |
| APPENDIX II. Chrysanthos of Jerusalem's <i>berat</i> in transliteration | 260 |
| APPENDIX III. Athanasios of Antioch's <i>berat</i> | 263 |
| APPENDIX IV. Athanasios of Antioch's <i>berat</i> in transliteration | 264 |
| APPENDIX V. Silvestros of Antioch's <i>berat</i> | 266 |
| APPENDIX VI. Silvestros of Antioch's <i>berat</i> in transliteration | 268 |
| APPENDIX VII. Parthenios of Jerusalem's <i>berat</i> | 272 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| APPENDIX VIII. Parthenios of Jerusalem's <i>berat</i> in transliteration | 273 |
| APPENDIX IX. Matthaïos of Alexandria's <i>berat</i> | 276 |
| APPENDIX IX. Matthaïos of Alexandria's <i>berat</i> in transliteration | 277 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 281 |

INTRODUCTION

In the course of the sixteenth century the Sultan acquired dominion over Syria and Egypt, thus absorbing the lands of the Orthodox Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. The Sublime Porte wished to centralise everything at Constantinople; and the Great Church followed its lead. As a result the Eastern Patriarchates were put into a position of inferiority in comparison with that of Constantinople. The Eastern Patriarchs lost in theory none of their ecclesiastical rights or autonomy, and they continued to administer the Orthodox within their sees. But in practice they found that they could only negotiate with the Sublime Porte through their brother of Constantinople. When a vacancy occurred on any of the Patriarchal thrones it was the Patriarch of Constantinople who applied to the Sultan for permission to fill it; and, as the Sultan himself was seldom much interested in naming a successor, it was easy for the Constantinopolitan Patriarch to secure the appointment of the candidate whom he advocated.¹

The reason why we still do not have a history of the Eastern Patriarchates (i.e. non-Constantinopolitan Greek Orthodox Patriarchates, namely Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria) under the early-modern Ottoman rule lies in the compelling model suggested in the above-quotation from Steven Runciman. Based on his understanding of the Constantinople-centric discourse within the Orthodox Church historiography, and of the Ottoman millet system, Runciman offered this picture of relations between the patriarchates in his seminal *Great Church in Captivity* (1968). Despite the developments in the scholarship of the Greek Orthodox church organisation in the Ottoman Empire, such a model putting the Patriarch of Constantinople on top of the whole of this organisation has been followed since Runciman without much questioning. However, to determine the status of the Eastern Patriarchates with respect to the Ottoman central administration and to the Patriarchate of Constantinople it is a must to investigate the triangle between the central administration, the Patriarch of Constantinople and the other Eastern Patriarchs. By challenging the above model on the ground that it is heavily influenced by the 19th-century perceptions of the Orthodox Church, this dissertation seeks to explore the true nature of the

¹ Runciman 1968: 176-177.

reciprocal relations between the Ottoman central administration and the Eastern Patriarchates in the earlier centuries of the Ottoman rule. The unpublished and unstudied correspondence between the Ottoman administration and the Eastern Patriarchates preserved in the Ottoman archives will be used together with the Greek, French, English and Arabic sources. The current debates based on these sources, which offer nothing more than patchy sub-models will be discussed. Another major contribution of this study will be its concentration on the interplay and interface between the Ottoman administration and various centres of power within the Orthodox Church. Therefore, this study intends to reveal the theoretical and practical changes and continuities involving the Ottoman central administration and the Orthodox Church organisation in the early-modern Middle East.

Current Historiography

Pioneer Works in the Field

If we are to exclude the treatments of the history of the Eastern Patriarchates by the Greek Orthodox churchmen who were often contemporary to the events they wrote in the period this dissertation covers, we may say that the first major contributions to the field were produced from the mid-19th century onwards. Cities such as St. Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa,² Istanbul, Paris, Athens, and London became centres of publication of works related to the history of the Eastern Patriarchates. This development coincided with the decline of Phanariot influence effectively since the 1830s on church politics in the Ottoman Empire.³ Of these cities, St. Petersburg had a special importance as it housed the influential Imperial Palestinian Society, which aimed to promote works relating to the

² Only between the years 1800-1863, 111 books in Greek were published in St. Petersburg (27), Moscow (47), and Odessa (37). Papoulidis 2011: 75.

³ For the disappearance of the role of Phanariot influence in church affairs, see Philliou 2004: 320-326.

history of the Eastern Patriarchates.⁴ These publications focused on two major endeavours, namely publication of primary, and often official sources shedding light on the history of these Patriarchates, and publication of works of history. As the true beginnings of the field of history of the Eastern Patriarchates in the Ottoman period are the publication of major primary sources, whose editors also contributed to the field through their critical analyses, the historiographic discussion should start with such publication efforts. In the late 19th and early 20th century, three names are prominent as the notable editors of documents about the history of the Eastern Patriarchates. Two of these had particular allegiance to the Imperial Palestinian Society in St. Petersburg. First, Porfirii Uspenskii, Archimandrite and head of a Russian mission sent to the Middle East, published in St. Petersburg documents relating mainly to the relations between the Russian Church and the Patriarchate of Alexandria.⁵ Second, Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, one time secretary of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, published a number of sources about the history of this Patriarchate.⁶ Although he mainly published in St. Petersburg, we learn from his unpublished correspondence with James Rendel Harris located in the Special Collections of the University of Birmingham that he was also in contact with other major printing houses in Europe. In one of his letters, for instance, he mentions that the Imperial Palestinian Society decided not to publish his *Spicilegium*, and that he considers publishing it with Cambridge University Press with an English preface, and thus asks Rendel if he might intervene by contacting the editors. After stating the texts he planned to publish in the book, he also says that if the Cambridge University Press does not agree to publish it, he would publish it in the ‘*Revue périodique*

⁴ Analysis of the religious and intellectual climate of St. Petersburg for the Greek Orthodox community can be found in Papoulidis 2011.

⁵ Uspenskii 1898.

⁶ The most useful for the purposes of this dissertation was his *Analecta*. Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963.

de France'.⁷ In addition to these two, another notable editor to publish documents about the history of the Eastern Patriarchates was Archimandrite Kallinikos Delikanis, who published in the Patriarchal Press in Istanbul the documents relating to the history of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem (together with those about Cyprus) in one volume of his three-volume edition of patriarchal documents in the archives of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.⁸ Another group of sources were also published at that time which relate directly to the history of the Eastern Patriarchates but were published as part of more general editions of Greek sources. Among such works, we may cite the two volumes of Emile LeGrande's *Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire* which included documents about the relations between the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and Roumania between 1569 and 1728,⁹ and the edition of the letters of Chrysanthos Notaras the Patriarch of Jerusalem,¹⁰ and Vasilii E. Regel's *Byzantino-Russica*¹¹ which included some documents about the relations between Eastern Patriarchs and the Russian Church, not to mention the few documents in the *Acta et Diplomata* of Miklosich and Müller already published in 1860.¹² In addition to the edition of these major sources which directly relate to the history of the Eastern Patriarchates, other sources were also published which deal with the topic in question through the Orthodox Church's relations with Catholic missionaries and the establishment of Catholic churches in the Middle East. The major texts of that sort were Antoine Rabbath's collection of the French official documents regarding the Catholic church in the Middle East, published in Beirut,¹³ and the letters of the Jesuite missionaries

⁷ University of Birmingham, Special Collections, DA21/1/2/1/28/5 (Letter written from St. Petersburg, 23 June 1890).

⁸ Delikanis 1904.

⁹ Legrand 1903.

¹⁰ Legrand 1888.

¹¹ Regel 1970.

¹² Miklosich & Müller 1860.

¹³ Rabbath 1905 and Rabbath 1910.

published in the late 19th century under the collective name of *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*.¹⁴ The journals of the Eastern Patriarchates such as *el-Ni'ma* of the Patriarchate of Antioch, *Nea Sion* of that of Jerusalem, and *Ekklesiastikos Faros* of that of Alexandria began to be published around this time. In parallel, it was around this time that such journals as *el-Machriq* and *Echos d'Orient* were introduced by the Catholic institutions in the Middle East publishing in Arabic and French respectively.

When we come to the critical treatments of the Eastern Patriarchates written around this time, we see two chief scholars namely John Mason Neale, who published three volumes on the history of the Eastern Patriarchates in London, two of which were dedicated to the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, and Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, whose scholarly activities mainly took place in Athens. It was again in the early 20th century that Cyril Charon (Korolevsky) wrote his multi-volume *Histoire des patriarchats melkites*, which gives important information about the relations between the Melkite Catholic and Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria.¹⁵ A notable aspect of these authors is that for all of them, writing about the history of the Eastern Patriarchates also involved a personal attachment to the church and dismissal of any role that the Ottoman administration might have over the Eastern Patriarchates.

The modern historiography on the Eastern Patriarchates in Ottoman times begins with the two major works by John Mason Neale on the Patriarchates of Antioch¹⁶ and Alexandria,¹⁷ and his general introductory work on the Eastern Church.¹⁸ A prolific writer, known mainly for his hymns, Neale was a Catholic whose interest in the relations and

¹⁴ Le Gobien 1810 and 1819.

¹⁵ The first volume serves the purposes of the present dissertation. Charon 1998. For a list of Charon's publications see Charon 1998: 189-208.

¹⁶ Neale 1873.

¹⁷ Neale 1847.

¹⁸ Neale 1850.

possible union of the Catholic and Orthodox churches led him to study further the history of the Orthodox church. In youth he had studied Byzantine art and Oriental languages and was already familiar with the Eastern Church. Neale never lost the ideal of a united Church and he found the closest prospect in the Greek Orthodox Church. This interest was precipitated through his patristic studies on the Eastern Church and finally he set out to write a history of the Eastern Church.¹⁹ During the time Neale was writing this work, it would seem unusual for a Catholic to do such a thing as manifestly seen in his letters in which he tries to convince the addressee that his work would not involve any anti-Catholic element, and justifies his work on the Eastern Church in accord with the Catholic church.²⁰

It must be mentioned however that though a Catholic, and one accused for this reason of being an alleged agent of the Vatican, Neale's cold attitude towards Rome was quite evident in his following words: 'We may be sure of this: if England ever becomes a Catholic country, it will be by the Church of England, not by that of Rome.'²¹ Similarly he says: 'England's Church is Catholic, though England's self be not.'²²

Although Neale's interest in the history of the Eastern Church was rare in the England of his time, his view of the Christians of the Ottoman Empire was quite typical in that he saw them as his co-religionists under infidel rule.²³ He had no doubt that the

¹⁹ Towle 1906: 98.

²⁰ In a letter written to Benjamin Webb on 11 January 1844, for example, he says the following: 'I know you are afraid that I shall take an Oriental view, i.e. I suppose so Oriental that it will cease to be Catholic. I hope not... We Orientals take a more general view. The Rock on which the Church is built is S. Peter, but it is a triple Rock, Antioch where he sat, Alexandria which he superintended, Rome where he suffered.' Lawson 1910: 69. Benjamin Webb was in Trinity College, Cambridge, with John Mason Neale, and co-founder of the Cambridge Camden Society, later named Ecclesiological Society. Lawson 1910: v. In another letter addressed to Benjamin Webb on the 26th of February of the same year, he goes on as follows: In the 'History of Alexandria' you need not be afraid of any anti-Romanism. For that Church and Rome have always been as it were allies: and with the exception of the Jesuits in Ethiopia and of one schismatical proposal to the Jacobite Patriarch in the 16th century, I am not aware that one has occasion to mention Rome except with praise, or merely historically. Lawson 1910: 71.

²¹ Lawson 1910: vi.

²² Lawson 1910: vi.

²³ It was one of the three major attitudes towards the Ottoman Christians who were rebelling against their Ottoman overlords. As Prof. Rosen notes for the case of the British support for the Greek rebellion, the

Ottomans were tyrants enslaving his fellow Christian brothers. So, he expressed his hope for the end of the Ottoman possession of Constantinople in less than four hundred years from its conquest by Ottomans writing that ‘the sands of the Turkish domination are now very fast running out.’²⁴

Soon after the publication of his book on the Patriarchate of Alexandria Neale’s interest in the history of the Eastern Church was appreciated by the emperor of Russia, who sent the following message to him through Rev. Eugene Popoff, a close friend of Neale. Popoff wrote him the following:

His Excellency our Ambassador, Baron de Brunnow, has kindly charged me to announce to you, that His Majesty, the Emperor of Russia, in acknowledgement of the value of your arduous and useful work on ‘the History of the Holy Eastern Church,’ as well as an encouragement in its continuance, has been graciously pleased to grant you the sum of £100.²⁵

It is no surprise that after his book on the Patriarchate of Alexandria, he set out to write a general preliminary book on the History of the Eastern Church which he dedicated to ‘Nikolai, the Prince of Russia’.²⁶

Another notable figure who produced important works on the history of the Eastern Patriarchates around that time was Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, who served as the archbishop of Athens between 1923 and 1938. While working as a professor of theology in

support for Greeks because ‘they were a Christian people in a bitter struggle against the infidel Turks’ was the second foremost argument they employed. The others were that Greeks were ‘responsible for the birth of European civilization’ and that ‘supporting Greece would lead to commercial opportunities.’ Rosen 1998: 73-74.

²⁴ Lawson 1910: 232. His anti-Ottoman perspective is also seen in another letter addressed to Benjamin Webb on 10 February 1853: ‘Don’t you trust that the Montenegrine affair will eventually end in the division of Turkey between Austria and Russia?’ Lawson 1910: 204. Likewise, he harshly criticises the alliance between the Ottomans and the British against Russia in the Crimean War, and writes the following to Benjamin Webb in a letter dated 9 December 1854: ‘About the Russian War I feel so strongly that I had rather not write. I am glad, at all events, to see that the Morning Chronicle to-day has the honesty at last to confess that we are fighting to ensure the perpetual slavery of the Turkish Christians. This simplifies matters. How you can be led away by this popular howl is most astonishing to me.’ Lawson 1910: 231.

²⁵ Towle 1906: 175.

²⁶ Apart from that he received an award from the United States of America. Despite such an interest from outside, he was not that popular at home. He was in his own day, ‘a prophet without honour’ his wife mentioned. Lough 1962: 147.

Jerusalem, he penned his seminal work on the history of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.²⁷ Publishing of his writings continued even after his death,²⁸ and constituted the backbone for the later works produced by the members of the Orthodox Church in Greek.

Born an Ottoman subject in Eastern Thrace, and getting much of his education in Ottoman lands, Papadopoulos was able to read Turkish and was familiar with the role of the Ottoman state and its institutions with regard to the Eastern Patriarchates, which contributed greatly to his work. Unlike many of his Western counterparts, such as Neale, who often disregarded the role of the Ottoman sources and institutions, he made use of Ottoman documents issued for the Eastern Patriarchates, some in the original and some in Greek translation. Despite this, his works are far from offering a perspective on the relations between the Ottoman local and central administrations and the Eastern Patriarchates. On the contrary, they provide a church history *per se*. In addition, Papadopoulos was active at a time when the fate of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates was changing in political terms, a time when the Phanariot and Ottoman influence was fading away. Therefore, Papadopoulos' works are also important in terms of reflecting a representation of the Eastern Churches, in which a number of negative elements about the role of the Ottoman administration over the Greek Orthodox Church were in formation.²⁹

Runciman's paradigm: union of the Orthodox ecclesiastical and Ottoman historiographies

²⁷ Papadopoulos 1910.

²⁸ Notably his two works on the history of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and Alexandria. See respectively Papadopoulos 1951, and Papadopoulos 1970.

²⁹ Papadopoulos devoted one of his articles solely to the Church and 'the Greek Nation' under 'the Turkish tyranny' see Papadopoulos 1922: 221-231. A certain favourism for the 'Greekness' of clergy is also abundant in his works. Regarding the events leading to the appointment of Silvestros as the patriarch of Antioch, Papadopoulos says that until then many Latin-minded clergymen of the Antiochian Church began to create an ethnic fraction against Greek clergymen. Papadopoulos 1951: 14. It was in the early 20th century again that Paulos Karolidis penned his seminal work on the ethnic origins of the Orthodox Christians in Syria and Palestine. Karolidis 1909.

In addition to these major scholars, there were a number of others writing general church histories or histories of the Orthodox Church who had something to say about the Eastern Patriarchates in Ottoman times. Only in some of these studies, and in some cases in obscure terms, do the Eastern Patriarchates appear as subordinate to that of Constantinople. Writing in 1824, Mosheim, for example, did not even comment on the Eastern Patriarchate as he thinks that ‘of those independent Greek churches, which are covered by their own laws, and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, there is none but the church established in Russia that can furnish any matter for an ecclesiastical historian.’³⁰ Waddington said that the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs had ‘the privilege (in name perhaps rather than in reality) of nominating his brother Patriarchs; and, after their subsequent election by the bishops of their respective Patriarchates, of confirming the election.’³¹ Appleyard made no comment on the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the Eastern Patriarchates under the Ottoman rule; the only exception being the tenure of Kyrillos Loukaris.³² After giving some information about the Patriarchate of Constantinople which, in Asia and Istanbul ‘has long sunk under the barbarism of its conquerors’, Stanley did not touch upon the relations between the Eastern Patriarchates and the Great Church, and moved to the church in Greece and Russia.³³ Lees said that in the ‘Turkish Empire’ the four metropolitan sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, ‘all have equal rights, and the first has only a primacy of honour.’³⁴ Hore dismissed the whole history of the four Patriarchates as ‘little more than a string of names and a series of persecution,’ among which ‘the Patriarch of Constantinople still continues to be the recognized head of the Orthodox

³⁰ Mosheim 1824, vol. III: 556.

³¹ Waddington 1829: 100.

³² Appleyard 1851: 85-90.

³³ Stanley 1864: 16.

³⁴ Lees 1884: 134.

Greek Church; but its dignity and importance henceforward centres round the Church of Russia.³⁵ Equalling Ottoman rule to Islamic rule, Hore also said the following: ‘For nearly four centuries and a half, the Patriarchal See of Constantinople has been in subjection to the Ottomans; for more than seven hundred and fifty years longer, the three other great Patriarchates of the East have, under their dominion, been little more than a name.’³⁶ Adeney said that the Patriarch of Constantinople ‘was now set over all the orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, including those of the other three patriarchates— the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria.’³⁷ Finally, Dowling wrote merely that at the time he was writing his work on the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, ‘This Patriarchate is an independent one, but it never initiates any important movement of general interest in the Orthodox Eastern Church, without previous consultation with the Oecumenical Patriarch, and the consent of its colleague in Alexandria.’³⁸ Fortescue did not need to touch upon the status of the Eastern Patriarchates during Ottoman times despite the fact that he talked about the flourishing of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, though with the problems thereupon occurred, under Ottoman rule: ‘It is strange that the last step in the advancement of the Patriarch of Constantinople should be due to the Turkish conquest.’³⁹ Therefore, until the early 20th century, the subordination of the Eastern Patriarchates to that of Constantinople was not yet a universally-established phenomenon while the role attributed to the Ottoman administration, if at all, is nothing more than the role of persecutor of Christians. Despite this, however, we cannot talk about a uniform approach of the dominating and centralising role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the Eastern Patriarchates. Attwater stated that despite the decline of the Patriarchate of Constantinople

³⁵ Hore 1899: 485.

³⁶ Hore 1899: 621.

³⁷ Adeney 1908: 312, n. 1.

³⁸ Dowling 1908: 15-16.

³⁹ Fortescue 1907: 240.

in Ottoman times, from the 16th to the 18th centuries ‘Greek ecclesiastical influence reached its height: Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem became almost totally dependent on Constantinople.’⁴⁰ As late as 1964, by contrast, Ware did not talk about such a subordination of the Eastern Patriarchates to the Great Church even though he referred to the millet system to explain the status of the Patriarch of Constantinople under Ottoman rule.⁴¹

Within the ecclesiastical histories of the Orthodox Church, however, emphasis upon the role of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate over the Eastern Patriarchates was growing⁴² and so was portrayal of the role of the Ottoman administration as supporter of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as one of its centralising tools.⁴³ To that end, it was also argued that the Eastern Patriarchs needed the mediation of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs to get their *berats* of investiture.⁴⁴ Theodore Papadopoulos maintained that because of ‘the concentration of a great amount of authority in the Oecumenical Patriarchate’ there occurred a modification in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the four

⁴⁰ Attwater 1937: 43.

⁴¹ Ware 1964: 2.

⁴² Archimandrite Kallistos, for example, makes no mention of the role of the Ottoman administration in researching ‘rights and privileges’ of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the Eastern Patriarchates. Kallistos 1921: 26-31. The historian of Antiochian Orthodox Patriarchate Asad Rustom says in his seminal work on the history of the Patriarchate of Antioch that following the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople and the Middle East the Patriarchs of Constantinople began to negotiate on behalf of the Eastern Patriarchates as the Patriarch of the capital and to defend their rights against the Ottoman supreme authority. Rustom 1928, vol. III: 13. Callinicos, too, put forward the same view as follows: ‘since the other three Patriarchal Thrones of the East were situated far from the Sultan’s capital and were themselves in a very sorry state, the Patriarch of Constantinople not infrequently took up the defence of their interests also before the Sublime Porte, not from a despotic wish to trample on their liberties, but from a brotherly spirit of concern for his weaker brethren.’ Callinicos 1931: 110.

⁴³ The argument that the Great Church followed the lead of Ottoman centralisation, has been voiced by some scholars such as John Meyendorff who said the following: ‘The jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch was virtually limitless, for it embraced not only the faithful belonging to his own patriarchate but also those in the other Eastern patriarchates—who were theoretically his equals according to canon law—and even heterodox Christians who happened to be living in the Ottoman Empire.’ Meyendorff 1962: 87. Likewise, another authority, Ware, had suggested that: ‘The other Patriarchates also within the Ottoman Empire—Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem—remained theoretically independent but were in practice subordinate.’ Ware 1963: 100.

⁴⁴ Philip Sherrard, for example, said in 1959 that the latter was ‘the sole intermediary through whom they could apply for the *berets* [sic] of their nomination.’ Sherrard 2002: 102.

Orthodox Patriarchates which gave the Patriarchs of Constantinople the role of mediation.⁴⁵ Papadopoulos supported this argument with an Ottoman *berat* of investiture, dated 1855, and published in French translation by d'Ohhson, and argued that despite its lateness 'it does confirm the traditional situation as regards the relations of the Phanar with the other Patriarchates.'⁴⁶ Therefore, he made one of the first attempts to prove with Ottoman documentation the intermediary role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the Eastern Patriarchates. Such involvement of the Ottoman administration in the paradigm, one may say, was in close connection with the development of the millet theory, which placed special importance on the centralising policies of the Ottoman administration,⁴⁷ then seen as a major characteristic of political authority.⁴⁸

Steven Runciman's *Great Church in Captivity* appeared under such conditions and encapsulated the secondary literature on the role of the Ottoman central administration and the Patriarchate of Constantinople with regard to the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. Although the main focus of this work was not the Eastern Patriarchates, Runciman's thesis on the centralising role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the whole Orthodox community and institutions in the Ottoman Empire has been used in subsequent secondary literature in varying degrees. Runciman's grand scheme suggests that the Eastern Patriarchates could negotiate with the Sublime Porte only through the mediation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Furthermore, he suggested that when there

⁴⁵ According to this modification in Ottoman times: 'the Oecumenical Patriarch, taking in former times only the honorary precedence of his colleagues, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, who, in all other respects were his equals, came to acquire such authority, as to practically nominate the candidates of his own choice to those Patriarchates, and moreover to be the sole intermediate person through whom they could communicate with the Porte.' Papadopoulos 1990: 11.

⁴⁶ Papadopoulos 1990: 11, fn.

⁴⁷ A full-fledged presentation of the millet system can be found in Gibb & Bowen 1965: 211-222. For two notable criticisms to the millet system by the opponents and revisionist proponents of the millet system see respectively Braude 1982, vol. I: 69-87, and Cohen 1982, vol. II: 7-18.

⁴⁸ In her short historiographic discussion of the Ottoman centralisation, Faroqhi notes that until the 1980s, political centralisation had been regarded as a hallmark of political development. Faroqhi 1999: 214-215.

was a vacancy on a throne of the Eastern Patriarchates, it was the Patriarch of Constantinople who asked for permission from the Sultan to fill it. As the sultan was not much interested in naming a candidate for Eastern Patriarchates, it was easy for the Patriarch of Constantinople 'to secure the appointment of the candidate whom he advocated.'⁴⁹

Although the arguments on the subordination of the Eastern Patriarchates to the Great Church and on the parallelism between the centralisation of the Ottoman political authority and that of Greek Orthodox ecclesiastical authority was not unique to Runciman, it was Runciman who produced the standard work on the status of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the Ottoman period in a systematic way and thus his argument that the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates were dealt with by the Ottoman central administration through the intermediation of the Patriarch of Constantinople, became a norm. In the end, this model was adopted by a surprisingly large and varied range of scholars, which the later scholars took for granted without much questioning. In almost all of the studies on the Patriarchate of Constantinople, it has become a norm then to mention the role of the former over the elections of the Eastern Patriarchs under Ottoman rule. Maximos the metropolitan of Sardes, for example, noted that the patriarchs of Alexandria had been appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople from 1660 onwards, and that it was the same for the Patriarchate of Antioch because the Patriarchate of Constantinople arbitrated in a patriarchal struggle between two candidates and even deposed a patriarch in 1672.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Runciman 1968: 176-177.

⁵⁰ Maximos 1976: 235.

Adopting the same paradigm, Nikolaos Pantazopoulos presented the role of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate in quite a similar way.⁵¹

Runciman's adherents placed a particular emphasis on the role of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch as a tool of the Ottoman central administration taking the role of the head of the Orthodox community, expressed in Turkish and Greek with the homonymous terms *milletbaşı* and *ethnarch*. This is a notable aspect, which was also adopted by a number of Ottomanists. Karpát, for example, associated the expansion of the Ottomans in Syria and Egypt with the expansion of the Orthodox Church as a result of cooperation between the Ottoman central administration and the Patriarchate of Constantinople:

in due time the Patriarchate of Constantinople acquired supremacy, not only because it was located in the capital and was thus close to the source of imperial power but also because it was a partner of the Ottoman rulers: their new role and consequent ascendancy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was a direct consequence of the agreement with the sultan.⁵²

Such fixation with the millet system and the role attributed to the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the whole Greek Orthodox population and institutions also brought about interesting attempts by scholars familiar with Ottoman institutions and documents to rely on Runciman's paradigm and to prove it from Ottoman archival documents. As these scholars, too, took the role of the Patriarchs of Constantinople as their point of departure, they relied on later documentation when explaining the status of the Eastern Patriarchates.

⁵¹ 'Especially after the Fall of Constantinople, Mohammed and his successors, for religious, political, and economic reasons, extend the strictly religious jurisdiction of the Patriarch and grant him with political authority as well. Thus, the Oecumenical Patriarch does not only become the head of Orthodoxy, due to the fact that the other Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria were obliged to forward all their cases to him, but is also officially ordained Millet-Bashi, i.e. Ethnarch of all the Christian subjects in the Ottoman Empire.' Pantazopoulos 1984: 19.

⁵² Karpát 1986: 132.

The recent work of Macit Kenanoğlu on the Ottoman millet system, for example, is instrumental in showing the influence of the paradigm about the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over the Eastern Patriarchates, established half a century before. Kenanoğlu says that ‘On the other hand, as Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were rich in historical terms but weak in spiritual terms, they could not very much stand against the new capital under the Ottoman rule.’⁵³ In another instance, in support of Runciman’s paradigm, he referred to Ahmet Cevdet Pasha’s account of the Orthodox patriarchates under Ottoman rule, as follows:

A. Cevdet Pasha stated that Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul is equal to Pope, and that although the patriarchates are separate (*müstakil*) Istanbul Patriarch comes before them and whenever they have a religious meeting they gather under his presidency.⁵⁴

In his analysis of each Eastern Patriarchate, he tried to support the argument that each patriarchate was subordinate to their brother of Constantinople. For the authority of that of Alexandria, for example, he mentioned that all the relevant documents are dated to the 19th century and quotes a document issued in 1263 AH (1846-47), in which the following is written: ‘Because of the death of the clergyman called (...) who had been the patriarch of Egypt, Alexandria, and its dependencies, which is included in the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul and its dependencies, and the *cemaat-i medropolidan* situated in my Sublime Port.’⁵⁵ For the Patriarchate of Antioch, in contravention of the above argument, he says that in documents written in the 18th century there is no mention of the interference of the Patriarchate of Istanbul in its affairs while in the 19th century, some documents are issued confirming the role of the patriarch of

⁵³ Kenanoğlu 2004: 100.

⁵⁴ Kenanoğlu 2004: 100.

⁵⁵ ‘*Rum Patrikliğine dahil Mısır ve İskenderiye ve tevâbii patriği olan (...) nam rahibin vefatı cihetiyle yerine aherinin tayini lazım gelerek İstanbul ve tevâbii Rum patriği ve Asitane-i saadetimde mukim cemmaat-i metropolidan bir yere bittecemmu (...).*’ Kenanoğlu 2004: 101.

Constantinople in the conduct of the affairs of the Patriarchate of Antioch.⁵⁶ With regard to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which Kenanoğlu strangely⁵⁷ analysed in a section on the Armenian and Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of Jerusalem, he aimed to establish the rights of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Jerusalem through the orders sent from the Sublime Porte in response to the petitions of the former rather than the relevant *berats* of investiture. These *berats* are in fact contained in the very same registers he used in order to explain the status of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and it is probably because of his concentration on the Patriarchate of Constantinople that he failed to note them and decided to focus on individual documents. Following a similar line of thought, he said that between 1646 and 1845, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem were chosen by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and that they resided in Istanbul.⁵⁸

In Kenanoğlu's analysis one can see that in the attempt to find an explanation for the Runciman paradigm, he ignored the documents written from the Eastern patriarchates to the Sublime Porte, which as will be detailed in the section on the sources, were located in the very same folders and the *defters* that he consulted in establishing the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Instead, he based his arguments on much later sources such as Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, who was reflecting the status of the Eastern Patriarchates *vis-*

⁵⁶ Kenanoğlu 2004: 101-102.

⁵⁷ Kenanoğlu seems confused about the number of the Patriarchates in the Ottoman Empire, as well. On one occasion, for example, he says that the Ottoman state included geographically five Orthodox patriarchates (Istanbul, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Mount Sinai) in addition to the archbishopric of Cyprus. Kenanoğlu 2004: 150. His inclusion of Sinai as a patriarchate is not accurate as it was an autonomous archbishopric. Confusingly, he mentions that at the beginning of the 13th century of Hegira (from 1785 onwards) there were four Orthodox patriarchates (Istanbul, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Egypt-Alexandria) and two archbishoprics (Cyprus and Mount Sinai). Kenanoğlu 2004: 151. The document he used is registered with the number BOA.C.ADL.5421. What is most interesting is that even after this document he mentions Mount Sinai as 'one of the five Orthodox patriarchates' in Ottoman domains. Kenanoğlu 2004: 151. fn.8. Such confusion can also be seen in Ercan, who claims that there were two Orthodox Patriarchates in the Ottoman Empire, namely Jerusalem and Istanbul. Ercan 2001: 101. To add to the confusion, the same historian analyses the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, together with that of Jerusalem, under the Melkites. Ercan 2001: 111-112.

⁵⁸ Kenanoğlu 2004: 118. In one case Kenanoğlu drew attention to the lack of any interference by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, when he talks about the ferman given by Selim I to the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Kenanoğlu 2004: 114

à-vis the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 19th century confirming the subordination of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria to that of Constantinople in the eyes of the Ottoman central administration.

It is possible to enlarge the list of the scholars who are very familiar with the Ottoman, and in addition Greek, sources who support this old argument without much questioning. In a quite recent article, for instance, Elizabeth Zachariadou repeated the same argument:

In a sense, the patriarch exercised an authority parallel to that of the sultan. This was furthered by the Ottoman conquest in 1517 of Syria and Egypt, which brought the three eastern patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria under Ottoman rule. In spiritual and dogmatic matters they had always been nominally subject to the authority of the ecumenical patriarchate, but now they came under its more effective control.⁵⁹

Repeating the argument that the Patriarchs of Constantinople had the backing of the Ottoman sultans in this because ‘a growth in the geographical scope of patriarchal authority served to increase the prestige of the Ottoman capital’⁶⁰ is a theme which necessitates more discussion here. In our view, the parallelism between the mutual enlargement of the Greek Orthodox church authority and the Ottoman political authority which is not entirely faulty lies at the core of the misunderstanding. Such parallelism has been quite convincingly used in the secondary literature with regard to the Ottoman expansion in the Balkans, where the role of the church in matters such as tax collection has been largely revealed for more than half a century.⁶¹ However, applying it to the Ottoman expansion in the Middle East, without actually looking at the interaction between the

⁵⁹ Zachariadou 2006: 184-185.

⁶⁰ Zachariadou 2006: 184-185.

⁶¹ The earliest Ottoman *timar defteri* dating to 1432 testifies to the fact that the Ottoman administration was keen not only in the Orthodox Church but also in incorporating it into its administrative system by permitting the clergymen to act as tax collectors. The *defter* in question is published in İnalçık 1954. For some major studies on the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in Ottoman tax-farming see İnalçık 1998b: 195-223, İnalçık 1982: 437-449, Kenanoğlu 2004, and Papademetriou 2001.

centre represented by the Ottoman central administration and the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the periphery represented by the Eastern Patriarchates and other provincial legal and administrative dynamics is the problem itself. Before moving onto an analysis of those scholars who adopted a provincial approach to the topic in question, one should also mention two scholars who adopted a different path among those writing on the patriarchate of Constantinople, namely İnalçık and Konortas. In addition to questioning the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople over time,⁶² these two scholars prudently refrained from touching on the issue of the authority of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate over the Eastern Patriarchates.

Views from Ottoman provinces

Besides those scholars who based their view of the history of the Eastern Patriarchates on the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, there appears another paradigm which analyses the history of the Eastern Patriarchates from a provincial perspective. The most useful service that this perspective has brought about is that it has opened up a new direction by looking at the very Patriarchates in question and their relations with the Ottoman provincial legal and administrative bodies and the semi-autonomous local amirs. Using the local sources produced by the Orthodox communities, scholars have also shed light on the developments within the Eastern Patriarchates. A particular weakness of these works, however, is that they focus on the local dynamics to such an extent that they tend to keep the history of the Eastern Patriarchates out of context.

It also appears in more than a few cases that the Ottoman period of the Middle Eastern

⁶² İnalçık questioned the preconceived arguments about the status of the Patriarch of Constantinople vis-à-vis the central administration in İnalçık 1998b: 195-223. Likewise, Konortas suggested that the expansion of the role of the Patriarch of Constantinople assuming the role of an *ethnarch/milletbaşı* came about only in the 19th century. For an example, based on the patriarchal *berats* of investiture given to the Constantinopolitan patriarchs, see Konortas 1999: 169-179.

Christians serves the nationalistic agendas of the post-Ottoman states in the Middle East. This is very much evident in the work of Kamal Salibi who associated the birth of the Melkite-Catholic Church from within the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch in Syria in 1724 as the first signs of Arab nationalism in response to the centralising dynamics of the Church and State in Istanbul.⁶³ Another notable notion of this group of scholars is that their focus on the provincial dynamics and internal church affairs prevents them from seeing the possibility of accommodation and cooperation between the Eastern Patriarchates and the Ottoman administration. Therefore, we see that they keep repeating some centuries-old misconceptions about the Ottoman administration's treatment of its Christian subjects. Alternatively, they tend to attribute a particular importance to the Eastern Patriarchates' connections to the outside world which appeared as sponsors of the Eastern Patriarchates on many occasions. Robert Haddad offers the best example in that respect, on the role of the Christians of Syria as mediators of European culture in the times of the Abbasids and the Ottomans.⁶⁴

Walbiner appears to be one of the handful of scholars who overcame the shortcomings of the provincial approach, and offered an alternative perspective. Specialising in the 17th century, he referred in many instances to the countless misjudgements of the above-mentioned scholars concerning the history of the Patriarchate

⁶³ Salibi 1988: 42-50.

⁶⁴ Haddad 1970. Although Haddad's work seems to cover the Ottoman period as well, he based his study of different groups of Syrian Christians on the role of these Christians as transmitters of European culture during the times of Abbasids and, as part of the Ottoman rule, the 19th century, which he back-projected to earlier centuries. Apparently, the author presumes a period of continuity between these two ages, namely the Abbasid and Ottoman, which is open to debate from many perspectives. Haddad's works are also heavily influenced by an antagonistic terminology. For him, to cite one example, 'the latest phase of the *essentially* hostile Muslim domination which over a period of 900 years had helped reduce the ancient Church to that sorry status which is perhaps the destiny of the socially and politically disabled minority.' Haddad 1970: 25-26. Some scholars have retained a more careful approach while talking about the French influence on the Christians of Ottoman Syria. Marcus, for example, says that 'even in Aleppo the eighteenth-century European penetration affected only a small portion of the city's economic activities and touched in restricted ways the fortunes of some local non-Muslims... The region was isolated from Western culture and unfamiliar with its ways...' Marcus 1989: 25.

of Antioch.⁶⁵ Despite his convincing arguments about the role of the Patriarchate of Antioch vis-à-vis that of Constantinople, Walbiner has no answer to the role of the Ottoman administration, if at all, in the government of the Eastern Patriarchates. On the contrary, his work is not safe from Christian-Muslim conflict, and thus he repeats the same myths about the status of the Patriarch of Antioch under Ottoman rule, regarding him in one case ‘a second-class citizen and fearful subject of the mighty Sultan who lived in permanent fear from the local Ottoman authorities.’⁶⁶

A sub-group among these scholars, namely Ottomanists with a special interest in Christians of Ottoman Syria and Egypt, are the next group that may provide a satisfactory explanation for the relations between the Ottoman administration and the Eastern Patriarchates. Despite shedding light on important aspects of church affairs in the Ottoman Middle East, when it comes to these Patriarchates’ relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople they mainly refer to the Runciman paradigm and fall victim to the parallelism between the expansion of the Ottoman political authority and Orthodox church authority in Balkan and in Middle Eastern contexts. In his analysis of the question of Holy Sites under early Ottoman rule, for instance, Peri says that with the inclusion of all the Orthodox Patriarchates in Ottoman administration, the Patriarchate of Constantinople launched a program of restoring the Byzantine Church through ‘Hellenization’ of the Eastern Patriarchates, a program also supported by the Ottoman administration.⁶⁷ Thomas Philipp, too, regards the birth of the Melkite Catholic Church following the Antiochian Schism a result of the infringements of the Patriarchs of Constantinople in the affairs of the

⁶⁵ He particularly refutes those arguments associating the birth of Melkite Catholic Church within the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch with a Greek-Arab conflict. See in particular, Walbiner 1997-1998: 577-587, and Walbiner 2003: 9-36.

⁶⁶ Walbiner 2000: 41.

⁶⁷ Peri 2001: 99-100.

Patriarchate of Antioch.⁶⁸ Masters states, though superficially and without making an attempt to explain the mechanisms governing the relations between the Ottoman administration and the church organisations, that whereas the local communities in the Ottoman Middle East were able to resolve their problems by making use of provincial actors during the 16th and the 17th centuries, by the second half of the 18th century the community organisations based in Istanbul tried to dominate the local hierarchies in the provinces.⁶⁹ However, his work too is heavily influenced by a Muslim-Christian dichotomy in explaining the governmental relations between state and society in the Ottoman Middle East and hence it presents a view of Christians who ‘knew that the state was not theirs.’⁷⁰

Recent Historiography on the Eastern Patriarchates

If there is any vibrant interest in the history of the Eastern Patriarchates during the recent decades it is within the Church itself. A number of church historians or church-related historians have produced a good deal of literature in the past few decades. Among these, we may cite a multi-volume guide to Melkite literature between the 5th and 20th centuries,⁷¹ a number of books and countless articles on the history of the Patriarchate of Antioch by Joseph Nasrallah, who, having converted to Melkite Catholicism acted as the patriarchal vicar of the Melkite Catholic Church in Paris.⁷² Among the recent publications

⁶⁸ Philipp 1985.

⁶⁹ Masters 2001: 62. Masters further noted the change in Ottoman policies towards Eastern Christians vis-à-vis the Catholics. In the 18th century, he says Ottoman administration sided ‘with the traditionalists in the hierarchies of the Eastern-rite churches.’ Masters 2001: 89.

⁷⁰ Masters 2001: 18. I strongly disagree with the view that non-Muslim Ottoman subjects had no concept of belonging to the state in a pre-modern sense, which Masters affiliates even with the Tanzimat period. For my discussion of this topic through the travel memoirs of a 17th-century archdeacon, and son of an Antiochian Orthodox Patriarch, Paul of Aleppo, see Çolak 2012: 375-385.

⁷¹ Nasrallah 1979-1989. For notes for this work, originally submitted as a PhD Dissertation to the University of Dijon by Nasrallah himself and for a list of his publications between 1983 and 1984 see Nasrallah 1984.

⁷² For some notes on his ecclesiastical and academic life see Canivet & Haddad 1995: 267-269.

about the Eastern Patriarchates and Patriarchs by Greek Orthodox churchmen are the dissertation on Silvestros of Antioch's tenure according to Arabic and Greek sources by Basileios Nassour⁷³ the present archbishop of Akkar, the book on the Patriarchate of Alexandria by the metropolitan of Zimbabwe Tillyridis,⁷⁴ the history of the Patriarchate of Alexandria by Chrysostomos M. Papadopoulos the metropolitan of Carthage,⁷⁵ archbishop Joseph Tawil's introductory work on the history of the patriarchate of Antioch,⁷⁶ Panagiotis Tzoumerkas' history of the Patriarchate of Alexandria,⁷⁷ and a series of works by Kyrillos Kogerakis, the metropolitan of Rhodes, on Alexandrian patriarchs who were also saints. In this series the saints Ioakeim Pany,⁷⁸ Gerasimos Palladas,⁷⁹ Meletios Pigas⁸⁰ and Kyrillos Loukaris⁸¹ have appeared so far. These scholars' most important contribution relates to their proximity to the sources in the patriarchal archives and libraries. Publication of such sources by these historians in recent years is a promising development for the future of the field.⁸² Two major shortcomings of these writers, however, are that they tend to ignore the other studies in the field and that they often lack specialisation in writing and rewriting general histories of the Patriarchates.⁸³ Because of their isolated approach to the history of the Eastern Patriarchates, their treatments either lack any mention of the Ottoman role,⁸⁴ or with some exceptions⁸⁵ they place the history of the Eastern

⁷³ Nassour 1992.

⁷⁴ Tillyridis 1998.

⁷⁵ Papadopoulos 2000.

⁷⁶ Tawil 2001.

⁷⁷ Tzoumerkas 2007.

⁷⁸ Kogerakis 2009a.

⁷⁹ Only a short summary of his life, though without any references whatsoever, has been included in this work which may appeal to a historian of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Kogerakis 2009b: 75-78.

⁸⁰ Kogerakis 2009c.

⁸¹ Kogerakis 2010.

⁸² A notable example is the publication of a codex of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Tzoumerkas 2010.

⁸³ In some cases, this is also valid for the biographies of Eastern Patriarchs, Nassour's treatment of Silvestros being an exception.

⁸⁴ Papadopoulos and Tzoumerkas are examples of that phenomenon. Papadopoulos 2000 and Tzoumerkas 2007.

Patriarchates under Ottoman rule in the centre of an Islam-Christian antagonism.⁸⁶ For other cases, they portray the Eastern Patriarchates as passive receivers of the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.⁸⁷

In the recent years a number of monographs on individual patriarchs have appeared. Pinelopi Stathi's dissertation on Chrysanthos Notaras⁸⁸ which also appeared as a book,⁸⁹ and Chatzoglou-Mpalta's monograph on Gerasimos Palladas of Alexandria are the two major proponents of this trend. These two studies take these two prominent patriarchs out of the context of ecclesiastical history and place them in the scientific world of the Enlightenment in Chrysanthos' case, and in the literary world of his time in Gerasimos' case. The efforts of Stathi and Chatzoglou-Mpalta to present these two 18th-century patriarchs by considering the non-ecclesiastical connections as well⁹⁰ fill an important gap on the history of the Patriarchates and offer new perspectives on individual patriarchs. Publication of such studies gives hope for the future of the field of Greek Orthodox Patriarchates under Ottoman rule by offering innovative perspectives on the relations between the Ottoman administration and the Eastern Patriarchates.

⁸⁵ Tillirydis talks highly of the beginning of the Ottoman era in Egypt: 'When Egypt was taken by the Turks in 1517, a new era dawned for the Christians. Persecution ceased.' Tillirydis 1998: 26.

⁸⁶ Nassour, for example, says that after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, 'on the throne of the Orthodox emperor sat an infidel sultan' and 'in place of Orthodoxy, Islam was put' while the *Romioi* became 'second-class citizens' Nassour 1992: 8-9.

⁸⁷ On this matter, Nassour follows the Runciman paradigm and says that the Patriarch of Constantinople became, on account of the privileges given to him 'the *ethnarch* of Roum-milet.' As such, he had the right to take *berats* of investiture for other patriarchs and bishops. Taking advantage of these privileges, the Patriarchate of Antioch fought the Uniate Schism in 1724. Nassour 1992: 9-10. Tawil adopts a similar view. Tawil 2001: 249.

⁸⁸ Stathi 1995.

⁸⁹ Stathi 1999.

⁹⁰ Seeking to analyse Chrysanthos' scientific activities within an Enlightenment background, Stathi pays special attention to providing the Ottoman political context, as well, although she is unable to carry out research in Ottoman archives. Chatzoglou-Mpalta, who sought to include the Ottoman aspect in the life of Gerasimos despite being linguistically unable to handle the Ottoman material encountered in the patriarchal and monastic archives, a most notable aspect of which being her publication of the *berat* of Gerasimos in Greek, translated by Phokion Kotzageorgis.

It would appear, however, that despite some prospects for the enrichment of the field with the introduction of some new sources and perspectives, there is a definite gap with regard to the mechanisms of relations between the Ottoman central administration and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria vis-à-vis the Great Church. In our view, this can only be overcome by a comparative approach to the sources and perspectives in question.

Primary Sources

Ottoman Sources

In this study extensive use has been made of unpublished and unexplored Ottoman archival documents. The bulk of Ottoman archival materials are from the Prime Ministerial Ottoman Archives in Istanbul (*Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri*), of which the most useful for this research are the *Piskoposluk Kalemi Belgeleri* (Documents of the Office of Bishopricks) and *Piskopos Mukataası Defterleri* (Notebooks of Bishops' *Mukâta'a*), containing the correspondence between the Ottoman central administration and the Eastern Patriarchates. According to Ottoman political practice, any Ottoman subject had the right to appeal to the Ottoman sultan as a final countermeasure to the possible injustice of other political and legal bodies.⁹¹ Thus, just as any subject of the Ottoman sultan, patriarchs and other church members could and did petition the sultan on several occasions.⁹² The decisions in response to these petitions were copied into the *Mühimme Defterleri*, during the initial stages of the Ottoman bureaucracy, and later were dispersed through more specialised *defter* series such as *Ecnebî Defterleri*, *Şikâyet Defterleri*, *Nâme Defterleri*,

⁹¹ İnalçık 2005: 75.

⁹² For some cases from the *ahkâm defteri* of the year 1675, see Ursinus 1994: 236-247. The *defter* in question is published in Majer 1984.

Ahkam Defterleri, and in later periods *Nişân Defterleri*.⁹³ The documents and defters we use in this dissertation, *Piskoposluk Kalemi Belgeleri* and *Piskopos Mukataası Defterleri* are the results of this mechanism. *Piskoposluk Kalemi Belgeleri* are the originals of the documents that the hierarchs sent to the imperial chancery (*Dîvân-ı Hümayûn*). Although in many cases it is difficult to find the complete responses to these appeals in these documents, they show how the petitioners presented their case in exact terms. It is possible to deduce, from the notes written by different officials of the *Dîvân* on the margins (*derkenâr*) of these documents, an approximate direction and how the procedure works in individual cases. According to Ottoman bureaucratic procedure, when a response was dispatched to an addressee, it was also copied into a *defter* (notebook) and thus the responses of the Ottoman central administration were recorded in *Piskopos Mukataası Defterleri*, whereas the original responses, if they still exist, should be in the archives of the Eastern Patriarchates.⁹⁴ The most important documents among these are the *berats* of investiture given to patriarchs and metropolitans, either when they were appointed to their sees or when there was a change on the imperial throne, in which case the Ottoman bureaucratic practice required the renewal of all the *berats*. *Berats* provide the most official details—as far as the Ottoman administration is concerned—about the jurisdiction and rights of the patriarchs. Thus, complementing each other, these two series of documents provide the best tools for understanding the interaction between the Ottoman central administration and the Eastern Patriarchates. Consisting of 31 folders *Piskoposluk Kalemi*

⁹³ İnalçık 2005: 49-59.

⁹⁴ The *ferman* collections in the archives of the Patriarchates of Jerusalem attest to the presence of these documents. Tselikas 1992: 397-498.

Belgeleri cover the years 1606–1792 while the 16 *defters* in the *Piskopos Mukataası Defterleri* cover the period from 1641 to 1834.⁹⁵

As these sources mainly consist of the correspondence between the Patriarchates and the Ottoman central administration, they are a *sine qua non* to understanding the role that the Eastern Patriarchates and the Ottoman central administration attributed to each other. Catalogued chronologically, these archival materials provide a wealth of information not only about the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria but also about the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Patriarchates of Peć and Ohrid, the Armenian Patriarchates, the Catholic bishoprics, the Syriac Patriarchate, and the Maronite and Nestorian Churches in the Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately, the earliest of these documents are concentrated in the last two decades of the 17th century. From the beginning of the 18th century, however, the documentation regarding the Eastern Patriarchates begins to increase in quantity and quality. Therefore, our analysis of this century will largely benefit from this unpublished—and as far as the Eastern Patriarchates go unused—documentation.

The information provided in *Mühimme Defterleri*⁹⁶ does not match the quality and quantity of the documents in *Piskoposluk Kalemi Belgeleri* and *Piskopos Mukataası Defterleri* as regards the Eastern Patriarchates. Although Uriel Heyd's publication of English translations for a selection of the orders relating to Palestine in the *Mühimme Defterleri*⁹⁷ aim at presenting all the issues in Palestinian affairs, because of the chronological and geographic limits of the selection, other published *Mühimme Defterleri* were also consulted.

⁹⁵ An introduction to the registers in the *Piskopos Mukataası Defterleri* can be found in İnalçık 1982: 437-449.

⁹⁶ For an introduction to the classification of the *mühimme* series, see Emecen 2005: 108-110.

⁹⁷ Heyd 1960.

Out of the 10 *Kilise Defterleri* (Church Notebooks) devoted to the church-related issues in the Holy Land, only two pertain to the period under question. Also known as *Kamâme Defterleri* (Holy Sepulchre Notebooks), these two *defters* contain the orders addressing the Greek Orthodox—and Armenian—Patriarchs of Jerusalem with regard to the status of the Church of Holy Sepulchre and other sacred churches in the Holy Land, and bear first-hand witness to the Empire-wide competition between the Armenian and Greek Orthodox communities to gain a high prestige in the holy sites.

Those major groups of sources were also supported by some other documents from the *Ali Emiri* and *Cevdet* classifications of the Prime Ministerial Ottoman Archives, Archive of Topkapı Palace Museum.⁹⁸ Also consulted are the Ottoman documents published by Kabrda from the Ottoman Archive in Sofia,⁹⁹ which is often complementary to the Istanbul archives, and the documents published by Zachariadou from monastic archives.¹⁰⁰ Finally, I had access to the Ottoman documents in the archive of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, which provides a perfect case for comparison.¹⁰¹

Greek Sources

The Greek sources used in this dissertation fall into two categories: documentary and literary. As explained above, a good deal of the patriarchal documentations is from the

⁹⁸ Despite its need for a full and proper catalogue, this archive shows at least some potential given the quality of the few documents relating to the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates. The recent transfer of some of the *defters* from the Archive of the Topkapı Palace Museum to the Prime Ministerial Ottoman Archives shows some hope for the document (*evrâk*) collections, which in our survey proved more useful for the purposes of this research, as well.

⁹⁹ Kabrda 1969.

¹⁰⁰ Zachariadou 1996.

¹⁰¹ Documents in this archive have already been microfilmed by the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. between 1949 and 1950. I benefited from the copies of these microfilms located in the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at the University of Birmingham. A checklist has been published in Clark 1952. For an introduction for the project of microfilming the archives of the St. Catherine's monastery, see Clark 1953: 22-43. From this large collection, which contains 670 Turkish documents, some have been published, edited and translated into German by Schwarz. Schwarz 1970.

19th century onwards. Of these documents, those published in Papadopoulos-Kerameus' five-volume *Analekta* provide a mine of information for the purposes of this dissertation.¹⁰² Delikanis' publication of patriarchal *acta* for Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria preserved in the archive of the Patriarchate of Constantinople provide the synodic decisions, orders, and correspondence within the Church.¹⁰³ These two sets of documents have been supplemented by some other documents, which contain relatively less information for the subject at hand.¹⁰⁴ The bulk of the above-mentioned Greek sources, which corresponds chronologically to the Ottoman documentation, and complements the information in Ottoman sources, constitute an appropriate case for comparative research. In addition, published catalogues of the patriarchal archives of Jerusalem¹⁰⁵ and Alexandria¹⁰⁶ also contain editions of some important Greek documents and thus are of use. *Notitiae Episcopatum* or *Syntagmatia* have also been consulted in tracing the jurisdictional boundaries of the Eastern Patriarchates, which, when used in combination with Ottoman *berats*, provide fruitful results.¹⁰⁷ The *Notitiae* or other similar documents of

¹⁰² Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963. This collection also contains Greek translations for some Ottoman documents which were separately analysed in Vryonis 1981: 29-53.

¹⁰³ Delikanis 1904, vol. II.

¹⁰⁴ Among these, the collection published by Uspenskii is the most comprehensive corpus documents dealing mainly with the relations between the Patriarchate of Alexandria and Russia, although giving important information about the former's relations with other foreign courts as well. Uspenskii 1898. Regel's *Byzantino-Russica* also contains some major documents bearing witness to the interaction between the Eastern Patriarchates and Russia. The documents discovered by Manoussacas in Italy, too, contain a few documents about the Alexandrian and Jerusalemite Patriarchates. Manoussakas 1968. Miklosich and Müller's corpus of *Acta et Diplomata* also has some documents relating to this dissertation. Miklosich & Müller 1890. Though prepared from the patriarchal codex of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the Archbishop Iakovos Library, Vapori's English translations of these documents have also been useful in terms of the participation of the Eastern Patriarchates in the activities of the Great Church. For Codex Gamma see Vapori 1974, and for Codex Beta see Vapori 1975. For an introduction on the Archbishop Iakovos Library, see Cotsonis 2000: 307-342.

¹⁰⁵ Tselikas 1992.

¹⁰⁶ Moschonas 1965.

¹⁰⁷ Zachariadou is the first to suggest the use of *berats* in comparison with *notitiae* and to attempt to establish the geographical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople based on some unpublished *berats* from the 15th and 16th centuries. Zachariadou 1996: 109-144. Following the same methodology, Konortas also analysed the published *berats* and *notitiae* for the whole Ottoman period. He also referred to some published *berats* for the Eastern Patriarchates. Konortas 1998: 229-295.

interest to the period this dissertation covers¹⁰⁸ include one prepared for the Patriarchate of Antioch in 1658 in Arabic,¹⁰⁹ three for all the Eastern Patriarchates, prepared by Thomas Smith in 1680,¹¹⁰ another in 1690,¹¹¹ and the third prepared by Chrysanthos Notaras of Jerusalem (1707-1731).¹¹²

As far as the literary sources written in Greek are concerned, the historical works written by the Eastern Patriarchs, notably two historical works written by Nektarios of Jerusalem,¹¹³ and Dositheos Notaras have been consulted.¹¹⁴ Although not relating directly to the Eastern Patriarchates, narrative sources about the Patriarchate of Constantinople have also been used.¹¹⁵

French Sources

The French sources fall into three major groups, namely letters of Jesuit missionaries active in the Ottoman Empire, diplomatic correspondence between the French court and the French ambassadors and consuls in the Ottoman Empire and personal letters and memoirs of these French diplomats. Largely published by Le Gobien¹¹⁶ and Rabbath¹¹⁷ missionary reports provide the best tool to understanding the inner-workings of the most active Catholic missionary order in the Ottoman Empire. French archival

¹⁰⁸ Those *notitiae* which concern only the Patriarchate of Constantinople have also been consulted in comparison with the Eastern Patriarchates. These *notitiae* are registered in Gelzer 1901: 531-641, Regel 1970: 85-99, Paul Rycout 1679: 85-89, Omont 1893: 313-320. In addition to these Fabricius' work has also been consulted with regard to the patriarchal titles around 1710. Fabricius 1808-1809: 479-482.

¹⁰⁹ Zayat & Edelby 1953: 341-350.

¹¹⁰ Smith 1680: 2-6.

¹¹¹ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1889: 468-478.

¹¹² Chrysanthos Notaras 1778: 75-79.

¹¹³ Nektarios 1783.

¹¹⁴ The original work was published by Chrysanthos Notaras in Bucharest in its entirety: Dositheos Notaras 1715. Some sections of this work have also been published in Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. I: 231-308.

¹¹⁵ For the 16th century, an anonymous History of the Patriarchate of Constantinople has been used. *Historia Patriarchiki* 1849. For the 17th and 18th centuries we have mainly referred to the following works. Hypsilantis 1870 and Makraios 1872.

¹¹⁶ Le Gobien 1819, vol. I and III, and Le Gobien 1810, vol. II, IV, and V.

¹¹⁷ Rabbath 1905, and Rabbath 1910.

materials, especially those published by Rabbath¹¹⁸ from the series *Correspondance consulaire* of *Ministère des Affaires Etrangères* offer crucial information not only on the role of the French polity with regard to the Ottoman Orthodox but also on the similar and differing policies between the French policies and the Jesuit perspective. Complementary to these sources are the memoirs of French diplomats who worked in the Ottoman Empire.¹¹⁹

English Sources

The English sources used in this dissertation are mainly of literary nature because of the relative lack of state or church interest in the affairs of the Ottoman Christians for much of the period under scrutiny. A study of the State Papers preserved in the National Archives at Kew, for example, show that on a patriarchal level, the British interest in the Eastern Church was at a peak during the time of Kyrillos Loukaris who, renowned for his Calvinist views, was in significant correspondence with the English court especially during his tenure as the Patriarch of Constantinople, and even sent his protégé, who would assume the patriarchal throne of Alexandria as Mitrofanis Kritopoulos, to England to be educated at Oxford.¹²⁰ Kyrillos' unsuccessful struggle against the Jesuit party in Istanbul, which resulted in his execution in 1638, seals the end of English correspondance about the Eastern Church in the National Archives, which would flourish again only in the 19th century. An exception is the appeals of the Alexandrian Patriarch Samouil Kapasoulis to

¹¹⁸ Especially noteworthy are the relevant documents in *Correspondance Consulaire* of *Ministère des Affaires Etrangères*, in Archives Nationales, Paris, published in Rabbath 1905, and Rabbath 1910.

¹¹⁹ A most important source in that respect is the memoirs of Bonnac, the French ambassador in the Porte between 1713 and 1724. Schefer 1894.

¹²⁰ Ravanis 1971: 232. Another important Eastern patriarch who studied for sometime in England is Chrysanthos of Jerusalem. Ravanis 1971: 326.

Queen Anne for financial support in the early 18th century.¹²¹ Therefore, the literary sources¹²² have been the focus of our concentration, written by ambassadors such as John Covell¹²³ and travellers with an interest in church affairs in the Ottoman lands such as Paul Rycaut¹²⁴ and Thomas Smith.¹²⁵

Arabic Sources

Owing to the fact that an overwhelming majority of the flock and clergy of the Patriarchate of Antioch were Arabic-speaking, the Arabic sources used in this research are related to this patriarchate. During the Druze-Maronite conflicts in Damascus in the year 1860, the Patriarchal archive, was set on fire and therefore whatever there is in the present patriarchal archive dates to later periods. In recent years, however, the University of Balamand, which belongs to the Patriarchate of Antioch, began to publish catalogues of monastic archives which offer a partial solution to the absence of a patriarchal archive.¹²⁶ Fortunately, despite chiefly concentrating on later periods, these catalogues contain the facsimiles of a few original documents which proved useful for the purposes of this dissertation. Recently, a church-based project aiming to prepare a pool of Antiochian manuscripts in world and mainly European libraries has also been launched under the leadership of the monk Elia Khalifeh.¹²⁷ The publication of the *kadi* court records in the

¹²¹ For an in-depth analysis of the issue, and the editions of the relevant letters, see Papadopoulos, 1910: 117-144, 119-225. Some of these letters were published in English translation in Arsenius 1715.

¹²² For a theoretical essay on the pre-18th century English travel writing on the Ottoman Middle East, see Murphey 1990: 291-303.

¹²³ Covell 1998.

¹²⁴ Paul Rycaut 1679.

¹²⁵ Smith 1680.

¹²⁶ Mahfuzât 1995.

¹²⁷ For an introduction on the project, see Khalifeh 2006: 423-431. More information and a yearly newsletter can be reached from the official website of the project: <http://www.antiochcentre.net>

Arabic-speaking lands of the Ottoman Empire, which is in its early stages, also partly benefited this dissertation.¹²⁸

One of the earliest narrative Arabic sources of importance for the current subject is Paul of Aleppo's travel account of his father's fund-raising journey to Muscovy. It provides a view of the Ottoman state by an archdeacon of the Patriarchate of Antioch in mid-17th century.¹²⁹ Another major source written in the late-18th century by an Antiochian Orthodox priest named Mikhâ'il Burayk,¹³⁰ is *Târîh el-Şâm* whose representation of the Ottoman central administration, often contrasts with that of Paul of Aleppo's memoirs,¹³¹ and presents important clues about church-state relations at a time following the period of centralisation of Eastern Patriarchates in Istanbul.

Contents of the Dissertation

Analysis of the three centuries of the Eastern Patriarchates under Ottoman rule far exceeds the limits and goals of this dissertation. Therefore, our analysis of the early centuries, namely the 16th and 17th centuries, will be focused on reconstructing the patterns of the relations between the Eastern Patriarchates and the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman central administration, rather than providing a full-scale narrative of their respective histories during these centuries. Accordingly, the first two sections of the first

¹²⁸ Cohen's selections from the Jerusalem *sicillât* on the basis of the Jewish participation in the kadi court are of utmost importance here as these *sicils* also involve some important cases regarding the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Cohen 1994. On the Ottoman *sicillât* of Syria and Jordan see Mandaville 1966. Recent interest in the *sicillât* of Bilâd-ı Şâm and Egypt can be seen in Abdul Rahman 1991: 88-97, and Meshal 1998. Appearance of studies devoted solely to the participation of zimmi of these lands in the kadi courts are important developments in the field. For one such work based on the zimmi of Damascus from late 18th to the mid 19th century see Al-Qattan 1996.

¹²⁹ Paul of Aleppo 1930: 1-200. For a discussion of literature and an analysis of Paul's character in a three-partite world of Orthodox, Syrian and Ottoman cultures, see Çolak 2012: 378-382.

¹³⁰ Burayk 1982. For an introduction on Mikhâ'il Burayk/Breik see El-Eid Bualuan 1996: 257-270, and Tamari 2007: 1-5. For a list of his writing see also Graf 1951: 152-154. Masters provides a broader discussion of the 18th-century historians of Syria, including Burayk as well. Masters 1994: 353-362. Likewise, Sajdi gives an account of Burayk vis-à-vis other 18th-century Ottoman historical works written in Arabic. Sajdi 2002: 141-145, 180-190, 240-254, 312-315.

¹³¹ Haddad 1970: 67-68.

chapter will discuss this theme based on the relatively scarce documentation. The latter sections of the first chapter focus on the attempts of the Patriarchs of Constantinople to infiltrate the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates and the power of these Patriarchates to stand against such infiltration. Here, attention will also be drawn to the types of correspondence they held with the Ottoman central administration. It will be shown that they did not need the mediation of the Patriarchs of Constantinople to access the Sublime Porte, contrary to the often repeated argument in the secondary literature. Our analysis of the Eastern Patriarchates before what is termed in this dissertation the centralisation of the Patriarchates of the Ottoman Empire in the capital covers the period when two dynamics brought about an overall change to the patterns of relations between the Patriarchates and the Ottoman central administration. The second chapter is devoted to these two dynamics, namely the Catholic missionary activities among the Greek Orthodox laity and, more importantly, the hierarchy and the rise of the Phanariots, the Greek Orthodox lay elites based in the Phanar district of Istanbul, which also housed the Patriarchate, and their increasing cooperation with the Ottoman central administration. For each patriarchate the discussion will extend to the tenure of a certain patriarch, who shows similar notions of centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates on the available evidence in the first half of the 18th century. Therefore, we will introduce the patriarchs of Antioch until the appointment of Silvestros in 1724, which we will analyse in much detail in chapter four. Regarding the Patriarchate of Jerusalem we will continue until the beginning of the tenure of Parthenios in 1737. Finally, we will end the account of the Patriarchs of Alexandria with the beginning of the time of Matthaïos in 1746. As will be mentioned in the second chapter, these lay elites began to hold key political and economic positions in the Ottoman Empire in the 18th century, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy began to be more and more dependent

on these elites. The third chapter is reserved for the study of the creation of a patriarchal elite class in parallel to the transformation of the lay elites. Here, I draw attention to how the chief hierarchs of the Eastern Patriarchates turned out to be more and more homogenous than in the previous centuries. The chapter also contrasts the new authority of the Eastern Patriarchs to the earlier period, explained in the first chapter, through the analysis of Ottoman *berats* of investiture which outline the rights of the individual Patriarchs. The study of these *berats* shows that during the first half of the 18th century, Eastern Patriarchs managed to have much more extensive rights included in their *berats*, rights which doubled and in some cases tripled in number those in the *berats* of their predecessors. The second half of this chapter is devoted to a single case study, namely the long tenure of Silvestros as the Patriarch of Antioch (1724-1766) as one of the patriarchal elites analysed in the first section of the chapter. Our analysis of Silvestros' tenure graphically shows the way the Patriarchate of Antioch was transformed from a peripheral and relatively unimportant Patriarchate, as far as the Ottoman central administration is concerned, into a more central part of the Greek Orthodox Church, and the Ottoman Empire. This section is based on an enormous amount of published and unused Ottoman documentation as well as the published sources regarding the tenure of Silvestros. His tenure is also instrumental in showing the transformation in the way the central administration handled church affairs in its provinces. The final chapter analyses the economic power behind this political success in the transformation of the Eastern Patriarchates. This chapter does not, however, aim to provide a study of the economy of the Eastern Patriarchates in its entirety. Our focus will be rather on the novel practices introduced in the Eastern Patriarchates, such as the establishment of pious endowments (*evkâf* in Turkish and *metochia* in Greek), and the excessive and combined practice of

collecting alms (*tasadduk* in Turkish and *ziteia* in Greek) and the inheritances of the testators who willed their possessions to the Eastern Patriarchates, all of which practices were carried out often outside the boundaries of these Patriarchates. The chapter concludes that the economic power behind the political success of the 18th century was the result of cooperation between a number of agents, namely the Eastern and Constantinopolitan Patriarchs, Phanariot elites, the Orthodox population and the Ottoman central administration.

CHAPTER 1. EASTERN PATRIARCHATES AND OTTOMAN ADMINISTRATION: 16TH-17TH CENTURIES

Eastern Patriarchates prior to Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt

It can be said that the relations between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Eastern Patriarchates, notably that of Alexandria, during the reigns of the Mamluk Sultans Baybars and Qalawun were much dependent upon the political relations between these sultans and the Byzantine emperors contemporary with them. Therefore, it is necessary to give a brief account of the political environment of that time. The early years of the reigns of Michael VIII Palaiologos and Baybars are characterised by a search for peace and alliance. As for the position of Michael, he re-conquered Constantinople from the Latins and tried to restore his power in the capital with a view to re-introduce the ideal Byzantine imperial ideology so as to be titled as 'the New Constantine'.¹³² However, his newly-restored Empire lay between the following potential threats: Charles of Anjou, the strongest Catholic king who intended to take Constantinople back, the newly converted Muslim Golden Horde in the North, who controlled Genghiz Khan's domains above the Black Sea, the Ilkhans in Iran, the pagan successors of Genghiz extending their political influence into Asia Minor through the Seljuk Sultans of Rum, and finally the Mamluks in Egypt and Syria. Though stopping Mongol expansion in Syria, and putting great fear into the Crusaders, Baybars was not in an easy position either. With Michael he had the common enemy, Charles of Anjou, who might have created trouble for him by trying to recapture the places Crusaders possessed.¹³³ Therefore, a Mamluk-Byzantine alliance was almost inevitable.

In such a political environment, according to the Mamluk historian Ibn Abd al-

¹³² On the imperial project of Michael VIII with the re-conquest of Constantinople, and its controversial aspects see Macrides 1980: 13-41. See also Macrides 1994: 269-282.

¹³³ Holt 1995: 23-25.

Zahir, in 26 November 1261, Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII sent a letter to Sultan Baybars offering him a mutual policy of assistance. Later on, the same historian goes on, Michael VIII sent al-Rashid al-Kahhal as the Patriarch for the Melkite Christians under Mamluk rule together with an ambassador called Amir Faris al-Din Aqush al-Mas'udi. He was received with great honour and gifts by Baybars. When Faris al-Din went back to Constantinople, the Emperor Michael showed him the mosque he restored after reconquering Constantinople. Concerning this event, Ibn Abd al-Zahir ascribes the following words to the Emperor: 'A mosque—and I have caused it to be preserved so that it may gain the sultan divine recompense.'¹³⁴

However, the good relations between the two states began to worsen when Michael detained the Mamluk ambassador going to Berke in the Golden Horde in 1263-64. The reaction of Baybars is recounted in Ibn Abd al-Zahir as follows:

The sultan sent for copies of the oaths, and took out the oath of the Emperor, Lord Michael, which was in Greek. The Patriarch and the bishops were summoned, and he discussed with them the case of someone who has sworn thus and thus, and then broke his oath. They said that such and such acts would render him an unbeliever and excommunicate. He took their signed statements to that effect, while they were unaware of what he wanted of them.¹³⁵

This incident shows that the Mamluk Sultan Baybars was fully aware of the importance of the Melkite patriarch and he made use of him as a political instrument in his relations with the emperor.

The second incident involving the Patriarch of Alexandria coincides with the reign of Sultan Qalawun, which is better documented. The Arabic version of the treaty was recorded in the chronicles of Ibn al-Furât and al-Qalqashandî, whereas the Greek version

¹³⁴ Holt 1995: 118. On the mosque built in Constantinople see also Reinert 1998: 125-151. On the rebuilding of the mosque which had been burnt during the Fourth Crusade, see Talbot 1993: 249-255.

¹³⁵ The incident reminds the process of taking a legal opinion (*fatwâ/fetvâ*) from a grand mufti in Islamic legal procedure.

was reconstructed by Dölger mainly through Canard's French translation of the Arabic text and supported by other contemporary Greek sources.¹³⁶ According to the Arabic text, in the oath undertaken by Qalawun, the Patriarch of Alexandria named 'Anbâ Yûnus' is cited as one of the Mamluk ambassadors who was dispatched to Constantinople in 1280.¹³⁷ Through an analysis of the text, Korobeinikov comes up with the conclusion that the text was translated in the Patriarchate of Alexandria.¹³⁸ In short, Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Alexandria were regarded by Mamluks at that time also as ambassadors, arranging the relations between Mamluks and Byzantines.

Mainly drawing upon the arguments of the 15th century historian al-Maqrizi modern historians take the death of the Mamluk Sultan Qalawun in 1290 as a turning point for the destiny of non-Muslims, especially Coptic Christians under the Mamluks.¹³⁹ A century-old fear of Crusaders had already resulted in anti-Christian feelings among the populace. To this was added the fear of an anti-Muslim alliance of Mongols and Crusaders in the second half of the 13th century.¹⁴⁰ Finally the significant wealth Christians possessed, and the positions they had within the state apparatus attracted the anger of the populace. Mainly for these reasons, during the 14th century, 'persecutions and massacres mounted, with peaks of violence in such years as 700/1301, 721/1321 and 755/ 1354; discriminatory laws against Dhimmis were revived; efforts were made to reduce the undue proportion of Copts in official positions; and churches and monasteries were closed or destroyed.'¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ The Arabic version was translated into English in Holt 1995: 122-128. For French translation see Canard 1937: 197-224. For the Greek reconstruction based on the French translation see Dölger 1956: 228-234.

¹³⁷ Holt 1995: 126.

¹³⁸ Korobeinikov 2004: 66-67.

¹³⁹ Little 1976: 553.

¹⁴⁰ Regarding the Mamluk policy towards the Mongols, Jackson notes that what made the Mamluks take a breath during their struggle against the Crusaders and Mongols, was more related to the conversion of the Golden Horde to Islam, namely 'divisions within the Mongol Empire of which the Mamlûks became aware far sooner than did the Franks, and of which, with the alliance between Cairo and the Golden Horde in 1262-3, they were able to take advantage.' Jackson 1980: 513.

¹⁴¹ Bosworth 1972: 65.

During the process of Coptic conversions to Islam, Little mentions two foremost dynamics: the Mamluk administrative and religious authorities themselves and the Muslim population of big cities such as Cairo, and Alexandria. As far as the role of the administration is concerned, he mentions a decree issued in 1301 which put in force the sumptuary laws on Christians. Upon the appearance of this decree, which was also published in Alexandria, ‘the Muslims hastened to destroy two churches which they claimed had been illegally restored after the Muslim conquest.’¹⁴² The same decree was published in Damascus as well, upon which ‘it was announced that the Dhimmis would be dismissed from public office.’¹⁴³ The impetus of these anti-Coptic movements soon disappeared,¹⁴⁴ though the sumptuary laws were re-imposed but this time it was the populace who enforced them.¹⁴⁵ With respect to the role of the people, they sometimes acted as a force taking advantage of the lack or inefficiency of Mamluk authority to attack the property of non-Muslims, and at others, put pressure on the administration to enforce sumptuary laws on them. Regarding the role of the Mamluk administration with respect to the social pressure, Little says that on account of the Coptic contribution to the prosperity of the Mamluk administration itself, and to avert any foreign involvement through the Copts, they often ignored the prosperity and influence that the Copts had unless their prosperity and influence ‘would constitute a threat to public order and stability, which would in turn jeopardize the Mamlûk’s own well-being.’¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² Little 1976: 556.

¹⁴³ Little 1976: 556.

¹⁴⁴ Al-Maqrizi associates this with the intervention of the Byzantine emperor and other Christian rulers. Little 1976: 557.

¹⁴⁵ Little 1976: 557

¹⁴⁶ Little 1976: 557.

Another notable feature of the Mamluk period regarding the Christians is the increase in the number of polemical literature against Christianity.¹⁴⁷ Such polemical works and *fatwas* are significant reflections of resentment on behalf of Muslims. Little puts forward that idea as follows:

Muslim resentment of *dhimmi* [italics] prerogatives was latent, but deep, among the religious leaders of the city and the populace in general... [B]oth Jews and Christians were well integrated into the dominant Muslim society of the city and were able to exercise their rights as *dhimmis*, including access to Muslim courts. Nevertheless, as the contests over holy places, as well as the attempt to enforce compulsory conversion of *dhimmi* orphans to Islam, prove, the entire Muslim establishment of jurists, scholars, and politicians at the highest level, both in Jerusalem and Cairo, could be quickly mobilized to assert Muslim and Mamluk interests when destabilizing conflicts among the communities arose.¹⁴⁸

The later centuries of Mamluk rule with regard to their Christian subjects are characterised mainly by conflict and hostility in the secondary literature.¹⁴⁹ However, as far as the Orthodox community is concerned one can say that it was not affected to the degree, for example, that Copts were affected. First of all, unlike the Copts, the Orthodox were not so well-off or integrated into Mamluk administrative offices as to displease the Muslim population, and so they escaped being targeted by acts of mob violence. However, during such occasions Orthodox churches and possessions were also plundered as part of the general anti-Christian movements mainly targeting Copts.¹⁵⁰ Papadopoulos mentions that in Bethlehem and Sion, too, a number of churches were damaged, the tomb of David was seized, and only some churches remained in the hands of Latin monks.¹⁵¹ Secondly, and more importantly, they often became the subject of diplomacy which Byzantine Emperors and Mamluk Sultans used as their primary weapon against each other at that time. Another

¹⁴⁷ Perlmann 1942: 843-861.

¹⁴⁸ Little 1999: 95.

¹⁴⁹ Little 1999: 69-96.

¹⁵⁰ Little 1976: 559 and 562.

¹⁵¹ Papadopoulos 1910: 443-444.

important aspect of late Mamluk rule for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem is conflict and competition for control over the Holy Sites in Jerusalem with other Christian communities, as well as Muslims themselves.¹⁵²

A final word must be said about the lively pilgrimage conducted in the Mamluk period. It is impossible to provide a comprehensive account of the pilgrims who visited the Holy Land during that time, thus only a couple, representing distinct groups will be mentioned. For example, the account of a Russian pilgrim who visited the Holy Land around 1400, reflects the activities of the Patriarch of Jerusalem during the pilgrimages by providing a lively description in which parts of Jerusalem, the Patriarch performs mass.¹⁵³ The account of the Spanish traveller, Pero Tafur, who visited the Holy Land around 1430, shows the involvement of Mamluk officers in the process of pilgrimage. According to him, Christian pilgrims were received and counted by the governor of the Sultan of Jaffa,¹⁵⁴ and counted again after the Mass in The Church of The Holy Sepulchre,¹⁵⁵ and they are accompanied by the governor while leaving.¹⁵⁶ Finally, the account of Bernardo Michelozzi and Bonsignore Bonsignori toward the end of the 15th century is important in showing the perspective of these two learned men with a completely non-religious interest, namely antiquarianism.¹⁵⁷ As far as the official Mamluk stance towards pilgrimage is concerned, a couple of documents may explain. In fact a few of the surviving Mamluk

¹⁵² A recent analysis of this issue can be found in Pahlitzsch 2001.

¹⁵³ Khitrowo 1889: 167-191. See especially the pages 178, 183, 184. His account is also important in showing the perspective of an ordinary pilgrim towards other Christian communities. For instance he easily refers to some as 'accursed heretics'. Khitrowo 1889: 173. Similarly he refers to Armenians as 'thrice accursed Armenians'. Khitrowo 1889: 184. The account of a certain merchant Basil is similar to Grethenios' account. Khitrowo 1889: 243-256.

¹⁵⁴ Pero Tafur 1926: 54.

¹⁵⁵ Pero Tafur 1926: 55.

¹⁵⁶ Pero Tafur 1926: 58.

¹⁵⁷ Borsook 1973: 145-197.

decrees are issued upon the request of monks of Mount Sinai against ‘the encroachments of government officials or of the Bedouins of the peninsula.’¹⁵⁸

During the last centuries of Byzantium, the role of the Church showed a considerable increase, which also oriented the Byzantine Emperors to emphasise their role as the head of Christendom alongside the head of a mighty state.¹⁵⁹ Drawing on the late Byzantine ecclesiology, for instance, Angelov concludes that the growing influence of the Church is also reflected in the views of the ecclesiologists, who put a novel emphasis on the ‘eternity’ of the Church vis-à-vis the worldly empire and emperors, whom they began to regard as the son and defenders of the Church.¹⁶⁰

Whether and how such a new outlook that the Church undertook worked in its relations with the state in practice is beyond the limits of this thesis, and thus the focus will be on how the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were involved in late Byzantine politics with respect to the Byzantine state and church. No doubt, such a universal ecclesiastical view entailed a more active policy regarding the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. Following the fall of Antioch, and Jerusalem to the Crusaders, Byzantine administration had been intensively interested in the Eastern Patriarchates. A ‘secret’ instruction sent to George Pachymeres in 1278 to survey the interest that the hieromonk Theodosios of Villehardouin may have in the patriarchal throne

¹⁵⁸ Stern 1966: 234. For the Arabic edition and English translation of each document, see Stern 1966: 238, 244-245, 250, 253, 257-262.

¹⁵⁹ The prominent Byzantine historian Oikonomides notes the increase in the number of prelates in the embassies sent to other rulers. He further states that ‘this is true not only of embassies dealing with ecclesiastical questions (such as the union of the churches), but also of embassies that had religious objectives.’ Oikonomides 1992: 80-81. A fresher and more extensive analysis of the topic can be found in Andriopoulou 2010: 180-251.

¹⁶⁰ Angelov 2007: 401. On the possible correlation between the Patriarch Athanasios’s view of the church as an eternal institution and the Pope Gregory IX’s (1227-41) letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople Germanos II, then based in Nicaea, accusing the Byzantine Church of becoming subjected to temporal power see Angelov 2007: 405. Angelov further analyses the reception of the Donation of Constantine in late Byzantine history and states that ‘the predominant domestic application of the Donation corresponded to the centralisation of the Byzantine church under the patriarchate of Constantinople in the course of the fourteenth century.’ Angelov 2009: 125.

of Antioch might give us an idea to what degree the Patriarchate of Constantinople was interested in the elections of the Eastern patriarchs.¹⁶¹ Likewise, in 1284-85, in a letter addressed to the grand logothete, the Patriarch of Constantinople Grigorios II expressed his discontent with Arsenios, the Patriarch of Antioch, his followers and the other ‘agitators.’¹⁶² After ten years, in 1288, the same Grigorios II and his synod refused the election of Kyrillos, the metropolitan of Tyre, to the patriarchal throne of Antioch because they suspected the latter of entering into communion with the Armenians.¹⁶³ Kyrillos’ election was confirmed only in 1296 during the tenure of Jean II Kosmas.¹⁶⁴

Indeed the role of individual patriarchs was quite important in terms of setting the course of the relations between Constantinople and the other patriarchal sees. A good example of that is Athanasios I, Patriarch of Constantinople (1289-1293, 1303-1309), who believed that the decay of the Byzantine Empire was a result of its alienation from the true path of God. Thus he ambitiously endeavoured to restore the Empire to what he believed to be the ideal, a fact that precipitated the flourishing of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In the case of Athanasios I, the authority of the Patriarch entailed interfering in the affairs of the other Greek Orthodox Patriarchates. In a letter addressed to the Emperor, Athanasios complained about the alleged actions of the Patriarch of Alexandria as follows:

What about ... the patriarch of Alexandria, who decides to accept whomever he likes in the ranks of orthodox, and to reject others, and to behave insolently toward the synod and patriarch here in the capital, refusing to be judged by him [the patriarch of Constantinople], while at the same time he himself weighs my actions in authority...¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ Laurent 1971: 230. On the identity of Theodosios and his friendship with Pachymeres see Cassidy 2004: 277-278.

¹⁶² Laurent 1971: 268-269.

¹⁶³ Laurent 1971: 304-305.

¹⁶⁴ Laurent 1971: 356.

¹⁶⁵ Talbot 1975: 168-169. Laurent provides a French translation. Laurent 1971: 403-407.

As this incident shows, the policies of such strong Constantinopolitan Patriarchs as Athanasios could infiltrate in the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates through the emperor. Besides, Athanasios also complained that the Patriarch of Alexandria has been supported by the emperor and the members of the senate and that 'his lap has been filled with gifts, and monasteries of men who had supposedly gathered together for salvation were handed over to him as slaves.'¹⁶⁶ Thus, in Athanasios' ideal world, support of the emperor for Eastern Patriarchs also necessitated the latter's submission to the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The section 'on the Promotion of a Patriarch' in *Treatise on Offices of Pseudo-Kodinos* presents a similar view of the Orthodox patriarchal organisations. Written around mid-14th century, the treatise contains a hierarchical list of Byzantine offices and protocols for ceremonies.¹⁶⁷ Concerning the promotion of the Patriarch of Constantinople, the author states that twelve prelates present in Constantinople choose three candidates for the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the most elevated *archontes* of the church took the list of the candidates to the emperor, who made the final selection, and notified the result to the Patriarchate through the *archontes*. If they accepted the result, they moved directly to the ceremony, if not, they proposed the second candidate, and repeated the same procedure until a final agreement was reached by both sides.¹⁶⁸ After mentioning the ceremony regarding the promotion of the patriarch, the author states that 'the promotion of the other patriarchs was also exactly the same, namely those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.'¹⁶⁹ What does that mean? Were the above-mentioned twelve prelates and the emperor involved in the election of the Eastern Patriarchs in a similar manner to that of

¹⁶⁶ Talbot 1975: 170-171.

¹⁶⁷ On the identity of the author, and the date it was written, see Verpeaux 1966: 23-40.

¹⁶⁸ Verpeaux 1966: 277-278.

¹⁶⁹ Verpeaux 1966:282.

Constantinople? Looking at the *regestes* of the Patriarchate involving the role of the Mamluk administration, it is difficult to say this was the general pattern. However, what is certain, in line with the conditions of the time, is the author's view of the notion of centralisation within the Orthodox Church, covering the whole Orthodox world including the domains outside Byzantine realms.

The following event may give us an idea of the role Constantinople undertook with respect to the Eastern Patriarchates. According to the register of patriarchal *acta*, toward the end of the 14th century, Michael II, who sat on the patriarchal throne of Antioch on 7 February 1395, appeared in Constantinople around May-August 1395 to have his profession of faith registered.¹⁷⁰ Whether this had become an established requirement for all the Eastern Patriarchates, it is difficult to say with certainty because this is the only example we have in the *Regestes*. Even if this was a single and even an extreme case, it shows us at least the possible limits of the involvement of Constantinople around that time. However, the following case indicates the Byzantine involvement in affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates, the affairs that are not of direct political concern. In a *pittakion* written on 3 January 1397, we see that the Patriarch of Constantinople Antony IV asks Dorotheos the Patriarch of Jerusalem to go to Alexandria to inform the newly-elected Patriarch of Alexandria on his election, which occurred in his absence. Although a representative had already been dispatched from Constantinople to Alexandria, Antony still asked for Dorotheos' presence in the election because the Mamluk Sultan preferred a countryman native to Mamluk Sultanate as well.¹⁷¹ Thus, even though the Mamluk Sultan required the attendance of a native prelate, it is striking that he asked for this through the Byzantine Empire.

¹⁷⁰ Darrouz s 1979: 267.

¹⁷¹ Darrouz s 1979: 298-299.

The flowering of the Church in Constantinople also involved not only the participation of the Eastern Patriarchates in the developments that are of interest to the wider Orthodox world as was the case with the Council of Florence,¹⁷² but also assuming the leadership of the Eastern Patriarchates. As mentioned above, we have some cases in which Constantinople took part in the patriarchal elections in the Eastern Patriarchates from the times of the Crusades onwards. Additionally, an intensified emphasis on the eternity and universality of the Church had become an established phenomenon within the Byzantine Church by that time. How this worked in practice vis-à-vis the Mamluks is open to debate but the emergence of the role of Constantinople as the centre of the global Orthodoxy is without question. Regarding the flourishing of the Church in Byzantium, Angelov says that ‘the late Byzantine ecclesiastics ... prepared the church ideologically for its important political position as leader of the multi-ethnic orthodox community in the rising empire of the Ottomans.’¹⁷³ How, if at all, this position involved the leadership of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans is the subject of following sections.

Ottoman Policies in the Period of Transition

There is little documentation that sheds light on the nature of the relations between the Ottoman administration and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria during the period of transition from Mamluk to Ottoman rule. Of the documents issued around this time, there is an Ottoman *ferman* written for the Patriarch of

¹⁷² A special attempt was made so that the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem were represented through their deputies in the Council of Florence. Zachariadou 1996: 39. The participation of the Eastern Patriarchs in this council is also evident in the first known codex prepared under Ottoman rule. Apostolopoulos 1992: 123-133, Andriopoulou 2010: 107, 125.

¹⁷³ Angelov 2007: 416.

Jerusalem in response to his petition,¹⁷⁴ which is of utmost importance for our analysis of the relations between the Ottoman central administration and the Eastern Patriarchates. The document is important for many reasons; but what makes it very interesting is that it was issued in 1458, long before the Ottomans actually conquered Jerusalem, which remained under Mamluk rule for nearly half a century after the document's issuance.

The document starts with a cautionary statement in case Mehmed's successors may annul the strictures of his order. Next, the document states that the Patriarch of Jerusalem Athanasios personally came to the Ottoman court with his entourage to congratulate Sultan Mehmed on account of his conquest of Constantinople. He also brought with him all the documents given to the Patriarchs of Jerusalem by Umar, the second caliph, and the other past sultans as well as the letter of Prophet Mohammad which he gave to the monks of Sinai,¹⁷⁵ and asked the sultan to confirm his rights in a number of places within and outside of Jerusalem, which Mehmed II eventually awarded to him. In conclusion, Mehmed made the following order:

¹⁷⁴ The copy given to the Patriarch is in the Archive of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem as catalogued by Tselikas 1992: 416. The copies kept in Istanbul and the several copies based on the original are in Ottoman archives in Istanbul, with numbers BOA.A. {DVNS.KLS.d.08,9, BOA.A. {DVNS.KLS.d.10,6, BOA.Ali Emiri Tasnifi, Fatih Sultan Mehmed, 22. A Greek translation is available in Miliaras 2002, vol. I: 507-508, Papadopoulos 1900: 51-52, n. 2, and Papadopoulos 1970: 488-489. Mirmiroğlu also provided a brief commentary and Turkish transliteration, and not translation, for the *ferman* in question although he did not quote a specific source for this Turkish version. Mirmiroğlu 1945: 86-87 and 87-88. In his introduction he maintained that there are *fermans* that Mehmed issued for the Greek and Armenian patriarchs and the grand rabbi, originals of which had perished during the great fires and take place only in historical works. After this statement he says that there is a *ferman* for the patriarch of Jerusalem (Fatih hazretlerinin Rum ve Ermeni Patriklerine ve Hahambaşı'ye ve mühtelif eşhasa Fermanlar isdar eylemiştir ki ekserisi İstanbulda eski zamanlarda vukubulmuş olan büyük yangınlarda yanmış olduğundan asılları bulunamamıştır. Bunların hakikaten Fatih hazretleri tarafından sadir olduklarını tarihlerde okuyoruz. Kuddüs Şerif Patriğine ait Ferman mevcuttur.) Mirmiroğlu 1945: 10. For a French rendering based on the Greek translation see Moschopoulos 1956: 369-370. Recently Hattox published, edited and translated into English the copy with catalogue number BOA.Ali Emiri Tasnifi, Fatih Sultan Mehmed, 22 comparing it with the other translations. Hattox 2000: 118-123. Kenanoğlu also transliterated the document considering the three copies in the Ottoman archives. Kenanoğlu 2004: 88.

¹⁷⁵ The document which is supposed to be given to the monks of Sinai is a widely used one as a basis for the retention of the rights of the church under Islamic rule. In our survey of the documents microfilmed from the Archives of Sinai, we came through forty three copies of this document in the period pertaining to the Ottoman rule. A.S.Turkish Firmans, Roll No:1, 1-43.

It is my most imperial command that those who have command over the affairs in my realm, be it by land or by sea, shall protect and preserve the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the aforementioned monks from molestation by anyone; should anyone, be he one of my successors, or one of my high ministers, or one of the *ulema*, or some civil authority, or one of the slaves of my court, or anybody else from the Muslim community, wish, for money or favour, to annul [this command], may he encounter the wrath of God and His revered Prophet!¹⁷⁶

As far as the chronology is concerned, the document was issued in the Şevval 862 of Hegira (12 August-9 September 1458). However, at the beginning, the document associates Athanasios' visit to the Ottoman court with the ambassadorial visits from the other states to congratulate the Sultan upon his conquest of Constantinople. The account of Kritovoulos says that these visits were paid following the conquest.¹⁷⁷ However, the fact that the Mamluk Sultan's envoy Yarışbay was also present in the Ottoman court at that time makes one think that the Patriarch of Jerusalem visited the Ottoman court at a later stage. Also, given the length of time that elapsed between the conquest in 1453 and 1458, it is highly probable that the Patriarch arrived in Mehmed's court at the time the document was issued, i.e. in the summer of 1458.

The most important question to be asked here is what the reasons for the issuing of this document were. There have been two major suggestions so far. Firstly, Hattox argued that there were political motives behind the issuing of such a *ferman*. He said that while giving this *ferman* to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Mehmed was not only acting as a Muslim sovereign confirming his rights following the example of preceding Muslim sovereigns, but also 'a self-styled protector of the Christians following the precedent of those who

¹⁷⁶ 'Tasarrufumda ve hükmümde olan memleketler eğer deryâda ve eğer karada hâkimü'l-vakt olanlar Kuds-i Şerîf Patriği ve ruhbânları mezbûrlara himâyet ve siyânet ve âherden kimesne rencîde eylemeyeler. Eğer bundan sonra gelen halîfeler ve vüzerây-ı 'izâmlar ve 'ulemâdan ve ehl-i 'örfden ve kapum kullarından ve ehl-i 'örfden ve sâ'ir ümmet-i Muhammedden akçe için ve yahud hatır için feshine murâd iderlerse Allah'ın ve Hazret-i Resûlün hışmına uğrasun.'

¹⁷⁷ Kritovoulos says that in Edirne, Sultan Mehmed received delegations 'from the Triballians [Serbs], and Illyrians [Albanians], and Peloponnesians, also from the people of Mitylene and Chios, and many others.' 'Similarly he gave audience to ambassadors sent him from the rulers of Persia and of Egypt, and also from Karaman, prince of the Cilicians.' Kritovoulos 1954: 85.

came before him as masters of Constantinople.’¹⁷⁸ Making this argument Hattox does not refer to the increase in the contacts between Byzantine capital and the Eastern Patriarchates during late Byzantine period. Nor does he clearly explain the implications of Ottoman imperial policies regarding their relations with the Mamluks, and the Christian ecclesiastical organisations in their realms.

Secondly, Kenanoğlu, unaware of Hattox’s work claimed in line with his arguments regarding the Ottoman millet system that the major reason behind the visit of the Patriarch to get the said *ferman* was to secure his visit to Ottoman realms to collect alms.¹⁷⁹ However, he failed to note that the Ottoman realms then were overwhelmingly under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. So, he commented neither on the role of the Patriarch of Constantinople in this matter, if any, nor on the implications of the relations between the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem. He most probably based his arguments on the practice of collecting alms (known in Ottoman documents as *tasadduk*) that came to a peak in the 18th century. Additionally, given that the access of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem to the Byzantine domains even before the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople was quite difficult and there is no similar document issued for a similar financial purpose, it seems unlikely that the document was issued merely for financial reasons.

Before moving to analyse the possible reasons behind the issuing of this document, it is necessary to mention the political context of that time. During the summer of 1458 Mehmed was mainly occupied with his campaign in Morea.¹⁸⁰ After his victory there, he turned his attention Eastwards, namely the Empire of Trebizond, which he took over in 1461. This seems to have created displeasure in the Mamluk court as the Mamluk Sultan

¹⁷⁸ Hattox 2000: 117.

¹⁷⁹ Kenanoğlu 2004: 89.

¹⁸⁰ Babinger 1978: 157-161.

did not congratulate Mehmed on this occasion, to which Mehmed retaliated by not congratulating Mamluk Sultan Hoşkadem on his enthronement. When he did so, he challenged his authority explicitly by calling him brother,¹⁸¹ and not father, which had been the tradition until then.¹⁸² Meanwhile, the Pope was also trying to launch a Crusade against the Ottomans and to persuade the duke of Burgundy by offering him the prospect of reviving the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.¹⁸³

The issue can be better analysed by approaching it from the perspective of both the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Ottoman Sultan. To take the first one, it is necessary to pay attention to late Byzantine-Mamluk relations, and the increasing role of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and the Byzantine Emperors on the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the late Byzantine period was one of the periods when the relations with the Eastern Patriarchates witnessed a great upsurge. Therefore, losing the backing of the Byzantine Emperors must have created a need on the part of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem to find a political support and legitimacy. So it is understandable that it looked for support from another source of power, which it found in the Ottoman court. Here, the role of the Patriarch of Constantinople should not be more than providing an example because there is no mention of him in the letter in itself, and because we do not have a correspondence between the two patriarchates at that stage.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹ Har-El 1995: 79.

¹⁸² Despite failing to note the tensions between the Mamluk and Ottoman courts on this occasion, Al-Thakafi's analysis of the diplomatic correspondence between the two courts presents a good overview. Al-Thakafi 1981: 54-77. He also notes that early in his reign, Mehmed wrote to the Mamluk Sultan Çakmak addressing the latter 'as a father.' Al-Thakafi 1981. 76.

¹⁸³ Tansel 1971: 263. Babinger 1978: 201.

¹⁸⁴ The letters of the first Patriarch of Constantinople Gennadios Scholarios do not show a correspondence with the Patriarch of Jerusalem. There are, however, two letters addressing Maximos Sofianos and all the other monks of Mount Sinai about the participation of Latins and Armenians in the sacraments and ceremonies of the Orthodox Church. One of the earliest letters of Gennadios after his appointment as the Patriarch of Constantinople, he signs not as the 'Ecumenical Patriarch' but as 'the servant of the children of God, the humble Gennadios' (*O doulos ton teknon tou Theou, o tapeinos Gennadios*). The two letters have

As far as the Ottoman perspective goes, a cursory look at the early Ottoman history shows that the periods of clashes with the Mamluks correspond to the periods when the Ottomans tried to change their polity from a frontier state fighting in the name of holy war to a well-established centralised empire. We know that the Ottomans first tried to establish a centralised state at the time of Bayezid I, and a number of early Ottoman chroniclers coming from a *gazi* background strictly criticised such a policy. They thought that this would bring an end to their source of power and wealth. On a general scale, these sources condemn Bayezid on several grounds, from attacking the Turco-Muslim principalities of Anatolia to drinking alcohol. They not only think that the Ottoman state would no longer be a frontier state fighting in the name of holy war, but also foresaw that this would easily lead to conflicts with the Mamluks. Indeed, all of the early Ottoman chroniclers mention, though rhetorically, that when Bayezid heard about Mamluk Sultan's death, he assumed that Egypt will come under his rule. Similarly, they make the criticism that he did not think that he would die too, referring to the defeat Bayezid suffered at the hands of Timur in the Battle of Ankara.

With regard to Mehmed II, we can say that he definitely had an interest in Mamluk domains. As early as 1458, he sent people to repair the wells for the Muslim pilgrims going to Mecca and Medina, which created displeasure among Mamluks who eventually did not allow them.¹⁸⁵ Following Mehmed's campaigns in Asia Minor, relations between them became more and more tense, especially when Mehmed tried to interfere in the affairs of the Anatolian principalities which had been patronised by Mamluks. When he died in

been published in Petit, Sidéridès & Jugie 1935, vol. IV: 198-206, and 206-207. For an introduction to the letter see Petit, Sidéridès & Jugie 1935, vol. IV: xi-xiii.

¹⁸⁵ Tansel 1971: 330. Emecen 2011: 22-23.

Gebze (1481), while on a campaign whose destination remains uncertain, his historian Tursun Beğ implies that he might have been heading for Mamluk domains.¹⁸⁶

Returning to the document given to the Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1458, it would be difficult to claim that Mehmed wanted to gain an ally against the Mamluks by confirming the rights of the Patriarch. It can be said that he confirmed the rights given to the Patriarchs of Jerusalem by the other Muslim rulers, which he would have almost certainly done in the event that he was to take Jerusalem. So, while doing this he had nothing to lose except the favour of the Mamluks, about which probably he was not particularly interested as some later instances were to prove. It appears that probably the Mamluks were not even aware of it, as the contemporary Mamluk historians make no mention of it.¹⁸⁷ Also, the patriarchs of Jerusalem continued to receive similar documents of confirmation from Mamluk sultans as well until the end of their rule.¹⁸⁸

In the end, the document did not produce any immediate practical results. When Mehmed's grandson Selim actually conquered Jerusalem in 1516, he issued a similar *ahidnâme* for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The document mentions that the Patriarch has shown him the documents of permission given to the Orthodox Patriarchs by other rulers who ruled Jerusalem until then, though without mentioning the one given by Mehmed II. However, we see that the Patriarch of Jerusalem alluded to Mehmed's *ferman* in a petition written in 1733-34. In this instance, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem asked for a register, containing all the Ottoman documents issued with regard to the Orthodox rights in Holy Sites, and stating each and every document they received from the Ottoman Sultans starting with that of Mehmed II.

¹⁸⁶ Tursun Beg 1977: 180-181.

¹⁸⁷ Hattox 2000: 116, n. 41.

¹⁸⁸ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963: 437-442.

In conclusion, it is obvious that the document in question cannot be analysed from a single religio-political point of view. We can confirm that this document shows us an interesting subject, not only from Ottoman or Mamluk perspectives, the approach of scholars so far, but also others such as late Byzantine, patriarchal (both Constantinopolitan, and Jerusalemite), and even papal perspectives. Ruling over the Patriarchates might be a matter of imperial prestige or mere practical policy in the eyes of Ottoman Sultans.¹⁸⁹ However, it is certain that all of these developments occurred at a time when things were changing and both the Ottoman Sultan and the Patriarch of Jerusalem were possibly showing the initial signs of this change. Indeed, after 1517, which in political terms started ‘the sixteenth-century world war’,¹⁹⁰ the course of politics in the region began to change in this new world all the Eastern Patriarchates were united under Ottoman rule.

The *Ferman* Given by Selim I to the Patriarch of Jerusalem

The Ottoman archives in Istanbul contain a few copies of the *ferman* given by Selim to Atalya the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the original having been given to Atalya as confirmed by the catalogues of the Jerusalem Patriarchate’s archive.¹⁹¹ One of the copies made for the use of the Ottoman diplomatic offices is preserved in the archive of Topkapı Palace Museum.¹⁹² This document also has later copies preserved in *Kilise Defterleri*, numbers 8 and 10,¹⁹³ which were most probably prepared on the basis of the copy which is in Topkapı now.

As far as the content of the *ferman* given by Selim I to Atalya, the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, is concerned, it starts with a statement on the conditions of the time

¹⁸⁹ Hattox 2000: 109.

¹⁹⁰ Hess comments that the fall of the Mamluk Sultanate to the Ottomans was the key factor that led to the Habsburg-Ottoman conflict in Europe. Hess 1973: 74.

¹⁹¹ Tselikas 1992: 416 (VII.B.5.5).

¹⁹² TSM.A.E.5585.

¹⁹³ BOA.A. {DVNS.KLS.d.08,11, BOA.A. {DVNS.KLS.d.10,7.

the document was issued. When Jerusalem was conquered, the document reads, ‘the priest named Atalya who is the Patriarch of the *Rûm* infidels has come, together with all clergymen, and the subjects, and submitted themselves’ (*Rûm keferesine patrik olan ‘Atalya nâm râhib cümle râhibân ile ma‘an re‘âyâ ve berâyâ gelüb itâ‘at*). More than half of the document is reserved for the names of the places the Patriarchate claimed the right to have. After confirming these rights and possessions of the Orthodox Patriarchate in the Holy Land in accordance with the *ahidnâme* of Caliph Umar and the decrees issued by the past sovereigns (*selâtîn-i mâziyyeden olan evâmir-i şerîfeleri*), the document gives the Patriarch the right to administer the *vakfs*, and the inheritance of the dead metropolitans, bishops, and priests. The document also makes it clear that the Patriarch will be exempt from any sort of taxation (*gümrük ve bâc ve sâ‘ir tekâlif-i ‘örfiyye[den] bi‘l-küllîye mu‘âf ve müsellemler olalar*). Finally, it states that the other communities should not interfere in their affairs. The document ends with another cautionary statement that whoever seeks to cancel it shall be exposed to the wrath of God.

As seen in this very first Ottoman document issued for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem following their conquest of Jerusalem, the major concern of the Patriarch was to secure his community’s rights in the Holy Land *vis-à-vis* the other rival communities as is clear from the long list of the places the Patriarch included in his petition and from the final point where the Patriarch requests the prevention of a potential interference from the other communities. The other set of terms included in the document are related to the rights of the Patriarch over his clergy. A final remark to be made would be the absence of any mention of the other Orthodox Patriarchates, both Constantinople and Antioch and Alexandria.

In search of the initial *fermans* for the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria

Another point to be made here is about what the other two Patriarchates, namely the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, did in this period of transition to the Ottoman rule. Neither primary nor secondary sources mention a similar interaction between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem and Mehmed II. Likewise, there is no such contact with the Ottoman court and Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai at the time of Mehmed II. Furthermore, we do not have any documentation for such an interaction between Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria and Selim I either although some church historians repeatedly, though without referring to any documentation and not unanimously, say that the patriarchs of Alexandria received *fermans* to preserve the privileges of their Patriarchate.¹⁹⁴ For the monks of St. Catherine, however, there is a detailed *ferman* issued by Selim sometime between 11 and 19 July 1517,¹⁹⁵ which further complicates the problem of the absence of correspondence between the Ottoman administration and the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria.

The contemporary historical narratives pose a problem as well. The Ottoman chroniclers often do not mention things relating to church affairs because of their background and the audience they wrote for. As for the Greek Orthodox sources, which are expected to show some interest in this issue, we have no mention of any Ottoman encounter, not only with the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria but also with that of Jerusalem. A very important 16th-century Greek source, most probably written by someone close to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, namely *Historia Politiki*, does not mention anything about the first contact between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Ottoman administration. As for the part about the incorporation of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt into

¹⁹⁴ Tillyridis says that Ioakeim Pany received a ferman from Selim I. Tillyridis 1998: 26. Papadopoulos holds onto the same view. Papadopoulos 2000: 146. Tzoumerkas, however, says that the same patriarch received a ferman from Süleyman without making any reference to Selim I. Tzoumerkas 2007: 24.

¹⁹⁵ Schwarz 1970: 25-30.

the Ottoman Empire through the campaigns of Selim I, with which the account of *Historia Politiki* comes to an end, we do not see any mention of the Patriarchs of Antioch, then based in Damascus, nor those of Jerusalem, and Alexandria. While mentioning Damascus, the anonymous author simply mentions that having seen Selim's huge army, the Damascenes 'prostrated themselves' before Selim I.¹⁹⁶ He makes no mention of the taking of Jerusalem, where Selim himself resided for a while, and gave a *berat* of investiture to the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Patriarchs confirming their rights. Similarly, he does not refer to such a thing as regards the Patriarchate of Alexandria.¹⁹⁷ Likewise, Arabic sources prepared in the milieu of the Patriarchate of Antioch from the 17th century onwards, make no mention of the way Damascus was taken by the Ottomans.¹⁹⁸

Haydar Çelebi, who was in the army of Selim when the latter conquered the Greater Syria and Egypt, does not mention such an encounter either. We learn from his testimony that between 28 September and 14 December 1516, Sultan Selim stayed in Damascus,¹⁹⁹ where the Patriarchate of Antioch had been based, and he is said to have visited the place where it is believed that Jesus would come back, alongside some other sacred places.²⁰⁰ Therefore one might expect the Patriarch of Antioch to have asked for an *ahidnâme* from Selim, but we do not have such a document. Following his capture of Cairo, Selim also went to Alexandria together with Mehmed Pasha on 28 May 1517 and arrived there on 2 June 1517.²⁰¹ His main purpose in going to Alexandria was to see the

¹⁹⁶ *Historia Politiki* 1849: 76. Likewise, Nektarios of Jerusalem does not make any reference to a meeting between the patriarch of Antioch and Selim. He merely says that the Damascenes did not oppose the Ottomans. Nektarios 1783: 369.

¹⁹⁷ Iorga 2000: 114.

¹⁹⁸ Paul of Aleppo, for example, does not interest himself with the fall of Damascus before the Ottomans. Paul of Aleppo 1930: 33.

¹⁹⁹ Senemoğlu n.d.: 101.

²⁰⁰ For an account of Selim's occupations in Damascus, see Emecen 2011: 233-240.

²⁰¹ Emecen 2011: 110.

fleet, in which he seems to have a special interest.²⁰² Until the 5th of June, he was occupied with the fleet, and on the 5th, he travelled to some holy places in Alexandria. These were Cami-i Garbi, where he performed the Friday prayer, the *maqâm* of Prophet Mohammed, which is believed to contain the traces of the horse of Caliph Ali, where Amr b. As stayed when he conquered Alexandria for the second time, the Mosque of Ebu'l-Abbas el-Mürsi and Yâkut-ı Şâzeli.²⁰³ On the 6th, Selim left Alexandria.²⁰⁴ Therefore, the Patriarch of Alexandria could have met Selim sometime in the city. On the way back from Egypt to Istanbul, he also spent some time in Damascus between 22 October 1517²⁰⁵ and 22 February 1518.²⁰⁶ During his stay in Damascus, he was mainly occupied with the provisioning of the food for his army, which would spend the winter in Damascus and needed to be ready for a possible encounter with Safevids. During one of his hunts outside Damascus, Emecen mentions that Selim is said to have visited Bethlehem, where Jesus was born.²⁰⁷ On 15 February he appointed Canberdi Gazali as the *beğlerbeğ* of Damascus and left for Aleppo on the 22nd. Therefore, it would be wrong to assume that the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria were unable to meet Selim as he spent a day in Alexandria and definitely considerable time on two occasions after the battles of both Mercidabık and Ridaniye. One may think that during Selim's first time in Damascus, the people and thus the Patriarch of Antioch were not sure of what was going to happen in the near future, and that such an encounter was impossible for the time Selim spent in Alexandria as well because, by that time, the defeated Mamluk Sultan Tumanbay was not dead yet, and was actually planning to attack Selim with his *emirs*. However, the fact that following the

²⁰² According to Emecen, some sources mention that despite being able to cross the Sinai Desert, Selim was not happy until he learned that his fleet was also able to come to Egypt on schedule. Emecen 2011: 301.

²⁰³ Emecen 2011: 301-302.

²⁰⁴ Emecen 2011: 302.

²⁰⁵ Emecen 2011: 310.

²⁰⁶ Emecen 2011: 318.

²⁰⁷ On this point Emecen refers to Hammer's account. Emecen 2011: 316.

decisive taking of Egypt Selim spent four months in Damascus and did not give the Patriarch of Antioch any *ferman* at that time either is enough to refute such an assumption.

Therefore, we cannot say that the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria did not have the occasion to ask for and receive a *ferman* similar to that of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The fact that they had not looked for protection from the Ottoman court before the conquest of the Middle East by the Ottomans as the Patriarch of Jerusalem had cannot be the reason behind the lack of an opportunity for such interaction between the Ottoman Sultan and the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria.

As an alternative to the above speculation, one may also refer to the past, when the three cities of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch were taken over by Muslims and the tradition regarding the rights of the Christians established thereafter. The Patriarch of Jerusalem was one of those who welcomed Caliph Umar and thus received a document from him stating his privileges.²⁰⁸ However, with regard to the Patriarchates of Antioch²⁰⁹

²⁰⁸ First lost to the Persians in 614, Patriarchate of Jerusalem was the first patriarchal organisation that fell to Muslim hands, and was restored by the Byzantine Emperor Heraklios around 630, and finally conquered by Umar, the second caliph in 641. Despite being cut off from the Empire, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem were allowed to hold post in Jerusalem through a decree given to the Patriarch Sophronios, which was confirmed and regarded as a model in matters relating to this Patriarchate by the subsequent Islamic rulers including Ottomans. Here it must be noted that these rights were given to the Christian community in Jerusalem on the ground that the city was taken by surrender (*sulhan*), and not by assault (*'anwatan*), and thus in accordance with the requirements of the *dhimma* covenant the Christians were allowed such rights. On the conditions of conquest by surrender and by assault in the Islamic law see Bilmen 1967, vol. III: 427-428. On the capitulation of Jerusalem to Umar, through the negotiations of a certain Christian Arab from Jerusalem called Abû al-Ju'ayd and Sophronios the Patriarch of Jerusalem see Shahid 2003: 236.

²⁰⁹ Antioch had already fallen to the Persians in 540. During the Persian invasion of Syria, the Patriarch of Antioch Ephraim was in favour of surrender but with the coming of a small defence force, realised that there is no hope and escaped for Cilicia. Bouchier 1921: 187-188. On the career of Ephraim and a discussion of sources on his attitude toward Persian invasion, see Downey 1938: 367-370. Subsequent Melkite Patriarchs had to reside in Constantinople until the end of the 7th century, a fact which enabled the Byzantine administration to have more and direct control over the patriarchal elections of Antioch. Though re-incorporated into the Byzantine Empire by Heraklios, Antioch was conquered by the fast-growing Islamic state in 640. However, we do not know of a document issued for the Patriarchate of Antioch similar to the one issued for the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

and Alexandria,²¹⁰ there was no such document from this period either as these two cities were taken by assault (*'anwatan*) and not capitulation (*sulhan*). So, by virtue of such a parallelism between the correspondence of Islamic conquerors and Eastern Patriarchs during the early Islamic and Ottoman conquests, one may also say that the both the Ottomans and the Eastern Patriarchates were following the practice established in the first conquest of the patriarchal thrones by the Muslims. Another reason, in relation to this latter argument, may be the economic status of the each Eastern Patriarchate which may be saved in having their status confirmed by the Ottoman administration. Thus, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which already had a significant share in incomes of the Holy Sites supported by all the Islamic administrations including the Mamluks, could in fact continue its status in the likely event of an Ottoman-Mamluk encounter, whereas those of Alexandria and Antioch, whose economic state was not necessarily dependent on the confirmation of an Islamic state did not rush to gain recognition by their new overlords. As the following section aims to show, in addition to the Ottoman central administration, a number of other dynamics played a role in the networks that the Eastern Patriarchates made use of.

²¹⁰ Like Antioch, Alexandria had also fallen into Persian hands in 619 and the Patriarch John V needed to escape to Cyprus. Neale 1847, vol. II: 58. Having ruled the whole Egypt about ten years from Alexandria, Persians did not allow for a patriarch in the city. Through the efforts of the Emperor Heraklios, Persians were defeated, and they evacuated Egypt in 629. However, because of the instability and demoralisation resulting from the loss of huge territories to Muslims after the conquests of the Emperor Heraklios, the Empress Martina and her followers were in favour of surrendering the remaining Egyptian lands to the Islamic armies, and they entrusted Cyrus the Patriarch of Alexandria with this duty. He was regarded by them both as the administrative and religious head of the Byzantine Egypt, a fact apparent in his wearing both red slippers and a monk's sandal, representing his worldly and religious authority respectively. Thus in 641 he signed the contract of surrender with 'Amr bin al-'Âs, the famous Arab commander who took over much of Egypt. Despite the submission of the city, though, Byzantines wanted to take advantage of the political instability in the Islamic capital following the murder of 'Ali, the fourth caliph and the replacement of 'Amr with another commander, and thus sent the imperial fleet led by Manuel to take Alexandria back. The latter managed to take control of the city because the small Arab garrison chose not to fight but to retreat into the heartlands of Egypt. The news struck the Islamic capital and an army led by the celebrated 'Amr took over Alexandria again in 646, this time by force. Odetallah 2004: 108-116.

Eastern Patriarchates in the local and central arena during the 16th and 17th centuries

A cursory glimpse into the secondary literature shows that during the first two centuries, a number of dynamics, both local and central, offered diverse paths for the actors of the patriarchal politics. Among these, the most cited, is the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Answering the question of whether the Patriarch of Constantinople had an absolute control over the whole Orthodox Church within the Ottoman Empire, and whether the Ottoman central authority accepted his role requires a glance at the nature of the intra-patriarchal relations within the Ottoman Empire during the 16th and 17th centuries. In the immediate decades after the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt, relations between the Patriarchates appear to be fostered with the inclusion of all the Orthodox Patriarchates within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. One of the earliest interactions between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Eastern Patriarchates following the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt regards the pilgrimage of Ieremias of Constantinople to the Holy Land. As recounted in a 16th-century history of the Patriarchate, when Ieremias sailed to Cyprus, some of the metropolitans sailed back to Istanbul. When Ieremias arrived in Jerusalem, he learned that those metropolitans who went back raised Ioannikios to the patriarchal throne, as a result of which four Patriarchs came together and excommunicated him,²¹¹ a case which shows not only an early interaction through the pilgrimage of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate but also an early example of cooperation. As mentioned in the earlier sections of this chapter, interaction between Constantinopolitan and Eastern Patriarchs often proved difficult because of Mamluk suspicions. As this incident shows, such difficulties appear to be overcome with the inclusion of all the Orthodox Patriarchates within Ottoman borders. Another example to the facilitation of the relations between these

²¹¹ Historia Patriarchiki 1849. 153-158.

Patriarchates can also be found in a major conflict between the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Jerusalem which occurred during the tenure of the said Ieremias. Such cooperation seems to have continued when Ieremias died in 1546,²¹² at which time Germanos of Jerusalem was in Istanbul. Convinced of the need for a change, Germanos contributed to the introduction of the new constitution regarding the patriarchal elections. According to these regulations, Patriarchs were required to be chosen by all the hierarchs, metropolitans, bishops, and archbishops of the East, West, and Peloponnesus. Measures were also taken to exclude those previously anathemised as law-offenders.²¹³

A very notable development involving all the Orthodox Patriarchates occurred in the late 16th century, namely confusion over the possession of St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai between the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Jerusalem. The Patriarch of Jerusalem claimed the control of Sinai which had been the subject of dispute between the two and had belonged to the Patriarchate of Alexandria at that time. The Synod headed by the Patriarch of Constantinople and attended by all the Eastern Patriarchs decided to hand over the control of Sinai to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem,²¹⁴ which put a major blow to the finances of that of Alexandria.

A more significant 16th-century development for the Orthodox world was the creation of the Patriarchate of Moscow in 1589, in which all the Orthodox Patriarchates cooperated. As will be detailed in the following section of this chapter, Eastern Patriarchates had already established strong ties with Russia and on this occasion, a synod led by Ieremias II of Constantinople created the Patriarchate of Moscow. Soon, in 1593 Sophronios IV of Jerusalem, and Meletios of Alexandria, who also represented Ioachim VI

²¹² On the time of the death of Ieremias, see Patrinelis 1967: 262.

²¹³ Iorga 2000: 99-100.

²¹⁴ The synodic decision can be found in Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 332-338.

of Antioch sent the synodic confirmation of the elevation of the Muscovite church to the statue of the fifth Patriarchate.²¹⁵

In addition to these, 16th century witnessed a number of interactions between the Constantinopolitan and Eastern Patriarchs. When unfrocked in 1565, for example, Ioasaph II convoked the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria (as well as those of Ohrid and Peć) to discuss his case.²¹⁶ Next, Metrophanes III of Constantinople (1565-1572) was visited by the Patriarch of Antioch.²¹⁷ In 1574 a Patriarch of Peć was sanctified in which the Patriarch of Alexandria also took part.²¹⁸

Dorotheos of Antioch, who reached a union with the Maronite Church, was deposed in 1543 by a synod in Jerusalem presided by Ieremias of Constantinople, Ioakeim of Alexandria, and Germanos of Jerusalem.²¹⁹ Haddad supports the arguments of Charon and Nasrallah that in the same synod in Jerusalem, Ioakeim ibn Cum'a was elected Patriarch by the Constantinopolitan one following Selim's conquest of Syria.²²⁰ The Orthodox of Antioch, however, did not accept Ioakeim and supported the anti-patriarchate of Makarios ibn Hilal ibn 'Awn leading to a struggle between the two that continued until the death of Makarios in 1550. Regarding the inability and reluctance of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch to insist on his candidate, Haddad says that 'the Great Church, as yet unaccustomed to exploiting at the expense of a sister Patriarchate the enormous power granted her by the Ottoman Sultans, did not press the issue.'²²¹

The last quarter of the 16th century witnessed a struggle for the patriarchal throne of Antioch between Mikhail al-Hamawi and Ioakeim ibn Dawu, which Haddad claims

²¹⁵ Iorga 2000: 130.

²¹⁶ Iorga 2000: 100.

²¹⁷ Iorga 2000: 111.

²¹⁸ Iorga 2000: 129.

²¹⁹ Haddad 1965: 4-5.

²²⁰ Haddad 1965: 7-8.

²²¹ Haddad 1965: 8.

established the general pattern for the following conflicts over the patriarchal throne of Antioch, in which contenders appealed to one or more of the following dynamics: Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman central administration, local Ottoman governors and officials, and semi-autonomous local authorities in Mount Lebanon. After Ioakeim's establishment in Damascus, Mikhail went to Istanbul and received the support of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Ieremias. Despite receiving a *ferman* from the central administration, Mikhail's influence was limited only to Aleppo, Hama, Latakia, and Adana because Ioakeim gained the support of the governor of Damascus and established himself in Damascus and Tripoli. However, Ioakeim had to flee Damascus because of his inability to overcome the economic problems of his Patriarchate.²²² Once giving support to the elevation of Theoliptos to the Great Church in 1585 in Pakhomios' state, Mikhail had to give up the Patriarchate when Pakhomios was restored to the Patriarchate, and escaped to Lebanon under the protection of the Harfush amirs.²²³

During the Ottoman period, unlike the Mamluk one, the Eastern Patriarchs had considerably easier access to the Patriarch of Constantinople. However, it is also difficult to claim that the latter had a dominant control over them. In most cases, the Eastern Patriarchs acted in accordance with their brothers of Constantinople and it was not rare for them to assist the latter with regard to their disputes over the patriarchal throne. Finally, Constantinopolitan Patriarch arbitrated in a dispute among two Eastern Patriarchates. Whether the Patriarchs of Constantinople had the necessary means to have such a dominant role over their brothers in the East is another matter, about which we can see some hints in the coming century.

²²² Haddad 1965: 10-11.

²²³ Haddad 1965: 14-15.

During the seventeenth century, similar occasions of cooperation between the Patriarchates did not cease to exist. Silvestros of Alexandria, for example, took an active role together with Sofronios of Jerusalem, in the disciplinary arrangements regarding the monks of St. John's Monastery in Patmos,²²⁴ while his successor, Meletios Pigas was the procurator of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.²²⁵ During that time, Meletios also acted as locum tenens for the Patriarchate of Constantinople between 1597 and 1598 and his successor on the Alexandrian throne, namely Kyrillos Loukaris, served as Patriarch of Constantinople for three terms. However, that century also witnessed some important conflicts which may serve one to understand the power relations between the Constantinopolitan and Eastern Patriarchates. An interesting example regards the deposition of Makarios of Antioch and Paisios of Alexandria by Parthenios of Constantinople. On the ground that the two patriarchs left the Ottoman lands for Russia without notification, Parthenios deposed the two patriarchs. This decision was reversed with the initiatives of the Russian tsar and Nektarios of Jerusalem in a few years. Patriarchs of Jerusalem played a particularly important role in the religio-political conflicts of the time and contributed to the establishment of an anti-Protestant and anti-Catholic front in the Orthodox Church.²²⁶ A similar conflict occurred over the Church of Cyprus in the year 1600, when Ioakeim of Antioch tried to appoint an archbishop for this island on account of the disruption caused by Athanasios of Cyprus. In this conflict, both the Cypriots and

²²⁴ Two letters of Silvestros of Alexandria addressing the monks of St. John's Monastery in Patmos can be found in Miklosich and Müller 1890, vol. VI: 266-275. For Sofronios' letter, see Miklosich and Müller 1890, vol. VI: 277-281.

²²⁵ While addressing similar problems in the monasteries of Patmos and Paros, Meletios signs as the procurator (*epitiritis*) of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Miklosich and Müller 1890, vol. VI: 282-290.

²²⁶ Synod was convened in the same year in Jerusalem headed by Dositheos Notaras of Jerusalem to the same end. For the Greek original of the decisions of the synod of Jerusalem, see Karmiris 1953, vol. II: 694-733. An English translation of the decisions and an introduction to the debates over the confession of Kyrillos Loukaris is offered Roberts 1899. What followed was the confession of Dositheos, which would be the standard confession of the Orthodox Church in their correspondence with the other churches for a possible union. Dositheos' confession can be found in Greek original in Karmiris 1953, vol. II: 734-772. On the role of his confession in inter-church relations with the non-jurors, see Williams 1868: 117-121.

Ioakeim appealed to Meletios Pigas of Alexandria who decided in favour of the Church of Cyprus.²²⁷ As these incidents show, in church matters, Patriarchate of Constantinople was only one of the dynamics binding the Eastern Patriarchates, and on many occasions, the Eastern Patriarchs took an active role in the resolution of conflicts.

Although it would not be wrong to say that the Orthodox of Syria and Egypt did not enjoy the patronage of local authorities to a degree the Maronites did, because of their demographic dispersion, there were occasional cases when Eastern Patriarchs made use of local authorities in dealing with problems of financial and administrative nature. Their active presence in the local *kadi* courts is a well-known phenomenon. To take the example of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, we have two major documents regarding their participation in correspondence with the local *kadis*. According to a register in the *sicillât* of Jerusalem, of which Cohen published the ones relating to the Jewish community, the Patriarch of Jerusalem was involved in a financial dispute with a Muslim and Jew. It is written in the record which dates to 4 January 1566 that a certain Ya'kûb bin Mîhâ'il, a priest from the community of the Orthodox Christians (*er-râhib min tâ'ifeti 'n-Nusârâ er-Rûm*), and the representative of their Patriarch Yermanos (Germanos) sued İbrâhim bin Faraca'l-lah of Sayda, Jew, and Hasan bin Abdullah, a janissary in the service of Mustafa Çelebi on the ground that he loaned to them the amount of twenty-five *sultaniyyes*. The latter paid him back the amount but İbrâhim bin Faraca'l-lah did not. Therefore he asked the issue to be solved in accordance with sharia in the *kadi* court. Accordingly, both İbrahim and Hasan were questioned during which Hasan admitted that he received a loan from the representative of the Patriarch and paid it back but İbrahim denied his receipt of

²²⁷ More information on this conflict can be found in Hill 1952, vol. IV: 323-329.

money.²²⁸ Likewise, we have a *hüccet* of an empty land issued in 1596 by the local Ottoman *kadi* for the monastery of Elias, under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch as preserved in the monastic archive. According to this *hüccet*, Süleyman, the abbot of the ‘Monastery of the Prophet abbot [sic] Mar Elias’ bought a land from Halîfe ibn el-Hac Elyas through the latter’s consent (*be-vech-i rızâ*) and had it registered by in the *kadi* court.²²⁹ These two documents show that at least two Patriarchs, one Jerusalemite and the other Antiochian, began to make use of Ottoman provincial legal bodies not long after the Ottoman conquest.

In addition to the *kadi* courts, Ottoman provincial governors constitute another major dynamic, to which the Eastern Patriarchs appealed for support on various occasions. Following the death of Makarios V of Antioch, a group of Damascenes supported the candidacy of Makarios’ grandson Kyrillos²³⁰ while a rival group came to being behind Neofytos the Chiot. In this conflict, Kyrillos had the backing of Kara Muhammed Pasha the *vâlî* of Damascus while Neofytos appealed to the Great Church with a petition signed by eight metropolitans. Even though Neofytos managed to have Kyrillos deposed, and himself enthroned, it was only with the elimination of the support of the governor of Damascus for Kyrillos that Neofytos was able to establish himself in Damascus.²³¹ With

²²⁸ Cohen 1994, vol. II: f. 243, 48/372(d).

²²⁹ Mahfûzât 1995: 105, ELI 3. Although the document is not dated in the catalogue, it is written in the document itself, which is published in the same catalogue in facsimile, that it was prepared in Şa’bân of the year 1004, i.e. March-April 1596.

²³⁰ Dositheos writes that Kyrillos also had behind him the support of Jesuits. Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. I: 286.

²³¹ On the struggle between Kyrillos and Neofytos, see Haddad 1965: 81-87, and Nassour 1992: 13-14. Haddad says that after 1672 Kyrillos went to Istanbul and received a *berat* with the support of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. Haddad 1965: 84-85. A petition that appears in the *şikayet defteri* of 1675, Kyrillos asks for a new *berat* because his patriarchate—which had been halted by the short tenure of Neofytos—is supported by the priests and monks of the Mount Lebanon, and the other Christians (*hâlâ üzerinde olan patriklik dağlar keferesinin papasları ve keşişleri ve sâ’ir kefere tâ’ifesi kendiüden râzî üzere olub*). From the short order, it appears that he would be given a *berat*. The document is published in Majer 1984: 196b/1. Ursinus proves unable to note the tenure of Neofytos in between and thus to understand the reason for the petition: ‘In the case of Kirilos, acting patriarch of Antiochia (Antakya), it is not clear from the text of the brief document ... why he submitted an *arzuhal*.’ Ursinus 1994: 241.

the extinction of Neofytos' resources, there occurred another struggle between the same Kyrillos and Athanasios ed-Dabbâs. In this struggle, too, Kyrillos was able to make use of the provincial administration, which provided him with a certain advantage in Damascus. As Haddad puts forward, it was Kyrillos' 'obvious superiority in Damascus' which in 1687 led Athanasios, who was then the official Patriarch, to leave Damascus for Aleppo.²³²

As far as the Antiochian Patriarchate is concerned, one should also mention the semi-autonomous amirs of the Mount Lebanon to these dynamics. Especially during times of Ottoman administrative weakness in this province, these amirs were often appealed to either by Patriarchs or by those who challenged their patriarchal authority. The best example of the involvement of the amirs in the patriarchal politics of Antioch is the conflict between Kyrillos ed-Dabbâs and Ignatios 'Atiye. Having received the support of the Patriarch of Constantinople against Athanasios, who died shortly after Ignatios' journey to Istanbul, and having received a *ferman* from the Ottoman Sultan, Ignatios returned to Damascus as the Patriarch of Antioch. However, after Athanasios' death, the latter's brother Kyrillos had assumed the patriarchal title in Tripoli with the help of the Lebanese amir Yusuf bin Sayfa, who forced the metropolitans of Hums, Hama and Acre to elevate Kyrillos to the Patriarchate. What makes these parallel appointments significant is that both appointments took place on the very same day. Practically, Ignatios obtained the patriarchal throne in Damascus while Kyrillos' influence was restricted to Tripoli where the Banu Sayfa was influential. Things got more complex due to the power struggles between amirs, too. When the Ma'an family under the rule of Fahreddin Ma'an, who had influence not only in South Lebanon but also in Damascus, crushed the Banu Sayfa in North Lebanon, for example, Kyrillos felt obliged to escape and took refuge in Egypt,

²³² Haddad 1965: 91, on the struggle between Kyrillos and Athanasios, see Haddad 1965: 87-94, and Nassour 1992: 11-12.

where he sought the support of Kyrillos Loukaris, the arch-rival to Timotheos of Constantinople who supported the candidacy of Ignatios. Despite Kyrillos Loukaris' support for him after becoming the Patriarch of Constantinople, Kyrillos could establish himself neither in Damascus nor in Aleppo although the *ferman* he carried was able to drive Ignatios to Sidon and Beirut to seek Ma'an protection. The struggle between Kyrillos and Ignatios continued on the local stage as the Ottoman central administration was mainly involved with Persians and did not direct its energies towards Lebanon. In the year 1628, the synod of Ras-Ba'albek, convened under the protection of Amir Fahreddin, recognised Ignatios as the Patriarch of Antioch. Such Druze protection, however, proved short-lived for Ignatios as the Ottoman operations against the Lebanese Druze began in 1633. During these operations, Ignatios was murdered by some Druzes by mistake while escaping in disguise. With his death, the metropolitan of Aleppo Meletios Karma, who had already denied Kyrillos in Aleppo and confirmed the patriarchate of Ignatios in the Synod of Ras-Ba'albek was elected the Patriarch of Antioch with the name Euthymios.²³³ Thus, in times of the weakness of Ottoman administration, semi-autonomous rulers of the Mount Lebanon also constituted a major dynamic for the Patriarchate of Antioch.

As we will show in greater detail in the following chapters, as part of the centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates in Istanbul, these networks were to be largely replaced by the Ottoman central administration as far as the Orthodox friction in the Eastern Patriarchates was concerned. It would often be the Catholic and pro-Catholic party who would benefit from the provincial dynamics in addition to lobbying in Istanbul. As the Eastern Patriarchs would get closer to the offers of the central administration, they would prefer to make use of central administration in accordance with the new statements in their

²³³ For more details on this conflict between Ignatios and Kyrilos, see Haddad 1965: 18-28, and Nassour 1992: 12-13.

berâts while the frequenting of the *kadi* courts and provincial governors' *divans* would show a decline. Whereas issues like having their lands registered, as in the case described above, were still dealt with in the *kadi* courts, any legal conflicts that arose in the provinces were solved in Istanbul rather than in the local *kadi* courts. Even though any such conflict might be handled in the *kadi* court in the first instance, in many cases these were transferred to Istanbul following the petitioning of the Eastern Patriarchates. In addition to the *kadi* courts, they would also have preferred orders from the *Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn* rather than provincial governors in case of an administrative problem.

Eastern Patriarchates in the International Arena: Foreign Courts

As we have already touched upon, the last centuries of Byzantium following Michael VIII's recapture of Constantinople in 1261 and the fall of Crusader kingdoms in the Middle East led to mainly peaceful relations between Byzantine Empire and the Mamluk Sultanate which now housed all the Eastern Patriarchates in its domains. In this period the Byzantine emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople asserted their role as supporters of the Eastern Patriarchates while the Mamluk sultans also tried to downplay their infiltration in various ways ranging from using the Eastern patriarchs themselves in delegitimising the Byzantine emperors to supporting candidates within their own realms and to not allowing the Eastern patriarchs to leave for councils within Byzantine territories. Under such conditions, the fall of Byzantine Empire in 1453 can be said to have created a loss of support for the Eastern Patriarchates. As we have already seen, Athanasios the Patriarch of Jerusalem was quick to seek recognition and support from the Ottoman court.

Among the foreign courts, there were not many to support the Patriarchates in the period following the fall of Constantinople. Although developing its political ideology

especially from the first half of the 16th century on,²³⁴ Russia appears to be one of the major foreign courts to which the Orthodox Patriarchates in the Ottoman realms appealed for support as one of the few Orthodox courts at the time. The Russian court is known to have attracted diverse groups of Greek Orthodox after 1464,²³⁵ and therefore it was not unexpected for the Patriarchs to appeal to it also. In the two and a half-century period after 1453, there was a certain need for Greek teachers and scholars among which the efforts of Maximos the Greek had a significant importance.²³⁶ Especially during the 17th century, there was ‘an intensified interest’²³⁷ towards Greek culture in Russia, which made the Russian court an important centre for the Greek Orthodox of the Ottoman Empire. The state of the Church of Moscow, which was elevated to the status of the fifth Orthodox Patriarchate in 1593 constituted another significant aspect of the relations between the Orthodox Patriarchates and Russia, a process in which Eastern Patriarchs also played a major role.²³⁸ Alongside what may be called relations involving mutual interests, there was the common bond of religious interaction, which was kept alive, in which the Russian pilgrims as well as the Greek-Orthodox going to Russia played a role of transmitters.²³⁹

As early as the mid-16th century, the Patriarchs of Constantinople had been in contact with Russian and some European courts. As Nasturel and Mureşan show in great detail, Denys of Constantinople (1546-1556) had established contacts with the courts of Ivan the Terrible and Charles V as well as with Rome and Venice.²⁴⁰ His successors,

²³⁴ Ševčenko 1978: 10.

²³⁵ Ševčenko 1978: 12.

²³⁶ Ševčenko 1978: 12-15. On Maximos, see also Dixon 2006: 263-264, and Geanakoplos 1988: 445-468. On a religious scale, Greek patristics had an important influence on the 17th and 18th-century Russia. Arzhanukhin 1999: 565-574.

²³⁷ Strakhov 1990: 123.

²³⁸ Angelopoulos 1983: 12.

²³⁹ Kirillina 2009: 137-169.

²⁴⁰ Nasturel & Mureşan 2007: 327-355.

notably Joasaph II,²⁴¹ Ieremias II, and Kyrillos Loukaris, also had contacts with European courts. Just like their brothers of Constantinople,²⁴² we see a number of Eastern Patriarchs receiving financial help from Russia some of whom headed there to ask for funds. Especially during the early decades of the Ottoman rule, a number of Alexandrian Patriarchs received important support from Russian emperors as is written widely.²⁴³ In mid-16th century, St. Catherine Monastery in Sinai was transferred from the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Alexandria to that of Jerusalem, which struck a blow to the finances of the former and led it to Russia for financial aid.²⁴⁴ The relations between this patriarchate and the Russian court are expected to be good as we understand from a letter of the Patriarch Ioakeim Pani, who himself went to Moscow in a fund-raising journey, to Ivan the Terrible requesting from him the release of Maximos the Greek, who had been put in prison.²⁴⁵

This was a time when the Protestant interest in the Orthodox Church was beginning and thus the relations between the Protestant Church and courts were in infancy. In 1574, for example, when Stephan Gerlach visited Silvestros of Alexandria who despite welcoming him warmly, was more interested in conversing about non-doctrinal issues. Thus, says Gerlach, the patriarch asked them about Germany, and what they heard about the ships of the Spanish and Turks whereas they asked him about the churches in Alexandria, and the ‘infidels’ in Africa, namely Jacobites, and Copts.²⁴⁶

²⁴¹ As Zachariadou notes just like Süleyman the Ottoman sultan contemporary to Ioasaph II, the latter was also named Magnificent (*Megaloprepis*). Zachariadou 1996: 24, and Zachariadou 2008: 184-185.

²⁴² For Ieremias’ journey between 1688 and 1689, see Goudziak 1995: 200-225, and for that of Serapheim II Patriarch of Constantinople (1757-1761), see Papoulidis 1976: 59-66, and Batalden 1977: 409-411.

²⁴³ Tzoumerkas 2007: 24.

²⁴⁴ Tillirydis 1998: 26-27.

²⁴⁵ Tillirydis 1998: 27.

²⁴⁶ Gerlach 2007: 150.

Anti-Catholicism was another feature of the Eastern Church during that time although it is not impossible to come across Orthodox clerics who were in favour of union of Catholic and Orthodox churches.²⁴⁷ Patriarchs of Alexandria were no exception. The activities of Silvestros' successor Meletios Pigas, for example, consisted of fighting against the Catholic infiltration among the Orthodox population both within and outside the Ottoman Empire. He persuaded the Copts to break off their contacts with the Catholics and tried to reach a union with them which resulted in failure. During his tenure, the Russian Church was elevated to the status of a patriarchate. This is not so say, however, that they had no contacts with the Catholic world.²⁴⁸ On the contrary, a number of Alexandrian Patriarchs received their education in Italy, just like Meletios Pigas himself who pursued his studies in Venice and Padua. Meletios had important political connections with Western ambassadors and as part of this anti-Catholic agenda he sent what would become his successor Kyrillos Loukaris to Poland to start a struggle against the Uniates in Poland.²⁴⁹ The English ambassador Edward Barton, who had friendly relations with Meletios, claims credit to the latter's appointment as locum tenens patriarch of Constantinople.²⁵⁰ Similarly, Paul Rycaut mentions that patriarchs of Constantinople, Aleppo (sic), and Jerusalem sought his protection.²⁵¹ Educated in the West like his predecessor, Kyrillos established very good connections with the Protestant courts of Europe, notably with England and Holland, and even sent his protégé to Oxford to study theology, who would be the Patriarch of Alexandria taking the name Mitrofanis

²⁴⁷ Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, the ambassador of the Holy Roman emperor to the Ottoman court in mid-16th century, notes one such hierarch, the metropolitan Mitrofanis of Chalki, favoured the union of Latin and Orthodox churches and thus disagreed with the other members of his congregation. Busbecq 2005: 129.

²⁴⁸ Ware provides a summary of the means of interaction between Catholics and the Orthodox, characterised by both hostility and friendship. For his analysis of these relations until the tenure of Kyrillos Loukaris, see Ware 1964: 16-26.

²⁴⁹ For an outline of Kyrillos' anti-Latin policies with regard to Poland, see Hering 1992: 49-81.

²⁵⁰ Davey 1987: 61.

²⁵¹ Anderson 1989: 224.

Kritopoulos. In the early period following his election as the Patriarch of Alexandria,²⁵² Kyrillos Loukaris wrote a letter to M. Uytenbogaert, the minister at the Hague, on the recommendation of von Haga, the Dutch ambassador in Istanbul with whom Kyrillos had already been friends. In this letter, he expressed his disapproval of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs' relation to the politics of the Ottoman state, while praising the stance of the Alexandrian Patriarchs: 'The Patriarch of Alexandria pays nothing to the Turks, nor does he ever join with them in any Church matters, or choose them as advisers or allies; the reason of which is, the prudence and vigilance of former Patriarchs, who, being aware of the danger, have always kept their subjects unanimous.'²⁵³ Kyrillos left a large corpus of correspondence with Protestant courts and ambassadors, which has been studied by a number of scholars,²⁵⁴ and will not be repeated here. During Kritopoulos' studies at Oxford, Gerasimos Spartaliotis sat on the patriarchal throne of Alexandria which was vacated by Kyrillos' election as the Patriarch of Constantinople.²⁵⁵ Despite being a close friend of Loukaris', Gerasimos did not support his close relations with the Dutch ambassador.²⁵⁶ A notable aspect of the tenure of Mitrofanis is the decrease in the relations of the Patriarchate of Alexandria with the Russian church. On the other hand, he seems to have seen England as a refuge from the Ottoman authority as seen in his following words:

²⁵² The document of Kyrillos' election as the Patriarch of Alexandria can be found in Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 3-5.

²⁵³ Neale 1873, vol. II: 375.

²⁵⁴ Hering provides an in-depth study of the Orthodox Church in the context of European politics during the second and third decades of the 17th century. Hering 1992. For Kyrillos' spiritual development, see Hering 1992: 30-42. For an account of Kyrillos' tenure as the Patriarch of Alexandria and his relations with Protestant courts, see Neale 1847, vol. II: 358-404, and for his tenure as the Patriarch of Constantinople, see Runciman 1968: 259-288, and Hadjiantoniou 1961. The letters written by Kyrillos Loukaris during his Patriarchate in Istanbul to the English Ambassador Roe can be found in NA.SP.97/11, 21, 37, 64, 115, 143, 145, 164, 166, 218, and 261. Thomas Smith's account of the tenure of Kyrillos Loukaris offers a useful tool to understanding how an English clergyman saw Kyrillos' positive relations with Protestants and his conflicts with the Jesuits. Smith 1680. For a recent study of Smith's account in comparison with that of Sir Paul Rycout, see Pignot 2009: 193-205.

²⁵⁵ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 5-6. For Gerasimos Spartaliotis' confession of faith registered in the Codex of the Patriarchate of Constantinople see Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 6-7.

²⁵⁶ Davey 1987: 290.

‘Besides, it may also be called the Haven, yea the Refuge and Sanctuarie for Greeks, oppressed by the Turkish tyrannie.’²⁵⁷ Having finished his studies at Oxford, he set out for Egypt but preferred to come through continental Europe spending a considerable time in Protestant kingdoms of Germany and Switzerland.²⁵⁸ Anti-Ottomanism appears to be a strong element in his writings. In his confession of the Orthodox Church, published in Helmstadt in 1661, he writes the following about the Ottoman rule:

They have taken from us all power and authority; they have deprived us of learning and the liberal arts; they have taken away all our wealth and good fortune; they have laid upon us heavy burdens that cannot be borne. Would that they were content with taxation only! But no, they compel us to provide horses and ships and provisions for their army and navy... Their rulers in town and country press us into their service, so that we spend more time on our masters’ duties than our own affairs. They take from us anything they fancy, a fine horse, or a good bull or goat or mule. Life under them is worse than death.²⁵⁹

A major transformation in the political proclivities of the Eastern Patriarchates towards foreign courts seems to have occurred in the period following the execution of Kyrillos Loukaris, which decreased the relations between Protestants and the Ottoman Orthodox. Following the Synods of Constantinople (1636) and Jerusalem (1672), the teachings of Kyrillos Loukaris were condemned, and afterwards anti-Protestantism began to feature the politics of the Orthodox Patriarchs in the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, relations with the English and Dutch courts diminished although not ceasing to exist as some Eastern Patriarchs still had some connections with these courts in late 17th and early 18th century. If we exclude the relations between the Eastern Church and the non-Jurors of England, whose efforts for a union with the former were halted in 1723 with the Eastern Church’s

²⁵⁷ Davey 1987: 77.

²⁵⁸ For a detailed account of his travels in continental Europe see Davey 1987: 147-263.

²⁵⁹ Davey 1987: 3-4. For the Greek original, see Karmiris 1953, vol. II: 558.

conditioning of the union to the decisions of the Synod of Jerusalem,²⁶⁰ the idea of union with Protestants would not re-emerge within the Orthodox Patriarchates until the mid-19th century.²⁶¹ However, the local presence of the English consuls in Ottoman provinces still provided a ground for cooperation, as was the case when Chrysanthos of Jerusalem wrote to the Porte on behalf of Makarios the metropolitan of Acre that the latter will be represented by the English consul—and a French monk—in the courts of the provincial governors.²⁶² Under such conditions, relations with the Catholic and Orthodox powers began to flourish.²⁶³ The relations established with Russia in some cases assumed not only a religious but also a political character. In particular, information-gathering in Istanbul about the Ottoman state by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchs (both Constantinopolitan and Eastern) which was ‘almost comparable with that of the Venetian Signoria’ and sharing this information with Russian diplomats was intense in this period.²⁶⁴ The Patriarchs of Jerusalem appear as the central figures in this new age. In many cases, non-Jerusalemite Patriarchs would get in contact with the Russian authorities through the mediation of the *Metokhion* of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Istanbul. Having convened the Synod of

²⁶⁰ The answers of the Eastern Church to the proposals of the non-Jurors, which was signed by Jeremias of Constantinople, Athanasios of Antioch, Chrysanthos of Jerusalem, and nine metropolitans, can be found in Williams 1868: 117-121.

²⁶¹ In 1830s, for example, Robert Curzon learns with great surprise that the Patriarch of Constantinople had not heard of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Ware 1963: 2-3. For a short overview of the re-establishment of the Protestant missions and the first Protestant missionaries’ approaches to the Christians of Palestine and Trans-Jordan, see Mattingly 2006-2007: 215-225.

²⁶² BOA.D.PSK.8/118 (1726-1727). For another example to the role of the English as a protecting body for the Orthodox churchmen in early 17th century, the Russian tsar Mikhail requests from the English king Charles I to offer hospitality to Kyrillos and Grigorios, two Greek archimandrites who went to Moscow to bring the letters of congratulation from Theofanis of Jerusalem when they pass through dangerous places in Poland, Germany, and Italy. The original Russian version is registered in NA.SP.102/49, 14. A contemporary English translation is preserved in NA.SP.91/2, 123-124.

²⁶³ Kitromilides 2006: 201.

²⁶⁴ Faroqhi 2007: 46-47. A notable example is that of a Greek clergyman who used the pseudonym Daniel the archbishop of Thessaly and informed Alexis Michailovich about the political developments in Istanbul which resulted in the execution of a number of Ottoman high dignitaries and Kösem Sultan, the grandmother of the young Sultan Mehmed IV in 1651. Originally preserved in the Office of the Ambassadors in National Archives of Ancient Acts of Russia, this letter was published and translated into French in Tchentsova 2007: 399-405, and 405-416.

Jerusalem in 1672, Dositheos Notaras had a particularly important role in the conduct of the new relations between the Eastern Patriarchates and the Russian court. It was due to Dositheos' efforts that an academy was established in Moscow that went through a flowering phase in late 17th and early 18th centuries.²⁶⁵ The Russian ambassador Ukraintsev (1699-1700) to the Porte, for example, had been assigned to get information from Dositheos of Jerusalem about the attitudes of the Porte regarding the Russian interests in the Black Sea, which he eventually received from the latter.²⁶⁶ Indeed, Dositheos is renowned as a central figure of his time not only in church administration but also in the anti-Ottomanist strand within the Orthodox Church.²⁶⁷ The blossoming of the relations between Russia and the Patriarchate of Antioch in this period is epitomised in the two visits that Makarios ez-Za'îm paid to Russia, one from 1652 to 1659, and the other from 1666 to 1669. The most valuable account of his travels to the Russian court is the memoirs of these travels written by his son Paul, the archdeacon of Aleppo. Despite Paul's displeasure with the Russian court,²⁶⁸ in his account the Russian tsar appears to be the first one to be pronounced in a ceremony in Istanbul: 'They mentioned the names of Alexis, the emperor of Muscovy (*melikü'l-Moskof*), empress Mary, Basil the *beg* of Moldavia, his wife Catherine, Matthew the *beg* of Wallachia, and his wife Helene.'²⁶⁹ Unlike many of his contemporaries, Paul's memoirs display a certain pro-Ottoman character as seen in his representation of the Ottoman polity, the peaceful co-existence of the Christian and

²⁶⁵ This school is also known as the school of Leichoudis brothers, whose services to Greek education in Moscow places their names right after Maximos the Greek. Kitromilides 2007b: 8.

²⁶⁶ Ünal 2012: 235-237, and 242.

²⁶⁷ His role in the anti-Ottoman offensives of in Ottoman Balkans involving the Principalities and the Serbian church has been touched upon in Karathanassis 1983: 455-463.

²⁶⁸ Due possibly to the current prejudices against Arabs in the Russian court, Paul declined tsar Alexis' offer to employ him in his court as a translator. Halperin 1997: 414.

²⁶⁹ Paul of Aleppo 1930: 85. For two other similar instances see Paul of Aleppo 1930: 124-125, 127.

Muslim subjects of the Ottoman sultan, and his attitude towards the Turkish language.²⁷⁰ In addition to these visits, Makarios' letters to the Russian court also bears witness to the role of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the conduct of relations between the Eastern Patriarchates and Russia. As Tchentsova shows through the correspondence preserved in Russian archives, Makarios' letters addressing the Russian court were penned in the *Metokhion* of the Brotherhood of Holy Sepulchre of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Istanbul and those in the trans-Danubian Principalities.²⁷¹ Makarios' second visit to Russia, resulting more from necessity than from his own intention, at the request of the Russian tsar to take part in the resolution of the latter's problems with the Russian Patriarch Nikon also played a major role in the enhancement of the relations between the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Russian court.²⁷² Just like Paisios of Alexandria, who insisted to join Meletius as the representative of the tsar and was taken through Georgia, where Makarios was on a visit to collect funds for his Patriarchate, Makarios had to leave the Ottoman lands without notifying the Porte, and was deposed by Parthenios of Constantinople. In addition to Makarios, another Antiochian Patriarch, namely Athanasios al-Dabbas (1686-1694, 1720-1724) had been in correspondence with the Russian court about the establishment of a printing press in Aleppo.²⁷³ Likewise, Alexandrian Patriarchs' relations with Russia which had assumed a diminishing character returned to their normal phase reaching a peak at the time of Paisios, who himself went to Russia taking an active role together with Makarios of Antioch in the efforts to end the disputes between Tsar Alexis

²⁷⁰ The scholars who have produced works on Paul's memoirs have either ignored this aspect of his identity, or have rather reduced Paul's positive appellations towards the Ottoman rule to mere 'cliché praises'. Halperin 1998-1999: 101. Haddad, on the other hand, while accepting Paul's positive depiction of the Ottoman state does not give an in-depth analysis. Haddad 1970: 67-68. I challenge Halperin's view and provide a more detailed analysis of Paul's Ottoman identity as part of his three-partite identity, others being his Syrian and Orthodox identities. Çolak 2012: 380-382.

²⁷¹ Tchentsova 2009: 313.

²⁷² On the uneagerness of Makarios to go to Russia for the second time, see Walbiner 1998: 99-101.

²⁷³ Tchentsova 2011: 48-53.

and the Russian Patriarch Nikon in mid-17th century.²⁷⁴ Paisios' long absence from Egypt would result in his deposition by Parthenios of Constantinople in 1665.²⁷⁵ Not surprisingly for the networks of patronage at the time, it was the Russian tsar, together with Nektarios of Jerusalem, who interfered and requested the sultan for the reversal of the decision to depose Paisios and Makarios.²⁷⁶ Relations between the Alexandrian Patriarchs and Russia would begin to show a dramatic decline during the tenures of Cosmas II, Cosmas III and Matthaïos in early 18th century. Following the treaty of Edirne in 1713 after the battle of Pruth, and further exhausted by its struggle against Sweden until 1721, Russia would have to abandon for a while its interests to expand southwards and to provide help for the Orthodox in the Ottoman Empire,²⁷⁷ an agenda that the Ottomans had to acknowledge officially by the terms of the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in 1774.

In this period following the execution of Kyrillos Loukaris, relations between the Eastern Patriarchates and the foreign courts began to involve the Catholic powers as well. As far as the relations with Catholic courts in this period are concerned one has to mention the role of the French court while some other may also be included on a much lower scale.²⁷⁸ Here, the Patriarchate of Antioch comes to fore as the one with a greater connection with the Catholic world. Despite the relatively peaceful relations between the Ottoman authorities and the Christians of Syria which lasted until early 17th century, the

²⁷⁴ A cursory glance at the documentation between the Alexandrian Patriarchs and Russia prepared by Uspenskij bears witness to this theory. While the documentation continues from the time of the Ottoman conquest of Egypt reaching a peak at the time of Meletios, the relations show a dramatic decline during the time of Kyrillos Loukaris and his successor Gerasimos Spartalotis and cease to exist in that of Mitrofanis Kritopoulos. A great amount of documentation between the Alexandrian Patriarchate and Russia can be found in Uspenskii 1898: 118-255.

²⁷⁵ The document which declares the decision of the synod led by Parthenios to depose Paisios can be found in Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 7-10. An important motive in the document is the antagonism between Russia and the Ottoman Empire.

²⁷⁶ Walbiner 1998:107-108.

²⁷⁷ Tchentsova 2011: 54.

²⁷⁸ Due to the Ottoman-Habsburg and French-Habsburg rivalries, Habsburg interest to sponsor the Patriarchates could not materialise. Faroqhi 2007: 173. Other Catholic powers such as Venice were in favour of protecting the interests of the Catholics in the Ottoman Empire. Dursteler 2001: 7.

foundation of Propaganda Fide in 1622, followed by the arrival of Latin missionaries who were warmly welcomed by the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch, unlike those of Alexandria and Jerusalem, seems to have changed the atmosphere.²⁷⁹ Therefore, during this period some Antiochian Patriarchs began to grow discontented with the Ottoman provincial administration and needed to establish contacts with the external dynamics, which they found in the French court. The first Antiochian Patriarch to write to the French King was Euthymios of Chios (1635-1648)²⁸⁰ while his successor Makarios ez-Za'îm composed three letters addressing the French King Louis XIV of which only two had been sent, in 1653²⁸¹ and 1663,²⁸² and the other one, written in 1671, presenting a refuting Calvinism could only be sent by his grandson Kyrillos ez-Za'îm.²⁸³ Unsurprisingly, Makarios' complaints about the provincial governors which reduced the Christians to poverty and hence Makarios' appeal for financial help appear as a recurrent element in these letters. In the first letter, for example, he complained mainly of 'the difficulties, pains, and calamities which strike them [Christians] as well as the utterance of injustices and the *harac* multiplied by three.'²⁸⁴ Likewise, in his second letter he expresses his sorrow for 'the calamities, injustices, and the most painful tests by the pashas and governors' and continues as follows: 'The tyranny exercised among them [Christians] is greater than ever. They have been reduced to selling their children because of their poverty and the excess of their distress.'²⁸⁵ Makarios is also known to have written a Catholic profession of faith to

²⁷⁹ Homsy 1966: 369-370.

²⁸⁰ Euthymios' letter is referred to in the first letter of Makarios: 'the late Patriarch Euthymios, who was before us, had a correspondence with Your Majesty during his lifetime' Rassi 2002: 118-119.

²⁸¹ For a recent publication of the two copies in St. Petersburg and Paris, edition, and French translation with commentary, see Rassi 2002: 111-123.

²⁸² For a French translation of the original as published by the same author, see Rabbath 1905. Vol. I: 373-376.

²⁸³ Rassi 2002: 126-127.

²⁸⁴ Rassi 2002: 118-119.

²⁸⁵ Rabbath 1905. Vol. I: 374.

be sent to Rome through the missionaries, asking for material help for his church,²⁸⁶ which led some to question whether he converted to Catholicism.²⁸⁷ In fact, it is only after these efforts brought no result that Makarios began to seek help from the Orthodox rulers abroad, and to look upon the missionaries.²⁸⁸ In addition to France and Russia, Makarios also had close ties with Georgian kingdoms and went to Georgia to collect funds for the Patriarchate.²⁸⁹

Eastern Patriarchates and the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia

In addition to these external powers, we may also cite the semi-independent trans-Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, whose Orthodox rulers had provided support for the Orthodox Patriarchates since the fall of Constantinople to Ottomans.²⁹⁰ Having acknowledged Ottoman suzerainty from 1476 in the Wallachian case and from 1538 in Moldavian case onwards on a constant basis,²⁹¹ these governors had been chosen by the Ottoman administration from among the local nobility and took their oath of allegiance in Istanbul from the 16th century onwards.²⁹² Their cultural relations with the Eastern Patriarchates were kept alive through a number of paths of interaction. The Greek immigrants in the principalities, who mainly came from Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Aegean and Ionian islands, Istanbul, Trabzon and Sinop, constituted one of these paths.²⁹³ Among these immigrants, those from Epirus played a special role of intermediaries as they

²⁸⁶ Walbiner provides an edition and English translation of the section from Yuhanna Ujaimi's manuscript preserved in Beirut, which dates the event to 1670. The relevant information in Arabic and English respectively can be found in Walbiner 2000: 54 and 56.

²⁸⁷ Zayat 1932: 881-892.

²⁸⁸ Thus, when he died a Catholic missionary wrote that he 'had returned to his schism'. Walbiner 2000: 44.

²⁸⁹ Walbiner 1996: 245-255.

²⁹⁰ Despite the fact that the principalities had offered support for the Orthodox church organisation outside their realm, the church of Moldavia and Wallachia had resisted to the claims of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Flaut 2008: 51.

²⁹¹ The acknowledgement of their tributary status comes earlier. After Bayezid I's defeat of Mircea the Elder in 1394 he is forced into exile and the Ottomans install as their tributary vassal Vlad I (1394-1397) with the title governor/ *voyvoda* of Wallachia. Although during the *fetret* Mircea re-established his rule from the reign of Mehmed I onwards they remained under a tributary status.

²⁹² Pedani 2007: 206.

²⁹³ Cicanci 2004: 239.

spoke a Romanian dialect.²⁹⁴ The common language that connected the two, however, was Greek which was present in the principalities since the 16th century due to the Byzantine refugees, *archontes*, merchants, men of letters and ecclesiastics.²⁹⁵ Latin had already been excluded in the principalities as part of anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant policies of the Princes,²⁹⁶ and in the mid-17th century, a systematic study of Greek had been introduced by the Princes Vasile Lupu and Matei Basarab.²⁹⁷ Additionally, the group known as *iatrophilosophes*, had been of particular importance in the introduction of the Western ideas as observed by the Greek scholars of the time who were also teaching in the principalities.²⁹⁸ Finally it has also to be mentioned that some of the princes of the Moldavia and Wallachia before the Phanariot period were of Greek origin: Alexandru Coconul, Radu Leon and the Kantakouzenoi.²⁹⁹ Due largely to their acceptance of the Ottoman suzerainty, these principalities constituted the easiest path for the Eastern Patriarchates to seek economic support,³⁰⁰ which in fact constituted an important aspect of the Eastern Patriarchates' relations with the trans-Danubian principalities. The correspondence between the trans-Danubian princes and the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, a great deal of which is devoted to the economic support for this Patriarchate, testifies to that aspect of the relations. Keen to provide economic support for the Orthodox Church as part

²⁹⁴ Pipidi 2004: 28. A further analysis of their role can be found in Camariano-Cioran 1984.

²⁹⁵ Nystazopoulou-Pélékidou 2004: 49. Karathanassis 1975: 57.

²⁹⁶ Karathanassis 2004: 253.

²⁹⁷ Nystazopoulou-Pélékidou 2004: 49-50, Cicanci 2004: 240, and Karathanassis 2004: 254.

²⁹⁸ Cicanci 2004: 243-244 and Karathanassis 2004: 256. For the activities of those scholars who got their education in Padua and taught science lessons in the principalities during the 18th century see Nicolaïdis 2004: 259-263.

²⁹⁹ Cicanci 2004: 240.

³⁰⁰ Feodorov 2007: 99-100.

of their political agenda,³⁰¹ the princes donated a number of *metokhia* for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.³⁰²

In addition, the occasional presence of some Eastern Patriarchs in the Principalities for support provided the most important mode of interaction.³⁰³ Antiochian Patriarchs' travels to the Principalities started as early as 1581 at the time of Ioakeim ibn Dawu of Antioch.³⁰⁴ During the first half of the 17th century, however, no Antiochian Patriarch had done so, until Makarios ez-Za'im, who spent around three and a half years in Moldavia and Wallachia while en route to Russia.³⁰⁵ During his anti-Patriarchate, Athanasios al-Dabbâs also travelled to the Principalities between 1700 and 1705 several times and received the support of Constantin Brâncoveanu to establish an Arabic printing house in Aleppo.³⁰⁶

As far as the relations between the Principalities and the Patriarchs of Alexandria go, we see almost an unbroken chain of Alexandrian Patriarchs who spent at least some time in the Principalities. Meletios Pigas, had contacts with the Principalities even before assuming his post as the Patriarch of Alexandria.³⁰⁷ Although not having the opportunity to visit the Principalities despite occasional invitations, Meletios played a major role in the conduct of the relations between the Porte and Michael the Brave of Moldavia, receiving eventually important financial support from the latter.³⁰⁸ Another important Alexandrian Patriarch who had close ties with the Principalities is Kyrillos Loukaris, who unlike his

³⁰¹ As early as 1569, the wife of the *voivode* of Moldovlachia donated a thousand aspers to the monastery of Karakalos in the Holy Mountain. Legrand 1903, vol. VII: 1-2.

³⁰² For one example, in which the Patriarch Parthenios of Jerusalem writes about the finances of the *metokhion* of Rakovitsa in Wallachia, see Legrand 1903, vol. VII: 15.

³⁰³ Cicanci 2004: 241-242.

³⁰⁴ Feodorov 2007: 95-96. Mundhir Mahmud Jabir states that Ioakeim went to Muscovy in 1586. Jabir 1998: 201.

³⁰⁵ For a recent study on the state of the Principalities vis-à-vis the Ottoman administration as observed Paul, the archdeacon of Aleppo, and son of Makarios the Patriarch of Antioch, see Feodorov 2006: 295-310. A short overview of Makarios' actions in the Principalities can be found in Flaut 2005: 168-172.

³⁰⁶ Feodorov 2007: 96-98.

³⁰⁷ Runcan 2006: 95.

³⁰⁸ Runcan 2006: 96-98.

predecessor Meletios Pigas, visited the Principalities several times.³⁰⁹ Almost all of Kyrillos' successors, for example Mitrofanis Kritopoulos, Nikiforos, Ioannikios, Paisios, Parthenios, Gerasimos Palladas and Samuel Kapasoulis, continued visiting the Principalities, with few exceptions such as Gerasimos Spartaliotis, who did not go to the Principalities in spite of carrying on relations with them and even asking for funds.³¹⁰

Financial role of the Princes was of great importance for the Patriarchs of Jerusalem as well. Patriarch Theofanis, for example, bought the Monastery of Agios Sabbas with the help of the Prince of Moldavia,³¹¹ where he had the monasteries of Galata, Agios Georgios of Bucharest, and Nikoritsa.³¹² The cultural role that the Principalities played for the Eastern Patriarchates was furthered with the establishment of the princely academies, one in Bucharest (in 1694-95)³¹³ and the other in Jassy (1707)³¹⁴ both instructing in Greek, where a number of Orthodox clergymen got involved in providing and receiving education.³¹⁵ Chrysanthos Notaras, for example pursued some of his studies in the principalities, and even helped in the making of the curriculum for geography classes by having his nephew Demetrios Notaras translate a book of geography.³¹⁶ The presence of printing technology further contributed to their importance as cultural centres for the Orthodox world. It is around this time that a good deal of printing activity by Greek Orthodox hierarchs was carried out in Moldavia and Wallachia. Of utmost importance is the printing of 1247-page work of Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, entitled *On the Patriarchate of Jerusalem* by his successor Chrysanthos in Bucharest. Dositheos is

³⁰⁹ Runcan 2006: 98-102.

³¹⁰ Runcan 2006: 102-105.

³¹¹ Feodorov 2007: 96.

³¹² Gritsopoulos 1959: 234.

³¹³ Camariano-Cioran 1962: 24.

³¹⁴ Camariano-Cioran 1962: 85.

³¹⁵ For the infiltration of Greek into the Principalities, see Camariano-Cioran 1962: 10-19. For a general assesment of the curricula of the princely academies, see Camariano-Cioran 1962: 140-147. See also Murphey 1999: 135.

³¹⁶ Camariano-Cioran 1962: 247.

generally regarded as the one who initiated the Greek Renaissance in the Principalities³¹⁷ while his nephew Chrysanthos' correspondence with these principalities produced a large corpus of letters.³¹⁸ Edmund Chishull, who visited the Principalities while he was the chaplain of the Levant Company in Smyrna at the turn of the 18th century, says that the Prince of Wallachia gave a short visit to Dositheos of Jerusalem, in his residence which the Prince built.³¹⁹

As the relations that the Eastern Patriarchs had with the foreign courts and the trans-Danubian principalities which were also in touch with the external powers show, in certain periods certain courts emerged keen to sponsor the Eastern Patriarchs and were appealed to accordingly. This is not to say, however, that all the Eastern Patriarchs who were in contact with a certain foreign court had no relation to some other courts. On the contrary, the relations were often fluid and changed from a patriarch to his successor and even changed within the tenure of a single patriarch. Nor do their relations with foreign courts suggest that they were necessarily on unfriendly terms with their Ottoman overlords. Although some of the Eastern Patriarchs definitely had an anti-Ottoman voice in their writings and correspondence with foreign courts, some Eastern Patriarchs, such as Makarios ez-Za'îm of Antioch, who is known to have sent two letters to the French King and to have visited the Russian court twice suggested to Russians the example of the Ottomans' treatment of their non-Muslim subjects. The most notable aspect of this period before the age of centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates is the lack of a sole and

³¹⁷ Cicanci 2004: 242 and Karathanasis 2004: 253. An outline of the role of the Greek Orthodox in the making of a cultural Renaissance in the Principalities in the pre-Phanariot period can be found in Karathanassis 1986: 29-59.

³¹⁸ Those letters many of which were written by the trans-Danubian princes both before and during the Phanariot period to Chrysanthos were published in Legrand 1888, vol. IV. Out of the 203 letters published in this volume, four addresses Dositheos Notaras of Jerusalem (Legrand 1888, vol. IV: 6-9, 11-12, and 15-17) and three addresses Gerasimos Palladas of Alexandria (Legrand 1888, vol. IV: 44-46, 76-85, and 106-107) in addition to those addressing some Constantinopolitan metropolitans.

³¹⁹ Chishull 1993: 100.

permanent political ally. Several foreign courts, be it Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant, have been appealed for support by the Eastern Patriarchs. While some of these Patriarchs' motivation to do so was their discontent with the Ottoman administration, the motivation for some others who had a certain appreciation for the Ottoman rule was simply economic. Whatever was the reason for each case, what was certain in this period was the lack of a permanent institutional support for the Eastern Patriarchates, which would largely replace these foreign courts from the early 18th century on with a confederation of lay and clerical elites supported through economic and political means by the Ottoman central administration. As will be mentioned in the following chapter, after the siding of Moldavia prince Dimitri Kantemir with the Russian army in 1711, Ottoman administration would begin to choose these princes exclusively from among the Phanariot families. In this way, the Eastern Patriarchates, who had already acquired some fruitful economic resources in the trans-Danubian principalities, would further benefit from these resources through the assistance of these Phanariot rulers. While the Eastern Patriarchs' relations with foreign courts and diplomats would never cease to exist—the Patriarch of Alexandria Samuil's dispatch of a delegation to the Queen Anne of England to ask for financial support,³²⁰ and Matthaïos of Alexandria's contacts with the Ethiopian and Russian Courts to establish a Greek church in Ethiopia³²¹ being two notorious examples from later periods—their sponsoring by the new political and economic networks would decrease these relations in a dramatic way.

Authority of the Eastern Patriarchates and Its Limits on the eve of Centralisation

This section explores different aspects of the authority of the Eastern Patriarchates in relation to the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman central administration in

³²⁰ Tzoumerkas 2007: 26.

³²¹ Roussos 2003: 152-154.

view of the widely-repeated argument that the Eastern Patriarchates conducted their relations with the Ottoman central administration through the mediation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Here, we will provide three case studies on the three Eastern Patriarchates during the period preceding the centralisation of their affairs in Istanbul. For the Patriarchate of Antioch, we will focus on the patriarchal struggle between Kyrillos and Athanasios. In the case of Alexandria, we will scrutinise a similar patriarchal struggle between Samouil and Kosmas, and analyse through the available documentation some economic-legal cases with which this Patriarchate was involved. Finally, we will try to shed light on the authority of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem with a focus on its relations with the Ottoman central and provincial administration. In each case, we will also look at the limitations of the authority of the Eastern Patriarchs, and how they tried to overcome them in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.

Before embarking on these case studies, however, it would be relevant to touch upon some similar cases whereby the Patriarchs of Constantinople tried to establish their authority on some provinces, which followed more or less similar patterns. Because Crete was the final long-lasting Ottoman conquest, integration into the Great Church presents a perfect case for the assessment of Ottoman ecclesiastical policies. With the conquest of the Cretan capital, Candia/Kandiye in 1669, following those of Chania and Rethymnon in 1645 and 1646 respectively, the whole island of Crete came under Ottoman rule after four and a half centuries of Venetian rule. Prior to Ottoman rule, the Sinaite monks and the Cretan Orthodox church were in a process of amalgamation over two centuries. In fact, Saint Catherine's monastery at Mount Sinai had been largely run by Cretans during the 16th and the 17th centuries, and at the time of the Ottoman conquest the Sinaites had already

been established in Crete.³²² One of the first things the Ottomans did, starting as early as the 1650s, even before the definitive conquest of the island, was to install a Greek Orthodox metropolitan in Crete by authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Yet, it was by no means straightforward for the new metropolitan, Neophytos Patelaros (attempted installation as metropolitan in 1651), who met stiff resistance from the Sinaite monks already established there. Having good connections within the Porte, Sinaite monks did not allow either Neophytos, or his successors to assume their posts in Crete for decades. There were even attempts to make the church of Crete autocephalous between 1715 and 1718. As will be mentioned in the next chapter, the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople would be sufficient to appoint its own candidate for the see of Crete during the time of centralisation.

It would be oversimplistic and misleading to analyse each Eastern Patriarchate in the same manner as each had a different experience not only during the earlier Ottoman period but also much before the Ottomans conquered Syria and Egypt. Contrary to the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria, for example, Antioch had a centuries-old tradition of Arabic-speaking patriarchs with a few exceptional Greek-speaking patriarchs.³²³ This period is equally characterised by the intensified involvement of the Catholic missionaries in converting not only the Orthodox flock but also the hierarchy itself, and a few Patriarchs had secretly submitted their Catholic profession of faith to the Pope. In many of the patriarchal elections in Antioch, the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople consisted largely of supporting one of the factions struggling for the patriarchal throne of Antioch, rather than attempting to install a candidate of its own as was the case, say for the Patriarchate of Alexandria. The breaking point for the transformation

³²² Greene 2000: 177. Bayraktar Tellan: 2012: 198-214.

³²³ Walbiner 1997-1998: 585-587.

of this patriarchate came about with the Antiochian Schism in 1724, when the newly-elected Patriarch Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas declared his Catholicism and Silvestros was appointed in a short time as the Patriarch of Antioch. As will be shown below, and in the following section of this chapter, with Silvestros, as a member of the patriarchal elites in the Ottoman Empire, the Patriarchate of Antioch became much centralised and established very strong ties with not only the patriarchal elites in the capital but also the Ottoman central administration, which contributed to the facilitation of the centralisation of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates.

From the late 17th century onwards Patriarchs of Constantinople showed themselves willing and sometimes able to interfere in the affairs of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. When, for example, Gerasimos II Paladas (1688-1710), allegedly introduced innovation during the Divine Liturgy, the Patriarchate of Constantinople reacted. Following Gerasimos' resignation in 1710, he was followed by Samouil Kapasoulis (1710-1723) but at the same time there appeared a parallel election of Kosmas of Klaudiopolis by the Patriarch of Constantinople. However, the new patriarch of Constantinople called Kyprianos II recognised Samouil's patriarchate. The Constantinopolitan Patriarchate was able to install its own candidate Kosmas only in 1736. Although those Patriarchs succeeding Kosmas III would have very similar Constantinople-related backgrounds, the full-fledged transformation within the Patriarchate of Alexandria would come about during the tenure of Matthaïos Psaltis (1746-1766), who had been the abbot of the Zlatari Monastery in Wallachia, and would be installed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Just like his counterpart on the Jerusalemite throne, Matthaïos would have a number of buildings, institutions, and churches in Alexandria, Cairo, Pylousion, Rahition and Libya renovated.

The Patriarchate of Jerusalem, for example, had already begun a process of integration with the Patriarchate of Constantinople much before the other Eastern Patriarchates because of its critical position with regard to the other Christian communities in the Ottoman Empire such as the Armenians and the Latins who had competed with these two in the Holy Land. This competition is apparent not only during the Ottoman period but from previous times as well. For this reason, the relations between the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem had been much closer as explained in the preceding chapter in detail. These close relations were further consolidated when Theophanes of Jerusalem (1608-1644) bought a residence in Istanbul and the Patriarchs of Jerusalem continued to reside in Istanbul from that time onwards until 1867.³²⁴ During the earlier half of the 18th century, the Patriarchal throne of Jerusalem was occupied by Dositheos Notaras (1669-1707), Chrysanthos Notaras (1707-1731), and Meletios (1731-1737). Of all these notable patriarchs, Dositheos Notaras had a central role not only for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem but also the whole Greek Church in the Ottoman Empire,³²⁵ and not surprisingly for such a universal outlook, he travelled much of the Empire and wrote about the situation of the Orthodox wherever he went.³²⁶ As will be mentioned in the forthcoming analysis Chrysanthos' role in the government of the whole Greek Orthodox Church apparatus was so decisive that in the French diplomatic correspondence he is often referred to as the one governing the whole Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire. He also took part in the appointment of Silvestros as the Patriarch of Antioch, who would begin a centuries-long tradition of Greek-speaking patriarchs in this Patriarchate. The long tenure of Parthenios

³²⁴ Dowling 1913: 16.

³²⁵ Dositheos was born in Arachova, Corinth on 31 May. 1641 and came to Istanbul in 1657, as he himself writes. Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. I: 302. For a treatment of the life and tenure of Dositheos, see 1907.

³²⁶ In addition to his see Palestine, and his regular residence in Istanbul, he travelled from Istanbul through Georgia on the Black Sea coast, other parts of Asia Minor, the Aegean islands, Syria, Balkans and the Principalities. Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. I: 302-307.

(1737-1766) would bring about an almost unprecedented flourishing of the cooperation between the two patriarchates, a mechanism which would also be supported by the Ottoman central administration through a number of means. Although similar problems of a provincial nature such as the patriarchs' problems with some of their metropolitans or the administrative officers (*ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*) in Palestine never ceased to occur, by Parthenios' time, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem developed the capacity to have such provincial conflicts solved in Istanbul, where it had closer ties with the administrative apparatus compared to Palestine.

Competition for the Antiochian throne between Kyrillos and Athanasios

The best-documented and the most significant case for the role of these three sets of actors is the struggle for the Patriarchal throne of Antioch between Kyrillos ez-Za'îm and Athanasios Dabbas in the late 17th century. According to our current knowledge about this struggle, Kyrillos, who was backed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople, was the Patriarch of Antioch from 1682 to 1720 while Athanasios who was educated in Rome and supported by the Papacy was anti-patriarch asserting his authority from 1685 to 1694.³²⁷ However, our knowledge of the significance of this struggle before the Ottoman central administration remains far from definitive. Haddad, for example, merely says that having been backed by the Great Church Kyrillos went to Istanbul to get *berats* on three occasions,³²⁸ without going into a discussion of the reciprocal views of the Ottoman central administration and the patriarchal candidates of Antioch.

Ottoman correspondence with Antioch which presents the best means to analyse the relations between the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Ottoman central administration

³²⁷ This can also be seen in a recent study by Walbiner who maintained that from 1685 onwards, Athanasios was anti-patriarch against Kyrillos for nine years until he gave up his resistance and was satisfied with the diocese of Aleppo. Walbiner 1998: 584.

³²⁸ Haddad 1990: 231-233.

includes five major documents with regard to this struggle. The first one,³²⁹ which is dated sometime between 25 May and 25 June 1683, carries the signature of Kyrillos as the Patriarch of Damascus (*Kirilos nâm patrik-i Şâm*), with reference to the then location of the Patriarchate of Antioch. Kyrillos started this document with a long prayer for the Sultan in Turkish. Towards the very end of the document, he said that he is sending the Sultan a box of Damascus fruit (*bir sanduk Şâm meyvesi*) so that his letter of obeisance to the Sultan does not remain ‘empty’; that is to say unfruitful or unsuccessful (*varaka-i ‘ubûdiyyet tehî olmamak için*). On the margin of the document, he also noted that he had already sent another box of Damascus fruit by means of Mahmud Çelebi but the fruit perished on the way (*andan bir nesne zuhûr itmedi*); that is to say did not achieve the desired result. He also wrote that he had been unable to send the Sultan the tent (*çadır*) that the latter ordered. Thus, through Mehmed Ağa Kyrillos sent back 100 *guruş* given to him by the Sultan. Finally, he requested that he be forgiven for being unable to send the tent. Therefore, from this document we learn that from a very early time onwards, Kyrillos endeavoured to keep good ties with the central administration, which may be reflective of Athanasios’ potential threat against Kyrillos’s patriarchate. As can be seen in the following sequence of documents, Athanasios indeed posed a danger against him.

The relevant document,³³⁰ a *rûznâmçe sûreti* issued three years later, contains the registration of the *pişkeş* of the Patriarchate of Antioch. This document explicitly states that the Patriarchate of Antioch was transferred to Athanasios from Kyrillos, the former Patriarch of Antioch. We also learn from this document that the amount of *pişkeş* he paid was the same as the previous one (*pişkeş-i kadîm*). Thus, the pressure of Athanasios on Kyrillos must have come to fruition in his appointment as the Patriarch in three years. This

³²⁹ BOA.D.PSK.1/19 [25 May-25 June 1683].

³³⁰ BOA.D.PSK.1/27 [25 April 1686].

change, however, seems to have been far from putting an end to the struggle between Kyrillos and Athanasios, as can be understood from another document.

The document in question,³³¹ written only a month later, shows the degree of confusion in political and economic terms. According to this petition written by Kyrillos who presents himself as ‘the former Patriarch of Antioch’ (*Patrik-i Antakya sâbikan*), he had been at a loss because the Greek Orthodox flock and the clergy of Erzurum and Ahışha in Eastern Anatolia had not presented the *patriklik rüsûmı* owing since the year 1093 Hegira, i.e. 1682 (*Erzurum ve Ahışha keferelerinin ve papaslarının bin doksan üç senesinden berü üzerlerine edâsı lâzım gelen patriklik rüsûmın edâ eylememeleri ile bu kullarına gadır olmağın*).³³² Therefore, he requested that if the said tax was already collected, it be debited to the accounts of those who had collected it, which probably refers to the deputies of Athanasios. If not, he asked that he be authorised to do so in accordance with the custom and law (*âdet ve kânûn üzere*). The order written on the margin of the document merely says ‘order in accordance with law’ (*Kânûn üzere hükm*). This document shows that although Athanasios managed to get the patriarchal throne, Kyrillos still had unfinished business with regard to the Patriarchate and this was clearly reflected in the correspondence with the Ottoman central administration, as can also be seen in a further sequence of documents.

One of these documents³³³ reveals that Kirillos had already been the patriarch as early as 5 November 1691 because on this date the *berat* of Kyrillos was renewed by Sultan Ahmed II, following his ascension to the Ottoman throne. Not only does the document ignore the name of Athanasios, but it clearly points that prior to his petition,

³³¹ BOA.D.PSK.1/28 [21 May 1686].

³³² Ahışha is modern day Akhaltsihe in Georgia.

³³³ BOA.D.PSK.1/120 [5 November 1691].

Kyrillos had been the Patriarch of Antioch with an imperial *berat* (*bundan akdem berât-ı 'âlîşân ile*). Despite the chronological difference, and the lack of reference to the Patriarch of Constantinople from the arguments of Haddad, this document confirms that Kyrillos took a *berat* of investiture. It is unlikely that he was referred to as the Patriarch beforehand on account of his tenure of the patriarchate before Athanasios who was appointed in 1686 because it is clearly stated in the document that after paying the necessary *pişkeş* of 10,000 *akçes* Kirillos had the *berat* he brought with him renewed (*berâtın getirüb on bin akçe mîrî pişkeşin teslim-i hazîne idüb hâliyâ tecdîd-i berât eylemişdir*). Therefore, at least from the official perspective of the Ottoman central administration, Kirillos had recovered his office from Athanasios and resumed his patriarchate before 1691. What is clear overall is that both Athanasios and Kyrillos were quite active in seeking legitimisation from the Ottoman sultan, in which correspondence there is no reference to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, in contrast to what has been suggested in the secondary literature.

A petition by Athanasios written in 2 June 1693³³⁴ raises some other questions. In this document, we see that Athanasios complained about Kyrillos whom he calls 'the previous Patriarch Kyrillos' (*sâbıkan patrik olan Kirilos*). Athanasios supports his argument by saying that although the office of patriarch still belongs to him, and the flock is content with him, the previous Patriarch of Antioch called Kirillos causes disturbance by sending administrative officials against him and making up gossip that the patriarchate does not belong to him and that he holds it in contradiction to the imperial order of appointment (*kâh patriklik üzerinde değildir ve kâh hilâf-ı berât ile zabt ider diyü*). On account of these causes and on the condition that he is to pay the necessary *pişkeş*, Athanasios asks for a *berat* of investiture showing that he holds the patriarchate. On the

³³⁴ BOA.D.PSK.1/143 (2 June 1693).

margin of the same document we see the order that he is to be given a *berat* ‘as the patriarchate belongs to him’ (*patriklik üzerinde olmağla*).

Before taking for granted Athanasios’ patriarchate prior to the issuing of this document, the suggestion that he may have been anti-patriarch at that time must be raised. Despite introducing himself as the Patriarch of Antioch, and referring to Kyrillos as the previous Patriarch of Antioch in the body of the document, Athanasios’ signature reads Athanasios, the clergyman (*râhib*). This may possibly be suggesting that Athanasios was anti-patriarch because in the normal use, if a patriarch was petitioning the Porte, they would mention their post in the signature. Therefore, although all the hierarchs were *râhibs* in the end, Athanasios’ hesitation to sign as the Patriarch of Antioch might be quite telling here. In this case, it would appear that although Kyrillos had been the patriarch prior to this petition, Athanasios became the Patriarch of Antioch by the time it was issued, *i.e.* 2 June 1693.

Among the documents from the period of Kyrillos, there is one regarding the appointment of a metropolitan. According to this document,³³⁵ dating to 2 August 1713, the metropolitan of Erzurum had died and Kyrillos wanted a confirmation of the new metropolitan from the central administration. Therefore, the Ottoman administration accepted the appointment of the new metropolitan on the condition that he pay the customary *pişkeş* (*pişkeş-i kadîm*) of 2,400 *akçes*.

Another document³³⁶ also gives us clues about a change in a metropolitan seat at the time of Kyrillos. In this case, Paisios the metropolitan of Çıldır, Ahışa and its dependencies had died, and Kyrillos wanted to appoint in his place Kallinikos on the condition that the latter paid the customary *pişkeş* (*pişkeş-i kadîm*) of 1,200 *akçes*.

³³⁵ BOA.D.PSK.4/139 [2 August 1713].

³³⁶ BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 48b [1717-18].

The final document that gives us a very good impression of a change of hands in the Patriarchate of Antioch is the *berat* of Athanasios³³⁷ dated 18 January 1720. Athanasios' *berat*³³⁸ gives a short account of Athanasios' period as anti-Patriarch against Kyrillos to whom he had left the throne by his own volition (*hüsn-i ihtiyâriyle*). Following Kyrillos's death, the *iş erleri*, persons with experience in that line of work, those competent to judge the suitability of an appointee, resident in Damascus, went to Evliyâzâde Ali Efendi, the *kadi* of Damascus, and said that they chose Athanasios as their patriarch. Thus they asked the *kadi* to inform the State that he would be patriarch over those infidels residing in Damascus (*Şâm-ı Şerîf'de mutavattın olan kefereye patrik olunmasın Der-i Devlet-medâra i'lâm idivir diyü*) and asked for a *berat* for him. Accordingly, Athanasios was given a *berat* on 17 February 1720. Athanasios' rights can be grouped under the following categories:

1. He is to be regarded as the Patriarch by both old and young of his community (*tâ'ife-i mezbûrenin ulusu ve keçisi*) in the lands under his patriarchate, namely Antioch, Aleppo, Adana, Çıldır, Ahışa, Erzurum and their dependencies in accordance with the established custom, law, and their rites,
2. The Patriarch is not to be interfered with from the outside (*âherden*) when he attempts to obtain the possessions of the dead priests, monks, and *kaligorias*, and whatever these priests bequeath for the poor of their churches are to be dealt with by the *kadi* through the testimony of Orthodox witnesses,
3. The Patriarch is not to be interfered with in matters of family law,
4. The Patriarch is to hold vineyards, gardens, farms, mills, and the similar items which are the endowment of a church, and the sheep (*kilisalarına müte'allik bağ ve bağçe ve çiftlik ve değirman ve sâ'ir bunun emsâli kenîseye vakf olan eşyâ ve davarlarına*) in the way his predecessors had done.

These four points constitute the four fundamental points of all the patriarchal *berats*. Two notable points in this particular *berat* is the lack of any reference to the *pişkeş* and the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. As will be shown in greater detail, the Patriarchs of

³³⁷ BOA.D.PSK.7/6 (17 February 1720). See Appendix III and IV for the facsimile and transliteration of Athanasios' *berat*.

³³⁸ BOA.D.PSK.7/6 (17 February 1720).

Antioch, and the other Eastern Patriarchs will gain much more extensive rights in their later *berats*.

To sum up, we may state a couple of conclusions. First, the parallelism in the policies of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman administration did not always necessarily apply at that time. As seen, Ottoman administration not only supported the candidacy of Athanasios, who was opposed by the Patriarch in Istanbul, but also Athanasios himself did not need any intermediary to reach the central administration other than the *kadi* of Damascus. Next, in the case of Kyrillos, who is repeatedly said to have been supported by the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the secondary literature, we do not see any mention of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs, at least in these particular Ottoman documents. As we will further mention in the next chapter, from the early 18th century onwards, the support of the patriarchs of Constantinople for candidates for the Eastern patriarchates would be clearly mentioned in the Ottoman documents.

Competition for Alexandrian throne between Samouil and Kosmas

The best example reflecting the authority of the Patriarchate of Alexandria in the early 18th century is the conflict over the patriarchal succession between Kosmas and Samouil, the former being elected locally, and the latter being supported by the Patriarchate of Constantinople. When he was ill and of an advanced age, Gerasimos of Alexandria (1688-1710) gave up the patriarchal throne in favour of Samouil on 22 January 1710³³⁹ but the latter faced the problem of a parallel appointment of Kosmas by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

³³⁹ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1885: 507.

We have three incidents when the conflict came to the fore. We understand the first one from a document dating to 25 December 1711.³⁴⁰ According to this order, the former ‘patriarch’, i.e. archbishop of Mount Sinai, called Kosmas petitioned the Porte saying that although the Patriarchate of Alexandria was given to him with a *berat*, Samouil who had been fired from the Patriarchate (*ref‘ olunan Samuil nâm râhib*) provoked (*tahrîk*) the people. In spite of his efforts to become patriarch through his financial power (*kuvvet-i mâliyyesi sebebiyle*), these had been neglected and he was prevented from assuming the patriarchate (*istimâ‘ olunmayub men‘ olunmuşken*) was ordered to go back to his monastery in Algeria.³⁴¹ Kosmas continued in his petition that not only did Samouil not obey the imperial order by not going back to the monastery he belonged to, but also he did not allow Kosmas to take up his patriarchate (*patrikliği dahî bana zabt itdirmeyüb*). Therefore, Kosmas asked for a separate order (*müceddeden emr-i şerîf-i ‘âlîşânım virilmek bâbında*) to have Samouil transferred to the said monastery. Thus summarising Kosmas’ arguments, the document provides the historical setting of the Patriarchate of Alexandria that led to this petition. The document clearly mentions that the Patriarchate of Alexandria is not under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and neither the Patriarchate of Constantinople nor that of Alexandria is to interfere with each other (*Mısır ve İskenderiye Patrikliği İstanbul Patrikliğinin iltizâmında olmayub İstanbul Patrikleri Mısıra ve Mısır Patrikleri İstanbula karışmayub başka patriklik iken*). Despite this, the document reads, when the Patriarch of Alexandria Gerasimos was old and ill, the Patriarch of Constantinople Athanasios sent an *arz* to the Porte saying that Gerasimos left the Patriarchate to Samouil, and thus Samouil was given a *berat*. However, because of

³⁴⁰ BOA.D.PSK.4/84 [25 December 1711].

³⁴¹ This reference to *cezâyir* should probably mean Libya (which was mistaken for Algeria) where Samouil had been metropolitan or less probably Chios in Cezâyir-i Bahr-i Sefid, from where Samouil originates. Papadopoulos 1912: 10-13, and 2.

Samouil's transgressions (*gadr itmekle*) the patriarchate was transferred to Kosmas on 2 October 1710 and he was given a *berat* accordingly. When Kosmas appeared to be the Patriarch of Alexandria in the patriarchal registers in the imperial chancellery, the central administration sent an order in support of him requiring Samouil to go back to the monastery where he had been until then. Finally, the recipients of the order were asked not to postpone the resolution of this particular issue.

As can be easily understood, this document reflects the issue from the viewpoint of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Therefore, the Patriarchate of Samouil is reflected only as a temporary event, which was soon changed by the appointment of Kosmas. However, as can be seen in the way Kosmas presented his case, Samouil was quite a challenge to the latter's patriarchate not allowing him to take up the Patriarchal throne. As will be shown further on, Samouil succeeded in overthrowing Kosmas and in a couple of years, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, Kyprianos, would accept Samouil as the Patriarch of Alexandria. As far as the standpoint of the Ottoman central administration is concerned, we see that despite supporting the candidacy of Kosmas who was supported by the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Ottoman administration explicitly mentions that the two patriarchates are separate from each other.

The confusion on the patriarchal throne can also be seen from the following document which was issued after more than two months.³⁴² With reference to the previous document which was issued on 25 December 1711, this second document merely repeats the content of the previous one and notes that Kosmas paid the necessary *pişkeş*. Here there may be two possibilities, either a decision was made and the order was retained but it was despatched only after two months, a long time span for the issuing of a document after a

³⁴² BOA.D.PSK.4/86 [1 March 1712].

decision was made and copied, or Kosmas' difficulties to take the Patriarchal throne continued and he needed to get a second order requiring Samouil to go back to the monastery to which he belonged. In any case, the competition between Samouil and Kosmas continued despite the central administration's support for the latter.

The final document³⁴³ about the patriarchal struggle between Samouil and Kosmas provides us with much information as to what happened from the time of the previous petition. The document in question is a petition written by Kosmas, and it contains a number of notes on the margins written by different officials of the imperial chancery. It appears from the document that the confusion over the Patriarchal throne continued until 17 January-15 February 1714 (during Muharrem of 1126) during which interval Kosmas gave up the patriarchal throne through his own will (*hüsn ihtiyâriyle*) and the new Patriarch of Constantinople Kyprianos accepted Samouil's patriarchate. What makes the document extremely important is that in his petition Kosmas openly explains why he gave up the patriarchal throne of Alexandria. His first reason appears to be his old age which put a hurdle to his struggle. As far as his incentives are concerned, though, we see that Kosmas had struck a deal with the new patriarch of Constantinople and the metropolitans. According to this deal, Kosmas writes in his petition, the then Patriarch of Constantinople Kyprianos and the metropolitans offered to pay him a thousand *guruş* a year and to give him the first vacant metropolitanate, which they agreed upon and signed. Therefore he consented to give up the Patriarchal throne of Alexandria (*rızâm ile Mısır Patrikliğimi ferâgat idüb*). And so, when there happened a vacancy in the metropolitanate of Ereğlü he demanded to be appointed there but they did not accept him because he did not agree to give them the *rüsûmât* which they required him to pay. Therefore, he petitioned the Porte

³⁴³ BOA.D.PSK.4/156 [13 March 1714].

asking to be appointed as the Patriarch of Constantinople, which he eventually obtained. It would appear that he would retain the Patriarchate of Constantinople for two years and then remain in Sinai until 1723,³⁴⁴ when Samouil of Alexandria died and Kosmas became the Patriarch of Alexandria, a post he held until 1736.

A number of conclusions appear from the patriarchal struggle between Samouil and Kosmas. We see in this incident that the Patriarchs of Constantinople began in this period to interfere in the patriarchal elections of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. This, however, should not be regarded as an attempt of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to dominate that of Alexandria. It was actually the patriarchal throne of Constantinople itself that constituted the major field of a patriarchal struggle between Athanasios and Kosmas. It was after Kosmas was appointed to the Patriarchate of Alexandria that he gave up the Constantinopolitan throne. After his tenure as the Patriarch of Constantinople, it was no surprise that he became the Patriarch of Alexandria. Thus, instead of a clash between the two patriarchates, the struggle between Samouil and Kosmas should primarily be regarded in the context of Kosmas' struggle against Athanasios first and Kyprianos later. As seen in this incident, Samouil was able to withstand the encroachments of Kosmas, despite the fact that the latter was also backed by the Ottoman central administration. Another point that must be underlined is that although the Ottoman central administration supported Kosmas' patriarchate, in all the documents written with regard to this issue we see that notice was made that the Patriarchate of Alexandria is not under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and a distinction was made between the two Patriarchates.

³⁴⁴ Papadopoulos 1905: 898-899.

Other correspondence between the Patriarchate of Alexandria and the central administration

From the late-17th century, we have two major documents which shed light on the legal and economic aspects of the relations between the Patriarchate of Alexandria and the Ottoman central administration. The first document,³⁴⁵ dating to the beginning of the tenure of Gerasimos (1688-1710), is a petition by Gerasimos regarding the debts of the previous patriarch Parthenios. Gerasimos clearly mentions in his petition that before his death his predecessor had debts, which he referred to as *mahsûlât* and *rûsûmât*. Therefore Gerasimos agreed to pay these debts, and wanted to be authorised to collect them (*bu kullarına tahsîl itdürilmek bâbında*). On the margin of the document we see that the sultan ordered the affair to be handled through the sharia (*ma'rifet-i şer'ile*).

The second document³⁴⁶ was also in the form of a petition by the same Gerasimos, issued a day after the first one. According to this document, during the time of Gerasimos' predecessor, some alms (*tasaddukât*) had been collected 'for the maintenance of the clergymen residing in the monasteries under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Alexandria' (*İskenderiye Patrikliğine dâhil manastırlarda sâkin ruhân tâ'ifesinin kefâfları için*). However, this money ended up in the house of two *zimmis* in İzmir. Therefore, Gerasimos wanted the said money to be taken from them through sharia procedures (*ma'rifet-i şer'ile*). As was the case with the first incident above, it was written on the margin of the document that the issue was to be handled in accordance with the sharia. Before drawing conclusions, though, one point needs more clarification. How did the alms collected for the maintenance of the monks of the Patriarchate of Alexandria end up in the house of these two *zimmis* in İzmir, which of course was far from the boundaries

³⁴⁵ BOA.D.PSK.1/102 [16 December 1688].

³⁴⁶ BOA.D.PSK.1/103 [17 December 1688].

of this patriarchate? Was it actually these two people who collected the alms on behalf of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, or were they taking care of the money? If so, why did it become necessary for the patriarch to petition the Porte to have the issue handled through the sharia? In any case, it seems likely that the patriarchate did not have the necessary means to conduct the flow of alms possibly from outside its jurisdiction to its monks, as was the case in the 18th century, which we will analyse in detail in the final chapter. Instead of relying on the infrastructure of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which one would easily expect depending on the assumption that the Eastern Patriarchs were subordinate to their brother of Constantinople during the Ottoman period, they made use of lay people. In case they were in trouble in controlling their affairs, they turned to the Ottoman central administration, and not the Patriarchate of Constantinople. As can be seen in both documents, we cannot see any mention and thus mediation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the conduct of the relations between the Patriarchate of Alexandria and the Ottoman central administration.

Overall, we may conclude on the available evidence from the late 17th century that the authority of the Patriarchate of Alexandria did not require the intervention of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. As seen in these two cases, Gerasimos of Alexandria wrote directly to the Porte and asked his cases to be handled in accordance with the sharia. This should be related to the nature of the cases. The first case directly involved the Ottoman central administration and thus Gerasimos got in contact with it. In the second one, he appealed to the central administration probably because he thought he would reach a much quicker and firmer result that way. However, the absence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in both documents suggests that the Patriarchate of Constantinople had no intermediary role before the Ottoman central administration. Such lack of the role of the

Patriarchate of Constantinople in the affairs of Alexandria is clearly visible in Gerasimos' *berat*, published in Greek rendering,³⁴⁷ which includes the following points:

1. Gerasimos is to be the patriarch over the Orthodox of Rayth, Dimyat, [Sovis], Tarsus, Trablusgarb, Tur-i Sina and their dependencies, is to be regarded as patriarch by the old and young of the Orthodox community,
2. The patriarch is to be responsible for the deposition and appointment of bishops, priests and nuns,
3. None of the officials are to have the right to interfere when the patriarch wants to obtain the inheritance of those priests and monks who belong to his patriarchate. If again a priest, monk or another infidel dies and leaves a covenant to someone, or to the poor of his church, this covenant is to be dealt with the help of Rum witnesses,
4. If the patriarch wants to judge a priest or a monk none is to have the right to interfere,
5. Without the authority of the patriarch no priest are to conduct an unlawful marriage, and if someone wants to marry a divorced woman, the only person to permit the marriage is the patriarch,
6. No person is to interfere during the collection of annual taxes from the infidels by a priest on behalf of the patriarch,
7. The patriarch is to hold the vineyards, gardens, farmland, monasteries, mills and other things, and movable *vakf* properties which are located inside them and belong to churches,

A comparison of this *berat* issued in 1704 on the basis of his original *berat* of 1688 with that of Athanasios ed-Dabbâs issued in 1720 shows that there are three different points in Gerasimos' *berat*. Two of these points, number 2 and 4, deal with the disciplinary matters of the clergy and one other, number 6, refers to the annual taxes, which the patriarch collects from the Orthodox under his jurisdiction. In this *berat*, *as well*, there is no mention of the mediation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

³⁴⁷ Chatzoglou-Mpalta 2006: 452-454. A transliteration of this *berat* into Latin script appears in Appendix I.

Patriarchate of Jerusalem

The Patriarchate of Jerusalem constitutes a completely different picture from the other two patriarchates due mainly to its already important status for the whole Orthodox world both inside and outside the Ottoman Empire. As mentioned, one of the most significant features of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in determining its role *vis-à-vis* the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Ottoman central administration was its surveillance over the Holy Sepulchre and the other major Christian possessions in the Holy Land.

The role of the surveillance of the Holy Sites by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem played a major role in this patriarchate's ability to negotiate with the Ottoman administration, which constituted the background to the transformation of the Eastern Patriarchates in the 18th century. An Ottoman order,³⁴⁸ issued in 1706, the late years of the tenure of Dositheos, presents a useful case in the role of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the resolution of a Catholic-Orthodox encounter in the Holy Land through the Ottoman administration. According to this document, the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos and the monks residing in the monasteries of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem sent a petition to the Porte. In this petition, they wrote that the Jerusalemite Patriarch had been awarded an *'ahd-nâme* by the conquering Caliph, Umar. They also wrote that the following rulers of Jerusalem kept confirming the rights given to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem over the Holy Sepulchre and the other major Christian possessions. referring to the Crusades, the letter continued that when the Franks took Jerusalem by force they seized the Holy Sepulchre forcefully (*Efrenc tâ'ifesi tagallüben Kuds-i Şerîfi aldıkda tagallüb tarîkiyle zabt idüb*) and when Saladin conquered Jerusalem, he restored these holy places to the Greek Orthodox. When the Ottoman Sultan Selim conquered Jerusalem, because these places were in their

³⁴⁸ BOA.D.PSK.1/167 [24 January 1706].

jurisdiction and use (*tasarrufi yedlerinde bulunub*) and they were the *ehl-i zimmet re'âyâ*, he gave them an *'ahd-nâme* for them to retain, possess, and use (*ibkâ, zabt ve tasarruf için*) these places in accordance with the documents from the previous sultans which they presented to the Ottoman Sultan. Therefore, the document continued, whenever there occurred a change on the Ottoman throne the Greek Orthodox of Jerusalem had their rights re-confirmed. However at the time of the Köprülü viziers, the Catholics managed somehow (*bir tarikle*) to get an order to repair the great gate of the Holy Sepulchre but they began not to allow the other Christian communities to use it. Therefore, the said petitioners asked that it be fixed through the consent and cooperation of Greek Orthodox, Armenian, Catholic, and other Christian communities (*Rum ve Ermeni ve Efrenc ve sâ'ir milel-i nasârânın rızası ve ma'rifetiyle ma'an*). The order despatched to the *kadi* of Jerusalem on account of this petition clearly says that he must involve all the Christian communities in this process. As seen, the ability of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in dispute resolution through the Ottoman authority proved successful this time.

A very interesting document dating to 25 March 1700,³⁴⁹ gives us some clues about the correspondence between the Ottoman central administration and the lower echelons of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem as well. According to this document, those monks residing in the monasteries in Jerusalem (*Kuds-i Şerîfde vâki' deyrde sâkin ruhbân tâ'ifesi*) presented a petition to the central administration that although they do not pursue a disruption (*ihtilâl*), or profit (*kâr u kesb*), when they circulate in public outside of their monasteries, the *cizye* collectors harass them as if they want to collect *cizye* in contravention of the sharia. Therefore, the monks in question asked for preventing such harassment by the *cizye* collectors. Thus, the present order was dispatched to the *kadi* of Jerusalem. The *kadi* was

³⁴⁹ BOA.D.PSK.1/182 [25 March 1700].

asked to inspect whether the monks are ‘monastery-residing’ (*deyr-nişîn*) and whether they cause disruption or trade with anyone (*kimesne ile ihtilâl ve ticâret*) when they go out for inspection. If what the monks say is proven to be true, the *kadi* was ordered to prevent the *cizye* collectors from harassing the said monks in accordance with the requirements of the old imperial order and the *fetvâs* in their hand (*muktezây-ı emr-i şer‘-i kadîm ve yedlerinde olan fetâvây-ı şerîfe mûcebince*). This document shows that the lower echelons of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem also had direct correspondence with the Ottoman central administration without reference to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, let alone that of Constantinople.

A notable patriarchal appointment for the throne of Jerusalem, which can be documented by both Ottoman and Greek sources is that of Chrysanthos Notaras (1707-1731). Concerning this appointment, we have two major documents, one in Ottoman archives written in response to the petition by Chrysanthos following the death of the Jerusalemite Patriarch Dositheos (1669-1707), and the other is the Greek translation of Chrysanthos’ *berat* of investiture as the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The first document³⁵⁰ reads that following the death of Dositheos, the metropolitan of Caesarea Chrysanthos wrote a petition to the Porte asking for a *berat* of investiture to be the next Patriarch of Jerusalem on the condition that he pay the *pişkeş* of 9,900 *akçes*. Therefore it was decided that he would be given a *berat*. His *berat* of investiture, which is available only in Greek translation,³⁵¹ states the following points among his rights:

1. He is to be patriarch in Jerusalem, Mount Sinai, Gaza, Ramla, and over the Georgians, Ethiopians, and Assyrians.

³⁵⁰ BOA.D.PSK.4/18 [1706]

³⁵¹ Gedeon 1910: 15-18. Although there are two editions for the Greek translation for his *berat*, neither of them provides the original and we are left to rely on these translations in terms of the content of the *berat*. The second translation, which is an exact replica of Gedeon 1910: 15-18, says that this translation is registered in the codex number 428 of the patriarchal library of Jerusalem. Papadopoulos 1900: 93-95, n. 3. A transliteration of this *berat* appears in Appendix II.

2. All the churches and monasteries are to be under the authority of the Patriarch without interference.
3. If he wants to expel or ‘teach’ any of the metropolitans, priests, monks, or nuns no one shall resist.
4. The Patriarch is not to be harassed either by *kassâm* or *beytü’l-mâlci*, when he or his deputies wants to obtain the inheritance of the dead clergymen.
5. With regard to marital issues, the priests are not to marry or divorce the Orthodox in contravention of law.
6. If a clergyman makes a covenant and devotes his inheritance to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, this covenant is to be dealt with the testimony of Rum witnesses.
7. If one of his metropolitans or bishops dies or is dismissed, his successor is to be appointed by the Patriarch himself, and is not to be interfered with.
8. The Greek Orthodox community is to be the first community in Jerusalem vis-à-vis the Armenians and any other communities are to be regarded thus up and down the city, the rooms and other places of pilgrimage of Virgin and Jesus, in the birthplace of Jesus, and in the Eastern and Western doors and other places of pilgrimage.
9. The patriarch is to hold the vineyards, gardens, animals, and other similar dedications to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and is not to be harassed by anyone.

Chrysanthos’ *berat* involves both the basic points which were in Athanasios’ *berat* and the two additional points in Gerasimos’ *berat* about the disciplinary matters and appointment of the clergymen and collection of their inheritance. In difference, Chrysanthos’ *berat* also involves a point, number 8, about the Greek Orthodox rights in the Holy Sites vis-à-vis the other Christian communities, notably the Armenians. The first point about the subjection of the Georgians, Ethiopians and Assyrians in the Holy Land to the authority of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate can also be regarded in this context because these communities had been under the authority of the Armenian Patriarchate.

Conclusion

During the first two centuries following the fall of Constantinople and Syria and Egypt to the Ottomans, the Eastern Patriarchates entered a new phase as far as the power networks they used are concerned. No more in the centre of the empire of their Mamluk overlords which brought about their quick relation to the positive and negative developments and no more under the imperial and ecclesiastical influence of Constantinople—which had both positive and negative connotations—the Eastern Patriarchates were to accommodate to the new setting. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem had already proved successful in gaining Ottoman recognition for their rights over the holy sites. In many cases, the Eastern Patriarchates appealed to the Patriarchate of Constantinople as well, although the times when both parties were at odds were not infrequent. The Eastern Patriarchates also benefited from the offers of the Ottoman provincial administrative and legal bodies in a wide stream of issues ranging from their financial disputes with local population to the struggles for the patriarchal thrones. Other local factors outside the effective control of the Ottoman administration, too, constituted a factor in the power networks of the Eastern Patriarchates. In the absence of a constant political supporter, Eastern Patriarchs often appealed to the foreign courts, either writing directly to or visiting in person, these courts, or through the foreign diplomats working in the Ottoman Syria and Egypt. As will be explained in the coming chapters, from the first quarter of the 18th century onwards, this set of relations will largely be replaced by a different one which I term centralisation in Istanbul. The first stages of the encroachments of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates before the introduction of this centralisation mostly resulted in failure. Even in those which resulted in the success of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Ottoman central administration

made a visible effort to make it clear that such cases of encroachment were not meant to bring about an institutional change to the relations within the Orthodox church mechanism subordinating the Eastern Patriarchates to the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

CHAPTER 2. COMING OF THE 18TH CENTURY: CENTRALISATION IN AN AGE OF DECENTRALISATION

It is often argued that in administrative terms, 18th-century Ottoman history was an archetypical age of decentralisation. According to this theory, from the 17th century onwards, in spite of the measures taken by the central administration to curb them, the provincial elites, known as *a'yân*, undertook a leading role in provincial administration by virtue of having maintained the mercenaries (*sekbân* and *sarıca*) or vagrant *re'âyâ* (*levend*) troops as part of their entourages.³⁵² Thus, by the late 17th and early 18th century, we see the rise of such important provincial magnates as the 'Azm family in Syria, and the Shihab family in Lebanon. Until recent decades when state centralism was regarded as a hallmark of political development, it had been accepted that the emergence of such provincial power-holders paved the way for proto-nationalist movements in the provinces.³⁵³ For the past few decades, however, this theory has been challenged by a number of Ottomanists³⁵⁴ who put forward the idea that because these provincial magnates' position was dependent on their share in the Ottoman financial endeavour, they were not interested in breaking away from the Ottoman Empire. In addition, the argument that the Ottoman central administration was merely a passive acceptor of decentralisation has also been disputed on the ground that by not taking punitive measures against the provincial authorities to centralise them, the central administration saved its subjects from suffering in such conflicts, which would result in a decay in provincial production, and taxation.³⁵⁵

It would be impossible to analyse the position of the Eastern Patriarchates *vis-à-vis* the Ottoman administration and the Great Church without taking into account the dynamics

³⁵² İnalcık 1977: 27.

³⁵³ Faroqhi treats this issue in comparison with the evaluation of centralism and decentralism in political science and history. Faroqhi 1999: 214.

³⁵⁴ For a discussion of historiography on the position of the Ottoman central administration *vis-à-vis* the provincial power-holders, see Khouri 2006: 135-157.

³⁵⁵ Faroqhi 1999: 214-215.

of decentralisation in the Ottoman Empire. So, regarding the state of the Greek Orthodox hierarchy in the 18th century, could we say that the Great Church was also falling apart because of the wider decentralisation that the Ottoman administration was experiencing? What was the response of the central administration to this if that was the case? Was it also a mere passive receiver of this phenomenon? And finally, were the Eastern Patriarchates subject to such decentralisation vis-à-vis the provincial elites in the Middle East?

In order to answer these questions, one has to examine two major developments that changed the course of events not only for the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but also for the whole Greek Orthodox hierarchy and community in the Ottoman Empire, namely the increase of Catholic propaganda among Ottoman Christians, and the rise of the lay elites of the Greek Orthodox community in Ottoman Istanbul. As we will see in the first part of this chapter, Catholic missionaries in the Ottoman Levant had extensive access to provincial authorities through either direct or indirect support of their patrons in Istanbul, namely the ambassadors, or through other minor authorities in the provinces, namely the consuls. Around the same time when the effects of this Catholic propaganda among the Ottoman Christians in general, and the Greek Orthodox in particular, became apparent, we observe that the role of the non-Muslim lay elites in Istanbul witnessed a rapid increase. It is during that time, for example, that the Armenian lay elites, known as the *amira* class, had an unprecedented power in controlling the Armenian Patriarchate, in building schools, and finally in creating cultural societies through their wealth and influence in the Ottoman government.³⁵⁶ As a recent study has shown, the Coptic community in Ottoman Egypt also went through such an economic-cum-political flowering around the 18th century through their elites known as *archons*, who attained posts in the households of regimental

³⁵⁶ Barsoumian 1982: 177-178.

officers.³⁵⁷ Cooperation between the top rulers of Ottoman Egypt and many Coptic *archons* such as Rizq and Jawhari brothers was further facilitated by the Copts' isolation from European dignitaries keen to patronise Ottoman Christians.³⁵⁸ The eventual outcome was an increase in the role of the *archons* in the politics of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate which led to either 'collaborative, congenial, and productive' or 'competitive or downright hostile'³⁵⁹ relations between the higher clergy and *archons*. In remote places of the empire, such as in Epiros and Albania,³⁶⁰ and Lebanon,³⁶¹ the Greek Orthodox Church was becoming more centralised in terms of controlling the monastic incomes. As will be shown in the second part of this chapter, Phanariots, the Greek Orthodox lay elites based in Istanbul, experienced a similar transformation, as well. In the end, they were able to take control of the Great Church and it can easily be said that the Phanariots experienced a golden age in terms of its co-operation with the Ottoman central administration. As the Catholic Propaganda aimed at appointing pro-Catholic or Catholic hierarchs on archiepiscopal or patriarchal thrones in the Ottoman Levant, which also played a role in the policy-making of the Eastern Patriarchs vis-à-vis Rome, in order to attain the Church Union, Eastern Patriarchates were a matter of direct interest and concern for the Great Church as well.³⁶² The result was that the Eastern Patriarchates became more and more centralised within and more closely dependent on the Great Church and the Ottoman central administration in both the negative and positive sense of the word. As will be shown in the third part of this chapter, while the Eastern Patriarchs began to come from

³⁵⁷ Armanios 2011: 29.

³⁵⁸ Armanios 2011: 31.

³⁵⁹ Armanios 2011: 34.

³⁶⁰ Giakoumis 2002: 357.

³⁶¹ Slim 2001: 73-74. The Maronite church *vakfs* were also thriving in Lebanon around that time. Van Leeuwen 1994: 174.

³⁶² Haddad analyses this Catholic-Orthodox rivalry over the thrones of the Eastern Patriarchates through his study of the tenure of Kyrillos el-Za'im. Haddad 1982: 67-90.

similar backgrounds and became more and more homogenous, they also began to benefit from the offers of the central state administration and became closer to it than ever before, sometimes even at the expense of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. This part of the chapter also attempts to reveal the role of the Ottoman administration in the rapprochement between the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates in the Ottoman Empire, in such an age of decentralisation.

Catholic Infiltration in the Ottoman Levant

Origins and Development

The origins of structural Catholic missionary activities among the Ottoman non-Muslims date back to the Council of Trent (1542-64), where, among other measures to compensate the losses of Catholic Christendom to Protestantism, the Papacy aimed to start missionary activities in the Far East. In addition, the Christians in the Middle East were also to be persuaded to recognise the primacy of Rome. For that purpose, a Greek college was founded in 1577 to educate Latin priests conversant in Greek, and other similar colleges followed it. By 1622, all the missions had been gathered within a single body known as *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*, the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.³⁶³ Orders particularly active in the Ottoman Levant were Jesuits, who arrived at Aleppo in 1625 and soon had other missions in Damascus, Saida, and Tripoli, Capuchins who arrived in Aleppo in 1625, too, and then moved to Saida (1625), Beirut, Tripoli (1634), Damascus (1637), and Abbay (1645), Carmelites, who established a house in Aleppo in 1627, and spread to the places where Capuchins were also active. In addition, Franciscans had already been established in the Holy Land for nearly three

³⁶³ For an account of the foundation of the Propaganda Fide during the tenure of Gregory XV and its missions, see Frazee 1983: 88-92. On Pope Gregory XV, and the influence of the Jesuits on him, see Kelly 1989: 278-280.

centuries, not for missionary activity but for the protection of Christian Holy Sites.³⁶⁴ Until the persecution of the order by the parliament of Paris during the 1760s,³⁶⁵ and specially after receiving a *ferman* from the Ottoman central administration in support of Latin missionaries in such years as 1665³⁶⁶ and 1689,³⁶⁷ the Jesuit missionaries conducted their activities without much problem.

These missionary orders often operated under the patronage of a European ambassador. Despite the Habsburg enthusiasm to patronise these missionaries, because of their enduring wars with the Ottomans, it was their arch-rival and the Ottomans' arch-ally in Europe, i.e. the French king, who appeared as the sole patron of the Catholic missions in the Ottoman lands. With the initiative of the King Louis XIV, in 1669 schools known as '*écoles des jeunes des langues*' teaching the oriental languages were founded to educate administrators and missionaries conversant in these languages.³⁶⁸ According to this model, twin schools were to educate students in Pera and İzmir, the latter of which was soon abolished. In 1698, the French *Chargé d'affaires* Fabre notes the following observation about these schools: 'No nation had a worse service to their state in dragomans than the French. Despite the rule which admitted no students older than nine or ten, there were students between 11 and 20 and even higher. No Arabic was taught while the Capuchins offered small amounts of French, Latin, modern Greek, Italian and Turkish in which students were barely competent.'³⁶⁹ In 1692, Jesuits received permission to set up a school in France with students from the Orient, who, after converting to Catholicism and receiving their education in France, would return to their home countries to help the

³⁶⁴ Raheb 1970: 49-50, Heyberger 2005: 632-633.

³⁶⁵ For a thorough analysis of the period of persecution of the Jesuit order, see Thompson 1984: 289-301.

³⁶⁶ The *ferman* has been published with French translation in Rabbath 1905, vol. I: 503-505.

³⁶⁷ For the French translation of this *ferman* see Rabbath 1905, vol. I: 122-125.

³⁶⁸ For a general introduction to these schools, see Testa and Gautier 2003: 41-91. For a reference to these schools see Rabbath 1910: vol. II: 557 [Letter from father Besnier to the minister, Istanbul, 17 April, 1705].

³⁶⁹ Kimpton 2006: 73-74.

Jesuits, and in 1700, such a school, named Louis-le-Grand was established in Paris. The idea was to educate students who would serve either as missionaries for Jesuits or as dragomans for the French diplomatic offices, but this model, too, proved to be unhelpful and from 1721, it was decided that the schools in Paris and the Capuchin school in Pera would work in cooperation. Only the French would be accepted to these schools and the students would study French, Latin, Turkish and Arabic in Paris for up to ten years, and would then go to Pera to refine their skills.³⁷⁰

As far as the 17th century is concerned, one may say that a number of European ambassadors were active in Istanbul, all taking part in ecclesiastical politics in the Ottoman Empire in varying degrees. In particular, the long reign of the French King Louis XIV (1638-1715), witnessed a revival of the old Franco-Ottoman alliance strengthened by exchange of embassies. As the 19th-century French Ambassador to the Porte Albert Vandal mentions, French politics in the Orient were concentrated along three chief paths, political-cum-military, religious, and commercial.³⁷¹ French religious policies in the Levant focused on protecting the Holy Land, a task which was transferred to the French King in 1604, and protecting the Catholic missionaries, upon whom by the terms of the French capitulations of 1673, the Ottomans granted the freedom to exercise their functions ‘as they used to be,’³⁷² and by 1674, the Jesuits took over the direction of the French missions.³⁷³ Despite some domestic opposition to the King on the ground that he used patronage of religion as a tool to overshadow his commercial and political collaboration with the Ottomans,³⁷⁴

³⁷⁰ Despite the similar problems, such major figures as Adamson received their education in this final model. Kimpton 2006: 74-75.

³⁷¹ Vandal 1887: 1.

³⁷² ‘*comme ils étaient auparavant*’ Vandal 1887: 8-9.

³⁷³ Vandal 1887: 10.

³⁷⁴ Hodson 2010: 101.

Vandal claims that the surveillance of missionaries gave French Ambassadors more occupation than any other affairs.³⁷⁵

In addition to Catholic France, some Protestant states like England and Holland also had influential ambassadors in the Ottoman capital, as well as consuls in important cities like Smyrna and Aleppo. In the events leading up to the execution of Kyrillos Loukaris, the patriarch of Constantinople (in five different periods between 1620 and 1638) and ex-patriarch of Alexandria (1601-1620), we see that these ambassadors were quite involved. On account of Kyrillos' close relations with English and Dutch ambassadors, the Catholic party, mostly represented by Franciscans in Istanbul worked hard to have him hanged, which was accomplished in the year 1638.³⁷⁶

The personal influence of French ambassadors on the Ottoman ruling elite is one of the most repeated themes as far as the missionaries in the Ottoman Empire are concerned. However, it would be wrong to say that Ottoman politics was solely dependent on such personal connections. We know that although some French ambassadors like Usson Marquis de Bonnac (1716-1724) had good personal relations with the Ottoman viziers, they had been unable to alter the then negative policies of the Ottomans against the Catholic missions in their lands.³⁷⁷ This apart, as will be shown, the destiny of the Catholic missions in the Ottoman provinces of Syria and Egypt did not necessarily go hand in hand with what was going on in the Ottoman capital for a long time.

Historical Sketch

İnalçık puts forward in his article 'İmtiyazat' that during the period after 1683, Ottoman Empire was faced with dangers in Europe and needed diplomatic support from

³⁷⁵ Vandal 1887: 11-12.

³⁷⁶ Neale gives a long account of Kyrillos' connections with the Dutch and English ambassadors, and changes in his doctrine over years. Neale 1847: vol. II: 364-456.

³⁷⁷ Refik 2007: 268.

European powers, which it found mainly in France.³⁷⁸ As a result of such diplomatic support, Ottomans granted privileges to France, as well as some other European powers such as England and Holland, which came to be known as capitulations. Mainly manifesting itself in trade, such diplomatic presence of the French in Ottoman politics also reflected upon the missionary activities of the Catholic orders in the Ottoman Levant at a lower scale. Therefore it would be necessary to give a general historical overview of Ottoman politics from late-17th to mid-18th century.

Although it is known that the relations between France and the Ottoman Empire were favourable on the whole, there were cases in which relations became tense which led to problems regarding the Catholic missions in Ottoman domains. In 1681, for instance, the French ships bombarded the island of Chios, and this led to a tension between French and the Ottoman courts lasting a few decades despite the French king's efforts to transcend that event.³⁷⁹ In 1693, the people of Galata wrote an *arzuhal* to the Porte saying that they did not want *Frenks* in their neighbourhoods. In 1697, Armenians began to write letters of complaint to the Ottoman court about the Catholic missionaries who 'humiliate and subvert the Orthodox, Armenians and other Christian peoples' (*Rum ve Ermeni ve sair millet-i Nasarayı ızlal ve ifsad ile*).³⁸⁰ In these years, local Christians were often supported by the Ottoman administration in their struggle against the Catholics, which eventually slowed down the conversions.³⁸¹

³⁷⁸ İnalçık 1971: 1185.

³⁷⁹ Quoted from *Tarih-i Raşid* in Refik 2007: 262.

³⁸⁰ Refik 2007: 263.

³⁸¹ In 1701, the Jacobite-Syrian patriarch of Aleppo was exiled by Ottoman authorities to Limnos on account of Catholic missionary activities among his flock. In the same year some Armenian presses in Istanbul were shut down because they published books coming from Frengistan, and an Armenian priest was arrested because of his alleged support for Catholics. Finally, Sahak, the Armenian patriarch in Istanbul was arrested because he was 'tolerant' of his people's conversion to Catholicism, and in his place the Armenians chose Avedik, known for his fierce anti-Catholic policies. The latter wrote many letters of complaint to the Porte about missionaries and had many of them imprisoned. Finally the missionaries had him deposed and exiled to Chios. They also bribed the person who was taking him to Chios, and with the help of the French consul

In a letter sent to the French King, Bonnac suggested two major options to open up the path to further conversions to Catholicism, first the influence of the sultan and the statesmen, which he deemed to be dangerous and difficult to apply, and second the administration of the heads of the two churches (Greek Orthodox and Armenian), which he personally supported.³⁸² From that moment on, we see that the Catholics in the Ottoman Empire gave particular importance to the patriarchal elections in the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates.

In the international arena, this period witnessed two long periods of war and peace for Ottomans, which had some influence on the fate of the Greek Orthodox and Catholics. In 1711 Ottomans fought Russians near the river Pruth. Prior to that battle Dimitrie Kantemir, the newly appointed *hospodar* of Moldavia and one of the leading intellectuals of his time, chose to side with Russia as he was convinced of the Ottomans' weakness. However, the Russian army barely escaped annihilation against the Ottomans. Following this incident, the Ottomans chose the *hospodars* of Moldavia (from 1711 onwards) and Wallachia (from 1715 onwards) exclusively from among the Phanariots.

Writing in early 18th century, Lady Mary Montagu, mentioned rumours about French ambassador's plans 'to buy the Holy Land',³⁸³ which shows the degree of influence the French were perceived to have possessed with the Ottomans in the eyes of the other foreigners. However, as will be further analysed the 1714-1718 war had negative effects on the fate of the Catholic missionaries in the Ottoman Empire. Ottomans also fought an

there, took Avedik all the way to France to imprison him in the Bastille. This occasion increased the tension altogether and the Catholic priests lost a great deal of power as opposed to Armenians and the Greek Orthodox. Thus, the French ambassador Vandal wrote that 'all the acts of conversion stopped immediately.' The grand vizier Çorlulu Ali Paşa (1706-1710) even thought of banning their presence in the Ottoman realms altogether. Although the next French ambassador Bonnac had very good relations with Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa, grand vizier between 1718 and 1730, he could not soften the Ottoman policies towards Catholic missionaries. Refik 2007: 266-267.

³⁸² Schefer 1894: 148-151.

³⁸³ Jack 2004: 125 [Letter written by Lady Montagu from Istanbul to her husband Wortley on 9 April 1718]. On the exaggeration of French influence in the Ottoman court by the rivalling states, see also Vandal 1887: 5.

unsuccessful war against the Habsburgs, who had joined the Venetians. As will be mentioned through the missionary letters below, the Ottoman pashas who came to Syria to replace those who went to join this war created a completely different and unfriendly atmosphere for the missionaries.

Following the treaty of Passarowitz (1718), Ottomans began to reorganise their provinces looking for ways to benefit from their resources in more efficient ways so as to compensate their losses in Balkans.³⁸⁴ In addition to provinces like Morea, which saw a chief transformation, another important example was Greater Syria, which included much of the area where missionaries were active.³⁸⁵ After the loss of Belgrade to Habsburgs in 1717, Russian expansion in Caucasus that was acknowledged by the Treaty of Istanbul (1724) accepted Russian spheres of influence in north-western Iran and Caucasus. This was harshly criticised by the *'ulemâ* and the population in Istanbul throughout the 18th century, and was to become one of the reasons for the unsuccessful Ottoman campaign against Russia in 1768. In 1733, French ambassador Villeneuve tried to incite the Ottomans against Russia over Poland, pressure to which Ottomans maintained a sustained resistance, but during 1735-39, the Ottomans had to fight against an Austro-Russian coalition. Despite their unsuccessful encounter with the Russians, they managed to defeat the Austrians on three major fronts and retook Belgrade by the terms of the Treaty of Belgrade (1739).³⁸⁶

These wars were followed by a long period of peace lasting for about 30 years (1739-68). Aksan sees the year 1739 as the apogee of French influence in the Ottoman Empire, strengthened by the capitulations in 1740, which included terms related to Catholic missionaries. Aksan concludes that learning from their losses in Europe, and

³⁸⁴ Faroqhi 2007: 62-63.

³⁸⁵ Murphey 2009: 209-231.

³⁸⁶ Aksan 1987: 48.

incited by France, the Ottomans allied with Sweden and granted generous capitulations to France.³⁸⁷ However, as will be shown below, the events took a different course in the Levant regarding the fate of Catholic missionaries. The good relations between the Ottoman Empire and France were strained when the former offered to take part in the war of Austrian succession in 1745, to which France replied with reluctance. The relations completely deteriorated in 1756 when France joined Russia and Austria, Ottomans' chief rivals, against Prussia. With the death of Tsarina Elisabeth in 1762, though, the anti-Prussian league automatically dissolved, and Russia made peace with Prussia. During 1762 and 1763, France returned to her customary policy of inciting the Ottomans against Russia over Poland. By 1766, the French point was quite clear when Choiseul allocated three million *livres* for the purpose of promoting war despite Vergennes' recent remarks that the Ottomans were reluctant to engage in another war. With Russian violation of Ottoman territory at Balta in the year 1768, though, the Ottomans were obliged to wage a devastating war against Russia that was to last until 1774, and concluded by the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca that gave Russia patronage over the Ottoman Orthodox *re'âyâ*, not to mention imposing vast Ottoman territorial losses.³⁸⁸

In short, one might naturally have expected the Ottoman authorities to mistreat the Catholic missionaries following the period between 1714 and 1718, when Ottomans fought against two Catholic powers, namely Venice and Austria, during 1720's when the Eastern Patriarchs sent a joint complaint about the missionary activities of the Catholics among the Ottoman Christians, and after 1756 when France joined the Ottomans' chief rivals Russia and Austria against the Prussians.

³⁸⁷ Aksan 1987: 45. This point is obvious in the capitulations of the 1740. Especially noteworthy is article 82, which says the following: 'Et lorsque nos sujets tributaires et les Français iront et viendront les uns chez les autres, pour ventes, achats et autres affaires, on ne pourra les molester contre les lois sacrées, pour cause de cette fréquentation.' Rey 1899: 530.

³⁸⁸ Faroqhi 2007: 67-69.

Profiles of the Catholic Missionaries in the Ottoman Levant

Before going into a deeper analysis of the missionary activities among the Ottoman Christians, it is necessary to present a self-portrayal of the missionaries themselves through the letters they produced that give us a lot of information about their profile. Through these letters one may learn not only the names of the missionaries, active in a certain geographical unit,³⁸⁹ or of those who converted to Catholicism through their efforts,³⁹⁰ but also gain information about their personalities, be they experienced³⁹¹ or new³⁹² in the Ottoman Levant. Although an overwhelming majority of the missionaries in the Ottoman Levant were French, and Italian, there were also native Ottoman Christians who were educated in Europe and returned to their homeland to work on behalf of Catholicism. We learn from one of the letters that a missionary was accompanied by a deacon, a Syrian Catholic from Aleppo, during his departure from Cairo in 1714.³⁹³ However, not all of the native Ottoman Christians who converted to Catholicism attained a prominent position and worked as missionaries. Because of their linguistic abilities they were often employed in search of manuscripts written in their native languages. M. Joseph Assemani, ‘of the Maronite nation’, for example, went to Cairo to look for Arabic and Coptic manuscripts to buy them in order to ‘enrich the library of Vatican’. Then he left for Syria in order to find ‘excellent Syriac manuscripts there.’ He was also expected to continue his search for

³⁸⁹ For example, for a successive list of the names of the missionary fathers active in Aleppo until 1679, see Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 80. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

³⁹⁰ Rabbath 1910. vol. II: 96-97 [Letter from father Boisot to the Ambassador, Aleppo, 1686].

³⁹¹ For some information about father Queyrot see Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 104. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini] He was so much loved by everybody that upon his death, ‘Greeks cried for him as if it was their father’s death.’ The clergy of the patriarchal church assist them with his funeral. Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 106. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini] On father René Pillon who was elected in his place see Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 107. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

³⁹² For a report on the progress of a new missionary in Aleppo, see Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 381-82. [Letter from the General Superior of the Missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria and Egypt to father Fleuriau of the same Company] See also Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 285-296 for notes on father Sicard [Letter from the General Superior of the Missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria and Egypt to father Fleuriau of the same Company] for a report on the activities of father Sicard, who came to Syria from Egypt as a missionary.

³⁹³ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 48. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, 1 May 1716, Cairo].

Coptic and Arabic books in the mountains of lower Thebaïs.³⁹⁴ The result is a three-volume *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino Vaticana*.³⁹⁵ Another similar example is that of André Scandar who was Maronite archpriest, and instructor of Arabic language in the College of Sapience. He came to Syria, a missionary writes, ‘by the order of the Pope to make copy of the ancient Arabic manuscripts and to enrich the College of Sapience ...’³⁹⁶

Considering the possible linguistic inadequacy of some of the missionaries, employment of native Christians seems to have been an essential adjunct for the missionary activities in the Ottoman Empire. The chief inefficiency of the European missionaries was their ignorance of languages spoken in the Ottoman Empire, among which Arabic and Turkish were of primary importance in Greater Syria and Egypt. During an encounter with some people in Syria, a missionary narrates the following conversation:

It is true that my incongruities in the way of language, my expressions, and my accent sometimes make them smile, but it was in an amicable rather than shocking fashion, and more capable of encouraging than ruffling me. Do you know Arabic, they tell me? No, I am just starting to learn. Do you know Turkish? No. What do you know then? I know French, Greek, Italian, and Latin.³⁹⁷

Even though one expects the missionaries to know at least Greek among the languages in the Ottoman Levant as seen in this case, there are instances in which they were unable to communicate with the people in Greek because of their lack of spoken Greek. In Chios, a missionary mentioned that he could have done even better if he had been able to speak ‘vulgar Greek’.³⁹⁸

³⁹⁴ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 279 [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau].

³⁹⁵ Assemani 1719-1728.

³⁹⁶ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 396 [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau].

³⁹⁷ ‘It est vrai que mes incongruités en fait de langage, mes expressions, mon accent les fesait quelquefois sourire, mais c’était d’une façon plutôt aimable que choquante, et plus capable de m’encourager que de me déconcerter. Savez-vous l’Arabe, me disaient-ils? Non, je ne fais que commencer à l’apprendre. Savez-vous le Turc? Non. Que savez-vous donc? Je sais le Français, le Grec, l’Italien et le Latin.’ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 155-156. [Letter from a missionary from Aleppo on the Ramadan of Turks, on the Paque of Christians, and on the principle circumstances of his voyage].

³⁹⁸ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 31. [Letter from a missionary to father attorney of the missions of the Levant]

Concerning the human source for the missions, one sees that despite the presence of schools like the Greek college in Rome, they had many recruits from France. In a letter written to the count of Toulouse, we see that a missionary brings up the issue of recruitment of missionaries from France.³⁹⁹ The provision of French missionaries in the Ottoman lands was divided into three French provinces. That of Paris was reserved to ‘Constantinople, Smyrna, Greece, and the islands,’ that of Tours to ‘Aleppo, Cyprus, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia,’ and that of Bretagne to ‘Syria and Palestine.’⁴⁰⁰ At the same time there are cases where local children are transferred to European Catholic schools to be educated as missionaries. In one of the letters, there is the mention of ‘a dozen of children from different nations of Levant, Armenians, Greeks, and Syrians to be elevated in [their] college in Paris.’⁴⁰¹

As mentioned above, the ultimate source of patronage for the missionaries in the Ottoman Levant was either the Pope or the French king. On a lower basis, however, we see that missionaries looked for other sources of patronage from French counts for various other purposes. One of the non-missionary purposes was to have their books published. In accordance with the collective name of these ‘edifying and curious letters’, we see that missionaries often wrote table of contents for these proposed books about the Levant to their correspondents in France to ask for funding.⁴⁰² In a letter addressing the count of Toulouse, Father Siccard bemoans that their finances do not allow them ‘more than three

³⁹⁹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 103. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi, to father Michel-Ange Tamburini]

⁴⁰⁰ Vandal 1887: 11.

⁴⁰¹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 121. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi, to father Michel-Ange Tamburini]

⁴⁰² For a plan of a book on Egypt consisting of 13 chapters see Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 193-210. [Plan of a work on ancient and modern Egypt in thirteen chapters with geographical cards and drawings of many ancient monuments].

or four missionaries to visit the sick, instruct the children, give lectures in particular houses, and in [theirs].'⁴⁰³

A more striking point is that in some instances missionaries were able to follow the domestic politics of France from the Ottoman lands. Arriving in a French consul's place they learned from their consul and their Frenchmen, that M. the count of Morville became the minister of Marine. Then a Catholic father writes to another one as follows: 'You cannot doubt, my reverend father, of my particular joy and that of our missionaries, who wish to find in his person all the protection that M. count of Toulouse have always wanted to give to our evangelical functions.'⁴⁰⁴

Missionary views of Ottoman Christians

With regard to the representation of Ottoman Christians by the missionaries one may say that the most notable appellations are negative in nature. The notion of 'ignorance' is a primary concept about which they level criticism about Ottoman Christians in general, and the Greek Orthodox in particular.⁴⁰⁵ In one letter, for instance, the author emphatically points out that: 'The Christians do not know, to speak properly, what they are. They have the honour, though, to say they are Christians but they are ignorant of what it is to be Catholics.'⁴⁰⁶ Another criticism about Ottoman Christians relates to their 'distance' from God.⁴⁰⁷ Although they talk highly of the lack of simony among Copts, in this matter they condemn Greeks to the same degree: '... among them ecclesiastical

⁴⁰³ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 13. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1 May 1716].

⁴⁰⁴ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 307. [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau].

⁴⁰⁵ For another use of the 'ignorance' with reference to Greeks, see Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 80. [Letter from a missionary to father attorney of the missions of the Levant]. This was also a common element in the writings of the French ambassadors in Istanbul. For one example, which also extends to Armenians and Copts, see Schefer 1898: 188.

⁴⁰⁶ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 383. [Letter from the general superior father of the missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria and Egypt to father Fleuriau of the same Company].

⁴⁰⁷ 'I have already written to you that Copts form a very distant nation from God.' Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 417. [Extract of a letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau, Cairo, 2 June 1723].

dignitaries are not venal as among Greeks. To attain it, they [Copts] neither address anything to the pasha nor give him any money.’⁴⁰⁸

There are only a few points where they remain relatively positive or neutral about Ottoman Christians in issues like how Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, Maronites, ‘be they Heretics, Schismatics, Catholics’ celebrate the Good Friday in Jerusalem by observing the same practices.⁴⁰⁹ There is a quite similar attitude in another account of how this procession takes place. In terms of rank, a missionary writes, first comes the Greek clergy ‘as the most noble and most numerous one’, then Armenian clergy, and Syrians, Copts, Georgians, Abyssinians follow the Armenian clergy. The Patriarch of the Greeks opens the procession.⁴¹⁰

So much is for the Ottoman Christians before/without their conversion to Catholicism, but did the missionaries see a change after they converted to Catholicism? Here, it must be noted that the aim of the missionaries was to persuade these Christians to accept the primacy of the Pope. So, they were not expected, at least in principle, to change their customs, prayers, or the language they used in prayers. After Greek Orthodox, Armenian, and Syrian Patriarchs’ complaints to the Porte about missionaries at some point, there followed a period of suspension of missions. Disagreeing with the arguments of the patriarchs that the missionaries make their flock change their religion, a missionary says the following:

[I]t is visible worldwide that the subjects of the Grand Seigneur conserve their same rite ... Their change, if there is, is purely interior, and does not consist of

⁴⁰⁸ ‘... chez eux les dignités ecclésiastiques ne sont point vénales comme chez les Grecs. Pour y parvenir, ils ne s’adressent point au Bacha, et ne lui comptent point d’argent.’ Le Gobien 1810. vol. IV: 335. [Letter from the father of Bernat to father Fleuriau].

⁴⁰⁹ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 136. [Letter from a missionary from Aleppo on the Ramadan of Turks, on the Paque of Christians, and on the principle circumstances of his voyage].

⁴¹⁰ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 88. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1 May 1716]. See Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 89 [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1 May 1716] for the competition between Greek and Armenian patriarchs inside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre during the procession.

anything else than abandoning certain superstitions, and some particular errors that schism introduced among Christians, and professing Catholic truths, that only ignorance has caught them.⁴¹¹

Such attitudes can also be seen in their designation of many Christian people who converted to Catholicism, who are still referred to with their 'nationality', e.g. André Scandar, 'a Maronite archpriest', who was instructor of Arabic in the College of Sapience,⁴¹² or M. Joseph Assemani, 'of the Maronite nation.'⁴¹³

Ottoman Christian Views of Missionaries

The situation referred to above, namely the implications of the conversion of Ottoman Christians to Catholicism, gave the local hierarchies a lot of trouble as it was not quite easy for them to reveal whether someone has converted or not unless someone sees their contact with missionaries or s/he confesses it in an interrogation by a clergyman. The following passage gives us hints not only about the difficulty in classifying them, but also the difficulty in envisioning an Ottoman Christian turning *Franc/Frenk*:

[A] Syrian who came to do his abjuration was interrogated on his religion by a schismatic patriarch. Are you not *Franc*, tells him the Prelate. The question is susceptible to ambiguity and equivocation: by the name of *Franc* it is intended here the Europeans and Catholic Romans. The new convert believes that interrogation is not clear enough to be obliged to declare himself neatly. No, he says, I am not *Franc*. But, goes on the Prelate, have you not embraced the religion of *Francs*? Of what *Francs* are you telling me about, responds the Syrian? To understand this response well it is necessary to know that the Christians of this country abhor the religion of the English and the Dutch, whom they say are not good *Francs*. To short cut the tergiversation, I am asking you, says the Patriarch, if you are not following the dogmas of the Pope and the Roman Church? ... Oh yes, responds the Syrian, and I am proud of it.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹¹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 186. [Letter from the general superior of missions of the company of Jesus in Syria to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴¹² Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 396. [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau].

⁴¹³ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 279. [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau]

⁴¹⁴ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II. 141-142. [Letter from a missionary from Aleppo on the Ramadan of Turks, on the Paque of Christians, and on the principle circumstances of his voyage].

As this conversation graphically depicts, it often proved difficult for the local Christian clergymen to inspect their flocks' conversation to Catholicism, let alone to prevent them.

With respect to the way common people regarded missionaries, one encounters a number of cases where the people of a certain place, probably visited by missionaries beforehand, ask for a missionary. For example we see that in a village around Damascus, almost all of the inhabitants of which were Turks, the Christians 'asked for a missionary for a long time.'⁴¹⁵ In Salauroy, many Greeks visited a missionary to invite him and his entourage to stay at their place for the night and give them instruction.⁴¹⁶ In another instance, the Maronites and Copts of Rosetta went to see a missionary and demanded to make their confession.⁴¹⁷ Likewise, in Chouifat, Christians received him 'with much charity' and they 'responded by eagerness of [their] zeal.'⁴¹⁸ Similarly, 'the Greeks of the city of Damascus who were established in Mansoura,' and to whom one of the missionaries has been 'particularly recommended,' received him 'with much charity.' They assembled the Christians of the city, he writes, 'to meet [him] with joy'.⁴¹⁹ In some cases, local Christians even complained to the missionaries about other Christian communities. For example during a mission among Maronites of Mount Lebanon which 'attracted the curiosity of Greeks' Maronites complained about Greeks to the missionaries.⁴²⁰

Catholic Methods of Conversion Told by Missionaries

As nothing is more necessary to a missionary in Egypt than to know the sentiments of Copts to combat them, and their customs to correct them; after having done Mission for a long time near those who lived in Cairo, I have believed that I have to visit Copts of the country, to be better informed of everything regarding them, and to make myself as better known by them,

⁴¹⁵ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 96. [Extract of a letter from a missionary from Damascus to father attorney of the missions of the Levant].

⁴¹⁶ Le Gobien 1810. vol. IV: 7. [Journal of the voyage of father Monier, from Erzeron to Trebizonde, 1711].

⁴¹⁷ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 46. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1716].

⁴¹⁸ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 456. [Relation of a mission done in the environs of Mount Lebanon].

⁴¹⁹ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 57. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1716].

⁴²⁰ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 445-46. [Relation of a mission done in the environs of Mount Lebanon].

through this means attract their confidence to me, and to work more usefully toward their instruction and their conversion.⁴²¹

Written by a missionary in Egypt, this passage reflects many typical steps helping one to manage to convert an Ottoman Christian: getting to know their sentiments, customs, establishing acquaintance with them, attracting their confidence to persuade them to come to their lectures, and ultimately convert them to Catholicism. In Sayda, for example, a missionary talks about his serving to a great enough number of Greeks and Maronites ‘to instruct their children, to visit their sick ones, to preach the advent ...’⁴²²

Among the methods used to gain the confidence of the local Christians were included visiting the sick, and providing them with remedies. These seem to have the greatest effect in persuading them to begin to follow their lectures. Father Sicard, writes a missionary, ‘attracts them by small recompenses, then he goes to visit the sick, and gives them medicines that the King had the kindness to send to the missionaries, in favour of these remedies, he gives them the salutary instructions.’⁴²³

Founding hospices and hospitals, and healing the prominent Ottoman governors brought even further advantages. In Diyarbekir, writes a missionary, the Capuchin missionaries do the profession of medicine, and they even cured the pasha who was ill: ‘We have shown them many times that we took their sick ones to cure them.’⁴²⁴ ‘It is unbelievable how much we took advantage of these remedies,’ wrote another, ‘They

⁴²¹ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 13. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1716].

⁴²² Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 143. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴²³ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 383. [Letter from the general superior of the missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria and Egypt to father Fleuriau].

⁴²⁴ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 343. [Letter written to M. Savary, general agent of the affairs of Duc of Mantoue in France, Basra 19 October 1675].

opened us the door to Turkish *Seigneurs*, who in consideration of the alleviation that they receive, rendered their protection for us to exercise our functions with more liberty.’⁴²⁵

The importance of the remedies that the missionaries distributed increased during outbreaks of diseases. A violent plague broke out in 1719 in Aleppo, which caused ‘120,000 deaths in a month’ and ‘Catholics, Heretics, Franks, the rich, and the poor’ appealed to missionaries equally, a missionary narrates.⁴²⁶ They distributed remedies sent to them from France ‘among schismatic houses, as well as Catholic Christians and at the same time those of Turks.’⁴²⁷ After the death of many people, he goes on, ‘our Greek and Maronite fathers gave us the honor to assist them with funerals. We began to collect the palms of charity.’⁴²⁸

Another important means employed by missionaries to attract converts was education, one of the core Jesuit principles. For Maronites, writes a missionary, ‘we began by opening a public school where the children are instructed. Their parents are instructed by the children.’⁴²⁹ They also visited houses to instruct Christian families, which they saw ‘necessary as well as useful because people do not have liberty to leave their houses.’⁴³⁰

Occasionally, the missionaries chose greater challenges such as visiting Balamand Monastery, ‘the richest and most numerous one among the ones that Greeks possessed in Syria’. Father Verseau often talked to them about St. Basil ‘whom they honour as their holy patriarch’ and he eventually managed to give two religious youngsters ‘the excellent

⁴²⁵ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 106-107. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1716].

⁴²⁶ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 100. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴²⁷ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 96. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴²⁸ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 102. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴²⁹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 169. [Letter from father Rousset, Antoura, 15 September 1750].

⁴³⁰ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 111. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

books of father Clisson and Nau written in Arabic to combat Schism and to re-establish the Catholic truths.’⁴³¹

In another case, Father Blein liberated a female Christian slave from her Muslim owner by asking help from a rich Greek, ‘a fervent Catholic.’ Some ‘Turks’ discovering this attacked Blein, and he was rescued by another ‘Turk’ who gave the attackers 500 silver pieces at the expense of going to the local *kadi* court later.⁴³²

Letters of the missionaries hint that not all the converted Christians held onto Catholicism for ever for various reasons. After a period of suspension of the missions, some missionaries realised that ‘the religious ones of the Holy Land disappeared.’⁴³³ In another instance, a disciple of a missionary promises him ‘to persevere in the practice of [their] holy faith that he had embraced, and maintain the holy exercises of piety and Religion that [he] had established in Etris and Oüardan.’⁴³⁴ Similarly, another one wrote in great happiness that after visiting Catholic Copts in Egypt, he saw that ‘they had retained their Catholicity since [their] previous visit in 1708.’⁴³⁵

That the endurance of missions was susceptible to decline or even extinction for this or that reason must be one of the causes of the need to supply them with a constant source of missionaries, which in the end led to a number of major problems involving not only the missionaries and local churches, but also the larger bodies of ecclesiastical organisations, and the Ottoman central administration.

⁴³¹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 128-130. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴³² Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 116-117. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴³³ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 467. [Letter from father Chabert, missionary in Levant on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus].

⁴³⁴ Le Gobien 1810. vol. V: 44. [Letter from father Sicard to the Count of Toulouse, Cairo, 1716].

⁴³⁵ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 414. [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau].

Factors behind the Success of the Catholic Missions in the Ottoman Levant

Role of French Ambassadors and Consuls

As mentioned above the French ambassadors had an important role in the protection of the missionaries. Although the French consuls in particular Ottoman towns were able to support the missionaries in Syria, and Egypt, it can be said that the French ambassadors in Istanbul were also involved in issues of the missionaries, in cooperation with consuls.⁴³⁶ Their major contribution consisted of obtaining a favourable *ferman* for the missionaries, allowing them to establish in a new place. The best example of that sort is the establishment of Jesuits in Aleppo in 1679. On this occasion, the French ambassador in Istanbul obtained them a favourable command from the Grand Seigneur securing their establishment in Aleppo,⁴³⁷ and Monsieur Piquet, French consul, gave them his chapel to be used for the missionary activities. This particular protection gave them, wrote a missionary ‘the facilities to assemble the Christians in the consular chapel.’⁴³⁸

Another service of the French consuls and ambassadors to the missionaries was to provide support for them in times of trouble in the provinces. Following a joint petition by Greek Orthodox Patriarchs, in the 1720s Ottoman administration outlawed missionary activities. As a result of this, the General Superior of the missions of the Company of Jesus, i.e. Jesuit order, in Syria wrote, the French consul obliged them to suspend their missions ‘that [they] have always exercised in this country for more than a century.’⁴³⁹ After some time, though, the marquis of Châteauneuf obtained them ‘most favourable

⁴³⁶ See for example the letter of the consul of Sayda to the ambassador in Istanbul written in 1745. Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 247-250. [History of different persecutions exercised against the Catholics of Aleppo and Damascus].

⁴³⁷ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 76. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴³⁸ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 80. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

This decision was supported by the patent of the French King. Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 80-81. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴³⁹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 186. [Letter from the general superior of the missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria to father Fleuriat, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

commandments to the Catholic Church.⁴⁴⁰ After returning to the previous state of affairs, the General Superior did not by-pass the name of the French monarch in his prayers: ‘I raise my hands to the sky to obtain from God the prompt protection that the religion demands and the conservation of our young monarch, our strong protector.’⁴⁴¹

Role of Local Ecclesiastical Organisations

Another important source of support for missionaries came from the local ecclesiastical organisations, notably through those who converted to Catholicism. In many instances we see that missionaries pointed out their gratitude to them. On one occasion they mentioned their friendly reception by the Greek metropolitan of Aleppo who was a Catholic.⁴⁴² From another letter, we learn that they have also been helped by the patriarch of Antioch Euthymios Karmah of Chios: ‘We have the principal obligation to a holy Greek bishop named Eutimios, a native of Chios.’⁴⁴³ On some occasions, though, it is difficult to tell whether the hierarch in question has converted to Catholicism by heart or declared it publicly. There are many cases where an Ottoman Christian hierarch converts to Catholicism but does not say it publicly until the appropriate moment. The following remark is a good example to this kind of case: ‘The Armenian bishop of this church is Catholic by heart and is waiting for the favourable occasion to declare it.’⁴⁴⁴

⁴⁴⁰ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 187. [Letter from the general superior of the missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723]. See also Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 464 [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742], where marquis de Bonnac received a firman for the missionaries in Damascus in 1721, which allowed them ‘to escape the insults and violence to which [they] had been exposed’. For the French translation of the firman, see. Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 464-465. [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742]

⁴⁴¹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 188. [Letter from the general superior of the missions of the Company of Jesus in Syria to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴⁴² Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 77-78. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴⁴³ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 103. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴⁴⁴ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 111. [Extract of a letter from a missionary in Damascus to father attorney of the missions of the Levant].

Finally, there are cases where the hierarchs make a compromise with some missionaries. A missionary reports that their departure from Cairo for Syria in 1716 gave some restlessness to the ‘Schismatics’ who went to their patriarch to complain about them. He mentions that they wanted to put opposition to their voyage but he says, ‘the patriarch is merely begging me not to treat, in my lectures, any doctrine contrary to that of Dioscorus.’ He eventually assured the patriarch and with this declaration, the patriarch gave them ‘letters of recommendation to be charitably received in their monasteries and to visit their libraries there.’⁴⁴⁵

Role of Local Ottoman administrators

The role of local Ottoman administrators was often crucial for the missionaries in having various sorts of their works done in the provinces or in getting rid of troubles. Indeed, local administrative support, often provided in the form of ‘recommendation letters’ by various administrators was used by missionaries in many ways. A Capuchin father received from the Kapudan Pasha⁴⁴⁶ a letter of recommendation for a Jesuit missionary, according to the testimony of the latter. By this letter this ‘Seigneur’ asked the *kadis* of Chios and Rhodes to treat that missionary as one of his domestics. Eventually, this Jesuit missionary used that letter ‘to place a Catholic in the Church of the Nestorians of Diyarbekir.’⁴⁴⁷

Following the issuance of a *ferman* upon the complaint of Greek Orthodox patriarchs about missionaries, there was a period of suspension of missions in the Eastern Mediterranean, and some missionaries were imprisoned. Even in such a state of affairs,

⁴⁴⁵ Le Gobien 1819. vol. III: 280. [Letter from father Sicard to father Fleuriau].

⁴⁴⁶ Kapudan Pasha, the chief commander of the Ottoman navy, was one of the principal Ottoman administrators dealing with the affairs of the Aegean islands, and it was often him who acted as media with regard to the matters relating to the Jesuit and Capuchin possessions in the islands. See the articles of the capitulations from the French archives, published in Rey 1899: 529. For a number of articles on the office of the Kapudan Pasha, see Zachariadou 2002.

⁴⁴⁷ Le Gobien 1810. vol. II: 28. [Letter from a missionary to father attorney of missions of the Levant].

missionaries were making use of the Ottoman administrative system to do their best to continue their missions through the help they received from local authorities. They believed that this commandment would be easily revoked because ‘Sieur Abraham, Maronite, ... has had the credit, by means of the *aga* of Sayda, and of Osman, the Pasha of Damascus, to obtain from the grand-vizier the liberty of the bishops and the imprisoned Catholics.’⁴⁴⁸

Despite such firm belief in the annulment of this *ferman*, they ‘still looked for protection before the Pasha of Damascus.’ Marquis de Villeneuve managed to get them ‘letters of recommendation for the principals of the city.’ The account reads that one was written to the governor by his *Capi-Kaikié* [*Kapı kahyası*], the other from the grand mufti, addressed to Ali Efendi, *defterdar*.⁴⁴⁹ The *defterdar* received them well and respectfully opened ‘the letter that the chief of the Muslim religion wrote’. He testified his sadness for ‘the disgraceful manner with which the father had been treated’ and suggested them to go to the Pasha and give him the letter addressed to him. He also returned them the one written by the grand mufti to himself so that the Pasha could read it, too. Finally, he provided them with a guide, called *toukadar* [*çuhadar*].⁴⁵⁰ Even though they received a very negative response from the Pasha, the incident shows the tendency of the missionaries to ask for aid from the local Ottoman administrators.

At the same time, French consul of Sayda, and the French ambassador resident in Istanbul were busy with organising relevant Ottoman officials to release the imprisoned missionaries. M. Martin, consul of Sayda, wrote a very strong letter to the *defterdar*, who

⁴⁴⁸ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 187-188. [Letter from general superior of missions of the company of Jesus in Syria to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴⁴⁹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 465. [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742] Vandal also mentions that French ambassadors often sought the support of the grand muftis in the Ottoman Empire. Vandal 1887: 4.

⁴⁵⁰ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 466. [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742]

‘recognised their innocence.’⁴⁵¹ Around the same time, the French Ambassador asked the *Bazerghan Bachi*, [*bezirganbaşı*], the merchant who provided Sultan’s clothes, to visit the missionaries in prison. He promised to deliver them fifty pieces of woollen cloth (*drap*) to pay their ransom.⁴⁵²

Results of Catholic Infiltration among Ottoman Christians

Some cases where the local administrative officials did not always follow the commands regarding the missionaries from the Porte were mentioned above. It should also be noted that the missionaries were not always able to maintain their good relations with the local authorities. There is the case of a pasha, for example, who ‘sided with the heretics’, and put two missionary fathers and two brothers in prison, even though they come to be released thanks to a gentleman named *Contour*, a friend of the new pasha, sent by the Sultan to defend the imprisoned ones.⁴⁵³ The letters of the missionaries also claim that some Pashas were susceptible to differing policies towards Catholics in accordance with the financial benefits they may gain from them when possible prospects come up. This is obvious in the case of Greek Catholic Patriarch Kyrillos,⁴⁵⁴ who was put into prison by the pasha who was ‘charmed with the idea of extracting money’ from him, and who released him in a few days upon the payment of his sum.⁴⁵⁵ The following case is also very noteworthy in terms of the attitudes of the local Ottoman administrators. During the period of suspension of missions in the Ottoman Levant, in the year 1721, a certain Catholic father, named David was beaten by a soldier. Then three superiors went to the pasha with

⁴⁵¹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 467. [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742]

⁴⁵² Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 468. [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742]

⁴⁵³ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 78-79. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴⁵⁴ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 88. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

⁴⁵⁵ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 89. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

two letters of recommendation written by the Kapudan Pasha's 'agent to the Porte' [*Kapı kahya*] and the grand mufti, addressing the governor, and the *defterdar*. As mentioned above, the latter received them well but pasha's reaction was completely opposite. Arriving at the Pasha's court, they give both letters to the pasha, who accused them of converting the Christians of the country to Catholicism and gave them the following reply: 'I know ... the remedy to this disorder, and I declare you that I will hang the first Armenian who becomes Franc. It has not been long that you have been here, and you will not stay here for longer.'⁴⁵⁶

External factors also had negative effects on Ottoman policies regarding the Catholic missionaries in the Ottoman Levant. Because of the war between Turks and Venetians (1714-1718), the Porte sent insistent orders to get the Venetians and Latins out of the city of Damascus as we learn from the letters of missionaries.⁴⁵⁷ Likewise we learn from these letters that because Ottomans declared war on Venetians, the Sultan sent orders to put Venetians and the French in Tripoli into prison, and father Amieu and twenty-five Frenchmen were arrested on this account.⁴⁵⁸

Another and more important reason behind the suspension of Catholic missionaries was the ecclesiastical organisations in the Ottoman Empire, notably the Greek Orthodox, which turned to the centre represented by the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Ottoman central administration for aid. A missionary mentions that the Patriarch of Jerusalem, 'the most zealous partisan of schism' became a first-hand witness to the

⁴⁵⁶ 'Je saurai ... remédier à ce désordre, et je vous déclare que je ferai pendre le premier Arménien qui se fera Franc. Il n'y a pas long-temps que vous êtes ici, et vous n'y serez plus long-temps.' Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 466-67. [Letter from father Chabert on the imprisonment of the missionaries in Damascus, Sayda, 25 June 1742].

⁴⁵⁷ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 104. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini]. Ottoman concern in such cases was primarily to avoid possible double loyalties of the missionaries. One of the preceding examples was that of the missionaries of Chios. When Venetians conquered Chios in 1694, which Ottomans took back later, the latter found the missionaries guilty of trafficking with the Venetian fleet. Vandal 1887: 14.

⁴⁵⁸ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 119. [Letter from father Antoine-Marie Nacchi to father Michel-Ange Tamburini].

progress of the Catholicism while passing through Damascus and Aleppo to go to Istanbul⁴⁵⁹ for a synod attended by ‘the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Damascus, and Jerusalem.’⁴⁶⁰ After the Synod, they managed to receive a favourable command from the Sultan. Accordingly, a command was despatched to Latin missionaries asking them to have no contact with Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians under the pretext of instruction.⁴⁶¹ In accordance with this command, the account reads, Ottoman officials ‘imprisoned the bishop of Aleppo, the bishop of Sayda, and a number of priests and a number of good Catholic lay people of the cities of Damascus, Aleppo, Tripoli, and Sayda menacing some to exile and the others to death if they did not resume the religion of their patriarch.’⁴⁶² In a letter written from Damascus on 4 November 1739, Gurynant associates ‘the cruellest vexations against Catholics’ were carried out jointly by ‘Turks and schismatics’ at the end of 1738. Here, the change of the governor also seems to have changed the course of affairs as is clear from Gurynant’s remark that Hasan Pasha succeeding Süleyman Pasha who went to war against the Habsburg Emperor pursued these ‘vexations.’⁴⁶³

Conflict at the local level eventually influenced French policies in the Ottoman Empire. Vandal admits that during the last decades of the reign of Louis XIV, ‘the interest that France showed to the Catholics assumed a narrow and intolerant character.’⁴⁶⁴ At the beginning France had seen itself in the Orient as ‘the refuge of all Christianity’ and the French kings used to pursue a larger policy: ‘they wrote to the Grand Seigneur with equal enthusiasm in favour of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople and the Latin bishops of the

⁴⁵⁹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 185. [Letter from general superior of the missions to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴⁶⁰ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 185. [Letter from general superior of the missions to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴⁶¹ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 184. [Letter from general superior of the missions to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴⁶² Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 185-186. [Letter from general superior of the missions to father Fleuriau, Sayda, 21 July 1723].

⁴⁶³ Le Gobien 1819. vol. I: 370, 370-77. [Letter from father Gurynant, Damascus, 4 November 1739].

⁴⁶⁴ ‘l’intérêt que la France témoignait aux catholiques prit un caract re étroit et intolérant.’ Vandal 1887: 14.

Archipelago.’ However, under the influence of ‘the schismatic clergy’, i.e. the Greek Orthodox and Armenian clergies, French politics ‘then gave way to aggressive moves against dissidents, used despotic or vexatious methods and drew cruel reprisals on Catholics.’⁴⁶⁵

This confrontation also led to a broad centralisation involving the provinces represented by the Eastern Patriarchates, and the centre represented by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman central administration. The latter began to use the Patriarchate of Constantinople in negotiations in terms of its affairs with the Eastern Patriarchates. Here the missionary activities that infiltrated in the Ottoman Christians and even divided some church organisations, notably the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch in 1724, functioned as a driving force to unify the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates in the Ottoman Empire against Catholic missions.

Great Church and Phanariots in the 18th Century

Through their connections with the Porte, Greek Orthodox, Armenian and Jewish lay elites were particularly able to help their ecclesiastical, or in the case of the Jewish community rabbinical organisations.⁴⁶⁶ As far as the Greek Orthodox lay elites of Istanbul were concerned, one has to mention the role of the *archontes*, who also appear to have taken a role in matters regarding the Patriarchate. Often active in trade and tax collection, we have the records from Greek Orthodox elites, showing that while some came from eminent Byzantine families, others merely attributed their lineage to them.⁴⁶⁷ In a 16th century source called *Historia Patriarchiki*, there is the mention of two *archontes* named

⁴⁶⁵ ‘Sous leur influence, notre politique s’abandonna alors à des mouvements agressifs contre les dissidents, usa de procédés despotiques ou tracassiers et attira sur les catholiques de cruelles représailles.’ Vandal 1887: 15-16.

⁴⁶⁶ See Bardakjian 1982: 89-100, and Epstein 1982: 101-116, for two case studies on Armenian and Jewish communities in the Ottoman Empire respectively. For a short survey of post-Byzantine archons, see Papademetriou 2001: 174-179.

⁴⁶⁷ İnalçık 1998a: 384-385.

Xenakes, and Demetrios Kantakouzenos who took part in the coordination of the correspondence between the Patriarch Ieremias during his second tenure (1522-1546) and the grand vizier in a conflict over the possession of churches in Istanbul.⁴⁶⁸ A more prominent, and much-cited example from late 16th century is that of Michael Kantakouzenos, or Şeytanoğlu as known in Ottoman sources. He was renowned for his three major economic enterprises, namely the Ahyolu Salt Works (as *Ahyolu tuz emini*), Ahyolu shipyard (as *tersane emini*), and imperial trade (as *hassa tüccarı*). His final enterprise was in relation to the Church, which consisted mainly of his appointing metropolitans or patriarchs.⁴⁶⁹ Ottoman documents show that the political authorities regarded his role in church administration as serious.⁴⁷⁰ Despite such cases, however, we see that the Greek lay elite did not have a well-established and well-structured influence in matters regarding the Great Church, and that the Ottoman administration before the 18th century preferred not to establish a long-term cooperation with the nascent Greek lay elite in matters relating to Church administration.

It is known that the Greek lay elite showed a remarkable structural transformation in the 18th century. This growth was so comprehensive as to outclass their Armenian and Jewish competitors, and they became much more able than their predecessors to manipulate the Ottoman bureaucratic system on behalf of community interests. Known as Phanariots, with reference to the Phanar/Fener quarter of Istanbul, which hosted a considerable Greek-speaking Orthodox population, this lay elite consisted of such notable families as Ghika, Doukas, Kantakouzenos, Rosetti, Mavrokordatos, Kallimachi,

⁴⁶⁸ *Historia Patriarchiki* 1849: 158-169. For English translation, see Çolak 2008: 125-133.

⁴⁶⁹ Papademetriou 2001: 185-193.

⁴⁷⁰ Some Ottoman imperial decrees issued for the Patriarchate were transferred to the Patriarchate through Michael Kantakouzenos/Şeytanoğlu. For such a document dated 8 April 1574, see Refik 1988: 49.

Mourouzi, Soutzo, Karaca, Hypsilantis, Mavrogenis, and Hançerli.⁴⁷¹ They came to have a crucial role in the Ottoman Empire tying together ‘personnel involved in the Ottoman central state, Orthodox Church administration, provincial administration, and international diplomacy.’⁴⁷² This elite gradually occupied many key positions in the Ottoman administration throughout the course of the 18th century.⁴⁷³ In addition to the post of grand dragoman, or the chief interpreter for the Porte, which their predecessors had held,⁴⁷⁴ they also took hold of the post of interpreter for the Kapudan Pasha. Both posts involved more than it would appear; while the first one allowed them take part in the decision-making in the international politics of the Ottoman Empire,⁴⁷⁵ the second gave them the opportunity to control the islands of Archipelago, from which Ottomans recruited their crews for the imperial fleet.⁴⁷⁶ Besides, they also came to have control over semi-autonomous provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, which had been governed until early 18th century by native princes.⁴⁷⁷ Following the battle of Pruth in 1711, during which the *hospodar*, or Prince of Wallachia, Dimitri Kantemir, allied himself with Russians, the Ottomans began to choose the *hospodars* of Moldavia and Wallachia exclusively from among the Phanariots, a

⁴⁷¹ Soutzo 1974: 236-237. Soutzo analyses each and every Phanariot prince of Moldavia and Wallachia in Soutzo 1974: 238-252.

⁴⁷² Philliou 2004: 19.

⁴⁷³ A study of the Mourouzi family, which the author says came to the Ottoman public scene in 17th century, shows, for example, that the members of the family appear first as merchants, and then dignitaries in the Divans of Moldavia and Wallachia, and finally dragomans of the Sultan and princes of Moldavia and Wallachia. Constantine, for example, was the grand *postelnic* in the Divan of Wallachia in 1761, while his son Alexander assumed the function of Grand Dragoman in 1790, and became the prince of Moldavia and Wallachia on five occasions from 1792 to 1807. Marinescu 1991: 56-57.

⁴⁷⁴ Even then, grand dragomans were involved with the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates. In 1707, for example, Mavrokordatos was dealing, alongside two other church-related issues, with the promotion of Chrysantos Notaras to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Apostolopoulos 2003: 126.

⁴⁷⁵ On the domestic scale, too, the role of grand dragoman had an important role. On the transfer of this post from Mavrokordatos to Grigorios Ghikas, Schefer says that Bonnac ‘became the first ambassador of Franch who would not have to complain about the bad behaviour and hostility of a high functionary belonging to the Greek rite. Schefer 1894: xxxi.

⁴⁷⁶ Clogg 1979: 33.

⁴⁷⁷ For an account of the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia during the Ottoman times before Phanariots, see Iorga. 2000: 129-155.

situation that lasted until 1821.⁴⁷⁸ Forming thus an integral part of Ottoman official system,⁴⁷⁹ Phanariots also had also been recruited into the office of *re'isü'l-küttâb* in this period.

Enabled by these economic and political means, Phanariots soon gained an important influence over the Great Church, as well. In order to pay the *pişkeş*, the hierarchs often borrowed from the Phanariots as the latter had large capital reserves in cash.⁴⁸⁰ From the 1730's onwards, the effective administration of the Patriarchate passed into their hands, too. As Papadopoulos explains in detail, from 1741 onwards the Synod tried to oppose this encroachment by trying to abate the power of the officials (*offikia*) in the administration of the Patriarchate, and attempted to consolidate this power in the hands of metropolitans, which they managed to achieve in 1763.⁴⁸¹ However, by that time the authority of the Phanariots before the Ottomans was so lofty that it was unusual for rich metropolitans to assert themselves as patriarchal candidates 'owing to the administrative difficulties and the absurd questions which arise out of the Patriarch's relations with persons of high position, foreigners or Greeks.'⁴⁸²

It is during this period of Phanariot domination over the Patriarchate in Istanbul that they gained an unprecedented success in terms of its internal jurisdiction. Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Constantinople, together with their Armenian counterparts, received a precedent-making *berat* in 1764 from the Ottoman Sultan that allowed them 'authorization to punish troublemakers in their community without having to bring the case to the attention of the Porte.'⁴⁸³ It is also during this time that the Patriarchs began to

⁴⁷⁸ Clogg 1979: 32.

⁴⁷⁹ Papachristou 1988: 5-26.

⁴⁸⁰ Jelavich 1983: 55.

⁴⁸¹ Papadopoulos 1990: 39-60.

⁴⁸² Papadopoulos 1990: 58, quoting from Hyspilantis 1870: 396-397.

⁴⁸³ İnalçık 1982: 440.

interfere in civil cases, which had been dealt with until then mainly by local *kadi* courts as well as community courts in places such as the Aegean islands.⁴⁸⁴

As far as their policies with regard to other minor Christian communities outside their jurisdiction are concerned, one can say that the Patriarchs of Constantinople began to pursue a more active and successful policy during the later part of the 18th century. One aspect of this policy can be seen in their attempts to take minor Christian communities such as Ethiopians, Nestorians and Jacobites under their authority, which had hitherto been under the authority of their Armenian counterparts. A century and a half after the conquest of Palestine by the Ottomans, in 1665 the Orthodox Patriarchate in Istanbul made its first attempt to intervene in the affairs of the Armenians with respect to the Ethiopian Church, which resulted in failure.⁴⁸⁵ In response to that failure, they persistently and continuously petitioned the Porte in the years 1732, 1733, 1734, and 1739, and eventually succeeded in taking control of the Ethiopian, Assyrian, and Coptic Churches in the year 1733.⁴⁸⁶ Although this subsequently led to other problems, the Patriarchate of Constantinople gained a dominant position in church administration, which had a key influence on the future development of the relations between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and its brothers in the Middle East after the mid-18th century.

We see a similar policy with respect to the Holy Land. It is known that throughout the Ottoman era, the Holy Land, and hence the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, were of paramount importance for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Constantinople. From the incorporation of Palestine into the Ottoman Empire onwards, they had been in constant competition with Armenian Patriarchs over a number of holy places, particularly the

⁴⁸⁴ Kermeli 2007: 205-210.

⁴⁸⁵ Ercan 1988: 21.

⁴⁸⁶ For the transliteration of the documents from Prime Ministerial Ottoman Archives under the title *Evâmir-i Mâliye Kalemîne Tâbi' Piskopos Mukâta'sı Defterleri* pertaining to this issue, see Ercan 1988: 21-24.

Church of the Holy Sepulchre. From 1637 to 1690, the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople established its dominant control over the Holy sites *vis-à-vis* the other Christian communities.⁴⁸⁷ This situation was altered only after the influence of France as the guardian of Catholics was asserted to a very considerable degree in the Ottoman Empire, a situation we have analysed in the previous section. Throughout the whole of the 18th century, the Greek Orthodox remained almost the sole competitors to Catholic infiltration in the Holy Land as will be analysed in the next chapter.

It is also in the 18th century that the encroachments of the Great Church in the affairs of other Orthodox Churches resulted in unprecedented success. The national churches of Serbia, Bulgaria, and Romania all came under the control of the Patriarchate of Constantinople by the year 1767.⁴⁸⁸ The autocephalous Serbian Patriarchate of Peć (Āpek) constitutes an interesting case in terms of the ecclesiastical policies of the Ottomans through the Phanariot elites and the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The Patriarchate of Peć, extinct since 1459 as it was subsumed under that of Ohrid which had a certain degree of autonomy, was restored under Ottoman rule.⁴⁸⁹ Scholars working on the Patriarchate of Peć point to the relation between the prominent Ottoman grand vizier Sokullu Mehmed (Mehmed Sokolović) Pasha and his brother or cousin Makarije, who had been a monk in the Athonite monastery of Chilandar, and who was appointed as the Serbian Patriarch in 1557.⁴⁹⁰ With new Ottoman conquests, the boundaries of the Patriarchate of Peć exceeded that of the Medieval Serbian Kingdom, and came to include regions north of Sava, the Danube, and west into Dalmatia. In spite of retaining its autocephalous position for a long time, the fact that a number of Ottoman-Habsburg wars took place in the lands under its

⁴⁸⁷ Peri 2001: 110-153.

⁴⁸⁸ Ware 1963: 100. For a short study of the Churches of the Ohrid and Peć through patriarchal acta edited by Delikanis see Angelopoulos 1983: 337-342.

⁴⁸⁹ Stavrianos 1964: 104.

⁴⁹⁰ Barkey 2008: 124-125.

ecclesiastical jurisdiction during the 18th century had important implications on the organisation of the Patriarchate of Peć. During the Ottoman-Habsburg contest, Serbians often rebelled against Ottomans and migrated to Habsburg domains to join forces with the Habsburgs. The first major Serbian migration was led by the Patriarch Arsenije III, who took with him thirty thousand Serbian families and joined the Habsburgs in 1690-91, and the second one took place on the eve of Habsburg-Ottoman war of 1736-1739.⁴⁹¹ As a result of the flight of Arsenije III, a Greek Patriarch named Kallinikos (1691-1710) was appointed in his stead in Peć. He was succeeded by another Greek Patriarch named Athanasios I (1710-1712). Although his successor Moisiје Rajovic (1713-1725), of Serbian origin, refrained from any political adventures, he eventually found his patriarchate in another political contest. Although Ottomans lost some places including Belgrade to Habsburgs, who allowed two different metropolitanates to be established under their authority, one in Belgrade and the other in Temes (Temeşvar), their re-conquest of Belgrade put the Serbian Church in a more difficult position. During the Habsburg-Ottoman war of 1736-1739, Patriarch Arsenije IV (1725-1737) emigrated to Habsburg domains. Upon this, Ottoman authorities supported the installation of a Greek Patriarch in his place in Peć named Ioannikios (1737-1747), who was succeeded by a Serbian one, Athanasije II Gavrilović (1747-1752). Exhausted of its resources and mired in debt, the Serbian Patriarchate was reduced to a position of less and less importance for the Ottomans and the patriarchs who succeeded after Athanasije III were insignificant. Finally in 1766, the patriarchate was abolished and placed the Serbian bishops under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, thus starting a period known as ‘the Phanariot epoch’ that

⁴⁹¹ Pappas 1994: 26-27.

lasted until the establishment of an autocephalous Serbian Church in 1920.⁴⁹² The role of the Phanariots in this eclipse of Serbian authority was very significant in that the Patriarch of Constantinople then was Samuel Hantcherli, ‘a member of an upstart Phanariot family, whose brother Constantine was for a time Prince of Wallachia.’⁴⁹³ Overall, in all instances when Serbian Patriarchs allied with Habsburgs, Ottomans appointed a Greek patriarch in their place. Although these patriarchs were sometimes succeeded by Serbian ones, when things got into an impasse, the Ottomans used the Phanariots and the Patriarchate of Constantinople as means for centralisation of the Orthodox ecclesiastical organisational authority in Istanbul.

The autocephalous church of Ohrid (or Ochrida/Achrida in Greek sources, and Ohri in Ottoman sources) presents a similar case. From 1408, when Ohrid fell before Ottoman armies, until 1767, it remained an autocephalous church, even including lands formerly under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Church in the years between 1459 and 1557. However, in the year 1767, it faced the same fate as Peć/Īpek. It was abolished by order of the Patriarch Samuel, who had also abolished the Patriarchate of Peć/Īpek, and was incorporated into the Patriarchate in Istanbul.⁴⁹⁴ The case of Ohrid was more unfortunate for its parishioners in that the Serbian church and flock continued to have an alternate authority in Sremski Karlovci under Habsburg control, which the Bulgarian one did not. In addition, Bulgarian lands were easier to control for the Constantinopolitan patriarchs because of their geographical proximity.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹² Hadrovics 1947: 148-154. Papadopoulos supports the view that the Patriarchate of Peć/Īpek was subordinated to that of Constantinople on demand of the former, and because of the material decline. Papadopoulos 1990: 89-91. On the abolition of the Patriarchate of Peć/Īpek see also Jelavich 1983: 91-95.

⁴⁹³ Runciman 1968: 380.

⁴⁹⁴ Runciman 1968: 380.

⁴⁹⁵ Jelavich 1983: 95-97.

With respect to the widening power base of the Patriarchate of Constantinople we see a very similar change in such late conquests as Crete. As mentioned in the first chapter, Patriarchs of Constantinople had been unable to appoint their own metropolitan in the newly-conquered island of Crete. We see that finally in 1735, Patriarch Gerasimos II managed to install a metropolitan for Crete.⁴⁹⁶ Bayraktar convincingly argues that the major reason behind the early failure and late success of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to appoint a metropolitan for Crete was the degree of the Ottomans' support for it. From the early decades of the 18th century onwards, Ottoman empowerment of the Patriarchate through the mediation of Phanariots came to full fruition. The age of deposition or even execution of the Patriarchs because of their pro-Catholic and pro-Uniate tendencies was over. The threat of foreign ambassadors' agenda regarding the Orthodox Church was also over as it was now the Phanariots who sponsored the Patriarchs.⁴⁹⁷

Overall, from the beginning of the 18th century onwards the Patriarchate of Constantinople, then supported by the Phanariot elites, was much stronger than it had been in earlier centuries under Ottoman rule. As Kitromilides observes, especially during the time of Ieremias III (1716-1726, 1732-1733), 'the will for a more energetic safeguarding of Orthodoxy in the Ottoman State began to appear on the Great Church's horizon.'⁴⁹⁸ Internally, it had gained a tighter control over its flock. It also began to take control of other minor Christian communities from Armenian patriarchs. Despite beginning to lose some control in the Holy Land to Catholics, it continued to be chief competitor to resist them. As far as the autocephalous Orthodox Patriarchates are concerned, it managed to abolish and incorporate them under its jurisdiction. Finally, it had ultimate control over late Ottoman conquests such as Crete, which had been under Sinaite control for centuries.

⁴⁹⁶ Greene 2000: 174-191. Bayraktar 2012. Sariyannis 2010: 28-32.

⁴⁹⁷ Bayraktar 2012.

⁴⁹⁸ Kitromilides 2007a: 2.

Therefore, it was now much easier for the affairs of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria to be centralised in Istanbul.

CHAPTER 3. POLITICS IN THE EASTERN PATRIARCHATES IN THE AGE OF CENTRALISATION

This chapter explores the networks of political power among the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates in the 18th-century Ottoman Empire. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Orthodox Church faced a very dangerous challenge from the Catholic missionaries in late 17th and early 18th century, at which time the Ottoman central administration also began to co-operate with the Greek Orthodox lay elites who started to play a major role in the policy-making of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Rather than seeing the Eastern Patriarchates as mere tools in the hands of these lay elites, who provided the means of support for the Patriarchate of Constantinople to dominate the Eastern Patriarchates, it will be suggested in this chapter that in parallel to these lay elites, there also emerged during the same period a patriarchal elite class within the Orthodox Church, who further contributed to the centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates in the Ottoman Empire. Instead of assuming that the relations between the patriarchs of Constantinople and those of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria was one of domination and/or submission, we will suggest that the transformation that was occurring in the Orthodox Church was put into action through a patriarchal elite class, which combined its sources and powers and formed a unified front against any other potentates such as the Catholics or the non-Greek Christian churches in the Ottoman Empire. In this period, it would also appear, the Eastern patriarchs began to solve their problems through the central administration almost exclusively, and in more than few cases, without the intervention of the patriarchs of Constantinople. The first section of this chapter explores the making of this patriarchal elite class, and the policy-making among them. The second one focuses on the tenure of a prominent Patriarch of Antioch, namely Silvestros (1724-1766), and analyses how this

patriarchal elite member transformed the Patriarchate of Antioch from a provincial one into one enjoying the immediate attention, and access to the central administration.

Making of the Patriarchal Elite

As mentioned in the previous chapter in detail, the Greek Orthodox community in Istanbul was undergoing a major transformation by the beginning of the 18th century and the patriarchate(s) formed an important aspect of this overall transformation in the Greek Orthodox world in the Ottoman realms. In this section, in order to trace the rupture from the earlier periods explained in the previous chapters, we will focus on the process of their appointments and the rights assigned to them relying on their *berats* of investiture. In this regard, special attention will be drawn to the forms of competition, cooperation and negligence between the central and provincial actors, ecclesiastical, political and social. Finally we will focus on the change in the nature of the policies that the Eastern Patriarchs followed in this critical transition. Finally, we will analyse the homogenisation in their authority that is graphically seen in their *berats*.

Rapprochement between the Eastern Patriarchates and Constantinople, and the Ottoman Administration

As was detailed in previous chapter, the Orthodox ecclesiastical organisation had met great threat from the Catholic missions and during that time Phanariots went through a remarkable phase of development engaging in the core of the Ottoman economic, administrative and political apparatus. The Orthodox Church responded to these developments accordingly, putting up resistance against the Catholics in many ways, especially through political and economic means often provided by the Phanariots

To start with the developments affecting the Patriarchate of Antioch, one may commence with the changes to its clergy and flock consisting overwhelmingly of the Arabic speaking peoples of greater Syria. Conversion of the Orthodox flock—and more

importantly hierarchy—into Catholicism was most effective in the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch. During the first two centuries of the Ottoman rule in Syria, the Patriarchs of Antioch had close ties with the Catholic world and several Antiochian patriarchs facilitated Catholic missions in their sees and even sent their Catholic profession to Rome, and some Catholic courts, a pattern which remained unchanged even during the tenures of the few Greek-speaking patriarchs of Antioch.⁴⁹⁹ A real transformation occurred in this patriarchate in 1724, when the Catholic Serafeim was elected the Patriarch of Antioch taking the name Kyrillos, which created panic in the Great Church in Istanbul. After many centuries of Arabic-speaking patriarchs, the Synod of Constantinople appointed Silvestros, a Cypriot monk from Mount Athos, as the patriarch of Antioch.⁵⁰⁰ Starting with Silvestros (1724-1766), patriarchs of Constantinople appointed the Antiochian patriarchs from Greek-speaking clergymen for two centuries, when, with Russian help, the patriarchs of Antioch began to be elected from among the Arabic-speaking local clergy, a tradition which has been retained to the present day in the Patriarchate of Antioch. Although it has been suggested that the strict rule of Silvestros resulted in estrangement between Istanbul and Antioch, the activities of Silvestros show that he had considerable success in managing to connect the two, as will be analysed in greater detail in the next chapter. In addition, the Patriarchate of Antioch began to benefit from unusual economic resources, such as collecting alms from the Orthodox people outside its domains, and *metochia/evkâf* founded under Constantinopolitan jurisdiction and devoted to Antioch. Finally, it managed to resist the economic encroachments of some Constantinopolitan metropolitans through successful lobbying at the Sublime Porte.

⁴⁹⁹ Walbiner 1997-1998: 585-586.

⁵⁰⁰ Walbiner 2007: 113-129.

On the Alexandrian throne Samouil was a protégé of Parthenios, who ordained him as deacon and employed him as his assistant.⁵⁰¹ As shown in the first chapter, Samouil's tenure (1710-1712, 1714-1723) faced the problem of parallel election of another Patriarch of Alexandria called Kosmas by the Patriarch of Constantinople, who also received a *berat* for the latter although the new Patriarch of Constantinople Kyprianos II accepted Samouil as the official Patriarch of Alexandria. Kosmas was appointed to the Patriarchate of Alexandria only in the following period. Despite the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the patriarchal elections of Alexandria, a true transformation that can also be traced through Ottoman documentation happened during the tenure of Matthaïos (1746-1766), who was also appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople. As will be detailed below, Matthaïos was supported with an extensive *berat* allowing him to tackle the problems of his patriarchate more effectively through the direct support of the Ottoman central administration.

We see a similar situation in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem which developed in this epoch of rapid change a much closer relationship with the Great Church and Ottoman administration compared with the others such as Antioch. We know that from the mid-17th century onwards, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem began to reside in Istanbul, and some of them like Dositheos and Chrysanthos Notaras played a major role in formulating the major policies of the Orthodox Church. Despite their proximity to the Ottoman central authority and the core of the church administration, however, a great number of their issues *vis-à-vis* the Porte had been of provincial nature, mostly concerning their position in the Holy Land, changes on Patriarchal thrones, the Patriarchs' problems in appointing new metropolitans,

⁵⁰¹ Vaporis 1974: 125. Papadopoulos 1935: 715-49.

and their conflicts with regional authorities.⁵⁰² With the coming of the 18th century, however, the connection between the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople witnessed a greater intensification. Meletios, Patriarch of Jerusalem between 1731 and 1737, gained considerable influence over some holy sites. It was during the long tenure of his successor Parthenios, Patriarch between 1737 and 1766, however, that the Patriarchate of Jerusalem became much stronger in economic and political aspects. Although similar regional problems recurred in his tenure as well, his solutions show the degree and extent of his connections with the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Sublime Porte. If we dig into the personality of Parthenios in the Ottoman archives, we learn that it was the Patriarch of Constantinople who appointed Parthenios to the Patriarchal seat of Jerusalem. In an Ottoman document issued in 1737 it is written that Meletios, the former Patriarch of Jerusalem is ‘quite old and sick, and thus no more fit to be Patriarch’ and that he had resigned ‘through his own will and the sealed petition of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul’.⁵⁰³ Through an analysis of Greek and Ottoman sources we learn that Parthenios was consistently quite close to the core of church affairs in cooperation with the Ottoman central administration, an involvement that had largely been realised within the church during the times of many of his predecessors. For example, we see that Parthenios supported the above-mentioned Silvestros, the Patriarch of Antioch, in his struggle with pro-Latin Kyrillos in 1740’s through a petition which he wrote jointly with Patriarch of Constantinople Paisios to the Sublime Porte.⁵⁰⁴

⁵⁰² See the following particular documents BOA.D.PSK.1/158 (7 January 1696), BOA.D.PSK.1/167 (1697-98), BOA.D.PSK.1/182 (25 March 1700), BOA.D.PSK.4/18 (1706-07), BOA.D.PSK.4/104 (3 August 1712), BOA.D.PSK.5/154 (19 January 1717), D.PSK.9.101 (1730-1731).

⁵⁰³ BOA.D.PSK.11/63 (1737-38). The Greek Patriarchal sources also confirm that it was Neofytos, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who appointed Parthenios as the Patriarch of Jerusalem. See Delikanis 1905. vol. II: 494.

⁵⁰⁴ BOA.D.PSK.15/56 (6 December 1745).

In short, in the first half of 18th century, Eastern Patriarchs began to come from similar backgrounds and to look more homogenous than in previous centuries. Because the Eastern Patriarchates now had more power because of their proximity not only to the Patriarchs of Constantinople but also to the Ottoman central administration, they began to support some candidates for the thrones of other Eastern Patriarchates, or to contribute to their brother of Constantinople through the orders they jointly signed with the latter within the Church, or through their joint petitions to the Porte. When Silvestros died, for example, Samouil of Constantinople, Matthaios of Alexandria, and Parthenios of Jerusalem unanimously elected Filimon, the metropolitan of Aleppo.⁵⁰⁵ However, it was also possible for an Eastern patriarch to impose his own candidate despite the opposition of that of Constantinople, as was the case with Parthenios' successor Efraim.⁵⁰⁶ Therefore, they further contributed to such homogeneity as well. Another factor supplying such homogeneity was the presence of the Princely academies in Moldavia and Wallachia, which through their role as educational and cultural centres for Orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire further contributed to the making of a homogeneous group of hierarchs, some of whom were to become the patriarchs of the time.

Before going into an analysis of the *berats* of the Eastern Patriarchs, which reflects this transformation in more concrete terms, it would be interesting to give a discussion of whether there was a change in the way that the Eastern Patriarchs, who began to come from very similar backgrounds, regarded their non-Greek-speaking clergy, and laymen, who also began to rise in the hierarchy through the help they received partly from the missionaries and the French diplomats in the Ottoman Empire, but mainly from the newly

⁵⁰⁵ Makraios 1872: 253.

⁵⁰⁶ As observed by Strantzalis in supporting the candidacy of Efraim the metropolitan of Bethlehem before his death, Parthenios was acting in contravention of the tradition established since the time of Dositheos, by which tradition the patriarchs of Jerusalem were chosen from among the metropolitans of Kaisaria. Strantzalis 2003: 92.

emerging Arabic-speaking magnates—who were also closely related to the Catholic party—in the Ottoman Middle East.

As we have mentioned throughout, an important aspect of the change in the patriarchal elections in the Eastern Patriarchates involved a change in the backgrounds of the patriarchs. A great majority of the patriarchs in the 18th century were mainly from the Greek-speaking lands of the Ottoman Empire, and a considerable number were born in places away from the patriarchates where they took office as patriarchs. The crucial question to be posed here is whether such transformation can be traced through an analysis of these patriarchs' perception of the Arabic-speaking Christians in their jurisdiction—both Orthodox and Orthodox-turned Catholic. We have at least a few cases all from 1740s among the correspondence of the Eastern Patriarchs with their Ottoman overlords, where we see that at least one of these patriarchs differentiated the Arab-speaking Christians in almost ethnic terms.

According to a letter written from Istanbul to the *vâlî* of Sayda and the *kadi* of Acre on 21 July 1740,⁵⁰⁷ Parthenios⁵⁰⁸ complained of the Arab Orthodox community (*'Arab Rum tâ'ifesi*) of Acre who converted to Catholicism. According to him, these Arab Orthodox were not content with causing disruption (*bir yerlerde ihtilâl eylediklerine kanâ'at itmeyüb*), and in contravention of the established custom, they wanted to take over the Orthodox churches and carry out their services differently whilst continuing to bury their dead in the same caves (*biz dahî âyinlerimizi başka icrâ idelüm ve mürd olanlarımızı dahî sizin mağıralarınıza defn idelüm diyü*). He also added that they are supported by some *meşâyîh* and *a'yân*. Therefore Parthenios wanted that these Arab Orthodox be prevented from taking control of their churches in Acre. It is known that the province of Sayda and in

⁵⁰⁷ BOA.D.PSK.11/147 (21 July 1740). This draft was registered in the *defter* with the following code: BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 97 (22 July 1740).

⁵⁰⁸ Parthenios was from Athens. Athanasiadou 1886: 234.

particular the town of Acre was one of the strongholds of the Catholic missionaries in Ottoman Syria, and the backing of the local Arab Orthodox converts to Catholicism was an important factor behind this, which eventually led the Patriarchate of Jerusalem to make use of the term Arab Orthodox. However, the response to this petition simply orders the relevant administrative and judicial bodies to prevent harassment and interference in contravention of the conditions of Parthenios' *berat* and the practice which had been followed until then (*hilâf-ı şurût-ı berât-ı 'âlişân ve kadîmden oligelmîşe mugâyir*).

In another letter,⁵⁰⁹ Parthenios complained of the Arab Orthodox of Jerusalem who urged their own candidate as the secretary (*yazıcı*) of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. This secretary, Parthenios wrote, was responsible for writing down the affairs of the Patriarchate in a *defter*, and had been chosen from among the monks of a monastery of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. However, some Orthodox Arabs residing in Jerusalem (*Kuds-i Şerîfde sâkin Rum 'Arab tâ'ifesinden ba'zıları*) insisted that they should chose the secretary and urged that they would achieve this by the decisive backing which they would receive from the *a'yân* and *hükkâm* residing in their own region (*biz size yazıcı oluruz diyü cebr ve ba'zı a'yân ve hükkâm tarafından dahî cebr ile yazıcı iderüz*). Parthenios further commented that their treachery is obvious (*hıyânetleri zâhir*) and thus asked for an imperial decree to prevent these Arab Orthodox from interfering in the appointment of a secretary for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Parthenios was given a decree in accordance with his *berat*, which, according to the wording of the document says that the Patriarchate belongs to Parthenios and shall not be intervened in by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* in contravention of the *sharia* and the imperial decree (*Kuds-i Şerîf ve tevâbi'i Rumiyan Patriği Parteniyoş râhibin üzerinde olub hilâf-ı şer'-i şerîf ve bilâ-fermân ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi taraflarından*

⁵⁰⁹ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 123a (25 May 1741).

rencîde olunmaya diyü). There is no mention of a similar term to the '*Arab Rum tâ'ifesi*' for the same Arab Orthodox, neither in the Ottoman state nomenclature nor in the Ottoman administration's response to the petition of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Therefore the Ottoman *hüküm* mentions only the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*, referring to the relevant administrators in Jerusalem, as is more apparent in the example below, which was written right after the previous one. This becomes apparent from the sequential responses to both the petitions of Parthenios in the records of the Ottoman central chancery. An interesting point to be made here is that in this particular document it is not clear whether the Arab Orthodox in question are Orthodox or Catholic as Parthenios did not need to demarcate them as in the previous documents.

The final example relates to the insistence of the Arab Orthodox in taking part in the administrative affairs of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, as well.⁵¹⁰ In this case Parthenios complained that the Arab Orthodox tried to intervene in the appointment of a *kocabaş* for the Patriarchate. As for their supporters, he identifies the *a'yân*, *hükkâm*, and *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*. From the response of the central administration, we see that the latter puts all these three under the unifying umbrella of *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*, and makes no reference to the Arab Orthodox. Therefore it orders the *kadi* of Jerusalem to prevent the intervention and harassment by this *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*. The document says that until this petition, patriarchs of Jerusalem have been provided with orders supporting their control of the administrative issues of the Patriarchate and preventing the intervention of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*. Therefore, Parthenios was given a supporting order by the central administration. In this document, too, Parthenios did not specify whether the Arab Orthodox in question are Orthodox or Catholic.

⁵¹⁰ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 123b, 1154.

We may conclude that at least one of the patriarchal elites, namely Parthenios of Jerusalem, had a subjective view of the Arabic-speaking Christian population in the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Interestingly, in one of these documents, the same patriarch used the term *'Arab Rum tâ'ifesi* to refer to those Arab Orthodox who converted to Catholicism while in the other two, he left it unclear whether he was referring to those Orthodox who converted to Catholicism or those who remained loyal to Orthodoxy. However, it is clear that these Arab Orthodox struggled to rise up in the patriarchal hierarchy by taking up administrative posts within the Patriarchate. From this competition there emerged an antagonism between this group and the upper echelons of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem with power bases in Istanbul, which resulted in the coinage of the term *'Arab Rum tâ'ifesi* by the latter. As far as the overall stance of the Ottoman administration to this division among its Orthodox subjects is concerned, it can be said that it did not acknowledge such a division at least in principle, which can be understood from its insistence not to use the term Arab Orthodox. As indicated above, although a Greek Orthodox Patriarch used this term to make a differentiation among his flock, Ottoman administration, though supporting Parthenios, refrained from acknowledging such difference by avoiding to use the term *'Arab Rum tâ'ifesi*, and referred only to *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*.

From the beginning of the 18th century onwards, the Phanariots, who were entrusted with many political and economic duties by the central administration, took part in the ecclesiastical governance of the Orthodox community as well. From that moment on, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, now in close contact with the Phanariots and supported by the Ottoman central administration, assumed a leading role over a larger portion of the Orthodox population in the Ottoman Empire. It can be convincingly argued that the

Catholic infiltration among the Ottoman Orthodox was one of the main reasons behind this flourishing of the Phanariots and the emergence of Istanbul, as the constant source of power for the Eastern Patriarchates in political and ecclesiastical terms. In economic terms, the Eastern Patriarchates were supported not only by the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but also the Ottoman central administration through a stable support they received from it in collecting alms and the profit of *evkâf/metochia* from outside the jurisdiction of a patriarchate. As will be shown throughout the final chapter on the economy of Eastern Patriarchates, this support reached the extent that the Eastern Patriarchs were sometimes able to circumvent the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople using the closer ties they established with the Porte.

Patriarchal *berats* of investiture at the turn of the 18th century

After this introductory information, it would be appropriate to concentrate on each particular *berat* as such documents provide us with a clear explanation of the rights of each patriarch and constitute the most instrumental means to analyse the transformation occurring in the Greek Orthodox church in the 18th-century from the perspective of the Ottoman central administration. A comparison of the earlier *berats*, shows that, despite sharing some common elements, they had particular articles depending on the individual position of each patriarchate.

Transformation in the *berats* of the Patriarchate of Antioch

Regarding the Patriarchate of Antioch we have two important *berats*, through which one can see the nature of transition occurring in this Patriarchate in early 18th century. The first one is a *berat* of Athanasios for his second tenure between 1720 and 1724, analysis of which appears in the first chapter,⁵¹¹ and the second one is the *berat* of

⁵¹¹ See Appendix III and IV for the facsimile and transliteration of this *berat*.

his successor Silvestros (1724-1766)⁵¹² renewed on the enthronement of Sultan Mahmud I in 1730. A comparison between the two *berats* shows dramatically the transformation going on in the Patriarchate of Antioch, which will be dealt with in greater detail below.

Silvestros' *berat* starts with an introduction on the context of the time, stating that it is a new *berat* given to Silvestros 2 October 1730, on the occasion of the metropolitanate of Aleppo's reattachment to the Patriarchate of Antioch. It states that when the previous patriarch of Antioch Athanasios died, Silvestros had been his warden (*kethüdâ*). It has been reported by the dragoman of the Porte, all the metropolitans and others that Silvestros is the choice of all, is reliable in all ways, is able to conduct their 'baseless' religion, is eligible for the patriarchate, is fit and deserving it in many ways, and is useful (*enfa'*) for the *zimmî re'âyâ* of those lands. After the metropolitanate of Aleppo was somehow detached from the Patriarchate of Antioch and transferred to that of Constantinople, it was reattached to the Patriarchate of Antioch in accordance with the petition bearing the seal of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Therefore Silvestros wanted to obtain an updated *berat* including in his jurisdiction the metropolitanate of Aleppo.

Silvestros' *berat* includes the following terms:

1. He is to be patriarch over the Greek Orthodox in Antioch, Damascus, Aleppo, Tripoli, Sayda, Beirut, Ladikya, Payas, Adana, Hama, Humus, Ba'albek, Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Ahîsha, Çıldır, and their dependencies in accordance with the old customs and their baseless rite (*'âyin-i 'âtilaları*), and he is to be regarded as patriarch by the old and young (*ulusı ve keçisi*) of his flock,
2. He is not to be opposed by such financial and administrative officers as *beytü'l-mâl âdemleri*, *voyvodas*, *subaşıs*, *mütevellîs* and the like, when he or his metropolitans want to obtain the inheritance of the dead metropolitans, priests, monks, and nuns,
3. No one is to take the churches of the Orthodox from them in contravention of the imperial order, and no one is to interfere when they repair them with the approval of sharia and my command,

⁵¹² See Appendix V and VI for the facsimile and transliteration of this *berat*.

4. Their legal disputes that require resolution in accordance with the *sharia* rules (*şer‘-i şerîfe müte‘allik lâzım gelan da‘vâların*) are to be handled in the Sublime Porte, and no one is to interfere in their legal cases related to marital issues,
5. Whatever the Orthodox clergy, or flock will for the poor of their churches or the Patriarch are to be accepted and dealt according to *sharia* rules through the testimony of Orthodox witnesses,
6. If the bishops, priors, priests, and monks act in contravention of their rite, their beards are to be shaved and places are to be given to others, and the patriarch is not to be interfered with in this issue,
7. The ascetic monks (*ba‘zı târik-i dünyâ olan keşîşler*) under his jurisdiction are not to wander wherever they like in contravention to their rite but should stay in whichever monastery they belong to,
8. The Patriarch and his men are to be given guides in places where they journey for collecting alms. When they wear civilian clothes (*tebdîl-i came*) to pass safely in some dangerous places, and carry weapons (*âlat-ı harb*) to avert danger and protect themselves from bandits in bridges and passes, they are not to be interfered by *bâcdârs*, *tamgacıs* and other *ehl-i ‘örf tâ‘ifesi* in contravention of law and established custom. Similarly they are not to be harassed in places they wander by the *ehl-i ‘örf tâ‘ifesi* who seek to extort money by forcing them to convert against their consent (*bir zimmînin kendi rızâsı yoğiken birisini cebren İslâm ol diyü ehl-i ‘örf tâ‘ifesi taraflarından celb-i mâl için rencide itdirilmeyüb*).
9. The *zu‘emâ*, *erbâb-ı timâr* and Muslim magnates are not to be allowed to prevent their *zimmi* servants from conducting their religious duties.
10. The contracts or annulments of marriage, disputes between two *zimmîs* who wish to solve these disputes among themselves and their papers relating to oath and excommunication are not to be interfered in from outside. The patriarch is not to be forced to strip a priest from a church or to give a church to a certain priest, and if a priest or monk is to be arrested (*alikonulub*) he is to be arrested through the mediation of the patriarch (*patrik-i mesfûr ma‘rifetiyle*),
11. The churches and whatever is related to these churches are to be held in the possession of the Patriarch (*patrik-i mesfûr tarafından zabt itdirülüb*) and any other community is not to be allowed to have them,
12. The Patriarch’s staff (*‘asâ*), horses (*bargir*), and mules are not to be taken from him,
13. If some clergymen who do not belong to a church wander neighbourhood by neighbourhood (*mahalle be mahalle gezüb*), and foment mischief (*fesâd*), they are to be disciplined by the Patriarch,
14. He is not to be harassed by the *kapıkulları* with the pretext of urging their service as guards (*biz sana cebren yasağçı oluruz diyü*),

15. The Patriarch is to judge the priests who embezzle the *patriklik rüsûmî* and the like, and he is not to be harassed by *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* with an intention to extort money on the days they perform their ceremonies from olden times. Likewise, while the Patriarch does not owe to anyone and does not stand surety for anyone, he is not to be harassed by such false allegations,
16. The Patriarch is to hold vineyards, gardens, farms, mills, pastures, fields, houses, shops, *escâr-ı müsmir*, *gayri müsmir*, holy springs, monasteries and any other stuff relating to their churches, or their sheep in the way his predecessors had done, and he is not to be prevented by *mîr-mîrâns*, *mîr-livâs*, *voyvodas*, *subâşıs*, and other *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*.

A cursory look at the *berats* of Athanasios and Silvestros reveal a number of differences at first glance. In Athanasios' case, there does not seem to be any involvement from the centre while Silvestros takes almost all of his support from the centre. The experienced men (*iş erleri*) of the Christian community of Damascus went to the local *kadi* to advise him of Athanasios' election so that he petitions the Porte accordingly for Athanasios' *berat* whereas Silvestros was chosen by the lay and patriarchal elites in Istanbul, namely the Grand Dragoman of the Porte and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and thus went to Syria from Istanbul itself. In addition, Athanasios' *berat* lacks any mention of *pişkeş*, whilst Silvestros' mentions it explicitly.

As far as the rights of the two *berats* are concerned, one sees that the *berat* of Silvestros is much longer and much more detailed, which might suggest the central administration's involvement, and thus interest in the affairs of the Patriarchate of Antioch, fostered by the centralisation of this Patriarchate through Silvestros' appointment. The places put under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch, for example, are trebled in Silvestros' *berat*. It would be misleading, though, to assume that Silvestros had a wider jurisdiction than his predecessor as these places were only stated in more detail, and as will be explained in the coming section about Silvestros, the latter established his control over many of these places in the very long run. The places mentioned in the *berat* of Athanasios are provided in a more general fashion.

Number 2 in Athanasios' *berat* is a very broad and somewhat vague statement that the Orthodox are not to be harassed in matters relating to their rite, while it is impossible in this document to see what this means in practice except for the inheritances, and the family law, mentioned in numbers 3 and 4 respectively. We see in Silvestros' *berat* that there are many more derivatives of what is involved in 'their rite', as can be seen in numbers 6, 7, and 13 regarding the disciplining of the clergy and in number 9 with respect to the legal matters among Christians and the tool of excommunication. Some of the other additional issues in Silvestros' *berat* relate to the new position and thus the new rights and problems of the Patriarchate of Antioch before the Ottoman central administration. Number 8, for example, refers to the practice of collecting alms often outside the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch, and the new problems this practice entailed. In some other cases, we see that there are hints on the boundaries of the Patriarch's legal rights in matters relating to the financial and administrative officers in the Ottoman Empire, as mentioned in number 10, 11, 14 and 15. The most revolutionary development, however, is the article 4 which allows patriarch of Antioch to transfer any dispute, which is normally dealt with in the local sharia court, to the *Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn*, epitomising the centralisation of the affairs of the patriarchate of Antioch, and the other patriarchates as will be shown below, in Istanbul in a most graphic way. As will be further analysed in the second part of the present chapter, Silvestros and Matthaïos and Parthenios would appeal to the *Dîvân* to have the provincial disputes settled in Istanbul on several occasions.

Transformation in the *berats* of the Patriarchate of Alexandria

As far as the Patriarchate of Alexandria is concerned, the *berats* we possess are confined to later periods and do not allow us to make such a comparison as the one between Chrysanthos and Parthenios of Jerusalem. The only *berat* we have for the

Patriarchate of Alexandria for the period we are dealing with is that of Matthaios (1746-66) issued in 1746.⁵¹³ A comparison between the *berats* of Matthaios and Gerasimos Palladas, which has been analysed in the first chapter, shows the degree of transformation in the Patriarchates of Alexandria.

Matthaios's *berat* starts with a short account of what happened prior to his appointment in 1746. In 1736, the document reads, the patriarchal throne was transferred from Kosmas to another Kosmas with the petition of Neophytos, Patriarch of Constantinople (*İstanbul Rumiyan Patriği Neofitos râhibin 'arzı ve telhîsi ile*). Upon the death of Kosmas in 1746, the then Patriarch of Constantinople Paisios wrote a petition to the Porte recommending the appointment of Matthaios with a *pişkeş* of 3740 *akçes*. Matthaios's rights can be summarised as follows:

1. He is to be patriarch over the Greek Orthodox in Egypt, Alexandria, and their dependencies in accordance with the old customs and their baseless rite (*'âyin-i 'âtilaları*), and he is to be regarded as patriarch by the old and young of the Orthodox community (*Rûmiyân tâ'ifesinin ulusu ve keçisi*),
2. He is not to be opposed by such financial and administrative officers as *beytü'l-mâl âdemleri*, *voyvodas*, *subaşıs*, *mütevellîs*, and the like, when he or his metropolitans want to obtain the inheritance of the dead metropolitans, priests, monks, and nuns,
3. No one is to take the churches of the Orthodox from them in contravention of the imperial order, and no one is to interfere when they repair them with the approval of sharia and my command,
4. Their legal disputes that require resolution in accordance with the *sharia* rules (*şer'-i şerîfe müte'allik lâzım gelan da'vâların*) are to be handled in the Sublime Porte, and no one is to interfere in their legal cases related to marital issues,
5. Whatever the Orthodox clergy, or flock will for the poor of their churches or the patriarch are to be accepted and dealt according to *sharia* rules through the testimony of Orthodox witnesses,

⁵¹³ BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 1 (13 August 1746). For the facsimile and transliteration of this document see Appendix IX and X.

6. If the bishops, priors, priests, and monks act in contravention of their rite, their beards are to be shaved and places are to be given to others, and the patriarch is not to be interfered with in this issue,
7. The ascetic monks (*ba'zı târik-i dünyâ olan keşişler*) under his jurisdiction are not to wander wherever they like in contravention to their rite but should stay in whichever monastery they belong to,
8. The Patriarch and his men are to be given guides in places where they journey for collecting alms. When they wear civilian clothes (*tebdîl-i came*) to pass safely in some dangerous places, and carry weapons (*âlât-ı harb*) to avert danger and protect themselves from bandits in bridges and passes, they are not to be interfered by *bâcdârs*, *tamgacıs* and other *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* in contravention of law and established custom. Similarly they are not to be harassed in places they wander by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* who seek to extort money by forcing them to convert against their consent (*bir zimmînin kendi rızâsı yođıken birisini cebren İslâm ol diyü ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi taraflarından celb-i mâl için rencide itdirülmeyüb*).
9. The *zu'emâ*, *erbâb-ı timâr* and Muslim magnates are not to be allowed to prevent their *zimmi* servants from conducting their religious duties.
10. The contracts or annulments of marriage, disputes between two *zimmîs* who wish to solve these disputes among themselves and their papers relating to oath and excommunication are not to be interfered from outside. The patriarch is not to be forced to strip a priest from a church or to give a church to a certain priest, and if a priest or monk is to be arrested (*alıkonulub*) he is to be arrested through the mediation of the patriarch (*patrik-i mesfûr ma'rifetiyle*),
11. The churches and whatever is related to these churches are to be held in the possession of the Patriarch (*patrik-i mesfûr tarafından zabt itdirülüüb*) and any other community is not to be allowed to have them,
12. The patriarch's staff (*'asâ*), horse (*bargir*), and mules are not to be taken from him,
13. If some clergymen who do not belong to a church wander neighbourhood by neighbourhood (*mahalle be mahalle gezüüb*), and foment mischief (*fesâd*), they are to be disciplined by the patriarch,
14. He is not to be harassed by the *kapıkulları* with the pretext of urging their service as guards (*biz sana cebren yasakçı oluruz diyü*),
15. The patriarch is to judge the priests who embezzle (*ekl u bel'*) *patriklik rüsûmı* and the like, and he is not to be harassed by *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* with an intention to extort money on the days they perform their ceremonies from olden times. Likewise, if the Patriarch does not owe to anyone and does not stand surety for anyone, he is not to be harassed by such false allegations,
16. The patriarch is to hold the vineyards, gardens, farms, mills, pastures, fields, houses, shops, orchards with fruitbearing and non-fruitbearing trees, holy

springs, monasteries and any other stuff relating to their churches, or their sheep in the way his predecessors had done.

Comparing Matthaïos' *berat* to Gerasimos' shows that, in Matthaïos' time, the articles assigned to the patriarchs of Alexandria more than doubled in quantity. While the basic points such as number 1, 3, 5, and 7 in Gerasimos' *berat* were followed respectively in number 1, 2, 4, and 16 in Matthaïos' time. The other points such as number 2, 4, and 6 were either further detailed or cancelled out and distributed among more specific articles. Finally, as was the case with the *berats* of the Patriarchate of Antioch, there are completely novel articles in Matthaïos' *berat* about the collection of alms, inheritances, and devotions of the Orthodox to the patriarchate (number 8), and about the legal rights of the patriarch with respect to the financial and administrative officers in the empire (number 10, 11, 14, and 15).

Transformation in the *berats* of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem

With respect to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem the *berat* which we have in original Ottoman Turkish showing the transformation of this patriarchate is the *berat* of Parthenios (1744-1766) renewed on 20 February 1755 upon the enthronement of Sultan Osman III,⁵¹⁴ which can be compared to the *berat* of Chrysanthos Notaras from 1707 as analysed in the first chapter.

Starting with a statement on the context of the time the *berat* was written, Parthenios' *berat* reads that it was renewed on the occasion of Sultan Osman's ascension to throne. Following the original *berat* given to Parthenios in 1737, the document in question repeats the terms of Parthenios' patriarchate as follows:

1. He is to be patriarch over the Greek Orthodox in Jerusalem, and its dependencies in accordance with the old customs and their baseless rite (*'âyin-i âtilaları*), and he is to be regarded as patriarch by the metropolitans, bishops,

⁵¹⁴ The document is registered in BOA.KK.d.2540/2, 77 (20 February 1755). A facsimile and transliteration appear in Appendix VII and VIII.

monks, and nuns in Jerusalem, Mount Sinai, Gaza, Ramla, Kal'a-i (?) 'Aclûn, Acre, Nasâra (Nâsıra?) and their dependencies and over the monks in Georgian, Ethiopian, Syrian, and Coptic monasteries, and the other old and young among the infidels (*kefere tâ'ifesinin ulusu ve keçisi*),

2. No one is to take the churches of the Orthodox from them in contravention of the imperial order, nor should the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* harass them with the pretext of inspection (*teftîş iderüz diyü*),
3. If the bishops, priests, and monks act in contravention of their rite, their beards are to be shaved and their places are to be given to others, and the patriarch is not to be interfered with in this issue,
4. He is not to be opposed by the *beytü'l-mâl âdemleri*, and others, when he or his deputies want to obtain the inheritance of the dead clergymen,
5. With regard to marital issues, the village priests are not to marry the Orthodox to those who are not eligible for marriage with the Orthodox (*nikâh câ'iz olmayan Rum tâ'ifesine ba'zı kurrâ papasları nikâh eylemeyüb ve itdirilmeye*). Likewise, if an Orthodox woman escapes from her husband or an Orthodox man wants to have a divorce or marriage (*bir zimmiye 'avret erinden kaçsa ve zimmi dahî 'avret boşamalu veyâhûd almalu olsa*), no one is to interfere with them except for the patriarch or his deputies.
6. The cash and other items that the Orthodox clergymen, monks, priests, or flock bequeath for Jerusalem as devotions, alms and inheritance for Jerusalem are to be taken by the Patriarch and to be dealt with according to *sharia* rules through the testimony of Orthodox witnesses,
7. If one of his metropolitans or bishops dies or is dismissed, his successor is to be appointed by the patriarch himself, and is not to be interfered with,
8. Their legal disputes whose resolution requires application of *sharia* rules (*şer'-i şerîfe müte'allik lâzım gelan da 'vâların*) are to be handled in the Sublime Porte,
9. The Patriarch and his entourage are not to be harassed in places where they journey for collecting alms by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* asking them why they go there or why they stay that much (*buraya niçün geldiniz ve niye çok meks idersiz diyü*). When they carry civilian clothes (*tebdîl-i came*) and weapons (*âlât-ı harb*) to pass safely in some dangerous places, and to avert danger and protect themselves from bandits, they are not to be interfered with by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* in contravention of old custom,
10. If the patriarch has not given his consent, he is not to be harassed by the *kapı kulları* imposing themselves as his guards by force (*biz sana cebren yasakçı oluruz diyü*),
11. He is not to be harassed in family matters between *zimmîs* such as contracting and annulling marriage, and his disciplinary actions relating to oath and excommunication are not to be interfered with by *kadis* and *nâ'ibs*,

12. The patriarch is to judge his deputies who embezzle the *patriklik rüsûmî* relating to the churches and monasteries, and he is not to be harassed in disciplining them,
13. If a monk who does not belong to a church wanders neighbourhood by neighbourhood (*mahalle be mahalle gezüb*), and foment mischief (*fesâd*), he is to be disciplined by the Patriarch,
14. The patriarch is to hold the vineyards, gardens, farms, mills, fields, pastures, houses, shops, orchards with fruitbearing and non-fruitbearing trees, holy springs, monasteries and any other stuff relating to their churches, or their sheep in the way his predecessors had done.

A comparison between the *berats* of Chrysanthos and Parthenios shows that Parthenios' *berat* largely follows the first seven points in Chrysanthos'. The remaining three points mentioned in Chrysanthos' *berat* however disappear in Parthenios'. Of particular importance is number 9, on the Greek Orthodox possessions in Jerusalem. As mentioned in second chapter, the Greek Orthodox and Armenian hierarchies were in almost constant competition for holy sites throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, and by the beginning of the 18th century, the Greek Orthodox dominance vis-à-vis the Armenians was established, as can be seen in Chrysanthos' *berat*. However, by Parthenios' time, this phrase was taken out of the patriarchal *berat*, as the Greek Orthodox domination of the Holy Sites then became an established phenomenon.

As far as the newly-introduced articles encountered in the patriarchal *berat* of Parthenios are concerned, we can say that almost all of them relate to the Patriarch's jurisdiction and dispute-resolution. Number 8 on the treatment of the patriarchal disputes in the Sublime Porte, for example, is quite a novel phenomenon, which is absent in earlier *berats* such as those of Chrysanthos of Jerusalem and Athanasios of Antioch. As will be further elaborated, this new phenomenon was common in the *berats* contemporary to Parthenios' namely the *berats* of Silvestros and Matthaios.

Similarly what is mentioned in number 9 in Parthenios' *berat*, namely the practice of collecting alms for the Patriarchate, is also largely a new phenomenon, which will be analysed in the next chapter. Collection of alms (*ziteia/tasadduk*) was not new to the Eastern Patriarchates, but by the early 18th century, and especially following the appointment of the Phanariots as the Princes for Moldavia and Wallachia, the Eastern Patriarchates intensified this practice largely in these principalities. The beginning of this practice was not without problems given its newness, and its openness to abuse by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*, and vulnerability to such disorders as banditry in these frontier zones between the clashing Ottomans and Habsburgs.

Number 10 in Parthenios' *berat* shows not only the disorders of the *kapıkulları* of the time, but also the Patriarchal elites' ability to oppose them through the help they received from the central administration. Number 11 is also highly significant as regards the jurisdiction of the Patriarch over the legal disputes within his flock, as it provides him with the highest authority in the Ottoman Empire to handle these disputes exclusively. Likewise, number 12 gives the Patriarch absolute authority over his clergy, and saves him from any sort of harassment from the outside. Number 13 should be regarded not only as a disciplinary condition against the clergy but also against the infringement of the Catholics among the Greek Orthodox clergymen. As mentioned through the letters of the missionaries in Chapter 3, encroaching on a church through its clergy was quite a common method among the Catholic missionaries in the Ottoman Empire. Finally, number 14 should not be regarded as a novelty in the patriarchal *berats*. It is known that the monasteries had already got their possessions acknowledged through the Islamic practice of endowment (*vakf*) and they were accepted by the state itself through the efforts of the

famous *seyhülislam* Ebussuud Efendi in mid-16th century,⁵¹⁵ and the *berat* of Athanasios, who was contemporary to Chrysanthos, would show that the latter also had a similar condition in his *berat*.

Comparison between three *berats* of the Patriarchal Elites in the 18th century: Silvestros (1724-1766), Matthaïos (1746-1766), and Parthenios (1737-1766)

In view of the patriarchal *berats* invested in the mid-18th century laid out above, we can easily say that all of them follow a similar pattern. What is more, the *berats* of Matthaïos of Alexandria and Silvestros relate to all the same points almost word for word. The only difference between these two would be the first point relating to their patriarchal jurisdiction covering different places. Matthaïos' *berat* refers to his jurisdiction only in broad terms whilst Silvestros' states the places in his jurisdiction in great detail. As regards Parthenios' jurisdiction, we see that his *berat* mentions not only the names of the places over which he had jurisdiction, but also the non-Greek Orthodox communities, namely the Georgians, Ethiopians, and Syrians. The other points referred to in Parthenios' *berat* follow the general pattern laid out in the *berats* of Silvestros and Matthaïos in a different sequence. This can be seen in the following series of numbers, where the first ones refer to the points mentioned in the *berat* of Parthenios, while the others, in parentheses, refer to the points mentioned in the *berats* of Matthaïos and Silvestros: 1 (1), 2 (3), 3 (6), 4 (2), 5 (=10), 6 (5), 7 (-), 8 (4), 9 (8), 10 (14), 11 (=10), 12 (15), 13 (13), 14 (16), - (7), - (9), - (11), - (12). As seen, the *berat* of the Patriarch of Jerusalem largely matches those of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch.

As far as the points of difference are concerned, there is only one which is included in Parthenios' *berat* and does not appear in the others, namely number 7, which prevents

⁵¹⁵ Kermeli 1997: 141-157.

the interference of the others in the appointment of metropolitans and bishops in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. With regard to the other points which appear in the *berats* of Mathhaios and Silvestros but do not occur in Parthenios', namely number 7, 9, 11, and 12 in their *berats*, we can say that they, too, do not deviate from the general model. Number 7 in the *berats* of Matthaïos and Silvestros about the monks being required to stay whichever monastery they belonged to, for example, can be related to the monks mentioned in number 13 in the same *berats*, the only difference being that in the latter example it is the monks who do not belong to a monastery who are prevented from wandering around and getting into mischief. Number 9 preventing the Muslim employers' obstructions to their Christian employees' pursuit of religious duties is a point strengthening the role of the patriarch at the provincial level. Similarly, number 11 empowers the patriarchs' possession of their churches against the other communities, which probably refers to the Orthodox converts to Catholicism. Finally number 12 relates to the inviolability of the patriarchs' insignia of staff, and his horses, and mules.

In terms of the bureaucratic language used in these later *berats*, we can also talk of another aspect of the centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates in Istanbul as there are some significant parallelisms with the *berats* of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Following the example of the patriarchs of Constantinople, the name of the Patriarch is presented with the *elkâb* 'kîdvetⁱⁱ muhtâri'l-milleti'l-mesîhiyye'. The same phrase is retained in the *berats* of Silvestros and Parthenios. As Bayraktar Tellan explains, from 1725 a *dua* or prayer phrase 'hutumet avâkıbuhu bi'l-hayr' has been appended to the names of the patriarchs of Constantinople.⁵¹⁶ This prayer has also been used in the *berats* of Parthenios and Matthaïos, which we do not encounter in Silvestros' *berat*. This

⁵¹⁶ Bayraktar Tellan 2011: 131.

homogeneity not only between the *berats* of the Eastern Patriarchates but also the parallelism to the *berats* of Constantinople bears a first-hand witness to the centralisation within the Orthodox Church in the eyes of the Ottoman administration as well.

Conclusion

In the light of all these points mentioned, we can talk about the making of a patriarchal elite class, which began to take role in the administration of the Greek Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire. One of the significant aspects of this new elite class is the similarities between them. Many of these elites were not born in Greater Syria and Egypt, where the Patriarchates in question were located, in contravention of most of their predecessors. Likewise, before their appointment, they spent a considerable time in the Constantinopolitan jurisdiction and notably the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, which came to be governed by Phanariot princes from the early 18th century onwards. Another important characteristic of these elites is the role of either the Patriarchate of Constantinople or of another Eastern Patriarch as one of these patriarchal elites in their appointments. Although it would be a forced argument to say that among these elites we see the first examples of the birth of Hellenism, it may still be said that at least one of the members of this elite group, namely Parthenios the Patriarch of Jerusalem, used in his correspondence with the Ottoman central administration a differentiating term for two groups of Arabic-speaking Christians: those who began to attempt an upward mobility in the patriarchal hierarchy and those who converted from Orthodoxy to Catholicism. This new outlook of the Eastern Patriarchates is to be contrasted to the earlier practice in many cases. Despite the role of the Patriarchs of Constantinople in the patriarchal politics of the Eastern Patriarchates in earlier times, it was only in the mid-18th century that their confirmation was sought in some patriarchal elections for the Eastern

Patriarchates. During that time, the Eastern Patriarchs gained much extensive and homogeneous rights with respect to the Ottoman central administration, as we sought to draw attention through an analysis of the earlier and later *berats* given to the Eastern Patriarchs before and after this new pattern of ecclesiastical affairs were set up. Indeed, a brief comparison between the *berats* of Athanasios of Antioch (1720-1724), Gerasimos of Alexandria (1688-1710), and Chrysanthos of Jerusalem (1707-1731) which we analysed in the first chapter, and those of Parthenios of Jerusalem (1737-1766), Matthaïos of Alexandria (1746-1766), and Silvestros of Antioch (1724-1766) shows the extent of the transformation in the Eastern Patriarchates. The differences between these two sets of *berats* can easily be seen as a reflection of the changes in the governing patterns of these patriarchates in the 18th century Ottoman Empire. The most significant of these changes is the addition of a number of novelties into the patriarchal *berats* regarding the legal role of the patriarchs not only in matters regarding their flock and hierarchy but also in matters that involved the Patriarchate and the central and provincial administrations at the same time. The changes within the Greek Orthodox community were important in terms of giving the patriarchs firmer control over their hierarchy and flock, which in some cases overlapped with the those who converted into Catholicism, which can be understood from such detailed points in the *berats* as the restrictions on wandering of the clergy requiring them to stay in whichever monastery they belong to or the family law which prevented the village priests from marrying Orthodox people to those who are not eligible to marry, such as Catholics, according to the Orthodox law. The changes in the matters involving both the Patriarchates and the Ottoman central and provincial administrations were particularly important as most of them point to the new powers that the Eastern Patriarchates were assigned, such as collecting alms, or the incomes of the church *vakfs*, both not only within

their respective jurisdiction but also outside, as will be explained throughout the next chapter. Overall, these patriarchal elites of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates can easily be said to have formed a uniform structure, showing a very similar character. One reflection of this uniformity can be seen in the later *berats* which included the very same rights and in case of those of Alexandria and Jerusalem almost word for word. This again, can be contrasted to the lack of such uniformity in earlier *berats* belonging to Athanasios, Gerasimos, and Chrysanthos. In the following section of the chapter, we will focus on the critical and symbolic tenure of Silvestros of Antioch (1724-1766) to see how he managed to bring this provincial Orthodox Patriarchate, which was almost out of the interest and reach of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman central administration into direct contact with Istanbul, which began to establish itself as the political and ecclesiastical centre for the Eastern Patriarchates.

From Periphery to Centre: Case Study of the Tenure of Silvestros of Antioch (1724-1766)

Chronological Introduction

The long tenure of Silvestros (1724-1766) constitutes the core of our discussion of the Greek Orthodox retaliation to Catholic advance among the flock and clergy of the Patriarchate of Antioch. It is known that the death of Athanasios ed-Dabbâs, the Patriarch of Antioch, was followed in 1724 by the election of Serafeim Tanas.⁵¹⁷ Taking the name Kyrillos VI, Serafeim assumed the patriarchal throne with the support of the Jesuit missionaries and the people of Damascus, where the seat of the Patriarchate of Antioch was located. Serafeim was also supported by Osman Pasha of Damascus who had good relations with the former's uncle Euthymios.⁵¹⁸ When the news struck the Great Church through the people of Aleppo, the Synod of Constantinople consecrated Silvestros a

⁵¹⁷ For an introductory glance at the life of Serafeim/Kyrillos, see Charon 1998, vol. I: 31-53.

⁵¹⁸ Burayk 1980: 18.

Cypriot monk⁵¹⁹ from Mount Athos as bishop, and appointed him as the Patriarch of Antioch.⁵²⁰ As mentioned throughout, with his appointment began an unbroken chain of Greek-speaking Patriarchs on the throne of Antioch until 1899, bringing to an end a centuries-long practice of electing a local, Arabic-speaking Patriarch.⁵²¹ On the Uniate side, a chain of Arabic-speaking patriarchs in union with the Papacy continued their existence which was recognised by the Ottoman central administration as a body only after the arrangements of Tanzimat. With such fractionalism, a polemic literature also began to appear in this period.⁵²² Regarded by an anti-Latin stream among the Orthodox as ‘a second Athanasios’ and ‘a truly apostolic man’⁵²³ and portrayed by the Catholic missionaries as a figure who pursued the most cruel vexations against the Catholics, Silvestros presents a controversial figure. The following provides a chronological sketch of the issues Silvestros was confronted with during his 42-year tenure. Then, a detailed analysis of some major subjects in his tenure will be presented, which epitomises the

⁵¹⁹ According to Le Quien, Silvestros had a Greek father and a Maronite mother. Concerning the latter information scholars disagree. See, in particular, Karnapas 1905: 193-194. For a short introduction to his life and works, see Kitromilides 2002: 252-254.

⁵²⁰ On the canonicity of the patriarchates of Silvestros and Kyrillos, Nassour maintains the following view: ‘No Orthodox hierarch or another competent one can question the canonicity of the patriarchate of Silvestros. By contrast, however, the election of Kyrillos Tanas was denied not only by the Orthodox but also by the monasteries, the competent clergymen, and even his close associates who had the same faith and commitment with him towards the Papacy.’ Nassour 1992: 118. Karparas says with certainty that Serafeim snatched the patriarchal throne of Antioch. Karnapas 1905: 535-536. In contrast, Walbiner casts some doubt on the election of both Silvestros and Kyrillos: ‘Sylvester was on Mt Athos when he was informed about the death of his teacher Athanasius and his nomination as successor. That he then preferred to be consecrated in Constantinople ‘where at that moment not a single bishop of the Antiochian patriarchate was present’ and not by a local synod of bishops in Syria might indicate his awareness of the troubles which he had to face soon. But also Cyril did not dare to present his candidature to a selective assembly of bishops as demanded by Canon Law and tradition. So from the strict point of view both elections/consecrations were at least doubtful if not in-canonical.’ Walbiner 2003: 13, n. 9.

⁵²¹ There were only a few exceptions to this practice, Neofytos and Euthymios, who were preceded and succeeded by Arabic-speaking patriarchs, and were not against the pro-Catholic atmosphere of the Patriarchate of Antioch. Walbiner 1997-1998: 587-588.

⁵²² Nasrallah 1976: 71.

⁵²³ Eustratios Argenti uses these appellations for Silvestros in one of his letters written in 1751. Ware 1964:30. Such a view is still retained in the Orthodox church historiography. Karnapas, for example, saw him as someone who ‘saved in the 18th century the Antiochian throne from a real sinking and struck the dangerous enemy on the head.’ Karnapas 1907: 866. Similarly, Nassour saw in Silvestros a ‘rigid defender of Orthodoxy’. Nassour 1992: 124.

transformation of this patriarchate with respect to the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman central administration.

Reflecting the improvement of the relations between the two patriarchates, Silvestros was given a donation sometime between 1726 and 1729 by Paisius, Patriarch of Constantinople, which we learn from a patriarchal document.⁵²⁴ The first years of Silvestros' tenure are characterised by his conflict with the supporters of Kyrillos, who fled to Mount Lebanon. As will be analysed in further detail below, despite his strict measures against not only the Catholic missionaries and the people but also the flock and relative alienation of these people from the pro-Orthodox party in the patriarchate, he was successful after a couple of years in urging the French diplomatic apparatus in the Ottoman Empire to confront the Orthodox party directly. Adopting a more antagonistic approach would ultimately diminish the interest that the French king had towards the Ottoman Orthodox, a point explained in further detail in the second chapter. This was due mainly to Silvestros' economic and political advantages compared to those of his adversaries.

As often mentioned in the secondary literature, Silvestros' strict policies were not welcomed by the masses, which started off at the point of his arrival in Syria to take up his patriarchal throne in Aleppo, where he was given a reception by the prominent Greek Orthodox Aleppines. Realising that as part of the table prepared as a gesture to welcome him fish was being served on the fasting day of Wednesday, he 'upset the table and violently reproved those leading Christian inhabitants who had come to meet him; paying not the slightest attention to their explanations.'⁵²⁵ He is also said to have excommunicated a considerable number of people, including eminent members of the Greek Orthodox community of Aleppo on account of their failure to observe the rules on fasting, and even

⁵²⁴ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 179-185.

⁵²⁵ Rustom 1928, vol. III: 143.

accused them to the pasha of being Franks and causing them to be imprisoned and punished.⁵²⁶ His somewhat strict policies following his appointment are reflected in some Ottoman documents as well. We have a series of petitions of complaint addressed to the Porte,⁵²⁷ some written as early as the 1730s by not only the Orthodox population but also the clergy of the Patriarchate of Antioch (*Haleb'de sâkin ruhbân ve Rumiyân re'âyâları*) who argued about the tax collection measures introduced during Silvestros' tenure. As a result of a complaint signed by a large number of Aleppines and sent to Istanbul through a delegation, the see of Aleppo was detached from the Patriarchate of Antioch and an easy-going metropolitan was appointed on the metropolitan throne of Aleppo, who later gave up his throne to a Catholic one called Maximos.

In early 1730s, Maximos, the Catholic metropolitan of Aleppo, petitioned the Porte complaining about the *ehl-i 'örf*, whom Silvestros made use of during his struggle with Maximos. Thus, the Porte found itself in the middle of a Catholic-Orthodox interface in Syria. From this dispute there emerged the issue of whether the see of Aleppo should belong to the Catholics or the Orthodox. To add to the Catholic-Orthodox confrontation in Aleppo, the *kadi* of Aleppo sent a letter to Istanbul, to which the Porte dispatched an order.⁵²⁸

The years following 1734 witnessed an increasing co-operation between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople pointing to the same problem, namely the advance of Catholicism. From that time, we possess two different letters, one written in 1734 by Silvestros on the missionary activities of Jesuits among the Orthodox flock,⁵²⁹ and the other in 1735 by Neofytos of Constantinople on the 'Papist' Orthodox population in

⁵²⁶ Charon 1998, vol. I: 34.

⁵²⁷ BOA.KK.d.2542/8, 45 (1731-32).

⁵²⁸ BOA.KK.d.2542/8, 90-91 (1733-34).

⁵²⁹ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. II: 385-389.

Aleppo.⁵³⁰ Such co-operation between Silvestros and Neofytos seems to have been supported through financial means as well. For a couple of years, the bulk of the Antiochian correspondence with the Porte was characterised by such economic activities as collection of alms (*tasadduk*), and inheritance (*vasiyyet*) of the Orthodox population who willed that their possessions should be given to the Patriarchate of Antioch in their testimonies, and endowments (*vakf*) of various sorts were donated to the Patriarchate of Antioch.⁵³¹ The role of the Patriarch of Constantinople in this process lies in the fact that a great majority of the economic resources stated above took place within his jurisdiction. Here, one should also mention the support provided by the Ottoman central administration to those deputies of Silvestros, who sometime got into trouble with local administrative officials, clergymen, and even the relatives of the testators.⁵³²

It has often been put forward that having been appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople with the approval of the Ottoman central administration, Silvestros had good relations with the Ottoman officials and that his success in integrating in the Antiochian flock was limited to places where Ottoman administration had a firm control.⁵³³ However, it would be misleading to assume that his co-operation with all the Ottoman officials was quite straightforward as we learn from one of his petitions to the Porte that he had problems with the janissaries of the *dergâh-ı mu'allâ* who accompanied him during his inspections.

In the years following the 1740s, Silvestros made at least five appointments in the Patriarchate of Antioch, which we will analyse in greater detail below. In 1745, he faced

⁵³⁰ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. II: 395-97.

⁵³¹ BOA.D.PSK.11/123 (7 February 1740), BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 17 (1737-38), BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 67a (1738-39), BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 67b (1738-39), BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 87 (1739-40).

⁵³² The economic aspects of the relations are further analysed in the next section of this chapter.

⁵³³ Philipp, for example, says that on the local stage Silvestros' rival Kyrillos had very good relations with the local authorities, notably Osman Pasha of Sidon, and even attempted to take Acre under his jurisdiction. Philipp 1985: 13.

another Catholic challenge, this time not on his flock or ecclesiastical hierarchy, but on his very throne by Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas, about whose patriarchate we possess two Ottoman documents. One of them is about his tax-collection from the Orthodox population.⁵³⁴ The other is an order dispatched to the *kadi* of Aleppo, in response to Kyrillos' petition about the Orthodox population in Aleppo.⁵³⁵ After this short interval in Silvestros' tenure, we see that on 7 November 1745 he managed to receive a *berat* reappointing him as the Patriarch of Antioch.⁵³⁶ His reappointment is also seen in an order dispatched to the relevant *kadis* telling them that the Patriarch of Antioch is Silvestros, and not Kyrillos.⁵³⁷ Alongside almost-always-present problems regarding Patriarch's tax collection,⁵³⁸ from 1745 onwards we see the controversy on the status of the metropolitanate of Aleppo reappearing. During these years there were a great number of changes of the deputies of Silvestros, who now resided outside his jurisdiction, not only in Damascus but also in other places under his jurisdiction. At the same time, Silvestros also attempted to appoint a Greek Orthodox metropolitan in lieu of Maximos, the Catholic metropolitan of Aleppo.⁵³⁹ Having been unable to achieve this, he concentrated his efforts on punishing those Orthodox who converted to Catholicism and sought Ottoman support for this policy. We also understand from his petitions, some of which he wrote jointly with the Patriarch of Constantinople, that the backing of the latter was a big asset in gaining Ottoman support. Finally, he managed to depose Maximos on 17 April 1750⁵⁴⁰ although Maximos' retaliations never ceased and he got his seat back in a few years' time following the parallel appointment of

⁵³⁴ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 55a (1745-46).

⁵³⁵ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 55b (1745-46).

⁵³⁶ BOA.D.PSK.15/56 (7 November 1745).

⁵³⁷ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 70 (1745-46).

⁵³⁸ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 62 (1745-46).

⁵³⁹ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 81 (1746-47).

⁵⁴⁰ BOA.D.PSK.18/23 (17 April 1750).

an Orthodox metropolitan named Sofronios in 1750.⁵⁴¹ In 1757, Silvestros admitted that he would not be able to challenge the Catholics of Aleppo and thus requested the incorporation of the see of Aleppo to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which continued to have it until 1792.

The late 1740s and early 1750s meant the emergence of another problem for Silvestros, this time from an unexpected source. The metropolitan of Gümüşhane, who was under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, began to interfere in the affairs of the Antiochian metropolitanate of Diyarbekir. Claiming that some of the Orthodox population in the see of Diyarbekir went there from his jurisdiction, the metropolitan of Gümüşhane tried to collect taxes from the Orthodox population of Diyarbekir, an issue Silvestros decided to solve not through the mediation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but through the Ottoman central administration. Having been closer to the central administration than most of his predecessors, Silvestros co-ordinated with the central administration successfully and prevented this recurring intervention by the metropolitan of Gümüşhane regardless of the policies of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.⁵⁴²

After this short introduction on Silvestros' tenure it would be appropriate to focus on some aspects of his time through which one may analyse the power relations governing the affairs of the Eastern Patriarchates which were beginning to change towards the beginning of the 18th century. We may categorise these aspects as follows: his appointment and early years, his struggle to re-incorporate the see of Aleppo to his patriarchate, his second confrontation with Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas in the middle decades of the century,

⁵⁴¹ BOA.KK.d.2542/6, 53a (1752-53), BOA.KK.d.2542/6, 53b (1752-53). The letter informing the Aleppines of Sofronios' election instead of 'Kako-Maximos', one of the infamous Latin-minded ones is registered in Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 195-200.

⁵⁴² In a similar case, Silvestros is said to have lagged in cooperating with the Patriarchate of Constantinople on the issue of anabaptism. Karnapas 1907: 652. For a discussion of the controversial issue of anabaptism resulting from the acceptance of the Catholics into Orthodox communion, see Dragas 1999: 235-271.

the extension of his control over the sees of the patriarchate of Antioch and his struggle with a Constantinopolitan metropolitan.

Silvestros' Appointment and Early Years

Regarding Silvestros' appointment as the Patriarch of Antioch, we have two major documents. The first one is a patriarchal letter written by Ieremias of Constantinople in December 1724 to the clergy and laity of the Patriarchate of Antioch, and the second one is Silvestros' second *berat*, which was renewed on the enthronement of Sultan Mahmud I in 1730. Here we will analyse the period between these two documents.

The first document,⁵⁴³ which was written following the consecration of the Catholic Kyrillos, starts with a long account of the importance of the 'Eastern Church of Christ'. Then it is mentioned that before his death, the late patriarch of Antioch Athanasios, had appointed his *protosynkellos*⁵⁴⁴ Kyr Silvestros as the future patriarch of Antioch, and this was encouraged and supported by Chrysanthos of Jerusalem. Therefore the Patriarch of Constantinople declared that they 'ordain him as the true, legitimate, and canonical Patriarch of Antioch by the seal and order of the church.' However, Serafeim Tanas the nephew of the late patriarch, referred to in the document as *Kako-Serafeim* or 'Bad' Serafeim, 'wanting to seize [the patriarchal throne] illegally and to run down and destroy the reasoned flock of Christ in it with Latin innovation and heresy' found supporters to his cause. The document gives a very long and detailed list of these supporters. The first ones who are responsible for the consecration of Serafeim as Kyrillos and his instalment as the patriarch of Antioch are 'Kako-Gabriel-ipni-Finan from Ramla and Kako-Neofytos, metropolitan of Saidnagia (i.e., the convent of the Virgin Mary at Saidnaya near Damascus which served at this time as the seat of the Patriarchate of Antioch), who with

⁵⁴³ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. II: 385-389.

⁵⁴⁴ Hypsilantis says that Silvestros was the archdeacon of the throne of Antioch, a view supported by Rustom. Hypsilantis 1870: 326, Rustom 1928, vol. III: 142.

pseudonymous consecration installed a third so-called archbishop to a village near Damascus called Fourzoul' (*ton kako-Gavriil-ipni-Finan apo Remliou kai ton kako-Neofyton mitropolitin Saidanagias, oi opoioi me pseudonymon cheirotonian apekatestisan ena triton tacha archierea eis onoma mias komis eggis Damaskou, Fourzoul onomazomenis*). The letter claims that in this instance, the 'unholy ones' made 'the holy one', 'the silly ones' made light of 'the divine and holy [things]'. Calling these three archbishops 'the impious and silly ones', the letter further associates this consecration with 'a big and brilliant comedy of the patriarchal honor and value,' 'kindergarten and laughter' (*oi anieroi ton anieron, kai ekaman oi dyssebeis kai anoittoi to mega kai upsilon tis patriarchikis timis kai axias komodian tina kai paidian kai gelota, paizontes oi anoittoi eis ta theia kai iera*).

Then, the letter gives an account of what the Great Church did after this incident was heard about and a synodal inquiry took place. The Patriarch and his attendants followed two major paths to deal with this appointment. First, the letter says, they 'ran to the imperial [i.e. Ottoman] rule, and sought both all these workers and the partners of such bad one be banished by imperial order'. Second, they 'considered it reasonable and declare[d] by common synodal opinion to punish such ones also with ecclesiastical punishment.' Here they divided supporters of Serafeim into two, those 'who supposedly were considered part of the holy hierarchy' who 'should be punished by synodal deposition, whoever and as many as they might be' and others from 'the order of seculars' who 'should be punished by excommunication and expulsion from the church of Christ as a lesson and example for the rest of the Christians.' In addition to the three archbishops who ordained Serafeim as the Patriarch of Antioch naming him Kyrillos, the letter also finds guilty another metropolitan, referred to as Kako-Gerasimos of Aleppo. In addition,

they also condemned ‘like-opinioned, like-minded, co-operating and assisting priests’ who were accused of being ‘the chief and first cause of the spiritual destruction of Christians’. These priests are listed as follows: ‘Chouri Vochpe from Lydda, Kasis Aptelmesich from the monastery of St. George in Teir-Echmeire, Chouri Tatros and Chouri Outraos from the surroundings of Damascus, Chouri Aptelmesich Zimpal, and Kasis Channa Choumpigie from Damascus.’ Finally the letter states two people ‘from the order of the seculars’, namely Osta-Mansour from Damascus, and Abdullah ibn Zaher from Aleppo. These are followed by long and harsh words of condemnation:

may they be excommunicated by the holy, consubstantial, life-giving and indivisible Trinity and may they be cursed, unforgiven and unloosed eternally, after death. The stones and iron may be freed but they may never. May they inherit the leprosy of Gehazi and strangling of Judea, groaning and trembling on earth, just like Cain, and may their share be with God-fighting Judeans, and crucifying the Lord of glory. The anger of God shall be over their heads and may they never see progress in the things they labour all their lives. May they be liable to all curses of the fathers and synods and to the eternal anathema, and subject to the fire of Gehenna, may they be outside Christ’s church and Christian community, neither be part of the church, blessed or mixed with Christians, nor buried after death ...

These lines reflect not only the reception in the Patriarchate of Constantinople of Kyrillos’ election as the Patriarch of Antioch but also the way they intended to tackle the issue at hand.

The second document about Silvestros’ appointment as the patriarch of Antioch is his second *berat* of investiture, which presents the manner in which the patriarchal elite class handled the issue vis-à-vis the Ottoman central administration, which had different agenda. Although we do not have his first *berat* of investiture, the second one,⁵⁴⁵ renewed on the occasion of a change on Ottoman throne in 1730 maintains the content of the first one. Therefore, it compensates for the lack of the first one as it explains how Silvestros

⁵⁴⁵ BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 170-71 (2 October 1730).

was appointed, as well as his jurisdiction, duties, and abilities, which were handled in the first part of the present chapter. According to this *berat*, issued by Sultan Mahmud I, Silvestros was elected on the Patriarchal throne of Antioch following the death of Athanasios. It is explicitly mentioned in the *berat* that the source of his support was ‘the dragoman of the Sublime Porte,⁵⁴⁶ and all the metropolitans’ (*Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn tercümânı ve bi’l-cümle metropolidân*). It is also clear that the Ottoman central administration also had concerns about the change that Silvestros would bring about in the traditional outlook of the patriarchs, which is seen in the statement in this *berat* that Silvestros is familiar with the Orthodox population of the Patriarchate of Antioch (*ol havâlîlerin zimmî re’âyâsına enfa’ olduğın*).⁵⁴⁷ According to the *berat*, his ecclesiastical jurisdiction extended over the Greek Orthodox populations of the following places: *Antakya ve Şam ve Haleb ve Trablusşam ve Sayda ve Beyrut ve Ladikya ve Payas ve Adana ve Hama ve Homs ve Ba’albek ve Diyarbekir ve Erzurum ve Ahışa ve Çıldır ve tevâbi’i*. As will be analysed in further detail below, the *de facto* extension of Silvestros’ authority to these sees occurred on a long-term basis. We also learn that the amount of the *pişkeş* which he paid before getting this *berat* was ten thousand *akçes*. The conjuncture of the time of the *berat* will be touched upon below.

What can these two documents tell us about the patriarchal politics of the early 18th century? The first document definitely shows the extent of the fury in the patriarchal circles in Istanbul resulting from the election of a Catholic patriarch and the policies

⁵⁴⁶ In 1724 the holder of this office was Grigorios Ghica (Djika), a member of a prominent family with Moldavo-Phanariote connections whose ancestor George Ghica had served for as time as Prince of Wallachia (1659-1660) and whose close conterminary Georgios II Ghika held sway over both Wallachia (two terms as Prince between 1733-1735 and 1748-1752) and Moldavia (successive terms as governor/*voyvoda* between 1726-1733; 1735-1739 (September) & 1739 (October) - 1741 and 1747-48; see Matei 1974: 449. Grigorios Ghica also held the office of Grand Dragoman from 1717-1727. Soutzo 1974: 238-239.

⁵⁴⁷ The interaction between the Patriarchate of Antioch and Cyprus had already been flourishing from the time of Makarios ez-Za’im. There were eleven Cypriots who had served in the Patriarchate of Antioch in episcopal and patriarchal levels, and Silvestros’ predecessor Athanasios had been appointed the archbishop of Cyprus in 1704. Walbiner 2007: 119-120.

adopted thereafter. The role of these patriarchal elites in Istanbul is perhaps the most important aspect of these documents. Both documents reveal the hierarchical and political aspects of their power, a point understood from the involvement of not only the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem and the metropolitans but also the Grand Dragoman with the Porte. The role of the Ottoman central administration is also quite significant in both documents. It not only supported the appointment of Silvestros, but also provided him with imperial janissaries to help him with his agenda regarding the Greek Catholics of Syria.

The time between Silvestros' appointment in 1724 and his receipt of the second *berat* on the occasion of Sultan Mahmud I's ascension on the throne in 1730 witnessed a fierce competition between the supporters of Silvestros, and his adversary Serafeim Tanas, who was ordained as Kyrillos and elected as the Patriarch of Antioch by the pro-Latin people of Damascus. After giving some information on Serafeim/Kyrillos, we will analyse the sources of power behind these two competing patriarchs and the nature of patriarchal politics in the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the 18th-century.

Silvestros' First Encounter with Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas

Serafeim Tanas, who was consecrated as Kyrillos, and was appointed as the Patriarch of Antioch was the chief adversary to Silvestros. He was the nephew of Euthymios Saifi, metropolitan of Sidon, and was Catholic like his uncle. Although it is generally accepted that Serafeim went to France and took a Catholic education there, Charon argues that this should be another nephew of Euthymios on the ground that 'that nephew was raised at the Propagation of Faith since his infancy and spent ten years at Rome.'⁵⁴⁸ Charon also maintains that it is impossible to know whether Serafeim was of

⁵⁴⁸ Charon 1998, vol. I: 31.

Greek or Syrian origin.⁵⁴⁹ However, we may easily say that his family was in Syria for a couple of generations and that he was a Syrian as regards his local identity. It is mentioned in both Orthodox and Catholic sources that Silvestros was designated as the next patriarch by Athanasios ed-Dabbâs. The letter of Ieremias of Constantinople mentions that Silvestros had already been the *protosynkellos* of Athanasios before his death, and was his favourite for the patriarchal throne of Antioch:

Kyr Athanasios, still alive and resident in Aleppo made a covenant and announcement in accordance with the opinion and vote of the archbishops of this throne and the pious Christians there ... after his death in order to be successor his *protosyncellos* Kyr Silvestros.⁵⁵⁰

Charon challenges this view on the ground that when the said designation occurred, Athanasios was at the very end of his life, and this decision was taken at the expense of the inhabitants of Damascus, who favoured Kyrillos.⁵⁵¹ One of the first things that Kyrillos did following his election on 1 October, 1724, was to send his Catholic profession to Pope Benedict XIII(1724-30).⁵⁵² However, things did not go as smoothly as one might have expected. Kyrillos, who was unable to counter the influence of Silvestros in Damascus either,⁵⁵³ received the confirmation of his election almost unofficially and he was awarded the papal *pallium*, recognising his election, only in 1744, by Benedict XIV (1740-58). Such unease on the papal side was chiefly rooted in the fact that the Papacy by that time did not have very good relations with the Jesuit missionaries in the Levant, who insisted on the use of Latin liturgy in the Greek Catholic churches. The popes of the time opposed Kyrillos because he was in favour of the use of Latin liturgies in the churches of the Patriarchate of Antioch. Therefore, Popes Benedict XIII (1724-30), Clement XII (1730-1740), and for a

⁵⁴⁹ Charon 1998, vol. I. 32.

⁵⁵⁰ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. II: 386.

⁵⁵¹ Charon 1998, vol. I: 32

⁵⁵² For an introduction to the tenure of Benedict XIII, see Kelly 1989: 293-295.

⁵⁵³ Karnapas 1906: 41.

few years Benedict XIV (1740-58), chose to remain silent about the issue of Kyrillos' recognition in official terms. Meanwhile, fearing Silvestros' coming to Syria, Kyrillos had to flee to Mount Lebanon, where he found protection under Shihab emirs. Although Benedict XIII recognised Kyrillos as the legitimate Patriarch of Antioch, the latter was informed of this almost unofficially in 1730. Benedict XIV re-handled the issue during the 1740's and issued his *demandatam* on 24 December, 1743, in which encyclical he decreed that no one, including the Patriarch of Antioch, could change, add to, or remove anything from the Byzantine rite and usage. He also forbade the faithful from passing from the Byzantine to the Latin rite and Kyrillos' previous recognition was made subject to his acceptance of the *demandatam*. Finally in 1744, Kyrillos was awarded the papal *pallium* by the same Benedict.⁵⁵⁴ As will be mentioned below, he continued his struggle against the patriarchate of Silvestros.

It would be appropriate now to move onto the sources of power behind Silvestros and Kyrillos. Rather than giving a series of actors who were supposedly supporting one or the other side and opposing the other unconditionally, one has to mention all the power holders who played a role in this conflict. In terms of the actors who took part in the making of this parallel election on the patriarchal throne of Antioch, it would be good to start with the Catholic missionaries, the Popes, the French party—involving the whole French diplomatic apparatus from the king to the ministers of marine and foreign affairs to the ambassadors, and the consuls—Greek Orthodox population of Syria, patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, the grand dragoman of the Porte. Finally it would be necessary to analyse separately how the Ottoman administration handled this religious-cum-political crisis.

⁵⁵⁴ Benedict 1826: 148-161.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Catholic missionaries had already been active in Ottoman Syria, converting not only the Orthodox flock but also the hierarchy. It is also known that not a small number of Patriarchs of Antioch were Catholic, but did not always declare this publicly. In the case of Kyrillos' election, too, the Catholic missionaries seem to be the most important actors, a point manifestly expressed in French correspondence. In a letter written by the consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1726, for instance, the former says that Kyrillos' zeal was provoked and directed by the missionaries of Damascus and embroiled him with the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos, and this 'gave birth to the troubles still reigning among Greeks.'⁵⁵⁵ As can be seen here and will be detailed below, the French party does not seem to be fully approving of the missionaries' support for Kyrillos' election. Regarding the Pope, it would not be easy to say that he endorsed Kyrillos' election readily as seen in his delay to dispatch the *pallium* until 1744.⁵⁵⁶

In addition to the purely religious reasons mentioned above, such as the use of Latin rites in the Orthodox churches, the French consul of Aleppo, as a first-hand witness of the events, also had some influence on the silence of three Popes on the issue. A cursory glance at the French correspondence of the time suggests that the French party represented by the French ambassador to the Porte and the consuls in Syria were in favour of reaching a compromise with Silvestros instead of choosing to support a Catholic Patriarch of Antioch. From a letter written by the Minister of Marine to Pèleran, Consul in Aleppo,⁵⁵⁷ we learn that the French Ambassador Marquis d'Andrezel talked to Silvestros in Istanbul before his departure for Syria. According to this letter, Andrezel was convinced that the religious groups both Orthodox and Catholic should hold out for the re-establishment of

⁵⁵⁵ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 375-76 (Consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 20 November 1726).

⁵⁵⁶ Benedict 1826: 148-161.

⁵⁵⁷ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 336 (Minister of Marine to the Consul of Aleppo, 14 November 1725)

tranquillity in their operations. In another letter between the same officials, it is mentioned that although Silvestros had promised to act ‘with moderation’ he did not keep his promise. Therefore the Ambassador endeavoured to get a *ferman* against Silvestros. During the first years following the appointment of Silvestros, the French party refrained from an open clash with the Orthodox party for the patriarchal throne of Antioch, and looked for a chance of reaching an agreement with Silvestros. It is only in 1727 that they were assured of the impossibility of reaching such an agreement. In a letter written by Fontenu Gérard, the Manager of the French Embassy in Istanbul to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, he told the latter that Kyrillos did not have the real means to counter his competitor Silvestros.⁵⁵⁸ In another one written by the Minister of Marine to the same Gérard, it is manifestly put forward that one should not expect to find in Silvestros the desire for peace, ‘as he did not keep his previous promises.’⁵⁵⁹

The French desire to avoid an open Catholic-Orthodox confrontation and their hope that Silvestros would comply with the conversions could be regarded as reflections of French reluctance. One of the major reasons behind this reluctance on the issue of the Patriarchate of Antioch was their dissatisfaction with Serafeim Tanas. According to a letter by Minister of Marine to the Ambassador, there is the mention of a certain Jean Abdalla from Aleppo who ‘pretends to have been deputed by the Catholics of Syria to Rome, from where he was directed by the Pope to the *Nonce* (*Nuncia*) to demand from the king, through him, the securing of the protection of his majesty for the re-establishment of the Patriarch Serafeim in the place of Silvestros.’ The letter reflects the clear position of the French king in the following words of the Minister of Marine: ‘His majesty is not at all in a state of giving him [money], all he could do has been to accord a gratification of 500 livres

⁵⁵⁸ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 381 (Fontenu, manager of the Embassy to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 19 June 1727).

⁵⁵⁹ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 381-82 (Minister of Marine to Fontenu, manager of the Embassy, 2 July 1727).

to his deputy.⁵⁶⁰ As will be seen below in some other correspondence, the French did not trust in what Jean Abdala presented himself to be. Relying on another document,⁵⁶¹ Rabbath approves that Jean Abdalla was a native of Sayda and was sent by the Melkite Patriarch and nation, and was sent back from France.⁵⁶² With regard to Jean Abdalla, the French consul of Aleppo also says in another letter⁵⁶³ that he had been able ‘to understand nothing, neither his character, nor the mission which he is said to be charged [with].’ And regarding Serafeim whom Jean endeavours to restore through the help of the French, the French consul does not seem to be very supportive of him either: He claims Serafeim’s character to be ‘too haughty and too violent...’ Comparing Serafeim to his uncle Efhymios, the archbishop of Sayda, he also presents him as more vehement than his uncle. Serafeim is also known in the Porte as an ‘*élève* of Rome’.⁵⁶⁴ It has been impossible to declare in his favour, he continues, ‘without exposing the missionaries to a certain peril of being chased out of the Ottoman Empire for having been solely responsible for the divisions among the subjects of the Grand Seigneur.’ On the other hand, for the French consul of Aleppo, the party opposing Serafeim is authorised by the orders of the Grand Seigneur everyday even more, although all the Greeks of Aleppo declared little against Silvestros.

What is described in this letter by the French consul of Aleppo, who had a first-hand experience of the situation regarding the Antiochian Schism summarises the French perspective in this matter, and would be followed in the later stages of the confrontation between the parties supporting Silvestros and Serafeim. After the Greeks of Aleppo sent a

⁵⁶⁰ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 353-54 (Minister of Marine to the Ambassador, 27 May 1726).

⁵⁶¹ The document in question is *Correspondance diplomatique de Turquie*, T. 76, f. 196.

⁵⁶² Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 354, n. 1.

⁵⁶³ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 375-76 (Consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 20 November 1726).

⁵⁶⁴ Raheb says that one of the reasons for the appointment of Silvestros contra Serafeim was the ‘direct intervention of Rome in the affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch.’ Raheb 1972: 142.

petition to the Porte through the *kadi* and Pasha of Aleppo following Silvestros' flight from Damascus, for example, the same consul of Aleppo wrote another report on the issue.⁵⁶⁵ After the petition arrived in Istanbul, the three Greek-Catholic deputies who also went to Istanbul to defend their case reported to the consul that Silvestros was deposed, and Aleppo was now separated from Antioch. The grand vizier also asked the deputies to present someone for the Patriarchal throne of Antioch but they said it is up to the people of Damascus as the Patriarch of Antioch resides there. Here the consul made the following comment: 'I believe that the Damascenes prefer Serafeim for this but I do not know if this would be agreed by the Porte.' He also adds that he will inform their missionaries to be content with this situation. As seen in this case, the French party tried to put some limits on the somewhat adventurous policies that the missionaries were following despite always endeavouring to patronise them, which eventually contributed to its political role in the European context.

The issue of restoring Serafeim as the Patriarch of Antioch rose again in the early 1730s. In reply to the respective letters of the French king and the pope, regarding the missionaries in Nahçıvan and Kyrillos' restoration, the ambassador Villeneuve explained how Silvestros and Kyrillos were elected, that the pasha of Damascus confirmed Kyrillos' election and the Greek Orthodox appealed to the patriarch of Constantinople.⁵⁶⁶ As there could not be a parallel appointment, the Porte annulled Kyrillos' election and installed Silvestros. Later, because of his 'tyrannies' Silvestros fled from Aleppo. Andrezel related his sending a *chaoux/çavuş* to a French church. Villeneuve remarkably put forward that since Silvestros' reestablishment in 1725, all the movements against him had been without effect, and that it would not be useful to try to reinstall Kyrillos. In order to persuade the

⁵⁶⁵ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 378-79 (Consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 21 December 1726)

⁵⁶⁶ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 390-94 (Ambassador to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 15 January 1730).

Pope, he also put forward the arguments that because Kyrillos was a renowned Catholic, everyone would target him and that Silvestros had the support of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem and the Dragoman, who gave him 30-40 thousand *écus* to maintain his post, while the Latins are poor. Furthermore, Kyrillos did not have material support to maintain himself either. According to the order given in 1725, the Catholic missionaries had been ordered to live only where there were French consuls, another order whose execution the French managed to prevent. Villeneuve also argued that putting Catholics on patriarchal thrones was not the best way to advance Catholicism there. On the contrary, he claimed that it would advance the Catholic cause if these posts were filled with moderate Greeks. He also added that since the beginning of his term, he had not come across any trouble in relation to those missions, which is also true for Diyarbekir and Damascus, where there were metropolitans installed by Silvestros. The Ambassador's cautions seem to have had some influence on the formulation of Papal policies, as can be understood from the silence of a number of Popes on this issue for about 13 years until the issue was reopened by Benedict XIV. So, when there was a change in the Ottoman throne on 2 October 1730, Silvestros was able to get his *berat* from the new sultan without opposition from the Catholic party.

Here one should also note the role of the Greek Orthodox and Catholic population in Ottoman Syria. It has been asserted that the Aleppines were favouring Silvestros, although many of them were pro-Catholic in spirit, and the Damascenes were in favour of Kyrillos. However, Silvestros' strict attitude towards the Aleppines led them to turn away from him, and Silvestros had to flee Aleppo. As the strongest centre of the Catholic missionaries, Aleppo would later pose the most determined challenge against Silvestros.

One may say that the first instance in which lay people played a decisive role in this issue relates to the election of a Catholic patriarch Serafeim. Some historians have taken this to the point that they saw the election of an Arab patriarch as an attempt to get rid of the influence of the Greek influence inserted by the patriarchs of Constantinople,⁵⁶⁷ a perspective strictly criticised by a revisionist approach.⁵⁶⁸ Whether or not there was such a confrontation, one may say that a number of Arabic-speaking laymen supported the election of Serafeim as the Patriarch of Antioch as can also be seen in the Constantinopolitan patriarch's letter on Silvestros' election, which lists a series of names who supported Serafeim.

A more important role that the people of Aleppo took part in this issue is their complaint regarding Silvestros upon the latter's flight from the patriarchate. They wrote a petition, which was testified to by '48 Turks and 13 Greek priests' and signed according to a later French letter by 'more than 2,000 people [*sic.*] both Greek and Turkish among whom 250 were émirs'.⁵⁶⁹ In addition to Silvestros' 'extortions and tyrannies' they also complained of the metropolitan of Damascus, Timotheos, whom Silvestros named his vicar a few days before his departure.⁵⁷⁰ They claimed that this Timotheos stole the Church's ornaments and money, all valuing around 9,000 *piastres* in total. They alleged he gave these to Sherman (spelled in the French document as Scherman), an English merchant, from whom he had already borrowed 'for his particular needs.' Both the *kadi* and the pasha gave them an *ilam* for Silvestros' punishment. The petitioners chose three of them to represent the case in Istanbul. In a letter from the ambassador to minister of foreign affairs,

⁵⁶⁷ Salibi 1988: 42-50. Philipp maintains a similar approach by seeing in this patriarchal struggle an attempt by the local dynamics to get rid of the centralising policies of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Philipp 1985: 19. In a recent article, Haddad retained a similar view. Haddad 1999: 217-239.

⁵⁶⁸ Walbiner challenges this view in a number of works. See notably, Walbiner 1997-1998: 585-587, and Walbiner 2003: 13-14.

⁵⁶⁹ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 376-77 (Ambassador to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 20 December 1726).

⁵⁷⁰ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 367-71 (Consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 6 September 1725).

written on 20 December 1726⁵⁷¹ it is reported that the Aleppine deputies who came to Istanbul found the means to detach Aleppo from the Patriarchate of Antioch and have it designated as an independent metropolitanate. The day after, the consul of Aleppo wrote to Minister of Foreign Affairs that the Aleppine Greeks who went to Istanbul say that Silvestros and the Patriarch of Constantinople [*sic*] were deposed, and it was also decided that Aleppo was to be separated from Antioch attaining a status similar to the autocephalous church of Cyprus.⁵⁷² As mentioned above, the grand vizier asked the deputies if they favoured someone as the Patriarch of Antioch but they abstained from suggesting someone on the ground that it should be decided by the people of Damascus which hosted the Patriarchate of Antioch. The French consul in Aleppo reported to the minister of foreign affairs, on 2 August 1727⁵⁷³ that the Patriarch of Constantinople put pressure on Chukry Bitar⁵⁷⁴ (deputy of the Aleppine petitioners) to accommodate with Silvestros but that he had refused. Since Silvestros' deposition was not certain as he was backed up by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem they came up with the more prudent plan of appointing a more 'moderate' archbishop in Aleppo, who was directly dependent on the patriarchate of Constantinople. What the power of the people achieved through the manipulation of their relationship with the Ottoman central administration, especially at a time of possible pressure by the patriarchate of Constantinople represents quite an achievement.

⁵⁷¹ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 376-77 (Ambassador to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 20 December 1726).

⁵⁷² Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 378-79 (Consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 21 December 1726). Silvestros' *berat* makes it clear that the detachment of Aleppo from the patriarchate of Antioch occurred in 10 January 1727. BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 170-171 (2 October 1730).

⁵⁷³ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 383 (Consul of Aleppo to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2 August 1727).

⁵⁷⁴ Unaware of Rabbath's selection of French correspondence, Charon disagrees with the misspelled version of this name in a missionary letter published under the comprehensive title of *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*. Charon 1998, vol. I: 35, n. 19.

As far as those who supported Silvestros during these years are concerned, one has to mention first the Patriarch of Jerusalem, namely Chrysanthos Notaras. In French correspondence dating from 1730, it is remarkably mentioned that ‘although the patriarch of Constantinople is the first in dignity, the patriarch of Jerusalem is running the whole Greek Church.’ Indeed it is not only in the Greek letter about Silvestros’ election in 1724,⁵⁷⁵ but also in the renewal of his *berat* in 1730 when Mahmud I ascended the Ottoman throne,⁵⁷⁶ that we can see Chrysantos played a major role. In fact, one of the chief reasons behind the French unease with Serafeim’s possible restoration was also that the latter was in conflict with Chrysanthos and that they did not want to oppose him directly.⁵⁷⁷ The role of Chrysanthos is quite significant in terms of constituting an excellent example of the patriarchal elite as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter.

From both the above-mentioned Greek letter of Ieremias, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Silvestros’ *berat* of investiture, it is clear that the support of the patriarchate of Constantinople was also crucial for Silvestros’ appointment. While Ieremias’ letter mentions that having heard the election of Kyrillos, they not only sought the support of the ‘imperial rule’ but also ‘ecclesiastical punishment.’ While the administrative support was provided by the Ottoman central administration, the ecclesiastical support was offered by Ieremias of Constantinople and Chrysanthos of Jerusalem.

Another source of support for Silvestros, presented in his *berat*, is ‘the dragoman of the Sublime Porte, and all the metropolitans’ (*Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn tercümânı ve bi’l-cümle metropolidân*),⁵⁷⁸ as a result of which the Ottoman central administration supported

⁵⁷⁵ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 179-185.

⁵⁷⁶ BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 170-171 (1730-31).

⁵⁷⁷ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 375-376 (Consul of Aleppo to Minister of Foreign Affairs, 20 November 1726).

⁵⁷⁸ An interesting point is that in the Patriarchal letter we do not see the mention of the Grand dragoman.

Silvestros' election in accordance with their demand. With regard to the dragoman, one should also take note of his role in the events following Silvestros' arrival in Syria. In a correspondence between the French Ambassador and French Minister of Foreign Affairs, dating to 15 November 1725,⁵⁷⁹ the Réis Efendi sent a letter through his dragoman—who probably was a Phanariot because Phanariots were also employed due to the growing importance of the office of *re'isü'l-küttâb* in the international arena— that because Damascus is not an old establishment like Galata, Smyrna, Sayda, and Alexandria where Franks had been established prior to Ottoman rule, which cities are expressly mentioned in the Capitulations, the French are not entitled to defend the missionaries in Damascus against Silvestros. This case shows the support the central administration provided for Silvestros against the missionaries by insisting on the non-application of Capitulations in Damascus. As will be mentioned later on, Silvestros' long tenure witnessed an almost unbroken cooperation and accommodation between the central administration and Silvestros.

Ottoman administration vis-à-vis the Antiochian Schism

With regard to the conflict between Silvestros and Serafeim, one has to avoid the paradigms that regard the Ottoman administration as always approving the policies of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and thus supporting Silvestros, or assuming that under French influence, Ottomans supported the advance of Catholicism in the Patriarchate of Antioch. Whether the Ottoman politics were squeezed between these two opposing parties with regard to the Antiochian Schism constitutes the focus of our discussion here. What the Ottoman administration had to take into account at that time could be summarised as not displeasing the French, but not allowing the missionaries to take whole control over

⁵⁷⁹ Rabbath 1910, vol. II: 337 (Ambassador to Minister of Foreign Affairs, 15 November 1725).

Ottoman Christians, taking into account the views of the Greek Orthodox lay and clerical elite in Istanbul, and providing justice for its subjects as one of the backbones of its authority. In the first incident, when Serafeim was elected as the patriarch of Antioch, we see that the Ottoman administration took into account the views of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and the grand dragoman. Therefore Silvestros was not only supported with a *berat* of investiture but he was also provided with imperial janissaries who helped him in executing the prosecution of 'trouble-makers'. However, this created problems on the local basis when Silvestros sometimes abused these janissaries and was required to confront the Ottoman pashas in Syria. As mentioned, the people of Aleppo brought their case against Silvestros to the Porte, and this time the Ottoman administration had to reverse their previous agenda by deposing Silvestros in order to protect its subjects from his harassment. Convinced of Silvestros' harsh treatment of the Catholics in Aleppo, and in accordance with the Aleppine deputies' demands, the Ottoman administration supported the disconnection of the see of Aleppo from the patriarchate of Antioch. However, by not ignoring the demands of the Greek Orthodox party in Istanbul, and possibly foreseeing the potential increase in Catholic influence in Syria, the Ottoman administration supported the idea that the see of Aleppo should be dependent directly on the patriarchate of Constantinople. In the end, the new archbishop was a moderate man and not only the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, but also the French party were content with this result. As can be seen in their correspondence, the French political authorities always mentioned their contentment with the new archbishop and also asked the missionaries to be content with him. From the perspective of the Ottoman administration, it not only fulfilled the wishes of the Catholic and Orthodox parties but also brought about a new manner to provide its provincial subjects with justice at the centre in an age often

referred to as an age of decentralisation through provincial magnates. Central administration's recurrent references to *vaz'-i kadim* and precedent and not ignoring the right of the local congregations to select/elect their own church leaders is important in terms of showing its traditional policies of 'accommodation' despite the fact that it also needed to take into account French influence, a decisive element in Ottoman government circles at that time.

Aleppo between Orthodox and Catholic Parties (1732-1750)

Before moving to a discussion of the issue, a short notice on the reception of the topic at hand is needed. In an interesting comparison between the case of Aleppo and the appointment of a Greek Orthodox metropolitan by the Patriarch of Constantinople in Crete following this island's conquest by Ottomans and the conflict between the Patriarchate and the Sinaite monks who had been established in Crete prior to Ottoman conquest, Greene locates these two struggles in a centre-periphery conflict.⁵⁸⁰ Following Philipp's line of thought,⁵⁸¹ she assumes that 'many of Cyrillus's predecessors had been of Arab origin but none before him had been elected by the local Christians.'⁵⁸² The most significant weakness of the arguments of Philipp and Greene is that both take the dominant role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople for granted for the previous periods and therefore presume that the genesis of a Melkite Catholic community in Aleppo was a response to encroachments of the central power dynamics. In our view, the Catholic-Orthodox struggle in Aleppo is a topic sacrificed for the purposes of grand theories and comparisons and requires a fresher look.

During the years following the 1730s, the status of the patriarchal see of Aleppo involving both contentment and competition between the Orthodox and Catholic parties

⁵⁸⁰ Greene 2000: 191-194.

⁵⁸¹ Philipp 1985: 19.

⁵⁸² Greene 2000: 192.

constitutes the core of our discussion here. As mentioned throughout, the Catholic-Orthodox competition took on a long and fiercely contested form in Aleppo, where the Catholic missionaries found a strong ground, and finally the see of Aleppo was disconnected from the patriarchate of Antioch in accordance with the demands of the people of Aleppo. However, Ottoman administration approved the appointment of an Orthodox archbishop in Aleppo following the demands of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem. As mentioned above, this archbishop was a 'moderate' man and fulfilled the wishes of all, namely the people of Aleppo, Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and the French community in the Ottoman Empire. This ideal state of affairs seems to have remained stable for a number of years.

Things began to take a different course when Grigorios the above-mentioned archbishop of Aleppo gave up his throne to Maximos in 1732. As mentioned above, Grigorios had been the metropolitan of Heraklea, and was appointed by the patriarch of Constantinople in 1727. He spent the last years of his tenure in Lebanon as a result of his conflict with the Catholic party but finally left the throne for Maximos, and had even been consecrated by the delegation of Serafeim Tanas. An Aleppine by birth, Maximos was a member of the Basilian Shouerite order, from which a great number of the founding fathers of the Greek-Catholic community sprang. He was also a member of the influential family of Hakîm, and it was his brother Mansour Hakîm who suggested Maximos for the archbishopric of Aleppo.⁵⁸³

In 1733, Maximos had to flee Aleppo and returned only in 1736. Maximos' correspondence with the Ottoman central administration shows that as early as 17 July

⁵⁸³ Karalevsky 1914: 105.

1732, he met resistance and appealed to the latter for help.⁵⁸⁴ A letter from the said date, which was written in response to Maximos' petition states that although he was given the metropolitan *berat* of Aleppo, his appointment was opposed and taken by some others to be in contravention of the holy *sharia* and the conditions stipulated in the imperial order of investiture (*hilâf-ı şurût-ı berât-ı 'âlîşân âherden ba'zı kimesneler müdâhale ve zabt*). Maximos also complained to the Porte of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* who tried to 'harass' him as he carried with him civilian clothes and arms.⁵⁸⁵ Confronting a lot of difficulties, Maximos finally left Aleppo in 1733.⁵⁸⁶

After he came back in 1736, Maximos did not have similar problems as understood from his correspondence with Istanbul or others' correspondence with Istanbul regarding him. We have two responses to a petition in which Silvestros asks help from the Porte to restore his candidate for Aleppo. In response to Silvestros' petition, it is mentioned in one of the documents that the registers in the Ottoman chancery were checked and it was found that 'the metropolitanate of Aleppo, İdlib, and Kilis was under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch, and belonged to Gennadios' (*Haleb ve İdlib ve Kilis metropolidliği Antakya Patriği iltizâmına dâhil ve hâlâ Yenadiyos râhib üzerinde olub*). Therefore, in accordance with what is written in the registers, the Ottoman administration supported Silvestros in this regard. This decision was dispatched to the relevant *kadis*⁵⁸⁷ and *vâlîs*.⁵⁸⁸

After one month, on 10 December 1745, Paisios of Constantinople, Parthenios of Jerusalem and ten other metropolitans from the Patriarchate of Constantinople were convinced that they needed to solve the issue of Aleppo and thus sent a petition to the

⁵⁸⁴ BOA.KK.d.2542/8, 62.

⁵⁸⁵ BOA.KK.d.2542/8, 56.

⁵⁸⁶ Karalevsky 1914: 105.

⁵⁸⁷ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 71.

⁵⁸⁸ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 81.

Porte complaining about Maximos of Aleppo.⁵⁸⁹ In this petition they clearly expressed the reasons they thought would persuade the central administration to accept their offer. They began by saying that Aleppo had always and especially ‘after the imperial conquest’ (*feth-i hakânîden berü*) been under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch who resides in Damascus. For several years however, they added, a priest named Maximos came from the Pope of Rome, and had been aiming to Catholicise the people (*re‘âyâyı Frenk eylemek sevâsında olub*). On account of his financial power, he ‘by some means or another’ (*bir tarikle*) managed to get ‘arzs from *vâlîs* and *kadis* and separated the metropolitanate of Aleppo from the patriarchate of Antioch and had a *berat* written for himself (*metropolid olmak üzere berât itdirüb*). Taking advantage of this, he converted the people to Catholicism day by day, and removed them from the authority of the sultan (*re‘âyâlıktan çıkarub*). After that, they turned to religious reasons namely that Maximos was Catholic and followed the Catholic ceremonies in churches reciting the name of the Pope of Rome in his ceremonies. In addition they also said that those who were not consecrated by patriarchs (*patrik olanlar kendüleri okumadıkça*) cannot be regarded as metropolitans according to Greek Orthodox rite. Because Maximos is Catholic he does not respect their rite (*âyinimize i‘timâd itmeyüb*) and wants to Catholicise all the Orthodox people in Aleppo. Therefore they suggested that Maximos be replaced by a truly Orthodox monk named Gennadios (*sahîh Rum keşîşlerinden Yenadiyos*) and that the metropolitanate of Aleppo be put under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch once again. This petition was supported by the Porte. One of the strange things in this document is not only the lack of Silvestros’ signature, which can be explained by the fact that he was not present

⁵⁸⁹ BOA.D.PSK.15/74 (10 December 1745).

in Istanbul at the time the petition was written, but also the lack of any mention of his name, which may suggest his unpopularity with the Porte in matters relating to Aleppo.

In 15 May 1746, Silvestros sent a petition to the Porte regarding the metropolitanate of Aleppo and Maximos.⁵⁹⁰ He wrote that although Maximos had already been deposed and replaced with Gennadios, Maximos and some of his supporters had taken the valuables in the churches and monasteries in Aleppo and continued to oppress the people. Therefore he requested that all these possessions be returned to Gennadios, the new metropolitan of Aleppo in accordance with the *shari'a*. Eventually he received the necessary order dated on 2 July 1746.⁵⁹¹ Silvestros and Paisios of Constantinople sent two separate petitions to the Porte about the Catholic proselytising activities among the Greek Orthodox population of Aleppo.⁵⁹² Silvestros pointed out that the Greek Orthodox population of Aleppo has been driven by some seditious persons' (*müfsîd*) incitement and began to leave their ancient rites and defect to another rite, namely Catholicism. Because their subversion (*ihtilâl*) is apparent, he continued, they were given a *hüccet* and an order asking them not to convert to another rite and keep to their previous condition (*âyin-i âhere sülûk itmeyüb kendü hâllerinde olmak üzere*). As those Greek Orthodox believers who converted to Catholicism were forbidden to visit the Catholic churches, they began to frequent Maronite churches and houses where the Maronites held Catholic ceremonies. Here, Silvestros' appellation of the Maronites is quite striking: a people whose situation is unknown (*mechûlü'l-ahvâl bir millet*). Therefore, Silvestros requested from the sultan to have a *hüccet* issued to prevent the Greek Orthodox from frequenting the Maronite churches. In addition to a *hüccet*, Silvestros also asked for an order entitling him and his representative(s) to punish such trouble-makers through the mediation of Islamic law

⁵⁹⁰ BOA.D.PSK.15/119 (15 April 1746).

⁵⁹¹ BOA.D.PSK.15/122 (2 July 1746).

⁵⁹² BOA.D.PSK.16/95 (2 June 1747).

(*ma'rifet-i şer'ile*). He also mentions the manners of punishment: *ahz ve hats ve kal'a-bend*. Paisios' petition pointed to the same problem and asked for the same things from the sultan.

On 17 April 1750, Silvestros and Kirillos, patriarch of Constantinople wrote a joint petition to the chancery,⁵⁹³ about the status of the metropolitanate of Aleppo, and the Catholic Maximos, who was referred to above. Although he was previously deposed, they mentioned, he seeks to be the metropolitan of Aleppo (*dâ'imâ Halep metropolitliği sevdâsında gezüb*). Therefore, they wanted to depose him again and replace him with Sofronios, metropolitan of Acre. The interesting point about this petition is the patriarchs' silence about the Greek Orthodox metropolitan Gennadios whom they had appointed in 15 May 1746 when they petitioned the Porte with the aim of deposing Maximos. This would suggest the failure of Gennadios to take hold of the archbishopric of Aleppo. From the notes in the margin of the document, we understand that Maximos was deposed and he was replaced with Sofronios with the payment of a *pişkeş* of 3,600 *akçes*.

It seems that Gennadios was unable to get the archbishopric of Aleppo, as we see that a year later, Maximos wrote a petition to the Porte complaining about the intervention of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch in the affairs of the archbishopric of Aleppo.⁵⁹⁴ His tenure as the archbishop of Aleppo continued until 17 April 1750,⁵⁹⁵ when the patriarch of Constantinople sent another archbishop of Aleppo called Sofronios, and Orthodox and Catholic hierarchies were split in Aleppo on an archiepiscopal level as well.

Although Sofronios was appointed in his lieu as seen above, Maximos did not give up resistance which is seen in his petition dating to 6 July 1753.⁵⁹⁶ In this petition he

⁵⁹³ BOA.D.PSK.18/23 (17 April 1750).

⁵⁹⁴ BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 53.

⁵⁹⁵ BOA.D.PSK.18, 23.

⁵⁹⁶ BOA.D.PSK.19/77 (6 July 1753).

requested that the metropolitanate of Aleppo be given to himself from Sofronios with an annual 250-*gurush* lump-sum payment. He also wanted to receive a separate *berat* showing that he was the metropolitan of Aleppo. As we will see further on, Maximos would succeed Kyrillos Tanas following the latter's death in 1760.

To conclude, one may say that the stance of the Ottoman central administration in this conflict is characterised by an almost constant support for the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, who were almost always in support of Silvestros except for the issue of Aleppo. It seems that the said patriarchs were sure that the Porte was not going to be easy with what Silvestros had done to the *re'âyâ* in Aleppo. The Porte's stance was apparent in its support of Maximos in his early years and what the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem endeavoured to do next was to keep the see of Aleppo dependent on the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Seeing Maximos' difficulties in getting control of the Christians of Aleppo, Ottoman administration supported Silvestros' favoured candidate, namely Gennadios. However, convinced of the latter's inability, it turned again to Maximos, who continued to hold officially the see of Aleppo until the parallel election of Sofronios by the patriarch of Constantinople, while he continued to regard himself as the archbishop of Aleppo and was regarded so by his congregation.

Silvestros' Second Encounter with Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas

In 1745, Catholic Kyrillos managed to get a *berat* of investiture at a time when Silvestros was away and even held the patriarchal throne for a short period,⁵⁹⁷ a period described in Burayk's account with utmost ferocity against Silvestros' supporters.⁵⁹⁸ We

⁵⁹⁷ Regarding the supporters of Kyrillos, Charon states 'a certain Salomon Rouma, a Greek-Melkite by nation', 'Mr. De Castellane, of M. Bona, the Latin patriarchal vicar, and two Greeks who were very influential and renowned for their *savoir-faire*'. Charon 1998, vol. I: 37-38.

⁵⁹⁸ Burayk 1980: 27.

have his petition addressing the Sublime Porte,⁵⁹⁹ which states many details about the causes of the Catholic party. First of all, he mentioned that Silvestros' harassments against the Greek Orthodox population resident in Aleppo are quite obvious, which he added can also be seen in the recent petition of the *kadi* of Aleppo supported by more than 1400 Aleppines. Since Silvestros was afraid that he would be given the heavy punishment of *kal'a-bend*,⁶⁰⁰ Kyrillos sought to take advantage of the fact that Silvestros had left for Wallachia and Moldavia and even gone to lands of the infidel enemies without notifying the Ottoman administration (*harbî kefere vilâyetlerine bilâ-fermân gidüb*) and claimed that, as a result of this unauthorized absence, Silvestros' patriarchal seat remained empty. After that Kyrillos introduced himself as being a monk for 52 years, currently in a Greek Orthodox monastery in Sayda and more importantly 'patriarchal representative for 21 years by demand of the people without a *berat*' (*yiğirmi bir sene re'âyâ talepleriyle bilâ-berât patrik vekîli olub*). On account of Silvestros' absence from Syria, the people asked him to be their patriarch so that they can be saved 'from the evil and oppression of Silvestros' (*Silvestros râhibin şerr ve gadrinden*). Next, Kyrillos stated his offers to the Sublime Porte, saying that in addition to the *pişkeş* of 10,000 *akçes* which Silvestros had paid, he would add another 10,000 *akçes* totalling 20,000 *akçes*. In addition, he offered to pay a yearly amount of 30,000 *akçes* to the imperial treasury, thus offering to pay 50,000 *akçes* for the year 1158 of Hegira (3 February 1745-23 January 1746). Considering that he wrote this petition in 19 April 1745, it appears that he paid a huge amount even for the earlier half of the year which had already passed by that time. He also complained about the supporters of Silvestros who wanted to force him to take himself to Istanbul and get rid of him through false accusations. Therefore he suggested that an inspection be made by the

⁵⁹⁹ BOA.D.PSK.14/135 (19 April 1945).

⁶⁰⁰ For *kal'a-bend* see Kenanoğlu 2004: 228-230.

local *kadis* among the people themselves so as to ascertain whether they wanted Kyrillos or Silvestros. He also reminded the authorities of a previous petition by the *kadi* of Damascus regarding the same issue in the year 1137 (1724-1735). Indeed, the order on the margin of the document reads that the decision was to organise an inspection among the people asking them whom they preferred.

As mentioned above Kyrillos managed to receive his *berat* of investiture and even stayed on the throne for a few months as is apparent from at least two Ottoman documents issued in his name.⁶⁰¹ However, Silvestros was quick to retaliate and in 7 November 1745 he managed to get his post back.⁶⁰² The source of his power is stated in an Ottoman document as Paisios of Constantinople, Parthenios of Jerusalem, thirteen metropolitans and the Greek Orthodox people. As far as the amount of *pişkeş* he was required to pay is concerned, he paid the same amount as Kyrillos paid (20,000 *akçes*), which is twice the amount Silvestros had paid on his first appointment in 1724. In the final analysis, it would be too oversimplifying a view to assume that Ottoman administration's attitude was influenced by the material offers of the candidates, but that it supported the candidate who would be able to take control of the affairs of the Christian *re'âyâ* in Syria as a potential tool of the central administration.

Expansion of Silvestros' control over Antiochian metropolitanates

One of the key issues of Silvestros' tenure is how he managed to take control of the metropolitanates under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch. Here we have to depend on two major sorts of documents, namely the *notitia/syntagmation* prepared by Chrysanthos Notaras,⁶⁰³ and Silvestros' correspondence with the central administration which confirmed the official election of the metropolitans giving them *berats* of

⁶⁰¹ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 55a (1745-46). BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 55b (1745-46).

⁶⁰² BOA.D.PSK.15/56.

⁶⁰³ Chrysanthos Notaras 1778.

investiture. As discussed in the introduction, it has been pointed out by a number of historians that the comparative use of *notitiae* and *berats* is the best way of identifying the metropolitanates under a certain patriarchate. Sometimes repeating the earlier versions, however, *notitiae* are not always the best source for determining the true case. A problematic case for the patriarchal *berats* is that they write the names of the *kazas* and not the patriarchal sees and therefore need to be used in comparison with the other *berats*, namely metropolitan *berats* issued around that time. For the case of Silvestros' patriarchate, one has to admit that his patriarchal *berat* is also far from showing the *de facto* authority of Silvestros. However, unlike the *notitia* and the patriarchal *berat* which in this particular case might be regarded as 'empty lists' because they do not touch upon the effective control of the patriarch over the metropolitanates, the metropolitan *berats* give us a more colourful picture of the conflicts and co-operations in relation to the metropolitan thrones. The reports by French political apparatus also add up to these sources for the period of Silvestros in terms of which sees were actually filled. The tenure of Silvestros provides a good case for a comparative use of these different sets of sources. The *notitia* prepared by Chrysanthos (1707-1731) shows the following sees under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Antioch: Aleppo, Epifaneia, Laodikeia, Seleukia, Amid, Tyre, Tripoli, Vostra, Emeusi, Bityros, Adami, Ilioupolis, Acre, Palmyra, Saidanagia, Theodosiopolis, and Akiska.⁶⁰⁴ Silvestros' patriarchal *berat* mentions almost all of the places mentioned in the *notitia* prepared by Chrysanthos: *Antakya ve Şam ve Haleb ve Trablusşam ve Sayda ve*

⁶⁰⁴ Chrysanthos also provides a geographic introduction on each see. Chrysanthos Notaras 1778: 77-78. The *notitia* of the year 1690 shows merely Aleppo, Laodikeia, Tripoli, Pagias, Beirut, Tyre and Sidon, Acre, Seitnaya, and Erzurum under the authority of the patriarchate of Antioch. Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1889: 474.

*Beyrut ve Ladikya ve Payas ve Adana ve Hama ve Homs ve Ba'albek ve Diyarbekir ve Erzurum ve Ahışa ve Çıldır ve tevâbi'i.*⁶⁰⁵

A cursory look at the metropolitan *berats* of the time shows a different picture. As mentioned above, the early years of Silvestros' tenure witnessed a fierce conflict with the Catholic party especially the missionaries who were supporting the Catholic Serafeim for the Patriarchate of Antioch. From these early years of Silvestros' correspondence with the central administration we do not see anything more than a struggle to establish himself as the patriarch of Antioch. We learn from French correspondence that by 1730, he had made two major metropolitan appointments, one in Damascus, and the other in Diyarbekir.⁶⁰⁶

From the year 1733 onwards, we see some more metropolitan appointments. In that year, Silvestros made two major appointments on the metropolitan thrones of Erzurum and of Ahışa and Çıldır. The document of the first appointment is a mere note on a small piece of paper, stating that 'it is the holy order named *zitiye* (*ziteia*) given in accordance with the old custom (*mu'tâd-ı kadîm*) to the priest Azarya (Azariah) who is the metropolitan of the *kazas* of Erzurum and its dependencies, which is under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch.'⁶⁰⁷ Later, in 1749, Silvestros would appoint Makarios the metropolitan of Ahışa as the metropolitan of Erzurum after the death of Azariah.⁶⁰⁸ The second one is in the form of the original petition sent by Silvestros, and contains the notes added in different offices of the chancery.⁶⁰⁹ According to Silvestros' petition, the metropolitan of Ahışa, Çıldır, and their dependencies died and in his stead he wanted s to appoint Kallinikos. Therefore, Kallinikos would pay the necessary *pişkeş*, which we

⁶⁰⁵ BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 170-171 (1730-31).

⁶⁰⁶ Rabbath 1910. vol. II: 390-94 (Ambassador to Minister of Foreign affairs, 15 January 1730).

⁶⁰⁷ BOA.D.PSK.10/104 (1 June 1733).

⁶⁰⁸ BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 56-57 (14 October 1749).

⁶⁰⁹ BOA.D.PSK.10/111 (n.d.)

understand from the additional notes in the margin to be 850 *akçes*, and he would be given his *berat* accordingly.

In 7 July 1736, he appointed a metropolitan for the see of Beirut in lieu of the previous metropolitan who had illness in his eyes and was not fit for the metropolitanate.⁶¹⁰ He also made a metropolitan appointment on the *kazas* of Diyarbekir, Çemişkezek, Ergani, Keban and their dependencies after three years.

In another case, which we have in the form of Silvestros' petition, the notes added on the same paper,⁶¹¹ and the draft⁶¹² and copy⁶¹³ of the *berat* dispatched, Silvestros wanted to appoint 'Nikiforos, from among the old servants of [their] monastery' (*keşişhânemizin emekdârlarından Nikiforos*) after the death of Leandros, the metropolitan of Adana, Payas, Tarsus, Silifke Sis, İskenderun, and their dependencies.⁶¹⁴ Silvestros requested from the Porte that the newly-appointed metropolitan of Adana, Iskenderun, and Tarsus should not be obstructed from getting his post, possibly by the administrative officers. However, we understand from a petition by Nikiforos asking for support of the central administration against the obstruction by 'some' and 'others' (*ba'zıları/taaraf-ı âherden*) that he had trouble in establishing himself in his metropolitanate.⁶¹⁵ As Burayk writes, this Nikiforos would be appointed by Silvestros as a deputy from Istanbul and would be facilitated by Esad Pasha of Damascus following his arrival in 1746.⁶¹⁶

In 8 March 1746, Silvestros managed to get an order dispatched to the *kadi* of Sayda appointing a representative in Sayda.⁶¹⁷ In this document, Silvestros asked to

⁶¹⁰ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 7 (7 July 1736).

⁶¹¹ BOA.D.PSK.12/101 (2 November 1741).

⁶¹² BOA.D.PSK.12/91 (12 October 1741).

⁶¹³ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 141 (29 October 1741).

⁶¹⁴ BOA.D.PSK.12/101. The amount of *pişkeş* to be paid by Nikiforos was 1000 *akçes*.

⁶¹⁵ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 161 (20 June 1742).

⁶¹⁶ Burayk 1980: 33. Rustom 1928, vol. III: 148.

⁶¹⁷ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 76 (8 March 1746).

appoint Eremya (Jeremias) in lieu of Ignatios from whose Catholic proclivities he complained with a particular focus on his ‘treason and lack of obedience’ and his efforts to convert the ‘pure subjects’ of the state from their traditional rite to that of the foreign infidels (*İgnatıyos râhibin hıyâneti ve ‘adem-i itâ‘ati zâhir olub ve ol havâlilerde vâki‘ Devlet-i ‘Aliyyenin hâlis re‘âyâsını tahrik ve ifsâd ve kadîmî âyinlerinden döndürüb harbî kefere dînine*).

In 2 May 1746, as a proof of his attempt to control Ba‘albek, Ras in the Cebel-i Lübnan, Fourzol in the Bekaa valley, and their dependencies, Silvestros appointed Serafeim after the death of his predecessor, as his representative in charge of collecting the customary taxes that the Orthodox had paid, and conducting the religious duties of the Orthodox (*re‘âyâ tâ‘ifesinin kadîmden viregeldikleri rüsûmâtları cem‘ ve tahsîl ve kilisa ve manastırlarında âyinlerin icrasına*).⁶¹⁸

Likewise, in 25 May 1746, Silvestros appointed a new representative in Damascus and its dependencies.⁶¹⁹ In the document, which we have as a copy of the order dispatched to the *vâlî* and *mütevelli* of Damascus, and *kadis*, Silvestros clearly defined the duties of his representative and the reasons he wants to replace him with another one. He claimed that his current representative Mihayil (Mikhail) who is responsible for collecting the state taxes (*mîrî rüsûmları cem‘ine*) and conducting the religious ceremonies (*âyinleri icrâsına*) is not a clergyman (*ruhbân tâ‘ifesinden olmamağla*) and thus is not qualified to conduct the ceremonies. In addition, he causes others to engage in open subversive activity (*ihtilâle bâ‘is olmağla*), referring most probably to his pro-Catholic views as the Greek Orthodox hierarchs described them to refer to his doubtful loyalty and submission to the Porte. Thus, he wanted to replace Mihayil with a clergyman called Nikiforos. While stating his duties,

⁶¹⁸ For Silvestros’ petition, see BOA.D.PSK.15/112 (2 May 1746). For the copy of the order dispatched to the kadi and voyvoda of Ba‘albek, see BOA.KK.d.2542/9.

⁶¹⁹ BOA.D.PSK.15/125 (25 May 1746).

the document also states that in addition to collecting state taxes and conducting the religious ceremonies of the Greek Orthodox community he is also entrusted with punishing those who act in contravention of their rite, again pointing to the anti-Catholic organisation of the Patriarchate of Antioch. The fact that the Porte accepted this petition⁶²⁰ shows its support for such a re-organisation. We understand from an order issued in a short while that Mikhail had been harassed by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* and needed to receive an order from the central administration to prevent such harassment.⁶²¹

In sum, the information provided in the *notitiae* and the patriarchal *berats* offer useful conclusions only when used in comparison with the metropolitan *berats* in order to understand the control of the patriarchs over their sees. Silvestros' authority over his patriarchate can only be understood through such an approach and use of sources. A careful analysis of Silvestros' appointments shows his attempts both to establish his control over the metropolitanates and other offices of the Patriarchate of Antioch and to challenge the established authority of the pro-Catholic party, proved to be a more difficult and prolonged struggle than has often been assumed in the secondary literature.

Struggle against the metropolitan of Gümüşhane (Argyropolis)

One of the most interesting aspects of Silvestros' tenure is his struggle against the metropolitan of Gümüşhane, which is under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople. Over a number of years, Silvestros tried to prevent the attempts of the metropolitan of Gümüşhane to collect ecclesiastical taxes from the Antiochian Orthodox flock of the metropolitanate of Diyarbekir, Çemişkezek, Ergani, and Keban. Silvestros' struggle against this through the mediation of the Ottoman central administration, and not the patriarch of Constantinople points to a very characteristic state of affairs by this time,

⁶²⁰ The order issued upon the receipt of Silvestros' petition is copied in BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 74-75.

⁶²¹ BOA.KK.d.2542/9, 82 (24 June 1746).

namely the proximity of the Eastern Patriarchs to the Sublime Porte. To put it another way, because the Eastern Patriarchs, and in this case the Patriarch of Antioch, are closer to the centre than their predecessors, they began to seek for Ottoman support more often, and in affairs with an ecclesiastical nature without reference to the patriarchs of Constantinople.

The problem arose in mid-18th century when Paisios, the metropolitan of Gümüşhane began to collect taxes from the Greek Orthodox population of Ergani and Keban, which were under the jurisdiction of the Antiochian metropolitan of Diyarbekir named Ignatios. The reason Paisios collected taxes in Antiochian jurisdiction, as Silvestros made clear in his petition, was that the Greek Orthodox people Paisios taxed in Ergani and Keban were previously under Paisios' jurisdiction and had migrated to Ergani and Keban afterwards.

The first document, issued on 30 December 1749, in response to Silvestros' petition, states that Paisios the metropolitan of Gümüşhane interfered in the affairs of the Orthodox in Ergani and Keban on the ground that he is to rule over them (*Ergani ve Keban re'âyâsının âyinlerin ben rü'yet iderim diyü*).⁶²² The second order issued shortly after the first one makes it clearer that the Orthodox of Ergani and Keban in question used to be under the jurisdiction of Paisios (*Ergani ve Keban re'âyâsı mukaddemâ benim iltizâmında olan Gümüşhâne re'âyâsıdır, âyinlerine ben rü'yet iderim diyü*).⁶²³ From another order, we understand that the Orthodox in question go to Ergani and Keban to work in the mines (*Ergani ve Keban ma'denlerinde işleyen*) and that the Patriarch of Constantinople managed in 6 August 1750 to reverse the previous order.⁶²⁴ So, wherever they work, the

⁶²² BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 62 (30 December 1749).

⁶²³ The original petition is in BOA.D.PSK.18/55 (10 July 1750) while the copy of the order is recorded in BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 73 (13 July 1750).

⁶²⁴ As Ballian maintains, Gümüşhane was the home to a large number of miners. The network of these mines, whose income constituted one of the most prominent incomes for the state, was extending to whole Eastern Asia Minor. Ballian 1995: 75-76.

Orthodox in question were required to be ruled by the metropolitan of Gümüşhane (*her ne mahalde i'mâl olunurlar ise Gümüşhane metropolidleri tarafından rü'yet olunmak üzere*).⁶²⁵ The final order makes it clear that despite the support that Kyrillos of Constantinople provided for Silvestros, Paisios was able to continue his encroachments due to his financial power and his local networks, and a final verdict preventing Paisios' efforts to collect taxes from the Orthodox in question was reached.⁶²⁶

The incident overall shows that Silvestros was able to cooperate with the Ottoman central administration successfully and despite the initial support that Paisios the metropolitan of Gümüşhane enjoyed from the local networks and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Silvestros managed to prevent Paisios' efforts to collect taxes from the Orthodox who came under the jurisdiction of the metropolitanate of Diyarbekir.

Conclusion

In summary, the time between Silvestros' first appointment in 1724 and recognition of his patriarchate by Sultan Mahmud I on the latter's enthronement in 1730 may be characterised as a time of competition between the supporters of Silvestros, and his adversary Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas. Serafeim had the backing of the Catholic missionaries in Syria and it is mentioned in copious French diplomatic correspondence that it is these missionaries who encouraged Serafeim's election as the patriarch of Antioch. We also see that the Papacy was not quite happy with his election either, as can be understood from its very late recognition of Serafeim's patriarchate in 1744 only after sending his *demandatam* in 1743. The French diplomatic apparatus in the Ottoman Empire seems to have been more interested in the order of the things in accordance with the Capitulations, encouraging the missionaries to content themselves with these rather than going for adventurous challenges

⁶²⁵ BOA.KK.d.2542/6, 3-4.

⁶²⁶ BOA.KK.d.2542/6, 48-49 (18 April 1753).

against the Orthodox hierarchy. As far as Silvestros' supporters are concerned, we mentioned the grand dragoman of the Sublime Porte, who was a Phanariot, and the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, the latter being deemed to have *de facto* control over the whole Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire in French diplomatic reports. To these were also added the Ottoman central administration because of the latter's cooperation with and support for Phanariots and the Patriarchate of Constantinople during that time as explained in the previous chapter in detail. However, it would be wrong to cite the central administration as a constant source of support for Silvestros. Especially during the time when the inhabitants of Aleppo sent a delegation to Istanbul to relate their problems with Silvestros, the central administration not only deposed Silvestros, though for a short period, but also detached the archbishopric of Aleppo from the control of the patriarchate of Antioch. In accordance with the possible wishes of both the Catholic and Orthodox parties the central administration approved the election of a 'moderate' archbishop for Aleppo namely Grigorios and took a major role in the establishment of order in Syria.

This short tranquillity began to change soon between 1732 when Grigorios had to give up his throne for the Catholic Maximos and 1750 when the Orthodox party appointed a parallel archbishop of Aleppo namely Sofronios leading to a split in the archiepiscopal level as well. During that time Maximos proved to be the arch-opponent to Silvestros' efforts to take control of the see of Aleppo.

By 1745, Silvestros seems to have lost some favour in the eyes of the Ottoman central administration. Serafeim used Silvestros' absence in Damascus and tried his chance to obtain sultanic confirmation. Putting a number of accusations on Silvestros, Serafeim managed to get a *berat* of investiture from the central administration. However, this proved

to be short-lived as the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem had retaliated and forced Silvestros' re-installation three months later.

A much-disputed aspect of Silvestros' tenure is the extent of his control over his patriarchal sees. Here the metropolitan *berats* of investiture prove to be a complementary source to the *notitia/syntagmation* of the early 1700's, Silvestros' patriarchal *berat* of investiture and the French diplomatic reports. As a result of a comparative use of these sources we see that the extension of Silvestros' control over metropolitanates was a long-term process.

A very interesting conflict between the metropolitan of Gümüşhane/Argyropolis under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Silvestros reveals a different aspect of the power relations between the Ottoman administration and the Patriarchates during that time. As a result of the Gümüşhane metropolitan's tax collection in the sees which are under the jurisdiction of the Antiochian metropolitan of Erzurum and Diyarbekir, Silvestros petitioned the Porte demanding the prevention of the said tax collection. Not only did he choose to solve this problem through the central administration and not the patriarchate of Constantinople but he shrank even from asking for the latter's mediation. Such an approach is proof of the authority of the Eastern Patriarchates in general and the Patriarchate of Antioch in particular in their relations with the Ottoman administration. In short, the Eastern Patriarchates were closer to the centre than ever before during the Ottoman period, and made use of the offers of such centrality not necessarily needing the mediation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

CHAPTER 4. ECONOMIC POWER BEHIND POLITICS: NETWORKS OF LAY AND ECCLESIASTICAL POWER IN THE 18TH CENTURY OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Introduction

In 1727, a monk named Azarya (Azariah) was dispatched to the Ottoman Balkans as the deputy of Chrysantos of Jerusalem. His main duty was to collect alms (*tasadduk*) from the Orthodox population in places such as Silistre, Varna, Transylvania, Vidin, Tirnova, etc. who donated to ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’ of their own volition. He was also entrusted with various other responsibilities like taking possession of the goods remaining from those who dedicated some of their properties to the poor monks of Jerusalem as both endowment and bequest (*vakf ve vasiyyet*). However, his work was by no means straightforward as we learn from the petition of the patriarch of Jerusalem to the Porte complaining about a number of problems encountered by Azarya. His first complaint was about those priests, presumably from the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, who presented themselves as Jerusalemite monks and sought to ‘deceive’ the people collecting alms for their own sake. Secondly, he complained about the children of those who dedicated some of their properties to the monks of Jerusalem because they refused to follow the testament of their parents on the grounds that they must have at least some share in the inheritance. Finally, he reported about the Ottoman administrative officers (*ehl-i ‘örf tâ’ifesi*) who wanted to take a gold piece from each member of Azarya’s company as a fee for passage, to collect tolls on the belongings they carried, and to intervene when the said monk’s company brought with them different clothes, and arms for camouflage and protection in some dangerous places. After stating these complaints, the patriarch made a number of requests from the Porte. First, he demanded that those priests who collected alms for their own sake be disciplined (*te’dib*) by his deputy Azarya. Second, in case his deputy and the children of the testators should present an appeal to the

local court of the *kadi*, he wanted the dispute to be considered in the light of the testimony of Orthodox witnesses. Finally he asks the central administration to prevent ‘the intervention and oppression’ (*müdâhale ve rencîde*) by administrative officials without authorisation.⁶²⁷ What is described in this incident is representative of much of the way the Eastern patriarchs conducted their economic activities in the context of the new networks.

The current historiography on the economic activities of the Eastern Patriarchates outside their normal jurisdiction has developed in two chief directions, which leaves a number of points unexplored regarding the nature, geographical distribution, and mechanism that they used in the early-modern Ottoman context. The first group of scholars have focused on the monastic estates dedicated by the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia to the Eastern Patriarchates in accord with their agenda to support the religious institutions of Orthodoxy during the Ottoman era. Iorga, for instance, placed his emphasis on the role of the Moldavian and Wallachian princes’ efforts in putting up pious endowments in their realms for the Orthodox Patriarchates. He put this argument within his wider paradigm of *Byzance après Byzance*, emphasising the role of the Rumanian princes as ‘inheritors’ of Byzantium.⁶²⁸ Giurescu provided a list of the pioneering monastic dedications to the Orthodox churches under the auspices of the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia in the pre-Phanariot period.⁶²⁹ With the exception of the monastery of Stanești in the Valcea region of Wallachia which is dedicated to the Patriarchate of Antioch in 1577, all of these dedications in the list provided by Giurescu are devoted to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Deletant closely followed the theory of Iorga in this respect and maintained that ‘the Rumanian princes began the practice of founding monasteries and

⁶²⁷ BOA.D.PSK. 8/110 (5 July 1727).

⁶²⁸ Iorga 2000: 129-195.

⁶²⁹ Giurescu 1944, vol. III: 23.

dedicating them to Mount Athos and the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem.’⁶³⁰ In geographical terms, this line of thought tends to ignore the economic activities of the Eastern Patriarchates outside Moldavia and Wallachia as it covers mostly the pre-Phanariot period in the principalities. The second group of studies have dealt primarily with the late or post-Ottoman period, focusing on the fate of the monastic estates established outside the jurisdiction of the Eastern Patriarchates. Batalden, for example, tackled the problematic status of these ‘dedicated monastic estates’ between Russians and Greeks in late 18th and early 19th century. In line with the other scholars mentioned, he maintained that these ‘dedicated monastic estates’ were treated in accordance with ‘Ottoman, Islamic rule’ though he made no reference to the actual process itself.⁶³¹ Despite being outside the scope of this dissertation for chronological concerns, the proponents of this second approach have managed to take the economic activities of the Eastern Patriarchates outside Moldavia and Wallachia. Focusing on the period between 1830 and 1888, for example, Ilias examined the status of the *metochia* of the Holy Sepulchre and Mount Sinai in Greece.⁶³² In a more recent work, Stamatopoulos published an annotated catalogue of the Ottoman archival materials relating to the *metochia* of the Holy Sepulchre between the 18th and 20th centuries preserved in the Princeton University Library.⁶³³ Although only a few of these documents relate to the period we deal with in this dissertation, the geographical range of the activities of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem outside its normal jurisdiction shows great parallelism with the earlier period which will be analysed in further detail in this chapter.

⁶³⁰ Deletant 1981: 2.

⁶³¹ Relying mainly on the works of Giurescu, Batalden also mentioned that by the end of the 18th century, monastic estates constituted anywhere from 10 to 25 percent of the arable lands in Moldavia and Wallachia. Batalden 1983: 468.

⁶³² Ilias 2003.

⁶³³ Stamatopoulos 2010.

As far as the late-17th and 18th centuries are concerned, Stamatopoulos drew attention to the networks of power between the Orthodox Patriarchates, the *hospodars*, and the Vlach-speaking Epirotes who migrated ‘from greater Epirus region and Western Macedonia to Constantinople, Bucharest, Iași, Constanta, and Sibiu’ and helped to consolidate the webs between all the agents mentioned. He rightly pointed to the fact that controlling the ecclesiastical revenues enabled ‘the elite among those supporting the monasteries of the Orthodox Patriarchates’ not only to manage the income from the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia but also control the patriarchal elections on the thrones of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria.⁶³⁴ Regarding the relations between the Ottoman authorities and the monks who were conducting the transactions of their church organisations outside their normal jurisdiction during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, Fotić focused on the Athonite monasteries.⁶³⁵ Kabrda had already published an Ottoman document regarding the economic activities of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Vidin, Kladovo, and Kutlovica.⁶³⁶

Although almost all of the secondary studies recognise that the Ottoman central administration was content with this process, no one has ever tried to give a thorough analysis of how the transfer of these lands and properties to the Eastern Patriarchates were seen through the prism of the Ottoman state, which, in fact, constituted one of the decisive agents involved in this process. How were these endowments recognised within Islamic law? What was the role of the *hospodars* of Wallachia and Moldavia, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem before the Ottoman central administration regarding this issue? How was the Orthodox populace represented in the Ottoman institutions in this

⁶³⁴ Stamatopoulos 2005: 86.

⁶³⁵ Fotić 2010: 157-165.

⁶³⁶ The facsimile of the document in question is in Kabrda 1969: Pl. xvi. A short summary and French translation can be found in Kabrda 1969: 123-126.

process? What sort of problems did the Eastern Patriarchs in general and the Jerusalemite patriarchs in particular encounter and how did they deal with them in line with the Ottoman bureaucratic apparatus in Istanbul? What was the geographical range of the economic activities of the Eastern Patriarchates? The present chapter aims to shed light on these unexplored aspects of the issue of the financial activities of the Eastern Patriarchates outside their normal jurisdiction. On a broader level, it reveals some unexplored aspects of lay and ecclesiastical networks within the politics of the 18th century Ottoman Empire within the framework of the newly-built networks as explained in the previous chapter.

Nature of the activities of the monks collecting alms from the Orthodox people

The practice of collecting alms was often combined with that of collecting the incomes of the church *vakfs* and the inheritance of the Orthodox testators for the Eastern Patriarchates. Therefore, as seen in many of the Ottoman documents, it would appear that a group of monks would set off from Istanbul and go as far as the Habsburg frontiers not only to collect alms and the incomes of the church *vakfs* and the inheritances from a specific distant town but also to collect alms on the way. Therefore, the orders dispatched from the central administration would address all the *kadis* from Istanbul to a particular Balkan province often maintaining the phrase ‘an order [dispatched] to all the *kadis* from Istanbul to the towns called ...’ (*İstanbuldan ... nâm vilâyete varıncaya değin kadılara hükm ki*). It is probably this encompassing aspect of the new economic structure of the Eastern Patriarchates which is supported by the Ottoman central administration to a great extent that brought about a rupture from the previous centuries giving them the opportunity to abstain from seeking economic, consequently political support, from foreign sources.

Incomes of church *vakfs*

One of the unusual circumstances noticed in the Ottoman documents with regard to this issue at first glance concerns the possession of *vakfs* by the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which requires some more clarification. According to Islamic jurisprudence, there are two types of *vakfs*, namely *vakf hairî*, dedicated with a discrete goal to please God and *vakf ahli*, or family *vakf* devoted for the general benefit of the children, grandchildren and other relatives where the aim to please God is not that obvious. However, one of the major criteria for the validity of the *vakf* is that its rationale must be lawful. Therefore establishing a *vakf* for construction and maintenance of churches and synagogues have been regarded as illicit by many jurists while some others have maintained that they may be valid if the *vakf* serves to provide hospitality to the poor or travellers, i.e. purposes not related to worship.⁶³⁷

Problems concerning the possessions and properties of the churches came to being in places where the church authority had been much crystallised and later incorporated under Muslim control such as Spain.⁶³⁸ Ottomans had a similar problem in the Balkans where the ecclesiastical organisation was economically much stronger and well-established *vis-à-vis* those in Asia Minor. Until the re-interpretation of this problem, it seems that churches and monasteries more or less had kept their possessions under the precepts of *vakf*. Thus around the mid-16th century we have a number of questions asked to grand muftis about the situation of churches which retained a number of privileges through the permissions/deeds (*hüccets*) they received from local *kadis*. In many of them the grand mufti is asked about what should be done with the *kadi* who gave permission for issues such as reconstruction, construction, or enlargements of churches without sultanic

⁶³⁷ Peters 2002: 61.

⁶³⁸ Jurists of Andalus made a lot of efforts to tackle the issue of the transfer of properties of churches between 10th-12th centuries. Carmona 2002: 77-78.

authorisation.⁶³⁹ Upon the issuing of an order for the confiscation of monastic properties in 1568, Ottoman grand mufti Ebussuud Efendi embarked on this problem personally. By regarding the church *vakfs* within the framework of family *vakfs*, and treating monks as family members, and the novices as relatives of the deceased monks, he prepared the legal basis for the retention of the monastic properties in the hands of monks on the condition that they should reregister them. In such a way he satisfied both the monks by regulating the affairs of their *vakfs* and the central administration by earning more revenues to the state treasury.⁶⁴⁰

As mentioned above, it is not licit to establish a *vakf* for construction and maintenance of churches and clergy, whilst here we have *vakfs* established to support ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’. Apparently these *vakfs* cannot be *vakf hairî* as far as their *raison d’être* is concerned. So, were they family *vakfs*? The very term ‘poor monks’ (*ruhbân fukarâsı*) adapted by the patriarch of Jerusalem from a similar well-established Ottoman term ‘poor subjects’ (*re’âyâ fukarâsı*) referring to the Muslim and non-Muslim tax-paying subjects of the Ottoman sultan shows his familiarity with and ability to navigate within normative legal concepts established by the Ottoman authorities. In addition, transmission of these *vakfs* to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem through replacement of deceased monks by others appointed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem is reminiscent of Ebussuud’s theory of church *vakfs* regarding the novices as relatives of those who passed away. However when compared to the church *vakfs* which Ebussuud treated in the spectrum of family *vakfs*, we still have a clearly different process. Ebussuud was dealing with the possessions of the churches and monasteries such as Patmos and Mount Athos that they inherited from the Byzantine period while in the case of the *vakfs* of Jerusalem, we

⁶³⁹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Şehid Ali Paşa 1067, 91. I have already transliterated and analysed a number of these *fetvas*. Çolak 2008: 90-92.

⁶⁴⁰ Kermeli 1997: 145-153.

talk about establishment of completely novel *vakfs* to support ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’ during the Ottoman period, which adapted itself successfully to the Ottoman legal and administrative system.

Ziteia/tasadduk

Introduction of the practice of collecting alms (*ziteia/tasadduk*) outside the jurisdiction of a Patriarchate is another aspect of the new economic outlook of the Eastern Patriarchates. Already an established Orthodox practice,⁶⁴¹ the infrastructure for the collection of alms for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was laid down during the time of Germanos (1537-1579) and was further facilitated in the time of Dositheos.⁶⁴² Apart from the patriarchs of Jerusalem, other Eastern Patriarchs such as Macarios of Antioch were going out of Damascus and collecting alms, not to mention the Patriarchs of Constantinople and archbishops and monks of Sinai.⁶⁴³ However, it can be said that this practice was used in an extensive way being supported by the Ottoman central administration through the terms inserted into the patriarchal *berats* for the first time in this age of centralisation, and the jurisdiction of the disputes of the patriarchs regarding alms-collection from the control of the local *kadis* to Istanbul, as will be detailed below.

Collection of alms in regions under the jurisdiction of another Patriarchate should normally be in accordance with the consent of both Patriarchates. Thus, the *enkyklios* of the Patriarch in whose jurisdiction the other patriarch(s) would collect alms was necessary, as was the case with the *enkyklios* of 1724 issued by Ieremias of Constantinople for

⁶⁴¹ According to Konortas, the term *ziteia* was mentioned for the first time in during the third tenure of Symeon I (1474-1475), and was a voluntary donation to the Church. Konortas 1986: 219-220.

⁶⁴² Ilias 2003: 15-16.

⁶⁴³ Archbishopric of Sinai was one of the most active collectors of *ziteia*, inheritance of Orthodox testators and church *vakfs* in many parts of the Ottoman and non-Ottoman world. As has been analysed by Greene, they pursued these activities in Crete even before the Ottoman conquest of the island. Greene 2000, and Bayraktar Tellan 2012. For those Sinaite possessions and assets in Cyprus see, for example, A.S.Turkish Firmans, Roll No:4, 579, 580, 588, 590, 591, 592, 593, 596, 597, 598, 600, 601, 602, 606, and 608. For similar examples to those in Selanik, Tırhala, Bükreş, see respectively Archives of Sinai Microfilm no: 5, Turkish Firmans 584, 585, 587.

Chrysanthos of Jerusalem.⁶⁴⁴ The cases contrary to this mutual understanding would lead to disputes between two parties. We learn about such a dispute between the monks of Sinai and the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople from a petition of the former dating to 1690.⁶⁴⁵ In this petition, the monks of Sinai stated that in their monastery, which had been active from the time of ‘Amr ibn el-‘Âs, there is a mosque whose frequenters the monks feed⁶⁴⁶ through the alms they collect from the Christians of ‘*diyâr-ı Rûm*’. However, they complained, the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople prevented without any reason the Christians from giving alms to the poor of the said monastery. The monks demanded that in accordance with the *fetvas* and orders they had already been given the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople be prevented from giving them trouble. The order given to the monks of Sinai, stated that, such prevention by the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople is against the convent of *zimmet* (*hilâf-ı ‘akd-i zimmet olmağla*) and thus needs to be averted. The order also reminded the bishops of these patriarchates and warned them that they should not mix these alms with the other taxes which they must collect, and use it as a pretext to obstruct the monks of Sinai. As this example suggests, a Patriarchate’s collection of alms in the jurisdiction of another Patriarchate was a practice which came into being with the consent of both patriarchates, showing an example of economic cooperation between the patriarchal elites who were politically tied to each other.

⁶⁴⁴ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 488-489.

⁶⁴⁵ Şakar 2007: 184.

⁶⁴⁶ The earliest Ottoman document issued by Selim I for the monks of Sinai upon his conquest of Egypt makes this point clear: ‘To the monastery of the clergymen and monks—who they say feed those who come to their monastery from every direction’ (*Ruhbân ve keşîş tâ’ifesinin—ki deyrlerine her cânibden sâdır ve vârid geldikçe ziyâfet ve ikrâm iderlerimiş—deyrlerine...*). Schwarz 1970: 25. For another Ottoman document dated 23 July 1613, testifying to the Sinaitic monks’ provisioning to the wayfarers, see Heyd 1960: 179, which says the following: ‘And they (the monks) do no harm and give no offence whatever to anyone ...; [on the contrary,] they serve the wayfarers who pass through that desert by [offering them] water and bread...’

Inheritance of Orthodox testators

Another aspect of such visits was collecting the inheritance of Orthodox testators who willed some of their possessions to a distant patriarchate. It was through the donations of the people who supported the Eastern Patriarchates with the cash, and movable and immovable properties they willed that the church *vakfs* were made possible. An interesting aspect of the transfer of these inheritances to the Eastern Patriarchates is that that the heirs of some of these people did not recognise the testators' will and claimed that they had a share in their inheritance as well. Having confronted prominent men of the church, they were unable to go to the community courts because of the fear of excommunication. Thus they chose the second option, namely to take their case to the court of the local *kadis*. To take an example of a dispute between the deputy of the patriarch of Jerusalem and the relatives of a testator, a legal case taken from the court records of Vidin gives a vivid account of the points of the two parties. According to this document dating to 1758,⁶⁴⁷ an old Christian woman named Vida wished on her deathbed that her house be given to the monks of Jerusalem. However, Vida's relatives prevented Nikodim, the deputy of the *evkâf* of the poor Christians of Jerusalem from taking possession of the house. Therefore, Nikodim went to the local *kadi* court to have the issue resolved. From the content of the document it is not clear why he went to the *kadi* court and why he did not direct the issue to the imperial chancery in accordance with the Jerusalemite patriarch's *berat*. That the account does not include the decision taken may suggest that the jurisdiction was transferred to the chancery and that Nikodim had the issue registered in support of his case to be dealt with in Istanbul.

⁶⁴⁷ Gradeva 1997: 46. The document in question is located in National Library-Sofia, S 44, p. 64, doc. II. I am grateful to Prof. Gradeva for sending me a copy of this document.

Facing a potential obstacle in *kadi* courts when the relatives of the testators sued the church officials, the patriarchs of Jerusalem referred them for resolution to the Porte as we see from a large number of petitions. Accordingly, a number of orders were dispatched to the local *kadis* asking them to prevent ‘the intervention’ of the relatives of those who dedicate their properties to the monks of Jerusalem because, the patriarchs of Jerusalem said, it is written in their *berats* of investiture that they are entitled to inherit the legacy of the Orthodox testators.

Patriarchal *berats* of investiture and the economic activities of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem outside Palestine

We have already dealt with granting of the right to collect alms, inheritances and incomes of the church *vakfs* for the Eastern Patriarchates as a novelty in the *berats* of Silvestros of Antioch, Parthenios of Jerusalem and Matthaïos of Alexandria. This innovation in their *berats* shows the Ottoman support for these economic pursuits, which eventually precipitated the whole process. However, it is known that before these patriarchs, too, there were major periods of revival such as during the tenure of Chrysanthos Notaras (1707-1731) whose *berat* does not have an article relating to this topic.⁶⁴⁸ An important aspect of the correspondence between the patriarchs of Jerusalem and the central administration concerns the issuing of the rights of the former to collect alms and receive the inheritance and incomes of the *vakfs* of the Orthodox testators in the Ottoman lands, a right they wished to see recorded in a separate document other than their *berats* of investiture. In a petition by Meletios of Jerusalem, dated to 12 June 1733 we see that he demands the renewal of his *berat* regarding the right of his deputy to collect alms in the Ottoman realms, to take hold of the inheritance of the testators who dedicated their

⁶⁴⁸ Ilias 2003: 20.

properties to ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’ without the disturbance of the children of the testators, and to wander in the said places without the ‘intervention’ of administrative officials. When compared with the beginning of the tenures of Sultan Mahmud I (1730) and Meletios (1731) one sees that the order which he demanded in this petition cannot be the one for renewal triggered by a change on the imperial or Patriarchal throne. What is striking then is that the Patriarch of Jerusalem wrote a separate petition reserved solely to the rights of his deputy in matters mentioned above.⁶⁴⁹ Similarly upon the enthronement of Osman III after Mahmud I on 14 December 1754, Parthenios petitioned the new sultan after three months (13 March 1755) and asked for the renewal of his rights. In this petition Parthenios said that he has already been granted a *berat* regarding collection of alms and income of their *vakfs* for ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’ and thus requests its renewal.⁶⁵⁰ All these points signify not only the decisive role of the backing of the Ottoman central administration in this process, but also the importance of this income for the patriarchate of Jerusalem, for which they sought the support of the central administration at the very beginning of their and the sultans’ tenures.

‘Expansion’ of the Jerusalemite Patriarchate outside Palestine: places, problems, and solutions

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, a number of scholars have focused on the role of the relations between the Eastern Patriarchs and the *hospodars* of Moldavia and Wallachia, and saw the financial activities of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in these provinces as resulting from acts of gift-giving. A record listing the names of the monasteries, the builders and the saints on whose memory these monasteries had been built provides important information on the role of the Moldavian and Wallachian rulers of

⁶⁴⁹ BOA.D.PSK.10/108 (12 June 1733).

⁶⁵⁰ BOA.D.PSK.20/103 (13 March 1755).

different ranks going back to the 16th-17th centuries.⁶⁵¹ The monasteries in question are as follows: Galata, Parnovski, Tzetatzougia, Agios Sabbas, Pournova, Nikoritzza, Pomprata, Pistritza, Tazlaios, Kassinon, Soveza, and Agios Georgios in Galati (Galatz). This record is instrumental in showing the spectrum of the places dedicated to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Moldavia and can be cross-checked and complemented with some other documents.⁶⁵² However, a glance at the patriarchal documents which give brief information on the dedication of some monasteries with their *metochia* to the Eastern Patriarchates shows that the *metochia* in question are not confined to Moldavia and Wallachia, which constituted a substantial portion. On the contrary it appears from these documents that during the 17th and 18th centuries, patriarchs of Jerusalem pursued similar economic activities on an empire-wide scale also covering the Balkans, Aegean islands, and Asia Minor. In the Balkans, the economic pursuits of the Jerusalemite patriarchs extended to Athens, Thebes, Euripos,⁶⁵³ Philippopolis and Sofia,⁶⁵⁴ Trikala,⁶⁵⁵ Thessaly, Verroia, Serres, Drama and Melenikos,⁶⁵⁶ Ohrid,⁶⁵⁷ Adrianople, Didymoteichou, Ainos, Vize, Midia, Agchialou Maronia, Sozopolis, Xanthi and Peritheoriou, Thessaloniki, Verroia and Larissa.⁶⁵⁸ Such Aegean islands as Milos,⁶⁵⁹ Chios,⁶⁶⁰ Skiathos,⁶⁶¹ Rhodes and

⁶⁵¹ Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. IV: 63.

⁶⁵² The patriarchal documents prepared by Delikanis contain the registers with regard to the monasteries established in the trans-Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. The monasteries in question are located in Iasi (Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 340), the village of Pogianni (Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 340), Proilavo (Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 340-341, 452-453), Tzatzatzouia (Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 376-377, 389), and Kassinon (Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 393). According to a particular document prepared in 1721 by grand and second logothetes in 'Dacian Dialect' and was published in Greek translation in Papadopoulos-Kerameus' *Analekta*, such monasteries 'built and rebuilt from foundations by the Orthodox rulers ... are not only embellished and strengthened, with both precious enclosure, lavish gardens, and other modesty according to proper ecclesiastical order but also intentionally beautified excessively and supported with capable properties and profitable revenues.' Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963, vol. IV: 48-52.

⁶⁵³ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 482-483. 487.

⁶⁵⁴ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 483-484.

⁶⁵⁵ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 484.

⁶⁵⁶ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 484-485.

⁶⁵⁷ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 485.

⁶⁵⁸ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 490

⁶⁵⁹ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 339. 453.

Paronaxia,⁶⁶² Andros, Skopelos,⁶⁶³ and Crete⁶⁶⁴ also appear as centres of monasteries dedicated to the patriarchate of Jerusalem. In Asia Minor, too, there were many dedications to the Brotherhood of Holy Sepulchre, including Antalya,⁶⁶⁵ Kaisaria, Pissidia, Konya and Ankara,⁶⁶⁶ Kyzikos, Nicomedia, Nicea, and Bursa,⁶⁶⁷ Gallipoli,⁶⁶⁸ Amasia, Neokaisaria, Trebizond, Theodosiopolis.⁶⁶⁹ Finally, two centres in Crimea, namely Gotthia and Kaffa⁶⁷⁰ constitute other places where the patriarchs of Jerusalem were economically active.

The incorporation of the Ottoman sources into the already existing sources and paradigms, too, confirms that this process was not confined to Wallachia and Moldavia only but was a much wider phenomenon. To state but few, Ottoman documents reveal that in addition to places such as Silistre, Varna, Vidin, İsakçı, Tulça, Tırnova, Yenişehir, Kozluca, Eynöz, Dimetoka, Gümülcine, İskete, Edirneköy, Sofya, Filibe, Samakov, Tatarpazarı, Livâdiye, Belgrad, Niş, Köstendil, Varad, Niğbolı, Ruscuk, Zağara-i ‘Atık, Uzunköpri, İpsalaboğazı, Keşan, Kavala, located in the Balkans, and the Balkan provinces of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem also pursued similar policies in many parts of Asia Minor such as İznikmid (Nicomedia), Kapudağı, Marmara, Tosya, Amasya, Sinop, Kastamonu, Trabzon, Giresun, Gümüşhane, and the Aegean island of Chios. In addition to the above mentioned regions, all of which were under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Ottoman documents also include some others with regard to Jerusalemite patriarchs’ financial activities in the

⁶⁶⁰ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 481. 489-490.

⁶⁶¹ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 482-483. 487.

⁶⁶² Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 483.

⁶⁶³ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 487.

⁶⁶⁴ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 389-390.

⁶⁶⁵ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 368-369. 390.

⁶⁶⁶ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 448-449.

⁶⁶⁷ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 481.

⁶⁶⁸ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 482.

⁶⁶⁹ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 487.

⁶⁷⁰ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 484. 489.

jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch, particularly in Erzurum, Aleppo, Damascus, and Tripoli.

Instead of analysing all these examples in detail, however, we will focus on some of their significant aspects, which reveal the problems that the patriarchs of Jerusalem faced and the solutions they fashioned. One of the problems they confronted was the other non-Muslim communities who wanted to interfere in the church *vakfs*. From a petition by Meletios, we learn that there is a church under the rule of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem on the Aegean island of Chios. The church named Aya Kirya, says Meletios, has been interfered with by ‘men and women from other *zimmi* communities’ (*âherden zimmi tâ’ifesinin ricâl ve nisvânlarından ba’zıları*), who ‘intend to harm the *vakf*’. Therefore, based on the conditions of his *berat*, he asked for an imperial order to the local judge in Chios so that the latter may prevent the ‘intervention’ of the others in the affairs of the Church of Aya Kirya.⁶⁷¹ So who are the ‘others’ mentioned in this document? It could possibly be the clergy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as the island is within its jurisdiction as well as the other non-Muslim Ottoman communities for whom the term *zimmi* were used or Armenians and the Catholics who were backed by the ambassador of France at the Sublime Porte.⁶⁷² As the document does not mention a particular group it is difficult to know, but what is certain is that the Patriarchate of Jerusalem came into conflict with other non-Muslims communities in such economic endeavours.

After a year or so, we see the same Meletios complaining to the central administration that in some places administrative officials are obstructing his deputies from collecting alms and asking for excessive fees ‘in contravention of the holy *shari‘a* and the ancient law’ (*hilâf-ı şer‘-i şerîf ve mugâyir-i kânûn-ı kadîm*). Thus he sought to prevent the

⁶⁷¹ BOA.D.PSK.10/167 (29 March 1735).

⁶⁷² BOA.D.PSK.3/134 (14 March 1706).

administrative officials from intervening when his deputies brought with them non-ecclesiastical dress and arms to get rid of troubles and avert danger during their travels (*tebdil-i câme ve kisve ve def'-i mazarrat için âlât-ı harb*) because his deputies mean no harm to anyone.⁶⁷³ What the patriarch refers to here is that his deputies needed to adopt civilian dress while passing through dangerous areas en route between cities, where appearing in their liturgical garb might make them subject to attacks by bandits especially in places near the Habsburg frontiers. The fact that he sent a similar petition after a short while shows that the same problems continue to recur but his silence about the details of the cases he mentions such as the places and agents involved may be a reflection of a wider patriarchal policy to have their cases accepted into the Ottoman system by bombarding the central administration with a steady stream of petitions. As we will see in the treatment of later petitions in the Ottoman bureaucracy, a major point of reference, alongside the *berats*, for issuing new documents would be the fact that in previous cases it has kept giving consistent orders confirming the *status quo*: as it has been written in the margin [of the document] that they have been given imperial decree, you shall act as the [contents of] the margin necessitates (*emr-i şerîf virilügeldiği derkenâr olunmağla derkenârı mûcebince amel oluna*).

In another case, the *nâ'ib* of Chios was sent an order in response to the petition of Parthenios, which is more detailed in comparison to the previous ones. Here Parthenios complained about four major issues. Similar to previous ones, he requested the facilitation of collection of alms and properties devoted to the monks of Jerusalem. His second complaint presents more clues on the transmission of the properties of the deceased monks and priests to the Patriarch of Jerusalem as the latter demanded 'the possessions of the

⁶⁷³ BOA.D.PSK.10/171 (10 July 1735).

deceased clergymen, monks, priests and the other Orthodox' to be collected by his deputy according to ancient custom (*mu'tâd-ı kadîm*). Here 'the other Orthodox' refers to those who dedicate their properties to the monks of Jerusalem as their inheritance and endowment. As for the children of those testators refusing their parents' wish to devote their properties to the monks of Jerusalem, Parthenios demanded his deputy's case with them be handled in the local *kadi* court according to the precepts of 'holy *shari'a*' (*şer'i-şerîf*) with the testimony of Orthodox witnesses. Finally, he requested the central administration to prevent the intervention of the administrative officials when his deputy collected alms from the above-mentioned properties. The Patriarch claimed these rights on the ground that such rights were granted to him through a *berat* in advance. So, what course of action did the Ottoman central administration take in dealing with this issue? The answer seems quite simple and is provided on the paper itself.⁶⁷⁴ It was first checked in the registers called *Piskopos Mukâta'sı Defterleri* containing the *berats* given to the bishops and patriarchs in the Ottoman Empire and it was confirmed that 'the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and its dependencies belong to the priest [named] Parthenios' (*Kuds-i Şerîf ve tevâbi'i Rûmîyân Patrikliği Parteniyos râhibin üzerinde olub*). Second it was checked whether he was really given each particular right, which was also confirmed by the document given to him in advance. Therefore, they issued the current order to the *nâ'ib* of Chios so that he could act in accordance with the confirmed demands of the patriarch of Jerusalem.⁶⁷⁵

In 1742, we see that an imperial order was sent to the *kadi* of Kozlıca, located near Varna in the Balkans, in response to the petition of the patriarch of Jerusalem. We learn from this document that in Kozlıca there was a certain monk called Kostantinos from the

⁶⁷⁴ BOA.D.PSK.11/65 (1737-38), p. 1

⁶⁷⁵ BOA.D.PSK.11/65 (1737-38), p. 1-2.

clergy of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Upon his death, the *voyvoda* of Kozlıca took hold of all of his properties. Thus, Parthenios demanded the transfer of Kostantinos' possessions from the *voyvoda* to his deputy because it is written in his *berât* that all the inheritance of clergy of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem belong to the Patriarchs of Jerusalem. Yet the fact that the Patriarch of Jerusalem has permanent clergyman in the Balkans is quite meaningful. He was established in the Balkans in order to control the immovable properties of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which could also be understood from recurrent demands of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem to inherit the properties of the deceased monks.

From an order issued on 15 July 1740, we learn something new about the lands where the patriarch of Jerusalem was active in collecting alms and performing other tasks. So far, all of the similar documents were issued for the collection of alms in places which could be regarded as the core places of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Phanariots whereas here, we see that the Patriarch follows such a policy within the realms of the Patriarchate of Antioch, namely in Aleppo, Damascus, Tripoli, and Sayda. There are three points raised by Parthenios, namely collection of alms, control of the properties dedicated by the deceased testators to the monks of Jerusalem, and the interference of the administrative officials. The most important aspect of the document is that the patriarch requested from the central administration to send orders to the *mütevellîs* and *kadis* of the said places before he dispatched his deputy. Therefore he aimed to minimise the slowdown of the whole process. That such an order was dispatched to the said offices shows the success of the patriarch of Jerusalem in Ottoman bureaucracy in the capital.⁶⁷⁶ Was there another motive apart from the facilitating and expediting of the collection of alms behind this petition? A search for such a case where a patriarch petitions the central administration

⁶⁷⁶ BOA.D.PSK.11/145 (15 July 1740).

beforehand would show that there are no previous examples. However, a couple of years later we see that Parthenios was to petition the Porte beforehand on the eve of his own departure towards Wallachia and Moldavia for similar purposes.⁶⁷⁷ In this case, it is apparent that the patriarch of Jerusalem and his entourage did not want an unpleasant encounter. However, in other cases they seem confident that they will not face any resistance despite later experiencing opposition and trouble from some of the Orthodox *re'âyâ* and the administrative officials. With respect to the lands under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Antioch, though, it seems that they expected a firmer opposition not only from the administrative officials, but also from metropolitans, whom they added to the list of officials. Thus, instead of writing the administrative posts and adding the frame 'and by other members of *ehl-i 'örf*—the general term *ehl-i 'örf* referring to all of those administrative posts mentioned—Parthenios appends 'the metropolitans' to the list of administrative officials followed by the frame 'and by others' as the term *ehl-i 'örf* does not cover metropolitans (*mîrmîrân ve mîrlivâ ve mütesellimler ve voyvodalar ve subaşılar ve metropolidler ve sâ'irleri taraflarından mugâyir-i şurût-ı berât-ı 'âlîşân müdâhale ve mümâna'at*). Who were these metropolitans? We know that during that time the patriarchate of Antioch was very much weakened by the Catholic propaganda and the division among its flock between the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate which had been based in Damascus for many centuries, and the newly created Catholic faction based in Aleppo, which was the wealthiest and one of the two most important metropolitanates with Damascus in the jurisdiction of Antioch. As analysed in the previous chapter, the years following 1740 witnessed Silvestros' attempts to take control in many of his sees including the metropolitanates mentioned in the petition with the exception of Damascus. Thus, by

⁶⁷⁷ BOA.D.PSK.15/20 (1 September 1745).

using the term ‘metropolitans’ who might obstruct his deputy (*vekîl*) the Patriarch of Jerusalem was most probably referring to the metropolitans closer to the Catholic cause. Another interesting difference between this document and its precedents and antecedents is that the deputy of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem serves another purpose on demand of the people, namely performing some religious ceremonies in their houses, which must have a special meaning in the case of the Patriarchate of Antioch that was suffering more from the Catholic propaganda.

The control of the monks in charge of these properties, in particular, seems to have constituted another problem for the Patriarch of Jerusalem. From an order sent to the *voyvoda* of Moldavia, in which Parthenios presents himself as ‘the *mütevelli* of the *vakfs* of [the Patriarchate of] Jerusalem’, we learn that Parthenios relates two major problems he encountered regarding some of his deputies in Moldavia. First, some of his deputies ‘betrayed’ the *vakfs* of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Moldavia and he wanted to replace them with other monks. However, he goes on, they turned ‘malicious’ and some people there claimed that they gave a loan to his deputies and thus wanted it back from Parthenios. They further say, they would not allow the patriarch to dismiss the previous monks and appoint new ones in their stead unless he paid the said debt to them.⁶⁷⁸ The content of the document does not allow a thorough analysis of the issue but it is apparent that these people are of considerable wealth and power, and with them the deputies of the Patriarch of Jerusalem seem to have made connections, which seem to be influential not only while they hold post in Moldavia but also when they face trouble with their patriarch as well. However, as the central administration supported Parthenios in this case, an order was

⁶⁷⁸ BOA.D.PSK.13/162 (1743-44).

dispatched to the *voyvoda* of Moldavia asking him to prevent their obstruction and to enable Parthenios to appoint a new deputy.

As a novelty in the set of the problems the deputies of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem encountered, we see that they started having disputes with *cizye*-collectors (*cizyedâr*) who not only wanted to ‘offer and forcefully give’ (*teklîf ve cebren virüb*) the deputies papers requiring them to pay heavier taxes than what they had traditionally paid but also detained them for about 10-15 days on the grounds that their *cizye* papers were outdated. As far as the response of the Ottoman administration to this petition is concerned, we see that as usual first it was checked in the relevant offices whether Parthenios is really the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and then it was copied from the *berat* of Parthenios to the margin of the document (*derkenâr*) that he is indeed the current Patriarch. Thus it was ordered that wherever the monks appointed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem went to collect alms for ‘the poor Orthodox monks inhabiting in the churches of Jerusalem’ they should not be interfered with by *ehl-i ‘örf tâ’ifesi* without reason and that ‘the cash and any other items that the Orthodox clergymen, monks, priests and other Orthodox people offer, release, and bequeath for Jerusalem’ (*Rum ruhbânlarının ve keşiş ve papas ve sâ’ir Rum tâ’ifesinin Kuds-i Şerîf için nüzûrât ve tasaddukât ve vasiyyet eyledikleri nukûd ve sâ’ir eşyâları*) should be collected by the Patriarch of Jerusalem with the testimony of Orthodox witnesses. However, this order is silent about their disputes with the *cizye*-collectors. Although we have two more cases where the deputy of the Patriarch of Jerusalem got into trouble with the *cizye*-collectors, unfortunately we do not have any orders issued upon these requests to deduce how the Ottoman central administration responded to this problem. In one of these two cases which occurred 3 years later, in 1748, we see that the *cizye*-collectors detained the deputy of the Patriarch of Jerusalem and his entourage on the

grounds that the deadline for the collection of *cizye* was imminent. The remaining details of the event are quite the same as the preceding one. Geographically speaking the patriarch uses the general term ‘in the districts of Rumili’ (*Rumili câniblerinde*).⁶⁷⁹ Despite the fact that the other petition sent to the Sublime Porte in 1754 is not of great use as it is an exact replica of the first example as far as the reasons for the dispute are concerned, it is quite helpful in sketching the geographical area. As mentioned above the first problem occurred in 1745 with the *cizye*-collectors of Eynöz, Dimetoka, Gümülcine, İskete and Edirneköy, all located throughout the easternmost reaches of the *Via Egnatia* (what the Ottomans called *Sol Kol*). We see that a number of these places also appear in the petition sent to the Sublime Porte in 1754: Dimetoka, Uzunköpri, İpsalaboğazı, Keşan, Eynöz, Gümülcine and Kavala.⁶⁸⁰ From a report prepared by the Ottoman bureaucracy on this petition, we also learn that Parthenios had already been granted an order in July-August 1749 (*Şa‘bân* 1162), most probably in response to the second petition which was made in 1748.⁶⁸¹ In brief, from these three examples (occurring in 1745, 1748, 1754), one can conclude that the Patriarchate of Jerusalem had problems with the *cizye*-collectors recurring in quite the same geographical region, along the *Via Egnatia*, which problem the patriarchs addressed to the central administration.

Another noteworthy document shows that the patriarchs of Jerusalem were following the same policy in Asia Minor along the Black Sea as well. The places mentioned are Erzurum, Sinop, Amasya, Kastamonu, Tosya, Trabzon, Giresun, Gümüşhane, etc.⁶⁸² The significance of this document is twofold: first in terms of showing the extent of the places where the Patriarchs of Jerusalem were financially active, and

⁶⁷⁹ BOA.D.PSK.17/64 (11 October 1748).

⁶⁸⁰ BOA.D.PSK.19/127, (20 July 1754), p. 2.

⁶⁸¹ BOA.D.PSK.19/127, (20 July 1754), p. 1.

⁶⁸² BOA.KK.2540/93, (1753-1754).

second in terms of providing an example for the lesser importance attributed to the jurisdictional boundaries. Among the places mentioned, Erzurum (Theodosiopolis) is normally within the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch as we know from a number of *notitiae*.⁶⁸³ Unlike the previous example, where three places under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch are handled as a single case, here the concern seems to be a geographical one because Erzurum is mentioned among neighbouring places which are under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which is evidenced in a patriarchal document of 1721 in which Amasia, Neokaisaria, Trebizond, and Theodosiopolis (Erzurum) are mentioned together.⁶⁸⁴

Finally, in an order issued in 13 December 1746, there appears an interesting detail, where we learn that the patriarch complained about some officials who did not allow horses and mules of his deputy and his entourage to enter Wallachia, adding to the difficulties that the patriarchs encountered. We do not see the order particularly addressing this issue which simply states that they should not be obstructed in accordance with the conditions written in Parthenios' *berat*.⁶⁸⁵

To sum up, it may be concluded that at the turn of the 18th century, due to the new set of lay and ecclesiastical networks outlined in the previous chapter the rapprochement between the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem showed a great upsurge. One of the implications of these relations is manifested in the transmission of a great wealth into the treasure of the patriarchate of Jerusalem from the Orthodox populations of a wide range of places in the Ottoman realms. The rulers of Moldavia and Wallachia constituted only one part of the networks enabling the Patriarchate of Jerusalem to access these resources. The fact is that the deputies of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem were active not only in

⁶⁸³ Zayat & Edelby 1953: 345, 348, Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1889: 474, and Chrysanthos Notaras 1778: 78.

⁶⁸⁴ Delikanis 1904, vol. II: 487.

⁶⁸⁵ BOA.D.PSK.16/27 (13 December 1746).

Moldavia and Wallachia but also in many other places in the Balkans, Asia Minor, and Syria. This implies that many other agents were also involved. The role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, in close connection with the more able Greek lay elite, and the Orthodox population should also be acknowledged. Finally, it must be said that the Ottoman central administration played a key role by facilitating the financial activities of the Jerusalemite patriarchs through a number of orders issued in favour of their agents.

Types of properties dedicated to ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’

As far as the types of the properties devoted to the Eastern Patriarchates in general and the Jerusalemite Patriarchate in particular are concerned, we see that a great number of them are items like fields, cash, vineyards, gardens, mills, horses, mules etc. over which the Patriarchs of Jerusalem were often asking the central administration to prevent the local administrative officials from imposing taxes and tariffs. From an order sent in 1745 to the *kadis* of Eynöz, Dimetoka, Gümülcine, İskete and Edirneköy, we see Parthenios complaining about eight problems that his representative Meletios had encountered. In addition to the recurring elements with respect to previous examples,⁶⁸⁶ here we see that the Patriarch of Jerusalem complained about the interference of the administrative officials⁶⁸⁷ not only in his deputy’s affairs and those of his entourage but also with their ‘sheep’. Thus, among the things that the Orthodox donated to the monks of Jerusalem, we can also talk about sheep and other livestock. Therefore it is clear that there was a wide range of cash and properties flowing from the Ottoman Balkans and Asia Minor to the

⁶⁸⁶ In addition to these, he also complains about some recurring problems deriving from the Orthodox laity and the church hierarchy itself: namely that some monks present themselves as monks of Jerusalem and collect money for their own sake although they do not have any papers from the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and that children of those who dedicated their property to the monks of Jerusalem refuse to honour the terms of the wills and *vakf* of their parents. BOA.D.PSK.15/23 (7 November 1745).

⁶⁸⁷ The three major complaints that the patriarch addressed to the central administration are as follows: (1) that they collect from each monk a road toll of one gold piece, (2) that the Ottoman officials deduct fees from the possessions they are collecting on behalf of monks of Jerusalem, (3) that they prevent the free movement of monks.

treasury of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. However, as we have seen in the previous section, they also had immovable properties in these places, whose control through the deputies of the patriarch of Jerusalem presented a number of problems. However, from an order sent to the *kadis* of Rumelia and Anatolia in 11 September 1740 we see that the spectrum of the properties devoted to the monks of Jerusalem also contains items related solely to worship: ‘silver candlesticks, candles, large pans, and ewers, and books that some Orthodox devoted to Jerusalem as *vakf*’, as well as ‘spindles ornamented with pearls and jewels, bibles, icons, pastoral staffs, taffeta clothes belonging to the Jerusalemite monks and their churches outside the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem’ (*âyinleri üzere kendilere ve kilisalarına mahsûs âyinleri icrâsı vaktinde isti‘mâl idegeldikleri kendülere münâsib incülü ve taşlu takiye ve İncil ve tasvîr ve ‘asâ ve dîbâ libâslarına ve ba‘zı Rum re‘âyâsı Kuds-i Şerîfe vakf idüüb gönderdikleri sim şamdân ve kandîl ve leğen ve ibrik ve sâ‘ir kendülere ve kilisalarına müte‘allik eşyâ ve kitâblarından*).⁶⁸⁸

The *vakfs* of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Moldavia were apparently so important that in 1745, Parthenios decided to go there himself. Prior to his departure, he petitioned the central administration saying that he would go to Wallachia and Moldavia with an entourage of 12 monks and 6 servants. He thus wanted orders to be dispatched to all the *kadis* on the route from Istanbul to Wallachia and Moldavia.⁶⁸⁹ In this petition he stated three major requests: first he asked not to be forced to pay one gold piece for each monk around the River Danube and other quays and mountain passes; second, he asked for the prevention of interference by officials when changed into civilian clothes while passing through dangerous places; and finally he wanted the intervention of administrative officials

⁶⁸⁸ BOA.D.PSK.11/158 (11 September 1740).

⁶⁸⁹ ‘*Âsitânedен Eflak ve Boğdan câniblerine varınca yol üzerinde vâki ‘olan kâdîlara’*

forbidden while they wandered in these areas to collect alms.⁶⁹⁰ As mentioned above the merit of this document is two-fold: first because the Patriarch himself set out to the Ottoman Balkans, and second he informed the Porte before he did so.

Aftermath of the Problem

With regard to the aftermath of the issue that followed the period of the decline of Phanariots from the early 19th century onwards, and hence the ecclesiastical and administrative system based on them, similar problems about the process of collecting the cash and kind from the Orthodox population continued even after the Ottomans lost jurisdiction over a large portion of the provinces in question. With the Russian occupation of the Danubian territories at the end of the eighteenth century, particularly during the Ottoman-Russian War between 1787 and 1792, there appeared other problems related to ‘the wider question of Orthodoxy and nationalism in the Balkans’ as Batalden puts it.⁶⁹¹ Those monasteries with the exception of the ones in Bessarabia retained their special status until 1863, when Alexandru Ioan Cuza the ruler (1859-1866) of the United Principalities of Romania secularised them.⁶⁹² Similarly, in Kingdom of Greece, by the 1834 order of King Otto, these monastic estates of the Brotherhood of Holy Sepulchre and St. Catherine’s monastery were lent to citizens through the ‘Ecclesiastical Fund,’ and despite the legislation of 1847 which returned these estates to the monasteries to which they were dedicated, there were cases of land-grabbing.⁶⁹³ However, the patriarchs of Jerusalem seem to have continued collecting alms in other places within Ottoman boundaries. According to an Ottoman document dated 1852, for example, we see that the central administration informed the local officials about a certain Parthenios, the deputy of the patriarch of

⁶⁹⁰ BOA.D.PSK.15/20 (30 October 1745).

⁶⁹¹ Batalden 1983: 470.

⁶⁹² In 1857-58, Saffet Pasha Ottoman minister of foreign affairs wrote a report on the issue. BOA.Y.EE.43/111.

⁶⁹³ Ilias 2003: 37-40. The legislation of 1847 can be found in Ilias 2003: 47-48.

Jerusalem who was to go to İzmir, Gemlik, Gelibolu, and Bursa, all located in Western Asia Minor, to collect alms.⁶⁹⁴ In 1880 the Patriarch of Jerusalem, wrote a joint petition with his brothers of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria to the central administration requesting the return of their rights in ‘Rumania’.⁶⁹⁵ Although the ones in Bessarabia remained subordinate to the Russian Synod, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem renewed its appeals to the British after the latter took over Palestine during the WW1.⁶⁹⁶ In short, the status of these dedicated monastic estates which we have analysed in this section turned out to be an international issue involving a number of countries, and the Ottomans were appealed to even after their loss of the Danubian provinces.

Practice of alms collection by the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria

The practice of collecting alms and the incomes of the church *vakfs*, occasionally established outside the jurisdiction of a certain patriarchate was special neither to the Greek Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire nor to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. We have a large number of documents showing the presence of this practice for the period we are dealing with, among such non-Greek Orthodox communities as the Armenians,⁶⁹⁷ Syrians,⁶⁹⁸ and Nestorians,⁶⁹⁹ and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, not to mention that of Constantinople⁷⁰⁰ and the archbishopric of Sinai⁷⁰¹. For

⁶⁹⁴ BOA.A.}DVN.MHM.10/14 (22 December 1852).

⁶⁹⁵ BOA.Y.PRK.HR.5/22 (22 April 1880).

⁶⁹⁶ Bertram & Luke 1921: 314-326.

⁶⁹⁷ For some examples on the practice of alms collection and church *vakfs* of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem, see BOA.D.PSK.2/83 (1 July 1702), BOA.D.PSK.3/63 (28 October 1704), BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 54 (1748-49), BOA.KK.d.2542/6, 24 (1751-52), BOA.KK.d.2542/6, 41 (1752-53).

⁶⁹⁸ For some examples on the church *vakfs* of the Syrian Orthodox, written on the occasion of Greek Orthodox intervention in them, see BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 118 (1720-21), and BOA.KK.d.2542/2, 52 (no date).

⁶⁹⁹ See, for example, BOA.KK.d.2542/2, 99 (1735-36).

⁷⁰⁰ For an interesting case where the Patriarch of Constantinople goes to Syria to collect alms, in Antiochan jurisdiction, see BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 17 (1737-38).

⁷⁰¹ As analysed by a number of scholars, the archbishopric of Sinai was particularly active in financial enterprises outside their jurisdiction, which consisted of nothing more than the monastery of St. Catherine. For the Sinaitic possessions in Crete even before the Ottoman conquest, see Greene 2000. For some primary sources from the Ottoman archives, see BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 160 (1724-25), BOA.KK.d.2542/8, 65 (1733-34), BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 87 (1739-40), BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 75 (1749-50).

the purposes of the content of this section, we will focus on the case of the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria.

As noted, the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria were invested with the right to collect alms outside their jurisdiction by 1724 in the case of Antioch and at least by 1746 in the case of Alexandria. As is the case with the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, we can deduce the involvement of the Ottoman central administration in the issues relating to alms collection and the church *vakıfs* outside the jurisdiction of a patriarchate through the problems that the Patriarchs or their deputies faced, afterwards informing the central administration of these problems.

As far as the Patriarchate of Antioch is concerned we have at least five documents regarding this issue, all written between the late 1730s and the mid-1740s, i.e. during Silvestros' tenure. The first document⁷⁰² in question was written in response to Silvestros' petition and thus addresses all the *kadis* in the places mentioned in the *berat* of the Patriarch of Antioch (*Şâm-ı Şerîf ve Şâm patrikliği berâtına dâhil olan yerlerin kâdîlarına hükm ki*). According to this response, Silvestros sent a sealed petition to the Porte complaining of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* who gave him trouble by extorting money (*mücerred celb-i mâl için*) when he collected alms from his flock for the maintenance of the poor clergy (*ruhbân fukarâsının nafakaları için*). In particular, Silvestros complained of the interference of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* when he and his deputies carried with them civilian clothes for safe passage in dangerous places and weapons for protection against bandits. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Silvestros was invested with such immunities in his *berat*, and thus the order in question was dispatched to the *kadis* of the above-mentioned places, in support of Silvestros.

⁷⁰² BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 17b (1737-38).

The second document,⁷⁰³ again written in response to Silvestros' petition, addresses the *kadis* of Antioch, Damascus, Adana, Tarsus, and Payas. On this occasion, too, Silvestros complained largely of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* who gave him trouble while he was collecting alms from his flock. In addition, he also complained of some other members of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* who opposed him when he was travelling around for performing their ceremonies (*re'âyânın âyinlerin icrâsı için mürûr ve 'ubûr eylediği yerlerde âherden bir vechile dahl olunmak icâb eylemez iken*). Therefore he requested the prevention of their interference, and in accordance with the conditions of his *berat*, the central administration sent this order to the relevant *kadis* to prevent this harassment.

The third document⁷⁰⁴ shares the same characteristics as the ones mentioned in the second case above. Relating to the problems that Silvestros encountered in Tripoli, Sayda, Beirut, and Lazkiye, this order, too, supports Silvestros' petition regarding the interference of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* when Silvestros or his deputies wanted to collect alms from his flock for the maintenance of the clergy, and when they travelled for the conduct of the ceremonies.

In all these three cases, we see that the central administration assigned the *kadis*, who were in charge of the legal administration, to see to the observance of the protection of the patriarch and his deputies against the harassment by the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi*. In the fourth document,⁷⁰⁵ though, we see that the central administration supported Silvestros through a wider range of offices. In this case, just as in the previous ones, Silvestros brought his complaint of the interference of the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* in Tripoli, Sayda, Beirut, and Lazkiye when he or his deputies collected alms or travelled for the conduct of the ceremonies. Unlike the previous cases, though, the central administration brought the issue

⁷⁰³ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 67a (23 January 1739).

⁷⁰⁴ BOA.KK.d.2542/3, 87b (29 January 1740).

⁷⁰⁵ BOA.D.PSK.11/123 (7 February 1740).

to the attention not only of the relevant *kadis* but also of the *vâlî* of Tripoli, thus supporting Silvestros not only through legal but also through one of the strongest administrative apparatuses in Syria.

The fifth, and the last document⁷⁰⁶ brings to the fore a practice that differs from the first four cases above in many respects. To begin with, in this case, Silvestros wrote his petition prior to his travel, which would be outside his normal jurisdiction, namely from Istanbul, towards Wallachia (*Eflak cânibi*). Therefore, he asked for a document ordering the *ehl-i 'örf tâ'ifesi* not to interfere in the alms collection by Silvestros and his entourage. Because this journey is different from the others as the patriarch travelled outside his normal jurisdiction, the document refers to him as 'patriarch of a different province' (*âher vilâyet patriği*), by which term the patriarchs of Jerusalem were never referred to. Another difference is that Silvestros associates the reason for his alms collection in Wallachia not with the maintenance of his clergy but his very own self as he does not have a source of income other than that (*patrik-i mesfûrin bir yerden medâr-ı ma'îşeti olmayub ancak mu'tâd-ı kadîm ve oligeldiği üzere re'âyâ tâ'ifesinden rızâlarıyla virenlerden tasadduk cem'i için*). The final significant difference from the other cases outlined above is that Silvestros was allowed, at least by the central administration, to go to anywhere he liked in the region between Istanbul and Wallachia as we understand from the addressees of the document, namely all the *kadis* on the way from Istanbul towards Wallachia (*Âsitânedен Eflak cânibine varınca kâdîlara hükm ki*). From this statement, we also understand that Silvestros was in Istanbul, from whence he was to set off. Here, one should also draw attention to the conjuncture of the time. By 1745, Kyrillos had deposed Silvestros on the ground that he had been in Wallachia and Moldavia and even went to the lands of 'the

⁷⁰⁶ BOA.D.PSK.16/11 (20 October 1746).

infidel enemies'⁷⁰⁷ and as mentioned in the section on Silvestros in the previous chapter, Silvestros managed to have Kyrillos deposed in a couple of months. This being said, it is very significant that Silvestros found support with the Porte for an action he had been accused of, and punished for a year earlier.

To sum up, we may say that financial infrastructure behind the patriarchal politics was crucial to the new networks involving the lay and patriarchal elites of the 18th century, and a member of one of these patriarchal elites, Silvestros, pursued the practice of alms collection not only within his normal jurisdiction but also elsewhere, namely in Ottoman Rumelia. Against all the mistreatment inflicted by the administrative officers, Silvestros often appealed to the central administration, and in all these cases he was given the relevant support through the orders dispatched to the related *vâlîs* and *kadis*.

Conclusion

As this chapter shows, the political connections that we outlined in the previous chapters from which the economic infrastructure that the Eastern Patriarchs benefited were also homogeneous in many respects. As was the case with these political networks, the economic networks, too, had many affiliations with the Ottoman central administration. Therefore, the 18th century witnessed a great intensification in comparison with earlier centuries in three major economic activities for the Eastern Patriarchates, namely collection of alms, collection of the income from church *vakfs* and inheritances often outside the jurisdiction of the patriarchates in question. As mentioned above, from the earlier periods onwards, Eastern Patriarchs had established economic ties with the other parts of the Ottoman Empire, the donations of the Orthodox rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia being notably important. From an earlier period onwards, the princes of

⁷⁰⁷ BOA.D.PSK.14/135 (19 April 1945).

Wallachia and Moldavia had been supporting the Eastern Patriarchates in a number of ways. Following the *Byzance après Byzance* approach of Iorga, scholars have tended to see these as mere gifts given by the rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia, which serves to confuse many aspects of the real process. Introduction of Ottoman sources into the current discussion reveals many insights about the actual situation. It has been maintained by many scholars that the Ottoman administration did not tax the properties of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, as well as the other Eastern Patriarchates. However, a comparison of these church *vakfs* with the theory of Ebussuud in regard to the church *vakfs* indicates two major points. First, the Ottomans were less strict with the church *vakfs* in this matter. Second, the attitude of the patriarchs of Jerusalem to present them as family *vakfs* and their insistence that they should be considered according to the precepts of Islamic law shows their ability to navigate within the Ottoman legal system. To put it another way, in the 16th century, the Orthodox monasteries were able to retain their Byzantine properties by negotiating with the relevant Ottoman institutions, as analysed by Kermeli, whereas in the 18th century, through the new set of networks, the patriarchal elites used the Ottoman institutions to a larger extent as a means of economic flourishing.

The Ottoman sources also reveal other agents involved in the network of relations enabling the patriarchate of Jerusalem to pursue an enormous number of transactions outside its normal jurisdiction. One of the most decisive agents here would be the Orthodox population, who provided donations for ‘the poor monks of Jerusalem’. While all the other sources mention that these estates and other items were presented by the rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia, Ottoman documents show that it was the Orthodox people, who donated to the patriarchate of Jerusalem through various forms of income although the major motivation behind these acts of endowments was the rulers of Moldavia and

Wallachia, both pre-Phanariot and Phanariot, and the patriarchal elites. A second group among the Orthodox population is also of importance in terms of presenting a handicap to the deputies of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem retaining the properties in question. We learn from these sources that they took the issue to the local *kadi* court but the patriarchs of Jerusalem constantly petitioned the Porte so that it sent orders to the *kadis* reminding them that the deputies are entitled to retain these properties. There appears another neglected agent in the process, namely the Ottoman central administration. Not only in cases where the agents of the patriarch of Jerusalem had recourse to local courts with the above-mentioned Orthodox *re'âyâ*, but also with regard to a number of issues of more modest nature such as the unauthorised intervention of the local administrative officials to take from them fees for passage, the patriarch of Jerusalem was supported by a number of orders sent from the imperial chancery. This phenomenon shows the ability of the patriarchs of Jerusalem in navigating in line with the Ottoman bureaucratic apparatus quite smoothly. The fact that they were able to transfer materials related solely to worship through Islamic law in addition to cash, immovable properties shows the degree they were supported by the Ottoman central administration. All these points raised in this chapter point to the interconnections between the political and ecclesiastical networks of power in the 18th-century Ottoman Empire.

As we analysed in the previous chapter, the increasing cooperation between all the Orthodox Patriarchates in the 18th-century Ottoman Empire resulted in new patterns of relations between the Orthodox Patriarchates and the Ottoman central administration in which the Eastern Patriarchs became more involved with the centre than before. Similarly, these patriarchal elites began to take their support mainly from the Phanariots, unlike their predecessors in previous centuries. The new economic outlook of the Eastern Patriarchates

had many common characteristics with their new political outlook. The Eastern Patriarchates in general and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in particular began to benefit from the economic resources outside their normal jurisdiction within the Ottoman Empire. Overall, as the Ottoman central administration constituted a significant part of the political backbone of the new system, strengthening the ties between the lay and patriarchal elites of the Orthodox community, the Eastern Patriarchs became less dependent on the economical offers of the foreign rulers and ambassadors.

CONCLUSION

The role hitherto attributed to the Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria under Ottoman rule according to a number of paradigms is one of passive receivers of the demands of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which allegedly dominated the Eastern Patriarchates, with the support of the Ottoman central administration. This is seen most manifestly in the paradigm initiated by Runciman who merged the 19th-century ideology of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Ottoman millet system theory and back-projected this view to the whole Ottoman period. However, in those studies that place a larger focus on the provincial dynamics and the Eastern Patriarchates themselves, too, we see a great influence of the Constantinople-centred paradigm. Such an exclusive emphasis on the Patriarchate of Constantinople lies in the centre of the problem, and one has to question this paradigm on two major grounds: first, whether the centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates was realised following the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt, and second when it indeed came into being whether it really connoted a relationship characterised by domination and subjection. Therefore, we have sought to place our focal point on the relations that the Eastern Patriarchates established with the Ottoman central administration and the Patriarchate of Constantinople regardless of the theories which have sprung from an exclusive endeavour to explain the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Without doubt, such research can only be conducted through a study of the correspondence between the three parties concerned. Although intra-patriarchal relations have already received scholarly attention, the correspondence between the central administration and the Eastern Patriarchates has been ignored, and we have had the privilege of studying these documents for the first time. In our study of the correspondence

in question, it appears that rather than being mere accepters of political developments, the Eastern Patriarchates successfully adapted themselves to the changing political conditions.

To recapitulate the context of the Eastern Mediterranean reshaped following the departure of the dynamics of the Crusades, some Eastern patriarchs may be said to have played a key role in conducting relations between the two principal powers of the region, namely the Byzantine Empire and Mamluk Sultanate. In this period, Constantinople re-appeared as a source of political and economic power for the Eastern Patriarchates. After the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453, however, Eastern Patriarchates began to seek a supporter that would replace Byzantium, and for this purpose one of them appealed to the Ottoman court half a century before the Ottomans conquered Syria and Egypt. With the Ottoman conquest of Mamluk domains, all the Orthodox Patriarchates were once again unified under a single state after a hiatus lasting nine centuries, which some scholars have used as a reason for their argument that the Eastern Patriarchates were dominated by the Great Church as part of this re-unification event. Our research shows that in the first two centuries thereafter, the Ottoman central administration, which for these scholars provided unconditional support for the centralisation of the Orthodox Patriarchates in Istanbul, constituted only one of many sources of power to which the Eastern Patriarchates could appeal for support. In fact, the central administration was content with the maintenance of the traditional state of affairs, as is epitomised in its continuous emphasis on the term ‘in accordance with the old custom’ (*mu‘tâd-ı kadîm üzere*). The Patriarchate of Constantinople, to which the Eastern patriarchs had easier and unhindered access compared to the Mamluk period, the two provincial Ottoman bodies, namely the *kadi* courts and the *divans* of the provincial governors, semi-autonomous power-holders in Syria, the courts of Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant states, and the semi-independent

principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia all constitute the other dynamic entities according to which the Eastern Patriarchates determined their policies. Most of these latter dynamics have become the subject of patchy models used by modern historians who sought to explain the relation between church and politics. If we return to the issue of relations between the Great Church and the Eastern Patriarchates, from the late 17th century onwards, Patriarchs of Constantinople made two major attempts to interfere in the patriarchal elections in Antioch and Alexandria, which are instrumental in terms of showing the abilities of the Eastern Patriarchates to withstand the centralising tendencies of the Patriarchate of Constantinople whose authority over the Eastern Patriarchate appears to have been limited. In these two conflicts, the Ottoman central administration made it clear even at times when it was supporting a candidate of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs that the Patriarchate of Constantinople did not have institutional jurisdiction over the Eastern Patriarchates.

Two major dynamics brought about a change to these networks governing the relations between the Orthodox Patriarchates vis-à-vis the central administration. On the one hand, the growth of Catholic propaganda among the Orthodox flock and clergy in Ottoman Syria and Egypt led to the emergence of a faction within the Orthodox Church that was determined to take action. On the other, the rise of a prosperous and powerful lay elite class based in the Phanar district of Istanbul was further facilitated through the appointment of these lay elites to important administrative posts, most notably as grand dragomans and as princes of Moldavia and Wallachia. These lay elites not only offered support to the Eastern Patriarchates but also tried to prevent the activities of the Catholic party, using their key role as Ottoman administrators. We were able to track such influence from some certain *berats*, e.g. that of Silvestros, in which the name of the grand dragoman

who was a Phanariot appears among those who recommended Silvestros for the patriarchal throne of Antioch.

Contrary to the repeatedly proposed argument that the Patriarchate of Constantinople exerted a hold over the Eastern Patriarchates through the power it received from the Ottoman central administration, we believe that this superficial view should also be altered. Our research shows that in this process of centralisation both the Eastern and Constantinopolitan patriarchs became more aligned in terms of their outlook and the tools they made use of in patriarchal politics. In this period their relations with local and international actors, which characterised patriarchal politics for the first two centuries of Ottoman rule, were largely replaced by the Ottoman central administration. This model was put into action through the patriarchal *berats*, which gave the Eastern patriarchs of the time more extensive rights than those given to their predecessors, enabling them to use the offices of the central administration to enhance their power and authority. That the *berats* of the time also became more homogenised also points to the way the central administration viewed the centralisation within the Orthodox Church. As we have analysed through the long tenure of Silvestros of Antioch (1724-1766), all the points mentioned in the patriarchal *berats* were effectively used by the patriarchal elites of the time, and these points brought their patriarchates to the direct attention and control of the central administration. Although Silvestros' strict policies attracted the Porte's displeasure, which even resulted in the ascension of his Catholic rival Serafeim/Kyrillos to the patriarchal throne for a short period, as a notion of the new patterns of networks, Silvestros enjoyed the support of the central administration, which even involved his conflict with a metropolitan under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Such a political scheme required an economic aspect as well, which also showed the same centralising features. Three major economic activities stand out in this period: collection of the incomes of the church *vakfs*, collection of alms, and the inheritance of those Orthodox who willed their properties to the Eastern Patriarchates outside the normal jurisdiction of the Eastern Patriarchates. These economic pursuits were precipitated by new articles inserted in the patriarchal *berats* of the period for the first time. Patriarchs of Jerusalem appear to have been the best practitioners of these economic means, pursuing revenue collection and garnishing of assets on an empire-wide scale. A notable aspect of the church *vakfs* is the way the patriarchs of Jerusalem identified them in the Ottoman legal system. The properties belonging to the Church from the pre-Ottoman period had already been incorporated into the *vakf* system as family *vakfs* by the 16th-century grand mufti Ebussuud Efendi, who accepted the church *vakfs*, whose notions of ‘worship’ could not legalise their existence in the Islamic system. In the 18th century, the properties transferred to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the Ottoman period were also merged into this system, which is also seen in the Jerusalem patriarchs’ prudent use of Islamic terminology. Drawing on the term ‘poor subjects’ (*re‘âyâ fukarâsı*) they referred to the monks under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem as ‘poor monks’ (*ruhban fukarâsı*), and in accordance with the requirements of the *berats*, all the income transferred to the Patriarchate for the monks was inherited by the patriarch when the monks died. In addition to the semi-independent principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, where the princes had begun supporting the Eastern Patriarchates through similar economic means before Phanariot rule, a cross-examination of Greek and Ottoman documents shows that the Jerusalem patriarchs were economically active in other parts of the Balkans, Asia Minor, the Aegean islands and Syria. The support of the central administration behind these

economic activities reached the extent that the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was able, in one case, to receive some items related solely to Christian worship as *vakf*. All these economic pursuits overall further contributed to the centralisation of the Eastern Patriarchates in Istanbul, which from their perspective began to appear as the source of political and economic power from the early 18th century onwards, and they made use of these means in a manner and degree never before experienced in Ottoman history.

With these considerations in mind, it is hoped that this dissertation will contribute not only to the history of the Greek-Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire per se but also to broader paradigms with respect to the study of non-Muslims in Muslim states, centre-periphery paradigms, pious endowments and church-state theories. First of all, it appears out of this research that there is a certain need to question afresh not only the models proposed in regard to the way the Ottoman central administration viewed the ecclesiastical organisations of its non-Muslim subjects but also our insistence to search for a uniform system. A certain weakness of such theories as seen manifestly in this dissertation is their exclusive focus on the centre and therefore the non-Muslims in the centre. A group of recent studies came out as a response to such a centralistic approach to the non-Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire, hence endeavouring to study such communities regardless of their position vis-à-vis the state. The present study differs from these two exclusivist approaches and tries to put the non-Muslim communities and their organisations in the context they adapted themselves to, paying due attention to the dynamics of state and provincial church organisation which we believe will lead to further directions in research. In the light of such an approach, the patriarchal and lay elites of Ottoman Orthodox society may be the subject of a comparative research with regard to other similar social groups in Ottoman context. One such group would be the *a'yân*, the

provincial notables who showed a similar, if not parallel, rise in the 18th century. Some scholars offered to study the members of the Orthodox Church in the Balkans as Ottoman elites but there was no attempt to study the members of the Eastern Patriarchates in such a manner which would bring about more fruitful results due to the involvement of more ‘provincial’ dynamics including the *a’yân* themselves. Introduction of a new type of social group active in the provinces—and in some cases the periphery of the Ottoman Empire—with power bases in the centre would greatly benefit centralisation-decentralisation paradigms, as well. Another social group which may be the subject of comparative research is the Ottoman *‘ulemâ* who gained extensive rights vis-à-vis the Ottoman central administration in the 18th century.

Another avenue for further research regards the collection of alms, inheritance of Orthodox testators, and the incomes of the church *vakfs* on an Empire-wide scale among the Orthodox population, a practice facilitated in an unprecedented scale in the 18th century. Comparing these practices to some other similar Ottoman ones, such as the Muslim *vakfs* for the Holy Places in Mecca and Medina, which we believe had more than a few commonalities, would prevent one from viewing the Orthodox church and community in utter segregation. Such a comparative approach to religious groups and practices regardless of their origin would also enable a more realistic and down-to-earth view of the Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire and open up new horizons for further comparative studies, which may be instrumental in understanding the way religion and politics interacted in the Ottoman world.

This brings us to the issue of church-state relations in Muslim contexts. While scholars have spent a considerable time tackling the issue of church-state relations in Christian states, they have often failed to note that the church itself successfully adapted to

such conditions as well. Therefore, these scholars have revolved around the concepts of toleration or persecution in the Ottoman context and rather concentrated their efforts on revealing the relations that the churches in Muslim states established with Christian courts abroad, which is exactly the same for the case of Eastern Patriarchates under Ottoman rule. This dissertation has aimed to show the way in which the lay and patriarchal elites of the Orthodox community adjusted themselves to the Ottoman administrative system. As clearly seen throughout the dissertation, in this mode of church-state relations the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the patriarchates was not the first and foremost concern of the Ottoman administration. During the 18th century, the type of patriarchal elites that emerged in parallel to the lay elites was qualified to collaborate with the Ottoman high elite in the state apparatus. Therefore, further research could delve into the tracts that both the lay and ecclesiastical elites wrote about the theories of church and state. Hopefully, the present research makes a contribution to the future studies that will seek to answer such questions.

APPENDIX I. Gerasimos Alexandria's *berat*⁷⁰⁸ in transliteration

⁷⁰⁸ Published in Chatzoglou-Mpalta 2006: 542-454 in Greek translation by Kotzageorgis on the basis of the copy preserved in Vatopedi Monastery.

APPENDIX II. Chrysanthos of Jerusalem's *berat*⁷⁰⁹ in transliteration

⁷⁰⁹ Published in Gedeon 1910: 15-18.

APPENDIX III. Athanasios of Antioch's *berat*⁷¹⁰

⁷¹⁰ BOA.D.PSK.7/6 (17 February 1720).

APPENDIX IV. Athanasios of Antioch's *berat* in transliteration

APPENDIX V. Silvestros of Antioch's *berat*⁷¹¹

⁷¹¹ BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 170-171 (2 October 1730).

APPENDIX VI. Silvestros of Antioch's *berat* in transliteration

APPENDIX VII. Pathenios of Jerusalem's *berat*⁷¹²

⁷¹² BOA.KK.d.2540/2, 77 (20 February 1755).

APPENDIX VIII. Parthenios of Jerusalem's *berat* in transliteration

APPENDIX IX. Matthaïos of Alexandria's *berat*⁷¹³

⁷¹³ BOA.KK.d.2542/5, 1 (13 August 1746).

APPENDIX IX. Matthaïos of Alexandria's *berat* in transliteration

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Primary Sources

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri, İstanbul

Major Folders and *Defters*

BOA.D.PSK.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20

BOA.KK.d.2542/1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9

BOA.A. {DVNS.KLS.d.08, 10

Individual documents

BOA.Ali Emiri Tasnifi, Fatih Sultan Mehmed, 22

BOA.C.ADL.5421

BOA.Y.EE.43/111

BOA.A. }DVN.MHM.10/14

BOA.Y.PRK.HR.5/22

Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi, İstanbul

TSMA.E.5585

Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul

Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Şehid Ali Paşa 1067

National Archives, Kew

NA.SP.97/11

NA.SP.91/2

NA.SP.102/49

Archives of Sinai

A.S.Turkish Firmans, Roll No: 1

A.S.Turkish Firmans Roll No: 4

University of Birmingham Library

University of Birmingham, Special Collections, DA21/1/2/1/28

Published Primary Sources

- Apostolopoulos, D. (ed.), 1992. *O Ieros Kodix tou Patriarcheiou Konstantinoupoleos sto B miso tou IE aiona: ta mona gnosta sparagmata*, Athens.
- Arsenius 1715. *Lacrimae & Suspira Ecclesiae Graecae: or, the Distressed State of the Greek Church, humbly represented in a Letter to her late Majesty Queen Anne, from the Patriarch of Alexandria; by the Hands of Arsenius Archbishop of Thebais, Now Residing in London*, London.
- Benedict 1826. *Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Benedicti Papae XIV. Bullarium*, vol. I., Mechliniae.
- Bertram, A. & Luke, H. C. 1921. *Report of the Commission Appointed by the Government of Palestine to Inquire into the Affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, London.
- Burayk, M. 1982. *Târihü 'ş-Şâm*, Damascus.
- de Busbecq, O. 2005. *Türk Mektupları* (trans. D. Türkömer), Istanbul.
- Cassidy, N. J. 2004. *A Translation and Historical Commentary of Book One and Book Two of the Historia of Geōrgios Pachymerēs*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Western Australia.
- Chishull, E. D. 1993. *Türkiye Gezisi ve İngiltere 'ye Dönüş: 12 Eylül 1698-10 Şubat 1702* (trans. Bahattin Orhan), Istanbul.
- Chrysanthos Notaras, 1778. *Chrysanthou Syntagmation peri ton offikion, klirikaton, kai archontikion tis tou Christou agias ekklesias meta ton egcheiridion ton peri ton epta mystirion Gavriil Filadelfias kai Iov Amartolou syn omilia tini thespesia Gennadiou patriarchou Konstantinoupoleos*, Venice.
- Cohen, A. 1994. *A World Within: Jewish life as reflected in Muslim court documents from the sijill of Jerusalem (XVIIth century). Part 1 (Texts), Part 2 (Facsimiles)*. Philadelphia.
- Covel, J. 1998. *John Covel: Voyages en Turquie, 1675-1677* (ed. J.-P. Grémois), Paris.
- Darrouz s, J. (ed.), 1979. *Les regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople. Vol.1, Fasc.6, Les actes des patriarches. Les regestes de 177 1410*, Paris.
- Delikanis, K. 1904. *Ta en tois Kodixi tou Patriarchikou Archeiofylakeiou Sozomena Episima Ekklesiastika Eggrafa: ta eggrafa ta aforonta eis tas scheseis tou*

Oikoumenikou Patriarcheiou pros tas ekklesias Alexandreias, Antiocheias, Ierosolymon kai Kyprou, 1574-1863, Constantinople.

Dositheos Notaras, 1715. *Istoria peri ton en Ierosolymois patriarcheusanthon, diirimeni en dodeka bibliois, syggrafeisa men para tou patriarchou Dositheou, kosmitheisa de, kai en taxei aristi tetheisa para tou makariotatou patriarchou ton Ierosolymon Chrysanthou etypothi epimeleia kai diorthosei Mitrofanous Grigora tou ek Dodonis*, Bucharest.

Fabricius, J. A. 1808-1809. *Bibliotheca Graecae*, Hamburg.

Gedeon, M. (ed.), 1910. *Episima Grammata Tourkika*. Constantinople.

Gelzer, H. 1901. 'Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum' in *Abhandlungen der Philosophische-Philologischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 21, 531-641.

Heyd, U. (ed), 1960. *Ottoman Documents on Palestine, 1552-1615: A Study of the Firman according to the Mühimme Defteri*, Oxford.

Historia Patriarchiki 1849. *Historia Politica et Patriarchica Constantinopoleos-Epirotica* (ed. Immanuel Bekker), Bonn, 1-77.

Historia Politiki 1849. *Historia Politica et Patriarchica Constantinopoleos-Epirotica* (ed. Immanuel Bekker), Bonn, 78-204.

Hypsilantis, A. K. 1870. *Ta meta tin Alosin (1453-1789) ek cheirografou anekdotou tis Ieras Monis tou Sina*, Constantinople.

Jack, M. (ed), 2004. *Turkish Embassy Letters: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, London.

Kabrda, J. (ed), 1969. *Le Système fiscal de l'église orthodoxe dans l'Empire Ottoman (d'après les documents turcs)*, Brno.

Karmiris, I. (ed). 1968. *Ta Dogmatika kai Symvolika Mnimeia tis Orthodoxou Katholikis Ekklesias*, Athens.

de Khitrowo, B. (ed.), 1889. *Itinéraires russes en Orient: Traduits pour la société de l'Orient Latin*, Geneva.

Kritovoulos 1954. *History of Mehmed the Conqueror* (trans. C. T. Riggs), Princeton.

Laurent, V. (ed), 1971. *Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. Vol.1. Les actes des Patriarches Fasc.1, Les registes de 1208 à 1309*, Paris.

Lawson, M. S. (ed), 1910. *Letters of John Mason Neale, selected and edited by his daughter*, London.

Le Gobien, C. (ed), 1810. *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses des missions étrangères: Memoires du Levant*, vols. III, IV, V, Paris.

- Le Gobien, C. (ed), 1819, *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses des missions étrangères: Memoires du Levant*, vols. I-II, Paris.
- Legrand, E. (ed), 1888, *Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire: épistolaire grecque ou recueil de lettres adressées pour la plupart à Chrysanthe Notaras Patriarche de Jerusalem par les princes de Vallachie et de Moldavie*, vol. IV, Paris.
- Legrand, E. (ed), 1903, *Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire: Requil de documents grecs concernant les relations du Patriarcat de Jérusalem avec la Roumanie (1569-1728)*, vol VII, Paris.
- Mahfuzat 1995. *Mahfûzât Deyr Sayyidâtü'l-Balamand el-Batriyarkî ve Deyrû'n-Nebî Ilyâs el-Batriyarkî, Şuveyyâ, ve Deyrû'l-Kiddîs Yûhannâ el-Ma'madân, Dûmâ, Beirut.*
- Majer, H. G. (ed), 1984. *Das osmanische "Registerbuch der Beschwerden" (Şikayet Defteri) von Jahre 1675. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. Mixt. 683, Vienna.*
- Makraios, S. 1872. 'Ypomnimata Ekklesiastikis Istorias (1750-1800)' in K. N. Sathas (ed), *Mesaioniki Vivliothiki*, vol. III, Venice.
- Malcolm Letts (ed.), 1926. *Pero Tafur, Travels and Adventures 1435-1439*, London.
- Manousakas, M. I. 1968. *Anekdotia Patriarchika Grammata (1547-1806) pros tous en Venetia Mitropolitias Filadelfeias kai tin Orthodoxon Ellinikin Adelfotita*, Venice.
- Miklosich, F. & Müller, J. 1890. *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, vol. 6, Vienna.
- Mirmiroğlu, V. 1945. *Fatih Sultan Mehmet II Devrine Ait Tarihi Vesikalar*, Istanbul.
- Moschonas, T. D. 1965. 'Katalogoi tis Patriarchikis Vivliothikis' in *Studies and Documents* 26, Salt Lake City.
- Nektarios 1783. *Epitomi tis Ierokosmikis Istorias, eis pente meristheisa tmimata*, Venice.
- Omont, H. 1893. 'Liste des métropolitains et évêques Grecs du Patriarcat de Constantinople vers 1725', *Revue de l'Orient Latin* 1, 313-320.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. 1963. *Analekta Ierosolymitikes Stachyologias, i syllogi anekdodon kai spanion ellinikon syggrafon peri ton kata ein eoan orthodoxon ekklesion kai malista tis ton Palaistinon*, Brussels.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. 1889. 'Taktikon ton Orthodoxon Ekklesion tis Anatonis kai Katalogos Archiereon Akmasanton en autais metaxy ton IZ' kai IH' aionas' *Deltion tis Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etairias tis Ellados* 3, 468-478.
- Paul of Aleppo 1930. 'Voyage du Patriarche Macaire d'Antioche: texte arabe et traduction française' (trans. Basile Radu), *Patrologia Orientalis* 22, 19-199.

- Paul Rycout 1679. *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches, Anno Christi, 1678*, London.
- Petit, L. Sidéridès, X. A. & Jugie, M. 1935. *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios, Vol. IV. Polémique contre Pléthon, oeuvres pastorals, ascétiques, liturgiques, poétiques, correspondance, chronographie*, Paris.
- Rabbath, A. 1905. *Documents inédits pour servir l'histoire du christianisme en Orient*, vol. I., Paris.
- Rabbath, A. 1910. *Documents inédits pour servir l'histoire du christianisme en Orient*, vol. II., Paris.
- Refik, A. 1988. *Onuncu Asr-ı Hicri'de İstanbul Hayatı (1495-1591)*, Istanbul.
- Regel, W. (ed). 1970. *Analecta Byzantino-Russica*. New York.
- Robertson, J. N. W. B. (ed). 1899. *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem sometimes called the Council of Bethlehem holden under Dositheus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1672*, London.
- Şakar, M. F. 2007. 1101-1102 (1690-1691) Tarihli 100 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri Transkripsiyonu ve Değerlendirilmesi, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Marmara University.
- Schefer, M. C. (ed), 1894. *Mémoire historique sur l'ambassade de France Constantinople par le marquis de Bonnac*, Paris.
- Schwarz, K. 1970. *Osmanische Sultansurkunden des Sinai-Klosters in Türkischer Sprache*, Greiburg.
- Senemoğlu, Y. (ed), n.d. *Haydar Çelebi Ruznamesi*, Istanbul.
- Smith, T. 1680. *An Account of the Greek Church as to its Doctrine and Rites of Worshop: with Several Historicall Remarks interspersed, relating thereunto, to which is added, An Account of the State of the Greek Church, under Cyrillus Lucaris Patriarch of Constantinople, with a Relation of his Sufferings and Death*, London.
- Stephan Gerlach 2007. *Türkiye Günlüğü: 157 -1576* (trans. Türkis Noyan), Istanbul.
- Talbot, A.-M. M. 1975. *The Correspondence of Athanasius I Patriarch of Constantinople*, Washington.
- Tzoumerkas, P. (ed). 2010. *O Kodix yp' Arithm. 9 tis Alexandrinis Patriarchikis Vivliothikis O Legomenos tou Patriarchou Alexandreias Paisiou*, Alexandria.
- Uspenskii, P. 1898. *Aleksandriiskaia patriarkhiia: sbornik materialov, izsledovanii i zapisok otnosiashchikhsia do istorii Aleksandriiskoi patriarkhii*, St. Petersburg.

- Vaporis, N. M. (ed). 1974. *Codex (G') Gamma of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople*, Brookline.
- Vaporis, N. M. (ed). 1975. *Codex (B') Beta of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople: Aspects of the History of the Church of Constantinople*, Brookline.
- Verpeaux, J. (ed.), *Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des Offices, Introduction, Texte et Traduction*, Paris, 1966.

Secondary Sources

- Abdul Rahman, A. R. 1991. 'The Documents of the Egyptian Religious Courts (Al-Mahâkim al-Shar'iyya) as a Source for the Study of Ottoman Provincial Administration in Egypt', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 34/1-2, 88-97.
- Adeney, W. F. 1908. *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, New York.
- Aksan, V. 1987. 'Ottoman French Relations 1738-1768' in S. Kunalp (ed.), *Studies in Ottoman Diplomatic History*, Istanbul, 41-58.
- Al-Qattan, N. 1996. *Dhimmi in the Muslim Court: Documenting Justice in Ottoman Damascus, 1775-1860*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Al-Thakafi, Y. A. 1981. *The Diplomatic Relationship between the Ottoman Empire and the Mamluk Empire in the First Quarter of the Sixteenth Century*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Anderson, S. P. 1989. *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut at Smyrna, 1667-1678*, Oxford.
- Andriopoulou, S. 2010. *Diplomatic Communication between Byzantium and the West under the Late Palaiologoi (1354-1453)*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Birmingham.
- Angelopoulos, A. 1983. 'The Greek-Russian Cultural Relations based on the Patriarchal Acta edited by K. Delikanis' in *Les relations gréco-russes pendant la domination turque et la guerre d'indépendance grecque: premier colloque/organisé à Thessalonique, 23-25 septembre 1981, par l'Institut d'études balkaniques de Thessalonique et l'Institut d'études slaves et balkaniques de l'Académie des sciences de l'URSS.*, Thessaloniki, 11-41.
- Angelov, D. 2007. *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium (1204-1330)*, Cambridge.
- Angelov, D. 2009. 'Donation of Constantine and the Church in Late Byzantium' in D. Angelov (ed.), *Church and Society in Late Byzantium*, Kalamazoo, 91-157.

- Apostolopoulos, D. 2003. *Gia Tous Fanariotes*, Athens.
- Appleyard, E. S. 1851. *The Greek Church: A Sketch*, London.
- Armanios, F. 2011. *Coptic Christianity in Ottoman Egypt*, Oxford & New York.
- Arzhanukhin, V. 1999. 'Greek Patristics in Russia of the 17th-18th centuries', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44/1-4, 565-574.
- Athanasiadou, K. 1886. 'Ta kata ton Aodimon Parthenion Patriarchin Ierosolymon', *Deltion tis Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etaireias tis Ellados* 4, 234-262.
- Attwater, D. 1937. *The Dissident Eastern Churches*, Milwaukee.
- Babinger, F. 1978. *Mehmed the Conquerer and His Time* (trans. R. Manheim), Princeton.
- Ballian, A.-R. 1995. *Patronage in Central Asia Minor and the Pontos During the Ottoman Period: The Case of Church Silver, 17th-19th Centuries*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Birmingham.
- Bardakjian, K. 1982. 'The Rise of the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople' in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, New York & London, 89-101.
- Barkey, K. 2008. *Empire of difference: the Ottomans in comparative perspective*, Cambridge.
- Barsook, E. 1973. 'The Travels of Bernardo Michelozzi and Bonsignore Bonsignori in the Levant (1497-98)', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 36, 145-197.
- Barsoumian, H. 1982. 'The Dual Role of the Armenian Amira Class within the Ottoman Government and the Armenian Millet (1750-1850)' in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, New York & London, 171-185.
- Batalden, S. K. 1977. 'A Further Note on Patriarch Serapheim II's Sojourn to Russia', *Balkan Studies* 18, 409-411.
- Batalden, S. K. 1983. 'Metropolitan Gavriil (Banulesko-Bodoni) and Greek-Russian Conflict over Dedicated Monastic Estates, 1787-1812', *Church History* 52/4, 468-478.
- Bayraktar Tellan, E. 2011. *The Patriarch and the Sultan: The Struggle for Authority and the Quest for Order in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Bilkent University.
- Bayraktar Tellan, E. 2012. 'The Orthodox Church of Crete: 1645-1735, A Case Study on the Relation between Sultanic Power and Patriarchal Will', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36/2, 198-214.

- Bilmen, Ö. N. 1967. *Hukuk-ı İslamiyye ve Istılahat-ı Fıkhiyye Kamusu*, Istanbul.
- Bosworth, C. E. 1972. 'Christian and Jewish Religious Dignitaries in Mamlûk Egypt and Syria: Qalqashandî's Information on Their Hierarchy, Titulature, and Appointment (II)', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 3/2, 199-216.
- Bouchier, E. S. 1921. *A Short History of Antioch, 300 B.C.-A.D. 1268*, Oxford.
- Braude, B. 1982. 'Foundation Myths of the Millet System' in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, New York & London, 69-87.
- Callinicos, C. 1931. *A Brief Sketch of Greek Church History* (trans. K. Natzio), London.
- Camariano-Cioran, A. 1962. *Les académies princières de Bucarest et de assy et leurs professeurs*, Thessaloniki.
- Canard, M. 1937. 'Un traité entre Byzance et l'Égypte au XIIIe siècle et les relations diplomatiques de Michel VIII avec les sultans mamlûks Baïbars et Qalâ'ûn', *Mélanges Gaudefroy-Demombynes*, Cairo, 197-224.
- Carmona, A. 2002. 'Wakf (a.)', *Encyclopedia of Islam* 2, vol. 11.
- Charon (Korolevsky), C. 1998. *History of the Melkite Patriarchates*, vol. I. *Pre-Modern Period (869-1833)* (trans. J. Collorafi), Fairfax.
- Chatzoglou-Mpalta, E. S. 2006. *Gerasimos B' Palladas Patriarchis Alexandreias (± 1625/30-1714): O Bios kai to Syggrafikon tou Ergon*, Athens.
- Cicanci, O. 2004. 'Représentants de la diaspora grecque dans la vie culturelle de l'espace roumain (fin XVIe-début XIXe siècle)' in P. M. Kitrolimidès & A. Tabaki (eds.), *Relations Gréco-Roumaines: Interculturalité et identité nationale*, Athens, 237-251.
- Clark, K. W. 1953. 'Exploring the Manuscripts of Sinai and Jerusalem', *The Biblical Archaeologist* 16, 22-43.
- Clark, K. W. 1953. *Checklist of Manuscripts in the Libraries of the Greek and Armenian Patriarchates in Jerusalem Microfilmed for the Library of Congress, 1949-50*, Washington.
- Clogg, R. 1979. *A Short History of Modern Greece*, Cambridge.
- Cohen, A. 1982. 'On the Realities of the Millet System: Jerusalem in the Sixteenth Century', in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, New York & London, 1-7.
- Çolak, H. 2008. *Co-Existence and Conflict Between Muslims and Non- Muslims in the 16th Century Ottoman İstanbul*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bilkent University.

- Çolak, H. 2012. 'Worlds Apart and Interwoven: Orthodox, Syrian and Ottoman cultures in Paul of Aleppo's Memoirs', *Studies in Travel Writing* 16/4: 375-385.
- Cotsonis, J. 2000. 'The Archbishop Iakovos Library and Learning Resource Center', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 45/1-4, 307-342.
- Davey, C. 1987. *Pioneer for Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589-1639) and Relations between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches*, London.
- Deletant, D. J. 1981. 'Some Aspects of Byzantine Tradition in the Rumanian Principalities', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 59/1, 1-14.
- Dixon, S. 2006. 'The Russian Orthodox Church in imperial Russia 1721-1917', in M. Angold (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. V. *Eastern Christianity*, Cambridge, 325-348.
- Dölger, F. 1956. *Byzantinische Diplomatie*, Ettal, 1956.
- Dowling, T. E. 1909. *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, London.
- Dragas, G. D. 1999. 'The manner of reception of Roman Catholic converts into the Orthodox Church with Special Reference to the Decisions of the Synods of 1484 (Constantinople), 1755 (Constantinople), and 1667 (Moscow)', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44/1-4, 235-271.
- Dursteler, E. R. 2001. 'The Bailo in Constantinople: Crisis and Career in Venice's Early Modern Diplomatic Corps', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 16/2, 1-30.
- El-Eid Bualuan, H. 1996. 'Mikha'il Breik, A Chronicler and a Historian in 18th century Bilâd al-Şâm', *Parole de l'Orient* 21, 257-270.
- Emecen, F. M. 2005. 'Osmanlı Divanının Ana Defter Serileri: Ahkâm-ı Mîrî, Ahkâm-ı Kuyûd-ı Mühimme ve Ahkâm-ı Şikâyet', *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 3/5, 107-139.
- Emecen, F. M. 2011. *Yavuz Sultan Selim*, Istanbul.
- Epstein, M. 1982. 'The Leadership of the Ottoman Jews in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, New York & London, 101-116.
- Ercan, Y. 1988. *Kudüs Ermeni Patrikhanesi*, Ankara.
- Ercan, Y. 2001. *Osmanlı Yönetiminde Gayrimüslimler: Kuruluştan Tanzimat'a Kadar Sosyal, Ekonomik ve Hukukî Durumları*, Ankara.
- Ercan, Y. 2007. *Toplu Eserler-II: Rumlar ve Diğer Müslüman Olmayan Topluluklar*, Ankara.

- Faroqhi, S. 1999. *Approaching Ottoman History: An Introduction to the Sources*, Cambridge.
- Faroqhi, S. 2007. *The Ottoman Empire and the world around it*, London & New York.
- Feodorov, I. 2006. 'Ottoman Authority in the Romanian Principalities as Witnessed by a Christian Arab Traveller of the 17th century: Paul of Aleppo', *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 148, 295-310
- Feodorov, I. 2007. 'Circumstances of a Special Relationship: Christian Arabs and Romanians during the 16th-18th Centuries', *Chronos* 16, 95-113.
- Flaut, D. 2005. 'Patriarchs of Antioch in the Romanian Countries (16th and 17th centuries)', *Revista Romana de Studii Eurasiatice* 1, 167-172.
- Flaut, D. 2008. 'The relationships between the State and the Church in the Romanian Countries (14th-18th centuries)', *Revista Romana de Studii Eurasiatice* 4, 49-63.
- Fortescue, A. 1907. *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, London.
- Fotić, A. 2010. 'Athonite Travelling Monks and the Ottoman Authorities (16th-18th Centuries)', in E. Causevic, N. Moacanin, & V. Kursar (eds). *Perspectives on Ottoman Studies. Papers from the 18th Symposium of the International Committee of Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Studies (CIEPO) at the University of Zagreb 2008*, Berlin, 157-165.
- Frazer, C. A. 1983. *Catholics and Sultans: The church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*, London.
- Geanakoplos, D. J. 1988. 'The Post-Byzantine Athonite Monk Maximos "the Greek": Reformer of Orthodoxy in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 33/4, 445-468.
- Giakoumis, K. 2002 *The Monasteries of Jorgucat and Vanishte in Dropull and of Spelaio in Luxheri as Monuments and Institutions during the Ottoman Period in Albania (16th-19th centuries)*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Birmingham.
- Gibb, H. A. R. & Bowen, H. 1965. *Islamic Society and the West, A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Moslem Culture in the Near East*, London (2nd edition).
- Giurescu, C. C. 1944. *Istoria Românilor*, Bucharest.
- Goudziak, B. 1995. 'The Sixteenth-Century Muscovite Church and Patriarch Jeremiah II's Journey to Muscovy, 1688-1689: Some Comments concerning the Historiography and Sources', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19, 200-225.
- Gradeva, R. 1997. 'Orthodox Christians in the Kadi Courts: The Practice of the Sofia Sheriat Court, Seventeenth Century', *Islamic Law and Society* 4/1, 37-69.
- Graf, G. 1951. *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur*, Vatican.

- Greene, M. 2000. *A shared world: Christians and Muslims in the early modern Mediterranean*, Princeton.
- Gritsopoulos, T. A. 1959. 'Oi Patriarchai Ierosolymon Sofronios kai Theofanis' *Deltion tis Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etaireias tis Ellados* 13, 218-240.
- Haddad, R. M. 1965. *The Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and the Origins of the Melkite Schism*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Haddad, R. M. 1970. *Syrian Christians in Muslim Society: An Interpretation*, Princeton.
- Haddad, R. M. 1982. 'On Melkite Passage to the Unia: The Case of Patriarch Cyril al-Za'îm (1672-1729)', in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. II, New York & London, 67-90.
- Haddad, R. M. 1990. 'Constantinople over Antioch, 1516-1724: Patriarchal Politics in the Ottoman Era', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 41/2, 217-239.
- Hadjiantoniou, G. A. 1961. *Protestant patriarch: the life of Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638), Patriarch of Constantinople*, London.
- Hadrovics, L. 1947. *Le peuple serbe et son église sous la domination turque*, Paris.
- Halperin, C. J. 1997. 'In the Eye of the Beholder: Two Views of Seventeenth-Century Muscovy' *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 24/4, 409-423.
- Halperin, C. J. 1998-1999. 'Friend and Foe in Paul of Aleppo's Travels of Patriarch Makarios', *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 14-15, 97-114.
- Har-El, S. 1995. *Struggle for domination in the Middle East: the Ottoman-Mamluk War, 1485-91*, Leiden.
- Hattox, R. S. 2000. 'Mehmed the Conqueror, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Mamluk Authority', *Studia Islamica* 90, 105-123.
- Hering, G. 1992. *Oikoumeniko Patriarcheio kai Europaiki Politiki, 1620-1638* (trans. D. Kourtovik), Athens.
- Hess, A. C. 1973. 'The Ottoman Conquest of Egypt (1517) and the Beginning of the Sixteenth-Century World War', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 4/1, 55-76.
- Heyberger, B. 2005. 'The development of Catholicism in the Middle East (16th to 19th century)', in H. Badr, A. A. R. Slim & J. A. Nohra (eds), *Christianity: a history in the Middle East*, Beirut, 631-653.
- Hill, G. F. 1952. *A History of Cyprus*, vol. IV Ottoman province, the British colony, 1571-1948, Cambridge.

- Hodson, D. 2010. 'A Would-Be Turk: Louis XIV in Le Bourgeois gentilhomme', *Seventeenth-Century French Studies* 32/1, 90-101.
- Holt, P. M. 1995. *Early Mamluk diplomacy (1260-1290): treaties of Baybars and Qalawun with Christian rulers*, Leiden.
- Homsy, B. 1966. *Les Capitulations la protection des Chrétiens au Proche-Orient: aux Ie, IIe et IIIe siècles*, Harissa.
- Hore, A. H. 1899. *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, London.
- Ilias, A. G. 2003. *Ta Metochia tou Panagiou Tafou kai tis Monis Sina stin Ellada (1830-1888)*, Athens.
- İnalcık, H. 1954. *Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-ı Arvanid*, Ankara.
- İnalcık, H. 1971. 'İmtiyâzât', *Encyclopedia of Islam* 2, vol. III, 1178-1189.
- İnalcık, H. 1977. 'Centralization and Decentralization in Ottoman Administration', in T. Naff & R. Owen (eds.), *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History, Papers on Islamic History*, vol. 4, Carbondale, 27-52.
- İnalcık, H. 1982. 'Ottoman Archival Materials on Millets', in B. Braude & B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, New York & London, 437-449.
- İnalcık, H. 1998a. 'Greeks in Ottoman Economy and Finances, 1453-1500' in H. İnalcık (ed.), *Essays in Ottoman History*, Istanbul, 375-389.
- İnalcık, H. 1998b. 'The Status of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch under the Ottomans' in H. İnalcık (ed.), *Essays in Ottoman History*, Istanbul, 195-229.
- İnalcık, H. 2005. 'Şikayet Hakkı: 'Arz-ı Hâl ve 'Arz-ı Mahzarlar' in H. İnalcık (ed.), *Osmanlı'da Devlet, Hukuk, Adalet*, Istanbul, 49-75.
- Iorga, N. 2000. *Byzantium After Byzantium* (trans. L. Treptow), Iași.
- Jabir, M. M. 1998. 'Es-siyâset ve'l-idiyolociya fi Rusiya bi-muvâceheti'd-devleti'l-'Osmâniyye tavzîfi'c-câmi'atîn el-Urthodoksiyye ve's-selâfiyye fi tefkîki's-saltana', in *Rusiya ve'l-Urthuduks eş-Şark*, Balamand, 233-287.
- Jackson, P. 1980. 'The Crisis in the Holy Land in 1260' *The English Historical Review* 95/376, 481-513.
- Jelavich, B. 1983. *History of the Balkans*, vol. I. *Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, Cambridge.
- Kallistos, A. 1921. 'O Patriarchikos Oikoumenikos thronos Konstantinoupoleos kai ta dikaia kai pronomia autou epi ton loipon autokefalon en Anatoli Orthodoxon Ekklision', *Ekklisiastikos Faros* 20, 5-39.

- Karalevsky, C. 1914. 'Alep', *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* vol. II, 102-116.
- Karathanassis, A. E. 1975. 'Des Grecs à la cour du Constantin Brîncoveanu, voévod de Valachie (1688-1714)', *Balkan Studies* 16/1, 56-69.
- Karathanassis, A. E. 1983. 'La participation des Serbes au mouvement antiottoman des princes de Valachie Cantacuzène et Brancovean et des patriarches orthodoxes Dosithéos Notaras et Dionysios Mousélimis, XVII-XVIII siècles', *Balkan Studies* 24, 455-463.
- Karathanassis, A. E. 1986. 'La Renaissance culturelle Hellénique dans les pays Roumains, et surtout en Valachie, pendant la période préphanariote (1670-1714)', *Balkan Studies* 27/1, 29-59.
- Karathanassis, A. E. 2004. 'Le rôle culturel des Grecs dans les Pays roumains' in P. M. Kitrolimidès & A. Tabaki (eds). *Relations Gréco-Roumaines: Interculturalité et identité nationale*, Athens, 251-259.
- Karnapas, K. 1905. 'O Patriarchis Antiocheias Silvestros O Kyprios, 1724-1766', *Nea Sion* 2, 191-207, 525-542.
- Karnapas, K. 1906a. 'O Patriarchis Antiocheias Silvestros O Kyprios, 1724-1766', *Nea Sion* 3, 28-44.
- Karnapas, K. 1906b. 'O Patriarchis Antiocheias Silvestros O Kyprios, 1724-1766', *Nea Sion* 4, 602-618.
- Karnapas, K. 1907. 'O Patriarchis Antiocheias Silvestros O Kyprios, 1724-1766', *Nea Sion* 5, 638-659, 846-868.
- Karpat, K. H. 1986. 'Ottoman Views and Policies towards the Orthodox Christian Church', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 31/1-2, 131-155.
- Karolidis, P. 1909. *Peri tis Ethnikis Katagogis ton Orthodoxon Christianon Syrias kai Palaistinis*, Athens.
- Kelly, J. N. D. 1989. *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford & New York.
- Kenanoğlu, M. 2004. *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve Gerçek*, Istanbul.
- Kermeli, E. 1997. 'Ebu's-Su'ud's Definition of Church vakfs: Theory and Practice in Ottoman Law' in R. Gleave and E. Kermeli (eds.), *Islamic Law: Theory and Practice*, London, 141-157.
- Kermeli, E. 2007. 'The Right to Choice: Ottoman Justice vis-à-vis Ecclesiastical and Communal Justice in the Balkans, Seventeenth-Nineteenth Centuries', *Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement* 23, 165-211.

- Khalifeh, E. N. 2006. 'A Project on the Antiochian Chalcedonian Orthodox Manuscripts : Syriac, Arabic, CPA and Greek', *Parole de l'Orient* 31, 423-431.
- Khoury, D. R. 2006. 'The Ottoman Centre versus Provincial Power-Holders: an Analysis of the Historiography', in S. Faroqhi (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. III. *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, Cambridge, 135-157.
- Kimpton, J. 2006. 'Jean-Baptiste Adanson (1732-1804): A French Dragoman in Egypt and the Near East' in C. Foster (ed.), *Travellers in the Near East*, London, 71-105.
- Kirillina, S. 2009. 'The Scope of Curiosity: Memorabilia in Russian Pilgrims' Narratives of the Middle East (Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries)' in J. Hathaway (ed.), *The Arab Lands in the Ottoman Era*, Minneapolis, 137-169.
- Kitromilides, P. M. 2002. *Kypriaki Logiosyni, 1571-1878: Prosopografiki Theorisi*, Lefkosia.
- Kitromilides, P. M. 2006. 'Orthodoxy and the West: Reformation to Enlightenment', in M. Angold (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. V. *Eastern Christianity*, Cambridge, 187-210.
- Kitromilides, P. M. 2007a. 'Initiatives of the Great Church in the mid-eighteenth century: hypotheses on the factors of Orthodox ecclesiastical strategy', in P. M. Kitromilides (ed.), *An Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, Aldershot & Burlington, 1-6.
- Kitromilides, P. M. 2007b. 'From Orthodox commonwealth to national communities: Greek-Russian intellectual and ecclesiastical ties in the Ottoman era', in P. M. Kitromilides (ed.), *An Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, Aldershot & Burlington, 1-6.
- Kogerakis, K. 2009a. *Agios Ioakeim O Pany Patriarchis Alexandreias: Akolouthia kai Vios*, Alexandria.
- Kogerakis, K. 2009b. *Agios Gerasimos O Palladas Patriarchis Alexandreias: Akolouthia kai Vios*, Alexandria.
- Kogerakis, K. 2009c. *Agios Meletios O Pigas Patriarchis Alexandreias: Akolouthia kai Vios*, Alexandria.
- Kogerakis, K. 2010. *Agios Kyrillos O Loukaris Patriarchis Alexandreias: Akolouthia kai Vios*, Athens.
- Konortas, P. 1986. 'Les Contributions Ecclésiastiques 'Patriarchik Z teia' et 'Basilikon Charatzion', Contribution à L'Histoire économique du Patriarcat Oecuménique aux XVe et XVIe siècles" in *Actes du IIe Colloque International d'Histoire (Athènes, 18-25 Septembre 1983) économiques Méditerranéennes équilibres et Intercommunications XIIIe-XIXe siècles*, vol. III, Athens, 217-255.

- Konortas, P. 1998. *Othomanikes Theoriseis gia to Oikoumeniko Patriarcheio: 17os-arches 20ou aiona*, Athens.
- Konortas, P. 1999. 'From Taife to Millet: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community' in D. Gondicas & C. Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy, and Society in the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton, 169-179.
- Korobeinikov, D. 2003. 'Orthodox Communities in Eastern Anatolia in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. Part 1. The Two Patriarchates: Constantinople and Antioch', *al-Masaq* 15/2, 197-214.
- Korobeinikov, D. 2004. 'Diplomatic Correspondance between Byzantium and the Mamlûk Sultanate in the Fourteenth Century' *Al-Masaq* 16/1, 53-74.
- Lees, J. C. 1884. 'The Greek Church', in *The Churches of Christendom*, Edinburgh, 113-145.
- van Leeuwen, R. 1994. *Notables & Clergy in Mount Lebanon: The Khâzin Sheikhs & the Maronite Church (1736-1840)*, Leiden.
- Little, D. P. 1976. 'Coptic Conversion to Islam under the Bahri Mamluks, 692-755/1293-1354' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39/3, 552-599.
- Little, D. P. 1999. 'Communal Strife in Late Mamlûk Jerusalem', *Islamic Law and Society* 6/1, 69-96.
- Lough, A. G. 1962. *The Influence of John Mason Neale*, London.
- Macrides, R. 1992. 'From the Komnenoi to the Palaiologoi: imperial models in decline and exile' in P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines: the rhythm of imperial renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th centuries: papers from the Twenty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St Andrews, March 1992*, Aldershot, 269-282.
- Macrides, R. 1994. 'The New Constantine and New Constantinople—1261?', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 6, 13-41.
- Mandaville, J. E. 1966. 'The Ottoman Court Records of Syria and Jordan', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 86/3, 311-319.
- Marcus, A. 1989. *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century*, New York.
- Marinescu, F. 1991. 'Les Mourouzi et les membres par alliance' in F. Marinescu, G. Penelea-Filitti & A. Tabaki (eds.), *Documents Gréco-Roumains: Le Fonds Mourouzi d'Athènes*, Athens and Bucharest, 55-67.
- Marinescu, F., Penelea-Filitti, G., & Tabaki, A. (eds.), *Documents Gréco-Roumains: Le Fonds Mourouzi d'Athènes*, Athens and Bucharest, 3-41.

- Masters, B. 1994. 'The View from the Province: Syrian Chronicles of the Eighteenth Century', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114/3, 353-362.
- Masters, B. 2001. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism*, Cambridge.
- Matei, H. et al. 1974. *Chronological History of Romania* (Bucharest, 1974)
- Mattingly, G. L. 2006-2007. 'Attitudes of Early Protestant Missionaries toward Local Christians in Palestine and Transjordan', *ARAM Periodical* 18-19, 213-228.
- Maximos, 1976. *The Oecumenical Patriarchate in the Orthodox Church: a study in the history and canons of the church* (trans. C. McLellan), Thessaloniki.
- Meshal, R. 1998. *Straddling the Sacred and the Secular: The Autonomy of Ottoman Egyptian Courts during the 16th and 17th centuries*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, McGill University.
- Meyendorff, J. 1962. *The Orthodox Church: its past and its role in the world today* (trans. J. Chapin), London.
- Miliaras, K. 2002. *Oi Agioi Topoi en Palaistini kai ta ep' auton dikaia tou Ellinikou Ethnous*, vol. I., Thessaloniki.
- Mosheim, J. J. 1824. *An Ecclesiastical History: Ancient and Modern, from the Birth of Christ to the Present Century*, vol. 3, New York.
- Murphey 1999, 'Westernisation in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire: How Far; How Fast?', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 23, 116-139.
- Murphey, R. 1990. 'Bigots or Informed Observers? A Periodization of Pre-Colonial English and European Writing on the Middle East', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110/2, 291-303.
- Murphey, R. 2009. 'Syria's 'Underdevelopment' under Ottoman Rule: Revisiting an Old Theme in the Light of New Evidence from the Court Records of Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century' in J. Hathaway (ed.), *The Arab Lands in the Ottoman Era* Minneapolis, 209-230.
- Nasrallah, J. 1976. *Église Melchite et Union des Églises*, Paris.
- Nasrallah, J. 1979-1989. *Histoire du Mouvement Littéraire dans l'Église Melchite du e au XXe siècle*, Louvain & Paris.
- Nasrallah, J. 1984. *Cheminement d'un chercheur de la Littérature arabe chrétienne: Soutenance d'une These de Doctorat d'Etat sur titre*, Dijon.
- Nassour, B. 1992. *Silvestros Patriarchis Antiocheias 1724-1766: kata tis Ellinikes kai Aravikes Piges*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

- Nasturel, P. Ş. & Mureşan, D. I. 2007. 'Denys II de Constantinople (1546-1556) et les débuts de la politique européenne du patriarcat oecuménique', in *Le Patriarcat Oecuménique de Constantinople aux XIVe-XVIe siècles: rupture et continuité, actes du colloque international Rome, 5-6-7 décembre 2005*, Paris, 319-367.
- Neale, J. M. 1847. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: Patriarchate of Alexandria*, London.
- Neale, J. M. 1850. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: General Introduction*, London.
- Neale, J. M. 1873. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: Patriarchate of Antioch*, London, Oxford and Cambridge.
- Nystazopoulou-Pélékidou, M. 2004. 'La tradition post-byzantine et la présence de l'Hellénisme dans les Principautés danubiennes', in P. M. Kitrolimid s & A. Tabaki (eds.), *Relations Gréco-Roumaines: Interculturalité et identité nationale*, Athens, 39-61.
- Odetallah, R. K. 2004. 'The Two Arab Conquests of Alexandria (22/642 and 25/645)' in S. Christidou, et al. (eds). *Treasures of Arab-Byzantine Navigation (7th-13th c.)*, Athens, 108-116.
- Oikonomides, N. 1992. 'Byzantine Diplomacy A.D. 1204-1453: Means and Ends' in J. Shepard and S. Franklin (eds). *Byzantine Diplomacy, Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot, 73-88.
- Pahlitzsch, J. 2001. *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit: Beiträge und Quellen zur Geschichte des griechisch-orthodoxen Partriarchats von Jerusalem*, Berlin.
- Pantazopoulos, N. I. 1984. *Church and Law in the Balkan Peninsula during the Ottoman Rule*, Amsterdam.
- Papachristou, P. A. 1992. *The Three Faces of the Phanariots: An Inquiry into the Role and Motivations of the Greek Nobility under Ottoman Rule, 1683-1821*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Simon Fraser University.
- Papademetriou, A. G. 2001. *Ottoman Tax Farming and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate: An Examination of State and Church in Ottoman Society (15-16th Century)*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Princeton University.
- Papadopoulos, T. 1990. *Studies and documents relating to the history of the Greek Church and people under Turkish domination*, Aldershot (2nd edition).
- Papadopoulos, C. 1900. *I Ekklisia Ierosolymon kata tous Tesseras teleutaious aionas (1517-1900)*, Athens.
- Papadopoulos, C. 1907. *Dositheos: Patriarchis Ierosolymon (1641-1707)*, Jerusalem.

- Papadopoulos, C. 1910. *Istoria tis Ekklisias Ierosolymon*, Jerusalem.
- Papadopoulos, C. 1911. 'Epistolai tou Arseniou Thibaidos peri apopeiras enoseos ton Agglon anomoton meta ton Orthodoxon (1716-1725)', *Ekklisiastikos Faros* 7, 117-144, 199-225.
- Papadopoulos, C. 1912. *Samouil Kapasoulis: Papas kai Patriarchis Alexandreias (1661-1723)*, Alexandria.
- Papadopoulos, C. 1922. 'I Ekklisia kai to Ellinikon Genos ypo tin Tourkikin Tyrannian', *Nea Sion* 17, 221-231.
- Papadopoulos, C. 1951. *Istoria tis Ekklisias Antiocheias*, Alexandria.
- Papadopoulos, C. 1970. *Istoria tis Ekklisias Ierosolymon*, Athens (2nd ed.).
- Papadopoulos, C. M. 2000. *To Patriarcheio Alexandreias kai Pasis Afrikis sto Chrono: Apo ton Apostolo Marko stin Triti Chiletia*, Athens.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. 1885. 'Autoviografikai Simeioseis tou Patriarchou Alexandreias Samouil Kapasouli', *Deltion tis Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etaireias tis Ellados* 3, 504-521.
- Papoulidis, C. 1976. 'Le Patriarche Oecuménique Sérapheim II et les Russes', *Balkan Studies* 17, 59-66.
- Papoulidis, K. K. 2011. *Oi Ellines tis Agias Petroupolis: Apo tin Istoriki Parousia kai Diaspora tou Ellinismou stin Anatoliki Europi (18os-20os aionas)*, Athens.
- Pappas, N. C. J. 1994. 'Between Two Empires: Serbian Survival in the Years After Kosovo', in A. Dragnich (ed). *Serbia's Historical Heritage*, Boulder, 17-37.
- Patrinelis, C. 1967. 'Chronologika Zitimata tis Patriarcheias tou Ieremiou A (1522- 1546)', *Mnimosyni* 1, 249-262.
- Pedani, M. P. 2007. 'Sultans and Voivodas in the 16th c. Gifts and Insignia', *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi/The Journal of International Social Research* 1/1, 193-209.
- Peri, O. 2001. *Christianity under Islam in Jerusalem: the question of the holy sites in early Ottoman times*, Leiden.
- Perlmann, M. 1942 'Notes on anti-Christian Propaganda in the Mamluk Empire', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10/4, 843-861.
- Peters, R. 2002. 'Wakf (a.)', *Encyclopedia of Islam* 2, vol. 11.
- Philipp, T. 1985. *The Syrians in Egypt: 1725-1975*, Stuttgart.

- Philliou, C. M. 2004. *Worlds, Old and New: Phanariot Networks and the Remaking of Ottoman Governance in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Princeton University.
- Pignot, H. 2009. 'A Trip to the Origins of Christianity: Sir Paul Rycaut's and Rev. Thomas Smith's Accounts of the Greek Church in the 17th Century', *Studies in Travel Writing* 13/3, 193-205.
- Raheb, A. 1970. 'Patriarcat Grec-Melkite Catholique d'Antioche: Naissance, Evolution et Orientations actuelles', *Ekklesiastikos Faros* 52, 42-72.
- Raheb, A. 1972. 'La conception de l'Union dans le patriarcat orthodoxe d'Antioche (1622-1672)', *Parole de l'Orient* 3/1, 131-144.
- Rassi, J. 2002. 'La premi re lettre du patriarche Macaire ibn al-Za'îm (1648-1672) au roi de France Louis XIV (date du 19 nov. 1653)', *Parole de l'Orient* 27, 105-131.
- Ravanis, G. 1971. 'Ellines Spoudastai eis Agglian kata tin Tourkokratian', *Ekklesiastikos Faros* 54, 322-327.
- Refik, A. 2007. 'Türkiye'de Katolik Propagandası' in Y. Ercan (ed). *Toplu Eserler II: Rumlar ve Diğer Müslüman Olmayan Topluluklar*, Ankara, 285-311
- Rey, F. 1899. *La protection diplomatique et consulaire dans les échelles du Levant et de Barbarie*, Paris.
- Rosen, F. 1998. *O Ellinikos Ethnikismos kai O Vretanikos Fileleutherismos/Greek Nationalism and British Liberalism*, Athens.
- Roussos, S. 2003. 'International Politics and Church along the Nile. Ordaining the First Greek Orthodox Metropolitan in Ethiopia, 1908-1910', *Chronos* 7, 149-183.
- Runcan, N. 2006. 'The Relatinos of Some Alexandrins Patriarchs with the Romanian Countries in the XVI-XVIII Centuries and their Travels in the Romanian Space', *Revista Romana de Studii Eurasiatice* 2, 93-107.
- Runciman, S. 1968. *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*, London.
- Rustom, A. 1928. *Kenîsetu Medîneti'l-lahi Antâkiyye el-'Uzma*, Beirut.
- Sajdi, D. 2002. *Peripheral visions: The worlds and worldviews of commoner chroniclers in the 18th century Ottoman Levant*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Columbia University.
- Salibi, K. 1988. *A house of many mansions: the history of Lebanon reconsidered*, London.
- Sariyannis, M. 2010. 'Le fonds ottoman du metochion sinaïtique à Candie', *Documents de travail du CETOBAC* 1, 28-32.

- Ševčenko, I. 1978. 'Byzantium and the Eastern Slavs after 1453', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, 5-25.
- Shahid, I. 2003. 'Arab Christianity in Byzantine Palestine', *ARAM Periodical* 15, 227-237.
- Sherrard, P. 2002. *The Greek East and the Latin West*, Limni.
- Slim, S. 2001. *The Greek Orthodox Waqf in Lebanon during the Ottoman Period*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Birmingham.
- Soutzo, D. S. 1974. 'Les familles princières grecques de Valachie et de Moldavie' in *Symposium l'Époque Phanariote, 21-25 Octobre 1970 à la mémoire de Cléobule Tsourkas*, Thessaloniki.
- Stamatopoulos, D. A. 2005. 'From Machiavelli to the Sultans: Power Networks in the Ottoman Imperial Context', *Historien* 5, 76-93.
- Stamatopoulos, D. A. 2010. *To Agiotafiko Metochi Konstantinoupoleos: Archeiakes piges (18os-20os aionas)*, Athens.
- Stanley, A. P. 1864. *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History*, London.
- Stathi, P. 1995. *Chrysanthos Notaras Patriarchis Ierosolymon: Prodromos tou Neoellinikou Diafotismou*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Athens.
- Stathi, P. 1999. *Chrysanthos Notaras Patriarchis Ierosolymon: Prodromos tou Neoellinikou Diafotismou*, Athens.
- Stavrianos, L. S. 1964. *The Balkans since 1453*, Hamden.
- Stern, S. M. 1966. 'Petitions from the Mamlūk Period (Notes on the Mamlūk Documents from Sinai)', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 29/2, 233-276.
- Strakhov, O. B. 1990. 'Attitudes to Greek Language and Culture in Seventeenth-Century Muscovy' (trans. H. M. Olmsted), *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 6, 123-155.
- Strantzalis, P. I. 2003. *O Patriarchis Ierosolymon Efraim B' O Athinaios: I Symvoli tou ston Ellinismo, sta Grammata kai sta Ekklesiastika Theologika Zitimata tou IH' aiona*, Thessaloniki.
- Talbot, A.-M. 1993. 'The Restoration of Constantinople under Michael VIII', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47, 243-61
- Tamari, S. 2007. 'Mikha'il Burayk', in C. Kafadar, H. Karateke & C. Fleischer (eds.), *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, 1-5. (www.ottomanhistorians.com).
- Tansel, D. 1971. *Osmanlı kaynaklarına göre Fatih Sultan Mehmedin siyasî ve askerî faaliyeti*, Istanbul.

- Tawil, J. 2001. *The Patriarchate of Antioch throughout History: An Introduction*, Boston.
- de Testa, M. & Gautier, A. 2003. *Drogmans et diplomates européens auprès de la porte ottomane*, Istanbul.
- Tchentsova, V. 2007. 'Documents grecs des métoques roumains de Mont Athos et des patriarchats orientaux conservés à Moscou à la lumière d'une analyse paléographique', in *Romanian Principalities and the Holy Places along the Centuries: Papers of the Symposium held in Bucharest, 15-18 October 2006*, Bucharest, 157-174.
- Tchentsova, V. 2009. 'Le scribe grec Nicolas de Rhodes et l'archimandrite Jacob de Mélos: Résultats préliminaires des recherches sur les documents relatifs au séjour du patriarche Macaire d'Antioche en Russie en 1654-1656', in E. Chrysos & E. A. Zachariadou (eds.), *Captain and Scholar, Papers in memory of Demetrios I. Polemis*, Andros, 297-341.
- Tchentsova, V. 2011. 'La correspondance du patriarche d'Antioche Athanase IV Dabbâs avec la cour russe: à propos de l'imprimerie arabe d'Alep', in *Travaux de Symposium International, le Livre la Roumanie, l'Europe, Bucharest*, vol. I. 46-59.
- Thompson, D. G. 1984. 'The persecution of French Jesuits by the Parlement of Paris, 1761-1771', *Studies in Church History* 21, 289-301.
- Tillirydis, M. 1998. *Patriarcheion tis Megalis Poleos Alexandreias-The Patriarchate of the Great City of Alexandria*, Alexandria.
- Towle, A. E. 1906. *John Mason Neale: a memoir*, London.
- Tselikas, A. 1992. *Katagrafi tou Archeiou tou Patriarcheiou Ierosolymon*, Athens.
- Tzoumerkas, P. 2007. *To Patriarcheio Alexandreias*, Athens.
- Ünal, F. 2012. 'Karadeniz'e Çıkan İlk Rus Savaş Gemisi "Krepost" ve Ukraintsev'in İstanbul Elçiliği (1699-1700)', *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 5/20, 221-245.
- Ursinus, M. 1994. 'Petitions from Orthodox Church Officials to the Imperial Diwan, 1675', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 18, 236-247.
- Vandal, A. 1887. *Une ambassade française en Orient sous Louis XV: la mission du Marquis de Villeneuve, 1728-1741*, Paris.
- Vryonis, S. 1981. 'The History of the Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem as Reflected in Codex Patriarchicus No. 428, 1517-1805', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7, 29-53.
- Waddington, G. 1829. *The Present Condition and Prospects of the Greek, or Oriental Church; with some letters written from the Convent of the Strophades*, London.

- Walbiner, C.-M. 1996. 'Accounts on Georgia in the works of Makariyus Ibn al-Zaim', *Parole de l'Orient* 21, 245-255.
- Walbiner, C.-M. 1997-1998. 'Bishops and Metropolitans of the Antiochian Patriarchate in the 17th century (Their Relations to the Muslim Authorities, Their Cultural Activities and Their Ethnic Background)', *ARAM Periodical* 9-10, 577-587.
- Walbiner, C.-M. 1998. 'The Second Journey of Macarius ibn al Za'im to Russia 1666-1668' in *Rusiya ve el-Urthuduks eş-Şark*, Balamand, 99-114.
- Walbiner, C.-M. 2000. 'Biographies of Prominent Clerics as a Possible Approach to the History of the Christian Arabs in the First Centuries of Ottoman Rule: The Case of Macarius Ibn al-Za'im', *Chronos* 3, 35-61.
- Walbiner, C.-M. 2003. 'The Split of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch (1724) and the Emergence of a New Identity in Bilâd al-Shâm as Reflected by some Melkite Historians of the 18th and Early 20th Centuries', *Chronos* 7, 9-37.
- Walbiner, C.-M. 2007. 'The Relations between the Greek Orthodox of Syria and Cyprus in the 17th and early 18th Centuries', *Chronos* 16, 113-129.
- Ware, T. 1963, *The Orthodox Church*, Baltimore.
- Ware, T. 1964. *Eustratios Argenti: a study of the Greek Church under Turkish rule*, Oxford.
- Williams, G. 1868. *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, being the correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the nonjuring bishops*, London, Oxford & Cambridge.
- Zachariadou, E. A. 1996. *Deka Tourkika Eggrafa gia tin Megali Ekklisia (1483-1567)*, Athens.
- Zachariadou, Z. 2002. *The Kapudan Pasha: His office and his domain*, Rethymnon.
- Zachariadou, Z. 2006. 'The Great Church in captivity 1453-1586', in M. Angold (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. V. *Eastern Christianity*, Cambridge, 169-186.
- Zayat, H. & Edelby, N. 1953. 'Les si ges épiscopaux du Patriarcat Melkite d'Antioche en 1658 d'apr s un document inédit du Patriarche Macaire III Ibn Za'im', *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 3, 341-350.
- Zayat, H. 1932. 'Hel kâne el-batriyark Makâriyûs kâthûlîken', *el-Machriq* 30, 881-892.

