

Ivan Sokolov

The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century

An Essay in Historical Research

7

Foreword by His All-Holiness
the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew

Preface by Metropolitan Kallistos Ware

Translated by Hieromonk Nikolai Sakharov

Peter Lang

Ivan Sokolov's work, first published in 1904, begins with a balanced overview of the situation of the Orthodox Church under Ottoman rule from the fall of Constantinople (1453) to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The author then gives a detailed description of the external situation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 1789 to 1900. This is followed by a discussion of the career and activity of each patriarch during this period, their relations with the bishops, their initiatives in the field of education, their regulations concerning marriage, and their work with parishes and monasteries. The book concludes with a thorough analysis of the administration of the Patriarchate during these years. Although written over a hundred years ago, this classic work has not been superseded. It is based on original sources, particularly on the patriarchal archives, to which few scholars have had access. No other existing study deals with the nineteenth-century Ecumenical Patriarchate in such a systematic and specific way. It constitutes an invaluable tool of reference.

Translated from the Russian.

Metropolitan Kallistos Ware, titular Bishop of Diokleia, taught Eastern Orthodox Studies for thirty-five years at the University of Oxford. He is the author of *The Orthodox Church* (1993) and translator of *The Philokalia* and several Orthodox service books.

Hieromonk Nikolai Sakharov is a member of the Orthodox Monastery of St John the Baptist at Tolleshunt Knights, Essex. He is the author of *I Love, Therefore I Am: The Theological Legacy of Archimandrite Sophrony* (New York, 2002).



The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century

Byzantine and Neohellenic Studies

Vol. 7

Edited by
Andrew Louth and David Ricks



PETER LANG

Oxford • Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Wien

Ivan Sokolov

The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century

An Essay in Historical Research

Foreword by His All-Holiness
the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew

Preface by Metropolitan Kallistos Ware

Translated by Hieromonk Nikolai Sakharov



PETER LANG

Oxford • Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Wien

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Sokolov, I. I.

[Konstantinopol'skaia tserkov' v deviatnadsatom veke. English]

The church of Constantinople in the nineteenth century : an essay in
historical research / Ivan Sokolov.

p. cm. -- (Byzantine and Neohellenic studies ; 7)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-0343-0202-9 (alk. paper)

1. Orthodoxos Ekklesia tes Hellados--History. 2. Constantinople
(Ecumenical patriarchate) 3. Christians--Turkey. 4. Eastern question
(Balkan) 5. Greece--History--War of Independence, 1821-1829. I. Title.

BX310.S613 2012

281.9'4961009034--dc23

2012035365

The original Russian text was published in St Petersburg, at the Press of M. Akinfiev
and I. Leontiev in 1904

ISSN 1661-1187

ISBN 978-3-0343-0202-9 (print)

ISBN 978-3-0353-0436-7 (eBook)

© Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2013

Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland

info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com, www.peterlang.net

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.

Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the
permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution.

This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming,
and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Germany

Contents

Foreword by His All-Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew	ix
Preface by Metropolitan Kallistos Ware	xi
Foreword	I
INTRODUCTION	
External Condition of the Church of Constantinople from the mid-Fifteenth to the late-Eighteenth Century (1453–1789)	43
PART I The External Condition of the Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century	125
CHAPTER I	
External Condition of the Church of Constantinople from the Reign of Sultan Selim III to the Start of the Greek Rebellion (1789–1821)	127
CHAPTER II	
External Condition of the Church of Constantinople from the Beginning of the Greek War of Independence to the Death of Mahmud II (1821–1839)	221

CHAPTER III

External Condition of the Church of Constantinople from the Issuing of the <i>Hatti Sherif</i> of Gulkhane to the Beginning of the Crimean War (1839–1853)	329
--	-----

CHAPTER IV

External Condition of the Church of Constantinople from the Crimean War and the Issuing of the <i>Hatti Humayun</i> to the Accession of Sultan Abdulhamid (1853–1876)	387
---	-----

CHAPTER V

External Condition of the Church of Constantinople in the Reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II (1876–1900)	451
---	-----

PART II Review of the Activity of the Patriarchs of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century	497
---	-----

Neophytos VII (1799–1801)	501
Kallinikos V (1801–1806, 1808–1809)	509
Jeremias IV (1809–1813)	524
Cyril VI (1813–1818)	534
Gregory V (1797–1798, 1806–1808, 1818–1821)	553
Evgenios II (1821–1822)	595
Anthimos III (1822–1824)	596
Chrysanthos (1824–1826)	606
Agathangelos (1826–1830)	612
Constantios I (1830–1834)	626
Constantios II (1834–1835)	644
Anthimos IV (1840–1841, 1848–1852)	646
Anthimos V (1841–1842)	658

Germanos IV (1842–1845, 1852–1853)	663
Meletios III (1845)	682
Cyril VII (1855–1860)	684
Joachim II (1860–1863, 1873–1878)	693
Sophronios III (1863–1866)	708
Gregory VI (1835–1840, 1867–1871)	716
Anthimos VI (1845–1848, 1853–1855, 1871–1873)	753
Joachim III (1878–1884)	775
Joachim IV (1884–1886)	797
Dionysios V (1887–1891)	799
Neophytos VIII (1891–1894)	804
Anthimos VII (1895–1897)	809
Constantine V (1897–1901)	811
 PART III Patriarchal Administration in the Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century	 821
 CHAPTER I Administrative System of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century and its Reorganisation under the <i>Hatti Humayun</i> of 1856	 823
 CHAPTER II Patriarchal Rule in the Church of Constantinople in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century with Reference to the General Regulations of 1858–1860 and the Supplementary Canons	 887
 Glossary	 957

Index of Names	971
----------------	-----

Index of Places	993
-----------------	-----

Index of Monasteries and Churches	1007
-----------------------------------	------

Subject Index	1015
---------------	------

Foreword

Dearly beloved readers, brethren and children in the Lord of our Moderation, grace and peace from God.

To provide an accurate and objective record of the historical trajectory of an institution such as that of the Holy Great Church of Christ, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, over the period of a century is unquestionably an arduous and laborious task that demands knowledge of the wider historical conditions as well as of previous history, meticulous sifting and study of the sources, sound judgement and no common degree of understanding.

The undertaking becomes even more complex and difficult for the historian who is called on to write the history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate during a period of multiple changes and transformations such as the nineteenth century – a period of critical importance marked by many sufferings and trials, but also one of exceptional creativity. Hence one could with certainty express the view that the composition of such a historical treatise is something well nigh unattainable and impossible.

The greater the difficulty of the undertaking, however, the greater the contribution to historical research and to the Holy Great Church of Christ that is offered by the scholar who successfully completes the long course of writing such a demanding work.

The Church of Constantinople found such a scholar in the person of the eminent and renowned Russian historian Ivan Ivanovich Sokolov, in whose work *The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century* we encounter not only a perceptive historian, a sensitive and elegant writer, a scholar and untiring researcher, but also the sacred institution of the Ecumenical Patriarchate that for centuries and through never-ending tribulations unwaveringly preserved the sacred deposit of our immaculate faith and in a spirit of sacrifice served the unity of the Church of Christ and supported her children in their varied needs.

As a deeply erudite specialist in the historical development and structures of the first-throne Church of Constantinople and of Byzantium, and with Greek and a host of other European languages at his command, Ivan Ivanovich Sokolov possessed a profound knowledge of the views of contemporary and earlier historians of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He did not, however, rely on these alone, but he himself, with the permission of our predecessors on the Patriarchal throne, as an indefatigable detective of truth conducted research in the precious store of documents in the Patriarchal Archives and thus was able to acquire a precise and clear knowledge of the events from the primary sources. Having acquired this great wealth of knowledge, he did not jealously keep it in the treasuries of his own spirit, but he wished to make it available to all people, setting out this chronicle with zeal and love in his mother tongue in the work in hand.

The importance of this work is evinced by the fact that in spite of the passing of one hundred years since its publication it remains not only unreplaced, but continues to be useful in a multitude of ways, both for specialist historians and for those with a genuine interest in the historical path and life of our Ecumenical Patriarchate in the critical conditions of the nineteenth century.

It is thus a source of particular satisfaction that through the care and labours of the Holy Patriarchal and Stavropegic Monastery of St John the Baptist in Essex in Great Britain and of our most revered brother Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia, emeritus teacher of the University of Oxford, this scholarly work is published anew, now in English translation so as to be available to everyone who wishes to become acquainted with and to study the history of the recent past of the Holy Great Church of Christ and of our Sacred Centre.

For this we offer our heart-felt congratulations and convey our thanks to those who carried out the translation and prepared the work for publication. On them and on all those who read it we bestow our paternal and Patriarchal blessings, wishing for them every good gift from God from whom all blessings flow.

7 February 2012

Beloved brother in Christ and fervent intercessor to God
Bartholomew

Preface

Although originally published more than a century ago, this remarkable work by Ivan Sokolov has not been superseded, but still retains its value and timeliness. Indeed, since its first appearance no other book has been issued in any language dealing in such systematic detail with the history of the Church of Constantinople in the nineteenth century. The distinctive significance of Sokolov's massive monograph lies in the wide range of material that he consulted. He was thoroughly familiar with the published literature on his subject, with books and articles, whether in Greek, Russian or Western languages; but in addition – and this constitutes the particular importance of his work – he also undertook extensive research in the manuscript archives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. These archives have never been published, and to the best of my knowledge no other outside scholar has been granted the privilege of examining them in the way that Sokolov was allowed to do. Based as it is on the primary sources both published and unpublished, his work constitutes a mine of information, an invaluable tool of reference, for anyone seriously interested in the history of the Orthodox Church.

Ivan Ivanovich Sokolov was born on 11 December 1865 in the village of Novaya Alexevna in the Saratov region. Although he was the son of a priest and received his education in ecclesiastical institutions, he was not himself ordained but followed an academic career. After graduating in 1890 from the Theological Academy of Kazan as a Candidate in Theology, from 1891 onwards he taught at the Kazan Theological Seminary. In 1894 he received the further degree of Master of Theology, and was invited to teach Ancient Greek in the Theological Academy of St Petersburg. Nine years later, in 1903, he became a professor in the department of the history of the Eastern Greek Church at the Academy. In 1904 he was granted the degree of Doctor of Church History, after submitting the present work, *The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century* (Volume 1).

Alongside his teaching work, Sokolov also began to assume wider responsibilities. He became editor of two periodicals, *The Messenger of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society* and *The Church Messenger*. He took part in the Great Council of the Russian Church held at Moscow in 1917–18, where he supported the restoration of the Moscow Patriarchate. During 1918–22 he was a member of the Supreme Church Council. In common with many others, however, he found that his research and writing were abruptly cut short by the 1917 revolution, and it became impossible for him to publish any further works. Nevertheless, for some years he continued his academic career, and during 1920–24 he taught at the Theological Institute and the Institute of History and Linguistics at Petrograd, as St Petersburg had come to be known. From 1924 he was a professor at the Institute of History, Philosophy and Linguistics in what was now named Leningrad. During the Stalinist period, in 1933 he was arrested and in the following year was sentenced to ten years of internment. Little seems to be known about his time in the *gulag*. The date of his death is uncertain, but was probably around 1939, when he was in his mid-seventies.

Sokolov was a prolific writer, and his numerous publications fall into two categories. First, he devoted much of his energies to Byzantine church history. His dissertation for the degree of Master of Theology was published under the title *The State of Monasticism from the Mid-Ninth Century to the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century* (Kazan, 1894). Later studies included *On Byzantinism in Relation to the History of the Church* (1903), *Church Politics of the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II Angelos* (1905), *Election of Patriarchs in Byzantium from the Mid-Ninth Century to the Mid-Fifteenth Century* (1907), *On Grounds for Divorce in Byzantium from the Mid-Ninth Century to the Mid-Fifteenth Century* (1911), and *Ecumenical Judges in Byzantium* (1915), all published in St Petersburg. Several of his writings on Byzantine history have been reissued at Moscow in 2005, in four volumes.

In the second place, Sokolov wrote on Greek Christianity during the Turcocrata. Apart from the work here translated, he is the author of *Ecclesiastical, Religious and Social Life in the Greek Orthodox East in the Nineteenth Century* (St Peterburg, 1903), and *The Election of Patriarchs in the Church of Alexandria in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*

(Petrograd, 1916). It seems that none of his writings, with the exception of the present work, has been translated into English or other languages.

On the Russian title page of this work, it is designated "Volume 1". Due to the 1917 revolution, the second volume never saw the light of day, but it appears to have been ready for publication by 1915 or 1916. A proof copy of the Appendix, containing Greek documents from the Patriarchal archives at Constantinople, is to be found in the Russian State Historical Archive. It is not clear whether the main text of Volume 2 has survived; if it has, then its present location remains unknown. In the first volume, Sokolov gave no indication what the contents of the second volume were to be. In all probability the main subject would have been the relations of the Ecumenical Patriarchate with the other Orthodox Churches, covering such matters as the autocephaly of the Churches of Greece, Serbia and Romania, and the prolonged conflict with the Bulgarian Church. These matters are mentioned in passing in the present volume, but they are not discussed in detail.

Sokolov undertook his research in the Patriarchal archives at Constantinople during the summer of 1902, working for a period of eight weeks in the Phanar. As he himself explains at the end of his Foreword, he was not granted unrestricted access, but "a special committee headed by the archive's academic director" monitored his work, deciding from which documents he might be permitted to make extracts. Sokolov does not, however, suggest that this limitation hindered him from gaining a true picture of the Patriarchate in the nineteenth century, nor does he imply that there were specific classes of material to which he was denied access. The documents included in the Appendix to Volume 1 belong chronologically to the years 1765–1864, and there is nothing subsequent to that date. In addition to material from the Patriarchal archives at the Phanar, he also consulted manuscript sources in the library of the Russian Monastery of St Panteleimon on the Holy Mountain, and in other Athonite libraries.

In the present English translation, the appendix to Volume 1 containing Greek documents (150 pages) has been omitted; here Sokolov gives only the original Greek text, without a Russian version. Otherwise Sokolov's text has been translated in its entirety. Notwithstanding the great length of the work, it would have been a mistake to abbreviate it; for its especial

value lies precisely in the wide range of detailed evidence that he provides with such painstaking labour. The footnotes in the translation are as given by Sokolov, except that occasionally, when he only supplies initials, we have given the full name of the author. Where the translators have inserted comments of their own into the footnotes, this is clearly indicated. We have added a glossary, and the index is more detailed than that provided in the original Russian edition.

While himself a Russian, Sokolov expresses throughout a strong sympathy for the Greeks. Some readers of this English translation may regret the severity with which he condemns the Turkish treatment of the Christian population during the Ottoman era. He describes the sufferings of the Greek *dhimmis* in impassioned terms that a reader of the twenty-first century may find surprising and exaggerated. He also makes sharply critical remarks about the policy of the western powers, and in particular about the behaviour of their diplomatic representatives in Constantinople, such as the British Ambassador Stratford de Redcliffe. Nevertheless, even if Sokolov sometimes appears to be onesided, his strictures are supported with exact and specific evidence.

Sokolov admits that the situation of Christians under Ottoman rule had “slightly improved” in the course of the nineteenth century, as a result of the Turkish movement of reform known as *tanzimat*. Yet his final conclusion about the external position of the Church of Constantinople remains distinctly sombre: “Its condition was sad. The ancient church and national privileges of the Christians were systematically and cruelly violated by the Turkish government and people. Their position of slavery was the same at the end of the nineteenth century as it had been at the beginning.”

The most striking feature of Sokolov’s comprehensive study is his highly positive estimate of the role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He does not deny that there were sometimes failings on the part of the patriarchs, bishops and clergy. He recognizes that harm was done by dissensions among the metropolitans in the Holy Synod. He regrets the corruption resulting from the practice whereby patriarchs and bishops had to pay large sums of money to the Turkish authorities at their appointment to office. Yet, after making full allowance for these negative features, he concludes with

words of praise and generous commendation for the Greek Christians during the Turcocratia.

“There are many glorious pages in this story,” writes Sokolov. “The Great Church of Christ ... headed by its patriarchs, was subjected, as was its people, to all sorts of trials and tribulations, but [it] always and unfailingly preserved, like the apple of its eye, the purity of Orthodoxy.” It succeeded in preserving “the freedom of its inner life”. Elsewhere he insists: “The immense spiritual power of the Christian Church was concentrated in the patriarchate. It united all Turkish Christians into a living union of the Orthodox faith. It was the most convincing witness to their single-mindedness and solidarity. True Christian freedom, which had not disappeared despite all the misfortunes and calamities of political slavery, possessed there its strong support.” The patriarchs in the nineteenth century were, in Sokolov’s view, “the best representatives of their epoch and of the nation ... educated, highly moral and self-sacrificing”. So he concludes: “The weaknesses of the Greek clergy have been highly exaggerated ... The Ecumenical Patriarchate does not deserve accusations or attacks, especially from the Russians, rather it deserves admiration for its self-sacrificial and difficult cross-bearing.” These words remain as true today as when they were first penned a hundred years ago.

During the twentieth century the external situation of the Church of Constantinople has changed out of all recognition, in ways that Sokolov could not possibly have predicted. As a result of the Russian revolution, of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, of the disastrous Greek campaign in Asia Minor in 1922 and the subsequent exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey – “ethnic cleansing”, as it would today be styled – the outward face of Orthodoxy has been profoundly altered. The Ecumenical Patriarchate has lost almost the whole of its flock in Asia Minor, and exists today in a secular Turkey very different from the Ottoman regime. Moreover, in 1928 with the blessing of the Ecumenical Throne the dioceses in Northern Greece were incorporated administratively in the autocephalous Church of Greece. At the same time, through the large-scale emigration of Orthodox from their traditional lands to the west, the Patriarchate has acquired a new and rapidly expanding flock in the so-called “diaspora” throughout Western Europe, North and South America, Australia and

the Far East. It will be good if a worthy successor to Ivan Sokolov can be found to chronicle all these changes in the twentieth century, with the same authority and skill he displayed in this, his *magnum opus*.

In conclusion, on behalf of the translators and on my own behalf, I wish to express our gratitude to His All-Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I for the blessing that he has given to the English translation of this work, and for his constant support and encouragement.

Kallistos Ware
Metropolitan of Diokleia

Foreword

In the summer of 1902 we embarked on a scientific expedition to the Hellenic east. The central object of our interest was the patriarchal archive in Constantinople. We had happened to hear that this archive is a “sanctuary” of resources for researchers of the history of the Greek Church during the Byzantine era and since the Turkish occupation. The unsuccessful attempts of certain Russian historians to gain access to the archive only heightened our aspiration to become acquainted with its manuscripts, for they are a real treasure of the Greek Church and people. As it happened, we were more fortunate than our predecessors. Our letter of recommendation, addressed to His All-Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III himself, had been provided by His Grace the Right Reverend Anthony, Metropolitan of St Petersburg and Ladoga, and had opened to us the doors to the hallowed archive. Under the guidance of a special patriarchal commission, we were able to study the codices of the only collection of its kind for seven weeks. Making the most of the time we had been granted and of our academic skills, we were eventually able to define our particular field of scientific research: we would be concerned with the recent history of the Greek Church, for there were few documents dating back to the Byzantine era. The archive (in its present form) is relatively new, because the calamities of the Turkish occupation and the devastating fires in Constantinople, as well as the turbulence surrounding the Greek uprising of 1821, gave rise to the persistent theft and destruction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate’s precious official codices. Moreover, all the efforts of former patriarchs to codify the archives had been sabotaged. Many were the times they had been forced to make a fresh start in gathering the ancient codices and organising their storage. Even the documents of the Turkish era date back no further than the second half of the sixteenth century. Of the 42 codices dated earlier than 1866, only seven (numbered I–VII) are sixteenth to eighteenth century documents, while the content of the remaining 35 codices (numbered

VIII–XXXV and DCXXXVII–DCXLIII) belongs exclusively to the nineteenth century. Of course, we had to carry out our task as scientists, and we seized upon this unique opportunity to honour our duty, which had come to be so clearly defined by the very content of the codices of the patriarchal archive, and so we delved into the late history of the Ecumenical Throne. The findings of our study of the patriarchal archive have been supplemented with research in the libraries of Athonite *metochia* in Constantinople, and in the libraries of monasteries and sketes on the Holy Mountain such as the Russian Monastery of St Panteleimon, Vatopedi Monastery, the Holy Lavra of St Athanasios, and the sketes of St Andrew and St Elias; and also in the library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate. Part of the material gathered has been used in the present and first volume of our history of *The Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century*.

Our work represents the first attempt at scientific research into this history, in both Russian and non-Russian (historical) writing. Interestingly, all the Greek studies of the late history of the Church of Constantinople are presented either as part of general outlines of Church history or, in a few instances, as specific essays or studies of various aspects of the (historical) situation of the Ecumenical Throne, or of particular questions of its history.

The popular *Essays on the History of the Greek Eastern Orthodox Church in the Nineteenth Century*¹ stand alone in offering an anthology of the printed material on the Church of Constantinople that is of some value. Naturally, as part of our scientific method, we have incorporated into our research all the most important literature on our subject, and, as far as possible, we have made use of the freshest and most reliable sources referred to in Russian and non-Russian works on the history of the Church of

1 *Очерки истории православной греко-восточной церкви в XIX веке (Essays on the History of the Greek Eastern Orthodox Church in the Nineteenth Century)*, St Petersburg, 1901; the history of the Church of Constantinople is presented in the first five chapters of the book (pp. 1–216). The essays would also become part of a second volume of *The History of the Christian Church in the Nineteenth Century*, published by Prof. A. P. Lopoukhin in Russian.

Constantinople, the ministry of the Ecumenical Patriarch and on patriarchal administration.

We were especially assisted by the well-known work of Professor A. P. Lebedev,² which concentrates exclusively on the general history of the Greek Church under Turkish rule, for it enabled us at the outset to grasp the complexity of the issues of our research. In the same field there is also the work of the priest V. Archangelsky,³ a superficial compilation with a rather muddled presentation and plan which betrays a blind reliance on his teachers, and cannot therefore be used as an academic reference. Concerning the situation of Christians in Turkey and the attitude towards them of the Islamic government and people, there is the valuable work of B. Girgas,⁴ which takes Islamic rule as its primary source within the context of historical fact. A substantial amount of historical material on this aspect has also been gathered in an article by D. Dmitrievsky,⁵ as well as in his extensive analysis of the excellent brochure by the Anglican priest Denton.⁶ The acclaimed works of Nil Popov⁷ and S. N. Palauzov⁸ shed

- 2 *История греко-восточной церкви под властью турок от падения Константинополя в 1453 до настоящего времени* (*The History of the Greek Church under the Turkish Domination: from the Fall of Constantinople (1453) to the Present*), 2nd edition, St Petersburg, 1904.
- 3 *Очерк истории греческой церкви со времени падения Константинополя до наших дней* (*An Outline of the History of the Greek Church from the Fall of Constantinople until our own Day*), Moscow, 1885.
- 4 *Права христиан по мусульманским законам* (*The Rights of Christians according to Muslim Law*), St Petersburg, 1865.
- 5 "Внешнее состояние константинопольской церкви под игом турецким в XIX веке (The External Condition of the Church of Constantinople under Turkish Domination in the Nineteenth Century)", *Православное Обозрение* (*The Orthodox Review*), 1891, Vols I–II.
- 6 "Христиане в Турции (Christians in Turkey)", *Русский Вестник* (*The Russian Herald*), 1864, January–March.
- 7 *Россия и Сербия. Исторический очерк русского покровительства Сербии с 1806 по 1856* (*Russia and Serbia: a Historical Survey of the Russian Patronage of Serbia from 1806 to 1856*), Parts I–II, Moscow, 1869.
- 8 *Румынские господарства Валахия и Молдавия в историко-политическом отношении* (*The Romanian Counties of Wallachia and Moldavia in Historical and Political Context*), St Petersburg, 1859.

light on the attitude of the Turkish government and people towards the Serbs and Romanians respectively. But the most important presentation of Russian foreign policy in the Hellenic East is to be found in the semi-official publication of T. Yuzefovich,⁹ which contains the Russo-Turkish treaties up to 1856. There are also the historical and juridical essays of S. Zhigarev,¹⁰ in which the “Eastern Question” is examined on the basis of the vast body of (predominantly Russian) literature written prior to 1895. He credits the writing of F. Martens¹¹ and the superb historical works of S. Tatischev¹² with particular significance. The academic writings by T. A. Kourganov¹³ and I. S. Berdnikov¹⁴ proved to be a solid foundation for our treatment of some particular issues. We have learned to heed their words since our student years. Our essays on patriarchal administration in the Church of Constantinople benefited from the refreshing observations

- 9 *Договоры России с востоком, политические и торговые* (*The Political and Trade Contacts between Russia and the East*), St Petersburg, 1869.
- 10 *Русская политика в восточном вопросе, ее история в XVI–XIX веках, критическая оценка и будущие задачи* (*A History of Russian Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century: a Critical Evaluation and Outstanding Tasks*), Vols I–II, Moscow, 1896.
- 11 *Собрание трактатов и конвенций, заключенных Россией с иностранными державами* (*Collected Treaties and Conventions between Russia and Other Countries*), Vol. III, St Petersburg, 1884; Vol. XI, St Petersburg, 1896; Vol. XII, St Petersburg, 1898. The last volume includes a very interesting historical survey (No. 456) of the diplomatic talks that took place shortly before the Crimean War. It is based on archive material.
- 12 *Внешняя политика императора Николая I* (*The Foreign Policy of Emperor Nicholas I*), St Petersburg, 1887; *Император Александр II, его жизнь и царствование* (*Emperor Alexander II: his Life and Reign*), Vols I–II, St Petersburg, 1903.
- 13 *Наброски и очерки из новейшей истории румынской церкви* (*Sketches and Outlines of the Modern History of the Romanian Church*), Kazan, 1904; “Исторический очерк греко-болгарской распри (A Historical Survey of the Conflict between Greece and Bulgaria)”, *Православный Собеседник* (*The Orthodox Companion*), 1873, Vols I–III; *Устройство управления в церкви королевства греческого* (*The infrastructure of Church Rule in the Greek Kingdom*), Kazan, 1871.
- 14 *Основные начала церковного права православной церкви* (*General Principles of the Ecclesiastical Rights of the Orthodox Church*), Kazan, 1902.

from Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow of eternal memory, whose opinions and comments are always lively and accurate.¹⁵ The Metropolitan was alive at the time of the reforms in the Constantinopolitan Church and, being wise and well-versed in the church canons, he was able to assess perceptively the current affairs even of the remote Hellenic east. The remarkable article by Prince G. Trubetskoy¹⁶ is a thorough exposition of Russian diplomatic participation in the Greek ecclesiastical reforms, in which he uses evidence from the archive of the Constantinopolitan embassy in Russia. Hieromonk Michael's recent work¹⁷ also deals with the subject of church administration in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. We also bore in mind the work of the following authors: the ever-memorable Professor I. E. Troitsky,¹⁸ Bishops Porphyry Uspensky¹⁹ and Arseny

15 *Собрание мнений и отзывов по делам православной церкви на востоке* (*Collected Opinions and Comments on the Affairs of the Orthodox Church in the East*), St Petersburg, 1886.

16 "Россия и вселенская патриархия после крымской войны, 1856–1860 годы (*Russia and the Ecumenical Patriarchate after the Crimean War: 1856–1860*)", *Вестник Европы* (*The European Herald*), 1902, April–June.

17 *Собрание церковных уставов константинопольского патриархата 1858–1899 г. в русском переводе с историей их происхождения* (*The Collected Ecclesiastical Canons of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate (1858–1899) in Russian Translation and with the History of their Origin*), Kazan, 1902.

18 We refer here to numerous articles that appeared under the heading "News from the East (Вести с востока)" in *Christian Reading* (*Христианское Чтение*) and *The Church Herald* (*Церковный Вестник*), which he published for many years beginning in 1867. Among other items in *Christian Reading* (1884), there is a wonderful translation into Russian of "The Official Correspondence between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Ottoman Government on the rights and privileges of the Greek Clergy in the Turkish Empire".

19 *Книга бытия моего. Дневники и автобиографические записи* (*The Book of my Life: Diaries and Autobiographical Notes*), Vols I & ff, St Petersburg, 1894; "Афон монашеский (The Monastic Mount Athos)", *История Афона* (*The History of Mount Athos*), Part III, Section 2, St Petersburg, 1892; *Александрийская патриархия. Сборник материалов, исследований и записок, относящихся к истории александрийской патриархии* (*The Patriarchate of Alexandria: a Collection of Materials, Studies and Notes Related to the History of the Patriarchate of Alexandria*), Vol. I., St Petersburg,

Ivaschenko,²⁰ Professor A. A. Dmitrievsky,²¹ I. Berezin,²² C. Bazili,²³ T. I. Philippov,²⁴ and A. Preobrazhensky who wrote the official report²⁵ on the life and work of Patriarch Gregory. We also considered the articles on the recent history of the Greek Church in journals such as *Church Review* and *Strannik*.²⁶ Finally, it is relevant to our foreword that we should mention the articles of Professors N. A. Skabalanovich,²⁷

1898; *Путешествие в метеорские и осолимитийские монастыри в Фессалии (A Trip to the Monasteries of Meteora and Olympus in Thessaly)*, St Petersburg, 1896.

- 20 *Летопись церковных событий и гражданских, поясняющих церковные от Р.Х до 1898 (The Annals of Church Events Explained in the Light of Civil Events, from the Nativity of Christ until 1898)*, 3rd edition, St Petersburg, 1899.
- 21 *Русские на Афоне. Очерк жизни и деятельности игумена русского Пантелеимонова монастыря священно-архимандрита Макария Сушкина (Russians on Mount Athos: a Survey of the Life and Works of the Very Reverend Archimandrite Makary Soushkin, Abbot of the Russian Monastery of St Panteleimon)*, St Petersburg, 1895.
- 22 *Православные и другие христианские церкви в Турции (The Orthodox Church and the other Churches in Turkey)*, St Petersburg, 1855.
- 23 *Очерки Константинополя (Essays on Constantinople)*, Parts I & II, St Petersburg, 1835.
- 24 *Современные церковные вопросы (Contemporary Ecclesiastical Questions)*, St Petersburg, 1882.
- 25 *Приложение 13 к Протоколам заседаний Совета казанской духовной академии за 1900 год (Appendix No. 13 to the Debate Protocols of the Council of the Theological Academy in Kazan for the year 1900)*. The publication of our research in *The Orthodox Companion* in 1904 (March, May and June) coincided with the publication of the first chapters of Preobrazhensky's special study of Gregory V.
- 26 We believe it is necessary to point out that all the articles published in *Church News (Церковные Ведомости)* between 1897 and 1904 under the heading "News from the East", as well as the articles in *The Pilgrim (Странник)* appearing under the heading "The Life of the Church and Society in the Orthodox East", are ours, though they sometimes carry the pseudonym I. Byzantiysky, if not our surname or its abbreviation.
- 27 "Политика турецкого правительства по отношению к христианским подданным и их религии (от завоевания Константинополя до конца XVIII века (The Policy of the Turkish Government towards its Christian Subjects and their Religion from the Conquest of Constantinople until the end of the Eighteenth Century)", *Христианское Чтение (Christian Reading)*, 1878, Vol. II.

V. V. Bolotov,²⁸ and V. I. Lamansky²⁹ and the studies by Professors I. I. Malyshevsky³⁰ and N. T. Kapterev.³¹

The western European works we refer to are concerned primarily with the international position of the Church within Turkey, as they deal either with Turkish history, describing the administrative, social and economic infrastructure within the context of the policy of the Porte towards Christians, or with the history of the Greek uprising of 1821. At our disposal were various works by the following authors: Ubicini,³² von Maurer,³³ Pichler,³⁴ Rosen,³⁵ Zinkeisen,³⁶ Hertzberg,³⁷ Mendelssohn-Bartholdy,³⁸

- 28 "К истории внешнего состояния константинопольской церкви под игом турецким (On the History of the External Conditions of the Church of Constantinople under the Turkish Domination)", *Христианское Чтение* (*Christian Reading*), 1882, Vols I–II (the article was not published in full).
- 29 *Могущество турок-османов в Европе* (*The Might of the Osman Turks in Europe*), St Petersburg, 1880.
- 30 *Александрийский патриарх Мелетий Пигас и его участие в делах русской церкви* (*The Alexandrian Patriarch Meletios Pigas and his Participation in Russian Church Affairs*), Kiev, 1872.
- 31 *Характер отношений России к православному востоку в XVI–XVII веках* (*The Character of the Russian Attitude to the Orthodox East in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*), Moscow, 1885.
- 32 A. Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie ou tableau statistique religieux, politique, administratif etc. de l'empire ottoman depuis le chatti-cherif de Gulkhané* (1839), Parts I & II, Paris, 1853–1854; *Etat présent de l'empire ottoman*, Paris, 1877.
- 33 G. L. von Maurer, *Das griechische Volk in öffentlicher, kirchlicher und privatrechtlicher Beziehung vor und nach dem Freiheitskampfe bis zum 31 Juli 1834*, Vols I–III, Heidelberg, 1835.
- 34 A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, Vols I & II, Munich, 1864–1865.
- 35 G. Rosen, *Geschichte der Türkei von dem Siege der Reform im Jahre 1826 bis zum Pariser Traktat vom Jahre 1856*, Vols I & II, Leipzig, 1866.
- 36 J. Zinkeisen, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa*, Vols VI & VII, Gotha, 1859–1863.
- 37 G. F. Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenlands seit dem Absterben des antiken Lebens bis zum Gegenwart*, Vols II–IV, Gotha, 1877–1879.
- 38 K. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, *Geschichte Griechenlands von der Eroberung Konstantinopels durch die Türken im Jahre 1453 bis auf unsere Tage*, Vols I & II, Leipzig, 1870–1874.

Prokesch-Osten,³⁹ Lamartine,⁴⁰ Juchereau de St-Denys,⁴¹ Caston,⁴² Riso Néroulos,⁴³ Eichmann,⁴⁴ Pouqueville,⁴⁵ Gervinus,⁴⁶ Chertier⁴⁷ and others;⁴⁸ and the introductory works of Hammer,⁴⁹ Ohsson⁵⁰ and Cantimir.⁵¹ In addition, we made use of descriptions of Turkey in the travel accounts of Eton,⁵² Savary,⁵³ Craven,⁵⁴ Sonnini,⁵⁵ Pouqueville,⁵⁶ Castellaine,⁵⁷ Gouffier⁵⁸

- 39 A. F. von Prokesch-Osten, *Geschichte des Abfalls der Griechen vom türkischen Reiche im Jahre 1821 und der Gründung der hellenischen Königreiches. Aus diplomatischem Standpunkt*, Vols I–VI, Vienna, 1867.
- 40 A. de Lamartine, *Histoire de la Turquie*, Vols VII & VIII, Paris, 1855.
- 41 Juchereau de St-Denys, *Histoire de l'empire ottoman depuis 1792 jusqu'en 1844*, Vols I–IV, Paris, 1844.
- 42 Alfred de Caston, *Musulmans et chrétiens. De Mohamed le prophète au sultan Abdul Aziz khan*, Vols I & II, Constantinople, 1874.
- 43 Jacovaky Riso Néroulos, *Histoire moderne de la Grèce depuis la chute de l'empire d'orient*, Genève, 1828.
- 44 F. Eichmann, *Die Reformen des osmanischen Reiches*, Berlin, 1858.
- 45 F. C. Pouqueville, *Histoire de la régénération de la Grèce*, Vols I–IV, Paris, 1824.
- 46 G. G. Gervinus, *Geschichte des XIX Jahrhunderts: Aufstand und Wiedergeburt von Griechenland*, Vols V & VI, Leipzig, 1865.
- 47 E. Chertier, *Reformes en Turquie*, Paris, 1858.
- 48 C. Junck, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, Marburg, 1853; M. B. C. Collas, *La Turquie en 1864*, Paris, 1864; Charles Rolland, "La Turquie contemporaine. Hommes et choses", *Etudes sur l'Orient*, Paris, 1854; Ami Boué, *La Turquie d'Europe ou observations sur la géographie, la géologie, la statistique etc.*, Vols II & III, Paris, 1840; J. G. Pitzipios-Bey, *L'Orient. Les reformes de l'empire byzantin*, Paris, 1859.
- 49 Joseph von Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, Vols I–IX, Pesth, 1834–1836.
- 50 D' Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'empire othoman*, Vols I–VII, Paris, 1824.
- 51 Demetrius Cantemir (Prince of Moldavia), *Histoire de l'empire othoman*, Vols I–IV, Paris, 1743.
- 52 W. Eton, *A Survey of the Turkish Empire*, London, 1768.
- 53 C. Savary, *Lettres sur la Grèce*, 1788.
- 54 E. Craven, *A Trip to the Crimea and Constantinople in 1786*, Moscow, 1795. (In Russian translation: the French original could not be found.)
- 55 C. Sonnini, *Voyage en Grèce et en Turquie*, Paris, 1801.
- 56 F. C. Pouqueville, *Voyage en Morée, à Constantinople, en Albanie*, Vols I–III, Paris, 1805.
- 57 A. Castellaine, *Lettres sur la Morée et les Iles*, Vols I & II, Paris, 1808.
- 58 Choiseul Gouffier, *Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce*, Paris, 1878.

and others.⁵⁹ Finally, for our section on patriarchal administration we bore in mind works by Pischon,⁶⁰ Silbernagl⁶¹ and Beth.⁶² Of the western works mentioned above, only one is concerned with the history of the Church of Constantinople, while the others are full of distorted facts and biased in their approach. And the best ones (Pichler, von Maurer, Zinkeisen, Hertzberg, Pischon, Silbernagl) have already been extensively and exhaustively used in the Russian literature on our subject. There little left for us to explore, but our work has been enhanced by our drawing on all the available material of academic and historical value and significance.

Naturally we have paid special attention to the standard Greek works, which are so numerous and diverse. Their approach to our subject is the correct one, and they are less well-known to us. However, even Greeks have not produced a specialised study on the subject that could have been used as a guide. There was one study by Professor A. Diomidis Kyriakos⁶³ containing limited information on the attitude of the Turkish government towards the Greek Church from the fall of Byzantium up until 1897, on church government, and on particular patriarchs and so on. The Greeks have, however, produced a number of studies, monographs, treatises and essays on specific questions of the history of the Church of Constantinople, and we have attempted to collect these and to study them as thoroughly as possible. As far as the international history of the Church is concerned, by far the most important work is the three-volume study by Professor Karolidis of Athens, which is concerned with the nineteenth century.⁶⁴ One

59 For example, B. Nicolaïdy, *Les Turcs et la Turquie contemporaine*, Vols I–II, Paris, 1859; James Baker, *Turkey in Europe*, London, 1877.

60 C. N. Pischon, “Die Verfassung der griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche in der Türkei”, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1864.

61 I. Silbernagl, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sömmtlicher Kirchen des Orients*, Landshut, 1865.

62 K. Beth, *Die orientalische Christenheit der Mittelmeerländer*, Berlin, 1902.

63 A. Diomidis Kyriakos, *Εκκλησιαστική ιστορία από της ιδρύσεως της εκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνων, ἐρανισθεῖσα*, Vol. III, Athens, 1898.

64 P. Karolidis, *Ιστορία τοῦ ΙΘ’ αἰῶνος μετ’ εἰκόνων*, Vols I–III, Athens, 1892. There is also an introduction to this history: Pavlos Karolidis, *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ ΙΘ’ αἰῶνος*, Athens, 1891.

also finds in it the nineteenth-century history of Turkey and the fate of the Greeks under Muslim rule. The second volume is particularly important as it deals with the Greek struggle for freedom. This Greek scholar gives a superb exposition of the reasons behind the 1821 movement, demonstrating the position and significance of the Church for captive Hellenism, and he also gives an account of the uprising itself in all its complexity. The second chapter of the study is a descriptive analysis of the events surrounding the assassination of Patriarch Gregory V. In general, Karolidis's work, based as it is on a careful study of the Greek and the other non-Russian sources, is very impressive especially where he touches on our subject, and it has been especially valuable to us as a reference work on the international history of the Church of Constantinople in the nineteenth century. A useful addition to Karolidis's study is the two-volume work of Kyriakidis, which examines the Hellenic situation between 1832 and 1892.⁶⁵ In his introduction, the author writes about the position of the Greek Church and people from the fall of Byzantium to the establishment of the Greek monarchy. Though the emphasis is on the history of Hellenic independence, the work gives some attention to the captivity of the Greek people and the struggle for their rights under the Turkish government during the period leading up to the time of Patriarch Dionysios V. Kyriakidis had Turkish sources at his disposal, and his work therefore includes historical details (such as the court case of Patriarch Gregory VI), which are passed over by other Greek and western European scholars.

The work of Koumas († 1836)⁶⁶ presents more general facts with regard to the Church of Constantinople: he describes the Turkish situation at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century; the status of the Greek Church and people under Muslim rule; the Greek uprising, and the ministry of the ecumenical patriarchs up to 1831. The work of this Greek scholar runs to many volumes, and is especially valuable in that

65 E. Kyriakidis, *Ιστορία του συγχρόνου ελληνισμού από της ιδρύσεως του βασιλείου της Ελλάδος μέχρι των ημερών μας (1832–1892)*, Vols I–II, Athens, 1892.

66 C. Koumas, *Ιστορία των ανθρωπίνων πράξεων από των αρχαιστάτων χρόνων έως των ημερών μας*, Vol. XII, Vienna, 1832.

it is based on his personal observation and study of the epoch using current reference material. There is also the well-known work of Paparrigopoulos,⁶⁷ who uses some valuable extracts from primary sources and thereby gives a thorough presentation of various aspects of Neo-Hellenism from the time of the fall of Byzantium up until the Porte's recognition of Greek sovereignty. C. Sathas's study of Hellas under Turkish dominion convincingly demonstrates the links between the 1821 movement and the many earlier Greek uprisings against the Turks, beginning in 1453.⁶⁸ He vividly depicts the conditions in which Turkish Christians were living at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. Philimon⁶⁹ and Trikoupis⁷⁰ also examine the period of the Greek uprising, and their studies are based on authentic historical documents that have been carefully selected and well presented. They give detailed accounts of the calamities endured by the Church during difficult times, when she was fighting for survival, and we made use of their account of the unfortunate fate of the *dhimmis* (Greek people under Turkish sovereignty) and its representatives. As for Turkish history, we used a good book by Evangelidis.⁷¹ His great advantage over his western European counterparts lies in the attention he gives to the Orthodox Church and in his accurate perception of its situation and its relations with the Muslim government. Moreover, his knowledge of the western literature on the subject is considerable.

No student of the recent history of the Greek Church would be able to dispense with the numerous and various valuable works of that splendid archivist and chronicler of the Great Church of Christ, Manuel I. Gedeon,⁷²

67 C. Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του ελληνικοῦ ἔθνους ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι τῶν κατ' ἡμᾶς*, Vol. V, Athens, 1896.

68 C. N. Sathas, *Τουρκοκρατούμενη Ελλάς. Ιστορικὸν δοκίμιον περὶ τῶν πρὸς ἀποτίναξιν τοῦ ὀθωμανικοῦ ζυγοῦ ἐπαναστάσεων (1453–1821)*, Athens, 1869.

69 I. Philimon, *Δοκίμιον ἱστορικὸν περὶ τῆς ἐλληνικῆς ἐπαναστάσεως*, Vols I–II, Athens, 1859.

70 S. Trikoupis, *Ιστορία τῆς ἐλληνικῆς ἐπαναστάσεως*, Vols I–V, London, 1853–1856.

71 T. Evangelidis, *Ιστορία τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς αὐτοκρατορίας ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρύσεως αὐτῆς μέχρι τῆς σήμερον (1281–1894)*, Athens, 1894.

72 Manuel I. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοὶ πίνακες. Εἰδήσεις ἱστορικαὶ – βιογραφικαὶ περὶ τῶν πατριαρχῶν Κων-πολεως κτλ.*, Constantinople, 1890; *Χρονικά τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ οἴκου καὶ*

a most industrious and prolific modern scholar in Constantinople. Of his works studied, we mention first of all the historical, biographical and chronological account of the patriarchs of Constantinople. It is a very useful reference book that maps the way towards more detailed study of the life and ministry of each of the ecumenical hierarchs. Furthermore, Gedeon has authored studies of the patriarchal court and church, the patriarchal academy and its archive, of education in the Greek world at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He has also written on poverty, theological schools, the responsibilities of parishes, the recent Greek collections of the church canons, the ministry of preaching, charity work, dowries. Gedeon compiles his work primarily from archival material, which he supports with authentic documentation, enhancing his academic reliability. We also found the articles by Chamoudopoulos to be a very useful academic reference.⁷³ They include a chronological survey of the ecclesiastical ministry of the ecumenical patriarchs based on the manuscripts of patriarchal codices, and supported by official (legal) acts. There is also the well-known work of Mathas (Constantine Oikonomos) on the patriarchs of Constantinople up to the time of Patriarch Gregory VI (1835).⁷⁴ It presents the ministry of

τοῦ ναοῦ, Constantinople, 1884; *Χρονικά τῆς πατριαρχικῆς ἀκαδημίας*, Constantinople, 1883; *Παιδεία καὶ πτωχεία παρ' ἡμῖν κατὰ τοὺς τελευταίους αἰῶνας*, Constantinople, 1893; "Ἀρχεῖα τῆς μεγάλῃς τοῦ γένους σχολῆς", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1903, 50 and elsewhere; "Ἡ διαχείρισις τῶν ἐνοριακῶν λογαριασμῶν", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1888, 13–14, 17; "Αἱ παρ' ἡμῖν συλλογαὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κανόνων κατὰ τοὺς τελευταίους χρόνους", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1887, 1–5; "Ἡ πνευματικὴ κίνησις τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ ΙΘ' αἰῶνος ἔτη", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1888, 45–48 and elsewhere; "Τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ θείου λόγου ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν κάτω χρόνων", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1888, 23–25; "Φιλάνθρωποι διατάξεις ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν κάτω χρόνων", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1888, 31–34; "Αἱ περὶ προικοδοσίας ἐπαρχιακαὶ καὶ πατριαρχικαὶ διατάξεις", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1888, 27–29; "Αἱ ἀρχαιότεραι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς θεολογικῶν σχολῶν", *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1888, 9.

73 M. Chamoudopoulos, *Πατριαρχικαὶ πινακίδες*, *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1882, II, 18–23, 27–28, 30, 32–34, 36, 38–39, 41; *Μνημείων γραπτῶν περισυναγωγὴ*, *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1881, I, 1–8 and elsewhere.

74 Archdeacon Zacharias (Mathas Andriou), *Κατάλογος ἱστορικῶς τῶν πρῶτων ἐπισκόπων καὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς πατριαρχῶν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἀγίας καὶ μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας*, Navplion, 1837.

the patriarchs within the context of civil events and in the light of contemporary historical facts. However, his work should be approached critically, especially where chronology is concerned.

Of those writings which are of a biographical character, we ought firstly to mention the biographies of the hieromartyr Patriarch Gregory V (deceased 1821) by Angelopoulos,⁷⁵ Goudas,⁷⁶ Pilavios⁷⁷ and Sathas.⁷⁸ They are all of a rather general character and are not very long, and on the whole do not sufficiently reveal the full significance of the life and ministry of the celebrated hierarch. Goudas has also published popular biographies of Patriarch Cyril VI of Constantinople (deceased 1821),⁷⁹ and of heroes of the uprising: Germanos, Metropolitan of Old Patras;⁸⁰ Theodoritos, Bishop of Vresthena;⁸¹ Neophytos, Bishop of Talantias;⁸² Gregory Papaphlesos⁸³ and others. As information about them is scarce even in the Greek literature, these biographies together with the five-volume modern Greek history, *Βίοι παράλληλοι*, also by Goudas, are significant historical material. In addition, there is a very good biography of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Constantios I (1830–1834) by Aristoklis,⁸⁴ which was published at the beginning of the collected works of this “wise” hierarch. In the author’s comments in this biography, he provides some factual information on Patriarchs Anthimos III, Chrysanthos, Agathangelos, Constantios II, Gregory VI, Anthimos IV, Germanos IV, Meletios III and Anthimos VI. The work of

75 G. Angelopoulos, *Βίος και πολιτεία του ιερομάρτυρος Γρηγορίου, πατριάρχου Κων-πόλεως; Τὰ κατὰ τὸν πατριάρχην Κων-πόλεως Γρηγόριον τὸν Ε΄*. Vol. I, Athens, 1865, 1–52.

76 A. Goudas, *Βίοι παράλληλοι τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως τῆς Ἑλλάδος διαπρεφάντων ἀνδρῶν*, Vol. I, Athens, 1872, 41–92.

77 G. Pilavios, *Τὰ κατὰ τὸν πατριάρχην Γρηγόριον τὸν Ε΄ (1821–1871)*, Athens, 1871.

78 C. Sathas, *Νεοελληνικὴ φιλολογία. Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων ἐλλήνων (1453–1821)*, Athens, 1868, 620–23.

79 *Βίοι παράλληλοι*, I, 1–39.

80 *Ibid.*, 93–132.

81 *Ibid.*, 133–66.

82 *Ibid.*, 375–414.

83 *Βίοι παράλληλοι*, V, Athens, 1872, 145–80.

84 Th. Aristoklis, *Κωνσταντίου Α΄ τοῦ ἀπὸ Σιναίου ἀοιδίμου πατριάρχου Κων-πόλεως τοῦ Βυζαντίου βιογραφία καὶ συγγραφαι ἐλάσσονες κτλ.*, Constantinople, 1866, 1–77.

G. Papadopoulos contains surveys of the ministries of Patriarchs Joachim III (1878–1884) and Neophytos VIII (1891–1894), as well as Anthimos VII (1895–1897) and Constantine V (1895–1897).⁸⁵ All these contain useful historical and canonical material. A quite detailed account of the first patriarchal ministry of Joachim III is offered by Spanoudis⁸⁶ (in which, by the way, he explains the so-called “Joachimism”). Sathas offers some biographical facts on Patriarchs Cyril VI and Constantios I,⁸⁷ while Thereianos presents an excellent monograph on the famous Adamantios Korais,⁸⁸ as well as publishing some of his writings. The monograph features his life and ministry in the context of Greek events at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, and makes for interesting and profitable reading. Other biographical surveys deserve our attention: those of the great interpreters (*diermineus*) of the Turkish Empire, by E. Stamatiadis,⁸⁹ and those of the scholars from Trebizond, compiled by E. Kyriakidis.⁹⁰ Finally Aravantinos has written the history of Ali Pasha of Ioannina, the “second Nero” as Christians would call him, which is especially rich in material concerning his character.⁹¹

At our disposal were some historical and archaeological studies by Greek authors. First of all was the well-known research on Constantinople by Skarlatos Byzantios:⁹² its value lies in the vast and significant material, and it is a very useful reference book for topography, archaeology, genealogies, history, and character. Priest Evgenios has compiled a very good history

85 G. Papadopoulos, *Η σύγχρονος ιεραρχία τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*, Vol. I, Athens, 1895, 1–424, 442–50.

86 K. Spanoudis, *Ιστορικαὶ σελίδες. Ἰωακείμ ὁ Γ΄*, Constantinople, 1902.

87 *Νεοελληνικὴ φιλολογία*, 678, 741–3.

88 D. Thereianos, *Ἀδαμάντιος Κοραΐς*, Vols I–III, Trieste, 1889–90.

89 E. Stamatiadis, *Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐλλήνων μεγάλων διερμηνέων τοῦ ὀθωμανικοῦ κράτους*, Athens, 1865.

90 Kyriakidis, *Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐκ Τραπεζοῦντος καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτὴν χώρας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως μέχρις ἡμῶν ἀκμασάντων λογίων μετὰ σχεδιάσματος ἱστορικοῦ περὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ φροντιστηρίου*, Athens, 1897.

91 Sp. Aravantinos, *Ἱστορία Ἀλῆ πασᾶ τοῦ Τεπελενλή*, Athens, 1895.

92 D. Skarlatos tou Byzantiou, *Η Κωνσταντινούπολις ἢ περιγραφή τοπογραφικὴ, ἀρχαιολογικὴ καὶ ἱστορικὴ τῆς περιωνύμου ταύτης μεγαλοπόλεως κτλ.*, Vols I–III, Athens, 1851–69.

of the Church of the Life-giving Spring (Baloukli) in Constantinople and its many Greek charitable organisations.⁹³ He bases his research on authentic documents which are listed in an appendix. The work of G. Georgiadis is similar.⁹⁴ It examines the history of the Church of St John τῶν Χίων in Galata, and includes a description of its infrastructure, its financial situation, its administration and present situation. A fairly substantial account of the churches, schools and buildings in the region of Kourouchesme, near the capital, is presented in the research of V. Mystakidis.⁹⁵ It is supported by archival documents. We have also studied the following: Evstratios Drakos's historical and archaeological study of the diocese of Smyrna and the city of Moschonesia;⁹⁶ Elevtheriadis's book on Sinassos (Nazianzus);⁹⁷ Dora d'Istria's work on the Ionian Islands;⁹⁸ the anonymous history of Soulios (Soli),⁹⁹ and other works.¹⁰⁰

For the history of various monasteries, we consulted the following: Bartholomew Koutloumousianos's account of the Monastery of the

93 Priest Evgenios, *Η Ζωοδόχος Πηγή και τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῆς προσαρτήματα*, Athens, 1886.

94 G. Georgiadis, *Ο ἐν Γαλατῇ ἱερὸς ναὸς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τῶν Χίων*, Constantinople, 1898.

95 V. Mystakidis, *Περὶ Κουρουτεσμέ τινα, ἥτοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, πατριαρχείων, σχολείων, αὐθεντικῶν οἰκῶν, κρηνῶν κτλ., Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1885, 8–11. A separate, fuller edition was published in Athens in 1888.

96 E. Drakos, *Ἑλληνικαὶ ἐκκλησιαστικαὶ σελίδες, ἥτοι Σμύρνης ἱεράρχαι, μοναστήρια κτλ.*, Part 1, Athens, 1891; *Μικρασιανά, ἡ γενικὴ πραγματεία περὶ ἑκατοντήσων τανῦν Μοσχονησίων*, Vols I–II, Athens, 1895.

97 Elevtheriadis, *Συνασμός, ἥτοι μελέτη ἐπὶ τῶν ἡθῶν καὶ ἐδίμων αὐτῆς*, Athens, 1879; cf. S. Archelaos, *Η Συνασμός, ἥτοι θέσις, ἱστορία, ἡθικὴ καὶ διανοητικὴ κατάστασις κτλ.*, Athens, 1899.

98 Dora d'Istria, *Αἱ Ἰόνιοι νῆσοι ὑπὸ τὴν δεσποτείαν τῆς Ενετίας καὶ τὴν ἀγγλικὴν προστασίαν*, Athens, 1859.

99 *Ἱστορία Σουλίου καὶ Πάργας*, Venice, 1815.

100 Anthimos Alexoudis, Metropolitan of Velegrada, *Σύντομος ἱστορικὴ περιγραφὴ τῆς ἱερᾶς μητροπόλεως Βελεγράδων*, Kerkyra, 1868; Archimandrite Melissinos Christodoulos, *Η Θράκη καὶ αἱ Σαράντα Ἐκκλησίαι μετὰ τινῶν διοικητικῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ζητημάτων*, Constantinople, 1897; Tr. Evangelidis, *Ἱστορία τῆς Τραπεζοῦντος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι τῶν καδ' ἡμᾶς*, Odessa, 1898; B. Kandis, *Η Προύσα, ἥτοι περιγραφὴ αὐτῆς*, Athens, 1883; Chourmouzis, *Η νῆσος Ἀντιγόνη*, Constantinople, 1869.

Mother of God in Chalcedon,¹⁰¹ Kyriakidis's work on the Monastery of the Mother of God of Soumela in Trebizond,¹⁰² *hierodidaskalos* Nicephoros' and Gregory Photeinos' study of the Νέα Μονή on Chios,¹⁰³ Karydonis's accounts of the Monastery of the Mother of God τῆς Μυρσινιωτίσσης, and of the Monastery of the Holy Archangels τοῦ Λειμῶνος,¹⁰⁴ and others.¹⁰⁵

Finally, the well-known research of Professor Paranikas constitutes an important presentation of the history of the Evangelical School in Smyrna.¹⁰⁶ Sathas¹⁰⁷ and Pekios¹⁰⁸ give an account of the enlightenment movement among the Greeks with reference to its leading representatives at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In other words, there is no single work in either the Russian or the non-Russian literature, nor even among the Greek writings, that addresses our particular subject; nor are there any reference books which might have been consulted for guidance in this matter. We had to make use of primary sources, which are voluminous and diverse.

Our research, then, is based on the official codices of the patriarchal archive in Constantinople, and the nucleus of our work consists of this

- 101 B. Koutloumousianos, *Υπόμνημα ἱστορικὸν περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν Χάλκην μονῆς τῆς Θεοτόκου*, Constantinople, 1846.
- 102 E. Kyriakidis, *Ἱστορία τῆς παρὰ τὴν Τραπεζοῦντα ἱερᾶς βασιλικῆς πατριαρχικῆς σταυροπηγιακῆς μονῆς τῆς Ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου τῆς Σουμελά*, Athens, 1898.
- 103 Nicephoros, *Τὰ Νεαμονήσια*, Chios, 1804 and its corrected edition by Gregory Photeinos, *Τὰ Νεαμονήσια*, Chios, 1865.
- 104 S. Karydonis, *Τὰ ἐν Καλλονῇ τῆς Λέσβου ἱερὰ σταυροπηγιακὰ πατριαρχικὰ μοναστήρια τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Μηθύμνης*, Constantinople, 1900.
- 105 Namely: Hilarion Synaitis, *Περιγραφή τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν Δράμας καὶ Φιλίππων ἱεροῦ μοναστηρίου τῆς Ὑπεραγίας Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου τῆς ἐπονομαζομένης Εἰκοσφοινίσσης*, Constantinople, 1869; Hieromonk Meletios, *Περιγραφή τῆς ἱερᾶς σεβασμίας καὶ βασιλικῆς μονῆς τῆς Ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου τοῦ Κύκκου ἐπιφημιζομένης κατὰ τὴν νήσον Κύπρον*, Venice, 1819.
- 106 M. Paranikas, *Ἱστορία τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς σχολῆς Σμύρνης, ἐκ τῶν πηγῶν συνταχθεῖσα*, Athens, 1885.
- 107 K. Sathas, *Νεοελληνικὴ φιλολογία κτλ.; Νεοελληνικῆς φιλολογίας παράρτημα. Ἱστορία τοῦ ζητήματος τῆς νεοελληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens, 1870.
- 108 A. Pekios, *Πνευματικὴ ἀποψὶς τῆς τουρκοκρατουμένης Ελλάδος κτλ.*, Constantinople, 1880.

primary source, which has never before been used in scholarship. In this volume we have drawn on material from thirty-five of the codices in the archive of Constantinople, each of which contains several hundred pages *in folio*. Some of our extracts are word for word, but in general more or less everything has been quoted in summary for the purposes of our research, where permission to do so had been obtained.

The superb general description of these precious codices, compiled by the former director of the archive, now Metropolitan Joachim Phoropoulos, assisted us greatly in becoming acquainted with them. Using this description as a guide, we made our way systematically through the wealth of documents gathered in each codex, and were thus enabled to select indispensable material of great interest and significance. To give a precise summary of the official documents selected from each of the codices would not have been without difficulty due to their great number: we have therefore left it to our readers to consult those extracts that are presented in the text itself, as well as references to them in the footnotes. Here we have indicated only the most general content of each of the codices within the range that was available to us, i.e. codices VIII–XXXV and DCXXXVII–DCXLIII.

The first series of codices contains codices VIII–XXXV, and is primarily concerned with the civil-political and ecclesiastical functions of the patriarchs of Constantinople during the period 1797–1866. The collection is arranged chronologically and consists of official patriarchal and synodal documents: *sigillia* (enactments) or declarations of important patriarchal decisions, e.g. the granting of stavropegic status to a monastery; *pittakia* or letters of promotion, from bishops to clergy; encyclicals and decrees, circular letters and dossiers. These documents shed light on relations between the patriarchs and the Turkish government; on legal action taken by the patriarchs on behalf of the *dhimmis*; on measures designed to ensure strict adherence to Orthodox dogmas and canons, and the protection of these from the propaganda offensives of alien religions and confessions. There are decrees on diocesan administration, on bishops and clergy, on ecclesiastical discipline, on parishes, monasteries and schools.

For example, the second half of codex VIII consists of such documents from Patriarch Gregory V's first appointment (1797–1798) and from Patriarch Neophytos II's second appointment (1798–1801). Codex

IX (ca. 500 pages) contains the protocols for the election, reappointment and discharge of the patriarchs and hierarchs of the see of Constantinople during the patriarchal ministries of Gregory V (1797–1798, 1806–1808 and 1818–1821), Neophytos VII, Kallinikos V (1801–1806 and 1808–1809), Jeremias IV (1809–1813), Cyril VI (1813–1818) and Evgenios II (1821–1822). It also contains decrees of the synod concerning the elevation of dioceses, as well as letters, oaths and confessions of faith by certain clergy, priests and bishops. It includes likewise the protocols of the hierarchal appointments during the terrible year of 1821, when special arrangements had to be made due to some of the hierarchs having been hanged, and others having fled. Codex X (ca. 300 pages) begins with the biography of Patriarch Gregory V, which is followed by a catalogue of the metropolitan and ordinary dioceses, stavropegic monasteries and patriarchal exarchates of the time of his first term of patriarchal service. Then there are many letters and epistles of the famous martyr-patriarch dating from 1797/1798; some documents from the time of Neophytos VII, and numerous enactments, letters, official synodal documents and dossiers on various ecclesiastical matters which had concerned Patriarchs Kallinikos V and Gregory V (1806–1808). Codex XI (ca. 200 pages) is concerned with the patriarchal ministry of Kallinikos V, the second term of Gregory V, as well as with Jeremias IV, and is full of official patriarchal and synodal documents dealing with administration and the canons.

Codex XII (ca. 300 pages) begins with a catalogue of the dioceses and monasteries of the Church of Constantinople up to 1803, and is followed by patriarchal and synodal documents concerning schools, monasteries, dioceses, high- and low-ranking clergy, petitions, complaints by Christians of harassment by the Turks, the internal affairs of the Christian communities. These date back to the period 1809–1817, during the time of Patriarchs Jeremias IV and Cyril VI. The rule of the latter is also presented in some of the opening documents of codex XIII (ca. 300 pages). The larger part of this codex relates to the patriarchal ministries of Gregory V (his third term) and Anthimos III (1822–1824). Codex XIV (ca. 400 pages) consists of documents registering the appointment and discharge of patriarchs and metropolitans, and other administrative changes in dioceses in the period 1823–1840. It also contains various official documents issued by

Patriarchs Anthimos III, Chrysanthos (1824–1826), Agathangelos (1826–1830), Constantios I (1830–1834), Constantios II (1834–1835), Gregory VI (1835–1840) and Anthimos IV (1840). Among other items, we find here the synodal tome of Patriarch Constantios II (20 December 1834), in which is registered the restoration of a patriarch's right to present himself to the sultan after his election, a right that was abolished in 1657. The codex also contains a valuable collection of epistles by Patriarch Gregory VI against Catholics, Protestants and Kairists, as well as the synodal decree (19 September 1839) of the canonization of George the New, and other documents concerning ecclesiastical life in Ungro-Wallachia (1840). Codex XV (ca. 350 pages) contains the official documents of Patriarchs Anthimos III and Chrysanthos. The whole of codex XVI (ca. 300 pages) is concerned with the civil policies and ecclesiastical administration of Patriarch Agathangelos, and codex XVII (ca. 300 pages) with Patriarch Constantios I the Wise.

The beginning of codex XVIII (375 pages) consists of documents relating to the time of Constantios II, while the larger part of its contents consists of documents of a similar type going back to Patriarch Gregory VI's first term of office, that is, up until the first half of 1838. The ministry of this great hierarch is featured in multiple manuscripts in codex XIX, towards the end (p. 277–362) of which are included documents concerning the relations of the patriarch with the council and the hierarchs of the Ionian Islands. Codex XX (over 355 pages) contains documents from the time of Patriarchs Anthimos IV (1840–1841) and Anthimos V (1841–1842) up to 31 October 1841. The second half of Anthimos V's term of patriarchal office as well as the first term of Patriarch Germanos IV (1842–1845) are contained in documents in codex XXI (400 pages). Codex XXII (480 pages) contains protocols concerning the election of patriarchs and metropolitans during the patriarchal ministries of Anthimos V, Germanos IV (his second term, 1852–1853), Meletios III (1845), Anthimos VI (1845–1848 and 1853–1855), Anthimos IV (1848–1852), Cyril VII (1855–1860), Joachim II (1860–1863) and Sophronios III (1863–1866), as well as documents concerning various developments in the dioceses, together with other patriarchal and synodal administrative documents. This same codex also contains the most recent documents (dated July 1866) of all the archive manuscripts studied.

Codex XXIII (380 pages) contains documents on Patriarchs Anthimos V, Germanos IV (his first term in patriarchal office), Meletios III, Anthimos VI (his first term) and Anthimos IV (his second term). Codex XXIV (350 pages) refers to the final years (from 1844) of the first patriarchal term of Germanos IV, to that of Meletios III, and to the beginning of the patriarchal ministry of Anthimos VI (up to mid-1846). Codices XXV (370 pages) and XXVI (350 pages) consist of material that relates exclusively to the first patriarchal term of Anthimos VI (August 1846 to June 1848). The first documents of codex XXVII (375 pages) relate to the end of his term, and these are followed by material on the second patriarchal term of Anthimos IV (up to 1850). This continues into codex XXVIII (360 pages), the documents of which relate the history of the second patriarchal term of Germanos IV and part of that of Anthimos VI. Codex XXIX (170 pages) contains the enactments, epistles, decrees and tomes of Patriarchs Anthimos IV, Germanos IV, and Anthimos VI during their second term in of patriarchal office. It also contains various official documents concerning the Patriarchs Cyril VII, Joachim II and Sophronios III. Codex XXX (370 pages) contains epistles and letters of Patriarch Anthimos VI but only from September 1853 to May 1855. The remaining epistles are to be found in codex XXXI (130 pages); the second half of this codex contains Patriarch Cyril VI's documents of 1855. The huge codex XXXII (over 500 pages) includes the rich and varied correspondence of Patriarch Cyril VII, part of which constitutes codex XXXIII (530 pages). In this latter codex, one can also find the documents on Joachim II's first term of patriarchal ministry. His correspondence is compiled in codices XXXIV (500 pages) and XXXV (270 pages).

The second series of codices (DCXXXVII–DCXLIII) primarily contains financial documents of the treasury, i.e., the ecclesiastical and civil accounts of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, reflecting mainly the finances and economics of the patriarchate. (Only very few documents in the series relate to the actual ministry of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs as regards civil policy and ecclesiastical administration.) Codex DCXXXVII (up to 140 pages) contains documents pertaining to the financial situation of the patriarchal treasury during the time of Patriarchs Cyril VI, Gregory V, Anthimos III and Chrysanthos. There are also synodal decrees on administration, lists

of the debts to the patriarchate of each diocese, the treasury accounts, and so on. The content of codex DCXXXVIII (250 pages) is similar. Among other items, there are documents from 1821 that witness to the financial poverty of the Great Church of Christ. Codex DCXXXIX (300 pages) primarily contains the patriarchal epistles of the years 1822–1824, which amount to reminders and requests addressed to the diocesan bishops who were in debt to the central ecclesiastical-national treasury. Codex DCXL (340 pages) contains similar documents for the time of Patriarchs Chrysanthos and Agathangelos, as well as memoranda concerning financial undertakings that involved a reform of the treasury administration and the renting out of the stavropegic monasteries. In Codex DCXLI (300 pages) are compiled financial and economic documents of the time of Patriarchs Constantios I, Constantios II and Gregory VI. Codex DCXLII (over 325 pages) contains similar documents belonging to successive patriarchs up until Joachim II. Finally, codex DCXLIII consists of Joachim II's letter to a diocesan bishop about the payment of debt to the patriarchate. Such is the general manuscript content of the thirty-five official codices that we examined in the patriarchal archive of Constantinople.

In the course of our research we also studied materials (in manuscript) in the codices of the library of St Panteleimon monastery on Athos. Thus from codex DCCXXI we were able to make use of a copy of Sultan Selim III's letter to Patriarch Gregory V (pp. 86–7), and decrees by the Constantinopolitan Church in 1798 (p. 69) concerning the sovereignty of the patriarch in spiritual matters and the freedom of the Church in its internal life. From the *Αθωνιάς* manuscript (in codex CCLXXXII) we found historical evidence of the conditions on Mount Athos from 1821 to 1855 (pp. 140–1). From codex CCIV we found two prayers, one to the Lord Jesus and the other to the Mother of God, which were read at the time of the Greek uprising. We have added our own comments for clarification.

These manuscripts, then, are the primary sources upon which the first volume of our research is based.

Our research is not, however, confined to these manuscripts alone: we have also drawn on printed sources of the nineteenth century history of the Church of Constantinople.

Of the historical studies constituting the first set of sources, we had at our disposal the church history by Sergios Makraios,¹⁰⁹ and the history of the Church and people by Athanasios Ypsilantis.¹¹⁰ The former completed his work in 1800, the latter in 1789: these years mark the beginning of the period with which our research is concerned. The first book is limited to the ministry of the patriarchs; the author's writing is rather long-winded, tedious and subjective. The other work mainly recounts national events. Nevertheless, because of the lack of comparable material, we have gratefully relied on these studies by Makraios and Ypsilantis, and have availed ourselves of most of the historical and ecclesiastical data in them relating to the end of the eighteenth century. We have also used some historical detail from the work on Hellenic culture by Korais,¹¹¹ from the memoirs of Metropolitan Germanos, one of the activists during the time of the Greek uprising,¹¹² from Geron Kolokotronis's account of those years,¹¹³ and from the description of events in Greece from 1821 onwards compiled by Constantine Oikonomos.¹¹⁴

Moreover, we attribute special significance to the Greek ecclesiastical journal published in Constantinople by Prof. V. Kalliphron from 1867 to 1884 under various titles. In 1867 Kalliphron published *Εκπαιδευτικά και Εκκλησιαστικά* in two parts. In the first (pp. 1–141) he presented historical statistics on schools and education in the Church of Constantinople from 1850 to 1867. The second (pp. 145–276) contains a chronology of

109 Sergios Makraios, *Υπομνήματα ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας* (1750–1800), in K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, Vol. III, Venice, 1872.

110 A. Komninos Ypsilantis, *Εκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν τῶν εἰς δώδεκα βιβλίων Η', Θ' καὶ Ι', ἧτοι Τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν* (1453–1789), ed. Archimandrite Germanos Aphthonidis, Constantinople, 1870.

111 A. Korais, *Υπόμνημα περὶ τῆς παρούσης καταστάσεως τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἐν Ἑλλάδι*, in Thereianos, *Ἀδαμάντιος Κοραΐς*, Vol. III, appendix 4, Trieste, 1890, 47–82.

112 Germanos, Metropolitan of Old Patras, *Απομνημονεύματα*, Athens, 1900.

113 Geron Kolokotronis, *Διήγησις συμβάντων τῆς ἑλληνικῆς φυλῆς*, Vols I–II, Athens, 1889.

114 *Τὰ σωζόμενα ἐκκλησιαστικά συγγράμματα Κωνσταντίνου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ οἰκονόμου τοῦ ἐξ' Οἰκονόμων*, Vol. II: *Τριακονταετηρίς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἡ συνταγματικῆς ἱστορικῆς τῶν ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συμβεβηκότων* (1821–1852), Athens, 1864.

the annals of the Constantinopolitan see from 1852 to 31 December 1866, i.e., from the first term of Patriarch Anthimos VI until the resignation of Patriarch Sophronios III. Prof. Kalliphron has dedicated six volumes of *Εκκλησιαστικά, ἡ Εκκλησιαστικὸν Δελτίον* to the second term of Patriarch Gregory VI (1867–1871), giving a chronological presentation of various official documents: synodal and circular epistles and letters, decisions, *pit-takia* and official papers, regulations of schools, parishes, committees and brotherhoods, official presentations and addresses, accounts, necrologies of departed hierarchs, correspondence with provincial towns, notes on current events.¹¹⁵ He similarly describes the patriarchal ministry of Anthimos VI (1871–1873),¹¹⁶ Joachim II (1873–1878)¹¹⁷ and Joachim III (1878–1884).¹¹⁸ In our research we used as far as was possible and, indeed, necessary, all this valuable information contained in these volumes by Kalliphron, which are so little known to Russian scholarship.

Another important and useful source for the historian of the Greek Church is the Constantinopolitan journal *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Αλήθεια*. It is an official publication of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, founded by Patriarch Joachim III in 1889, and in print ever since. Over a period of twenty-four years, a rich collection of official documents of all sorts, as well as scholarly studies, historical chronologies and annals of noteworthy events have been published in this journal – enough to compile a detailed history of the Patriarchate of Constantinople for the past quarter of a century. We have made every effort to make extensive use of the wealth of this source of church history. We were, however, limited to using only the

115 The full title of the publication is V. D. Kalliphron, *Εκκλησιαστικά, ἡ Εκκλησιαστικὸν Δελτίον, περιέχον τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς παραιτήσεως τοῦ πρώην Κων-πόλεως πατριάρχου κ. Σωφρονίου καὶ ἐφεξῆς ἱστορίαν τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ τῆς Κων-πόλεως θρόνου*, Vols I–VI, Constantinople, 1869–1871.

116 *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Συλλογὴν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς παραιτήσεως τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Γρηγορίου VI ἐκδοθέντων ἐπισήμων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐγγράφων καὶ πράξεων κτλ.*, Period 2, Vols I–VII, Constantinople, 1872–74.

117 *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Εἰσαγωγή κτλ.*, Period 3, Vols I–VII, Constantinople, 1874–79.

118 *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Εἰσαγωγή κτλ.*, Period 4, Vols I–VII, Constantinople, 1880–84.

volumes which were available to us.¹¹⁹ All that has been borrowed from the journal has been indicated in the footnotes. Finally, for our introduction we have consulted *The History of the Patriarchate of Constantinople*¹²⁰ and *A Political History of Constantinople*,¹²¹ and the famous historical research of George Sphrantzis [=Phrantzis],¹²² Matthew Kigalas,¹²³ Metropolitan Meletios of Athens,¹²⁴ Metropolitan Dorotheos of Monemvasia,¹²⁵ Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem,¹²⁶ Kaisarios Dapontis,¹²⁷ Ioannis Stanos¹²⁸ and an extract from the anonymous chronicles of Epirus.¹²⁹

Our second set of sources consisted of the *Lives of the Holy New Martyrs* who suffered in the east from the fall of Byzantium up until the mid-nineteenth century. Documentation of this kind is quite common for, according to the Greek sources, up to three hundred martyrs and saints have been glorified in the east during the period of Turkish rule.¹³⁰ At our disposal were the lives of those Greek saints who are mentioned in the *Great Synaxarion* of Constantine Doukakakis.¹³¹ For our introduction and

- 119 The whole series of *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια* (from 1880) is missing, and could not be found even in the head office of this honourable publication in Constantinople.
- 120 *Πατριαρχική Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ιστορία από τοῦ 1434 ἕως τοῦ 1578 ἔτους Χριστοῦ*, Bonn, 1849 (*Corpus scriptorum byzantinorum*, Vol. XVII).
- 121 *Ιστορία πολιτική Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ τοῦ 1391 ἕως τοῦ 1578 ἔτους Χριστοῦ*, Bonn, 1849 (*Corpus*, Vol. XVII).
- 122 *Χρονικὸν Γεωργίου Φραντζῆ τοῦ πρωτοβεστιαρίου*, Bonn, 1838.
- 123 M. Kigalas, *Νέα σύνοψις διαφόρων ιστοριῶν*, Venice, 1637.
- 124 Meletios, Metropolitan of Athens, *Εκκλησιαστική ιστορία*, Vol. III, Vienna, 1784.
- 125 Dorotheos, Metropolitan of Monemvasia, *Βιβλίον ιστορικὸν περιέχον ἐν συνόψει διαφόρους καὶ ἐξόχους ιστορίας*, Venice, 1781.
- 126 Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, *Ιστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πατριαρχευσάντων*, Bucharest, 1715.
- 127 K. Dapontis, *Χρονογράφος* (Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, III, Venice, 1872).
- 128 I. Stanos, *Βίβλος χρονική, περιέχουσα τὴν ἱστορίαν Βυζαντίδος*, Vol. VI, Venice, 1767.
- 129 *Ἡπειρωτικά, Fragmentum IV, Corpus scriptorum byzantinorum*, XVII, Bonn, 1849.
- 130 *Ελληνισμός, σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν*, 1901, IX, 107. Cf. Sathas, *Κατάλογος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως τῆς Κων-πόλεως μέχρι τοῦ 1811 ἔτους ὑπὲρ τῆς χριστιανικῆς πίστεως μαρτυρησάντων*. *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, III, 605–610.
- 131 K. Doukakakis, *Μέγας Συναξαριστὴς πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν καθ' ἅπαντα τὸν μῆνα ἑορταζομένων*, I–XII, Athens, 1889–96.

our research we have referred to this publication for the lives of the following saints: John of Trebizond (deceased 12 June 1492),¹³² George the Serb (deceased 11 February 1515),¹³³ James the Athonite and his disciples James and Dionysios (deceased 1 November 1520),¹³⁴ John of Ioannina (deceased 18 April 1526),¹³⁵ Theophanis (deceased 8 June 1559),¹³⁶ Dimitrios Tornaras (deceased 19 March 1564),¹³⁷ Luke (deceased 24 April 1564),¹³⁸ John Kalphos (deceased 26 February 1575),¹³⁹ nun Philothea (deceased 19 February 1589),¹⁴⁰ Makarios (deceased 6 October 1590),¹⁴¹ Archbishop Seraphim of the Phanar (deceased 4 December 1601),¹⁴² Ecumenical Patriarch Parthenios III (deceased 24 March 1657),¹⁴³ Patriarch Gabriel II (deceased 3 December 1659),¹⁴⁴ Archbishop Gabriel of Ipek (deceased 13 December 1659),¹⁴⁵ Bishop Zacharias of Corinth (deceased 30 March 1684),¹⁴⁶ Nicholas (deceased 16 May 1617),¹⁴⁷ Theophilos (deceased 24 July 1635),¹⁴⁸ Mark (deceased 14 May 1643),¹⁴⁹ Jordan (deceased 2 February 1650),¹⁵⁰ John (deceased 20 December 1652),¹⁵¹ Hieromonk Athanasios

132 Doukakis, *M.Σ.*, VI, 14–17.

133 *Ibid.*, II, 204–17.

134 *Ibid.*, XI, 21–58.

135 *Ibid.*, IV, 210–20.

136 *Ibid.*, VI, 61–2.

137 *Ibid.*, III, 324.

138 *Ibid.*, IV, 401–2.

139 *Ibid.*, II, 403–4.

140 *Ibid.*, II, 306–29.

141 *Ibid.*, X, 90–4.

142 *Ibid.*, XII, 120–6.

143 *Ibid.*, III, 405–7.

144 *Ibid.*, XII, 88–9.

145 *Ibid.*, XII, 341–2.

146 *Ibid.*, III, 486.

147 *Ibid.*, V, 309–12.

148 *Ibid.*, VII, 350–5.

149 *Ibid.*, V, 254–6.

150 *Ibid.*, II, 66–7.

151 *Ibid.*, XII, 498–9.

(deceased 29 October 1653),¹⁵² Symeon (deceased 14 August 1653),¹⁵³ John Koulikos (deceased 8 April 1654),¹⁵⁴ Anastasia (deceased 1 February 1655),¹⁵⁵ Dimitrios (deceased 2 June 1657),¹⁵⁶ Nicholas Karamanis (deceased 6 December 1657),¹⁵⁷ John (deceased 12 May 1662),¹⁵⁸ John Navkliros (deceased 8 April 1669),¹⁵⁹ Athanasios (deceased 24 July 1670),¹⁶⁰ Nicholas (deceased 23 September 1672),¹⁶¹ monks Gabriel (deceased 2 February 1676)¹⁶² and Cyprian (deceased 5 July 1679),¹⁶³ Triantaphyllos (deceased 8 August 1680),¹⁶⁴ Stamatis (deceased 16 August 1680),¹⁶⁵ Angel (deceased 1 September 1680),¹⁶⁶ Athonite monk Damaskinos (deceased 13 November 1681),¹⁶⁷ Paul the Russian (deceased 3 April 1683),¹⁶⁸ Athonite monk Elias Ardounis (deceased 31 January 1686),¹⁶⁹ Joseph (deceased 4 February 1686),¹⁷⁰ Apostolos (deceased 16 August 1686),¹⁷¹ George of Mytilene (deceased 14 February 1693),¹⁷² Hieromonk Romanos (deceased 6 January 1695),¹⁷³ Athanasios (deceased 7 January 1700),¹⁷⁴ Avxentios (deceased 25

152 *Ibid.*, X, 490.

153 *Ibid.*, VIII, 191–2.

154 *Ibid.*, IV, 107.

155 *Ibid.*, II, 23–4.

156 *Ibid.*, VI, 17–21.

157 *Ibid.*, XII, 191–2.

158 *Ibid.*, V, 210–11.

159 *Ibid.*, IV, 106–7.

160 *Ibid.*, VII, 355–66.

161 *Ibid.*, IX, 291–6.

162 *Ibid.*, II, 67–9.

163 *Ibid.*, VII, 73–9.

164 *Ibid.*, VIII, 143–4.

165 *Ibid.*, VIII, 246–8.

166 *Ibid.*, IX, 31–6.

167 *Ibid.*, XI, 351–5.

168 *Ibid.*, IV, 55–8.

169 *Ibid.*, I, 675–7.

170 *Ibid.*, II, 76–7.

171 *Ibid.*, VIII, 251–9.

172 *Ibid.*, II, 254.

173 *Ibid.*, I, 148.

174 *Ibid.*, I, 155.

January 1720),¹⁷⁵ Athonite monk Nikodimos (deceased 11 July 1722),¹⁷⁶ Argyra (deceased 30 April 1725),¹⁷⁷ Sava Nigdelis (deceased 12 November 1726),¹⁷⁸ Akakios the New (deceased 12 April 1730),¹⁷⁹ Athonite monk Pachomios the Russian (deceased 21 May 1730),¹⁸⁰ Nikitas (deceased 21 June 1732),¹⁸¹ Hieromonk Anastasios (deceased 8 July 1743),¹⁸² Christos (deceased 12 February 1748),¹⁸³ Kyrianna (deceased 28 February 1751),¹⁸⁴ George (deceased 25 April 1752),¹⁸⁵ Nicholas (deceased 31 October 1754),¹⁸⁶ Dimas (deceased 10 April 1763),¹⁸⁷ Akylina (deceased 27 September 1764),¹⁸⁸ Michael of Athens (deceased 30 June 1770),¹⁸⁹ Athonite Hieromonk Damaskinos (deceased 16 January 1771),¹⁹⁰ John (deceased 21 October 1773),¹⁹¹ Anthony (deceased 5 February 1774),¹⁹² Athanasios (deceased 8 September 1774),¹⁹³ Christodoulos (deceased 26 July 1777),¹⁹⁴ Kosmas Equal-to-the-Apostles (deceased 4 August 1779),¹⁹⁵ Zacharias (deceased 20 January 1782),¹⁹⁶ Theodore of Mytilene (deceased 30 January 1784),¹⁹⁷ Manuel

175 *Ibid.*, I, 574–7.

176 *Ibid.*, VII, 176–8.

177 *Ibid.*, IV, 463–5.

178 *Ibid.*, XI, 304.

179 *Ibid.*, IV, 128–38.

180 *Ibid.*, V, 394–8.

181 *Ibid.*, VI, 250–7.

182 *Ibid.*, VII, 111–13.

183 *Ibid.*, II, 224–5.

184 *Ibid.*, II, 412–16.

185 *Ibid.*, IV, 387–9.

186 *Ibid.*, X, 515–24.

187 *Ibid.*, IV, 112–15.

188 *Ibid.*, IX, 369–72.

189 *Ibid.*, VI, 298–400.

190 *Ibid.*, I, 273–5.

191 *Ibid.*, X, 372–7.

192 *Ibid.*, II, 88–92.

193 *Ibid.*, IX, 116–18.

194 *Ibid.*, VII, 428–31.

195 *Ibid.*, VIII, 55–63.

196 *Ibid.*, I, 465–70.

197 *Ibid.*, I, 660–2.

(deceased 15 March 1792),¹⁹⁸ Dimitrios (deceased 27 January 1784),¹⁹⁹ John (deceased 5 March 1784),²⁰⁰ Myron (deceased 20 March 1793),²⁰¹ Alexander the Dervish (deceased 26 May 1794),²⁰² Mitros (deceased 28 May 1794),²⁰³ Anastasios (deceased 8 August 1794),²⁰⁴ Polydoros (deceased 3 September 1794),²⁰⁵ George (deceased 2 October 1794),²⁰⁶ Theodore (deceased 17 February 1795),²⁰⁷ Zlata-Chrysa (deceased 13 October 1795),²⁰⁸ Nicholas (deceased 24 April 1796),²⁰⁹ Constantine (deceased 14 November 1800),²¹⁰ George (deceased 5 April 1801),²¹¹ Mark (deceased 5 June 1801),²¹² Dimitrios (deceased 29 January 1802),²¹³ Luke (deceased 25 March 1802),²¹⁴ Lazaros (deceased 23 April 1802),²¹⁵ John (deceased 14 May 1802),²¹⁶ Hieromonk Zacharias (deceased 28 May 1802),²¹⁷ John or Nanas (deceased 29 May 1802),²¹⁸ Dimitrios (deceased 14 April 1803),²¹⁹ Argyros (deceased 11 May 1806),²²⁰ George (deceased 26 November 1807),²²¹ Prokopios (deceased 25

198 *Ibid.*, III, 256–9.

199 *Ibid.*, I, 605–6.

200 *Ibid.*, III, 89.

201 *Ibid.*, III, 328–9.

202 *Ibid.*, V, 464–9.

203 *Ibid.*, V, 493–6.

204 *Ibid.*, VIII, 141–3.

205 *Ibid.*, IX, 61–9.

206 *Ibid.*, X, 30–2.

207 *Ibid.*, II, 285–97.

208 *Ibid.*, X, 170–3.

209 *Ibid.*, IV, 402–5.

210 *Ibid.*, XI, 363–77.

211 *Ibid.*, IV, 76–80.

212 *Ibid.*, VI, 30–51.

213 *Ibid.*, I, 626–36.

214 *Ibid.*, III, 376–97.

215 *Ibid.*, IV, 389–97.

216 *Ibid.*, V, 256–60.

217 *Ibid.*, V, 472–9.

218 *Ibid.*, V, 499–513.

219 *Ibid.*, IV, 148–56.

220 *Ibid.*, V, 162–5.

221 *Ibid.*, XI, 581–9.

June 1810),²²² John (deceased 15 September 1811),²²³ Evthymios (deceased 22 March 1814),²²⁴ John (deceased 23 September 1814),²²⁵ Ignatios (deceased 8 October 1814),²²⁶ Akakios (deceased 1 May 1814),²²⁷ Onouphrios (deceased 4 January 1818),²²⁸ Paul (deceased 22 May 1818),²²⁹ Nektarios (deceased 11 July 1820),²³⁰ Angel, Manuel, George and Nicholas of Crete (deceased 28 October 1824)²³¹ and George the New (deceased 17 January 1838).²³²

Furthermore, we have made use of Gerasimos Loukakis's *New Martyrologion*, from which we have used the lives of the holy martyrs monk Hilarion (deceased 20 September 1804)²³³ and Constantine (deceased 2 June 1819).²³⁴ From the *Athonite Paterikon* we have used the lives of the following saints: monk Romanos (deceased 16 February 1808),²³⁵ Hieromonk Nikitas (deceased 4 April 1808),²³⁶ Gedeon (deceased 30 December 1818),²³⁷ Agathangelos (deceased 19 April 1819)²³⁸ and Timothy Esphigmeniotis (deceased 29 October 1820).²³⁹ In the book by priest Peter Solovyov we

222 *Ibid.*, VI, 310–15.

223 *Ibid.*, IX, 238–41.

224 *Ibid.*, III, 340–67.

225 *Ibid.*, IX, 297–300.

226 *Ibid.*, X, appendix, 33–41.

227 *Ibid.*, V, 19–30.

228 *Ibid.*, I, 682–9.

229 *Ibid.*, V, 406–10.

230 *Ibid.*, VII, 178–92.

231 *Ibid.*, X, 464–7.

232 *Ibid.*, III, 494–501.

233 Hieromonk Gerasimos Loukakis, *Νέον Μαρτυρολόγιον, ἥτοι Βίοι νέων ἁγίων μαρτύρων*, Athens, 1895, 6–7.

234 *Ibid.*, 75–8.

235 *Афонский Патерик или жизнеописание святых на св. Афонской Горе просиявших (Athonite Paterikon or The Lives of the Glorious Saints of Holy Mount Athos)*, I, 7th edition, Moscow, 1897, 251–3.

236 *Ibid.*, 305–16.

237 *Ibid.*, II, 453–7.

238 *Ibid.*, I, 371–92.

239 *Ibid.*, II, 313–22.

consulted the lives of Sts Panagiotis of Caesarea (deceased 1785),²⁴⁰ George of Mytilene (deceased 1770),²⁴¹ Michael (deceased 1772)²⁴² and Anastasios (deceased 1777).²⁴³ Also, the autobiography of Bishop Sophronios of Vrachia (1739–1810) is of great interest.²⁴⁴ Finally, Anthony Georgiou has published a life of St Panteleimon (deceased 14 November 1848), known to us as the most recent of the new Christian martyrs, and also a church service in his honour.²⁴⁵

We have thus had at our disposal over a hundred of the holy new martyrs' lives, and we have used them as a historical source. They also assisted us in imagining the conditions Christians were living in under Turkish rule, their sufferings and afflictions, as well as their moral dignity and fortitude, the power of their faith, the depth of their confessional identity, and the unshakable adherence to the holy Orthodox Church on the part of the afflicted and persecuted *dhimmis*. For the sake of Christ, these people suffered great hardship, confinement, hunger, nakedness, and for His sake they were being slaughtered "all the day long". As far as we are aware, the lives of these new martyrs who suffered at the hands of the Turks following the fall of Byzantium have never before been used as a historical source by scholars.

The third set of printed sources consists of documents concerning ecclesiastical and civil rights. On the one hand there are nineteenth-century canonical decisions by the Church of Constantinople, patriarchal and synodal epistles, tomes, enactments and decrees, as well as the rules

240 P. Solovyov, *Христианские мученики, пострадавшие на востоке со времени завоевания Константинополя турками* (*Christian Martyrs who Suffered in the East from the Time of the Turkish Invasion of Constantinople*), St Petersburg, 1862, 194.

241 *Ibid.*, 197–9.

242 *Ibid.*, 199–200.

243 *Ibid.*, 217.

244 *Жизнь и страдания грешного Софрония* (*The Life and Sufferings of Sophronios the Sinner*), transl. from Bulgarian, *Славянский Сборник* (*Slavonic Collection*), II, appendix 4, St Petersburg, 1877, 5–26.

245 A. Georgiou, *Ασματική ακολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου νεομάρτυρος Παντελεήμονος*, Athens, 1892.

of various ecclesiastical bodies such as patriarchal commissions and parochial communities. On the other hand there is Turkish legislation on the Church and Christians. As far as ecclesiastical rights are concerned, there is the famous publication of M. Gedeon, containing official documents written by various patriarchs: Neophytos VII (one document), Kallinikos V (3), Gregory V (19), Jeremias IV (6), Cyril VI (2), Anthimos III (3), Agathangelos (5), Constantios I (5), Gregory VI (32), Anthimos V (1), Germanos IV (two), Meletios III (1), Anthimos VI (1), Sophronios III (1), Dionysios V (1).²⁴⁶ An excellent sequel to Gedeon's publication is the anthology of church documents published by John Stavridis.²⁴⁷ His volume subsumes the patriarchal and synodal epistles under the patriarchal edicts and commendations of the supreme chancellor (101 items altogether) that were published from the time of Patriarch Sophronios III (1863) up until 1900, and which feature various aspects of the ecclesiastical and social life of Christians. Stavridis's work is useful in that his concise edition includes all the canonical documents that are to be found separately throughout the publications of Kalliphron and *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*. His presentation of the canonical content of these periodicals is, however, incomplete, and any scholar of the history of the Ecumenical Throne must therefore refer to each of these three sources. We also had private documents at our disposal. For example, the history of Patriarch Gregory V's three terms of office is contained in Angelopoulos's collection of documents, and it features the political, social and ecclesiastical work of the great patriarch.²⁴⁸ Archimandrite Kallinikos Delikanis, the head of the patriarchal archive in Constantinople, has also published a series of official patriarchal documents from the archive codices in which is reflected the history of Mount

246 Manuel I. Gedeon, ed., *Κανονικαὶ διατάξεις, ἐπιστολαί, λύσεις, θεσπίσματα τῶν ἀγιωτάτων πατριαρχῶν Κων-πόλεως κτλ.*, Vol. I, Constantinople, 1888, 302–80, 391–2, 399–407, 410–18; Vol. II, Constantinople, 1889, 81–363, 464–5.

247 *Σύλλογὴ πατριαρχικῶν καὶ συνοδικῶν ἐγκυκλίων, πατριαρχικῶν ἀποδείξεων καὶ ἐγκυκλίων τῆς μεγάλῃς πρωτοσυγκελίας ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου Σταυρίδου*, Constantinople, 1900.

248 Angelopoulos, *Τὰ κατὰ τὸν πατριάρχην Κων-πόλεως Γρηγόριον τὸν Ε΄*, Vol. I, 53–285; Vol. II, 455–519.

Athos during the Turkish period.²⁴⁹ Other documents concerning Russian monasticism on Mount Athos have been published by the Monastery of St Panteleimon in two special editions.²⁵⁰

The history of the dispute between the patriarchate and the Porte during the time of Joachim III²⁵¹ and Dionysios V over the ancient privileges of the Greek Church and people is presented in two separate editions of official documents addressing issues of contemporary importance.²⁵² The documents concerned are to be found in the publications of Ralli and Potli,²⁵³ Miklosich and Müller,²⁵⁴ Blancard²⁵⁵ and in the above-mentioned works of Gedeon, Chamoudopoulos, G. Papadopoulos, priest Evgenios, Georgiadis, Mystakidis, Elevationis, Kyriakidis, *hierodidaskalos* Nicephoros, Prof. Gregory Photeinos, Karydonis, Paranikas, as well as

- 249 Archimandrite Kallinikos Delikanis, *Περιγραφικός κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ ἀρχιεποφυλακείου σωζομένων ἐπισήμων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐγγράφων περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀθῶ μονῶν (1630–1863), Καταρτισθεὶς κελεύσει τῆς Α.Θ. Π. Τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου Ἰωακείμ τοῦ Γ', Constantinople, 1902.*
- 250 *Акты русского на св. Афоне монастыря св. великомученика и целителя Пантелеимона (The Acts of St Panteleimon on Mt Athos)*, Kiev, 1873; Philalithis, *Περὶ τοῦ ζητήματος τῆς ἐν Ἀθῶ ἱεράς μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Παντελεήμονος*, Constantinople, 1874.
- 251 *Τὰ κατὰ τὸ ζήτημα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν προνομίων ἀπὸ τῆς 19 Φεβρουαρίου 1883 μέχρι τῆς ἐπιβραβεύσεως τοῦ ἀρχαίου καθεστώτος*, Constantinople, 1884.
- 252 *Εγγράφα μεταξὺ τῆς ὑψηλῆς Πύλης καὶ τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριαρχείου, ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὴν λύσιν τῶν δύο ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ζητημάτων τοῦ τε προνομιακοῦ καὶ τοῦ βουλγαρικοῦ (ἀπὸ 22 Ἰουνίου 1890 μέχρι 31 Ἰανουρίου 1891)*, Trieste, 1891.
- 253 The 1849 circular by Patriarch Anthimos IV about oath-taking is to be found in G. A. Ralli and M. Potli, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, Vol. V, Athens, 1855, 617–27.
- 254 F. Miklosich and J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, Vol. V, Vienna, 1887: the three official documents (1803) of Patriarch Gregory V and one of Sultan Selim III; Vol. VI, Vienna, 1890: the two official documents of Gregory V, one of Kallinikos V and one of Germanos IV, that was given to the Monastery of St John the Theologian on Patmos.
- 255 Théodore Blancard, *Les Mavroyéni. Essai d'étude additionnelle à l'histoire moderne de la Grèce, de la Turquie et de la Roumanie*, Paris. In the appendix to this interesting “essay” there are the manuscripts of the documents about the history of the Mavrogenis’ family from the Phanar.

other Greek authors who are well accustomed to backing up their research with substantial evidence. In the magazine *Μέλισσα* (1820) we discovered a noteworthy circular by Patriarch Gregory V (dated 1819) concerning national education and learning.²⁵⁶

We have also included various canons in our scientific methodology. Firstly, the general regulations (1858–1860) concerning administration in the Church of Constantinople. From amongst these canons we offer our own translation of the guidelines issued by the Porte which were sent to the patriarch in 1857, and dealt with the organisation of the council for reform, the regulation of its activity, its election and appointment of patriarchs, the organisation of the Holy Synod and mixed lay council; and of extracts concerning the expenses of the patriarch and the election of hierarchs.²⁵⁷ We also offer a translation of the regulations of the central patriarchal church commission published by order of Patriarch Constantine V.²⁵⁸ We also present the following in our research: the first rules of the central spiritual committee published in 1836 by Patriarch Gregory VI;²⁵⁹ the canons of the central ecclesiastical committee established by Gregory VI in 1868²⁶⁰ and Joachim II in 1874;²⁶¹ the canons of the patriarchal central educational committee published in 1873 in the time of Patriarch Anthimos VI²⁶² and in 1892 by Patriarch Neophytos VIII;²⁶³ the general regulations for public schools

256 “Πατριαρχικὸν γράμμα περὶ τῶν σχολείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος”, *Μέλισσα*, ἡ ἐφημερίς ἑλληνική, τετράδιον Β, Paris, 1820, 219–39.

257 *Γενικοὶ κανονισμοὶ περὶ διευθετήσεως τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ ἐθνικῶν πραγμάτων τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οἰκουμενικὸν θρόνον διατελούντων ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν ὑπηκόων τοῦ σουλτάνου*, Constantinople, 1900, i–xv, 1–9, 13–14, 17–18, 20, 25–55, 61–2.

258 *Κανονισμὸς τῆς πατριαρχικῆς κεντρικῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἐπιτροπῆς*, Constantinople, 1898.

259 *Εὐαγγελικὴ Σάλπιγξ*, σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν ὑπὸ Γερμανοῦ ἱεροκλήρυκος, Vol. I, Athens, 1836, 69–87.

260 *Κανονισμὸς τῆς κεντρικῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἐπιτροπῆς*. Kalliphron, *Εκκλησιαστικά*, Period 1, III, 113–19.

261 *Κανονισμὸς κτλ.* Kalliphron, *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἐπιθεώρησις*, Period 3, I, 115–25.

262 *Κανονισμὸς τῆς πατριαρχικῆς κεντρικῆς ἐκπαιδευτικῆς ἐπιτροπῆς ἐν Κων-πόλει*, Constantinople, 1873.

263 *Κανονισμὸς κτλ.*, *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, 1892, 37, 295–6.

in the archbishopric of Constantinople published in 1897 at the time of Patriarch Constantine V;²⁶⁴ the regulations of the committee for the property of hierarchs, introduced by Patriarch Joachim II in December 1873;²⁶⁵ the general regulations of the committees for the Holy Church and the educational establishments of Constantinople published in 1864 by Patriarch Sophronios III;²⁶⁶ the general rules of the Holy Church in Constantinople published in 1868 at the time of Gregory VI;²⁶⁷ the regulations on *mukhtars* in the Constantinopolitan parishes published by Patriarch Joachim III in 1880;²⁶⁸ the first general rules of the parish clergy, established by the same patriarch in 1881;²⁶⁹ the election regulations for the parishes of the Constantinopolitan archbishopric, endorsed by Patriarch Neophytos VIII in 1892;²⁷⁰ the rules of the parishes of the Constantinopolitan archdiocese, published in 1899 by Patriarch Constantine V;²⁷¹ the regulations for the treasury of the clergy in Constantinopolitan archdiocese, published in 1897 at the time of Patriarch Constantine V;²⁷² and also his rules for the sacristans of the Constantinopolitan archdiocese, published in 1899.²⁷³ Finally we had in mind the five regulations (1845, 1853, 1857, 1867, and

264 *Γενικός κανονισμός των κοινοτικών σχολών τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κων-πόλεως*, Constantinople, 1897.

265 *Κανονισμός τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχιερατικῶν περιουσιῶν ἐπιτροπῆς*. Kalliphron, Period 3, I, 97–101.

266 *Γενικός κανονισμός των ἐπιτροπῶν τῶν ἐν Κων-πόλει ἱερῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκπαιδευτικῶν καδιδρυμάτων*, Constantinople, 1864.

267 *Γενικός κανονισμός των ἐν Κων-πόλει ἱερῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*. Kalliphron, Period 1, III, 75–9.

268 *Κανονισμός των μουχταρήδων τῶν ἐνοριῶν Κων-πόλεως*, Constantinople, 1880.

269 *Α' Κανονισμός περὶ τοῦ ἐνοριακοῦ ἱεροῦ κλήρου, τοῦ ὑπὸ τὴν ἄμεσον δικαιοδοσίαν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κων-πόλεως*, Kalliphron, Period 4, III, 52–63.

270 *Εκλογικός κανονισμός των ἐνοριῶν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κων-πόλεως*, *Εκκλ. Αλήθεια*, 1892, 40, 322–4.

271 *Κανονισμός των ἐνοριῶν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κων-πόλεως*, Constantinople, 1899.

272 *Κανονισμός ἱερατικοῦ ταμείου τοῦ ἱεροῦ κλήρου τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κων-πόλεως*, Constantinople, 1897.

273 *Κανονισμός των ἐν τῇ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ Κων-πόλεως νεωκόρων*, Constantinople, 1899.

1874) of the theological school on the isle of Halki;²⁷⁴ the two statutes (1875 and 1887) of the Constantinopolitan theological school;²⁷⁵ the “statute of mutual schools and of the Greek schools within the Patriarchate of Constantinople”, published in 1846 at the time of Patriarch Anthimos VI;²⁷⁶ the statute of Greek Orthodox schools, published in 1856 during the reign of Patriarch Cyril VII;²⁷⁷ the regulations of the mercantile school on the isle of Halki (1851);²⁷⁸ the statute of the Great School of the Nation of Constantinople (1889);²⁷⁹ the educational programme for both boys’ and girls’ city schools in the archdiocese of Constantinople, endorsed by Patriarch Constantine V in 1897;²⁸⁰ the regulations of the national hospital for the Orthodox in Constantinople, published in 1864;²⁸¹ the regulations of the national charitable foundations in Constantinople published in 1887;²⁸² the regulations for clerks of the patriarchal offices (1863);²⁸³ the pension regulations for lay employees of the Ecumenical Patriarchate

274 *Κανονισμός τῆς ἐν Χάλκῃ θεολογικῆς σχολῆς τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας*, Constantinople, 1845–74.

275 *Κανονισμός τῆς ἐν Κων-πόλει ἱερατικῆς σχολῆς*, Constantinople, 1875; *Κανονισμός τῆς ἐν Κων-πόλει πατριαρχικῆς κεντρικῆς ἱερατικῆς σχολῆς*, Constantinople, 1887.

276 *Κανονισμός τῶν ἀλληλοδιδασκτικῶν καὶ ἐλληνικῶν σχολείων κτλ.*, Constantinople, 1846.

277 *Κανονισμός τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐλληνικῶν σχολείων*. Kalliphron, *Εκπαιδευτικά*, Constantinople, 1867, 22–33.

278 *Ἐσωτερικός διοργανισμός τῆς ἐν Χάλκῃ ἐλληνοεμπορικῆς σχολῆς, συντεθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεολογοδιδασκάλου Ἀνθίμου Μαζαράκη*, Constantinople, 1857.

279 *Κανονισμός τῆς ἐν Κων-πόλει πατριαρχικῆς μεγάλης τοῦ γένους σχολῆς*, Constantinople, 1839.

280 *Ἀναλυτικὸν πρόγραμμα τῶν ἀστικῶν σχολῶν τῶν ἀρρένων καὶ τῶν θηλέων τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Κων-πόλεως*, Constantinople, 1897.

281 *Κανονισμός τοῦ ἐν Κων-πόλει ἐθνικοῦ νοσοκομείου τῶν ὀρθοδόξων*, Constantinople, 1864.

282 *Κανονισμός τῶν ἐν Κων-πόλει ἐθνικῶν φιλανθρωπικῶν καταστημάτων*, Constantinople, 1887.

283 *Κανονισμός τῆς ἐσωτερικῆς ὑπηρεσίας τῶν ἐν τοῖς πατριαρχείοις γραφείων*, Constantinople, 1863.

(1889);²⁸⁴ the regulations for specific schools, educational committees and charity foundations – both in the country and in the cities.²⁸⁵

As far as the documents on civil rights are concerned, we studied those on the current Turkish laws in the edition by Dimitrios Nikolaidis,²⁸⁶ from which we have quoted the following documents and laws: the *berat* (letter from the sultan granting religious privileges) to Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim II in 1869 from Sultan Abdulmecid;²⁸⁷ the *hatti sherif* (signed order of the religious leader) of Gulkhane, issued by the same sultan in 1839,²⁸⁸ together with the corresponding *firman* or edict of the sultan;²⁸⁹ the *hatti humayun* (signed order of the sultan) of Abdulmecid (1856);²⁹⁰ the *hatti* (signed order) of Sultan Abdulaziz, published in June 1861;²⁹¹ the

284 *Κανονισμός περί τῆς συντάξεως τῶν λαϊκῶν ὑπαλλήλων τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριαρχείου*, Constantinople, 1889.

285 For example the rules and programmes of the gymnasium of Zografou and other public schools in the Constantinopolitan parish Stavrodromi (1896), the institute of Zografou in Neochorion (1892) and the institute of Zappeion (1885), the regulations of the Hellenic humanities society in Constantinople, established in 1861 (1886), the missionary brotherhood in Triglia (1899), the Greek hospital of St Charalambos in Smyrna (1895), the local missionary brotherhood of the Holy Unmercenary Physicians (1901), the rules of the various societies in the capital city, printed in the edition of Kalliphron.

286 D. Nikolaidis, *Οθωμανικοί κώδικες ἤτοι συλλογὴ ἀπάντων τῶν νόμων τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς αὐτοκρατορίας διαταγμάτων, κανονισμῶν, ὁδηγῶν καὶ ἐγκυκλίων*, I–IV, Constantinople, 1889–91.

287 Nikolaidis, *Πατριαρχικὸν βεράτιον, δοθέν εἰς τὸν πατριάρχην Ἰωακείμ, μετὰ τὴν ἀναγνώρισιν τοῦ κανονισμοῦ τῆς ἐθνοσυνελεύσεως*, III, 2739–49. We offer our own translation of the *berat*.

288 Nikolaidis, *Αὐτοκρατορικὸν διάταγμα, ἀναγνωσθὲν ἐν Γκιουλχανέ*, III, 2849–54. We offer our own translation.

289 Nikolaidis, *Αὐτοκρατορικὸν φερμάνιον, συνοδεῦσαν τὴν ἀποστολὴν τοῦ νέου τούτου θεσμοῦ εἰς ὅλους τοὺς διοικητάς*, III, 2854–7. We offer our own translation of the document.

290 Nikolaidis, *Υψηλὸν φερμάνιον, ἀπευθυνόμενον εἰς τὸν πρωθυπουργόν, ἐκδοθὲν περὶ τῶν μεταρρυθμίσεων καὶ κεκοσμημένον ἄνωθεν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοκρατορικοῦ χαττίου*, III, 2858–66. We offer our own translation.

291 Nikolaidis, *Αὐτοκρατορικὸν χάττι, ἐκδοθὲν μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου ἀνάβασιν καὶ ἀπευθυνόμενον πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλὸν πρωθυπουργεῖον*, III, 2879–83. We offer our own translation.

address of the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Rushdi Pasha, delivered in May 1867 to the great nations' ambassadors to Constantinople, in which he accounted for the implementation of *hatti humayun* of 1856;²⁹² the two laws of 1868 and 1870 on the state council of Turkey;²⁹³ the laws of 1864 and 1870;²⁹⁴ the instructions of 1872 and 1876 concerning the administration of the magistracy;²⁹⁵ the laws of 1876 on the administration of the communities in villages²⁹⁶ and cities;²⁹⁷ the tax laws passed by sultans Abdulaziz and Abdulhamid II;²⁹⁸ the law on the duties of the Ministry of Justice and Confessions (1878);²⁹⁹ the orders concerning the state census whereby the births, marriages and deaths of Christians in the empire would be registered;³⁰⁰ the legislation of the Ministry of the Interior (1881), on

- 292 Nikolaidis, *Υπόμνημα τῆς α.ὑ. τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξωτερικῶν ὑπουργοῦ τῆς ὑψ. Πύλης πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Κων-πόλει ἀντιπροσώπους τῶν μ. δυνάμεων περὶ τῆς ἐφαρμογῆς τοῦ χάττι-χουμαγιού*, III, 2866–78.
- 293 Nikolaidis, *Θεμελιώδης κανονισμὸς τοῦ συμβουλίου τοῦ κράτους. Ἐσωτερικὸς κανονισμὸς τοῦ συμβουλίου τοῦ κράτους*, III, 2892–911.
- 294 Nikolaidis, *Νόμος περὶ συστάσεως νομαρχιῶν. Νόμος περὶ τῆς γενικῆς διοικήσεως τῶν νομῶν*, III, 2911–72.
- 295 Nikolaidis, *Οδηγίαι ἐπεξηγηματικαὶ περὶ τοῦ βιλαετίου νόμου. Οδηγίαι περὶ τῆς γενικῆς διοικήσεως τῶν νομῶν*, III, 2972–3001.
- 296 Nikolaidis, *Νόμος περὶ τῆς διοικήσεως τῶν δήμων (ναχηγέ)*, III, 3001–7.
- 297 Nikolaidis, *Νόμος περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς νομαρχίαις δημαρχιῶν. Νόμος περὶ τῆς δημαρχίας Κων-πόλεως*, III, 3071–115.
- 298 Nikolaidis, *Εἰδικὸς νόμος (1861) περὶ τῶν οἰκονομικῶν*, IV, 3751–74); *Νόμος (1861) περὶ τῶν ἐκτελεστῶν πράξεων κατὰ τὴν διανομὴν τῶν ὀρισμένων φόρων μεταξὺ τῶν κατοίκων τῶν ἐν ταῖς νομαρχίαις καὶ διοικήσεσι χωρίων καὶ συνοικιῶν*, IV, 3775–9; *Οδηγίαι (1869) ἀφορῶσαι εἰς τὰ ἐφαρμοστέα μέτρα κατὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς νομοῖς διεξαγωγὴν τῆς διανομῆς καὶ εἰσπράξεως τῶν νενομισμένων τοῦ β. ταμείου ἀμέσων καὶ στρατιωτικῶν φόρων*, IV, 3780–7; *Αὐτοκρατορικὸν διάταγμα (1875) περὶ τῶν ἐσωτερικῶν μεταρρυθμίσεων ἀπευθυνθὲν πρὸς τὸν ὑψηλὸν πρωθυπουργόν*, III, 2884–92; *Νόμος (1885) περὶ εἰσπράξεως φόρων*, IV, 3829–40; *Νόμος (1877) περὶ δεκάτων*, IV, 3920–54; *Ἀπόφαισις τοῦ ὑπουργικοῦ συμβουλίου ἐπικυρωθεῖσα (1877) δι' αὐτοκρατορικοῦ διατάγματος περὶ τοῦ στρατοῦ νόμου*, IV, 3748–50.
- 299 Nikolaidis, *Κανονισμὸς περὶ τῶν καθηκόντων τοῦ ὑπουργείου τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ὀργανισμῶν κτλ.*, III, 2157–66.
- 300 Nikolaidis, *Νόμος περὶ τοῦ μητρώου πληθυσμοῦ*, IV, 3667–82; *Ἀπόφαισις περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰς δημαρχίας τῆς Κων-πόλεως ἐγγραφῆς τῶν γάμων, τῶν γεννήσεων καὶ τῶν ἀποβιώσεων*, IV, 3665–6.

the building of Christian churches, schools, charitable institutions and so on.³⁰¹ In this collection are also codices concerning civil and criminal law; the laws governing *vakufs*, passports, commercial and industrial concerns, and so on.³⁰² M. Karavokyros has compiled a useful index for the codex of the Turkish law.³⁰³ In it we found, among other things, the ancient type of patriarchal *berat*.

Our fourth and final group of sources consisted of the letters of certain figures active during the epoch. Rich historical material is contained in many of the letters of the famous Greek scholar Adamantios Korais (deceased 1833),³⁰⁴ and this was used to indicate the civil and social status of Christians in Turkey at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. In addition, there were letters written by Patriarch Gregory V concerning Mount Athos which had been translated into Russian and published.³⁰⁵ Finally, we had at our disposal a letter of Prince Mustafa Fazil Pasha addressed to Sultan Abdulaziz.³⁰⁶

Guided by the sources we have already mentioned, as well as by some of lesser importance, we undertook the task of compiling an international and domestic history of the Church of Constantinople in the nineteenth century. It is full of lively and interesting aspects, such as its relationship with the Turkish government, and its internal life including the formulation

301 Nikolaidis, *Εγκύκλιος τοῦ ὑπουργείου τῶν ἐσωτερικῶν περὶ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς ἐφαρμογῆς τῶν διατάξεων τοῦ ὑψηλοῦ φερμανίου τῶν μεταρρυθμίσεων, ἀφορῶσα εἰς ἀνέγερσιν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ λοιπῶν*, III, 2841–2.

302 Nikolaidis, *Αστικός κώδὲξ βιβλία 1–16*, I; *Νόμοι, ἐγκύκλιοι καὶ λοιπὰ σχετικὰ πρὸς τὰς διατάξεις τῶν βιβλίων τοῦ Αστικοῦ κώδικος*, II; *Ποινικὸς νόμος, δικονομία κτλ.*, III.

303 M. Karavokyros, *Κλεῖς τῆς συνήθους ὀθωμανικῆς νομοθεσίας*, Constantinople, 1882.

304 N. Damalas, *Επιστολαὶ Ἀδαμαντίου Κοραΐ*, I–III, Athens, 1885–86. We read the anthology of Korais's wonderful letters with great interest. They are surely of significance to many besides historians. They are splendidly written in the popular literary language.

305 *Тринадцатъ писемъ патриарха Григорія V и одно къ патриарху Григорію, сообщены о. Азаріемъ* (*Thirteen Letters of Patriarch Gregory V and One Letter to Patriarch Gregory, as transmitted by Fr Azary*), Kiev, 1876.

306 *Επιστολὴ διευθυνθεῖσα πρὸς τὴν α.μ. τὸν σουλτάνον παρὰ τῆς α. ὑψ. Πρίγκιπος Μουσταφᾶ Φαζίλ πασσᾶ* (there is no indication of the place or date of publication).

of new administrative regulations. The present volume is a presentation of the first half of our accomplished task, and it is organised according to the following plan:

In our Introduction we discuss the condition of the Church of Constantinople in Turkey from the mid-fifteenth century until the end of the eighteenth century (1453–1789), i.e., from the fall of Byzantium to the enthronement of Selim III, the first sultan of the Tanzimat Dynasty. We used sources that are already well-known to Russian scholars of the subject, and we have therefore related facts that had previously been made known by others. We have, however, presented the old material and facts in a new light and in a way that differs from that of our predecessors. We have filled in certain gaps with new material such as the *Lives of the Holy New Martyrs*, which have never been used before.

Part I of our research concentrates on the foreign affairs of the Church of Constantinople in the nineteenth century. We describe the civil, political and social status of Christians in Turkey, including the relationships between the sultans, the Porte and the Muslims on the one hand, and the Christian Church, the patriarchs, and the *dhimmis* on the other; the changes in these relationships, positive and negative; the state legislation and decrees with respect to the Church and Christians; the methods and extent of their actual implementation; the oppression of Christians by the fanatical Turkish state and people; the government offensives against the inalienable *de jure* rights and privileges of the Church and Christians; the patriarchs' battle against the Porte and the Muslims for the ancient privileges of the *dhimmis*; their defence of the sovereignty and freedom of the internal life of the Church against the government and Muslim agitators; the attitude of western Christian countries, and Russia in particular, towards Turkish Christians; the fact that Christians were martyred for their faith, even though religious freedom had been proclaimed; the period during which the Greek uprising took place in 1821, and so on. Thus in the first part we present the historical changes – *de jure* and *de facto* – in the conditions of the Church of Constantinople, that came to pass in its relationship with the Muslim state. The Church existed there as a “state within the state”. During the nineteenth century these changes took place according to stages in the evolution of the Tanzimat Dynasty established by Selim III in 1789.

These stages gave us some indication of how to divide the history of the relationship between the Church and the Turkish state into different periods. According to our plan, the following events are important landmarks: the Greek uprising of 1821; the *hatti sherif* of Gulkhane (1839); the *hatti humayun* of 1856 which came into effect after the Crimean War; and the enthronement of Sultan Abdulhamid II (1876), who proved to be a faithful adherent of pan-Islamism. We present the main theses of this first part of our study in our Conclusion, and believe they have been convincingly demonstrated in the first five chapters of our research by the numerous and varied illustrations, both historical and juridical.

Part II of our research consists of chapters – twenty-six in all – on the ministry of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs of the nineteenth century. After a short biography of each patriarch, and a summary of his political and civil position (already discussed in Part I), we describe his spiritual and administrative work concerned with the financial state of the patriarchate and its clergy, with churches and charitable institutions, with matrimonial traditions and the family life of the Christians; with diocesan administration, church discipline, church services, the conditions in monasteries; with schools and national education; with countering alien propaganda; with the patriarchate's position in regard to the other Churches, and so on. The general character of our research does not allow us to go into all the details of the multifarious and highly productive ministries of the nineteenth-century ecumenical patriarchs, many of whom would merit special biographical monographs to themselves. Nevertheless, the value of our contribution becomes manifest if one compares our chapters with even the best studies written by the Greeks.

Part III reviews the patriarchal government of the Church of Constantinople during the nineteenth century, which falls into two distinct periods separated from each other by the administrative reforms of 1858–1860. With this in mind, we made use of materials which are, to some extent, commonplace in the existing Russian literature on the subject. We have, however, presented these materials within a new context in an attempt to reveal the inner character of the reforms.

We have placed 215 extracts in the Appendix entitled *Τὰ Νεοελληνικά*.³⁰⁷ These have been taken from the codices in the patriarchal archive in Constantinople and from the library of St Panteleimon's monastery on Athos. Some have been copied word for word, whereas others have been summarised. We attribute special significance to this Appendix, for the documents it contains support our ideas and prove our conclusions. It also has scholarly value, though we have not taken full advantage of this. In evaluating *Τὰ Νεοελληνικά* from an academic point of view, the quite extraordinary circumstances under which we were granted access to the patriarchal archive, that great treasure of the Greek Church and people, must be taken into account. We had a moral obligation to abide unconditionally by the regulations of this institution. We were privileged with the opportunity of copying material from the codices, but only to the extent determined by the permission granted. Our extracts were monitored by a special committee headed by the archive's academic director, and then received the official approval of His All-Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III and the Holy Synod of the Church of Constantinople, which was granted during one of the synodal sessions of the summer of 1902. Furthermore, some of the material here published (such as the letter of Patriarch Gregory V) is registered in the official codices of the patriarchal archive only in summary. Therefore the academic competence of our *Sources for the History of the Church of Constantinople in the Nineteenth Century* should not be doubted.

The author entertains the hope that the present research will be of use not only to the academic world, but also as a practical reference work in which the archive documents, unknown in their completeness to both Russian and non-Russian historical scholarship, have been compiled and edited. Moreover, there is a great need to revive ecclesiastical relations between our country and the Greek Orthodox East. Our research therefore serves the interests of the unity of the faith of Orthodox nations, their

307 [Not included in the present translation.]

mutual love, and the overall oneness of mind among all Christians.³⁰⁸ The lack of knowledge on both sides is a great obstacle to this unity.

In conclusion, we consider it our moral obligation to express our deepest gratitude to His Grace Metropolitan Anthony of St Petersburg and Ladoga, to the chief executive of the Holy Synod, His Excellency K. P. Pobedonostsev, and the assistant to the chief executive, V. K. Sabler, for their wise patronage. Without their assistance it would not have been possible to publish this research.

In fulfilling our academic task we received assistance in a foreign land. We are morally obliged to express our sincere gratitude to His All-Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III who granted us the rare privilege of studying within the hallowed patriarchal archive, enfolding us in his blessed care. We are also deeply grateful to the Holy Synod of the Church of Constantinople, and to the members of its summer session of 1902, who considered and approved our case.³⁰⁹ Our guide within the walls of the patriarchal archive was Archimandrite Kallinikos Delikanis, the head of the archive. We also received the assistance and guidance of the second secretary to the Holy Synod, Hierodeacon Athanasios Piper, and of the secretary to the Patriarch C. Papayannis. It is our pleasure to express our cordial gratitude to them all. Finally, on Mount Athos we enjoyed the assistance of the librarian of the Russian Monastery of St Panteleimon, Fr Matthew, to whom we also communicate our gratitude.

308 The Church of Constantinople shares the same aspirations: *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 1902, 2, 18.

309 The following metropolitans were present at this session: Joachim of Ephesus, Nathanael of Prusa, Alexander of Neocaesarea, Athanasios of Iconium, Basil of Smyrna, Constantine of Chios, Polycarp of Varna, Joachim of Xanthi, Nikodimos of Vodena, Nicephoros of Litsa, Tarasios of Hilioupolis, Jerome of Gallipoli and Madyta.

INTRODUCTION

External Condition of the Church of Constantinople from the mid-Fifteenth to the late-Eighteenth Century (1453–1789)

In 1453 the Byzantine Empire fell to the sword of the Ottoman Turks. From the ruins of the once glorious and mighty Christian power rose a new Muslim state with a different type of political and social structure. The Orthodox Byzantine Church which for centuries had enjoyed external independence and had flourished, famous for its great throng of hierarchs and saints who had spread the sacred gift of Christianity and the testament of true morality among many pagan peoples, was suddenly deprived, together with the Byzantine state, of its independent status, of its former greatness and glory, and found itself ushered into an entirely different stage in its history.

The Muslim Empire that grew up on the ruins of Byzantium had as its basis the Qur'an, the holy book of Islam, the main source of all Muslim law, and also Shari'a, i.e. later Islamic laws based on the Qur'an and providing practical interpretation of its teaching. The Turkish Empire was organized on an entirely religious basis, as the Qur'an and Shari'a between them comprehensively cover all aspects of religious and secular life. Religion was the thread running through all aspects of the life of the state and imbued the empire with its overwhelmingly Islamic character.

The sultan was at the head of the empire, an absolute monarch, God's representative on earth, guardian and defender of Shari'a. His instructions and laws were bound to be in total agreement with the precepts of holy Muslim law, otherwise he could be deposed. During the religious ceremony called the "donning of the sword" which is performed at his ascension to the throne in place of a Christian-style coronation, the sultan makes a solemn oath to root out the infidel by fire and sword, to systematically

visit mosques, to reverence the garments of Muhammad and the tomb of the prophet Ayub, to take part in religious ceremonies, to observe all Muslim fasts and religious festivals – all of which is a sign of the sacred calling of the *padishah*, and fixes in the minds of the Orthodox the idea of his divine authority.

The sultan exercises his legislative and executive authority through two highly placed officials, the Grand Vizier and *sheikh-ül-islam*. The Grand Vizier is in charge of the secular administration, acts in the sultan's name and carries out his orders; through his office passes everything in the legislative and executive sphere that needs the sultan's approval, as well as everything that emanates from the *padishah* himself. On the same level as the Grand Vizier is the *sheikh-ül-islam*, the supreme interpreter of the law, the keeper of the state seal, the government's legal adviser. He occupies an extremely important place in government affairs because his *fatwas* or brief written conclusions on any legal point, based on Shari'a, are necessary to give legality to any law, instruction or undertaking coming from the higher authorities in general, and from the sultan himself. No government legislation, not a single order passed down from above, can have meaning or force if it has not received the *fatwa* of the *sheikh-ül-islam*. On the other hand, the latter, in the name of Shari'a, has the right to set the Muslims against the government if it should deviate from Islamic principles in any way. He has at his disposal a large body of *ulema*, educated lawyers, interpreters of the law, teachers and ministers of the public liturgy, who are divided into three categories: *kadi* (judges), *muftis* (interpreters of the law) and *imams* (religious ministers), each of which are in their turn sub-divided into several classes as follows: mullahs, sheikhs, *mufetisi*, *naibs*, *kiatibs*, and so on. Leading the religious and public life of the people, having enormous material means belonging to religious institutions, the body of *ulema* actually wields enormous power, before which even the government trembles. Together with the *ulema*, the dervishes also take a leading role in religious and public life; these are the ascetics of the Muslim world, who have taken the strictest religious and moral vows.¹

1 Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, I, Paris, 1853, 29–37, 92.

The Grand Vizier, the *sheikh-ül-islam*, the ministers of war, finances, domestic and foreign affairs and the state secretary make up the supreme council, otherwise known as the Divan or the Sublime Porte, which is in charge of state affairs, taking decisions in general assembly under the vizier's chairmanship, and in important cases, under the chairmanship of the sultan himself.² Administratively speaking, the empire under Mehmed II was divided into small provinces called *liva* or *sandjak*, the rulers of which were subordinate to two main governors, of Roumeli and Anatolia.³ Under Sultan Murad III (1574–1595) the empire was divided into larger regions or *vilayets*, numbering 40, each of which covered several *liva*; their rulers were called viziers or pashas. But by the end of the eighteenth century there were only 26 *vilayets*, consisting of 163 provincial areas and including 1,800 *kaza* or legal constituencies, each of which was either a town with its surrounding area, or several villages, called *nahia*.⁴ This administrative division existed until 1834.⁵ The supreme council and each one of the distinguished officials or ministers of both higher and lower administrative and judicial authorities running affairs in the regions, provincial areas, *kazas* and *nahias*, were regulated exclusively according to the Qur'an and its commentaries which also had significance for civil statutes. In the same way, decrees relating to legal proceedings and punishment for crime, to taxation and other obligations, family relations, property rights and forms of ownership, inheritance, military service and domestic life were all based on Shari'a.⁶ Thus by its structure the Turkish Empire was a theocratic monarchy.

2 *Ibid.*, 38.

3 Evangelidis, *Ιστορία τῆς ὀθωμανικῆς αὐτοκρατορίας*, Athens, 1894, 287.

4 Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'empire othoman*, VII, Paris, 1824, 301–7.

5 Ubicini, I, 44.

6 Baron N. Tornau, *Изложение начал мусульманского законовeдения* (*The Origins of Muslim Jurisprudence Explained*), St Petersburg, 1850, 115ff., 174, 382; *Особенности мусульманского права* (*Characteristics of Muslim Law*), St Petersburg, 1892, 22–34, 48–61; *О праве собственности по мусульманскому законодательству* (*On Property Rights in Muslim Legislation*), St Petersburg, 1882, 2–3; Fanden-Berg, *Основные начала мусульманского права* (*Fundamentals of Muslim Law*), St Petersburg, 1884, 25.

The Qur'an and laws emanating from it also laid the foundation for the structure of the Orthodox Christian community within the confines of the Turkish Empire. It is well known that the Qu'ran promulgates holy war (*jihad*) against the infidel in general and against Christians in particular, with the aim of fanning the flames of fanaticism, courage and cruelty in the true believers. On the one hand it promises them constant success in the war against the infidel, and on the other the highest rewards in the life to come. War must be waged against the unbelievers until they accept Islam or until they promise to pay taxes to the true believers.⁷ In the latter case the unbelievers enter into total slavery with the absolute minimum remaining to them – life and faith. Paying poll and other taxes to their victors, the unbelievers do not only surrender all private and civil status rights, but also find themselves totally outside the remit of the law. Shari'a exists only for the true believers, ensuring them all the rights of private and civil status, but in relation to *giaours* it legalises arbitrary behaviour and enmity. Muslims may only tolerate Christians in their community if they live off them and make full use of their lack of rights and total enslavement.⁸

7 “When the forbidden months end, says Muhammad, then kill the polytheists where you find them; try to capture them, lay siege to them, surround them in every place you can. Wage war against them: God will punish them by your hands and disgrace them, and give you victory over them” (*Qur'an*, 9:5–14). “Wage war with those who do not believe in God and the last day, who do not consider forbidden that which God forbade and His emissary, and with those who have received the Scriptures but do not recognise the true faith, until such time as they pay a ransom for their lives, worn out and degraded” (*ibid.*, 9:29). “When you meet unbelievers, cut off their heads until you have vanquished them” (*ibid.*, 47:4). “It is not possible that God should give success to the unbelievers against the true believers” (*ibid.*, 4:140). “Those killed on God's pathways are not considered dead; no, they live, they are receiving their dues before the Lord, taking comfort in that which God gave them from His generosity. For them there is neither fear nor sadness; they rejoice in the blessings generously showered upon them by God” (*ibid.*, 3:163–5; cf. 4:76, 97, 140; 9:20; 8:66–7).

8 Tornau, *Изложение начал мусульманского законовождения*, 350, 392, 402, 403, 429, 460; Girgas, *Права христиан на востоке по мусульманским законам*, St Petersburg, 1865, 66.

In his policy towards the indigenous Christians, Sultan Mehmed II, the conqueror of Byzantium, was guided by the Qu'ran and its commentaries, and also by the additional political programmes of his predecessors. The Christians were kept down by armed strength and as a result were forced to admit their dependence on the Turks. But they did not wish to rescind their faith. In this case the Qu'ran recommended getting rid of the infidel. However, for military and political reasons Mehmed II was convinced that it was necessary to limit extreme and passionate Islamic outbursts in favour of more acceptable injunctions. The Turks, in the time of Mehmed II, were warriors, skilled in campaigns and conquests, but not in peaceful, cultured living. These warriors needed craftsmen and workers, persons who cultivated the land and paid tribute, who could provide them with the means of living and improving their lives while allowing them to give themselves over to a military existence. In this respect the Christians were invaluable servants to the Turks. The Greeks and the Slavs were settled peoples with strong family traditions, hard workers, dexterous and knowledgeable, agriculturally experienced, skilled craftsmen, traders. In the interests of maintaining and expanding the new Muslim Empire, it would have been a waste of resources to forcibly convert them to Islam, and even more so to exterminate them for religious reasons. On the contrary, it was necessary to create a *modus vivendi* by which they could be of maximum use to the empire.

It so happened that during previous confrontations with Christians, the sultan and his entourage had learned to appreciate the creature comforts offered by Byzantine civilisation and had willingly exchanged the ancient Turkish tents and *kibitkas* for the stone-built chambers and palaces of the Greeks. Now they had at their disposal a rich city, with a uniquely beautiful position, wonderful buildings and monuments. Mehmed II was also aware that the relationship between the last Byzantine emperors and western Europe had aimed at launching a crusade against the common enemy. This fear was uppermost in his mind in the early period of the conquest of Byzantium and led him to arrange matters with the Greeks in such a way that the West seemed less attractive. This meant countering the authority of the pope in the West with that of the patriarch in Constantinople. For these reasons, in his policy towards the subjugated Christians, Sultan Mehmed

II used those injunctions of Shari'a which allowed the vanquished the rights of internal self-rule, civil and political independence, on condition that they paid various taxes to their conquerors. The result was that under Sultan Mehmed II and his immediate successors the Christian community was structured in the following way.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople was set up as a separate ecclesiastical and secular organisation within the empire. Its members, officially called *dhimmis*, i.e. Greek community or nation, had the right to practise the Christian faith, and to have their own administrative and judicial power. At the head of this community stood the Ecumenical Patriarch. He is, first and foremost, the spiritual head of all the bishops, clergy and lay people. To him, together with the synod of bishops which he heads, belongs the highest authority over all church matters within the patriarchate as well as in all churches and monasteries with their properties. The patriarch is elected by the synod and representatives of the people and is approved by the sultan. The patriarch would come to the sultan's court accompanied by hierarchs who were members of the synod. During an audience with the sultan he would kiss his hand, and the *padishah* would present him with a *berat* in which were laid out all the rights accruing to patriarchal power.⁹ Following the election of Gennadios Scholarios, the first Patriarch of Constantinople during the Turkish period, the sultan did him the great honour of inviting him to dine, spending a long time in discussion with him, promising his patronage and assistance, making him a gift of a precious crosier and beautiful, richly decorated steed on which Gennadios returned to the patriarch's residence, accompanied by the sultan's large and dazzling suite.¹⁰ Gennadios was given a salary from the state purse of one thousand golden ducats.¹¹ The patriarch and the synod elect and depose

9 *Patriarchica Constantinopoleos historica a 1454 usque ad 1578 annum Christi*, in *Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum* XVII, Bonn, 1849, 177, 179, 193, 200.

10 Georgios Sphrantzis, *Annales*, Bonn, 1838, 305–8; *Historia politica Constantinopoleos a 1391 usque ad 1578 annum Christi*, Bonn, 1849, 27–8.

11 Matthew Kigalas, *Νέα σύνοψις διαφορών ιστοριών*, Venice, 1637, 428; Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία ελληνικού έθνους*, V, Athens, 1896, 498. The gold florin or ducat in the early Turkish period had different values. In 1522 it was worth 50 aspers, as the asper was

metropolitans and bishops, and the Porte, on his representation, accords him the *berat*, or rights. He is the supreme judge for all the clergy. When one of the bishops is accused of a misdemeanour by the Porte, it cannot investigate the complaint without the patriarch's permission, and certainly cannot try him, since this lies within the jurisdiction of the patriarch alone. The patriarch himself is legally accountable only to the Divan, and complaints against him can only be lodged by the synod, which can accuse him either of breaching dogma and the rules of the faith, or of administrative infringement. Only if the patriarch has committed treason can the government take action against him, but it must carry out a formal investigation of the crime and pronounce verdict according to the law. Deposing the patriarch is something only the sultan can do.

Having kept hold of the supreme ecclesiastical and religious authority which was still expanding in the Byzantine period, under the Turks the Patriarch of Constantinople acquired significant secular power as well. He was the secular representative of the Christians to the Porte and was responsible for ensuring their obedience to the government and for their fulfilment of obligations to the state. This new authority made the patriarch also the secular leader of all his fellow believers. He was responsible for ensuring that the Christians faithfully paid their tribute, and if they did not obey government requirements, he would send out notices ordering, if necessary, that the guilty parties be arrested, and he would try them and pronounce verdict. In the same way, civil cases involving metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, committees and those below them, no matter what the issue, had to be heard in the capital, in the patriarch's presence. If under civil law it was necessary to arrest a clergyman, priest, monk or nun, the arrest would take place on the orders of the patriarch. All contentious matters concerning marriage, divorce and maintenance of wives and children after divorce, and also Christian inheritance cases, come under the patriarch's jurisdiction. Even Christian criminal cases can, if the parties so

equivalent to the present day Turkish piastre or gross; then it rose to 60 aspers, and in 1688 even to 300 aspers (Skarlatos Byzantios, *Κωνσταντινούπολις*, III, Athens, 1869, 251, 269).

wish, be referred to the patriarchal court. The patriarch has the right to collect money not only from the clergy but from lay people too, for the needs of the Church and to pay for the guards or police that look after him. To the patriarch likewise belonged the right to approve constitutions and contracts made by Christian tradesmen and craftsmen and companies of furriers, fur fashioners, tailors and so on.¹²

In return for the duties assumed by the patriarch as the secular representative and leader of the people, Mehmed II and his successors granted the Orthodox Church certain privileges. All the Orthodox clergy, from the patriarch to the least significant church servers and monks, were exempted from taxation. The Christians received the formal right to freely carry out their religious duties, conduct marriages and interments, celebrate Easter and other festivals, and they were protected from enforced conversion to Islam. The land and holdings of churches and monasteries were inviolable, as were sacred buildings, and also cemeteries; these buildings could be restored to their former design without hindrance, but the construction of new churches and monasteries was not allowed. The patriarchate received property by escheat. The patriarch was also put in charge of Greek schools, approving their curricula and appointing teachers. Turkish bureaucrats were obliged to render the patriarch all the assistance he required in the performance of his duties but were not allowed to interfere. The patriarch communicated with the Porte on church and secular matters through the good offices of the Great *Logothete* and his assistant, but it was the Porte that appointed the relevant minister of foreign affairs. In this way, the Patriarch of Constantinople, under the newly-established Turkish domination, was not only the church leader but also the secular leader of the Christians living under the sultan. He was their national leader, master and even the king (ἐθνάρχης, αὐθέντης καὶ βασιλεύς). Thus, with both the ecclesiastical and secular roles of ruined Byzantium residing in

12 In February 1765 Patriarch Samuel, using special legislation, approved the constitution of the Constantinople Society of Fur Coat Makers (τῶν καζακλιδῶν), and in December of the same year he approved a tailoring shop contract (τῶν ἀμπατζιδῶν). *Archive of the Patriarchate of Constantinople* (C.P.A.), m/s. Gk. Codex V, 295, 301.

his one person, he acquired an authority that he had not even had during the Byzantine period.¹³

The patriarch delegated certain of his wide powers to provincial hierarchs whose ecclesiastical and secular authority within their own dioceses mirrored his patriarchal authority, each having administrative and judicial powers in the same matters as did the patriarch for the whole of the Church of Constantinople, and each being the people's representative and guarantor before the government in matters of civil duties, defending the people's interests, and so on. As the head of his diocese in both the ecclesiastical and the civil senses, the hierarch made use of his parish clergy and selected lay people as administrators. Each town, settlement or village had its own civic authority which was elected by the local Christians and was approved by the hierarch.

The representatives of the local authority were called *demogeron*, or *geron*, *archon*, *proestos*, *epitropos* or in Turkish *kodzabashi* (κατζαμπάσινδες). Usually twelve elders were elected for a year at a time (to run from St George's Day, 23 April) and would meet in special council at the head of which sat the local priest. The *demogeron*tes were the father figures of their communities. They resolved disputes within the same village, were responsible for keeping the area clean, for managing public property, fixing

- 13 Athanasios Komninos Ypsilantis, *Τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσην*, Constantinople, 1870, 3–4; Meletios, Metropolitan of Athens, *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία*, III, Vienna, 1784, 330; Zacharias Mathas, *Κατάλογος ἱστορικός τῶν πρώτων ἐπισκόπων καὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς πατριαρχῶν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας*, Navplion, 1837, 158; M. Karavokyros, *Κλείς τῆς συνήθους ὁθωμανικῆς νομοθεσίας*, Constantinople, 1882, 128–9; Paparrigopoulos, V, 478–80, 493; Kyriakidis, *Ιστορία τοῦ συγχρόνου ἑλληνισμοῦ*, I, Athens, 1892, 12–13; P. Karolidis, *Ιστορία τοῦ 10' αἰῶνος*, II, Athens, 1892, 29–47; Evangelidis, 245–9; Jacovaky Riso Néroulos, *Histoire moderne de la Grèce depuis la chute de l'empire d'Orient*, Geneva, 1828, 30–36; Juchereau de St Denys, *Histoire de l'empire ottoman*, II, Paris, 1844, 6–15; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, I, München, 1864, 420–4; Maurer, *Des griechische Volk in öffentlicher, kirchlicher und privat-rechtlicher Beziehung*, I, Heidelberg, 1835, 380–3; Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, *Geschichte Griechenlands von der Eroberung Konstantinopels durch die Türken im Jahre 1453 bis auf unsere Tage*, I, Leipzig, 1870, 12–13; Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenland*, II, Gotha, 1877, 543–7.

rates of taxes levied on property holdings, receiving legacies left to the community or to the patriarchate, caring for orphans until they reached the age of majority, looking after local schools and charitable institutions, and being the defenders of and advisers to any Christian who felt under attack from the Turkish authorities. In general they were the diocesan hierarchy's executive assistants in the fulfilment of his ecclesiastical and secular duties. The Turkish authorities themselves used them as their first port of call when they wanted to collect taxes and other dues or to investigate crimes committed in Christian areas, rather than going directly to the people themselves.

The role of the *demogeron* was easier in wholly Christian villages where the clergy were the leaders. This was so on the island of Hydra in the Archipelago, where the *demogerontes* were all clergy – the accountant, the *sakellarios*, *skevophylax*, *chartophylax* and *sakellios* – who themselves elected two lay elders; the authority of the clergy in local affairs on the island continued until the late eighteenth century.¹⁴ In towns and villages with a mixed population the authority of the *demogerontes* was divided between Christians and Muslims depending on the population numbers of each. In these communities it was more difficult to achieve a unity of purpose at *demogeron* level, and they frequently degenerated into squabbling and enmity. The Christian population of the Peloponnese managed to extract from the Porte the right to have three representatives in Constantinople to defend their interests and to combat arbitrary Turkish rule. In addition, each Peloponnesian diocese was granted the right to elect two Christian committees, who appeared before the Turkish pasha once or twice a year in order to present petitions from the Christians. There were similar committees in Epirus.¹⁵ In the end the Christian Church communities in the towns had their own elected committees who formed a “council” to run the community's affairs with remit to cover trade, education, charity matters and so on, in the manner laid down by the Church.

14 Paparrigopoulos, V, 547.

15 *Ibid.*, 518; Sp. Aravantinos, *Ιστορία Αλή Πασᾶ τοῦ Τεπελενλή*, Athens, 1895, 105.

In this way the internal structure of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was like a state within a state, having its own administration and court, *de jure* freedom to profess its faith, and the right to run its own community affairs. But this is only to look at one side of the position of Christians in the Turkish Empire. The other side was the actual relations between the Christians and the Turkish state whose citizens they were. Here, at first glance, matters did not seem so rosy.

First of all, Christians were considered by the Turks to be a subject people obliged to pay taxes, a people of no value, causing only feelings of disgust to true believers who treated them with disdain and as they saw fit. To the Turks these people were no more than *giaours*, dogs or cattle, obliged to feed and serve their conquerors, doomed to eternal slavery. The subjugated Christians who did not convert to Islam had no right to life, but could save their lives on condition that they paid taxes to their true-believing overlords. Therefore the Christians, shortly after the fall of Byzantium, were burdened with a range of taxes of different sorts. Above all the Roman or Greek “oxen” were obliged to pay a poll tax per head of population which was by way of a ransom for their lives, for the right to exist in a Muslim land. This poll tax was obligatory for all “oxen” except women, children under twelve years of age, feeble old folk, cripples, the blind, slaves, the poor, those who were not able to earn their living, hermit monks, i.e. those whom it was prohibited to kill during a holy war. The poll tax was levied on Christians in varying amounts. Soon after the Turkish victory the rich paid 48 dirgems per year, people of moderate means paid half this amount, and the poor who lived by their own labour paid one quarter or 12 dirgems. There were subsequent and frequent changes to this poll tax. It was paid personally by every Christian to his tax collector in a rather demeaning manner. The tax collector would sit and receive the dues, saying: “O enemy of the one and only God, render up your poll tax”, meanwhile striking the Christian on the neck. The tax payer would receive a receipt which he had to carry with him at all times in order to avoid being called upon to pay a second time.

In addition to the poll tax the Roman and Greek “oxen” had to pay a land tax. This tax took two forms, fixed amount and sliding scale. In the first case the tax was levied on the amount of land under cultivation, and

in the second case the harvest was taxed. The “oxen” who still owned land even after the fall of Byzantium paid both types of tax for the right of continued land use, the harvest tax being one dirgem in gold per *desyatina* of wheat and one *saa* or pood of wheat yield. In the case of arable land, the payment was five dirgems per *desyatina*, and of vineyards ten dirgems per *desyatina*. Land tax as a percentage payment varied between one fifth and one half of the total harvest. Christians living off land rented from Turkish owners had to pay a fixed tithe either in money or in kind to these big landowners. Since almost the whole of the Turkish Empire was either in the ownership of the Muslim spiritual leaders and mosques, or divided among the sultan’s associates on a semi-feudal basis, only a small amount of agricultural grade land was left in Christian hands. Notwithstanding, the level of land tax paid by the “oxen” was huge, leaving them only a small proportion of each harvest for their own use. Subsequently the land tax was changed to a tax per acre, which was levied on all produce. Under the first sultans the *desyatina* was paid only by merchants on turnover and was used by the government to secure the highways.¹⁶

The Christians of Roumeli, i.e. the European provinces of Turkey, paid an impossibly heavy tithe in kind which they called “blood tax” (φόρος τοῦ αἵματος), or “sons tribute” (παιδομάζωμα). This tribute undoubtedly existed under Mehmed II, but under Sultan Selim I (1512–1520) and Suleiman I (1520–1566) it was organised and exacted systematically. Every five years troops were sent out from the capital to forcibly conscript Christian boys between the ages of 8 and 14 years. The officers carried the sultan’s *firman*. The *demogerontes* of the Christian communities had to draw up lists of all the local families, and every father had to indicate how many sons he had and to produce them for the inspectors. The inspectors would take 10 per cent of the Christian children, always the most healthy, handsome, active and strong among them. They would dress them in a special uniform and take them away to Constantinople. Here they were circumcised and converted to Islam, the more able ones were taught foreign languages and kept at court, the others were given a very strict education as vassals of the

16 Girgas, *Права христиан на востоке по мусульманским законам*, 19–34.

sultan and his law. Many of these young men would later enter the sultan's guard, either as foot soldiers or cavalry.

Finally Christians paid not only legally required taxes, but *ad hoc* taxes on the unmarried, the married, or those getting married, as well as material taxes (judicial duties), fines for greater and smaller infractions, customs duties (on import, export, transit and transportation by road), duties payable on meat and wine, on mercantile receipts, stamp duty, taxes on salting, fishing, mining and other industries, and so on. In general the Greek populace was so burdened with various taxes and tithes that they really were little more than draught animals (“oxen”), destined for the most oppressive economic slavery.

The Christians' legal position, their social and civil status, was no better. This side of their existence had been regulated since the seventh century by an agreement between Caliph Omar and the Christians.¹⁷ The agreement was aimed at demeaning the Christians as much as possible, and consists of a series of astonishing limitations. Christians did not have the right to build new churches or renovate ruined churches, they were obliged to allow Muslims to enter their churches at any time of day or night, to keep the doors of their houses open to passing Muslims, to receive them as guests even in the middle of the night and to feed them, not to harbour spies, not to teach their children the Qu'ran, not to make open spectacle of their religion and not to preach it, not to prevent those wishing to convert to Islam from doing so, to respect Muslims and to offer them their seats, not to dress like Muslims, not to use either expressions or names used by Muslims, not to use Muslim saddles on horses, not to carry weapons, not to engrave anything in Arabic on signet rings, not to openly sell wine, to shave their heads at the front, not to change the manner of their clothing under any circumstances or wear girdles round their waists, not to carry or wear crosses or holy books in public, to sound the bells or *simandron*

17 N. Mednikov, *Палестина от завоевания ее арабами до крестовых походов по арабским источникам*, I (*Palestine from the Arab Conquest to the Crusades in Arabic Sources, Study I*), in *Православный Палестинский Сборник* 50 (*Palestinian Orthodox Series* 50), St Petersburg, 568–604.

in the churches only quietly, not to raise their voices in churches when Muslims are present, not to wail at funerals, not to carry palm fronds or sacred images in public, not to carry fire in Muslim districts, not to bury their dead near Muslims, not to take slaves belonging to Muslims, not to look inside a Muslim home, not to build houses higher than Muslim houses, not to beat Muslims, not to purchase captive Muslims, not to take on Muslim servants or employees, not to criticise the Qu'ran, Muhammad or the Islamic faith, not to marry Muslims, to allow Muslims to settle in Christian areas, not to openly keep pigs, to ride only donkeys and mules, to attach beads to their saddles, to wear a stamp on their necks (proof of payment of taxes), when entering the bath house to wear a bell, to sit side saddle, not to sit in seats reserved for respected persons at meetings, not to initiate greetings when meeting Muslims, to give way to Muslims; finally, any agreement is nullified if a Christian should strike a Muslim. In addition, on the basis that a Christian cannot hold a position of authority over a true believer, Muslim law deprived the Christians of the right to occupy any position that might put a Muslim into a position of legal dependence on them. Thus Christians do not have the right to become secretaries or chief clerks, to be guardians of a Muslim, his judge or administrator. Worse still was the fact that Christian witnesses were not allowed to give testimony against Muslims no matter what the circumstances, the injustice, or the numbers of Christians involved. As for political rights for Christians, there was certainly absolutely no possibility of that.

One cannot help noticing inconsistencies and even contradictions in the rules governing Christians living within the Turkish Empire. In actual fact the Church of Constantinople, which took the place in the Christians' lives of the defeated Orthodox Empire, not only kept its former religious and moral power and grandeur, but acquired new national political rights. The Church became a sort of state within a state, with its patriarch-tsar, with its administration and judiciary, with its civil subjects who were at the same time its spiritual children, with its official language Greek, with its unity established by the Orthodox faith held by the whole Greek or "Romaic" populace, and with clergy exempted from taxes and other obligations. Considered in isolation, the Church may have seemed to be in an enviable position. But a glance at the other side of the coin is sufficient to

shatter the illusion. One must bear in mind that the Church was a state within a *Muslim state*, where Christianity, from the point of view of the only source of legislation, the Qu'ran, was no more than a *religio licita*. The privileges granted to the Church of Constantinople by Mehmed II were not founded on the principle of conscious religious tolerance, neither was it Turkish sympathy that guaranteed the advantages enjoyed by the Christian community as a "state within the state". On the contrary, everything was conditioned by the government's political and economic aims, and sprang from its effective inability to act in any other way towards the Christians except in accordance with the various laws of Shari'a. This was categorically absolutist in regard to true believers and to unbelievers, considering the latter, without exception, to be slaves, and preaching total separation from them in religion and in social, domestic and political life, along with legalised hatred towards them, disdain, violence and arbitrariness.

Thus on the one hand there were the rights or privileges (*pronomia*) that had been granted by virtue of political expediency and had never been understood by the Muslim public at large, and on the other hand there was a position of slavery legalised by both the divine and human dictates of Islam, something which all true believers could fully identify with and which was much to their advantage. Again, on the one hand there was the "state within the state", while on the other they squeezed all the juices out of the "oxen" for the benefit of the empire whose citizens they could never be. Likewise there was on the one hand a juxtaposition of systematic regulation, bureaucratisation and legislation of the Greek clergy and people, and on the other a complete disregard for them and rejection of their rights in the name of God's law. It was obvious that one hand was working against the other, that the structure of the Christian community based on irreconcilable principles was unnatural and by its very essence contained the seeds of its own downfall. This is exactly how it turned out. The *de facto* position of the Christians in Turkey was an open and systematic flaunting of the law, a rule of fanatical intolerance, violence and arbitrary acts, utter degradation and disregard of human rights. The Christians had no civil rights, only the status of slaves. They were not members of the state but merely slaves to cruel and inhuman conquerors who had the right at any moment to deprive them of their property, honour or life itself.

Sultan Mehmed II (1453–1481), having laid down the new *modus vivendi* for the Church of Constantinople, was the first to start destroying its laws. In the first place, many Christian churches in the capital and elsewhere were, on his orders, turned into mosques; the famous Church of the Holy Apostles in which Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios (1453–1456) first settled, was, following his move to the Church of Pammakaristos (The All-blessed), pulled down and in its place a mosque built.¹⁸ Sultan Mehmed's behaviour towards Christians was also inhuman in the extreme. He had despised and hated them from childhood and more than once had said that when he became ruler he would find the right time strike down the Greek and Roman power and get rid of all Christians.¹⁹ Now the *dhimmi* populace was at his mercy. But in the early years of his reign the sultan did not launch any persecutions against the Christians due to the political necessity of needing them to contribute to the growth of the new empire, of wanting to prevent a mass exodus of Greeks to western Europe, and for fear of provoking a crusade against the Turks. The sultan took cruel and repressive measures only against members of leading Greek families, fearing political intrigues against his person and a concentration of power in infidel hands.²⁰ At the same time, he issued apparently generous orders respecting Patriarch Gennadios, whose services were needed as leader of the *dhimmi* "oxen". It seemed that he personally felt a certain liking for Gennadios and so did not touch any of his tax exemptions, did not harass or threaten him, and allowed him continued protection from his potential enemies.²¹ But despite all of this even Gennadios was, in Mehmed's eyes, a *giaour*.²² His good disposition towards him was hypocritical, as could

18 Ypsilantis, 12; *Historia politica*, 28–9; Paparrigopoulos, V, 500.

19 Sphrantzis, 211–12.

20 *Ibid.*, 293–4; *Historia politica*, 22–3.

21 Sphrantzis, 308; Mathas, 163.

22 A. P. Lebedev, *История греко-восточной церкви под властью турок* (*The History of the Eastern-Greek Church under Turkish Power*), 2nd edition, St Petersburg, 1901, 210.

be said of Mehmed II's whole policy towards the Christians, which was founded upon cold calculation, perfidy and cunning.²³

As military successes gradually expanded Mehmed's territorial possessions and his early fears about holding on to power dissipated, there was an abrupt change in his attitude towards the Christians which showed him to be their evil and perfidious enemy. The number of executions of leading Byzantines increased, and this was accompanied by an increase in numbers fleeing abroad. Many were obliged to convert to Islam to save life and honour. Mehmed II needed well-educated and influential men, and was only too pleased to take the renegades into his service and to give them honourable positions and titles. There were many cases of apostasy among ordinary folk too, burdened as they were with huge taxes and subject to the fanatical behaviour of the Muslim military horde and to the arbitrary despotism of the Turkish authorities. Neither property nor honour nor the life itself of the Greek populace were safeguarded before Muslim justice and its faithful executors, who considered the law to be on their side whenever it suited them.

The sultan behaved with particular treachery towards the conquered Christians in Serbia, Trebizond, the Peloponnese and Hellas, massacring those to whom he had guaranteed safety, deporting others and imposing impossible taxation on them. In this way, having subdued Evripos, Mehmed ordered all the menfolk and boys over twelve to be killed, while women and children were to be deported to Constantinople.²⁴ Terrible massacres, despite agreements to the contrary, were inflicted on many living in Boeotia and in the Peloponnese, while others were forced to convert to Islam to save their lives; up to 10,000 Christians were deported to the area around Constantinople.²⁵ The sultan promised the people of besieged Gardikion that they would be safe if they capitulated; the Christians took him at his

23 Sphrantzis writes of Mehmed II (p. 308): "This all-defiled destroyer of the Christians, being cunning and devious and full of hypocritical deceit like the fox, did not do these things out of any pious or noble motive" (when he invited the Christians to return to Constantinople).

24 *Historia patriarchica*, Bonn, 1849, 125.

25 Evangelidis, 277.

word and 1,300 people came out of the city, at which the sultan gave the order to kill them all immediately.²⁶ In general, the Turkish Empire, in the second half of the reign of Mehmed II, was characterised by an orgy of barbarism, caprice and lawlessness. The enforced conversion of Christians to Islam, merciless massacring of men, the systematic abuse of women, the seizure of children as slaves, excruciating levels of taxation that included the taking of children into the sultan's guard, the barbarous sacking of Christian cities and villages with all their fine Byzantine buildings and monuments that frequently left once flourishing places as desert wastelands: these are some of the despicable acts against Christians perpetrated by Sultan Mehmed II.²⁷

However, Mehmed's despotism was not limited to the *dhimmi* "oxen" alone, for soon it was to impinge on the patriarch's rights. Gennadios Scholarios was already finding no support from Mehmed when it came to fighting "the many great scandals" (πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα σκάνδαλα) that afflicted his people during the early years of Muslim rule, and he felt compelled to stand down from the patriarchal throne, although the hierarchs, clergy and the whole Greek populace asked him to say at the helm of church power.²⁸ Obviously the intrigues against him came from the Porte itself, which found it difficult to come to terms with the presence of a Christian leader in Constantinople, and threw obstacles and regulations in his way which finally pushed Gennadios, two and a half years after acceding to the throne, to step down, "embracing the stillness that he dearly loved".²⁹ Patriarch Sophronios I (1463–1464)³⁰ was also forced to vacate the patriar-

26 Girgas, 84.

27 *Historia politica* says about Mehmed (p. 45): Οὐδ' ὅλως ἡσύχασεν ὁ κακὸς ἐχθρὸς οὗτος καὶ ἀφανιστῆς τοῦ γένους χριστιανῶν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἀγέλας προβάτων ἔφερε κατ' ἔτος τοὺς δυστυχεῖς, οὓς μὲν πωλῶν, οὓς δὲ καὶ δωροῦμενος τοῖς βουλομένοις; cf. 26, 47, 50; Evangelidis, 288; Paparrigopoulos, V, 449, 494; Mathas, 159.

28 *Historia patriarchica*, 94.

29 *Historia politica*, 31; Mathas, 160; cf. M. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοὶ πίνακες*, Constantinople, 1890, 472; Lebedev, *История греко-восточной церкви под властью турок*, 216–20.

30 Mathas, 161; Gedeon, 480.

chal throne, and his successor Joasaph I (1464–1466) was extremely badly used by Mehmed II, despite the guarantees contained in the document specifying the patriarchal rights.

There was a Greek in the service of the sultan called George Amiroutsis, a scholar and doctor who had been a *protovestiaris* in his previous position at the court of the Trebizond King David Komninos. This man had a wife and children, and fell in love with the beautiful widow of the last Athenian duke Franco Acciaioli (deceased 1460) and wished to marry her. But Patriarch Joasaph would not hear of a divorce. Amiroutsis complained, first to the Grand Vizier and then to the sultan, who summoned Joasaph and demanded that he grant Amiroutsis a divorce and then conduct his marriage to the widow. When the patriarch refused, citing church canon law, Mehmed insulted him, ordered his beard to be cut off, and decreed his dethronement and banishment into exile. When, on the sultan's orders, the patriarch's beard was shaved off, he said loudly: "You may cut off not only my beard for the sake of the truth, but my hands, feet and head, yet I will not break the laws of which I am the keeper and guardian." The Ecclesiarch Maximos suffered together with Joasaph, his nostrils were slit for refusing the gifts sent to him by Amiroutsis to persuade him to intercede on his behalf with the patriarch, instead of which he supported the patriarch's stand in the matter.³¹ In this way the sultan himself set in motion the breach of the rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople, the supreme head of the Church and people, unlimited in his actions, inviolable in his sacred authority. This beginning was to have a very sad continuation.

The unlimited spiritual and secular authority which the Patriarch of Constantinople enjoyed made his throne an object of envy and controversy for the power-hungry and the greedy, who would do anything for their own ends. From then on the patriarchate became a centre of intrigue and discord, the flames of which were fanned by the Turkish government in an effort to weaken the patriarch's authority and to make what gains they

31 *Historia politica*, 38–9; *Historia patriarchica*, 97–8; Kigalas, 434–5; Dorotheos, Metropolitan of Monemvasia, *Βιβλίον ιστορικόν περιέχον ἐν συνόψει διαφορὰς καὶ ἐξόχους ιστορίας*, Venice, 1781, 422–3.

could from frequent changes of head. This was not too difficult, given that there were plenty of contenders who were willing to pay in gold for the right to accession. This sad state of affairs in the patriarchate was evident as early as Mehmed II. The first patriarch to buy his way into office was Symeon (1472–1475), who came from Trebizond. In his defence it should be said that it was not actually he who aspired to the throne, but he was put forward by his fellow countrymen, who, following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Trebizond, had settled in great numbers in Constantinople and were seeking influence and position there to compensate in some measure for what they had lost at the fall of their empire. They chose the monk Symeon as their man, announced that he was a worthy candidate for the patriarchal throne. But the throne was actually occupied at the time by Patriarch Mark II. Undeterred, Symeon's supporters launched a whispering campaign against Mark, accusing him of bribing his way into office by paying the sultan a thousand gold pieces that he would have received as his official government-paid allowance. The accusations were denied by Mark, at which Symeon's supporters collected a thousand gold pieces which they sent to the sultan announcing that they were following Mark's example by offering this amount to the *padishah* if he would permit the replacement of the unpopular Mark by Symeon, who would not require an allowance from the sultan. Mehmed consented to allow them to elect whom they pleased on condition that from henceforth each newly-elected patriarch would make a payment of one thousand gold pieces to the sultan's purse.³² This was not the end of their troubles. Sultan Mehmed's mother, Maro, wanted to take advantage of the disturbances in the Church following the illegal deposition of Mark to put her own candidate on the throne, Metropolitan Dionysios, who was her confessor. So she sent the sultan two thousand gold pieces on a dish and thus secured the throne for Dionysios. This prompted Mehmed to increase the tax henceforth to two thousand gold pieces for each new patriarch.³³ Patriarch Maximos (1476–1482), a

32 *Historia patriarchica*, 102–4; *Historia politica*, 39–40; Kigalas, 438; Dorotheos, 423; Mathas, 164.

33 *Historia patriarchica*, 106; Mathas, 164.

man of high moral standards and a scholar, in addition to the annual poll tax of two thousand gold pieces had at the same time to pay 500 gold pieces. This amount remained fixed for some considerable period.³⁴

Maximos was the last of the *nine* patriarchs to occupy the throne of Constantinople during the 28-year reign of Mehmed II. This relatively short period was riddled with problems for the Ecumenical Church. Out of nine patriarchs only two (Isidore II and Maximos III) died in office, the remaining seven (Gennadios Scholarios, Sophronios, Joasaph, Mark II, Dionysios, Symeon and Raphael) left it before their hour, sometimes due to the Turkish government's actions, sometimes due to those of the Greeks themselves. Church and secular authority had reached its zenith under Gennadios Scholarios, surrounded by an aureole of glory and magnificence, bringing together Greek religious and national ideals. In the years that followed the patriarchal throne was devalued, lost its brilliance, and became a weapon in the struggle for power, mercenary ends and intrigues. The instrument of this downwards slide of the Church was Sultan Mehmed II, who was unfailingly supported by the Porte, while the Greeks, instead of standing up to the unjust rule and actions of the Muslims, actually assisted it. The result was not only that the patriarchate lost its former prestige, but it was also burdened further by a demeaning tax, and the ecumenical patriarchs experienced rude insults, being reduced by the sultan and the Porte to the level of the unhappy and defenceless *dhimmi* "oxen".

Mehmed's successor, Sultan Bayazid II (1481–1512), continued his father's policy towards Christians. He acted with enmity towards Christians, and systematically chipped away at patriarchal power. During the time in office of Patriarch Niphon II (1486–1489), the deposed patriarch Symeon died (in 1486). He was a well-off man who left neither will nor obvious heirs. His property should have gone by escheat to the patriarchate. However, the renegade Amiroutsis meddled in the affair by informing the state treasury, which immediately wanted to deflect this valuable inheritance from the Church. On a personal level he did not like Niphon who paid him little attention. Thus it happened that not only the money left

34 *Historia patriarchica*, 116; Mathas, 169–70.

by Symeon, but the sacred books and other things – the Gospel, censers and robes to the value of 180,000 aspers – were commandeered by the sultan through an act of arbitrary coercion. Naturally the patriarch and clergy protested against this illegal act, but Amiroutsis answered by jailing the clergy and persecuting the patriarchate. In these circumstances, Niphon, having consulted the Greek *archons*, declared Symeon's nephew Basil to be his rightful heir. But Amiroutsis declared the heir to be false and those who backed his claim to be unreliable, and he took his side of the story to the sultan. Bayazid became extremely angry with the patriarch and ordered him to be dethroned and thrown out of the city. Those who had supported Basil's claim were to have their nostrils slit. Among these there was a certain hieromonk called Anthony. After this the church silver and other property was transferred to the sultan's ownership, but Niphon continued to live outside Constantinople for a long time afterwards, only occasionally appearing in the city to pay his poll tax which, as legal patriarch, he considered it his duty to pay, although he did it in secret for fear of losing his head to the fearsome sultan.³⁵

Niphon was to accede to the patriarch's throne for a second time (1497–1498) during a period of great troubles caused, for the most part, by the Turks, and he left it not of his own free will, but under compulsion. When the Constantinople synod offered him the Ecumenical See for the third time in 1502, he would not hear of it (οὐδὲ θέλει νὰ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ πατριαρχείου).³⁶ Subsequently the Porte decided that Patriarch Joachim (1498–1502) should pay a tax of 3,000 gold pieces, but despite being well loved by his flock (ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου) he was forcibly deposed on Bayazid's orders. Once the sultan was strolling around Chrysokherama and noticed a building with a steeply pitched brick roof, standing a little way from the surrounding buildings which had flat roofs. In response to his questions, the local priests and *demogerontes* told him that it was a church built with the patriarch's permission. The sultan flew into a fury with Joachim, whose only fault was that he had ordered a new roof for the church after the old

35 *Historia patriarchica*, 129–31; *Historia politica*, 59–60; Kigalas, 448–9.

36 *Historia patriarchica*, 135, 138.

one had caved in, and demanded that he should stand down as patriarch. The hierarchs came away shaking with fear (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν) and hurriedly elected a new patriarch, Pachomios (1503–1504, 1505–1514).³⁷

Pachomios was required to pay a tax of 3,500 ducats to the sultan's treasury. During his time the Church of Constantinople suffered another invasion into its internal affairs, this time by the Latins, with whose help the monk Arsenios, without the patriarch's agreement, took over the metropolitan see of Monemvasia,³⁸ having expelled the legal incumbent. When Patriarch Pachomios condemned this action, Arsenios, being a devotee of the Papacy (παπολάτρης), appealed to Pope Julius II in Rome. The pope gave secular Venice the authority to defend the interests of the Roman see, as Monemvasia was a protectorate of Venice. The Greeks in this city and their church dedicated to St George were under very real threat from the powerful defenders of the false metropolitan Arsenios, but the sudden death of the latter brought an end to the papist intrigue.³⁹ This fact is of great significance since it demonstrates that during the Turkish period the Church of Constantinople suffered not only at the hands of the despotic Turkish government and at the hands of greedy and power-hungry pretenders to the patriarchate from among the *dhimmis* themselves, but also that there was interference by the Latins in Greek ecclesiastical affairs, and leadership claims by the Roman pope over the Eastern Church. This old and intractable Roman disease led her to cause as much harm to the Eastern Church following the fall of Byzantium as did the Turkish regime. In particular, under Bayazid Latin interference in the Greeks' church affairs was particularly pernicious due to the friendship between the Roman throne and this enemy of Christianity.⁴⁰ During Bayazid's reign there were six different periods of patriarchal office: Niphon II acceded three times,

37 *Ibid.*, 135–7; M. X., *Μνημείων γραπτῶν περισυναγωγή, Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, I, 7, 1880, 105.

38 (Αρσένιος) ἔλαβε τὸν θρόνον μετὰ δυνάμεως λατίνων: *Historia patriarchica*, 143.

39 *Ibid.*, 141–9.

40 Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, II, Pesth, 1835, 618–20; Evangelidis, 317–18.

Joachim and Pachomios twice each. Thus under this sultan the patriarchal throne suffered many trials and tribulations.

The position of the ordinary people was no better. Bayazid's cruelty towards them earned him the nickname *χριστιανομάχος*, "enemy of the Christians".⁴¹ The following episodes illustrate the aptness of this name. In 1500 the sultan took the city of Methoni and killed all males over 12 years old; two towers (*πύργοι*) were built using the heads of the slaughtered.⁴² The people of Epirus and Albania were dealt with in similar barbaric fashion, following the setbacks of the sultan's Peloponnese campaign.⁴³ In 1509 there was a terrible earthquake in Constantinople which filled even Bayazid with terror and led him to flee to Adrianople. However, the earthquake caught up with him there. The sultan interpreted this as God's punishment for his cruelty and persecution of the Christians. Thus it was that right at the end of his terrible reign he recommended that the Turks move from a policy of enmity to one of mercy towards the Christians.⁴⁴ We also know that the sultan ordered certain Christian churches to be closed,⁴⁵ and others to be changed into mosques. In this way ten churches were taken from the Christians in Constantinople.⁴⁶ During Bayazid's reign St John of Trebizond suffered a martyr's death. He was a trader travelling on a Turkish vessel from Trebizond to Akkerman, and during the voyage he would pray, which annoyed the ship's captain. In Akkerman the captain, wanting to have done with John, made out to the Turks that John wanted to convert to Islam. Despite John's firm rejection of the allegation, the local *kaimakam* listened to the captain and ordered that John should be put to torture. He was beaten with rose sticks, hauled through the city tied behind a horse, and so on. It was in vain – John died a Christian. On 12 June 1492 they beheaded him. John of Trebizond was the first martyr

41 Meletios, *Εκκλησιαστική ιστορία*, III, 338.

42 *Historia patriarchica*, 149.

43 Evangelidis, 317.

44 *Ibid.*, 323.

45 *Historia politica*, 72.

46 Paparrigopoulos, V, 500.

of the Turkish period that history records, the first to suffer for Christ for whom the Turks felt such fanatical hatred and intolerance.⁴⁷

Bayazid's successor Sultan Selim I (1512–1520) began his reign by raising the tax on Christians by the same amount as that of the salary increase he gave to the Janissaries.⁴⁸ He then proceeded to burden them with duties and in general to show ill will towards them.⁴⁹ However, a rich Christian merchant from whom the sultan had taken 60,000 ducats asked him, in return for the money, to give his son a modest military rank with a salary of two aspers per day. In reply to the request, which was transmitted by the Grand Vizier, the sultan wrote: "I swear by my ancestors that I would put you all to death, were it not that I fear that there would be whisperings that I had done so in order to avoid repaying a debt I owed to this man. Pay him the money immediately and make sure that I never receive such petitions again."⁵⁰ But a contemporary *sheikh-ül-islam*, on the subject of the war between the Turks and the Persians, issued the following *fatwa*: "A faithful Muslim who has killed one heretic, a Shiite or seventy Christians, shall find his religious standing increased."⁵¹

Under Selim, on 11 February 1515, George, by birth a Serb, met a martyr's death. He was an orphan and very good-looking, his looks bringing him to the attention of the Turks. Afraid that they would force him to become a Janissary, George moved away from his village in the Kratovo district to Sophia where he lived with an Orthodox priest. His beauty, intelligence and way of life soon came to the notice of the Turks who used to conscript all the strongest, most handsome and healthy Christian youths. They accused him of slandering Islam and the prophet, of criticising the sultan and all the Turkish authorities. The Turkish judge offered George the option of converting to Islam, and when he refused he was burned

47 Κατάλογος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως μέχρι τοῦ 1811 ἔτους ὑπὲρ τῆς χριστιανικῆς πίστεως μαρτυρησάντων, in Sathas, *Μεσαιωνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη*, III, Venice, 1872, 605; Doukakis, *Μέγας Συναξαριστής*, VI, June, 14–17.

48 Hammer, II, 695; Evangelidis, 327–8.

49 *Historia politica*, 71.

50 S. Byzantios, *Ἡ Κωνσταντινούπολις*, III, 245.

51 Evangelidis, 333–4.

at the stake.⁵² On 1 November 1520, on the orders of Sultan Selim, an Athenian ascetic, St James, and two of his followers hierodeacon James and monk Dionysios, were hanged in Didymoteichon. They had been accused of inciting the people to rebel against the government, when in fact they had actually been going about their monastic business of teaching Christian faith and morality. Notwithstanding the fact that there was no proof to back the accusation made against them, the saints were tortured and suffered a shameful death. The sentence was drawn up with the full knowledge of the sultan.⁵³

Finally in 1520 Selim decided to change all Christian churches into mosques and to force the Christians to become Turks or to erase them as enemies of the prophet and the Qu'ran. In order to give his cruel policy the air of a religious sanction, he asked the *mufti* Jamal: "What would be the most pleasing to God, victory over the whole world or the conversion of all unbelievers to Islam?" The *mufti*, not suspecting what lay behind this question, told him that the latter would be the most pleasing to God. Then the sultan issued an order that all churches should be turned into mosques, and all Christians converted to Islam or exterminated. The trembling *mufti*, who had some sympathy with the Christians, attempted together with the Grand Vizier Piri Pasha to dissuade the *padishah* from this terrible decree which was extremely disadvantageous to the sultanate in economic terms, and at the same time advised Patriarch Theoleptos (1514–1520) to petition the sultan for mercy. Through their joint efforts the patriarch, the Grand Vizier and the *mufti* managed to persuade the sultan not to implement the *fatwa* in its full form. The Christian apologists quoted passages from the Qu'ran against the enforced conversion to Islam of those who paid the poll tax, and likewise quoted a document, issued by Mehmed II, granting special rights to the Christians.

Unfortunately the *berat* received by Gennadios Scholarios from Sultan Mehmed was lost during the fire of Constantinople in 1515,⁵⁴ and this made

52 Sathas, *Κατάλογος*, 605; Doukakis, II, 204–17.

53 Sathas, *Κατάλογος*, 605; Doukakis, XI, 21–58.

54 Mathas, 177; Evangelidis, 342; Σ. Byzantios, *Κωνσταντινούπολις*, I, 577.

the task of defending before Selim the legally-granted Christian rights all the more difficult. It is highly possible that the enemies of the Christians made use of this circumstance in their attempt to abolish the rights that had been granted. But their efforts were in vain as, not only were there people who were well disposed towards the Christians among the Turks themselves, but also the events of Mehmed's reign and the rights accorded by him were still fresh in everyone's minds, to the extent that to help calm down Muslim religious fears, the patriarch, assisted by three Janissaries who had served that sultan, provided formal proof of the Christians' right to autonomy in their church life. By their action they succeeded in averting a massacre of the Christians and their conversion to Islam, but almost all the Christian churches in the capital and other cities were handed over to the Muslims. In place of their beautiful stone churches, the Christians put up low-built wooden buildings without cupolas or bell towers, with iron doors and bars on the narrow windows which were set right under the roofs, and they surrounded them with high stone walls or tall trees to keep them from Muslim eyes. The pealing of church bells was replaced with the hollow sound of a wooden clapper. Even Turkish sources bear witness to Selim's action.⁵⁵ There is therefore no reason not to believe this story, and at the same time there is no reason for considering Selim I to be one of the Christian-friendly sultans. His kindly actions towards the "beasts of burden" were random and limited in effect,⁵⁶ but in general his decisions were based on the strict principles of Islam and were implemented in the spirit of the anti-Christian stance of his father and grandfather before him.

Sultan Suleiman I (1520–1566) demanded from Patriarch Jeremias (1520–1537) a tax of 4,000 ducats (στρογγύλος ἀριθμός, "a goodly sum", exclaims Mathas).⁵⁷ Under this patriarch the Muslims' attempt at depriving the Christians of their rights granted by Mehmed was repeated. Just as under Selim I, this arose because the *berat* and other documents setting out the

55 Evangelidis, 342–3; Kyriakidis, I, 28–9; Mathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, III, 413–14.

56 Meletios, III, 338–9; D. Cantemir, *Histoire de l'empire othoman*, II, Paris, 1743, 47–56.

57 Mathas, 176–7; *Historia patriarchica*, 154–7.

privileges to be enjoyed by the Greek Church had been lost in the 1515 fire of Constantinople. Patriarch Theoleptos himself, a contemporary of Selim, could not manage to persuade him to issue any replacement documents due to the sultan's own death not long after the Christian persecutions. Making the most of the Christians' precarious position, the *ulema* demanded that all Christian churches be razed as, according to Islamic principles, "in cities which did not surrender voluntarily to the Muslims but were taken by force, there shall be no Christian places of worship tolerated".

This caused a huge commotion in the capital. Christians flocked to the Grand Vizier and other Turkish figures of authority, bearing gifts and pleading with tears, begging to be spared this latest blow. The Grand Vizier Ibrahim Pasha (1523–1536) rendered enormous service to the Christians. A Greek by birth, he had been converted to Islam as a child. Not only did he avert the catastrophe threatening the Christians but he also helped Patriarch Jeremias to get a new *berat* from Sultan Suleiman, according to which the patriarch was exempted in perpetuity from any threats or coercion, and the Christians again received the right to free expression of their faith and possession of church buildings.⁵⁸ Having delivered the Church from this trial, Patriarch Jeremias had to pay the Porte a poll tax of 4,100 ducats in 1533, as he was responsible for the Serbia bishopric, which was trying to use bribery to install Archbishop Prochoros of Ochrid. The tax remained fixed at this level for some time, usually being paid on the feast day of St George.⁵⁹ Having been forced to vacate the patriarchal throne twice, a few months later Jeremias was back again for a third spell (1537–1545), having made the economic enrichment of the patriarchate his main concern. He died while returning to the capital from Moldavia and Wallachia, where he had gone to raise donations.⁶⁰

Following his election, Jeremias's successor, Patriarch Dionysios II (1537, 1545–1555), as was normal, went to present himself to the *padishah*

58 *Historia patriarchica*, 158–69; Ypsilantis, 62; Meletios, 368–9; Mathas, 177; M. Gedeon, 503; Evangelidis, 346; S. Byzantios, I, 254–6; II, 414.

59 *Historia patriarchica*, 170–1; Ypsilantis, 62–3; Mathas, 178–9; Gedeon, 503.

60 Gedeon, 505.

and kissed his hand, but instead of the previous 4,000 ducats he only paid 3,000 and then “ascended the throne and fearlessly presided”. The hierarchs “reverenced him as their lord and tsar and patriarch, – ἐπροσκύνησαν αὐτὸν ὡς αὐθέντην αὐτῶν καὶ βασιλέα καὶ πατριάρχην”.⁶¹ Nevertheless, Dionysios’s patriarchal rule was marked by upheavals caused by both internal problems and Turkish arbitrary rule.⁶² Sultan Suleiman, having granted the patriarch and people religious and civil independence in the *berat*, subsequently went on to breach his own agreement by ordering that the cross on the patriarchate’s Church of the All-Blessed be taken down, an action which caused much sorrow to the Christians, as it deprived them of a dearly regarded religious symbol which could be seen shining on land as well as from sea, marking out the modest residence of their patriarch.⁶³ Then Suleiman, having gained victory over Rhodes, Leros, Kos, Kalymnos and other islands, ordered that the local Christian population should be killed, the churches destroyed, the altars desecrated and icons smashed.⁶⁴

During Suleiman’s reign there were martyrs for their faith. In 1526 (on 18 April) St John of Ioannina was burned at the stake in Constantinople. He was a handsome, lively and eloquent man whom the Turks threatened, made of fun of and insulted in an effort to make him convert to Islam. In the end they resorted to their usual ruse of slandering him and accusing him before a Turkish court of allegedly promising several years previously, while living in the town of Trikala, to repudiate Christ, while at the same time remaining Christian. The Muslims who were called to bear false witness confirmed this story, and the saint was given the terrible choice of death or the Islamic faith. Of course, he chose death.⁶⁵ On June 8, 1559 the Turks tortured St Theophanis in Constantinople by stretching him over

61 *Historia patriarchica*, 177.

62 *Ibid.*, 172, 180, 188, 195; Ypsilantis, 93; Mathas, 179.

63 *Historia patriarchica*, 178; Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, *Ιστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πατριαρχευσάντων*, Bucharest, 1715, 1165; Ypsilantis, 91; Mathas, 179.

64 Evangelidis, 349.

65 Doukakis, IV, 210–20. In addition the monk Makarios met a martyr’s death in 1527, the monk Joasaph in 1536, Michael in 1544 and on 16 August 1551 the monk Nikodimos: Sathas, *Κατάλογος*, 605.

the sharp metal prongs of a harrow, because he, having been converted to Islam at the age of discretion, later chose to convert back to Christianity.⁶⁶ The Turks also tried to forcibly convert St Dimitrios Tornaras, but when he refused, they swore before a judge that he had insulted their faith, which led to this totally innocent Christian being beheaded on 19 March 1564.⁶⁷ In the same year, on 24 April, a Christian called Luke was flayed alive in Constantinople and his disfigured body cast onto the prongs of a harrow. This cruel punishment was inflicted on Luke because he had turned up in the house of a rich Turk for whom he had sewn a caftan, and had supposedly insulted the Turk's wife in her husband's presence. The story was told by the wife herself before the Grand Vizier and a complaint lodged. It does not, however, seem very likely that a man with the status of a slave would go into a rich Turk's house and insult his wife in the presence of witnesses. The story is questionable. Luke's more likely version of the story is that the insults were made not by him but by the Turk's wife, whose husband was away at war and who had taken an amorous liking to this good looking and upright young Christian man. Her advances having been refused by him, she concocted her terrible revenge on the new Joseph.⁶⁸

However, under Suleiman the Ecumenical Patriarch Joasaph II (1555–1565), famed for having an eye to the finances of the patriarchate,⁶⁹ managed by a mixture of lobbying and gift-making to reduce the patriarchal tax to 2,000 ducats.⁷⁰

Joasaph's immediate successors Mitrophanis III (1565–1572) and Jeremias II (1572–1579) also paid 2,000 ducats.⁷¹ Of the latter it is known that the sultan of the time, Selim II (1566–1574), having presented him with the *berat*, also “gave him every authority and power over all Orthodox Christians in holy orders and laypeople, so long as they shall abide by the law and their faith and shall not be in any way a nuisance”. As soon as the

66 Doukakis, VI, 61–2.

67 Doukakis, III, 324.

68 Doukakis, IV, 401–2.

69 Gedeon, 512–13.

70 *Historia patriarchica*, 179.

71 *Ibid.*, 193; Meletios, III, 401.

patriarch received this royal *berat*, he started presiding over the law court in a way befitting the head of the Church, justly and in the imitation of Christ, regardless of matter or person. He presided in the general court as “the overlord of the universe” (ὡς κοινὸς δεσπότης ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης),⁷² as the Ecumenical Patriarch, father and teacher.⁷³ But when a new sultan ascended to the throne, Murad III (1574–1595), Patriarch Jeremias paid the 2,000 ducat tax to him as well and received a new *berat*. “And the sultan gave to the patriarch a new *berat*, so that he should act according to his faith, judge metropolitans, archbishops, priests and every *dhimmi* and [should have authority] over the churches and monasteries. And any who should oppose this *berat* were to be punished severely by the authority of the sultan. The patriarch, having received the royal *berat*, ascended his patriarchal throne as judge and master of the universe, and judged and issued decrees. And the Christians honestly implemented his rulings, for he held universal authority. And Jeremias did other similar things according to his lordship and power held as patriarch.”⁷⁴

This was what the position of the patriarch should have been, the status that he should have enjoyed in accordance with the legal decrees of Sultans Selim II and Murad III and with the convictions of the Christian people. The reality was somewhat different. Patriarch Mitrophanis III came to the throne for the first time through the good offices of a Greek called Michael Kantakouzinis, who was an intriguer and the sworn enemy of patriarchs and metropolitans whom he would fleece, relying on his good contacts with Turkish ministers. The holder of an immense fortune acquired in the most underhand ways, Kantakouzinis gained control of Greek ecclesiastical and social affairs and turned the patriarchal throne and metropolitan sees into his personal monopoly, selling and making appointments to them as he pleased. The Church of Constantinople, in the persons of her archpastors, was living through a difficult time of humiliations and debasements at the hands of this man who feared neither God

72 *Historia patriarchica*, 193–4.

73 *Ibid.*, 197.

74 *Historia patriarchica*, 200; cf. Ypsilantis, 108.

nor man, who was a sacrilegious thief and slanderer. Having extracted from Patriarch Mitrophanis everything that he could, he brought a false accusation against him before the Porte and replaced him on the throne with Jeremias II, whom he proceeded to exploit in exactly the same way. When his shameless deeds finally reached the ears of Sultan Murad III, it was ordered that he should be hanged in Anchialos in front of his own house and his property confiscated.⁷⁵

The power-hungry and mercenary-minded claimants to patriarchal power managed to arrange the downfall of Jeremias and his exile to Rhodes under the pretence that he had been plotting against the Turkish government, accusing it of various crimes against the Church and the Christians.⁷⁶ Then the Porte put Pachomios II (1584–1585) onto the patriarchal throne. He paid up to 12,000 ducats for the privilege.⁷⁷ Ten months later Theoleptos II (1585–1586) was installed. The Alexandrian Patriarch Meletios Pigas who lived in Constantinople protested against the election of these men as they brought only trials and tribulations to their people. For his pains he almost lost the right to live in the capital and had to pay out 3,000 ducats in gifts to pacify those he had offended. Nevertheless, Pachomios and Theoleptos were forced out of office.⁷⁸ After this the synod determined to elect Jeremias II to the throne, but Sultan Murad III objected. The throne again became a target of bargaining. One of the claimants, the Metropolitan of Philippoupolis, offered to pay 24,000 gold pieces to the Porte, but it was his adversary who won the day.⁷⁹

Then, in spring 1586, when the patriarchate was being ruled by Archdeacon Nicephoros, *protosynkellos* and *locum tenens* of Patriarch Jeremias (1586–1595), who had been elected for the third time, the Turks also seized from the Orthodox the Church of the All-Blessed which, in 1455, had become the location of the residence of the ecumenical patri-

75 Mathas, 180–1; Gedeon, 515–16; Evangelidis, 412; Lebedev, 286–90.

76 Mathas, 183; Gedeon, 521.

77 Paparrigopoulos, V, 498.

78 Ypsilantis, 116–17; Mathas, 183; Gedeon, 526–8; Paparrigopoulos, V, 498.

79 Paparrigopoulos, V, 499.

archs.⁸⁰ The reason given for this was that one morning the body of a murdered Turk had been found outside the patriarch's gates. The Muslims created a hue and cry, accusing the Greeks in the patriarch's residence of the crime and complaining to the authorities that they were frightened to have Christians living in their midst any more, demanding that they be ejected from the Church of the All-Blessed and the building turned into a mosque. The timing of all this could not have been better for the accusers, as Patriarch Jeremias had not yet returned from exile, and his *locum tenens* was unable to do anything in the face of the determination of the Porte and people. Thus it happened that Archdeacon Nicephoros transferred the sacred vessels and icons as well as the patriarchal throne to the Church of Vlach Serai, which was to become the centre of Orthodoxy until 1597, after the Church of the All-Blessed had been turned into a mosque.⁸¹ Patriarch Jeremias was to spend his entire reign here until he died. By his careful manoeuvring he was able to delay somewhat the decline in patriarchal power and was able to re-establish somewhat its prestige and authority in the eyes of the Porte and to improve its economic position.⁸² Even so, the patriarchate was in a sorry state, and news of this percolated through to the West. "The Patriarch of Constantinople," wrote Pope Clement VIII in 1594, "*is utterly dependent on the will of the sultan, who is the sworn enemy of Christianity*. His power depends totally on the sultan's whim, he pays money to receive his position and can be pushed out by anyone who offers a higher price."⁸³

Life for the "beasts of burden" during this time was likewise extremely hard. Under Selim II a terrible misfortune overtook the Christians of Cyprus. While preparing in 1570 to take over this island, the sultan asked

80 Gedeon, 530.

81 Ypsilantis, 123; Mathas, 180–8; Gedeon, *Χρονικά τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ οἴκου καὶ τοῦ ναοῦ*, Constantinople, 1884, 69.

82 Gedeon, 531–6.

83 Instructions issued by the pope to his envoy Count Ludovic Angvisiol, sent to the Russian Tsar Theodore Ioannovich to persuade him to form a union against the Turks: *Русская Историческая Библиотека (Russian Historical Library)*, published by the Archeographic Commission, VIII, St Petersburg, 1884, 34.

the *sheikh-ül-islam* if it was “permitted to abrogate the agreement with the Christians and use weapons to seize their lands”. A *fatwa* to this effect was issued saying “any agreement with the infidel is only legally valid when it brings benefit to Islam”.⁸⁴ Taking this as his guiding rule, the sultan razed Cyprus to the ground. In Nicosia alone up to 20,000 Christians were exterminated and about 2,000 boys and girls loaded into ships bound for the capital. Mothers killed their own children before the very eyes of the Turks and then turned their hands against themselves. One Greek woman, whose name history does not record, set fire to the Turkish fleet carrying the young captives, preferring die with them rather than facing the harem and seraglio. The Christian populations of Paphos, Lemesos and Larnaca were completely wiped out, together with their church buildings, and the population of Famagusta, despite an existing accord to the contrary, was put to death or shipped to Constantinople for sale in the marketplace as “beasts of burden”.⁸⁵

In 1571, at the battle of Lepanto, the united fleet of Venice, Spain and Pope Pius V wiped out the huge Turkish squadron. When news of this reached Sultan Selim he could not eat for three days and lay with his face to the ground begging God to have mercy on the true believers. Suddenly recovering from his lethargy, he flew into a rage and vowed to exterminate all Christians. Many of them were imprisoned and hanged, until the sultan, fearing reprisals from Europe, was forced to back down.⁸⁶

Selim II tried to regularise the payment of taxes and tithes. Under him the poll tax had been set at 12 gross per year for rich men and merchants, 6 gross for men of middle income and 3 gross for the poor. In addition, all Christians had to pay an extra tithe of 8 gross per annum called the *σπέντσα*. However, the sultan’s good intentions foundered on rude reality and the Christians remained, as before, grievously overtaxed. The fact is that taxes were farmed out to private people, always Muslims. A man could pay a good

84 Evangelidis, 395.

85 Evangelidis, 396–7; Ioannis Stanos, *Βιβλος χρονική, περιέχουσα τήν ιστορίαν τής Βυζαντιδος*, VI, Venice, 1767, 17–18, 25–6.

86 Evangelidis, 399.

sum in the capital for the right of *iltizam*, which entitled him to collect taxes, and eventually he would more than get his money back. Usually the holder of the tax right either collected the money using his own hired collectors, each sent to a specific district and each with a specific target sum to raise; or he would, in his turn, re-lease out the right to smaller tax collectors, who would arrange the collection in the way they thought best. In neither case did the Christians come off well, being thoroughly fleeced.

In the villages and the countryside, the tax collectors behaved just as they pleased. They would increase the poll tax with no warning, change the rules, oblige parents to pay for underage children, use violence and extortion, lock people up and in general wield the power of the strongest. The way of determining whether a boy was twelve years old was to force him to hold the end of a rope between his teeth, wind it once round his neck, pull it up above his head, and if there was enough rope left to reach down to his shoulders again, then the boy was deemed to be twelve years old and liable to pay the poll tax. Having paid the poll tax, each Christian was given a receipt with a Turkish stamp and the words: "The holder of this receipt has permission for the course of one year to keep his head on his shoulders." Some tax collectors would stop every passing Christian on the road, particularly if they were young, and demand proof of payment of the poll tax. If the receipt was not immediately forthcoming, the tax had to be paid again.

In the same way other taxes were extracted from the Christians, such as land tax, customs dues, tax on goods, personal tax, and especially child tax. This tax was a very heavy burden on the Christian population, particularly affecting families and their welfare. Initially payable every five years, it was then demanded more frequently, every three, then every two years and eventually on an annual basis, depending on the state's requirements. To begin with each Christian family had to give up one son, then two and three; even widowed mothers were deprived of their only sons and breadwinners if they were handsome and strong. The Turkish authorities did not care what age these boys were, they took whomever they wanted, often as young as six or seven years old. In an effort to keep their children the unhappy parents would promise them in marriage while they were still very young, and some would convert them to Islam, but even this did

not save them from being taken away. It was common for rich Christians to bribe the authorities, which made the burden on the poor even greater. Only those living in coastal or mountainous regions managed to evade this cruel duty by sending their children into hiding in the mountains or onto islands. Those putting up resistance were killed together with their children. The unfortunate mothers and fathers would plead with Providence to take their children so that the Turks should not get them. The barbaric practice of taking Christian boys for state service continued until 1638 when Sultan Murad IV abolished it.⁸⁷ As one Greek writer put it, it is not possible to describe all that the Christian population especially those living in provinces far from the capital had to endure from the Turkish pashas and soldiers: the desecration of churches and robbing of Christian villages, the dishonouring of Christian women, girls and boys, the enslaving of men, the destruction of Christian property, murders, theft, and so on. These horrors that happen only occasionally in modern society were everyday occurrences for the Turkish Christians against which they were powerless to do anything.⁸⁸

The Greek “beasts of burden” were to suffer similar iniquities under Sultans Murad III (1574–1595) and Mehmed III (1595–1603), each of whose reigns was notable for particular measures taken against them. The former brought in tighter restrictions on the form and colour of clothing that Christians could wear, allowing them only the simplest clothing in the most sombre of colours. It was during his reign that the Constantinople fanatics again raised the issue of turning all Christian churches into mosques, but without success, as the sultan was scared of provoking the Europeans.⁸⁹ During the reign of the latter, his mother, a fanatic Muslim who considered that the Christians brought about the war with Hungary, proposed that they should all be killed, but all she achieved was the exiling of many Greeks from the capital.⁹⁰

87 Ioannis Stanos, VI, 210; Paparrigopoulos, V, 443–4, 446; Evangelidis, 455.

88 Evangelidis, 406.

89 Girgas, 87.

90 Evangelidis, 425.

In the second half of the sixteenth century (after 1566), the Orthodox Church had five new martyrs for their faith. In 1568 the Turks put to death the monk Damian⁹¹ and on 26 February 1575 St John the Cabinetmaker was beheaded in Constantinople, a well-educated and kind man, an architect whose only crime was to explain, to a Turk who asked, the differences between Christianity and Islam, between Christ and Muhammad. It goes without saying that the comparison was not flattering to Muhammad. His Turkish interlocutor took this as an insult against the prophet and started demanding that the Christian expiate his sin by reneging on his faith. Receiving a flat refusal, he lodged an official complaint against him in court. The Christian was sentenced to death.⁹² On 19 February 1589 a nun called Philothei was beaten almost to death by the Turks in Athens for having given shelter to Christian women fleeing from captivity. Following terrible tortures she died a martyr's death.⁹³ On 6 October 1590 St Makarios was beheaded in Piraeus for his fidelity to the Christian faith. His father had voluntarily converted to Islam and wanted his eighteen-year-old son to do the same. But Makarios refused to be an apostate. The Turks seized him, beat him and circumcised him. But Makarios remained in his heart a Christian, went away to Athos where he lived for a long time, became a monk, and then came back to Piraeus where the Turks recognised him and condemned him to death for refusing Islam.⁹⁴

Finally, in 1601, the Turks impaled the holy martyr Seraphim, Archbishop of Phanarion and Pharsala. Not long before that the Bishop of Trikala, Dionysios, rose against the Turks in Epirus, having been outraged by the inhuman cruelty of the Muslims against the Christians and by the impossible taxes. His uprising was put down and the heroic bishop was executed.⁹⁵ Shortly after the execution of Dionysios, Archbishop Seraphim appeared in Phanarion bearing the usual gifts for the local Turkish authorities. Having energetically defended his flock's religious rights against

91 Sathas, *Κατάλογος*, 606.

92 Doukakis, II, 403–4.

93 *Ibid.*, 306–29.

94 Doukakis, X, 90–4.

95 K. Sathas, *Τουρκοκρατούμενη Ελλάς*, Athens, 1869, 211–14.

the Turks, he had made many enemies among the Muslims, who used the uprising by Dionysios to engineer the downfall of Seraphim. They accused him of co-conspiring with Dionysios against the government. Although no proof of the archbishop's guilt was produced during the hearing, the court nonetheless sentenced him to death. Thus he became a martyr for the Christian faith and for his zeal in fulfilling his role as archbishop. The Turkish "kangaroo court" did not distinguish between ordinary Christian citizens and their religious and secular leaders; all were equally maltreated.⁹⁶

The further history of the patriarchate in Constantinople is just as full of instances of an arbitrary and violent nature committed against the Christians by the Turks, of bribery and intrigue by the Greeks, of incursions of secular interests into the life of the Church, of Jesuit machinations, and so on.⁹⁷ Thus the Grand Vizier Aali Pasha demanded from Patriarch Timothy (1612–1621) a poll tax of 100,000 ducats, explaining that the patriarch, who had 300 metropolitans under him, could easily raise up to 300,000 gold pieces. The patriarch, however, was not happy with this level of contribution and reached an agreement to pay 30,000 gold pieces instead.⁹⁸

The story of Patriarch Cyril I Loukaris is typical. He came to the throne on six separate occasions, including a term as *locum tenens* in 1612. On the death of Patriarch Timothy, the synod of the Church of Constantinople unanimously elected Cyril to the throne (1621–1623). But the Jesuits, who in the seventeenth century had established themselves in Turkey and were

96 Doukakis, XII, 120–6; K. Sathas, 215–21.

97 Gedeon, 542–7 (the administrative expulsion of Patriarch Neophytos in 1612 to Rhodes, the forcible deposition of Raphael II from patriarchal office in 1607). Cf. Mathas, 187. Incidentally, in 1597 the Alexandrian Patriarch Meletios Pigas, the *locum tenens* of the Constantinople patriarchal throne, transferred the patriarchate to the Church of St Dimitrios in Ksiloporta, from where the patriarchal residence was moved to the Phanar in 1601 under Patriarch Matthew, where it remains to this day at the Church of St George: Gedeon, *Χρονικά του πατριαρχικού οίκου και του ναού*, 72, 74–5.

98 S. Byzantios, II, 421; Paparrigopoulos, V, 499.

infiltrating among the Orthodox population in an effort to bring them over to the Latin Church, were extremely displeased by the election of Cyril, since he, during his period of office as Patriarch of Alexandria (1602–1620), was engaged in an energetic defence of Orthodoxy.⁹⁹ They paid the Grand Vizier Hussein 40,000 thaler to have Loukaris removed from the throne. In his place they put the devoted servant of the papal throne and of the Jesuits, Gregory (1623), who together with his like-minded colleagues systematically complained against Cyril to the Porte, representing him as a traitor to the state and a friend of the Franks.

Yet even Gregory only managed to stay on the throne for 33 days, as neither the synod nor the clergy wanted to work with him because of his liking for the Latins, and so persuaded the Porte to dethrone him. The majority of clergy and people were for Cyril's reinstatement, and he was willing to return. The Jesuits, however, encouraged by the French envoy, spun a story to the Porte that Cyril was plotting to hand over one of the Aegean islands to the Florentines. This strange story, supported by a bribe of 20,000 thaler, seemed convincing enough to the Grand Vizier, who ordered that Cyril should leave the city without so much as an inquiry. For the next three months the throne was occupied by Anthimos II, who, in view of the sad state of church affairs and the enormous patriarchal debt, was obliged to absent himself on Mount Athos. At the same time the Janissaries brought down the Grand Vizier Hussein and Cyril was given permission to return from exile and to ascend the patriarchal throne for a third time (1623–1630). This news was greeted with dismay in the Roman Catholic world. Rome quickly announced to the Porte that it was willing to pay another 20,000 thaler to have Cyril dethroned yet again. When this failed, the Jesuits returned to their old ruse of accusing the patriarch of being friendly with Russia, then offering him a peaceful alliance that would be of benefit to the Greeks, and eventually accusing him of insulting Islam by publishing anti-Islamic books in the newly-opened patriarchal printing house and also of Calvinism. Finally they managed to secure his

99 Bishop Porphyry Uspensky, *Александрийская патриархия (The Alexandrian Patriarchate)*, I, St Petersburg, 1898, 72–5 (editor's prologue by K. M. Loparev).

dethronement on the ground that he was a friend of the Franks and a traitor to the Turkish government.

The next occupant of the throne was the sworn enemy of Cyril Loukaris, Cyril II Kontaris, a graduate from the Jesuit school in Galata and a devoted servant of Rome. He survived in office for a few days only (5–11 October 1630) before being forced to step down by the government and exiled to the island of Tenedos. Loukaris, by now well known to all, became head of the Ecumenical Church for a fourth time (1630–1634), and energetically carried on the struggle against the Jesuits, in return for which he was exiled to the island of Chios. The Jesuits, seeing that their machinations against this famous patriarch were only serving to increase his standing, started wondering how to get rid of him for good. While Cyril was living on Chios there was even an attack launched on him with the help of Aegean pirates, who were supposed to seize and kill him. The plan failed because Cyril had been forewarned and managed to escape to Rhodes.

Returning from exile, Cyril ascended the throne for a fifth time (1634–1635) and, finally, a sixth time (1637–1638), following another spell in exile in 1635. Seeing Cyril on the throne yet again, the Jesuits came to the conclusion that “only the dead do not return”, and decided to rid themselves once and for all of this troublesome and energetic adversary. They accused Cyril of treachery, of seeking to instigate an uprising, of being in contact with the Russian Cossacks whom, they alleged, he had invited to Constantinople. This accusation, amply backed up with 50,000 gold pieces, was sufficient to persuade Sultan Murad III and the Grand Vizier Bairam Pasha to disregard all the rights conferred on the patriarch and to take terrible measures against him. Not daring to hang him publicly, the Turks put him aboard a ship as though sending him into exile. As soon as they had put to sea they strangled him and threw his body overboard. The patriarch’s body subsequently turned up in nets belonging to Christian fishermen and thus he was properly buried. However, the Jesuits’ hatred for their opponent was so strong that they dug him up again and dumped the body at sea for a

second time. The tide was moving in towards the island of Halki where the body was eventually washed up and given a second burial on dry land.¹⁰⁰

Patriarch Cyril Loukaris, tragically killed on 27 June 1638, was the first patriarch to die a martyr at the hands of the despotic Turkish regime which safeguarded neither the property nor honour nor the very lives of their vassals the Greeks. In truth the exclusive rights of patriarchal power were affirmed on the sand, in the words of the Greek scholar Paparrigopoulos.¹⁰¹ On the one side this unprincipled act and on the other the complete lack of rights created a terrible unease within the patriarchate, as can be seen from the following incident. In January 1637, under Patriarch Neophytos III, Metropolitan Gabriel of Philippoupolis was forcibly relieved of his throne and the former Bishop of Corinth, Cyril, put in his place. The official document recording this move, which is preserved in the archive of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, contains not only the signatures of the bishops of Ephesus, Herakleia, Didymoteichon and Peritheori but also those of three Turks, who were obviously participants in the Church's decision-making process. In September 1639, under Patriarch Parthenios I a synodal decision was made, as a result of which Cyril's removal from Corinth to Philippoupolis was declared illegal, carried out by those not empowered to do so.¹⁰²

After Cyril Loukaris, the other Cyril, Cyril II Kontaris (1638–1639), was patriarch for a third term. He was a friend of the Jesuits and fierce opponent of his predecessor. During his time the Church sank into a sorry state. Among other things he set in motion a purge of Loukaris's supporters and was soon almost universally hated by the Greek people. The Greeks demanded his resignation and exile to Carthage. On the way he was strangled on orders from Sultan Murad IV.¹⁰³ His successor, Parthenios I

100 Meletios, III, 448; Dositheos, 1170; Mathas, 192–202; K. Sathas, *Νεοελληνική φιλολογία*, Athens, 1868, 238–47; Gedeon, 550–67.

101 *Ιστορία*, V, 493.

102 *Archive of the Patriarchate of Constantinople* (C.P.A.), Codex 1, 299: “Υπόμνημα Κυρίλλου ...”, p. 300: “Παρθενίου Α' τοῦ Γέροντος πράξις συνοδική ἀκυροῦσα τὴν εἰς Φιλιππούπολιν μετάρθεσιν τοῦ πρώην Κορίνθου Κυρίλλου, ὡς βιαίαν καὶ δυναστικήν, ὡς φαίνεται ὀπισθεν καὶ τινὰ τῶν ἔξω ὀνόματα συγκαταλεγόμενα τοῖς ἐπιψηφισθεῖσιν”.

103 Mathas, 203–5; Gedeon, 567–8.

(1639–1644) was exiled to Cyprus. Parthenios II, following two terms as patriarch (1644–1645, 1648–1651), was killed by order of the sultan but without Jesuit participation and without participation of the rulers of Moldavia and Wallachia.¹⁰⁴ The tragic deaths of Parthenios II (on 10 May 1651) and of the two Cyrils sent a wave of terror through the Christian community and the aspirants to the patriarchal throne. Many patriarchs were forced to leave office hastily in an attempt to preserve their own lives. The second half of the seventeenth century (1651–1702) saw 31 patriarchs on the Ecumenical Throne, of whom several were in power for only a few months,¹⁰⁵ or in some cases, a few days.¹⁰⁶ Several patriarchs occupied the throne three, four or even five times.¹⁰⁷ The longest period of rule by one patriarch was nine years¹⁰⁸ and the next longest was five years.¹⁰⁹

The Turkish government greatly encouraged frequent changes of patriarch as it derived significant financial benefit. The strengthening relations in the seventeenth century between the Eastern Patriarchs and Russia created a new source of income for the inventive minds of the Porte. By granting the patriarchs permission to visit Russia to raise funds, the Porte was able to subsequently level accusations of pro-Russian activity and political unreliability, and to allow them to purchase their pardon from the hangman's noose with Russian money.¹¹⁰ In the seventeenth century there was also the murder of a patriarch on suspicion of political treachery, carried out as

104 Mathas, 209–11; Gedeon, 576–7.

105 Ioannikios II – nine months (1653–1654), then fled in terror and hid; Paisios – eleven months (1654–1655), also left in secret (*Εκκλ. Αλ.*, 1880, 7, 105); Parthenios III – eight months (1656–1657); Parthenios IV – four months (1671); and Clement – three months and 20 days (1667).

106 Athanasios III – 15 days (1652), Gabriel II – 10 days (1657), Athanasios IV – 8 days (1671).

107 For example, Parthenios IV 1657–1662, 1665–1667, 1671, 1675–1676, 1684–1685; Dionysios IV 1671–1673, 1676–1679, 1683–1684, 1686–1687, 1694.

108 Kallinikos II 1694–1702.

109 Parthenios IV – his first period in office.

110 Prof. N. Kapterev, *Характер отношений России к православному востоку в XVI–XVII в.* (*The Character of Russian Relations with the Orthodox East in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*), Moscow, 1885, 403–23; appendix, 13, 20.

part of a Jesuit plot. We are referring here to the tragic end of Parthenios III, who had been accused of encouraging the Russians to attack Turkey. In their turn the Jesuits showed the sultan a letter from Parthenios addressed to the ruler of Wallachia, bearing the words “the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, in which the just will be rewarded”. This Sultan Mehmed IV took to mean something else, and without further enquiry ordered Parthenios to be hanged (on 24 March 1657). His body was left on the gibbet for three days and was then thrown into the sea. The sultan ordered that patriarchs, as heretics and enemies of the Porte, should from henceforth not come in person to receive the *berat* but should receive it from the hands of the Grand Vizier. The martyr’s death of St Parthenios on the most scanty of evidence highlighted the perilous nature of the patriarchal privileges, the arbitrariness and cruelty of the sultans.¹¹¹ Parthenios’s successor, Patriarch Gabriel II, also met a tragic end. After a ten day rule (in April 1657) he was ousted and sent to Prusa. Two years later he was accused before the Porte of baptising a Turk. Gabriel insisted that he had baptised a Jew and not a Turk. Nevertheless, on the sultan’s orders, he was hanged on 3 December 1659.¹¹² In the same year the Turks hanged Archbishop Gabriel of Pech/Ipek, who was accused before the sultan of plotting with Russia.¹¹³ In 1684 Bishop Zacharias was beheaded in Corinth, charged with carrying out a secret correspondence with the Franks.¹¹⁴

Under the influence of these circumstances, Sultan Mehmed IV became more hostile towards the Christians. *Inter alia* he forbade the patriarchs to wear the *palakin* (σκιᾶδιον) which had been used on official patriarchal engagements, and forbade them to appear in the Porte accompanied by a suite of twelve metropolitans, as had always been the practice.¹¹⁵

111 Meletios, III, 465–6; Kaisarios Dapontis, *Χρονογράφος*, 6 (Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, III, Venice, 1872); Doukakis, III, 405–7; M. X., *Μνημεία γραπτὰ, Εκκλ. Αλήθεια*, 1880, I, 7, 106–7; Kapterev, 295–6.

112 Meletios, 466; Dositheos, 1172; Doukakis, XII, 88–9; Gedeon, 586.

113 Meletios, 466; Dapontis, 6; Doukakis, XII, 341–2.

114 Doukakis, III, 486.

115 Paparrigopoulos, V, 501.

The tribulations of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, so dependent on the unpredictable Turkish regime and its swings of mood, continued throughout the eighteenth century. As before, the patriarch's throne was more or less on offer to the highest bidder, and the Turkish government would raise or lower the price as it saw fit.¹¹⁶ The swift succession of patriarchs and the increasing taxes and "backhanders" paid to the government meant that the patriarchal exchequer was empty and owed large amounts of money (τὰ αὐλικά χρέη).¹¹⁷ The patriarchs, who were dedicated to serving the Church, experienced extreme financial hardship. Jeremias III spent his life in great poverty trying to pay off the debts of his office inherited from former times. He kept only two priests and two deacons, who took it in turns to serve liturgy in the patriarchal cathedral. Thanks to his extreme frugality, the patriarch managed to pay off half of the debt owed to some people and one third of the debt owed to others. To speed up the repayment process he partitioned the debts, sharing them among different dioceses according to their possibilities, insisting that each of the hierarchs should pay an annual fixed sum over and above the usual tithes payable to the patriarchate. He threatened them with loss of office should they refuse.¹¹⁸ The last measure was not new, having been unsuccessfully used as long ago as the early seventeenth century by Patriarchs Neophytos II (1602–1603) and Raphael II (1603–1607), who had likewise insisted that the diocesan hierarchs help to pay off the patriarchate's debts, or lose their positions.¹¹⁹

As, however, the majority of the hierarchs were themselves in financial difficulty, having had to purchase their own positions and to pacify the Turkish authorities with cash payments, and finding it impossible to raise large sums from the exhausted people, they were not only unable to repay their own debts, but were frequently forced out of office, only to come back again later, once they could meet the patriarchate's demands. Thus there were cases where hierarchs would be unseated two to five times, and

116 Examples are given in Mathas, 235–7, 244, 248.

117 Sergios Makraios, *Εκκλησιαστική ιστορία*, 205, 206, 218, in Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, III, Venice, 1872.

118 Gedeon, 627.

119 Meletios, 403–4; Ypsilantis, 121–2.

each time would return again.¹²⁰ The measures taken by Jeremias III did not attain the desired goal. The patriarchal debt grew to 100,769 gross or 400,000 francs.¹²¹

When Seraphim II (1757–1761) ascended the throne, the patriarchal purse was still burdened with unpaid debts. The patriarch and some secular community leaders managed to obtain from Sultan Mustafa III a *hatti* (1759) which legalised new methods of putting the financial affairs of the patriarchate into order. The *hatti* makes mention of how certain of the Greeks, *having entered into relations with the Franks*, driven by self-interest, had introduced into the Church in Constantinople a strange custom that was not in accordance with her teaching: they continually removed from the patriarchal throne people who were sometimes uneducated and depraved, and the costs associated with this they attributed to the patriarchate and metropolitans. In this way the patriarchate inherited a huge debt from former years (up to 1,150 pungeia¹²²), and the metropolitans also found themselves in debt to the people who were themselves undergoing hardship and privations. For this reason the sultan decreed that claimants to the patriarchal throne should henceforth cover all their own accession expenses,¹²³ and not use the patriarchal purse and contributions made by metropolitans. In addition, the sultan laid down that from henceforth all documents pertaining to debt and patriarchal bonds should bear the stamp of the members of synod, if they really did not relate directly to the patriarch, but to the patriarchal exchequer. Any demand for money from the patriarch addressed to the metropolitans which did not have this stamp would be considered invalid, as having emanated personally from the patriarch rather than from the Church as a whole.¹²⁴

Yet even after this, little changed for the better. As previously the patriarchs not only used church funds to cover patriarchal needs and the patriarchal tax every year, but also made cash gifts to the vizier, courtiers,

120 Meletios, III, 430; Ypsilantis, 122.

121 Gedeon, 631.

122 One pungeion (πουνγγείον) or koshelek (kise) equals 500 piastres.

123 Up to 60 talents according to Ypsilantis or 120,000 francs according to Gedeon.

124 C.P.A., Greek codex V, 225; S. Makraios, 228–9; Ypsilantis, 379–80; Gedeon, 253.