Citizenship in historical perspective / edited by Steven G. Ellis, Guðmundur Hálfdanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs
(Transversal theme ; 1)

323.6 (21.)
1. Cittadinanza 2. Individuo e società I. Ellis, Steven II. Hálfdanarson, Guðmundur III. Isaacs, Ann Katherine

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-006164.
The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Volumes published (2006)

I. *Thematic Work Groups*

I. Public Power in Europe: Studies in Historical Transformations
II. Power and Culture: Hegemony, Interaction and Dissent
III. Religion, Ritual and Mythology. Aspects of Identity Formation in Europe
IV. Professions and Social Identity. New European Historical Research on Work, Gender and Society
V. Frontiers and Identities: Exploring the Research Area
VI. Europe and the World in European Historiography

II. *Transversal Theme*

I. Citizenship in Historical Perspective

III. *Doctoral Dissertations*

I. F. Peyrou, La Comunidad de Ciudadanos. El Discurso Democrático-Republicano en España, 1840-1868

Cover: Ambrogio Lorenzetti (1285-1348 ca.), *The Effects of Good Government in the City and the Countryside*, fresco (central part), Palazzo Pubblico, Siena. © 1990. Photo Scala, Florence.

Association of American University Presses

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43
56126 Pisa
Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945
info-plus@edizioniplus.it
www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

ISBN 88-8492-406-5

Manager
Claudia Napolitano

Editing
Francesca Petrucci

Informatic assistance
Michele Gasparello

From Millets to Minorities in the 19th-Century Ottoman Empire: an Ambiguous Modernization

Dimitrios Stamatopoulos
University of Thessaloniki

Το άρθρο αποπειράται να μελετήσει με ένα τρόπο συγκριτικό την ιστορική εξέλιξη των μιλλέτ (των αναγνωρισμένων δηλαδή από το Οθωμανικό κράτος θρησκευτικών κοινοτήτων) μέσα στην Οθωμανική αυτοκρατορία. Περιγράφει τις επιδράσεις που είχε στην εσωτερική τους δομή το μεγαλεπήβολο εγχείρημα των μεταρρυθμίσεων του Τανζιμάτ (1839-1876) αλλά και η αναστολή τους κατά τη βασιλεία του Αμπντούλ Χαμίτ. Η προώθηση των μεταρρυθμίσεων από την Οθωμανική γραφειοκρατική ελίτ αλλά και η έκρηξη των εθνικών επαναστάσεων στα Βαλκάνια διαμόρφωσαν ουσιαστικά άνισες συνθήκες ανάπτυξης των τριών μη μουσουλμανικών μιλλέτ κατά τον 19ο αιώνα αλλά και τις προϋποθέσεις της εσωτερικής διάσπασής τους και της δημιουργίας νέων μιλλέτ.

In one sense, the history of the gradual dissolution of the Ottoman Empire during the 19th and 20th century, i.e., the famous 'Eastern Question', could be described from another, entirely different standpoint: that of the progressive collapse of a cultural value system based on the predominance of the religious element, and its replacement by the principle of the nation-state, as formulated in Western Europe during the Great Revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries.

It is well known that during what has been called the "classical age" of the Empire, there were three non-Muslim *millets* [religious communities] recognized by the Ottoman authority: the 'Rum' (Greek-Orthodox), the Armenian (Gregorian), and the Jewish millet. The first included all the Balkan or Asia Minor populations, subject to the authority of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople[1]. The second included the (Gregorian) Armenians primarily, but also and more generally, all Christian religious groups, chiefly pre-Chalcedonean monophysites, that were not subject to the Orthodox Patriarchate, for example the Copts of Egypt or heretical groups like Paulicians and Bogomils[2]. The third included all Jewish populations in the empire (Romaniotes, Ashkenazi, and Sephardic Jews). Naturally, there were a number of gradations along this path of recognition: the Jewish millet was characterized by a decentralized administrative structure and was only officially recognized by the Ottoman state in the mid-19th century, whereas the Orthodox and Armenian millets operated according to a pyramidal, hierarchic principle from the fall of Constantinople in 1453[3].

But recent historical research has shown that the awarding of privileges by the Ottoman state to religious functionaries of the millets occurred through *berats* [titles of privileges

given to the laic or clerical officials on behalf of the Ottoman state] which did not necessarily presuppose recognition of the Orthodox or Armenian Patriarchates as institutionalized mechanisms of the Ottoman state or, to put it in modern terms, as public legal entities[4].

The concept of the millets in the Ottoman Empire frequently treads a fine line in historical analyses (chiefly those of the Balkan historiographers) between being defined as a strictly religious community recognized by the Ottoman state and being referred to as a more or less unified ethnic-religious whole which in some fashion constituted the mould from which emerged the nationalist groups which laid claim during the 19th century to state fulfillment[5]. In reality, this confusion reflected an inability to define the use of the term "millet" historically within the framework of the Ottoman legal system. From this standpoint, the related studies by Benjamin Braude[6], carried out during the 1980s, were ground-breaking, for they linked the use of the concept with the famous hypothesis of 'privileges', presumed to have been awarded by Ottoman authority to these religious groups during the first centuries of the Ottoman conquest. The fashioning of many of these privileges after the fact by the political or intellectual elite of the nationalist groups which during the 19th and 20th centuries were claiming an enhanced degree of political and cultural self-governance would suggest that the institutionalization of the millets was actually something belonging to approximately the same period[7].

Braude claimed that the use of the term *millet*, at least in the case of the Greek-Orthodox population, dates no earlier than the 19th century. However, it seems that the term already appeared in the Ottoman state terminology during the 18th century. Official Ottoman documents from the 16th to the 18th centuries employ the concept of the *taife kâfirlerin*, i.e. of a group of non-believers, to define Orthodox populations that came under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It was natural that the Orthodox population be considered as the most important group of non-believers, given that they greatly surpassed in numbers all other non-Muslim ethnic-religious groups, such as the Armenians and the Jews. Nonetheless, a fundamental conceptual shift took place around 1700. The Patriarch of Constantinople no longer appears in the official *berat* ascribed to him as "Patriarch of the non-believers," but as "Patriarch of the *Romaioi* (Orthodox, usually Greek-speakers, inhabitants of the Empire)". The use of this term from the beginning of the 18th century essentially prepared the way for the introduction of the term *Rum millet* (or *millet-i Rum*), i.e. the religious group of *Romaioi* (or *Romioi*), as replacement for the former term *taife kâfirlerin*[8]. Moreover the term of millet had been established before the 19th century in order to describe the community of Jews of the Empire[9].

The appearance of the term in fact coincides with the concession of increased powers to the Patriarchate of Constantinople (as well as to the leaderships of the other millets), which was directly connected with the first military defeats of the Ottoman Empire in the wars with Hapsburg Austria, resulting in the Treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718) as well as with the appearance of another great opponent to the North, Russia. In Istanbul, the rise of a new social class with enormous political and cultural influence, the Phanariots, was actually a consequence of this same historical development[10]. This Greek-speaking aristocracy, ideologically gathered around the Patriarchate and exercising

a host of commercial and civic functions, managed to control the promotion of leaders in the Danube Principalities and to occupy important posts in the Ottoman administration. It would appear that the Phanariots, a social group guaranteeing the maintenance of Ottoman legitimacy in border-states vital to the empire, and the influence they had over internal political issues, may be considered responsible for the definition of the Orthodox millet as *Rum*.

Accordingly, the problem of defining the term *millet* in relation to its introduction to Ottoman political terminology may also prove useful in defining its contents. Simply put, this means that from the moment we see it appearing in the Ottoman legal system, we know that the terms for the construction of an internal hierarchy of ethnic-linguistic groupings that compose it had developed. The Greek Orthodox population, represented chiefly by the Phanariot elite and the higher Orthodox clergy, gradually acquired greater political and social power and laid the groundwork for imposing its own (primarily) cultural predominance over the other Orthodox peoples of the Balkan peninsula, mostly Slavs but also Moldo-valachians and Albanians. The outcome of the Russo-Turkish Wars at the end of the 18th century (1768-1774, 1788-1792) also contributed to this development: Catherine the Great made Russia the protector of the Orthodox populations of the Empire and gave the opportunity for enormous economic development to the rising bourgeois elements of the Greek peninsula[11].

It would probably be anachronistic to consider the cultural hegemony of the Greek-speaking merchant and bureaucratic element as an expression of some form of 'proto-nationalism' (in accordance with Hobsbawm[12]), or to conceive the identity of the various ethnic-linguistic groups which in fact existed within the millet as a model for the nations which were to arise from the revolutions of the 19th century (according to Anthony Smith[13]). However, the pre-eminence of the Greek-speaking Orthodox clergy and the cultural dominance in the 18th century of the Phanariots created the presuppositions for a relatively early revolutionary uprising (essentially the consequence of a chain of events set in motion by the French Revolution), but which necessarily turned against the imperial model – the only framework within which the above-mentioned social groups could reproduce their social dominance. This important fact did not prevent other Orthodox peoples of the Balkans from construing Greek Orthodox cultural dominance as an impediment to their own course of nationalist self-awareness. Nineteenth-century Serb and Bulgarian intellectuals, for example, viewed the movement by the Patriarchate in Constantinople in 1766-67 to abolish the arch-dioceses of Peć and Ohrid (historical centers of the medieval Serbian and the first Bulgarian kingdoms, respectively)[14] as moves which militated against the nationalist reformation of their peoples, while the Romanians for their part built their modern national identity in opposition to everything represented by the Phanariot leaders, who controlled the thrones of the Danube Principalities for more than a century (1711-1821).

The 19th century would also reveal the same internal separation of ethnic-linguistic groups in the case of the dominant Muslim element: both Arab Muslims (particularly during the period when Pan-Islamism held sway as the preeminent ideology of the Ottoman state) as well as Albanian nationalists would be forced by events to distance them-

selves from – and to manifest nationalist movements which in the end turned against the unity of – the Ottoman Empire.

The early 19th century was marked by the outbreak of the Serbian Revolution (1804) and then the Greek Revolution (1821), in consequence of which the Ottoman Empire would for the first time come to know the phenomenon of the secession of European territories not included among its traditional opponents (like Russia and Austria), but which constituted new state entities, independent or autonomous. This process, like the pressure exercised by England (chiefly) – in parallel to the unsuccessful attempt by the Ottomans to squelch the Revolt of Mohammed Ali in Egypt – to open the Empire's market to importation of Western products (a direct result of this pressure would be the Anglo-Ottoman Trade Pact of 1838), imposed a new phase of reforms which have become known in history as the Tanzimat reforms. The chronological starting-point for these reforms is considered to be the issuing of the imperial decree of Hatt-i Şerif in 1839, which contained declarations of equality, freedom, and isonomy by which the Ottoman state bound itself to treat its non-Muslim subjects. These declarations were repeated immediately following the end of the Crimean War in the famous decree of Hatt-i Hümayûn (Imperial Rescript) in 1856 as a consequence of the terms established by the Paris Conference[15].

But, beyond the influence of national revolutions at the beginning of the Tanzimat reforms, which affected the character of the millets, for one to understand the importance of the reforms it is necessary to understand the "development" phase of each millet, or rather the new relationships created either between or within millets. The Greek War of Independence resulted in the collapse of the old Phanariot world. The Phanariot families were either eradicated or compelled to find refuge outside the territorial bounds of the Empire (some settled in Moldo-Valachia). The tolerance or concealed support of the Phanariots vis-à-vis the Greek revolution led the Ottomans to re-define the privileged position which the Rum millet had occupied on the political stage until that time. This meant the position of the other millets in the Empire was automatically improved, in particular that of the Armenians: in fact, during the first decades of the 19th century Armenian moneychangers, the famed *saraffs*, acquired especially great influence, becoming involved in the process of tax sub-contracting, in close cooperation with Muslim officials[16].

Meanwhile, however, the same process also created centrifugal tendencies within the millets themselves: in the case of the Rum millet, there appeared for the first time, especially after the 1840s, a national movement (namely, the Bulgarian) which claimed not only a separate national entity but also the independence of its people/faithful from control by the Patriarchate of Constantinople. At the same time, in the midst of the 'favored' (in some sense) Armenian millet, there also appeared centrifugal tendencies, for example the recognition for the first time of a Catholic millet, whose base was composed primarily of the Armenian Catholics of Istanbul. Indeed, their spiritual leader, Yakob C'uxurean, was recognized in 1835 as Patriarch (the Catholic millet was already established in 1831 under the influence especially of the French embassy of Istanbul), with the consequence that the Armenian millet, in common with the Orthodox one, underwent a process of dangerous deconstruction[17].

At the same year, in 1835, the Orthodox millet confronted some important turnovers: the patriarch Constantios II was forced to resign and Gregorius VI was elected in his

place – a clergyman well-disposed towards the Russian factor and controlled by the Great Logothete of the Patriarchate, Nikolaos Aristarchis (it is worth remembering that he was of Armenian origin). This change in the patriarchal throne was immediately connected with the strengthening of the Ottoman Empire's control on the Danubian Principalities after the withdrawal of the Russian army (so this could not happen without the consent of Russia) and meant the dominance of the pro-Russian wing in the Patriarchate for a five-year period.

These two tendencies recognizable in the historical development of the two largest millets, the first one of reversal (the process of upgrading/downgrading in relation to the degree of legitimacy they claimed vis-à-vis Ottoman authority) and the other a parallel process (the appearance of centrifugal tendencies which would lead to the Sultan's recognition of 'new millets') are very important for our understanding of the different but at the same time, similar phase of development in which the Tanzimat reforms found them. Precisely as a number of splits in the Armenian millet created the presuppositions for the institutionalizing of both the Protestant and the Catholic millets, the break-up of the Orthodox millet resulted in the creation of nationalized churches (the Greek Church in 1850, the Serbian in 1879, the Rumanian in 1885, and finally, after a lot of cruel confrontations, the Bulgarian in 1945). In a rather odd sense, this process began with the declaration of the Greek Church as autocephalous in 1833, a decision promoted by the English and French embassies to cut off the Orthodox clergy of the newly-formed Greek state from Russian influence, of which they considered the Ecumenical Patriarchate to be a bearer. But the latter refused to recognize the Greek Autocephalous Church for 17 years[18]. A compromise solution between the two sides was finally reached in 1850, but the concession made by the Patriarchate proved decisive for developments in the 19th century: national secession from the Empire now automatically entailed the establishment of national churches.

The Jewish millet was, also, influenced by the reform process, and we might say that its position was also enhanced following the chaotic decade of the 1820s.

However the violent breakup of the Janissaries in 1826 and the extermination of certain Jews, who had been collaborating with them, represented a disaster for the Jewish community of Istanbul but also of the other regions of the Ottoman dominion. Many Jewish tradesmen, lenders (bankers) and suppliers had developed narrow economic bonds with the members of the Janissaries' orders. The dissolution of the Janissaries undermined temporarily the Jewish urban elite's power and constituted a comparative disadvantage for the Jewish bankers against their main economic competitors, the Armenians.

In any case the course to Tanzimat and the implementation of a more liberal economic policy allowed a part of the Jewish bankers to recover their power, already at the beginning of the decade of 1830. Among them, Abraham Camondo, was the dominant figure[19].

A prelude to the strengthening of the Jewish millet was the first recognition of its institutional presence, and the enforcement of a type of internal centralism**.** More specifically, in 1835 there was created by imperial decree (*ferman*) the rank of Hahambaşı, i.e., Chief Rabbi[20]. In reality, the Porte gave institutional form to the Jewish millet for the first time,

recognizing as a unified whole all Jews in the Empire. Apart from the early centuries of the Empire (1453-1526), when the rank of Chief Rabbi for the Jewish community of Constantinople had been acknowledged, the Jewish millet had never been a formally institutionalized entity, despite the fact that the Ottoman Empire had been a genuine shelter, especially for the Sephardic Jewish of the Iberian Peninsula, who finally prevailed on the demographic and political level over the other Jews communities in the great urban centers of the Empire (Istanbul, Adrianople, Salonica, Smyrna)[21].

Karmi Ilan was the first to point out the simultaneity of the recognition of the Catholic and the Jewish millets, although he was not able to interpret it sufficiently[22]. Actually in 1834-5 a simultaneous intervention of the Ottoman state is observed (more precisely: of different interest groups of the leading Ottoman personnel) in the administrative structure of the three millets which can be described as follows: an interference inside the Orthodox millet with the appointment of a new patriarch well-disposed to Russia; a relative weakening of the Armenian one through the recognition of the Catholic millet (movement that had the approval of the Great European Catholic Powers, like France and Austria, and was promoted by powerful Armeno-Catholic families, such as the Duzian); and, finally, the strengthening of the centralism in the Jewish millet with the nomination of a Hahambaşı.

These movements could be interpreted as consequences of the Treaty of Hunkiar Iskelessi (1833) and the increase of the Russian influence in the internal affairs of the Empire. We could indeed hold that the last two 'interventions' comprised a remedial movement regarding the first: the support of the pro-Russian wing of the Patriarchate under Nikolaos Aristarchis (well-disposed to Husrev paşa, minister of military affairs, who starred in negotiating the Russian-Ottoman treaty), should have been faced with a controlled split of the Armenian millet, in which it was necessary to discourage pro-Russian and to strengthen pro-Western trends, and with the imposition of a type of centralism in the Jewish millet, where the preferential treatment of the Sephardic element, would constitute another answer to an excessive development of the Russian 'East"s charm.

The Venture of Ottomanism

The announcement of the Hatt-i Hümayûn in February 1856 marked the start of a second, more important period of reforms in the Ottoman state. To a certain extent, the imperial decree was the result of concessions the Ottoman Empire had been compelled to make after the end of the Crimean War[23], with the object of minimizing the possibility of further interference by Russia in the Empire's internal affairs.

The decisive role played by France and England, and particularly by the English Ambassador in Istanbul, Lord Stratford Canning de Redcliff, in publishing the decree, aimed not only to secure the Empire a strong negotiating advantage at the Paris Conference (March 1856), but also at the long-term exclusion of Russia from similar types of intervention. Of course, as we know, defeat in the Crimean War contributed to a changed alignment for the Russian Empire: the policy of defending Orthodox populations of the Ottoman Empire, which the victorious wars of Catherine the Great had established in the 18th

century, was followed by embracing the basic aspirations of the Pan-Slavic movement and the defense of the Slavic peoples of the Balkan peninsula, particularly the Bulgarians[24].

On the other hand, important representatives of the Ottoman political stage, such as Mehmet Emin Âli paşa and Keçecizade Mehmed Fuad paşa, had understood the necessity for reforms. Both were intellectual descendants of Mustafa Reşit paşa, a leader of the first Tanzimat period, which had been inaugurated by the declaration of Hatt-i Şerîf in 1839. The basic thrust of both decrees, and in particular that of Hatt-i Hümayûn[25], was the strengthening of conditions of equality before the law and religious tolerance for all citizens of the empire, Muslims and non-Muslims alike. In addition, the Hatt-i Hümayûn guaranteed the safety of their lives, fortunes, and honor. But it went one step further: aiming at the homogenization of the empire's population through the establishment of new administrative institutions and the construction of a new Ottoman identity (this was the basic goal of the ideological attempt at Ottomanism, identified with the Tanzimat effort), it promoted the reorganization of religious communities (the millets). In fact, according to its second article, which confirmed the validity of the privileges that had been granted to the Patriarch of Constantinople by various sultans in the past[26], it foresaw the formation of special "assemblies" under the supervision of the Sublime Porte. The assemblies would discuss the necessity of affirming these privileges, and the introduction of the required reforms to update the structure of the millets, "which (*sc*. reforms) time and the program of men and civilization demand"[27].

As Roderic Davison has very rightly noted, the imperial decree of 1856 was characterized by one essential contradiction ('dualism'): while it insisted on the theme of equality among Ottoman subjects, irrespective of their religion, at the same time it preserved the millet system as a basic organizing principle of Ottoman society[28]. While the force of the religious factor was theoretically being done away with in the face of the constitutionally based equality of subjects, the millet acquired legal substance, consolidating the differentiation of the empire's populations into millets.

This contradiction may naturally be explained by the fact that reforms in the Ottoman state were almost always the result of political choices made by the higher echelons[29]. Thus their consolidation presupposed the reorganization of the millets' leadership structure. This effort was of enormous importance, as it was necessary to control the means by which the reforms would be received by the empire's populations. For this reason, as we will see in what follows, the intervention of the Ottomans in the Orthodox millet had the goal of confirming the preeminence of those leadership circles identified to a greater or lesser extent with the policy of reforms.

The goal of reorganizing the millets, apart from affirming the privileges which had been accorded them – whether administrative, judicial, or educational – was to institutionalize the introduction of the lay element into the management of the millets' finances, as well as to eliminate corruption among the higher clergy in the provincial regions (especially in the case of the Orthodox millet)[30]. With respect to the entrance of lay individuals, the hope of the reforms was to extend the social support of Ottomanism into the inner structure of each millet, while simultaneously promoting the separation of the political and religious fields (comparable to the separation of church and state in Western Europe)[31]

by means of a separation of spiritual and material duties, and consequently the reduction of the jurisdictions of the highest-ranking members of the clergy[32]. As for the eradication of phenomena of corruption on the part of the provincial bishops, which normally burdened the Slavic-speaking rural populations and accentuated the problems caused by the demands of Bulgarian nationalism for secession, the ultimate goal was to prevent a new intervention by Russia in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire.

As regards the Orthodox millet, the 'National' (namely, Millet-i) Assembly (*Ethnosinelefsi*, in Greek) called upon to implement the provisions of the Hatt-i Hümayûn took place from 1858-1860. The result was the composition of a constitutional text that has remained known as the "General Regulations". The articles it included were ratified by the Sublime Porte, from 1860-1862, but an important change took place: the addition of the article no. 8 of the First Regulation concerning the Election of the Patriarch, which provided the Sublime Porte's right to exclude from the electoral process persons she did not like.

Enactment of the General Regulations permitted the regular intervention of representatives from Neo-Phanariot circles (families which substituted the old Phanariots after the end of Greek Revolution) and the rising social strata (merchants and bankers) in managing the 'material affairs' of the Patriarchate. Firstly, the Regulations provided for the formation of the "National" Mixed Council, an organ in which the laity would participate (8 laymen with 4 cleric members of the Holy Synod), to undertake the auditing of the economic and administrative functioning of the Patriarchate. At the same time, a new type of Holy Synod was enacted into law, in which all the priests and bishops in the Patriarchate's service would participate on a rotating basis. This meant doing away with the old regime of 'Gerontismos' i.e. of that administrative system which had obtained in the Patriarchate up until the mid-19th century and which in essence gave the possibility to the Synod's bishops (the 'Gerontes') of co-rule in concert with the Patriarch[33]. In any case, the most important reform concerned the legislation of participation by the laity in the process of electing the Patriarch, even though its final phase (i.e., election of the individual who would become Patriarch among three candidates) remained under the control of the Holy Synod[34].

Simultaneously, the reform wing drastically limited the role of guilds, both in the process of electing the Patriarch and in the administration of the Patriarchate, to the benefit of the Neo-Phanariots and the bourgeois merchants and bankers. The leaders of the guilds of Istanbul had played a decisive role in the election of patriarchs as early as the mid-18th century, in spite of often being controlled by powerful Phanariots.

Yet behind the officially declared objectives, there were two basic parameters in the promotion of the reforms: a) the eradication of all support for Russian foreign policy within the Ecumenical Patriarchate (i.e., the marginalization of the Great Logothete, Nikolaos Aristarches) and b) the overturning of the balance in favor of the Neo-Phanariot families who were pro-Western and supported reforms in the Ottoman state (and who were closely bound to Stephanos Vogoridis, a Neo-Phanariot of Bulgarian origin, and to a lesser extent, Ioannis Psycharis, the Supervisor of the island of Chios).

But if the importance of the General Regulations in the formation of this new political field proved to be a catalyst, the same did not happen with the financial restructuring of

the Patriarchate's functioning provided for in the reform program. The payroll for the highest-ranking clergy was particularly important for the goals of Ottoman reformers. With the implementation of this measure the Porte's goals were: a) to impose its control on ecclesiastical real estate and the income of bishops, probably as a solution to meeting its own financial needs; b) to turn the Orthodox clergy into civil servants of the Ottoman state in order to limit their political activities, and c) to satisfy corresponding Bulgarian demands, which aimed at a precise determination of the income of bishops in order to eliminate the phenomenon of heavy taxation on provincial populations.

Both the conservative as well as the reformist wings of the 'National' Assembly refused to implement the salary scheme and supported the solution of a grant, in fact a form of ecclesiastical tax, with the following differences from previous forms of bishopric incomes: a) it was a monetary remuneration, and b) it was uniform, but based on the population of each province and not on that of the population of the Empire as a whole. This was to create extreme imbalance in the distribution as well as in the collection of this specific tax.

The consolidation of the new system of bishops' remuneration would lay the basis for the smooth expansion of reformist efforts from center to periphery. Consequently, it constituted a critical moment in the reformist movement. Nevertheless, the reasons which led to failure in implementing this specific Regulation (inertia exhibited by the provincial bishops and some of the Elders, unequal distribution of amounts among the population of the provinces, reactions by local notables that were related to the development of philanthropic and educational foundations, and national antagonisms) resulted in the deterioration of the Patriarchate's finances and the assignment to the Porte, on the part of then-Patriarch Sophronios and the Holy Synod, of the right to collect the amounts from the state. This action called forth the reaction not only of the pro-clerical wing but of a large proportion of the reformers as well, led by S. Karatheodoris; it was the cause for raising once again the issue of reviewing the General Regulations[35].

But the most important problem of internal unity that the leadership of the millet had to deal with was the Bulgarian one. The 'National' Assembly of 1858-1860 was the first opportunity for the Bulgarian nationalist movement to display its opposition to the Patriarchate. The demand of Bulgarian nationalists for the creation of an autonomous national church (a demand which had matured following twenty years of claims centered around the use of Church Slavic in the liturgy instead of ancient Greek, and on the creation of schools to teach Bulgarian) met the opposition of the Patriarchate for two basic reasons: first, since a nation state had not already been formed, it was not possible to recognize an autocephalous 'national' church on analogy with Greece, Serbia, and Romania. And secondly, it was not possible for two ecclesiastical authorities of the same faith (i.e., the Patriarchate and the Exarchate) to co-exist within the same territory; i.e., two bishops of the same faith could not co-exist within the same city[36].

After the collapse of numerous attempts at mediation between the two sides during the 1860s, there ascended to the Patriarchal throne two Patriarchs, Gregorios VI (1867-1871), known for his pro-Russian sympathies, and Anthimos VI (1871-1873), both aiming basically at a compromise solution. But attempts at compromise collapsed under the pressure of the extreme nationalistic wings of the two sides. Thus, in February 1870, the

Sublime Porte issued a firman establishing the Bulgarian Exarchate. The Patriarchate refused to accept the decree, and in September 1872 summoned a Local Synod to the Ottoman capital, in which the occupants of the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch also participated, as well as the Archbishop of Cyprus (Kyrillos, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, refused to participate). The Local Synod not only renounced the Exarchate and its supporters, but also what it called the "Heresy of Ethnophyletism", namely Nationalism. But if this renunciation confirmed at the ideological level Ecumenism as the dominant ideology of the Patriarchate, it also signaled the beginning of a lengthy antagonism between Greeks and Bulgarians in the Ottoman territories for the realization of their mutually exclusive dreams. It is especially interesting that their conflict was not conducted according to national terms but according to religious ones: not between Greeks and Bulgarians, but between supporters of the Patriarchate and supporters of the Exarchate.

Developments on this front resulted in the separation of the leadership elite of the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul on the basis of two alternative strategies: a) direct opposition to the "Pan-slavist danger" and towards this purpose the creation of an alliance between Greeks and Ottomans. The ideological form of this strategic alliance, around which the millet's leadership elite allied itself, remained known as 'Helleno-Ottomanism' (the very process of introducing reforms was at the same time an attempt to marginalize both clerical and lay elements within the Patriarchate that were directly influence by Russian foreign policy[37] and b) second, the strategy of a policy of moderate concessions to the Bulgarians so as not to disturb relations with Russia. Both these strategies were in fact a further development of the views that had been expressed during the previous period by the reformist and pro-clerical wings, respectively.

In any case, it would be a mistake to attribute to the Patriarchate claims to Greek nationalism, or to see it as a tool for the domination of the latter in opposition to the demands of the other Balkan nationalisms for one very simple reason: the groups which operated within it and which competed for leadership were harmed by the creation of nationalized churches[38].

In the case of the Gregorian Armenians the dominance of the lay element, the *amiras*, (a title given by the Sultan to the strong laic Armenians, bankers or officials, who were financially connected to the Sublime Porte) in the election of Patriarchs was the standard until 1846. Reform had the character of bringing into question the precedence of the money-changers (sarrafs) by new lay powers, which arose and sought redistribution in the area of policy management[39]. In the provinces of Anatolia with Armenian populations, it was a frequent phenomenon for the sarrafs as well as local notables to collaborate with members of the Ottoman state machine in jointly exploiting their "compatriots" (chiefly in regards to taxation)[40]. In any case, within the leadership elite of the Armenian laity of Istanbul there appeared the same dichotomy as that within the Greek Orthodox community – that is to say, between a class of bourgeoisie, merchants, and bankers (who were engaged in speculation either by loaning money to the Ottoman public sector to cover its deficits, or by undertaking to make available to Ottoman officials funds for purchase of tax-farms in the Asiatic and European provinces[41], and a number of the powerful officials who held civil service positions in the Ottoman state machine. But this opposition,

in contrast to the case of the Greek Orthodox, had already appeared in the 1830s, over control of the newly-founded (1838) college in the Istanbul suburb of Üsküdar. Members of the guilds also became involved in this conflict, taking the side of the powerful civil servants[42]. The lessening of the social power and economic influence of Armenian money-changers and money-lenders was tied directly to the end of tax-farming imposed by the Tanzimat reforms. Many of the old amiras were financially destroyed by unfilled contracts[43]. The Crimean War later struck the Armenian money-changers another blow, when the Greek Orthodox community's bourgeoisie, taking advantage of emergency needs to cover the public debt due to purchase of military armaments[44], created the presuppositions to break their monopoly on loans to the Ottoman public sector.

These conditions proved favourable to strengthening the presence of the guilds in managing the financial affairs of the millet. The Armenian guilds, in contrast with the Greek-Orthodox ones which had undertaken a leading role in the election of Patriarchs and the financial management of the Patriarchate's finances as early as the mid-18th century, began to get involved with common affairs and to claim a level of representation on the institutional organs of the millet only in the mid-19th century (for example, as late as 1834, when the clerical-lay Armenian assembly elected a ten-member committee to undertake responsibility for the financial management of schools, a hospital, and other institutions, this committee was simultaneously entirely controlled by the amiras). The economic crisis the Armenian money-changers confronted was for them an opportunity to claim a larger share in the distribution of power in their millet. But in 1842, when the Porte once again legalized the sub-contracting of taxes, the position of the amiras was temporarily elevated, and the guilds were forced to give up control of the Committee of Twenty Four, the collective body of the millet which had been established in 1840 by Patriarch Yakobos to oversee the finances of the Patriarchate and the other institutions of the millet[45].

When Mattheos took over as Patriarch, the political power of the artisans' guilds grew. Mattheos was elected Patriarch in July 1844, hoping to establish a *modus vivendi* between the opposing factions. Attempting a historic compromise, the Patriarch convened a council of the laity, in which guild members, as well as tradesmen and bankers, would be represented (14 of the former, 16 of the latter). Yet the aspirations of the latter to power within the millets, coupled with their desire to control the election of bishops in the provinces, led the Patriarch to side with the guild leaders. The reform Mattheos enacted in 1847 should be understood as a consequence of this alliance; it consisted of the founding of two new councils, one of the clergy and one of the laity, each with its own respective duties.

Actually, the example of the 1847 reforms in the Armenian millet, which functioned for about a decade, was followed in the Orthodox millet with the 'National' Assembly of 1858-60. In the latter case, however, the imposition of a distinction between spiritual and secular duties did not lead to the marginalization of the bankers, but rather to the beginning of their social and political supremacy.

Oddly enough, however, this was brought about neither through the marginalization of the higher ranks of the Orthodox clergy by the millet leaders, nor through the development of anticlerical discourse. Instead, it was achieved by the supremacy of certain groups

of clerics (chiefly revolving around the Patriarchs Joachim II and Joachim III), who succeeded in gradually weakening their rival clerics, i.e. those who were controlled by the old Neo-Phanariot families. But the peculiar nature of the political conflict among the various groups of clergy undermined the potentially radical character of the reformation that began with the National Assembly of 1858-60 and was confirmed by the Sublime Porte with the recognition of the text of the General Regulations. This meant that an institution dominated by the laity could be founded beside the Holy Synod, but the critical question of the election of the Patriarch would be left to the Holy Synod's discretion.

In the case of the Armenians, by contrast, the intensity of the confrontation between the amiras and the new social strata that had won political representation through the millet resulted in the definitive establishment of the laity's dominance through Hatt-i Hümayûn's reformation of 1856. Indeed, in 1860, after two earlier proposals by the conservative amiras and the clergy were rejected, a plan for an Armenian National Constitution (*Azgayin Sahmanadrut'iwun Hayoc*) was finally agreed on, and then confirmed by the Sublime Porte in 1863. According to the Constitution, the two collective institutions created during the days of Patriarch Mattheos remained in operation, but both they and the election of the Patriarch were subject to the discretion of a National Assembly of which the laity made up an overwhelming majority (only 20 of its 140 representatives were clergymen). The number of lay representatives included Armenians both from Istanbul (80) and from the large cities of the provinces (40). The latter were elected via a pyramidal process (that is, by electors from the level of the nahiyes and the kazas all the way up to that of the Vilâyet. In contrast with the Greek Orthodox system, this process was used only in the selection of a new Patriarch, not in determining the representation of provincial populations in the collective mixed body (except in the days of Patriarch Gregorios VI, when it was composed exclusively of lay members) that functioned as an institutional check on the Holy Synod. Therefore, the potentially radical nature of the reforms in the Orthodox millet was tempered on that level as well. In the case of the Armenians, the representation of the provinces, though there was some, was not proportionate to the millet's demographic breakdown: the 90% of the population that lived in the provinces was represented by barely 2/7 of the representatives in the Armenian National Assembly. Yet the provincial councils, which were founded, of course, as a result of the Vilâyet Law (1864), functioned in a similar fashion in both the Greek Orthodox and the Armenian Gregorian millets, since they fulfilled a number of functions vital to the survival of their respective communities (both tax-related and administrative)[46].

Davison believes that the Ottomans primarily intended to reorganize the two large millets, i.e. the Greek and the Armenian, for in the case of the Jewish millet, the Chief Rabbi did not stand at the top of a large ecclesiastic hierarchy as did the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Gregorian Patriarchs. Rather, in the case of the Jewish millet, the powers and duties of the Chief Rabbi (*Hahambaşı*) of Istanbul were actually expanded by the Regulations of 1834, which made him, as we have seen, the leader of all Jews in the Empire. The object of the reformation under dispute was the reduction of the duties of the clergy. As in the Orthodox millet, the 'reformers' were led by a powerful banker, in this case Abraham Camondo[47]. Camondo led within the Jewish millet, supporting the election of two 'reformist' Chief Rabbis in the 1860s: Ya'akov Avigdor (1860-63) and Yakir Gueron

(1863-71). In contrast with the National Assembly convened by the Orthodox, however, the 'General Regulations of the Rabbinate' (*Hahamhane Nizamnamesi*) agreed on by the Jewish millet in 1865, having to confront the historical facts both of the expansion of the Chief Rabbi's powers and of the dominance of the Istanbul synagogue over the others in the Empire, established the participation of the laity in a more radical fashion. Namely, the Chief Rabbi would be elected not only by the circle of other rabbis, but by a mixed convention consisting of 20 rabbis, 60 lay representatives from Istanbul, and another 40 lay representatives from the provinces. Yet these Regulations were never fully implemented, and the 'conservatives' strove to restore the earlier Chief Rabbi's expanded powers until the early 20th century[48].

Therefore, when uncovering the similarities and differences between the Greek Orthodox and Jewish cases, we must first note that here, in contrast with the Armenian millet (where we saw the gradual decline of the amira bankers), the groups of bankers who endeavored to promote their social supremacy through the attempt at reformation found common ground. But the depth of their radicalism differed due to the powerful position of the Orthodox clergy. While the 'conservatives' of the Jewish millet had adopted the political position of supporting the expansion of the Chief Rabbi's powers, in the case of the Rum millet, Joachim II (1860-1863), as the chosen candidate of the bankers' circle, made sure to balance the 'conservative' political stance with the fulfillment of the expectations of the up-and-coming bourgeoisie, and the model of patriarchal centralism with the interests of his supporters.

The Dissolution of Empire: from millets to "Minorities"

Yet the conclusion of the Ottomanist endeavor, which led to the outbreak of the Eastern crisis and the ascendance of Abdul Hamid to the Ottoman throne in 1876, signaled a drastic change in the treatment of the old millets. The brief parliamentary hiatus experienced by the Empire's non-Muslim populations, culminating in the first Ottoman constitution introduced by Grand Vizier Midhad paşa in 1876, collapsed along with the blows the Empire sustained from the Russo-Turkish war the next year. The gradual fragmentation of the Empire's new lands, following the creation of a Bulgarian nation-state on the basis of the Treaty of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin, finalized the Ottoman elite's alienation from any reforms that might have led to the incorporation of the Christian peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. Abdul Hamid's Pan-Islamism, as a strategic proposal for the Empire's Muslim populations to come together, now became the dominant national ideology, and remained so until the Young Turk Revolution (1908)[49].

This new framework definitely affected the position of the non-Muslim millets. As for the Orthodox millet, the new regime soon sought to limit its 'privileges': both in 1883-84 and in 1891, the Ottoman government demanded the transfer of powers previously claimed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the Ottoman state. Specifically, the Patriarchate's right to adjudicate the cases of priests accused of political rather than spiritual misdeeds was brought into question. And more importantly, the Ottoman state targeted the relative autonomy enjoyed by the Greek Orthodox communities in the matter of managing their own education and activities. Although the Patriarchate protested in both cases and

managed to avert harmful developments, the Ottoman Empire's Ministries of Justice and Education began gradually to replace the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs as chief negotiators of the privileges accorded to the Greek Orthodox population. It is interesting to note that two very significant events occurred during this period. Firstly, within the higher echelons of the Orthodox clergy, there appeared a split between those who sympathized with nationalistic ideals and those who insisted on preserving the Patriarchate's ecumenical character (in practical terms, this meant maintaining its bridges with the Russians and with the other Slavic peoples of the Balkans). An external divide corresponding to this internal one also appeared at this juncture, namely a confrontation between the faction of the Orthodox clergy that believed in the ecumenical ideal, and therefore the preservation of the imperial model, and the faction that condoned the irredentist policies that the Greek state had set into motion with particular fervor in the late 19th century. Actually, this latter faction was merely composed of the groups organized in earlier decades by clerics dependent on the bankers – namely, Joachim II and Joachim III.

Joachim III especially became a symbolic figure of the Patriarchate, from his original ascension to the ecumenical throne in 1878 to his death in 1912, while serving his second term as Patriarch. It should be noted that the Patriarch's political protector, Georgios Zafiris, eventually became the personal banker of Abdul Hamid himself, having acquired tremendous influence over the economic life of the Empire. The fall of Joachim III during his first term as Patriarch in 1883-84 was a result of the fierce opposition exercised by nationalist circles reacting to the Ottoman state's attempts to challenge the Patriarchate's privileges. From 1884 to 1901, the Greek Embassy and its supporters in Constantinople prevented Joachim from being restored to the Patriarchal throne, believing that his political views favored the survival of the Empire more than the expansion of the Greek state[50]. However, after the Greco-Turkish war of 1897, which proved ill-fated for the Greeks, and the increasing tension between Greek Orthodox and Bulgarian populations in the Macedonian area, the Greek Embassy consented to the re-election of Joachim III (1901). Of course, the Patriarch's political orientation had also changed, as he now saw that the blend he had attempted to achieve during his first term through the ideological model of Ecumenicalism was now encountering limitations: the preservation of the Empire's integrity was very difficult to reconcile with a Pan-Orthodox policy, which would of course favor the spread of Russian influence within the Ottoman state.

The internal division of the Orthodox millet, the largest one of the Empire, was not only heightened by the rise of nationalisms and the creation of nation-states on lands formerly belonging to the Empire, but also by of the collapse of the Orthodox world, now that its former champion, Russia, had changed political orientation.

The same factors influenced developments in the Armenian millet. The dynamic intervention of Russia, with its declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire, kindled the hopes of Armenians that the problem of their own national consolidation might be solved, just as it had been solved for the Balkan peoples. Yet the extensive migrations of Armenian populations to the coast of Asia Minor, and the coexistence of those Armenians who had remained in the lands of historical Armenia (especially its western areas) with numerous groups of Turks and Kurds, made the problem particularly thorny. The Armenian bour-

geoisie was scattered throughout the Empire's urban centers, from Istanbul to Smyrna to Cairo to Alexandria, which rendered impossible the task of organizing a political agenda for liberation in which the social strata of farmers and artisans could be incorporated. If one considers, furthermore, the conservative political role of the Armenian clergy, who insisted on lawful conduct towards the Ottoman government, it is clear why Armenia made no clear demands for national liberation until the mid-19th century (this may further explain the intensity of the discussions in the Armenian millet regarding the imposition of new reforms: the redistribution of power among the ruling elite carried more significance than in the other millets)[51].

In the early 1860s, the important revolt at Zeitun in 1862 (provoked by the mass migrations of Muslims from the Transcaucasian regions that had just been conquered by Russia, as well as by the mass slaughter of Christian Maronites in Lebanon that year), was the first of a series of revolts and even some early political moves aiming at secession from the Empire. Nevertheless, such moves remained marginal until 1876: the Armenians (and Grigor Odian in particular) actively participated in the formulation of the Constitution of 1876. The Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 was not only waged in the Balkans, but also in Western Anatolia. The Russian army invaded Western Armenia, where Armenian populations were at the mercy of Turkish, Circasian, and Kurdish irregulars. Russia, based on the Treaty of San Stefano, annexed Kars, Ardahan, Batum, Alashker, and Bayazid, while the Russian army extended its stay in the remaining regions of Western Armenia until the Ottoman state kept its promises of political equality as expressed in the Constitution of 1876. The Congress of Berlin, which overruled Russian policy on the foundation of a Great Bulgaria, also forced Russia to depart from the regions of Alashkert and Bayazid, as well as from the provinces of Western Armenia, and did not even mention the possibility of the foundation of a semi-autonomous Armenian territory (after the example of Lebanon), in favor of which an Armenian mission led by the former Patriarch of Istanbul Khrimian attempted to argue.

Russia's military intervention into Western Armenia increased Sultan Abdul Hamid's displeasure with the Armenians, among whom he could see pro-Russian sentiment increasing. After all, the dominant ideology of Pan-Islamism left no room for a powerful, independent Christian population "interrupting" the communication between Ottoman Muslims and the Muslim populations of the Caucasus and Central Asia (which were also of Turkish descent). So the pogroms of the 1880s, executed by military teams of Circassians and Kurds and organized by the government of Sultan Abdul Hamid II (the very pogroms which had provoked the creation of Armenian military self-defense groups), peaked in the 1890s with the great massacres of 1895-96. The potential foundation of an Armenian state on Anatolian territory would cast doubt on the only region where a modern Turkish national identity could be constructed (especially after the mass migration of Turkish and other Muslim populations from the Balkans and the Caucasus). The number of victims these massacres incurred in the six provinces of Western Armenia is calculated at between 100,000 and 200,000, but we should also not forget the thousands who were forced to emigrate to Europe, the USA, and the Arabian peninsula; all of this was merely prefiguring the genocide of 1915. Just as Abdul Hamid's massacres in 1895 were inspired by the Pan-Islamic ideal, and gained social and political support among the populations

of Turkish descent that had been expelled from the Balkans and the Caucasus, the genocide of 1915 derived its political legitimacy from the ideology of Pan-Turkism as introduced by Ziya Gökalp[52], and its political support from a new wave of refugees, mostly resulting from the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1908 and the Balkan Wars in 1912-13. The parenthesis of the Young Turk Revolution in 1908 re-kindled some hopes of cooperation between Turks and Armenians, and of the fulfillment of old promises of legal and political equality. These hopes quickly expired (with the slaughter of 15,000 Armenians in Cilicia, which was the result of Hamid's coup in April 1909, but in which many supporters of the Young Turk movement nonetheless participated).

The Young Turk Revolution essentially proclaimed the equality of all citizens of the Empire, but now considered the millets to be 'minorities': although the Empire had not yet collapsed, the mentality of the nation-state prevailed. Of course, most of the Empire's Christian populations had already become incorporated into the Balkan nation-states after the 1912-13 Balkan Wars, and with them the majority of Jewish populations, apart from that of Istanbul and Izmir. The Balkan Jews, in turn, constituted a prime example of an ethnic minority, and eventually became themselves the target of more organized anti-Semitic persecutions.

Notes

1 Here we should recall that the remaining Orthodox Patriarchates of the old Byzantine Empire – Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch – had come under Islamic control as early as the first centuries of Arab conquest. For the history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate see G. Georgiades-Arnakis, *The Greek church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire*, "Journal of Modern History", 24, 1953, pp. 235-252, H. Inalcik, *The status of the Greek Orthodoxe Patriarch under the Ottomans*, "Turkica", 21-23, 1991, pp. 407-436. See also for its history during the 19th century, D. Stamatopoulos, *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση: προς μια ανασύνθεση της Ιστορίας του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου τον 19ο αιώνα* [*Reform and Secularization: towards a reappraisal of the History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the 19th century*], Alexandria-Athens 2003.

2 P. Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804*, Washington 1977, p. 277.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 45-49. Generally, for the millet issue in the Ottoman Empire, see also, B. Braude - B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the function of a plural society*, vol. 2, New York 1985; B. Gülnihâl, *Alman-Ingiliz Belgerinin ve siyasî gelişmelerin isiği altında: Gayrimüslim Osmanlı vatandaşlarının hukukî durumu (1839-1914)* [The legal status of the non-muslim Ottoman subjects under the light of the German-English documents and political developments], Ankara 1989; E. Bilal, *Osmanlı Devletinde Gayrimüşlim tebaanin yonetimi*, [The administration of the non-muslim subjects in the Ottoman state], Istanbul 1996. Most recently, S. Anagnostopoulou, *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nations-States*, Istanbul 2004, pp. 37-55.

4 P. Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο, 17ος –αρχές 20ου αιώνα* [Ottoman perspectives on the Ecumenical Patriarchate, 17th – beginning of the 20th century], Alexandreia-Athens 1998, p. 123. See also A. Cohen, *Communal Legal Entities in a Muslim Setting Theory and Practice: The Jewish Community in Sixteenth-Century Jerusalem*, "Islamic Law and Society", 3, 1996, pp. 149-181.

5 The problem of the modern use of the term is related to the problem of the perspective selected by each historian: that is, whether he chooses to study the national-linguistic groups that comprised the millets based on the identity attributed to them by the Ottoman state, or whether he chooses to face the problem of these groups' collective self-orientation. Naturally, the second option is much harder, for the danger of an anachronistic projection of the 19th-or 20th-century reality into the 16th- or 17th-century past is always present. The reconstruction of the past according to the demands of the century of nationalisms presents a true obstacle to our comprehension of the millet as a religious unit. For this complex issue, see I.K. Hassiotis, *From the "Refledging" to the "Illumination of the Nation": Aspects of Political Ideology in the Greek Church under Ottoman Domination*, "Balkan Studies", 40, 1999, pp. 41-55.

[6] B. Braude, *Foundation Myths of the Millet system*, in Braude - Lewis, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* cit., pp. 69-88.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[8] P. Konortas, *From tâi'fe to millet: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek-Orthodox Community* in D. Gondicas - Ch. Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy and Society in the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton 1998, pp. 169-179. See also E.A. Zachariadou, *Δέκα Τουρκικά Έγγραφα για την Μεγάλη Εκκλησία (1483-1567)*,[Ten Turkish Documents for the Great Church (1483-1567)], Athens 1996, pp. 91-97.

[9] Karmi I., *The Jewish Community of Istanbul in the Nineteenth Century. Social, Legal and Administrative Transformations*, Istanbul 1996, pp. 33-34.

[10] On the Phanariot class, see, among others, *L'Epoque Phanariot*, Symposium, 21-25 Octobre 1970, Thessaloniki 1970, S.C. Zervos, *Recherches sur les Phanariots et leur idéologie politique (1666-1821)*, Thése de doctorat nouveau, 2 vols., Paris 1990.

[11] See for this issue, G.F. Müge, *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire. Ottoman Westernization and Social Change*, New York– Oxford 1996, pp. 92-97.

[12] E. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality*, Cambridge 1992.

[13] A. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford-Malden 1987.

[14] P.M. Kitromilides, *Orthodox culture and collective identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century*, *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών*[Bulletin of the Asia Minor Studies Centre] pp. 82-95, and especially pp. 89-93.

[15] For the limits of the pursued reforms, see the interesting article of James J. Reid, *Was there a Tanzimat Social Reform*, "Balkan Studies", 40, 1999, pp. 173-208.

[16] V. Artinian, *The Armenian Constitutional system in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1863*, London 1970, p. 21.

[17] *Ibid*.

[18] C.A. Frazee, *The Orthodox Church and independent Greece, 1821-1852*, London 1969.

[19] On the Camondos family, see N. Seni, *The Camondos and their imprint on 19th – century Istanbul*, "International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies", 26, 1994, pp. 663-675.

[20] A.H. Eroğlu, *Osmanlı Devletinde Yahudiler (XIX. Yüzyılın Sonuna Kadar)* [Jews in the Ottoman State (up to the end of the 19th century)], Ankara 2000, pp. 185-198.

[21] B. Lewis, *The Jews of Islam*, Princeton, New Jersey 1984, pp. 174-175. For a brief description of the Jewish populations in the most important cities of the Ottoman Empire, see also Eroğlu, *Osmanlı* cit., pp. 94-108.

[22] Karmi, *The Jewish Community of Istanbul* cit., p. 34..

[23] On the Crimean War and its effects on the Ottoman Empire's foreign policy, both with regard to Greece and the major European powers, see B. Jelavich, *A century of Russian foreign policy, 1814-1914*, New York 1964, p. 113 ff.; J.V. Kofas, *International and Domestic Politics in Greece during the Crimean War*, New York 1980, D. Wetzel, *The Crimean War: a diplomatic history*, New York 1985; Y. Yüçel - A. Sevim, *Türkiye Tarihi* [*Turkish History*], vol. 4, Ankara 1992, pp. 271-288.

[24] On the rise of the Pan-Slavic movement during the period in question and on its increasing influence on the exercise of Russian foreign policy, see B.H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans 1870-1880*, Oxford 1937; M.B. Petrovich, *The emergence of Russian Panslavism, 1856-1870*, London-New York 1956; H. Kohn, *Pan-Slavism, its history and ideology*, Notre Dame 1953, J. Milojković-Djurić, *Panslavism and national identity in Russia and in the Balkans, 1830-1880: images of the self and others*, Colorado–New York 1994. In the Turkish bibliography, see S. Kocabaş, *Avrupa Türkiyesi'nin kaybi ve Balkanlarda Panislavizm*, [The loss of European Turkey and Pan-Slavism in the Balkans], Istanbul 1986.

[25] Ch. Papastathis, *Οι Κανονισμοί των Ορθόδοξων Ελληνικών Κοινοτήτων του Οθωμανικού κράτους και της Διασποράς*, [*The Regulations of the Greek Orthodox Communities in the Ottoman State and Diaspora*], Thessaloniki 1984, pp. 21-26, containing a reprint of Hatt-i Hûmayün by Δ. Νικολαΐδης, *Οθωμανικοί Κώδικες*, [Ottoman Codices], vol. III, pp. 2858-2866. A French translation of the text can be found in E. Engelhardt, *La Turquie et le Tanzimat*, Paris 1882, pp. 260-270.

[26] On the question of progressive concessions of privileges to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, see P. Konortas, *From tâi'fe to millet* cit., pp. 315-361.

[27] Papastathis, *Οι Κανονισμοί* cit., p. 22.

[28] R. Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876*, Princeton 1963, p. 56.

[29] A. Feroz, *The making of modern Turkey*, London- New York 1993.

[30] Επ. Κυριακίδης, *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού* [History of Modern Hellenism], vol. 2, Athens 1892, p. 40; Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* cit., p. 114 ff.

[31] N. Berkes, *The development of secularism in Turkey*, Montreal 1964.

[32] Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* cit., p. 115.

[33] For the establishment of the Gerontismos regime, see Th.H. Papadopoullos, *The History of the Greek Church and people under Turkish domination*, Brussels 1952.

[34] Stamatopoulos *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση* cit., pp. 121ff.

[35] Stamatopoulos *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση* cit., pp. 185-193.

[36] Z. Markova, *Bâlgarskata Ekzarhija* [*The Bulgarian Exarchate*], 1870-1879, Sofia 1989.

[37] E. Skopetea, *Το «Πρότυπο Βασίλειο» και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα. Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα (1830-1880)*, [The "Pattern" Kingdom and the Megali Idea. Aspects of the National Issue in Greece,(1830-1880)], Athens 1988, pp. 309-324.

[38] The re-election of the patriarch Joachim II in 1873 confirmed the hegemony of the circle of bankers (who in the meantime had also gained social predominance through their energetic participation in the collective organizing of the Greek Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Empire) in the political sphere of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. This hegemony continued with the election of Joachim III in 1878 following the death of Joachim II. The Pan-Orthodox policies of these two Patriarchs, as well as G. Zarifis' 1878 plan for the creation of a unified Greek-Ottoman empire along the model of the Austro-Hungarian one, demonstrated that this circle had by no means abandoned its defense of the imperial-ecumenical model. However, it was clear that aborting the consequences of the Schism presupposed the Patriarchate's making an advance to Russia; in contrast, the attempt at Greek-Ottoman coexistence was based on repulsion of the Slavic threat. The contradictory nature of these political choices between the circle of bankers and the clerics who represented them to the Patriarchate must be sought in the quality of dependency relations obtaining between laity and clergy: see Stamatopoulos *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση* cit., pp. 349-352.

[39] H. Barsoumian, *The dual role of the Armenian Amira Class within the Ottoman Government and the Armenian Millet (1750-1850)*, in Braude - Lewis, *Christians and Jews* cit., p. 180.

[40] Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire* cit., p. 118.

[41] Artinian, *The Armenian Constitutional system* cit., pp. 20-21.

[42] *Ibid*., pp. 53-54.

[43] *Ibid*., p. 53.

[44] Ch. Clay, *Gold for the Sultan. Western Bankers and Ottoman Finance 1856-1871: A Contribution to Ottoman and to International Financial History*, London-New York 2000, pp. 18-19.

[45] Artinian, *The Armenian Constitutional system* cit., p.58.

[46] On all this, see G.A. Bournoutian, *A Concise History of the Armenian People*, Costa Mesa 2003, p. 202.

[47] Clay, *Gold for the Sultan* cit., pp. 24-25.

[48] Karmi, *The Jewish Community of Istanbul* cit., pp. 33-45.

[49] D. Selim, *The Well-Protected Domains: ideology and the legitimation of power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*, London-New York 1998. See also K.H. Karpat, *The politicization of Islam: reconstructing identity, state, faith, and community in the late Ottoman state*, Oxford-New York 2001.

[50] E. Kofos, *Patriarch Joachim III (1878-1884) and the irredentist policy of the Greek state*, "Journal of Modern Greek Studies", 4, 1986, pp. 107-120.

[51] Bournoutian, *A Concise History* cit., pp. 257-258. See also Bilal *Osmanlı* cit., pp. 186-202.

[52] A. Davison, *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey. A Hermeneutic Reconsideration*, New Haven-London 1998, pp. 90-133.

Bibliography

Anagnostopoulou S., *The Passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Nations-States*, Istanbul 2004.

Artinian V., *The Armenian Constitutional system in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1863*, London 1970.

Braude B. - Lewis B. (eds*.), Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the function of a plural society*, vol. 2, New York 1985.

Bournoutian G.A., *A Concise History of the Armenian People*, Costa Mesa 2003.

Bozkurt G., *Alman-Ingiliz Belgerinin ve siyasî gelişmelerin isiği altında: Gayrimüslim Osmanlı vatandaşlarının hukukî durumu (1839-1914)* [The legal status of the non-muslim Ottoman subjects under the light of the German-English documents and political developments], Ankara 1989.

Davison A., *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey. A Hermeneutic Reconsideration*, New Haven-London 1998.

Davison R., *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1876*, Princeton 1963.

Deringil S., *The Well-Protected Domains: ideology and the legitimation of power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909*, London-New York 1998.

Eroğlu A.H., *Osmanlı Devletinde Yahudiler (XIX. Yüzyılın Sonuna Kadar)* [Jews in the Ottoman State (up to the end of the 19th century)], Ankara 2000.

Eryilmaz B., *Osmanlı Devletinde Gayrimüşlim tebaanin yonetimi* [The administration of the non-muslim subjects in the Ottoman state], Istanbul 1996.

Frazee C.A., *The Orthodox Church and independent Greece, 1821-1852*, London-Cambridge 1969.

Gondicas D. - Issawi C. (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy and Society in the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton 1998.

Karmi I., *The Jewish Community of Istanbul in the Nineteenth Century. Social, Legal and Administrative Transformations*, Istanbul 1996.

Konortas P., *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο, 17ος – αρχές 20ου αιώνα* [Ottoman perspectives on the Ecumenical Patriarchate, 17th – beginning of the 20th century], Athens 1998.

Markova Z., *Bâlgarskata Ekzarhija 1870-1879* [The Bulgarian Exarchate1870-1879], Sofia 1989.

Papadopoullos Th.H., *The History of the Greek Church and people under Turkish domination*, Brussels 1952.

Stamatopoulos D., *Μεταρρύθμιση και Εκκοσμίκευση: προς μια ανασύνθεση της Ιστορίας του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου τον 19ο αιώνα* [Reform and Secularization: towards a reconstruction of the History of Ecumenical Patriarchate in the 19th century] Athens 2003.

Sugar P., *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804*, Washington 1977.

Sources

Rum Millet

Article no. 8 of the First Regulation, concerning the Election of the Orthodox Patriarch (translation from the Greek text of the General Regulations of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, 1860-1862):

Given that the person who will become Patriarch, as the spiritual leader at the ecclesiastical level, is thus a medium of the High Government at the political level for implementing its decisions regarding the secular affairs of Christians belonging to his Patriarchate· for this reason, as regards the nomination of the most capable individual vis-à-vis spiritual and national affairs, the election (viz., of the Patriarch) belongs to the spiritual and lay leaders but inasmuch as the High Government does not wish to find itself forced to exercise its natural right to exclude candidates acclaimed by common election for the position of Patriarch, the List of eligible individuals (...) should immediately be dispatched to the Sublime Porte and if, from among those included in this List, there be some not considered capable as regards the political level, then the Sublime Porte, having excluded them from the List, shall inform the Patriarchate (...) so that the election of the Patriarch may take place from among the remaining candidates.

Armenian Millet

Five of the nine points found in the report of the Armenian National Committee, on which was based the revised version of the Armenian National Constitution (1863) (Azgayin Sahmanadrut'iwun Hayoc):

The office of the Patriarch as the medium between the nation and the Sublime Porte should remain as it was in the old system
The organization of the National (millet-i) General Assembly should be reformed. The national delegates, instead of being elected by the esnafs, should be elected by the different Quarters in Istanbul
The administration of religious affairs should belong to the Religious Council, and that of mixed affairs to the Mixed Council, which shall consist of the two Councils together.
The Religious and Political Councils should manage through appointed committees all national affairs including churches, schools, hospitals, monasteries, and other national institutions.
The administrative center should be the national Patriarchate. The patriarch, as the official head of the Patriarchate, should preside over both the National General Assembly and the two Councils and, under the inspection of the National General Assembly, he should manage all affairs concerning the nation, directly or indirectly.
(.....)

Jewish Millet

Anonymous, "The Jews of the East", originally published in The Occident and American Jewish Advocate, Volume I, No. 1 Nisan 5603 / April 1843

"...All the Jews of Constantinople are under the control of a Grand Rabbi, (Haham Başı) who, to distinguish him from other rabbis, is called "Haham Hakolel". He represents the whole nation (millet) at the Ottoman Porte, receives the capitation tax, and is judge in all the civil and religious controversies of the Jews. Even the Christians, in their quarrels with the Jews, always refer to him, this functionary having long enjoyed a character of strict impartiality in all his decisions; his verdict is irrevocable; he has the power to order the infliction of the bastinado, but not to pronounce a sentence of death. The Government allows him two soldiers to execute his commands; he may ask for more assistance, if it be required. He enjoys the privileges of the other functionaries of the country, and stands on the same footing as the patriarchs of the other Rajahs. In council his place is above theirs, and the pipe is first offers to him; a courtesy highly appreciated among Eastern nations. He is assisted by a sanhedrin of rabbis, who, however, have only a deliberative voice. It must not be presumed that the Grand Rabbi is always chosen as being the most intelligent and the most pious. When he is to be elected, the representatives of the different communities (each quarter has a community) assemble to elect him, and their choice is generally approved by the Porte. The other Rajahs have a political influence, and in the election of their patriarchs disputes and cabals often occur, particularly among the ambassadors of foreign powers. But not so in the election of the Grand Rabbi. The representatives generally choose a man whom they think they can influence; they even exact a promise of him to that effect. If he should afterwards refuse to comply with his promise, an application for his dismissal from office can easily be made, and will be most generally complied with. The Grand Rabbi does not receive a very large salary, it being only about 500 francs; but he receives many presents".

Catholic millet

From the Imperial Edict (ferman) which established the Catholic Millet in the Ottoman Empire (Artinian, The Armenian Constitutional system cit., p. 38):

"Whereas the tax-paying Catholics of the Empire have hitherto been under the jurisdictions of the Greek and Armenian patriarchs, without a bishop of their own, and on account of the Catholic rites being different from the Greek and Armenian liturgies, have been unable to

observe their own rites, and compelled to frequent the churches of the foreigners and to ask them to perform their marriages and other rites, have experienced great distress and suffering.
Therefore, I, on this 21st day of the month of *Rejeb*, in the year 1246 [May 24, 1831], in order that they may refrain from attending the churches of the foreigners and be able to perform their rites in their own churches, have appointed Yakob C'uxurean as *episkopos* over all Catholics living in my imperial City and other parts of my dominion".

Protestant millet

From the Imperial Edict (ferman) which established the Protestant Millet in the Ottoman Empire (Artinian, The Armenian Constitutional system cit., p. 42):
"Whereas, hitherto those of my Christian subjects who have embraced the Protestant faith, in consequence of their not being under any specially appointed superintendence, and in consequence of the patriarchs and primates of their former sects, which they have renounced, naturally not being able to attend to their affairs, have suffered much inconvenience and distress.
Whereas, by reason of their faith, the abovementioned are already a separate community, therefore it is my Royal compassionate will, that...a respectable and trustworthy person, acceptable to and chosen by themselves, from among their own number, be appointed with the title of Agent of the Protestants, who shall be attached to the Prefecture of the Police" [November 27, 1850].