

'PHILETISM' IN THE BALKANS:
THE FORMATION OF THE BULGARIAN EXARCHATE (1830-1878)

by
ÜMİT ESER

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Sabancı University
Spring 2009

ABBREVIATIONS

BOA. Bİ.	Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry/ Decrees of Bulgaria (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri/ Bulgaristan İradeleri)
BOA. DED. BBD	Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry/ Registers of Foreign States/ Berat Registers of Bulgaria (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri/ Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri/ Bulgaristan Berat Defteri)
BOA. MH.	Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry/ Central Chancery Registers (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri/ Mühimme Defterleri)
BOA. MV	Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry/ Official Reports of Council of Ministers (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri/ Meclis-i Vükela Mazbataları)
C. ADL	Judiciary of Cevdet's Classification (Cevdet Tasnifi/ Adliye)
H. H.	Reform Decree (Hatt-ı Hümayun)
MMZC	Official Report of the Ottoman Parliameny (Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express deepest gratitude for my advisor, Prof. Dr. Fikret Adanır, for his excellent guidance, encouragement, and conversations full of motivation. I am glad to have the chance to study with him.

I would like to thank Elif Kiraz, who translated the crucial chapters of single German book- the book of Michael Ursinus- used in this study and assisted to read some Ottoman documents. I also would like to thank Leyla Kenarođlu, Emil Sabri Halil and Necmi Kasapođlu for their help in the translations of Bulgarian works. I must thank to Katerina Antoniou for her help about some Greek names and her support. All translations from French into English, Turkish into English, and Russian into English are the work of author of this thesis. Admittedly, all the mistakes in these translations belong to me.

I would like to thank Dr. Akřin Somel and Dr. Elçin Macar for their help on various occasions and for their suggestions.

I would like to render my thanks to the staff of Ivan Vazov National Library in Plovdiv and helpful clerics of the Assumptionist Roman Catholic Church at Moda, who provided the copies of *Revue d'Orient*. Besides, I would like to thank Demet Akman, who provided access to the Külliyyat-ı Kavanin documents in the Turkish History Association (Türk Tarih Kurumu).

And lastly, I am grateful to my mother, Nilgün, for her strong support throughout my thesis time, and sister, Gizem, for her support and understanding.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyze the formation process of the Bulgarian Exarchate. The method of presentation in this work is topical-chronological. First chapter deals with different aspects of Ottoman modernization (transformation/formalization process of *millet* system, rise of secularist tendencies, and attempt to create an Ottoman nation by Tanzimat cadres) starting from the 19th century. Following chapter continues with structural and cultural changes beginning from the mid-18th century in the Bulgarian lands and role of Catholic and Protestant missionaries within these changes in the 19th century. The third chapter investigates the phases of the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate between the 1830s and 1872. Our argument is that establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate is the most crucial event in the fragmentation of the Orthodox realm in the Balkans realized in the 19th century due to the spread of ideas of Enlightenment and Romanticism. Ethnic violence and secular parochialism posed the most serious threat against ecumenic character of Orthodoxy. Even though the Ecumenical Patriarchate had a reserve against nationalist ideas, 'official' churches of the nation-states became the instruments of these new political structures.

The research of problem under study is based on archival collections and secondary sources. These archival materials are the Ottoman Archives of the Prime Ministry, Külliyyat-ı Kavanin documents in the Türk Tarih Kurumu (Turkish Historical Association), and Tasnif-i Cevdet/Adliye (Classification of Teacher Cevdet for Judiciary). The existing historiography on the Exarchate is very old and very limited, though many researches were conducted about the Ottoman *millet* system, reforms of the 19th century, and missionary movements in the Bulgarian lands.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Bulgar Eksarhlığının biçimlenme sürecini incelemektir. Bu çalışmada sunum metodu konuyla ilgili-kronolojiktir. İlk bölüm 19. yüzyıldan başlayarak Osmanlı modernleşmesinin farklı veçheleriyle (*Millet* sisteminin dönüşüm/ resmileşme süreci, seküler eğilimlerin yükselişi, Tanzimat kadrolarınca bir Osmanlı ulusu yaratma girişimiyle) ilgilenir. Takip eden bölüm 18. yüzyılın ortasından başlayan Bulgar topraklarındaki yapısal ve kültürel değişimlerle ve 19. yüzyılda bu değişimdeki Katolik ve Protestan misyonerlerin rolüyle devam eder. Üçüncü bölüm 1830larla 1872 arasında Bulgar Eksarhlığının kurulma evrelerini inceler. İddiamız Bulgar Eksarhlığının kuruluşunun 19. yüzyılda Aydınlanma ve Romantizmin fikirlerinin yayılmasından dolayı gerçekleşen Ortodoks aleminin parçalanmasında en önemli olay olduğudur. Etnik şiddet ve seküler dar görüşlülük Ortodoks mezhebinin ekümenik karakterine yönelik en ciddi tehdidi yaratmıştır. Ekümenik Patrikhanenin milliyetçi fikirlere karşı ihtiyatı olmasına rağmen, ulus-

devletlerin 'resmi' kiliseleri, bu yeni siyasi yapıların aletleri haline gelmiştir.

Çalışılan sorunun araştırması arşiv koleksiyonlarına ve ikinci el kaynaklara dayanır. Bu arşiv materyalleri Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri, Türk Tarih Kurumu'nda Külliyyat-ı Kavanin dökümanları ve Muallim Cevdetin Adliye Tasnifidir. Birçok araştırmacının Osmanlı millet sistemi, 19. yüzyıl reformları ve Bulgar topraklarındaki misyoner hareketleri hakkında araştırmalarını yürütmesine karşını Eksarhhane üzerine var olan tarih yazımı eski ve hala çok sınırlıdır.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Historiography of the Topic	3
Historical Background of So-Called <i>Millet</i> System: An Autonomous Realm for non-Muslim Communities	4
Nomen: <i>Millet</i>	4
Discussions about the Existence and Autonomy of the <i>Millets</i>	8
The Greatest non-Muslim <i>Millet</i> in the Empire: <i>Millet-i Rum</i>	11
Centrifugal Tendencies at the End of the 18th Century: Kardzhaliisko, Rule of <i>Ayan</i>, and Emergence of Local Liability in the Balkans	15
CHAPTER I: GENERAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	21
The Imperial Edict of Rose Chamber and Reforms in the Provincial Administration	21
War and Ongoing Reforms: Announcement of the Reform Decree	28
Centralist Modernization Project: Ottomanism	33
Modernization: Secularization Attempts within the non-Muslim Communities	39
CHAPTER II: VAZRAZHDANE: SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TRANSITION PERIOD AMONG THE BULGARIAN COMMUNITIES	41
Economic Revival and Major Centers of Economic Activity	42
Cultural Revival and Emergence of Schooling Network	50
Disorder in the Northwestern Edge: Peasant Rebellions, 1841-50	52
Rise of Catholic Missionary Efforts and the Establishment of a Uniate Church	55
Nascent Involvement of the Protestant Missions	61
CHAPTER III: ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS OF THE BULGARIAN EXARCHATE, C. 1830-1872	69
Early Demands for the Bulgarian-Speaking Metropolitan Bishops, c. 1830-1847	69
Construction of a Bulgarian Church in the Ottoman Capital and Search for Restoration of Friendly Relations under the Guidance of Stefan Bogoridi, 1847-1859	71
Years of Crisis, 1859-1864	74
The Ambassadorship of Ignatiev and the Disruption of the Russian Pan-Orthodox Policies, 1864-1870	77
The Pronunciation of the <i>Ferman</i> (Imperial Decree) and the Establishment of the Exarchate	

	83
Ignatiev's Last Attempt for Reconciliation, 1870-1872	88
Formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate: A Philetism?	92
Aftermath	93
CONCLUSION	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY	107

INTRODUCTION

The roles of educational and religious institutions are important in the nation-formation period in the 19th century Balkans. The duty of these institutions is acceptance of nationalistic policies by local rural masses and conviction of these masses to be 'national'. The centralization, bureaucratization, and homogenization triggered by these institutions led to the nationalist indoctrination of the masses¹. Since the religious institutions (churches, monasteries, synagogues) and educational institutions were controlled by the same group (clerics) in the Ottoman *millet* system, establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate is a milestone for the development of Bulgarian nationalism.

Formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate is related with the intellectual aspect of nationalism. It had a crucial importance over the school issue in the Macedonian question and linguistic programs of the Bulgarian nationalism. Miroslav Hroch, who successfully related the construction of an élité nationalism to the capitalist developments, has a model of the development of nationalism for small nations in Eastern Europe. Hroch has five phases for non-dominant ethnic groups for the development of linguistic programs². In this work, initial four stages were investigated in the Bulgarian context. In the Stage A, Hroch shows that 'language is celebrated and defended'. A few educated scholars and bishops published some works on the role of their national groups or dictionaries. In these works, 'aesthetic value, ability to express all manner of feelings or the convey of information, and historical merits' of vernacular language were praised. These works were generally related with language and history. This phase coincided with the period of Enlightenment in the European context, whereas Paisiy Hilendarski and Sofroni Vrachanski-in a limited scale-represented this stage in the Bulgarian case in the second half of the 18th century. Hroch argues that movement in the Phase A does not include a political program. The Stage B is the period of 'language planning and codification' as an 'intrinsic part of cultural standardization'. Until the vernacular language was codified, it existed as regional dialects. This period can be illustrated as the widespread activities of Catholic and Protestant missionaries in the Bulgarian provinces after the second half of the 19th century. Some indigenous scholars also contributed to this standardization process. The Western European scholars had regarded all the South Slavs

1 See Michael Mann, 'The Emergence of Modern European Nationalism', *Transition to Modernity: Essays on Power, Wealth, and Belief*, (eds.) J. Hall and I. Jarvie, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

2 Miroslav Hroch, 'The Social Interpretation of Linguistic Demands in European National Movements', *Regional and National Identities in Europe in the XIXth and XXth Centuries*, (eds.) Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Michael G. Müller & Stuart Woolf, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), pp. 75-80.

(Bulgarians, Serbians, Croats etc.) as a single monolithic ethnic group until this stage³. Until the 19th century, narrow terms such as 'Dalmatian', 'Croat', 'Slavonian', and 'Bulgar' were carrying geographical and/or professional meanings. The Stage C is the 'intellectualization of national language'. During the period between the 1850s and 1900s, many interconnected academic disciplines were established in the newly-founded eastern European universities. Especially political history, philology (historical study of language), 'national' folklore, and traditional culture (ethnology and anthropology) were the most favorite disciplines. The patriotic scholars, whose works were ingrained in the nationalistic ideological process of the 19th century, were active in new educational institutions. All the materials in these disciplines⁴ had to reflect 'the unique metaphysical essence of the particular collective soul, the national Self'⁵. Among the manifestations of some national metaphysical essence, the dynastic glory, the revolutionary heroism, the national characteristics of landscape, and the folk costume were emphasized. The local leaders became the believers of the idea of nation and tried to spread these ideas to the public. The most popular disciplines were history, linguistics, and ethnography in the Bulgarian case. The Bulgarian intelligentsia was very influential in the creation of the national culture in the 1890s⁶. The believers of nationalist idea were a small group, again; however, national idea became the basis of a real agitation at the end of the Stage C. The fourth and the last stage investigated in this work, Stage D, is 'introduction of language into the schools'. The national schools intended to promote a *communauté de conscience* not only in the Bulgarian Principality but also in the Macedonian provinces of the Ottoman Empire. This phase would pave the path for school issue as a part of Macedonian question.

The formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate was completely related with the *millet* system and emergence of collective responsibility/local liability in the Danubian towns. The Bulgarian intelligentsia, who would like to indoctrinate the rural masses with a nationalist, secular, 'enlightened' education, aimed to have a *millet* status for their ethnic group. Therefore, this introductory chapter, the Ottoman institutions such as *millet* system, *ayanlık*, and emergence of

3 John V. A. Fine, Jr., *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Pre-Nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), pp. 277-80, 355-58, and 448-52.

4 For further information about the nationalism in Bulgarian high school and university textbooks, John Georgeoff, 'Nationalism in the History Textbooks of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, (October 1966), pp. 442-50.

5 Alexander Kiossev, 'The Dark Intimacy: Maps, Identities, Acts of Identification', *Balkan as Metaphor: Between Globalization and Fragmentation*, (ed.) Dušan Bjelić and Obrad Savić, (Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2005), pp. 175-76.

6 Боян Пенев, 'Увод в българската литература след Освобождението', *Защо сме Такива?: В Търсене на Българската Културна Идентичност*, (comp.) Иван Еленков and Румен Даскалов, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo Prosveta, 1994), pp. 151-62.

local liability will be explored. Another reason why *millet* system is investigated is that its autonomy and even existence was denied by some scholar. Thus, a glance over *millet* system is a requirement to explore its nature and autonomy.

Historiography of the Topic

Writing a thesis about the formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate necessitated to explore the historiography about Ottoman *millet* system. The origins of *millet* system has drawn the attention of scholars, who have dealt with the Ottoman history, since the end of the 19th century. However, the debate was rekindled after the 1980s. Even though I dealt with very limited part of this great debate in the Ottoman history, I would like to summarize historiography related with this subject. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire* (1982) is the first comprehensive collection about the *millet* system. Discussions within this book have a critical approach. Especially Benjamin Braude's article, 'Foundation Myths of the Millet System' has the severest criticisms to the concept of the Ottoman *millet* system. In the same book, C. E. Bosworth has an article related with the status of non-Muslims in the early Islamic states ('*Dhimma* in Early Islam'). Again, Richard Clogg investigated the *millet-i Rum* ('The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire'). Roderic Davison's article, 'The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire', emphasizes the role of non-Muslims in the modernization of the Ottoman Empire. In 1986, Michael Ursinus wrote the 'Millet' article in *Encyclopedia of Islam*. The 1990s brought a new dimension to the discussion, Parasekevas Konortas' outstanding article, 'From *Ta'ife* to *Millet*: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community' (1999), underlined the autonomous positions and longevity of the Ottoman *millets*. Though this article does not say an exact date for the emergence of this institution, it exhibited the possible continuities between some former such as *ta'ife* or *cins* and *millets*. Some Turkish scholars also attempted to contribute to the discussions. Among those, the most outshining was the work of Macit Kenanoğlu, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi* (2004). Even though archival materials were employed very successfully in this work, it suffers from many theoretical setbacks. The severest handicap of the work is that it tries to reduce *millet* system to a mere bureaucratic organization. The close governance relations between the *ethnarchs* and the sultan and authority of *ethnarchs* over their *millets* are disregarded.

Unlike *millet* system, the works on the Bulgarian Exarchate is very limited. In 1869, Marin Drinov, who would be the founder of history department in the first Bulgarian university wrote a book, *Balgarska-ta Tsarkva ota Samo-to i Nachalo i do Dnesa* (Bulgarian Church from Beginning to Today) (1869). This archetypal Bulgarian nationalist work justifies the Bulgarian demands for a

separate church. The Macedonian question triggered the emergence of new works about the Exarchate in Europe. Richard von Mach's book, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey* (1907), emphasized the Greek-Bulgarian struggle over Balkan dioceses in the eve of the First Balkan War. In the same year, Grégoire Troubetzkoi authored *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*. Although he was depicted as a Pan-Slav, he had reserves to Russian foreign policy in this book. Anastas Ishirkov also wrote a book about the role of the Bulgarian Exarchate in the emergence of Macedonian question, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte* (1918). Stranimir Stranimirov's *Istoriya na Balgarskata Tsarkva* (History on the Bulgarian Church) followed this book in 1925. In the post-1945 period, Marxist influence increased in the Bulgarian historiography. Dinkov's work, *Istoriya na Balgarskata Tsarkva* (History on the Bulgarian Church) (1954), can be an example to this trend. The most comprehensive book about the role of Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador in Istanbul, in the formation of the Exarchate, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, was written in by Thomas Meininger in 1970.

Historical Background of the So-Called *Millet* System: An Autonomous Realm for non-Muslim Communities

Nomen: *Millet*

The term *millet* marked the Muslim community in the pre-Tanzimat period, whereas non-Muslim communities were represented by the term *zimmi* or ethnic terms. In many cases, ethnic terms, such as *Rumi* (Greek), *Ermeni* (Armenian), *Latin* (Roman Catholic), and *Yahudi* (Jew), are used to call non-Muslim communities within the empire. As distinct from the Greek Orthodox, Arabic-speaking Orthodox Christians were being named as *Nasraniye*⁷. In the *cizye defters* (per capita tax registers) of the Balkan towns, ethnic terms, such as *surf* (Serb), *eflak* (Vlach), *rum* (Greek), and *bulgar* (Bulgarian) were very common in the late 17th century⁸. The term *gebran* includes all type of Christians. Some of these terms, like *gebran*, could acquire derogatory meaning and their uses were limited by the Rose Chamber Edict.

Use of *millet* as a term denoting Muslim community goes back to the reign of Süleyman I.

7 Benjamin Braude, 'Foundation Myths of the *Millet* System', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 68-70.

8 Svetlana Ivanova, '*Varoş*: The Elites of the Reaya in the Towns of Rumeli, Seventeenth-Eighteenth Century', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2005), p. 219.

During his reign, Sheikh-ul Islam Ebu Suud Efendi, the highest religious official for Muslims in the Ottoman Empire, employed this term ('din ve devlet, mülk ve millet' ['religion and state, realm and people']) to mark the Islamic community⁹. It was used in contradistinction to the term *zimmi*¹⁰. In other words, the term *al-milla* denotes the true religion, i.e., the Islamic religion, whereas that of *al-dhimma* represents non-Muslims under the protection of Islam¹¹.

The term *millet* was not prevalently employed until the 17th century in Ottoman documents. It did not have a prevailed employment unto the 19th century, when the reforms made preparations for the use of this term. Nonetheless, the relatively rare usage of the term in Ottoman documents does not mean the non-existence of autonomous religious communities in the empire. In general, the term *millet* is under debate in a very formalist perspective in Ottoman historiography. The imperial decrees of 1839 and 1856 were just affirmations of the *de facto* autonomous non-Muslim communities. Some researches argue that in the *jizya* (per capita tax imposed on free non-Muslim adult males) registers, court orders, and *mühimme defteris* (estate registers), *millet* was not used as a valid term¹². However, even in the pre-19th century period, the term *millet* was being used by the Ottoman bureaucracy since *millet*s were recognized as empire-wide religious communities at the end of the 16th century¹³. The term *millet* had certainly widespread currency with the reform projects of the 19th century, but the institution of autonomous religious communities¹⁴ and their privileges had appeared in the phase of initial social construction of the empire, namely between the dawn of the 15th and that of the 16th century. This autonomy was valid in the spiritual, administrative, and judicial realms. The sultan did intervene in the process of the election of the religious leader of a community in some cases, but mostly in order to approve the decisions taken by that community.

Instead of *millet*, the widespread use of the term *ta'ife* may be observed¹⁵ in the documents belonging to the pre-17th century period. The latter term, which means group, was utilized to denote religious communities along with other groups such as trade guilds¹⁶. In a limited scale, the terms

9 Benjamin Braude, 'Foundation Myths of the Millet System', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 70.

10 *Zimmi* is the vulgarized form of *dhimmi* in the vernacular Ottoman language. It was one of the most prevalent denomination for non-Muslim communities in the pre-Tanzimat period.

11 F. Buhl, 'Milla', *EI2*.

12 Benjamin Braude, 'Foundation Myths of the Millet System', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 67-73.

13 Michael Ursinus, 'Millet', *EI2*. According to Ursinus, the first *mühimme defteri* mentioning 'memalik-i mahrusada sakin millet-i Armeniyan' belonged to 1591 and term *millet-i Rum* was used first time in a *mühimme defteri* in 1757.

14 F. Buhl, 'Milla', *EI2*.

15 A. Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), p. 48-50.

16 N. Beldiceanu, *Recherches sur la ville Ottomane au XV e siecle: Etudes et actes*, (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1973), pp. 45-49 and Paraskevas Konortas, 'From *Ta'ife* to *Millet*: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox

takim, *cemaat*, and *cins*¹⁷ accompanied to the use of *ta'ife* till the 17th century. There is no certain rule for the use of these terms in the Ottoman documents. For example, both *millet* and *ta'ife* were sometimes used in a single document. In some cases, different institutions of the bureaucracy preferred the one term to the other¹⁸. In some Ottoman documents stemming from the 17th century, the term *kefere* attracts the attention. Yet, in time, the use of that term gradually declined. Increasing influence and the mobility of the Phanariotes within the Ottoman bureaucracy and an upsurge in the power of Orthodox clergy, paralleled with the decrease of Ottoman central authority in the provinces can be cited as reasons for this decline¹⁹. However, there are exceptional cases of the early uses of the term *millet*. To exemplify, the *berats* (charters) donated by Selim I to the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Apostolic patriarchs during the conquest of Jerusalem were examples of early usages of this term²⁰. Another early usage of the term *millet-i mesihyye* for high-ranking Christians can be found in an imperial decree of Bayezid II to Mara Branković in 1486. In this document, *millet-i mesihyye* must have meant Christianity²¹. Even in an earlier date, Orhan, son of Süleyman, used the term *millet* in a letter sent to the St. Paul Monastery in Mount Athos in 1412²².

The leaders of the *millets* (*milletbaşıs* or ethnarchs) were not only interested in religious matters, worshipping, and charity, but also personal issues such as marriage, education, divorce, tutelary, and inheritance. The disputes related with marriages, divorces, and other disagreements among the community members would be resolved by the metropolitan bishops. Except the lawsuits conducted in the sharia courts, *millet* (communal) courts could deal with trials among *millet* members²³. Moreover, similar to taxes taken by religious congregation, taxes which had to be paid to the sultan were collected by the *millet* institution.

The Ottoman Empire was recognizing patriarchs and chief rabbi as arch-spokesman of *millet*

Community', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 171.

17 Benjamin Braude, 'Foundation Myths of the *Millet* System', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 70-82.

18 Michael Ursinus, 'Millet', *EI2*.

19 Paraskevas Konortas, 'From *Ta'ife* to *Millet* : Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 173.

20 Külliyyat-ı Kavanin, c. 1, nr. 2599, t. 923 (Ermenilerin Kudüs-i şerifte haiz oldukları imtiyazata dair nişan-ı hümayun), Külliyyat-ı Kavanin, c. 1, nr. 3995, t.923 (Rumların Kudüs-i şerifte haiz oldukları imtiyazat-ı kadimelerini müeyyid ferman-ı ali), and Külliyyat-ı Kavanin, c. 1, nr. 2600, t. 927 (Ermenilerin Kudüs-i şerifteki imtiyazata dair Yavuz Sultan Selim Hazretleri tarafından ihsan buyurulan 923 tarihli nişan-ı hümayunun teyidinde dair nişan-ı alişan). Please see also Appendix part for the copies of these documents.

21 Michael Ursinus, 'Millet', *EI2*.

22 Benjamin Braude, 'Foundation Myths of the *Millet* System', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 70.

23 The patriarchates and chief rabbinate and their extensions such as Holy Synod had judiciary authority over all cases among *millet* members, except the murder trials. For further information, investigate H. H., nr. 46390-A, t. 5, s. 1254.

and civil chiefs, and supporting them against any rival factions. In parallel to that, these clerics had accepted to obey the commands of the sultan and to collaborate with the central authority on the grounds that their interests were consistent with the Ottoman rule²⁴. There was a dependency between the Sublime Porte and the patriarchates and rabinates. This dependency became apparent especially in a time of crisis. To illustrate, when the principles of French Revolution began to be heard among the Balkan peoples and Pazvandoğlu launched an effective propaganda in order to entice Orthodox peoples to rebel, Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem badmouthed the French Revolution and praised the Ottoman sultan in his *Dhidaskalia Patriki (Paternal Exhortation)*, published at the press of Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul in 1798²⁵. In another case, Gregory V, Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul, excommunicated all the rebels, who participated in the Greek revolt in 1821.

The *ethnarchs* had to implement many administrative duties in order to supervise their communities. The patriarchates and chief rabbinate had to appoint local priests and rabbis as well as metropolitan bishops, check the publications made by printing offices of communities, hear law cases, and inspect schools, endowments, and orphanages²⁶. Moreover, they were administering and benefiting from the pious endowments (*waqfs*) of their communities. Nevertheless, development and construction of public facilities were not controlled by the above-mentioned institutions of the non-Muslim communities. The Muslim judges (*kadis*) and chief architects were dealing with these matters²⁷. In order to rebuild or mend a non-Muslim worship place the community needed the permission of the sultan in the early modern period of the Ottoman Empire²⁸. The *varoş*, representative community of the Orthodox Christians, was sustaining the maintenance of the churches and the living costs of clerics as a municipal-like service²⁹.

The believers of monotheistic /Abrahamic religions were entitled as *Ehl-i Kitab* (Peoples of the Book) inconsistent with the shari law.³⁰ The Islamic law regarded other monotheistic religions as people who had received God's revelation. However, God's message, which they had is incomplete; therefore, they are inferior to the Muslims. Non-sharia law and non-Muslim jurisprudence have been an autonomous realm for a long time in the Islamic world. The document

24 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1973), pp. 13-14.

25 Richard Clogg, 'The Dhidaskalia Patriki (1798): An Orthodox Reaction to the French Revolutionary Propaganda', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 5, 1969, pp. 102-08.

26 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimatdan Cumhuriyete Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, (Istanbul: Hil, 1985), p. 113.

27 Ibid., p. 114.

28 See Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Ottoman Policy towards Christian Church Buildings', *Etudes balkaniques*, vol. 4, 1994.

29 Svetlana Ivanova, '*Varoş*: The Elites of the Reaya in the Towns of Rumeli, Seventeenth-Eighteenth Centuries', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2005), p. 218.

30 Donald Quateart, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 174-75.

known as the 'Covenant of 'Umar' determines the status of *dhimmis* (the non-Muslim subjects of a state governed in accordance with sharia). 'The Prophet's Edict to all the Christians'³¹, an agreement between Muhammad and Christians of Najran, had been seen as a precursor of this covenant. In the period of Abbasids, many churches were rebuilt and patriarchs were capacitated in the social and judiciary realm of their communities by the caliphs³². Like all former and contemporaneous empires, the Ottoman Empire had a multi-ethnic and multi-religious structure. The relationships between the Porte and non-Muslim communities were established upon the principles of *sharia* (Muslim canonical law), related with *zimmi*s. The politics of non-Muslim communities can be regarded as a not territorially but juridically/culturally autonomous area (space) in the Ottoman Empire. In other words, the *millet* system can be accepted as traditional Ottoman constitution based on confessions and beliefs. All the members of the same community had the same rights. The limits for autonomy of *millets* were determined and assured by the Sublime Porte. These so-called *millets* were different from the ethnic groups. An ethnic group is 'a named human population sharing common myths of descent, shared historical memories, a common culture, an association with a recognized territory, and a sense of solidarity'³³, whereas millets were defined on the basis of religion, sect, and/or Christological controversies.

Discussions about the Existence and Autonomy of the *Millets*

There were two different social groups in the Ottoman Empire. First group was *askeri*, including the sultan, his family, administrators and fellows. These people served as military people, religious officers, court officials and bureaucrats. Second group was known as *reaya* (literally flock, meaning subjects). General characteristics of the subjects was that they did not have any office in the service of sultan. The subjects were again divided into categories in terms of religious and sectarian affiliations. Ethnic differences within millets usually did not influence the notional position of ethnic groups in the society.

Halil İnalcık asserts that three non-Muslim communities, the Greek Orthodoxy (*millet-i Rum*), the Armenian Apostolic (*millet-i Ermeni* or *millet-i Armeniyan*), and Jewish, were recognized by the Ottoman authorities after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. In traditional Ottoman historiography, it is argued that Sultan Mehmed II donated an imperial decree/order (*firman*), guaranteeing the existence and security of worshipping of Orthodox community, to Georgios

31 This edict is present in the anonymous *Nestorian Chronicle of Si'irt* and *Ecclesiastical Chronicle* of Jacobite Barhebraeus. Please see, C.E. Bosworth, 'Dhimma in Early Islam', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982).

32 A. S. Tritton, 'Islam and the Protected Religion', *The Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 2, 1931, pp. 309-13.

33 Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, (New York: Blackwell, 1988), pp. 244-46.

Gennadios Skholarios, the newly-appointed patriarch. However, it is argued that this decree had burned in one of the fires, which affected the patriarchal building. Even if it was burned, a copy of this document might be preserved by the Ottoman bureaucracy. The existence of such a decree is possibly a myth generated by the Orthodox community; nevertheless, this (its absence) does not mean that the roles and obligations were prearranged between Ottoman statesmen and non-Muslim clergies in the context of governance of non-Muslim communities. Indeed, data related with the appointment of Gennadios and emergence of millet system are limited and contradictory. The Greek chronicles including the fall of Constantinople usually do not mention the relations between the sultan and Orthodox ecclesiastical élites, except the work of Mikhail Kritovoulos (Michael Critobulus), *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*³⁴. Georgios Frantzis (George Sphrantzes), another chronicler, asserts that Sultan Mehmed appointed the patriarch with a gorgeous ceremony even after the fall of the city and gave a document showing his privileges and obligations to the patriarch³⁵. By contrast with this account, the Greek Orthodox community had to wait the date of January 1454 for the appointment of the new patriarch³⁶. In my opinion, the privileges³⁷ donated by Mehmed II to the non-Muslim communities were not written but verbal ones. Moreover, until the reign of Selim I, practically no problems related with the privileges and rights did arise³⁸. The civil authority and juridical power of the patriarchate may be formed on the speech of Mehmed II in the appointment meeting of Gennadios³⁹.

İnalçık points out that parallel to the decentralist tendencies of the provincial notables, the hierarchy of Istanbul Patriarchate participated emerged as an autonomous realm. Certainly, some clerics were active in the decentralization experienced in the second half of the 17th century, but the

34 Please see Kritovoulos, *İstanbulun Fethi*, (Istanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları, 2005).

35 See Yeorgios Francis, *Şehir Düşüü! Bizanslı Tarihçi Francis'den İstanbulun Fethi*, (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995).

36 Apostolos Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation, 1453-1669*, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1976), pp. 102-04.

37 These communities had also obligations as well as privileges. The clothing of non-Muslims was standardized in the earlier periods of the empire. For example, only the Muslims could wear yellow shoes in the 18th century. Consult with Baron de Tott, *Mémoires du Baron de Tott sur les Turcs et les Tartares*, (ed.) Ferenc Toth, (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2004), pp. 128-69. Moreover, the sultan could launch campaigns in order to destroy illegally-built churches. See Rossitsa Gradeva, 'On Zimmis and Church Buildings: Four Cases from Rumeli', *War and Peace in Rumeli: 15th to Beginning of 19th Century*, (Istanbul: Isis, 2008), pp. 180-81. The reasons behind these rules are formative practises of the governing class and ostentatious inegalitarianism between the Muslims and non-Muslim. Please investigate, Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset*, (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007). These norms could gain derogatory meanings for non-Muslims in the next years. Bernard Lewis, *The Jews of Islam*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 38-44 and 138-39. In the post-Tanzimat period, limitations over clothing of non-Muslims came to an end. Kemal Çiçek, 'Osmanlılar ve Zimmiler: Papa Pavlosun İslam'a Hakaret ya da Renklere İsyani', *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 25, 1996, pp. 27-29.

38 Theodore Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, (New York: AMS Press, 1995), pp. 3-6.

39 It is asserted that Mehmed II had said that 'Be patriarch! You have our amity with each cause and all the privileges possessed by your predecessor are valid for you, too' to Gennadios. For further information, Basil Giannakis, *International Status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate*, (Massachusetts, 1959), pp. 34-36.

representability of these cases continues to remain a problematic issue⁴⁰. Moreover, these prelates did not relinquish sacerdotal duties and assignments their duties implied as regards communal affairs. Again, in the same article, İnalçık mentions the tax-farmer positions of the non-Muslim clerics⁴¹. However, tax-farming is only one duty of them⁴². They had to deal with every aspect of their communities' everyday life. The patriarchate dispatched a deputy called *eksarhos* to the metropolitan sees in order to collect *mal-ı miri* (tax on state-owned properties). The security of these people were guaranteed by the provincial officials. In these cases, a collaboration among the Sublime Porte, provincial officials, and the Church was conspicuous. Nevertheless, this tax-collection attempts of the clerics do not mean that they abdicated their classical duties.

Some scholars had claimed that there was a close connection between tax-farming system and the appointment of ecclesiastical people, and called this system as 'spiritual tax-farming system'⁴³. According to this view, a certain payment to the Porte, known as *pişkeş* for the appointment of patriarchs and *rav akçesi* for that of chief rabbi⁴⁴, was a prerequisite for clerics in order to start their functions. However, a careful observer has to ask whether this payment was really a must for all clergy. Furthermore, the *pişkeş* payments were not considered as bribes⁴⁵ or price of obtaining a seat in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Another objection of the author of these lines is that not only non-Muslim clerics but also Muslim statesmen and bureaucrats had to pay a lump sum. In this manner, is it possible to speak of a 'bureaucratic tax-farming system'?

Another criticism to the term *millet-i Rum* is that the Orthodox Church was administered by more than one patriarch and each of them were independent. Even at the end of the 16th century, five Orthodox patriarchal seats (Istanbul, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Peć) and five autocephalous archbishoprics (Ohrid, Mount Sinai⁴⁶, Cyprus, Beirut, and Crete) were existing in the Ottoman realm. Notwithstanding, some Turkish scholars' claim that the Ecumenical Patriarchate

40 Halil İnalçık, 'The Status of the Greek Patriarch under the Ottomans', *Turcica*, vol. 21-23, 1991, pp. 409-13.

41 Ibid., pp. 409-13.

42 Due to their roles in the tax-farming process, the Orthodox clergy and metropolitan bishops should also be regarded members of the Ottoman élite. For this issue, see Penelopi Stathi, 'Provincial Bishops of the Orthodox Church as Members of the Ottoman Elite', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press), pp. 77-85. As Stathi points out, the metropolitan bishops were organizing Greek Orthodox communities in the provinces. They were both religious and political representatives of the Orthodox Christians in the provinces. Apart from performing religious ceremonies, they were to certify divorces, dowry contracts, statutes of guilds etc.

43 An example of this approach is the work of M. Macit Kenanoğlu, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi*, (Istanbul: Klasik, 2004), p. 60.

44 Ibid., p. 61.

45 Halil İnalçık, 'Ottoman Archival Materials on *Millets*', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 447-49.

46 The autocephalous archbishop of Mount Sinai was, indeed, *hegumen* of that monastery. Later, his title was elevated to the autocephalous archbishopric.

among the Eastern Orthodox Churches was the most hostile to the Ottoman Empire⁴⁷, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul was closer to administration mechanisms and had deep-rooted relations with the Ottoman authorities. The patriarch has been resided in Constantinople where also the sultan settled after 1453. In the Council of Chalcedon (451), his *primus inter pares* (first among equals) position had gained acceptance among the bishops of the east⁴⁸. His *primus inter pares* position and closeness to *Vasileus*, Christian and Orthodox emperor, and then the Sultan, led to a tradition of governance. This patriarchate had a supervision over other Orthodox patriarchates and monasteries such as Mount Athos and Mount Sinai⁴⁹. Further, after the fall of Constantinople, Mehmed II obliged all Orthodox patriarchs in his realm to answer to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople⁵⁰.

The autonomy of the *millets* attracts the attention especially in the cases of appointments and dismissals of the metropolitan bishops. Unless the patriarch did confirm the complaints of *kadis*, the dismissals of the metropolitan bishops were impossible. In the 19th century, even if there was a necessity to detain a clergyman by the Ottoman officers, the detainment was supposed to be made/performed through the agency of the metropolitan, a higher bishop⁵¹. Moreover, the Sublime Porte did not interfere in the elections of the patriarchs, at least in theory. Autonomy of non-Muslim communities, reproduced itself generation after generation, contributed to the internal peace and stability.

The Greatest Non-Muslim Millet in the Empire: Millet-i Rum

After the complete dissociation from the Roman Catholic Church in 1054, the Greek Orthodox Church presented itself as a confederation of equal between unities⁵². The Ottoman invasion of Orthodox lands brought changes to the administration of non-Muslim communities. Under the Ottoman régime, patriarchal jurisdiction acquired a civil character except ecclesiastical

47 Yavuz Ercan, *The Nineteenth Century Balkanic Church*, (Ankara: Şafak Matbaası, 1987), p. 3.

48 Harry J. Magoulias, *Byzantine Christianity: Emperor, Church, and the West*, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970), pp. 25-27.

49 Külliyyat-ı Kavanin, vol. 5, nr.4474, Safer 1276. In this document, it is stated that '(...) on account of ambient and communal supervision of those, who are the patriarchs of Constantinople over the great monasteries of Jerusalem, Mount Sinai, Mount Athos etc. (...) ['(...) İstanbul patriği olanların Kudüs-i Şerif, Tur-i Sina, Aynaroz vesair büyük Manastırlara dahi nezaret-i şamile ve umumiyesi olmak hasebiyle (...)] and '(...) on account of ambient and communal supervision of those, who are the patriarchs, over all belonged to the Greek Orthodox community (...) ['(...) patrik bulunanların bilcümle Rum milletinden madud olanlara nezaret-i şamile ve umumiyesi olmak hasebiyle (...)].

50 Ralph S. Hattox, 'Mehmed the Conqueror, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Mamluk Authority', *Studia Islamica*, vol. 90, 2000, pp. 110-111.

51 C. ADL., nr. 4771, t. y.

52 Theodore H. Papadopoulos, *The History of Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, (Brussels: Librairie Scaldis, 1952), p. 86.

one. The authority of the patriarch was no more limited with only ecclesiastical field⁵³. Due to the rising importance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul, other three patriarchates (those of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem) sank into oblivion. Moreover, penetration of the Roman Catholic Church in the Orient influenced the authority of these patriarchates, negatively.

The Ottoman Empire had a multi-lingual and multi-religious structure and the *millet-i Rum* or Greek Orthodox community was the most populous non-Muslim religious group in this empire⁵⁴. This group was consisting of not only Greeks, but also Rumanians, Serbs, Bulgarians, Orthodox Albanians, and Orthodox Arabs⁵⁵. Until the 19th century, both Greek and non-Greek speaking Orthodox Christians were generally referred as 'les Grecs' in western diplomatic correspondences and 'Rums' in Ottoman documents since they were identified as members of the Orthodox Church. Apart from commerce, the church and higher education kept the conscious of Orthodox peoples alive as a single community. Despite the fact that the Greek-speaking element had a control over the Patriarchate of Constantinople and formed the majority in the highest ranks of the Orthodox ecclesiastical hierarchy, same temples, pilgrimage places, and monasteries were being used by the Orthodox congregation. The young people, who were capable of being educated in their hometowns, had to continue their higher education in the upper schools administered by the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. Advancing in the church hierarchy was a grateful option so as to benefit from social mobility for the young boys, who chose celibacy and ordination. They could be appointed to the metropolitan sees and could rise in the patriarchal hierarchy. Therefore, in a sense, the church was the highest rank for Orthodox Christians in the Balkan Peninsula and Anatolia since there was not any Orthodox Christian states in the region⁵⁶.

It is easily understood that the Orthodox patriarch of Istanbul had a jurisdiction over his community, but the limits of his realm is a problematic issue. The *milletbaşı* status of Istanbul Patriarch was not recognized in the mid-16th century. In a sixteenth-century imperial order, Ottoman sultan referred to both the Patriarch of Istanbul and Archbishop of Ohrid as patriarchs ('Ohri patriği')⁵⁷. This attitude can also reveal that the differences within Orthodox hierarchy was not cared

53 Ibid., pp. 88-90.

54 Cevdet Pasha asserts that the Greek Orthodox community had priority over the other *millets* in the state protocol. See Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), p. 68.

55 Richard Clogg, 'The Greek *Millet* in the Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 164-65.

56 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'Orthodox Culture and Collective Identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 136.

57 Paraskevas Konortas, 'From *Ta'ife* to *Millet* : Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 174.

by the Ottoman central administration and sultan. The clergy in their dioceses had to recognize the patriarch as their supreme authority. When the patriarchal seat became vacant due to any reason, the metropolitan bishops of Heraclea, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Nicaea, and Chalcedon and other metropolitan bishops, who resided in Istanbul and were members of the Synod, would choose the new patriarch and declare this decision to the Porte.

There were two major threats, which influence the policy of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. The first was the Catholic propaganda among the Orthodox laymen and clerics. Effective Catholic propaganda had led to a schism in the Patriarchate of Antioch in 1724⁵⁸. Second one was the increasing conversions in the inner parts of the Balkan Peninsula, especially in the juridical areas of the Patriarchate of Peć and Archbishopric of Ohrid. The drive behind the abolitions of these ecclesiastical institutions was possibly the intention to stop the conversions in these areas rather than Hellenizing the flocks of these institutions⁵⁹. The Bulgarians, who were living on the Rhodope Mountains, were converted to Islam in the 15th to 17th centuries⁶⁰; however, they continued to speak a kind of archaic Bulgarian⁶¹.

Despite the objections and animosities of their clergymen against such kind of acts, many Christians opted for *kadı* courts/sharia courts in order to reach a final decision in some cases. The sharia courts were regarded to be the final authorities in order to resolve disputes and their decisions were definite sentences, carried out according to the sharia law. The reason why some non-Muslims preferred to appeal to these courts was that they anticipated more agreeable decisions than those obtained in their own communal courts⁶².

Throughout the 18th and first half of the 19th century, the network of higher schools were expanding in the Ottoman Balkans. Medium of communication of these schools was Greek and they attracted pupil from all Balkan Orthodox communities. They were concentrated on the Balkan Peninsula and western part of Asia Minor: Istanbul-Patriarchal Academy, Bucharest (1689), Yaş (Iaşi) (1707), Izmir (Smyrna)-Evangelical School (1733), Janina (Ioannina)-Haroutsia School

58 Robert M. Haddad, 'Constantinople over Antioch, 1516-1724: Patriarchal Politics in the Ottoman Era', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 41, 1990, pp. 217-38.

59 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'Initiatives of the Great Church in the Mid-eighteenth Century: Hypotheses on the Factors of Orthodox Ecclesiastical Strategy', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 2.

60 Maria Todorova, 'Conversion to Islam as a Trope in Bulgarian Historiography, Fiction, and Film', *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory*, (ed.) Maria Todorova, (New York: New York University Press, 2004), pp. 136-48.

61 These people were known as Pomaks and the Ottoman authorities regarded them as a part of Muslim millet. Nevertheless, after the independence of Bulgaria and its expansion toward southwards, the Pomaks were considered as 'converted' Bulgarians and a large-scale 'national rehabilitation' campaign was launched over these people. See Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), pp. 87-89.

62 Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Orthodox Christians in the *Kadı* Courts: The Practice of the Sofia Sheriat Court, seventeenth Century', *Rumeli under the Ottomans, 15th -18th Centuries: Institutions and Communities*, (Istanbul: Isis, 2004), pp. 193-94.

(1742), Patmos (1769), Chios (1792), Ayvalık (1803), and Odessa-Commercial School (1817)⁶³. The Greek was the *lingua franca* of not only commercial networks, but also the highest clergy and scholars after the abolitions of Patriarchate of Peć⁶⁴ in 1766 and Archbishopric of Ohrid⁶⁵ in 1767. These two ecclesiastical institutions were abrogated by an imperial decree during the patriarchal reign of Samuel I Khatzaris and their flocks were put under the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. To state the matter differently, both the jurisdiction and obligations of these ecclesiastical institutions had passed to the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul, which had to pay fixed sums for them. Nevertheless, privileges of former staff of them continued to operate and their tax-exemption kept going⁶⁶.

Many scholars regarded this development as a conspiracy organized by the Patriarchate of Istanbul against the Slavic Orthodox communities with the aim of hellenizing them⁶⁷. Actually, after the flight of Arsenije IV to the Austrian lands, Patriarchate of Istanbul started to appoint the patriarchs in Peć and Greek-speaking prelates were already serving in the Archbishopric of Ohrid⁶⁸ in the 1750s. All the higher ranks of clergy was invaded by ethnically Greek clerics. For example, the bishop of Belgrade was an ethnically-Greek prelate, Leontios, at the beginning of the 19th century. The lower ranks of the clergymen in the Rumelian province were appointed among the priests who could communicate with the local people through the vernacular language. Nevertheless, issue of hellenization of Slavic Christians needs further exploration, but I am inclined not to see such a planned project by the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. Although Greek was employed as medium of communication in some schools and a lot of Serbian, Rumanian, and

63 Peter Mackridge, 'The Greek Intelligentsia, 1780-1830: A Balkan Perspective', *The Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 63-65.

64 The Patriarchate of Peć had been reinstated in 1557 as an independent patriarchate. For further information about this issue, Mirko Mirković, *Pravni položaj i karakter srpske crkve pod turskom vlašću, 1474-1766 (Character and Juridical Condition of the Serbian Church under the Turkish Domination, 1474-1766)*, (Belgrade, 1965), pp. 212-22 and Srete Petković, *Zidno slikarstvo na području Pečke patrijarkije, 1557-1614, (Mural Paintings in the Region of Pec Patriarchate, 1557-1614)*, (Belgrade, 1965). Until its abolition, this patriarchate had the privilege of correspondence to the Sublime Porte. See C. ADL., nr. 57, t. 1137, and C. ADL., nr. 5157, t. 1152.

65 Even though Karpat claims that the archbishop of Ohrid used Bulgarian liturgy in church services, Greek was used in correspondence and jurisdiction throughout the jurisdiction realm of this institution. Even the hagiographies, such as the Life of Saint Clement, was written in Greek in this archbishopric. See, George C. Soulis, 'The Legacy of Cyril and Methodius to the Southern Slavs', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 19, 1965, pp. 21-23 and Sharon E. J. Gerstel, 'Civic and Monastic Influences on Church Decoration in Late Byzantine Thessaloniki', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 57, 2003, pp. 232-34. Nonetheless, Slavic languages was possibly employed by the lower rank priests.

66 *Gayrimüslim Cemaat Defteri*, nr. 1, s. 1.

67 An example of this argument is the work of Charles Jelavich. Charles Jelavich, 'Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the Eighteenth Century', *Church History*, vol. 23, 1954, pp. 144-52. Karpat also follows this line, Kemal Karpat, 'Millet and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 166.

68 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'Orthodox Culture and Collective Identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 140.

Bulgarian merchants adopted the Greek for communication, there was not any planned project for hellenization. These adoptions were possibly based on the requirements of the period. Moreover, the motive behind these abolitions is to facilitate the administration of religious communities through power concentration in the hands of a single institution, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul. Herewith, the patriarch in Istanbul would be the highest responsible of communal affairs related with the Orthodox flock. Consistent with the centralization attempts in the ecclesiastical affairs, the patriarchs of Jerusalem were appointed by the Orthodox patriarchs of Istanbul between 1645 and 1845.

In 1758, Paisiy Hilendarski left the Slavic monastery of Hilendar and went about Karlowitz and possibly Croatia and Dalmatia in order to explore historical origins of his Slavic people⁶⁹. He completed his work *Istoriya Slavyanobolgarskaya (Slavonic-Bulgarian History)* in the Monastery of Saint George the Zograf in Mount Athos. His narrative was based on the work of Mauro Orbini, a Benedictine abbot from Croatia. Throughout his work, he mentioned medieval achievements and magnificent works of Bulgarians. He harshly criticized the use of Greek among the Bulgarian propertied classes and tried to encourage the employment of Bulgarian⁷⁰. After the completion of his work, he was dispatched to the Bulgarian lands in order to collect alms by brother Lavrenti. In Kotel, a town in Central Bulgaria, he got acquainted with Stoyko Vladislavov, who would be called as Bishop Sofroniy of Vratsa later, and gave a copy of his work to him in 1765⁷¹. After his ordination, Sofroniy started to conduct religious ceremonies in his own vernacular language, Bulgarian. Nevertheless, he did not have any nationalistic arguments. He preferred Bulgarian since his flock easily understood this vernacular and he could get into touch with them⁷².

Centrifugal Tendencies at the End of the 18th Century: Kardzhaliisko, Rule of Ayan, and Emergence of Local Liability in the Balkans

The *kardzhaliisko* (rural uprisings led by former imperial soldiers in the Bulgarian provinces at the end of the 18th century) triggered the spontaneous process of self-organization and self-defense of the towns in Bulgarian provinces as well as the nomination of leaders. A kind of

69 Ante Kadic, 'The Croatian Sources of Paisii's *Historia*', *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, vol. 10, 1983, pp. 71-82.

70 Paisiy states that '(...) There are those who do not care to know about their own Bulgarian nation and turn to foreign ways and foreign tongues...but try to read and speak Greek and are ashamed to call themselves Bulgarians.' See Marin V. Pundeff, 'Bulgarian Nationalism', *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, (eds.) Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), p. 101.

71 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'Athos and the Enlightenment', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 271 and *Sofroni Vračanski: Vie et tribulations du pecheur Sofroni*, (ed.) Jack Feuillet, (Sofia: Sofia-Press, 1981), pp. 11-34.

72 *Sofroni Vračanski: Vie et tribulations du pecheur Sofroni*, (ed.) Jack Feuillet, (Sofia: Sofia-Press, 1981), pp. 90-106.

collective responsibility understanding emerged among Bulgarian communities with the aim of protecting themselves *kardzhali* bandits. These semi-urban communities looked to the Porte and *ayan* for help, especially at the last decade of the 18th and first decade of the 19th centuries.

The period between the 1790s and 1820s was characterized by the rule of *ayan* in both Balkan and Anatolian provinces. The rise of provincial élites (*ayan*) and centrifugal tendencies determined Ottoman social history from mid-18th century to the third decade of the 19th century. The provincial notables, leading by the local *kadı*, were the representatives of the nascent regional élite. In later stages, this group played the role of intermediary between rural population and central authorities. There are two motives, which initiated the rise of *ayan*. Firstly, due to the changes in the *timar* system, the close tie between *sipahis* and *valis* (provincial governors) was weakened. Secondly, there is a close relation between the triumph of the *çiftlik* economy and increasing powers of provincial notables. The *çiftlik* was a fairly large farm specialized for production for the distant markets. Starting from the onset of the 17th century, *çiftlik*s had emerged on the western Black Sea coast with the aim of providing foodstuffs for capital of the Empire. At the beginning of the 18th century, these *çiftlik*s expanded to Macedonia and Thessaly. While the *çiftlik*s on the western coast of Black Sea were specialized in the provisioning of the capital and closed to European merchants, agriculture in the *çiftlik*s of Macedonia and Thessaly was commercialized and *çiftlik sahibis* (owner of great estates) produced for exportation to Europe⁷³. The European demand for cereals, tobacco, and cotton in the international market made the *çiftlik*-owning as a lucrative post and tempted the establishment of large-scale agricultural enterprises along the Danube, Dobrudja, and Thracian plain.

Absence of central authority triggered the governors' arbitrary rules in the provinces. Indeed, misdeeds of the governors became a steadfast problem in the provinces of the Ottoman Empire until the first half of the 19th century. In the 1790s, most of the Balkan territories was under the control of *ayan* dynasties: Ali Pasha in Janina (Tr. Yanya, Gr. Ioannina), Ismail Bey in Serez (Serres), Bushati family in İşkodra (Shkoder), Tirsiniklioğlu and Alemdar Mustafa Pasha in Rusçuk (Rousse), and Pazvandoğlu in Vidin. A new hierarchy emerged among *ayan* and between central government and *ayan* following the distribution of Balkan territories among the *ayan*⁷⁴. Vidin, Janina, Serres, and Rousse appeared as new centers of *ayan* in the Balkans and many minor *ayan* centers were subservient to them. For example, serdars or janissary commanders were under the authority of

73 Suraiya Faroqhi, 'Making a Living: Economic Crisis and Partial Recovery', *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 2, (eds.) Halil İnalcık and Donald Quateart, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 447-48.

74 Вера Мутафчиева, *Кърджалийско Време*, (Plodiv: Janet 45, 2008), pp. 146-48.

Osman Pazvandoğlu in Vidin region⁷⁵.

Shift of the provincial capital from Sofia to Monastir⁷⁶ (Tr. Manastır, Bg. Bitolya) was another 19th century change in the administration of Rumelian province. This provincial capital shift was the result of the turmoil in the Rumelian provinces. Considering that Sofia was in the political and economic decline and Monastir offered more advantageous geographical position to the governors, this change had become a must. Another factors can also be enumerated. Firstly, *kardzhali* bands had organized attacks to Sofia many times in the *kardzhaliisko* period and governors were not in a safety there. Secondly, thanks to its strategic position and its closeness to the Albanian, Greek, and Serbian lands, military and governmental importance of Monastir increased. Although Michael Ursinus claimed that this shift from Sofia to Monastir occurred at the end of the 18th century, it is difficult to give an exact date for this modification⁷⁷. As Gergana Georgieva points out, an imperial decree advises that the governor should move immediately to Sofia even in 1797⁷⁸. Thus, it can be asserted that Rumelian province was divided between two capitals, Sofia and Monastir in this period and as Ursinus maintains, Monastir was the western capital of this province. Georgieva asserts that when Sofia served as headquarter for campaigns against Pazvantoğlu and insurgents in the Belgrade pashalik, Monastir was considered a base against *kardzhali* bands, Ali Pasha of Janina, and Greek insurgents⁷⁹. The Russian occupation of Sofia was a further blow to the wealth of this city during the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828-29. A population decrease followed this event since many Muslims left Sofia region in these years. Besides, Mustafa Pasha Bushati organized an assault on Sofia in 1832⁸⁰. Conversely, Monastir handled the incursions of troops of *ayan*⁸¹. In addition to these, governor of Rumelian province

75 Gergana Georgieva, 'Administrative Structure and Government of Rumelia in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: The Functions and Activities of the *Vali* of Rumelia', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 9.

76 Gergana Georgieva, 'Administrative Structure and Government of Rumelia in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: The Functions and Activities of the *Vali* of Rumelia', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), pp. 13-14.

77 Gergana Georgieva, 'Functions and Prerogatives of the Rumeli Vali in the First Half of the 19th Century', *Etudes balkaniques*, vol. 39, no.2, 2003, pp. 57-78 from Michael Ursinus, *Regionale Reformen im Osmanischen Reich am Vorabend der Tanzimat: Reformen der rumelischen Provinzialgouverneure im Gerichtssprengel von Manastir zur Zeit der Herrschaft Sultan Mahmuds II (1808-39)*, (Berlin: K. Schwarz, 1982).

78 Gergana Georgieva, 'Administrative Structure and Government of Rumelia in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: The Functions and Activities of the *Vali* of Rumelia', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 15.

79 Ibid., p. 16.

80 Michael Kiel, 'Urban Development in Bulgaria in the Turkish Period: The Place of Turkish Architecture in the Process', *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1989, pp. 11-13.

81 Mark Cohen, 'Monastir: Oasis of Civilization, 1839-63', *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*, vol. 24, no.2, Fall 2000, pp. 3-22.

started to organize provincial army in Monastir and this city became a militarily important settlement of the Ottoman Balkans. Monastir was officially declared as the capital of Rumelian province in 1836.

One of the provincial élites, Pazvandoğlu, deserves special attention because he and his political formation or proto-state had a deep impact over the prospective political developments in Bulgarian lands and he was one of the two most powerful *ayans* in the Rumelian province at the dawn of the 19th century, with Ali Pasha of Yannina. Moreover, his rule offered many chances to the non-Muslims in his realm and since he tried to integrate Slavic Orthodox Christians in his proto-state. Pazvandoğlu was controlling present-day northwestern and north central Bulgaria as well as some parts of northeastern Serbia. He entered a quarrel with Wallachian Prince, Nikolaos Mavrogenis (Nicholas Mavrogenes) and participated in Austro-Ottoman War of 1787-91 with his troops. He could dare to object to the reform scheme of Sultan Selim III and launched attacks against the Principality of Wallachia in the north and the Belgrade *Pashalik* in the west, as well as to Danubian Bulgaria and even Thracian region. Despite the fact that Pazvandoğlu established diplomatic links with revolutionary France and sent envoys to Napoleon, the independent status of his realm was not officially recognized. Nedelko Popovich, envoy of Pazvandoğlu to Napoleon, called himself as the *bazirganbashi* of the government in Vidin. He mentioned that he was interested in finances and international correspondence in Pazvandoğlu's government. Indeed, he was a renowned merchant, who had commercial ties with Vienna markets and was known by Austrian and Russian diplomats in Istanbul and Bucharest⁸². When he got into contact with France, he embraced a revolutionary rhetoric and utilized the slogans of the revolution in order to draw attention of the French. Nonetheless, his importance was minor for the French and France continued to count on traditional alliance with the Ottoman Empire.

In the last decade of the 18th century, France followed a very active foreign policy in the Balkans and the Levant, where her interests collided with those of Russia. Regular information related with the course of events in the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia has started to reach Paris through French agents in the Danubian principalities, especially Konstantinos Stamatis (Constantin Stamaty), French consul in Bucharest, since 1795. Stamatis negotiated with Polish patriots, who intended to join the army of Pazvandoğlu. These refugees tried to create an accommodation place for themselves in the Rumelian province of the Ottoman Empire. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Charles-François Delacroix, exhorted Raymond de Verninac-Saint-

82 Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Secession and Revolution in the Ottoman Empire at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Osman Pazvantoğlu and Rhigas Velestinlis', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 89.

Maur, French ambassador in Istanbul, in order to determine the adversaries of Russia and incite Muslim populations in the Russian frontier, simultaneously with the occupation of positions in the Mediterranean, particularly Egypt⁸³.

Yet, Napoleon's Egyptian campaign changed the policies of European states towards the Ottoman Empire and Pazvandoğlu. On the one hand, French diplomats contacted Ali Pasha of Janina and Pazvandoğlu in late-1797⁸⁴. However, the image of Pazvandoğlu did not change in the French press. He was represented as 'a sole rebel' in *La Moniteur Universel*, main French newspaper during French Revolution, till mid-May 1798⁸⁵. After the Peace of Campo Formio in October 1797, France consolidated her power in Europe and the newspaper changed its discourse related with Pazvandoğlu, completely, since she sought an ally against the Sublime Porte. On the other hand, the Austrians had a hostile attitude towards Pazvandoğlu inasmuch as he could act as an intermediary for spreading revolutionary ideas among the Slavic subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Also Russians regarded Pazvandoğlu as an obstacle to the realization of their Balkan policies. Hence, Russian diplomats cautiously investigated his relations with the Orthodox Christian subjects of the empire⁸⁶. Many Christians had already entered his service. In order to guarantee their support, Pazvandoğlu considered to improve the status of his non-Muslim subjects.

Selim III, who was put to his trump by Napoleon's invasion of Egypt, was obliged to forgive Pazvandoğlu and appoint him as commander of Vidin in 1799⁸⁷. Followed by that, Pazvandoğlu was the ally of janissaries in the Belgrade *pashalik* and uprising in this region constituted a grave danger for his projects⁸⁸. When the janissaries were expelled from the Belgrade

83 Rachida Tlili Sellaouti, 'La France révolutionnaire et les populations musulmanes de la Turquie d'Europe au moment de l'expédition d'Egypte: une mise à l'épreuve du cosmopolitisme', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 102.

84 Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Secession and Revolution in the Ottoman Empire at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Osman Pazvantoğlu and Rhigas Velestinlis', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 92.

85 Rachida Tlili Sellaouti, 'La France révolutionnaire et les populations musulmanes de la Turquie d'Europe au moment de l'expédition d'Egypte: une mise à l'épreuve du cosmopolitisme', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 98.

86 Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Secession and Revolution in the Ottoman Empire at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Osman Pazvantoğlu and Rhigas Velestinlis', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), pp. 91-92.

87 Fikret Adanir, 'Semi-autonomous Forces in the Balkans and Anatolia', *Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. III: *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, (ed.) Suraiya Faroqhi, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 181, Вера Мутафчиева, *Кърджалийско Време*, (Plovdiv: Janet 45, 2008), pp. 166-219, Yücel Özkaya, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dağlı İsyanları (1791-1808)*, (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1983), pp. 58-60, and Robert Zens, 'Pasvanoğlu Osman Pasha and the Paşalık of Belgrade, 1791-1807', *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1-2, Spring 2002, pp. 98-100.

88 Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Secession and Revolution in the Ottoman Empire at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Osman Pazvantoğlu and Rhigas Velestinlis', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), p. 93.

pashalik, they took shelter in Vidin⁸⁹. Therefore, Pazvandoğlu emerged as the advocate of janissaries and other former military élites, who opposed to the novelties imposed by centralist rule of Selim⁹⁰. All of the mercenaries and brigands from Bulgaria, *bashibazouks* (irregular forces) from Albania, and janissaries from Serbia and Bosnia had joined the army of Pazvandoğlu. Janissaries, who had taken refuge in Pazvandoğlu's realm, organized an assault the Belgrade *Pashalik* and general turmoil in the Rumelian province started to be internationalized. They established their rule in the *pashalik* again and murdered Hacı Mustafa Pasha, beloved and appreciated governor of Belgrade, in 1801. Mustafa Pasha had aimed at reestablishing the authority of state over janissaries. In that manner, that assassination can be illustrated as a victory of centrifugal forces over centripetal ones. In reply to these acts, Selim declared them as grabbers and encouraged Ebubekir Pasha, governor of Bosnia, to kick out janissaries from the *pashalik*⁹¹. Although the Porte had attempted to neutralize the janissaries, the 1801 Ottoman offensive against the powerful *ayan* Pazvandoğlu of Vidin provided an opportunity for the janissaries to reassert their power. In 1803, *knezs* revolted against the arbitrary rule of janissaries. Before the beginning of the revolt in the Belgrade *pashalik*, commanders of janissaries had decided to strike to the revolt and Nenadović family was one of the most prominent targets of the janissaries.

In 1806, Selim III was ready to recognize the autonomous status of Belgrade *Pashalik*, if Karadorđe, Serbian rebel, acknowledged to pay annual tributes. When French-Russian War resumed, one of the main targets of the French diplomacy was the securing of reconciliation between Pazvandoğlu and the Sublime Porte in order to form a joint front against Russia. Despite the fact that a French envoy was sent to Vidin in 1807, Pazvandoğlu had already died by the time he arrived there⁹².

89 Cevat Eren, 'Pazvand-oğlu', *İslam Ansiklopedisi* and Robert Zens, 'Pasvanoğlu Osman Pasha and the Paşalık of Belgrade, 1791-1807', *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1-2, Spring 2002, pp. 89-105.

90 Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Osman Pazvantoğlu of Vidin: Between Old and New', *War and Peace in Rumeli: 15th to Beginning of the 19th Century*, (Istanbul: Isis, 2008), pp. 27-28.

91 Fikret Adanır, 'Semi-autonomous Forces in the Balkans and Anatolia', *Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. III: *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, (ed.) Suraiya Faroqhi, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 182.

92 *Ibid.*, p. 184.

CHAPTER I

GENERAL SOCIO-POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The 'long' 19th century is generally acknowledged as the most difficult period of the Ottoman Empire. This century, commenced with accelerating decentralization⁹³, ended with the demise of the empire. This chapter aims at analyzing the socio-political conditions in the empire till the 1860s. Nationalistic revolts, state-sponsored reforms, the institutionalization of a new army on the basis of a modern system of conscription, projects geared to centralize the administration, the rise of secularist tendencies among the intelligentsia, the proclamation, revocation, and re-proclamation of the constitution, and projects of developing the infrastructure, including port-cities, rail transportation, and banking networks-all of these-marked the Ottoman Empire as a part of modernity. It has four sub-chapters. First and second parts are mainly related with the imperial edicts of 1839 and 1856 and reforms in the provincial administration. The Ottomanism as a modernist nation-building project is handled in the third part and growing secularist ventures among the non-Muslim communities as in the case of declaration of constitutions of religious communities in the 1860s are investigated in the last part of the chapter.

The Imperial Edict of Rose Chamber and Reforms in the Provincial Administration

The changes brought by increasing contacts with the West and the transformation occurring within the Ottoman society led to the *Tanzimat* reforms and reorganization of the internal structure of the *millet*s⁹⁴. Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Treaty marked the onset of free trade in the empire and the Ottoman Empire became first export market of Britain. The Istanbul Convention of 1838 and ensuing Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Treaty accelerated the commerce between Europe and the Ottoman Empire. With this treaty, the restrictions over international commerce and Ottoman (*peşin alma hakkı*) for cereals were repealed⁹⁵. At that time, the Christians had gained a prominent position among the Ottoman merchant groups and specifically among the Black Sea traders⁹⁶. That

93 Fatma Müge Göçek, 'Decline of the Ottoman Empire and the Emergence of Greek, Armenian, Turkish and Arab Nationalisms', *Social Constructions of Nationalism in the Middle East*, (ed.) Fatma Müge Göçek, (New York: University of New York Press, 2002), pp. 15-83.

94 Emilie Théropoulou, 'Les élites urbaines à l'époque du Tanzimat: Le cas de Salonique', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Antonopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2005), p. 343.

95 Şevket Pamuk, *The Ottoman Empire and European Capitalism, 1820-1913: Trade, Investment, and Production*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 19-24.

96 A. Üner Turgay, 'Trade and Merchants in Nineteenth-Century Trabzon: Elements of Ethnic Conflict', *Christians and*

development caused a social and economic imbalance in the Ottoman Empire and Christian bourgeoisie remained as beneficiaries of that growth in commerce.

In the 19th century, central authority reasserts itself in the Ottoman Empire. The bureaucratic élites of the empire, whose main purpose was the re-establishment of the central authority and institutions, and restoration of the fiscal, administrative and judiciary structures, became more effective after the declaration of Noble Edict of Rose Chamber (*Hatt-i Şerif of Gülhane*) in 1839. In the Ottoman historiography, the period stretching from the declaration of edict in 1839 to the promulgation of constitution in 1876 is known as *Tanzimat* or reform period⁹⁷. The term *Tanzimat* is the plural form of *tanzim*, which means arranging in the Ottoman language and implied crucial regulations in the Ottoman institutions.

There are some new principles declared in this edict:

- i) The sultan accepted the limitation of his authority by this document.
- ii) The security of people's life, property, and honor would be guaranteed by the laws rather than the sultan's will.
- iii) The government would also be determined by the laws rather than the wishes of sultan⁹⁸.

Above clauses were called as the basic principles (*mevadd-ı esasiye*) of the edict. This edict, known as *Tanzimat-ı Hayriye* (the Auspicious Arrangings) corroded the superior position of the Muslims and declared the equality of all religious communities. This edict, which positioned individuals as citizens, determined the rights and obligations of both state and individuals⁹⁹. The motive for the 'principle of equality' in the edict was the apprehension of crises triggered by structural transformation. This apprehension was consisting of regional revolts and the provocative activities of the European great powers¹⁰⁰. *Tanzimat* movement was born immediately after the collapse of agricultural system of the empire. Moreover, the Sublime Porte had to cope with a loss of legitimacy after the march of Mehmed Ali Pasha to Kütahya in the 1830s. This act of ambitious Egyptian governor could trigger the reforms at the end of the decade¹⁰¹.

Even the announcement of the edict, reforms had started in the judiciary realm. The Supreme Council (*Meclis-i Vala-yı Ahkam-ı Adliye*), established in 1838, included formed the first

Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, vol. 1 *Central Lands*, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 291-96.

97 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1973), p. 42.

98 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1973), pp. 44-48.

99 Kemal Karpat, 'Millet and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 163.

100 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), pp. 1-2.

101 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1973), pp. 32-36.

body of central government¹⁰². At the beginning of the 19th century, the practise of mixed commercial commissions had already been begun in order to solve the problems between European merchants and Ottoman subjects. In 1840, these commissions were formalized under the name of commercial assemblies (*ticaret meclisleri*). In 1847, they turned into mixed courts. Mixed commercial courts, which were composed of local merchants and artisans, were established in order to prevent criticisms and interventions of great powers¹⁰³. Apart from ten foreign members, non-Muslims and Muslims were equally represented in these courts. Three years later, a commercial law was prepared on the basis of capitulations and European commercial practises for these courts. With this movement, the trial scope of non-sharia courts expanded against sharia courts¹⁰⁴. The foundation of mixed commercial courts was followed by that of mixed courts of session. In accordance with egalitarianism principle, non-Muslims could attest in these courts, like Muslims.

The difference between the Alliance Pact and Rose Chamber Edict is that the participants of the edict was not limited with sultan, ayan, and their forces. This edict can be considered as a contract, announced to the peoples of the empire, between the sultan and government¹⁰⁵. Reşid Pasha, former Ottoman ambassador in London and declarer of the Rose Chamber Edict, had intended to increase the power of central administration and ministers, and protect the bureaucracy from the arbitrary acts of the sultan.

After the declaration of the Rose Chamber Edict, the reforms were launched so as to implement a centralized system in the fiscal affairs. The intention behind the appointment of tax-collectors (*muhassıls*) was the termination of tax-collecting duties of *ayan* and governors and ending their malpractices. The main principles of the modern fiscal administration were the collection of taxes in the name of state treasury and the organization of all kinds of expenditures by the treasury. Another innovation stipulated in the edict was the abolishment of tax-farming (*iltizam*) system. The reform-makers aimed to establish a simplified tax system. Their main motivations were that these reforms would make an improvement in treasury and the power of central authority would increase¹⁰⁶. The state apparatus would implement the duty of tax collection.

Even though the centralized status of *muhassıls* could lead problems in the provincial administration, the *muhassıllık*s and *muhassıl* assemblies marked the involvement of Muslim and non-Muslim local groups in the administration of provinces in *Tanzimat* period. Indeed, these

102 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 28.

103 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 45.

104 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 162-66.

105 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 37.

106 Fikret Adanır, 'The Ottoman Peasantries, c. 1360- c. 1860', *The Peasantries of Europe from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, (ed.) Tom Scott, (New York: Longman, 1998), p. 309.

muhasıl assemblies, which would be called as *memleket* assemblies in the later periods, did play an important role in the involvement of local people in the provincial administration rather than being local administrative units¹⁰⁷.

The structure and composition of these assemblies set an example for *vilayet* and *liva* assemblies¹⁰⁸ as well as municipalities¹⁰⁹. These institutions were including entourage of *muhasıl*, i.e, property clerk, population and land clerk, and four provincial notables or governmental officials. Moreover, if any, non-Muslim religious men, such as metropolitan bishop and rabbi of the region, and two *kocabaşıs* (Christian provincial officials and/or tax-collectors) would join to these assemblies¹¹⁰. Non-Muslim clerics and *kocabaşıs* became the representatives of non-Muslim communities. President of the assembly would be elected among the members of assembly. The president had to be approved by governor (*vali*) for taking office. Generally, a prominent members of *eşraf* (notables of a town) was charged with this duty¹¹¹. Although consultation assemblies (*meşveret meclisleri*) have been existing since the 18th century, participation and increasing status of non-Muslims in these assemblies were the innovations of the edict¹¹². In some cases, interpreters, who could communicate with foreign merchants and consuls, were being appointed to the some assemblies. Since Tanzimat principles could not be effective in all of the Ottoman realm, such kind of institutions could not be founded in each Ottoman province¹¹³.

The seats in the *muhasıllık* assemblies were seized by former *ayan* and *voyvodas*, who were owners of either assets or land. Former *ayan* and *voyvodas* could be *muhasıls* in the small assemblies and continue to benefit from their former privileges in the new system, though their privileges were limited and checked by the central authority. Essentially, the election system, in line with social structure and interests of different classes and groups, for the assemblies had guaranteed the attendance of the notables and influential people in the assemblies. Anyway, most of the *Tanzimat* statesmen were not against this participation. Their main concerns were the approval of

107 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), pp. 17-21.

108 The inhabitants of *kazas* and *livas* were usually from the same ethnic group but the population of *eyalets* had multi-ethnic and multi-religious characteristics. Kemal Karpat, 'Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 153.

109 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 15.

110 Ibid., pp. 15-16.

111 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimatdan Cumhuriyete Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, (Istanbul: Hil, 1985), p. 161.

112 Halil İnalcık, 'Tanzimatın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkiler', *Bellekten*, vol. 78, no. 119-22, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1964), pp. 632-34 (623-90)

113 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 16.

central authority by these notables and ensuring their collaboration with the central state¹¹⁴.

As *Tanzimat* principles stipulated, religious leaders and *kocabaşıs* of non-Muslim communities would have the same rights with the Muslim members. Nevertheless, the Muslim members could not tolerate to the existence of non-Muslim members. Their attitudes towards non-Muslims in the assemblies led many problems, which were tried to be coped with by the central government. To illustrate, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimos, complained about the insults and indifferent attitudes of Muslim members towards the metropolitan bishops and *kocabaşıs* in the *memleket meclisleri* in an official message (*arz tezkiresi*) to the Sublime Porte on 14 January 1841¹¹⁵. An order (*irade-i seniyye*), approved by The Supreme Council (*Meclis-i Vala*), was dispatched to the provinces in order to prevent these attitudes.

Equal mixed composition of these assemblies were regarded as an unjust phenomenon by not only Muslim members, but also some non-Muslim representatives. Some non-Muslim members from the Balkan provinces would assert that criterion of equal quotas for Muslims and non-Muslims had to be abolished in the provincial assemblies. This led to a great quarrel between deputies from the Balkan provinces and Anatolian deputies. Christian representatives from Anatolian provinces, like Mike Efendi, objected to this proposal since non-Muslim communities would be represented less if the voting would determine the composition of assemblies¹¹⁶.

After the Greek uprising, the Ottoman authorities immediately began to turn off Greeks in the important bureaucratic posts of the empire. To exemplify, the monopoly of Phanariote princes (*hospodars*)¹¹⁷ over the thrones of Wallachia and Moldavia was terminated in 1821. Besides, Bureau of Translation (*Tercüme Odası*) was established in 1821, shortly after the Greek revolt and the abolition of the imperial dragomanate. Furthermore, the Sublime Porte preferred Christian converts, as in the case of Bulgarzade Yahya Efendi, and/or the Armenians, such as Sahak Abro Efendi instead of Phanariotes for the post of imperial interpreter (*dragoman*). Nevertheless, this change was a temporary precaution and some Phanariotes continued to be favored subjects. These people could operate in the bureaucratic posts of the Ottoman Empire. To illustrate, Kalimaki Bey

114 Ibid., p. 20.

115 BOA. Ir-Med. Va 19 Zilkade 1256/226 Arztezkeresi.

116 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimatdan Cumhuriyete Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, (Istanbul: Hil, 1985), pp. 84-85 and MMZC, 7 Nisan 1877, 12th session.

117 The term *hospodar* has Slavic origins and was derived from *zocnodap* (lord). Appointment of Phanariote notables to these principalities in 1711 is meaningful. This central appointment system guaranteed the flow of annual tribute and commodities to the Ottoman capital in the 18th century, when the ability of the empire for collecting resources was under crisis. About the origins of word Phanariote, see Andrei Pippidi, 'Phanar, Phanariotes, Phanariotisme', *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, 13, (1975), pp. 231-39. The author claims that this aristocracy-like group was known as 'Greeks of Phanar' in western sources and 'Constantinopolitan Greeks' in Rumanian sources. This article correctly argues that the Phanariotes presents a heterogenous political class among the 'servants of the state' and distinctions of ethnic origins do not have an affect on the formation of this class..

became the ambassador of Vienna, Fotiadi Bey took office as that of Athens¹¹⁸, Musurus Pasha as that of London, Aristarchi Pasha to that of Berlin, Komnenos Pasha as that of St. Petersburg, and Sava Pasha had been appointed to the governorship of Cezair-i Bahr-i Sefid and then as foreign minister. Both Fotiadi Bey and Sava Pasha had served as the administrator of *Lycée Impérial Ottoman de Galata-Sérai*. All of them hold themselves at a distance to European and Greek political intentions and were protectors of the Ottoman cause¹¹⁹.

The professionalization and centralization of Ottoman bureaucracy can be regarded in the conduction of censuses. In the previous years, the practice for keeping records of the Ottoman population was developed in order to meet some crucial administrative and military requirements. The principal reason for the Ottoman censuses was not the straight recording of ethnic composition of the society. The establishment of a modern army made conduct of the systematic censuses and their recording inevitable¹²⁰. In 1829, the first modern census has been conducted in the Balkan and Anatolian lands, though each town was not considered¹²¹. In 1831 census, only adult males were counted¹²². In these censuses, the term *Rums* (Greeks) and *reaya* (non-Muslim subjects of the sultan) were preferred to denote all the Eastern Orthodox Christians. Nonetheless, there are some specific cases in which Christian communities were called by their ethnic denomination. To illustrate, there was a category of *ta'ife-i Bulgar* ('Bulgarian people'), similar to the Armenians and Paulicians (Catholic Bulgarians) in the Plovdiv (Filibe) census of 1831¹²³.

However, understanding behind these censuses would transform after the signing of Paris Treaty in 1856. In other words, the religious and ethnic composition of the Ottoman population became an important issue after the announcement of the Reform Decree in the same year. The Sublime Porte hugged some European governmental concepts such as functional government. Therefore, the statesmen aimed to evaluate human and natural resources of the empire. Moreover, the demands for *millet* schools and churches increased among the different Christian communities. Due to these reasons, the imperial authorities needed to know the exact population the each

118 İlber Ortaylı, 'Greeks in the Ottoman Administration', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 162.

119 Roderic Davison, 'The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 326-27.

120 Michael Palaret founds his arguments on a different standpoint from Karpat. He claims that the Sublime Porte preferred to update census records in 1835, 1838, 1844, and 1857 instead of conducting new censuses. See Michael Palaret, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 4.

121 Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), p. 56.

122 Ibid., p. 58.

123 Ibid., p. 59.

Christian ethnic groups¹²⁴.

The application of principles of Rose Chamber Edict was an ominous process and this edict was not found acceptance by large segments of society¹²⁵. Innovations, which were anticipated through *Tanzimat* movement, could not be fully-achieved in the fiscal, judiciary, and provincial administration realms. Through the centralist modernization projects in the provincial assemblies and democratization efforts in the administration, a new system was tried to be created. Despite the fact that *Tanzimat* reforms constituted a great experience for all communities of the empire, they could not operate in all realms¹²⁶. The reasons of Ottoman political decline were numerous and complex. However, Reform Decree, taken shape in the atmosphere of the Crimean War and Paris Treaty, would pave a new way for the participation of non-Muslim communities to the provincial administration.

Military service obligation of non-Muslims became a permanent problem in the Ottoman politics after the announcement of imperial decree in 1839. In 1850, the issue of military service for non-Muslims was negotiated in High Justice Assembly; however, most of the Christians preferred to pay traditional exemption tax instead of performing military service. The principle of equality became inoperative in this issue. A special tax was imposed on non-Muslims in return for exemption from military service. This tax called as *bedel-i askeri* was introduced in 1857. When this question became a current issue in the sessions of the Ottoman parliament in 1877, number of Christian deputies, who defended the military obligations of the Christians, was very limited¹²⁷. The practice of tax-collection from non-Muslims would continue until 1909, when military service declared as an obligation for all male citizens regardless of religion. Briefly, military service of non-Muslims remained a thorny issue in the Ottoman politics throughout the second half of the 19th century.

The Great Powers did dislike the secularization attempts in the Ottoman Empire because they could demand protection over a religious group in case of crisis and weakness of the empire. Whereas Protestants benefited from protection of Britain and the Catholics from that of France or sometimes Austria, the principal protector of the Orthodox flock was Russia. The protector power was changeable and volatile for the other Christian sects, such as Apostolic Armenians and Orthodox Syriac, time to time. If the empire is secularized, the Great Powers could not intervene in

124 Ibid., p. 47.

125 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 42-43.

126 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 31.

127 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 95.

for protection¹²⁸.

Russian protectionism over the Orthodox flock and the problem of Holy Places in Jerusalem brought a crisis in 1852. An ambiguous clause of Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca had donated the right to establish a Greco-Russian church in Istanbul in 1774; however, this clause was interpreted as confirmation of protection rights of Russia over the Orthodox flock of the Sublime Porte by the Russian diplomats. The existence of a great Orthodox population provided a legitimacy for them to conduct Russian imperial desires¹²⁹. In other words, one of the main targets of Russian foreign policy was intervention to the affairs of the Ottoman Empire through utilization of Orthodox *millet*. Russian consuls did not hesitate to give economic support to Orthodox schools, church construction projects, and offer protégé status to Ottoman subjects through consular services¹³⁰. Provoking attitudes of Russian ambassador in Istanbul led to a growing antagonism against Russia and exacerbation of opposition of Muslims against the principles of egalitarianism and Ottoman fraternity, and reform projects¹³¹.

War and Ongoing Reforms: Announcement of the Reform Decree

The stagnancy in the reforms of the Tanzimat period would be surmounted by the ill-effects of the Crimean war. The British and French ambassadors were putting pressure on the implementation of reforms and the valid application of egalitarianism principle, ceaselessly. The Vienna Protocol, prepared by European powers (Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Piedmont-Sardinia) in February 1855, was mentioning further arrangements for the status of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Serbian Principality; free transportation on the River Danube and Black Sea; and privileges of Christian communities in the empire. The Ottoman government declared that it would abolish tithe (*aşar*) and would not obstruct to participation of non-Muslims to the army and bureaucracy. Moreover, non-Muslims could repair their worshiping places without consulting to the local authorities and even build churches in homogeneous non-Muslim neighborhoods. However, the right of participation to the army would create new quarrels between state and non-Muslim communities and prompt their anxieties¹³². One week after the announcement of the decree,

128 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 93-97.

129 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'From Orthodox Commonwealth to National Communities: Greek-Russian Intellectual Ties in the Ottoman Era', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), pp. 9-10 and Hugh Ragsdale, 'Evaluating Traditions of Russian Aggression: Catherine II and the Greek Project', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 66, 1988, pp. 91-117.

130 İlber Ortaylı, 'Greeks in the Ottoman Administration during the Tanzimat Period,' *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999) p. 163.

131 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 49-51.

132 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 33

delegates of European states gathered in Paris with the aim of ending the Crimean War since Russia was defeated by a coalition of European forces, including Britain, France, Austria, Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, and the Ottoman Empire. At the end of the Crimean War, the Sublime Porte was seeking to gain European goodwill. Therefore, the Reform Decree (*Hatt-ı Hümayun*) was proclaimed at the grandest of ceremonies in Istanbul. With Paris Treaty, the Ottoman Empire was officially affiliated to the Concert of Europe, and its independence and territorial integrity were guaranteed. British, French, and Austrian delegates appreciated the high value of this decree in Article IX of Paris Treaty and were ready to accept the Ottoman Empire as an equal member of the European state system, which was created in 1815 in Vienna, for the first time¹³³.

The main intention behind the announcement of the decree, prepared due to the pressures of European states and requirements of the period, was the launch of reforms in behalf of non-Muslim peoples of the Sublime Porte. To state the matter differently, the Reform Decree played an important role in the augmentation of non-Muslims' rights and the development and elaboration of provincial administration institutions. Furthermore, it guaranteed the security of non-Muslim communities, again, as similar to the 1839 edict. The innovations brought by this decree can be put in order as below:

- i) Security of life, property, and honor
- ii) Equality of all individuals and rule of law
- iii) Liberty for changing religion and/or sect
- iv) Equality in the imposition of taxes
- v) Abolishment of the iltizam system and direct collection of taxes by central authorities
- vi) Equal testimony rights in the courts for non-Muslims.¹³⁴

As the document stipulated, each individual had the right to take charge in the bureaucracy, whichever the millet of person who applies ('herkangı milletin olursa olsun'). Three months after the announcement of the decree, first Christian delegates were appointed to the Supreme Council. The right to found the *millet* schools ('milletçe mektepler') of the communities was being confirmed in the document¹³⁵. As it can be noticed, the Reform Decree mainly signed the European guarantorship for the rights of non-Muslim communities in the empire. Both the Noble Edict and especially Reform Decree exhibits formalization of millet system and European umbrella over these institutions.

133 Ibid., pp. 31-35.

134 Ibid., p. 35.

135 Benjamin Braude, 'Foundation Myths of the Millet System', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 73.

Announcement of the Reform Decree facilitated the development of communal institutions, such as pious endowments, churches, and schools for non-Muslims. Immediately after its announcement, some people tried to change their *millet* belongings without any relevant religious reasons. These alteration motives were arisen from wish of escape from ecclesiastical taxes, will for protection of individual political influence, and/or benefitting from a protégé status offered by a Western power¹³⁶.

When the Reform Decree was proclaimed, apart from many prominent Muslims, Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul, Armenian Patriarch of Istanbul, Chief Rabbi, and other distinguished representatives of non-Muslims had attended in the ceremony¹³⁷. The Reform Decree pleased neither Muslim *ulema*, nor non-Muslim clerics since the authority and interests of these leaders over the *millets* were constrained¹³⁸. The high clerics, who would lose their influences over the *millets* and monetary opportunities of the former arrangements, was one of the most decisive opponents of the decree. Moreover, the decree did not only guarantee the religious freedom but also determined the limits of patriarchal authority. The Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul had faced a dual modern challenge after the proclamation of the Reform Decree. From a certain point of view, it had to cope with secularist and nationalist tendencies of the Greeks, which were growing after the 1860s. For instance, the Greek Orthodox clergy was one of the harshest criticizers of the Decree because the authority of the patriarchate over the community was being undermined. For instance, when the decree was put back to its pouch, metropolitan bishop of Nicomedia (Izmit) muttered to himself: 'God grant that it not be taken out of this bag again'¹³⁹. Besides, its monopoly over judiciary, fiscal, and educational affairs would be shattered. They also objected to the equality principle of all *millets* due to the fact that Orthodox ecclesiastical leaders claimed that they had privileges and precedence over the other groups. Many prominent clerics hated to be considered equal with the Jews¹⁴⁰. From another point of view, it was to deal with rising Bulgarian nationalistic ideas stipulating the establishment of an independent Bulgarian ecclesiastical institution¹⁴¹. There were 112 metropolitan sees and 56 episcopacies under the rule of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul in 1857 throughout the Ottoman Empire¹⁴². Some of these sees began to be demanded by the supporters of this

136 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 118-19.

137 Ibid., p. 3.

138 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 144-52.

139 Roderic Davison, 'The Millets as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 332.

140 Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), pp. 67-68.

141 İlber Ortaylı, 'Greeks in the Ottoman Administration during the Tanzimat Period', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 164.

142 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), pp. 60-61.

movement.

Its announcement also created a discontentment among the Muslim communities throughout the empire, especially in the provinces of Bosnia, Damascus, and Aleppo¹⁴³. The work of Cevdet Pasha gives a detailed account of reactions of Muslim community to this imperial decree:

This [the decree] affected the Muslims particularly hard. Many of the Muslims started complaining, saying, 'Today, we lost our sacred rights as a religious community, those rights which had been won by the blood of our fathers and forefathers. The Muslim community, which had been the dominant community, has been deprived of such a sacred right. This day is a day of mourning and despair for the Muslims¹⁴⁴.

Despite the fact that the decree brought positive alterations, Christian communities had confused reactions. Their assessments were established upon their specific position. The Bulgarians were the most enthusiastic group on the grounds that the decree stipulated the reorganization of *millets* and commanded the determination of fixed fees for ecclesiastical services instead of inconsistent payments. Ordinary Christians, irrespective of their sects, generally approved both the equality principle and involvement of laymen in the inspection processes of *millet* affairs¹⁴⁵. The Christian peoples were contented with the newly-bestowed rights albeit military service or obligation of toll in return for exemption from this service¹⁴⁶. Notwithstanding, Christian peoples were motivated by local élites for further social reforms in the Balkan provinces.

This decree had a discourse based on equality of all peoples throughout the empire. Nevertheless, mentioning communal rights of non-Muslims meant de facto continuation of *millet* system¹⁴⁷. Reşid Pasha asserted that full equality, promised in the decree, would disappear the differences between 'dominant *millet*' (*millet-i hakime*) and 'dominated ones' (*millet-i mahkume*). Although *millet* system was more favorable for the Muslims, it had also provided a relative autonomous space for non-Muslim communities. Its replacement with a western/modern type citizenship idea would erode traditional privileges of non-Muslim communities, though it brought an equality principle. Notwithstanding, *millet* system could not continue in a period when the industrial products and modernity could retrieve to the all parts of the globe and had a deep impact over the local economies¹⁴⁸.

The European pressure continued for the practice of reforms even after the announcement of the Reform Decree. For instance, ambassadors of European states had given a memorandum asking

143 Ibid., p. 36.

144 Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), pp. 67-68.

145 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 58-59.

146 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 144-52, p. 218.

147 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 55-56.

148 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 211-21.

the implementation of reforms in September 1859. The European states did make an emphasis on the implementation of Tanzimat reforms throughout the Ottoman lands in the Paris Conference. The representatives of the great powers, especially the British ambassador, felt themselves as the responsible because of the problems hung by the decree¹⁴⁹. Indeed, constant European interventions prevented the development of reforms and led to the territorial losses of the Ottoman Empire¹⁵⁰. Reforms from the above were the general characteristics of the period.

Besides, Russian ambassador demanded the conduct of further reforms in the province of Bosnia and other Balkan provinces. Thereupon, the Ottoman Empire declared that a commission including non-Muslim members would be sent to the Slav provinces¹⁵¹. Nonetheless, this development could not solve the question. The disturbances in Niš led to the interferences of European states, particularly Russia, in 1859. And Prime Minister Rüşdü Pasha resigned. The Ottoman Empire had targeted to prevent proposals for the establishment of an international commission. Thus, it sent a commission including two Christian members under the leadership of Kıbrıslı Mehmed Pasha, new prime minister, to Varna in May 1860. Yet, the commission could not end its work in Balkan lands because of a violent conflict between Druzes and Maronites in Lebanon¹⁵².

A major problem of this period was the resettlement of Tartar and Circassian migrant, who left their territories because of Russian invasion. When Russians invaded Circassian lands in 1864, they gave the northern Caucasian peoples two alternatives. These peoples would either settle in new places or ask for permission to migrate. Thousands of Circassians and Tartars migrated to the Ottoman lands¹⁵³. The Sublime Porte, which faced a difficult question in the issue of resettlement of these Caucasian migrants, opted to settle them in the different parts of the empire, such as Danubian province, Manastir district, Sakarya valley, Çukurova, Armenian provinces, province of Damascus, and Transjordan. Nearly 400,000 people had resettled in the Ottoman lands. The government could aim to increase the population of Muslims against the non-Muslims especially in the settling

149 Ibid., p. 216.

150 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 8-9.

151 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), pp. 36-37.

152 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 138-42.

153 There is a rich literature about the emigration of the Caucasian tribes into the Ottoman Empire and modernization projects imposed by Russia. See Turgay A. Üner, 'Circassian Immigration into the Ottoman Empire, 1856-78', *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, (eds.) W. B. Hallaq and D. P. Little, (Leiden, Brill, 1991), pp. 193-217; Bruce Grant, 'Empire and Savagery: The Politics of Primitivism in Late Imperial Russia', *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, (eds.) Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), pp. 292-310; Austin Lee Jersild, 'From Savagery to Citizenship: Caucasian Mountaineers Muslims in the Russian Empire', *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, (eds.) Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), pp. 101-114; and Firouzeh Mostashari, *On the Religious Frontier: Tsarist Russia and Islam in the Caucasus*, (London: Tauris, 2006).

programs of Danubian province and Armenian provinces in the east. In the Danubian province, local authorities provided land and housing for these Caucasian migrants. These grants and common/legitimate robbery activities among new migrants made local population angry. Moreover, local authorities had to do with sudden population increases due to the migrations. In the case of Varna, the population increased 50% nearly overnight¹⁵⁴.

Centralist Modernization Project: Ottomanism

Âli Pasha believed in that the integrity of the empire and its peoples would be protected on the condition that the Christian-Muslim equality would gain the validity and some Christians lost their ardent separatist sentiments. Apart from Âli Pasha, many prominent bureaucrats supported the Ottomanist motive. The *Tanzimat* cadres intended to promote the *homo ottomanicus*, the Ottoman citizen, with the aim of the fortification of the threatened state. They would like to eradicate the legal distinctions between the Muslims and non-Muslims, and launched policies which targeted 'to make the non-Muslim subjects of the sultan less eager to break away from the Ottoman realm'¹⁵⁵. Efforts for Ottomanism are one of the attempts to construct a supranational identity in the modern European history. Through these policies, Muslims, Christians, and Jews of the empire would perceive themselves as the equal members of the Ottoman nation.

These Ottomanist efforts continued through almost *Tanzimat* period. Through the promotion of Ottomanism, a secular sense of political belonging was tried to be created. The Ottomanism, brand of reform movement, argued that people had to forget their ethnicities and all peoples in the Ottoman Empire belonged to same nation, the Ottoman nation. The reformist cadres had reasoned that if all peoples had equal rights in the empire, the Great Powers could not intervene in the affairs of the empire. However, except Great Powers, élites of individual groups opposed to the Ottomanism because they started to be directed by nationalistic feelings, parallel with the trends in Europe. At that time, European experiences, such as the unification of Italy and Germany, challenge to these efforts as alternative paths for nation-building. Nevertheless, difference is that whereas European experiences were based on single ethnicity, Ottomanism was tried to be promoted on a multi-ethnic base. The Ottomanist motive was conspicuous in trivet development of the emergence and composition of *Jeune Turcs* movement; establishment of a European-type school, *Lycée Impérial de Galata-Sérai*; and a new provincial administrative development in the

154 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 151-52.

155 Michael Ursinus, 'In Search of the Homo Ottomanicus: The Cases of Nikola Pop Stefanoff and Sheykh Shemsuddin from Ottoman Macedonia (ca. 1780-1840)', *Figures anonymes, figures d'élite: pour une anatomie de l'Homo ottomanicus*, (eds.) Meropi Anastassiadou & Bernard Heyberger, (Istanbul: Isis, 1999), p. 21.

Danubian region.

The Young Ottomans were usually named as 'Young Turks' and a segment of them sometimes used the term *Jeunes Turcs* in order to describe themselves. However, the latter term should be employed for post-1889 groupings in order to prevent further confusions. *Jeunes Turcs* meant a person who had a western mentality. With considerable certainty, *La Giovine Italia* (Young Italy), a political movement founded in 1831 by Giuseppe Mazzini, and other European 'young' organizations affected the emergence of Young Turk movement¹⁵⁶.

The Ottoman administrators in Tanzimat period, such as Âli Pasha, Fuat Pasha, and Midhat Pasha, maintain that non-Muslims never become loyal subjects as long as they continue to their own *millet* schools. In order to promote the ideology of Ottomanism, these pashas created *Lycée Impérial Ottoman de Galata-Sérail* or *Galatasaray Mekteb-i Sultanisi* in 1868. The language of instruction was French. The harshest reactions against the establishment of that school came from the Papal States and Russia. Before the opening of the school, the representative of the Papal States prohibited the attendance of Catholic pupils at this school. Nikolai (Nicholas) Pavlovich Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador in Istanbul, started to propogandize so as to prevent the attendance of Orthodox Greeks and Bulgarians at this school. His main aim was to diminish the French influence in the Ottoman capital¹⁵⁷.

Concurrently with the opening of *Lycée de Galata-Sérail*, many foreign schools like *Liceo Scientifico Italiano* (1861), Robert College (1863), *Deutsche Schule* (1868), *Lycée Français Saint-Joseph* (1870), Üsküdar American Academy for Girls (1876) were established in Istanbul. These schools offered education not only of European languages, literature, and history, but also of practical methods for commercial life. Main attendants of these schools were Bulgarian, Greek, and Armenian students. Namely, local Christians had priority in the access of education of these schools, though some Muslims also had the chance to enroll in them. This flourishing of foreign schools was not limited with the capital. In 1860, a boys' school was inaugurated by American missionaries of the Congregationalist Church in Plovdiv. The missionary activities and foreign schools were both encouraging sectarianism among the local Christians and redounding national conscious of these peoples¹⁵⁸.

Structural bifurcation between mission/community schools and Ottoman state schools hindered the formation of a unified educational systems¹⁵⁹. These two different types of schools

156 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 173-75.

157 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 173-88.

158 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 64-72.

159 Fatma Muge Gocek, 'Ethnic Segmentation, Western Education, and Political Outcomes: Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Society', *Poetics Today*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 519.

served and generated two different groups of people in terms of workspace, ideals, mentalities, political ideas etc. In the mid-19th century, Western concept of nationalism was increasingly found acceptance among the intellectuals of non-Muslims, who were giving more importance to their own vernacular languages. These intellectuals were dragging on separatist nationalism instead of embracing Ottomanism¹⁶⁰. The efforts of Russian diplomats, who asked for privileges behalf of Balkan Slavs, were leading apprehensions among Ottoman statesmen. The Ottoman bureaucrats thought that these privileges would initiate the dissolution of the empire.

After the promulgation of Land Code in 1858, former legal categories of land, such as *mülk*, *miri*, *mevkute*, *metruke*, and *mevat*, continued to exist. The tenancy of *miri* land was bestowed upon the peasant, though the character of land was not altered¹⁶¹. People gained the right to sell and buy land. Nevertheless, this land code can be one of the reasons of the revolt of Muslim landowners (*begs*) in the Bosnian province, with the Reform Decree. Because they were lost their former judiciary privileges¹⁶². The authority of clergy became less secure and the power of laymen was growing gradually due to the emergence of a bourgeois class, an increase in commercial relations with the West, administrative reforms (Rose Chamber Edict and Reform Decree), and the alterations in the land system (1858 code). The Nationality Law was confirmed in 1869 and legalized the modern status of Ottoman subjects. It tried to create the sense of the common Ottoman citizenship irrespective of religious affiliation and ethnicity¹⁶³.

Since the transportation networks and channels for foreign trade have changed in the 19th century, production and control centers were also shifting. Provincial divisions of the empire were continuously being organized. To illustrate, Danubian region was re-organized in the 1860s¹⁶⁴. With the enactment of Provincial Law (*Vilayet Kanunu*), a new administrative organization started to be generated, gradually. Regulation of this law was affected by views of Fuad Pasha, who had gained experiences during governorship terms in the problematic provinces like Damascus. When he had to deal with separatist effects originated from Greece during his private instructorship in Janina during the Crimean War, his ideas were taken shape. The purposes of this law were augmentation of central authority in the provinces and ending of non-Muslims' and foreigners' complaints thanks to

160 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 61-62.

161 Fikret Adanır, 'The Ottoman Peasantries, c. 1360- c. 1860', *The Peasantries of Europe from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, (ed.) Tom Scott, (New York: Longman, 1998), p. 309.

162 Reaction of Muslim landowners was common in the Ottoman world. Kurdish *emirs*, Albanian *begs*, and Arab notables of Damascus followed the example in Bosnian province.

163 Fatma Muge Gocek, 'Ethnic Segmentation, Western Education, and Political Outcomes: Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Society', *Poetics Today*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 519-23.

164 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 5.

widespread representation of non-Muslims¹⁶⁵. 1864 Regulation was put into practice in the Danubian and Bosnian *vilayets* (provinces), respectively, because of needs for immediate reforms in these provinces. The reactions triggered by the Reform Decree and increasing confusion throughout the Danubian province brought about disorder and interferences of European powers and Russia. After the appointment of Midhat Pasha to the governorship of Niš in 1859, three *sandjak* (subdivisions of the province) (Niš, Vidin, and Silistre) were unified under the name of Danubian province due to his successful administration in the Niš *sandjak*. Midhat Pasha had influence in the preparation of regulation for this province¹⁶⁶. This province was the pilot project for modernization¹⁶⁷. Krikor Odian Efendi, one of the architects of the Constitution of the Armenian Nation (*Nizamname-i Millet-i Armeniyan*), assisted to Midhat Pasha in the implementation of reform projects for the Danubian Province¹⁶⁸.

The geographical condition of the Danubian province, its developed transportation system, and its well-organized settlement pattern rendered a new structuring and organization possible in the subdivision of province. Apart from the governor, whose jurisdiction was increased in fiscal and political affairs compared with pre-Tanzimat period, district treasurer (*defterdar*), chief secretary (*mektupçu*), governmental official for public works (*umuru-nafia memuru*), official for commerce and agriculture, investigator of judges (*müfettiş-i hükkam*), and foreign affairs civilian (*umuru-hariciye memuru*) were present at the office of prefecture. The latter position was a must for the provinces, where the commercial links with Europe were strong, and consuls and foreign merchants dwelled in¹⁶⁹.

Pursuant to the Provincial Law, Danubian province was divided into seven *sandjaks* and forty-eight *kazas*¹⁷⁰. On 17 October 1864, Midhat Pasha was appointed as governor, Sabri Pasha as head official (*kaymakam*) of Vidin, Süleyman Pasha as that of Niš, Fehim Pasha as that of Sofia, Mehmed Faiz Pasha as that of Rusçuk, Mustafa Arif Efendi as that of Varna, and Hüseyin Tahsin Pasha as that of T'rnovo¹⁷¹. With regard to the sentences of regulation, this province was divided

165 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 149-50.

166 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 42.

167 Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), p. 45.

168 Roderic Davison, 'The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire', Roderic Davison, 'The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 327.

169 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), pp. 46-50.

170 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 153-54.

171 The seventh *sandjak* was Tulça.

into *sandjaks*, *sandjaks* into *kazas* (districts), and *kazas* into *karyes* (villages)¹⁷².

Midhat Pasha did not only cope with separatist tendencies in Niš district, but also performed reforms. Midhat Pasha had also founded the country coffers (*memleket sandıkları*), a banking institution, with the aim of organizing the economic life in the Niš *sandjak*. Later, these institutions were extended to the Danubian province. At the same time, tradesman coffers were in the threshold of bankrupt. Yet, during his rule, the risk of bankrupt was prevented and these coffers were reformed as credit institutions. Abadzhis, who had taken credits from these coffers, extended their businesses to Central Europe¹⁷³. When Midhat Pasha was the governor of Niš *sandjak*, he had convinced local notables to contribute the public works and improvement projects for transportation in the region. He continued to collect donations from members of assemblies and leaders of religious communities during his term in the Danubian province. Because of these achievements, he drew attention of new prime minister, Fuad Pasha¹⁷⁴.

The administrative councils (*idare meclisleri*) were founded for the administration of provinces, *sandjaks* (subdivisions of a province), *livas*, and *kazas* (small administrative districts governed by a *kaymakam*). The ordinary members of provincial administrative councils were judge, chief secretary, province treasurer, and official of foreign affairs. Additionally, mufti and religious leaders of other communities were also natural members. Except for these people, there are four elected people, two of them from non-Muslims and two from Muslims¹⁷⁵. In the *kaza* assemblies, three people could be affiliated irrespective of their religious affiliation. Consequently, election principle spread to the subunits of provincial organizations¹⁷⁶.

The most important successes of Midhat Pasha were putting an end to the *hajduk* movement, assuring public security, and constructing new roads. Moreover, he ensured considerable improvements in the administration and social life of the Danubian province. He broke Austrian monopoly over the transportation on the Danube via establishing a new steamboat company. Moreover, he established hospitals, vocational schools, and workshops with taking any or very limited contribution from the central government. His rule marked a tolerant and flourishing period for also Bulgarian community. He was always cautious about Bulgarian nationalistic sentiments, encouraged by Bulgarian revolutionaries in the Danubian principalities and Principality of Serbia.

172 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 43.

173 Nikolay Todorov, '19. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Bulgaristan Esnaf Teşkilatı', *İÜİF Mecmuası*, vol. 27, no. 1-2, pp. 26-28 (1-36).

174 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), pp. 46-52

175 Ibid., p. 44.

176 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 146-48.

On the one hand, he aggregated Christian and Muslim prominent people in his meetings¹⁷⁷. Besides, use of Bulgarian was permitted in the communal schools, though textbooks and teachers were offered by central administration. *Tuna/Dunav*, first provincial bilingual (Bulgarian-Ottoman) newspaper, was published in order to diminish the influence of foreign newspapers in the region. On the other hand, he was not tolerant against separatist movements¹⁷⁸.

In 1866, a census was organized in the Danubian province. The crucial changes in the economic, social, ethnic, and religious character of the province made the conduct of a new census inevitable. The Danubian province was consisting of the settlements of Rusçuk, Vidin, Sofia, T'rnovo, Varna, Niš, and Tulça (Tulcea). It was comprising most of the lands of Bulgarian-speaking people. According to this census, the non-Muslim population was nearly 611,000, whereas the population of Muslims was limited with 410,000 in the province. In spite of the fact that non-Muslims formed a clear majority in Vidin, Sofia, T'rnovo, and Niš, the Muslims were more crowded in Ruse, Varna, and Tulça¹⁷⁹. The urban population of Danubian province was around 15-18 % in the 1860s and that of Filibe *sandjak* was higher than former.

The census records show that population of the Danubian province increased 2,1 % per year in the period between 1864 and 1875. In order to explain such a great population increase, migration movements have to be considered except for natural population growth. Not only the Caucasians and Tatars, but also the Bulgarians migrated from the lands of Russian Empire to the Ottoman Empire. On the other part, population of Edirne province remained almost the same¹⁸⁰. During this period, Midhat Pasha and his officials followed the policies of gratuitous land distributions, tax exemptions, and tolerance so as to encourage the migrations to the less-populated regions¹⁸¹.

Because of new applications put into effect by Midhat Pasha in the 1860s throughout the province, agricultural production increased and the deficits of political administration was removed. These trends hastened the Bulgarian migration from the rural areas to the towns and cities. Thus, some parts of the Bulgarian society began to become urbanized during the 19th century and a privileged merchant class, which was active in the commerce of Danubian ports, Wallachian and Moldavian cities, Istanbul, and even some Black Sea ports of Russia, appeared.

Indeed, the Provincial Law provided a local flexibility, which could solve some questions

177 Ibid., p. 145.

178 Ibid., pp. 149-52.

179 Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), p. 63.

180 Michael Palaret, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 11.

181 Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), p. 62.

and create a unified Ottomanist ideology within the empire. The fate of new provincial system was contingent upon many variables. Existence of a stable council of ministers in the capital, improvement in the education of peoples, and cultivation of a new generation of governmental officials are three of these variables.

Provincial administration in the Danubian province had demonstrated the possibility of success of Ottomanist ideology and centralist modernization project. When Sultan Abdülaziz came back from Paris in 1867, he was deeply impressed by the modernizing deeds of Midhat Pasha¹⁸². However, there were discontents because of these efforts. For example, Namık Kemal regarded this system as a novelty launched in order to gratify European powers and local Christians. In addition to that, he claimed that even the efforts of Midhat Pasha did not establish a full control over the Bulgarians. Another opponent, Mahmut Nedim, criticized provincial law on the grounds that it enabled the governors to establish petty absolutist states. Probably, he was discontented due to the possibility of (over-)resurgence of any power¹⁸³.

Governorship of Midhat Pasha was certainly successful in the province. The development of peace atmosphere in the province created apprehensions in Austria-Hungary and Russia. Following his successes, he was summoned to Istanbul in order to organize the State Council (*Şura-yı Devlet*). The pressures of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian ambassadors, and violent acts of Panslavist Bulgarian groups could be decisive in this invitation. His next office would be the presidency of State Council¹⁸⁴. In the post of the presidency of State Council, he continued to be one of the most prominent defenders of the constitutionalist regime¹⁸⁵.

Modernization: Secularization Attempts within the Non-Muslim Communities

A secularization process had begun for non-Muslim *millet*s of the empire. In spite of the fact that the Rose Chamber Edict could not grant a constitution to the Muslim *millet*, the Reform Decree became the milestone for the constitutional developments of Christian *millet*s¹⁸⁶. The constitution of non-Muslim *millet*s were the products of fundamental administrative reform movements of the Porte. In 1862, *Rum* (Orthodox) and Armenian (Apostolic) *millet*s, respectively, obtained their constitutions, which limited the authority of clerics and increased the influences of laymen in the

182 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 157-59.

183 Ibid., pp. 167-69.

184 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 47.

185 Enver Ziya Karal, 'Non-Muslim Representatives in the First Constitutional Assembly, 1876-77', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 389.

186 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 144-52.

organization of these communities¹⁸⁷. Implementation of reforms within the *millet-i Rum* was slower than the Armenian *millet* in that the laymen enthusiasm was not powerful within this *millet*. In the new organization of this *millet*, ecclesiastical control remained stronger than that of Armenian Apostolic *millet*. Notwithstanding that the situation of non-Muslim communities were improved in the 1860s, they could rightly complain about some iniquitous practices directed themselves¹⁸⁸.

According to 1862 Constitution of *millet-i Rum*, patriarch had to consult to the Holy Synod and a mixed council for the administration of *millet*. The memberships of twelve seats of Holy Synod were got properly circulated among nearly seventy metropolitan bishops. Thus, all metropolitan bishops could have seat in the synod for a time limit. This membership system was preventing to gain strength of some metropolitan bishops more than the others. Mixed council composed of laymen and clerics was checking the assembly of millet, fiscal affairs, educational institutions, and hospitals. Moreover, it acted as appellate court. It consisted of eight lay members and four metropolitan bishops. In order to be a lay member in this assembly, residing in or around Istanbul was a prerequisite¹⁸⁹. The elections had two phases for determining the deputies. In the first phase, people living in Istanbul were choosing some representatives. In the next phase, these representatives were electing lay members of the assembly. Provincial organization of the Orthodox (*Rum*) *millet* was undeveloped, when compared with that of Armenian *millet*. To illustrate, due to the fact that there was not any provincial assembly, metropolitan bishops appointed by the Synod did not regard public opinion, and political and social power was concentrated in the hands of them¹⁹⁰.

The Sublime Porte aimed to extend its authority on the *millets*. In order to secularize the religious courts, the right of appealing to the state courts was donated to the individuals. After the declaration of the Educational Law in 1869, the officials began to examine the textbooks of *millet* schools¹⁹¹.

There are two main problems in the organization of millet system after the publication of the Reform Decree. First one is that even though this reorganization targeted to eradicate abuses and increase loyalty of the non-Muslims to the Ottoman Empire, it was carried on the basis of *millets*

187 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p. 114 and Richard Clogg, 'The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 194.

188 Ibid., pp. 115-17.

189 Richard Clogg, 'The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 195.

190 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), p.128-29.

191 Kemal Karpat, 'Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 164-65.

rather than through a holistic manner. Therefore, these attempts revealed and underlined non-homogeneous ethnic structure of the empire. Second one is that secular education and lay participation in the *millet* administration would utilize nationalistic sentiments, in parallel with trends in Europe.

CHAPTER II

VAZRAZHDA NE: THE PERIOD OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TRANSITION IN BULGARIAN COMMUNAL LIFE

In the earlier centuries of the Ottoman rule, Rhodopa Planina and eastern Danubian plain regions had undergone Turkish colonization and conversions. The Muslim presence was relatively more limited in the western regions of Bulgaria because of their state of being far and inaccessible. Apart from western regions, the Orthodox Bulgarians dwelled in the core regions of the Bulgarian lands, i.e., Stara Planina. The network of medieval cities was preserved and developed by the Ottoman rule and served as administrative and commercial bases. These urban and semi-urban settlements would experience a structural and cultural transformation, starting from the second half of the 18th century. The Bulgarian cultural revival (*Vazrazhdane*) had to face with not only Ottoman administration but also patriarchal jurisdiction¹⁹². The present chapter will attempt to present the main themes of the structural transformation in the Bulgarian lands in connection with the economic revival, emergence of schooling network, regional peasant uprisings and activities of Catholic and Protestant missionaries in the 19th century, respectively.

Nikolay Genchev, a prominent Bulgarian historian, maintained that 'the Bulgarian Revival (*Vazrazhdane*) is a part of the general European process which accomplished the transition from the Middle Ages to the bourgeois world'¹⁹³. Indeed, in this period, which began in the second half of the 18th century, commercialized agriculture and animal-husbandry replaced the subsistence economy. Thanks to these developments, the Bulgarian lands became one of the proto-industrialization centers of the Ottoman Empire¹⁹⁴. Although this period of socio-economic development was called as Bulgarian Revival in some sources¹⁹⁵, Greek, Armenian, and Jewish entrepreneurs also contributed to the economic revival, which was also triggered by Ottoman structural alterations in the Bulgarian provinces¹⁹⁶.

192 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 151.

193 Николай Генчев, *Българско Възраждане*, (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestvenia front, 1988), pp. 3-12.

194 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 34.

195 Константин Косев, 'Към въпроса за действието и взаимодействието на вътрешните и външните фактори в българското националноосвободително движение през възраждането', *В Чест на Академик Христо А. Христов*, (Sofia: Institut za Istorija, 1976), pp. 35-48.

196 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 163. The greatest part of city-dwellers was Muslims in the Bulgarian provinces, whereas there were sizable Greek, Armenian, and Jewish communities in the towns and the Bulgarians were latecomers to these settlements. Investigate, Richard J. Crampton, 'Bulgarian Society in the Early 19th Century', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp157-59.

Economic Revival and Major Centers of Economic Activity

Defragmentation of new arteries of commerce through the Danubian basin along the valleys of Morava and Vardar (Axios) with traditional main routes of the Levant brought the emergence of non-Muslim merchant class in the Ottoman Empire, after the signing of Passarowitz Treaty in 1718¹⁹⁷. Moreover, the expansion of the Western trade in the European provinces of the empire contributed to the reinforcement of the position of this 'new' bourgeoisie, including entrepreneurs, bankers, and liberal professionals¹⁹⁸. Provincial élites, which played an important role in this process, directed production patterns, regarding the demands of European merchants. Cotton, tobacco, and maize were the most requested products by these merchants. The non-Muslim merchants established a monopoly on the transportation activities in the commerce routes between cultivation areas and port-cities, gradually. They also had the capability to negotiate with European merchants¹⁹⁹.

Until the third quarter of the 18th century, production of textiles, cotton, silk, glass, paper, porcelain, tobacco, and dyes increased under the leadership of state enterprises. The development of iron industry can be added to these improvements in Sofia-Samokov region. Deforestation had reached its apex in the region; therefore, kadı of Samokov would like to prevent permits for new furnaces²⁰⁰.

Development of the urban network of small towns coincided to the period of economic revival. The Ottoman Empire sustained the tradition of collection of special taxes from non-Muslim communities, which can be observed in the previous Islamic empires. However, some vocational categories, such as miners, *doğancıs* (people who breed and train hawks and falcons), tar extractors, *derbendçis* (guardians of passageways, especially mountain passes), *voynuks*²⁰¹ (Christian auxiliary units), and producers of gunpowder had been free from tax obligations and a

197 Traian Stoianovich, 'The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant', *Between East and West: The Balkan and Mediterranean Worlds*, (ed.) Traian Stoianovich, (New York: A. D. Caratzas, 1992), pp. 35-58, Apostolos E. Vacalopoulos, *History of Macedonia, 1354-1833*, (Thessaloniki, 1973), pp. 386-426, Виржиня Паскалева, *Средна Европа и Земите по Долния Дунав през XVIII-XIX в.: Социално-икономически Аспекти*, (Sofia, 1986), pp. 49-80.

198 Emilie Théropoulou, 'Les élites urbaines a l'époque du Tanzimat: Le cas de Salonique', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2005), p. 345.

199 Fikret Adanır, 'The Ottoman Peasantries, c. 1360- c. 1860', *The Peasantries of Europe from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, (ed.) Tom Scott, (New York: Longman, 1998), pp. 296-303.

200 Ibid., p. 297.

201 For further information related with *voynuks*, see Wayne S. Vucinich, 'The Yugoslav Lands in the Ottoman Period: Postwar Marxist Interpretations of Indigenous and Ottoman Institutions', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 27, no. 3, September 1955, pp. 287-305.

kind of self-rule had developed in the settlements of these vocational groups. To illustrate, self-governing assemblies existed in prominent Balkan towns, like Gabrovo, Koprivshtitsa, Tryavna, Kotel, Kalofer, Lovech (Lofça), Kratovo, Teshevo²⁰² and Panagyurishte. These towns are usually *derbendçi* or *voynuk* villages in the earlier periods.

Although non-Muslims were portrayed as either small farmer or merchants, entrepreneurs, and/or craftsmen in some sources, they could employ another career path. As in the cases of tar extractors, miners, *voynuks*, and producers of gunpowder, non-Muslims can be government officials. Briefly, non-Muslims had the chance to join Ottoman governance mechanisms as civilians till the third quarter of the 19th century. This career path and the chance to participate to ecclesiastical hierarchy would provide rights to non-Muslims so as to play important roles in the central and provincial bureaucracy.

Moreover, *mahalles* (quarters), guilds and confessional congregations (*millet* organization) as institutions played an important role in the local administration of more crowded towns²⁰³. Thus, collective responsibility of different groups precipitated the development of local liability (*отговорност*)²⁰⁴. A chosen political body under the leadership of a chief, a metropolitan bishop or a chief steward (*başkethüda*) of associated guilds became the representative of a village, a confessional group, or an associated guild in local administration. The main duties of these leaders were the consultation/debate about the amounts of tax related with local administration and determination of intercommunal distribution of pressure of taxation. Furthermore, these guilds and their leaders financed cultural activities in the rural areas circumambient the towns and cities²⁰⁵.

Trading activities had also increased since the 18th century throughout the empire. Considering that animal husbandry and subsistence agriculture were major means of living for the inhabitants of Balkan Peninsula until this century, emergence of the developed commercial activities signed an important change, which brought social and economic transformations. The *celeps* (cattle merchants in Bulgarian lands) accumulated wealth and emerged as one of the

202 Kratovo and Teshevo had become mining and metal works centers in an earlier date, possibly at the end of the 13th century due to the migration of Saxons there. Kemal Karpat, 'Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Period', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 150.

203 Fikret Adanir, 'Semi-autonomous Forces in the Balkans and Anatolia', *Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. III: *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, (ed.) Suraiya Faroqhi, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 161. and Стефан Андреев and Елена Грозданова, *Из Историята на Рударството и Металургията в Българските Земи през XV-XIX Век*, (Sofia: Narodna Biblioteka Sveti Kiril i Metodi, 1993).

204 Светлана Иванова, 'Институт на Колективната Отговорност в Българските Градове през XV-XVIII в.', *Исторически Преглед*, no. 46, vol. 1, 1990, pp. 33-44, and Елена Грозданова, *Българската Селска Община през XV-XVIII Век*, (Sofia: Institut za Istoriya, 1979), pp. 118-26.

205 Dennis P. Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century: Slavic Orthodox Society and Culture under Ottoman Rule*, (Jefferson: McFarland, 1993), pp. 193-94.

important local commercial groups²⁰⁶. Due to the protection of foreign ambassadors for non-Muslims in the economic life and accelerating relations with the Western commercial world after the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Treaty, a wealthy bourgeois class, who would claim that it would be representative of masses and act as intermediary between the central authority and governed people, has risen²⁰⁷.

The networks of Balkan diasporas played an important role in the formation of ethnic identities in the 19th century²⁰⁸. On the one hand, these diaspora communities, embodied by Balkan Orthodox merchants, scholars, clerics, and students, had multi-functional, pluralist and polyglot nature. On the other hand, these communities were the first groups affected by incitations of nationalistic thoughts. For example, the *Filiki Etaireia* (*Friendly Society*) had been founded in the port of Odessa in 1814 and most of its members were from the mercantile Greek Orthodox communities of Russian ports and Danubian principalities²⁰⁹. Yet, its influence over the Balkan provinces of the Ottoman Empire was limited.

Commercial relations within the Balkan peninsula had also pluralist tendencies. Majority of the population of the peninsula was formed by stationary peasant groups, though these members of diaspora communities were usually mobile²¹⁰. There was a religious and linguistic pluralism in the Balkan port-cities and towns. The town of Arbanasi (Arvanitohori) could be a proof of the existence of infra-national belonging ties in the early modern Balkans. Although the town was on the center of traditional Slavic/Bulgarian territories, its establishment was attributed to the Vlach traders, who migrated there in the 16th century, and its inhabitants were Greek-speaking people in the 18th century. Since the town was at the crossroads of two main commercial routes²¹¹, a great capital accumulation had been realized in the hands of its inhabitants in the 18th century. Whereas Bulgarian historians claimed that the inhabitants were Bulgarians since they lived in the core Bulgarian territories, Greek ones asserted that they were Greek since they wrote in Greek²¹².

206 See Bistra Cvetkova, 'Les services des celep et la ravitaillement en bétail dans l'Empire Ottomane (XVe-XVIIe s.)', *Etudes historiques* 3, (1966), pp. 145-72.

207 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), p. 188-92.

208 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'Orthodox Culture and Collective Identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 133.

209 Viron Karidis, 'A Greek Mercantile *Paroikia*: Odessa, 1774-1829', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 111-36.

210 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'Orthodox Culture and Collective Identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 134.

211 First commercial route was stretching from Istanbul to Austrian and Polish cities through Bucharest. The second route linked Istanbul to Russian lands through Jassy.

212 Paschalis Kitromilides, 'In the Pre-modern Balkans...: Loyalties, Identities, Anachronisms', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), pp. 26-27.

Notwithstanding, scholars have to regard how these people defined themselves in order to understand their belonging. Certainly, they considered themselves as '*Ρωμαιοι*' (Rhomaioi/Romans) and their town as '*Ρωμαίων κατοικία*' (Rhomaion katoikia/Roman residence). These people see themselves neither Greek nor Bulgarian, but heirs of the Roman Empire and Orthodox Christianity played an important role in their identity-formation²¹³.

The rise of privileged Greek merchants in the Ottoman Empire and their role in the formation of Hellenist ideology was the result of these economic developments initiated by the flourishing European capitalism²¹⁴. Starting from the second half of the 18th century, the Orthodox Bulgarian society has experienced a profound economic and demographic transformation. The Bulgarian middle classes lived a rapid growth and gained an important economic power in the 19th century since they benefited from the adjacent position of their lands to the Ottoman capital and reform programmes of the Ottoman administration. Liquidation of the *sipahiliks* in the 1830s allowed the peasants to control the agricultural lands, whether directly or indirectly and peasants could possess their own lands²¹⁵.

The Ottoman institutions, which fluctuated completely, had an imprint over the Bulgarian economic life, especially over agricultural structures. In accord with the records and data compiled by Michael Palairet, the Bulgarian provinces were the most fertile and economically dynamic regions within the Ottoman realm. The 1860s was the most fertile decade of the agricultural and textile production in the Bulgarian provinces. Thus, the Ottoman rule was faced with a crisis in these provinces, an economic revival was being experienced there²¹⁶.

The rise of settlement concentration and expansion of agricultural enterprises in the less-populated lands precipitated the contraction of economic activities based on animal-husbandry and increase of agricultural production in the arable lands at the beginning of the 19th century. Intensive agricultural activities had commenced in the mountainous regions of inner Bulgaria. Furthermore, distribution of agricultural enterprises could be facilitated the proto-industrial development in the more crowded lands. Even though many Bulgarian peasants had migrated to the Rumanian principalities, the mountainous regions of Stara Planina and Rhodopa Planina continued to be

213 Ibid., p. 27.

214 Kemal Karpat, p. 86. This view was criticized by Richard Clogg in his article 'The Greek Mercantile Bourgeoisie: 'Progressive' or 'Reactionary'?', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 85-111. Briefly, he criticized the view that Greek bourgeoisie led the revolt because of its interests in the preservation of the integrity of the empire and regarded the terms 'progressive' and 'reactionary' as insufficient in order to understand the discussion.

215 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 132.

216 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 83-84.

overpopulated²¹⁷. Hence, these development brought the improvements in infrastructure, such as road construction and river transportation.

In spite of the fact that the *sipahilik* institution was officially abrogated in the 1830s, *çiftlik*s were remained intact and the *çiftlik*-owners were being obliged to continue to pay the tithe (*aşar*). The largest *çiftlik*s were in Edirne and its surrounding regions in the 1840s, whereas around Filibe and Burgas *çiftlik*ization process was very limited due to the population movements²¹⁸. The situation of peasants did not alter and most of the *çiftlik*-owners kept regarding the peasants as serfs²¹⁹. Apart from arable lands and *ex-miri* (state-owned) lands, some *çiftlik*s were in the form of pastures and woodlands. *Izpolicharstvo* (tenantship) and *ortakchiystvo* (tenant farmers paying rents), variants of share-cropping methods, were common in former wholly-*çiftlik*ized areas. Due to the scarcity of land, the peasants leased extra lands from *çiftlik*-owner. When the landowners provided the seeds, the peasants harnessed their animals and labor for production. Another form of land tenure was *kesimdjiystvo*. In that form, rent of the land was not a part of crop but a pre-agreed quantity of the agricultural products. Besides, the tenant was compelled to offer labor services²²⁰.

The Danubian province was specialized in the agriculture of fruits, legumes, tobacco, and viticulture. Besides, there were considerable rose plantations in Kazanlık (Kazanlak) and rice fields in Tatar Pazarcık (Pazardzhik)²²¹. The maize exportation of the Black Sea and north Aegean ports in the Balkan peninsula rocketed from 296,000 hectoliter in 1840 to 1,6 million hectoliter in 1848. In another case, the *kaytan* (silk hank) production experienced a dramatic rise between 1870 and 1877 in the ratio of 19 per cent. Moreover, until 1877, cereal production continued to increase in the Danubian and Edirne provinces. Notwithstanding, this was just an aspect of the issue. The economic revival was not limited with the Bulgarian provinces, though they carried the banner in this process. As one of the prominent Ottoman economic historian shows, exportation rates had reached their climax in 1876²²².

217 Ibid., pp. 52-53. At the end of the 18th century, a migration movement had started from Stara Planina region and approximately 100,000 people left this region for Wallachia and Moldavia. Investigate, Виржиния Паскалева, 'За някой особености и фактори образиването на българската нация през първата половина на XIX в.', *Известия на Института за История*, vol. 16-18, 1966, pp. 423-52.

218 Richard J. Crampton, 'Bulgarian Society in the Early 19th Century', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 172-73.

219 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 41-42.

220 Richard J. Crampton, 'Bulgarian Society in the Early 19th Century', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 160-62 and Фани Г. Милкова, 'К характеристике кесимской форму эксплуатации крестьян в болгарских землях до освобождения', *Actes du premier Congres des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*, (Sofia, 1969), pp. 71-76.

221 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 58. Rose oil is one of the demanded product in the foreign markets.

222 Şevket Pamuk, *The Ottoman Empire and European Capitalism, 1820-1913: Trade, Investment, and Production*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 148-50.

Starting from the 1850s, the properties of Muslim landowners commenced to be acquired by the Christian money-lenders with the support of local authorities. To illustrate, during his governorship, Midhat Pasha gave hope for the resettlement of grassy plains in the Danubian province. Considering that the nascent Christian magnates could buy lands, land costs had risen suddenly and rapidly²²³.

Apart from animal-husbandry in the plains, a mobile animal-husbandry also existed in the mountainous regions. While shepherds were promenading with flocks in the mountainous areas in the summers, they settled in the winter pastures of Sofia, Lukovit, Plevne (Pleven), and Burgas. *Celepzhiistvo*, animal-rearing, particularly sheep-rearing had become a prevailing type of commerce in these regions. It would become a very organized business in the 19th century, though its origins go back to the 17th century²²⁴. Most of the animal exportation was in the form of livestock sheep, directed to Istanbul. Even in the 1870s, last decade of the Ottoman rule, 200,000-250,000 sheep and 6,000-8,000 cattles were forwarded from Filibe (Plovdiv) *sandjak* to Istanbul. Additionally, thanks to dairy-farming tradition, the Bulgarian provinces were selling large amounts of cheese, meat, and wool to Istanbul, and those of sheepskin to the French textile industry.

The development of small-scale manufacturing industry was encouraged by the organization of regular army²²⁵ instead of janissary corps in the post-1826 period. The Ottoman statesmen preferred to purchase textures produced in the Danubian proto-industrial towns instead of those of Selanik (Thessaloniki)²²⁶. Samokov, Panagyurishte, Karlovo, Kalofer, Koprivshitsa, Gabrovo, Tryavna, Sliven, Etropole, Sopot, Kazanlık, and Kotel, located on the mountainous Stara Planina region, were the centers of the Bulgarian proto-industrial development. Even in the 18th century, there was a traditional industry and limited commerce, which would receive a blow after the *kardzhaliisko*, in these towns. The revival in Samokov *aba* commerce was the result of suppression of *kardzhali* uprisings, and improvement of the commercial routes and living standards in the 1840s. The crafts was also developing in Gabrovo and a textile industry arose in Karlovo thanks to the imported textile machines²²⁷. Increasing division of power in crafts can be regarded in the first

223 Michael Palairat, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 46.

224 Bistra Cvetkova, 'Les services des celep et la ravitaillement en bétail dans l'Empire Ottomane (XVe-XVIIIe s.)', *Etudes historiques* 3, (1966), pp. 151-60.

225 The Ottoman reform programme aimed to regain former possessions of central bureaucracy in the 19th century. When the janissary corps were liquidated in 1826, a new professional and modern army, known as Victorious Soldiers of Muhammad (*Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammediye*), was established. Through this institution, Mahmud II could establish his authority in the provinces of empire, except Egypt.

226 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press 2001), p. 132.

227 Michael Palairat, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 56-57.

half of the 19th century. In the 1820s, production of cotton batiste was one of the dominant occupations in Karlovo. The cotton fabrics made in Karlovo were requested products in the local fairs of the Macedonian towns in the 1860s. This economic revival kept on till the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-78²²⁸.

Aba (strong coarse wool cloth) was being produced in Kotel, Sliven, and Panagyurishte, whereas *şayak* (a kind of woolen cloth) was manufactured in Tryavna. Besides, a limited amount of *şayak* was produced in Samokov, too²²⁹. A *şayak* factory was opened in Panagyurishte in 1870 and establishment of two workshops in Sliven followed that factory within four years. The Ottoman army was the greatest purchaser of the Bulgarian textile products, especially *aba* and *kaytan* (silk hank). The Ottoman civilians began to place orders to the textile contractors so as to meet the demand of the army. Some villages in the Rhodopa Planina were entrusted with the task of providing these materials²³⁰. These products of textile industry were consumed by the Ottoman urban population to a great extent. Due to the limited purchasing power of the Bulgarian peasants, demand of woolen cloths were made by the city-dwellers of the empire²³¹.

The livestock rangers of Koprivshitsa played an important role in the large-scale sheep commerce. This activity triggered the appearance of textile industry there in the 1850s. Despite the *kardzhali* plunders in 1793, 1800, and 1803, a revival was being experienced in the town. Because of the development of proto-industrial activities, population increased from 150 in 1810 to 8,000 in 1860. After a decade, the number would be to 10,000 people. In line with this economic and demographic boom, architecture and construction works were also developing in the town. The architectural style blossomed out such that 'inhabitants of Koprivshitsa joked that Sofiotes who visited the town usually crossed themselves every time they passed a merchant's house for so imposing and opulent was the building that the visitors assumed it must be a monastery.

Supposing that Tryavna was remote from the main commercial arteries, it became one of the centers of silk commerce in the 18th century. A century later, the renown of its inhabitants would spread as masters of *kaytan*. The *kaytan* production was the most important way of making a living in Tryavna²³²; however, its dwellers began to be engaged in new occupations²³³. The talents of its

228 Ibid., pp. 59-67.

229 Ibid., p. 70.

230 Константин Канев, *Миналото на село Момчиловци, Смолянско; принос към историята на Средните Родопи*, (Sofia: Sofia OF, 1975), pp. 510-13.

231 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 72-73.

232 Ibid., pp. 67-68.

233 In the 1800s, trimming machines, brought from Kronstadt (Braşov), had facilitated the mechanization of *kaytan* production. The beaters also became distributed in Sliven. See, Жечка Янакиева, *Абаджийството в Сливенския край*, (Sliven: Okrazhen Istoricheski Muzey, 1978), pp. 3-5

migrant hod carriers helped Tryavniots to distinguish themselves from other towns and contributed to the flow of remittances there. At the same time, another lucrative craft, icon-painting, flourished and wandering Tryavniot icon-sellers could be seen in all of the Balkan towns. Since its many inhabitants were busy with estival occupations, Tryavna became crowded only in the winters²³⁴.

Underdeveloped networks of commercial routes and political instability hindered the developments in production and commerce in the mountainous regions. In these conditions, masses of craftsmen left their hometowns and worked as temporary artisans (*pechalbar*) in the great cities of the Ottoman Empire. Beginning from the late 18th century, many Bulgarian craftsmen found seasonal occupations especially in Istanbul²³⁵. Due to the lack of male labor, amounts of agricultural production were remaining limited in these towns.

Generally, the Jews, Armenians, and Greeks were active in the local and international commerce. Newly-developed Bulgarian merchant houses, which achieved capital accumulation, such as Brakalov, Karaminkov, and Stransky appeared in the commercial area by the first half of the 19th century. Later, Gueshov brothers, Tupchileshtov, and Zolotovich families established commercial bases in Istanbul and extended their commercial activities to the southern Russian port-cities and Rumanian principalities²³⁶. These merchant families exhibited a wide distribution of economic activities. For instance, Tupchileshtov family had bought the right of tax-collection in some Rumelian settlements in the 1880s, except its commercial and manufacturing activities²³⁷.

The merchant tailorship rose firstly in Panagyurishte, Samokov, and Kotel. In a very short time, all the Balkan cities and towns became the clients of the Bulgarian tailors. Moreover, some Bulgarian tailors had settled in Anatolian and even Egyptian cities of the Ottoman Empire. Certainly, the largest Bulgarian tailor colony was in Istanbul, imperial capital, and its members usually opened their worships in the quarters of Galata and Tophane. Most of them were coming from either Koprivshtitsa or Kalofer. The emergence of the colony coincided with the establishment of an imperial sewing factory for the uniforms of new army at the beginning of the 19th century. Later, these tailors would start to deal with merchant tailorship activities for non-combatants. Many apprentices had a very difficult life in Istanbul; nonetheless, many prominent families kept the tradition of giving their children to the renowned masters of Istanbul because this profession still

234 Richard J. Crampton, 'Bulgarian Society in the Early 19th Century', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 176-80.

235 Ibid., p. 175.

236 Virdzhinia Paskaleva, 'La mer noire et son littoral a l'époque de la domination ottomane sur les terres bulgares', *Bulgarian Historical Review*, vol. 3, 1975, pp. 78-94.

237 Richard J. Crampton, 'Bulgarian Society in the Early 19th Century', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), p. 190.

found acceptance as the shortest path for reaching wealth²³⁸.

This colony of merchant tailors gave an importance to the education and established schools with that intention in Istanbul. Therefore, most of the Bulgarian intellectuals, who had grown up in the Ottoman capital, were the offsprings of these tailors. Later, the Koprivshitsian tailors established conjugal relations with the bankers of Galata and purchased great estates in Cairo²³⁹. The networks of Bulgarian merchant tailors reached to even Egypt. By reason of demand, a merchant from Koprivshitsa established two workshops in Iskenderiye (Alexandria) and Cairo²⁴⁰. The tailors of Klisura were wandering in the coastal towns of Asia Minor and Aegean islands each year and those of Kotel were participating to the Balkan fairs.

That economic period was not a smooth transitional period among all the Bulgarian communities. Unlike to core zones and diaspora communities, limited revival was accompanied by regional peasant rebellions in the northwestern edge of Bulgaria. Throughout the first half of the 19th century, society was controlled there by the transformed archaic institutions and long-standing cultural dependencies. The reforms and revival, starting from the 1830s, would soon subvert these dependencies.

Cultural Revival and Emergence of Schooling Network

Eric Hobsbawm, one of the prominent historians of the British Marxist school, related the rise of nationalism in the European context with the growth of schools and universities in the 19th century²⁴¹. In the Bulgarian case, non-national educational institutions played a role in the gradual nationalization of society and produced an intellectual group, which was named as intelligentsia. The Bulgarian cultural revival was inspired by the Grecophone institutions. The schooling network functioned as a system in which nationalist ideology was indoctrinated to the prospective citizens of the nation-state. The crucial moment in the creation of a national language was its employment in the secondary²⁴² and high education institutions. In the Ottoman Balkans, the Balkan nation-builders employed church affiliation as well as educational system so as to indoctrinate the peasant masses, since possessing a *millet* status provided the control of both schools and churches to the communities.

The first secular-type school, which gave bilingual education in both Bulgarian vernacular

238 Michael Palairat, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 73-75.

239 Ibid., pp. 161-62.

240 Nikolay Todorov, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), pp. 246-59.

241 Eric J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), p. 169.

242 Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 117-19.

and Greek, was founded in Gabrovo in 1835 with the financial help of Vasil Aprilov, a wealthy merchant. Aprilov had received education in a Greek school in Moscow. Although Aprilov was close to the Greek education, he spearheaded to the inauguration of first school teaching Bulgarian apart from Greek. Establishment of this school was followed by Men's School of Selanik in 1839 and School of Istanbul in 1840. The secular education institutions had already been established in the Bulgarian territories. In the period between 1835 and 1878, exactly 1,658 secular schools were opened among the Bulgarian communities²⁴³.

Vasil Aprilov proposed that the eastern dialects should be adopted as the essence of the Bulgarian literary language. Even though Bulgarian-Macedonian authors wrote in the western Bulgarian dialects in the pre-1850 period, eastern dialects gained importance in the second half of the 19th century. This shift was accompanied by the rise of Stara Planina towns as the centers of Bulgarian cultural revival. After the establishment of the Bulgarian Principality, eastern dialects were codified as the base of literary language. This adoption led to the resentment of western Bulgarian-Macedonian intelligentsia²⁴⁴.

Istanbul was the major center of Bulgarian cultural revival. The number of Bulgarian newspapers and journals proliferated there within a decade. In the 1850s, there were only 13 Bulgarian periodicals in the Ottoman lands (10 in Istanbul, 2 in Rouse and 1 in Smyrna). A decade later, there were 22 periodicals in Istanbul²⁴⁵. Moreover, the number of Bulgarian schools increased in the imperial capital. In the 1870s, seven Bulgarian primary schools had already opened in the quarters of Fener, Pera, Langa, Topkapı, Ortaköy, Kumkapı, and Hasköy²⁴⁶.

Starting from the 1850s, *chitalishtes* (reading rooms) were being founded in the Bulgarian towns. Until the 1870s, nearly 130 *chitalishtes* had already been established. The English word 'reading room' does not cover the meaning of *chitalishte*. Apart from reading activities, courses were conducted and activities aiming to develop the Bulgarian language were performed in these institutions. Moreover, discussions and conferences were being organized there. In other words, *chitalishtes* served as the local library, theater, and community center and served to spread ideas of the Enlightenment, nation and modern state. Raina Gavrilova points out, national identity was both reason and means for getting people interested in them. Some of them possessed French, Greek, and

243 Tatyana Khristova Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985), p. 85.

244 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 145.

245 Начо Начов, *Цариград Като Културен Център на България до 1877 година*, (Sofia: Sbornik na Balgarskata Akademia na Naukite, 1925), pp. 170-72.

246 Yeorgios Kiutuçkas, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pinelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), p. 49.

Russian newspapers as well as Bulgarian ones²⁴⁷. Greater *chitalishte*s could publish journals and/or periodicals in their printing presses. For example, *chitalishte* of Istanbul had a journal named as *Rakoveditel na Osnovnoto Uchenie* (Guide of Basic Education).

A new Bulgarian intelligentsia educated in these schools argued that the Slavic Orthodox Christianity should be withdrawn from the Greek sphere of influence. This group alienated the Ecumenical Patriarchate and incited peasantry to resist Greek bishops and their arbitrary acts. It was influenced from the nationalist ideals of Enlightenment and Romanticism. The Bulgarian romantics put great emphasis on 'the glorious acts of medieval Bulgarian tsars'. These people, who followed the path of German romanticism, idealized the medieval past of the Bulgarians. Apart from the mythological heroes, medieval tsars, and imperial narratives, they focused on the peasant folklore and brigands possessing the image of 'gentle savage'. Moreover, they gave a great importance to the issue of ecclesiastical autonomy of the Bulgarians²⁴⁸. The Bulgarian money-owners and merchants provided material support for Bulgarian intelligentsia, including authors, poets, and journalists. These mercantile communities had also already experienced a shift. Although the Bulgarian merchants identified themselves as *Rums* till the 1820s, they started to explore their Slavic identities starting from the 1820s²⁴⁹.

Disorder in the Northwestern Edge: Peasant Rebellions, 1841-50

The main reasons for the Vidin Revolt in 1850 were the increasing control of landowners in the provincial assemblies and the governmental officials, and dissolution of governors' authorities²⁵⁰. As maintained in the previous chapter, both Muslim and non-Muslim representatives, attached to the provincial governor, attended at these consultative bodies²⁵¹. These assemblies became the conflict zone of provincial notables, who have been entering into rivalry with each other for wealth and influence²⁵². Disagreements and conflict among different interest groups and factions, and weakness and impotence of the representatives of central authority also contributed to the emergence of revolts in Niš and Vidin²⁵³. Additionally, both Muslim and Christian *ayan* had corroborated with each other against the establishment of central authority in this region. The

247 See Raina Gavrilova et al., *The Bulgarian Chitalishte: Past, Present, and Future*, (Sofia: United Nation Development Program, 2000).

248 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), pp. 136-37.

249 *Ibid.*, pp. 132-33.

250 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), pp. 75-77.

251 Mark Pinson, 'Ottoman Bulgaria in the First Tanzimat Period: The Revolts in Nish [1841] and Vidin [1850]', *Middle Eastern Studies*, (May 1975), p. 113.

252 İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, 1974), p. 27.

253 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

central authority had intended to end the political vacuum, created by disintegration of former provincial organizations and malpractices in the provincial administration.

Gospodarlık régime, a new form of proprietorship, in Vidin was a combination of pre-Ottoman feudal practices and *malikane* system, life-lease tax farm. This institution was confined to the northwestern edge of Bulgaria and most serious outbursts occurred in this region, such as the revolt of Niş (Niš) in 1841 and that of Vidin in 1850. Furthermore, small-scale uprisings had arisen in Berkovitsa in 1835 and Pirot in 1836. Under that régime, the former *sipahis*, who secured their privileges as local lords, were collecting extra taxes in the region. While they were dispatching first tithe to the imperial treasury, they saved the second tithe for themselves²⁵⁴. Hence, tax burden was heavier in Vidin region than the other provinces. In the course of collection of these extra taxes, tax collectors and local officials worked together in the 1840s.

As Vidin neighbors with autonomous principality of Wallachia and is close to the military frontier, Christian peasants were not allowed to own land. Apart from usual obligations and regular taxes to the state treasury, Christian peasants had to work for *gospodar* during two months per annum.

Maladministration and arbitrary taxation contributed to the outbreak of revolt. Arbitrary taxes imposed by provincial governor were very common in the region, though the Sublime Porte had tried to improve provincial administration in the 1840s by the establishment of provincial assemblies. Hüseyin Pasha's arbitrary decision to increase the taxes was only one example of overtaxation. Gerome Blanqui, French surveyor for Niş region, emphasized problem of taxation and failures of reforms as possible causes of Niş revolt in 1841²⁵⁵. Moreover, commercial activities were not well-developed in the region. During his inspection in 1846, Abdülmecit had commanded the abolition of land customs in Edirne and Zıřtovi (Svishtov), whereas the petition of Vidiniots was disregarded²⁵⁶.

Nationalistic drive of the rebels is hotly-discussed issue among the scholars. To illustrate, Palairet regards that those revolts in the Bulgarian lands in 1835, 1836, 1837, 1841, 1850, 1862, 1867, 1872, 1875, and 1876 are incidents, which proved the increase of national conscious among the Bulgarians²⁵⁷. Halil İnalçık, a prominent Ottoman historian, asserted that the purpose of insurgents was to establish an autonomous Bulgaria, though he admitted that arbitrary rule of

254 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), p. 50.

255 Mark Pinson, 'Ottoman Bulgaria in the First Tanzimat Period: The Revolts in Nish [1841] and Vidin [1850]', *Middle Eastern Studies*, (May 1975), p. 105. Whereas Blanqui mission was dispatched in order to increase French influence in the Bulgarian affairs and support the campaign for the foundation of a Bulgarian Uniate church, the Russian Empire sent Kodinetz, former Russian consul at Tabriz, to protect its interests there.

256 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), p. 81.

257 Michael Palairet, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 158.

landowners and taxation questions played more important roles than nationalistic feelings in the eruption. He asserts that the arch-framer of Tirnovo revolt in 1835, Velcho, had the purpose of establishing Bulgaria²⁵⁸. Again, he maintains that the committees, which participated in Vidin revolt, targeted the foundation of an autonomous Bulgaria, similar to the case of Serbia. However, his shift can be noticed in the issue of roles of taxation and agrarian problems from many traditional scholars. In the course of Vidin revolt, indeed, landless masses had rioted against the arbitrary rule of landowners²⁵⁹. İnalçık also noticed that this revolt was directed against landlords rather than the Porte. He rightly argued that the problem of taxation and agrarian questions were more crucial than the nationalistic feelings in the formation of Vidin revolt. The author of this study is also inclined that the uprisings in these lands did not have a clear nationalistic agenda and can be regarded as rebellions of displeased peasants. These revolts are certainly not an uprising for national independence.

Another contested issue among the scholars is the Serbian and Russian provocations in the emergence of revolts in this region in the 1840s and 1850s. İnalçık underlines the importance of Serbian incitements and Russian agitations in outburst of Niš revolt in 1841²⁶⁰. He mentioned visit of Tsolo, knez of Belogradchik, and his request for Serbian assistance. He added that Serbian provocateurs were wandering around Niğbolu (Nikopol) region. Miloš Obrenović, the former prince of Serbia, had visited Bulgarian towns and met with local prominent laymen and clerics during his journey to Istanbul in 1835. The Serbian ecclesiastical books and newspapers, like *Novine Srpske*, were the most common and demanded materials in the Vidin and Niš regions. Furthermore, the Serbian instructors had joined to the early phases of schooling process in the Bulgarian provinces. Annexation of six districts by Serbia could also create expectations for further Serbian expansion in 1833; however, maladministration was the main drive for uprising²⁶¹. İnalçık claims that there was a considerable Serbian influence in the formation of Vidin revolt, but Serbian government had followed a reconciling policy during the revolt²⁶². As he points out, Alexander Karađorđević, the prince of Serbia, could not rely on Russian aid in case of an Ottoman attack, if he had provoked and led the Vidiniot rebels. Besides, the Serbian authorities had banned the sale of guns and powder to them²⁶³ and a pact between them and Ömer Pasha, marshal of Ottoman army, stipulated that any

258 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), p. 27.

259 Ibid., p. 83.

260 Ibid., p. 29 and 44.

261 Mark Pinson, 'Ottoman Bulgaria in the First Tanzimat Period: The Revolts in Nish [1841] and Vidin [1850]', *Middle Eastern Studies*, (May 1975), p. 109.

262 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), p. 58.

263 Mark Pinson, 'Ottoman Bulgaria in the First Tanzimat Period: The Revolts in Nish [1841] and Vidin [1850]', *Middle Eastern Studies*, (May 1975), p. 121.

renegades and rebels would not be welcomed in the Serbian Principality²⁶⁴. Moreover, at that time, the Serbian expansionist policy, *Načertanije* (Draft), was not formed. Even it was declared at the executive session in the *Skupština* (National Assembly), it did not have a clear agenda for the incorporation of Bulgarian lands to the Principality²⁶⁵.

After the suppression of the revolt in 1850, rule of *ayan* was replaced with central authority²⁶⁶. The Porte took aim at reasserting its influence to the region, it bestowed the land registers (*tapus*) to the peasants. In February 1851, disposal of the *gospodarlık* lands were promulgated²⁶⁷. Nonetheless, not only landlords but also peasants resisted against this decision. The peasantry contended that these lands were *miri* (state-owned); therefore, they could till these lands with just paying taxes to the state and refused to buy these lands. Furthermore, land disputes between landlords and Christian peasants continued till the 1860s and these peasants began to migrate²⁶⁸ to governorates of Bessarabia, Kherson, Taurida, and Yekaterinoslav. The relief in the situation of peasantry could be realized with the applications of further *Tanzimat* reforms. The peasants' demands for reduction of taxes and collection of them by the officials of provincial governor rather than *subaşı*s (policing forces in the provinces) gained admissions.

Rise of Catholic Missionary Efforts and the Establishment of the Uniate Church

The Catholic missionary efforts in the Ottoman Empire date back to the beginning of the 17th century. In 1577, Pope Gregorius (Gregory) XIII had already inaugurated an educational institution, College of Saint Athanasius at Rome, for the higher education of the Greek Orthodox boys. In 1622, Pope Gregorius XV encouraged the establishment *La Congregazione di Propaganda Fide* (The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) as an anti-reformationist agent²⁶⁹. Moreover, he planned to mitigate the influences of Catholic monarchs of Spain and Portugal in the missionary movements and to summon all the Catholic missions under the centralized authority of the Papacy²⁷⁰. Apart from the some coastal cities on the Adriatic Sea and Aegean islands, all the

264 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), p. 56.

265 See Stevan K. Pavlowitch, *Serbia: The History behind the Name*, (London: Hurst, 2002), pp. 41-64 and Mirjana Marinković. 'The Shaping of the Modern Serbian Nation and of Its State under the Ottoman Rule', *Disrupting and Reshaping: Early Stages of Nation-Building in the Balkans*, (eds.) M. Dogo and G. Franzinetti, (Ravenna: LongoEditore, 2002), pp. 37-45.

266 Halil İnalçık, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992), pp. 76-77.

267 Ibid., pp. 104-05.

268 Mark Pinson, 'Ottoman Bulgaria in the First Tanzimat Period: The Revolts in Nish [1841] and Vidin [1850]', *Middle Eastern Studies*, (May 1975), p. 129.

269 Марин Дринов, *Българска-та Църква отъ Само-то и Начало и до Днесъ*, (Sofia: Balgarsko Knizhevno Druzhestvo, 1869), pp. 160-61.

270 Mustafa Soykut, *Image of the 'Turk' in Italy: A History of the 'Other' in Early Modern Europe, 1453-1683*,

Catholic missions entered the rule of *Propaganda Fide*²⁷¹. The number of Catholic missions was always higher than those of the Protestants in the Ottoman territories. There was a considerable Paulician population, following the Latin rite, around Filibe (Plovdiv) during the Ottoman rule. Moreover, Franciscans of Herzegovina were influential in the promotion of Catholic centers in Bulgaria in the 17th century²⁷².

In the Levantine provinces of the Ottoman Empire, *Propaganda* and other groups encouraged the establishment of the Uniate churches (Eastern Catholic churches), which are autonomous churches in full communion with the pope. These new churches also recognized the supreme authority of the pope within Christianity; however, they preserve the liturgical and theological traditions of the Eastern Orthodoxy or the Oriental Orthodoxy. For example, the Syriac Catholic Patriarchate of Antioch, following the Antiochian rite, was established in 1662 as a schism within the Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch. This church was followed by the Melkite Greek Catholic Patriarchate of Antioch, following the Byzantine rite, as a product of schism within the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch in 1724 and the Armenian Catholic Patriarchate of Cilicia, following the Armenian rite, as that within the Armenian Apostolic Catholicossate of Cilicia in 1740. The Armenians were the most-influenced group from the activities of *Propaganda Fide* in the Ottoman lands. With the establishment of this institution, protection of the Catholic Armenians and Maronites had been intended²⁷³. The archbishop of Catholic Armenians was the only Catholic 'official/representative' recognized by the Sublime Porte²⁷⁴.

France, Polish refugees in Istanbul, Catholic Armenian Patriarchate, and in a limited scale, the Austrian Empire, backed the Uniate Bulgarian community in the formation process. Notwithstanding that the post-revolutionary French politics had anti-clerical elements, the French diplomats continued to act as protectors of Catholics in the Ottoman Empire²⁷⁵. The political intention of France was to limit the Russian sphere of influence and create pet groups, which would guard French interests in the Ottoman Balkans²⁷⁶.

(Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2001), pp. 82-83.

271 Charles A. Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 88. The Catholics in the Aegean islands and some coastal cities on the Adriatic Sea were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Candia (Iraklion).

272 Fikret Adanır, 'The Socio-Political Environment of Balkan Nationalism: the Case of Ottoman Macedonia, 1856-1912', *Regional and National Identities in Europe in the XIXth and XXth Centuries*, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), p. 222.

273 Mustafa Soykut, *Image of the 'Turk' in Italy: A History of the 'Other' in Early Modern Europe, 1453-1683*, (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2001), p. 84.

274 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), p. 38.

275 Hristo Gluskov, 'Les missions catholiques et l'influence française en Thrace de l'Est durant les années 80 du XIXe siècle', *Bulgarian Historical Review*, no. 1-2, 1998, pp. 178-80.

276 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim,

A Polish refugee group, which came into existence after the collapse of Warsaw Uprising in 1831, living in Istanbul in the second half of the 19th century. This Polish group was in a close contact with *Hotel Lambert* of Adam Czartoryski, a liberal aristocratic faction of the Polish emigration in Paris²⁷⁷. The reason why Polish refugee colony in Istanbul encouraged Catholic Bulgarians for the official recognition was that these refugees were alive with anti-Russian feelings. With their assistance in order to break off the Bulgarians from Russian sphere of influence, they would impair Russian political interests in the Ottoman Empire.

The Sublime Porte also favored that unionist movement. Emergence of a huge Catholic Bulgarian community could diminish the appeal and influence of Russia over the congregation of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul²⁷⁸. The Ottoman Empire has also targeted to diminish Russian influence over the Bulgarians thanks to the Russian defeat in the Crimean War. Its authorities would like to employ these non-Orthodox Bulgarians as tools against Pan-Slavist policies of Russia.

First Uniate Bulgarian-speaking community came into being in Kılıkış (Kukush in Bulgarian and Kilkis in Greek) in 1859. This community, like other Eastern Catholic churches, would be in full communion with Rome, though members preserved their Byzantine liturgy and theological traditions. Dimitar Mladinov, who was favor of Bulgarian education in schools, was the leader of Uniate Christians in Kılıkış. One year before, the inhabitants of Kılıkış had already rejected the Greek Orthodox bishops and teacher and introduced Bulgarian vernacular in the church and school²⁷⁹. The nationalistic feelings of Kılıkış community can be noticed in the inscription on the walls of town church: 'On March 1, 1858 we recovered our national tongue'²⁸⁰. The Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul charged Mladinov with being a Pan-Slavist spy. In Kılıkış and its environment, nearly 3,000 Uniate Bulgarians were dwelling²⁸¹.

Beginning from 1859, members of the Catholic Bulgarian community have started to meet with with Paolo Brunoni, Vicar Apostolic of Istanbul, and Anthony Petros IX Hassun, the Armenian Catholic Archbishop of Istanbul²⁸². On 24 December 1860, Iosif Sokolski, founder of two monasteries in Gabrovo, and Makariy Savov, a priest from the Samokov monastery, gave a petition

2002), p. 144.

277 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 55.

278 Ibid., p. 62.

279 Ibid., pp. 243-45.

280 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 22.

281 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 242.

282 Although the official seat of the Catholic Armenian Patriarchate of Cilicia was in Sis as a schism within the Armenian Patriarchate based in Cilicia in the 1740s, the Catholic Armenian patriarchs were residing in Istanbul in the second half of the 19th century.

about the Slavic-speaking Catholics in the Macedonian provinces to Hassun²⁸³. In a meeting with him, they stated that only Catholicism could save Bulgarians from the dangers of Hellenism and Pan-Slavism, and demanded the French protection for their community. They had three demands from the Vicariate Apostolic of Istanbul: education in Bulgarian language for their schoolchildren, protection of unity of Istanbul community, and performing masses in Slavic languages²⁸⁴.

The strong requests of the Catholic Bulgarians were presented to the Sublime Porte by Hassun. After the official recognition of the community by the Porte, the Uniate movement accelerated in the Macedonian cities, such as Selanik (Thessaloniki) and Yenice (Giannitsa), and Edirne (Adrianople) province. In other words, Catholicism flourished among the Slavic peoples of Macedonian provinces and Edirne province²⁸⁵. The locations, where Catholic missionaries were successful in creating new Uniate congregations, had problems with the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul²⁸⁶. For Bulgarians, masses performed in the Slavic vernacular and autarchy of the community were regarded as benefits of embracing the spiritual authority of the Pope²⁸⁷.

Some Bulgarian intellectuals started to ponder on embracing Catholicism as a strategy and alternative path in order to obtain independence. They would like to utilize embracing Catholicism as a tactical tool to have a national church and provide French support. They argued that embracing Catholicism would protect the Bulgarian community from the arbitrary acts of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Russian admonitions in order not to break ties with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. This group, led by Dragan Tsankov, Slavic language instructor in the Lazarist College at Bebek, aimed at taking support from against the coercive actions of Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul and Russia. Dragan Tsankov, who published a Bulgarian grammar textbook in Vienna in 1852, intended to establish a printing press in Istanbul. He and his followers published a newspaper, *B'lgariya*, between March 1859 and 1861 in the Ottoman capital. This newspaper, which was also supported by Polish and Hungarian refugees in Istanbul, was spreading propaganda of church union. Hence, it addressed to the tiny Catholic Bulgarian community of Istanbul²⁸⁸; however, its readers were not only Catholic Bulgarians but also Poles, Hungarians, and other other Slavic Catholic residents from

283 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), pp. 36-37.

284 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), pp. 97-99.

285 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 40.

286 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), p. 144.

287 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 22-23.

288 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), pp. 102-04.

the Austrian Empire and Russian Empire. In a very short time, his newspaper became the chief rival of *Tsarigradski Vestnik*, first and pro-Russian newspaper in Istanbul²⁸⁹.

Makariy Savov became the spiritual leader of Istanbul community and the main worshipping place of the community was Sveta Troitsa (Holy Trinity) Church inaugurated in Galata quarter in January 1861. He was very influential in the foundation of the 'Bulgarian Union Committee', established by Brunoni with the aim of assisting people recognizing the Bishop of Rome (the Pope) as the highest authority in the Christianity. The president of the committee was Brunoni. This committee was consisting of participants from the Polish refugee colony, Catholic Armenian community, and Lazarist clerics in Istanbul. Other members of the committee were Hassun, Catholic Armenian Archbishop; Reverend Azarian, secretary of the Catholic Armenian community; Reverend Testa, secretary of the Vicar Apostolic; M. Boré, superior of Lazarists in Istanbul; M. Faveyral, a Lazarist; the Prince Czartoryski; the doctor Podhaiski, interpreter of French consulate in Edirne; and Reverend Arabadjiski, a Bulgarian priest from the Latin rite²⁹⁰.

Russia and the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul were not content with these developments. The opposition of Russian diplomats against the Uniate movement in the Ottoman Empire, especially in Istanbul and Macedonian provinces, had two-fold targets: prevention of expansion of French political, religious, and cultural influences and defending the unity of Orthodox community in the Ottoman realm²⁹¹. After the insistence of Nikolay (Nicholas) Pavlovich Ignatiev, Russian ambassador in Istanbul, the Sublime Porte declared even in the case that a part of local community or the priest of the community embraced Catholicism, church building would be belong to the Orthodox community. Following to the triumph of the Uniate movement especially in the Macedonian regions, the Russian diplomats were probably compelled to shift their Pan-Orthodox policies²⁹².

At the end of March 1861, the Pope Pius IX consecrated Iosif Sokolski as the archbishop of Bulgarian Greek Catholic Church. Nonetheless, with a conspiracy organized by Ignatiev, Archbishop Sokolski was kidnapped to Odessa by a Russian vessel in August of that year. He was carried away from Odessa to Kiev and imprisoned in Pechersk Lavra Monastery, there, till his death in 1879. He was obliged to make propaganda for Orthodoxy in the Catholic Ukrainian provinces of

289 Ibid., p. 96 and Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 244.

290 Ibid., pp. 99-101.

291 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 262.

292 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), p. 105 and p. 145.

Zhytomyr and Khmelnytski²⁹³. This conspiracy was a blow over the Unionist Bulgarian community and the number of community decreased from 10,000 to 4,000 people²⁹⁴. Makariy Savov reverted the Orthodoxy and Tsankov, owner of *Balgariya*, receded to Rusçuk (Rousse).

Because of Sokolski affair, the Vicar Apostolic of Istanbul would like to appoint a cleric embracing Latin rite rather than Byzantine rite for the Bulgarian unionists. As a matter of fact, number of Slavic-rite clerics had already decreased in half after the Russian conspiracy. For the purpose of gratifying Catholic Bulgarians from the Byzantine rite, Brunoni appointed Petar Arabadzhiski, who was himself a Paulician and awarded for his activities among the Bulgarians in Edirne by Propaganda Fide, as the religious leader of the community in February 1862²⁹⁵. Since he did not change his Latin rite as Paulician, the community was in disfavor with him. Eventually, the community applied to the Sublime Porte and the French ambassador, François René Moustiers, for changing Arabadzhiski. The Sublime Porte also would like to remove Arabadzhiski from his office seeing that he had foreign citizenship. One year later, Arabadjiski was left no choice but to resign from his office on account of the pressures of the Sublime Porte and Rafail Popov was appointed as the archbishop of Catholic Bulgarians of Byzantine rite.

Except for Istanbul, the Catholic missions served in the provinces of Edirne, Selanik, and Monastir. In April 1866, Popov visited Edirne community with the encouragement of *Propaganda*. At the same time, the relation of Catholic Bulgarians with Orthodox community of Istanbul was straining. Due to the rising tension in the Ottoman capital between Catholic Bulgarians and Orthodox community, they moved their center from Istanbul to Edirne in 1869 and St. Elias Church was inaugurated as the episcopal church of the city. The Conventual Franciscans possessed a church there. The Oblate Sisters of Providence also conducted the hospital of St. Louis and a girls' school in Edirne and *Les Filles de la Charité d'Agram* (Sisters of Charity of Zagreb), feminine branch of St. Vincent de Paul order²⁹⁶, established St. Hélène College there. In the suburban area, a boys' school were operated by the Assumptionists. Moreover, there was a Resurrectionist college and church, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, in the same city. The Assumptionists and Resurrectionists operating in Edirne applied for a financial assistance to the French diplomatic institutions²⁹⁷. These

293 Charles Fabregues, 'Le Vicariat Apostolique Bulgare de Thrace', *Echos d'Orient*, vol. 7, no. 44, January 1904, pp. 36-38.

294 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 275.

295 Crescent Armanet, 'Les mouvement des bulgares vers Rome', *Echos d'Orient*, vol. 13, 1910, p. 105.

296 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 241.

297 Hristo Gluskov, 'Les missions catholiques et l'influence française en Thrace de l'Est durant les années 80 du XIXe siecle', *Bulgarian Historical Review*, no. 1-2, 1998, p. 182.

orders targeted to exploit ecclesiastical conflict between the Greeks and Bulgarians²⁹⁸. Filibe (Plovdiv) and Dedeğaç (Alexandroupoli) were the important centers of the Catholic orders. The Assumptionists, who established their mission in Filibe in 1864, set up their first school in the Ottoman Balkans, St. André School, there²⁹⁹. The Capucin order was also influential among the Paulicians in Filibe. Apart from two Franciscan schools in the same place, the Conventual Franciscans had also already inaugurated a boys' school in Dedeğaç³⁰⁰.

A French consulate started to serve in Edirne starting from 1878. On account of the Polish origins of its missionaries and Austria-Hungarian support for them, the French consulate hesitated to back the Resurrectionists. Charité d'Agram was also under the protection of the Austria-Hungarian Empire. The rivalry between the French consulate-supported orders and non-French consulate-supported order was one of the main reason for the limited influence of Catholic propaganda in the Edirne province in the post-1878 period.

Until the 1860s, a mass unionist movement manifested itself in Selanik, Yenice, and İştîp (Štip) in Macedonia. The Lazarists had already established missions in Selanik in 1842 and in Monastir in 1856³⁰¹. They cooperated with Les Filles de la Charité d'Agram in Selanik. There were approximately 4,500 Catholic from the Latin rite Monastir, Kavala, and notably Selanik. The first reason why the Slavic populations of Macedonia was accessible for the Catholic influence was the Catholic institutions were historical roots in the Macedonian provinces. To illustrate, a Roman Catholic archbishopric was operating in Üsküp in the second half of the 17th century³⁰². The second reason was the lack of anti-Catholic fanaticism there because of coexistence between Catholic and Orthodox Christians throughout the centuries³⁰³. Many Orthodox Bulgarian parents did not waver to send their children to the Catholic schools in Selanik and Monastir³⁰⁴.

The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, Russian victory in the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-78, and foundation of the Bulgarian Principality were the reasons which triggered the comedown of the Uniate movement in the Bulgarian territories. After the death of Popov, with the appointment of Nil Izvorov in October 1876 as the head of the Catholic Bulgarian

298 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), pp. 115-16.

299 Ibid., p. 27.

300 Ibid., p. 29-31.

301 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 240.

302 Fikret Adanır, 'The Socio-Political Environment of Balkan Nationalism: the Case of Ottoman Macedonia, 1856-1912', *Regional and National Identities in Europe in the XIXth and XXth Centuries*, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), p. 224.

303 Ivan Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960), p. 230.

304 Ibid., p. 242.

Church, Istanbul again became the center of the Catholic Bulgarians³⁰⁵. The Uniate movement became in vain after the recognition of the Bulgarian Orthodox community by the Sublime Porte.

The Berlin Treaty, which signed the foundation of an autonomous Bulgarian Principality, guaranteed the rights of the Uniate and other non-Orthodox Christians in the new principality. With the proposal of William Henry Waddington, French plenipotentiary in this congress, the privileges and properties of Catholic clerics were assured in the autonomous province of Eastern Rumelia³⁰⁶.

Nascent Involvement of the Protestant Missions

The history of Protestant missionary involvement among the Bulgarian communities can be regarded as one example of foreign penetration to the Balkan Peninsula. Amongst the Protestant missionary institutions, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) was the most outshining one in the Bulgarian lands. Pliny Fisk and Levi Parsons, who came from Boston to the Ottoman lands, were the first missionaries attached to the ABCFM in 1819. Their limited attempts were directed to proselytize the local Christians in the *vilayets* of Damascus and Aleppo. Even though they were successful in distributing Protestant literature among the local people, their attempts were met by a harsh opposition of the Maronite Patriarchate of Antioch. Due to the turmoil in these regions and uprising in the Morean Peninsula, their followers had to withdraw to Malta in 1828. Two years later, Eli Smith and William Goodell, another two board members, arrived at Asia Minor in order to make surveys among the Armenian Apostolic communities. In 1831, Goodell would open a mission station in Istanbul³⁰⁷. This station would be the headquarter of the American Board in the empire.

Main task of the missionaries, at the beginning, was to convey the Protestantism to the Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. However, they could not convey it since any apostasy from Islam was penalized with capital punishment. The Jews also ignored their teachings. Therefore, they directed their works to the members of the Orthodox and Oriental churches. The Protestant missionaries started their work with the translation of the Bible into the languages of the empire. For example, the New Testament had already been published in Turkish with Armenian characters in 1815.

In the early phase of these missionary activities, a demand had been made to the Prudential committee of the Board at Boston in order to open a school in Istanbul. In 1840, a Board school,

305 Elçin Macar, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002), pp. 110-13.

306 Ibid. pp. 110-14.

307 William Webster Hall Jr., *Puritans in the Balkans: The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, (Sofia: Cultura, 1938), pp. 1-2.

which would be the basis of Robert College, was opened in Bebek quarter. Its first students were three Armenian youth, and curriculum was consisting of English, maths, philosophy, history, local languages, exegesis, and theology courses³⁰⁸. At the same time, British diplomatic activities were going on for the explicit acknowledgment of a separate Protestant *millet* by the Sublime Porte. In 1847, Reşid Pasha, grand vizier, declared the recognition of the Protestant *millet* in one of his circular letters thanks to the perseverance of Stratford Canning, the British ambassador in Istanbul³⁰⁹. The Protestant community, therefore, would have the same rights with the other recognized religious communities (*millets*) in the empire.

After the Crimean War, missionary activities targeted to proselytize among the Bulgarian-speaking Orthodox communities. The missionaries began to open schools, publish textbooks in Bulgarian vernacular, organized masses in that language, and later, give sanitary services to the inhabitants of Edirne (Adrianople) and Eastern Rumelia *vilayets* (provinces). To illustrate, the New Testament in Bulgarian had already been issued in Izmir (Smyrna) by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1840. This society was effective in the emergence of Protestant communities in the Ottoman realm and its activities were directed to evangelize the Orthodox Greek and Apostolic Armenian communities of Izmir and assisted to the American Board in their early periods. Two years later, there, Konstantin Fotinov inaugurated first Bulgarian printing office, which published the first Bulgarian magazine, *Lyuboslavie*³¹⁰.

The influence of headquarter of American Board at Istanbul spread to Edirne and Tekirdağ (Rodosto). In 1857, Cyrus Hamlin, future president of the Robert College, made a tour from Istanbul to Filibe (Plovdiv). *En route*, he also visited Tekirdağ and Edirne. After his visit, the Board determined the Bulgarian lands as the base of proselytizing activities among the South Slavs. In October of the same year, Board sent E. E. Bliss to northern Bulgaria with the aim of assisting to the newcomer Methodists in Varna and Şumnu (Shumen). The Methodist Episcopal Mission had started to work in northwestern Bulgaria around 1857. In March 1858, Charles F. Morse opened a station in Edirne³¹¹.

In 1860, the Ottoman lands were divided into three missions/work areas, whose names were Western Turkey Mission, Central Turkey Mission, and Eastern Turkey Mission instead of Northern Armenian and Southern Armenian missions in 1860³¹². The Western Turkey Mission had four

308 Ibid., p. 8.

309 See Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, *Majestelerinin Konsolosları: İngiliz Belgeleriyle Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki İngiliz Konsolosları*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2004).

310 Richard J. Crampton, *A Concise History of Bulgaria*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 63.

311 William Webster Hall Jr., *Puritans in the Balkans: The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, (Sofia: Cultura, 1938), pp. 19-20.

312 Ibid., pp. 11-12.

stations: Istanbul, Edirne, Zağra-i Atika³¹³ (Stara Zagora), and Samokov³¹⁴. On 27 May 1870, a change in the organization of board was made that stations in Istanbul, Edirne, Filibe, Sofia, and Zağra-i Atika constituted a separate mission under the name of European Turkey Mission³¹⁵.

The Board primarily established schools and attempted to be active in educarional realm. A boarding school for boys was introduced with an official ceremony in Filibe in 1860. This was the first school opened by the Protestant missionaries in the Bulgarian lands. Even though it began to operate with only two students in October of that year, numbers of its attendees increased at the year end. The Board envisaged a four-year course of study for the attendees. Three years later, a girls' boarding school followed this school in Zağra-i Atika³¹⁶. There was a demand for secular type education among the Bulgarians. As James F. Clarke points out that targets of the most students were not to read gospel but to receive a secular education in the school at Filibe. These schools would be transferred to Samokov in 1871. In 1861, prominent Bulgarians in Istanbul asked for the inauguration of a girls' school to the Protestant missionaries. This request was repeated in Filibe for a seminary and girls' school. However, the second board school for girls in the Balkan Peninsula would be established in Monastir in 1881³¹⁷. these schools could offer improved facilities to students and all of them were well-equipped. To illustrate, boys' school in Filibe was the first school which had a chemical laboratory in the Bulgarian territories. Other than education, missionaries provided sanitary facilities to local populations all around the world. However, missionaries were not interested in sanitary affairs of the local population in the early phases of movement in the Bulgarian lands. First medical branch of the European Turkey Mission could be founded in May 1881 with the arrival of Dr. F. L. Kingsbury.

First Protestant church in the Bulgarian lands was founded in Bansko by the Board in August 1868. These missionaries did not expect the immediate evangelization of all the Bulgarians. To illustrate, James F. Clarke had stated in 1864: 'We do not come to ask you [the Bulgarians] to leave your church, but to receive the Bible and live by it in the church³¹⁸.' He was aware of the strength of Orthodoxy among the Bulgarian-speaking people and regarded it as a stagnant institution. According to him, any religious reform among the Orthodox Bulgarian communities

313 The station in Zağra-i Atika was closed later.

314 Samakov station would be abolished in favor of that of Sofia in 1869.

315 Tatyana Khristova Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985), p. 21.

316 William Webster Hall Jr., *Puritans in the Balkans: The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, (Sofia: Cultura, 1938), p. 30.

317 Although a board school started to give education in Bahçecik, a town close to Istanbul, it generally adressed to the Armenian residents of that town and surrounding settlements, like Izmit. Tatyana Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985), p. 96.

318 Ф. Шашко et al., *Американски Пътеписи за България през XIX Век*, (Sofia: Planeta 3, 2001), pp. 79-80.

'was not in the church, but rather despite of it...³¹⁹. Due to the limited appeal of missions to the Bulgarian Orthodox community in the early phase, the German and Protestant Russian refugees played an important role in the spread of Protestantism in Bansko, Zağra-i Atika, and Filibe. In 1872, new churches were opened in Merichleri, close to Zağra-i Atika, and Yanbol (Yambol). Two years later, a new station was established in Monastir³²⁰.

Around 1866, first Baptists also arrived at Bulgarian lands. They inaugurated their first church in Rusçuk (Rousse) in 1872. Herewith, the Baptists became third Protestant congregation operating in the Bulgarian provinces, except the Board and the Methodists. In order to systematize evangelical efforts, the Board and Methodists sought for an arrangement to divide the lands into spheres of influence. Due to the lack of adequate economic means³²¹, the members of the Board made an agreement, which allocated south of the Balkan Mountains to themselves, with the Methodists, who would be active in the north of the Balkan Mountains. Nevertheless, these two different groups contacted with each other and organized regular meetings to investigate the results of their activities.

In the early beginnings, Protestant missionaries had ambitious targets for spread of Protestantism among the Bulgarians. In 1840, after a visit to the Bulgarian lands, James F. Clarke argued that Bulgarian lands were promising for further missionary activities³²². He, later, described the enthusiasm of Bulgarians towards the books, especially New Testament, in their vernacular:

The destruction of books in their language by the Greeks led Bulgarians to purchase eagerly the New Testament, first published in 1856, chiefly because it was in the sweet mother tongue...³²³

The missionary literature, notably the New Testament in Bulgarian vernacular language, was so popular among the Bulgarians since it is quite inexpensive and easily found everywhere³²⁴.

As one can regard in the case of Peshtera, the local populations favored Protestant missionaries instead of Greek Orthodox priests, who compelled locals to use Greek religious texts. Especially during the Greco-Bulgarian ecclesiastical dispute, Bulgarian-speaking populations welcomed missionary printed materials and missionaries provided these texts to them without any hesitation³²⁵.

Although there was a hopeful atmosphere for missionaries in the Bulgarian lands, there were

319 Tatyana Khristova Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985), p. 15.

320 Ibid., pp. 16-20.

321 Ibid., p. 12.

322 Ibid., p. 10.

323 James F. Clarke, *Sketch of the European Turkey Mission of the American Board*, (Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1901), p. 4.

324 Странимир Странимиров, *История на Българската Църква*, (Sofia, 1925), p. 10.

325 Tatyana Khristova Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985), pp. 21-28.

obstacles, too. First obstacle was that the Protestants inevitably would enter an open confrontation with the dominant religion, Orthodoxy. Even though the Orthodoxy was prevailing among the Bulgarian communities, the rule of Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul was discouraged. The missionaries usually supported the Bulgarian side in the Bulgarian-Greek ecclesiastical conflict³²⁶. However, many Bulgarians continued to adhere to the Orthodox sect. Even though the missionaries hoped that their support to Bulgarian party would create pro-missionary feelings among the Bulgarians, these expectations were shaken at the 1860s. Second obstacle was the Roman Catholic propaganda, which aimed at exploitation of the dissatisfaction of local people due to the arbitrary acts of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. The Russian defeat in the Crimean War had lapsed the Russian protectorate over the Orthodox Christians. In Edirne, with the help of French diplomats, the Assumptionists had already inaugurated a Catholic church. The Roman Catholicism had a deep and historical interest in the Balkan Peninsula. As early as the 17th century, *La Congregazione di Propaganda Fide* (The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) was active among Catholic communities in Ohri (Ohrid) and Üsküp (Skopje)³²⁷.

In addition to the reasons above, another reason for Protestant failure in the Bulgarian lands was that many habits and traditions among the Orthodox Bulgarians, such as icon-worshiping, praying to the Virgin Mary, candle-lighting within the churches, presenting food to graveyards in the festivals, and other rituals related with dead people, were disapproved by the Protestant missionaries. The Protestant liturgy was very different from the Orthodox one. Moreover, new Protestants had to cope with exclusionist attitudes of their friends and acquaintances.

The Bulgarian nationalist intelligentsia had very negative approach against the Protestant missionary activities. Both the conservatist and liberal factions defended the idea that spread of Protestantism would divide the Bulgarians owing to its 'inherent divisive nature'. In 1866, *Turtsiya*, the conservative Bulgarian newspaper in Istanbul, argued that the Americans and Protestant Bulgarians targeted 'to create parties among the people'. Moreover, Lyuben Karavelov criticized missionaries in his works and equalled Orthodoxy with freedom:

Our Orthodoxy is related to our freedom and to our Bulgarian nationality... that is why every honest Bulgarian must remain faithful to his own religion³²⁸.

Another Bulgarian nationalist intellectual, Georgi Rakovski, maintained that the religious unity of Bulgarians had a great importance.

326 Ibid., p. 14.

327 Mustafa Soykut, *Image of the 'Turk' in Italy: A History of the 'Other' in Early Modern Europe, 1453-1683*, (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2001), pp. 83-107.

328 Tatyana Khristova Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985) p. 176.

Even the fact that Petko R. Slaveykov cooperated with non-evangelizing work of the European Turkey Mission, he completely rejected Protestantism as a harmful element to Bulgarian national unity and opposed to the proselytizing activities in his newspaper, *Makedoniya*:

We are against the Protestants with all the cruelty of a person who feels all the bad consequences of the division of the people due to such religious wrangles³²⁹.

Many Bulgarian intellectuals had regarded the representatives and members of European Turkey Mission as tools of American diplomatic interests. Nevertheless, European Turkey Mission was considered as a private enterprise by the American diplomats and in some cases, missionaries of the American Board could not get regular consular protection from American diplomatic institutions.

Besides, raising value of a state-controlled secular education after 1878 extinguished enthusiasm for missionary educational activities within the borders of the Bulgarian Principality. The boarding schools had faced with the fierce challenge of the schools of Bulgarian Orthodox community, and later, secular schools of the Bulgarian Principality. For instance, boys' boarding school, which had been transferred from Filibe to Samokov, had to compete with Orthodox Theological Seminary in Samokov. Not only Orthodox theological seminars but also secular schools threatened the existence of Protestant missionary schools. Notwithstanding, thanks to its compulsory English education, Samokov boys' boarding school continued to be popular among the local people. Moreover, the evangelizing activities were retarded due to the Bulgarian demands for education. Many Bulgarians went to the Board's schools and attended courses there; however they did not tergiversate. Even in the Macedonian provinces, number of attendees was very limited in the Protestant missionary schools on account of the competition among Greek, Serbian, and Bulgarian educational institutions at the beginning of the 1880s³³⁰.

Subsequent to the establishment of the Bulgarian Principality, a hostile policy towards Protestant schools was embraced by the bureaucrats of the new principality. To exemplify, the Methodist schools in Svishtov and Lovech was closed down in 1882; however, the boys' boarding school in Samokov could obtain an official protection document from the Bulgarian Prince, Alexander³³¹.

Furthermore, the relations between American missionaries and Protestant missionaries were not free of problems. The huge gap between the payments of missionaries and those of native employees strained the relations between American missionaries and Protestant Bulgarians. Apart from that material gap, existing nationalist sentiments among the Bulgarian Protestants

329 Ibid., pp. 69-70.

330 Ibid., pp. 73-78.

331 William Webster Hall Jr., *Puritans in the Balkans: The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, (Sofia: Cultura, 1938), pp. 55-57.

disappointed the expectations of Protestant missionaries³³². Hristo Hristov, a Bulgarian Marxist historian, mentioned the perceptions of ordinary Bulgarians about the Baptist missions: 'It is historically true that not only the servants of Orthodoxy, but also a large percentage of ordinary population viewed the Baptists as proselytizers, breakers of people's traditions, cosmopolitans, and carriers of ideas and interests foreign to the people'³³³. However, this explanation can be enlarged to all Protestant groups operating in Bulgaria.

The evangelizing efforts carried on in the 1870s and the missionaries played an important role in the emergence of anti-Ottoman rhetoric during the Great Eastern Crisis of 1875-78. The Bulgarian Evangelical Society, whose object was '[...] to seek to spread a pure Christian faith and good morals among men, especially among our Bulgarian nation', was founded in July 1875. This society encouraged all Protestant movements in the Bulgarian lands, though it was dependent on the American Board and Robert College in Istanbul. Many Methodists and Baptist also participated to it because of its non-denominational character³³⁴. It played a crucial role in the spread of rumors related with 'Bulgarian Horrors'. After the appointment of Albert Long to the Robert College in 1872, number of Bulgarian students had increased in the college. Detailed eyewitness accounts of the bloody events were reached to Long through these students and missionaries of the Bulgarian Evangelical Society. Long informed Sir Henry Elliot, the British ambassador in Istanbul, and Edwin Pears, correspondent of the *London Daily News* about the events. Thus, this newspaper sent Januarius McGahan³³⁵ to the Bulgarian lands to report the incidents there. Besides, S. Panaretov, a professor at the Robert College, published a pamphlet about the 'Turkish cruelties' during the April Uprising in 1876.

An anti-Ottoman atmosphere was created in European capitals, especially in London. Benjamin Disraeli, Prime Minister of Britain, was compelled to withdraw British political support for the Ottoman Empire, when Russia declared war against her in April 1877. Moreover, William Gladstone, leader of the British Liberal Party, contributed to this political shift by publishing his famous anti-Ottoman pamphlet, *The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*³³⁶.

The Berlin Treaty as the total revision of that of San Stefano had divided the San Stefano Bulgaria into three parts in 1878: the Bulgarian Principality recognizing the nominal suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire, autonomous province of Eastern Rumelia, and Macedonian provinces or

332 Tatyana Khristova Nestorova-Matejić, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985), p. 168.

333 Христо А. Христов, *Протестантските секти в България*, (Sofia: Partizdat, 1972), p. 95.

334 William Webster Hall Jr., *Puritans in the Balkans: The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, (Sofia: Cultura, 1938), pp. 76-77.

335 Following to his visit to Bulgaria, Januarius MacGahan would write an anti-Ottoman book, *The Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria*.

336 Ibid., p. 43.

Western Rumelia in where Ottoman rule was confirmed in return for prospective reforms. An Organic Statute was prepared for Eastern Rumelia by an international commission and Alexander Stefanov Bogoridi (Alexandros Vogoridis in Greek and Aleko Pasha in Turkish) was appointed as the governor of that province. Until 1879, the Bulgarian Principality and Eastern Rumelia remained under the Russian occupation and a provisional Russian government was established in these autonomous political units.

The Grand National Assembly, convened in Tarnovo, introduced a constitution and elected the Bulgarian prince, Alexander of Battenberg. The draft of that very liberal constitution was arranged by Alexander Mikhailovich Dondukov-Korsakov, the Russian commissioner in the Bulgarian Principality. It stipulated the establishment of the unicameral legislation system and election of the prince by an extraordinary assembly. This extraordinary assembly would also be responsible for decision process of extraordinary important issues, such as alterations of borders and acknowledgment of constitution. Despite the fact that the 40th and 41st articles of this liberal constitution declared toleration for all religions within the borders of principality and guaranteed the freedom, the Orthodoxy was recognized as the religion of the state and Bulgarian Orthodox Church as the national church. The church was being supported by the state funds and the appointment of bishops was organized by the government³³⁷.

337 Ibid., pp. 68-69.

CHAPTER III

ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS OF THE BULGARIAN EXARCHATE, c. 1830s- 1872

In the 1830s, the demands of Bulgarian bourgeoisie which appeared in the flourishing towns of the Balkan Peninsula and particularly Ottoman capital, commenced to lodge two claims from the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul: appointments of metropolitan bishops, who could conduct the mass in Bulgarian vernacular, to these towns, and the inauguration of schools, whose education language would be Bulgarian. Despite the fact that the ecclesiastical conflict influenced especially Macedonian dioceses, the contributions of Istanbul Bulgarian community to the movement cannot be disregarded. The idea of an independent Bulgarian Church was germinated in Istanbul by prominent Bulgarian nationalist intellectuals and some clerics in the 1840s. The origins of Istanbul community go back to the Bulgarian migrations at the end of the 18th and the onset of the 19th centuries, triggered by *kardzhali* movement, Serbian revolts, and three consecutive Russo-Ottoman Wars (1787-92, 1806-12, and 1828-29)³³⁸.

Early Demands for the Bulgarian-speaking Metropolitan Bishops, c. 1830-1847

In the first phase of conflict, the idea of establishment of the independent and separate church had not been formed yet, though a very limited number of secular intellectuals backed this idea at the end of the 1840s. The Bulgarian demands was directed to the appointment of the bishops, who could conduct liturgy in Bulgarian, to the Bulgarian-inhabited provinces. The Slavic communities of Üsküp (Skopje) and Samokov were the first group, which demanded to have the Bulgarian speaking-metropolitan bishops in 1830; nevertheless, their demands were refused by the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. Four years later, the residents of Köprülü declared the same requests. When Sultan Mahmud II visited Bulgarian provinces in 1838, residents of these provinces petitioned for 'the appointment of Bulgarian-speaking bishops to the bishoprics, whose dwellers spoke Bulgarian vernacular'³³⁹. These petitions were followed by the requests of habitants of Vidin, Tırnovo, and Filibe³⁴⁰.

Neofit Hilendarski Bozveli and Ilarion Makaripolski, two prominent clerics, guided the

338 Yeorgios Kiutuçkas, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pınelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 36-37.

339 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 10.

340 К. Динков, *История на българската църква*, (Sofia: Poliprint, 1954), p. 72.

Bulgarian ecclesiastical movement in the 1840s. In his earlier career, Bozveli mainly served as a priest in Zıstovi and Kalofer, though he visited many Bulgarian towns and held instructive sermons³⁴¹. After the death of the metropolitan bishop of Tırnovo (Tarnovo) in 1838, he coveted this seat. But the Patriarchate chaired the bishop Panaretos, who was himself ethnically Greek. This selection did not please the Bulgarian community³⁴². Bozveli was also displeased with this appointment and incited the residents of Tarnovo against the Patriarchate³⁴³. When he lost his hopes about that office, he settled in Istanbul by 1839 and gave speeches emphasizing that the Bulgarian community of Istanbul should contend with the coercive acts of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul³⁴⁴. He suggested the building of a Bulgarian Church in Istanbul to the members of Bulgarian community in that year. This suggestion found many supporters in the Ottoman capital³⁴⁵. In his sermons, he underlined the importance of the Rose Chamber Edict as an instrument, which was able to put an end to the gross injustices of the Greek metropolitan bishops³⁴⁶.

He also spearheaded the effort to institutionalize the resistance against the Patriarchate and was appointed to the metropolitan bishopric of Tırnovo with the support of the Bulgarian community of Istanbul; however, he was discharged from office and exiled to Mount Athos by the Patriarchate in 1841³⁴⁷. When he returned to Istanbul in 1845, he met with Ilarion Makariopolski, who was an anti-patriarchate monk. Bozveli and Makariopolski collaborated with Michal Czajkowski³⁴⁸, who was working for French interests in Istanbul. With the support of Adam Czartoryski, Czajkowski heartened these priests in order to petition about the abuses of the Greek clerics and to request strongly for possessing metropolitan bishops, who could conduct Bulgarian rites and establishing *millet* schools. Later, Makariopolski would write an official report, related with 'cruelties' of the Greek metropolitan bishops, to Mustafa Reşid Pasha, the Grand Vizier. In spite of the fact that Mustafa Reşid Pasha asked detailed accounts from him, Bozveli and Makariopolski were again exiled with the pretext of collaborating with the migrant Poles and

341 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 12.

342 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 133.

343 Yeorgios Kiutuçkas, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pinelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), p. 40.

344 Pars Tuğlacı, *Bulgaristan ve Türk-Bulgar İlişkileri*, (Istanbul: Cem Yayınları, 1984), pp. 65-66.

345 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 133.

346 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 13.

347 For the first exile of Bozveli, investigate Михаил Петров Арнаудовъ, *Неофитъ Хилендарски Бозвели, 1785-1848: Животъ, Дѣло, Епоха*, (Sofia: Hudozhnik, 1930), pp. 413-64

348 Later, he would embrace Islam and take the name of Mehmet Sadık Pasha.

opponent Russians by the Patriarchate³⁴⁹. Since Russia was favoring pan-Orthodox policies at that time, she was self-contained about the exiles. Whereas Bozveli died in exile in 1848, Makariopolski could return from Mount Athos to Istanbul two years later thanks to an act of grace.

In the mid-19th century, the Bulgarian community of Istanbul was consolidated and well-organized³⁵⁰. At that time, because of the great numbers of Istanbul community³⁵¹, imperial capital became the intellectual center of the Bulgarian nationalist movement³⁵². *Tsarigradski Vestnik* was founded as the first newspaper of the imperial capital in 1849 and the Bulgarian literary society commenced to publish the review of *Balgarski Knizhitsi* (Bulgarian Library) in 1857³⁵³. While a limited group of intellectuals and bourgeoisie, who had received education in the secular schools and foreign schools in Istanbul, engaged in nationalistic ideas, a body of Bulgarian believers aimed to establish an independent national church instead of execution of the reforms under the leadership of Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul after the announcement of the Reform Decree. The Bulgarian intellectuals asked for secularization, on the one hand. On the other hand, they struggled for the recognition of the Bulgarian Orthodox population and the establishment of a national church. The Patriarchate asserted that a segregation based on ethnicity ('kavmiyet') would be disadvantageous for all the Orthodox community. Its main argument is that one and sole higher clergyman must be appointed as a shepherd (pastor) for many ethnic groups ('kavimler') sharing the same sect. It had a fright that the independence of the Bulgarian ecclesiastical institution set an example for the other ethnic groups³⁵⁴. Besides, an independent Bulgarian church meant the loss of flock, prestige, and fiscal power for this patriarchate. If the patriarchate could prevent the establishment of this independent church, it would remain as the most powerful representative of non-Muslims in the empire³⁵⁵.

Construction of a Bulgarian Church in the Ottoman Capital and Search for Restoration of Friendly Relations under the Guidance of Stefan Bogoridi, 1847-1859

349 The second exile years of Bozveli is narrated in Михаил Петров Арнаудовъ, *Неофитъ Хилендарски Бозвели, 1785-1848: Животъ, Дѣло, Епоха*, (Sofia: Hudozhnik, 1930), pp. 639-82.

350 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 13.

351 The newspaper of Tsankov, *Bulgaria*, asserted that the population of Bulgarians in the Ottoman capitas was equal to 50,000 people thanks to periodic increases in the population. See Yeorgios Kiutuçkas, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pinelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), p. 38.

352 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 9.

353 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

354 Gayrimüslim Cemaat Defteri, nr. 3, s. 26, t. 7, Ramazan 1277.

355 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 126-27.

Stefan Bogoridi was the leader of the Istanbul Bulgarian community at the end of the 1840s. He had served as interpreter in both the Porte and the British Embassy in the first decades of the 19th century. Thanks to his former post in the British Embassy, he benefitted from sincere relations with Stratford de Redcliffe, who served in the imperial capital from 1842 to 1852. He made the first application to the Porte for the establishment of a Bulgarian church in Istanbul. In his petition, he affirmed that the Bulgarians residing in Istanbul could not understand Greek. As he maintained, because of that reason, they asked for possessing a separate church in where they conducted Bulgarian liturgy.

Bogoridi entered a rivalry with Alexander Exarch, a wealthy Bulgarian merchant, about the location of the Bulgarian Church. Exarch, who was born in Zağra-i Atika (Stara Zagora), went to a primary school in his hometown. Then, he continued his education in a Greek school in Istanbul. He attended the courses in the Patriarchal Academy of Bucharest, and schools in Budapest, Vienna, and Munich, respectively. When he started to his duty in the Ottoman Embassy of Paris in 1838, he established close contacts with French administrative milieux and discussed the condition of Balkan Christians with them³⁵⁶. After returning to the Ottoman Empire in 1849, he encouraged the establishment of an independent Bulgarian Church in his writings in *Tsarigradski Vestnik*. While Bogoridi was suggesting that the Bulgarian community of Istanbul should purchase land to construct a priest house, Alexander Exarch, argued that some houses could be bought in Unkapanı district with the support of the Russian Embassy³⁵⁷. By granting his house in Fener (Phanar) district for construction, Bogoridi drove Exarch's proposal away. Additionally, Bogoridi sent a letter of application, in which he argued that the Bulgarian community of Istanbul should possess a separate church, to the Porte³⁵⁸. In 1849, Sultan Abdülmecit confirmed the construction of the priest house in Fener. On 23 October 1849, this priest house was consecrated in the name of Sveti Stefan (Saint Stephen). This humble church was still attached to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The trustee committee of that small church attempted to build a *metoh*³⁵⁹, neighboring the priest house. Apart from this church, an *Obshtina*, the legal representative of the Bulgarian community in Istanbul and its advisory board, was founded³⁶⁰. In 1850, the construction of this building was also completed³⁶¹.

356 Akşin Somel, 'Aleksandır Ekzarh ve 19.-20. Yüzyıllarda Avrupa'ya Giden 'Bulgar Yolları', *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, vol. 2, (Fall 2005), p. 210.

357 For a short biography of Alexander Exarch, see Selçuk Akşin Somel, 'Aleksandır Ekzarh ve 19.-20. Yüzyıllarda Avrupa'ya Giden 'Bulgar Yolları', *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, vol. 2, (Fall 2005), pp. 209-17. Alexander Exarch had close ties with the Russian Embassy. In November 1847, with the encouragement of the Russian Embassy, he had dispatched a petition, asking for the foundation of Bulgarian churches and schools, to the Porte in November 1847. See also, Yeorgios Kiutuçkas, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pinelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 41-42.

358 Ibid., p. 42.

359 Metoh is a small ecclesiastical institution in where the priests live.

360 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the*

The Patriarchate went all out in order not to entrust an ethnically Bulgarian bishop to the Church of Sveti Stefan. Stefan Kovačević, a Serbian archmandrite born in the Austrian Empire, was consecrated as the bishop of the Bulgarian Church in August 1851. Nevertheless, his term satisfied neither the Patriarchate nor the Bulgarian community. Hence, Patriarch Anthimos VI exiled him to Trabzon and nominated Polikarpos, the metropolitan bishop of Patara, to this church, but, this appointment also faced with harsh criticism and boycott of the Bulgarian community. After this unsuccessful trial, the Patriarchate was left no choice but to send Ilarion Makariopolski as the *in partibus* (without seat) bishop of this church in November 1858³⁶². Amicable relations continued between the Patriarchate and the coalition of Bulgarian community of Istanbul and Bulgarian-speaking metropolitan bishops. In 1859, the use of Slavonic was permitted in the churches of Filibe and Edirne³⁶³.

After the inauguration of the Bulgarian Church in Istanbul, the movement entered a new phase. During the leadership of Bogoridi, the relations between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarian community were smoothed. Because of his former post in the imperial bureaucracy and his prestige among and close contacts with the Phanariote families, he wanted to solve the question without displeasing the Patriarchate. However, demands of peripheral groups were going on. At the end of the 1850s, the Bulgarian nationalist intellectuals and clerics focused on the issue of appointment of Bulgarian bishops to the Balkan dioceses and conduct of Bulgarian masses in these provinces. Natanail (Nathanael) Ohridski, a prominent nationalist cleric, published his pamphlet, *A Friendly Letter by Bulgarian to Greek*, in 1853 in Prague so as to demand the appointment of Bulgarian-speaking metropolitan bishops. In the same year, this pamphlet was transmitted to the Russian Embassy at Istanbul³⁶⁴.

Moreover, Bogoridi had mediated between Makariopolski and Kyrillos (Cyril) VII, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul, and requested re-ordination of Makariopolski. In 1858, he was appointed as the bishop of Makariopol in return of a safeguard that proved he would not like to possess a metropolitan bishopric. The Orthodox *millet* assembly, including four Bulgarian delegates, was convened in 1858 at Istanbul to solve the church question. In this convention, the Bulgarian representatives demanded the election of metropolitan bishops by the parishioners and

Balkans, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 133

361 Hasan Kuruyazıcı and Mete Tapan, *Sveti Stefan Bulgar Kilisesi: Bir Yapı Monografisi*, (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1998), p. 18.

362 Yeorgios Kiutuçkas, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pınelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 44-45.

363 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), pp. 137-38.

364 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), pp. 11-12.

the fixation of their salaries. However, these demands were refused. Later, they demanded the restoration of the patriarchates of Tarnovo and Ohrid in February 1860 in the same convention; nevertheless, these demands were again ignored by the Ecumenical Patriarchate³⁶⁵. Therefore, *rapprochement* was not long-lasting between the Bulgarian community of Istanbul and the Patriarchate. Two years later, the negotiations were interrupted without a solution and at the last session Stefan Karatheodori, the private doctor of sultan, pronounced a violent speech against Bulgarians' requests³⁶⁶. In 1859, marriage of a Macedonian boy at the Bulgarian church led to the further disputes and the Patriarchate excommunicated the priests at that church. The animosities grew among two parties. The leaders of thirty three Bulgarian guilds from the regions of Danubian Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia, were assembled in the Uzundzhovo fair in September 1860. After the meeting, they presented an official report, which was signed by thousands of craftsmen and declared that they would not recognize the Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul as their religious leader anymore to the Porte³⁶⁷. They requested the recognition of Ilarion as the leader of Bulgarian ecclesiastical hierarchy³⁶⁸. Kyrillos VII was compelled to resign in the same year because of these reactions. Besides, the patriarchal elections were protested in the dioceses of Tirnova, Vidin, Nis, and Samokov.

Years of Crisis, 1859-1864

The period between 1859 and 1864, following to the death of Bogoridi, can be illustrated as a phase of emergence of harsh rivalry between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarian community of Istanbul. Following to the elections, the rule of newly-elected patriarch, Ioakim (Joachim), was not recognized by any dioceses in the Bulgarian lands. Despite the fact that Ioakim had proposed the use of Bulgarian extensively in the church services and appointment of Bulgarian bishops to some bishoprics, Bulgarian prominent clerics and laymen refused that decision³⁶⁹.

On 3 April 1860, during the Easter celebrations, the name of patriarch was replaced by the name of sultan and the phrase of 'all Orthodox metropolitan bishops' in the Bulgarian Church at Istanbul³⁷⁰. After that event, relations between the Patriarchate and Bulgarian Church was tensed.

365 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p.138.

366 Ibid., p. 15.

367 Ahmed Refik, 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Fener Patrikhanesi ve Bulgar Kilisesi', *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası*, 80, r. 1340 (1924), pp. 78-80.

368 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 18.

369 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 20-21.

370 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors*

Ilarion Makariopolski, priest of the Bulgarian Church in Istanbul, was elected as the spiritual leader of the Bulgarians by the votes of members of Istanbul community.

With an imperial decree, the Sublime Porte requested the appointment of Bulgarian-speaking metropolitan bishops to the dioceses in where the Bulgarian element was more crowded in February 1861 to the Patriarchate³⁷¹. This decree created complicated responses within the Bulgarian communities. Whereas provincial communities appreciated the decree, the Bulgarians residing in Istanbul asked for hindering the exiles of three bishops; namely Ilarion, Auxentios, and Paisios; by the Patriarchate. Yet, these three bishops were exiled to three different towns due to the insistence of the Patriarchate in the same year³⁷². After three years in exile, Ilarion and Auxentios were permitted to return to Istanbul by the Porte. Moreover, in 1861, Istanbul community called for an autonomous religious community under the name of 'Religious Community of Christian Bulgarians', which would be independent from Patriarchate³⁷³. The Patriarchate, certainly, blocked this demand. Nevertheless, this refusal provoked the Bulgarian decision to inaugurate a national assembly in the Ottoman capital, including representatives from each of the Bulgarian-habited towns³⁷⁴.

In this period, resistance against the appointed Greek bishops went on rushing. In April 1860, the Slavic residents of Köprülü expelled their newly-appointed metropolitan bishop, Meletios³⁷⁵. The hostile acts of the indigenous population against the metropolitan bishops appointed by the Patriarchate triggered the visitation of Kıbrıslı Mehmet Emin Pasha, the Grand Vizier, to the Balkan lands. During the visitation of Sadrazam Kıbrıslı Mehmet Emin Paşa to the Balkan lands in 1860, the conflicts between Greek metropolitans and Bulgarian population were realized by the Ottoman statesmen. Particularly in northeastern cities like Varna and Şumnu (Shumen), Greek religious texts and Bibles were destroyed in the protests. *Chorbadjis* and *kocabashis*, as in the case of *kocabashi* Anastas, guided this movement and demanded the replacement of Greek religious texts with the Bulgarian ones³⁷⁶.

texte, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 17 and Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 20.

371 BOA., MD., No: 261, p. 38. See the Appendix in order to investigate the copy of this document.

372 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), P. 138.

373 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 18.

374 Ibid., pp. 18-19.

375 For further details about the reflections of ecclesiastical conflict over the Macedonian dioceses, see G. D. Todorov and N. Zhechev, 'Documents ayant trait aux luttes des bulgares pour une église et des écoles nationales en Macédoine vers le milieu du XIXe siècle', *Etudes historiques*, vol. 3, 1966, pp. 173-239.

376 Yonca Köksal and Davut Erkan, *Sadrazam Kıbrıslı Mehmet Emin Paşanın Rumeli Teftişi*, (Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), pp. 234-36

After this visitation, the conflicts quietened down until 1865; however, owing to the fact that the Patriarchate appointed a Greek bishop to see of Vidin in 1865, exasperated masses gathered and attacked to the church. The Patriarch, Sofronios (Sophronius) III, made a promise that he would resettle Greek bishops, displeased by Slavic believers, to the other sees, i.e. Tırnovo, Lofça (Lovech), Zıřtovi (Svishtov), řumen, Sofia, Filibe (Plovdiv), and Prizren- in April 1865³⁷⁷. However, by 1866, all Greek metropolitan bishops had already expelled from the Bulgarian provinces and control of the Patriarchate ended over these regions³⁷⁸.

There was not any antagonism among different ethnic groups of the Greek *millet* till the second half of the 19th century. Generally, the hostilities were directed against other religious communities, namely Apostolic Armenians, Jews, and especially Roman Catholics. Ethnic hostility against the Greeks cannot be noticed in the Bulgarian society until the 1850s. Starting from the 1860s, Greek and Bulgarian identities, which were rival to each other, were underlined/created. For example, Plovdiv guild was divided into Greek and Bulgarian organizations at that time³⁷⁹.

The Pan-Slavism, as an ideological fashion, emerged in the Habsburg Empire, especially in the Bohemia and Moravia regions and Vienna, in the first half of the 19th century. Adam Franz Collar and Pavel Jozef řafarik were the architects of the Pan-Slav movement in the Austrian Empire. Frantiřtek Ladislav řelakovsky, a Czech poet published a book about the proverbs of various Slavic groups and collected Slavic folksongs between 1822 and 1827³⁸⁰. In a very short time, this movement found acceptance among the intellectual milieux of the nascent Serbian Principality. Frantiřtek Zach, a pan-Slav Czech, influenced the ideas of Ilija Garařanin, Minister of the Internal Affairs, about the future expansion of Serbian Principality. Vuk Stefanović Karadzić, the nationalist Serbian author and nation-builder, collected Slavic folksongs and fairytales in the early 19th century³⁸¹.

The Pan-Slav influence increased among the Russian bureaucrats after the second half of the 19th century. In the 1860s, the Russian policies were transforming due to the influences of newly-emerging Pan-Slavs in the Russian bureaucracy. Black Sea clauses of the Paris Treaty, which encroached its sovereign rights, were disgraceful for the Russian Empire. After the Crimean defeat,

377 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 33., and Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p.11.

378 Barbara Jelavich and Charles Jelavich, *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009), pp. 340-42.

379 Richard Clogg, 'The Greek *Millet* in the Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 189-91.

380 Janko Lavrin, 'The Slav Idea and Russia', *Russian Review*, vol. 22, no. 1, January 1962, p. 13.

381 *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

nationalism and Pan-Slavism became much more visible in the Russian politics. Subsequent to the development of the Pan-Slavist movement in the Russian Empire, St. Petersburg and Moscow became headquarters of the movement there. Although Pan-Slavism was not a coherent ideology, it was manipulated by different groups in Russia. The Russian industrialists regarded it as an influential tool in order to ask higher tariffs and taxes for foreign products. The Russian Orthodox Church established close contacts with the Pan-Slavs in bureaucracy so as to limit the influences of Catholicism and Islam in the Russian Empire. The Russian intellectuals employed it as a stick with which to beat the Germanized oligarchy of Saint Petersburg and for redemption of semi-feudal structures in Russia. However, Pan-Slavist tendencies could not lead Russian policy and always remained as minor targets until the 1870s³⁸². The Russian conservatism was not able to squelch the nationalists and Pan-Slavs since even the tsar and other prominent conservatives were vulnerable to the nationalist manipulation³⁸³. Both the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Ottoman Empire were appalled by the Pan-Slavist idea.

Despite the fact that the Crimean War was a major blow over the Russian policies, Russian influence was revived over the Ottoman lands. However, the Russian diplomats were afraid of the invasion risk of the Straits by the British navy. Following to the war, the new ambassador of Russia in Istanbul received an instruction about the Ecumenical Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul from Foreign Ministry in Saint Petersburg. In this instruction, former demands of the British ambassador to declare the Moscow Patriarchate as schismatic and different from the other Eastern Orthodox patriarchates were emphasized³⁸⁴. When the early Bulgarian demands appeared in the 1850s for a new ecclesiastical institution, the Russian diplomats abstained from the fragmentation of Orthodox community; therefore, they did not back Bulgarian ecclesiastical movement³⁸⁵.

The Ambassadorship of Ignatiev and the Disruption of Russian Pan-Orthodox Policies, 1864-70

Nikolay (Nicholas) Pavlovich Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador at Istanbul, was one of the prominent personalities in the process of formation of the Exarchate because of his practice of personal diplomacy. Ignatiev was born into a highly placed noble family in Russia in 1832, and sat

382 Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism, 1856-70*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 241-82.

383 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 9.

384 Grégoire Troubetzkoi, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit, 1907), p. 2.

385 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 138.

under the prestigious military schools. He had served in the Baltic front during the Crimea War and after the armistice, he participated to the peace negotiations in Paris³⁸⁶. During his service in the Foreign Ministry, he did not get along with Alexander Gorchakov, the Foreign Minister. Gorchakov and his faction were clung to the concept of the European Concert. The main argument was that all European disputes were to be settled. They asserted that this peaceful period would contribute to Russia for economic recovery and domestic reform³⁸⁷.

The attitudes of Asiatic Department were considerably different from the Foreign Ministry. Indigenous and Slavic origin of its staff was one of the reasons in their different attitudes. Most of the staff was composed of people of Russian or Balkan origin in this institution, whereas Baltic Germans dominated the ministry. Moreover, the tsar, Alexander II, had increased the importance of Asiatic Department and appointed Ignatiev, a zealous expansionist and a Pan-Slav, as the chair³⁸⁸.

Russian policies towards the Ottoman Empire had revisionist tendencies in the 1860s. When Ignatiev was appointed as the Russian ambassador to Istanbul in 1864, he had already determined three targets related with the Ottoman Empire. Firstly, the articles of Paris Treaty pertaining to the Black Sea and the cession of Bessarabia had to be revised. Secondly, Russia should insert the control over the Straits through diplomatic channels. Finally, the Balkan Slavs and Russia were to work for reaching the solicited solution in the Eastern Question³⁸⁹. In order to reach his last goal, he struggled to transform the Slav states in the Balkan Peninsula, namely Serbia and Montenegro, to the Russian satellites³⁹⁰. Since he was an ardent Pan-Slavist, West represented the archenemy for him.

When Ignatiev was appointed to Istanbul, three factions had already developed in the Bulgarian national movement in the Ottoman capital. First group named as the 'Olds', who had a conservative approach and usually dealt with commerce and/or agriculture. This party was the backbone of the Bulgarian élites. Second group was called as the 'Youngs', who were generally trained in the foreign universities. This group was tend to the direct action for revolution, unlike the conservative olds. There was a classic 'fathers and sons' relations among the Olds and the Youngs. Even though the chorbazhis, who constituted majority of the 'Olds' faction, would like to strengthen the Greek culture within the Orthodox millet, their 'sons' manipulated the educational institutions in order to overthrow the Greek culture. The principal centers of the Youngs for political

386 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 4.

387 Ibid., p. 8.

388 Ibid., pp. 9-10.

389 Н. П. Игнатъев, 'Записки графа Н. П. Игнатъева, 1875-1877', *Исторический вестник*, vol.1, 1914, pp. 51-55.

390 Ibid., pp. 117-19.

actions were Bucharets, Belgrade, and Odessa, whereas the 'Olds' constituted most of the Bulgarian *nouveau-riche* and élites in Istanbul. After the announcement of the Reform Decree, well-to-do rural élites and merchants (*chorbadji*) continued to be allies of the Sublime Porte in the Bulgarian provinces. Moreover, petty bourgeoisie and small craftsmen started to lead the ecclesiastical movement after the Crimean War, though the magnates had supported the movement in the earlier phase³⁹¹. There was a mutual dependence between the Porte and these propertied élites. Both of them had possibly noticed the menaces posed by the Pan-slavist policies of Russia and nascent nationalistic intellectuals. Thus, the *chorbadji* degraded and seen as collaborators in the period of 'Turkish yoke' by nationalistic intellectuals. This class was equaled with the lack of patriotism in their works³⁹². Third group was the 'Moderates' led by Gavril Krastevich, a leading Bulgarian, cooperated with the Porte, and Teodor Burmov, a known journalist. *Vreme* (The Times) was the favored newspaper of the Moderates³⁹³.

Both 'Young' and 'Old' Extremists had the idea that the church question was essential for the nationalist movement. In their newspapers, *Gaida* and *Makedonia*, they defended that opinion. Both of these group did not abstain from the schism³⁹⁴. Stoyan Chomakov, confirmed leader of those faction, dared to object to Ignatiev and was declared as *persona non grata* by him in the solution of church question. He was educated in the western schools and became the representative of the Bulgarian habitants of Filibe. Around 1864, he had already become there leader of Bulgarian community in Istanbul³⁹⁵. Ignatiev considered Chomakov as a rival in the church question.

Even though Engelhardt claims that Russia incited Bulgarian demands for an independent Bulgarian church and used these demands as an instrument in order to recover its influence over the Ottoman lands after the Crimean War³⁹⁶, Ignatiev attempted to support fellow Slavs but he did not

391 Fikret Adanır, *Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2001), p. 68.

392 The contribution of Vazov's *Under the Yoke* is a brilliant example of this denigration. See Ivan Vazov, *Under the Yoke*, (trans.) Marguerite Alexieva and Theodora Atanassova, (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971), p. 39. There is a symptomatic but caricatured description of *chorbadji* on this page:

Yordan Diamandiev, who was an already old man, and sickly, morose, and irritable, was one of those Bulgarian *chorbadjis* who had made the term odious. His wealth grew apace, his numerous family flourished, his word was respected, but nobody loved him. Old injustices, his robbing of the poor, his intimacy with the Turks, had made him hated even when he no longer did any harm or was able to do any. He belonged entirely to the past.

Not only Yordan Diamandiev, but also members of his household were portrayed as evil people, who against the 'Bulgarian revolutionary apostles', as in the case of his sister, Hadji Rovoahma. For further information about Ivan Vazov and his other works, see Светлозар Игов, *История на Българската Литература*, (Sofia: Ciela, 2001), pp. 275-335.

393 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 45-46.

394 Ibid., pp. 46-47.

395 Ibid., pp. 47-48.

396 Philippe Edouard Engelhardt, *La Turquie et la Tanzimat*, (Paris: A. Cotillon, 1882), pp. 163-66.

want to divide the unity of Eastern Orthodox Church³⁹⁷. When Patriarch Sofronios was compelled to resign because of Bulgarian resistance and diplomatic maneuvers in the Ottoman capital, Ignatiev began to look for a new candidate, who could be beneficial for Russian interests. He prevented the candidacy of Ioakim (Joachim) II, the former patriarch, with this motive. Ignatiev regarded Ioakim as a Russophobe and an ally of France³⁹⁸. He was very influential in the election of Gregorios (Gregory) VI as the patriarch. Gregorios, who was chosen as the Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul again in February 1867, enjoyed a great popularity among the Orthodox people because of his austere and venerable character³⁹⁹.

Thanks to the encouragement of Ignatiev, Gregorios VI, Orthodox Patriarch of Istanbul, suggested a plan for the solution of the question of the Bulgarian Church in 1867. This plan specified a nominal dependence of the future Bulgarian church upon the Patriarchate and its realm of legal authority stretching from the Danube to the Balkan Ranges. This ecclesiastical institution was comprising following dioceses: Vidin, Niš, Köstendil (Kyustendil), Vraça (Vratsa), Sofia, Lofça, Rusçuk (Rousse), Tırnov, Preslav, Silistre (Silistra), and Varna⁴⁰⁰. Notwithstanding, this plan could not provide clarification to the question of mixed dioceses in Macedonia and Thrace as well as that the location of residing place of the head of this ecclesiastical institution in Istanbul, that is to say, the rights of Bulgarians in the imperial capital⁴⁰¹. Since the Extremists, led by Chomakov, dominated the Bulgarian community of Istanbul, Gregorios' suggestion was refused. The Porte also would not like to see a compromise, promoted by the Russian ambassador in Istanbul⁴⁰². The Extremists had demands in order to re-establish the ancient church in Ohrid⁴⁰³.

The Cretan Crisis played an important role in the estrangement process of Greece from Russia, though by 1866, she was following a pro-Greek policy in the Cretan revolt. One year later, France, also supported the Greek cause in Crete and proposed an agreement, which required the annexation of Thessaly, Epirus, and Crete by Greece. Nevertheless, the Luxembourg crisis

397 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 138.

398 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 89.

399 Grégoire Troubetzkoi, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit, 1907), p. 13.

400 Ibid., pp. 15-16.

401 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 83-84.

402 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), pp. 19-20.

403 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 87 and Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 20.

prevented on active entanglement of France to the issue⁴⁰⁴. During the Cretan crisis, the Russian Foreign Ministry and its Embassy at Istanbul followed different paths. While the Foreign Ministry was favor of protection of status quo, Ignatiev gave attention to the creation of Balkan alliance system⁴⁰⁵. Ignatiev was fervent supporter of negotiations between Serbian and Greek diplomats and encouraged the continuation of interrupted negotiations in March 1867; however, negotiations came to a dead stop due to the conflicting territorial aspirations⁴⁰⁶. Due to the Cretan Crisis, both Russia and Greece had to account for the alteration of their policies. Greece was needing Slav allies and the Uniate movement started to threaten the unity of the Orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire.

A group of Bulgarian moderate nationalists suggested a plan, which stipulated the foundation of a dual monarchy between the Orthodox Slavs and Muslims at the beginning of 1867⁴⁰⁷. This proposal was possibly influenced by *Ausgleich* (Compromise) of 1867⁴⁰⁸ in the domain of Austria-Hungary and envisaged that Abdülaziz would be both Ottoman sultan and Bulgarian tsar. A Bulgarian national assembly would elect a governor-general, who would represent Abdülaziz in the Slav lands. A petition formalized by this proposal was presented to the sultan as a barrier against the Greek expansionist ideology, Megali Idea. Besides, formation of an independent Bulgarian Orthodox Church was asked in this petition⁴⁰⁹.

In the same year, France and Russia proposed different reform plans for the prospective reforms in the Ottoman Empire. The French plan anticipated implementation of widespread equal rights for *millet*s, common practice of the mixed education, and coalescence of all peoples of the empire via reduction of religious influence in the *millet* system. The Russian plan, which was doubtlessly objected by the Ottoman statesmen, was envisaging the division of the empire into autonomous regions. Fuad Pasha had described this plan as the foundation of 'Etats désunis de la Turquie' in his meeting with Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador⁴¹⁰. First plan is much more agreeable for Ali and Fuad pashas. These people were relying on British and French supports in face of Russian intentions. Notwithstanding, the defeat of France by the Prussian troops in 1871 compelled

404 Ibid., p. 63.

405 Ibid., pp. 64-66.

406 Ibid., pp. 64-67.

407 Prime mover of the confederation idea was Alexander Exarch. In 1843, he had dispatched petitions demanding the establishment of a confederation between the Orthodox Slavs and Muslims to the foreign ambassadors in Istanbul and the Porte. The appointment of Alexander Exarch to the Embassy in Paris as a consultant in 1867 can be related with this proposal. After this proposal, the Porte might want to send Exarch away due to the suspicion of contact. Both of the events (proposal and appointment) occurred in the same year. However, this appointment can be related with the irreconcilable and ambitious personality of Exarch. See Akşin Somel, 'Aleksandır Ekzarh ve 19.-20. Yüzyıllarda Avrupa'ya Giden 'Bulgar Yolları', *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, vol. 2, (Fall 2005), p. 210.

408 *Ausgleich* of 1867 created the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary remained unified through several ministries and in the form of a single ruler, Emperor-King Franz Joseph.

409 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 155-56.

410 Ibid., pp. 234-35 and Н. П. Игнатъев, 'Записки графа Н. П. Игнатъева, 1875-1877', *Исторический вестник*, 1914, pp. 95-97.

the Sublime Porte to revise her relations with European powers.

While Ali and Fuad pashas meant to whistle up British and French ambassadors, Mahmud Nedim Pasha had established a close contact with Ignatiev. This close relationship was not a secret in the capital. Because of his friendliness to the Russian authorities, he was nicknamed as 'Nedimov'. These friendly relations were probably based on the animosity against the policies of Ali Pasha. The reason why Ignatiev contravened the policies of Âli Pasha was that the empire would be fortified thanks to his policies. Ignatiev's influence has been increasing in the capital since 1871, the date of French-Prussian War. He had also gained the amity of the sultan. After all, he continued to develop Russian foreign policy through preparing conspiracies and inciting revolts among the Balkan Slavs and Armenians in Anatolia⁴¹¹.

Nonetheless, the Greek politicians had resented to the Russian inertness about the issue. The Greeks regarded the Slavs as their arch-enemies and were afraid of a Slav conspiracy in the Balkans. A united action and solution of the ecclesiastical question were seen as impossible developments. In the Greek nationalist milieu, there was a rising anti-Slav sentiments. The publication of this association, *Ο Φαρος του Βοσπορου* (*The Lighthouse of the Bosphorus*), accused Russia of 'exploiting Greek element in favor of the interests of Slav', and warned the Greek community⁴¹². Because of these anti-Slav feelings⁴¹³ in Greece, Ignatiev had to shift his policy from pan-Orthodoxy to pan-Slavism⁴¹³.

As can be observed above, in a very short time, the great powers decided to intervene in the Cretan question, when the possibility of war between Greece and the Ottoman Empire appeared. The Porte was also pleased due to this status quoist intervention and eagerly tried to focus on the church question. Thus, it decided to form a mixed commission under the presidency of Âli Pasha, including three lay Greeks and three lay Bulgarians to investigate the question in 1869. While Alexander Karatheodori, Fotiadis Bey, and Khristos Vitos were representing the Greek community in the commission, Bulgarian group was including Stoyanovich, Hadzhi Ivanko, and Gabriel Khristich Effendi⁴¹⁴. This commission prepared a project. In accord with this project, 74 dioceses of the ecumenical patriarchate would be divided. Whereas the Greek-speaking metropolitan bishops would dominate 37 dioceses and Bulgarian-speaking bishops would rule over 25 of them, the

411 Ibid., pp. 283-84 and Н. П. Игнатъев, 'Записки графа Н. П. Игнатъева, 1875-1877', *Исторический вестник*, 1915, pp. 145-48.

412 Grégoire Troubetzkoi, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit, 1907), p. 30.

413 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 118-22.

414 Grégoire Troubetzkoi, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit, 1907), p. 31.

Serbian-speaking bishops would control 4 of them. Eight dioceses would have mixed priests⁴¹⁵. Nevertheless, the question of territorial extent of the prospective Bulgarian church was blocked negotiations as the major obstacle⁴¹⁶.

When the ecclesiastical conflict began between Greeks and Bulgarians, Ignatiev tried to get the favor of both contending parties in the early phases. He also acted as mediator between insubordinate Bulgarian clerics and the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. With this motivation, he obtained the patriarchal permission for the return of three exiled bishops, Auxentios, Paisios, and Ilarion⁴¹⁷.

Ignatiev admitted the complexities of his double mission in the Ottoman capital. On the one hand, he endeavored to console the Bulgarians and persuaded them not to break the ties with the Greeks because establishment of the church would create a scandal in the Orthodox world. According to him, the foreseen estrangement between the Greeks and Bulgarians would not only trouble the believers, but also drew the attraction of western powers. On the other hand, he struggled to defend the Orthodox community from the Catholic and Protestant propaganda⁴¹⁸. Indeed, he tried to pose a neutral stance, he was indeed a tenacious supporter of church unity and Bulgarian nationalism at the same time⁴¹⁹. For him, Bulgarians were the prime ally of Russia in the Balkans. He regarded that the Greeks, indeed, had already become estranged to Russia. Besides, Austro-Hungarian influence was dangerously powerful over Serbia and Serbian state was weak itself.

The Pronunciation of the *Ferman* (Imperial Decree) and the Establishment of the Exarchate, 1870

When Russian attempts vanished for the solution, the Porte interfered in the question. Âli Pasha, the Grand Vizier, invited two parties in order to come an agreement⁴²⁰. Despite the all efforts of the Porte, the Patriarchate and Bulgarian community of Istanbul could not reach an agreement. At that time, the Slavic metropolitan bishops of Filibe, Sofia, and Lofça presented their resignations to the ecumenical patriarchate⁴²¹. The Porte was obliged to recognize the independent status of the

415 Ibid., p. 33.

416 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 106-07.

417 Ibid., pp. 33-34.

418 Н. П. Игнатъев, 'Записки графа Н. П. Игнатъева, 1875-1877', *Исторически вестник*, 1914, pp. 161-64.

419 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 101-02.

420 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 21.

421 Grégoire Troubetzkoi, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit,

Bulgarian Church due to the pressures of the Russian Embassy. Moreover, through recognition of the Bulgarian ecclesiastical institution, the Porte could perform a *divida et impera* (divide and govern) policy among its Christian citizens. The exact translation of the decree, which grants independency of the Bulgarian Church, to English is as follows⁴²²:

'All loyal subjects and inhabitants of my Empire enjoy, in respect to religion and the practise of their faith, as in all other respects, complete and permanent security, and they should be animated with feelings of good mutual understanding and friendship, as beseems fellow-countrymen and civilized peoples. It is my inmost wish that they should continue to support, to the utmost extent of their power, the efforts which I am constantly making for ensuring the welfare of the country and the progress of civilization.

It is therefore with regret that I have observed the misunderstandings and dissensions, which contrary to this agreeable expectation, have for some time past existed between the Bulgarians of the Orthodox Church and the Greek [*Rum*] patriarch, as regards the spiritual bonds which unite the Patriarchate and the metropolitan bishops and priests of the Bulgarian Church.

In order to bring about a favorable solution of the difficulty, the following decisions have been arrived at as the result of negotiation and deliberations:

- iv) A special spiritual denomination is formed under the name of the Bulgarian Exarchate, which comprises all the dioceses, bishoprics and other places hereinafter set out. It will be invested with authority in all ecclesiastical matters appertaining to the Bulgarian confession.
- v) The highest in rank among the metropolitans of this denomination will be given the title of Exarch; he will be invested with the presidency of the Bulgarian Synod which will be attached permanently his person.
- vi) The internal spiritual administration of the Exarchate will be subject to the confirmation of the Sublime Porte; it will be determined by special regulations which must in all particulars be in harmony with the canonical constitution of the Orthodox Church and the principles of the faith. These regulations are to be so drawn up as to exclude the interference, whether direct or indirect, of the patriarch in the affairs of the Exarchate and more especially in the election of the bishops and the exarch. As soon as the election of the exarch has taken place, the Bulgarian Synod must inform the patriarch, who will draw up without delay the letters

1907), p. 25.

422 This translation is excerpted from Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), pp. 13-15. An Ottoman Turkish version of that ferman can be investigated in the Appendix part of this work.

of confirmation required by the canons of the church.

- vii) The exarch, who is appointed by imperial certificate [*berat*], must make mention in the liturgy of the name of the patriarch of Constantinople, in accordance with the canons of the church. Before taking the steps required by the canon law for the election of the person found worthy of being appointed exarch, the opinion and assent of my government must first be obtained
- viii) The exarch is authorized to address himself directly to the local authorities and whenever necessary to the Sublime Porte in all questions in which he has according to the existing laws the legal right of intervention, and which fall within his spiritual jurisdiction. In particular, the charters for the clergy under his jurisdiction will be delivered at his request.
- ix) In matters relating to the Orthodox faith and requiring an exchange of views and mutual support the Synod of the Exarchate will apply to the Ecumenical Patriarch and his Synod and the latter will hasten to afford the necessary assistance and to furnish the desired answers.
- x) The Synod of the Bulgarian Exarchate must apply to the patriarch of Constantinople for the holy oils required for the use of the church
- xi) The bishops, archbishops and metropolitans of the Patriarchate may without impediment traverse the districts of the Bulgarian Exarchate; the same privilege applies to the Bulgarian bishops, archbishops and metropolitans as regards the diocese belonging to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. They are at liberty to reside temporarily for business purposes at the headquarters of the province [*vilayet*] or at any other place which is the seat of government, but they may not convoke a synod outside the limits of their spiritual jurisdiction; they may not interfere in the affairs of Christians not subject to their spiritual jurisdiction, nor may they celebrate divine service without the consent of the local bishop.
- xii) In the same way as the Jerusalem Monastery in the Phanar is dependent on the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and is subject to the patriarch of Jerusalem, so also the Bulgarian Monastery at the Phanar and the adjoining Bulgarian Church will be dependent on Bulgarian Exarchate. The exarch is authorized to reside in this monastery whenever his duties call him to Constantinople. In all that concerns his arrival at the capital and the exercise of his ecclesiastical rules followed in similar cases by the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch.
- xiii) The spiritual jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Exarchate extends over the metropolitan dioceses of Rusçuk, Silistre, Şumla, Tırnovo, Sofia, Vratsa, Lofça, Vidin, Niş, Piroto, Köstendil, Samokov, Veliko, Varna (excluding the town of Varna and about twenty villages

on the coast of the Black Sea as far as Köstence, the inhabitants of which are not Bulgarians), the district [*sandjak*] of İslimiye without the towns of Ahırcı and Messembria; the kaza of Süzebolu excluding the villages on the coast; Filibe, excluding the town and the district of Stanimaka, the villages of Kokpınar, Vodina, Arnavutköy, Panaya, Novoseli, Laskovo, Arkhlani, Batchkovo, Velestitza, and the monasteries of of Batchkovo, Agios Anargiros, Agia Paraskevi, and Agios Georgios. The Panaya quarter in the city of Filibe will belong to the Bulgarian Exarchate; those of its inhabitants who do not wish to be subject to the Bulgarian Church and Exarchate will be quite free in this respect⁴²³. The details of this arrangement are to be settled between the patriarch and the Exarchate in accordance with the ecclesiastical custom, principles and regulations. If all, or not less than two-thirds, of the inhabitants of Orthodox faith in places other than those abovementioned wish to be subject to the Exarchate in their spiritual affairs, and if this fact is clearly established, they shall be permitted to do as they wish; but such permission is to be granted only on the demand, or with this assent, of the entire population or of at least of two-thirds of the same. All persons who may seek on this pretext to bring about dissensions and disturbances among the population will be prosecuted and punished according to law.

- xiv) The rules affecting monasteries legally dependent on the Patriarchate but situate within the district of the Bulgarian Exarchate will be observed and carried out as heretofore.

As the foregoing provisions appear to meet the legitimate demands of the parties and to be calculated to put an end to the regrettable dissensions which have taken place, they have been agreed to by the government. They will in future have the force of law, and the present decree has been promulgated to give proof of our formal desire that all persons shall refrain from acting contrary to his law or from departing from its provisions.'

The decree of 1870 was very different from the project of Gregorios in 1870⁴²⁴. While the project was promising an autonomous structure for the Bulgarian ecclesiastical institution and underlining the ascendancy of the Patriarchate in the mutual relations, the decree granted an independent status to the Bulgarian Exarchate and bestowed the Bulgarians the right to have an

423 These exceptional provinces overlaps with the Greek-dwelled settlements in Bulgaria. The ethnic Greeks were dwelling in the coastal towns of the Black Sea, especially in the settlements of Burgaz (Burgas), Mesimvria (today's Nesebar), Ahyolu (Ankhialos in Greek and Pomorie in Bulgarian), and Sozopol; and in the urban cities of southern provinces, particularly in the quarter of Stanimaka, today's Asenovgrad. See Lubor Niederle, *La Race Slave: Statistique, Demographie-Anthropologie*, (trans.) Louis Leger, (Paris: F. Alcan, 1911), pp. 196-97.

424 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), pp. 23.

exarch⁴²⁵.

The third article of the decree emphasized the autocephalous status of the Bulgarian Exarchate and stated that the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul could not intervene in its affairs. The required approval of the Porte for the elected exarch, mentioned in the fourth article, was a general requirement within the *millet* system.

The ninth article declared that the Bulgarian church in Istanbul would be belonged to the Bulgarian Exarchate and exarch could dwell there whenever he wanted. In this issue, the Bulgarian Exarch could benefit from the same rights, possessed by the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch. However, the location of central building of Exarchate remained as a question and its place was not determined in the decree.

The tenth article stipulated that the Exarchate would control fifteen bishoprics in the Danubian Bulgaria. The Macedonian sees were excluded except for a small portion ground Veles. The tenth article, the most important clause of the decree, maintained that when a region wanted to adhere to the Exarchate, two-thirds vote of its habitants would be needed. In other words, it required that the Exarchate could gain additional dioceses if two-thirds of the residents of a region confirmed to join to the exarchate. The Exarchate would not have included any diocese in Macedonia and Eastern Thrace. However, 10th article of the decree contemplates the probability of future extensions of the Exarchate into these regions⁴²⁶. Even though the Danubian province and Filibe region were abandoned to the rule of Exarchate, Panagia quarter of Filibe, whose habitants were usually Greeks, constituted an exception. The Bulgarian nationalist intellectuals would regard the borders of the Exarchate as the frontiers of their prospective states⁴²⁷.

Patriarch Gregorios VI objected to the decree, immediately. He asserted that he was incapable of recognizing the validity of the decree and this decree was irreconcilable with the ecclesiastical principles⁴²⁸. When his objection was disregarded by the Porte, he dispatched an official message declaring his intention to resign. However, Âli Pasha did not accept his resignation and declared the contentment of the Porte due to his office⁴²⁹. Mass protestations of the Greek community went after the objection of the Patriarchate. The Greeks performed demonstrations in the streets of Istanbul and shouted as 'Long live our sect! We don't let Bulgarization of our children,

425 Exarch was a rank in the ecclesiastical hierarchy falling between metropolitan bishop and patriarch.

426 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 16.

427 Fikret Adanır, *Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2001), p. 74.

428 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 23.

429 BOA., DED., BBD.

we don't let the Slavs to eat us!"⁴³⁰.

The regulation for the administration of the Bulgarian Exarchate was formulated, simultaneously with the announcement of decree, in 1870. With reference to the regulation, the first exarch would be chosen by the Mixed Council. The candidates of exarch had to fulfill defined requirements:

- a) He must be an Ottoman subject.
- b) He must be Bulgarian by birth.
- c) He must be over forty.
- d) He must receive either literary or ecclesiastical training.
- e) He must have administered a diocese for at least five years.
- f) He must have the universal respect of Bulgarians and non-Bulgarians alike.

The regulation was also stipulating that the synod members were to be chosen by the bishops for four years⁴³¹.

When the demands of some Bulgarian clergymen started for an independent church, both Russians and Ottomans would not like to see any division in the *Rum* millet, one of the confessional autonomous communities in the Ottoman Empire. On the one hand, this division might mean the weakening of the power of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople for Russia. On the other hand, the Ottomans feared about the demands of other non-Greek Orthodox communities. As Crampton indicates⁴³², religious affiliation determines cultural identity in the Ottoman *millet* system; notwithstanding, Bulgarian intellectuals intended to reverse this pattern and tried to make religious affiliation a consequence of national allegiance.

Ignatiev's Last Attempt for Reconciliation, 1870-72

Even after the announcement of declaration in 1870, Ignatiev continued to pursue a consensus among two contending parties. He had figured out that he had a great prestige among the Bulgarian prominent laymen because of his contributions to the declaration. At that time, Patriarch Gregorios retired in June 1871. With this aim of providing a consensus, Ignatiev again did not hesitate to intervene in patriarchal elections and his favorite candidate was Anthimos VI, one of the

430 B. H. Sumner, 'Ignatyev at Constantinople, 1864-1874', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 11, January 1933, p. 571.

431 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 32.

432 Richard J. Crampton, *Bulgaria, 1878-1918: A History*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1983), pp. 27-35.

former patriarchs of Istanbul⁴³³. When Anthimos was elected as the patriarch in September 1871, he contacted with the members of the Bulgarian Church movement immediately in 1871, with the support of Ignatiev, in order to reach a reconciliation, which would be favor of Orthodox interests and essential for the normal development of the Bulgarian Exarchate⁴³⁴. Throughout the meetings, Anthimos wanted the renunciation of the tenth article of the decree and asserted that the exarchate had to possess fixed boundaries. Whereas the Bulgarian party claimed over thirty five dioceses, Anthimos would like to restrict the control of the exarchate with eleven dioceses in the Danubian Bulgaria⁴³⁵. The territorial expansion of the Exarchate was the main issue in the negotiations. Thanks to the persuasion of Anthimos by Ignatiev, the Exarchate gained metropolitan bishoprics in Ohri , Üsküp Monastir, and Köprülü⁴³⁶. This cession would incite the resistance and objections of numerous Greek bishops⁴³⁷. The other group, which disliked these negotiations, was Chomakov-led Extremists. Both of these groups played an important role in the obstruction of negotiations⁴³⁸. Therefore, the impossibility of a consensus was noticed in a very short time.

Despite the fact that he was the most powerful foreign representative in Istanbul after the French-German War 1870-71, he could not succeed to settle the disagreement between the Greeks and Bulgarians by making mutual concessions⁴³⁹. Nonetheless, the French defeat at Sedan in 1870 created a chance for Russian ambassador. Russia unilaterally denounced the articles related with the Black Sea in Paris Treaty. Moreover, Ignatiev produced difficulties for Bulgarian students, who were drawn to the orbit of Robert College⁴⁴⁰.

Since Ignatiev regarded the Orthodoxy as a universal religion, and peaceful relations between the Greeks and Bulgarians were crucial for Russian policies, he sought a reconciliation between Greeks and Bulgarians⁴⁴¹. His goal to preserve the Orthodox unity failed, though he employed all means of personal diplomacy. However, he was successful in his second goal, namely, promotion of the Bulgarian national movement⁴⁴².

The Mixed Council of Bulgarian Clerics and Laymen, which was aware that sympathy of

433 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 163-64.

434 Ibid., p. 165 and Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), pp. 25-26.

435 Ibid., pp. 166-67

436 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 26.

437 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 167-68.

438 Ibid., pp. 172-76.

439 Ibid., pp. 151-54.

440 Ibid., pp. 154-55.

441 Ibid., pp. 191-92.

442 Ibid., pp. 196-97.

the Porte, had to complete its mission as early as possible before the interventions of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul. It chose Ilarion, metropolitan bishop of Lofça (Lovech), as the first exarch on 23 February 1872⁴⁴³. Although Ilarion had applied three times to the patriarch, Anthimos VI, in order to launch divine service in the Bulgarian church, he was refused by the patriarch in each case. On 3 April 1872, Antim I took the office thanks to the imperial letters patent. However, Patriarch Anthimos stated that the newly-elected exarch was to renounce his title and name himself as metropolitan bishop of Vidin again. Later, he added that the Exarchate had to be referred as the Exarchate of the Haemus rather than the Bulgarian Exarchate⁴⁴⁴. On 23 May 1872, Exarch Antim celebrated the Bulgarian liturgy in the Bulgarian church at Phanar district, and he declared the independence of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. Due to this action, the Saint Synod stripped Antim of his ecclesiastical dignity and excommunicated him⁴⁴⁵.

The Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul maintained that the followers of the exarchate were genuine schismatics. The other principal patriarchs in the Ottoman lands -the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem- had promised to Ignatiev that they would not participate in the declaration of schism performed by the Patriarchate of Istanbul⁴⁴⁶. Notwithstanding that the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch supported to the decision of the Patriarchate of Istanbul, those of Jerusalem and Russia and the metropolitanates of Belgrade and All Rumania refused this decision⁴⁴⁷. The Russian attitude, which began to take a favorable stand for the Bulgarian Exarchate, had influenced the metropolitanates of Belgrade and All Rumania⁴⁴⁸.

On 5 January 1872, the day before the Epiphany, Bulgarian community of Istanbul, leading by Chomakov, Sloveykov and Tupchileshtov, again declared that it does not recognize the authority of the ecumenical patriarchate. The Ecumenical Patriarchate formulated its demands in a *takrir* (official note) to Mahmut Nedim Pasha, the grand vizier. In this *takrir*, it demanded the dissolution of illegal assembly in Ortaköy and dismissal of Bulgarian clerics, serving in the Sveti Stefan Church, from Istanbul⁴⁴⁹. Due to the demands of the Patriarchate, the Porte exiled three bishops, Ilarion Makariopolski, Ilarion of Lofça, and Panaret of Filibe, since they conducted the mass in

443 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 17.

444 Ibid., p. 18.

445 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 181 and pp. 189-90.

446 Ibid., pp. 185-87.

447 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), pp. 81-93.

448 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 139.

449 Grégoire Troubetzkoi, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit, 1907), p. 53.

Bulgarian at the Epiphany celebrations on 6 January 1872. Furthermore, the Saint Synod declared Bulgarian movement as a *philetism*, i.e. 'the distinction, disputes, quarrel, jealousies, and divisions among races in the Church of Christ'⁴⁵⁰.

These acts of the Patriarchate incited an effervescence among the Bulgarians of Istanbul⁴⁵¹. The Exarchate tried to increase its influence over the imperial capital and Macedonian bishoprics. It had already nominated the metropolitan bishops of the dioceses of Tırnovo and Samokov on 25 May 1872, that of Filibe was consecrated on 28 May of that year⁴⁵². After the 1870s, the Exarchate tried to insert its influence over the southern dioceses, whereas the Patriarchate attempted to limit the domain of its rival.

The most sinister effects of this nationalist conflict under the guise of an ecclesiastical rivalry were felt in the regions with mixed populations, especially three Macedonian *vilayets*, Kosovo, Monastir, and Salonica. The spiritual aspect of this conflict was overshadowed by the need to affirm prospective territorial claims. The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate prepared the ground for Macedonian Question, one of the most unyielding nationalist disputes in the Balkan history. The activities of the Exarchate and exarchist bands to expand their juridical realm were one of the causes, which sparked the Macedonian question. For the Macedonian dioceses, the Ottoman authorities stipulated the conduct of plebiscite in order to determine whether the Orthodox population opted for the Patriarchate or the Exarchate⁴⁵³. Exarch Antim requested the appointment of the Bulgarian metropolitan bishops to the eparchies of Edirne (Adrianople), Monastir (Bitolya), Ohri (Ohris), Selanik (Thessaloniki), and Üsküp subsequent to the elections from the Porte⁴⁵⁴. Although the Danubian Bulgaria was entrusted to the Bulgarian-speaking metropolitan bishops by the Porte, it avoided from appointment of Bulgarian bishops to the Macedonian dioceses. The Bulgarian habitants of cities above petitioned the Porte for the enforcement of the tenth article of decree⁴⁵⁵. Üsküp and Ohri were two exceptional Macedonian cities in where the Porte took the appeal of Antim into consideration. In accordance with the 10th article of the decree, the habitants of the dioceses would make a decision whether they were devoted to the Exarchate or the Patriarchate. In these regions, the Vlachs also chose to participate the Bulgarian Exarchate⁴⁵⁶. After the first elections Bulgarian bishops of Ohri and Üsküp had gained their *berats* (titles of privilege) from the

450 Ibid., p. 58.

451 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 27.

452 Ibid., p. 28.

453 Ibid., p. 28.

454 BOA. Bİ. No: 116, lef. 2.

455 BOA. Bİ. No. 112, lef. 21-22.

456 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 29.

Porte⁴⁵⁷. In spite of the fact that the Patriarchate objected to the existence of two metropolitan bishops in one diocese⁴⁵⁸, the Bulgarian metropolitan bishops were nominated to these two dioceses.

In order to compete with the Greek influence for the combat of Macedonian dioceses, the Bulgarians would like to have the headquarter of exarchate in Istanbul⁴⁵⁹. An edict, dated to July 1872, allocated Portakaloğlu garden to the Bulgarian community of Istanbul so as to construct the building of Exarchate there⁴⁶⁰. With this decree, the right of the exarch to reside in Istanbul was confirmed. The Bulgarian Mixed Council gathered at the Portakaloğlu garden in Ortaköy quarter in February 1870 for the first time. Despite the objections of Ignatiev, the delegates from Macedonian provinces had also attended this gathering⁴⁶¹.

Formation of the Exarchate was an example of the structural transformations within the *millet* system. Two factors, as can be observed in this case, have been decisive in the transformation of Ottoman *millets* into ethnic groups: reproduction of Ottoman cultural divisions and Western influence over the Ottoman institutions⁴⁶².

The Porte had preferred to alienate the Greeks rather than Bulgarians since the latter group was more numerous. Moreover, Ottoman diplomats thought that the proclamation of that decree could cancel out the Russian influence in the Bulgarian provinces⁴⁶³. Against the view of Aşkın Koyuncu who states that the Porte aimed to cease the struggle between the Greeks and Bulgarians through the proclamation of that decree⁴⁶⁴, we would like to stress that it targeted to fuel the conflict. To state the matter differently, the goal of the Porte was too keep the Greeks and Bulgarian alienated. Ignatiev had also comprehended that the intention of the Sublime Porte was to conduct a *divide et impera* policy, an imperial tactic which was practiced also in the other regions of the empire. Although Mahir Aydın asserts that the issue of Bulgarian national church was saved from abusing by many parties thanks to the pronouncement of the decree in 1870⁴⁶⁵, he passes over

457 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907) p. 18.

458 BOA., MV., 2/42.

459 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 160-61.

460 BOA. Bİ. No: 115. The Exarchate office would remain in Istanbul until 1913. See the Appendix for the copy of this document.

461 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970) pp. 156-58.

462 Fatma Muge Gocek, 'Ethnic Segmentation, Western Education, and Political Outcomes: Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Society', *Poetics Today*, vol. 14, no. 3, Autumn 1993, p. 514.

463 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 130-31.

464 Aşkın Koyuncu, *Bulgar Eksarhlığı*, (Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yakınçağ Tarihi Bilim Dalı, 1998), (unpublished MA thesis), pp. 108-09.

465 Mahir Aydın, *Osmanlı Eyaletinden Üçüncü Bulgar Çarlığına*, (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 1996), pp. 77-78.

Ottoman abuses about the issue, especially in the subject of competition between the Greeks and Bulgarians over the Macedonian dioceses. The Ottoman central administration was inclined to split the Orthodox people so as to implement a more efficient control over them in the second half of the 19th century. Exclusive promises of the Sublime Porte to both sides confirmed Ignatiev's premonitions⁴⁶⁶. The factioning between the Greeks and Bulgarians was enjoyable for the Ottoman statesmen. Through implementing Bulgarian demands, the Porte created the impression that it would grant more rights to its Christian citizens so as to hinder foreign pressures-at the same time; however, it divided its Christian citizens.

Formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate: A Philetism?

On 16 September 1872, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople excommunicated the followers of the Bulgarian Exarchate for the sin of 'philetism'. The term 'philetism' means literally 'clannishness'⁴⁶⁷. Was the formation of this ecclesiastical institution a 'genuine' philetism? Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate would introduce a novelty in Orthodox doctrine and practices. In the case of recognition of the Exarchate, the Ecumenical Patriarchate was compelled to admit that the ethnic principle played an role in ecclesiastical organization as opposed to the territorial delimitations. At one time, in 1589, the Ecumenical Patriarchate had recognized the metropolitans of Moscow as patriarchs of Moscow and all Russia since the influence zone of this institution was limited with the lands of Tsardom of Russia. Moreover, the Patriarchate of Moscow did not put in a claim for the dioceses of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

In face of this modernist challenge, the main argument of the Ecumenical Patriarchate was that the destiny of the ecumenic Orthodox realm cannot be reduced to that of a single ethnic group or race⁴⁶⁸. With the formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate, a separate ecclesiastical institution based on the ethnic identity rather than territory would be established in the same political body for the first time in the Orthodox realm.

Aftermath

In 1875, Russian influence had incredibly augmented in the Ottoman capital. Mahmud

466 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 28.

467 Spas T. Raikin, 'Nationalism and the Bulgarian Orthodox Church', *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics*, (ed.) Pedro Ramet, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989), pp. 354-55.

468 P. Jivko Panev, 'Introduction aux sources de la tradition canonique de l'église', *Tradition Canonique de l'Eglise*, (eds.) P. Grigorios Papatthomas and P. Jivko Panev, (Paris: Institut de Théologie Orthodoxe 'Saint Serge', 1995), pp. 11-24.

Nedim had been appointed as prime minister with the support of Ignatiev⁴⁶⁹. He continued to carry out a favorable policy for Russian interests. As a matter of fact, Ignatiev was intent on benefiting from Herzegovinian revolt as much as possible and preventing an Austro-Hungarian intervention⁴⁷⁰. This uprising expanded to Bosnian province and was upheld by the limited number of Serbian, Montenegrin, and other Slav volunteers from Austria-Hungary and Russia. In spite of the fact that European public opinion favored mutineers, the European powers would not like to accelerate the dissolution of the empire. Even Austria-Hungary and Russia preferred the application of further regulations consistent with their interests in Bosnia and Herzegovina; however, the question was already internationalized⁴⁷¹.

Sultan was imprudent to form a new government. In face of this situation, three different dispositions developed among the Ottoman political milieu. First group was claiming that the Ottoman Empire had to be organized on the basis of autonomous provinces as a federal state. Midhat Pasha, who was experienced on the administration of Danubian and Baghdad provinces, was the representative of this tendency. Second group argues that a principal law, which could fasten all citizens to each other, has to be legislated and any discrimination based on religion, language, and ethnicity has to be inhibited. Last group was struggling in order to plant a nationalist ideology for both Muslims and Christians. Ignatiev objected to these three movements.

Three events affected the emergence of 'the Great Eastern Crisis'. First of all, the Ottoman treasury declared that it would cease the half of interest payments to the creditor states. Secondly, the Three Emperors' League, including Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, started to make pressure for European control over the *Tanzimat* reforms. Thirdly, the bloody events in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and especially Bulgaria created political reactions in the European, particularly British, public opinion⁴⁷². William Gladstone, leader of British Liberal Party, conducted a great election campaign against Disraeli government. He had criticized policies of Benjamin Disraeli towards the Ottoman Empire and underlined massacres in the Bulgarian districts. In his work about 'Bulgarian massacres', Gladstone employed the rhetorical commonplaces, which could have been drawn from any source related with Christian values and humanity⁴⁷³. Disraeli, who would not like to lose the support of the Conservatives and prime ministry, was compelled to be moderate against

469 B. H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880*, (North Haven: Archon Books, 1962), p. 145.

470 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 307-08.

471 Ibid., pp. 311-12, B. H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880*, (North Haven: Archon Books, 1962), p. 145, and R. W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question: A Study in Diplomacy and Party Politics*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1972).

472 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp.333-48.

473 Alexander Kiossev, 'Gears behind the Stage: Rhetorical Structures of the National Imagination/s', *Mythistory and Narratives of the Nation in the Balkans*, (ed.) Tatjana Aleksic, (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), p. 118.

Russia in the Istanbul Conference. Moreover, he had to consent the election of Lord Salisbury (Robert Cecil), pro-Russian Secretary of State for India, as the British representative.

1876 April Revolt (*Aprilsko Vastanie*) is canonized as the heroic culmination of the national revival and the central heroic-martyr event in the Bulgarian national memory⁴⁷⁴. The 'martyrs', who lost their lives in this struggle, were represented as 'fighters', who would like to contribute to the 'progress of the enlightened nations'⁴⁷⁵. After two years, first self-governing Bulgarian state will be established since the Medieval Ages. However, the Bulgarians could not establish this state thanks to a revolutionary struggle since the revolt was suppressed within a month. Furthermore, establishment of a Bulgarian Principality created a shock among some Bulgarian intellectuals and prospective statesmen because of their unreadiness. The April Uprising exhibited the weakness of Bulgarian nationalism. Moreover, the Bulgarian intelligentsia had failed to understand the unwillingness of Bulgarian peasants to confront the power of the Ottoman Empire. Although the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee (BRCC)⁴⁷⁶, founded in Bucharest, played the organizer role during the revolt, the strategy of insurgents had no clear sense of goals. This revolutionary committee could not inflame the population. Bulgarian peasants, who were tailored as soldiers of the Bulgarian nationalist movement by the intelligentsia, were not in the habit of carrying arms, unlike the Herzegovinian peasants⁴⁷⁷.

With the establishment of the BRCC in the 1870s, four Bulgarian nationalist intellectuals, Georgi Rakovski, Vasil Levski, Lyuben Karavelov, and Hristo Botev, planned a conspiracy against the Ottoman rule in Bulgarian vilayets. Despite the fact that the April Uprising failed in 1876 and led to a great catastrophe, these figures were heroized by the authors, historians, and men of letters of the new Bulgarian state in the 1880s and 1890s. Even today, Rakovski, Levski, Karavelov, and Botev were the central icons of the Bulgarian national identity as 'the heroes of revolution'. These four people had different places in political spectrum. Although all of them can be accepted as nationalist intellectuals, their ideas were varying and there were minor differences among themselves. Rakovski, creator of Bulgarian revolutionary tradition⁴⁷⁸, was a political activist and agitator and Levski was a strong nationalist, whereas nationalist ideas of Karavelov were influenced by the idea of Balkan confederation, which would block nationalist struggles in the peninsula. According to him, if the peoples in the peninsula could not implement this idea, they would become

474 Ibid., p. 109.

475 Ibid., p. 108.

476 For further information about the BRCC, Vangel K. Sugareff, 'The Constitution of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 4, no. 4, (December 1932), pp. 572-80.

477 Cevdet Paşa, *Tezahir*, vol. 3, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991), pp. 24-37.

478 C. E. Black, 'The Influence of Western Political Thought', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 48, no. 3, (April 1943), p. 510.

tools of the great states. Like Karavelov, Rakovski also supported the idea of Balkan confederation. He accentuated political liberties and had admiration for the constitutional monarchies of Western Europe. According to him, European nationalism and liberalism could be solutions to the problems of prospective Bulgaria⁴⁷⁹. Yet, Karavelov disliked the trust of Rakovski over *chetes* (brigands), which would bring success to the revolution, according to Rakovski. Karavelov followed the precepts of some Russian *narodniks* and claimed that people have to be educated by a small number of dedicated 'apostles' before a successful uprising. All in all, these figures of the April uprising were idealist and fearless people. Nonetheless, they had prepared incredible sorrows to their prospective compatriots, who were persecuted by the Ottoman irregular forces (*bashibazouks*) after ill-planned rebel.

There have been some rumors about Russian incitements for a revolt on the Montenegrin border and other Slav provinces since the 1870s. In May 1876, news about attacks of Bulgarian revolutionaries directed to the Muslim villages reached to the Ottoman capital⁴⁸⁰. Whereas Ottoman authorities regarded this revolt as attacks of Bulgarian brigands, European public opinion had believed it to be 'the Bulgarian massacres'. The Muslim masses were agitated throughout the empire. For instance, French and German consuls in Selanik were killed by a mob after the protests of Muslim groups. In Istanbul, people started to elicit a reaction against the activities of Ignatiev and his companion, Mahmud Nedim Pasha⁴⁸¹. Subsequent to the demonstrations, the government of Mahmud Nedim was toppled and anti-European, especially anti-Russian, sentiments ascended in the Ottoman public opinion. After the death of Abdülaziz in June 1876, Ignatiev deliberately spread murder gossips related with his death so as to enlarge the chaotic atmosphere in the Ottoman capital⁴⁸².

The Ottoman statesmen were striving to declare the constitution (*Kanun-i Esasi*) as soon as possible. By means of this development, Istanbul Conference would be reduced to an absurd gathering⁴⁸³. 1876 Constitution, which was the apex of the Tanzimat reform period, exhibited the self-defensive intentions of the empire in its first article, which argued that 'the empire cannot be divided at any time whatsoever, any cause whatsoever'⁴⁸⁴.

When Russia waged war against the Ottoman Empire in 1877, Russian diplomatic authorities claimed that Russia acted in behalf of non-Muslims of the Ottoman Empire.

479 Ibid., p. 510.

480 Vangel K. Sugareff, 'The Constitution of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Committee', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 53, December 1932, pp. 372-80.

481 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 323-25.

482 Ibid., pp. 341-42.

483 Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), pp. 256-71.

484 Roderic Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordion Press, 1973), pp. 5-6.

Nonetheless, many Christian deputies objected to the Russian claims in the Ottoman assembly. Manok Efendi, deputy of Aleppo (Halep), stated that Christians living in the Ottoman realm did not need a Russian protection. Besides, Nufel Efendi, deputy of Damascus, mentioned from the long-term good relations between the Sublime Porte and non-Muslims. The Bulgarian deputies, such as Karamihaloğlu Yorgi from Edirne (Adrianople), Dimitri from Selanik (Thessaloniki), Misho Todari and Zahari from Sofia, and Istefanaki and Dimitraki from Danubian province, did not abstain from declining Russian allegations. They declared that '(...) we, Bulgarian subjects of the Ottoman Empire, reject such claims. Our intentions are to work for the Ottoman nation founded under the Constitution (...)'⁴⁸⁵.

Following to the April Uprising, the relations were strained between the Porte and the Exarchate. When the revolt erupted in the towns located on the Stara Planina in 1875, the Greek side was strong-willed to exploit this turmoil, and claimed that the Bulgarians were disturbers of the peace, whereas the Greeks remained loyal to the empire⁴⁸⁶. After the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-78, the Synod with its four bishops was compelled to operate in the lands of the Bulgarian Principality. Hence, there was not any synodical gathering in the Ottoman provinces after 1878.

The Serbian ecclesiastical authorities did not hesitate to interfere in the struggle between the Patriarchate and the Exarchate in favor of the former one, though their activities were much more limited in the Macedonian provinces, when compared to those of Patriarchists and the Exarchists. The metropolitan bishop of Belgrade, Mihailo Jovanović dispatched an official message to the Patriarchate in which the dioceses of Ohri (Ohrid) and Peć as parts of old Serbia should not remain under the domain of the Bulgarian Church. Notwithstanding, Ignatiev warned Bogičević, the Serbian ambassador in Istanbul, that ' [...] their interference is contrary to [their] real interests [...]'⁴⁸⁷.

When Russia declared war against the Porte on 24 April 1877, Bulgarian exarch, Antim, was replaced by the Porte. The petitions of some Bulgarians mentioning from the maladministration of Exarch⁴⁸⁸ were used as pretext by the Porte in order to remove Antim from his post and exile him to Ankara⁴⁸⁹. On 6 May 1877, Yosif, the metropolitan bishop of Lofça (Lovech), was chosen as the

485 Enver Ziya Karal, 'Non-Muslim Representatives in the First Constitutional Assembly, 1876-77', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 396-97.

486 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 19.

487 Thomas A. Meininger, *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 109.

488 BOA. Bİ. No. 170, lef. 1, and Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 20.

489 BOA. Bİ. No. 178/22.

new exarch. Furthermore, the Porte put an end to the appointments of metropolitan bishops of Üsküp (Skopje) and Ohri until the 1890s and these sees have remained vacant for a decade.

After the war, since the newly established Principality of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia remained under the control of exarchate and the exarchate would not have any bishoprics out of these political units, the Greeks had proposed that the exarch should abandon Istanbul and resettle in Filibe (Plovdiv) or Sofia⁴⁹⁰. Following years witnessed tightened relations between the Porte and Exarchate till 1881.

All questions related with the school system were handled by the education department of exarchate. The exarch himself supervised the priests' seminary in Istanbul. Furthermore, there was a clerical seminary in Üsküp, which targeted to supply priests to parishes. The Exarchate was assigning an inspector for four provinces, Selanik, Kosovo, Monastir, and Edirne⁴⁹¹. The process of opening of new schools was difficult but not impossible. Firstly the prominent community members had to meet with the president of the council of the Bulgarian community. And then teachers were to be chosen, the curriculum of school was to be determined, and lists of textbooks and teachers' names were to be forwarded to *kaymakam* (head official of a district). The *kaymakam* should convey these documents to school inspector of the province⁴⁹².

After the war, improvements in the conditions of the Bulgarian schools were made⁴⁹³. The number of Bulgarian schools in the Macedonian provinces were multiplied in the last quarter of the 19th century. In 1876, there were about 350 Bulgarian schools in the region. This number would increase to 800 by 1900⁴⁹⁴. Moreover, the Turkish commissioners instead of Greek bishops would supervise the Bulgarians schools. At that time, the authority of Turkish commissioners had been enlarged over also the Greek schools. Hence these dispositions can be regarded as precautions, which targeted to bring the education of Christians under the control of the state⁴⁹⁵.

Following to the establishment of the Bulgarian Principality, Stambolov régime employed the Exarchate as a tool to foster the development of Bulgarian national identity in the Ottoman lands, especially in the Macedonian provinces and Thrace. Adherence to the Bulgarian Exarchate meant to have a pro-Bulgarian orientation among the Balkan Slavs in the post-1878 period. Thus, the Ottoman statesmen were cautious about this institution and limited the permissions for the

490 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 22.

491 Ibid., p. 40.

492 Ibid., pp. 40-41.

493 Ibid., p. 24.

494 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 145.

495 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 24.

appointment of Bulgarian bishops. The first appointments of bishops could be made twelve years after the Berlin Treaty. In July 1890, a new imperial decree permitted the re-establishment of two Bulgarian bishoprics out of the Bulgarian Principality and the province of Eastern Rumelia. These first bishoprics was located in Üsküp (Skopje) and Ohrid⁴⁹⁶. In 1894, new Exarchist bishoprics could be founded in Nevrokop and Veles (Köprülü).

Thanks to Berlin Treaty, juridicial authority of the Metropolitanate of Belgrade extended to the dioceses of Niš , Pirot and the region of Vranja, a part of diocese of Üsküp⁴⁹⁷. After the Serbo-Bulgarian War of 1885, which was the result of annexation of Eastern Rumelia by the Bulgarian Principality, anti-Bulgarian propaganda, encouraged by Serbian statesmen, began to flourish in the Macedonian provinces. In the first phase of Macedonian conflict, the Serbian demands were limited only with Kosovo province, so-called Old Serbia. Nevertheless, in the oncoming phases, the Serbian teachers established schools, continued to recognize the authority of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul, and cooperated with this institution against the Exarchate⁴⁹⁸. all of these developments demonstrated that the Serbian party was emerging as a new contender in the region. The new role of Serbia can be noticed in the official letters sent to the Serbian diplomatic representatives in July 1904 by Nikola Pašić, Prime Minister of Serbia:

[...] to protect our compatriots from the damaging consequences of the monopoly of Patriarchal organs which have placed themselves in the service of Hellenism to the detriment of the non-Greek adherents to the Patriarchal church; and to counter the activity of Exarchate agents whose committees are appearing with weapon in those areas of eminent interest to us: Poreč, Kičevo, Drimkol, Dibra [Debar], Köprülü⁴⁹⁹.

Ethniki Etairia (the National Association), the leading Greek nationalist institution⁵⁰⁰, was targeting the annexations of Macedonian provinces and Crete. In the 1890s, the Cretan question had risen again. A small army was landed to the island under the command of the Crown Prince Konstantin (Constantine) in 1897. After this landing, great powers of Europe suggested the grant of autonomy to Crete; however, Greece and the Ottoman Empire had already declared war against each other. The result of the war was a clear Ottoman victory. The most important adverse effect of this war to the Macedonian provinces was the dissolution of network of Greek agents there.

The Ottoman authorities had pragmatist attitude towards the demands of the Bulgarian

496 Ibid., p. 25.

497 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 30.

498 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 100.

499 Fikret Adanır, *Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2001), p. 222.

500 For *Megali Idea*, the Greek expansionist project, see Richard Clogg, 'The Byzantine Legacy in the Modern Greek World: The Megali Idea', *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe*, (ed.) L. Clucas, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1988), pp. 253-81.

Exarchate for inauguration of new metropolitan bishoprics. For example, in 1890, the Bulgarian habitants of Monastir, Pirlepe (Prilep), and Köprülü demanded the appointment of the exarchist metropolitan bishops⁵⁰¹; however, the Porte rejected these demands not to alienate the Patriarchate. The Ottoman authorities were setting the Greeks and Bulgarians quarreling. Another example shows that during the Greco-Ottoman War of 1897, three more titles of privilege were delivered for the dioceses of Monastir, Strumitsa (Ustrumca) and Debre (Debar) due to the application of the Russian ambassador⁵⁰². Inauguration of new bishoprics was a victory for the Exarchate. Moreover, the Greek revolutionaries could not rebuild the network of agents in the post-war period.

The Bulgarian, Serbian, and Greek statesmen were competing with each other in order to exhibit that they were forming the majority in the Macedonian provinces. However, all of them used different manipulation methods so as to prove their rights over these lands in statistics. Even the meaning of terms of 'Macedonia' and 'Macedonian provinces' were different for them. Although the Ottoman authorities regarded three provinces (*Vilayat-i Selase*), including Kosovo, Monastir, and Selanik, as the reform region and rarely employed the term Macedonia, authorities of these three states defined Macedonia through discretionary criteria. To illustrate, the Greeks excluded Kosovo province and Elbasan district, belonging to Monastir province, in their statistics. The Bulgarians regarded their former lands, which was lost by the Treaty of Berlin, as Macedonia. Seeing that the Serbians form smaller community than the Greeks and Bulgarians, they put in a claim for so-called 'Old Serbia', Kosovo region⁵⁰³.

After the establishment of the Exarchate in 1870, unlawfulness of Ottoman posts continued. The malicious intentions of the Sublime Porte can be noticed in that statistical tables on the basis of former Ottoman censuses prepared by the command or Hilmi Pasha, Inspector-General of reform provinces from 1902 to 1908. In these tables, only the numbers of Christian communities were determined. Since the Ottoman civilians considered Bulgarians as chief grave-diggers in the Macedonian question, they had taken the side of Greek and Serbian bands at the end of the 1890s⁵⁰⁴. Hilmi Pasha's census was a further stage in these arbitrary practices. To illustrate, if the oldest male member of the family had allegiance to the patriarchal cause, all family members were registered as Greeks regardless of any statement that they were adhered to the Bulgarian Exarchate⁵⁰⁵.

501 BOA. Bİ. No. 895-97.

502 Anastas Ishirkov, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918), p. 33.

503 Ibid., pp. 34-39.

504 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907) pp. 95-96.

505 Ibid., p. 90.

In this census, there were three types of dioceses: dioceses in which the Exarchate possesses bishoprics; those in which the Exarchate possesses no bishoprics, but it is officially represented; and those in which the Exarchate is not officially represented. The Greeks constituted a crushing majority in the last group of bishoprics, namely, Karaferye (Veroia), Aikaterini, Kassandra, and Vize (Vizii in Greek). In the first category of bishoprics, i.e, Debre , Ohri, Üsküp, Köprülü, Monastir, Ustrumca, and Nevrokop, the Exarchist Bulgarians outnumbered another ones. The situation in the second category-dioceses in which the Exarchate did not have any bishoprics, but it was officially represented- was the most complicated one. Whereas the combination of Patriarchist Bulgarians and Greeks formed majority in the westernmost dioceses, such as Kesriye (Kastoria), Vodina (Edessa), Selanik, Serez (Serres), and Drama⁵⁰⁶, the Exarchist Bulgarians were more crowded in the easternmost dioceses, İskeçe (Xanthi), Gümülcine (Komotini), Dimetoka (Didimotheikho), and Edirne (Adrianople)⁵⁰⁷. The importance of Patriarchist Bulgarians must not be considered as too little in the western dioceses. Their existence was very crucial for the formation of majority in the dioceses of Selanik⁵⁰⁸, Vodina⁵⁰⁹, and Serez. Nevertheless, there were, of course, exceptions in this eastern-western modelling. Although Kukuş (Kilkis) was located in the west, most of its habitants was adhered to the Exarchate. And Christian residents of Enes⁵¹⁰ (Ainos) and Ereğli (Irakleia) were supporters of the Patriarchate in the east. Another important fact was that the non-Bulgarian Orthodox Christians- the Vlachs, Albanians and Serbians, in a limited scale- continued to be devoted to the Patriarchate, apart from the exceptional cases of Üsküp, Monastir, and Ohri. Especially the Grecophone Vlach communities supported the Patriarchist cause in northwestern Macedonia.

The Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul called Patriarchist Bulgarians as 'Bulgarophone Greeks'. The historians of the Greek nation-state came up with theses which intended on proving that these 'Bulgarophone Greeks' were genuine Greeks. According to this theory, they were forced to settle in the region between Stara Planina and Rhodopa Planina by medieval Bulgarian tsars. Despite the fact that they lost their mother-tongue there, they continued to be devoted to the Patriarchate. They even retained their Greek knowledge in some cases⁵¹¹.

506 Similar to many Thracian dioceses, the Muslims were the most numerous community in Drama, though the Greeks were the most crowded Christian ethnic group. The Exarchist Bulgarians were persecuted by the Greek bands with the collaboration of Ottoman authorities in an unbelievable scale, especially after the Ilinden uprising of 1903.

507 For all that the Exarchists did not possess any official bishopric, they formed a clear majority in this diocese.

508 Most of the Bulgarians did not recognize the Exarchate there. Ibid., p. 63.

509 Majority of the Bulgarian population remained loyal to the Patriarchate. The Bulgarian demands for Exarchist authority were met by the objections of the Ottoman authorities. Many Bulgarians, who ventured to abandon the patriarchal cause, were forced to exile from the diocese, Ibid., p. 64.

510 The Ottoman authorities intended to prevent all conversions to the Exarchate.

511 Ibid. pp. 92-93. For a detailed account of mutual relationships between emergence of state-sponsored historiography and nation-building in Greece, see Effi Gazi, 'Nationalist Ideology, Scientific Disciplines, and

The church and the school were the most important institutions, which hold the key of a settlement's identity. In the 1890s, influence of IMRO (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/ Vatrashna Makedono-Odrinska Revolyutsionna Organizatsia in Bulgarian) was increasing over these institutions in the Macedonian provinces. Although governing cadres of IMRO⁵¹² promised to include all ethnic groups in the Macedonian provinces, the Slavic element dominated it. Thus, the Greeks, Hellenized Vlachs, and Albanians shared a common hostility against the members of the IMRO. As the IMRO strengthened more, the cooperation between the Patriarchists, including Vlachs and Albanians, and the Ottoman authorities increased.

The establishment of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in 1870 increased the conflicts between Greek and Bulgarian clerics for control of the Orthodox ecclesiastical buildings (and schools⁵¹³). This conflict was acknowledged as a crucial national problem because the priest (and teachers) could be very effective in determining 'the national allegiance' of the local community. In other words, allegiance to an ecclesiastical institution, was regarded as the most practical path for determining the national commitment of the settlement. To illustrate, if residents of a village declares that their village church belonged to the Patriarchate, this act could make them Greeks irrespective of their vernacular language and common past. Therefore, conversions and shifting identities were very common especially in the rural settlements and ethnic identities were intertwined in the Macedonian provinces:

I was talking to a wealthy peasant who came in from a neighboring village to Manastir [Monastir] market. He spoke Greek well, but hardly like a native. 'Is your village Greek', I asked him, 'or Bulgarian?'. 'Well,' he replied, 'it is Bulgarian now, but four years ago it was Greek.' The answer seemed to him entirely natural and commonplace. 'How,' I asked in some bewilderment, 'did that miracle come about?'. 'Why,' he said, 'we are all poor men, but we want to have our own school and a priest who will look after us properly. We used to have a Greek teacher. We paid him 5 pound a year and his bread, while the Greek consul paid him another 5 pound; but we had no priest of our own. We shared a priest with several other villages, but he was very unpunctual and remiss. We went to the Greek bishop to complain, but he refused to do anything for us. The Bulgarians heard of this and they came and made us an offer. They said they would give us a priest who would live in the village and a

Intellectual Fields in Greece', *Südost-Forschungen*, vol. 58, 1999, pp. 247-65.

512 For Macedonian question and the role of IMRO, see Fikret Adanır, *Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2001), Mehmet Hacısalıhoğlu, *Jön Türkler ve Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008), and Anastasia Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), pp. 77-137.

513 As Akşin Somel shows, the Reform Decree prepared the favorable environment for establishment of their own schools to the officially recognized religious communities in 1856. See Selçuk Akşin Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908*, (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 42-54. After that time, schooling network developed fast among the Bulgarian communities and the imperial decree in 1870, which confirmed the foundation of the Exarchate, meant the official recognition of existing Bulgarian schools by the Porte.

teacher to whom we need pay nothing. Well, sirs, our is a poor village, and so of course we became Bulgarians.⁵¹⁴

514 Henry Noel Brailsford, *Macedonia: Its Races and Their Future*, (London: Methuen, 1906), p. 102.

CONCLUSION

The Greek Orthodox *millet*, more or less, had been buffeted about by the political developments in the 19th century, such as the establishment of the Greek kingdom, declaration of expansionist policy of Greece (*Megali Idea*) in 1844, and the recognition of the autonomy of the Church of Greece in 1850. Nevertheless, foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate would constitute the most severe blow to the unity and existence of the *Rum millet*. After the foundation of this institution, the Greek and Bulgarian élites would form their states, and the so-called national and religious institutions on mutually-exclusivist heritages.

The Orthodox religious tradition of the Balkan peoples, which is still important in the region, was deformed by the nationalist quarrels in the 19th century⁵¹⁵. With the collapse of the ecumenic Orthodox community⁵¹⁶, 'national allegiance' became a personal and communal preference. The violent struggles among the national leaders of Greek, Serbian, and Bulgarian groups focused on maps and population statistics and each of them maintained that their own groups constituted the majority in the disputed territories of the Balkan Peninsula. In order to put an end to the quarrel of maps and statistics, the Sublime Porte decided to arrange a new census with the assistance of representatives of these groups in 1906. The group, which comprised majority in accord with the results, could appoint the priest. If the different ethnic groups were more or less in equal numbers, each group could entrust its own priest⁵¹⁷.

The new notions of secular statehood and nationality, ideas of the Enlightenment and Romanticism, disrupted religiously-defined collective identities and Orthodox unity in the southeastern edge of Europe. Throughout the 19th century, nationhood was articulated as a normative standard in Europe. Nationalist movements targeted to abrade 'the earlier bonds of shared spiritual values'. And the religious institutions were embedded in political and nationalistic quarrels⁵¹⁸. The shared past of the Orthodox peoples, which prevailed over a chiliad, began to be shattered because of rival nationalisms. The *millet-i Rum* (Greek Orthodox *millet*) would be

515 Paschalis M. Kitromilides, 'Modernization as an Ideological Dilemma in Southeastern Europe: from National Revival and Liberal Reconstruction', *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy: Studies in the Culture and Political Thought of South-Eastern Europe*, (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994), p. 75.

516 In the previous centuries, people generally had allegiance to tribes, feudal lords, households and/or religions. After the rise of nationalism in the 19th and 20th centuries, nation emerged as the most common form of belonging and loyalty. See interpretation of Eric Hobsbawm about the dissolution of the mainland empires in Eastern Europe and emergence of the paradigm of ethnically homogenous nation-states, Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 146-50.

517 Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), p. 75.

518 Paschalis M. Kitromilides, 'From Orthodox Commonwealth to National Communities: Greek-Russian Intellectual and Ecclesiastical Ties in the Ottoman Era', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 16.

replaced by national belongings created by new nation-states. The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate pointed out the non-uttered but foreboded end of the ecumenical character Orthodoxy as main element of the identity of Christians in the region.

Violence and secular parochialism, which were the by-products of nationalism, posed a serious menace against ecumenic character of Orthodoxy and universalism of the Great Church of Christ⁵¹⁹. Secular states, which started to form in the Balkan Peninsula after the first two decades of the 19th century, would intervene into the realm of church⁵²⁰. Although the Ecumenical Patriarchate had a reserve against nationalist ideas, the regional/national churches of the Balkan states had become apparatuses of nation-states and were nationalized⁵²¹. These nationalized churches became the instruments of Balkan nationalisms, though the Patriarchate adhered to the principles of *Tanzimat*⁵²².

Another outcome is that the nationalistic movements of the Balkan peoples were directed against the domination of Greek element and that of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul in religious affairs as well as Ottoman political rule in the second half of the 19th century. Due to the challenge of Bulgarian schism, the patriarchate was obliged to review its precedences. The Holy Synod had failed to find a solution to the Bulgarian question in 1872 and could not prevent the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, though it organized protest movements. The Bulgarian Exarchate would appear as the major tool for the promotion of Bulgarian demands in the Macedonian provinces. Traditional methods proved of little use in dealing with nationalism and the Pan-Slavist threat grew stronger in both Macedonian provinces and Thrace⁵²³. The Patriarchist metropolitan bishops took militant national stands in order to counter the rival clerics. These two rival groups fought over the ecclesiastical institutions and schools since the administration of schools was determined within the framework and limitations of the *millet* system.

These developments precipitated the employment of the patriarchate by the Greek nationalism. Greek consular staffs were employed along with ecclesiastical authorities, attached to the patriarchate, in collection of data useful for establishing the demographic characteristics of the

519 The Holy Great Church of Christ is another denomination used for the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul.

520 Paschalis M. Kitromilides, 'The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the 'National Center'', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007), p. 7.

521 Paschalis M. Kitromilides, 'Imagined Communities' and the Origins of the National Question in the Balkans', *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy: Studies in the Culture and Political Thought of South-Eastern Europe*, (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994), p. 181.

522 Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 140.

523 C. E. Kofos, 'Attempts at Mending the Greek-Bulgarian Ecclesiastical Schism (1875-1902)', *Balkan Studies*, vol. 25, 1984, pp. 6-12 and C. E. Kofos, 'Patriarch Joachim III (1878-84) and the Irredentist Policy of the Greek State', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 4, 1986, pp. 107-121.

Ottoman Greeks in Anatolia and Thrace between 1910 and 1912⁵²⁴. There is no any reason to doubt the nationalistic motives of this action. Dimitrios Kallergis, the Greek Foreign Minister in 1910, was the architect of this census. He also proposed that Orthodox clerics should assist the consular authorities in their region. The Greek government was bent on learning the genuine size of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire, since the principle of proportional representation in the Ottoman assembly was again functioning after 1908. Moreover, owing to the fact that the Young Turk regime had introduced military service as an obligation for also non-Muslims, Greek government needed to know the number of Greek soldiers in the Ottoman army. The use of Greek census of 1912 by the Greek diplomats with the aim of legitimizing their expansionist efforts formed a prejudgment for authenticity of this document⁵²⁵.

Through the educational and literary societies (*sylogoi*), Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul tried to Hellenize the Orthodox populations in the Macedonian and Anatolian provinces⁵²⁶. Greek clerics, who corroborated with nationalist brigands and irregulars, was first seen in the Cretan and Macedonian struggles; and then in the Greco-Turkish War of 1919-22 and finally in the Cyprus dispute. The ethnarchic tradition of the Christian Orthodoxy had already been crumbled. The Bulgarian schism and the Pan-Slavist movement had played an important role in the transformation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate into a functional tool of Greek nationalism. A commentator could argue that this priest figure, who collaborated with nationalist armed groups, was not peculiar to the Balkans and can be seen in metropolitan sees of Anatolia, as in the cases of Khrisostomos (Chrysostomos) Kalafatis of Izmir (Smyrna), Agathangelos of Grevena and Germanos Karavangelis of Amaseia⁵²⁷. One should consider, however, that these clerics had served formerly in the Balkan metropolitan sees. Thus, Khrisostomos had been the metropolitan bishop of Drama, Germanos Karavangelis that of Kastoria. The latter Germanos Karavangelis had not hesitated to cooperate with Ottoman troops against the Bulgarians. The hostile acts of the Greek bishops were not directed only against the Bulgarians. For instance, Agathangelos of Grevena persecuted the Vlachs, and for that reason he was summoned to Istanbul because of the pressures of Rumania and European great

524 Alexis Alexandris, 'The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910-12): A Contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 48.

525 Alexis Alexandris, 'The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910-12): A Contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), p. 71.

526 Richard Clogg, 'The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), p. 197.

527 Even though the metropolitan see was called as diocese of Amaseia, metropolitan bishops have preferred to live in Samsun since the 19th century because of flourishing trade there.

powers. The Porte did not allow him to return to his diocese⁵²⁸. These metropolitan bishops regarded the Bulgarian/Exarchist influence as the greatest menace directed to the Patriarchate and Greek nationalist interests. They were aware that the struggle between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Exarchate was not religious in character. Thus, they advocated the cooperation between the Orthodox Greeks and Muslims against the Exarchists. To conclude, nationalist radicalization of the church and its cadres was a gradual process that started from the Macedonian metropolitan sees, where was one of the most problematic regions of the empire and the threats of Bulgarian schism and Pan-slavism were more acute, and expanded to the other metropolitan sees through the circulation of clerics.

528 Richard von Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 96.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Materials

- BOA. Bİ. No. 112, lef. 21-22.
BOA. Bİ. No: 115.
BOA. Bİ. No: 116, lef. 2.
BOA. Bİ. No. 170, lef. 1.
BOA. Bİ. No. 178/22.
BOA. Bİ. No. 895-97.
BOA., DED., BBD.
BOA. Ir-Med. Va 19 Zilkade 1256/226 Arztezkeresi.
BOA. , MD., No: 261, p. 38
BOA., MV., 2/42.
C. ADL., nr. 4771, t. y.
Gayrimüslim Cemaat Defteri, nr. 1, s. 1.
Gayrimüslim Cemaat Defteri, nr. 3, s. 26, t. 7, Ramazan 1277.
H. H., nr. 46390-A, t. 5, s. 1254.
Külliyat-ı Kavanin, c. 1, nr. 2599, t. 923.
Külliyat-ı Kavanin, c. 1, nr. 3995, t.923.
Külliyat-ı Kavanin, c. 1, nr. 2600, t. 927.
Külliyat-ı Kavanin, vol. 5, nr.4474, Safer 1276.
MMZC, 7 Nisan 1877, 12th session

Primary Sources

- Brailsford, Henry Noel, *Macedonia: Its Races and Their Future*, (London: Methuen, 1906).
Cevdet Paşa, *Tezahir*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991).
Cevdet Paşa, *Tezahir*, vol. 3, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991).
Clarke, James F., *Sketch of the European Turkey Mission of the American Board*, (Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1901).
Дринов, Марин, *Българска-та Църква отъ Само-то и Начало и до Днесъ*, (Sofia: Balgarsko Knizhevno Druzhestvo, 1869).
Engelhardt, Philippe Edouard, *La Turquie et la Tanzimat*, (Paris: A. Cotillon, 1882).
Köksal, Yonca, and Davut Erkan, *Sadrazam Kıbrıslı Mehmet Emin Paşanın Rumeli Teftişi*, (Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007).
Francis, Yeorgios, *Şehir Düştü!*, *Bizanslı Tarihçi Francis'den İstanbulun Fethi*, (Istanbul: İletişim

Yayınları, 1995).

Kritovulos, *İstanbulun Fethi*, (Istanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları, 2005)

de Tott, Baron, *Mémoires du Baron de Tott sur les Turcs et les Tartares*, (ed.) Ferenc Toth, (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2004).

Vazov, Ivan *Under the Yoke*, (trans.) Margurerite Alexieva and Theodora Atanassova, (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971).

Secondary Sources

Adanır, Fikret, 'The Ottoman Peasantries, c. 1360- c. 1860', *The Peasantries of Europe from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, (ed.) Tom Scott, (New York: Longman, 1998), pp. 269-310.

Adanır, Fikret, 'The Socio-Political Environment of Balkan Nationalism: the Case of Ottoman Macedonia, 1856-1912', *Regional and National Identities in Europe in the XIXth and XXth Centuries*, (eds.) Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, G. Müller & Stuart Woolf, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), pp. 221-54.

Adanır, Fikret, *Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2001).

Adanır, Fikret, 'Semi-autonomous Forces in the Balkans and Anatolia', *Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. III: *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, (ed.) Suraiya Faroqhi, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 157-85.

Ahmed Refik, 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Fener Patrikhanesi ve Bulgar Kilisesi', *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası*, 80, r. 1340 (1924), pp. 74-82.

Ahmed Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935).

Андреев, Стефан and Елена Грозданова, *Из Историята на Рударството и Металургията в Българските Зему през XV-XIX Век*, (Sofia: Narodna Biblioteka Sveti Kiril i Metodi, 1993).

Арнаудовъ, Михаил Петров, *Неофитъ Хилендарски Бозвели, 1785-1848: Животъ, Дѣло, Епоха*, (Sofia: Hudozhnik, 1930).

Aydın, Mahir, *Osmanlı Eyaletinden Üçüncü Bulgar Çarlığına*, (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 1996).

Beldiceanu, N., *Recherches sur la ville Ottomane au XVe siecle: Etudes et actes*, (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1973).

Berkes, Niyazi, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*, (London: Hurst & Company, 1998).

Black, C. E., 'The Influence of Western Political Thought', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 48, no. 3, (April 1943), pp. 507-20.

Bosworth, C. E., 'Dhimma in Early Islam', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier

- Publishers, 1982), pp. 37-54
- Braude, Benjamin, 'Foundation Myths of the *Millet System*', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 68-88.
- Buhl, F. 'Milla', *EI2*.
- Clogg, Richard, 'The Dhidhaskalia Patriki (1798): An Orthodox Reaction to the French Revolutionary Propaganda', *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 5, 1969, pp. 87-115.
- Clogg, Richard, 'The Greek Mercantile Bourgeoisie: 'Progressive' or 'Reactionary'?', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 85-111.
- Clogg, Richard, 'The Greek *Millet* in the Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 185-201.
- Clogg, Richard, 'The Byzantine Legacy in the Modern Greek World: The Megali Idea', *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe*, (ed.) L. Clucas, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1988), pp. 253-81.
- Cohen, Mark, 'Monastir: Oasis of Civilization, 1839-63', *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*, vol. 24, no.2, Fall 2000, pp. 3-22.
- Crampton, Richard J., 'Bulgarian Society in the Early 19th Century', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 157-204.
- Crampton, Richard J., *Bulgaria, 1878-1918: A History*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1983).
- Crampton, Richard J., *A Concise History of Bulgaria*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Cvetkova, Bistra, 'Les services des celep et la ravitaillement en bétail dans l'Empire Ottomane (XVe-XVIIe s.)', *Etudes historiques* 3, (1966), pp. 145-72.
- Çiçek, Kemal, 'Osmanlılar ve Zımmiler: Papa Pavlosun İslam'a Hakaret ya da Renklere İsyanı', *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol. 25, 1996, pp. 28-33.
- Davison, Roderic, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-76*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1973).
- Davison, Roderic, 'The *Millets* as Agents of Change in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 319-33.
- Динков, К., *История на българската църква*, (Sofia: Poliprint, 1954).
- Ercan, Yavuz, *The Nineteenth Century Balkanic Church*, (Ankara: Şafak Matbaası, 1987).

- Eren, Cevat, 'Pazvand-oğlu', *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya, 'Making a Living: Economic Crisis and Partial Recovery', *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 2, (eds.) Halil İnalcık and Donald Quateart, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 433-73.
- Fine, John V. A. Jr., *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Pre-Nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006).
- Frazer, Charles A., *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Gavrilova, Raina, et al., *The Bulgarian Chitalishte: Past, Present, and Future*, (Sofia: United Nation Development Program, 2000).
- Gazi, Effi, 'Nationalist Ideology, Scientific Disciplines, and Intellectual Fields in Greece', *Südost-Forschungen*, vol. 58, 1999, pp. 247-65.
- Генчев, Николай, *Българско Възраждане*, (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestvenia front, 1988).
- Georgeoff, John, 'Nationalism in the History Textbooks of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, (October 1966), pp. 442-50
- Georgieva, Gergana, 'Functions and Prerogatives of the Rumeli Vali in the First Half of the 19th Century', *Etudes balkaniques*, vol. 39, no.2, 2003, pp. 57-78.
- Georgieva, Gergana, 'Administrative Structure and Government of Rumelia in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: The Functions and Activities of the Vali of Rumelia', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), pp. 3-21.
- Gerstel, Sharon E. J., 'Civic and Monastic Influences on Church Decoration in Late Byzantine Thessaloniki', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 57, 2003, pp. 225-39.
- Giannakis, Basil, *International Status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate*, (Massachusetts, 1959).
- Gluskov, Hristo, 'Les missions catholiques et l'influence française en Thrace de l'Est durant les années 80 du XIXe siècle', *Bulgarian Historical Review*, no. 1-2, 1998.
- Gocek, Fatma Muge, 'Ethnic Segmentation, Western Education, and Political Outcomes: Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Society', *Poetics Today*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 507-38.
- Göçek, Fatma Müge, 'Decline of the Ottoman Empire and the Emergence of Greek, Armenian, Turkish and Arab Nationalisms', *Social Constructions of Nationalism in the Middle East*, (ed.) Fatma Müge Göçek, (New York: University of New York Press, 2002), pp. 15-83.
- Gradeva, Rossitsa, 'Ottoman Policy towards Christian Church Buildings', *Etudes balkaniques*, vol. 4, 1994, pp. 14-36.

- Gradeva, Rossitsa, 'Orthodox Christians in the *Kadi* Courts: The Practice of the Sofia Sheriat Court, seventeenth Century', *Rumeli under the Ottomans, 15th -18th Centuries: Institutions and Communities*, (Istanbul: Isis, 2004).
- Gradeva, Rossitsa, 'Secession and Revolution in the Ottoman Empire at the End of the Eighteenth Century: Osman Pazvantoglu and Rhigas Velestinlis', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), pp. 73-95.
- Gradeva, Rossitsa, 'Osman Pazvantoglu of Vidin: Between Old and New', *War and Peace in Rumeli: 15th to Beginning of the 19th Century*, (Istanbul: Isis, 2008).
- Gradeva, Rossitsa, 'On Zimmis and Church Buildings: Four Cases from Rumeli', *War and Peace in Rumeli: 15th to Beginning of 19th Century*, (Istanbul: Isis, 2008).
- Grant, Bruce, 'Empire and Savagery: The Politics of Primitivism in Late Imperial Russia', *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, (eds.) Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), pp. 292-310.
- Грозданова, Елена, *Българската Селска Община през XV-XVIII Век*, (Sofia: Institut za Istoriya, 1979).
- Mehmet Hacısalihoğlu, *Jön Türkler ve Makedonya Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008).
- Haddad, Robert M., 'Constantinople over Antioch, 1516-1724: Patriarchal Politics in the Ottoman Era', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 41, 1990, pp. 217-38.
- Hall Jr., William Webster, *Puritans in the Balkans: The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, (Sofia: Cultura, 1938).
- Hattox, Ralph S., 'Mehmed the Conqueror, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Mamluk Authority', *Studia Islamica*, vol. 90, 2000, pp. 105-23.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1996).
- Христов, Христо А., *Протестанските секти в България*, (Sofia: Partizdat, 1972).
- Hroch, Miroslav, 'The Social Interpretation of Linguistic Demands in European National Movements', *Regional and National Identities in Europe in the XIXth and XXth Centuries*, (eds.) Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Michael G. Müller & Stuart Woolf, (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), pp. 67-97.
- Hupchick, Dennis P., *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century: Slavic Orthodox Society and Culture under Ottoman Rule*, (Jefferson: McFarland, 1993).

- Игнатъев, Н. П., 'Записки графа Н. П. Игнатъева, 1875-1877', *Исторический вестник*, vol.1, 1914.
- Игов, Светлозар, *История на Българската Литература*, (Sofia: Ciela, 2001).
- Inalcık, Halil, 'Tanzimatın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkiler', *Belleten*, vol. 78, no. 119-22, (Ankara: Tarih Kurumu, 1964), pp. 623-90.
- Inalcık, Halil, 'Ottoman Archival Materials on *Millets*', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 437-43.
- Inalcık, Halil, 'The Status of the Greek Patriarch under the Ottomans', *Turcica*, vol. 21-23, 1991, pp. 407-37.
- Inalcık, Halil, *Tanzimat ve Bulgar Meselesi*, (Istanbul: Eren, 1992).
- Ishirkov, Anastas, *La Macédoine et la Constitution de l'Exarchat bulgare (1830 a 1897) avec une carte hors texte*, (Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1918).
- Иванова, Светлана, 'Институт на Колективната Отговорност в Българските Градове през XV-XVIII в.', *Исторически Преглед*, no. 46, vol. 1, 1990, pp. 33-44.
- Ivanova, Svetlana, 'Varoş: The Elites of the Reaya in the Towns of Rumeli, Seventeenth-Eighteenth Century', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2005), pp. 201-47.
- Jelavich, Barbara, and Charles Jelavich, *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009).
- Jelavich, Charles, 'Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the Eighteenth Century', *Church History*, vol. 23, 1954, pp. 144-52.
- Jersild, Austin Lee, 'From Savagery to Citizenship: Caucasian Mountaineers Muslims in the Russian Empire', *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, (eds.) Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), pp. 101-114.
- Kadic, Ante, 'The Croatian Sources of Paisii's *Historia*', *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, vol. 10, 1983, pp. 71-82.
- Канев, Константин, *Миналото на село Момчиловци, Смолянско; принос към историята на Средните Родопи*, (Sofia: Sofia OF, 1975).
- Karakasidou, Anastasia, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
- Karal, Enver Ziya, 'Non-Muslim Representatives in the First Constitutional Assembly, 1876-77', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin

- Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 387-401.
- Karidis, Viron, 'A Greek Mercantile *Paroikia*: Odessa, 1774-1829', *Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 111-36.
- Karpat, Kemal, 'Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 141-69.
- Karpat, Kemal, *Ottoman Population, 1830-1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).
- Kenanoğlu, M. Macit, *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi*, (Istanbul: Klasik, 2004).
- Kiel, Michael, 'Urban Development in Bulgaria in the Turkish Period: The Place of Turkish Architecture in the Process', *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1989, pp. 86-115.
- Kiossev, Alexander, 'The Dark Intimacy: Maps, Identities, Acts of Identification', *Balkan as Metaphor: Between Globalization and Fragmentation*, (ed.) Dušan Bjelić and Obrad Savić, (Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2005), pp. 165-91.
- Kiossev, Alexander, 'Gears behind the Stage: Rhetorical Structures of the National Imagination/s', *Mythistory and Narratives of the Nation in the Balkans*, (ed.) Tatjana Aleksic, (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), pp. 107-34.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis, 'From Orthodox Commonwealth to National Communities: Greek-Russian Intellectual Ties in the Ottoman Era', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007).
- Kitromilides, Paschalis, 'Initiatives of the Great Church in the Mid-eighteenth Century: Hypotheses on the Factors of Orthodox Ecclesiastical Strategy', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007).
- Kitromilides, Paschalis, 'In the Pre-modern Balkans...: Loyalties, Identities, Anachronisms', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum 2007).
- Kitromilides, Paschalis, 'Orthodox Culture and Collective Identity in the Ottoman Balkans during the Eighteenth Century', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum, 2007).
- Kitromilides, Paschalis, 'Athos and the Enlightenment', *Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, (London: Ashgate Variorum

- 2007), p.
- Kiutuçkas, Yeorgios, '1878'e kadar İstanbul'daki Bulgar Cemaati', *19. Yüzyıl İstanbulunda Gayrimüslimler*, (ed.) Pinelopi Stathis, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 36-52.
- Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur, *Majestelerinin Konsolosları: İngiliz Belgeleriyle Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki İngiliz Konsolosları*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2004).
- Konortas, Paraskevas, 'From *Ta'ife* to *Millet*: Ottoman Terms for the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), pp. 169-79.
- Косев, Константин, 'Към въпроса за действието и взаимодействието на вътрешните и външните фактори в българското националноосвободително движение през възраждането', *В Чест на Академик Христо А. Христов*, (Sofia: Institut za Istoria, 1976), pp. 35-48.
- Koyuncu, Aşkın, *Bulgar Eksarhlığı*, (Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yakınçağ Tarihi Bilim Dalı, 1998), (unpublished MA thesis).
- Kuruyazıcı, Hasan, and Mete Tapan, *Sveti Stefan Bulgar Kilisesi: Bir Yapı Monografisi*, (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1998).
- Lavrin, Janko, 'The Slav Idea and Russia', *Russian Review*, vol. 22, no. 1, January 1962, pp. 11-24.
- Lewis, Bernard, *The Jews of Islam*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- Macar, Elçin, *İstanbulun Yok Olmuş İki Cemaati: Doğu Ritli Katolik Rumlar ve Bulgarlar*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2002).
- von Mach, Richard, *The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907).
- Mackridge, Peter, 'The Greek Intelligentsia, 1780-1830: A Balkan Perspective', *The Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence*, (ed.) Richard Clogg, (London: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 85-110.
- Magoulias, Harry J., *Byzantine Christianity: Emperor, Church, and the West*, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970).
- Mann, Michael, 'The Emergence of Modern European Nationalism', *Transition to Modernity: Essays on Power, Wealth, and Belief*, (eds.) J. Hall and I. Jarvie, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 137-65.
- Mardin, Şerif, *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset*, (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007).
- Marinković, Mirjana, 'The Shaping of the Modern Serbian Nation and of Its State under the Ottoman Rule', *Disrupting and Reshaping: Early Stages of Nation-Building in the Balkans*,

- (eds.) M. Dogo and G. Franzinetti, (Ravenna: LongoEditore, 2002), pp. 37-45.
- Meininger, Thomas A., *Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864-1872: A Study in Personal Diplomacy*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1970).
- Милкова, Фани Г., 'К характеристике кесимской форму эксплуатации крестьян в болгарских землях до освобождения', *Actes du premier Congres des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*, (Sofia, 1969), pp. 71-76.
- Mirković, Mirko, *Pravni položaj i karakter srpske crkve pod turskom vlašcu, 1474-1766 (Character and Juridical Condition of the Serbian Church under the Turkish Domination, 1474-1766)*, (Belgrade, 1965).
- Mostashari, Firouzeh, *On the Religious Frontier: Tsarist Russia and Islam in the Caucasus*, (London: Tauris, 2006).
- Мутафчиева, Вера, *Кърджалийско Време*, (Plovdiv: Janet 45, 2008).
- Начов, Начо, *Цариград Като Културен Център на Българите до 1877 година*, (Sofia: Sbornik na Balgarskata Akademia na Naukite, 1925).
- Nestorova-Matejić, Tatyana Khristova, *American Missionaries in Bulgaria (1858-1912)*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1985).
- Niederle, Lubor, *La Race Slave: Statistique, Demographie-Anthropologie*, (trans.) Louis Leger, (Paris: F. Alcan, 1911).
- Ortaylı, İlber, *Tanzimatdan Cumhuriyete Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, (Istanbul: Hil, 1985).
- Ortaylı, İlber, *Tanzimattan Sonra Mahalli İdareler (1840-78)*, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü).
- Ortaylı, İlber, 'Greeks in the Ottoman Administration', *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, (eds.) Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1999), pp. 161-67.
- Özkaya, Yücel, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dağlı İsyanları (1791-1808)*, (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1983).
- Palairat, Michael, *The Balkan Economies, c. 1800-1914: Evolution without Development*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Pamuk, Şevket, *The Ottoman Empire and European Capitalism, 1820-1913: Trade, Investment, and Production*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Papadopoulos, Theodore, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, (New York: AMS Press, 1995).
- Паскалева, Виржиния, 'За някой особености и фактори образиването на българската нация през първата половина на XIX в.', *Известия на Института за История*, vol. 16-18, 1966, pp. 423-52.

- Paskaleva, Virdzhinia, 'La mer noire et son littoral a l'époque de la domination ottomane sur les terres bulgares', *Bulgarian Historical Review*, vol. 3, 1975, pp. 78-94.
- Паскалева, Виржиния, *Средна Европа и Земите по Долния Дунав през XVIII-XIX в.: Социално-икономически Аспекти*, (Sofia, 1986).
- Pavlowitch, Stevan K., *Serbia: The History behind the Name*, (London: Hurst, 2002).
- Пенев, Боян, 'Увод в българската литература след Освобождението', *Защо сме Такива?: В Търсене на Българската Културна Идентичност*, (comp.) Иван Еленков and Румен Даскалов, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo Prosveta, 1994), pp. 144-63.
- Petković, Srete, *Zidno slikarstvo na podroczju Pečke patrijarkije, 1557-1614, (Mural Paintings in the Region of Pec Patriarchate, 1557-1614)*, (Belgrade, 1965).
- Petrovich, Michael Boro, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism, 1856-70*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956).
- Pinson, Mark, 'Ottoman Bulgaria in the First Tanzimat Period: The Revolts in Nish [1841] and Vidin [1850]', *Middle Eastern Studies*, (May 1975),
- Pippidi, Andrei, 'Phanar, Phanariotes, Phanariotisme', *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, 13, (1975), pp. 231-39.
- Pundeff, Marin V., 'Bulgarian Nationalism', *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, (eds.) Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), pp. 93-165.
- Quateart, Donald, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Ragsdale, Hugh, 'Evaluating Traditions of Russian Aggression: Catherine II and the Greek Project', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 66, 1988, pp. 91-117.
- Raikin, Spas T., 'Nationalism and the Bulgarian Orthodox Church', *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics*, (ed.) Pedro Ramet, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989), pp. 352-77.
- Roudometof, Victor, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*, (Abingdon: Greenwood Press, 2001).
- Sellaouti, Rachida Tlili, 'La France révolutionnaire et les populations musulmanes de la Turquie d'Europe au moment de l'expédition d'Egypte: une mise a l'épreuve du cosmopolitisme', *Ottoman Rule and the Balkans: Conflict, Transformation, Adaptation*, (eds.) Antonis Anastasopoulos and Elias Kolovos, (Rethymno: University of Crete, 2004), pp. 95-123.
- Seton-Watson, R. W., *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question: A Study in Diplomacy and Party Politics*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1972).
- Шашко, Ф. et al., *Американски Пътеписи за България през XIX Век*, (Sofia: Planeta 3, 2001).

- Smith, Anthony, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, (New York: Blackwell, 1988).
- Sofroni Vračanski: *Vie et tribulations du pecheur Sofroni*, (ed.) Jack Feuillet, (Sofia: Sofia-Press, 1981).
- Sofranov, Ivan, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Eglise Catholique au XIX siecle*, (Rome: Desclée, 1960).
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908*, (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Somel, Akşin, 'Aleksandır Ekzarh ve 19.-20. Yüzyıllarda Avrupa'ya Giden 'Bulgar Yolları', *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, vol. 2, (Fall 2005), pp. 209-17.
- Soulis, George C., 'The Legacy of Cyril and Methodius to the Southern Slavs', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 19, 1965, pp. 19-43.
- Soykut, Mustafa, *Image of the 'Turk' in Italy: A History of the 'Other' in Early Modern Europe, 1453-1683*, (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2001).
- Stathi, Penelopi, 'Provincial Bishops of the Orthodox Church as Members of the Ottoman Elite', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press), pp. 77-85.
- Stoianovich, Traian, 'The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant', *Between East and West: The Balkan and Mediterranean Worlds*, (ed.) Traian Stoianovich, (New York: A. D. Caratzas, 1992), pp. 1-77.
- Странимиров, Странимир, *История на Българската Църква*, (Sofia, 1925).
- Sugareff, Vangel K., 'The Constitution of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 4, no. 4, (December 1932), pp. 572-80.
- Sumner, B. H., 'Ignatyev at Constantinople, 1864-1874', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 11, January 1933, pp. 341-53.
- Sumner, B. H., *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880*, (North Haven: Archon Books, 1962).
- Théropoulou, Emilie, 'Les élites urbaines a l'époque du Tanzimat: Le cas de Salonique', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Antonis Antonopoulos, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2005), pp. 343-49.
- Todorov, G. D., and N. Zhechev, 'Documents ayant trait aux luttes des bulgares pour une église et des écoles nationales en Macédoine vers le milieu du XIXe siecle', *Etudes historiques*, vol. 3, 1966, pp. 173-239.
- Todorov, Nikolay, '19. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Bulgaristan Esnaf Teşkilatı', *İÜİF Mecmuası*, vol. 27, no. 1-2, pp. 1-36.
- Todorov, Nikolay, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983).

- Todorova, Maria, 'Conversion to Islam as a Trope in Bulgarian Historiography, Fiction, and Film', *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory*, (ed.) Maria Todorova, (New York: New York University Press, 2004), pp. 129-58.
- Tradition Canonique de l'Eglise*, (eds.) P. Grigorios Papatomas and P. Jivko Panev, (Paris: Institut de Théologie Orthodoxe 'Saint Serge', 1995).
- Tritton, A. S., 'Islam and the Protected Religion', *The Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 2, 1931, pp. 475-85.
- Troubetzkoi, Grégoire, *La politique russe en Orient: le schisme bulgare*, (Paris: Typographie Plon-Nourrit, 1907).
- Tuğlacı, Pars, *Bulgaristan ve Türk-Bulgar İlişkileri*, (Istanbul: Cem Yayınları, 1984).
- Ursinus, Michael, 'Millet', *EI2*.
- Ursinus, Michael, *Regionale Reformen im Osmanischen Reich am Vorabend der Tanzimat: Reformen der rumelischen Provinzialgouverneure im Gerichtssprengel von Manastir zur Zeit der Herrschaft Sultan Mahmuds II (1808-39)*, (Berlin: K. Schwarz, 1982).
- Ursinus, Michael, 'In Search of the Homo Ottomanicus: The Cases of Nikola Pop Stefanoff and Sheykh Shemsuddin from Ottoman Macedonia (ca. 1780-1840)', *Figures anonymes, figures d'élite: pour une anatomie de l'Homo ottomanicus*, (eds.) Meropi Anastassiadou & Bernard Heyberger, (Istanbul: Isis, 1999), pp. 21-34.
- Üner, A. Turgay, 'Trade and Merchants in Nineteenth-Century Trabzon: Elements of Ethnic Conflict', *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, (eds.) Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, vol. 1 *Central Lands*, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), pp. 287-319.
- Üner A. Turgay, 'Circassian Immigration into the Ottoman Empire, 1856-78', *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, (eds.) W. B. Hallaq and D. P. Little, (Leiden, Brill, 1991), pp. 193-217.
- Vacalopoulos, Apostolos E., *History of Macedonia, 1354-1833*, (Thessaloniki, 1973).
- Vacalopoulos, Apostolos E., *The Greek Nation, 1453-1669*, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1976).
- Vucinich, Wayne S., 'The Yugoslav Lands in the Ottoman Period: Postwar Marxist Interpretations of Indigenous and Ottoman Institutions', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 27, no. 3, September 1955, pp. 287-305.
- Янакиева, Жечка, *Абаджийството в Сливенския край*, (Sliven: Okrazhen Istoricheski Muzeu, 1978).

Zens, Robert, 'Pasvanođlu Osman Pasha and the Pařalık of Belgrade, 1791-1807',
International Journal of Turkish Studies, vol. 8, no. 1-2, Spring 2002, pp. 89-104.

APPENDIX

مجموعه رساله‌های کتبه الفقیر الساجد محمد
الطاهر بقدرت شریف
عفی عنہ

ساده سرفه سیانه سالی مطافه سلطانی و سوری سری چه سانه سعای
بعون اللہ تعالی رسول قدس شریف بیت اللہ کلوب ماه حضرت امیر کبری ششمنی کوفی فتح باب اولنوب ارضی لما نفست
بطریقہ اولی سرگز نام ز اہب حمد رهبان ایل معاً رعایا و برایا کلوب عطارد و انعام مدہ رجا و تقنا قلندرد
قدیماً مشرولہ لری اولوب عہدہ کزہ اولانکینسا و منکتر و سائر زیادتیری و ایچوردہ و طہرہ دہ واقع کینسا و معد خانی
قدیمہ جنبہ و تصرف ایہ کلادی عنوان اولرہ ارضی طائفہ بطریقہ اولند جنبہ و تصرف لیر و حضرت عمر رضی
اللہ تعالی عنہ حضرت زینہ اولد عہد نامہ ہیچونہ و معلوم ملک جمدی کہیمہ زمانہ زود ویرتا اولر سرفہ لری بوجہ جنبہ و
تصرف زینہ اولد تمام و بیت اللہ مفاہ و شمال لرفندہ کی قیو و کینسای کبر لری مای یعقوب و دیر الریتونہ و جس
المسیح و نابلس و کینسایزینہ تابع ہم ملتدی اولد جسہ و قلبی و سیرانہ ملتدی مای یعقوب کینسایزینہ تمکک اولاد
ارضی بطریقہ لرفندہ جنبہ و تصرف اولنوب اخر ملتدہ منہ بعد بر فرد مدافندہ ایزیر لملک باینہ بوشادہ ہیچونہ سعادت
مقدومی ویردوم و یوردومک بوجہ عمل اولنوب ذکر اولسانہ کینسای کبر لری مای یعقوبہ تمکک اولر ارضی بطریقہ
ایچوردہ و طہرہ دہ واقع اولانکینسای و منکتر لری و سائر زیادتک اهدی و کذولرینہ تابع ہم ملتدی و مای خانی
اولد جسہ و قلبی و سیرانہ ملتدی ایندی اولرہ جنبہ و تصرف یایوب واقع اولر اولرینہ و غزل و فب و سائر
و قفانہ تقاضا خصوصانہ و مرد اولد ترمہ بولید و یقیوس و رهبانہ و یایس و مای خانی و سائر ارضی لما نفست
مرد و کلادی اخذ و قبضہ ایوب ما تقدم تبروا ارضی لما نفست بطریقہ جنبہ و تصرف زینہ اولد کینسا و منکتر و معد
و سائر زیادتیرینک و کذولرہ تابع ہم ملتدی و مای خانی اخر ملتدہ منہ بعد بر فرد مدافندہ ایلیوب و تمام اولرینہ
واقع اولد تربی و قدس شریف طہرہ سنہ مریم نامہ قبری و حضرت عیسی علی الصلوٰۃ والسلام لرفندی بیت اللہ مفاہ
و شمال لرفندہ اولد قیونک مفاہ و ایچوردہ تمام قیوسنہ ایکی شعدانہ و قدیلری و تربہ قیوسنہ و ایچوردہ اولد
قدیلری و یا قدلی شمع و بخور لری و تمام ایچندہ ایندی اولرہ نامہ شمع لہورنہ کذولرہ تابع اولر ہم ملتدی
تربہ داخذ کیروب و مولیندہ دور ایندی و قیو ایچوردنک زیر و بالای و ایکی بخور لری و ایچوردہ اولد معد و
زیادتیری و هو قیوس و تمام مولیندہ واقع مای یوجنا کینسای و طہرہ سنہ مای یعقوب قربنہ واقع جس المسیح و سائر
منکتر لری و بقدر کلادی و مدفندی و بیت اللہ مفاہ قربنہ اولد اولر لری و مسافر خانی لری و باغ و باغ و زینت کلادی
و ایچندہ ذکر اولسانہ کینسا و منکتر و معد و زیادتک اهدی و کذولرینہ تابع ہم ملتدی و سائر امدون و تابع قدیلری
تقیبہ اولرینہ اولرہ ارضی طائفہ و بطریقہ جنبہ و تصرف ایلیوب و کینسایزینہ زیادتہ کلاد ارضی لما نفست زینم
تعبیر اولنوب عہد اولرینہ و زیادتیرینہ و سائر معد و زیادتیرینہ وار دقلندہ اهل عرف طائفہ سنندہ و افراد معد
بر فرد دخل و تصرف ایلیوب بعد ایوم و جہ مشرود اولرہ ویرتوشادہ ہیچونہ سعادت مقدوم بوجہ عمل اولنوب اولر ملتدہ بر فرد
مدافندہ ایلیوب اولسایہ اولاد ایجاد مدہ و یا خود و زای نظام مدہ و صلحای کرامتہ و قاضیدرہ و کلاد
بکی و سجادہ بکی و میرانہ و یوردہ لری و بیت المال و قسام اولری و هو بکتری و نجا و ایاب نجا و مبارک لری عمال
و ایسہ لری و تصرفیہ عوال و سائر قیوم قولندہ و غیرینہ محصلہ و فب و رضع و کیردہ ہیچ بر فرد افراد
آفریدہ دنہ کلامہ مکاتہ و جلا مدہ لوجوہ و سیبائہ لاسباب دخل و تصرفه قلیوب تبیل و تغییر ایلیوب هر کیم دخل
و تصرفه و تبیل و تغییر ایسہ عن اللہ الملک المعبود زمرہ مجرمیہ و اعداد ایچندہ معدود اولر لری سولہ بیلر حکم
کندہ کتا و لغزای غزای عالم آرا ایل مجہد و غیرینہ کوزر منضمونہ جوتن حقہ و نحوای ہیچونہ معدودہ بیلیوب عہ
شریف اعتماد قیلر کتب فی سنہ ثلث و عشرینہ و تسعمائ

ارشدان قدسی شریفه کی ایمازانه دار ۹۲۷ تاریخ خوارزمی است ایندین در قرآنی صفحه سی و نهمه خانه حضرتزری لر فیه اجساد بر پشته

اطالع - بیخ لاول ۹۲۷

« نشانه همیونم بر مفضل اوله »

نشانه عیشانه سلطان و لغزای غزای مهرانسته خاقانی X بعون الربانی والمن السلطان و علم اوله رکه

قدس شریفه ارشد بطریق اوله داندنه مقال بی منال و رافع ترفیع رفیع الهی بر کله سلطان سرکرام راهب
درگاه معاد عرض حال ایدوب مانقده مدینه برو حضرت عمر رضی الله تعالی عنه حضرتزنده الدنده اوله عهدنامه همیون و سلطان
صمدی الدینه و سلطه خیزدن دیریتل او امر شریفه بویجیه قدس شریفه واقع قدیمه جنبه و تفرزنده کنیسارین
و مناسترین و سار معبد و زیارتگاهارین و کزدره تابع یماقارین و هم ملتدین فتح قدس شریفه حضرتزمتکمان
فردوسی آشیانه مرموم و مفضوله بابام سلطانه سلیم خانه انام الله تعالی برهان حضرتزری بعون الله تعالی و رسول
قدس شریف بیت الله واروبه فتح باب اولدنده مذکور راهب جمد رهبانیه یلم معا و رعایا و بریا واروبه
مرموم بابام طاب تره حضرتزری عطا و انعامنده رجا و تمنا قدیمه قدیمه ارشی طائفه سنک سر و طوری
اولوب عهدنامه اوله کنیساری و مناسترلی و سار معبد و زیارتگاهاری و ایچوده و لشروه واقع
کنیسا و معبد خداری قدیمه جنبه و تفرز اید کلاگری منوال اوزده ارشی طائفه بطریق اوله جنبه و تفرز
ایلدیر دیو حضرت عمر رضی الله تعالی عنه حضرتزندن اوله عهدنامه همیون و سلطه ماغیزه دیریتل او امر شریفه
بویجیه جنبه و تفرزنده اوله تمامه و بیت اللحم مفاره و سنک لر فیه کی قیو و کنیسای کزاری ما یعقوب و

هذه صورته لاول ا
السید محمد امیر الکافی بقدرت شریف
عقرا

۴۰۰-۶۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰

دیر الزیتون و حبس المسیح و نایس و کزدره تابع یماقاری و هم ملتدی اوله جسبه و قلبی و سبائی ملتدی ما یعقوب
کنیسانده اوله ارشی بلدی لر فیه جنبه و تفرز و نوب افر ملتده مه بعد بر فرد مذاخذ ایدر طامک ایدنه
عنایت رجا ایدگری مرموم و مفضوله بابام طاب تره حضرتزنده عرصه اولدنده عولف علی خسرو ایندنه ذکر اولنان
منوال اوزده اوله و نوب تفرز اوله دیو نشانه همیون معاد تقدره یلم معنون مقر زمانه و صورت و قدر خاقانی یلم
لکامه ایقا و مقر اوله با ایدنه حال سیر سلطنت و مقر خدمت با جناب جلاله بین و قائنده اولوب منوال شروع
اوزده ذکر اولدنه کنیسای کزاری ما یعقوبه و سنکه اوله ارشی بلدی ایچوده و لشروه واقع کنیساری و مناسترلی
و سار معبد و زیارتگاهاری و کزدره تابع هم ملتدی و یماقاری اوله جسبه و قلبی و سبائی آیندی اوزده جنبه
و تفرز ایوبه واقع اوله امرزری و غزل و نصب و سار و تقارین معاصره جنوداری و مرد اولدنده اوله یلم
و رهبان و یایس و یماقارینک و سار ارشی طائفه سنک تره کاترین جنبه و قبسه ایدوب مانقده مدینه و ارشی طائفه
بطریق جنبه و تفرزنده اوله کنیسا و مناستر و معبد و سار زیارتگاهارینک و کزدره تابع هم ملتدینه و یماقارینه
افر ملتده مه بعد بر فرد مذاخذ ایوب و تمامه اولدنده واقع اوله ترتیب و قدس شریف لشروه مریم انایقاری
و حضرت عیسی علیه الصلوة والسلام لموعینی بیت اللحم مفاره و سنک لر فیه اوله قونک مفتای و ایچوده تمامه قیونده
ایلی شمسانه و قنایلداری و تره قیونده و ایچوده اوله قنایلداری و ایچوده قوی شمع و تجوری و تمامه ایچده
آیندی اوزده ناز شمع لمودنه کزدره تابع هم ملتدینه تره داخله کیروب و هولینده دورا بقداری و تجوری و
زیر و بلوس و ایلی تجوی و ایچوده اوله معبد و زیارتگری و هو قیوس و تمامه هولینده واقع ما بوجنا کیسی

عنایت بجاینگری مرحوم و مفقوله بابام گناه هفتزیمه عرصه اوله قدح عولف علی خسروایندنه ذکر اولسان
 منوال اوزده دخل اونوب تفری اولر دیو نشانه همیونه سعادت قفرونه ایله معنون مقرنامه و صورت ذکر حاقاقیل
 لکانه ایقا و مقر اولعه باینده حاله سیر سلطنت و مقر خدمت با جناب جلالت عین و قاضیه اولوب منوال شروع
 اوزده ذکر اولسانه کینسای کبرلری مایه یعقوبه تنگه اوله ارضی بلریقدی ایچروده و لمشوده واقع کینسای و منکازی
 و سائر معبد و زیارتگاهلری و کذوره تابع هم ملندی و یاقدی اوله جسمه و قلبی و سیرانه آیندی اوزده جنب
 و تفری ایوبه واقع اوله امر لری و غل و نصیب و سائر و قفرونه متعاده هفتصدی و مراد اوله تیره یولیه و قیوس
 و رهبان و بیایس و یاقدینک و سائر ارضی لمافسنت نزد لاترین جنبه و قصه ایوبه مانقده مدبر و ارضی لمافس
 بلریقتن جنبه و تفری اوزده اوله کینسا و منکر و معبد و سائر زیارتگاهلریک و کذوره تابع هم ملندی و یاقدی
 افر ملنده صد بعد بر فرد مضافه ایوبوب و قحامه اوله سنده واقع اوله تربیک و قدسی شریف لمشوده مریم نام بقدی
 و حضرت عیسی علیه الصلوة والسلام لموعظنی بیتا اللحم مغاره و سوال لمشوده اوله قیونک مفتاحی و ایچروده قحامه قیوسنه
 ایلی شحصانه و قنادیلری و ترب قیوسنه و ایچروده اوله قنادیلری و یاقدی شمع و تجوری و قحامه ایچده
 آیندی اوزده ناسیح لمشوده کذوره تابع هم ملندی ترب داخله کیروب و حوالینده دور ایتمدی و قیو ایچروده
 نیر و بلاسی و ایلی تجرعی و ایچروده اوله معبد و زیارت لری و هو قیوس و قحامه حوالینده واقع مایه یولیا کینسای
 و لمشوده مایه یعقوبه قیوسنه واقع حسن المسیح و سائر منکازی و مقبره کلری و مد قفدی و بیتا اللحم مغاره قیوسنه
 اوله و مسافر خابری و بانج و بانج و زیتون کلری و ایچده ذکر اولسانه کینسا و منکر و معبد و سائر زیارتگاهلری و
 کذوره تابع اوله یاقدی و هم ملندی و سائر امدون و توابع قدیم لری تعینه اولدنی اوزده ارضی لمافس و بلریقدی
 جنبه و تفری ایوبوب و کینسای تابع زیارت کلام ارضی لمافس زفرم تعمیر اولر هر اوزده زین و پنجاهینده و سائر

۲۸

معبد و زیارت لری و اقدنه اهل عرف لمافس و ایچروده صد بعد بر فرد دخل و تفری ایوبوب بعد ایوبوم وجه مسروح
 اوزده ویریل نشانه همیونه سعادت قفرونم بر یوج عمل اولوب افر ملنده بر فردی مضافه ایندی ایوبوب اولسانه مرحوم
 و مفقوله بابام انا الله برهان هفتزیمه عطا و انعام ایندی کبری نشانه همیونه سعادت قفرونه ایله معنون مقرنامه لری

مصدق و تقر اولسینه ملند و مایه ایلمدی کینده بحر عولف منال اولده

حسنات عمیرة البرکات
 متنکلیه عیبا (مرحوم بابام گناه تراهنده ویریل مقرنامه لری به دی
 مقر و صدقه و صلح و محققه لموتوب بر حکم شریف عالم آرا جهانیه مطایحی X ویردم و بیور و ملکه ذکر اولسان
 کینسای و منکازی و معبد و سائر زیارتگاهلری و کذوره تابع یاقدی و هم ملندی و ایچده مسطور اولده
 اوله امدون و توابع قدیم لری تعینه اولدنی اوزده تفری ایوبوب

اولان ایجاد و مناسبت سلطنت انتصاب
 و نایب لری و زعمای و ایاب تیمار و بیت المال و مقروضه منوال و منادی عملی و ایسه لری و یگیوی و سیاه و سائر قیوم قولدی
 و غیره ییچ فرد افراد آفریده ده کانه ماکانه بیوج صد کجوه و سیبانه کلساب و نوج صد کونوج مانع و رافع و
 و منازع اولیه دخل و تفری ایوبوب و تبیل و تغیر ایله هر کیم دخل و تفری ایوبوب تغیر و تبیل و تحریف ایله جک اولور
 ایسه و الله خصمه یوم القیامه اعداد اتمیه و زمره مجرینده معدود اولر استوی بیدر عدوت شریفه اعتماد قید لری
 و عالم لری مطاع قید لری مضمونه میومن محققه و فحوی همیونن صدقه لموتوب اعتماد و انقه و اعتماد صادق ظاهره
 کونور و دخل ایچده تحریرا مارتعالی فی اوله مشد رح اولدر فی سلتک شهر منه سبع و عشره و تسعمه

سنه : ۹۵۲
امیر شریف محمد علی دهم گیم بغیر شکر
بسم الله تعالی صلوات علی او و آله و
اتباعه

بعونه الله تعالی و سوله حبیب قدس شریف بیت الله و اوردی حضرت الحزین کبری مشی کونده فتح باب اولوب روم
کفده سنه بطریقه اولاده عطا کیم نام اهدی جمله اهدای معاً - عایا و رایا الماعت و رجا و تمنا قلم کرده
قدیمه واقع اولاده کلیسا و مناسکری و زیارتی و ایچو و ایشرده نمون اولاده جنبه و تصرفه و کلمه
اولوال اولاده مزبور بطریقه دخی جنبه و تصرفیل و حضرت عمر رضی الله عنه حضرت زینب اولاده عهدنامه همیون و سلطیه
ماخیزده اولاده اوامر شریف کبری موچی جنبه و تصرف الملک ایچو دیو بیور دمه حکم شریف موچی جنبه و تصرفیل و تمام قیوس
قائوشنده و قیوس طرفه مفضل قومی کی شعبار و قنادیلار و ینه محل مزبورده واقع بطریقده تابع کولکوله اولاده
دست کربک اشغسی و یوقایسی و سنت بیلم اولاده یدی قطع کمرک زیر و باواس و کلیسای کبر او رتبی معاً جمله زیارتی
و ایشرده تمام جویسی اوچ کلیسای و قائوشنده کلیسای ما یوچما و بطریقه تمکله اولاده اولاده کلیسا اولاده الله دیکله
معروف و مار بقول و سنت ای و مراقیبوس و مریکال و مرورکی و مریوچما و نجی و مرزاس و مرزقول و مرزقری
و سنت مریم و دیک ما یوچما و دیک کلیسای و مار یعقوب کویچ مناسک و مرورکی نام کلیسای و قدس شریف ایشرده مریم
انا مقدسک و ما سیرومه و حضرت عیسی نکه زندانی جنانک اولری و صحارده اولاده مقدس کبری و کویچ مناسک مصالک و ما کوی
و مار الیاس مناسک و نجی و یتونه و مار صوه مناسک و قریه بیت اولاده مار یورکی و حضرت عیسی علیه السلام لمو قدغی بیت النور
نام معافه و کلیسایه واقع موضع شمال و قبله طرفه اولاده ایچ قیونک مفاصلی و المرافذه اولاده ایچ قطع نجی و یتولود و
قدس لقای و سان قریه اولاده کلیسا و مناسکری و بطریق تابع اولاد کویچ و جبره و سربانی و سبار و وقف اولادی و حومه لیدری
و اهدی و مرد اولاده ^{مرد} ~~مرد~~ بقیوس و اهدیک مرزاقی اخذ و قبصه ایوب و قدس شریف قیونک و زرم قیود و عرب
قائنده و اسکدرده و کشفه ایتکونده و کربک و باچ و سار تکلیف عرفیه بالکله معافی و مسلم اولدر مزبور و مشروح اولاده
اولاد امیر شریف بوچراخر ملتت مضافه و بنجیده ^{ایما} ~~ایما~~ سار ملتده روم بطریق اولاده مقدم اولاد حضرت عمر رضی الله تعالی عنه حضرت زینب
عهدنامه همیون و سلطیه ماخیزده اوامر شریف کبری موچی بنده و روم و بیور دمه حکم شریف موچی بعد ایوم و مشروح اولاده اولاد امر
سلطانه اولاد یاخود و زای غلام و علما و ملحدده و قاضیدده و صیربان و میرلار و و یوده کبری و بیت الملک قسام اولدی و هو
بابیلر و عیما و اباب تحار و متفرق و چاوسه و سیاه و کویچ و سار قیوم قوللنده دهم گیم فتح مرزوری اولاد الله تعالی نده
حسبه و غزانه اوغراسون دیو بو حکم همیون مزبور کربک ندرینه ابقا ایوب عدومت شریف اعتماد قیدر تحریاتی من لک و عکرون
بمقام قدس شریف

