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When a Catholic is invested as the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch: Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas and the Ottoman central administration in 1745**

Following the death of patriarch Athanasios al-Dabbâs in 1724, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch became a focal point of competition between two rival parties led by Serafeim/Kyrillos Tânâs and Silvestros. Among the many layers of difference between the two contenders and their supporters, the fact that the former was a Catholic functioned as the core reason for Silvestros’s supporters. The earlier part of the conflict resulted in Silvestros’s appointment as the “lawful” patriarch by a synod convened under the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and in Silvestros’s appointment with a diploma, berat, issued by the Ottoman central chancery. Until he challenged Silvestros in the 1740s again, Serafeim retained his ecclesiastical name Kyrillos and found shelter among the local emirs in the Mount Lebanon who had also offered protection to his Catholic uncle Euthymios, the bishop of Sayda. While a lot has been written on this earlier part of the rivalry between the two which culminated in the Antiochian Schism of 1724,¹ the later
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part of their rivalry in the 1740s is mostly, if at all, noted in passing. That Kyrillos officiated for a brief period before he was deposed by Silvestros, and that he used a procurator to control the patriarchal church in Damascus are among the reasons that attached considerably little significance to this episode. This article incorporates into the discussion the unpublished and often-ignored Ottoman documents relating to Kyrillos’ brief tenure, most notably his berat of investiture, preserved in the Piskopos Mukâta’âsi registers in the Prime Ministerial Ottoman Archives. The article has a three-fold purpose and structure. First, on the basis of a combined use of the information contained in this berat and the other references in the primary and secondary sources, it establishes a more solid chronological context. The new chronology adds a more global nature to the local character of the episode connecting the Ottoman context to the French and Papal contexts. Second, by contextualizing the episode with special focus on the Ottoman dynamics, it searches for the major reasons for Kyrillos’ appointment by the Ottoman administration. The way Kyrillos presented his case provides us with a new glance to see his interaction with the Ottoman court, one characterized not only with his financial offers as often noted in the secondary sources, but also by his discourse as a reliable partner with the central administration. Thirdly, the article presents a detailed analysis of Kyrillos’ unpublished berat in comparison with earlier and later berats in search of the continuities and ruptures that his berat exhibits and a contemporary French translation preserved in the Archives nationales in Paris. The essay is also appended by the facsimile, transliteration, and English translation of the berat issued for Kyrillos, and a copy of the Greek-Arabic imprint of Kyrillos’ seal as preserved in the original copy of his petition. An overall aim of the article is to complement local Syrian and European contexts with the introduction of the Ottoman sources and dynamics of the Ottoman state and society of which the Orthodox and Catholic parties competing for the control of the Patriarchate of Antioch constituted and/or claimed to be a part.


For two cases in which Kyrillos’ brief tenure did not merit the attention of the authors of two significant monographs, see Steven Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 234, 382, and Charles A. Frazee, Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 201-204, 218.

When a Catholic is invested as the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch

Temporal and Spatial Context

The unexplored documents preserved in the Ottoman archives in Istanbul about the conflict between Silvestros and Kyrillos are helpful, first and foremost, for a better understanding of the temporal and, in a connected way, spatial context in which Kyrillos managed to ascend the patriarchal throne of Antioch. While one of the most reliable sources from the Phanariot circles in Istanbul noted that Kyrillos deposed Silvestros in the year 1749, a more common chronology offered by the primary and secondary sources are 1743 and 1745. Even if the years 1743 and 1745 are quite close to each other, ascertaining the exact date when the berat was issued allows us to offer a more solid and spatial context.

Relying on later French diplomatic records, at the turn of the twentieth century, d’Avril, Charon and Vailhé dated Kyrillos’ brief patriarchate to the year 1743 and maintained that the latter received a berat from the Ottoman court without mentioning a specific date. Such a chronological context, appear to have placed the Ottoman dynamics outside the picture.

Later scholarship drew heavily on local sources such as the account of Mikhâ’il Burayk, an Orthodox priest who worked for Silvestros and wrote a history of the Patriarchate of Antioch. Possibly the most important narrative source for the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch for the eighteenth century, Burayk clearly mentions that in the year 1745 Kyrillos made several offers to the state which were duly accepted, and he was presented with an imperial order [fermân]. Overall, Burayk maintained, the duration of the Catholics in the city of Damascus was thirty-two days after which Silvestros restored his control. The year 1745 suggested by Burayk as Kyrillos’ receipt of a berat is also supported by the Ottoman documentation, a point which will be further detailed below.

---

Despite using certain parts of Burayk’s account directly or indirectly, some other scholars interpreted this episode within the narrow confines of Ottoman Syria. Philipp, for instance, gave the year 1745 as the date but noted that it was “an order from the local authorities” rather than the sultanic order that made it possible for Kyrillos to depose Silvestros. In Philipp’s account, the portrayal of the Orthodox stands in stark contrast to that of the Catholics who are “fairly free to run their own affairs unless the protests of the Greek Orthodox clergy reached Istanbul and the central government lent them an ear”.¹⁰ Heyberger also presented the conflict between the Catholic and Orthodox parties primarily in the context of Damascus, where each party sought “l’appui des forces locales”.¹¹ Following Burayk, he also noted that the Catholic clergy retained the control of churches in Damascus for thirty-two days. In the hands of scholars who used the Islamic sharia court records in Syria, the role of the Ottoman central administration in issuing a berat for Kyrillos is missing. For instance, without mentioning the fact that Kyrillos was able to obtain a berat of investiture from the Ottoman central administration, Masters associated the success of the Catholics in evicting the Orthodox clergymen in Damascus with Catholic ones in 1745 with their achievement “in convincing the local authorities”.¹² Likewise, he repeated Burayk in noting that the Catholic control of the city continued for thirty-two days “until the Orthodox faction obtained an imperial order”.¹³

Several modern scholars such as Rustom, Haddad, Nassour and Panchenko repeated the same interpretation using the same components of Burayk’s account. They paid due attention to minute detail in the local context and to the fact that the main reason for the Catholics’ gaining of the upper hand in Damascus was the berat issued by the Ottoman central administration for Kyrillos in 1745. The official historian of the Patriarchate of Antioch, Rustom, for instance, provided a sequence of events following Burayk’s account, and even supporting this source with later accounts by Burayk’s progeny in narrating the atmosphere during and after Kyrillos’ short tenure. However, he did not offer a detailed chronology.¹⁴ Haddad’s work is important in terms of providing the dates when Kyrillos’ orders for enthronement and deposition were registered in the court records of Damascus, namely 1 July 1745 and 22 August 1745.¹⁵ Nassour, on the other hand, referred to the congruity in Kyrillos’ policies in receiving a papal pallium and seeking his recognition by the Sublime Porte.¹⁶ He also associated his ability to dethrone Silvestros in 1745 to the firman

issued by the Ottoman sultan. Nonetheless, he avoided referring to the recognition of the patriarchal elections and appointments by the Ottoman authorities because it meant intervention of worldly authority in the internal affairs of the Church. Alongside the other significant pieces of information about the agents who helped Kyrillos in receiving a berat, Panchenko offered the date 21 July 1745 as the day in which Kyrillos’ “representative arrived in Damascus and occupied the patriarchal residence”.

Having evaluated the secondary literature, one may observe that the scholars’ interest and ability to incorporate the role of the Ottoman central administration into the picture appear to have been absent at worst and limited at best. Kyrillos’ berat carries the following date: 22 Muḥarrar 1158 A.H. (bin yüz elli sekisensi Muḥarrremiņi yığirmı ikinci gündü), i.e. 24 February 1745 A.D. Another Ottoman berat issued to reinstall Silvestros in lieu of Kyrillos carries the following date: 7 Receb 1158 A.H., i.e. 5 August 1745. By bringing the exact date of Kyrillos’ berat into the picture, the following chronological steps emerge: on 24 February 1745 Kyrillos’ berat is issued, on 1 July 1745 his berat is registered in the sharia court of Damascus (as per Haddad), on 21 July 1745 his representative arrives in Damascus (as per Panchenko), on 5 August 1745 Kyrillos is deposed and Silvestros receives his berat, and on 22 August Kyrillos’ deposition is recorded in the sharia court of Damascus (as per Haddad).

The long span of time between Kyrillos’ berat and the day in which it was recorded in the sharia court of Damascus (127 days, i.e. 4 months and 7 days) and the short span of time when between Silvestros’ berat and the day in which it was recorded in Damascus (17 days) are points that deserve more research in the future. For the time being, it may possibly indicate the relative difficulty that Kyrillos faced in the local context, especially if we also take into account the fact that he preferred to dispatch his representative to Damascus in the first place. If the two chronologies offered by Haddad and Panchenko are correct, it may also be assumed that the berat might not have been registered by Kyrillos’ representative. Instead, it might have been registered as a result of the Ottoman bureaucratic procedure in which copies of berats are also dispatched into the relevant administrative and legal bodies. Burayk’s oft-quoted thirty-two days also requires at least some revision in the light of this chronology. If we take the days in which the berats were issued in Istanbul as criterion, Kyrillos was recognized as the patriarch of Antioch by the

---

17 Nassour, Silvestros Patriarchis Antiocheias 1724-1766, p. 162.
18 Nassour, Silvestros Patriarchis Antiocheias 1724-1766, p. 119n.
19 Constantin Panchenko, Arab Orthodox Christians Under the Ottomans, p. 390.
20 BOA.KK.d.2542/09, fol 51.
21 BOA.KK.d.2542/09, fol 68-70.
22 BOA.KK.d.2542/09, fol 51.
24 Constantin Panchenko, Arab Orthodox Christians Under the Ottomans, p. 390.
25 BOA.KK.d.2542/09, fol 68-70.
26 Haddad, The Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and the Origins of the Melkite Schism, p. 203.
Ottoman central administration between 24 February and 5 August, i.e. 162 days (5 months and 12 days). If we take the days in which these berats were registered in the sharia court of Damascus as criterion, Kyrillos’ right to officiate as the patriarch of Antioch was recognized by the kadi of Damascus between 1 July and 22 August, i.e. 52 days (1 month and 21 days).

The fact that Kyrillos received the recognition of the Ottoman imperial administration in 1745 and not in 1743 is an extremely important piece of information not only in terms of supporting Burayk’s account but also connecting the Ottoman central administration into the European and local Syrian contexts. We know that on 24 December 1743, the pope Benedict XIV had issued his demandatum. Following Kyrillos’ oath to abide by the connotations of the demandatum on 7 October 1744, the same pope issued a pallium recognizing Kyrillos as the legitimate patriarch on 29 February 1744. Therefore, the fact that there was approximately a year between Kyrillos’ receipt of the pallium and berat indicate that his interest in gaining recognition of the Ottoman central administration was not bereft of his recognition by the pope. Therefore, Kyrillos’ patriarchate cannot be understood solely with reference to European and Syrian contexts. The context of the Ottoman central administration appears to be relevant for the spatial context of Kyrillos’ brief tenure.

Kyrillos as a partner of the Ottoman central administration

Even if Kyrillos’ berat does not allow us to trace the name of the agent(s) who assisted with the process of receiving this document,29 the contents of the berat shows, at least, that this agency was quite successful in translating Kyrillos’ case into a discourse that would convince the Ottoman central administration on many grounds. When it comes to encounters between the Ottoman administration and clergy, a still prevalent conviction

28 For the English translation of this document, see Charon (Korolevsky), History of the Melkite Patriarchates, vol. I. p. 40n.
29 So far, the names of several individuals have been mentioned as agents who enabled Kyrillos to receive a berat and the ambassadorial reports by Michel-Ange de Castellane (1741-1747) preserved in the Archives nationales de France (hereinafter AN) confirms the role of these individuals in obtaining Kyrillos’ berat. AN.AE/B/I/422, 164-167, AN.AE/B/I/423, 9-13, AN.AE/B/I/423, 82-92, AN.AE/B/I/423, 152-159, AN.AE/B/I/423, 164-165, AN.AE/B/I/424, 84-87, AN.AE/B/I/424, 146-153, AN.AE/B/I/424, 154-157, AN.AE/B/I/425, 28-31, AN.AE/B/I/426, 151-152, AN.AE/B/I/426, 151, AN.AE/B/I/426, 372-375, AN.AE/B/I/428, 73-74, AN.AE/B/I/428, 150-153, AN.AE/B/I/428, 324-329, AN.AE/B/I/430, 328-335, AN.AE/B/I/430, 336-339, AN.AE/B/I/431, 27-32. Although the British ambassador Aspinwall made several references to “the influence of the French” in the Ottoman court, at a time when the Ottoman wars with Nadir Shah and the intra-European conflicts in the Ottoman seas dominated the British agenda, he did not mention the conflict between Silvestros and Kyrillos. See, most notably, two letters dated 11 July 1745, NA.97/32, fols. 240-243 and 244-248.
maintains that the former was rarely interested in the intra-Christian matters and could be easily manipulated through financial offers. Obviously, the interests of the imperial treasury were among the top priorities in the Ottoman Empire, just as it was the case elsewhere. However, just as was the case with other pre-modern states, the Ottoman state based its raison d’être on certain principles. If the sultan does not observe these principles, he would cease to be just (‘âdil) and become tyrant (zâlim). The petition submitted by Kyrillos, which is quoted in the narratio (iblâğ) section of the berat, appears to have taken care to observe a certain balance between the financial offers of Kyrillos’ prospective patriarchate, his reliability as a decent follower of his duties both to the state and the Church, and a reliable partner.

Kyrillos’ petition follows the typical standard of petitions to the Ottoman imperial chancery and so starts with an introduction of the petitioner. Kyrillos put a particular accent on his credibility as a clergyman and his popularity among the laymen. Thus, he introduced himself as a member of “the community of clergymen for fifty years who had been residing in Rûm monasteries in Saida and the patriarchal representative for twenty-one years by demand of the poor subjects without a berat”. The French translation of this berat rendered the said expression as ‘les fonctions de Patriarche sans barat’. On another occasion, he emphasized his popularity by claiming that all the subjects of the sultan are “happy and content with [him]” a typical expression in patriarchal berats. Drawing on another much-cited expression in patriarchal berats, he presented himself “worthy for the patriarchate of the Rûm community in Antioch and its dependencies in accordance with the requirements of their rite.” Prudently abstaining from implying any intra-Christian conflicts and clinging to the term Rûm—to which term both the Orthodox and Catholics laid claim—Kyrillos, appears to have presented himself as a legitimate contestant to Silvestros. The French translation of Kyrillos’ berat simply renders the term Rûm as “Grec/Greque,” hence “Rûm manastır” is “un couvent Grec” “Antakya ve tevâbi’inde sâkin Rûm tâ’ifesinin patrikliği” is “la charge de Patriarche de la nation Grecque à Antioche et Dépendances”.

Continuing with the financial offers of his patriarchate, Kyrillos appears to have made several appealing offers. First of all, he promised to double the amount of the pîşkeş, the lump-sum tax that the patriarchal candidates pay in order to obtain their berat when there is a change on the patriarchal or sultanic throne. While we know that this practice was much more common in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the case of Antioch seems to have a shorter and less consistent tradition of paying a pîşkes. The extant berats issued for the patriarchs of Antioch show that Makarios paid a pîşkes of 5,120 akçe in 1649.

30 AN.AE/B/1/422 fol. 171-174v, esp. 171.
31 AN.AE/B/1/422 fol. 171-174v, esp. 171.
Athanasios’ *berat* of 1720 had no reference to the payment of a *pîşkeş*,\(^{33}\) Silvestros paid a *pîşkeş* of 10,000 *akçes* in 1724,\(^{34}\) hence almost doubling the amount that Makarios had paid. This can be explained partly by the eventful context caused by the first election of Kyrrillos in the same year. This amount appears to have remained the same when he renewed his *berat* as a result of the accession of a new sultan to the throne in 1730.\(^{35}\) Possibly aware of the difficulty of his task, Kyrrillos promised to pay a *pîşkeş* of 15,000 *akçes* and eventually, an amount of 20,000 *akçes* was fixed. What is more, he offered to pay a yearly fixed amount, which was eventually raised to 30,000 *akçes* which he referred to as the *mâl-i maktû’*. In the context of non-Muslims, this term is used in cases of cumulative collection of the jizya in a given land and was often the result of “an agreement” between the state and its non-Muslim subjects.\(^{36}\) Those who had contacted the central administration for the payment of the jizya on a community, rather than individual basis were often prominent lay members of the community, known as the *kocabaşs*. As far as the patriarchal *berats* are concerned, the term *mâl-i maktû’* features frequently in the *berats* of patriarchs of Constantinople.\(^{37}\) The financial aspects of Kyrrillos’ tenure also take place in Burayk’s account. He referred to this ‘state tax’ (*mâl mîrî*) as something that Kyrrillos and his supporters ‘invented’ in the Patriarchate of Antioch.\(^{38}\) The fact that the amounts proposed by Kyrrillos as *pîşkeş* and *mâl-i maktû’* were raised by the Ottoman central administration appear to be a rare case in which the process of negotiation was noted down in a published *berat*. This aspect of Kyrrillos’ *berat* may also suggest his difficult position in the eyes of the Ottoman central administration.

The prospect of a total of 50,000 *akçes* for the patriarchal throne of Antioch must be an attractive one for the imperial treasury given that the Ottomans were in war with Nadir Shah of Iran who had laid siege to such strategic Ottoman castles as Mosul and Kars since 1743, and had just won a victory against the Ottomans in the battle of Muradtepe in August 1745.\(^{39}\) Presented as one of the three key terms in the Ottoman economic mind by

---

\(^{33}\) BOA.D.PSK.7/6. The document was transliterated in Çolak & Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution*, p. 91.

\(^{34}\) BOA.KK.d.2542/08, fol. 3. The document was transliterated in Çolak & Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution*, pp. 92-93.

\(^{35}\) BOA.KK.d.2542/01, fols 170-171. The document was transliterated in Çolak & Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution*, pp. 99-101.


\(^{38}\) Burayk, *Târihi-i Şâm*, p. 27.
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the pioneering historian of Ottoman economy, fiscalism was resorted to in times of crises, sometimes with such tendencies to see many areas primarily as a source of income for the state.\textsuperscript{40} The fate of the conflict with Nadir Shah during the 1740s was dependent not only on the military might of the two sides but also on their financial resilience.\textsuperscript{41} If we are to believe Hammer, one of the ways in which the then grand vizier Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha tried to increase the financial capabilities of the Ottoman state on the verge of a new war with Nadir Shah was to seek execution of Kabakulak İbrahim Pasha and the confiscation of his possessions.\textsuperscript{42} This former grand vizier had barely escaped having his possessions confiscated upon his dismissal in 1732.\textsuperscript{43} He had already attracted the animosity of not only Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha but also one of the strongest figures in the Ottoman court, the chief eunuch Hacı Beşir Ağa,\textsuperscript{44} whose central role in Ottoman power mechanisms was noted in 1746 by British ambassador Stanhope Aspinwall as follows: “This person had for near three Reigns had the controlling sway in the management of affairs, even over the Vizirs”.\textsuperscript{45} The same ambassador noted after the death of the said chief eunuch that “The Vizir is certainly more truly Vizir than fifty or sixty of his Predecessors have been; … He could not help expressing it himself with great satisfaction, soon after his controller’s death, saying three days afterwards, It is now three days that I am Vizir”.\textsuperscript{46} Another foreign observer, Russian diplomatic resident in Istanbul, Alexei Veshniakov noted that the French ambassador managed to convince the Sublime Porte for 50,000 piasters to depose Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch Silvestros and replace him by his Catholic competitor.\textsuperscript{47}

Kyrillo’s financial offers to the imperial treasury might also be perceived in a similar fisco-centric context. Even in this case, however, Kyrillos did not present his offer in purely financial terms, and as his further correspondence with the Ottoman central administration shows, his discourse comprised several other motives for cooperation. In an


\textsuperscript{41} İlker Külbilge, 18. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı-İran Sıyası İlişkileri (1703-1747), (PhD Diss., Ege University, 2010), pp. 276, 318 and 347.


\textsuperscript{45} The National Archives, Kew, State Papers (hereinafter NA) NA.97/32, fol. 327.

\textsuperscript{46} Constantin A. Panchenko, “Iyerusalimskiy patriarkh Parfeniy (1737–1766 g.) i Rossiya. Neponyatyy soyuznik”, in Constantin A. Panchenko, Prawoslavnye arabы: put’ cherez veka, (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo PSTGU, 2013), p. 422. I am thankful to one of my reviewers for bringing this piece of information to my attention.
attempt to claim that there are no other powers on the Patriarchate of Antioch than the
Ottoman state, he noted that neither the Patriarchate of Constantinople nor any other
patriarchate had authority on this patriarchate. This was a clear reference to the Ottoman
administration’s prudent policy to demarcate the authority of different Orthodox
patriarchates even in cases when it supported one of them in intra-patriarchal conflicts. In
a potential attempt to emphasize the religious nature of his role other than being a tax-
farmer, he requested that he be given the Patriarchate of Antioch “in a manner similar to
Ohrid and Peć” (Ohri ve İpek patriklığı müzillii). In the French translation of this berat, this
expression appears as “en forme de termes comme les Patriarcats d’Ypek et d’Oukhry.” Kyrillos’ offer to make a yearly payment to the Ottoman state must not be seen solely as a
financial offer but also as a sign of his confidence to collaborate with the Ottoman central
administration on a long-term basis.

The connotations of this collaboration feature in the conditions of the berat issued for
Kyrillos and the correspondence between him and the Ottoman central administration.

Continuity and change: Correspondence between Kyrillos and the Ottoman central administration

As the most binding documents between the holder of an office and the Ottoman imperial
chancery, berats lay out the terms of the rights and responsibilities of the berat-holders on
which their correspondence with the Ottoman central administration is based. My study of
the Piskopos Mukâta’ası registers shows that Kyrillos received not only his berat but also two
imperial orders issued in response to and quote from his petitions. I have also come across
the original copy of a petition by Kyrillos, which contains Kyrillos’ seal (see Appendix IV).

Let us start with the content of the rights and responsibilities in Kyrillos’ berat which
may be found in facsimile, transliteration and English translation in the Appendix. As was
the case with the berats of Silvestros in 1724 and 1730, the berat in question gave Kyrillos
several advantages, at least in theory, over several groups of people who were connected to
the lay and ecclesiastical spheres of the Orthodox Church and community and the
administrative and financial affairs of the Empire. The term Rûm was used by both the
Orthodox and Catholic parties and as such, it does not seem to have created a paradox in
the Ottoman parlance because the berat simply retained this term. In practice, the Ottoman
administration appears, at least on paper, to have seen this episode in the context of a
patriarchal struggle, and not necessarily accession of a Catholic on the throne of an
Orthodox patriarchate. Therefore, in the discursive sphere, the berat represents similarities
with the earlier berats issued for Silvestros.

48 For a comparative case involving the patriarchates of Constantinople and Alexandria, see
BOA.D.PSK.12/6 quoted in Çolak, The Orthodox Church in the Early Modern Middle East, p. 97.
49 AN.AE/B/1/422 fol. 171-174v, esp. 171.
Regarding the content of the rights and responsibilities, a comparison of Kyrillos’ berat with the two berats that had been issued for Silvestros in 1724 and 1730 and the later patriarchal berats is a task worth pursuing. A cursory glance at the berats issued for Silvestros in 1730 and for Kyrillos in 1745, in particular, shows that Kyrillos’ berat follows the contents of Silvestros’ berat of 1730 almost to the letter. The berats of 1730 and 1745 both have seventeen conditions (şürût) all of which follow the same order with more or less the same wording. To enable the comparison, the relevant sections in Silvestros’ berat of 1730 were rendered in the notes after the reciprocal conditions in the transliteration and English translation of Kyrillos’ berat in the Appendix. Collectively, these conditions supported the office of the patriarch over the ecclesiastical and lay members of the community in disciplinary matters, and centrifugal and centripetal actors in the provinces. Inevitably, these conditions placed the patriarch in direct connection with the central administration in administrative, legal and economic domains.\(^{50}\)

However, there were also minor, but, in my opinion, significant details that refer to the potential difficulties that Kyrillos would encounter in controlling the Patriarchate.\(^{51}\) These details that were added to the relevant conditions as separate phrases were probably a result of the negotiations between the Ottoman central administration and Kyrillos’ agents. These differences feature in conditions number 6 and 15. To showcase the significance of these differences, it would be pertinent to copy these conditions below.

The condition number 6 in Silvestros’ berat of 1730 reads as follows:

\[6\]
\[
\text{patrikliğine müte’âllik piskoposlarnın ve gumenoslarnın / ve papasların ve keşişlerin ayınları üzere kabâhatleri zuhûr eyledikde ayınları üzere patrik-i mesfûr tedîb ve saçların traş ve / yerlerin âhere virdükde kimesne müdâhale eylemeyüb ve ayınları üzerinde ‘azl ve nasb müstehakk olan papasları ve gumenoslari / ve keşişleri ve mitrepoldleri patrik-i mesfûr ayınları üzerinde ‘azl ve yerlerin gayrî râhiblere virdükde âherden ferd / muhâlefet eylemeyüb ve}
\]

English translation:

\[6\] When, in accordance with their rite, the said patriarch disciplines and shaves the hair of those bishops, priors, priests and monks under his jurisdiction who commit offence against their rite and dismisses them and gives their posts to others he shall not be interfered with. When the aforementioned patriarch appoints and dismisses the priests, priors, monks and metropolitans in accordance with their rite and gives their posts to other priests, no one from outside shall prevent them.

Here is the reciprocal condition in Kyrillos’ berat of 1745:

\[50\] Colak & Bayraktar-Tellan, The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution, pp. 49-56.

\[51\] The first historian who studied the changes and continuities in berats issued for patriarchs and bishops in the long run is Konortas. See Paraskevas Konortas, Othomanikes Thoriesis gia to Oikoumeniko Patriarchei, 17as-arheis 20ou aionas (Athens: Alexandreia, 1998).

English translation:

When, in accordance with their rite, the said patriarch disciplines and shaves the hair of those bishops, priors, and priests in places dependent on his patriarchate who commit offence against their rite and dismisses them and gives their posts to others he shall not be interfered with. When the aforementioned patriarch appoints and dismisses the priests, metropolitans, priests, monks and priors who deserve to be dismissed or appointed in accordance with their rite and sends petitions to appoint metropolitans and bishops, they shall be given my imperial berats and orders with their conditions to obtain (these posts) after the required customary pişkeş is paid to my Imperial Treasury. Without the sealed petition of the patriarchs no one shall be allowed to have a metropolitanate and bishopric. The said patriarch’s petition shall be observed and if there is a petition regarding their rite it shall be allowed.

Here, the part in italics appear to be an addition. Therefore, even if Silvestros’ berat of 1730 was probably used as a model in preparing Kyrillos’ berat, the latter differed from the former at least in part. A comparison of Kyrillos’ berat with the most recent berat issued for an Orthodox patriarch, namely Neofytos of Constantinople’s berat of 1743 shows that some parts of the above-quoted section in italics are scattered across different sections of this berat. So, one may assume that the condition number 6 was partly a result of copying from other berats and partly a result of negotiation between Kyrillos’ agents and the Ottoman central administration. The fact that the process of the appointment of metropolitans and bishops was associated with their recognition by the Ottoman central administration through the berats may also refer to the concerns for the cooperation between Kyrillos and the Ottoman central administration. While the contents of the berats do not allow us to go beyond informed guesses, the condition number 15 can be easily interpreted in the context of security concerns that Kyrillos probably felt.

Silvestros’ berat of 1730 makes only the following remark:

patrik-i mesführ kendü rızası yüklen biz sana cebren yasakç / olsun deyuy kapum kuları taraflarından rence ve ta’addî itdürülmeyüb ve
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English translation:

[15] The aforementioned patriarch shall not be harassed by my kapıkulları with the pretext of urging their service as yasakçıs against his consent.

Kyrillos’ berat of 1745 renders the same condition as follows:


English translation:

[15] The monasteries where the aforementioned patriarch resides shall not be sent anyone from the ‘askerî and others. The aforementioned patriarch shall not be harassed by my kapıkulları with the pretext of urging their service as yasakçıs against his consent.

Therefore, Kyrillos’ berat also contains the additional section in italics. A comparison with other berats shows that this is the earliest case in which the berat in question offers protection to the patriarch from the members of the ‘askerî, a term that refers to military and administrative officials of the Ottoman administration. This phrase was included in Kyrillos’ berat most probably at the request of Kyrillos’ agents. Later on, in the berat issued for Matthaios of Alexandria in 1758, we see reference to a similar expression52 which might suggest that Kyrillos’ berat might have been used in drafting this berat. However, here we see a major difference in that Kyrillos’ berat offers protection from the members of the ‘askerî to the monasteries where Kyrillos resided while Matthaios’ berat does the same for the mansion where Matthaios resided. If we remember the fact that Kyrillos presented himself as living in the monasteries in Sayda, and that he was hesitant to leave Sayda for Damascus even after receiving this berat, one may assume that this phrase was most probably reflecting Kyrillos’ security concerns. Similar concerns also feature in the berat as we see in the way the first condition was phrased. In this case, the patriarch’s authority was presented not only with regard to the lay members of the Orthodox community as in Silvestros’ berat of 1730, but also with regard to the bishops in the Patriarchate of Antioch. Likewise, in the seventeenth condition, the name of Silvestros was also noted among the people who should be prevented from interfering in Kyrillos’ patriarchate.

These security concerns proved to be well-founded even in the short run. On 19 May 1745 Kyrillos wrote a petition to the Ottoman imperial chancery and complained about Silvestros’ supporters who tried to prevent him from conducting the affairs of his community.53 In this well-argued petition Kyrillos made several temporary and historic references to Silvestros whom he depicted as a weak actor who tormented “all the poor subjects” of the sultan and as a result the members of the Rûm community asked for

52 Çolak & Bayraktar-Tellan, The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution, p. 168.
53 BO.A.D.PSK.14/135.
Kyrillos' assistance to protect them against Silvestros. One of Kyrillos’ arguments was that Silvestros had left his patriarchate for Moldavia, Wallachia and hinted that he might even be in ‘the lands of hostile infidels’ (harbî kefere vilâyetleri). Despite the tone of his argumentation, the fact that Kyrillos asked for an inspection on the spot to prove the people’s contentment with him refers to his somewhat weak position as the patriarch of Antioch. The petition is also important in terms of containing an imprint of Kyrillos’ seal which was forged in the year he became patriarch, i.e. 1158 A.H. In opposition to Silvestros’ seal in Greek and Turkish, Kyrillos’ is in Greek and Arabic (note the way the word patriarch is spelled).54 While two imperial orders were issued in response to this petition and one dispatched to “the mollaś and kadiś of the places where the Orthodox subjects under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch are”.55 and the other to the kadi of Antioch,56 the Orthodox party was quick to retaliate and reinstall Silvestros with a berat on 5 August 1745.57

As noted above, Kyrillos’ berat had a series of similarities with the contemporary berats. The berat issued for Matthaios of Alexandria’s berat of investiture in 1746 and that of renewal in 1758 included the same points following a similar wording. Likewise, Parthenios of Jerusalem’s berat of renewal issued in 1755 closely followed the same pattern with some additional terms relating to the control of Holy Sites.

**Conclusion**

Recent years have witnessed the flourishing of publications that have introduced the riches of Ottoman studies and archives into the history of Catholicism in the Ottoman Empire.58 Incorporating the sources and dynamics of the Ottoman central administration also has the potential to revisit the history of Catholic Church in the Ottoman Empire. However limited they might be in number, the Ottoman documents about the brief tenure of Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas as the patriarch of Antioch offer a more nuanced view of the Antiochian Schism of 1724. First of all, they allow us to discuss this problem on a more solid chronological context, which consequently brings in the Ottoman central administration as a significant actor in the spatial context of the Antiochian Schism. While

---

54 For a recent analysis of the Orthodox metropolitan of Brăila’s seal, see Yevhen Buket, Maryna Kravets, Vera Tehentsova, and Roman Zakharchenko, “A Bilingual Greek-Ottoman Turkish Seal of Daniel II, Orthodox Metropolitan of Brăila (1751)” *International Journal of Turkology* 14 (2021), pp. 4-21.

55 BO.A.KK.d.2542/9, fol. 55a.

56 BO.A.KK.d.2542/9, fols 55b.

57 BO.A.KK.d.2542/9, fols 68-70.

When a Catholic is invested as the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch

the scholarship has tended to see this schism in the confines of Syria or in the axis of Syrian/European entanglements, Kyrillos’ berat shows that alongside his ties with the European and local Syrian dynamics, Kyrillos took care to receive the support of the Ottoman central administration in ascending the patriarchal throne in 1745. The fact that he sought recognition by the Ottoman administration immediately after his recognition by the Pope is one of the key conclusions to be drawn from the study of the Ottoman documents. Kyrillos’ ability to negotiate successfully with the Ottoman imperial chancery in an attempt to prove himself as a reliable partner also suggests that he had access to agents who were familiar with the requisite principles of the Ottoman state and the functioning of the Ottoman bureaucracy. When studied in the context of the other patriarchal berats at the time, Kyrillos’ berat also offers important insights into the changes and continuities in the way the Ottoman central administration and Kyrillos perceived the Schism in question. The changes in Kyrillos’ berat point to his rather weak stance in opposition to the influence of the Orthodox party, as can also be seen from the brevity of his tenure. How Kyrillos’ berat of 1745 was written also appear to have influenced the way in which Silvestros’ unpublished berat of 1745 was written only partially. Therefore, a comparative analysis of Kyrillos’ berat with that of Silvestros in 1745 also has the potential to shed light on this aspect of the Catholic-Orthodox encounters in the Ottoman Empire, which is the topic of a prospective study. Finally, the fact that at the time when Kyrillos was seeking the support of the Ottoman central administration, Silvestros was also occupied with his printing activities in Arabic in Moldavia also calls for the importance of the Ottoman context for a more complete history of Arab Christian printing in the Ottoman Empire.

Appendix I

Facsimile of the berat of Kyrillos Tanas of Antioch, 1745.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{60} BOA.KK.d.2542/09, fol. 51.
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Appendix II

Transliteration of the *berat* of Kyrillos Tanas of Antioch, 1745.

Nişân-ı hümâyûn


[1] mesûrûr Kyrillos râhib varû ref’ olunan mesûrûr Silvestros râhib yerine Antakya ve tevâbî’ Rûm / tâ’îfesûnun patricli olub mesûrûr Silvestros râhib zikr olunan Antakya ve tevâbî’ı

61 This word was written probably by mistake on the part of the scribe. The contemporary French translation did not include this word and Silvestros’ *berat* of 1745 did not repeat this word in quoting from Kyrillos’ *berat*. See, respectively, *AN.AE/B/I/422* fols 171-174v, esp. 171 and *BO.AK.K.d.2542/09*, fols 68-70.
patrikliğine kadımden ne minvâl / üzere zabt ve mutasarrıflı olagelmış ise mesfür Kirilos râhib dahî ol minvâl üzere zabt ve mutasarrıf olub / refî olunan mesfür Silvestros râhib ve âherden bir ferd mâni' ve mûzahîm olmayub dahî ve ta'arruz kılmalar ve kadımden / Antakya patriği ilitzâzûnun dâhil olan mitrepolîdlıklerdan Adana ve Tarsus ve Payas ve İskenderun ve tevâbi'i / ve kazâ-i Diyârberkîr ve Çemişkezek ve Çildır ve Ahhsa ve tevâbi' ve Erzurum ve tevâbi'ii mitrepolîdîler ve patrikliğine / tâbî mahallerde sâkin Rûmîyan tâ'îfesinin ulus ve kiçisi mesfür Kirilos râhibi hutimet 'avakıbûhûyû üzêrûn patrik / bilüb âyînlerine müte'allik umûrlarında doğru sözûn tecâvûz eylemeyeler ve62

2) patrikliğine tâbî lerde mûrûd olan / mitrepolîdî ve papaslar ve keşîşler ve kalogriyalar bilâ-vâris mûrûd oldıklarında mu'tâd-ı kadîm üzere her nesi var ise patrik-i mesfür veyâhûd / mitrepolîdîleri ahz ve kabz eylemlerinde hilâf-ı mu'tâd-ı kadîm beytül-mâl ve kasmâm âdemler ve voyvodalar ve subaşılar ve mütevellîler / ve sâ'irleri mühâlefet eylemeyüb ve63
3) patrikliğine tâbî lerde kadîmden tasarrûflarında olan kilîsa ve manastırlar bilâ-emr-i şerîf' / kimesne yedlerinden almayub ve vaz'-i kadîmi üzere izn-i şerî ile ve emr-i şerîfîmle väki' olan meremmatlarna dahl olunmayub / ve64
4) şer'işerîfe müte'allik lâzım gelen da'vâlari Divân-ı Hümâyûnumda görilmek ve Rûmîyan tâ'îfesine biri âyînleri üzere / tezvic îmêlû ve veyâhûd 'avrat boşamalu oldûkda aralarında patrik-i mesfür veyâhûd / mitrepolîdîleri ahz ve kabz eylemlerinde hilâf-ı mu'tâd-ı kadîm beytül-mâl ve kasmâm âdemler ve voyvodalar ve subaşılar ve mütevellîler ve sâ'irleri mühâlefet eylemeyeph 65
5) mûrûd olan ruhbânlar ve Rûm tâ'îfesi kendü âyînleri üzere / tezvîc itmelü veyâhûd 'avrat boşamalu oldûkda aralarına patrik-i mesfür vekîllerinden gayri kimesne girme / ve karşmaya ve66
6) patrikliğine tâbî lerde olan piskoposlâr ve gumenoşlar âyînleri üzere kabâhatleri zuhûr itdikde / patrik-i mesfür te'dîb ve saçların traş ve yerlerin âhere

62 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: mesführ Silvestros nâm râhib varub gebûn uzege zîkî oluân / Antakya ve Şâm ve Haleb ve Ta’bulsam ve Seýda ve Beyrut ve Ladikiye ve Payas ve Adana ve Hama ve Humus ve Ba’albek ve Diyârberkîr ve Erzurum ve Ahhsa / ve Çildır ve tevâbi’i kazâlarda sâkin Rûmîyan tâ’îfesi üzêrûnne kadîmden olugelên ’ade ve kânûn ve ayîn-ı ’antlalari mukturzânsa / patrik olub patrikligine tâbî yerlerde Rûmîyan tâ’îfesinin ulus ve kiçisi râhib-i mesfür üzêrûnne patrik bûlub ayînleri müte’allîk / umûrûlarda dogn sözendîn tecâvûz eylemeyeler ve
63 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patrikligine tâbî yerlerde mûrûd olan mitrepolîdîler ve papaslar ve keşîşler ve kalogriyalar / mu’tâd-ı kadîm üzêrûn ne resi var ise patrik-i mesfür veyâhûd mitrepolîdîleri ahz ve kabz eylemlêde hilâf-ı mu’tâd-ı kadîm beytül-mâl ve kasmâm / âdemeleri ve voyvodalar ve subaşılar ve mütevellîler ve sâ’irleri mühâlefet eylemeyüb ve
64 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patrikligine tâbî yerlerde kadîmden tasarrûflarinda olan kilîsa ve manastûrlar bilâ-emr-i şerîf’ / kimesne yedlerinden almayub ve vaz-’ı kadîmi üzere izn-i şerî ile ve emr-i şerîfîmle väki’ olan meremmatlarna dahl olunmayub / ve
65 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patrikligine tâbî yerlerde mûrûd olan mitrepolîdîler ve papaslar ve keşîşler ve kalogriyalar / mu’tâd-ı kadîm üzêrûn ne resi var ise patrik-i mesfür veyâhûd mitrepolîdîleri ahz ve kabz eylemlêde hilâf-ı mu’tâd-ı kadîm beytül-mâl ve kasmâm / âdemeleri ve voyvodalar ve subaşılar ve mütevellîler ve sâ’irleri mühâlefet eylemeyeph 66
66 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: mesführ Silvestros nâm râhib varub gebûn uzege zîkî oluân / Antakya ve Şâm ve Haleb ve Ta’bulsam ve Seýda ve Beyrut ve Ladikiye ve Payas ve Adana ve Hama ve Humus ve Ba’albek ve Diyârberkîr ve Erzurum ve Ahhsa / ve Çildır ve tevâbi’i kazâlarda sâkin Rûmîyan tâ’îfesi üzêrûnne kadîmden olugelên ’ade ve kânûn ve ayîn-ı ’antlalari mukturzânsa / patrik olub patrikligine tâbî yerlerde Rûmîyan tâ’îfesinin ulus ve kiçisi râhib-i mesfür üzêrûnne patrik bûlub ayînleri müte’allîk / umûrûlarda dogn sözendîn tecâvûz eylemeyeler ve
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[7] patriklîgine tâbi’ yerlerde ba’zî târiski dünyâ olan keşîsler âyînlerine muhâlîf / istedikleri yerlerde gezmeyüb kadîmi sâkin oldukları manastırlarına gönderile ve


[9] mûrûr / ve ‘ubûr eyledigi yerlerde bir zimmînin rızası yoğiken biz seni cebren Müslûman ideriz deyu ehl-i ‘ôrf tâ’ifesi taraflarından / celb-i mâl içün rençîde itdürülmeyüb ve

[10] ba’zî zu’emâ ve erbâb-i timar ve zî-kudret kimesnelerin çiftliklerinde / ve köşklerinde ve hâneîlerinde olan zimmîlere bunlar bizim irgâmımız vevehûd hizmetkârımızdır deyu âyînleri icrâsına / mûhâlefet itdürülmeyüb ve

67 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patriklîgine müte’âllîk piskopolus’un ve gumenoslar / ve papaslar ve keşîsler âyînleri üzere kabâhatleri zuhûr eyledikde âyînleri üzere patrik-i mesfûr te’dîb te’bedîb ve saçların traş ve / yerlerin ahûre virdikde kimesne müdaâhale eylemeyüb ve âyînleri üzere ‘azl ve nasba müstehakk olan piskopolus / ve keşîsler ve mitrepolides patrik-i mesfûr âyînleri üzere ‘azl ve yerlerin gayri râhîliber virdikde ahberen ferd / mûhîfedet eylemeyüb ve

68 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patriklîgine müte’âllîk yerlerde ba’zî târisk-i dünyâ olan keşîsler âyînlerine muhâlîf istedikleri yerlerde gezmeyüb / kadîmi sâkin oldukları manastırlarına gönderile ve

69 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patriklîgine müte’âllîk piskopolus’un ve gumenoslar / ve keşîsler ve piskopolus’un ve keşîsler ve mitrepolides patrik-i mesfûr / ve sa’îr ehl-i ‘ôrf ve sa’îr ehl-i ‘ôrf tâ’ifesi tarafîndan / hâlâf-i kanûn ve mûgâyir-i mu’tâd-i kadîm muhâlîf omad etdükde âyînleri / i’lâm / olub ve sa’îr ehl-i ‘ôrf tâ’ifesi tarafîndan hâlâf-i şer-i şerîf / avâ’id ve hediyye talebîyle rençîde itdürülmeyüb / ve

70 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: mûrûr ve ‘ubûr eyledigi yerlerde bir zimmînin kendü rızası yoğiken birisini cebren Müslüman ol deyu ehl-i ‘ôrf tâ’ifesi tarafîndan / mezuda mülâcumetlerin / diye âyînleri icrâsına mûmûna’at itdürülmeyûb ve

71 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: ba’zî zu’emâ ve erbâb-i timar ve zî-kudret kimesnelerin çiftliklerinde / ve köşklerinde ve hâneîlerinde olan zimmîlere bunlar bizim irgâmımız vevehûd hizmetkârımızdır deyu âyînleri icrâsına mûmûna’at itdürülmeyûb ve
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[12] kadîmden Rûmiyân tâ’ifesine mahsûs olan kilisalar / ve derûn-ı kilisaya müte’allik her nesi var ise fi’l-cümle patrik-i mesfür tarafından zabt / itdürûlb millet-i sâ’ire tarafından zabtına kat’a müdâhale olûmaya ve 23

[13] patrik-i mesfürün mu’tdâ-i kadîm üzere yedinde götürdûgi / ‘asasına ve bindûgi bârgîr ve kâtûrlara müdâhale olûmaya ve 24

[14] patrik-i mesfürün berâtına dâhil olan yerlerde ruhbân / tâ’ifesinden ba’zîlari kilisa ve manastırlar yoğiken mahalle be-mahalle gezüb fasada bâ’is olanlari patrik-i mesfür ma’rifetile te’dîb / ve men’ olûn ve 25

[15] patrik-i mesfürün sâkin olduğu manastırlarına ‘skerden ve gayrîden kimesne gönderilmyûb ve patrik-i mesfür / kendü râzsî yûgiken biz sana cebren yasakçî olûn deyu kâpi kulları tarafindan recîde ve ta’addî itdürûlb yê 26


72 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: ‘akd-i nikâh ve fesh-i nikâh ve münâza’un fihi olan iki zimmî mabeyninde rızâlaryla ıslâh / ve âyînleri üzere kilisalarında yemin ve afyos ta’bir olûnr / şu ‘avrâdi şu zimmîye nikâh eyle vevâhûd şu papası ‘azl ve kilisasin şu papasa vir deyu ta’addî itdürilmeyûb ve bir zimmî tâ’ifesini / te’dîb ve terbiyeye için âyînleri muktezâsinca afyos ta’bir olûmr te’dîb ka’âdılara bî-vech müdâhale olûmaya ve papas ve keşî tâ’ifesinden / ızn-i şer’ ile alîkonлим租车ım lazım gelenen patrik-i mesfür ma’rifet ile alîkonlûb ve

73 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: kadîmden Rûmiyân tâ’ifesine mahsûs olan kilisalar / ve derûn-ı kilisaya müte’allik her nesi var ise fi’l-cümle patrik-i mesfür tarafından zabt itdürûlb millet-i sâ’ire tarafından zabtına kat’a müdâhale / olûmaya ve

74 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patrik- i mesfürün mu’tdâ-i kadîm üzere yedinde götürdûgi ‘asasına ve bindûgi bârgîr ve kâtûrlara müdâhale olûmaya ve

75 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patrik / ve patrik-i mesfürün berâtına dâhil olan yerlerde ruhbân tâ’ifesinden ba’zîlari kilisa ve manastırlar yoğiken mahalle be-mahalle gezüb fasada / bâ’is olanlari patrik-i mes sûr ma’rifet ile te’dîb ve men’ olûn ve

76 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: patrik-i mesfürün kendü râzsî yûgiken biz sana cebren yasakçî olûn deyu kâpi kulları tarafindan recîde ve ta’addî itdürûlb yê ve
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deyu màdâm ki üzerinde şer’en nesne sâbit olmadıkca / patrik-i mesfûr bi-vech ve hilâf-ı şer’-i şerîf recîde itdürilmeyüb ve

77 [17] kadîmden kendü âyîn ‘âtılaları üzere kilisalanna / müte’âllik bağ ve bahçe ve çiftlik ve deşirmen ve çayır ve tarla ve buyût ve dekâkîn ve eşcâr-ı müsmire ve gayr-i müsmirelerine / ve ayazma ve manastırlarına ve sâ’îr bunun emsâli kilisaya vâkf olan eşyâ ve dâvârlarına bundan evvel / Antakya ve tevâbi’i Rûmiyân patrîği olanlar ne vechile zabt ve tasarruf idegelmişler ise mesfûr Kirilos nâm râhib dahî / ol vechile zabt ve tasarruf eleyüb mir-i mirân ve mîrlivâ ve voovdalar ve subaşlar ve sâ’îr ehl-i ‘örf taraflarından / ve refî olan mesfûr Silvestros ve taraf-i âherden hic ferd mânî ve dâfi’ ve müzâhim olmayub vechen mine’l-vücûh ve sebeben mine’l-esbâb dahî ve ta’arruz kilmayalar. 78

Şöyle biler dey u berât-ı şerîf yazılmışdır.

---

77 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: kadîmden kendü âyîn-i ‘âtılaları üzerinde kilisâ ve manastîrlarına / vekîl olub düşen patrikîk rüsumun ekl ve bel’ iden râhiblerin patrik-i mesfûr muhâsebelerin gördikde hilâf-ı mu’tâd-ı / kadîm âherden müdâhale olmamayub ve kadîmden berü âyînleri icrâ ıyedikleri günlerde hilâf-ı şer’ ve mugâyîr-i kânûn / mûcéréd celi-bî mîl için ehl-i ‘örf tâ’ifesi taraflarından bi-vech recîde ve ta’addî itdürîlîmeyüb ve patrik-i mesfûrûn kimesneye sabîh / sübût bulub deynî ve kefâleti yoğûn mûcéréd celi-bî mîl için biz sana kark âcke vûdk veyêhûd kefîl oldun deyu màdam ki / üzerinde şer’-en bir nesne sâbit olmamîrça patrik-i mesfûra bi-vech ve hilâf-ı şer’ recîde itdürîlîmeyüb ve

78 Compare with the following condition in Silvestros’ berat of 1730: kadîmden kendü âyîn-i ‘âtılaları / üzere kilisalanna müte’âllik bağ ve bahçe ve çiftlik ve deşirmen ve çayır ve tarlalannın ve buyût ve dekâkîn ve eşcâr-ı müsmire ve gayr-i müsmirelerine / ve ayazma ve manastîrlarına ve sâ’îr bunun emsâli kenisaya vâkf olan eşyâ ve dâvârlarına bundan evvel Antakya ve Şâm ve Haleb / ve tevâbi’i Rûmiyân patrîği olanlar ne vechile zabt ve tasarruf idegelmişler ise mesfûr Silvestros nâm râhib dahî ol minvâl üzere / zabt ve tasarruf eleyüüb mir-i mirân ve mîrlivâ ve voovdalar ve subaşlar ve sâ’îr ehl-i ‘örf tâ’ifesi taraflarîndan mânî ve müzâhim olmamayub / dahî ve ta’arruz kilmayalar.
English translation of the *berat* of Kyrillos Tanas of Antioch, 1745

**Imperial sign**

The holder of this imperial order the priest named Kyrillos—may his end be auspicious—has petitioned my Imperial Chancery and stated that he is from the community of clergymen for fifty years who had been residing in Ṛûm monasteries in Saida and the patriarchal representative for twenty-one years by demand of the poor subjects without a *berat*. [He also stated that] all the subjects are content and happy with him and that he is worthy for patriarchate of the Ṛûm community in Antioch and its dependencies in all regards. Because the aforementioned patriarchate is not under the jurisdiction of the patriarchs of Istanbul and other places and is a separate patriarchate, he requested my benevolence in giving the patriarchate of Antioch to him independently as *maktû’* in a manner similar to the patriarchate of Ohrid and Peć on the condition that his old *pîşkeş* be increased for 3,000 *akçes* and that he give a yearly amount of 100 *guruş* to the side of the state as *maktû’* every year. When the *Pîskopos Mukâta’ası Defterleri* preserved in my Imperial Treasury were consulted, it was written on the margin that the abovementioned patriarchate belonged to the priest named Silvestros with a state *pîşkeş* of 10,000 *akçes* since the year [11]36. [It was also written that] it is not under the jurisdiction of the Ṛûm patriarchate of Istanbul, that it is invested with the petition of the kadis of Antioch and Damascus, that the patriarchate of Cilicia and Damascus do not have any other registers and that it belongs to the patriarchate of Antioch. Granting the patriarchate without a petition [by the kadis] has been caused by the fact that the said one’s request to have the [throne] of the abovementioned patriarchate depends on the state as it is a separate patriarchate. Hence, the honour of the governors and the grandees, my başdefterdâr Yusuf—may his grandeur continue—has sent a petition and report personally that the abovementioned Orthodox patriarchate of Antioch and its dependencies be granted from the priest Silvestros to the said priest Kyrillos and he be given a *berat* on the conditions that the old *pîşkes* of 10,000 *akçes* be increased by 5,000 *akçes* and the yearly *mâl-i maktû’* of 150 *guruş* be assigned and that he present to my Imperial Treasury the *pîşkeş* of 15,000 *akçes* and the said *mâl-i maktû’* for the year 1158 in cash. Hence, it has been my imperial order to grant him [Kyrillos] [the patriarchate] from him [Silvestros] in accordance with the report with another increase of 5,000 *akçes* on his *pîşkes* and 100 *guruş* on his *maktû’*. Because he has been given my imperial *rüzgârname* paper after he presented the *pîşkes* of 20,000 *akçes* and the *mâl-i maktû’* of 30,000 *akçes* to my Imperial Treasury in the customary manner, I have given this bliss-inspiring imperial *berat* on the 22nd day of Muharrem in the year 1158 [24 February 1745] on the conditions that he present his yearly *mâl-i maktû’* of 30,000 *akçes* to my Imperial Treasury every year and settle the accounts with the state and take a copy of the accounts at the end of each year. And I have ordered that
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[1] The said priest named Kyrillos shall go and become the patriarch over the Orthodox community in Antioch and its dependencies. The said priest called Kyrillos shall have the abovementioned patriarchate of Antioch and its dependencies in the way the aforementioned priest named Silvestros had done. The priest named Silvestros who has been dismissed and anyone from outside shall not prevent, trouble, interfere and attack him. The said priest Kyrillos—may his end be auspicious—shall be regarded as the patriarch by the bishops of Adana, Tarsus, Payas, Alexandretta, Diyarbekir, Çemişkezek, Çıldır, Ahısha, Erzurum and their dependencies which are under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch since olden times and by the old and young of the Orthodox community living in places dependent on his patriarchate. They shall not go against his legitimate word in matters related to their rite.

[2] The patriarch or his metropolitans shall hold whatever the dead priests, monks and nuns under his jurisdiction have in accordance with ancient customs. The beytü'l-mâl and kassâm officials, voyvoda, subaşıs and mütevellîs shall not oppose in contravention of ancient customs.

[3] Nobody shall take their olden churches and monasteries under his jurisdiction from their hands in contravention of the imperial order, and no one shall interfere when they repair them according to their ancient layout with the approval of sharia and my imperial order.

[4] Their legal disputes whose resolution require application of sharia rules shall be handled in my Imperial Chancery, and if someone from the Orthodox community wants to marry or divorce a woman according to their rite, no one apart from the patriarch or his deputies shall intervene.

[5] Everything the dead clergymen and the Orthodox community will for the poor of their churches and the said patriarch according to their rite shall be accepted and dealt with according to sharia rules through the testimony of Orthodox witnesses.

[6] When, in accordance with their rite, the said patriarch disciplines and shaves the hair of those bishops, priors, and priests in places dependent on his patriarchate who commit offence against their rite and dismisses them and gives their posts to others he shall not be interfered with. When the aforementioned patriarch appoints and dismisses the priests, metropolitans, priests, monks and priors who deserve to be dismissed or appointed in accordance with their rite and sends petitions to appoint metropolitans and bishops, they shall be given my imperial beratı̄s and orders with their conditions to obtain [these posts] after the required customary pîşkeş is paid to my Imperial Treasury. Without the sealed petition of the patriarchs no one shall be allowed to have a metropolitanate and bishopric. The said patriarch’s petition shall be observed and if there is a petition regarding their rite it shall be allowed.

[7] The ascetic monks under his jurisdiction shall not wander wherever they like in contravention of their rite but shall be sent back to the monastery to which they customarily belong.
[8] The patriarch and his men shall be given guides in places where they journey. When they change clothes to pass safely from dangerous places, and carry weapons to avert danger and to protect their souls from bandits, they shall not be interfered with and harassed by the бикар, тамга и the other [members of the] еhl-i ‘örf on the bridges, passages and similar places in contravention of sharia and ancient customs. The said patriarch shall not be harassed by the султан and the [members of the] еhl-i ‘örf with the pretext of asking for favours and presents in contravention of sharia.

[9] In places where they journey, no зимми shall be harassed to be converted into Islam by force against his/her consent by [the members of] the еhl-i ‘örf and others.

[10] Some powerful people, зам, тимер holders, and others shall not object them from performing their ceremonies on the allegation that the зимми living in their farms, winter quarters, and houses are their labourers and servants [and thus are exempt from taxation].

[11] In matters of solemnization or annulment of marriage, or a dispute [to be resolved] between two зимми on their consent, when they take an oath in church and excommunication in accordance with their rite, no one shall interfere. Some powerful people shall not force them to marry a woman to a зимми against their rite, or harass them to dismiss a priest and give his office to another one. Their disciplinary papers of excommunication which they dispatch in accordance with their rite to discipline зимми shall not be intervened without any reason. When the priests and monks need to be detained with the permission of sharia, they shall be detained with the mediation of the said patriarch.

[12] The said patriarch shall hold the churches that customarily belong to the Orthodox community and whatever [property] they have inside [the churches], and the other communities shall in no way interfere with this.

[13] Nobody shall interfere with the sceptre that the said patriarch holds in his hand as of old, and with the packhorses and mules that he rides.

[14] If under the jurisdiction of the abovementioned patriarch, some clergymen who do not have a church or a monastery wander neighbourhood by neighbourhood, and foment mischief, they shall be disciplined and prevented through the patriarch.

[15] The monasteries where the aforementioned patriarch resides shall not be sent anyone from the ‘askerî and others. The aforementioned patriarch shall not be harassed by my капшулар with the pretext of urging their service as ясакъы against his consent.

[16] The patriarch shall not be harassed from outside when he customarily settles the accounts of those deputies of churches and monasteries who embezzle the related taxes according to their baseless rite. When they customarily perform their ceremonies on certain days, they shall not be harassed by [the members of] the еhl-i ‘örf in contravention of sharia and law purely for their own interests without any reason. The patriarch shall not be harassed without the proof of his debt or guarantee, alleging [falsely] that ‘we have given you forty акче’ or that ‘you became a guarantor’ purely for their own interest, without any reason and in contravention of sharia.
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[17] The said priest named Kyrillos shall hold the vineyards, gardens, farms, mills, pastures, fields, houses, shops, trees with or without fruits, holy springs, monasteries, and any other items relating to their churches and their sheep as vakf in the way the preceding Orthodox patriarchs of Antioch and its dependencies have done customarily and according to their rite. In this regard, the mîr-i mîrân, mîrlivâs, voyvoda, subaşıs, the other [members of the] ehl-i 'ürf and the dismissed patriarch Silvestros and anyone from outside shall not interfere with, and trouble him in any way or for any reason.

An imperial berat has been written so that they know as such.
Appendix IV

The imprint of Kyrillos Tanas’ bilingual seal
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Abstract: While a lot has been written on the earlier phases of the Antiochian Schism of 1724, the rivalry between Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas and Silvestros in the 1740s is mostly noted in passing. This article introduces the unpublished and often-ignored Ottoman documents relating to Kyrillos’ brief tenure, most notably his berat of investiture preserved in the Ottoman Archives. The article has three major purposes: First, it establishes a solid chronological context, which adds a more global nature to this episode. Second, by contextualizing the episode with special focus on the Ottoman dynamics, it searches for the major reasons for Kyrillos’ appointment by the Ottoman administration through a discussion of his discourse presenting himself as a reliable partner with the Porte. Third, it analyzes Kyrillos’ unpublished berat in comparison with the earlier and later berats and a contemporary French translation preserved in the Archives nationales in Paris.
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Resumen: Si bien se ha escrito mucho sobre las primeras fases del Cisma de Antioquía de 1724, la rivalidad entre Serafeim/Kyrillos Tanas y Silvestros en la década de 1740 se menciona casi de pasada. Este artículo presenta los documentos otomanos inéditos, y a menudo ignorados, relacionados con el breve mandato de Kyrillos, sobre todo su berat de investidura conservado en los archivos otomanos. El artículo tiene tres propósitos principales: primero, establece un contexto cronológico sólido, que le da una naturaleza más global a este episodio. En segundo lugar, al contextualizar el episodio con un enfoque sobre la dinámica otomana, busca las principales razones del nombramiento de Kyrillos por parte de la administración otomana a través de una discusión de su discurso presentándose a sí mismo como un socio confiable con la Sublime Puerta. En tercer lugar, analiza la berat inédita de Kyrillos en comparación con las berats anteriores y posteriores y una traducción francesa contemporánea conservada en los Archivos nacionales de París.

Palabras clave: Patriarcado de Antioquía; Interrelaciones ortodoxas y católicas; berat; Imperio Otomano.