



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**THE THREE FACES OF THE PHANARIOTS :  
AN INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE AND MOTIVATIONS OF  
THE GREEK NOBILITY UNDER OTTOMAN RULE, 1683-1821**

by

**PANAYOTIS ALEXANDROU PAPACHRISTOU**

B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1988

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

History

© Panayotis A. Papachristou 1992

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

January 1992

All rights reserved. This work may not be  
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy  
or other means, without permission of the author.



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file - Votre référence*

*Our file - Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-83623-7

## APPROVAL

**NAME:** Panayiotis Papachristou

**DEGREE:** M. A.

**TITLE OF THESIS:** THREE FACES OF THE PHANARIOTS:  
An Inquiry into the Role and Motivations of  
the Greek Nobility under Ottoman Rule,  
1683-1821

### EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

**CHAIR:** Ian Dyck

---

Rod Day, Professor

---

Robert Keopke, Associate Professor

---

John Spagnolo, Associate Professor

**EXAMINER:** Peter F. Sugar, Professor Emeritus  
History Department  
University of Washington

**DATE:** 21 May 1992

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

THREE FACES OF THE PHANARIOTS: An Inquiry into the

---

Role and Motivations of the Greek Nobility under

---

Ottoman Rule, 1683 - 1821

---

---

Author: \_\_\_\_\_

(signature)

Panayiotis Papachristou

---

(name)

05 / June / 1992

---

(date)

## Abstract

This thesis examines the role and motivations of the Greek moneyed aristocracy under Ottoman rule from the late seventeenth century to the eve of the Greek Revolution. The ascendancy of the so-called Phanariots was a corollary of Ottoman vulnerability vis-a-vis the challenge of modern Europe, and Greek political reconciliation with Ottoman power. As a result, a Greco-Ottoman political collaboration was formed that opened a vast field of action for the abilities of the Greeks. It is in the role of collaborators and vassals of the Porte that the Phanariots are remembered today. The complicated evolution of the situation of the Phanariots leading to the events of 1821, however, tells a different story, one of ambition either to build gradually a Greco-Turkish political condominium or to establish a sovereign multinational state of their own.

Using primary and secondary sources from Greek, French, English and Romanian historiography, the thesis stresses the diverse character of the Greek aristocracy and attempts to demonstrate the three developing and interrelated dimensions of the Phanariot mind: Ottomanism, Byzantine Imperialism and Neo-Hellenism. Phanariot actions were based on the belief in the historical distinction of their "race" and the vision of a Greek imperial regeneration. But, also deeply aware of their status as Ottoman officials, they had chosen the path of reform through education and cooperation with the Ottoman government.

This gradualist approach (along with their position) allowed them not only to work for a future Helleno-Ottoman partnership but also to undermine the empire in hopes of replacing it with their own regime -preferably one that resembled the old Byzantium with important accretions of Russian absolutism and enlightened utilitarianism. Accordingly, the Phanariots had an anti-

revolutionary tradition. They believed that a revolution would destroy the complex network of Greek influence within the empire, and thus would jeopardize the century old effort of Greco-Christian consolidation and the future hopes associated with it. Yet, their resentment as Greeks and Christians under Turkish and Muslim masters made them increasingly candidates for action against Turkish arbitrary power. More importantly, the new found emphasis on Hellenism, in the late eighteenth century, infused into them a pride that, in time, would allow many among them to become revolutionaries. It is with these complex aspects of their history that the thesis deals.

*To my parents*



## Acknowledgments

The author is grateful for the continuing patience and encouragement of his senior supervisor, Dr. Rodney Day, and the members of the graduate committee, Dr. Robert Koepke and Dr. John Spagnolo.

## Table of Contents

<b>Approval</b>	.....	ii
<b>Abstract</b>	.....	iii
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	.....	vi
<b><i>Introduction</i></b>	.....	1
<b>1 <i>The Ottoman Officials</i></b>	.....	5
<b>Notes</b>	.....	26
<b>2 <i>The Byzantine Imperialists</i></b>	.....	33
<b>Notes</b>	.....	66
<b>3 <i>The Neo-Hellenists</i></b>	.....	77
<b>Notes</b>	.....	109
<b>4 <i>From Gradualism to Revolution</i></b>	.....	119
<b>Notes</b>	.....	151
<b><i>Conclusions</i></b>	.....	160
<b>Bibliography</b>	.....	165

## Introduction

In a letter, dated 28 February 1820, to John Capodistrias, the Tsar's joint foreign minister, the Russian ambassador in Constantinople baron Stroganov, while referring with sympathy to the Greek aspirations for freedom, made the following remark regarding the Greek Phanariot nobility: "They are almost foreigners to the rest of their compatriots. The two Principalities are the sole objective of their avidity, the only aureole to which they aspire".<sup>1</sup>

This opinion about the Greeks of Phanar was quite widespread among their contemporaries.<sup>2</sup> Yet, when the Greek revolution of 1821 broke out, of the Phanariots who held high offices at the time only the family of Aleco Sutzou justified the trust given to them by the Porte.<sup>3</sup> The others were already members of the Greek secret revolutionary organization of Philiki Etairia whose leader was the son of a Phanariot ex-hospodar: Alexandre Ipsilanti. So, by 1821, many Phanariots when forced to choose between their golden servitude and liberty chose liberty. Captured either by the circumstances or by Etairist propaganda, they united with their compatriots in the struggle for the liberation of their nation.

The above antithesis only hints at the complexity of the Phanariot question. The historiography concerning this Greek nobility is dominated by two conflicting judgements. The first, and until recently very influential, is that they were a thoroughly unscrupulous lot who lived by intrigue and obsequiousness, who cynically exploited the Danubian Principalities that they were assigned to govern, and finally, who constituted a wicked clique that

exerted a profound influence on the affairs of the Porte and were unconcerned with the real interests of their fellow-Greeks.

The other judgement, which found few adherents until after the second world war, is that the Phanariots were imbued with the loftiest patriotism; that they civilized their subjects in the Danubian Principalities; and that they worked for the regeneration of the Greek people.

Thus, the Phanariot question is a complicated one and understandably so since many of the accounts concerning the Greek aristocracy are written either in a polemical or a sentimental vein and, therefore, lack the calm objectivity required for such a task. Also, most discussions of the subject appear either in chapters length, a fact which implies a sketchy treatment, or in dispersed articles which tend to concentrate on a specific aspect of the Phanariot experience. As a result, we still lack a comprehensive study of the Phanariot question which in the words of Alexandre C. Stourdza "est beaucoup plus compliquée qu' elle ne le paraît le prime abord".<sup>4</sup> For these reasons, the purpose of this work is to explore the Phanariots' role and motivations within the Ottoman empire from their ascendancy as a political force in the 1680's to the eve of the Greek revolution of 1821. This inquiry will attempt to demonstrate that the Phanariot mentality had three developing but also interrelated dimensions: Ottomanism, Byzantine Imperialism, and Hellenism. In other words, the Phanariots' actions were based on the belief in the historical distinction of their "race" and the vision of a Greek imperial regeneration. But they were also deeply aware of their status as Ottoman officials and most of them had chosen the path of reform through education and co-operation with the Ottoman government. This gradualist approach allowed them to believe in the future partnership with the Ottoman rulers. The Turkish internal decline, however, of the second

half of the eighteenth century, permitted them to dream, at the same time, of a new Byzantium based on Russian absolutism, French enlightenment and Greek language and culture. Finally, their Neo-Hellenism prompted many among them to become revolutionaries when their plans failed and their expectations proved to be groundless.

The thesis will be divided into four parts. The first will cover the period from the Phanariots' appointment to the princely thrones of the Danubian Principalities to the Russo-Turkish wars of Catherine the Great. In this segment, utilizing mainly the Mavrocordato family as a model, we will deal with the Phanariots as Ottoman officials and therefore subjects of the Ottoman system. Here we will endeavor to answer questions such as how powerful, and therefore responsible, they really were within their domains, and what principles and motivations governed their exercise of authority in this early period. In addition, their perception of their position towards their "race" and their masters will be examined.

In the second part, which will cover approximately the same period, we will inquire into the character of Phanariot self-awareness prior to the Napoleonic years, and their relationship with ecclesiastic ecumenicity. Their neo-Byzantinism will be explained as well as their imperialist designs, which did not now include cooperation with the Turks but in which they viewed themselves as an enlightened nobility under the aegis of a Christian emperor, preferably a Russian.

The third part will be devoted to the Phanariot Hellenism and will cover mainly the second half of the eighteenth century. In this section, their early Hellenism will be discussed along with its connection to Orthodox Christianity and Western influence. Here we will attempt to answer questions regarding the Phanariot influence on Greek political self-awareness

through education and literature. Particular emphasis will be placed on French cultural influences and the coming of Neo-Hellenism. Finally we will discuss the divergence of lay and ecclesiastical culture and its effect on the juxtaposition between ecumenicity and Neo-Hellenism.

The fourth and final part will cover the period of the French and Napoleonic Wars and the early years of Restoration. We will ask how the Phanariots were affected by French revolutionary thought and Great Power diplomacy, what their approach towards Greek emancipation was, and how and why post-Napoleonic international and internal developments turned many of them into revolutionaries?

#### NOTES:

1. A. Otetea, "La Désagrégation du Régime Phanariote", Symposium L'Epoque Phanariote, ed. Institute for Balkan Studies (Thessaloniki, 1974), p. 445.
2. For negative views on the Phanariotes by contemporary writers see Mark Philip Zallony, Essai sur les Phanariotes (Marseil, 1824), and William Wilkinson, An account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia (London, 1820). For a more condensed view see William Eton, A Survey of the Turkish Empire (London, 1799), pp. 351-4.
3. In fact, Aleco Soutso died just before the revolution but until the end he had given all the evidence of a loyal Ottoman official.
4. Alexandre A. C. Stourdza, L' Europe Orientale et la Rôle Historique Des Mavrocordato 1660-1830, avec un Appendice contenant des Actes et Documents Historiques et diplomatiques inédits ( Paris, 1913), p . 82.

## 1

**The Ottoman Officials**

*We conform to the prescription  
of the Gospel 'Render unto  
Caesar the things which are  
Caesar's'; it is not the custom  
of us Christians to confuse what  
is temporary and corruptible  
with what is divine and eternal.*

*Alexandre Mavrocordato\**

In this chapter we will deal with the Phanariots as Ottoman officials and therefore as subjects to the Ottoman system of Imperial administration. Particular emphasis will be placed on their role as governors of the Danubian Principalities but also on their Ottomanism, namely their conformity to the Ottoman status quo and their aspirations regarding the future of the Greco-Turkish condominium.

The idea of Phanariot Ottomanism implies an almost contradictory set of values. On the one hand, the Phanariots as governors had little real power since as Ottoman officials they had constantly to be geared to the Ottoman system's requirements. On the other hand, the Phanariot élite occupied important positions in the Ottoman administration and fulfilled essential functions. If this appears contradictory, it is not. Ottoman absolutism was compatible with adventurous and opportunistic administrators, particularly if the Sultan was indolent and unwilling to deal with details. "From their first appearance the Turks", wrote Sir Charles Eliot, "displayed a strange power of collecting together apostates, renegades who had more ability than

moral qualities".<sup>1</sup> But in the final analysis, they were all subjected to the slightest whim of the Turkish sovereign, and there lies the essence of Turkish despotism. The Phanariots knew all too well that their very existence was dependent on their usefulness to their Ottoman masters. But they also knew that, together with the Church, they constituted one of the principal pillars of the Ottoman imperial structure and, as a result, the Greek segment of the empire played a part in the Ottoman administration. This Greek influence, due primarily to the mounting political pressure from the West, could increase gradually in political value as the only Ottoman element able to cope with the Europeans. Accordingly, it was natural for the Greek aristocracy to believe that the continuing cooperation with the Turks could, in the long run, develop into a form of a Greco-Turkish partnership. So, the first vision of the Phanariots was a gradual takeover of the empire by the Greeks through reform, education, and cooperation with the Muslim rulers.

#### **FROM MERCHANTS TO CIVIL SERVANTS**

After the second unsuccessful Ottoman siege of Vienna in 1683, the tide turned definitely against the Ottoman empire in the conflict between the Turks and the Christian world.<sup>2</sup> As a result, from this time onward the Ottomans began to encounter formidable complications in the conduct of their foreign relations.<sup>3</sup> No longer were they strong enough to dictate terms to their western adversaries. For the first time they had to carry on protracted and involved diplomatic negotiations. But they were not equipped to do this because hitherto they had regarded western languages and cultures as being unworthy of their attention.<sup>4</sup> Needing skilled diplomatists and administrators for the first time, the Ottomans found it necessary to employ the services of those who had knowledge of foreign languages and customs.



Under these circumstances the so-called Phanariots came to be employed by the Turkish state as imperial administrators.

The Phanariots were a Greek moneyed nobility who had built their fortunes originally as merchants and bankers.<sup>5</sup> Their name was derived from the Phanar district of Constantinople, where they lived. The Greek Church had established its headquarters there in 1601.<sup>6</sup> Gradually the district became the preserve of Greek entrepreneurs as well as the Greek clergy. These Phanariot laymen were primarily merchants and businessmen who prospered greatly during the seventeenth century. They became bankers and imperial tax farmers, they rented the salt monopoly, undertook contract works, became purveyors to the Ottoman court and military, and gained control of the Black Sea wheat trade.<sup>7</sup> These activities allowed them to enter into commercial relations with the western world and to acquire a first-hand knowledge of western manners, customs and languages.<sup>8</sup> In addition, as managers of the ecumenical Patriarchate's affairs, they acquired a wide practice in and close understanding of Ottoman administration.<sup>9</sup> For these reasons, the Phanariots were allowed to enter the Ottoman bureaucracy where they gradually rose to the top-most ranks. In fact, the Ottoman empire invested them with the monopoly of four high offices of state which were key-positions in the new political situation. These four offices were the two "dragomanships" (the posts of interpreters of the Porte and the Fleet) and the hospodarships of the autonomous Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. The two dragomanships were new creations, and largely corresponded to the functions of secretaries of State for foreign affairs and for the navy; the two hospodarships were existing offices which were now placed in Phanariot hands.<sup>10</sup>

## HISTORIOGRAPHY AND PHANARIOT UNPOPULARITY

From 1711 until the outbreak of the Greek revolution in 1821, the Phanariots were appointed as governors of the Danubian Principalities with the title of hospodars (princes). Before this date Wallachia and Moldavia had paid tribute to the Ottomans in return for recognition of their complete autonomy, including the right of the local boyars (nobles) to elect their own princes. This agreement prevailed until Tsar Peter the Great invaded Moldavia in 1710, and the reigning hospodar Demetrios Cantemir, went over to his side. This occurrence led the Porte to strengthen its control over the Principalities, which were now assuming a new strategic importance as bastions against the expanding Russian and Habsburg empires.<sup>11</sup> Accordingly, knowledgeable and trusted Phanariot administrators were appointed regularly as hospodars of the Principalities from 1711 to 1821.<sup>12</sup>

The traditional view of this period of Phanariot reign in the Principalities is one of intellectual bankruptcy, unbridled corruption, gross exploitation of the land by foreign and native dignitaries, and a complete lack of political stability. This most unfavorable judgement resulted from an anti-Phanariot climate created by the travelling western writers of the eighteenth century and was rendered authoritative by Romanian historiography in the nineteenth century.

It started with the eighteenth century European interest in discovering the motives, stories, and customs of "small" and faraway people. As a result, a taste developed in western Europe for descriptive literature based on travels in "exotic" places. This development served not only to satisfy the curiosity of an increasingly romantic public, but also to inform European diplomatic agents on the social and economic conditions of the regions of the Ottoman empire which at the time were in a state of political flux.

What came out of this sensational and amateurish literature was a complete new world, half European and half Middle Eastern, full of social conspiracies and exotic court ceremonies. In the "Observations" of De Peyssonnel, for example, the Phanariot princes were the "petits tyrans" who had resorted to the "plus criantes extorsions".<sup>13</sup> In his turn, E. De Bauer referred to the yoke that oppressed the Romanian people, the vanity of the Greek princes, and the plots of the Porte. "Les descendants des Romains sont devenus les esclaves d'un peuple barbare et jadis inconnu" notes Bauer referring apparently to the Turks.<sup>14</sup> Also, Charles Marie de Salabery asserted that "Le trône est devenu la patrimoine des Grecs du Fanal(sic). Il est le prix de leur bassesses et de leur intrigues. Rien n'égale la perfidie de leur trames que la rapidité avec laquelle ils se souplent tous".<sup>15</sup>

This kind of descriptive and sensational literature was very popular even as late as the third decade of the nineteenth century. Louis Carra's "*L'Histoire de la Moldavie et de la Valachie*", for example, was translated into four languages,<sup>16</sup> while Thomas Thornton's "*The Present State of Turkey*", published in 1807, was translated into French, German and Romanian.<sup>17</sup> The work of W. Wilkinson also enjoyed great popularity. The French version underwent three editions (1821, 1822, 1831). This English consul was, like all the others, very critical of the Phanariots. "None of the events", he contended, "that had influenced the political existence, and undermined the public spirit of the Wallachian and Moldavian nations, proved more ruinous to them than the system of policy introduced by the Greeks of the Phanar, when they were placed at the head of the Principalities".<sup>18</sup>

But the most unfavorable judgement is stated most fully in a book entitled "*Essai sur les Phanariotes*" published in 1824 by Mark Zallony, a

Roman Catholic Greek doctor, who was afraid that the Phanariots might assume control of the independent Greek state that was then in the process of being born. Zallony's viewpoint was that the Phanariot princes marked their administration by the most violent acts of extortion and an invariable system of spoliation.<sup>19</sup>

This negative literature went on until after the Crimean war, and the anti-Phanariot feeling continued to be amplified by the negative conclusions of authors such as Elias Regnault<sup>20</sup> and Felix Colson.<sup>21</sup> Even in contemporary fiction, Phanariot characters appeared wicked.<sup>22</sup> In general, the Phanariot rule was presented in such a negative way that R.W.Seton-Watson wrote that "it is impossible to conceive a more disheartening task than that of recording in detail these hundred years in Wallachia and Moldavia".<sup>23</sup> The consequence of this phenomenon was that Romanian historiography, very young at that time, based its view of Phanariot rule on the descriptions of the foreign authors. As a result, the whole of nineteenth century Romanian historiography paid allegiance to the anti-Phanariot tradition and in its turn conferred credibility upon the old amateurish writings of the western authors. This development created, according to Romanian historian Traian Ionescu-Niscov, a "conception désavantageuse [for the Phanariots] - et en partie non véridique".<sup>24</sup>

Later historiography, however, has revealed new elements which, to a point, exonerate the Phanariot rule. This antithesis has its origins in the work of the distinguished Romanian historians A. Stourdza and Nicolae Iorga, who since the beginning of the twentieth century have tried, with some success, to demolish the edifice of anti-Phanariot historiography.<sup>25</sup> This revisionist school includes modern historians, such as Radu Florescu, Traian Ionescu-Niscov, D. A. Zakythinos, A. Pallis, K. Amantos and H.

Konstantinidis, who have tried to present the Phanariot era under a different, more positive, light.

### THE OTTOMAN SERVANTS

In order to examine the various accusations of exploitation, corruption and political instability of Phanariot rule, one should remember that the traditional historiography has treated the Phanariot princes as sovereign rulers. It is necessary, however, to emphasize from the outset that the Phanariots were appointed Ottoman officials. That entailed not only the insecurity involved in their position but also their loyalty, at the time, to the Ottoman empire.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, many Phanariots distinguished themselves as Ottoman officials in difficult periods of the empire.<sup>27</sup>

The family which best demonstrates this early Phanariot conformity is the Mavrocordato family. Alexandre Mavrocordato (1636-1709) is in many respects a prototype of this early Phanariot non-confrontational spirit. In his philosophical work "*Meditations*", he expresses a sense of discretion and compromise in recommending acceptance of one's lot as the basis of true happiness and contentment.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Alexandre's son Nikolas Mavrocordato (1680-1730) describes justice, in his "*Book of Duties*", in terms imbued with the notions of propriety, seemliness and minding one's own business: "When a just man is in a position of subordination, then he will maintain a spirit of agreement, will do nothing to destroy harmony, will bow the neck, will submit to the laws and to the orders of his superiors, will zealously proffer the service imposed on him, will be content with the situation in life to which he has been called, will have no truck with wicked desires and impulses for the sake of obtaining honor, will not meddle in what does not concern him".<sup>29</sup>

It can be assumed, then, that for this people, in the early years, being effective and efficient was more important than being free. In fact, according to G. Henderson, the word freedom is absent from these early Phanariot writings. Nikolas Mavrocordato's work in particular is far from revolutionary because, as he puts it, "what befits a human being is to let things be put right by discussion; force belongs altogether to the beasts".<sup>30</sup>

In the light of the above evidence, it appears that the early Phanariots' greatest aspiration was to be the best they could be as Ottoman officials. In this undertaking, they could hope to be nothing more than another branch of the Ottoman system; a bit more efficient and modern, perhaps, but always an integral part of the Ottoman social, administrative and economic reality. Seen in this light, it is evident that the Phanariots could not do much against the pernicious social and economic conditions predominant in the Danubian Principalities. They found them there, and were not powerful enough to effect a lasting change even if they wanted to. This is apparent in the cases of enlightened Phanariot hospodars such as Nikolas and Constantine Mavrocordato, Gregory A. Ghika, Alexandre Mourouzi, and Alexandre Ipsilanti.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, when the Ottoman government wanted to effect a change the hospodars had to follow suit. It is not an accident, for example, that most princes supported handicrafts and factories in the period of "Nizam-i- Djedid", when the Turkish government encouraged the setting up of factories.<sup>32</sup> In fact in 1793, the Grand Vizir advised Michael Soutso that, according to Selim III's "New Order", he had to establish factories useful to the local needs. It appears, therefore, that regardless of their own intentions, the hospodars had success in their efforts only in proportion as their designs accorded with Porte's will.<sup>33</sup>

## CAPTIVES OF THE SYSTEM

In order to demonstrate that the Phanariot behavior was essentially subjected to the Ottoman politico-economic system, we have to deal with the various anti-Phanariot arguments which have developed due to traditional historiography. To begin, the Phanariot princes have usually been depicted as representatives of an alien Greek element which stifled the native Romanian development. This accusation has two aspects; one cultural and one political.

In the cultural sphere, certainly, the dominance of the Greek language and culture was never challenged during the Phanariot era. Greek was the native language of the princes and of several of the leading boyars, and books were printed in Greek at Bucharest and Jassy where the academies were veritable centers of Greek culture.<sup>34</sup> The careful student of history has to take into account, however, the Orthodox ecumenical feeling which was quite widespread not only among the Phanariots, but also among the Romanian upper classes and clergy. If one adds to this the common fear of western Catholic expansion, it appears that the spread of Greek (the language of the New Testament) was far from exploitation of the natives. In fact, it was, as much as anything, the voluntary work of the native Church in order to secure the support of Greek learning and Phanariot money and influence, and to strengthen itself against Latin missionaries operating from the Habsburg dominions and from Poland. For example, the Greek academies at Bucharest and Jassy were established originally not for nationalist purposes but in the general interest of Orthodoxy.<sup>35</sup> Consequently, the early Phanariot hospodars can be perceived as Ottoman officials who promoted the religious centralization and therefore the social unity of a large segment of the empire. That was because, in the eighteenth century Ottoman reality, religion was

deeply intertwined with social and political issues, and Orthodox Christianity was an officially recognized socio-political unit since it was one of the two major religions of the empire. And, since nationalist sentiments had not yet arisen, the Porte encouraged this centralization for economic and administrative reasons. Some native boyars, however, had a different point of view, but their opposition to the Phanariots was not an ideological or nationalist struggle: instead, they simply wished to transfer to themselves the Turkish patronage and sought, therefore, access to the Romanian thrones and the privileges associated with it.<sup>36</sup>

Even from the Romanian perspective, however, the Phanariots were not culturally abusive. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that far from having despised the Romanian tongue, many Phanariots supported it against the Slavonic. Iorga contended, for example, that "it were these foreigners who buried Slavonism" and that the most eminent of the Phanariot hospodars (men like Nikolas Mavrocordato, Gregory Ghika and John Callimachi) took the trouble to study and to learn Romanian.<sup>37</sup> Also, Phanariot princes, far from interfering with the vernacular liturgy, encouraged the Romanian language at the expense of Slavonic. Moreover, the governorship of Nikolas Mavroyeni, hospodar of Wallachia from 1786 to 1790, saw the printing of one of the earliest Romanian grammars at Rimnic in 1787, while in December 1817, John Karatza, prince of Wallachia, sanctioned the foundation of St. Sava, the first college in Wallachia in which Romanian was the language of instruction. As for Romanian culture, the performance of plays in Bucharest in 1818 was a Greek initiative, and the example of the Greeks prompted young Romanians to translate plays from French, German and classical Greek which were performed by the pupils of St. Sava; this, in fact, constitutes the first record of a Romanian theater in Bucharest.<sup>38</sup> Finally, it is not by chance



that the first major historical works concerning the Romanian people were written by Greeks who were living and working under the Phanariot regime. In fact, professor C. Tsourkas has underlined not only the contribution of those Greek writers towards the issues of Romanian latinity, continuity and unity but also their sympathy for the Romanian people.<sup>39</sup>

In the political sphere, the argument is that with the Phanariot establishment, the local boyars were robbed of the right to elect their own princes, and as a result, the holder of the throne became an appointee of the Ottoman government. The fact is, however, that the appointment of foreign princes to the Romanian thrones was already a part of the Ottoman system. A.D. Xenopol contended that "les Turks avaient pris l'habitude d'envoyer des princes étrangers dans les pays Roumains encore avant l'époque phanariote".<sup>40</sup> In the late seventeenth century, the sultan appointed foreigners such as Gaspar Gratiani, George Duca and Antoine Ruset, to name a few, without consulting the local élite.<sup>41</sup> It is evident, therefore, that the Phanariots did not initiate the system of appointment. Instead, much like other Ottoman officials, they were part of a system practised long before their establishment.

The limited power of the Phanariots in their capacity as Ottoman officials is more evident when we deal with the issues of taxation and peasant exploitation. To be sure, rural oppression and exploitation was rampant in the Phanariot era and some of the Greek hospodars were harsh and rapacious rulers. Wilkinson wrote that "there does not perhaps exist a people labouring under a greater degree of oppression from the effect of despotic power and more heavily burdened with impositions and taxes than the peasantry of Wallachia and Moldavia."<sup>42</sup> However, the Phanariot princes, far from all being harsh and oppressive, included high minded and able rulers.<sup>43</sup> Indeed,

a number of Phanariot hospodars introduced centralizing and modernizing measures in order to reduce the rural oppression and exploitation of the peasantry by the boyar class, and, at the same time, to develop a more efficient fiscal system. Nikolas and Constantine Mavrocordato, Gregory Ghika Alexandre Mourouzi and Alexandre Ipsilanti were examples of princes who took "des sévères mesures pour combattre les abus commis par les boyards envers la population."<sup>44</sup> Nikolas Mavrocordato, especially, was determined to establish an enlightened rule and endeavored to improve the economic situation and along with it the fate of the peasantry.<sup>45</sup> However, his efforts failed to overcome the resistance of the local élite and he was almost thrown into prison by the sultan after accusations from the boyars. Thus, the boyar class imposed on him the obligation to respect what they called "les anciennes coutumes du pays".<sup>46</sup>

It appears then, that the hospodars' intentions as rulers were not enough to carry out reform projects. It was quite another matter, however, when they acted as Ottoman officials; that is, when they were simply serving the needs of the empire and their wishes were in accordance with those of the Ottoman government. Indeed, it was in such a unison of intentions that the most profound reforms took place. The liberation of the serfs is a case in point.

Certainly, a number of Phanariot princes held enlightened views regarding the peasant population who were under servitude. The social policies of Nikolas and Constantine Mavrocordato as well as M. Racovitza and A. Ipsilanti testify to this.<sup>47</sup> But successfully to carry out reforms took an exceptional situation. This situation took place in Wallachia in 1742-46, when the flight of peasants from the heavy exactions and the ruthless servitude imposed by the boyar class took catastrophic proportions.<sup>48</sup> As a

result, the public treasury was decimated by a steep decrease of taxpayers. From 147,000 in 1741, their number decreased to 115,000 in 1742 and reached a record low of 70,000 in 1745. A great source of revenue of the Porte (and of course of the princes and the boyars as well) appeared to be threatened.<sup>49</sup> Alarmed by its lost income, the Porte urged Constantine Mavrocordato to reorganize the socio-economic structure of the regions. So it was Ottoman fear of the economic consequence of this demographic decline for its income that initiated the movement of social and economic reforms of 1746-49, which resulted in the abolition of serfdom. The Ottoman instructions were, in fact, categorical regarding the primary task of the ruling prince: "Tu t'efforceras de relever et de repeupler le pays.....tu rameneras à leur foyers tous les habitants... dispersés dans toutes les directions."<sup>50</sup> As a result, by 1757 all serfs had been emancipated in both Wallachia and Moldavia, and it is evident that what the princes wanted to do was possible only when their wishes were in harmony with Porte's will.

It appears, then, that the Phanariot princes cannot be held solely responsible for rural oppression, since they were never the all-powerful despots so often depicted. This is particularly true when we consider the power relations between the ruling princes and the old boyar class.<sup>51</sup> On this question, Radu Florescu contends that "the princes had to be all the more content with the external manifestations and insignia of power since they did not enjoy the solid satisfaction of its reality."<sup>52</sup> We have seen already the case of Nikolas Mavrocordato who in his correspondence often mentioned "l'instabilité des 'Daces'", and "l'adversité des boyars qui n'étaient pas d'accord avec ses mesures radicales ayant comme but la régénération du pays."<sup>53</sup> Unaccustomed to local realities and reigning an average 2.5 years the Greek hospodar could often find himself powerless in front of the assemblies

of the boyars who were "far more entitled to be considered the real masters of the land."<sup>54</sup>

The above information sheds a different light on the rural problem as it demonstrates that the old boyar class (which should not be confused with the venal parvenu nobility) was never domesticated.<sup>55</sup> Shunning court life, this old native nobility still had much power and a firm hold on the peasant world. In fact, it was they who had reduced the peasants to serfs in everything but name. Even the reforms of C. Mavrocordato and later of A. Ipsilanti (who attempted to set the peasants' fixed labour at the modest rate of twelve days per year) did not last. The old boyar class in the end had their way and by 1805, the new "free" peasant had to do servitude duty of forty working days annually, plus he had to continue to pay the heavy fiscal charges of the tithes, twentieths and customary fees.<sup>56</sup> So, it appears, again, that the Phanariot princes were not powerful enough to have their way and that the greed and intransigence of the old boyar class were equally responsible for the predicament of the peasants.

The question, finally, of Phanariot corruption, although always indefensible and unpardonable, should also be understood under the premise that the Phanariots were pawns of the Ottoman politico-economic system. To be sure intrigue, simony, sinecure, and bribery were rampant in Phanariot circles.<sup>57</sup> But this disgraceful situation should be seen as a part of the overall Ottoman reality of corruption based in Constantinople. After all, the vices of the Romanian society associated with Greek rule preceded the eighteenth century and continued to prevail long after the last of the Phanariots had lost his throne. In fact, Ion Ionascu explains that "la venalité de l'administration Phanariote,...présent des points communs et dans la pratique des dignitaires...du XVII siècle (Ghinea Tzukalas, Nic. Sofialaul, Balasaki, Stroe

Leurdeanu, C. Stirbei, etc.)."<sup>58</sup> In fairness, therefore, the Greeks did not initiate the system of corruption; they simply found it in the Principalities and lived with it as they had in their native quarters in Constantinople. "I have succeeded in reigning over Moldavia", explained Michael Sutzko, "only by employing the means always currently used at Asiatic courts".<sup>59</sup> In fact, even if the Phanariot princes aspired to be the exception to the rule, the task was very difficult. This was because the newly appointed princes had to rule according to the conditions of the tenure which discouraged them from changing their ways. Again, Ionescu explains that "la cupidité des princes régnants Phanariotes...était dû à la trop courte durée de leur règne ainsi qu'à l'accroissement incessant des demandes d'argent et de provisions de la part de l'Empire Ottoman".<sup>60</sup>

To understand the above, one has to remember that after 1731, the sultan appointed the prince himself in return for payments in cash to himself and to his ministers.<sup>61</sup> It was, therefore, in the sultan's interest to make as many changes as possible: to depose a prince and then oblige him to buy back his throne, or to transfer him from one principality to the other, or to threaten the prince of Wallachia with transfer to the poorer throne of Moldavia unless he paid an indemnity. Since pretexts for deposition could be easily found, the princes felt insecure and their conduct was hampered by their uncertainty of tenure. Even a model Ottoman official like Nikolas Mavrocordato, who had condemned the "apostasy" of Demetrius Cantemir, lived constantly in fear, and we have seen already, that "Le sultan voulait le jeter en prison, irrité par les accusations portés contre lui par les boyars."<sup>62</sup> Another example is his son Constantine, a conscientious and enlightened administrator who issued a reform constitution for each principality, made the incidence of taxation fairer and its collection less onerous; and tried to

improve the lot of the serfs.<sup>63</sup> But although between 1730 and 1769 he reigned for six periods in Wallachia and four in Moldavia, the longest of these periods lasted for only six months. Such frequent coming and going made good government and a consistent policy almost impossible.

Apart from the uncertainty of tenure, financial burdens compelled the princes to extract all the money they could from their subjects. The hospodar had to recover his outlay and pay the annual tribute; he had to maintain his court and administration; he had constantly to bribe Turkish officials, and he was expected to give generous financial support to the Patriarchate.<sup>64</sup> Since the prince's official income would in no way satisfy his numerous creditors, he had not only to tax his people to the utmost but also to auction off to the highest bidder every court function in his power. As a result, Saineau explains, "les dignités devenues simplement nominales..... l'argent devint alors la vrai savonette à vilain."<sup>65</sup> The court was thus inundated by Greco-Romanian parvenus who held an empty distinction granted during the lifetime of an individual as a mere sinecure. It becomes apparent, then, that the Phanariot system rested upon a subtle bargain which stated implicitly that the prince might enrich himself at the expense of each provinces so long as the sultan and his favorites enriched themselves at the expense of the prince.

This arrangement, however, ended sometimes with the bankruptcy of the prince. This was because the Ottoman government was constantly demanding more money. "The policy of the Porte", Willkinson explains, "has....rendered the fixed amount of the tribute....nominal; and it is perfectly understood that the later [princes], on receiving their appointments, engage to satisfy any calls of the Turkish government, of money and other necessaries."<sup>66</sup> So, despite the large revenues from simony and taxes, the prince often ended his reign a poorer man. In fact, two of the three families

who monopolized the Romanian thrones in the eighteenth century, had severe financial problems. By the late eighteenth century, the Mavrocordato family, rich though it had been, could no longer afford to provide princes, and it is interesting that an offspring of the family, Alexandre Mavrocordato (1791-1865), became a prominent Greek revolutionary in the 1820's. The Racovitsas were also ruined. Different Phanariot clans, the Ipsilanti, the Mourousi, and the Callimachi, took their place.<sup>67</sup>

So it appears that the early Phanariot princes were simply Ottoman officials devoted to the empire and with no power to effect changes without the Turkish government's consent. Consequently, the Phanariot regime in the Principalities was not so powerful or even financially beneficial to the Greek governors. Apart from pomp and titles, the office offered little taste of real power and the hospodar had constantly to be geared to the Ottoman system's requirements. In addition, the foreign prince had to deal with the strong native boyar class with inherited wealth and social privileges which it defended successfully. Finally, the Greek princes were burdened with numerous financial obligations and insecurity of tenure which included the fear of losing their head.

## THE OTTOMANISTS

In view of the above mentioned financial burdens, tenure uncertainty and lack of real power why did anyone ever wish to be a prince? To answer this question one has to explore the real dimensions of the Phanariot psyche which correspond to the three aspects that constituted the Phanariot world-view: Ottomanism, Byzantine or Orthodox ecumenism, and Neo-Hellenism. This writer has chosen to treat these elements as different dimensions of the same thought-world rather than as traits of different groups of people. The

reason is that although the Phanariots were continually feuding among themselves, they never formed distinct political or social groups which could be identified as carriers of a definite ideology. Since the turn of nineteenth century, there existed Phanariot family-groups with certain attachments to foreign powers (for example, Sutzo to France and Ipsilanti to Russia), but this phenomenon, as will be demonstrated in the third chapter, was based on political manoeuvres rather than ideological inclinations. Hence, this writer is convinced that the Phanariot princes acted as individuals sometimes in a liberal and sometimes in a conservative manner, with the common denominator the belief in the historical distinction of their "race" and the vision of a Greek imperial regeneration. But as we have already seen, they were also deeply aware of their status as Ottoman dignitaries, and the great majority of them had chosen the path of reform through education and cooperation with the Ottoman government. As a result, by the last decades of the eighteenth century, the Phanariot élite had occupied important positions in the Ottoman empire and fulfilled essential functions. In fact, Arnold Toynbee contended that "it looked as though the result of western pressure might be to endow the old Ottoman empire with a new governing class by first forcing the Ottomans to take the Phanariots into partnership and then enabling the Phanariots to make themselves, in effect, the senior partners in the Ottoman firm."<sup>68</sup> Certainly, this notion of the Phanariots as partners and potential supplanters of the Turks in the administration of the empire sounds at first a bit far-fetched. Nevertheless, the fact is that the Greek aristocracy and the Orthodox church together constituted one of the principal pillars of the Ottoman imperial structure, and, as a result, the Greek nation had a part in the Turkish government through political and ecclesiastical leaders. But these leaders knew all too well that they owed their existence



primarily to their utility to the Muslim rulers. Therefore, the Phanariots were in a very delicate position as Ottoman officials who had to serve the Turkish goals, and simultaneously as Greeks who wanted to uphold the Greek cause. This delicate position, although never understood by the common Greeks who had no knowledge of high politics, was workable in the early years. However, when Greek nationalist and separatist feelings started to develop the Phanariots were dubbed by rival factions as "Greco-Turks" and traditional Greek historiography has treated them as anti-national elements. Zallony wrote, for example, that the Phanariots and the church had organized methodically the subjugation of the Greeks.<sup>69</sup> Particularly in the economic sphere, he goes as far as to assert that the Phanariots "pour les [the people] depouiller d'une partie de leur revenus, il a fallu insinuer au Gouvernement que de fortes sommes entre leur mains pouvaient rendre leur soumission problématique."<sup>70</sup>

Clearly, Zallony's views appear to be exaggerated and based on personal resentment. And this is not only because Zallony was a Catholic, but also because he had personally served the Phanariots for years as a doctor. After all, as Iorga has justly asked why did they serve "des maîtres qu'il considerait si mauvais"?<sup>71</sup> But apart from that, the beneficial attitude of the Phanariots towards the Greeks, as we will see in the third chapter, is well documented.<sup>72</sup>

Even if this is the case, however, there is still very much evidence of Phanariot adherence to the Ottoman status quo. After all, due to the cooperation with the Ottomans, the political power of the Phanariots was steadily enhanced in the course of the eighteenth century. The explanation of this apparent contradiction is what has been called "a peaceful penetration". According to A. Toynbee, the development of Phanariot influence and patronage, by virtue of their position and the mounting political pressure

from the West, would increase their political value as the only Ottoman group able to deal with the Europeans. This Phanariot penetration into the Ottoman political and economic system might in the long run develop into some kind of a Greco-Turkish understanding.<sup>73</sup> The Phanariots, thus, had to continue to cooperate with the Turks. In this apparently anti-national behavior lies the first dimension of the Phanariot mind: the vision of a gradual takeover of the Ottoman empire by the Greeks through reform, education and cooperation with the Muslim element.

This is the idea of Hellenoturkism; that is the establishment of a Greco-Turkish political ensemble.<sup>74</sup> This theory was a bit complicated but very widespread. In fact, it expressed the views of the majority of the Greek aristocracy and the high clergy. These people were aware that thanks to the Ottoman expansion the Orthodox world was reunited and the Patriarchate given unprecedented power. This fact gave the Greeks a unique opportunity to expand Hellenism over a vast territory. This cultural expansion combined with the Greek economic and bureaucratic achievements made many Phanariots think that it was possible for the Ottoman empire to become eventually a Greco-Turkish condominium over a multinational unity.<sup>75</sup> All that was needed, they thought, was patience and time. After all, the Greeks had always thrived in multinational empires. Was it not a historical fact that the once omnipotent Roman empire ended up in the hands of the Greeks? The same could happen in the Ottoman case. In fact, the Greeks were already in control of vital functions and slowly but surely would establish themselves as equal partners of the Turks in the administration of the empire. It was obvious that the Muslims could not keep up with the times. The Greeks would offer their services in exchange for increasingly more power until reaching the status of full partnership.

This idea originated in a document written circa 1783.<sup>76</sup> The author was the Grand Logothete of Wallachia, the Phanariot Dimitri Katartzis (1730-1807), who with his "Advice to the Young" became the main representative of this political conception.<sup>77</sup> "Although we do not participate in the administration of the State together with those who are fully in power", he asserted, "we are not nevertheless entirely nonparticipants. Many of our civil (political) laws, customs, and all our ecclesiastical laws are valid... and our nation in many parts of Turkey has minute political systems with privileges. There are, furthermore, many of our genos (race) who hold offices, namely patriarchs, high prelates, and administrators with imperial berats (warrants). Some of them wear the Kavadhi (headgear indicative of high rank), the ecumenical patriarch, for instance, or the grand dragoman and, often, the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia. All these participate in government and, therefore, fall under Aristotle's definition of a citizen".<sup>78</sup> So, the Greeks, according to Katartzis, had rights and privileges that they could use to ameliorate their position. In fact, Greek influences could emerge from within and change radically the empire to their favor, realizing, thus, "their own liberating dream through the Turkish empire which would be transfigured as an 'Ottoman estate of the Greek nation'".<sup>79</sup>

## CONCLUSION

So, a multinational state, governed by a rising Greek political and ecclesiastical aristocracy as an equal partner (or even as a dominant element), appears to be the policy towards which the conservative part of church and Phanariot aristocracy was drawn in its vision of the future restoration of Greece. This view represented the most conservative, and admittedly anti-revolutionary if not anti-national, dimension of the Phanariot mind.

Nevertheless, this optimistic line of thought was based not only on the universal spread of Greek culture throughout the Balkans and Asia Minor but also on the lessons of a long experience. The showdown of the 1821 revolution destroyed this vision and the western (and foreign to the Greeks) idea of the nation-state took root in Greece with the known consequences. It is impossible to tell what would have happened if the Greeks had chosen the path of reform. But the existing co-existence of the political and administrative system of the Ottomans with another parallel Greco/Christian political and ecclesiastical system, strengthened by the elevation of Greek officials, implies that a future Helleno-Turkish partnership was possible. After all, the nineteenth century was the era of reforms for the Ottoman empire.

Helleno-Turkism, however, was not the only vision of the Greek aristocracy, who were fully aware of its weakness under the existing system. Indeed, never forgetting that in reality they were no more than Christians subjugated to Turkish whim, the Phanariots had kept alive, at the same time, the dream of a Byzantine imperial regeneration. And this hope appeared much more realistic when, by the middle of the eighteenth century, coreligionist Russia replaced Austria as the principal enemy of the declining Turks.

#### **NOTES: CHAPTER 1**

- \* Alexandros Mavrocordatos, Istoria iera itoi ta Ioudaika, ed. Livadas (Bucharest, 1716), No. 85, p. 145.
- 1. Sir Charles Eliot, Turkey in Europe (London, 1965), p. 55
- 2. For this turn of the tide and its eventual effects upon Turkish morale see Toynbee A.J. A Study of History V.II (London, 1934), pp. 179-88, 222-228.

3. Ibid., pp. 224-225.
4. L. Sainean, "Le Régime et la société en Roumanie pendant le Règne des Phanariotes (1711-1821), ", Revue International de Sociologie X (1903), p. 718.
5. A.A. Pallis, The Phanariotes: A Greek Aristocracy under Turkish Rule (London, 1951), p. 103.
6. Ibid., p. 105.
7. Basile Sfyroeras, "Les Mavroyeni et la vie économique de la Mer Egée", Symposium, pp. 327-28. See also, A.A. Pallis, p. 106.
8. Ibid., pp. 327-328.
9. Under the Ottoman ruling system the Greek Patriarch was the official intermediary between the Sultan and his Christian subjects and thus, was invested in this capacity with many of the functions of sovereignty over his co-religionists. See Steven Runciman, The Greek Church in Captivity (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 378-79.
10. A. J. Toynbee, A Study V.II, p. 225
11. N. Iorga, A History of Roumania (London, 1925), pp. 182-186
12. Ibid.
13. De Peyssonnel, Observations Historique et Géographique sur les peuples barbares (Paris, 1765), p. 240.
14. M. De Bauer, Histoire de la Moldavie et de la Valachie (Paris, 1791), p. 247.
15. Charles Marie de Salaberry, Voyage à Constantinople en Italie et aux îles de l'Archipel (Paris, 1799), p. 110.
16. Louis Carra, Histoire de la Moldavie et de la Valachie avec une dissertation sur l'état actuel de ces deux provinces (Jassy, 1777).
17. Thomas Thornton, The present state of Turkey (London, 1807).
18. W. Wilkinson, p. 95.

19. Marc-Philippe Zallony, Essai sur les Phanariotes (Marseille, 1824).
20. Elias Regnault, Histoire politique et sociale des principautés danubiennes (Paris, 1855).
21. Felix Colson, Confidence sur la Turquie (Paris, 1855).
22. Alexandre Cioranescu, "Nicolas Filimon et le Portrait Littéraire du Phanariote", Symposium, pp. 88-89.
23. R.W. Seton-Watson, A History of the Roumanians (Cambridge, 1963), p. 127.
24. Traian Ionescu-Nisicov, "L'Époque Phanariote dans l'Historiographie Roumaine", Symposium, p. 145.
25. See, for example, N. Iorga, Roumain et Grecs au cours de siècle (Bucharest, 1921), p. 48.
26. For example, Iorga has discussed "La profonde fidélité à l'Empire, pendant toute cette première période ... Ainsi Jean Mavrocordato déclarait à Chrysanthe Notaras que, la guerre s'étant ouverte entre les Turcs et les Impériaux allemands [in the 1730's] il désire la victoire du 'Puissant Empire' pourvu que les 'chrétiens' en retirent un avantage". N. Iorga, Byzance après Byzance (Bucharest, 1971), p. 219.
27. Basile Sfyroeras, Symposium, p. 333.
28. G. P. Henderson, The Revival of Greek Thought 1620-1830 (New York, 1970), pp. 20-27.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 24.
31. D. Ciurea, "Nicolas Mavrocordato: Précurseur du Despotisme Éclairé", Symposium, p. 359.
32. Vlad Georgescu, Political Ideas and the Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities (New York, 1971), p. 133.
33. See, also, the connection between Alexandre Ipsilanti's reforms and Selim III's reforms. Vlad Georgescu, p. 78.
34. Raphael Demos, "Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment 1750-1821", Balkan Studies IX (1974), pp. 529-530.

35. For the role of the Greek Church as a socio-political unit see G. Arnakis, "The Greek Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire", The Journal of Modern History XXIV (1952). For the role of Phanariote hospodars as protectors of the Orthodox faith, see A.A. Pallis, pp. 76-78.
36. For the opposition of native boyars to Phanariotes see Vlad Georgescu, pp.30-43. See also Radu Florescu, "The Phanariote Regime in the Danubian Principalities", Balkan Studies 9 (1967) : 301-318.
37. The Phanariots translated the Bible, ecclesiastic hymns and the liturgy of the Eastern church to the Romanian dialect. Also, under the encouragement of A. Ipsilanti, the boyar Jannaquitza Vacarescu drafted the first Wallachian Grammar and regulated the local patois - a mixture of a Slavonic linguistic idiom and a corrupted form of Latin. See Jacovaky Rizo Neroulos, Cours de Litterature Grecque Moderne (Paris, 1828), pp. 33-34.
38. For Romanian culture in the Phanariot period, see Alexandru Dutu, "La Culture Roumaine à L'Époque des Phanariotes: Heritage et nouvelles Acquisitions", and Stefann Barsanescu, "La Pensée Pédagogique du Siècle des Lumières d'après des Parchemins Princiers de la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle destiné aux écoles. Sa Genèse", Symposium, pp. 77-83 and 57-60. See, also, N. Iorga, "Le Despotism éclairé dans les pays Roumains au XVIIIe siècle", Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Science Vol. 9 (Paris, 1939), pp. 101-115.
39. Cl. Tsourkas, "Les Historiographes Grecs de l'Epoque Phanariote et les Problèmes Fondamentaux de l'Histoire Roumaine", Symposium. See, also, Istoria tis Roumanias by Demetrius Philippidis (Leipzig, 1816), and Istoria tis palai Dakias, ta nun Transilvanias Vlachias kai Moldavias by Dionyssios Fotinos (Vienne, 1818-1819).
40. Ion Ionascu, "L'influence des Grecs des Principautés Roumaines", Symposium, p. 218.
41. Ibid., p. 222.
42. W. Wilkinson, p. 155.
43. N. Iorga, "Le Despotism éclairé", p.112.
44. D. Ciurea, p. 395.

45. Ibid., p. 362.
46. Ibid., p. 363.
47. Ibid., p.359. See, also, C. Giurescu, "Un Remarquable Prince Phanariote: Alexandre Ipsilanti, Voévide de Valachie et de Moldavie", and Florin Constantiniu, "Constantine Mavrocordato et L'Abolition du Servage en Valachie et en Moldavie", Symposium, pp. 61, 378.
48. Constantiniu, pp. 379-80. See,also, Serban Papacostea, "La Grande Charte de Constantine Mavrocordato", Symposium, pp. 365-369.
49. Constantiniu, pp. 379-80.
50. Ibid., p. 380.
51. The constant struggle between the old boyar class and the Phanariots is evident in the following account of Etairist Pavel and Dimitri Macedoski : "The Wallachian boyars have been trying for a long time in secret to find ways and means to remove the main Phanariot rulers from Wallachia. They never missed a single opportunity they thought favourable for such an attempt". Cited from Vlad Georgescu, pp. 107-108
52. Radu Florescu, p. 304.
53. D. Ciurea, p. 362.
54. Florescu, p. 304.
55. For the power relations between the Phanariot hospodars and the boyar class see Vlad Georgescu, pp. 25, 31-33.
56. Florescu, pp. 312-317.
57. L. Sainean, pp. 728-29; W. Wilkinson, pp. 95-99.
58. Ion Ionascu, p. 222.
59. Vlad Georgescu, p. 42.
60. Ionascu, 222; A.C. Stourdza, p. 74.
61. L. Sainean, p. 724.
62. D. Ciurea, p. 362.



63. For the reforms of C. Mavrocordato see Serban Papacostea, pp. 365-376; and Florin Constantiniu, 377-384.
64. Alexandre A. C. Stourdza, p. 77.
65. L. Sainean, p. 729.
66. Wilkinson, p. 62.
67. R. W. Seton-Watson, pp. 126-143.
68. A. J. Toynbee, *A Study V.II*, p. 225.
69. Zallony, pp. 152-3.
70. *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.
71. N. Iorga, "Le Despotism éclairé", p. 115.
72. For Phanariote beneficial role towards the Greeks see Basile Sfyroeras, pp. 325, 331, 333, and especially in the appendix, document No. 2. See also Marie Nystazopoulou-Pelekidis, "Actes des Princes Phanariotes en faveur du couvent de Patmos", plus annexed Inventory, Symposium, pp. 327-339 and 419-437.
73. A.J. Toynbee, A Study V.II, pp. 222-228
74. Dimitri Kitsikis, Review of "Ottoman Relations with the Balkan Nations after 1683" by Kemal Karpat in Balkanistica ed. K. Naylor 1 (AASSS, 1974), p. 63.
75. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65.
76. There was, however, a Byzantine precedent. In fact, after the fall of Constantinople, the scholar George of Trebizonde (1396-1483). "S'efforça de trouver quelque ressemblance, certains points commun entre le Christianisme et l'Islamisme" and "selon lui, la seule voie sûre et la meilleure solution était le rapprochement immédiat et la collaboration immédiat des vaincus [Grecs] avec les conquérants [Turks] ". G. Zoras, "Orientations idéologiques et politiques avant et après la chute de Constantinople", Le Cinq-Centième Anniversaire de la Prise de Constantinople, 103-124. ed. L'Hellenism Contemporain (Athens, 1953), p. 119.

77. C. Th. Dimaras, ed., Demetrios Katartzis, The Extant Works (Athens, 1970), p. 44. See, also, Stefan G. Xydis, "Modern Greek Nationalism", Nationalism in Eastern Europe, eds. Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer, (University of Washington Press, 1969), p. 224.
78. Reprinted from Stephen G. Xydis, "Modern Greek Nationalism", p. 255.
79. D. A. Zakythinos, The Making of Modern Greece (Oxford, 1976), p. 148.

## 2

**The Byzantine Imperialists**

*Constantinople presides  
today not only over Europe,  
but also over Asia and Africa"*  
*Iakovos Argeios*  
*Tutor of Nicolas*  
*Mavrocordato\**

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the Phanariot aristocrats were deeply aware of their status as Ottoman dignitaries and the great majority of them had chosen the path of reform through education and cooperation with the Ottoman government. But, as has also been emphasized, the Phanariot way of thinking was far from monolithic. In fact, the Phanariot psyche was a three dimensional one and, along with the reformist adherence to the Ottoman state, the ideas of Byzantine Imperialism and Hellenism were equally important to the Phanariot mind. To be sure, they saw cooperation with the ruling power as a necessity and submission to it as a means of eventually acquiring a dominant influence. This spirit, however, did not always take the same form, nor was it continuously present, for the Phanariots cherished also the hope of a Byzantine imperial regeneration. This dream represented the second dimension of the Phanariot mind-set and was dominated by the idea of Byzantine Imperialism.

To define Phanariot Byzantine Imperialism one has simply to say that it was the belief that one day the Greco/Roman empire of the Bosphorus would be restored to the Orthodox Christian and Greek-speaking inhabitants of the

Levant. This vision had two equally important and interrelated belief-systems: a temporal and a spiritual justification of the neo-Byzantine vision.

The first was based on the medieval claim of the Greek-educated Byzantine upper classes to exclusive supremacy in temporal sovereignty and cultural eminence as heirs of the Romano/Hellenistic universalism and Hellenic culture.<sup>1</sup>

The second ideological persuasion represented the also medieval and "divinely sanctioned" claim of the Eastern (Greek) Orthodox Church to world dominion, the so-called idea of ecumenicity.<sup>2</sup> By the eighteenth century, of course, the words "universalism" and "world dominion" could no longer apply to the realities of the Phanariot class and the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople. Yet, even then, Byzantinism was still a cohesive force which inculcated and preserved the unity of the Phanariot Greco/Christian imperial idea and its claim to pan-Balkan and pan-Levant sovereignty based on the exclusive orthodoxy and spiritual supremacy of the Eastern Church and creed, and on the continuity and ineffable superiority of the Hellenic/Hellenistic culture. As a result, encouraged by Russian help and Turkish decline, the Phanariots, although still maintaining the ambition of inheriting the empire intact from the Turks, were pursuing another ambition of establishing a sovereign multinational state of their own based, to a large degree, on the Byzantine tradition.

To analyze Phanariot Byzantine Imperialism, a thorough understanding of the Phanariot class and its goals is necessary. For such an understanding, we must look at their identity and national conscience. Accordingly, we have to examine not only the diversity of the Phanariot psyche, but also the evolution of the Phanariot mind during the eighteenth century. From their formation as a distinct group, in the second half of the seventeenth century,

the aristocracy of Phanar represented a new class with new intellectual needs. These needs, based on a thirst for knowledge and a search for a new ethic, gave life to a Phanariot promoted diffusion of culture which initiated a gradual divergence from the traditional ecclesiastic anti-Hellenism and anti-westernism.<sup>3</sup> This intellectual development, enhanced by Phanariot secular power and their access to western thought, awakened a temporal aspect of Greek self-awareness, latent since the Ottoman conquest. As a result, a political dimension was added to the religious identity of the Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Levant.

The new temporal self-awareness, however, was still closely connected with Orthodox Christianity. In fact, until the first half of the eighteenth century the Phanariot education was employed in close cooperation with the Patriarchate which, in search for weapons in its anti-Catholic campaign, had started by late seventeenth century to use secular knowledge in order to enhance the credibility of its dogmas.<sup>4</sup> The result of this Church-Phanariot intellectual collaboration was the diffusion of a culture which, although it served primarily religious purposes, also possessed the seeds of a political self-awareness and secular knowledge.

It is therefore important to emphasize that until the new found emphasis on Hellenism and French rationalism in the 1770's and 1790's, this exercise of the Phanariots'"intellectual curiosity" and political self-awareness operated under the spiritual influence of the Church which had, essentially, remained a firm defender of Orthodoxy and Tradition. The Church, in fact, had been the preserver of traditional religion, culture and language, and had inculcated in the Balkan Christians a form of "ethnic" togetherness based on religion.<sup>5</sup> The ascendancy of the Phanariots, in the late seventeenth century, did not substantially disrupt this sentiment despite the introduction of a new

political dimension in the identity of the Greek-speaking people. That was partly because the Phanariots themselves were devoted Orthodox Christians who had been brought up to consider the Orthodox Church as the leader of the Balkan peoples. But more importantly, the Phanariot new culture was based, apart from its knowledge of western thought, on their self-proclaimed association with the administrative élite of the late Byzantine empire (1204 - 1453). In fact, the Phanariots considered themselves the modern counterpart of this Byzantine group of administrators and intellectuals who have been considered by several historians as the advocates and creators of a short-lived Greek "Renaissance" and the original representatives of Byzantine Hellenism.<sup>6</sup>

The early Phanariot political awareness and intellectual inquisitiveness, therefore, had also an internal stimulus since the Greek aristocrats had been influenced by Byzantine models. As a result, the Phanariots felt themselves to be heirs and custodians of the Byzantine formal culture, and sought to imitate the Byzantines both intellectually and, to some extent, politically. Indeed, they were, like their Byzantine counterparts, monarchists, neo-Platonists, and advocates of the archaic language and centralized government.<sup>7</sup> Even their proto-capitalistic activities were not unfamiliar to their Byzantine counterparts, who were distinct from the medieval military élite in the same way as the Phanariots were alien to the Turkish military establishment.<sup>8</sup>

So the Phanariot class, particularly in its early phase, felt itself to be closely associated with the Byzantine administrative élite, and a custodian of its culture. It was natural for them, then, to envision themselves as the leaders of a religio-political undertaking that would, in God's time, resurrect the Greek empire of the East.

This Byzantine attachment of the Greek aristocracy explains both the early Phanariot political identity and their conservatism. Accordingly, Byzantine institutions and belief systems composed the Phanariots' early conservative approach to self-awareness. This form of self-distinction was based on religion but also on what may be called Greco-Byzantine proto-nationalism.

### GRECO / BYZANTINE PROTO-NATIONALISM

Nationalism has been defined as "a state of mind permeating the large majority of people and claiming to permeate all its members. It recognizes the nation-state as the ideal form of political organization, and the nationality of the source of all creative cultural energy and of economic well-being. The supreme loyalty of man is therefore due to his nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare".<sup>9</sup> Although there are several variations in its definition, most western historians agree that nationalism is a child of late eighteenth century western Europe.<sup>10</sup> With Rousseau and Herder as its prophets, it received a great impulse from the American and French revolutions and inaugurated a new era : the age of nationalism.

On the other hand, H. Kohn has also observed "isolated germs" of nationalism in fifteen century France but notes that this "new sentiment did not reach the masses".<sup>11</sup> G.H. Sabine offers the even earlier example of Philip the Fair, the territorial monarch of France, who felt strong enough to proclaim himself the leader of "the national cohesion of the French kingdom" based on the concept of "Patria" as opposed to the concept of the "Dominus", the feudal Lord.<sup>12</sup> In addition, Kohn noted that in Italy "Petrarch and Cola di Rienzo were forerunners of modern nationalism" but

their feelings "were confined to a narrow circle of literary men" and the people were indifferent to these sentiments.<sup>13</sup>

What we perceive here is that this new sentiment of the fifteenth century in France and Italy did not reach the large majority of the people. Indeed, its main recipient was a new bureaucratic nobility who, having strong intellectual proclivities, combined the characteristics of both the aristocratic and intellectual class. In other words, it was the administrative "Aristocracy of the Robe" who became the original recipient of the sentiment of proto-nationalism.

The above distinction can be very helpful in understanding Greco/Byzantine proto-Nationalism. This phenomenon can be defined as a belief of the élite classes of medieval Balkan Christian society in a common cultural heritage based primarily on Greco/Roman culture, Orthodox Christianity, and the Greek language. Unlike eighteenth century French patriotism, which applied to the collective personality of the "people", medieval proto-nationalism centered around a strong leader who could be either a temporal or a spiritual one. Thus, proto-nationalism implied strong monarchy, centralized government, and a sense of togetherness based on a common intellectual heritage. The important element here is that this kind of national conscience did not permeate the majority of the people and can be seen as a nationalism from above. As a result, there was little ethnic identification of the élite with the bulk of population, who could be of any nationality or race. On the other hand, the élite was not a closed caste and social mobility was permitted to whomever, regardless of race, was willing and able to adopt the culture and the language of the élite. Consequently, it was culture - including religion - that was the basis of "nationality", rather than race.<sup>14</sup>



To understand better the above, one has to be aware of the difference between a formal and a popular culture. The former is the culture of the élite and does not have to accord with popular beliefs, particularly in political entities such as empires. Since the time of Alexander the Great, and in fact as a corollary of his conquests and policies, Greek learning and culture spread throughout the Near and Middle East to such an extent that we can say that the formal culture of the so-called Hellenistic period was Greek.<sup>15</sup> This meant that most people in those territories were not Greeks either in blood or in language, but if they wanted to advance themselves socially and politically, they had to adopt the Greek language and manners; in other words, they had to be Hellenized. As a result, the élite classes in particular adopted a sense of Greekness and famous thinkers of the time, such as the philosopher Zeno, the father of Stoicism, passed into history as Greeks, although they did not belong to the Greek race.<sup>16</sup>

After the Roman conquest, of course, the Romans were the master race. Roman rule, however, to a large extent continued the pattern of Greek culture as the culture of the élite.<sup>17</sup> That was because élite Greek culture was integrated into Roman culture and became an inseparable and vital part of the culture of the ruling class.<sup>18</sup>

In Byzantine times, finally, the dynastic aristocratic and bureaucratic classes frequently incorporated people of Slav, Latin, Armenian and Turkish origin into the Greek.<sup>19</sup> All these foreign elements, however, were essentially Byzantinized in the long run. That meant that they in fact became members of an élite whose formal culture had evolved from the culture of the Greeks with, of course, important accretions from Rome and Christianity.<sup>20</sup>

By the time of the Turkish conquest, therefore, a Byzantine aristocracy was in existence which "boasted neither birth nor race but Hellenic

culture".<sup>21</sup> This pride in Hellenism was strengthened in the thirteenth century. Indeed, several historians have traced Greek nationalism's origin to the efforts of the thirteenth century Lascarid rulers of Nicaea to liberate Constantinople and the Byzantine empire from the hands of the "Franks", who had conquered and divided Byzantium in 1204, under the pretext of a crusade. Also, in the critical fourteenth century, when most of the Empire had been lost, the administrative and intellectual classes of Constantinople, Thessalonike, and Mystra had begun to form a political (that is Greek as opposed to Christian) self-awareness. The result was a period of intellectual effervescence and a return to the literature of the ancient Greeks. "Pay attention to the thought of the ancient Greeks", wrote a contemporary Byzantine scholar, "and through them try to diminish your ignorance".<sup>22</sup>

This new excitement, although not perhaps a genuine intellectual renaissance or an effective challenge to the religious establishment, did create a political feeling of togetherness among the administrative and intellectual Byzantine élites who resisted, to a point, the complete christianization of Hellenism advocated by the Church and the masses, whose only conscience was religious.<sup>23</sup> This increasing sense of pride in belonging to the superior culture of Hellas, however, should not be connected with modern Greek nationalism, for the idea of nation was alien to Byzantine political thought and there was complete indifference to the variations of race. It was rather a Proto-Nationalism based on Orthodox Christian religion, Greco/Roman culture, and the Greek language.

#### **BYZANTINISM AND THE FASCINATION FOR THE PAST**

This historical development of the Levantine formal culture is very important in understanding the Phanariot sense of belonging. Its Byzantine

aspect, in particular, is indispensable in providing an insight into the early Phanariots' national conscience and intentions. That is because the Phanariot mentality - especially its early and conservative phase - was dominated by a fascination with the Byzantine past.<sup>24</sup> This tendency, which we can call Byzantinism for the sake of brevity, reveals in itself the Phanariot dream of recreating the Byzantine empire.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, the Greek aristocrats of the eighteenth century were very much aware of the pre-existent Christian empire, whose dominant culture had been Greek in much of the Balkans and Anatolia.<sup>26</sup> Motivated by this awareness, they felt themselves to be the natural heirs of the Byzantine governing élite and endeavored to strengthen the Byzantine formal culture of which they claimed to be - along with the Church - at once the guardians and the representatives. This formal culture, then, was of fundamental importance to the Phanariot self-awareness for, along with Orthodox Christianity, it distinguished them from the Ottoman ruling élite. Accordingly, the Phanariot cultural emphasis represented a preparatory step towards an imperial regeneration, as part of a long term policy of preserving and strengthening the Greco/Byzantine elements within the Ottoman empire, so that in case of a collapse of Ottoman Moslem authority, the Greek aristocracy could substitute their own.<sup>27</sup>

One can thus suggest that there was a Phanariot inclination to identify themselves with the Byzantine élite classes and to imitate them as a first step towards an imperial regeneration. This can be demonstrated by the Phanariot desire to be associated with the Byzantine upper classes, their presence in the Danubian Principalities, their inclusive sense of nationality, and their sensitivity towards the Byzantine tradition.

### The Heirs of Byzantium

The new Greek aristocracy strove to spread the belief that they were descendants of the noble Byzantine families and even enshrined themselves in a book called "Le Livre d'Or de la nobless Fanariote".<sup>28</sup> According to this book, for example, the Ipsilantis were connected to the old and powerful families of Xiphilinos and Comnenos; the Soutsos to the Byzantine family of Draco Tipaldo, and the Rossetis' noble origin had been certified by imperial decrees.<sup>29</sup> In fact, some historians have accepted such Phanariot claims, as for example their historian M. Rizo Rangabé.<sup>30</sup> The great majority of historians, however, have asserted that the leading Phanariot clans cannot be regarded as having any connection with the old Byzantine nobility. This assertion is based on the proposition, endorsed by most historians, that after the Turkish conquest of 1453, the Byzantine dynasties disappeared.<sup>31</sup> Based on this assumption, then, the concensus regarding Phanariot origins is that the Phanariots emerged from a new monied élite of provincial origin which arose in the seventeenth century. Since in the Levantine mentality - unlike the western feudal tradition - money-making can be easily compatible with aristocracy, a wealthy nobility tied by common goals and interests began to emerge among the ranks of the enterprising Hellenized Ottoman subjects.<sup>32</sup>

The important point for our discussion, however, is the very fact that the Phanariots tried to propagate the myth of their Byzantine ancestry. This effort demonstrates their sensitivity towards the memory of Byzantium and their desire to be associated with the Byzantine governing élite and its culture. Such a conclusion would have enhanced their influence among the Balkan Christian population. This asset, along with their riches and their increasing influence at the Patriarchate and the Sultan's court, might ultimately have been used to recreate the empire of Byzantium.

### The Danubian Principalities

Accordingly, the Phanariots' claims of nobility were vigorously put forward, and any newcomers into the group hastened to ally themselves by marriage to whatever old illustrious names were available. This latter process had started early in the Danubian Principalities, but it was accelerated in the late seventeenth century as many more Phanariots married into the local nobility and acquired great power.<sup>33</sup> As a result, the aristocracy of the Danubian Principalities had, by the eighteenth century, become considerably Hellenized (Byzantinized).<sup>34</sup>

These developments in the Danubian lands bear witness not only to the Phanariot Byzantinism but also to their imperial dream. "En effet", wrote Alexandre Stourdza, "ayant pénétré dans le gouvernement même de l'empire Ottoman.....les Phanariotes devaient fatalement aboutir à obtenir, ... par cette voie indirect et détournée, la couronne même de principautés roumaines, qui était à leur yeux comme un reflet de la couronne impériale de Byzance, objet et but de leurs rêves intérieurs".<sup>35</sup> Indeed, one can suggest that the Phanariots' interest and activities in the Principalities were based on their Byzantine vision of imperial regeneration. After all, why would anyone wish to be a hospodar considering the already mentioned financial burdens, uncertain tenure, and lack of real power? If to all the above one adds the fear of losing one's head, the position of a hospodar does not appear to have been much of a bargain, especially for a class of people who already possessed great wealth and prestige. On the other hand, when the idea of pursuing an imperial dream, the rebirth of Byzantium, is introduced, everything seems to make sense.<sup>36</sup> Under Phanariot princes, a neo-Byzantine culture could find home in the Principalities, and a Greco/Byzantine nobility could root itself in lands there.<sup>37</sup> In the final analysis, as Filitti has put it, "Les principautés

étaient devenues la patrie d'un grand nombre de leurs (Phanariot) congénères qui s'étaient alliés avec les plus hautes familles et... exerçaient un rôle important".<sup>38</sup> There, away from the core of Turkish might, new schools could educate citizens for the new Byzantium and the Byzantine dream could be kept alive. "The Phanariots", Runciman explains, "saw in the Principalities a territory in which they could entrench themselves, and more Greeks began to flock across the Danube and to marry into the Moldavian and Wallachian nobility".<sup>39</sup>

### The inclusive sense of nationality

The above mentioned "interracial" exchange, practiced in the Principalities and other Balkan areas, has long baffled some historians who, trained in the Herderian and post-Napoleonic tradition of nationalism, have found it difficult to perceive fully the meaning of the word "Greek", or "Phanariot Greek", in the context of seventeenth and eighteenth century Ottoman society.<sup>40</sup> Still others, such as the Count de Gobineau, have been impressed by the Greek "strength through flexibility" approach to nationality.<sup>41</sup> In any case, the important element here, for our discussion, is the very practice of Phanariot mingling with other races (nations). This conduct demonstrates another aspect of the Phanariot affinity to Byzantine élites and, therefore, their Byzantinism. "Ce n'est pas comme Grecs voulant gréciser", wrote Iorga, "mais comme héritiers d'une civilisation universelle de langue grecque, que ces didaskales [Phanariots] tâchent de gagner, par les écoles qu'on vient de fonder, tout orthodox à leur hellénisme de saveur byzantine".<sup>42</sup>

It appears, then, that the Phanariots, much like the Byzantine upper classes, never stressed race, birth, or blood relationships as the basis of nationality. The foundation of their self-awareness, again like the Byzantines,

was religion and culture. For this reason, they assumed that non-Greek races (nations) would be happy to include themselves within the Greek Patriarchical family, to recognize the superiority of Greek culture, and even to aspire - as indeed they often did - to a Greek education and regard themselves as Greeks".<sup>43</sup> "Indeed", professor Richard Clogg asserts, "many of the other subject peoples of the Empire regarded Greek culture as having a unique civilizing and unifying role in the Balkans".<sup>44</sup> This unique quality of the Greek culture can be demonstrated in a poem (1802) by a Vlach priest, Daniil of Moskhopolis, who exclaims :

*Albanians, Wallachians, Bulgarians, speaker of  
other tongues, rejoice, and ready yourselves all to  
become Greeks. Abandoning your barbaric tongue,  
speech and customs, so that to your descendants  
they may appear as myths. Honor your nations,  
together with your motherlands, making the  
Albanian and Bulgarian motherlands Greek. 45*

So, a common cultural heritage and religion was the basis of the Phanariot conception of nationality where chronological, historical and geographical factors played the most important role. Indeed, regardless of the variety in their origin, the Phanariots constituted a superior, but open, Christian class characterized by cultural, linguistic, and religious homogeneity and a common propensity to intellectual, diplomatic, and commercial, rather than military, pursuits. Moreover, this Phanariot conception of togetherness was greatly aided by the fact that until the early nineteenth century, the Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Balkans were predominant in education, religion, finance, and commerce. The early medieval mingling with the Slavs had no effect on their preeminence.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, the majority of the Balkan

Orthodox Christians shared with the Phanariots a formal culture derived from Byzantium, plus a popular culture (with its significant Christian-Byzantine admixture in hagiolatry, monasticism, popular arts and crafts) which tied them to the Phanariots and the rest of the Greeks.<sup>47</sup>

Thus, birth and race (namely group identification based on common characteristics revealing a shared ancestry) were not essential to being accepted as a Greek or a Phanariot. Consequently, even the question of language was not fundamentally important (much like the Hellenistic and particularly the Byzantine times) in deciding one's "ethnic" allegiance. Indeed, one did not have to be born a Grecophone to be welcome into the Greek nation. The Greek "race", then, like the Phanariot nobility and the Byzantine élite, was open to newcomers. Slav, Albanian, or Romanian-speaking peoples were welcome to learn Greek and to become part of the large Greco/Byzantine family. In fact, as D. Dakin explains, "anyone who thought and called himself a Greek was in general estimation a Hellene. The shape of his nose, the color of the hair, the measurement of skull were all irrelevancies. What mattered was his soul, his mind, the way of thinking. The result was that Greek-speaking Albanians, Vlachs, Romanians and Slavs were all eligible to become true Hellenes and many of them, particularly Albanians and Vlachs, figure prominently in the annals of Greek patriotism".<sup>48</sup>

Certainly this situation did not remain the same after the advent of the western conception of nationalism. But this is mostly because the non-Greek-speaking Balkan peoples discovered their own history, and not because the Phanariots sought to detach the Greeks from the rest. Indeed, one might say that the Phanariot policy regarding nationality was an inclusive one. In other words, the Greek aristocracy sought to include others in what they considered



- and which in fact was - the most celebrated culture of the Balkan peninsula, instead of excluding themselves and their nation from the rest. In doing so, the Phanariots were running against the essence of modern nationalism and, indeed, against the times; they were consistent, however, in their Byzantine dream that one day a Greco/ Christian political entity would be founded on the ruins of the Ottoman state.

### **THE BYZANTINE TRADITION**

It should be apparent by now that the early Phanariot sense of self-awareness, in adherence to the Byzantine model, was based on a continuity of cultural and ecclesiastical tradition.<sup>49</sup> This tradition was based primarily on Byzantine (Roman) Law, Hellenic letters, and Christian dogma as transferred to later ages by Byzantine writings and education. The chief element of this education was the Greek language as compiled by Byzantine rhetoricians out of Greek classical texts and medieval church scripts.<sup>50</sup> This core of Byzantine formal culture became the model for Phanariot law making, social policy, education and Christian self-awareness, especially in the period when their world view was relatively harmonious with that of the Patriarchate. To demonstrate the above, a closer look at Phanariot law making, social policy, literature and Christian self-awareness is necessary.

#### **Law and social policy**

The Byzantinism of the Phanariot aristocracy is particularly evident in its effort to establish Romano/Byzantine law into the Danubian Principalities.<sup>51</sup> In fact, the Phanariot judicial borrowings and indebtedness to Byzantine law persisted until the very end of their rule. "Dans l'histoire du droit du peuple Roumain", G. Crompton has written, "l'époque Phanariote se caractérise par une plus ample utilisation des textes et des principes du droit

romain, connus par la voie des sources Byzantines".<sup>52</sup> Accordingly, in Wallachia the Syntagmaticon Nomicon (Constitutional Law) was promulgated in 1780 by Alexandros Ipsilanti, and the "Nomothesia" (Body of Laws) was published in 1818 under the reign of John Karatza.<sup>53</sup> To these we may add the "Judicial Art", by Demetri Katartzis, composed in Bucharest (1793), and the Moldavian Code of prince Callimache (1817).<sup>54</sup> "All these", wrote Panayotis Zepos, "were Greek texts whose Byzantine origin is manifest".<sup>55</sup>

Similarly, the Phanariot social policy was based on Byzantine tradition. "Cette (Phanariot) politique sociale", Zepos has written, "fondée sur la vieille tradition Byzantine qui dominant les acts des Phanariots devient, en effet, manifest dan leur oeuvre et dans leur legislation".<sup>56</sup> In fact, one of the two most admired qualities of a Byzantine aristocrat was "Philanthropia": literally, love of humankind, but it really means beneficence (the other was piety).<sup>57</sup> These virtues can be traced back to Hellenistic philosophy, but it was in the Byzantine period that they gained new interest due to their association with Christianity and their influence on the ruling class.<sup>58</sup>

Worthy descendants of these traditions, the Phanariots provided asylum for the old, sick, and poor as well as the orphan. The centers of such philanthropic activities were the monasteries.<sup>59</sup> Accordingly, a newly built monastery always had a place dedicated for use as an orphanage. The monks were in charge not only of the welfare of poor children but also of the task of finding husbands for destitute girls. Also, monasteries such as Saint Sava operated as hospitals for the sick and needy or as old people's homes.<sup>60</sup> "En effet", Zepos has told us, "les Phanariots ont déployé une activité remarquable dans ce secteur de la politique social, c'est où la compassion et la philanthropie occupent une place préponderante".<sup>61</sup>

## Literature

The Phanariot Byzantinism is also evident in their writings. Indeed, as in law and social policy, the Phanariot approach to literature and education reflected the literary habits and tradition of the Byzantines. In fact, the writings of the Greeks living under Ottoman domination remained, to a large measure, within the literary perimeters of medieval Byzantium, a natural consequence of the century and a half literary hiatus which took place after the fall of Constantinople. Accordingly, like the Byzantine, the content of this literary form is basically theological: catechisms, eulogies, liturgies, breviaries, and book services. But there are also collections of letters, epigrams, laudations, chronicles, school textbooks and poems.<sup>62</sup> The works of the Phanariots belong to this form of literature and exhibit the same linguistic dichotomy, the same rhetoric, the same primacy of Christian teaching over secular knowledge, as does Byzantine literature.

To demonstrate the above, one can point out the Phanariot imitation of the Byzantine conservative approach to ancient Greek language and thought. Indeed, to the Byzantine bureaucratic aristocracy, the Hellenic literature was only subject to study, imitation and commendation.<sup>63</sup> For this reason, the Byzantines dealt mostly with the barren study of words, grammar, syntax and rhetorical expression, approaches that prevented them from grasping the essence of ancient Greek thought.<sup>64</sup> As a result, Byzantine scholars were generally occupied with relatively trivial elements such as grammar, word-lists, quotations and proverbs, and consequently originality of thought and freshness of observation were impossible.<sup>65</sup> Similarly, the Phanariots, by imitating the Byzantine approach to Hellenic language and learning, were deprived of the essence of Greek writings, while they were given the opportunity only to dabble in the superficialities and the format of the

language. "Ils lisaient Hérodote", wrote Jacovaky Rizo Neroulos, "pour son dialecte ionien et pour l'inimitable simplicité de son style, mais non pour y étudier ce temps fecond en heros citoyens. La precision, la vigueur, la gravité de Thucydide, étaient leur unique object de recherches; mais il ne se souciaient guère d'approfondir les causes des jalousies, des discordes et des haines qui divisèrent les Grecs.... Ils lisaient Démosthène seulement pour son éloquence et sa force oratoire: ils ne réfléchissaient pas sur ses vertus civique".<sup>66</sup>

A characteristic aspect of this attachment to the formality of the language was the high regard of the Phanariots for the art of rhetoric. Here indeed, the continuity of the Phanariot practice with that of the Byzantines is as clear as it is regrettable. "Perhaps", professor Banes has asserted, "the most fatal legacy which the Greek kingdoms left to Byzantium was an education which was based upon the study of rhetoric".<sup>67</sup> Similarly, the Phanariot aristocracy had an almost religious attachment to rhetoric, which again indicates their desire to uphold formal Byzantine culture.

This Phanariot Byzantinism, expressed by a love for rhetoric and formality, led them to another Byzantine trait : the linguistic dichotomy. The Byzantine cultural élite in Constantinople, as we have seen, regarded the use of the ancient Greek language as a very important aspect of their superiority.<sup>68</sup> In fact, to speak and to write correctly, in what was thought to be the old Attic language, distinguished the elect. In contrast, the partly adulterated tongue(s) spoken by the lower classes and the peasantry was despised. Similarly, the Phanariots distinguished between two idioms : the Hellenic, that is ancient Greek which was used for official and academic purposes; and the spoken (popular) tongue, which was considered vulgar and unsuitable for any serious purpose.<sup>69</sup> In fact, the early Phanariots - like the

Church and many contemporary intellectuals - refused to accept the possibility that the spoken language of the people could be enriched from the ancient sources and developed into a means of handling difficult ideas with precision.<sup>70</sup> On the contrary, it seemed to them more suitable to call on the ancient language as a relatively complete and sophisticated instrument and to supplement its vocabulary as necessary. "[Alexandre] Mavrocordato", Dimaras tells us, "wrote in the archaic language, except in letters to his intimate friends; the spoken language, even in its most cultivated form, was for him only a servant destined for humble use. His directives and his recommendations are summarized in the following: study of ancient language and cultivate rhetoric".<sup>71</sup> For this reason, he was greatly annoyed when his sons wrote to him in the spoken tongue. "When will you cease, O beloved ones" he exclaims in one of his letters to them "chattering in the dialect of the marketplace?... Is this the result of your studies that you do not hesitate to speak barbarously to your father whom you know to prize the charms of rhetoric and artful elegance more than nectar and ambrosia".<sup>72</sup>

#### Orthodox ecumenicity and Christian self-awareness

Apart from the similar approach to law and education, the Phanariot writings bear witness to the same range of interest and stock of assumed knowledge with those of the Byzantine élite. That was due to the teachings of the Orthodox Church whose influence is evident in the literature of both groups.<sup>73</sup> Indeed, as during the Byzantine period, the doctrines of the Greek church occupied a predominant position in the political and cultural reality of eighteenth century Balkan society. As a result, Orthodox Christianity exercised a paramount influence on the self-awareness of the Balkan peoples.

This powerful influence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was a result of the Greek Church's assumption of a form of cultural and political

leadership after the Turkish conquest. In fact, the power and prestige of the Greek patriarchate increased after the fall of Constantinople since the new Greek patriarch was granted privileges which were both ecclesiastical and political.<sup>74</sup>

Exercising these privileges, professor Zakyntinos tells us, the Greek Patriarchate "created within the framework of the Ottoman empire an almost autonomous religio-political entity : the Greek Orthodox Church State. This quasi-official body", Zakyntinos continues, "had a great network of clericals which was more complete than the Ottoman empire itself".<sup>75</sup> This kind of organization made possible a form of cultural indoctrination which strove towards a sense of Balkan unity and which was relatively successful until the advent of western nationalism. This unity had been traditionally preserved as a kind of "nationalism" based on the Orthodox Christian religion- as opposed to the traditional allegiance to clan and region of the Balkan pre-modern social structure.<sup>76</sup>

This sentiment, however, should rather be considered a Christian Pan-Balkanism based on the teachings of the Orthodox Church. A very important component of this teaching emanated from Byzantine/Christian universalism, the so-called doctrine of ecumenicity. According to this credo of the medieval Orthodox Church- which was very compatible with Phanariot Byzantinism - the boundaries of the Byzantine empire were coterminous with those of Orthodox Christianity, which were in theory unlimited.<sup>77</sup> After the Ottoman conquest, however, this religio-political effort to promote Orthodox unity and cooperation through a common belief had concentrated on the Balkan Orthodox Christians. As a result, the emphasis was shifted from universalism to a form of Pan-Balkan "nationalism" based on the

primacy of the Christian teachings as prepared and compiled by Byzantine scholars and Church scripts.

This Byzantine/Christian stock of teaching and assumed knowledge greatly influenced the early Phanariots.<sup>78</sup> And this also bears witness to the Phanariot adherence to Byzantine tradition. We can find a reflection of the above in Alexandre Mavrocordato's "historical" work called "History of Hebrews". There the author demonstrates a Byzantine stock of knowledge and interests and informs us that history is divided into six periods : the first two from Creation to Abraham, the third and fourth from Abraham to the Resurrection and the fifth and sixth from the Resurrection to the Second Coming. This is to be followed by a seventh period which is that of endless rest in heaven.<sup>79</sup> This "History of Hebrews" is actually based on the authority of the Old Testament. Here, then, we witness a primacy of Christian teaching over history and philosophy. This primacy of Christian learning simply means that the early Phanariots kept their knowledge and philosophy in close touch with their Orthodox faith. Their historical or philosophical enquiry, then, was guided by their religious faith, unlike the western tendency (in modern times) to divorce secular knowledge from religion. In this respect, the early Phanariots were quite like the Byzantines.<sup>80</sup>

This Phanariot religious aspect can be seen in a letter of Nicolas Mavrocordato (son of Alexandros) in which he discusses the content of his book "Concerning Obligations" with Etienne Bergler, the translator of the Latin version published in 1722. Nicolas explains that "the book was written to the glory of God and the advancement of virtue among the Greeks, not from motives of philosophical curiosity".<sup>81</sup> It is apparent, here, that Nicolas' educational inquiry was consummated by his Christian faith. To consider the Phanariots obscurantists, however, would be a mistake for there

was another element in the complexity of their mind. In fact, the same man, Nicolas Mavrocordato, who wrote the above letter, had written in his book "Leisure Thoughts of Philotheos": "But meanwhile I admire and never cease from praising and encouraging those Moderns who have penetrated to the innermost recesses of nature and who by their remarkable studies in every field of learning have made countless discoveries no less true than novel; so that often enough it occurs to me to say that if were possible for the sage Aristotle to come to life again he would confess himself to be defeated outright in both physics and theories of morals and character, and would gladly become the pupil of such men".<sup>82</sup>

This passage suggests a knowledge of the writings of Galileo, Newton and Locke. Indeed, the Phanariots, often educated in the west, were very much aware of western humanism.<sup>83</sup> Their religious belief, however, was genuine since they had been brought up under the teachings of the Greek Orthodox Church whose educational influence was paramount in the Balkans until the late eighteenth century. Indeed, until the emergence of the bourgeois spirit during the 1770s and the 1790s, most Greek thinkers and teachers were ecclesiastics and therefore obliged to go along with the external pressure of the Church and their own theological predilections. Such exemptions as Eugenios Vulgaries, who attempted to reform the ecclesiastical system of education by introducing modern philosophy and science, were swiftly attacked and expelled.<sup>84</sup> This clerical influence in cooperation with the increasing Phanariot westernism produced, by the turn of eighteenth century, a form of "religious humanism" which lasted until the 1790s.<sup>85</sup>

This, "intellectual compromise" between the westernized Phanariots and the Church establishment had an effect on both sides. On the one hand, an intellectual approach that we may call, to use a term of C. Cavarnos,



"Christian Eclecticism" became popular in Phanariot circles; namely the principle of allowing the free study of any non-religious knowledge, and the appropriation of those elements in it that can be assimilated organically into Christian teaching.<sup>86</sup> A good example is the writings of Nicolas Mavrocordato. "Il a bien étudié", wrote Borge Knös, "les anciens philosophes et leur fait de nombreux renvois, mais il s'en rapporte aussi à la Sainte Ecriture et aux Pères de l'Eglise. Les deux piliers de sa philosophie sont la parfaite honnêteté de l'antiquité grecque et la vertu chrétienne, des réflexions antiques et chrétiennes s'entremêlent, l'esprit grec et la foi chrétiennes s'unissent dans ses pensées".<sup>87</sup>

On the other hand, since the late seventeenth century, the Church, under the influence of Phanariot westernism and the leadership of brilliant clergymen such as Dositheos of Jerusalem and Chrysanthos Notaras, supported this religious humanism as a means of containing Catholic expansion.<sup>88</sup> But the treaty of Belgrade (1739) inaugurated in the Near East an era of Austrian containment, Russian expansion, and French enlightened influence.<sup>89</sup> As a result of these developments, the Orthodox Church's confidence was strengthened and became more tolerant towards western humanism. Indeed, in the period between the 1740s and 1770s the Patriarchate, feeling less threatened by the Catholic Church, expressed a more conciliatory intellectual approach towards the West, because the Catholic Church, absorbed in its own difficulties with the Enlightenment, gave only secondary importance to its efforts at proselytism.<sup>90</sup> But this period also corresponds precisely with the high point of Phanariot financial and administrative influence over the Church. Indeed, by the middle of the eighteenth century, the Greek aristocracy had completed a gradual infiltration into the ecclesiastic establishment and, by holding high lay offices within the

Patriarchate, influenced ecclesiastical policy.<sup>91</sup> In fact, it is not an accident that the most enlightened Patriarchate of the period, Samuel Chatzeris was a Phanariot who protected the sciences and gave the Patriarchate great authority.<sup>92</sup>

So, from the 1680s to the 1770s, the Phanariot experience contributed to spreading some western influence in Constantinople and the Ottoman occupied Balkans - although it is important not to exaggerate either the earliness or the speed of these changes. This western influence on the Balkan peoples will be treated extensively in the third chapter. For now, it is sufficient to say that, with the ascendancy of the Phanariots, a new, more progressive, spirit had started to be formulated in the Christian aristocratic circles of the Near East. This progressive element, however, although promoting an active implementation of neo-Byzantine ideas and liberation from the Turks, was not a revolutionary one. In fact, these enlightened aristocrats were convinced that an uprising would be foolish and hopeless and that the only hope for deliverance lay with the great powers, especially with Russia whose policy towards the declining Ottomans had become markedly more aggressive by the middle of the eighteenth century.<sup>93</sup> In fact, this belief in Russia was common among the Greeks and was due primarily to the Orthodox Church's Messianic Byzantinism : the belief in the restoration of the Byzantine Empire not by internal revolution but by a providential intervention of Russia.

### **THE RUSSIAN FACTOR**

The idea of a Christian crusade to save or to restore Byzantium had sustained the Greeks for centuries, but never more so than the Orthodox Russia in the leading role. The reasons were historical and religious. Indeed,

the Greek ties with Russia were very old. Professor Zakynthinos tells us that from the conversion of Russia to Christianity in 989, "the presence of Greek priests and artists in Kiev played a fundamental part in the organization of the Russian Church, the development of Russian culture, the formation of the Russian law, the philosophy of the government and the promotion of art and letters".<sup>94</sup> Norman Banes also talks about the five Byzantine gifts to Russia : "her religion, her law, her view of the world, her art and writing".<sup>95</sup> Furthermore, after the fall of Constantinople, the marriage of Ivan III with the Byzantine princess Sophia, in 1472, greatly strengthened the Greco-Russian ties. Members of the great Byzantine families, churchmen, and intellectuals sought refuge in Russia, a fact which led Russia towards the doctrine of Moscow as the Third Rome.<sup>96</sup>

This old tradition persisted with the rise of Muscovite Russia, and was reinforced by the common Catholic threat to the Eastern Orthodox faith.<sup>97</sup> Ever since the fall of Constantinople, the integrity and continuity of a rich Byzantine Orthodox past were at stake. Non-Orthodox peoples, like the Polish, Venetians and Austrians, were very successful and by the late seventeenth century Muscovite Russia was the only state in which Eastern Orthodoxy was followed by both rulers and ruled.<sup>98</sup>

As a result, in the seventeenth century the role of Muscovite Russia became decisive in the religio-political fortunes of the Orthodox East.<sup>99</sup> It was, however, only at the turn of the eighteenth century, with the reign of Peter the Great and the tenure of the brilliant Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, that the Orthodox forces started to achieve some significant success.<sup>100</sup> As a result, the religio-political fortunes of ecumenical Orthodoxy were substantially improved. The educational and missionary successes against the Jesuits testified to that, as well as the Russian expansion in the

steppe and the generally weakened position of the Ottoman empire.<sup>101</sup> Basic to such improvement in the fortunes of the Orthodox East was the growing realization by the Greeks that defence of the faith rested not only on its ideological purity but on the cultivation of a Russian financial, political and (beginning with Peter the Great) military support.<sup>102</sup> It was in such a religio-political environment that Phanariot ascendancy took place within the Ottoman lands. Those of the Phanariots who looked to Russia as the liberator, took it as a duty to sustain and expand the old Greco/Russian ties and play a prominent role in Russian relations with the Greek East.

The Phanariots as a class, however, had additional, and more realistic, reasons to be inspired by Russia. Indeed, the Phanar aristocrats were oligarchs and had, despite their enlightened nuances, absolutist propensities.<sup>103</sup> Their main concern was how to wed their neo-Byzantine vision with their increasing sense of Greek self-awareness. In fact, in the course of the eighteenth century, Russia offered them an irresistible model for the inevitable fusion of Byzantine imperialism and nationalism.<sup>104</sup> In other words, the Russian state offered the Phanariots a "happy" combination of the union of various ethnic groups under one language and one religion; but also, and more importantly, Russia offered a model of "Byzantine" strong monarchy, centralized government, administrative nobility and bureaucratic order. For after all, the Phanariot neo-Byzantine vision never included fundamental social changes, and the Greek aristocrats knew that they were going to lose rather than gain if they supported a change of the Ottoman system which they (or their patron) could not control. What they had in mind, as far as their neo-Byzantinism is concerned, was the establishment of a new empire ruled firmly by a strong Orthodox monarch and governed by a Greek political and ecclesiastical nobility. The Russian absolutist model,

therefore, suited them perfectly. "Ils espéraient...", wrote Alexandre Stourdza, "avec le concours russe, le rétablissement de leur ancien empire Byzantine, dans lequel ils s'attendaient à jouer un rôle encore plus important que dans celui des Ottomans".<sup>105</sup> Thus, the Phanariot world stretched from Moscow to Jerusalem or Alexandria, the world of Eastern absolutism and Orthodoxy. Gradually the Phanariots included a Hellenism, but without an Athens. Indeed, as far as the Greek aristocracy was concerned, the rights and needs of the "Demos" had been lost in the centuries of religious intolerance and eastern despotism.<sup>106</sup>

The absolutist element was present in the Ottoman empire and so were the privileges of the Greek aristocracy. But political and economic advantages could not always compensate for psychological and religious subjugation. To a point, actually, the Phanariots were content with the Ottoman reality and as a rule exhorted the Christians to respect the Sultan, but they were also aware of their weakness under the existing situation. Although exercising (through the Church) a civil authority over the Ottoman Christians, they knew that their power was subject to the whim of the Ottoman rulers. At once pampered and scorned, privileged and persecuted, they wavered between loyalty and sedition towards the Ottoman masters, never forgetting that, in fact, they were Christians subjugated to Moslems. "The trouble stems", Alexandros Mavrocordatos wrote, "from the fact that the Turks are extremely contemptuous towards the Christians. To make matters worse, the Sultan is constantly changing his ministers. I have succeeded by dint of great exertion to win one Vizier's favour; but now he has fallen and another has taken his place, and then another. Each time I have to start afresh".<sup>107</sup>

To be sure, as long as the Sultan was omnipotent, the Phanariot aristocracy had to accept the situation. Yet, they were very aware that the

emperor was a moslem. And when the Sultan became gradually weaker and his rule progressively corrupt and tyrannical, many Phanariots turned to another emperor who was both Christian and Orthodox : The Tsar of Russia.<sup>108</sup> By the middle of the eighteenth century, when policy towards the Ottomans became markedly more aggressive, and Russia replaced Austria as the principle foe of the Sublime Porte, the Phanariots were convinced that Russia would be the ultimate liberator of the Greeks. Traditional religious ties, political affinity and the nostalgic Byzantine vision were thus responsible for the effectiveness of Russian overtures in the Near East. Russia's ascendant position in the eighteenth century gave new credibility to the hopes for a revived Byzantium, including prospects for liberation from the Turks and reestablishment of Orthodox rule in Constantinople. As a result, a host of Phanariot intellectuals and high-placed officials within Ottoman lands were drawn into a Russian orbit.<sup>109</sup>

### **MESSIANIC BYZANTINISM**

The fascination, however, which the Greeks felt for Russia, in this crucial period of their history, was clearly too strong to be attributed to mere tactical considerations in the struggle for liberation. In fact, there was also a mystical element concerning the image of Russia as a liberator which was propagated for centuries by the Greek Church : Messianic Byzantinism. That was the unwavering belief in oracles and prophesies that the Greek empire of the East would in God's time be resurrected in all its pristine majesty. Kordatos tells us that since the fifteenth century the Greek priesthood had done everything in its power to perpetuate the myths, prophesies, messianic oracles, religious apochrypha and pseudo-historical chronicles which even in the last decades before the revolution circulated widely in the Greek world

and profoundly influenced the great majority of the Greeks.<sup>110</sup> These popular literary forms had reached a climax of popularity among the Greek populace in the second half of the eighteenth century. That was because the Phanariots - in accordance with the Byzantine theory of sovereignty as a celestial trust - had sought to reinforce this messianic element in Greek thought which was still truly representative of the Greek collective mentality.<sup>111</sup> An example of this Phanariot utilisation of the prophetic genre can be seen in the case of the oracle of Leo the Wise. He prophesied that a certain providential ox would bellow when the long awaited emperor John came to liberate Constantinople. Accordingly, the emblem of Moldavia was an ox-head and all the Phanariot princes, on their accession to the Throne, assumed the ceremonial name of John.<sup>112</sup>

It appears, then, that the Phanariots used the prophecies in order to reinforce the belief in the resurrection of the Greek empire. Indeed, the writers of the Phanariot milieu, such as K. Dapontes, C. Karatza, and D. Photinos, had always invested God with an important role in the Greco-Byzantine regeneration.<sup>113</sup> But there is also evidence that the Phanariots themselves believed in these prophecies. For example, after the disappointing, for the Greeks, end of the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-1774, C. Dapontes had to say the following : "The time appointed by the oracles for the restoration was 320 years after the Conquest, and it so happened that this time coincided with the six years war when (the Russians) approached the City (Constantinople), surrounded it and were on the point of taking it but they did not take it..., if... He (God) saw fit that the utterances of so many astronomers...and Saints should prove vain in preference to giving the empire to men (Turks) unworthy not only of this empire but of life itself, now how is it possible henceforth that the resurrection of the Roman

(Byzantine) Empire should happen when no assurance of oracle concerning this has remained".<sup>114</sup>

As is apparent from Dapontes' lamentations, these prophecies for the most part told, either explicitly or implicitly, of the liberation of the Greeks from the Turkish yoke. In fact, those that appear to have circulated most widely were the prophecies attributed to "Agathangelos". John Nikolopoulos tells us that they were forgeries compiled by archimandrite Theoklitos Polyeides in a pamphlet that enjoyed extraordinary popularity in the second half of the eighteenth century and which were characteristically dedicated to Gregorios Ghikas, prince of Moldavia (1764-67).<sup>115</sup>

This collection of prophecies predicted the destruction of the "Latin Pride" and celebrated the rising star of Russia and its emperors who "will spread Christ's victorious banner over Byzantium and will destroy the power of the Ismaelites". In consequence, "the Orthodox faith will be raised high and will spread from East to West...the Barbarian will shudder and trembling will retreat in panic abandoning the Metropolis of the World. Then God will be in his glory".<sup>116</sup>

These hopes must have seemed far more realistic in the 1760's and early 1770's in the face of the Russo-Turkish conflicts and the shifting of the international balance of power.<sup>117</sup> Certainly the Greek hopes for a revived Byzantium had been transformed into a fever of anticipation with Catherine II's project of a restored Byzantine empire under her Greek-speaking grandson Constantine. The Phanariot princes played a dominant role in this period of excitement and anticipation and, in turn, were embraced and protected by Russia. Gregorios Ghikas defected to Russia shortly after the declaration of war in 1768. Ghikas, a Russian client, was reinstated on the Moldavian throne under the terms dictated by Russia to Turkey at Küçük



Kainardji (1774).<sup>118</sup> Even after the assassination of Ghikas (1777), unofficial Phanariot ties with Russia continued, especially through the newly established Russian consulates within Ottoman lands. In fact, Alexandre Mavrocordato, the Moldavian hospodar, developed a plan to stir up the Balkan Christians against the Ottomans, and with Russian help, to effect the establishment of a pan-Orthodox state in the Balkans.<sup>119</sup> For this reason, at the outset of the Catherine's second Russo-Turkish war, in 1787, A. Mavrocordato took refuge in southern Russia and remained in the Russian empire after the war.<sup>120</sup>

These Russo-Phanariot ties were to continue and along with them a portion of Messianic and imperial Byzantinism. Even when Catherine's plans failed to materialize in the 1770's and 1790's, some Phanariots insisted on seeing that as only a postponement, to be dealt with in the reign of Catherine's other grandson, Alexander, who bore a Greek imperial name perhaps even more evocative than Constantine. But something had started to change in the Greek world after the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-1774 and the abortive revolution of 1770's. First, the terms of the Russo-Turkish treaty of Küçük Kainardzi (1774) became the catalyst of a socio-economic reorganization in the Balkan world; a fact which generated new economic classes and by the 1790's, new ethics and ways of learning. The war, in addition, had not resulted (as the prophesy wanted) in the liberation of Constantinople, and therefore, the treaty of Küçük Kainardzi, favorable as it was to Greek interests, aroused profound disappointment.<sup>121</sup> Moreover, in the last decade of the eighteenth century, it became clear even to the Phanariots that religious and traditional sympathy was not enough to sway the Russian court, who proved capable of neglecting their co-religionists when they were no longer of use. Furthermore, by the 1790's, the European

scene and international circumstances had changed as well. The traditional historiography of the Eastern Question asserts that the Ottoman empire was far more vulnerable to partition in the decades prior to Catherine II's second Russo-Turkish war of 1787-92. After this period, the more tangible involvement of Great Britain in the Eastern Question and the subsequent preoccupation of Europe with Napoleon served greatly to internationalize the problem of Ottoman weakness and thus limit the potential for grandiose partition plans of either Russia or Austria.<sup>122</sup> Finally, by the 1790's, a new cultural upsurge took place in the Greek world which, based on a new bourgeois spirit, promoted a new emphasis on Hellenism and education, and focused on the creation of an independent Greek state with its own distinct national character. As a result of all the above developments, the indigenous Balkan peoples, especially under the impact of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Conquests, became increasingly less disposed to the notion of outside liberation. In fact, this turnabout in the loyalties of key Balkan national figures has been largely responsible for the negative treatment accorded to Phanariots by subsequent generations of writers who, using a post-Napoleonic national standard, judged the Russophile and paternalistic Greek aristocracy as anti-national.<sup>123</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Thus, coexisting with the hope of a future Helleno-Turkish partnership, there was also a Byzantine vision in the Phanariot mind. Accordingly, the Greek aristocracy strove to recover for themselves the Byzantine past as a first step towards the materialization of their dream to revive, in time, the Greek empire of the Bosphorus. In doing that, the Phanariots tried to present themselves as descendents of the Byzantine élites, and as heirs, trustees and

representatives of the Byzantine formal culture which, based on Orthodoxy, Roman law, Greek culture and language, had welded together for centuries the heterogeneous élite elements in the Balkans and Anatolia. This culture not only survived the Ottoman conquest but, incorporated in the Christian culture, had by the eighteenth century spread to the popular level, forming a common Balkan bond. Following this tradition, the Phanariots spread Greek culture and language to the Moldo-Wallachian nobility, upheld Orthodox ecumenicity, and sustained the messianic belief in providential emancipation by Russia. But more realistically, the Phanariots wished to utilize the Russian model in their effort to combine a Pan-Orthodox and Byzantine self-awareness with the increasing Greek ethnic distinction. Based on this combination, they had designs on an alternative to Helleno-Turkism which appeared possible as Turkish power waned: an Orthodox multinational state, based on Greek culture and language and a Russian type oligarchic/bureaucratic political system under themselves or in cooperation with an offspring of the Russian dynasty.

By the last decade of the eighteenth century, however, the first cracks appeared in the Phanariot edifice of Neo-Byzantine imperialism, particularly in its aspects of Messianic Byzantinism and Russian aid. The prophecies had been proven wrong, and a new, more rational spirit, incited by an invigorated bourgeoisie, strengthened the Phanariot doubts about the old ways - particularly as the Church had shifted from conservatism to reaction. Still fearing, however, the emerging social structure, the Phanariots remained hopeful of Russian cooperation. But they also perceived Russia's ability to betray the Greek cause if the Greeks were no longer of use. So in this critical period, some Greek aristocrats, with their position weakened vis-à-vis Turkish authority, bourgeois liberalism, church reaction, and Russian

opportunism, felt the need to look elsewhere for support. The obvious choice was France, since the disappointment with the messianic and Byzantine hopes came about at a time when French rationalism was beginning to exert some real impact upon the better educated Greeks. Besides, by 1804, Napoleon had proclaimed himself an emperor.

#### NOTES: CHAPTER 2

- \* Alexandros Mavrocordatos, Istoria iera itoi ta Ioudaika, ed. Livadas (Bucharest 1716), Preface.
- 1. For the Byzantines as the intellectual heirs of the Hellenistic age see Norman H. Baynes, "The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome", Byzantine Studies and Other Essays, ed. N.H. Baynes (Connecticut, 1955). See also, Romilly Jenkins, "Byzantium and Byzantinism", Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, first series 1961-65 (Princeton, 1967).
- 2. Baynes, p.9; Jenkins, p.142. See also Cyril Mango, "Byzantinism and Romantic Hellenism", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XVIII, 1965, 29-43.
- 3. Borge Knös, L'Histoire de la littérature Néo-Grecque, (Uppsala, 1962), p. 468.
- 4. "Les auteurs ecclésiastiques", wrote Borge Knös, "achèvaient souvent leur études à l'étranger. Mais l'antiquité elle même n'attirait pas leur intérêts comme en Occident, ils n'étaient pas non plus saisis de cet humanism qui était en vogue dans les autres pays de l'Europe... Les Grécs lettrés étaient en général occupés à défendre la foi orthodox contre les attaques de missionnaires catholique". Borge Knös, p. 385.
- 5. George Arnakis, "The Role of Religion in the Developments of Balkan Nationalism", The Balkans in Transition, ed. by Ch. and Barbara Jelavitch, (University of California, 1963), p. 116.
- 6. The Lascarid dynasty of Nikaea (13th century) has been considered by a good number of historians as the catalyst of the national idea of Hellenism. In addition, this dynasty has been credited with the preservation of the intellectual development of the Macedonian period (dynasty of Komnenes, 11th century), and the introduction of a new

intellectual activity that some historians have elevated to the level of an intellectual renaissance. The emperor Theodore II Lascaris (1254-58) has been perceived as an enlightened despot who fought the feudal aristocracy of the old Byzantium; a rationalist who believed in the progress of the human spirit; and a medieval sovereign who allowed philosophical and theological works to reflect a Platonic knowledge. See, Stephen G. Xydis, "Medieval Origins of Modern Greek Nationalism" Balkan Studies, 9 (1968). A. Vacalopoulos, The Origins of the Greek Nation (New Brunswick, 1971). G.G. Arnakis, "Byzantium and Greece", Balkan Studies 4 (1963) 2: 379-400. Borge Knös, pp. 47-49.

7. "Their political idea", wrote Raphael Demos, "was that of enlightened despotism somewhat in the manner of Plato's government of a philosopher king. R. Demos, p. 529.
8. For the beginning of Byzantine proto-capitalism, see J. Kordatos, Great History of Greece, Vol. IX (Athens, 1956), pp. 22, 28
9. H. Kohn, The Idea of Nationalism (New York, 1961), pp. 16-17. C.J. Hayes, in his Essays on Nationalism (N. York, 1962), p. 6, defined nationalism as "a condition of mind among members of a nationality, perhaps already possessed of a national state, a state of mind in which loyalty to the ideal of the act of one's national state is superior to other loyalties and of which in one's nationality and belief in its intrinsic excellence and its "mission" are integral parts" .
10. For example, G.P. Gooch., in Studies in Modern History (N. York, 1968), p. 217, called Nationalism a child of the French Revolution. See, also, D. Thompson, Europe since Napoleon (London, 1957), pp. 99-103. This view is based on the modern sense of nationalism : the desire of a community to assert its unity, identity, and independence vis-a-vis a dynastic rule or other communities.
11. Kohn, p. 112.
12. G.H Sabine, A History of Political Theory (N. York, 1950), p. 265.
13. Kohn, pp. 98-100.
14. Romilly Jenkins, pp. 143, 146.
15. P McKay, B.D. Hill, J. Buckler, A History of Western Society, Third Edition, Vol. I: From Antiquity to the Enlightenment. (University of Illinois, 1987), pp. 108-110.
16. Zeno (335-262 B.C.) was a Hellenized Phoenician. See *Ibid.*, p. 120.

17. Ibid., pp.149-152. An impressive demonstration of the influence and potency of Greek culture in the Roman period is cited by the Fourth Gospel: According to this source, when Jesus learned that some Greeks had expressed the desire to see him, he is supposed to have answered "the hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified". As Samuel Angus has put it, "This was tantamount to a confession that if the Greek world accepted Him the whole world would follow". S. Angus, The Environment of Early Christianity (N. York, 1915), pp. 212-13.
18. Norman H. Baynes, p. 3.
19. Ibid., pp. 3-4. See also A. Vacalopoulos, "Byzantinism and Hellenism" Balkan Studies 9, 1968 101-126.
20. Jenkins, p. 143.
21. Ibid., p. 146.
22. Ελληνων τον νουν προσεχειν. Και δια εκεινων της αγνοιας καθαριρει αυτον πειρασθαι. (Νειλου ∇Εγκωμιον ∇ Μινγε ΧΛΙ, 665), reprinted from J. Kordatos, p. 21. See also Borge Knös, pp. 86-92.
23. For the debate regarding the extent of the Byzantine Intellectual Renaissance, see Cyril Mango "Byzantinism and Romantic Hellenism", Journal Of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes XVIII 1965 29-43. For the Greek point of view, see A. Vacalopoulos, "Byzantinism and Hellenism", Balkan Studies 9, 1968 101-126.
24. "C'est aux Phanariotes", wrote Iorga, "...qu' échet la charge de continuer les traditions byzantine dans le territoire même sur lequel s'étendait l'autorité du Sultan". Cited in P. A. Argyropoulos, "Les Grecs au service de l'empire ottoman", Le Cinq-Centième Anniversaire de la Prise de Constantinople :151-178, ed. L'Hellenism Contemporain, (Athens, 1953), p. 161. See, also, J. Kordatos, p. 174; and D. A. Zakythinos, p. 104.
25. The personal seal of the Mavrocordato family, for example, depicted a phoenix reborn from its ashes and coming out of flames. This mythical bird represented the act of regeneration of the Byzantine empire and the Greek people. The same emblem was used by A. Ipsilanti in the revolutionary flag of 1821. A. Sturdza, p. 277.
26. For example, writers and historians of the Phanariot milieu, such as Michael Cantacuzene and Dionysios Photino, made extensive use of Byzantine sources. There were also many Byzantine works in

- circulation such as "The Chapters of Agapetus to Emperor Leon" and "The Teachings of Basilius, Emperor of the Greeks". Vlad Georgescu, p. 76
27. Steven Runciman, p. 363. See also Gregoire Cassimatis, "Esquisse d'une Sociologie Du Phanariotism", Symposium , p. 164.
  28. Ibid., p. 362. For a more specific discussion of "Le Livre d'Or" see Démètre S. Soutzo, "Les Familles Princieres Greques de Valachie et de Moldavie", Symposium, pp. 234-236.
  29. Jean-C. Filitti, Role Diplomatique des Phanariotes de 1700 à 1821 (Paris, 1901), pp. 5-7.
  30. E. R. Rangave, Le Livre d'Or de le Noblesse Phanariote (Athens, 1892). See, also, Soutzo pp. 232-236. Ioannis Molyvdos Comnenus was another bolsterer of this belief. See O. Ciciani and P. Cernovodeanu, "Contribution à la connaissance de la biographie et de l'oeuvre de Jean (Hierothee)Comnene", Balkan Studies XII (1971).
  31. Kordatos, p.170, Runciman, p. 362-364. See, also, Carra, p.87; La Croix, La Turquie Chrétienne (Paris, 1695), p.6; Speros Vryonis Jr, "The Greeks Under Turkish Rule", Hellenism and the first Greek War of Liberation (1821-1830): Continuity and Change, eds. N. Diamandouros, J. Anton, J. Petropoulos, P. Topping (Thessaloniki, 1976), pp. 49-50.
  32. Runciman, pp. 360-362.
  33. Filitti, p. 15.
  34. Soutzo, p. 229.
  35. Alexandre A.C. Sturdza, p. 73
  36. The only explanation and excuse, wrote Sydney Vigneaux was "ce reve éblouissant et insensé qui leur faisait envisager l'hospodarat comme un passage.... qui menait à l'Empire". Cited in A. Sturdza, p. 77
  37. The Phanariots had similar designs on both Serbia and the Ionian Islands during their respective political turmoils. In the Islands, during the French presence in 1797-99 and the subsequent Russo-Turkish occupation, the Phanariots wanted the Ionians to become a principality like Moldavia and Wallachia. Finally, when the islands became a republic their new constitution was completely "Byzantine" and advantageous to the established aristocracy. See Norman Saul, Russia

- and the Mediterranean 1797-1807 (Chicago, 1970), pp. 96-100. For Serbia, see Filitti, pp. 178,195
38. Filitti, p. 13
  39. Runciman, p. 366.
  40. G. Finlay, History of Greece since the Roman Conquest (Oxford, 1870)vol.VI pp. 7-8, 332-342, 204. See also R.W. Seton Watson, A History of the Roumanians, p. 192. Finlay finds "bigotry of religion" in the Balkans "more powerful than patriotism", and wonders what priests have to do with politics. Watson seems surprised that the Phanariot A. Ipsilanti initiated the revolution in the Principalities whose inhabitants he finds "alien in blood". Regarding the complexity of the word Greek, see Douglas Dakin, The Unification of Greece 1770-1923 (London, 1972)p. 8, and C. Eliot, Turkey in Europe (London, New impression, 1965), p. 272.
  41. Count de Gobineau, impressed by the Greek ability to absorb other races, described Greekness as "un amalgame très particulier doué d'une grande souplesse, fort peu disposé à se laisser absorber a son tour, repoussant, avec la même énergie que le peuve faire les races pures, toute nouvelle fusion avec n'importe qui, et représentant en un mot avec une confiance, une securité un orgueil implacable, à se qualifier du mot de nationalité". See Le Compte de Gobineau, Deux Etudes sur la Grece. Capodistrias - Le Royaume des Hellènes (Paris, 1905), pp. 244-246.
  42. N. Iorga, Byzance, p. 218.
  43. Emile Legrand, commending on the correspondance between Nikolas Mavrocordato and Chrysanthos Notaras, wrote: "Ses lettres semblent laisser percer la pensée de Nikolas Mavrocordato de vouloir une sorte d'union intime entre Roumains et Grecs sur le terrain religieux, et le prince parait vouloir se servir de l'influence du Patriarchate no point comme instrument d'oppression, mais comme instrument d'union et comme agent de pacification et de civilisation". Cited in A. Sturdza, p. 106
  44. Richard Clogg, The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821. (London, 1976), pp. XVIII- XIX.
  45. Daniil Mikhali Adami Khatzi of Moskhopolis, "Eisagogiki Didaskalia Periekhousa Lexicon Tetraglosson ton Tessaron Koinon Dialecton.." (Constantinople,1802), The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821. (London, 1976), p. 91.



46. Sir Charles Eliot, p. 273.
47. Since the fourteenth century, for example, Roumanian boyars and hospodars had founded many monasteries to which they donated large revenues. They also annexed them to Mount Athos or to Mount Sina. The abbots were almost always Greeks installed by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem or the archbishop of Mount Sina. The abbots had to be confirmed by a hospodar's "Chrysobulle" (a diploma). The liturgy traditionally was half Greek and half Slavonic. Jacovaky Rizo Néroulos, pp. 32-33.
48. Douglas Dakin, p. 8.
49. "La charge de continuer", wrote Iorga, "les traditions byzantine entre les limites du territoire même sur lequel s'étendait l'autorité du Sultan échet donc à ceux qui... sont appelés les Phanariotes". N. Iorga, Byzance, p. 228.
50. Ibid., pp. 6-7. For specific information about the intellectual continuity of the Greek nation, see A. Vacalopoulos, "Byzantinism ", pp. 101-126.
51. A typical example of that fusion of traditions that constituted the modern Greek (and Phanariot)culture is offered by the story of Roman Law. In fact, Constantinople had been built as a Christian (not Roman)city set in Greek-speaking lands, and the west, by the time of Justinian, had drifted apart, forgetting its Greek. Justinian,however, with his Italian (and African)campaigns, made the last great bid to restore the Roman heritage of a Mediterranean empire. Similarly, he made the last great gesture of a Latin tradition in his codification of the law. Both efforts failed and the West went its own way. In the East, the Greek language and culture triumphed, but the law, although preserved in Greek texts, was Roman law. It is interesting, however, to note that the original languages of Roman Law were both Latin and Greek. J. Voyatzidis, "La Grande Idée", Le Cinq-Centième Anniversaire de la Prise de Constantinople, ed. L'Hellenisme Contemporain, (Athens, 1953), p. 280.
52. Georges Crompton, "Le Droit Romano-Byzantin dans les Pays Roumains a l'Époque Phanariote", Symposium, p. 318. Regarding the Roman role see the Digest of Roman Law, translation and introduction by C.F. Kolbert (Penguin Books, 1979).
53. Panayotis J. Zepos, "Byzantine Law in the Danubian Countries", Balkan Studies (1968), pp. 343-356.

54. Ibid.
55. Ibid., p. 348.
56. P. Zeppos, "La Politique Sociale des Princes Phanariotes", Balkan Studies XI (1970), p. 81.
57. Norman H. Baynes, "The Byzantine State", Byzantine Studies and Other Essays, ed. N.H. Baynes (Connecticut, 1955 ), pp. 47-66.
58. Ibid.
59. Tunusli Brothers, History of Wallachia (Bucurest, 1806), pp. 32, 81, 83.
60. Ibid.
61. Zeppos, "La Politique Sociale", p. 81-84.
62. For a full discussion of the kinds and authors of Modern Greek Literature, see C. Th. Dimaras, A History of Modern Greek Literature, (N. York, 1972). See, also, B. Knös, L'Histoire de la Literature Neo-Greque (Uppsala, 1962), and Jacovaky Rizo Néroulos, Cours de Littérature Grecque Modern (Paris, 1828).
63. Jenkins, pp. 145 -146.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., p. 149. In fact, Voltaire, Jenkins wrote, called the Byzantine existence "a disgrace to the human mind". Jenkins, p. 138.
66. Jacovaky Rizo Néroulos, pp. 57-58.
67. Banes, p. 11.
68. Jenkins, p. 149; Runciman, p. 383
69. C. Dapontes, for example, in the preface to his Kathreptis Gynaikon (Leipzig,1766), laments the use of popular tongue in translations of the Old Testament, a fact which obliged him to use "vulgar Greek" himself. Also, Jacovaky Rizo Neroulos wrote that "Les jeunes Fanariotes destinés au maniemant des affaires public...se pénétraient de bonne heure de sentimens élevés, et apprenaient à user d'un langage supérieur à celui du vulgaire".

70. It was, nevertheless, the Phanariot environment which produced the first scholars who promoted the establishment of the "living" Greek. For the language problems in 18th and early 19th century see Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp. 145-152, 200-203.
71. Dimaras, p. 110.
72. The Collected Letters of Alexandros Mavrocordatos, Ed. Livadas, No 14, p. 20.
73. Jenkins.
74. L.S. Stavrianos, The Balkans since 1453 (N. York), p. 103; D. A. Zakynthinos, pp.49-50.
75. Ibid., p. 51.
76. G. Arnakis, "The Role of Religion ", Balkans in Transition, ed. Ch. and B.Jelavich (California,1963), and, "The Greek Church", Journal of Modern History XXIV September 1952 235-50 . Also, see Karpat pp. 1-8
77. Jenkins, p.148, Banes, p. 9
78. Constantine Dapontes, for example, when princess Eleni Mavrocordatou asked his opinion regarding readings, recommended: The Octoechos of John Damascene; the akathist hymn and other hymns in honor of the Virgin and Saint John the Baptist; the seven prayers to the Virgin contained in the Synopsis; the Exposition of the Liturgy by Nicolas Cabasilas; and the chapters of the deacon Agapetus addressed to Justinian. Constantine Dapontes, Kathreptis Gynaikon, (Leipzig, 1766) II, p. 396.
79. Alexandros Mavrocordatos, Istoria iera itoi ta Ioudaika (Bucharest, 1716).
80. For a discussion on the primacy of Christian teaching over secular knowledge see Constantine Cavarnos, Modern Greek Thought (Massachusetts, 1969), pp. 22-24.
81. G.P. Henderson, p. 23.
82. Ibid., p. 25.
83. C. Th. Dimaras, p. 113.

84. Stephen Batalden, Catherine II's Greek Prelate: Eugenios Boulgaries in Russia 1771-1806 (N. York, 1982). See also Timothy Ware, Eustratios Argenti: A study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule ( Oxford, 1964), p. 285.
85. The divergence between lay and ecclesiastic culture in the 1790's, however, did not eliminate "religious humanism" altogether. See, for example, G. Soutzos, The Catechumen or the Cosmogonical Theatre (Venice, 1805). Soutzos supported the view that although the Newtonian system had some merit, that of the Old Testament remained the most perfect and the most divine of all others old and new.
86. Constantine Cavarnos, pp. 24-27.
87. Borge Knös, p. 471
88. For the early ecclesiastic humanism, see Chysanthos Notaras' appreciation of science and his acquaintance with the renowned Italian mathematician and astronomer Jean- Doninique Cassini in Paris (1700). Chysanthos Notaras, "Introduction to the Geographic and the Globular" (Paris, 1716), in Emile Legrand, Bibliographie Hellenique, XVIIIe siècle, Vol I (New Impressions, Bruxelles, 1963), No. 107, p.137. Other enlightened clergymen of the period were Nectarios of Jerusalem, Meletios Pigas and Kritopoulos of Alexandria, and Serafim and Samuel of Constantinople. Borge Knös, p. 380; see, also, Iorga, Byzance, pp. 219-223.
89. Knös, pp. 392, 469.
90. Dimaras, Greek Literature, p. 110.
91. Th. H. Papadopoulos, Studies and Documents relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination (Brussels, 1952), p. 49.
92. Knös, p. 380.
93. G. Kordatos, p. 226.
94. Zakynthinos, p. 126
95. Banes, p. 21
96. Zakynthinos, p. 127

97. Kordatos, p. 192
98. Ibid., p.194
99. Ibid.
100. Lawrence P. Meriage, Russia and the First Serbian Insurrection (N. York, 1987), pp. 2-4.
101. Ibid., pp. 23-27
102. A. Sorel, The Eastern Question in the Eighteenth Century, Trans. Bramwell (N. York, 1969), p. 10
103. For example, according to Michael Soutso the source of Phanariot power in the Danubian Principalities was double: "we were entrusted (with the throne) by the merciful Lord and by the mighty Sultan". For other Phanariot families such as Mavrocordato, Racovitsas, Callimache and Ghikas, their claims to the throne were based on the ancient rights of their families. Vlad Georgescu, p. 107, see, also, G. Finlay, p. 9.
104. J. Nicolopoulos, " From Agathangelos to the Megale Idea : Russia and the Emergence of Modern Greek Nationalism", Balkan Studies XVIII (1984), p. 43.
105. A. Sturdza, p. 270.
106. George D. Frangos, "The Philiki Etairia: A Premature National Coalition", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R. Clogg (MacMillan Press, London and Basingstock, 1973), p. 90.
107. The Collected Letters of Alexandros Mavrocordatos, ed. Livadas, No 85, p. 145.
108. For the causes of the Ottoman decline see Peter F. Sugar, South Eastern Europe under Ottoman Rule 1354-1804 (London, 1977), pp. 188-207.
109. A. Otetea, "Les Grandes Puissances et le mouvement Heterist dans les Principautes Roumaines", Balkan Studies 7 (1966), pp. 381-82.
110. Kordatos, p. 162.
111. For the Messianic mentality of the Greeks see Cyril Mango, pp. 29-43.
112. E. Kourilas "Ta khrysovoulla ton igemonon tis Moldovlakhias kai to symvolon 10 i Ioannis", Eis mnimin S. Lamprou (Athens, 1935), p. 245.

113. Georgescu p. 84
114. C. Dapontes, "Istorikos Katalogos", Mesaioniki Vivliothiki, ed. Sathas (Venice, 1872), p. 119. The Phanariot religious sentiment (even in the late eighteenth century) is evident also in Michael Sutzos' order (1783) which reproached the Wallachians for "having again forgotten to lead a decent Christian life, for having forgotten about the past and for not going to church on the great divine holidays". Vlad Georgescu, p. 83. See, also, the lamentations of the Phanariot historian Ioannis Comnenos Ipsilanti who deplored (after Küchük Kainardji) that from the sins of his generation the prophesies, that had announced "la délivrance des Grecs de l'esclavage... et la restauration de l'Empire", had been cancelled. Cited in N. Iorga, Byzance, p. 246.
115. Nicolopoulos, pp. 45-47.
116. Ibid.
117. For the contemporary international balance of balance see M.S. Anderson, The Eastern Question (London, 1966), pp. 13-25.
118. A. A Palis, p. 86.
119. I. C. Filitti, "La ancienne solidarité balkanique et la Roumanie", Le Balkans, 5-6 (1934), p. 427. See, also, Vlad Georgescu, p. 169, and A. Sturdza, pp. 263-266.
120. Pallis, p. 389.
121. For example, Ioannis Comnenos Ipsilanti wrote after the signing of Küchük Kainardji: "Si donc, à leur indiquée par les oracles et après de telles victoires des Russes contre les Ottomans et dans les circonstances si favorable, les Rhomées [Greeks] n'ont pas été delivrés, il est très difficile que plus tard se produise le relevement de l'Empire romain.... Et non seulement difficile, mais presque impossible à cause de la persistance de nos mauvaises moeurs, de notre manque de solidarité et de notre malice les uns à l'égard des autres et souvent à cause aussi des embuches". Cited in N. Iorga, Byzance, p. 246
122. M.S. Anderson, pp. 13-25.
123. Finlay, p. 280; Kordatos, p. 199.

## 3

**The Neo-Hellenists**

*Let those who disparage the present  
time for its unproductiveness and  
poverty keep silent. Nature has not  
been reduced to such sterility. No,  
God has given an Athens to Hellas.*

*Alexandre Mavrocordato\**

In the previous two chapters, we witnessed a Greek aristocracy conscious of their special position as Ottoman administrators but equally aware of their role as leaders of a community defined by Byzantine culture, Greek language and Orthodox Christian tradition. Accordingly, from their ascendancy as a political force in the 1680's, the Phanariots utilized political sagacity and the cultivation of letters to distinguish successive Phanariot generations both as Ottoman officials and as heirs of Byzantium. But they were also representatives of a new cultural orientation which produced the first Greco-Western understanding in the Turkish occupied Balkans. This new cultural trend - based on Phanariot intellectual curiosity about the West and Orthodox introspection - was heavily influenced by medieval Christian teachings; a fact which united the Church of Constantinople and the Phanariot aristocracy in a common educational activity for the greater part of the eighteenth century. This intellectual and cultural compromise did not allow fundamental western ideas such as liberalism and, to some extent,

secularism to be part of the early Phanariot world. As a result, the early Phanariot mind had acquired a strong Byzantine color. Consequently, the Phanariots worked for a restored Byzantium and to achieve their goal employed political flexibility and education.

The Phanariot-promoted cultural upsurge also had a political aspect. In fact, the ascendancy of the Phanariot class allowed the reawakening of a Greco/Byzantine political self-awareness which had been superseded, since the Ottoman conquest, by a Church-promoted religious identity. As a result, the Phanariot cultural upsurge also had a political aim : the awakening of the Greek "race" not only as opposed to Catholic and Moslem proselytization but also in relation to its pre-Ottoman and pre-Christian past. For the Phanariots this meant the realization of the "Great Idea", namely the supremacy of Hellenism in the Balkans and western Anatolia. This aspiration implied an imperial destiny for the Greeks and there lies the third dimension of the Phanariot psyche : the distinction of the Greek "race".

This Hellenic aspect of the Phanariot mind was always there, since a form of Hellenism was part of the Byzantine formal culture. Moreover, the early Phanariot westernism had allowed a glance at western rationalism which itself contained elements of the Hellenic past. In the late eighteenth century, however, the Hellenic sentiment gained momentum due mainly to the increasing influence of enlightened European thought. The arrival of western travellers in the Balkans spread European neoclassicism, and informed the educated Greeks about the new universal respect in the West for the ancient Greek civilization. The Greeks of the diaspora, also, as well as the rising Balkan bourgeoisie, contributed to the dissemination of western ideas. Particularly after the treaty of Küçük Kainardji (1774), the Greek enterprising and professional class, armed with new confidence, acquired a



more coherent character and started to express its own particular intellectual needs which amounted to an admiration of pre-Christian Hellenism and western thought. All the above, combined with the disillusionment towards the old ways represented by the Church, gave a tremendous impetus to Hellenism and enlightened education, and served as an accelerator toward disconnecting a great number of the Phanariots from the religious regression and educational pedantry.

In spite of this later development, however, the Phanariot mind remained complex and variable. In fact, this new stage of Phanariot national conscience amounted to a continuity of conservative and traditional ideas which, by the turn of the century, were evolving under a mounting - but not dominant - western influence. Hence, although in the second half of the eighteenth century Greek self-distinction emerged out of Phanariot Byzantinism, we also see a form of Byzantinism which continued to exist. For this reason, the Phanariot mind evolved a political hybrid based on enlightened education, autocracy and Greek self-awareness, a hybrid embodying the conflicting elements of the age : reason, authority, and sentiment. Thus, for all their Ottomanism and diplomatic opportunism, the Phanariots were believers in the historical distinction of the Greek "race", and their main concern, from the second half of the eighteenth century onward, was how to wed their neo-Byzantine vision with the increasing sense of Greek self-awareness.

#### **EARLY HELLENISM AND ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY**

As we have seen, Hellenism was part of the Byzantine formal culture. In fact, there is evidence that the Byzantine Empire was becoming increasingly Greek in the last two centuries before its fall.<sup>1</sup> After the Ottoman conquest

this spirit of Hellenism did not perish. For one, it survived in the Venetian occupied Greek lands such as Crete and the Ionian Islands.<sup>2</sup> But also, learned Greeks from Constantinople, the Greek mainland and the Greek islands, sought refuge in Italy and France, and contributed to the new Humanism of the Renaissance which largely represented a return to the rationalism of Greek antiquity.<sup>3</sup> The seed sown by these early refugees fructified from the early sixteenth century onward in the founding of Greek educational centers in Italy, a development which served to maintain the Greek tradition and learning, and to produce teachers who in time would bring back to Greece the light of knowledge.<sup>4</sup>

Hellenism survived also in the occupied lands. There, however, its spirit was under the yoke of Orthodox dogma. In fact, since Byzantine times, the Orthodox Church had attempted a Christianization of Hellenic thought, turning the Byzantine empire into a Christian state: apocalyptic and intolerant towards ideas that could, by their rationality, spread doubt among the faithful.<sup>5</sup> This hostility of the Byzantine ecclesiastical establishment to Hellenic intellectualism was due to two reasons: fear that Hellenism would become a channel towards paganism and heresy, and hatred towards the Latin West which by fifteenth century had become the true heir of Greco-Latin civilization.

It appears, then, that Orthodox Christianity was the enemy of the essence of Hellenism, namely the expression of the creative spirit of the Hellenic era represented by Greek philosophy and Drama. The Byzantine lay élites had traditionally collaborated with these ecclesiastic inclinations. That was because the ecclesiastical claims were spiritual and did not threaten the secular power of the élites. Moreover, the élites were accustomed to receiving their Hellenic culture embodied in Orthodox doctrines and therefore already

diluted and Christianized. But by the thirteenth century, there were also signs suggesting that a Greek "renaissance" was in the making.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, several historians have expressed the opinion that the Byzantine empire was gradually becoming more and more Greek in a political sense. According to this view, the gradual loss of the Latin West (both spiritually and temporally), Syria, Egypt, Anatolia, and finally Constantinople itself (1204) awakened an "ethnic" awareness among the Byzantines, particularly the bureaucratic élite and the intellectuals. The result was a more pronounced Greekness, and therefore rationalism, which gave birth to some liberal minded intellectuals such as Nicephoros Blemmydes, George Acropolite, and later Bessarion, Chrysoloras, George Gemistos, and Marc Mousouros.<sup>7</sup>

This humanistic and protonationalist process was certainly destroyed by the fall of Constantinople.<sup>8</sup> Many liberal minded scholars emigrated to the West, leaving the conservatives and the religious fanatics in charge of the occupied territories. The Ottoman conquest thus resulted in the strengthening of the Christian dogmatic views, since it created a new political status for the Orthodox Patriarchate. Indeed the Church, invigorated by Turkish protection, assumed not only spiritual but also temporal powers and focused undistractedly on the completion of the Christianization of Hellenism. This new situation is demonstrated fully by the famous exclamation of Gennadius, the first Patriarch under the Ottomans: "I may be a Hellene in language but not otherwise; for I am a Christian".<sup>9</sup>

Hellenism, nevertheless, did not perish under the Church. On the contrary, some historians have asserted that the Orthodox Church, by incorporating Hellenic culture into Christian learning, became the preserver of a form of Greek culture, language and, in short, Greek "nationalism".<sup>10</sup> But the activities of the Orthodox hierarchy, although they preserved a

knowledge of Hellenic literature and language, resulted in a form of anti-western ecclesiastical Hellenism which denounced Greek antiquity as heretical and un-Christian. In other words, the Hellenistic background of the Orthodox Church was suppressed by its religious identity, and therefore Greeks became identified with Christian Orthodoxy. As a result, the ecclesiastic Hellenism was not a national sentiment in the political sense, and therefore, until the late seventeenth century, there was not a secular "ethnic" feeling in the Greek communities of the occupied territories. In that sense, the political "ethnic" awareness that had emerged after 1204 among the Byzantine élites was completely superseded by a religious identity.

#### **THE BEGINNING OF WESTERN INFLUENCE AND THE FIRST WAVE OF POLITICAL SELF-AWARENESS**

The Orthodox denial of pre-Christian Hellenism and western rationalism was very detrimental to the Balkan Christians for it created an "iron curtain" (to use a term of L. Stavrianos) which cut off the Balkan civilization from the rest of Europe. Consequently, in the following centuries the Balkan Christians were isolated not only, as is often suggested, by the Ottoman conquest but also by the religious intransigence of their Church.<sup>11</sup> Under the surface, however, western (Latin) influence was by the latter half of the seventeenth century gaining ground in the Balkan territories, undermining the foundations of Orthodoxy. A part in this development had been played by the Greek savants of the diaspora, such as Nicolas Sophianos, who represented a window to contemporary Western world for the enslaved Greeks.<sup>12</sup> Another vehicle of early European infiltration was western trade which affected the economies and thinking of many parts of the world including the Balkans. In fact, the late seventeenth century witnessed the

creation of Greek urban communities in the Ottoman empire. Armed with special privileges, particularly after the treaty of Carlovitz (1699), these communities gradually attained a great commercial importance. Furthermore, the Scientific Revolution of the West attracted the attention of the Balkan scholars. Indeed, the scientific breakthroughs of people such as Galileo provided Orthodox intellectuals with a reason to compromise with the West. After all, the latter no longer exported only Catholic Christianity and Greco/Latin philosophy, but also a scientific and secular approach to knowledge which had started to become, to a degree, acceptable to a gradually growing number of educated Greeks.<sup>13</sup> Thus, toward the close of the seventeenth century the Orthodox intellectuals diffidently inscribed themselves as students in a new-model Western school and, therefore, a slow process of educational emancipation started to develop in the Balkans.<sup>14</sup>

The primary recipient of this new way of thinking was the wealthy lay Greek element of Constantinople, which little by little had been able to come to power in the Ottoman administration. Only the wealthy and urban Greeks could benefit from the new knowledge as only they had both the necessary leisure and motivation to study as well as the means to travel abroad. Accordingly, the new way of thinking was spread primarily to the Balkans and Constantinople by the many wealthy Greeks who had the opportunity to read the Greek savants of the diaspora, to meet western traders, or to go abroad and study (particularly at the university of Padua) and return with westernized views.<sup>15</sup> A great majority of these western educated Greeks belonged to the class of the Phanariots who brought to the intellectual morass of Orthodoxy a fresh sense of curiosity and energy. In fact, the rise of the Phanariots as a social class (along with the development of new urban centers) generated a "new order" in the Balkan world. Indeed, the period

from the 1680's to the French Revolution witnessed (for the first time since the Conquest) the beginning and the gradual development of an opposition to old dogmas, an educational emancipation, and an organization of new ideas in order to spread encyclopedic and scientific knowledge to Greeks. These innovations were often encouraged by the Phanariots who (perhaps without fully realizing it) "inaugurated a new era of Hellenism."<sup>16</sup>

The Phanariots, therefore, were, on the whole, a progressive element and became an important factor in the promotion of Greek culture. Brought up in the cosmopolitan environment of the Ottoman capital, and having studied in the West, they were more advanced culturally than the rest of the Greeks. In fact, the new aristocracy which rose in the late seventeenth century was superior in terms of education to anything the Ottoman lands had ever produced. This was due to internal as well as external reasons. First, at the time of the ascendancy of the Phanariot class, European techno-economic development had initiated a socio-economic process that was gradually reducing the Turkish Empire to a political, technological and economic client, instead of an enemy of the West.<sup>17</sup> In fact, a great part of the age of Ottoman expansion and fanaticism was over, and the new era needed a bureaucratic class to take care of Ottoman diplomacy and business.<sup>18</sup> This social and political position was occupied by the Phanariots who, in combination with their commercial and professional activities, became the original Ottoman bourgeoisie, that is a "nobility of the robe" that was not above business transactions. This development had as a result an open-mindedness, usually associated with enterprising and professional groups.<sup>19</sup> But it also entailed the accumulation of great wealth which allowed the Phanariot youth to study abroad. There, they were able to experience first hand the various

philosophic and religious disputes which since the sixteenth century had shaken the European socio-political establishment.

This new European awareness also had a particular attraction for Greek youths for it emphasized the indebtedness of western civilization to the Hellenic past. Indeed, the scientific and political thought of the age (as well as the sixteenth century irruption of Platonism and the legacy of Erasmus, Luther, Shakespeare and Rabelais) had created an intellectual evolution based on the Hellenic spirit of freedom of thought through humanism. This development completed the reconstruction of Greco-Latin classicism started by the Italian Renaissance.<sup>20</sup>

The Phanariots thus benefitted from both the internal Ottoman realities and European developments. The result was, first, the development of a secular center of power outside the Church's direct influence. That gave the Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians (entirely conditioned hitherto by their cultural, "ethnic", and linguistic relation to the Patriarchate) a new secular basis of influence, power and national allegiance.<sup>21</sup>

On the other hand, the Phanariots, by sending their sons to the West to study, found their Hellenic inheritance and claimed it back. United by this new pride, they were no longer just "Christian slaves of the Turks" for they had discovered that a universal respect had been formed in the West for ancient Greek civilization. This new self-pride, a sentiment similar to Greco-Byzantine Proto-nationalism, represented the first signs of a political, and therefore secular, view of ethnicity among Greek speaking Ottoman subjects. And it was, considering the realities of the age, the first timid step towards a gradual breakdown of the universal concept of Orthodoxy, and its conversion into a Greco/Byzantine political identity that envisioned the "Balkan and Anatolian Greece" of the Patriarchate's religious jurisdiction as the territorial

limits of a political state. As a result of this combination of internal and external developments, Greek self-awareness acquired a political identity that had not existed since the Ottoman conquest. D.A. Zakyntinos has observed in this connection that : "the main achievement of the administrative aristocracy.... was that it gave the enslaved Greek people a political individuality, scope for a political career and a field within which it could radiate political, (and) cultural influence...This political life was a fruitful experience for the Greeks as a whole because it not only brought out the ability of the higher ranking political and cultural leaders of the nation but also secured for the Greeks a leading position in the Ottoman administration and among the other subject peoples".<sup>22</sup>

It appears, then, that the Phanariot mind had been formed from its inception under the impact of secular (that is political, economic and social) forces which had colored it with a proto-nationalistic but also modernist nuance. The Phanariots, however, had to be very careful in the early years vis-a-vis the Turkish authority and the Patriarchate. For this reason, the role of the early Phanariots appears dubious and enigmatic. For instance, Alexandre Mavrocordato had this to say regarding the influence of the West : "I have often deplored the fact that Greeks who have gone abroad have not only acquired disgusting and spurious manners, but have also polluted their minds with alien doctrines and have drawn thousands of simple souls into the same abominations. Would that they had suffered shipwreck upon their departure".<sup>23</sup>

The above quotation bears witness to a conservative mind. Yet, the same person, Alexandre Mavrocordato, wrote to his children the following: "Let those who disparage the present time for its unproductiveness and poverty keep silent. Nature has not been reduced to such sterility. No, God



has given an Athens to Hellas...".<sup>24</sup> The awareness of the greatness of the Hellenic past is obvious in this second quotation and the above juxtaposition suggests a learned man who was, however, very sensitive to the duties and obligations of his position to the Orthodox community and, particularly, the Ottoman government.

Similarly, we encounter the same enigmatic and ambiguous attitude in Alexandre's son Nicolas. On the one hand, his writings are full of moralistic conservatism, tradition and dogmas, supported by constant reference to, mostly biblical, authority. Yet, G. Henderson writes that "The picture of him as a rather time-marking traditionalist...requires modification in at least two respects. The first concerns his platonism. To express his moralistic outlook he draws on ideas from classical as well as Christian tradition, in a thoroughly eclectic way. But the point is that he derives inspiration, and a cast of thought, from Plato (notably from the Phedo, Republic and Laws) at least as much as Aristotle. His general allegiance to Plato is new; and if Plato be counted a liberating influence, then (Nicolas) Mavrocordato did his best to open up Greek education in this respect".<sup>25</sup>

So it appears that there was a secular Proto-nationalism in the Phanariot mind that we have called already Greco-Byzantine Proto-nationalism. Its difference from ecclesiastic self-distinction was its new pride in Greek antiquity, its association with the Byzantine intellectual élites, and an appreciation of western knowledge. Actually, Cornelia Dima-Dragan has offered us plenty of evidence regarding the Phanariot modern Humanism and universal culture: a vast collection of books of both the old and the new learning, and even an appreciation of Francis Bacon.<sup>26</sup> What seemed to make the ideas of the Greek aristocracy intellectually dubious, therefore, was really an indication of the political contradiction in which their class found itself in

and the uncomfortable juxtaposition between their public position and their personal convictions. In spite of all the politics, however, the early Phanariots appear much more conscious of the value of contemporary Western thought than has been often thought, and with a sense of Greco-Byzantine Proto-nationalism.

To be sure, their Hellenism was still very much under the influence of Orthodox teachings. In particular, until the 1740's the Phanariot writings were on the side of the Church affirming, essentially, its dogmas, faith and ecclesiastic tradition.<sup>27</sup> But it was natural for the Phanariots to do that, for the Church, until at least the first half of the eighteenth century, exercised predominant influence over the Greeks, who had been taught for centuries that their interest as a nation was identified with the Patriarchate. We should not forget that the Orthodox Church, and to a lesser degree the Ottoman rule, were for the early Phanariots part of a frame of reference to be taken for granted. And it is obvious that regarding these established institutions, the Phanariots were in a position only to take advantage of their entrenched power. And that in itself must have been a feat of balance, perpetually exercised by the Greek aristocracy. Considering, moreover, the jealousy that their position and wealth generated, theirs was quite a balancing act. One has only to consider that, on the one hand, the Turks "les méprisaient comme non musulmans et comme fauteurs d'embûches souterraines", and on the other hand, "Leur frères de Grèce...les considéraient comme des renégats, avilis par leur soumission volontaire à la puissance des conquérants".<sup>28</sup>

This many sided struggle for survival and ascendancy produced the typical Phanariot who has at once amazed and infuriated historians. A subtle, vigorous, calculating man who had no qualms about fighting his surroundings with weapons which were in daily use in the Ottoman Empire:

he bribed the powerful, cajoled the vain, and even sought to intimidate the faint-hearted. In other words, he used every possible means to avoid danger and attain security for himself and his family, and to realize his vision of a restored Byzantium that would be Greek.

## EARLY EDUCATION

The vehicle most utilized by the early Phanariots to achieve their objectives (and which also demonstrates their early political awareness) was education. The Phanariot contribution to education was multiform. There were Phanariot teachers and scholars, but also builders of schools, reformers and, in general, benefactors of education.<sup>29</sup> Indeed, the Greek aristocracy had a high regard for the effect of education and their message was that the Balkan Christians had to educate themselves and earn the right of liberation through moral regeneration. In fact, there had been writers and distinguished scholars among them.<sup>30</sup> Steven Runciman has written that "many of the Princes especially those of the Mavrocordato family were men of wide culture, able to converse on equal terms with the most sophisticated visitors from the West".<sup>31</sup> Alexandre Mavrocordato, for example, was, according to Raphael Demos, "a philosophical thinker and a writer. Among his works may be cited his Rhetoric and Grammar and especially his Frontismata (Inquiries) in which he maintained the need for moral principles and moral education, put forth the ideal of a balanced life and espoused something like the doctrine of the Stoics concerning the acceptance of fortune and misfortune".<sup>32</sup> In addition Alexandre Mavrocordato had written a "History of the Jews" and a "Treatise on the Circulation of the Blood".<sup>33</sup> Alexandre's son Nicolas was also a thinker and a writer. His work included a

philosophical treaty called "The Thoughts of Philotheo", and a " book of Duties" (1719).<sup>34</sup>

Early Phanariot literature, however, despite its effort to uphold both rational ideas and Orthodoxy, is mainly a testimony to the early Phanariot intellectual subservience to Christian eclecticism and pedantry. The atmosphere of Phanar in Constantinople, in particular, due to the proximity of the Patriarchate and the center of Turkish power, was not congenial to humanistic and secular writing, and education free from dogma in areas such as poetry, drama, romance or philosophy. Instead, theology flourished in it, as well as "safe" forms of history and literature.<sup>35</sup> Thus, Phanariot Byzantine Hellenism and humanism found their fullest development in the Danubian Principalities which were out of reach of the Sultan's arm and the direct jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. As early as 1679, Greek schools founded by Hellenized local princes had started to appear in Wallachia. A year later, in 1680, a Greek Academy was founded at Bucharest. Its founders were the brothers Catacuzene, early Phanariot-Romanians "of Byzantine extraction and Greek culture".<sup>36</sup> Soon thereafter the capital of Moldavia, Jassy, also acquired its Greek academy, and the two Greek institutions attracted the most distinguished Greek teachers from all over Greece. These Academies became very important centers for the development of Greco-Byzantine education.<sup>37</sup> As George Crot has put it, "Les Académies Princières jouèrent un rôle actif dans l'histoire de la langue et de la littérature grecque. On peut étudier maintenant à Bucharest et à Jassy des écrits littéraires introuvable même dans les pays occidental connus par leur vieille tradition scientifique liée à l'étude historique de la langue grecque".<sup>38</sup>

This hellenization of education, already in place since the late seventeenth century, increased after the establishment of the Phanariots as

hospodars in 1711.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, the quality and quantity of Greek books improved in the early eighteenth century. Greek books printed in the Principalities in the pre-Phanariot era were religious and dogmatic polemics directed against Catholicism.<sup>40</sup> The Greek books of the Phanariot era, on the other hand, although still predominantly religious, brought, in general, a fresh new air of European civilization. Indeed, along with the traditional theological writings and school manuals of grammar and rhetoric, there were now also books on French conversation, general history, pedagogy, and even "safer" forms of science.<sup>41</sup>

So, the early Phanariot education appears to have been a mixture of Hellenism, Byzantinism and rationalism. Certainly the Greek aristocrats on the whole were not among those conservative thinkers who judged that school lessons should be limited to religious subjects and to grammar. In fact, the Phanariots had dealt with European translations since the beginning of the eighteenth century and supported Eugenius Voulgaris, when, in the 1750's, he tried to reform the ecclesiastical educational system in the occupied territories.<sup>42</sup> But, on the other hand, until at least the middle of the eighteenth century, the Phanariot hellenization process subscribed to the demands of Orthodox ecumenicity and Greco/Byzantine Protonationalism. Indeed, devoid of the exclusiveness of post-Napoleonic nationalism, the Phanariot approach to Hellenism and education was still Byzantine, tending towards a Balkan unity based on Byzantine culture, Greek language and Orthodox credo. This belief in the common cultural heritage of the Balkan Christians allowed an educational environment in the Principalities which benefited not only the Greeks but also the Romanians and the other Ottoman Christian subjects.<sup>43</sup> That was because Phanariot cosmopolitanism and love for culture and education awakened not only the spirit of the Greeks but also

that of the other Christian peoples under Ottoman yoke.<sup>44</sup> The Phanariots then, as Sir Charles Eliot has put it "revived and diffused the culture which led to the awakening of the Christian races of South-Eastern Europe. It was not an unworthy...idea to unite those races under one Church and one language; and for such a purpose Greek was the only possible language...but it does not appear that they drove out Slavonic or Romanian culture. They introduced Greek culture in the place of no culture at all, and thereby aroused native genius, and ultimately excited it to rivalry".<sup>45</sup>

Phanariot education had thus a pan-Balkan character and all Balkan Christians were welcome to study in the Academies and became worthy citizens of the new Greek Byzantium. This unifying sentiment was in harmony with the ecumenical idea and the Byzantine tradition enriched by a sense of progress borrowed from the West. But these modern sentiments of the Greek aristocracy were not strong enough, in the first half of eighteenth century, and therefore the Phanariot world-view was also compatible with that of the Patriarchate. But this compatibility had, by the 1760's, started to wane since the Phanariots, imbued already with a spirit of inquiry and a secular sense of ethnicity, were turning increasingly towards rationalism. The reason for this gradual change was the continuous influence of the French Enlightenment, and particularly its emphasis on neoclassicism.

### **FRENCH CULTURAL INFLUENCE**

French influence on the Greeks was both cultural and political. France, particularly in the realm of culture, was the unquestioned "primum mobile" of intellectual endeavor in the eighteenth century. In fact, the penetration of western European ideas into regions which had formerly been entirely in the realm of Byzantine civilization meant primarily the penetration of French

ideas. At Constantinople, and throughout the Ottoman empire, where direct diplomatic and commercial contacts existed, there was an intellectual climate favorable to the ideas of the Enlightenment, even in government circles.<sup>46</sup> Even the territories of Southeastern Europe, which were within the cultural perimeter of Vienna, were recipients of the same influences, for the Habsburg court under Maria Theresa and Joseph II lived in an intellectual milieu which was largely French.<sup>47</sup>

Westernism found the most enthusiastic votaries among the prosperous Greek merchants of the diaspora who, spread all over Europe, had commercial connections with the trading bourgeoisie of France and England.<sup>48</sup> But, also, as we know, many Phanariots were fully aware of western ideas through their education or their position as administrators and diplomats. The Francophilia, however, of the second half of the eighteenth century was largely a result of the treaty of Belgrade (1739). In fact, this treaty (a work of the French ambassador) arrested the Austrian (Catholic) expansion, and gave France considerable prestige among the Greek people. As a result, a French intellectual influence started little by little to be felt among the Phanariots.<sup>49</sup>

This new westernized spirit bore fruits primarily in the developing Greco/Byzantine culture of the Danubian Principalities where the dividing cultural line between the East and West had begun to disappear and an intellectual merger of two different worlds was in the making. In fact, their geographic position and the lack of Turkish settlements had allowed the Principalities to preserve a native aristocracy and to maintain an intellectual life that, originally Byzantine and largely religious, developed a more western and secular spirit. In this later development, the Phanariot rule appears to have played a decisive role. We know already that professor Iorga, foremost

among other revisionists, has endeavored with considerable success to elevate the Phanariot role to the level of Enlightened Despotism.<sup>50</sup> According to this view, Greek princes such as C. Mavrocordato, G. Callimachi, A. Ipsilanti, G. Ghika, and C. Mourouzi not only were well aware of the theories prevalent in the west but they also showed a desire to import at least some of the western spirit to illuminate the darkness of their surroundings.<sup>51</sup> For example, Constantine Mavrocordato, hospodar intermittently of both Wallachia and Moldavia from the 1730's to 1769, oriented the Principalities toward the French Enlightenment by encouraging the spread of French literature.<sup>52</sup> C. Th. Dimaras tells us that "a French scholar (the abbot P. Guyot DesFontaines) dedicated a book to him in 1743, in which he congratulated him for honoring French authors by procuring their works, thereby expressing his love for France".<sup>53</sup> As a result of Constantine's promotion of French letters, most members of the Greco-Romanian élite began to read French authors. Among them were some enlightened ecclesiastics, the bishop of Rammis Cesaire reaching the point of ordering the "Encyclopédie".<sup>54</sup> This trend continued under subsequent Phanariot princes, who also took up the cause of the French Enlightenment, and a series of translations of serious French works took place. For example, Rallou, daughter of the hospodar Alexandros Soutsos, translated the Marquise de Lambert's "Avis d'une mère à sa fille"; Catherine Soutsos rendered into Greek Mably's "Les Entretiens de Phocion" while K. Manos is credited with a translation of Barthélemy's "Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis...".<sup>55</sup> Similarly, Demetraky Mourouzi translated "Phèdre" of Racine, Jacovaky Argyropoulo "l'esprit des lois" of Montesquieu, and the Princess Rallou, daughter of hospodar Karadza, "L'Histoire de la Grèce" of Gillies.<sup>56</sup> In fact, even works of Voltaire (translated by Jacovaky Rizo) were popular, although his books



were hard to find since the Patriarchate had banned them as dangerous atheist propaganda likely to lead astray the faithful.<sup>57</sup>

As a result of this infiltration of French culture, an enlightened spirit emerged among the Phanariots. In fact, P. Depasta, the chronicler of C. Mavrocordato, thought that the world should be "governed by the helm of the guiding reason existing in it", and he advised against the "irrational gambols of abnormal passions".<sup>58</sup> A similar enlightened approach to government is evident in a C. Mavrocordato's letter to the prefect of Putna: "Vous savez que Nous ne saurions souffrir que l'on occasionne de tracas à personne et qu'on ne fasse à personne rien hors de propos et avec injustice. Nous ne nous serions pas attendu de votre part à une injustice et Nous vous ordonnons de rendre justice aux malheureux...".<sup>59</sup> So, by the middle of the eighteenth century, enlightened education had started to influence seriously the Phanariot Princes who now perceived that the task of administration as a thing that had to be learned, and that certain governing posts should be given only to competent people. Alexandre Ipsilanti, for example, declared that "there is nothing fairer and no greater duty of the Princes whom the Lord has entrusted with sovereignties than the good of society".<sup>60</sup> Guided by a similar spirit, Gregory III Ghika effected promotions on the basis of merit and education.<sup>61</sup> Thus, although N. Mavrocordato had introduced district functionaries and permanent fiscal agents in the 1720's, it was only in the second half of the eighteenth century that regular programmes of good government were initiated by progressive princes such as C. Mavrocordato, Gregory Ghika, A. Ipsilanti, and C. Mourouzi.<sup>62</sup> These first attempts at good government and meritocracy received a great impulse after the 1790's from the increasing importance of the bourgeois and intellectual elements. The initiative, however, in making merit and education more important than

name and wealth came from the Phanariot Princes who had been influenced by the French Enlightenment. The Phanariot hospodars and their inner circle thus were instrumental in opening the gates to French literature and Enlightened thought, and gradually French rationalism started to exert some real influence among the better educated Greeks.

### **French Neo-Classicism**

The above mentioned Francophilia was intensified after the 1770's, when Greek contacts with the West took on a new significance. That was because in the latter half of the century a fascination for Greece had arisen in western Europe and particularly in France. "The fashion for all things Grecian", writes Cyril Mango, "knew no bounds: Grecian Odes, Grecian plays, Grecian costumes..."<sup>63</sup> This European neoclassicism triggered off academic classicism and antiquarianism. Archaeological missions and researchers started to travel to Greece. Along with this scholarly investigation, a popular taste for the exotic and the picturesque was developed among Europeans. To satisfy this trend, a literature of travel developed which had a tremendously popular appeal for the educated European who longed for stories about simple rusticity and splendid art.<sup>64</sup> It was through these travel accounts that the people of Europe became acquainted with the current state of Greece and the condition of the inhabitants of the Balkan peninsula.<sup>65</sup>

One of the first accounts which attracted European interest in Greece, was the "Voyage Litteraire de la Grèce" (1771) by Pierre Guys. Guys' generous account brought the Greeks as a people to the foreground. In fact, coinciding with the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74 and Orlov's campaign in Morea (1769-70), Guys' work aroused speculation on the question of Greek emancipation.<sup>67</sup> As a result, the effort of Catherine II to help the Greeks met with enthusiasm

in the West. Voltaire demonstrated his joy in a poem with which he calls for a western crusade to liberate the land of Athena and Homer :

*Voici le vrai temps de croisades  
Français, Bretons, Italien  
C'est trop supporter les bravades  
Des cruels vainqueurs des Chrétiens  
Ecoutez Pallas qui vous crie:  
Vengez moi ! Vengez ma patrie*<sup>68</sup>

After Guys, many other traveling accounts popularized Greek antiquity even more. In particular, Choiseul-Gouffier "Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce (1782) and Savary's "Lettres sur la Grèce" sought to kindle the hope for Greek liberation.<sup>69</sup> In addition, the Greek cause gained an enormous impetus by the evocation of antiquity reflected in the multiple publications of the "Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis en Grèce..." (1788) by Abbot J. Barthélemy.<sup>70</sup> This book created such a Grecophilia in France that when the Revolution broke out, the passion for all things Greek was evident throughout : "No speech at the National Assembly was complete without a reference to Sparta and Lycurgus; the Supreme Being was honored with tripods and libations; (and) Mme Vigée Lebrun gave Grecian Parties ".<sup>71</sup>

### THE COMING OF NEOHELLENISM

In the midst of all this excitement, European admiration for Greece reached a climax. It was natural for the Phanariots to be inspired by it. The Greeks, they thought, might be slaves now to the Turks but they were of the Great race that had civilized Europe. It must be their destiny to rise again. Accordingly, the Phanariot Hellenic part of their Byzantinism received a great impetus in the second half of the eighteenth century and particularly between

the first Russo-Turkish war and the 1790's. In fact, during this period the Phanariots became the most active representatives of the political activity since the bourgeoisie was not yet articulate enough.

This new stage of Phanariot self-awareness we may call Byzantine neo-Hellenism. In fact, this new spirit has many similarities with neo-Byzantinism. Indeed, the Phanariots were seeking, with Russian help, the establishment of a new Eastern Empire ruled firmly by a strong Orthodox monarch and governed by a Greek administrative and ecclesiastical nobility. If we can also talk about a feeling of neo-Hellenism in the second part of the eighteenth century, it simply means the intensification of Hellenic pride and secularism which, in combination with Russian aid and Ottoman decline, brought about a brand new socio-political activity. So, Byzantine neo-Hellenism can be defined as a more nationalistic, enlightened, secular and active neo-Byzantinism, which had as its political model Tsarist Russia (namely the elements of empire, Orthodoxy, monarchy, and administrative and ecclesiastic nobility).

This new spirit was partly expressed by a Phanariot effort to promote and support the Greek cultural and economic awakening which had started to take off after the treaty of Küçük Kainardji. Accordingly, the Phanariots sought to strengthen the Greek character of the cultural and commercial activity in the Principalities and the rest of the Balkans. In fact, thanks to the efforts of the Drogmans C. Hanjerli and Demetre Mourouzi, the Greek commercial fleet had been granted special privileges.<sup>72</sup> In addition, the Greek aristocracy made almost the whole ecclesiastical organization of Serbia and Bulgaria directly dependent on the Patriarchate, while it provided the Greek merchants with opportunities in trade and land acquisition.<sup>73</sup> Greeks became

a majority among the merchant class of Bucharest, Sibiu and Jassy, and Greek the *Lingua Franca* of the Balkan merchant world.<sup>74</sup>

But the Phanariots were also involved in direct political activity. In fact, in 1769 two Phanariots, the hospodar of Moldavia Gregory Callinachi and the Grand Dragoman Nicolaos Soutso, had been arrested and executed by the Porte as supporters of the Orlov revolution in Morea.<sup>75</sup> Moreover, the very treaty of Küchük Kainardji, with its beneficial terms for the Greeks, was partly a work of a Phanariot : Grand Drogman A. Ipsilanti.<sup>76</sup> Finally, in 1786 the prince of Moldavia, Alexandre Mavrocordato, the so called fugitive, was forced to flee to Russia after the Turkish discovery of his secret contacts with Russia designed to restore the Byzantine empire.<sup>77</sup> Indeed, a report of Durosoy, the French secretary of Firari, in December 1795 maintained "que l'on prépare une révolte sous l'égide de la Russie, que les principaux de la conspiration sont le prince Mavrocordato (Firari), le patriarch Eugène, évêque de Pultava, et le général commandant Lascarof".<sup>78</sup> In fact, A. Sturdza has asserted that there was a plan for Byzantine restoration since the times of Panayotis Nikousios and Alexandre Mavrocordato (Ex'Aporitou), and that this idea "prit corps ensuite pendant la guerre russo-turque de 1769, sous l'égide de Catherine II qui voulut...restaurer l'empire byzantine...Alexandre Mavrocordato (Firari) fut réellement un émissaire de cette cause et l'un de ses puissant promoteurs".<sup>79</sup>

It appears, then, that the last three decades of the eighteenth century inaugurated a new period during which the Phanariot secular sense of Greekness was intensified. Certainly, the vision of a restored Byzantium was always strong and the Byzantine élite was still their kith and kin on account of religion, language and customs, all contrasting with these of the alien Ottomans. But their pride in their cultural roots of pre-Christian Greece (a

feeling harnessed hitherto by the spiritual dynamic of the Orthodox dogma) became much stronger. Consequently, their Hellenism flourished along with their Byzantinism in the same garden of national pride. The Phanariots' aim, therefore, was a combination of the nationalistic force of Hellenism with a universal (pan-Balkan) tradition of Byzantium and Orthodox Christianity.

### THE DIVERGENCE OF LAY AND ECCLESIASTIC CULTURE

To achieve its goals, the Greek aristocracy needed the cooperation of the Church. In fact, at the time of the emergence of the Phanariots as a class, "The Patriarchate ...constituted the only institution throughout the enslaved countries, which enjoyed a relative degree of independence and security, accompanied by a prestige unattainable by the mass of the Greeks, even the richest among them".<sup>80</sup> As a result, the hierarchy was regarded as the legitimate leader of the Orthodox religio-political entity, and, therefore, the main representatives of the Balkan Christians. Indeed, the average Christian, until the late eighteenth century, could not imagine survival and liberation without the Church.<sup>81</sup>

A fundamentally important aspect of the Church's cultural predominance was its control of education. This ecclesiastical form of learning - taught originally in the Patriarchal school of Constantinople and various monasteries - sought to promote three basic tenets : faith in religious Orthodoxy and the cultural eminence of the Eastern Church; Messianic Imperialism (namely acceptance of Turkish rule as a divine punishment and belief in a providential resurrection through Russia); and instinctive hatred for the West, that is people of non-Orthodox faith who were branded heretics and barbarians.<sup>82</sup>

Needless to say, in spite of whatever services it might have offered to the preservation of faith, culture and language, the Church was a doubtful leader of the intellectual progress. But the conservative spirit was not always present, for occasionally some clerics were capable of acting boldly such as the Patriarch Cyrill Loucaris (d.1630) and the philosopher and cleric Theophilos Korydaleas (d.1646).<sup>83</sup> Such men created conditions favorable for change. When, thus, the western educated Phanariots appeared on the scene, they found an intellectual atmosphere which allowed them to be the first to acquire a new more progressive spirit which transformed many of them in time into enlightened scholars and rulers.<sup>84</sup>

The intellectual evolution of the Phanariots was very important for the future development of Greek culture and education. That was because, by the middle of the eighteenth century, the Greek aristocracy, in seeking the Church's cooperation for their plans, had used their high positions in the Ottoman bureaucracy to infiltrate the Constantinople Patriarchate itself.<sup>85</sup> In time, all the important administrative offices of the Church properties and revenues were filled by Phanariot laymen.<sup>86</sup> This economic infiltration resulted in an increased hellenization and secularization of the Church establishment, a fact that aided the intellectual curiosity already in progress. But as has been already emphasized, this Phanariot curiosity, until the late eighteenth century, represented merely a superficial memesis of western ways in an effort to wed dogma and reason. On its side the Church, passing through a phase of introspection and feeling temporarily less threatened by Catholicism, learned to tolerate the new ideas that were "safe", that is compatible with religious dogmas. "The Church", wrote Dimaras, "had no reason to become greatly concerned because serious liberalism was rare and easy to suppress".<sup>87</sup>

So it appears that in the century that elapsed between the ascendancy of the Phanariots and the first Russo-Turkish war of 1768, the Phanariot policy of mild westernism and Greco-Byzantine Proto-nationalism was compatible with Church education and ecumenicity. Certainly the Phanariots were influenced by western learning and occasionally fissures opened between them and the ecclesiastics, especially those who were afraid of a total Phanariot takeover. But on the whole the Greek aristocrats reached an intellectual and political compromise with the Church, and by infiltrating its economic establishment they endeavored to take advantage of its entrenched prestige.<sup>88</sup> On its side the Patriarchate gained much from the connection. For example, the Phanariots saw to it that Church's financial burdens were not increased and they paid the greatest part of them. There were also many Phanariot gifts of money, of real estate, of plate, or of vestments. In addition, many Greek hospodars founded monasteries in Romania which were assigned to Greek Orthodox centers such as mount Athos or the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem.<sup>89</sup>

In the last three decades of the eighteenth century, however, and particularly in the 1790's, the Phanariot-Church connection ran into difficulties. The reasons for this divergence of lay and ecclesiastic culture were two: the Phanariots' new emphasis on neo-Hellenism, and the new type of education, both movements which were already in progress but which intensified sharply in this period.<sup>90</sup>

#### The new type of education

The existence of Greek commercial colonies outside the sphere of Ottoman power and Orthodox cultural hegemony had always had some cultural and economic repercussions in the Balkans and particularly on the Greek way of life.<sup>91</sup> But the important element in the new learning was that,



unlike in the past, the initiative came from within the Ottoman ruled Balkans. That was a result of a remarkable economic renaissance that occurred in the Greek world thanks to Russian diplomacy, the Greek commercial colonies abroad and finally the French revolution and the Napoleonic wars.<sup>92</sup> This great revival of Greek commerce brought rapid and widespread economic progress. One of the effects of this financial growth was the appearance of a new middle class in the Ottoman held territories, which was in direct connection with the Greek merchant communities abroad.<sup>93</sup> Interestingly, the new commercial bourgeoisie (mariners, artisans, merchants) had an entirely different approach towards the West from that of the hitherto dominant hierarchy. Many of these "new people" had experienced life in western cities where they had been influenced by western intellectual life, prosperity, political institutions and rule of law.<sup>94</sup> Rather than branding western culture as "Latin" and therefore heretical, they perceived it as a model to be imitated and, therefore, they disconnected themselves from the third tenet of Orthodox teaching, the hatred of the West. This attitude became gradually more acceptable, partly because of the undeniable advances of the West, but also because of the deterioration of the Church's position.

This pro-western point of view led educated and wealthy Greeks throughout the Turkish occupied Balkan and western Anatolia to seek to bring European enlightened education to their people.<sup>95</sup> This new fermentation of learning and enlightened benefaction took many forms : Generous gifts of money, books and other learning material to the benefactors' native villages and towns; financing of the education of young Greeks in European universities; publication of books and newspapers in

Greek; and also the translation of the work of enlightened thinkers such as Locke, Leibnitz, Voltaire, Rousseau and others.<sup>96</sup>

The important thing, however, was that all the above activity meant not only education but a new kind of education no longer based on religion and with an emphasis on neo-Hellenism and experimental science.<sup>97</sup> Accordingly, the new progressive teachers (while still professing their devotion to religion) took the path of reason and taught ancient Greek, civic, political, and philosophic principles, as well as enlightened humanism and the scientific achievements of Copernicus, Galileo and Newton. In short, they taught that the Good of Man consists less in heavenly felicity than in happiness in this world and that his nature could be explored by scientific method.<sup>98</sup>

The Church, first tolerant, became annoyed by the advancement of the new learning, and reached the point of hysterical reaction after the French Revolution. Progressive scholars found themselves denounced and their work anathematized. Several Patriarchs advised educated laymen not to be influenced by European "false wisdom".<sup>99</sup> As a result of this reaction, a divergence developed between the lay and ecclesiastical cultures, and lay scholars began to dissociate themselves from the reactionary Church.

If, however, the Patriarchate chose to resist the new ideas, the Phanariots still favored the Enlightenment. In fact, Greek aristocrats, aware of the limitations of a system based on religious subjects and grammar, had by the 1790's intensified their effort to improve Greek lay education.<sup>100</sup> Indeed, by 1780, experimental sciences were taught in the Danubian lands and modern philosophy was vigorously supported.<sup>101</sup> As early as 1765 the philosopher Moisiidakas had freely cited Voltaire in front of the prince of Moldavia, while later D. Mourouzi cried out to the Patriarchate "Do not harass the

philosophers because you will be embarrassed".<sup>102</sup> In all, the Phanariot attitude in the last decades of the eighteenth century can be presented in the following anonymous text of Phanariot inspiration (1779) :

*If curiosity were lacking, he (Man) would not be able to ascertain the nature of things to such an extent that he would not understand their powers and operations, he would not be able to discover so many sciences, he would not be able to understand the countless arts, assigning to each such order and adroitness, and therefore he would still be in the deep chaos of ignorance and barbarism.*<sup>103</sup>

Thus despite ecclesiastic opposition, the Greek aristocracy supported the intellectual liberalism of the new education and its emphasis on ancient and modern philosophy and science. In fact, the Phanariot school model resembled more the university of Padua than any religious institution. And the professors (although still loyal members of the Orthodox Church) were greatly affected by the western fashions of the age and the tendency toward rationalism. In short, they wanted to demonstrate that they and their students were as enlightened as anyone in the West.<sup>104</sup>

The challenge, however, for the Church was abrupt. The force of the Byzantine Church had always been the contribution of a highly educated laity that was deeply interested in theology. Now the laity had begun to despise the traditions of the Church, and the traditional elements in the church had begun to mistrust and dislike modern education, retreating into a thickening obscurantism to defend themselves.<sup>105</sup> By the turn of the century, then, the cleavage between the Phanariots and the Church grew wider since the Greek aristocrats, in their desire to impress the West, had no use for the Church's

regressive attitude to education. Instead, seeing the high prestige of ancient Greek learning, they wished to show that they were by culture as well as by "race" the heirs of ancient Greece.

### **The incompatibility of Neo-Hellenism and Ecumenicity**

The increasing Phanariot emphasis on neo-Hellenism created further incongruity between the policy of the Greek aristocrats and the Patriarchate.<sup>106</sup> In fact, the increasing nationalism of the Greek aristocracy proved to be incompatible with the Church's ecumenical vision. That meant that the Church, under Phanariot pressure, was run more and more in the interests of the Greek people and not of Orthodoxy as a whole.<sup>107</sup> In fact, contrary to the Patriarchate's traditional christianization of Hellenism, a Phanariot hellenization of Orthodox Christianity started to take shape in the second part of the eighteenth century.

This development went against the traditional credo and practice of ecumenicity. The agreement made between the conquering Sultan Mehmet II and the first Patriarch Gennadius had put all the Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman empire under the authority of the Patriarch which was inevitably controlled by Greeks. But traditionally the Church was always aware of its ecumenical nature. Accordingly, until the first half of the eighteenth century, the Church-Phanariot efforts towards the Hellenization of the Balkan peoples subscribed to the demands of the ecumenical credo. As a result, the early Greek schools in the Principalities had been found not for racial purposes but for the interest of the ecumenical vision, and the local Church had helped in this endeavor. Indeed, the Romanian hierarchy were eager to secure Greek learning and Phanariot financial support in order to fortify their faith against the Latin missionaries operating from Poland and Austria.<sup>108</sup>

All the above activities were in harmony with the Byzantine tradition of which many Balkan Christians considered themselves a part. Accordingly, the Patriarchate had been sympathetic to the sensitivities of non-Greek peoples and cautious not to appear as if it was imposing a Greek hierarchy upon other Balkan groups. Until the 1760's, for example, the Serbian and Bulgarian Churches had their own bishops. Similarly the Romanian liturgy was in slavonic, following the Byzantine tradition of encouragement of vernacular liturgies. Furthermore, the upper clergy of the non-Greek Balkan Churches included many Romanians, Serbians or Bulgarians. In short, the Patriarchate of Constantinople traditionally had emphasized unity of religion, not Hellenism. 109

But the increasing political sense of ethnicity among the Phanariots in the second half of the eighteenth century demanded tighter Greek control. Thus, the Serbian and Bulgarian churches were each put under Greek officials of the Patriarchate.<sup>110</sup> Naturally, these ecclesiastic administrators (called exarchs) did their best to impose Greek bishops on the Balkan Christians of Serbia and Bulgaria. This policy, however, proved to be self-defeating in the long run. In fact, it caused so much resentment that when the time came neither the Bulgarians nor the Serbs would cooperate in any Greek-led movement toward liberation. So, in the long run, the price paid by the Patriarchate for its connection to the Greek aristocracy was heavy as westernism and nationalism prevailed over ecumenicity. But the late eighteenth century divergence of lay and ecclesiastical culture also demonstrates that Phanariot increasing Hellenism caused political sentiment to supersede the traditional cultural and spiritual unity advocated by the Church and this awakened the exclusive nationalism of the Balkan Christians.

## CONCLUSION

Thus on the one hand, the Phanariots felt responsible for continuing the Byzantine tradition of Orthodoxy, nobility, empire and absolute monarchy. But on the other hand, they were imbued with a new sense of active Hellenism based on the ideals of Greek antiquity and French Enlightenment. The first feeling was backward looking, while the second looked forward. The Phanariot paradox was, therefore, that they wanted to combine the two in their amalgam of a "westernized" and "Greek" Byzantium. Thus, encouraged by Russian support and Turkish decline, the Phanariots, although still maintaining the old ambition of inheriting the empire intact from the Turks, were pursuing another ambition of establishing a sovereign state based on Byzantine tradition, Enlightenment and Greek self-awareness. In their efforts, they utilized the Patriarchate's entrenched prestige, but their westernized Hellenism undermined the Balkan Christian unity, a fact which created in the 1790's a divergence between them and the ecclesiastic establishment.

The dissensions between the Phanariot neo-Hellenism and the ecclesiastical ecumenicity did not result, however, in a common ground between the Greek aristocracy and the nationalistic middle class. That is because the Phanariot sense of "ethnic" distinction due to its Byzantine component did not constitute in itself (nor was it sufficient to produce) that vision of a community in which people place exclusive loyalty to their nation as a whole above the traditional allegiance to caste, family, region and religion. In other words, the Phanariots never envisioned a nation-state, and their Byzantine neo-Hellenism was not synonymous with what has been understood as modern national consciousness, namely the desire of a community to assert its unity, identity, and independence against a dynastic

ruler or other communities. In fact, the Phanariot's increasing Hellenism in the last decades of the eighteenth century was a change in quality more than in kind. With the trend of neoclassicism in Europe, a more intensive pride developed among the Phanariots because they belonged to a "race" that had given the lights to humanity and, therefore, they were the heirs of a past that was much older than Byzantium. Armed with this new confidence, the Greek aristocracy became more determined to include the other Balkan Christians in their vision, disconnecting itself substantially from the theocratic approach of the Church.

### NOTES: CHAPTER 3

- \* The collected Letters of Alexandros Mavrocordatos, ed. Livadas, No. 20, p. 27.
1. Indeed, there was an increasing tendency among the Byzantine élite in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to value the old heritage of Hellenism. See, for example, C. Hermoniacos' translation of Iliade to medieval Greek, as well as "The History of the Fall of Troy" by Dares of Phrygia, and the "Journal of the Trojan War" by Dictys of Crete. See also the Epic of Achilliade (1343), and the folk stories focusing on Achilles and Alexandre the Great. Borge Knös, pp.133-138.
  2. C. Th Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp. 94-105.
  3. "The réfugiés grecs de Byzance", wrote Emile Eggert, "ont contribué dans une large mesure à l'un des plus féconds progrès de l'esprit humain, à la création d'une époque nouvelle d'oeuvres de l'esprit". Emile Eggert, L'Hellenism en France, (Paris, 1869), t. 1, p.107. Cited in J.C. Voyatzidis, "La Grande Idée", p. 280. See, also, A.P. Vacalopoulos, "Byzantinism", p. 119, and R. Demos, p. 524.
  4. Deno J. Geanakopoulos, "The Diaspora Greeks: The Genesis of Modern Greek National Consciousness", Hellénisme and the First Greek War of Liberation (1821-1830) Thessaloniki, (1976), pp.59-77. See also J. Gennadius, A Sketch of the History of Education in Greece (Edinburgh,

- 1925) pp.11-13, and Douglas Dakin, The Unification of Greece, 1770-1923 (London,1972), pp. 5-6.
5. Gregoire Cassimatis, p. 160; R. Demos, p. 524
  6. "A ces mouvements intellectuels de Nicée et de l'Epire", wrote Knös, "on pourrait comparer les préludes de la Renaissance qui se montreraient en Italy au XIIIe siècle". Knös, p. 88.
  7. Stefen G. Xydis, "Medieval Origins ", pp. 12-13; G.G. Arnakis, "Byzantium and Greece", p. 387; Ap. Vacalopoulos, "Byzantinism", pp. 116-120; C. Th. Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp. 50, 51, 52; Borge Knös, pp. 47-52; and G. Zoras, "Orientations", p.112
  8. "Par la prise de Byzance et la conquete des Turks", wrote Borge Knös, "l'élément national grec comme facteur actif dans la civilization européenne a disparu". Knös, p. 373.
  9. Raphael Demos, p. 524. For the Church temporal powers see G. G. Arnakis, "The Greek Church ", pp. 235-50; See also Dakin, pp. 6, 7; and Knös, p. 379.
  10. Douglas Dakin, p. 11,12; G.G Arnakis, " The Greek Church", p. 245
  11. L.S. Stavrianos, " The Influence of the West on the Balkans", The Balkans in Transition, ed. Ch. and B. Jelavich ( Los Angeles, 1963); Knös, p. 374.
  12. Actually, Sofianos is, also, considered an early Hellenist. He translated, in 1545, Plutarch's "Concerning Children's Upbringing" into vulgar Greek, and designed a map of Greece relating the ancient with contemporary toponyms. G. Valetas, Epitome Istorias tis Neoellenikis Logotechnias (Athens, 1966), pp. 51-52.
  13. For this western scientific influence on Orthodox scholars see the works of Chrysanthos Notaras (1675-1731) and Meletios Mitrou (1661-1714), Emile Legrant, Bibliographie Hellenique, ou Description Raisonnée Des Ouvrages Publiés par des Grecs Au Dix-Huitième Sciecle, Vol. I (Paris 1918, Bruxelles, New Impression ,1963), pp. 137-139; and G. Valetas, p. 72.
  14. A. J. Toynbee A Study of History VIII, (1954), pp. 119-120. Note also that western influence for the Greeks at that time meant Italian influence.
  15. The University of Padua was at that time perhaps the most important European center for advanced learning in philosophy and medicine.



From the fifteenth century onward, such great personalities as Vesalius, Copernicus, Galileo and Harvey were among its scholars. See Philip Sherrard, The Greek East and the Latin West : A study in the Christian Tradition (London, 1959), p. 172.

16. Knös, p. 468.
17. Bernard Lewis, "The Impact of the French Revolution on Turkey", Journal of World History 1 (1); 1953-54, pp. 109-113.
18. Gregoire Cassimatis, p. 160.
19. A. Mavrocordato, for example, was the first "Easterner" who kept a diary. He also wrote a universal history imitating Bossuet. Rizo Neroulos, p. 146.
20. Ibid.
21. Kemal Karpat, "Ottoman Relations ", p. 34.
22. D.A. Zakyntinos, pp. 105-106. In fact, since the formation of the Phanariots as a social class a difference was created between lay and ecclesiastic intellectuals and political and canonical judgement. Vlad Georgescu, p. 124.
23. The collected Letters of Alexandros Mavrocordatos, ed. Livadas, No. 77, p. 130.
24. Ibid., No 20, p. 27.
25. G.P. Henderson, pp. 24-25.
26. Corneliu Dima-Dragan, "La Bibliophile des Mavrocordato", Symposium, pp. 211-216.
27. Emille Legrand, Bibliographie Hellénique, Vol. I (Bruxelles, New Impression, 1963).
28. J.C. Filitti, Role Diplomatique, p. XI.
29. Particularly in the period of 1700-1750, when, under Phanariot leadership, the study of Greek learning reached its climax : The rhetoric of Athonius, Theology of John Damascene, the elements of Euclide, Logic and Physics of Blemmides. Rizo-Neroulos, p. 23.
30. D.A. Zakyntinos, p. 147

31. Steven Runciman, p. 376.
32. Raphael Demos, p. 529.
33. Sir Charles Eliot, p. 282.
34. D. Ciurea, "Nicolas Mavrocordato ", Symposium, pp. 359-364. See, also, C. Th. Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp. 111-112.
35. The ecclesiastic schools (in existence, since 1592, after a synodal decision under Jeremia II) taught, originally, only ecclesiastic works, calculation, and writing. In the Patriarchal Academy, after several reforms (of Jeremias II, Cyrill Loucaris, Korydaleas), the emphasis remained on Grammar and "Interpretations" of classic and ecclesiastic authors including the "Octoechos" and "Psalmoi". Modern methods were initiated in the new found Anthonian Academy (1750s) by Eugene Voulgaris, but they did not survive his removal. Emile Legrand, Bibliographie Hellenique; See, also, Knös, pp. 380-383.
36. Greco-Byzantine education flourished in the Principalities, particularly in the period of Constantine Brancoveanu (1688-1714). Brancoveanu, bonded by family ties to the Phanariots, and intimate relations to the Greek Church, was a protector of Greco-Byzantine education and learning and a genuine "Byzantine" precursor of the Phanariots. Knös, p.468. For the brothers Cantacuzene see A.A. Pallis, pp. 116-117.
37. The early education included Homere, Phocilede, Pythagoras, Esope, Sophocles, and Euripide, Pindare, Xenophon, Thucydide, Plutarche, the "Organon" of Aristotele, Demosthene and Isocrate. It also included ecclesiastic and Byzantine authors such as Gregory the Nazianzenos, John Chrysostome, St. Basil, Synesios, Agapetus, Theophylactus and Symocata. The Grammars of Lascaris and A. Mavrocordatos were also taught. The curriculum then was very much Greco-Byzantine. In fact, the monk Athanasios, in 1720, demanded the teaching of the Byzantine Chrysoloras and even Cato. Iorga, Byzance, p. 217.
38. George Cront, p. 132.
39. Karpat, p. 36.
40. Dan Simonescu, "Le Livre Grec en Roumaine", Symposium, (Thessaloniki, 1974), pp. 132-133.
41. Ibid., p. 134. Apart from the indispensable Theology, the curriculum of the Academies, in the later years of C. Mavrocordatos (1750s), included

also Languages (Ancient and Modern Greek, Latin, French, Italian), History, Rhetoric, Philosophy (Metaphysics, Logic, Morality, and a form of Psychology based on Aristotle's study of the Soul); and sciences (Mathematics, Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Logarithms, Geography, Physics, and elements of Medicine). A. Sturdza, pp.200-201 . See, also, Emile Legrant, pp. 137-9, 368.

42. C. Th. Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp. 140, 152.
43. Iorga, Byzance, p. 218; A. Sturdza, p. 106.
44. For example, A. Sturdza has asserted that if C. Mavrocordato's family "peut le revendiquer comme une gloire et un exemple digne de respect, les pays Roumains peuvent et doivent egalement le revendiquer comme une gloire national (malgré son origine hellénique. et un modèle de prince". A. Sturdza, p. 217.
45. Sir Charles Eliot, p.281. See also George Crompton, p.317; and Rizo Neroulos, p. 33.
46. Nicolae Iorga, "La Pénétration des Idées de l'Occident dans le Sud Est de l'Europe aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècle", Revue Historique du Sud-Est Europeen, Vol I ( 1924), pp. 9-13.
47. Ibid., pp. 19, 23.
48. L.S. Stavrianos, The Balkans since 1453 ( N.York, 1965), p. 276.
49. Knös, pp. 392, 469.
50. Nicolae Iorga, Roumains et Grecs au Cours des Siècles (Bucharest, 1921), pp. 37-54.
51. Nicolae Iorga, "Le Despotism Eclairé", p. 100-15; Byzance; "La Pénétration", pp.14-20; Roumains et Grecs, p.49.
52. Denis Deletant, "Romanian Society in the Danubian Principalities in the early nineteenth century", Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence, ed., R. Clogg (London, 1981), p. 231. See, also, Corneliu Dima-Dragan, pp.211-216, and A. Sturdza, pp. 185-188.
53. C. Th Dimaras, Greek Literature, p. 113. The entire letter of DesFontaines to C. Mavrocordato is printed in Emille Legrand, Bibliographie Hellenique ,Vol. I pp. 308-9, and in A. Sturdza, L'Europe Orientale, p. 185.

54. Deletant, p. 231. See, also, Iorga "Pénétration", p. 15.
55. M. Gedeon," Peri tis Phanariotikis Koinonias", O en Konstantinoupoli Ellinikos Philologikos Syllogos, XXI (1892), p. 65.
56. Rizo Neroulos, pp. 147-148.
57. Deletant, p. 231; Rizo Neroulos, p. 147.
58. Vlad Georgescu, p. 85.
59. A. Sturdza, p. 188.
60. Vlad Georgescu, p. 109.
61. Ibid., p. 127.
62. Iorga, Byzance, p. 242. C. Mavrocordato's enlightened program of government was the most impressive of all: Emancipation of Serfdom; liberation from Corvée; unification of taxes; balance of direct or indirect taxes; power to the assembly concerning economics; harmony of public administration; improvement of moral, material and intellectual state of Roumanian Clergy; laws and decrees to enhance the intellectual level (creation of schools not only for boyars but also for merchants).
63. Cyril Mango, p. 36.
64. Catherine Koumarianou, "The Contribution of the Intelligentsia towards the Greek Independence Movement", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1973), pp. 74-75.
65. Ibid., p.37 See, also, Stephen G. Chaconas, Adamantios Coraes ( N. York 1942), pp. 11-12.
66. Emile Malakis, French Travellers in Greece (1770-1820) A Thesis (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 31.
67. Ibid., p. 30.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., pp. 44.
70. Ibid.
71. Mango, p. 37.

72. Demetre S. Soutso, p. 230.
73. Karpat, p. 36. It should be noted, however, that while the Bulgarian church became fully dependent on the Patriarchate, the Serbs had since 1790 their own Metropolitanate in Sremski Karlovci, a Serbian town within the Habsburg dominions and, therefore, outside the Ottoman (and Phanariot) power.
74. Richard Clogg, "Aspects of the Movement for Greek Independence", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1973), p. 11. In this period, the Phanariots also intensified their role as protectors of the Greeks. For example, after the first Russo-Turkish war and the defeat of Turkey, the Sultan Mustafa IV wanted to exterminate the Greeks. The Phanariot Patriarch Samuel, however, in concert with the Phanariot clans of Ipsilanti, Mourouzi, Karadza and Soutso, presented the Sultan with a memorandum which made him change his mind. Rizo Neroulos, pp. 87-88
75. Soutso, p. 230.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. A. Stourdza, p. 265.
79. Ibid., p. 263.
80. Theodore H. Papadopoulos, p. 79.
81. Ibid., pp. 126, 129-130, 151.
82. For example, Saul Norman writes that the Patriarchate encouraged their flocks to regard the Ottomans as their protectors against Catholic subversion. As a result, many Greeks in the battle of Lepanto (1571) had fought against the Christian forces. Saul Norman, Russia and the Mediterranean 1797-1807 (Chicago, 1970), pp. 6-7, 100. For Orthodox anti-westernism see also Raphael Demos, p. 527 and Papadopoulos, p. 152-53. For the general Orthodox conception towards the Ottomans and the West see Sherrard Philip, "Church, State and the Greek War of Independence", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed., R. Clogg (London, 1973).
83. Cyril Loucaris had tried to open the door to new ideas from the West and was executed for that. Theophilos Korydaleas reorganized the

Patriarchal school and tried to separate philosophy from theology and therefore to kindle a sense of Neo-Hellenism. Korydaleas was attacked by contemporary ecclesiastic scholars for his concepts and, discarding his episcopal throne and his vestments, returned to his native Athens where he died in a state of acute neurasthenia. C. Th. Dimaras p. 64-66. See, also, G.P. Henderson, p. 12-18.

84. C. Th. Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp. 108-114.
85. Th. Papadopoulos, pp. 80-85.
86. Ibid.
87. C. Th. Dimaras, Greek Literature, pp 138-139. In the case of serious transgression, however, the measures of the hierarchy and conservative establishment were drastic. For example, the scholar Methodios Antrakites was condemned as a heretic by the Synod of the Patriarchate and had to renounce his views and burn his works. R. Demos, p. 531.
88. Th. Papadopoulos, pp. 138-139, 142.
89. The Phanariot protection and aid towards the ecclesiastic establishments is evident in the following letter to Alexandre Mavrocordato "Ex'Aporitou" to Neophyte Notara regarding the Holy Places: "Que Votre Eminence veuille bien avoir soin de surveiller tout ce qui concerne les Lieux Saints... Nous avons consenti, d'accord avec le Saint-Synode convoqué, et avec la grâce de Dieu, à l'œuvre du maintien en bonne paix des Saints Lieux, à leur surveillance nécessaire et à leur avenir....". A. Sturdza, p. 42. For C. Mavrocordato's aid to the Church, see p. 198. See, also, Marie Nystazopoulou- Pellekidis, "Actes des Princes Phanariotes", Symposium, pp. 419-437, and Steven Runciman, p. 376.
90. Dakin, p. 7; Runciman, pp. 387-94.
91. Deno J. Geanakopoulos, pp. 59-77; Kordatos, pp. 211-225.
92. L.S. Stavrianos, Balkan Federation: A History of the Movement toward the Balkan Unity in Modern Times (Northampton Mass., 1944), p. 29.
93. Catherine Koumarianou, pp.68-69; Kordatos, pp. 274-288.
94. For the admiration expressed by the Greek merchants for the Western Law and Institutions see "The Concerns of a Greek Merchant: The

- Journal of Ioannis Pringos of Amsterdam" The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821. A collection of documents, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), pp. 42-45.
95. Koumarianou, pp. 75-76.
  96. "On traduit", wrote Rizo Neroulos, "quantité d'ouvrages qui roulaient sur les sciences, l'histoire, la morale et la philosophie; les écoles se multiplièrent plusieurs d'entre elles se transformèrent en lycées et en universités. Une foule de Grecs, après avoir étudié en Europe, revinrent dans leur patrie, et s'imposèrent la tâche honorable de l'enseignement public. Cette période est éminemment scientifique". Rizo Neroulos, p. 25. See, also, Koumarianou, pp. 68-71, 79, and Kordatos, pp. 547-584.
  97. Particularly, from 1790s onward, Greek scholars taught less the beauty of style and the charms of diction. They concentrated more on the ethics, characters, and the political or civic principles that were included in the classic literature. The result was a teaching of the causes of ancient Greek successes and disasters. This new learning was adopted by teachers such as Lampros Photiadis, George Constantas, Daniel Philippidis, Benjamin of Lesbos, Athanasios Psalidas of Yannena, Vandalachos, Dorotheos Proius, Etienne Duncas and, above all, Adamantion Coraes. Rizo Neroulos, pp. 58-59. See, also, Koumarianou, p. 70, and A. Coraes, "Memoire", in Kordatos, pp. 549-551.
  98. Raphael Demos, pp. 535-541; N. Iorga, "La Pénétration" pp. 27- 30.
  99. Philip Sherrard, "Church State .", pp.182-183. See also "A Satire against Francophilia: The moral versification of Alexandros Kalfoglou of Constantinople (1794)", The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821. ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976) pp. 89-90. For the specific reaction of the Patriarchate see the "Paternal exhortation of Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem (1798)", The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821. ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), pp. 56-64.
  100. After 1774, educational reforms were undertaken by the Phanariots. For example, the new schools founded by A. Ipsilanti and Gregory Ghika, at Bucharest and Jassy, were oriented towards sciences and occidental languages. The Phanariots, also, financed and protected the teachers of new learning. Daniel Philippides and Demetrios Constandas worked in the Principalities as did Nikiphoros Theotokis, a protégé of G. Ghikas. Benjamin of Lesbos was, also, under the protection of Demetraki Mourouzi. In addition, it was the latter who conceived the idea for a second school for the students of Constantinople in Couroutzesme

(Thrace) in 1799. Its first maitre was Dorotheos Proius who taught mathematics and Physics. In all, the Phanariots supported the new learning and the Danubian Academies were transformed into modern institutions, where privileged positions were enjoyed by Greek scholars. Vlad Georgescu, p. 180; Rizo Neroulos, pp. 35-43, 64-75; Iorga, Byzance, p. 225.

101. C. Th. Dimaras, Greek Literature, p. 144
102. Ibid., pp. 144, 147.
103. Ibid., pp. 143-144. Dimaras does not cite any author, but he asserts that the text is of Phanariot inspiration.
104. R. Demos, pp. 529-531.
105. Ibid., pp 532-533.
106. J.C. Filitti, Role Diplomatique, p. 175.
107. Kemal Karpat, p. 36.
108. "La Vallachie et la Moldavie, depuis leur conversion au Christianism", wrote Rizo Neroulos, "était toujours restées fidèles à l'Eglise d'Orient; elles n'avaient jamais cessé de reconaitre la suprématie du Patriarche de Constantinople; leur metropolitains avaient toujours tenu un des premiers rangs parmi les membres du Synod grec". Rizo Neroulos, p. 32.
109. Runciman, pp. 383-384.
110. During this period (1760s), the patriarchs were Phanariotes, such as John Karadzas and, particularly, Samuel Hatzeris, who suppressed the Bulgarian and Serbian Churches of Ochrid and Pec aided by Jacovaky Rizo and agents of the hospodars. Rizo Neroulos, p. 36-37.



## 4

**From Gradualism to Revolution**

*Appelons donc de nouveau  
 ô vaillants et magnanimes  
 Grecs, la liberté sur la terre  
 classique de la Grèce! Livrons  
 bataille entre Marathon et les  
 Thermopyles. Luttons sur les  
 tombeaux des nos pères!  
 Le sang de tyrans est agréable  
 aux ombres du Théban  
 Epaminondas et de l' Athénien  
 Thrasybule....  
 Alexandre Ipsilanti\**

As we have seen in the previous chapter, by the 1790's the cultural evolution of the Phanariot class caused a divergence between the ecclesiastical establishment and them. This dissension, however, did not result in a Phanariot understanding with the new social force that came to maturity by the turn of the nineteenth century : the commercial bourgeoisie.

The development of an indigenous middle class in the Balkans was a product of the economic renaissance that occurred in the late eighteenth century. Due primarily to Russian diplomacy and the French wars, Greek commerce in the Levant was revived and its revival generated a rapid and widespread economic growth. One of the effects of this economic progress was the rise of a new bourgeoisie that, unlike the Greek commercial colonists abroad, lived within the sphere of Ottoman power and Orthodox cultural

hegemony. This rising social class, however, espoused a different approach to politics from that of the hitherto dominant socio-political establishment. Many among these (mostly Greek) mariners, artisans and merchants had experienced life in western urban centers where they were favorably influenced by western political institutions and intellectual life. The events of the French Revolution, in particular, had a great effect upon them, turning them into patriots and liberals. Accordingly, their national consciousness became romantic and exclusive, and they began to attach new value to local Greek institutions, native customs and national language. As a result, their model and inspiration was not the cosmopolitan Hellenistic kingdoms and Byzantium but particularist fifth century Athens. In addition, this new bourgeoisie sought a more organic and complete relationship between government and society than that existing under the Ottoman dynastic regime. And they aspired to a political leadership that would rest on the organized consent of at least the most important sections of society, and which, moreover, would have the responsibility to concern itself with the interest of all.

The Greek aristocracy, on its side, became distrustful of the new bourgeois generation and its liberal thought, as Phanariot evolution never reached the same progressive level in the political sphere as it had done in the realm of culture. As a result, the Phanariot political position within the Greco-Christian world became isolated, at once too "nationalistic" and westernized for the reactionary Church and too Byzantine and anti-national for the liberal bourgeoisie.

So, doubting both the old and the new social structure, the Greek aristocracy resorted to political maneuvering (reaching occasionally the frontiers of opportunism) in an effort to achieve gradually a solution of the

Eastern Question compatible with their vision. In this endeavor, the Phanariots paid particular attention to international diplomacy, and placed their hopes on the Christian powers of Europe. Russian aid was always sought and expected, but so was Napoleon's, especially after his coronation and the battle of Austerlitz.

Disillusioned, however, like the rest of the Greeks, by the Congress of Vienna, and tired of continued uncertainty and Turkish arbitrariness, many of the Phanariots reached an understanding with the conservative elements of the Greek society, which by 1820 were in control of the revolutionary conspiracy. The result was that the force of events pushed the Greek aristocrats towards a cause they never wanted : revolution and the establishment of a nation-state. Experienced diplomats and astute internationalists, the Phanariots knew that the time was not appropriate for such a venture. But by 1821, there was no return for the Greeks, and therefore for the Phanariots. The dies were cast and a broad segment of the Greek aristocracy, caught up by events, embraced the revolutionary cause. So, while the Church was incapable of change, the Phanariots resisted radical change. But despite their anti-revolutionary tradition, many ended up experiencing enough discontent to turn them into revolutionaries.

#### **Phanariot state leadership and the dissemination of ideas**

The cosmopolitan attitude and enlightened leadership of the Phanariot princes in the Principalities helped substantially the economic and political development of the bourgeois class and played a central role in the dissemination of ideas.

As has already been emphasized, French ideas had a great impact on the Greek world. In the political sphere particularly, the French Revolution acted in the last decade of the eighteenth century as an inspiration to subject Balkan

Christians.<sup>1</sup> But more importantly, "it provided the political and ideological content for movements which, until then, had been unable to express in concrete terms even their immediate aims, or to organize their activities coherently".<sup>2</sup> For example, the occupation of the Ionian islands by the French republican army (1797-8), not only provided an inspiring example for the Greeks, but it also became a catalyst for concrete political activism towards national emancipation.<sup>3</sup> By the turn of the nineteenth century, therefore, a part of Greek society - especially the intellectual middle class - was ideologically ready to strive against Turkish domination.<sup>4</sup>

In this development the political, intellectual and economic environment of the Phanariot-led Principalities played a central role. That was partly because the various French governments, desirous of countering the spread of Russian and Austrian influence in the Balkans and of extending revolutionary prestige in the East, started, in the 1790's, officially to send agents to the Principalities.<sup>5</sup> This French effort inspired the Greeks, especially of Wallachia, who organized a number of political/literary societies in Bucharest.<sup>6</sup> After the disillusion resulting from the Russo-Turkish alliance and their joint occupation of the Ionian Islands (1799), there was a steady growth of French political influence among the Greeks. As a result, many educated Greeks of Wallachia started to be influenced by democratic ideas.<sup>7</sup> A Bucharest bookseller's catalogue at the time lists books such as "Histoire de la Convocation et les Elections aux Etats Généraux en 1789", "Histoire politique de la révolution en France", "De la Souveraineté du Peuple" and "Le manuel du citoyen", while there were also translations of an anonymous treatise "On Revolutions", the "Appeal Addressed to the People", and a speech of Carnot.<sup>8</sup>

It appears, thus, that from the last decade of the eighteenth century onwards, the Danubian Principalities became one of the greatest political and

intellectual centers of South-Eastern Europe where French political ideas were freely disseminated. In this dissemination of French revolutionary thought, the benevolent attitude of the Greek hospodars played a pivotal role. First, the neo-Byzantine thinking and enlightened internationalism of the Phanariots allowed the development of a cosmopolitan environment which welcomed all kinds of political activism (except, of course, any against their throne).<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the Greek princes introduced legislation for the needs of the rising commercial groups. New buildings were built, passages were cleared, and the navigation of rivers was improved. These efforts along with the reorganization of customs and fiscal life helped the development of commerce.<sup>10</sup> In particular, the Phanariot hospodars provided special treatment for Greek merchants who were living in Danubian ports. These new opportunities brought to the Greek enterprising class wealth, education and higher social position.<sup>11</sup>

All the above factors aided substantially the awakening of a political identity among the new bourgeoisie, which liberated many merchants and intellectuals from a monolithic religious self-awareness.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, the Phanariot economic and cultural policies in the Principalities allowed the development of a flourishing Greek (but also Romanian) middle class and, therefore, created favorable conditions for the dissemination of nationalistic ideas and even revolutionary activism.<sup>13</sup> In fact, it was from the Greeks in the Principalities that the larger proportion of the membership of the Greek revolutionary organization "Philike Etairia" was to be drawn.<sup>14</sup> And Rigas Pheoros, the great forerunner of the Greek revolution, conducted his subversive activities almost entirely within a Phanariot framework.<sup>15</sup>

## THE PHANARIOTS AND FRENCH POLITICAL INFLUENCE

In spite of their contribution to the dissemination of French political ideas, the Greek aristocracy was not affected politically by France in the same way as the middle class. Certainly, a political relation of sorts had existed for many years between unofficial French agents and the Phanariots. Indeed, since the Ottoman Empire and Poland represented traditionally important links in the French security system, Bourbon foreign policy could hardly neglect the diplomatic no-man's land between them, where flexible princes could be of much help.<sup>16</sup> That was particularly true in the second half of the eighteenth century when French political influence in the Ottoman government had diminished dramatically.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, the French had persistently endeavored before 1789 to ameliorate their weakened position and, in their efforts, the Principalities and the Phanariot aristocracy had been perceived as very valuable elements in the Eastern diplomatic scene. After all, the Principalities were at the intersection of a flow of correspondence, and the hospodars controlled a great deal of information coming to and from Europe.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the Greek aristocrats of Phanar were advisers of the Sultan in Constantinople and, to an extent, the real directors of Ottoman foreign policy.<sup>19</sup> So, "La France avait reconnu la nécessité de s'assurer du bon esprit des hospodars...de ce pays (Principalities) dont l'importance politique ne l'échappait pas".<sup>20</sup> But diplomatic relations had not existed between France and the Principalities before the French Revolution. Instead, French influence made itself felt through certain merchants and intellectual adventurers who often "Fuyaient leur patrie et quelque passé douteux".<sup>21</sup> Accordingly, Bourbon Paris had tried to gain political advantages in the Principalities by establishing unofficial agencies directed by commercial houses and by inducing the Phanariots to appoint French secretaries in the

hospodar's office to look after the flow of information. These secretaries were, occasionally, learned and devoted individuals such as Count d' Hauterive, the secretary and friend of Alexandre Mavrocordato (Firari).<sup>22</sup> But, often, they were spies of the French ambassadors in Constantinople, and, sometimes, simply unscrupulous and tactless adventurers. For example, Durosoy, secretary of Firari for foreign affairs, was not above assuming the right to steal government papers.<sup>23</sup> Also, a correspondence of secretaries such as François Linchou and Gianpietro Nagni, with the French ambassadors Des Alleurs and Vergennes, bear witness to spying activities.<sup>24</sup>

The Phanariots were vulnerable to this cultural and crypto-political French infiltration due, largely, to their attachment to French letters. Great votaries of French literature and "le bel esprit", the Greek aristocrats considered Paris as a second Constantinople and enjoyed discussing in the Salons of Bucharest and Jassy the events that were taking place there.<sup>25</sup> This French cultural influence was, of course, greatly facilitated by the fortuitous fact that in the second half of the eighteenth century the accepted language of diplomacy in the Near East was French.<sup>26</sup> For this reason, although fluent in it themselves, the Greek hospodars felt the need to surround themselves with French secretaries, and the use of French in Phanariot court circles was common.

### The French Revolution

After the French Revolution, the various French governments, eager to extend revolutionary prestige in the East, sought to establish official diplomatic relations in the Principalities. There, it was argued, they could take advantage of all kinds of nationalistic sentiments: Polish against Austria and Russia, Hungarian against Austria, and, if necessary, Greek and Romanian

against Turkey. On their side, many Phanariots had received favorably the news of the Revolution. "The...boyars", wrote Vlad Georgescu, "and most of the princes showed sympathy for republican France".<sup>27</sup> For one, a "tyrant" who fell was always good news for a subject people even for those who lived in a golden cage. Besides, any Phanariot pro-French sentiment could not jeopardize their position since in Constantinople, where Louis XV and his successor had hardly been popular, the news of the fall of the French monarchy was received with indifference. It appears, then, that the French Revolution and its agents "trouvaient dans les Principautés un terrain favorable parmi l' élite de la société surtout".<sup>28</sup> Accordingly, Phanariot clans such as those of Soutsos and Callimachi welcomed the French consul Stamati in 1796.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, another French consul, Fleur, "fut reçu avec grand enthusiasm" in Wallachia by the hospodar C. Hadjery.<sup>30</sup> In addition, in Moldavia, Phanariot officials such as Panayoti Kodrika declared themselves friends of revolutionary France.<sup>31</sup> On their side, devoted Russophile clans, such as the Ipsilantis and Mourouzis, invited many emigrés to their courts after the Revolution, partly moved by curiosity to learn from eye-witnesses what had happened in Paris. Some even reached the point of assigning them administrative posts, a fact which demonstrates their anti-republicanism. A case in point is the hospodar of Moldavia, Constantine Ipsilanti (1799-1801) who made Gaspar-Luce le comte de Belleval, his foreign minister.<sup>32</sup> Much more often, however, Frenchmen were simply appointed as tutors for the sons of princes and boyars. In 1804, for example, C. Ipsilanti (now hospodar of Wallachia) welcomed the Marquis Beaupoil de Saint-Aulaire as the teacher of his children one of whom, Alexandre, was to become the leader of the Greek revolutionary organization "Philike Etairia" in 1820.<sup>33</sup> The Phanariot benevolent attitude towards France, however, was not based on an acceptance



of French revolutionary ideas. In fact, after the passing of the initial enthusiasm, the radicalism of the French Revolution frightened some of the Phanariots.<sup>34</sup> Actually, their original "Francophilia" was simply a tactical move based on need and political calculation. "Ce qui les (Phanariots) intéressait", Filitti has asserted, "c'était de trouver dans la France un appui au besoin".<sup>35</sup> In other words, to some Phanariot individuals such as Michael Soutso and Alexandre Callimachi, this new turn of events offered an alternative to traditional alliances.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, in the 1790's some Phanariots, disappointed by Russian opportunism and isolated by Church reaction and middle class liberalism, welcomed the friendship of France, a player now in the Near Eastern scene.<sup>37</sup> So, the amenable behavior of some Phanariots towards France was another balancing act which indicates the tight-rope conditions on which the Greek aristocracy walked during that time. For example, the "Francophile" Michael Soutso had to flee to Russia after the invasion of the moslem rebel Pasvanoglou. When he returned his position was under Russian protection!<sup>38</sup> But the Phanariot "Francophilia" also demonstrates elements of personal antagonism and clan competition. For example, one of the reasons John Karadja and Demetrios Scavani turned pro-French in 1805 and 1806 was simply their animosity to the Russophile Ipsilanti.<sup>39</sup>

Consequently, by the turn of the nineteenth century, the Phanariot political behavior appears complex and opportunistic. Essentially, however, the Phanariot mind had remained considerably Byzantine and Russophile. "The Christian chiefs of Greece", wrote count Capodistrias, "remained persuaded that only Russia had the power and the desire progressively to improve their lot".<sup>40</sup> Certainly, Phanariot individuals and even families attached themselves to French interests for personal and political advantages,

but the Greek aristocracy on the whole distrusted France. "Cette puissance...", wrote J. D. Ghikas, "était tres loin (and)... presque eclipsé devant les puissances rivales et avait en à subir une révolution intérieure terrible, qui passait pour l'avoir sérieusement ébranlée".<sup>41</sup> Besides, the French had always been declared enemies of Russia and an old friend of Turkey. But more importantly, the Phanariots had remained devotees of authoritarianism since the Byzantine component of their nationalism was still there and their ultimate goal was always the taking over of the Ottoman Empire either under Russian patronage or Turkish partnership. As G.D. Ghikas has put it "A premier vue, leur politique vis-à-vis des puissances semble d'une complication achevée; en réalité ils sont imbus de la grand conception, chère aux Phanariotes, de la domination par leur race de l' empire turc entier;... en même temps et pour se maintenir leur trône, ils évoluent habilement entre les turcs qui sont les maîtres d' aujourd'hui, et les Russes qui pourraient être ceux de demain".<sup>42</sup>

Consequently, it appears that in spite of their benevolent attitude towards the spread of new ideas, the Greek aristocrats had remained enlightened despots. Indeed, new ideas of equality and of free expression had never been adopted by them. In this respect, the Phanariots had absolutist tendencies and, although some of them wanted to improve society from above, they repeatedly forbade political discussions hostile to their government to be held in public places.<sup>43</sup> It was not surprising, therefore, that by the first decade of the nineteenth century, the Phanariots started to show signs of intolerance towards the liberal and even radical spirit adopted by some bourgeois intellectuals.<sup>44</sup> "Les hommes", wrote the Phanariot Rizo Neroulos about the French Revolution, "éblouis plutot qu' éclairés, erraient au hasard, poussés avec violence de coté et d'autre, et non guidés vers le but

qu' ils se flattaient d' atteindre".<sup>45</sup> Similarly, this Phanariot loss of patience with radical liberalism is evident in a collection of poetry published anonymously in 1810 by Alexandre Mavrocordato, the so-called fugitive (1794-1819). This work, which is called "Bosporus in Borysthemia", welcomed the hopes of Greek emancipation but also demonstrated a spirit of distrust towards the new French radical ideas: "There are few rational men", Mavrocordato exclaims, "the wicked are numerous, and all are inclined to bad manners". And again: "At present, I am an honest man ; after having studied (the new radical ideas) perhaps I will have lost my virtuous dispositions".<sup>46</sup>

The interesting part, however, is that Mavrocordato was a nationalist who in 1786 fled Moldavia when he discovered that he was in danger of being executed by the Turks for subversive correspondence with Saint Petersburg.<sup>47</sup> Having found refuge in Russia, he also participated in the liberation movement and became a member of the "Philike Etairia" .<sup>48</sup> Moreover, his poetry is inundated with Hellenic symbolism : "Only Athena (education) is favorable to them (Greeks). She enumerates their virtues...Athena convinces the gods, and they decide to execute their threats... one sees a multitude of soldiers exercising assiduously. Two generals, one descended from Themistocles and the other from Xenophon, lead the troops".<sup>49</sup>

In the poetry of Mavrocordato we have a good example of the Phanariot neo-Hellenism, although its militarism is not typical of the Phanariot mind. Perhaps the anonymity of the publication and Alexandre's personal plight can explain that. Equally important, however, is the obvious contempt for the bourgeois generation and the distrust of the French liberal and revolutionary thought. That demonstrates the resilience of the Byzantine component of the Phanariot psyche and thus its main diversion from the bourgeois spirit and

modern nationalism. Indeed, the Phanariots, although sympathetic and hopeful to their compatriots' predicaments, never accepted ideas such as freedom of political expression or political equality. As a result, their culture and variability notwithstanding, they retained a Byzantine distrust for the social structure envisioned by the liberal and occasionally egalitarian bourgeoisie. In that sense the evolution of the Phanariot mind did not reach the same level in the political arena as it had done in the sphere of culture. Consequently, their socio-political understanding was traditional and pre-modern. Their "ethnic distinction", therefore, organized primarily along cultural and religious lines, was not the equivalent of a genuine modern national ideology, its Hellenism notwithstanding. What was lacking was primarily the elements of liberalism and modernization which with contemporary standards were almost synonymous with modern nationalism.<sup>50</sup>

Indeed, the Phanariots never considered the right of a people to determine their own form of government, let alone to control the conduct of that government. Notions such as parliamentarism did not mean anything to them, let alone political equality and sovereignty of the people; and the word liberty in their mind was only associated with the Turkish yoke. The Phanariot brand of nationalism lacked the element of modernization which, according to Dankwart Rustow, is closely related to modern nationalism. "Modernization", writes Rustow, "denotes rapidly widening control over nature through closer cooperation among men...It implies an intellectual, a technological and a social revolution. It transforms three of man's most fundamental relations: to time, to nature and to his fellowman".<sup>51</sup> Even after the great neo-Hellenic impetus of the 1770's and 1790's, therefore, the Phanariot vision remained essentially Byzantine : the reestablishment of a

multi-national state united not by liberal values and the principle of national union, but by the enlightened dominance of a Greco/Byzantine élite supported itself by a strong patron. In that sense, the later development of the Phanariot national conscience was also a continuity of their conservative tradition which by the turn of the nineteenth century was evolving under a mounting, but not dominant, western influence.

It appears then that French liberal ideas had not affected the Phanariot mind, and any political overtures to revolutionary France were based on need and expediency. And although confidence in Russian sincerity toward the Greek cause had been already shaken, Russia remained the political model for the Greek aristocracy, which continued to seek the support of the Tsar. As for the Turkish reality, the Phanariot attitude was that Greeks were not ready for self-determination and nationhood. Consequently, any effort against the Turks would be hopeless without outside help. Therefore, the emphasis on education should continue along with hellenization and reforms which would in time "enlighten" the Balkan Christians and bring them together. So, during the French and Napoleonic wars the likelihood of any general revolution was considered by the Phanariots as quite impractical. "Most of the higher classes", John Hobhouse had concluded in 1810, "are apparently willing to acquiesce in their present condition" .52

### The Napoleonic factor

It appears then that in the first decade of the nineteenth century, the Phanariots were content with the spread of education and expected outside forces to help the Greeks. One such major force was Napoleonic France which had rapidly changed the map of Europe and had broken many old ties. This French temporal power could not but reinforce the influence already gained by French thought, and the Greeks tried to make capital of the

situation. Accordingly, they persuaded themselves that Napoleon was a godsent Achilles combining conveniently theocratic messianism and Hellenism. "Ce qu'on ne peut ignorer", Filliti has written, "c'est que Bonaparte était pour les Grecs un nouvel Achille: Certes c'étaient les Francs qui étaient destinés par la providence à délivrer la Grèce".<sup>53</sup> In fact, the Greek traditional wishful thinking reached the level of absurdity; they even spread rumors among themselves that Bonaparte was one of their own: a Greek of Mainote origin whose family had emigrated to Corsica.<sup>54</sup>

The Phanariots were also attracted to Napoleon, especially after he proclaimed himself emperor. They were particularly impressed by his victories over the third coalition which actually made France a neighbor of the Ottomans.<sup>55</sup> As a result, the French factor became much stronger in the Phanariot schemes and the French agents in the Principalities were treated with increasing flattery by the hospodars. C. Ipsilanti, for example, a Russian client, "dissimulant ses sentiments montra-t-il d' une politesse exquise pour Sainte Luce, le consul de France à Bucarest, en lui faisant un accueil digne de celui de Fleury et il écrivit à Talleyrand en le priant de ne pas prêter foi à ce que Besancon lui aura dit de se vues politiques".<sup>56</sup>

Napoleon, however, proved to be an opportunist in regard to the Eastern Question, and his Near Eastern foreign policy was a succession of personal reactions to circumstances.<sup>57</sup> For all his pretensions to the contrary, Napoleon was not an enthusiast for nationalities per se, and he regarded the Near East as a part of Ottoman Empire with which he could bargain with his enemies.<sup>58</sup> In fact, Vandal tells us that "Cette idée de partager la Turquie... (Napoleon) s' en saisit et la formule, non pour la réaliser encore, mais pour en faire, selon les cas, un appât ou un épouvantail ; tour à tour...il se montre pressé de détruire la Turquie ou jaloux de la conserver".<sup>59</sup> The Principalities,

especially, were for him a geographical expression which he could assign to Russia or Austria according to the direction of his policy at any given time. In Ghikas' words "il se sert de ce territoire (Principalities) comme d'une appât pour diviser ses ennemies, s'assurer leur concours et conclure des traités".<sup>60</sup>

The Phanariots soon realized that Napoleonic opportunism worked against their interests. For one, they did not want the partition of the Ottoman Balkans.<sup>61</sup> Accordingly, Demetre Mourouzi had as early as 1805 warned the Sultan that Bonaparte "ne considerait pas comme impossible un partage de l' Empire Ottoman".<sup>62</sup> This prediction proved correct after Tilsit, where Napoleon and Alexandre I agreed to partition the Balkans between themselves and Austria.<sup>63</sup> The Phanariots opposed this treaty. The swallowing of the Principalities by Russia and the French annexation of much of Greece was against their interests. Their fear was that Napoleon would destroy Turkish power without benefiting the Greeks.<sup>64</sup> Certainly, the Turks were not the best of rulers, but under their declining power the Greek aristocracy had a future, and the dream that one day the Greeks would inherit the empire was kept alive. Bonaparte's opportunism could destroy that hope without replacing it, and turn the Balkans into provinces of France, Russia, and Austria.<sup>65</sup>

For this reason, the Phanariots sought a very cautious and flexible political approach in the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century. The period between 1805 and 1812, in particular, marked by an acute internal crisis of the Ottoman state and a growing influence of foreign forces on its policies, saw the development among Phanariots of groupings oriented to one or another of the great powers.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, having their agents in the European capitals particularly in Vienna, the Phanariot clans followed painstakingly the contemporary political and strategic realignments in trying

to reach agreements that would safeguard the continuation of their political future and, therefore, their vision. In that sense, the Phanariots could appear, according to the situation, Russophiles, Francophiles or Austrophiles while they were supposed to represent the Ottoman interests.<sup>67</sup>

So, in the tumultuous opening years of the nineteenth century, the Greek aristocracy of the Phanar seemed to concentrate on security. In doing that, the Phanariots appeared to pursue two almost contradictory goals. First, the preservation of the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Balkan Empire which, according to their Byzantine dream, the Greeks should inherit intact. But also, the Phanariots paid particular attention to international diplomacy and sought to be part of an agreement that would entrench them in the Principalities and put them in charge of troublesome areas like Serbia and the Ionian Islands.<sup>68</sup> There, under the protection of one or more great powers, they could be granted hereditary rights and therefore a basis on which their class could build their "Great Idea".<sup>69</sup> Indeed, on several occasions, Phanariot princes such as Demetrios Mourouzi, Constantine Ipsilanti, N. Caradza and Michael Soutso tried to persuade powers like England, Russia and Austria to mediate with the Porte to that effect.<sup>70</sup> "Nous avons vu", Filliti writes, "que leur (Phanariots) préoccupation constante était la conservation du trône vacillant sur lequel la Porte ne les laissait jamais séjourner qu'un moment."<sup>71</sup> Accordingly, C. Ipsilanti, hospodar of Wallachia, mediated in 1804-1806 between insurgent Serbia and Russia with the hope that the final settlement would grant his family hereditary rights in that area.<sup>72</sup> Similarly, in the Ionians during the French presence and the subsequent Russo-Turkish occupation, the Phanariots worked for the Islands becoming a Phanariot-led Principality like Moldavia and Wallachia. When that proved impossible and the Islands became a republic, the Phanariots made sure that the new state



became tributary to the Sultan and that its new constitution was completely "Byzantine" and advantageous to the established local aristocracy.<sup>73</sup>

Phanariot policy thus sought not only to preserve the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans but also to favour the extension of the existing system of autonomous Principalities under Ottoman suzerainty.<sup>74</sup> The rationale behind this policy seems to have been that the creation of more Balkan autonomous principalities under Phanariot hereditary leadership would facilitate the spread of the Greek culture and the continuation of cooperation with both the Great powers and the Ottoman government.<sup>75</sup> That would have been a positive step towards future settlements that could lead to a large and united Greco-Byzantine state sanctioned by international conventions.

It appears, then, that during the Napoleonic wars, the Phanariots, in an effort to deal with the contemporary political realignments and geographic fluidity, sought a piecemeal realization of their plans. What they appear to have wanted at this point was to turn the Balkan area into a series of autonomous principalities. These geo-political entities would be governed by hereditary Phanariot princes who, although still vassals of the Sultan, would gradually build a larger Balkan state based on Greco/Byzantine culture, Orthodox religion and enlightened ideas. Certainly, it is impossible to know whether this optimistic Phanariot policy would have led to the disintegration of the Ottoman empire, or whether a multinational state would have replaced it. The Greek aristocracy, however, had on their side the pan-Balkan spread of Greek culture and the lessons of a long experience of diplomacy and cooperation with the Turks.<sup>76</sup>

In any case, the Phanariot political calculations demonstrate, apart from their gradualism, their propensity towards diplomatic solutions and

particularly their belief in the importance of the Great Powers. The Phanariots believed that the Greeks could achieve their goal only with Great Power support, sanctioned by international conventions. For this reason, an armed Greek insurrection should be avoided for the time being. The Greeks had to wait for favorable international circumstances when outside aid would promote their cause. The Greek aristocracy, therefore, in dealing with a tumultuous Europe and an uncertain future, paid particular allegiance to international diplomacy in the years before the congress of Vienna. As a result, they expected the victors, after the settling of the Napoleonic menace, to draw a better future for the Greeks.

## THE FINAL ACT

### Disappointment

The Congress of Vienna, however, brought only disappointment to the Phanariots and the rest of the Greeks. In fact, Capodistrias, The Greek born joint foreign minister of the Tsar, tried in vain to convince Alexandre I to put the Greek question on the agenda of the congress.<sup>77</sup> But Alexandre was afraid of the reaction of Metternich and the English. In fact, the Russia Tsar had made that clear in a meeting with Metropolitan Ignantios in October 1814, when he indicated that "there is nothing to be done for them (Greeks) here, and whatever one might try to do would lead precisely to the consequences that you fear the most, namely the intervention of foreign powers in our relations with the Turks".<sup>78</sup> Indeed, Austria, due to her own particular socio-demographic making, was very hostile to nationalist movements. In fact, the Austrian mentality regarding the Greek cause was summed up later in Metternich's question, "what is Greece" - to which he

himself provided the scornful answer that "Greek...is employed indiscriminately to signify a race, a territory, a language, even a religion".<sup>79</sup> In addition, France and Britain perceived Greece mainly as a "future battlefield in their struggle for the Near and Middle East" as well as a symbol of the past - a glorious myth subject to the occasional traveller and the romantic scholar.<sup>80</sup> Britain in particular had political reasons to keep the Balkan Christians under the Ottoman yoke. To put it in Andre Otetea's words, "l'Angleterre tenait à l'intégrité de l'Empire Ottoman et par conséquent, était hostile à tout mouvement d'émancipation des peuples chrétiens".<sup>81</sup> France had an almost equal indifference towards the Greek cause. Napoleon's lack of interest was more than matched by the French attitude during the era of the Restoration. In fact, when the Greek insurrection began, the French government instructed the French ambassador in Constantinople to try "to avoid creating even the slightest difficulties for the Turkish government, (and) to do nothing that would create the impression that the Greeks are recognized".<sup>82</sup>

In retrospect, therefore, it is obvious that the Greeks had nothing to expect from the great powers. But the Phanariots had hoped that the Congress of Vienna would ameliorate the Greek plight. This expectation was directed primarily at Russia whom, in spite of past experience, the Phanariots continue to consider the obvious ally and supporter of any Greek cause.<sup>83</sup>

Indeed, Russian religious and traditional sympathies had always been fundamental in the Greek visions of liberty. But more realistically, Russian aid towards Greek emancipation had also been encouraged by self-seeking Russian courts motivated by the desirability of a back door to Constantinople. This form of expansionism simply meant a policy of propping up a feeble ally to whom the Tsar could dictate at will. Obviously, the advantages were fewer complications for Russian unity and less trouble with Austria, France, and

England.<sup>84</sup> But in Vienna, Russia, after the exhausting Napoleonic wars, needed a respite.<sup>85</sup> Pressed by the anti-nationalism of England and Austria, Alexandre pursued, in the period 1815-1820, a policy of preserving the status quo in the Balkans and normalizing the improving relations with the Turkish government.<sup>86</sup> Certainly the Tsarist government endeavored to preserve its image as "protector" of the Balkan Christians, and thus the Greeks did not lose faith in Russia until the end. But officially Saint Petersburg had no longer any desire to support Greek subversive plans.<sup>87</sup>

This Russian policy hurt Phanariot diplomacy and the Greek cause since after 1815, the claims of subjected people throughout Europe were officially condemned. That was especially true in the Near East as the Ottoman Empire had been accepted in the Congress of Vienna as part of the European political structure and the Sultan recognized as the legitimate ruler of Greece.

### The Society of Friends

In such inopportune times, the Greeks realized that if they were to be free some day they had to do it by themselves. Already a secret revolutionary organization, called Philike Etairia (Friendly Society), had been founded in 1814, in Odessa (Russia), with the goal of spreading Greek culture and creating a Greek national state. Most of its members were petty merchants and adventurers who came to seek their fortunes in the cities and towns of South-Western Russia and the Danubian Principalities.<sup>88</sup>

There were also Phanariots who chose this active approach to their national cause. Constantine Ipsilanti, former hospodar of Moldavia and Wallachia (1799-1806), before he died in 1816 left, as a political statement to his class the conclusion of a life-time experience: "Les Grecs pour se liberer ne doivent compter que sur leur propres forces".<sup>89</sup> Indeed, C. Ipsilanti's

residence in Russia, where he lived as a refugee since 1807, had turned the Phanariot politician into a Greek patriot. A testimony of the former hospodar's patriotism is his memorandum "Survey of the present state of the Ottoman Empire", which he presented to the Russian Tsar in 1816.

According to this memorandum, the whole social and political system of the Turkish empire was based on coercion and arbitrary rule. Particularly hopeless was the predicament of the Christian subjects: "to strike a dog in the streets is a sin", Ipsilanti asserted, but in the Ottoman Empire "to strike a Christian matters nothing, to kill him even less".<sup>90</sup> The real responsibility for this Turkish tyranny, Ipsilanti continued, lay with the Great Powers, particularly England which, "while supposedly seeking humane treatment for the black slaves, was doing nothing to alleviate the great number of whites and Christians, subjects of the Ottoman Empire, who are treated worse than the Negroes in the Colonies".<sup>91</sup> Finally, the former hospodar discussed the vitality of the Greek people: "Those who think that the Greek nation has degenerated... make a gross mistake... There is no nation which has so much preserved its character as the Greek. The intentions they show in all circumstances, even least favorable, and their readiness to sacrifice all for a tiny ray of hope, prove what they are capable of".<sup>92</sup>

Constantine Ipsilanti was not the only Phanariot who thought that way. Alexandre Mavrocordato (1754-1819), the so-called Firari (fugitive), became a member of Philike Etairia and later he initiated his nephew, of the same name, who became one of the revolution's leaders and a prime minister.<sup>93</sup> Theodore Negris, diplomat, man of letters, and former minister in Moldavia, also became an early votary of the revolutionary cause.<sup>94</sup>

### Capodistrias and the persisting conservatism

Until the years 1819-1820, however, the Phanariot class as a whole was not a participant in the revolutionary conspiracy. The reasons were several. Most of them, hardened pragmatists, could not find much sense, given the international situation, in going against the status quo. Accordingly, they chose to follow the instructions of a very influential Greek at the time, John Capodistrias, an Ionian nobleman who had entered the service of Tsar Alexandre I and who, from 1816 onwards, served as joint foreign minister of Russia. Capodistrias, in full knowledge of both the European political scene and the Balkan realities, believed that the Greeks should earn gradually the right of liberation through moral regeneration. "We repeat", he writes, "the Greeks must solely and exclusively occupy themselves with moral and literary education ; every other object is vain every other occupation is dangerous".<sup>95</sup> Greeks then, according to him, were not ready for self-determination, particularly as "Asiatic" habits of servility and particularism were rampant among them.<sup>96</sup> Accordingly, with the enthusiastic support of many Phanariots, he encouraged the foundation of institutions such as "The Society of the Philomousi" (Lovers of the Muses).<sup>97</sup> This institution, with establishments both in Athens and Vienna, had been founded "en vue de fournir une assistance aux pauvres jeunes Hellenes ayant soif d' instruction".<sup>98</sup> So, Capodistrias' idea of regeneration concentrated once more on education and diplomacy. In fact, he abhorred as disastrous to the Greek people the plans that he knew were being made by other Greeks for armed insurrection, and he refused to accept the leadership of the "Philike Etairia".<sup>99</sup>

Capodistrias' message corresponded closely to the Phanariots' conservative belief in Greek self-education, trust in God, and patience until

the international situation produced circumstances propitious for their emancipation. Accordingly by 1819, the majority of the Phanariots were still anti-revolutionary and thus not receptive to advances of the revolutionary conspirators. Besides, the leaders of the conspiracy were originally humble people who had not much in common with the Greek aristocrats, and who therefore could not approach them easily. Moreover, if the Phanariots, as leaders of the "nation", participated they would demand the leadership of the movement. But in the early years of the Etairia, due to the Phanariots' administrative position, the revolutionaries did not consider it prudent to give them the leadership of the organization.<sup>100</sup> The Etairists thought that inter-Phanariot antagonism could prove disastrous for the cause. If, for example, the leadership was given to a certain Phanariot grouping, another clan, jealous and antagonistic, could perhaps betray the whole organization to the Turks.<sup>101</sup> After all, inter-Phanariot back-stabbing was common practice, and the fame of their political acumen and duplicity was much more known to the common Greeks than their patriotism.

#### The questions of uncertainty and arbitrariness

In the years 1819-1820, however, the situation started to change. In fact, by 1819 the Greek aristocracy had reached a stage of extreme uncertainty about the future. Of course the Phanariot position was always precarious. By the eve of the Greek revolution, however, the situation had become unbearable. For example, the monetary price of becoming a prince had reached exorbitant heights, and no Phanariot prince could ever predict the duration of his tenure - in spite of the *hati-sherif* of 1802 that supposedly had fixed the tenure at seven years.<sup>102</sup> In addition, the constant necessity of thwarting the intrigues of their rivals and of resisting the opposition of the local boyars exhausted the *hospodars* and made them ready for an alternate solution.<sup>103</sup> To make things

even worse for the Phanariot Byzantine aspirations, the Turkish government had promulgated, in January 1819, a statute according to which the Phanariot families eligible to supply hospodars had been reduced to four. The Ottoman justification was that "dernièrement, parmi les Phanariots se sont introduits des individus incapables et tarés qui ont forcé la Porte à établir un nouveau Règlement pour réserver les places d'hospodar à des personnes loyales, intégrées et éprouvées".<sup>104</sup>

This latter ordinance demonstrates also the unpredictability and arbitrariness of Ottoman rule. In fact, one of the premises under which the Phanariots had accepted and exercised the dubious role of Greeks in the Ottoman service was that, in the long run, the Turks would acknowledge in theory as well as in fact the political function and existence of the Greek aristocracy.<sup>105</sup> This development could in time have led to a better understanding between the two major Ottoman religious groups and therefore to a genuine improvement in the Turko-Christian relations, sanctioned by the rule of law. But by 1821, nothing seemed further from the truth than the above. Ottoman rule, more and more subject to individual whim rather than to consistent policy, was going from bad to worse. In fact, on the eve of the Greek revolution, a once strong and well-organized Ottoman state had been reduced to a chaotic one.<sup>106</sup> The authority of the central government was diminishing to the point of de facto loss of control of provincial territories where notables such as Ali pasha of Yanena, Pasvanoglou of Vidin, and Mohamet Ali of Egypt had built up almost independent dynasties.<sup>107</sup> Moreover, in the cities unpredictable and unruly Janisaries had created an atmosphere of fear among the non-Muslim population (a result of such an unlawfulness was the revolt of the Serbs in 1804).<sup>108</sup> This situation required change, but efforts to reverse the decline by



Selim III (1789-1807) had met with failure.<sup>109</sup> In fact, the very concept of change was treated with suspicion by most Ottoman Muslims since the idea of the divine mission of the Ottoman state was never abandoned.<sup>110</sup> As a result, any de facto change did not really correspond with an acceptance in theory.<sup>111</sup> Accordingly, the existence of the Phanariots was a new actuality of Ottoman life which had occurred in fact but was not admissible in theory. Although the Phanariots had gained power and influence in fact, in theory they were not entitled to power and influence and, therefore, they had to be challenged constantly.

The examples of Turkish unpredictability and arbitrariness regarding the Phanariots are many. And although in several cases Turkish cruelty can be rationalized by a Phanariot double game, it appears that in most cases the culprit was intrigue, jealousy, vengeance, greed and corruption; those were the elements of behavior and action prevalent in the Ottoman socio-political system.<sup>112</sup> As a result, many loyal and efficient Phanariots, such as John Ipsilanti in 1737, Constantine Ghika in 1741, Nicolas Mavroyeni in 1789, and Constantine Handjery in 1799, were executed and had their fortunes confiscated.<sup>113</sup> Still others ended up in exile, or poorer men like C. Mavrocordato who, although a successful governor of Wallachia six times and Moldavia four times, had to sell his ancestral house at Constantinople and to pawn his grandfather's library to an English merchant.<sup>114</sup> During the Napoleonic wars the international political fluidity worsened the already untenable Phanariot position. Indeed, Michael Soutso and the brothers Panayoti and Demetre Mourouzi were decapitated.<sup>115</sup> Even as late as 1818, John Karadja, prince of Wallachia, fled to western Europe to escape from the executioners of the Ottoman minister Hallet-effendi, who favoured the intrigues of Karadja's rivals.<sup>116</sup>

The most typical demonstration of Turkish arbitrariness vis-à-vis the Phanariots, however, is offered by the life of Alexandre Ipsilanti, grand-father of the leader of the Philike Etairia and "le reveur de l' alliance permanent entre la force turque et l' esprit grec".<sup>117</sup> Alexandre was a very efficient Ottoman official.<sup>118</sup> For all his contribution, however, Alexandre's enemies in Constantinople found an opportunity to attack him when his sons Constantine (19 years of age) and Demetre (17) fled to Transylvania for reasons unrelated to politics. As a result, Alexandre was forced to resign and was exiled to Rhodos.<sup>119</sup> Later, after paying another heavy monetary price, he was allowed to become again hospodar in Moldavia (1786-1788) and Wallachia (1796-1797) only to be deposed again due to his anti-French sentiments. In fact, he was replaced by C. Handjeri who was decapitated two years later for his pro-French sentiments! Finally, in 1806, when Alexandre's son Constantine Ipsilanti fled to Russia to escape the Turkish executioners, Alexandre (living at the time in Constantinople) was arrested, tortured and executed at the age of eighty, and his family properties were confiscated.<sup>120</sup>

Thus, the arbitrariness of the Ottoman rulers could affect any Christian subject regardless of position or wealth. "All in Turkey fear for their life and property, particularly the rich", reads a contemporary document.<sup>121</sup> The Turkish impositions and corruptions, however, had existed for a long time and therefore could not by themselves have turned the Greek aristocracy against the Turks. They added, nevertheless, to the mounting frustration of a good number of the Phanariots, who by the eve of the revolution had had enough of the Turkish heavy-handed tactics and were eager for an active solution to their problems. Capodistrias writes in his autobiography about a meeting he had with two of them in 1818: "In their discussion with me, they strove to prove to me that the continuation of peace with the Turks was

impossible and that, as Greeks, they burned to learn that the Russian armies were on the eve of crossing the Pruth".<sup>12</sup>

#### A. Ipsilanti and the conservatism of the wealthy merchants

In this psychologically vulnerable period of the Phanariot existence, crucial developments took place which deradicalized the secret revolutionary movement and thus allowed a section of the Greek aristocracy to reconcile its status and beliefs with the subversive conspiracy. The development, in particular, that facilitated the Phanariot transformation into revolutionaries was the increasing conservatism of both the leadership and the membership of the Philike Etairia. Indeed, in the early years, not many upper class Greeks had become members, and the ones who were made persistent efforts to clarify the real nature of the Etairia's relations with Russia. After all, the Greek wealthy classes, fearing a popular rising, would rather free Greece from "above" with the aid of Russia. Accordingly, it was necessary for the movement to find a leader among the Greek upper classes and, if possible, one connected with Russia.

In April 1820, therefore, the Phanariot Alexandre Ipsilanti was persuaded by the Etairist E.Xanthos to assume leadership of the revolutionary movement.<sup>123</sup> Alexandre, the son of Constantine Ipsilanti, was a scion of one of the greatest and most renowned Phanariot families. A Russian officer and hero of the battle of Dresden (1813), where he lost his right arm, Ipsilanti was also a general at the age of 25, and an aide-de camp and protégé of the Tsar.<sup>124</sup> The presence of such an ardent monarchist and Tsar's protégé at the head of the Etairia seemed to guarantee for the Phanariots and the other wealthy classes two things : the conservative political goal of the movement, and the help of Russia.<sup>125</sup> Ipsilanti, the Phanariots thought, could never accept the leadership of a revolutionary organization without the consent of Alexandre

I. In fact, Ipsilanti himself, like the rest of the Etairists, sought persistently to cultivate the impression of Russian help. When he started the Revolution in March 1821, he promised the Moldavians that "si, par hasard, de misérable Turks dans leur désespoir osent faire des incursions sur votre territoire, n' en soyez pas effrayés, car une force toute puissance est prête à punir leur audace".<sup>126</sup> The presence thus of Ipsilanti at the helm of the revolutionary society made the Greek upper classes feel more at ease with the nature and goals of the Philike Etairia. "A cette époque", asserts A. Daskalakis, "beaucoup de Phanariotes... s' associent à l' Etairie".<sup>127</sup>

Similarly in the same period, the membership of the Etairia became more conservative, a fact which facilitated the final transformation of many Phanariots from diplomats into revolutionaries. Indeed in the early years, the founders of the secret society and the people who formed its membership were petty merchants and adventurers who had emigrated from the Balkan countryside during the surge of commercial activity that accompanied the French Wars. However, not having the resources or the advanced trading methods of the established Greek bourgeoisie, these men had been ruined by the economic depression that followed the peace of 1814.<sup>128</sup> The early main recruits of the Etairia were, therefore, economically frustrated men who resented Muslim power and wealth in their own land, and felt that an ethno-religious revolution would offer them the opportunity to improve their financial lot.

On the other hand, the wealthy and established Greek merchants wanted nothing to do with the Etairia in the early years. Most of these wealthy Greeks had emigrated much earlier and were in control of the Hellenic communities abroad. Their desire to share their good fortune with the rest of the Greeks was genuine and indeed many among them had

bestowed generous gifts upon their compatriots of the Ottoman empire. They were not keen, however, to pay the price of a social uprising to deliver Greece. Instead, they had chosen to believe that national independence could be achieved only after the Ottoman Greeks became educated enough to be ready for self-determination.

This conservative bourgeoisie consisted of two important groups: the wealthy merchants of the diaspora who since the late seventeenth century had established networks with commercial offices in cities as diverse as Amsterdam, Vienna, Paris and London; and the great shipowners of the Aegean islands who had amassed immense fortunes during the blockades of the French and Napoleonic wars. Both groups had learned from the West the nationalistic ideas of the late eighteenth century but, unlike the Phanariots, they took up the neo-Hellenic cause in its post-Napoleonic sense, free from Byzantinism and aristocratic pretensions. They favored Greek independence, however, only inasmuch as it did not result into a social revolution, or entailed only the transfer of wealth from one small group to another, that is from wealthy Turks to themselves. For this reason, they were distrustful of the poorer and more radical merchants who formed the early membership of the Etairia.

After the Napoleonic wars, however, the post-war economic slump and successful competition by the Austrian Jewish merchants hit Greece's maritime commerce very hard. As a result, by 1820, the profits of the wealthy Greek bourgeoisie had been affected seriously. This decline of profit brought many wealthy merchants to seek membership in the Etairia.<sup>129</sup> Thus both the election of Ipsilanti and economic considerations served to attract the wealthy and conservative bourgeoisie who had not hitherto joined the revolutionary conspiracy. This further conservative transformation of the

movement reassured many Phanariots and induced them to become members. "A cette dernière période", wrote Daskalakis, "à laquelle l' Etairie avait pris une expansion extraordinaire à travers l' empire et les communautés grecques de l' Europe, plusieurs hommes appartenant plutôt à la noblesse moyenne de Phanar... étaient habilement attirés par les hétairistes".<sup>130</sup> Thus, the original plans of the founders of the Etairia did not prevail until the end. In fact, "The revolt was....devoted not...to a social transformation in which all Greeks would be equal in the eyes of the nation, but to the enrichment and preservation of a traditional oligarchy".<sup>131</sup>

At any rate, it appears that the increasing conservatism of the Etairist leadership and membership was another factor which, along with future uncertainty and mounting frustration, finally turned many Phanariots into revolutionaries. As for those who even until 1821 had chosen to remain neutral or loyal to the Sultan, the coup de grace came with the irruption of the revolution and the ensuing Turkish retributions. Indeed, after the news of the insurrection in the Principalities reached Constantinople, the Turks executed a large number of members of Phanariot families such as the Mourouzies, the Handjeris, the Mavrocordatos, the Callimachis, the Mavrogenis as well as the Manos, the Scavanies, the Photinos and others.<sup>132</sup> This explosion of Turkish wrath left no alternatives for those Phanariots who still had qualms about following the revolutionary path. By that time, however, broad segments of the Phanariots had already chosen liberty from golden servitude. It suffices to say that by 1821 three of the four "most trusted" Phanariot families were already members of the Philike Etairia. As Andre Otetea has put it, "Des quatre familles choisisés, une seule, celle d' Aleco Soutso, allait justifier son élévation par sa fidelité a la Porte. Les autres étaient heteristes...".<sup>133</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The Greek aristocracy was prompted to strive for the attainment of power as a nation and not simply as a class due primarily to future uncertainty, Turkish arbitrariness, faith in Russian aid, and the deradicalization of the revolutionary movement. By 1821, frustration and insecurity along with a determination to destroy the limits set by the actions of the Ottomans caused many Phanariots to throw in their lot with the insurgents. One should not, however, fail to include as a motive some genuine patriotism based on Byzantine Hellenism. But the Phanariots, influenced more by French culture than French politics, were primarily diplomats, reformers and educators. After the French Revolution, finding themselves in the midst of a European power struggle, and doubting both the liberalism of the middle class and the reaction of the Church, they used diplomacy and political acumen to preserve their status and their ideas. The card of Russia was always there. But when Napoleon came into play the Phanariots tried to accommodate him, although they soon were disillusioned by his opportunism. Nevertheless, throughout the Napoleonic wars, they paid particular attention to international diplomacy, seeking an agreement that would safeguard their future both as Ottoman vassals and neo-Byzantinists.

By 1821, however, their three dimensional existence was no longer tenable. The new historical idea of modern nationalism not only demanded the exclusion of Ottomanism but also rendered impossible the very essence of the Phanariot belief in a combination of Byzantinism and neo-Hellenism. Thus by 1821, many Phanariots, disillusioned with the Europeans and tired of Turkish coercion, made a final effort to combine the two ideas by the force of

arms. And although their effort failed in the fields of the Danubian Principalities, the shot fired by Ipsilanti incited the Greeks of Peloponnese into revolutionary action. Indeed, in less than a month after the uprising in the Principalities the people of the whole peninsula of Morea had arisen against the Turks.

Many Greek aristocrats, thus, proved that, despite their gradualist tradition, they were capable of revolutionary activism. In fact, some Phanariots became national heroes in the struggle for Greek emancipation. Alexandre Ipsilanti became the enthusiastic, if careless, leader of the abortive revolution in Moldavia. His brothers Demetrios and Nicolaos after the defeat in the Principalities joined the Greeks of the Peloponnese in another (truly national) revolution which resulted in a free Greek kingdom. Also, Alexandre Mavrocordato, the future prime minister of the new kingdom, threw his lot in with the revolt while deploring the barbarities of the opening stages and wishing that the Greeks had been given another ten years at least to grow and to prepare. One can find many Phanariot participants in the Greek War of Independence : Constantine and George Karadja, Theodore Negris, Mathieu Cantacuzene, Constantine Rosseti or Demetre Soutso. Even more Phanariot names appear in the lists of families executed by the Turks after the beginning of the hostilities. And one, of course, cannot fail to cite those who contributed financially such as Mando Mavroyenni and Michael Soutso. These people demonstrated that, by 1821, they had been imbued with a strong sense of Hellenism that allowed them to become revolutionaries when their former hopes failed to materialize. Indeed, it was a Phanariot, Alexandre Ipsilanti who, when Capodistrias told him to beware of "these miserable merchants' clerks", retorted : "And what will become of these poor



Greeks. Will they always be slaughtered by the Turks, and will politics do nothing for them?". 134

#### **NOTES: CHAPTER 4**

- \* Cited in J. C. Voyatzidis, "La Grande Idée", p. 287.
- 1. John Kordatos, pp. 317- 318.
- 2. C. Koumarianou, p. 72. See, also, George D. Frangos, p. 91.
- 3. "Political Pamphleteering: The Greek Nomarchy or a Word about Freedom (1806)". The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821. ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), pp. 106-117.
- 4. Filitti, *Role Diplomatique*, p. 161, Koumarianou, pp. 69-72. Kordatos, pp. 307-320.
- 5. Denis Deletant, p. 233.
- 6. *Ibid.*, 233, N. Iorga "La Pénétration", pp. 28-30.
- 7. Germaine Lebel, La France et les Principautés Danubiennes (Paris, 1955), p. 301.
- 8. Deletant, p. 233. See, also, Vlad Georgescu, p. 72.
- 9. N. Iorga "La Pénétration", pp. 33-34; Sir Charles Eliot, p.281. See, also, D.A. Zakynthinos, p. 34.
- 10. P. Zepos, "La Politique sociale", p. 82.
- 11. *Karpat*, p. 36.
- 12. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
- 13. As N. Iorga has put it "un ouvrage Français publié en traduction greque, n' était pas destiné seulement a la nation greque, mais pouvait servir a tout lecteur qui desirant s' imiter aux idées occidentales n'avait pas encore appris le Français. Iorga, "La Pénétration", p. 28.
- 14. *Karpat*, p. 38; D.A. Zakynthinos, p. 106 ; Frangos, pp. 93-94.

15. N. Iorga "La Pénétration", p. 33-34; Lebel, pp. 301-302.
16. V. Mihordea, "Contribution aux Relations Franco-Roumaines au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle". Mélanges offerts A M. Nicolas Iorga ( Paris, 1933), p. 895.
17. The reasons for the decline of French political influence on the Ottoman Near East were two: Louis XV's friendly foreign policy towards Austria (starting in 1756-57), which essentially meant the abandonment, for the first time, of the traditional Turkish ally. But also, the internal difficulties of Louis XVI weakened French prestige and reduced France to a neutral spectator in the partition of Poland and the increasing weakening of the Ottoman Empire by Russia. See Filitti, p. 149. Lebel, p.52-58. See,also, J.D. Ghikas, "La France et les Principautés Danubiennes de 1789 à 1815", Annals de L' Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques Vol II (Paris, 1896 ), p. 208
18. N. Iorga, "La Pénétration", p. 15.
19. Michordea, p. 898; Ghikas, p.213; Georgescu, p. 26.
20. J.D. Ghikas, p. 209.
21. Ibid., 210.
22. Georgescu, p. 67.
23. A. Sturdza, p. 265.
24. Gianpietro Nagni was secretary of the princes of Moldavia from 1763 to 1768. François Linchou was secretary of prince Constantine Racovitza from 1750 to 1754. For the correspondence of French ambassadors with the secretaries of the Phanariot hospodars, see Jean Filitti, Lettres et Extraits concernant les Relation de Principautés Roumaines avec la France, 1728-1810 (Bucharest, 1915).
25. Ibid., p. 207.
26. Ibid., p. 210 ; C.Th. Dimaras, p. 150.
27. French revolutionary ideas had reached the Danubian Lands, in the early 1790s, through Jacobin agents and consuls such as Hortolan and Emile Gaudin. Also, French revolutionary writing was read in the Principalities very early. Vlad Georgescu, pp. 71-72; D. Deletant, p. 233.
28. J. D. Ghikas, p. 210.

29. Filitti, *Rôle Diplomatique*, p. 159.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 162. Actually, Kodrika was executed in 1802 for his subversive activities. Georgescu, p. 72.
32. Ghikas, p. 228.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 229 ; Filitti *Rôle Diplomatique*, p. 180.
34. C. Ipsilanti, for example, had forbidden the boyars to contact the French diplomatic agents in Buharest, and even dismissed those who disobeyed the order. Vlad Georgescu, p. 141.
35. Filitti, *Rôle Diplomatique*, p. 168.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
37. Especially after the treaty of Campo Formio ( 1797)and the invasion of Egypt (1798), Lebel, p. 220-222; Filitti, p. 175.
38. Filitti, *Rôle Diplomatique*, p. 159-159, 174.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 181, 187.
40. Count Ioannis Capodistrias: "A sketch of my Career between 1798 and 1822" *The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821*, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), p. 137.
41. Ghikas, p. 216.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
43. See, for example, the orders of M. Soutso (1783)and N. Caradja (1782). Georgescu, p. 141.
44. For the Phanariot intolerance towards the bourgeois spirit, see the dialogue regarding the language question between P. Codrika and Adamantios Coraes, Kordatos, pp. 579-584.
45. Rizo Neroulos, p. 45.
46. C.Th. Dimaras, p. 172.
47. Demetre S. Soutso, pp. 224-245.

48. Ibid., p. 245 ; C. Th. Dimaras, p. 171.
49. C. Th. Dimaras, p. 172.
50. David Thompson, pp. 92-106.
51. Dankwart A. Rustow, A World of Nations, Problems of Political Modernization (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 3.
52. J.C. Hobhouse, A Journey through Albania and Other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia to Constantinople during the years 1809 and 1810 ( London, 1813)II, p. 597.
53. Filitti, Rôle Diplomatique, p. 165.
54. Ibid. Another story has him as descendant of Calomeri Porphyrogenetos - a Byzantine emperor. See,also, Lebel, p. 86.
55. Filitti, Rôle Diplomatique, p. 181.
56. Ibid., p 178; Ghikas, p. 323-325; Ipsilanti, in fact, had written earlier a manifesto against France. Filitti, p. 167.
57. L.S. Stavrianos, Balkan Federation, p. 37,39
58. Ibid., pp. 37, 39, 41.
59. A. Vandal, Napoléon et Alexandre Ier Vol. I. (Paris, 1891), pp. 4-5.
60. Ghikas., p.321; Vlad Georgescu, p. 72.
61. "Par leur façon de conduire la Politique étranger de la Turquie", wrote Gion Ionesco, "ils (Phanariots) réussirent à metre aux Carpathes et au Pruth un obstacle séculaire, à empêcher la destruction de l' Empire du Sultan dans un moment ou un partage de la Turquie aurait été accepté par l' Europe avec une indifférence étonnée comme celui de la Pologne". Gion Ionescu, Histoire des Phanariotes (in Roumanian) Reprinted from P. A. Argyropoulos; "Les Grecs au service de l' Empire ottoman", Le Cinq- Centième Anniversaire, p.172. See, also, Filitti, pp. 20-21.
62. Filitti, Rôle Diplomatique, p. 182.
63. Ibid., p. 188.

64. Ibid., p. 195.
65. Ibid.
66. L.S. Stavrianos, Balkan Federation, p.37-44; Filitti, Role Diplomatique, p. 178.
67. Phanariot services, wrote Borge Knös, were welcomed everywhere due to their vast culture and their profound knowledge of the international situation. Furthermore, their ability was enhanced by their "Byzantine" flexibility, sense of opportunism and duplicity. Borge Knös, p. 386. See, also, G.L. Ars, "On the Life in Russia of The Greek Patriotic Family of Ipsilanti" Balkan Studies (1982) p. 84 ;Stavrianos, Balkan Federation, p. 33; Filitti, Role Diplomatique, pp. 179, 187, 191; Lebel, p. 325.
68. Filitti, Role Diplomatique, pp. 180, 187, 195.
69. Argyropoulos, p. 175; D.A. Zakyntinos, p. 149.
70. A few years later, Scarlat Callimachi and John Caradja were exploring even the possibility of independence. In fact, Caradja's project was presented to Capodistria and Alexander the Ist in 1817. Georgescu, p. 151. Argyropoulos, p. 175.
71. Filitti, Rôle Diplomatique, pp. 207, 180, 186.
72. Encouraged by Adam Chartoryski and the victories of the Serbians C. Ipsilanti expressed some federalist ideas which included the creation of a large Christian Balkan state governed by his family. Similarly, a few years earlier (1792) Alexandre Mavrocordato (Firari) had persuaded Saint Petersburg to constitute in his favour a "new Wallachia". In fact, according to the Prussian diplomat Von Knobelsdorf's report of 1792, "tout le pays compris entre le Dnister et le Bug sera constitué ce principat. On dit que le gouvernement en sera confié au prince Mavrocordato, le même qui peu de temps avant le commencement de la guerre avait passé aux Russes". A. Sturdza, p. 263 ; Vlad Georgescu, p. 170; Filitti, pp. 178,187, 195.
73. Norman Saul, pp.96-100. See, also, Ioannis Capodistrias, "A sketch ", p. 136.
74. Georgescu, p. 152; D.A. Zakyntinos, p. 149.
75. See, for example, the plan of M. Codrika in Stavrianos, Balkan Federation, p. 38.

76. Argyropoulos, pp. 170, 172; Zakyntinos, pp. 149-150.
77. Helene E. Koukkos, "La Comtesse Roxandra Stourdza- Edling et sa Contribution a l' Education des Etudiantes Hellènes en Europe", Symposium, (Thessaloniki, 1974), pp. 178.
78. Capodistrias, "A sketch", p. 138.
79. Reprinted from Glynn R. Barratt, "A Russian View of the Greek War of Independence" Balkan Studies (1970), p.61. See, also, "The Memoires of Emmanouil Xanthos", The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), pp. 183-184.
80. Barratt, *ibid.*, p. 61.
81. A. Otetea, "Les Grandes Puissances ", p. 389.
82. Nina Athanassoglou- Kallmyer, French Images from the Greek War of Independence (Yale University, 1989), p. 9.
83. "If the Peace of Tilsit", wrote Capodistrias, "momentarily shook their confidence in Russian protection, other circumstances were to reanimate it and render it more intimate and more profound". Capodistrias, "A sketch", p.137; see also "The Memoirs of E. Xanthos", P. 190.
84. C.W. Crawley, The Question of Greek Independence (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 28-34.
85. Capodistrias, "A sketch", p. 137.
86. *Ibid.*, 138; p. 85.
87. Stavrianos, Balkan Federation, p. 42.
88. George D. Frangos, "The Philiki Etairia", p. 87-103; See, also, "The Memoirs of E. Xanthos", p. 185.
89. D.S Soutsos, p. 250. G.L Ars., p. 80; E. Xanthos, pp. 185-186.
90. G.L Ars., p. 79.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *ibid.*

93. Ap. Daskalakis, "Les Phanariots et la Révolution Grecque de 1821", Symposium, (Thessaloniki, 1974), p 72. See,also, C. Th. Dimaras, p. 171.
94. Ibid. See also E.Xanthos, pp. 185-186.
95. "The address of Count Ioannis Capodistrias to the Greeks" (1819) The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), p. 133.
96. Frangos, p. 90.
97. Capodistrias, "A sketch", p. 138.
98. Helene E. Koukkos, p. 178.
99. Capodistrias, "A sketch", p.139-142. See,also, "Capodistrias and the Philike Etairia 1814-1821", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1973), pp. 105-131, and E. Xanthos, pp. 191-192.
100. Ap. Daskalakis, p. 71.
101. Ibid.
102. A. Otetea, "La désagrégation du régime Phanariote", Symposium, (Thessaloniki, 1974), p. 443.
103. Indeed, the Phanariots had been tired of trying to hold on to "un trône qui pouvait leur être enlevé au moindre caprice d' une Sultan ou à la suite d' une obscure intrigue de Sérail; et surtout donner, donner toujours pour satisfaire l'insatiable cupidité de leur protecteurs à Constantinople". Theodore Blancard, Les Mavroyéni : Essai d' Etude additionnelle à l' Histoire moderne de la Grèce, de la Turquie et de la Roumanie (Paris, 1893), p. 8.
104. Ibid., p.440. It was the Hatti-Houmayan of the 18th December 1818 which became effective in January 1819. According to this statute, only four families (united by blood relationship) could obtain from the Sultan the thrones of the Principalities, and the offices of Dragoman would be reserved for them. Argyropoulos, p. 171.
105. Zakyntinos, pp. 148-150.
106. Richard Clogg, "Aspects of the Movement for Greek Independence", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1973), pp. 2-5; William Eton, A Survey of the Turkish Empire (4th ed.; London, 1809), pp. 190-193, 206-210, 231-233, 275, 278-281, 283-284. See, also, " The

- Decline of Ottoman Central Authority: The Ayans and Derebeys", The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), pp. 17-27.
107. Barbara Jelavich, The Establishment of the Balkan National States 1804-1920 (University of Washington, 1977), pp. 16-19. For a thorough analysis of the decline of the Turkish central authority see Peter Sugar, Southeastern Europe Under Ottoman Rule 1354-1804 (University of Washington Press, 1977), pp. 190-195.
  108. "An urban Riot in the Ottoman Empire: The Smyrna "Rebellion" of 1797", Public Record Office: State papers 105/126, The Movement, ed. Clogg, pp.15-17 ; P. Sugar, pp. 193-195.
  109. Haluk Necdet Goze, Modernism and Traditionalism in the Ottoman Empire 1790-1922, (The American University, Ph.D., 1964), pp. 37-41.
  110. P. Sugar, p. 194.
  111. "Les Turks", wrote Papparigopoulos, "ne regardaient jamais les Chrétiens comme des membres organiques de l' Etat, mais comme une annexe formé de vassaux et tributaires". Cited in Borge Knös, p. 374.
  112. R. Clogg, pp. 3-4 ; P. Sugar, pp. 189, 208.
  113. The list of the Phanariots executed or murdered by the Turks includes Jean Soutso (1760), Stavrachi (1765), Gregory Callimachi (1769), Nicolachi Soutso (1769), Gregory Ghika (1777), Petrachi-Della-Zecca (1778), and Nicolas Mavroyeni (1789). Theodore Blancard, Les Mavroyéni, p.10. See, also, Filitti, 170 ; Soutso, 252; Argyropoulos, p. 160.
  114. Athanasios Komninos Ipsilantis, Ta Meta tin Alosin (1453-1789), ed. G. Aphthonidis (Constantinople, 1870), p. 375; A. Sturdza, p. 201. Actually, there is no example, wrote Blancard, "d' une famille Fanariote qui n' ait eu à endurer, sans chercher à les éviter, les plus grandes injustices et les dernières indignités de la part des Turcs". Theodore Blancard, Les Mavroyéni, p. 10.
  115. Filitti, Rôle Diplomatique, pp. 192, 199 ; A. Sturdza, p. 275.
  116. Andrei Pippidi, "Jean Caradja et ses Amis de Geneve", Symposium, (Thessalonike, 1974), p. 191.
  117. Iorga, Byzance, p. 243.



118. Const. C. Giurescu, p. 63.
119. Ibid., p. 65.
120. Ibid ; Iorga, Byzance, p. 243.
121. "Greece under Ottoman Rule : A Greek Perspective (Geographia Neoteriki)", The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821, ed. R. Clogg (London, 1976), pp. 3-5.
122. Count Ioannis Capodistrias: "A sketch ", p. 142.
123. E. Xanthos, pp. 192-200.
124. G. L. Ars, pp. 73-89.
125. Ibid., pp. 75-76.
126. A. Otetea, "Le Grandes Puissances", p. 382 ; A. Despotopoulos, p. 406.
127. A. Daskalakis, p. 92.
128. "The Memoires of E. Xanthos", pp. 182-200.
129. George D. Frangos, p. 90, 93, 95.
130. A. Daskalakis, p. 72.
131. George Frangos, p. 100.
132. Soutsos., p. 231.
133. A. Otetea, "La désagrégation", p. 440.
134. Count Ioannis Capodistrias: "A sketch", p. 145.

## Conclusions

In the course of this work we have attempted to explain, in historical and sociological terms, the role and motivations of Phanariot aristocracy from their ascendancy as a social class to the eve of the Greek Revolution. Particular emphasis has been placed on the diverse and almost contradictory currents of Phanariot thought as it related to the Ottoman establishment, Byzantine tradition, and Greek Nationalism, and on how this diversity affected their action.

The Phanariot ascendancy was a corollary of the Turkish vulnerability in the late seventeenth century, and of Greek political reconciliation with Ottoman power. As a result, a Greco-Turkish political collaboration was formed that opened a vast field of action for Greek intelligence and flexibility since the Phanariots had the mission to serve as intermediaries between the foreign powers and the Porte.

For these Phanariot administrators and diplomats, assimilation with the Ottomans was not a goal. Instead, they believed that a Helleno-Turkish collaboration could establish a lasting mutual need which in turn would provide the Greek people with new opportunities. Thus, according to the Phanariots' early aspirations, the Ottoman empire could be transformed, in time, into a multinational state, governed by an upcoming Greek political and ecclesiastical aristocracy in equal (or even dominant) partnership with the Muslim element.

This Helleno-Turkish understanding also established the Phanariots as a governing class in the Danubian Principalities, where their record often demonstrates a tendency towards corruption, duplicity and opportunism. One

should not forget, however, that they were Ottoman officials subjected to the imperial system. More importantly, they were Greeks and Christians under Muslim and Turkish masters, and their situation required them to be crafty and often dubious calculators.

The Phanariot commitment to the Turks, however, did not prevent them from seeking the support of the Great Powers, particularly correlative Russia, when the Ottoman empire entered an era of internal difficulties in the second half of the eighteenth century. Thus, the Phanariots were diplomats who served the Porte and the Principalities while serving their own interests as nobles, Greeks, and Orthodox Christians. These interests were the counterpart of the services they rendered to the Porte. Indeed, utilizing the credit they had obtained in foreign courts, the Greek aristocrats struggled through collaboration and diplomacy to acquire a form of self-reliance that would gradually strengthen the Greco-Christian position within the empire vis-à-vis Turkish arbitrary power and Catholic encroachment. This Phanariot effort towards consolidation and international ratification of their position was part of a greater goal: the liberation from the foreign yoke and the establishment of a "Byzantine" multinational state based on Greek language and Orthodox religion. And although French enlightened ideas had started to influence them, it was Tsarist Russia that became the political model for their aspirations.

Thus, along with the hope in a future Helleno-Turkish partnership, the Phanariots sought at the same time to undermine the Ottoman empire and to replace it with their own regime, preferably one that resembled the empire before the Conquest. As a result, the Phanariot position was extremely delicate and their thought hidden. Consequently, they appeared to the common Greeks and to contemporary travellers as an iniquitous lot who

lived by intrigue and base adulation. But although the Phanariots followed a policy without scruples that occasionally had nothing to do with the desires of the common people, they were also philanthropists and reformers combining in their good deeds a blend of Byzantine soul saving and eighteenth century enlightened utilitarianism.

It appears, then, that the Phanariot mind contained elements from both the old and the new worlds. Accordingly their Byzantinism was not without a new-found emphasis on Hellenism. In fact, the most important contribution of the early Phanariots was to have laid the foundation for a psychological regeneration of the Greek people as a political force. In the eighteenth century, as the Church gradually lost its preponderant role, it was the Phanariots who guided the Greeks to a new sentiment of political self-awareness and attempted to re-hellenize their religious identity. Consequently, the Greek aristocracy came gradually to represent a lay spirit of education and Greek self-awareness as opposed to the old ecclesiastical spirit.

Phanariot Byzantinism, however, could not be completely replaced by modern nationalism. This idea, when spread in the late eighteenth century among the Greek middle classes, called for the foundation on the territories of ancient Greece of an exclusively Greek state imbued with a national rather than Byzantine conscience. This notion was incompatible with Phanariot designs. A national state would exclude the majority of Orthodox Christians within the Ottoman empire from the new political unit. After all, the Greek position in the Balkans was never based on a compact territory or a large and united population but rather on a loose influence based on commerce, religion, literature, language and tradition. In a large empire the Greeks could always be in a position to develop and establish themselves in great commercial and educational centers where their active nature would find

plentiful opportunities and resources to prosper and lead the way in education and politics. In contrast, a national state could mean a confinement of the Greek restlessness within the boundaries of a poor and undeveloped corner of the Ottoman dominions. For these reasons, the Phanariots reserved for the Greeks an imperial destiny and chose to superimpose the new idea of nationalism upon their Byzantinism without realizing that the two are mutually exclusive.

The result was that the ideas of nation and empire were combined in the Phanariot mind. Accordingly, the Phanariots felt themselves to be the proud members of a "race" that was the sole representative of both Byzantine imperial greatness and ancient Greek wisdom. And they dreamt of a future territorial state that would be the unique recipient of all the cultural heritage, religious righteousness and imperial pride of Byzantium as well as the birthplace of Plato and Aristotle: a new center of Christian and Greek civilization.

The Byzantine component of the Phanariot mind, however, prevented them from appreciating the new era that was inaugurated by the French Revolution. Indeed, the Phanariots, although influenced by the eighteenth century enlightened thought, never considered accommodating their Greco-Byzantine vision to liberal or radical views. To be sure, as Byzantinists and "enlightened despots" the Phanariots were capable of envisioning a cosmopolitan environment receptive to new ideas, but they could not by virtue of their position in the empire and the sources of their wealth accept the French ideas of liberty and equality.

Hence the Phanariot class was not a revolutionary group. A revolution could destroy the complex network of Greek influence within the Ottoman government and the privileges and future hopes associated with it .

Accordingly, the hopes of the Greek aristocracy were based on a gradual solution of the Eastern Question and not an abrupt uprising that would endanger the century old effort of Greco-Christian consolidation and the vision of a large state. In particular, the Phanariots were afraid of revolutionary action based merely on enthusiasm. Such an eventuality would inhibit sound reflection and would put the whole project of Greek emancipation in peril before the cautious process of the circumstances provide gradually the means for a durable success.

Thus, the Phanariots, on the whole, were gradualists. Yet, their sentiments as subject people made them candidates for action against Turkish arbitrary power. More importantly, their Hellenism infused into them a pride that, in time, would allow a good number among them to become revolutionaries. Indeed, the post-Napoleonic era revealed a European indifference towards Greek aspirations, while the Turks proved to be incapable of perceiving the Greek aristocracy as anything more than "hired slaves" destined to "do a job" and be dispensed with at the whim of the Sultan. As a result, by 1821, many among the Phanariots had been influenced by revolutionary ideas and, when their conspiratorial involvement reached a point of no return, they threw their lot in with the insurgents. So, despite their anti-revolutionary tradition, many Phanariots demonstrated in 1821 that within their diverse personality there were also the seeds of a revolutionary activism.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES

#### Government Publications

Nystazopoulou-Pelekidis Marie, "Documents Roumain des Archives du Couvent de Saint Jean le Théologien"; Inventaire des Actes Roumains en Faveur du Couvent de Patmos, Symposium L'Epoque Phanariote (Thessaloniki, 1974) pp. 433-437.

Sfyroeras Basile, Documents des Archives Générales d'Athènes, Collection Zerlentis dossier 153; in index of "Les Mavroyéni et la Vie Économique de la Mer Égée", in Symposium L'Epoque Phanariote (Thessaloniki, 1974) pp. 335-339.

Topping W. Peter, The Public Archives of Greece, American Archivist XV (July, 1952) pp. 249-257.

#### MS Collections

Camariano Nestor, "Trois lettres de Jean Capodistrias envers Manoun Bey 1816-17" Balkan Studies (1970), pp. 97-105.

Clogg Richard (ed.), The Movement for Greek Independence 1770-1821: A Collection of Documents, (London, 1976) .

Filitti I. C., ed., Lettres et Extraits Concernant les relations des Principautés Roumaines avec la France, 1728-1810 (Bucharest, 1915) .

Kolokotronis Theodoros, Memoirs from the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1833. Trans : G. Tertzetis (Chicago, 1969) .

Leicester Stanhope, Series of Letters and other Documents on the Greek Revolution (London, 1825 ).

Makriyannis, The Memoires of General Makriyannis, Edit and trans. by H.A. Lidderdale, (London, 1966 ).

Mavrocordatos Alexandros, Istoria Iera itoi ta Ioudaika, ed. Livadas (Bucharest, 1716);

----- The Collected Letters of Alexandros Mavrocordatos, ed. Livadas (Trieste, 1879).

Papadopoulos T.H., Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish domination (Brussels, 1953).

Stourdza Alexandre, L'Europe Orientale et la Rôle Historique Des Mavrocordato 1660-1830, avec un Appendice Contenant des Actes et Documents Historiques et Diplomatiques inedits (Paris, 1913).

Xanthos Emmanouil, Apomnimoneumata peri tis Philikis Etairias (Athens, 1845).

Ipsilanti Nicolas, Memoires du prince Nicolas Ypsilanti d'après le manuscrit no 2144 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Grèce. Publié par D. G. Kambouroglou (Athènes, 1901).

Travellers' and Consuls' Accounts

Bauer E. De, Histoire de la Moldavie et de la Valachie (1781).

Colson Felix, Confidences sur la Turquie (Paris, 1855).

Carra J. L., Histoire de la Moldavie et de la Vallachie, avec une dissertation sur l'état actuel de ces provinces (Jassy, 1777).

Didot Ambroise, Notes d'un Voyage fait dans le Levant en 1816 et 1817, (Paris, 1826 ).



Hobhouse J. C., A Journey through Albania and other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia to Constantinople during the years 1809 and 1810 (London, 1813).

Peyssonnel D. De, Observations Historiques et Géographiques sur les Peuples Barbares (Paris, 1765).

Regnault Elias, Histoire Politique et Sociale des Principautés Danubiennes (Paris, 1855).

Thornton Thomas, The Present State of Turkey or a description of the political civil and religious constitution, government and laws of the Ottoman Empire (London, 1807).

Wilkinson W. An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia (London, 1820).

## SECONDARY SOURCES

### Theses

Frangos D. George, The Philike Etairia, 1814-1821 : A Social and Historical Analysis Ph.D. Thesis (Columbia University, 1971).

Malakis Emile, French Travellers in Greece 1770-1820 Ph.D. Thesis (Philadelphia, 1925).

Goze Haluk Necdet, Modernism and Traditionalism in the Ottoman Empire 1790-1922 Ph.D. Thesis (The American University, 1964).

### Books

Angus Samuel, The Environment of Early Christianity (N. York, 1915).

Antonakaki-Dendrinou Kalliniki, Greek Education (New York, 1955).

Athanasoglou-Kallmyer N., French Images from the Greek war of Independence (Yale, 1989).

Batalden Stephen, Catherine II's Greek Prelate : Eugenios Voulgaris in Russia 1771-1806 (N. York, 1982).

Baynes N. H., ed., Byzantine Studies and Other Essays (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1955).

Blancard Theodore, Les Mavroyeni : Essai d'Etude Additionnelle à l'Histoire Modern de la Grèce de la Turquie et la Roumanie (Paris, 1893).

Cavarnos Constantine, Modern Greek Thought (Massachusetts, 1969).

Chaconas S.G., Adamantios Corais : A Study in Greek Nationalism (New York, 1942 ).

Crawley C. W., The Question of Greek Independence: A Study of the British Policy in the Near East, 1821-1833 ( Cambridge, 1930 ).

Clogg Richard, Balkan Society in the Age of the Greek Independence, ed.(London, 1981);

----- The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed.(London, 1973).

Dakin Douglas, Unification of Greece 1770-1923 (London, 1968); The Greek Struggle for Independence ,(London, 1973 ).

Dapontes C., Kathreptis Gynaikon (Leipzig, 1766) .

Dimaras C. Th., La Grèce au temps des Lumières (Geneva, 1969).

----- A History of Modern Greek Literature, (Albany, 1972).

----- Demetrios Katartzis, The Extant Works, ed. (Athens,1970).

Djordjevic Dimitrije and Fischer-Galati S., The Balkan Revolutionary Tradition (New York, 1981).

Driault Ed., La Renaissance de l'Hellénism (Paris, 1920).

----- Napoleon et la Resurrection de la Grèce (Paris, 1924).

Eliot Charles, Turkey in Europe (London, 1965).

Filitti J. C., Rôle Diplomatique des Phanariotes de 1700 à 1821 (Paris, 1901).

- Finlay G., A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present time; B.C. 146 to A.D. 1869, ed. Tozer, V and VI vols (Oxford, 1870, 1877).
- Daskalakis Apostolos, Causes of and Contributing Factors to the Greek Revolution of 1821 ( Paris, 1927 ).
- Frazer Charles, The Orthodox Church and Independent Greece 1821-1852 (Cambridge, 1969).
- Gennadios J. A., A Sketch of the History of Education in Greece (Edinburgh, 1925).
- Georgescu Vlad, Political Ideas and the Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities 1750-1831 (New York, 1971).
- Geweher Wesley, The Rise of Nationalism in the Balkans 1800-1930 (Archon Books, 1967 ).
- Gobineau Le Compt de, Deux Etudes sur la Grèce. Capodistriasis-Le Royaume des Hellenes (Paris, 1905).
- Gooch G. P., Studies in Modern History (N. York, 1968).
- Hayes C. J., Essays on Nationalism (N. York, 1962).
- Henderson G. P., The Revival of Greek Thought 1620-1830 (New York, 1970).
- Iorga N., Byzance après Byzance, (Bucharest, 1935).
- La Révolution Française et le Sud-Est de L'Europe, (Bucharest, 1934).
- Roumains et Grecs au cours des siècles (Bucharest, 1921).
- A History of Roumania (London, 1925).
- Institute for Balkan Studies, Les Relations Greco-Russes pendant la domination Turque et la Guerre d'Indépendance Grecque (Thessaloniki, 1983).
- Ipsilanti Athanasios Komninos, Ta Meta tin Alosin (1453-1789), ed. G. Aphonidis (Constantinople, 1870).

Jelavitch Barbara, History of the Balkans Vol I 18th and 19th centuries (New York, 1983).

----- The Establishment of the Balkan National States 1804-1920  
(University of  
Washington, 1977).

Kedourie E. Nationalism in Asia and Africa (London, 1970).

Knös Borge, L'Histoire de la Littérature Néo-Grecque (Uppsala, 1962).

Kohn H., The Idea of Nationalism (N. York : MacMillan Company, 1962).

Kordatos John, The Great History of Greece, Vol. IX (Athens, 1956).

Kolbert C. F., trans., Digest of Roman Law (Penguin Books, 1979).

Lebel G., La France et les Principautés Danubiennes (Paris, 1955).

McKay J. P., Hill B. D., Buckler J., A History of Western Society, Third Edition,  
Volume I: From antiquity to Enlightenment (University of Illinois, 1987).

Meriage Lawrence, Russia and the First Serbian Insurrection 1804-1813 (New York, 1987).

Pallis A.A., The Phanariots : A Greek Aristocracy under Turkish Rule  
(London, 1951 ).

Puryear Vernon John, Napoleon and the Dardanelles (Los Angeles, 1930).

----- France and the Levant : From the Bourbon Restoration to the Peace of  
Kutah (Berkley).  
and Los Angeles, 1941).

Rizo-Neroulos Jacovacky, Cours de Littérature Grecque Modern (Paris, 1828).

Runciman Steven, The Great Church in Captivity (Cambridge, 1968).

Sabine G. H., A History of Political Theory (N. York, 1950).

Saul Norman, Russia and the Mediterranean 1797-1807 (Chicago 1970).

Seton-Watson R.W., A History of the Roumanians (Cambridge, 1963 ).

----- The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans (New York, 1966).

Sugar Peter, South Eastern Europe under Ottoman Rule 1354-1804 (London, 1977).

Sorel A., The Eastern Question in the Eighteenth Century, Trans. Bramwell (N. York, 1969).

Soutzos G., The Catechumen or the Cosmogonical Theatre (Venice, 1805).

Stavrianos L. S., Balkan Federation. A History of the movement toward the Balkan unity in modern Times (Northampton Mass., 1944).

----- The Balkans since 1453. (N.York, 1965).

Thompson D., Europe since Napoleon (London, 1957).

Toynbee Arnold A Study of History (London, 1934) Vol. II, pp. 222-228, Vol. VIII 1954, pp. 185-189 .

----- The Western Question in Greece and Turkey (Oxford, 1922).

Tunusli Brothers, History of Wallachia (Bucharest, 1806).

Vacalopoulos A., The Origins of the Greek Nation (New Brunswick, N.J., 1971).

----- The Turkish Rule, 1669-1812 : The Economic Rise and the Enlightenment of the Race (Thessaloniki, 1973).

----- The Origins of the Greek Nation (New Brunswick, 1971).

Valetas G. Epitome Istorias tis Neoellenikis Logotechnias (Athens, 1966).

Ward B., Nationalism and Ideology (New York, 1966).

Ware Timothy, Eustratios, Argenti, A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule (Oxford, 1964).

Woloch Isser, Eighteenth century Europe Tradition and Progress, 1715-1789 (N. York, 1982).

Woodhouse C.M., The Greek War of Independence : Its Historical Settings (London, 1952 ).

Zakynthinos D.A., The Making of Modern Greece (Oxford, 1976 ).

Zallony M.P., Essai sur les Fanariotes (Marseille, 1824).

Articles

Argyropoulos P. A., "Les Grecs au service de l'empire Ottoman", Le Cinquième Anniversaire de la Prise de Constantinople, ed. L'Hellénisme Contemporain (Athens, 1953), pp. 151-178.

Arnakis G., "The Role of Religion in the Development of Balkan Nationalism", Balkans in Transition, ed. Ch. and B. Jelavitch (University of California, 1963).

----- "The Greek Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire" Journal of Modern History XXIV (Sept, 1952), pp. 235-50.

----- "Byzantium and Greece", Balkan Studies 4 (1963) 2 : 379-400.

Ars G. L., "On the Life in Russia of the Greek Patriotic Family of Ipsilanti", Balkan Studies 26 (1985), pp. 73-90.

Barratt, "A Russian View of the Greek War of Independence" Balkan Studies 14 (1973).

Barsanescu Stefann, "La Pensée Pédagogique du Siècle des Lumières d'après des Parchemins Princiers de la seconde moitié du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle destiné aux écoles. Sa Genèse", Symposium L'Époque Phanariote, ed. Institute for Balkan Studies (Thessaloniki, 1974).

Camariano Cioran Ariadna, "Les Academies Princières de Bucharest et de Jassy et leur Professeurs", Balkans Studies 20 1979 168-176.

----- "Le Théâtre grec à Bucharest au debut du XIX siècle", Balcania VI (1943), pp. 381-416.

----- "La Guerre Russo-Turque de 1768-1774 et les Grecs", Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes II (1964), 513-547.

Camariano Nestor, "Nouvelles Information sur la Création et l'activitié de la typographie greque de Jassy 1812-21", Balkan Studies 7 (1966), 61-76.

- "Sur l'activité de la "Société littéraire Gréco-Dasique" de Bucharest 1810-12", Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes II (1968), 39-54.
- Cassimatis Gregoire, "Esquisse d'une sociologie du Phanariotisme", in Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974), 159-166.
- Cicani O., Cernovodeanu, "Contribution à la connaissance de la biographie et de l'oeuvre de Jean (Hierothée) Comnene", Balkan Studies XII (1971)
- Ciornescu Alexandre, "Nicolas Filimon et le Portrait Littéraire du Phanariote", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Ciurea D., "Nicolas Mavrocordato Précurseur Du Despotisme Éclairé", Symposium pp. 359-364.
- Geanakopoulos Deno, "The Diaspora Greeks : The Genesis of Modern Greek National Consiousness", Hellenism and the First Greek War of Liberation (1821-1830) (Thessaloniki, 1976)
- Clogg Richard, "Didaskalia Patriki (1798) : An Orthodox Reaction to French Revolutionary Propaganda", Middle Eastern Studies, V (1965) 97-115.
- Constantiniu Florin "Constantine Mavrocordato et L'Abolition du Servage en Vallachie et en Moldavie", Symposium (1974).
- Crampton R. J., "Bulgarian Society in the early 19th century", Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence ed. Clogg R. (London, 1981).
- Crawly C. W., "John Capodistrias and the Greeks before 1821", Cambridge Historical Journal 13 (1957).
- Crout Georges, "Le Droit Romano-Byzantine dans le Pays Roumains à l'Époque Phanariote", Symposium (1974).
- Dakin Douglas, "The Origins of the Greek Revolution", History 37, 1952.
- Dapontes C., "Istorikos Katalogos", Mesaioniki Vivliothiki, ed., Sathas (Venice, 1872).

- Daskalakis Ap., "Les Phanariots et la Révolution Grecque de 1821", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Demos Raphael, "Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment 1750-1821", Balkan Studies IX (1974).
- Deletant Denis, "Romanian Society in the Danubian Principalities in the early 19th century", Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence ed. Clogg R. (London, 1981).
- Despotopoulos A., "La Révolution Grecque Alexandre Ipsilanti et la politique de la Russie", Balkan Studies VII (1966) 395-410.
- Dima-Dragan Corneliu, "La Bibliophile des Mavrocordato", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Dutu Alexandre, "La Culture Roumaine à L'Époque des Phanariotes: Heritage et nouvelles Acquisitions", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Filitti I. C., ed., "La ancienne solidarité balkanique et la Roumanie", Le Balkans, 5-6 (1934).
- Florescu Radu, "The Fanariot Regime in the Danubian Principalities", Balkan Studies 9 (1968), 301-318.
- Frangos George, "The Philike Etairia : a premature National Coalition", The Struggle for Greek Independence ed. R.Clogg (MacMillan Press, London and Basingstock, 1973).
- Gedeon M., "Peri tis Phanariotikis Koinonias", O en Konstantinoupoli Ellinikos Philologykos Syllogos, XXI (1982).
- Georgescu Valentin Al., "Réalités Roumaines et Initiatives Juridiques Phanariotes", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Ghikas D. J., "La France et les Principautés Danubiennes de 1789 à 1815", Annales de l'Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques V. II (1896) pp. 208-229; 321-352.



- Hatzopoulos Konstantinos, "Greek Volunteers from Wallachia in the Military Corps 'Les Chasseurs d'Orient'during the Campaign of the French Army in Dalmatia (1808-1809)", Balkan Studies 24 1983.
- Henderson G. P., "Greek Philosophy 1600- 1850", The Philosophical Quarterly (1955)
- Iorga N., "Le Despotism Éclairé dans les Pays Roumains au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle", Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Science IX 1939),101-115.
- "La Pénétration des Idées de l'Occident dans le Sud Est de l'Europe aux XVIII<sup>e</sup> et XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle", Revue Historique du Sud-Est European Vol I (1924).
- Ionascu Ion, "Le Degré de L'Influence Des Grecs des Principautés Roumaines Dans la Vie Politique De Ces Pays", Symposium (Thessaloniki,1974).
- Ionascu-Niscov Traian, "L'Epoque Phanariote dans l'Historiographie Roumaine ", Symposium (Thessaloniki,1974).
- Jenkins Romilly, "Byzantium and Byzantinism", Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, First Series 1961-65 (Princeton, 1967).
- Karathanasis Athanasios, "La Participation des Serbes au mouvement anti-ottoman des Princes de Vallachie Catacuzéne et Brancovean XVIII siècle", Balkan Studies 24 (1983).
- Karpat Kemal, "Ottoman Relations in the Balkans after 1683", Balkanistica ed. K. Naylor 1, AASSS, (1974).
- Kitsikis Dimitri, Review of "Ottoman Relations" by K. Karpat, *ibid.*
- Koukos Hélène, "La comtesse Roxandra Stourdza-Edling et sa contribution à l'éducation des étudiantes Hellènes en Europe", Symposium (Thessaloniki,1974).

Koumarianou C., "The contribution of the Intelligentsia towards the Greek Independence Movement, 1798-1821", trans. E. W. King in The Struggle for Greek Independence (London, 1973).

----- "Cosmopolitanism and Hellenism dans le 'Mercure Savant, première revue greque 1811-1821", Proceedings of IVth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association (Fribourg 1964, The Hague, 1966), pp. 601-608.

Kourilas E., "Ta Khrysovoulla ton igemonon tis Moldovlakhias kai to symvolon 10 i Ioannis", Eis mnimin S. Lamprou (Athens, 1935).

Lewis B., "The Impact of the Fr. Revolution on Turkey", Journal of World History I (July, 1953).

Limona Dimitru, "Les Relations Commerciales du Sud-Est de l'Europe à la fin du XIIIe siècle et au Dèbut du XIXe siècle Refletées dans les documents Archivistiques de Bucharest, Sibiu, Brasov", Symposium (Thessalonike, 1974).

Mango Cyril, "Byzantinism and Romantic Hellenism", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes XVIII (1965), pp. 29-43.

Mihordea V., "Contribution aux Relations Franco-Roumains au XVIIIe siècle", Melanges Offerts à Iorga par ses Amis de France (Paris, 1933), pp. 895-924.

Miller W., "Greece under the Turks", Westminister Review CLXII August 1904 195-210 and CLXII Sept. 1904 304-320.

Nicolopoulos John, "From Agathangelos to the Megale Idea: Russia and the Emergence of Modern Greek Nationalism", Balkan Studies XVIII (1984).

Otetea A., "La Desagregation du Regime Phanariote", Symposium (Thessalonike, 1974).

- Panayotopoulos W., "The 'Great Idea' and the Vision of Eastern Federation", Balkan Studies V. 22 (1981).
- Papacostea Serban, "La Grande Charte de Constantino Mavrocordato (1741) et les Réformes en Vallachie et en Moldavie", Symposium (Thessalonike, 1974).
- Pavlovitch Stevan, "Society in Serbia 1791-1830", Balkan Society in the age of Greek Independence ed. R. Clogg (London, 1981).
- Pippidi Andrei, "Nicolas Soutso et la Faillite du Régime Phanariote dans les Principautés Roumaines", Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes 6 (1968).
- Sainean L., "Le Règime et la société en Roumaine pendant la règne des Phanariotes 1711-1821", Revue International de Sociologie X (1902) 717-748.
- Sfyroeras Basile., "Les Mavroyéni et la Vie Économique de la Mer Égée", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Sherrand Philip, "Church, State and the Greek War of Independence", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R.Clogg. (London, 1973).
- Siminescu Dan, "Le Livre Grec en Roumaine", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Soutzo, Démètre Skarl., "Les Familles Princières Greques de Vallachie et de Moldavie ", Symposium (Thessaloniki, 1974).
- Stavrianos L. S., "The Influence of the West on the Balkans", The Balkans in Transition, ed. Ch. and B. Jelavitch (Los Angeles, 1963).
- Tappe E. D., "The 1821 Revolution in the Romanian Principalities", The Struggle for Greek Independence, ed. R.Clogg. (London, 1973).
- Thumb A., "The Modern Greek and his Ancestry", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (1914).

Tsourkas Cl., "Autour des Origins de l'Académie Grecque du Bucharest 1675-1821", Balkan Studies 6 265-280.

----- "Les Historiographies Grecs de l'Époque Phanariote et les Problèmes Fondamentaux de l'Histoire Roumaine", Symposium.... (Thessaloniki, 1974).

Vacalopoulos A., "Byzantinism and Hellenism", Balkan Studies 9, (1968), pp. 101-126.

Vryonis Jr. Speros, "The Greeks under Turkish Rule", Hellenism and the First Greek War of Liberation 1821-1830 : Continuity and Change eds. N. Diamandouros, J. Anton, J. Petropoulos, P. Topping (Thessaloniki, 1976).

Voyatzidis J., "La Grande Idée", Le Cinq-Centième Anniversaire de la Prise de Constantinople, ed. L'Hellénisme Contemporain (Athens, 1953).

Xydis Stephen D., "Medieval Origins of Modern Greek Nationalism", Balkan Studies 9 (1968).

----- "Modern Greek Nationalism", Nationalism in Eastern Europe, eds Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer (University of Washington Press, 1969).

Zepos Panayiotis, "Le politique sociale des Princes Phanariotes", Balkan Studies XI (1970) 81-90.

----- "Byzantine Law in the Danubian Countries", Balkan Studies (1968) 343-356.

Zoras G., "Orientations idéologiques et politiques avant et après la chute de Constantinople", Le Cinq-Centième Anniversaire de la Prise de Constantinople, ed. L'Hellénisme Contemporain (Athens, 1953), pp. 103-124.

### Bibliographies

Dimaras C. Th., Koumarianou C., Droulia L., Modern Greek Culture, A Selected Bibliography (Thessaloniki, 1970).

- Diamantouros Nikiforos, "Bibliographical Essay", Hellenism and the First Greek War of Liberation 1821-1830 : Continuity and Change eds. N. Diamandouros, J. Anton, J. Petropoulos, P. Topping (Thessaloniki, 1976).
- Kircheisen Friedrich M., Bibliographie du Temps de Napoleon 2 vols (Paris, 1908-12).
- Kyparissiotis Niove, The Modern Greek Collection in the Library of the University of Cincinnati A Catalogue (Athens, 1960).
- Legrand Emile, Bibliographie Hellénique ou Description Raisonnée des Ouvrages Public en Grec par des Grecs aux 17e et 18e siècles Vol I (New Impressions, Bruxelles, 1963).
- Lists of Works in the New York Public Library, Relating to the Near Eastern Question and the Balkan States Including European Turkey and Modern Greece, Part I-IV, (New York, 1910).
- Topping Peter, "Greek Historical Writing on the Period 1453-1914", The Journal of Modern History 33 (1961), pp. 157-173.
- Yovanovitch V. M., An English Bibliography on the Near Eastern Question 1481-1906 (Belgrade, 1909).