

# ARCHIVUM OTTOMANICUM

Edited by György Hazai †

with assistance of

P. Fodor, G. Hagen, E. İhsanoğlu,

H. İnalçık †, B. Kellner-Heinkele,

H. W. Lowry, H. G. Majer,

Rh. Murphey, M. Ursinus, and E. A. Zachariadou

33 (2016)

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ARCHIVUM OTTOMANICUM concerns itself primarily with Ottoman history and Ottoman philology. However, the editors also welcome articles on subjects related to Ottoman studies in the history and culture of Europe, including in particular Danubian Europe, the Black Sea area and the Caucasus, and in the history and culture of the Arab and the Iranian lands, and Byzantium.

Authors of articles will receive a PDF file of their contribution and a free copy of the volume in which their article appears.

Contributors are invited to send articles in one digital copy to:  
Professor Dr. Pál Fodor (e-mail: Fodor.Pal@btk.mta.hu) and  
Professor Dr. Barbara Kellner-Heinkele (e-mail: heinkele@zedat.fu-berlin.de).

Secretary of the Editorial Board and technical editor:  
Miklós Fóti (e-mail: fotimiklos@yahoo.com),  
Mónika F. Molnár (monikafmolnar@gmail.com).

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2016

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.

Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

[www.harrassowitz-verlag.de](http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de)

ISSN 0378-2808

# THE ORTHODOX EXARCHATE OF LITTLE RUS': A FEW REMARKS ON THE OTTOMAN CONFESSIONAL POLICY IN THE LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

DARIUSZ KOŁODZIEJCZYK\*

The situation of the Orthodox Church under the Ottoman rule has long been epitomized in historiography by the title of Steven Runciman's classic monograph: *The Great Church in Captivity*.<sup>1</sup> Yet, as we know today, partly due to the impact of post-colonial studies, a captive rarely behaves in a completely passive way. His relations with his master are subject to constant renegotiation and, in certain conditions, can turn into cooperation. When Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror appointed Georgios Scholarios, a Byzantine theologian, to become the first patriarch of Constantinople under the Ottoman rule, the latter closely cooperated with the sultan by helping to legitimize his rule among his Christian subjects and by acknowledging Mehmed's claim to the title of the Roman Emperor (*Kayser-i Rum*). A symptomatic judgment of Ottoman rule in the Balkans can be found in the *Slavo-Bulgarian History* authored by Paisij Xilendarski, a Bulgarian monk and chronicler, today regarded as the father of the so-called "Bulgarian renaissance". Writing in the mid-eighteenth century, Paisij devoted one passage of his chronicle to the Turks. According to the author, although the Turks initially seized the Bulgarian land, turkicized young lads, turned churches into mosques, plundered and killed, "[...] when they strengthened their position in the Constantinople Kingdom, they learned a great deal about Christian order and law and for some time at the beginning they stopped for a while, they felt embarrassed to rob unlawfully the Christians' belongings and properties. But at present again, the wretched people have neither justice, nor any court of law."<sup>2</sup> As I will try to show below, it was perhaps not merely a rhetorical figure that Paisij dated the largest Turkish atrocities to two specific periods of their rule over the Balkan Christians: the initial phase of the conquest, typically accompanied by massacres and plunder, and the final phase, namely his present time, when the Porte, endangered by the Russian and Habsburg

---

\* Professor, University of Warsaw/Polish Academy of Sciences (darkol@uw.edu.pl)

1 Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge, 1968.

2 Paisij Hilendarski, *A Slavo-Bulgarian History*. Sofia, 2000, 211–212.

military power and troubled by internal crisis, was gradually losing legitimacy in the eyes of its Christian subjects.

My paper focuses on the brief Ottoman rule in present-day Ukraine and the attitude of the new masters towards the local Orthodox church. In 1672, the Ottomans conquered the fortress of Kamjanec' (Pol. Kamieniec Podolski, Tur, Kamanıçe) along with the whole province of Podolia. The province had previously belonged to the Kingdom of Poland, but Catholic Poles constituted a majority only in Kamjanec', whereas the rural population of Podolia consisted mostly of Orthodox Ruthenians, the ancestors of present-day Ukrainians. The Ruthenian Orthodox elites of that period were deeply divided in their political sympathies: some supported Poland, even though the latter tried to enforce church union with Rome, highly unpopular among Orthodox masses; some sided with Moscow and the Russian tsar regarding him as the protector of Orthodoxy; finally, there was a growing number of those who, disillusioned with both Warsaw and Moscow, looked at the Porte as the best potential guarantor of Ukrainian political and church autonomy. In fact, the Ottoman invasion of Poland of 1672 was inspired and assisted by Petro Dorošenko, the Ukrainian Cossack hetman who in return was granted autonomous rule in Dnieper Ukraine under the sultan's patronage.<sup>3</sup>

To be sure, Dorošenko's decision to side with "infidels" against Catholic Poland was not unanimously accepted by his Orthodox coreligionists. Many Ruthenian authors of the period deplored the ruin of Christian lands and the desecration of Christian sanctuaries at the hands of the Muslim conquerors. The Ukrainian author of a somewhat later *Eyewitness Chronicle (Lĕtopis' Samovidca)* described with distaste the Ottoman entry to Kamjanec' and their efforts to Islamize the city and "purify" it from its earlier Christian character:

„All the dead had been dug up from the tombs and graves and taken away from the city, and the holy images removed from the Catholic and Orthodox churches had been laid in the mud on the streets upon which the Turk [i.e., the sultan] and his servant, unfaithful hetman Dorošenko, entered Kam'janec.“<sup>4</sup>

The ceremonial entry of Sultan Mehmed IV to Kamjanec' on Friday, September 2, 1672, was crowned by his participation in the Muslim Friday noon prayer, held in

3 On Dorošenko's political plans and chances of their realisation, cf. Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, 'Tertium non datur? Turec'ka al'ternatyva v zovnišnij polityci kozac'koji deržavy', in *Hadjac'ka unija 1658 roku*. Kiev, 2008, 67–80; Victor Ostapchuk, 'Cossack Ukraine In and Out of Ottoman Orbit, 1648-1681', in Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević (eds.), *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden, 2013, 123-152, esp. 139-147. On the hetman's first embassy to the Porte and the Cossack-Ottoman negotiations in Edirne in 1667, see Kirill Kočegarov, 'Kazackoe posol'stvo M. Rodkeviča-Portjanki k Tureckomu sultanu v 1667 godu', *Slavjanovedenie* 4 (2014) 65–71.

4 "Vsix umerlyx tak z skleпов jako i z hrobov vykopyvano i za misto voženo, a obrazy Božie, beručy z kostelov i cerkvej, po ulycax moščeno, po bolotax, po kotoryx Turčyn vjexal v Kamjanec i jeho poddaniy nezbožnij Dorošenko hetman," Orest Levyc'kyj (ed.), *Lĕtopis' Samovidtsa*. Kyiv, 1878, 115; reprinted as *Eyewitness Chronicle*. Munich, 1972.

the former Catholic cathedral. Together with the cathedral, seven churches were converted into mosques, the majority of them being formerly Catholic – no wonder, considering the fact that Catholic Poles constituted the largest ethno-religious group in the city and their churches were the largest and richest ones. Yet, also the Armenian church of St. Nicolas was converted into the mosque of the then third vizier (and later grand vizier), Kara Mustafa Pasha. The Ruthenian community lost two Orthodox churches, of St. John and of the Holy Trinity, converted into the mosques of the grand vizier, Ahmed Köprülü, and of the second vizier, Musahib Mustafa, respectively.<sup>5</sup>

Having already lost two churches, converted into mosques, the Ruthenians also lost one more church, and this fact probably infuriated them the most. The Ottomans resolved to recompense the Catholics, whose churches had been converted into mosques, by giving them the Orthodox church of St. St. Peter and Paul. In the map drawn by Cyprian Tomaszewicz, the former head of the Polish community (*wójt lacki*), who recorded the changes made by the Turks in Kamjanec', we find this church labeled with the letter R and described in the legend: *Ecclesia SS. Petri et Pauli ante Ruthenorum nunc Catholicis pro exercenda devotione concessa*.<sup>6</sup> This information is confirmed in the Ottoman register of properties, prepared immediately after the conquest of Kamjanec' in the fall of 1672. We find there an entry titled *monastir-i Santi Petro Rus* ("the Ruthenian monastery of St. Peter") with a margin note "although the said church is a Ruthenian church, yet, as the Ruthenians also have other churches, it has been given to the Polish priests" (*kilise-i mezbur gar çe Rus kilisesidir ve lakin Rusların sair kiliseleri dahi olmakla Lih papaslarına verilmiştir*).<sup>7</sup> The move caused violent reaction on the part of the Orthodox community. A French captive la Magdeleine, employed as interpreter in the Ottoman camp, recorded an intervention of Ruthenian elders who asked Halil Pasha, the newly appointed Ottoman governor of Kamjanec', to keep the sultan's dogs in the church rather than turn it over to the Poles: *les Russiens du rite Gréc ayant été chassés des leurs [Eglises] pour servir aux Polonois, ce qui les fâcha tellement qu'ils alerent en cors trouver Haly Pacha de Silistrie, Gouverneur de la place, pour le prier d'y loger plutost les chiens de Sa Hautesse que de les donner aux Polonois*.<sup>8</sup>

5 Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *The Ottoman Survey Register of Podolia (ca. 1681). Defter-i Mufassal-i Eyalet-i Kamaniçe*. Cambridge, Mass., 2004, 1, 53; Kołodziejczyk, *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim. Ejalet kamieniecki 1672–1699*. Warsaw, 1994, 188–198.

6 For the map, drawn in ca. 1673 and donated to the bishop of Cracow, Andrzej Trzebicki, see Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, Dział Kartografii.

7 Istanbul, Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Maliyeden Müdevver 709 (Defter-i haneha-i ve 'arazi ve besatin ve bagceha ve dekakin ve 'arazi-i dekakin ve gayruhu dar derun-i kal'e-i Kamaniçe el-vakı' fi sene-i 1083), 41.

8 C. de la Magdeleine, 'La marche de sultan Mahomet contre la Pologne et en Ukraine, avec un succinct récit de tout ce qui c'est passé de considerable de part et d'autre', in idem, *Le Miroir Ottoman avec un succinct récit de tout ce qui c'est passé de considerable pendant la guerre des*

Although the protest was futile and the pasha reportedly rebuked the petitioners for their lack of Christian solidarity, such inter-confessional conflicts were quite useful for the Porte, who had mastered for centuries of its rule in South-Eastern Europe to play them off in its domestic and foreign policy. In the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Porte took the keys of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem from the Franciscan friars, who had kept them since the era of the Crusades, and donated these keys to Orthodox Greeks. The protests of the French and Polish kings, who invoked their ancient friendship with the Porte and reclaimed that the keys be returned to the friars, brought no results. The Polish ambassadors Wojciech Miaskowski, Hieronim Radziejowski, and Jan Gniński, sent to the Porte in 1640, 1667, and 1677, respectively, carried along royal instructions which specifically ordered to raise this issue, yet their efforts were in vain. The Ottoman court, advised by an influential Greek dragoman Nicousios Panaiotis, found more prudent to endear itself in the eyes of the masses of its Orthodox subjects than cherish distant Catholics, even those friendly disposed towards the Porte.<sup>9</sup>

In analogy, after the conquest of Crete in 1645, the Ottomans reinstalled an Orthodox metropolitan in the island after almost four-and-a-half centuries of Catholic hegemony when the Venetian authorities had abolished higher Orthodox hierarchy.<sup>10</sup> No wonder that during the Ottoman conquests of Cyprus, Crete, and later on, Peloponnesus, the Turks could often count on the support of the Greeks, upset with their Venetian Catholic lords. Meticulous studies by Machiel Kiel have proved beyond doubt that, under the Ottoman rule, many Orthodox churches in the Balkans were not just restored, but enlarged and embellished, even though it was contrary to the letter of the Islamic law.<sup>11</sup>

In their anti-Habsburg policy, the Ottomans consistently supported Hungarian Protestants in their struggle against Catholic Vienna. In the early seventeenth century, many Protestants in Europe awaited an Ottoman intervention, to mention such individuals as Gábor Bethlen, the prince of Transylvania, or Cornelius Haga, the Dutch envoy to the Porte. The idea of a Protestant-Orthodox coalition against Rome and the Habsburgs was embodied in the person of Kyrillos Loukaris, the patriarch of Constantinople. Although he ended his life as a Christian martyr

---

*Turqs en Pologne, jusqu'en 1676.* Basle, 1677, 10.

9 The fact that also today, under the Israeli administration, after decades of the British mandate and Jordanian rule in Palestine, the Holy Grave in Jerusalem remains under the custody of Greek monks is the visible trace of the cooperation that once existed between the Muslim Ottoman state and the Greek Patriarchate.

10 Nükhet Adıyeke – Nuri Adıyeke – Evangelia Balta, 'The Poll Tax in the Years of the Cretan War. Symbol of Submission and Mechanisms of Avoidance', *ΘΗΣΑΥΡΙΣΜΑΤΑ* 31 (2001) 330.

11 Machiel Kiel, *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period. A Sketch of the Economic, Juridical and Artistic Preconditions of Bulgarian Post-Byzantine Art and its Place in the Development of the Art of the Christian Balkans, 1360/70–1700.* Assen-Maastricht, 1985, 143–205; see also Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Ottoman Policy towards Christian Church Buildings', in eadem, *Rumeli under the Ottomans, 15th-18th centuries: Institutions and Communities.* Istanbul, 2004, 354–356 [the article was originally published in 1994].

executed at the sultan's order, his tragic end should not distort the fact that his policy was largely in line with the Ottoman foreign policy, whose principal aim was to weaken the Catholic Habsburgs, the Ottoman arch-enemies in Europe.<sup>12</sup>

To sum up: be it in Crete, Hungary, or Ukraine, the Ottomans tended to support Christian dissidents who were opposed to the Catholic Church and their Catholic rulers. In Crete and Podolia, the Ottoman conquerors also stirred a "social revolution" by expulsing former Catholic landlords – respectively Venetian and Polish – and by abolishing *corvée*, thus gaining popularity among the Orthodox peasants. During the Ottoman invasion of Poland in 1672, an anonymous Italian report recorded that the Turks treated the nobles badly but remained generous towards the peasants (*dichiaratosi di trattare male la sola nobiltà e bene la gente rustica*).<sup>13</sup>

For the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople, Ottoman territorial expansion in South-Eastern and Eastern Europe could be perceived as a chance, because it simultaneously enlarged the Patriarchate's direct jurisdiction. Moreover, by weakening the material basis of the Catholic Church in the conquered territories, the Porte undermined Catholic missionary activity among the Orthodox Christians and thus contributed towards the Orthodox reconquista.

It is within this context that we should examine the Ottoman confessional policy in Podolia and the role of the Orthodox Patriarchate in this policy. To be sure, the declared Ottoman aim in the conquered province was no less but its full Islamisation, to be attained through both colonisation and conversion of local inhabitants. Invigorated by the spirit of Islamic fundamentalism associated with the teaching of Vani Mehmed Efendi, a representative of the so-called Kadizadeli school, both Sultan Mehmed IV (r. 1648–1687) and, especially, Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa (in post 1676–1683) adopted a much less tolerant policy towards non-Muslims than their sixteenth-century predecessors. Yet, even the most rigid Muslim leaders knew that such aim was hardly realistic within a short span of time. It was no one else but Kara Mustafa who, still as the third vizier in the late 1660s, had entered negotiations with Ukrainian Cossacks encouraging their rebellion against Warsaw. A decade later, it was also Kara Mustafa who resolved to support Imre Thököly and his Hungarian followers in their insurrection against Vienna. No matter how fundamentalist in his personal Weltanschauung, the grand vizier was perfectly aware of the confessional divisions within the Christian world and knew to utilise these divisions for pragmatic purposes.

Since the efforts of Muslim settlement in Podolia and the encouragement of conversion to Islam by local inhabitants could not bring immediate results, in the

---

12 For some less known details about Loukaris' earlier career and his visits to Poland-Lithuania with the aim of strengthening the position of the Orthodox church, see Tomasz Kempa, 'Kyrillos Loukaris and the Confessional Problems in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century', *Acta Poloniae Historica* 104 (2011) 103–128.

13 Kołodziejczyk, *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim*, 63.

years following the conquest the Ottoman authorities adopted a more modest policy of dividing the local non-Muslims into groups which could be relied on and those “unreliable,” to be expelled from the border province. Not surprisingly, the Catholic Poles were deemed the least reliable as they had lost the most – in both material wealth and legal privileges – in result of the Ottoman conquest.

While the majority of Polish nobles voluntarily left Podolia already in 1672, the Polish Catholic townsmen were expelled from Kamjanec’ in the fall of 1673. In the following year, the Ottomans also resettled the Armenians from Kamjanec’ to Filibe (Plovdiv in present-day Bulgaria).<sup>14</sup> In the case of Armenians, the reason of their resettlement was probably not so far the Ottoman fear of their disloyalty, but rather the need to clear the border fortress from excessive civilian population. Whatever the specific reasons, due to the Ottoman policy, within a few years the population of Kamjanec’ and of the entire Podolia became much more homogenous than it had been before 1672, namely more Ruthenian and more Orthodox.

While the Ottoman efforts to organize the new province after the Treaty of Bučač of 1672 were almost immediately frustrated by the outbreak of a new war, a lasting Ottoman-Polish peace was only attained with the Truce of Žuravno (1676), which was confirmed by the solemn Polish embassy to the Porte, effected in the years 1677–1678. Only then, the Ottomans resumed their efforts to organise their new province. In 1680, Polish and Ottoman commissioners effected a border demarcation and in 1681, the Ottomans undertook the land survey (*tahrir*) of the new province, distributing its incomes among the sultan’s domains (*havass-i hümayun*), the *timar* holders, Islamic pious foundations (*evkaf*), etc. Precisely in the same year, in August 1681, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Iakovos,<sup>15</sup> created an Orthodox eparchy in Kamjanec’ and appointed its first metropolitan named Pankratij. The appointee was probably a Greek clergyman, already present in Podolia and the neighbouring Polish province of Ruthenia (centered in L’viv) in the

<sup>14</sup> Kołodziejczyk, *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim*, 75 and 79.

<sup>15</sup> Iakovos, a native from Chios and the former bishop of Larisa, held the position of Ecumenical Patriarch three times: from August 10, 1679 till July 30, 1682, from March 20, 1685 till late March 1686, and from October 12, 1687 till March 3, 1688. This period was characterized by the strong rivalry over the patriarchal throne between Iakovos and Dionysios IV, who held this post as many as five times in the years 1671–1673, 1676–1679, 1682–1684, 1686–1687, and 1693–1694; for the chronology of their appointments, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821). Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens*. Munich, 1988, 400; for some details on Iakovos, his life and career, see Manouel I. Gedeon, *Patriarchikoi pinakes: Eidēseis istorikai viographikai peri tōn patriarchōn Kōnstantinoupoleōs*. Constantinople, 1900, 603–605. It is worth noting that although his life and career was strongly linked with the Greek Aegean world, in the Greek language version of wikipedia we can read that Iakovos spent his last days and died in Moldavia, which might suggest his familiarity with the Orthodox world of Eastern Europe; see [http://el.wikipedia.org/wiki/Πατριάρχης\\_Ίάκωβος](http://el.wikipedia.org/wiki/Πατριάρχης_Ίάκωβος) (accessed September 26, 2014). I warmly thank Dan Ioan Muresan and Małgorzata Borowska for their help in tracing biographical details about this barely known personage.



earlier years. For instance, we know that in May 1678 he consecrated clerics in the Orthodox monastery at Mańjava, and on December 25, 1679 he consecrated two clerics in the L'viv (Pol. Lwów) Orthodox Cathedral (a note: *Tye konsekrovanye sut' ot Pankratijja Metropolita Greckoho*).<sup>16</sup>

The parchment document of appointment, issued in Greek and provided with the patriarch's signature, was already published in 1868 by Antonij Petruševič.<sup>17</sup> Until WW2, it was held in the archive of the L'viv Metropolitan Chapter at the Greek-Catholic Cathedral of St. George. After WW2, the document was long believed to be lost; only quite recently it was identified in the Ukrainian National Library in Kiev among the manuscripts associated with Andrij Šeptyc'kyj, the long-term Metropolitan of L'viv and Ukrainian spiritual leader, who died in 1944, shortly after the Soviet Army entered the city.<sup>18</sup>

The newly created eparchy was given autonomous privileges of an exarchate and depended directly on Constantinople. Interestingly, in the Greek document it was referred to as the eparchy of the Little Rus' (in Greek: *Μικρὰ Ρωσία*). A few years earlier, an analogous title had been adopted by Jurij Xmel'nyc'kyj, whom the Porte had appointed, in 1677, the new hetman of Ukraine after the desertion of Dorošenko to Moscow. By titling himself "the prince of Little Rus' and Sarmathia" (*książę Małej Rusi i Sarmacji* in the Polish sources), Xmel'nyc'kyj infuriated the Polish authorities who repeatedly demanded from the Porte to prohibit the hetman to use such "excessive" titles.<sup>19</sup> Although this topic requires a further research, the coincidence of the "secular" title of the prince of the Little Rus' with the "religious" title of the metropolitan of the Little Rus' might reflect the existence of a quite sophisticated program to create a new political entity in Eastern Europe under the common patronage of the Ottoman sultan and the Greek Orthodox patriarch. Such

16 Ihor Skočyljas, 'Terytorial'ne rozmiščennja orhanizacijnyx struktur Halyc'koji (L'vivs'koji) pravoslavnoji eparxiji na Podilli', in *Istoryčne kartoznavstvo Ukrajinu. Zbirnyk naukovyx prac.* Lviv-Kyiv-New York, 2004, 437. The corresponding entries are recorded in the Book of Consecrations of the L'viv Orthodox Eparchy, held in the Nacional'nyj muzej u L'vovi, Viddil rukopysiv ta starodrukiv, ms. 89, pp. 31 and 36 (my warmest thanks go to Ihor Skočyljas for having provided me with their reproductions); the note from p. 36 is published in Antonij Petruševič (ed.), *Svodnaja halycko-russkaja letopys' s 1600 po 1700 god. Sbornik izdavaemij Galicko-russkoju Maticeju. 1872 i 1873.* L'vov, 1874, 195.

17 Antonij Petruševič (ed.), *Akty otosjaščiesja k istorii Južnozpadnoj Rusi.* L'vov, 1868, 51–55; the document was also known to Izidor Szaraniewicz, 'Patryjarchat Wschodni wobec Kościoła ruskiego i Rzeczypospolitej polskiej (Dokończenie)', in *Rozprawy i sprawozdania z posiedzeń Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego Akademii Umiejętności.* Vol. X., Cracow, 1879, 42–44; cf. also Mikołaj Andrusiak, *Józef Szumlański. Pierwszy biskup unicki lwowski (1667–1708).* Zarys biograficzny. Lwów, 1934, 93.

18 Kiev, Instytut Rukopysy Nacional'noj Biblioteki Ukrajinu im. V. I. Vernads'koho, f. XVIII (A. Šeptyc'kyj Collection), no. 121. My warmest thanks go to Ihor Skočyljas and Jaroslav Fedoruk for having provided me with this information and sending me the document's reproduction.

19 Kołodziejczyk, *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim*, 96; see also Franciszek Pułaski (ed.), *Źródła do poselstwa Jana Gnińskiego wojewody chełmińskiego do Turcyi w latach 1677–1678.* Warsaw, 1907, 76, 93, 132, 208 (for *princeps Sarmatiae*), and 189, 376 (for *książę Małej Rusi*).

program could have been developed among the Greek clergy in Constantinople, but was certainly based on local expertise, provided by Ruthenian clergymen and Cossack leaders inspired by the political programs from the times of Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj and Ivan Vyhovskij, the two Cossack hetmans who had first elaborated the idea of a Ukrainian statehood in the mid-seventeenth century.

The common target of the sultan and the Greek patriarch in the recently conquered Ukrainian lands was to cut off their new subjects from the influence of their former rulers and spiritual superiors. By creating a new eparchy, carved out from the ancient eparchy of L'viv, Patriarch Iakovos removed Orthodox faithful in Podolia from the jurisdiction of the Orthodox bishop of L'viv who was residing in Poland and was remaining a subject of the Polish king. Interestingly, according to Ihor Skočyljas, it was precisely this move and the pro-Ottoman stand of Patriarch Iakovos that induced the Orthodox bishop of L'viv, Josif Šumljans'kyj, to embrace the union with Rome. Faced with the diminishment of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and incomes from the divided eparchy, Šumljans'kyj resolved to join the Union and thus secure the support of Polish authorities.<sup>20</sup>

There was yet another political and religious center where the coordinated policy of the Porte and the Greek patriarchate must have been seen with anxiety. The creation of the Little Ruthenian Principality under the Ottoman protection, with its own Orthodox hierarchy, dependent directly on Constantinople, could endanger the influence of the Russian tsar and the Muscovian patriarchate not only in the right-bank Ukraine, but also in the left-bank Ukraine, annexed by Russia as recently as in 1667 in result of the long war with Poland.

No wonder that the tsarist diplomacy strongly supported the patriarchate of Moscow in its conflict with Constantinople over the jurisdiction over the Ukrainian lands. Starting from 1683, the patriarch of Moscow began preparations to subjugate the ancient metropolitan see of Kiev, which by that time had belonged to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Although supported by tsarist diplomacy, his first efforts were rebuked in Constantinople by both the Patriarchate and the Porte. Yet, during the Russian-Ottoman negotiations in the spring of 1686, this issue was again raised by Nikita Alekseev, the Russian envoy to Edirne. As the Porte then tried, at all cost, to appease Moscow and dissuade it from joining the Holy League, the request of the Russian envoy was favorably received by Grand Vizier Sarı Süleyman Pasha and forwarded to Patriarch Dionysios IV.<sup>21</sup> In June 1686, the patriarch issued documents requested by the Russian side, although he treated the cession of jurisdiction over Kiev as only temporary and conditional.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps of some importance was the fact

20 Skočyljas, "Terytorial'ne rozmiščennja", 438.

21 See Kirill Kočegarov, *Reč' Pospolitaja i Rossija v 1680–1686 godax. Zaključenie dogovora o večnom mire*. Moscow, 2008, 289.

22 For a recent reexamination of the documents issued in 1686 by Patriarch Dionysios IV and an analysis of the preceding negotiations between the Kremlin, the Patriarchate of Moscow, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the Porte, see Vadim M. Lur'e, *Russkoe pravoslavie meždu Kievom i Moskvj. Očerki istorii russkoj pravoslavnoj tradicii meždu XV i XX vekami*. Moscow,

that none of the architects of Istanbul's "Ukrainian policy," formulated in the early 1680s, had remained in power by that time. Kara Mustafa Pasha was executed in result of his disastrous campaign of 1683, and Patriarch Iakovos lost his post in March 1686, to regain it only in October 1687.

By their move, the new vizier and the new patriarch not only abandoned Kiev, but also sacrificed the pro-Ottoman metropolitan of Little Rus', who was still alive and acting. We know little about the subsequent fate of Pankratij. He probably stayed for some more years in Podolia and the neighbouring Moldavia, but after 1690 his trace disappears.<sup>23</sup>

The Ottoman resignation from the patronage over Ukraine, where, in fact, the sultan's authority had never grown roots, might be considered of minor importance. Yet, it coincided with much more serious developments, whose impact influenced the future of the empire. In 1688, following the Habsburg military triumphs in the Balkans, a Bulgarian uprising broke out in the area of Čiprovci – it was the first massive Bulgarian anti-Ottoman movement since the 15<sup>th</sup> century. After the Habsburgs took Belgrade in the same year, also numerous Serbians shifted their allegiance. Even though the Ottomans were able to recapture Belgrade two years later, the receding Habsburg troops were accompanied by thousands of Serbians, including their Orthodox patriarch, who decided to move from his see in Peć to Sremski Karlovci under the Habsburg protection. Granted extensive privileges by Emperor Leopold I in 1690–1691, Sremski Karlovci soon replaced Peć as the main center of Serbian religion and culture.

By losing so many territories and exposing his subjects to the depredations of enemy troops in the late seventeenth century, the Ottoman sultan began to lose his legitimacy as the protector of the *re'aya*. A simultaneous failure to support Orthodoxy against the Catholic expansion, and to protect the integrity of the Constantinople patriarchate, compromised both the sultan and his Orthodox protégé in the eyes of the Christian faithful and directed their attention towards alternative centers of religious authority and political power. In the eighteenth century, not only Russia, but also the Habsburg Empire began to present themselves as the protectors of Orthodox Slavs and Greeks against the "Turkish yoke." Although the majority of Orthodox subjects remained calm and loyal to the Porte for most of the eighteenth century, their gradual shift of allegiance was to prove fatal to the Porte in the years to come. The Ottoman "betrayal" of Pankratij and – more importantly – the Porte's unwillingness to support the claims of the patriarch of Constantinople in 1686, can be thus regarded as the beginning of alienation of non-Muslims and of contraction of the once multiethnic heterogeneous empire into a purely Muslim sultanate inhabited mainly by Turks.

---

2010, 176–181 and 188–209.

23 E. S[ecinskij], 'Cerkovno-ierarxičeskija otnošenija Podolii k Kievskoj i Galickoj mitropolijam (istoričeskij očerk)', in *Podol'skija eparxial'nyja vedomosti*, 38:46 (1899) (13 nojabrja), čast' neoficial' naja, 1110; cf. Skočyljas, 'Terytorial'ne rozmiščennja', 437.