



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

The 'Dhidhaskalia Patriki' (1798): An Orthodox Reaction to French Revolutionary Propaganda

Author(s): Richard Clogg

Source: *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (May, 1969), pp. 87-115

Published by: [Taylor & Francis, Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4282281>

Accessed: 21/06/2014 20:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Middle Eastern Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The 'Dhidhaskalia Patriki' (1798): an Orthodox Reaction to French Revolutionary Propaganda

Richard Clogg

'No hostile or satirical critic', wrote 'Odysseus',¹ an illuminating commentator on the Orthodox world, could better have described the attitude of the Orthodox hierarchy during the late eighteenth century to the influence of Western ideas in the Greek world than the author of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* or *Paternal Teaching*, attributed to the Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem, and published in Istanbul in 1798. Some years earlier K. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy had aptly described the work as 'ein kaltes Sturzbad' directed at the movement of national revival in Greece.² The *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* has in fact achieved a certain notoriety among historians as one of the more extreme examples of ecclesiastical anti-Westernism, and its significance was not lost on contemporaries. That 'new Hippocrates'³ and intellectual mentor of renascent Greece, Adhamantios Korais, devoted the first of a number of polemical tracts, the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia* or *Brotherly Teaching*, published anonymously in 'Rome' in 1798, to a specific rebuttal of the ideas expressed by Anthimos. Korais's friend Charodon de la Rochette shortly afterwards published extracts of this work in French translation in *La Décade philosophique*.⁴ A few years later, Colonel William Leake included extracts of Anthimos's tract, 'one of the most remarkable' of a number of such publications 'intended to serve as antidotes to the poison of the revolutionists', in his *Researches in Greece*.⁵ The interest and importance of this document as a reflection of Orthodox attitudes and as an illustration of the Ottoman Porte's propaganda war against France and French revolutionary propaganda at the time of Bonaparte's Egyptian expedition, perhaps justifies a translation of this bizarre work, together with an attempt to set it in its historical context and to discuss the vexed question of its authorship.

The traditional good relations existing between France and the Porte were scarcely affected by the French Revolution, or even by regicide. The supply of the French naval and military experts⁶ necessary to a vital part of Sultan Selim III's *Nizam-i Cedid* or *New Order*, his efforts to modernize the army and navy on European lines, continued unimpeded. Aubert du Bayet, who brought with him a number of skilled technicians, was greeted with considerable warmth on arriving to take up his post as French ambassador in 1796.⁷ Moreover, French attempts to propagate the revolutionary cause were not hindered, and their supporters could be found among the heterodox population of Istanbul. In 1793 a 'Club de la Société républicaine' was founded in Istanbul, on the lines of those already existing in Izmir and Aleppo, while in the streets of Pera patriots danced around a tree of liberty, roaring out the *Carmagnole*. Turks wearing the *cocarde tricolore* joined in these festivities.⁸ A year later it was reported that Turks

in the streets of the city greeted French wearers of the tricolour cockade with the cry 'Friend, Brother!', while royalist emigrés were subjected to insults.⁹ The *Gazette Française de Constantinople* was published at irregular intervals from September 1796 to September 1798,¹⁰ as were a number of publications in Italian extolling the French cause, which began to be published at the French press in Istanbul after the 'liberation' of the Venetian Republic. As late as March 1797 Aubert du Bayet renewed the offer made to the Porte by his predecessor Verninac of a Franco-Turkish alliance against Russia and Austria, while in the same month the Porte decided to send Ali Efendi as ambassador to France.

At about this time, however, there were indications of increasing strain in Franco-Turkish relations. The Porte refused to accept the appointment of Constantine Stamaty, a Greek of ardent republican sympathies who had earlier been active in the Principalities, as French consul in Bucharest. Further alarm was caused by the discovery in January 1797 that an Austrian bookseller of Greek origin 'Publio Marquides Pulio' had been selling a number of 'highly pernicious' (sehr schädlich) French books to various boyars in Bucharest. The complaints which his activities provoked prompted the Prince of Wallachia to ask the Austrian consul to take steps to prevent the export of such books from the Empire. Some of the titles listed by the consul in his report of the incident, such as 'De la Souveraineté du peuple. 2 tomes à Paris 1790' could clearly be regarded as potentially subversive, others, such as 'Délices du Cloître ou la none éclairée' were simply salacious.¹¹

The British minister to the Porte, Spencer Smith, believed he saw French influence behind the so-called Izmir 'rebellion' of March 1797. This was an extremely destructive urban riot, anti-Christian and anti-foreign in character, which resulted in the massacre of some two thousand Greeks and the burning and pillaging of much of the property of the foreign merchant community. The rebellion, he wrote to Grenville, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 'must be considered as the untimely fruit of a conspiracy: and that conspiracy a contagious consequence of the destructive doctrines so progressive in the present day', which had been inculcated 'both by precept and example' by the French squadrons in the Levant.¹² It was, he observed, 'a singularity offering awful abundance of reflection' that the tricolour cockade had throughout provided immunity from attack. In July of the same year Francis Werry, British consul in Smyrna, feared that the 'democratical badge' displayed of late by the Venetians in the city presaged a further outburst of violence.¹³ Spencer Smith's fears received confirmation at a 'democratic assembly' held in the Venetian embassy in Istanbul on 22 June 1797 to celebrate French 'regeneration' of the Venetian Republic. At this gathering Aubert du Bayet was observed 'interchanging individually kisses and embraces with hundreds of the most filthy vagabonds that the eye of a traveller can figure to itself', while 572 revolutionary cockades were distributed among the guests.¹⁴

The French annexation of the Ionian Islands in October 1797, by the Treaty of Campo Formio, dealt a severe blow to Franco-Turkish relations. French revolutionary activity could be tolerated from afar, but when the Directory embarked on the 'liberation' of territory at the very borders of the Empire this was a very different matter. Nor were the Porte's appre-

hensions in any way lessened by the manner in which the occupation was carried out. On his arrival in Corfu in June 1797 the Corsican general Gentili declared in a proclamation, printed in French, Italian and Greek, that he had brought with him liberty and equality, that the virtues of Miltiades and Themistocles would live once more and that Greece would again be restored to her ancient splendour. Gentili was welcomed by the 'proto-papas' of the Greek church, who asked him not to despise his unlettered flock which was yet capable of becoming what it had once been. As a token of this conviction he presented a book to Gentili, who was not a little surprised to find that it was a copy of Homer's *Odyssey*.¹⁵ The 'proto-papas' later wrote to Gentili that 'the principles of the French Revolution were in such perfect conformity with the teachings of the Gospel that none could consider himself a good and true Christian if he did not feel in his heart and bear witness in his actions that the best form of government was the democratic'.¹⁶

The occupation of the Ionian Islands, in Bonaparte's view of greater importance to France than the whole of Italy,¹⁷ was accompanied by all the trappings of revolutionary 'liberation'. Laurel crowns were presented to the French troops, while in the square of Argostoli a tree of liberty was planted by the archbishop, wearing a cockade and surrounded by the rest of his clergy. After singing the Marseillaise the *Libro d'oro* of the Ionian nobility was publicly burnt. The same fate awaited the *Libro d'oro* in Corfu, after it had been dragged through the streets 'à la huée de la foule du bas peuple'.¹⁸ A committee of public safety (*to vouleftirion tis genikis asfaleias*) was set up, as was a printing press directed by the French propagandist, Khristoforos Perraivos, author of a poem in praise of Bonaparte. One of the proclamations printed at this press in Greek and Italian claimed that 'with the establishment of a press those kings still sitting on their shaky thrones tremble, their iron yoke has been lifted from off the necks of the people by revolution'.¹⁹ Much of the enthusiasm of the Ionian islanders for these revolutionary festivities may have been no more than sensible prudence with regard to their new rulers. There is some evidence, however, that certain elements in the population were receptive to their philosophy. The Ionian Islands by virtue of Venetian rule and their geographical situation were always in closer touch with European developments than much of the rest of the Greek world. Editions of Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists were to be found in Ionian libraries at the end of the eighteenth century. One of the Ionian *literati*, Martelaos, dedicated a poem to Gentili and to Bonaparte, 'the hero who will once more resurrect Greece'.²⁰ According to one historian, the Ionian *arkhontes* were planning a purge of Corfiote 'Jacobins' even before the arrival of the French.²¹ Moreover, when the Russians and Turks reoccupied the island of Zante in October 1799, the 'karmanioloï' were given three days to leave the island, on pain of confiscation of their property and of being sent as slaves to Istanbul.²²

There seemed, moreover, to the Porte to be abundant evidence that French ambition was not satisfied only with the former Venetian territories, but that it had designs on Ottoman territory. The French lost no time in making contact with Tepedelenli Ali Paşa, the 'lion of Jannina' and a persistent thorn in the flesh of the Ottoman central government, whose authority in large parts of the empire had been usurped by *ayans*

or *derebeys*, powerful feudatories nominally owing allegiance to the Porte but in practice quite independent and frequently hostile. Among the most powerful at this time were the Karaosmanoğullar in Asia Minor and Pasvanoğlu of Vidin and Ali Paşa himself in European Turkey. Ali was quite prepared to exploit French overtures to his own advantage. Indeed his court poet, Hacı Sekhretis, recorded that one of Bonaparte's emissaries, Roze, 'came from Corfu intending to cause the Christian *raya* to rise up against their sovereign'. To Ali he brought the offer of being created king of *Roumeli*, with jurisdiction over Venice and Corfu.²³

Further serious alarm was occasioned by the arrest in Trieste in December 1797 of the Greek patriot Rigas Velestinlis, who was consumed with 'une passion presque délirante pour l'affranchissement de sa Patrie'.²⁴ The cause of his downfall was the discovery of a chest containing several thousand copies of a revolutionary proclamation printed in Greek with, in the words of the Austrian police, 'der Devise Freyheit, Gleichheit, Brüderschaft, worinn ganz nach französischen Style wider die Monarchen debutirt, die Menschenrechte und die demokratische Verfassung hervorgestrichen und Freyheits-Lieder und mehr andere zur Erbitterung der Gemüther und Erhitzung der Köpfe abzweckende Tiraden befindlich sind'.²⁵ No copy of the original version of the revolutionary proclamation has survived, although a German translation from the Austrian archives has been published by K. Amantos. The principal target of this proclamation was 'the insufferable tyranny of the abominable Ottoman despotism'.²⁶ Also included were copies of the *Thourios*, a revolutionary poem which achieved considerable popularity, a declaration of the rights of man and the citizen and the famous 'New Political Constitution of the inhabitants of Rumeli, Asia Minor, the Archipelago and the Danubian principalities'.²⁷ These latter two were based on the French constitutions of 1793 and 1795. Rigas, a thoroughgoing Greek chauvinist, was essentially a believer in the Byzantine 'Great Idea'. What he sought above all was a restored Byzantium, with republican institutions on the French model in the place of a divinely ordained emperor.²⁸ It is not altogether surprising that his main appeal was to the Greek element in the Balkans, while the Rumanians and Serbs remained largely indifferent. After an Austrian enquiry had revealed that during his projected tour of Greece Rigas had intended 'die Freyheit überall zu predigen und sodann mit Hilfe derselben die ganze Halbinsel mit gewalt vom türkischen Joche zu befreyn',²⁹ he was handed over to the Turks and executed with seven fellow-conspirators in June 1798.

The practical effects of Rigas's activities were not great but his name continued to inspire terror in the hearts of those wedded to the *status quo* long after his death. In December 1797 the Ecumenical Patriarch, Gregory V, informed Anthimos, Metropolitan of Smyrna, that a copy of Rigas's constitution, written in simple Greek, had come into his hands. Anthimos was commanded to search diligently for copies, either printed or manuscript, in every part of his diocese, and to send any he found without delay to the patriarch. Every effort was to be made to prevent copies falling into the hands of Christians, for they were highly damaging to the faith.³⁰ It has been claimed that Rigas was a personal friend of Pasvanoğlu of Vidin, with whom the Porte was in constant conflict, and his writings are said to have circulated in Pasvanoğlu's camp early in 1798.³¹

It was at this time that Nicolo and Dimo Stephanopoli were despatched to the Mani, with instructions that they were to 'répandre les semences de la véritable liberté, de rendre les enfans de la Grèce dignes de leurs ancêtres et de la grande nation qui vient de briser leurs chaînes. . . .'³² The two emissaries duly reported back to Bonaparte in optimistic terms. A meeting of delegates from all over Greece at Marathonissi in the Mani decided that an uprising should take place when the circumstances were right. Maniot women were reported to keep a candle perpetually burning before a picture of Bonaparte, as they did before icons of the Virgin Mary, while an enterprising Greek merchant brought 300 copies of an engraving of Bonaparte to distribute in Larissa and in 'les cantons les plus éclairés de la Macédoine'.³³ It was from a town in Macedonia that some school pupils wrote in July 1797 to the editor of the *Termometro politico* that 'we already sense the birth of a golden age in Italy. That is why we wish . . . to break the iron shackles from off our feet, when the liberator of Italy will come, to see and conquer.'³⁴ The Porte's suspicions that the French had designs on its territorial integrity were further confirmed by the intelligence reports of Hasan Paşa, Vali of the Morea.³⁵ French agents were also reported to be active in the *eparkhy* of Amvrakia and in the region of Preveza and Arta.³⁶

Rumours of insurrection in different parts of European Turkey were reported with increasing frequency. In a despatch from Semlin dated 16 December 1797, the *Moniteur Universel* reported Greek merchants fleeing into Hungary with their fortunes in fear of 'une grande révolution'. Some days later it was reported that the spirit of revolt was making itself felt throughout the Empire, in Bulgaria, Bosnia, Macedonia and Albania. In February 1798 it was claimed that the imminent revolution would be 'the result of writings in the Greek language which arrive in great profusion and which are distributed among the people to prepare them for a great change' and it was rumoured that the Christians of the Morea, Crete and Cyprus had already overthrown the yoke under which they had groaned for centuries, after horribly butchering their oppressors. These reports circulated with an increasing frequency in the capital itself, until something like an atmosphere of mass hysteria was built up. This is strikingly revealed in a despatch of Ruffin, the French chargé d'affaires, to Talleyrand on the 14th of June 1798. Alarmed at the rumours circulating to the advantage of Pasvanoğlu, the Porte closed down a number of coffee shops where they had originated and had the principal rumour mongers strangled. Prohibitions against defeatist talk were renewed, with the inevitable result of making conjecture appear more credible.³⁷

Against this background of mounting crisis, the Porte undertook vigorous measures to check the spread of disaffection among its Orthodox populations. Paisios, Metropolitan of Plovdiv from 1810, recalled in an autobiographical note written in 1818, that at this time he had been sent to the Morea, to Lakonia and the Mani, at the sultan's command, to impress upon the Christian population the need for obedience to the civil power and to counter 'the wily snares of unrest and rebellion' being propagated in those parts by the French.³⁸ What was regarded as a flood of subversive literature in Greek circulating among the members of the Orthodox *millet* was clearly considered a serious threat to stability, which called for counter-measures. The distribution of Rigas's writings has been alluded

to above: to these were added the productions of the French press on Corfu, Greek translations of standard revolutionary works such as Poisson de la Chabeaussière's *Catéchisme Français, ou principes de philosophie, de morale, et de politique républicaine* . . . printed in Venice in 1797³⁹ and cleverly concocted forgeries such as Constantine Stamaty's *Pros tous Romaious tis Elladhos o filopatris Eleftheriadhis* published in Paris in 1798 with a spurious Constantinopolitan imprint. The Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory V, a vigorous opponent of the 'foolish wisdom of Europe' who complained that 'the Platos and Aristotles, the Newtons and Descartes, triangles and logarithms lead to indifference in matters divine',⁴⁰ had little difficulty in gaining the Porte's permission to re-activate the moribund patriarchal press with a view to countering this flood of atheistical and seditious literature.

Gregory and the Holy Synod envisaged the printing of books in *romaika* (the popular language) and *ellinika* (archaic Greek) which would be of benefit to learning and the correction of morals. More importantly, a committee was to be set up to license not only the books printed at the patriarchal press but all Greek books, whatever their origin, held in stock by booksellers, as almost all Greek books at this time were published outside the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire. Only those works that were considered as not injurious, either spiritually or bodily, to their readers and those which offended neither against the spotless doctrines of the faith nor the jurisdiction of the state, were to be licensed. A censorship committee consisting of the patriarch himself, the grand dragoman of the Porte, a bishop and one of the leading Greek citizens of Istanbul, each of whom possessed part of the seal of approval, was to be set up.⁴¹ One of the earliest productions, if not the earliest, of the newly reconstituted press was Athanasios Parios's anonymously published *Khristianiki Apologia* printed in 1798 (reprinted Leipzig 1800 and 1805). This was intended, in the words of its author, as a 'preventative medicine for all those who, by the mercy of God, had not yet drunk of the Voltairean poison',⁴² and commended its readers to guard their ancestral faith and to give absolute obedience to the civil power. Athanasios sought to sound a dreadful warning of the horrors attendant upon the spread of liberty, the overthrow of kings and the destruction of established religion.

The views of the Orthodox hierarchy exactly coincided with those of the Porte, whose tolerance of French revolutionary excesses was rapidly waning as these same ideas began to infect its own subjects. In the spring of 1798 the *Reis ül-Küttab*, Ahmed Atif Efendi, was invited to prepare a memorandum for the Porte on the political situation, which was causing growing alarm. 'The conflagration of sedition', he reported, 'and wickedness that broke out a few years ago in France . . . had been conceived . . . in the minds of certain accursed heretics . . . the known and famous atheists Voltaire and Rousseau . . . had printed . . . works, consisting, God preserve us, of insults and vilification against the pure prophets and great kings, of the removal and abolition of all religion, and of allusions to the sweetness of equality and republicanism.' These works were expressed in the language of the people which led astray 'most of the people, even youths and women . . . so that heresy and wickedness spread like syphilis to the arteries of their brains . . . the leaders of the sedition . . . have removed the fear of God and the regard for retribution from the common

people . . . they had their rebellious declaration which they call "The Rights of Man" translated into all languages . . . and strove to incite the common people of the nations and religions to rebel against the Kings to whom they were subject.⁴³

These mounting fears on the part of the Porte and the Orthodox hierarchy were finally confirmed with the news of the French capture of Malta and of the Egyptian expedition. The landing in Alexandria took place on July 1, and by the 17th rumours were rife in the capital.⁴⁴ On August 10 definite news reached Istanbul, which by this time was gripped by anti-French hysteria, fanned by rumour, religious fanaticism and economic privation. Already in a despatch of July 20 of the previous year to Grenville, Spencer Smith, alarmed at the breakdown in provincial order, had seen in the situation parallels with the state of Byzantium under the last Palaeologi. It was now reported that Bonaparte, with 100,000 troops, was about to raise the siege of Vidin before marching on the capital itself.⁴⁵ On August 6, 1798, it was rumoured that an attempt had been made to draw the Ecumenical Patriarch himself into a conspiracy. The Patriarch, it was said, pretended to lend his support but in fact informed on the conspirators, who were strangled on the orders of the Porte.⁴⁶ Egypt was a major source of food supplies and by August the price of rice and coffee in the capital had doubled. The Porte was in no mood to listen to Talleyrand's explanations that the Egyptian expedition was directed solely against the British or to accept his proposal that Egypt might still be governed in the name of the Sultan, who would continue to receive tribute.⁴⁷

French influence at the Porte was in total eclipse. A number of Greeks, who had 'assez inconsidérément affecté de donner une éducation républicaine à leurs enfans', prudently got rid of their French tutors.⁴⁸ The final blow to French influence was the news of Nelson's victory at the Nile (August 1). The Grand Vizir, Izzet Mehmet Paşa, and the Şeyh-ül-İslâm were arrested at the end of August on account of their pro-French sympathies, while the French chargé d'affaires Ruffin was imprisoned in Yedikule on September 2, war with France being officially declared a week later. A memorandum announcing this, sent to Spencer Smith on September 11 by the Porte, accused the French of being engaged 'in the heinous attempt of perverting the Subjects of His Majesty the Grand Signor by sending Agents into Anatolia, Morea, and in the Islands of the Archipelago (people notorious for their intriguing practices) and by spreading Manifestos [sic] of the most insidious tenour, among which the one addressed by Buonaparte to the people of Maino, with several others distributed by the same, are sufficiently known to the Publick.'⁴⁹ To those Greeks who looked for salvation to the French, the news of the Egyptian landings came as a great encouragement, and the enthusiasm of many Greeks outside the Orthodox hierarchy and the Phanariot aristocracy remained undimmed. In a highly coloured message of July 24, one of Spencer Smith's agents reported, apparently from within the capital itself, that 'toute cette nation [of the Greeks] est généralement infectée des principes qui menacent de brûler le reste de l'Europe, et il est certain que les Républicains français leur ont promis le rétablissement des Gouvernemens de l'ancienne Grèce.' With the exception of the womenfolk who were in the clutches of the priests and the *arkhontes* who enjoyed the inexpressible pleasure of calling them-

selves princes, all the others were the 'partisans outrés des Républicains, et fanatiques au point qu'ils parloient il y a quelques jours avec une extrême imprudence'.⁵⁰

With the declaration of war the Ottoman propaganda counter-offensive now began in real earnest, and it is against this background that the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* should be seen. As both spiritual and civil leader of the Orthodox *millet*, the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory V entered with relish into the task of countering French propaganda among his flock. Already in July he had exhorted the metropolitans, bishops, clergy and laity of Crete to remain utterly obedient to their indulgent Sultan, telling them of the murder of priests and the destruction of monasteries by the French in Egypt and counselling them to shun 'the much-trumpeted Satanic liberty'.⁵¹ A similar exhortation was sent on September 23 to Anthimos, metropolitan of Smyrna, again pointing to anti-religious attacks by the French in Egypt and reaffirming the solicitude of the Sultan for the Christian *raya*.⁵² These injunctions fitted in well with the Porte's policy of creating a common front of believers, of whatever religion, against the atheistical French. Similar in its general tenor was a proclamation distributed in Syria, Egypt and Arabia by the Ottoman government: 'they [the French] assert that the books which the prophets brought are clear error, and that the Quran, the Torah and the Gospels are nothing but lies and idle talk'.⁵³ Some of these exhortations and warnings seem to have borne fruit. The citizens of Parga, for instance, in a letter of December 6, 1799, in reply to a letter of Gregory V urging obedience to the Sultan, declared that 'we recognize more clearly the French as intriguing rogues and sham lovers of freedom, whom we had bloodlessly driven out even before we received your fatherly warning . . . instead of freedom we see tyranny, instead of peace, carnage. . .'.⁵⁴

Whether the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, obviously intended as part of this overall campaign, was published before or after the Ottoman declaration of war on the French cannot now be established. Chardon de la Rochette claimed that it was published at the beginning of 1798 and that he had been prompted to publish a short extract to indicate the hostile attitude of the Porte even before the Egyptian expedition. Some credence is given to this view by the fact that Adhamantios Korais's rebuttal, the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia*, which was prefaced by the complete text of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, was, according to the title page, published anonymously in 'Rome' (in fact Paris) in 1798. If Korais's tract was in fact published in 1798, publication before September would be strongly indicated, as a considerable time would have to be allowed for a copy to reach Korais and for him to prepare and print an adequate reply.

It is possible that it was to the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* that Spencer Smith referred in a despatch to Grenville from Büyükdere on August 2, 1798. He reported that a council of state had been held to consider the first news of the French landings in Egypt and that he had been assured that a *fetva*, announcing war with France, was being prepared. 'Thus much', he added, 'I can collect with certainty; that the Greek Patriarch has already been directed to compose a pastoral letter in a similar sense.' Gregory V did of course issue a number of patriarchal letters on these lines, but it is possible that he delegated to Anthimos the task of preparing an exhortation to the Orthodox *millet* to remain faithful in the event of war with France. Cer-

tainly a date sometime in the late summer or autumn would appear the most likely date of publication of the tract.⁵⁵

Similar uncertainty surrounds the question of authorship of the pamphlet.⁵⁶ Korais refused to accept that such a submissive work had in fact been written by the Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem as the title page indicated. Rather, he believed that it must have been written by some turcophile, 'an official enemy of the Greek nation', without, however, being more specific. Some have denied Anthimos's authorship on the inadequate grounds that no patriarch, however turcophile, could possibly have written such a work.⁵⁷ Some scholars have contented themselves with stating simply that the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* was written pseudonymously, without attempting to identify the real author.⁵⁸ Others, notably T. H. Papadopoulos, follow the contemporary chronicler Sergios Makraios and hold that not Anthimos but the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory V was the true author. 'The latter', Papadopoulos adds, 'made an illegal use of the name of Anthimos whose death from a serious illness was instantly expected, and, therefore would enable Gregorios to evade the consequences of his forgery. . . . Macraios is such a trustworthy authority, that his testimony . . . leaves not much ground for doubt. We must believe that Korais knew the real author, but abstained from reporting his name.'⁵⁹ In arriving at this conclusion, Papadopoulos bases himself entirely on the testimony of Makraios, whose own extraordinary behaviour and passionate loathing for Gregory V suggest that his judgements should be treated with very considerable caution.⁶⁰

More plausibly, authorship has been attributed to Athanasios Parios, the principal for many years of the famous Academy at Chios. Athanasios was, as has been noticed, the author of the *Khristianiki Apologia*. He was perhaps the most virulent and prolific of the numerous Orthodox antagonists of Western thought, who make what may perhaps be termed the Greek 'Counter-Enlightenment' such an interesting phenomenon. In his *Antifonisis or answer to the absurd fervour of the 'philosophers' coming from Europe, demonstrating that the harm which they do to our nation is vain and nonsensical, and teaching what is in fact the real and true philosophy. To which is added a most beneficial exhortation to those sending their sons to Europe for education . . .* (Trieste, 1802) he sought to warn parents of the grave spiritual dangers their children underwent in seeking an education in Europe, which was none other than 'a chaos of corruption, the very brink of Hades'.⁶¹ Those who studied in the West ran the risk of losing their senses or of sinking into Popery. For good measure, he denounced Plato as 'woman-obsessed, a pederast and a parasite'.⁶² Athanasios's authorship would be entirely plausible, and indeed it may have been written by him and then adopted as his own by Anthimos. Certainly the name of a patriarch on a work of this sort would give it much greater authority. If Athanasios was the author, then he must have published within a few months of each other in Istanbul two tracts bearing much the same message, namely the dangers to the established order posed by the French and their dangerous system of liberty and equality.

It must, however, be stressed that no convincing arguments have yet been put forward to show that Anthimos was not the author of the work. To those historians who maintain that the Orthodox church acted as a bul-

wark of Hellenism during the dark ages of Turkish rule, it has obviously been something of an embarrassment that a very prominent member of the Orthodox hierarchy should actually declare that the Ottoman Empire was specifically raised up by God to protect Orthodoxy from contamination by the heresies of the West. Hence the numerous ingenious attempts to attribute authorship to Turks, turcophiles or ecclesiastics of less exalted rank than a Patriarch of Jerusalem. But this type of reasoning was by no means new in the Orthodox world,⁶³ for had not Loukas Notaras during the last days of the Byzantine Empire suggested that the sight of the Turkish turban might be more acceptable in the capital than that of the Latin biretta. Some Greek scholars have accepted Anthimos's authorship,⁶⁴ certainly nothing of the little we know of Anthimos's life provides any indication that he could not himself have written the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*. Because of the sentiments expressed in the work it has been claimed that it could only have been written under the duress of the Porte. Without denying that the initial impetus may have come from official sources, what we know of Anthimos's character suggests that he might have just as easily entered on the task of denouncing the quadruple evils of democracy, atheism, popery and protestantism on his own initiative, and with a great deal of enthusiasm.

The principal source for Anthimos's life is the introduction by Dhionysios Kleopas to his edition of Anthimos's *Erminea eis tous 150 Psalmos tou Profitanaktos David*.⁶⁵ Born in 1717, Anthimos received his early education from Iakovos of Patmos in Jerusalem, learning besides his native Greek, Arabic, Persian and Turkish, and achieving a reputation for the breadth of his knowledge. After ordination he succeeded Iakovos as *skholarkhis* of the patriarchal school in Jerusalem. In 1774 he was consecrated Metropolitan of Skythopolis and in 1788 Patriarch of Jerusalem. In this office, which he held until his death in 1808 at the age of ninety-one, he gained a reputation as a vigorous champion of Orthodoxy and an opponent of Latin proselytism. For the benefit of his flock he wrote in Arabic a theological treatise *al-Hidāyat al-qawīmah* (Vienna, 1791), described in the licence to print as a work 'ob Eruditionis, et linguae Arabicae Elegantiam omni laude dignum', and an edition of the Psalms (Vienna, 1791). He apparently enjoyed good relations with Sultan Selim III (1789–1807) who helped him to secure Orthodox rights in the Holy Places. For much of his patriarchate he seems to have lived in Istanbul, where he became known as a patron of the more extreme champions of Orthodoxy. Parthenios of Thessaloniki dedicated his edition of Prokopios the Peloponnesian's *Vivlion kaloumenon elenkhos kata atheon kai dhyssenvon* . . . (Venice, 1792), to Anthimos, as did Sergios Makraios, the principal of the Patriarchal Academy (Megali tou Genous Skholi) in Istanbul, his *Tropaion ek tis elladhikis panoplias kata ton opadhon tou Kopernikou* (Vienna 1797).⁶⁶ In this bizarre work, written to counter Panagiotis Kodhrikas's translation of Bernard de Fontenelle's *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*, Makraios claimed to have routed the adherents of Copernican cosmology and utterly to have destroyed their profane system, confirming in the process his reputation as one of the most bigoted of the champions of Orthodox conservatism. The work is very fulsomely dedicated to Anthimos, who is described as 'a spotless mirror of right belief, and a relentless judge of contrary opinions'. Anthimos's patronage of Makraios may in-

deed provide some clue as to the reasons why the latter sought to attribute authorship of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* to Gregory V. The storm of controversy which broke out on publication may have led him to shield his powerful patron and deflect the hostility of progressive Greeks on to his arch-enemy Gregory. Be this as it may, it can safely be assumed that Anthimos fully shared the views of his reactionary protégés.

Further evidence of his conservatism is provided in a curious passage in the *Apanthisma tis Khristianikis Pisteos yani Gülzarı imanı mesihi* (Istanbul, at the press of the Patriarchate, in 1803. Asitanede Patrikhanede olan basmahanedede. 1803 senesinde), published for the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians of Anatolia. In this book a passage, printed in Turkish (in Greek characters) only, states that certain of the prayers have been given only in Greek, because Anthimos, *Kuds-ü Şerifin patriği*, disapproved of the publication of books incorporating religious texts in Turkish, the language of the infidel, as this might lead the faithful to blasphemy against God.⁶⁷ This injunction is curious in view of the fact that Anthimos had himself published religious texts in Arabic, no less the language of the infidel. The 1799 Vienna edition of Serapheim of Antalya's pilgrim guide to Jerusalem and Palestine, *Kuds-ü Şerif. Azim mübarek Hristos efendimizin mevlûd olup ayak bastığı yerin ziyaretnamesi . . .* (Turkish in Greek characters), was published at the order of Anthimos, whose portrait faces the title page. Moreover he is reputed to have preached in Arabic and Turkish as well as Greek. It is also clear from a passage, dated January 7, 1800, in the journal of Joseph Dacre Carlyle, professor of Arabic at Cambridge University, that he was more than eager to collaborate in Carlyle's plans to publish an edition of the New Testament in Arabic, adding that 'he wished exceedingly to have the Church at Jerusalem taken under the protection of the King of England & expressed the utmost affection to our country'.⁶⁸ Carlyle gives an interesting personal glimpse of Anthimos who 'appeared a most venerable & interesting figure—very old (our interpreter told us 95, but of that I rather doubt) but perfectly possessed of all his faculties'. In the journal of his visit to Mount Athos Carlyle again referred to his friend Anthimos whose character 'as it deserves to be, is universally known throughout every part of the Empire'.⁶⁹ A more personal motivation for Anthimos's attacks on the horrors of liberty may have been a concern, widely shared at the time, that Bonaparte had designs on Jerusalem after he had consolidated his position in Egypt.

The authorship of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* may now never be definitively established, but there is no doubt that its publication caused an immediate reaction on the part of progressive Greeks. Indeed Korais, who shared Voltaire's dismissal of the history of Byzantium as a disgrace to the human mind, felt that so great was the potential damage that the work might inflict on efforts to develop a sense of national consciousness among the Greeks that an immediate rebuttal was called for. This took the form of the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia* or *Brotherly Teaching addressed to the Greeks throughout the Ottoman dominions. In answer to the Paternal Teaching published pseudonymously in Constantinople in the name of His Beatitude the Patriarch of Jerusalem*. This, the first of Korais's political tracts, bore the imprint 'in Rome, year one of Liberty (1798)' although it was in fact printed in Paris. Korais prefaced his rebuttal with the complete text

of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* and his reprint is less of a bibliographical rarity than Anthimos's original. He was fearful lest Europeans should form the impression that a work of such monkish obscurantism reflected the true feelings of the Greeks, that not only were they enslaved but that they 'baisent encore affectueusement la main qui les enchaîne'.⁷⁰ Korais, ever careful to steer, as he put it, between 'the Scylla of atheism and the Charybdis of superstition', and fully aware that anti-clericalism on the French model would be of little help in his efforts to infuse the Greeks with a desire to liberate themselves, was careful to buttress his arguments in defence of liberty and democracy with copious references to biblical texts and well-judged appeals to the religious prejudices of his Orthodox readers. Among the many obstacles to the overthrow of the 'Ottoman yoke' by the Greeks, he stressed the 'wretched ignorance of the masses, and the superstitions to which this ignorance gives rise'. Referring to the liberation of the papal states he asks whether it is to be regretted that the Cardinals have been forcibly deprived of their lovers, male and female, and that the Roman church can no longer castrate new-born infants so that they might sing in its churches like the Corybantes in the temple of Cybele. According to Sathas, Athanasios Parios, indefatigable in the cause of reaction, composed a rebuff directed at the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia* entitled the *Neos Rapsakis or a reproach and denunciation in the form of an apology against the atheistical blasphemies put out by one of the libertines against the pious and beneficial Paternal Exhortation, recently published by ecclesiastical providence for all Christians*. Athanasios was dissuaded from publishing this however, according to Valetas, by the force of Korais's rebuttal of Anthimos.⁷¹ The title of Athanasios's unpublished tract might, unless he was quite unusually egotistical, be a further indication that Athanasios was not in fact the author of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*. It is perhaps significant that although Athanasios is clearly referring to Anthimos's work he calls it the 'Paternal Exhortation' (*Patriki Parainesis*) rather than the 'Paternal Teaching' (*Dhidhaskalia Patriki*), a slip he would presumably not have made had he in fact been its author.

Anthimos's concept of 'voluntary slavery' (*ethelodhouleia*), willing acquiescence in Turkish rule, was the obvious target of an even more vigorous critic than Korais, the anonymous author of the *Elliniki Nomarkhia (Greek Constitution), or a speech about liberty*, published in 'Italy' in 1806. The two principal reasons for the continued servitude of the Greeks, the author claimed, were the ignorance of the clergy and the absence abroad of Greece's best citizens. 'How', he asks 'should the Greeks be woken from the fog of tyranny? The preachers, who were under an obligation to show them the truth, do not undertake the task. But how do these wordly automata, these false preachers answer? . . . "Beloved", they say, "God gave us the Ottoman tyranny, to punish us for our sins, chastising us in the present life so that he may liberate us after death from eternal torment".' The author is here clearly referring to the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*. Although careful to point out that he is a believer and to exempt certain of the clergy from his strictures, the anonymous author is much more overtly anti-clerical than Korais. Does the Holy Synod in Constantinople, he asks, resemble the Holy Apostles of the Word of God? 'You are full', he continues, 'of the money which you daily steal from the wretched Christians. Perhaps [you resemble the Apostles] in temperance and the bridling of

the passions? But in what great revelry is there not to be found one of your members? And which one of them does not adore two or three well-born women with the utmost shamelessness and almost openly . . . ?' The metropolitans, he adds, eat and drink like pigs, sleeping fourteen hours at night and two hours at midday. When they are not eating, drinking and slumbering 'then they think up the most shameful and base things you could possibly imagine'. 'In church why do preachers never mention the maxim "Fight for faith and country" [popularly but probably incorrectly attributed to Constantine Palaeologos, the last Emperor of Byzantium] . . . why do they never point to the examples set by Themistocles, by Aristides, by Socrates and the myriad other virtuous and wise men . . . why do they never mention how the world is governed and what is the best form of government. . . ?' 'No, no,' he fulminates, 'you are not shepherds, neither guides of lightness, but wolves and the fount of darkness, O impostors and hypocrites. For how long will ignorance cover your profane souls with the cloak of hypocrisy?'⁷²

According to Makraios, in his chronicle written circa 1800, the synod 'endhimousa', the members of the Holy Synod residing permanently in Constantinople, became thoroughly alarmed at the strength of the reaction provoked by publication of the tract and destroyed the remaining copies of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*. It is not clear whether or not this was in fact done. No such inference can be drawn from the small number of copies that survive, for, as D. Ghinis has pointed out, there are numerous examples of works printed during this period which survive in one or two copies only.⁷³ This is particularly the case with Greek printed books and pamphlets of a popular nature, as the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* was clearly intended to be. Many of these are of very considerable scarcity and fewer examples exist of some of them than of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, without there being any suggestion that the bulk of the edition was deliberately destroyed. Indeed at least four copies of the original edition of Anthimos's tract have survived. These are now in the Library of the British Museum (868.e. 33), originally from the library of Frederick North, 5th Earl of Guilford, in the Library of Parliament in Athens (IA. 4. ΝΑΛ.), in the Kozani Public Library (E'. X. 2.) and in the Gennadeion Library in Athens (BT. 1561. 22).⁷⁴ According to Valetas a copy existed during the early years of the nineteenth century in the library of the famous Greek academy at Ayvalik (Kydhonies), that 'New Miletus, metropolis of learning for the whole of Asia Minor'.⁷⁵

Unlike some of the works of Athanasios Parios, many of which are similar in tone, the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* was not, as far as is known, published in more than one Greek edition, if Korais's reprinting is discounted. It is difficult to assess the size of the edition or the extent to which copies circulated and in what areas of the Ottoman Empire, for very little is known of the mechanics of publishing and the size of the reading public in the Greek world at this time. It is certain, however, that Korais's reprinting ensured a wider circulation than it would otherwise have had. That the tract was intended for as wide an audience as possible is indicated by the relative simplicity of the language in which it is written, which, although described by Chardon de la Rochette as 'rocailleux, incohérent' and reminiscent of the style of a second-century pedant, was by no means as tortuous as that of, say, Anthimos's contemporary and protégé Sergios

Makraios. Anthimos's text would certainly be more intelligible to the less educated members of the Orthodox flock than much other ecclesiastical writing of the period.

Despite Korais's attempt at an immediate rebuttal, and other attempts to pour scorn on Anthimos's thinking, the ideas expressed in the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* were by no means discredited in the eyes of many members of the Orthodox hierarchy. Shortly after Alexandros Ypsilantis's ill-fated attempt to foment an uprising in the Principalities, a Rumanian translation of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* by Meletie, Bishop of Huși, was published at the press of the metropolitanate at Iași in November 1822. This bore the title *Invățătură părintească alcătuită de prea fericitul patriarh al sfintei cetăți a Ierusalimului chir Antim spre folosul pravoslavnicilor hristiani . . .*⁷⁶ It is interesting to note that in this edition the work is still attributed to Anthimos. If, as Makraios claimed, Anthimos vigorously denied authorship when the Greek edition was first published then one might have expected the title page of any subsequent edition to omit reference to his name. The title page adds that the translation was made at the command of Ioan Sandu Sturza, the turcophile Prince of Moldavia. Clearly published for political reasons, the tract was to be distributed gratis to all churches, to help instill a sense of obedience to the Ottoman Porte. Ariadna Camariano is inclined to believe that Sturza did not charge the bishop of Huși with the translation of the work on his own initiative, but rather on the instructions of the Sultan, who was alarmed at the intensification of the Greek revolt, and fearful lest the Rumanian populations be drawn into the conflict.⁷⁷ Again there seems little reason to doubt that Anthimos's views were widely shared in the higher echelons of the Orthodox clergy in the Rumanian Principalities.⁷⁸

The Rumanian translator of Athanasios Parios's *Khristianiki Apologia* (Mănăstirea Neamțul, 1816; București, 1819) was apparently so slavish in his adherence to the original text that the Rumanian version is, in places, scarcely intelligible.⁷⁹ Ariadna Camariano had no opportunity of comparing the *Invățătură părintească* with a copy of the original Greek text, but it would seem likely that the Rumanian version would be equally confused, and one can only sympathise with Meletie's attempts to extract a coherent pattern of thought from Anthimos's rather confused exhortations.

The title page of the original editions of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* reads:

ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΙΑ / ΠΑΤΡΙΚΗ / Συντεθεισα Παρά τοῦ Μακαριωτάτου / Πατριάρχου τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως ἱερουσα / λῆμ κῦρ 'ΑΝΘΙΜΟΥ εἰς ὠφέλειαν / τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν νῦν πρώτον / τυπωθεῖσα δι' ἰδίας δαπάνης τοῦ / Παναγίου Ταφου. / 'ΕΝ ΚΟΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ / ΠΟΛΕΙ / Παρά τῷ Τυπογράφῳ Πογῶς Ἰωάννου / ἐξ Ἀρμενίων / ἀψγη.

'Fatherly Teaching, compiled by His Beatitude the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Kyr Anthimos, for the benefit of Orthodox Christians. Now printed for the first time at the special expense of the Holy Sepulchre. In Constantinople. At the printer Pogos Ioannis of the Armenians. 1798.'

The pamphlet measures 16×10.5 cm., contains 28 pages and has no signatures. The title page is of interest for a number of reasons. In the first

place it states that the work has been printed 'at the press of Pogos Ioannis of the Armenians', and not 'at the press of the Patriarchate of Constantinople', although some historians have stated simply that it was printed at the patriarchal press.⁸⁰ This last imprint is found on at least two books printed in Greek in Istanbul in the same year, the *Khristianiki Apologia* of Athanasios Parios and an edition of the Psalter. The type face, although not the ornaments, used in the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* and in these editions is similar and indeed it seems that Pogos Ioannis made the matrices for the type used in the newly re-established patriarchal press.⁸¹ Understandably the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* does not bear the characteristic device of the patriarchal press. More puzzling is the absence of the licence to print authorized by the censorship committee whose creation has been discussed above. So little is known of the history of Greek printing in Constantinople in the eighteenth century that it is difficult to draw any firm conclusion from this omission. It is certainly curious, however, that a tract seeking to defend Orthodoxy and apparently written by a very high-ranking member of the Orthodox hierarchy was seemingly not published at the patriarchal press, nor did it have the licence that was apparently mandatory for Greek publications, although in practice by no means all the Greek books printed in Istanbul at this time bore this licence. It is interesting to note that Constantine Stamaty's pro-French propaganda tract *Pros tous Romaious tis Elladhos o filopatris Eleftheriadhis* was given the spurious imprint, 'at the press of Pogos Ioannis of the Armenians in Constantinople' together with the date October, 4 1798, i.e. a date after the Porte's declaration of war against France, in an attempt to spread confusion among the Orthodox subjects of the Sultan. It was in fact printed in Paris.

It should be stressed that works such as the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, seeking to counter French revolutionary propaganda and the circulation of ideas held to be subversive of established order, formed part of a common genre to be found in most European countries at this time. A well-known example is that 'lasting monument of fatuous credulity' compiled by John Robison, professor Natural Philosophy at Edinburgh University, and first published in Edinburgh in 1797: *Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the secret meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*. This was published in numerous editions in Edinburgh, London, Dublin and New York, and in French (London, 1798–99) and German (Königslutter, 1800) translation. In Catalonia broadsheets were distributed containing verses urging the populace to take up arms against the malevolent French in defence of 'God, the Law, the Fatherland, the King, Persons, Goods, Families and Houses'.⁸² In Hungary during this period French ideas were the object of severe criticism by both Catholic and Protestant writers,⁸³ while during the great religious revivals that swept the western territories of the United States in the 1790s, Voltaire and Thomas Paine were among the favourite targets of evangelical preachers.⁸⁴

In this introduction an attempt has been made to sketch the historical background to the publication of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, to suggest that the ideas it expresses, bizarre as they may seem, were by no means untypical of Orthodox thinking of the time, and to discuss some of the problems of authorship and dating. Whether or not Anthimos was the

real author, and it seems likely that he was, it can fairly be claimed that the work gives expression to a vein of thought that has powerful roots in the Orthodox tradition, and one that is by no means without significance in the Greece of today.

THE PATERNAL TEACHING⁸⁵

To my readers: Anthimos, by the Grace of God, Patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem and all Palestine.

Three reasons moved me, my brethren in the faith and children of the Church of Christ, to print the present teaching for the benefit of the Christian brethren reading it.

A. The command of our Lord, who enjoins that each person who has received a gift from God make use of it for the benefit of his brethren, in order that he who hides his talent be not condemned as a deceitful slave.

B. Since I found myself, through divine dispensation and mercy, servant and protector of the most Holy Apostolic and Patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, a throne which is helped and shown consideration by all the Christians of the world in its bodily and essential needs, my conscience did not permit me to remain silent, but impelled me to benefit all my fellow Christian brethren spiritually, as they willingly help materially; just as the Christian faith from the beginning was proclaimed from Jerusalem to all the world as it is written 'from Sion stems the law, and the word of God from Jerusalem'.

C. Since I have arrived at such an age⁸⁶ where I await the hour of death at every moment, I take the opportunity, in order to leave as a command and exhortation to the faithful and orthodox people, to declare with brevity to the hearts of all, the correct beliefs of our faith and the deceit and delusion of the devil, who, from generation to generation, continually struggles to dupe, if possible, even the chosen, to topple them from the true faith and to trip them up with snares and delusions; as well as in the present age, the fiend tries us with newly appearing types of constitution and government, allegedly more desirable and more beneficial, which transgress the true precepts of God and the Christian evangelical life, which is restricted and set about with commandments and laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, which guide the faithful to pass the short time of the present life, with patience in sorrow, and hope, not in the present, but in the future life.

For this reason, we urge all, with a fatherly prayer, to receive zealously these few admonitions, and to sweep away every obstacle, visible and invisible, that you meet with in the examination of the injunctions of God, so as not to be tripped up and fall into an abyss of evil and perdition, that you be not deprived of that eternal blessedness, which, in the patience of our souls, may we all achieve according to our Lord's promise: 'See therefore, brethren, do not be deceived for many shall come in the last days, neither knowing what they say, nor whereof they confidently affirm, to the deception of simple souls'. And take care.

Of the trials of God towards the faithful and the chosen

From among the creatures of God who possess reason and freedom of the will only the devil and man have apostasized against God, and for this they have been condemned according to the incomprehensible and inscrutable justice of God. And the devil has been condemned for eternity to the underworld, because he sinned with pride and arrogance against the divine dignity of God and wished to set his own throne above the heavens and, imagining himself on high, was condemned to the underworld.

Man, however, was not condemned for eternity, because he was deceived by that very devil into imagining himself the equal of God, but was only ejected from the blessed life of paradise for a time, assigned in the present life to eat his bread with sweat, to meet with thorns and thistles, sorrows, misfortunes, tyrannies, sufferings, tears, sickness, persecutions, calumnies, and all such bitter and painful things. All these, however, are transitory.

Since God in his unfathomable compassion, decided that man should die and by being dissolved into the elements from which he was composed, according to the decision of God, to be able in time again to reach paradise, and when he had been tested in the present life and tried with temptations, as gold is tested in the crucible, to be considered worthy again of that blessed life, and to take pleasure eternally in the splendour of heavenly rewards with joy and eternal delight.

For this reason, those men and women who have had, from the time of Adam until the present, this just decision of God rooted in their souls and have known the reason for their exile from paradise, have praised God. And for all that they were exiled, they who had experienced bitterness and sufferings, they have given thanks and have run through fire and water, patiently enduring the sorrows of the present life and hoping to be restored to the future and blessed life of paradise.

Since, however, this falling Lucifer, the devil, was envious of such great love of mankind on the part of God and, being by nature after his fall full of wickedness, he became a hater of men and he never again ceased inciting man, now towards one delusion, now towards another unseemliness.

Because of this, at diverse times God has sent inspired and righteous prophets, to guide mankind and to teach them and to counsel them to endure with thanksgiving the sorrows of the present life, so as to be worthy of the inexpressible joys of that future life. This compassionate creator, seeing mankind tyrannized over in this way by the devil, in order to hasten and make more easy their salvation, deigned to send his only begotten Son, who, bending back the heavens, came down to earth and gave mankind a new form, causing it to be born again through water and the spirit, and giving himself as the type and model for salvation to all, he ascended from whence he never at all departed, having accomplished the mystery beyond reason of his incarnation.

Who, Christian brethren, could not admire such condescension on our behalf by God? Who cannot take as an example in the present life this same God, seeing him hunger and thirst, in tribulation, in distress, in persecution? This truly is in the present existence the life of the true Christian, if he wishes to be worthy of the heavenly kingdom.

But the devil, who ever stalks about as a roaring lion, who from the beginning led astray our first parents, and never ceases to sow tares, has made it his aim again to sever the faithful from divine love, and in every way to place difficulties and obstacles in the way of their salvation. And, indeed, in the beginning he raised up persecutors, to chastise with various punishments the Apostles, the Christians, and with persecutions, with bitter deaths, with seizures of their possessions and with exile. But the one who ensnares the wise in his trickery constituted all these things a means of great salvation; he actually strengthened the Christians to suffer these tribulations, and to confess before their persecutors the avowal of their faith, bringing shame on them and the evil devil who prompted them. And truly nothing of human things, wealth, glory, honour, property or possessions, and almost life itself did they prefer to their faith in Christ.

Secondly, when the evil one came to realise that, as a result of his torments and chastisements, not only did he not gain his ends but he caused many thousands of the faithful to be martyrs, he undertook another course of villainy. He sowed the tares of heresies in a treacherous and underhand way, in order

to cause the faithful Christians to break with their faith while yet appearing faithful to Christ, becoming the devil's own special followers, they removing themselves from Christ.

And there are diverse heresies that have appeared from time to time, now against the only son, like that of the Arians, now against the Holy Spirit, like that of the Macedonians, now against the Incarnation, such as that of the Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites, Iconoclasts, and innumerable others. Because of these heresies diverse ecumenical and local synods took place, and, having censured these heresies, anathematized these turbulent beliefs, and made clear to the faithful the beliefs against God of the heretics, and strengthened the Christians in the spotless faith; they shamed the fiendish devil and his vessels, the heretics, and thus the holy fathers did not allow the worthy to come to grief, except those who of their own set purpose showed themselves worthy of perdition.

Thirdly, the devil raised from the West another newer heresy for the ruin of the pious, I mean the Latin heresy, different in name but similar to the foregoing heresies and leading to destruction. And with this he led astray all the West. This heresy gave birth afterwards to offshoots and different sects: Lutherans, Calvinists, Luthero-Calvinists, Evangelicals and others without number; this heresy engendered its own destruction, so that it might become clear that it was rotten and unstable, as born of an unsound mind.⁸⁷

However, beloved Christians, here again we should see and admire the boundless love of God towards us. See how clearly our Lord, boundless in mercy and all-wise, has undertaken to guard once more the unsullied Holy and Orthodox faith of us, the pious, and to save all mankind. He raised out of nothing this powerful empire of the Ottomans, in the place of our Roman [Byzantine] Empire which had begun, in a certain way, to cause to deviate from the beliefs of the Orthodox faith, and He raised up the empire of the Ottomans higher than any other kingdom so as to show without doubt that it came about by divine will, and not by the power of man, and to assure all the faithful that in this way He deigned to bring about a great mystery, namely salvation to his chosen people.

The all-mighty Lord, then, has placed over us this high kingdom, 'for there is no power but of God', so as to be to the people of the West a bridle, to us the people of the East a means of salvation. For this reason he puts into the heart of the Sultan of these Ottomans an inclination to keep free the religious beliefs of our Orthodox faith and, as a work of supererogation, to protect them, even to the point of occasionally chastising Christians who deviate from their faith, that they have always before their eyes the fear of God.

The Church of Christ has all the freedom that it has under Orthodox sovereigns of the same faith in the building of churches, as from generation to generation many splendid churches in different provinces and places have been built with the permission of the mighty Empire. And this imperial approval existed from the beginning, and continues up to the present. And let no one think that, because the building of many churches is sometimes hindered, freedom of Christian worship is thereby curtailed. For shame! This is the superstition of some, to consider the building of churches a great benefit.

The faith of Christ has achieved all its growth and perfection not with dignified and lavish temples, but with churches wretched and few in number. For God is not found 'in temples made with hands; neither is He sewed by men's hands'. Elsewhere 'You are the Church of God', says the Apostle. And certainly it is according to divine command that the building of churches magnificent beyond necessity is forbidden, 'for our citizenship is in heaven' and 'we have not here an abiding city, we seek after the city which is to come' according to the Holy Apostle Paul.

The arch-apostate, the devil, understanding then these trials of God, that He changes these trials for the faithful people from generation to generation, as a

means of their salvation and to enable them to enjoy eternal and inexpressible blessedness, seeks to lead astray and once more to lead to destruction the abandoned chosen faithful. For this he has devised in the present century another artifice and pre-eminent deception, namely the much vaunted system of liberty, which perhaps on the surface appears to be good, so as to deceive if possible the chosen people. It is, however, a trap of the devil and a destructive poison, to drive the people headlong into corruption and confusion.

And since the evil one is wounded in the heart, seeing the soul-destroying treacheries which he had contrived from time to time trampled underfoot, and seeing that this our Orthodox faith flourishes in this powerful empire, in his envy and shame he has summoned, in desperation, all the spirits of evil to help devise this new and ingenious trap, so that in the end even good Christians may finally fall into it and lose their heavenly kingdom and be eternally tortured with him.

Brothers, do not be led astray from the path of salvation; but as you have always with bravery and steadfastness trampled underfoot the wiles of the devil, so now also close your ears and give no hearing to these newly-appearing hopes of liberty 'for now is salvation nearer to us'. And be very certain that their boastings and teachings, as we have been able to understand them, and from what we know in practice of the nations which have received them, that they are not only the direct contradiction of the written word of the Scriptures and the Holy Apostles, which enjoins us to subject ourselves to the superior powers, not only to those that are just but also to those that are perverse, that we may have tribulation in this world, and keep our minds pure for the Lord; they are, I say, not only the contradiction of Holy Writ, but they do not bring about any transitory good in the present life, as they guilefully promise, in order to lead you astray and to strip you of all riches in heaven and earth.

Where is the glorious and most attractive sight of the envy of all, beautiful Italy? Where now the inexhaustible treasure of the very ancient and serene republic of the Venetians?⁸⁸ Everywhere this illusory system of the diabolical one has led to poverty, murder, damage, rapine, complete ungodliness, spiritual destruction and vain repentance.

The teachings of these new libertines, Christian brethren, are deceitful. And beware: guard steadfastly your ancestral faith and, as followers of Jesus Christ, resolutely give your obedience to the civil government, which grants you that which alone is necessary to the present life, and what is more valuable than anything, does not present any obstacle or damage to your spiritual salvation. 'For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self?'

These newly-appeared teachings, being hostile to the Holy Scriptures and to the Apostolic teaching, even if they were to enable you to obtain all the wealth of the world they should still be hated as a device of the fiendish devil, ever alert for the spiritual destruction of Christians. How much more so when these promises are false and fraudulent, and the consequences are not wealth and blessings but poverty, misfortune and disorder, and what is aimed at by this freedom is a hated oligarchy and tyranny, as experience has shown.

But let us analyse more scientifically the very name of this 'liberty', to see if it can be reconciled with any civil government in which abides order, morality, and safety for its citizens. Let us pass over, for the sake of brevity, monarchical and aristocratic government, as in these (as all admit) such liberty is not granted, and let us examine if, in truth, liberty is granted in a well-administered democratic form of government. When we say 'government' we must mean a group of men, by nature of different constitutions, who inhabit one and the same state, that is the strong and the weak, the healthy and the sick, the wise and the ignorant. Can freedom, then, exist among them?

True freedom is, A, that disposition of the rational soul which, by the grace

of God, leads man to the good without, however, compelling him. Such liberty is called 'freedom of the will'. B, it is freedom for man to be able, unhindered, to put into practice the appetites of his desires, which is insubordination. C, it is called freedom for someone to live according to divine and human laws, that is to live free of every reproach of conscience and free of civil discipline.

In such a democracy, when we look on men of different dispositions, possessed of free will and insubordinate, how can such a government be formed? The powerful will dominate the weak, the healthy the sick, and the wise will deceive the ignorant. What order can then remain in such a government, and what morality, when the passions rule? What safety is there for the citizens, when rapine prevails?

The only praiseworthy liberty is the third noted above. This has no place in the system of the new freedom lovers. For how can they live without the reproach of conscience, those who themselves, having been led astray and having been reduced to a wretched condition, are already trying to deceive and to ruin others?

How can they live without any civil discipline, those who despise unsullied marriage, and harm the whole state? How can they live without the reproach of conscience, those of them who, won over by gain, can lightly cheat the civil law; when the fear of God and the threat of eternal punishment is not a bridle against wrong-doing?

You should understand, brethren, that true freedom cannot exist in a good government without faith in God. And for this reason, the Holy Apostles, the immovable pillars of the godliness of our faith, who were enlightened by God, thus preached to the world, thus they and their successors behaved. These same things the Church of Christ received from them and guarded steadfastly.

And when we see with such clarity that this new system of liberty is none other than a confusion and overturning of good government, a path leading to destruction or, simply speaking, a new ambush of the evil devil to lead astray the abandoned Orthodox Christians, are we not going to be judged worthy of all condemnation if we give the slightest hearing to these sly and deceptive teachings? Are we not going to be justly punished afterwards if, knowing most clearly the truth, we follow the guides of the false one against the commandments of God?

No, Christians! Let us have steadfastness and prudence, let us not lose the unfading crowns of eternal blessedness for a false and non-existent liberty in this present life. Let us not deprive ourselves of the inexpressible rewards. Let us not listen at all, in order to bring shame without consolation to the devil, and to enjoy those good things which God has prepared from time immemorial for those who love him.

Strengthen yourselves then, brethren, in the Lord and in the greatness of his strength, take on the panoply of God so that you can resist the machinations of the devil.

Above all take on the emblem of faith, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit, that is the command of God, that you rout every onslaught of the evil one, to be judged worthy of the heavenly kingdom, which may we all succeed in gaining through the love and charity of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory, the honour, and the adoration for ever. Amen.

*Political Verses*⁸⁹

Let everyone remain in that state to which he has been called,
Let him not gainsay the kingdom to which he is subject.

It is acknowledged by those who discern
Things with the logic of the mind and judge,
How inevitable, and how necessary is

Precise reflection in all the things that have to be done.
 Right reason demands that everyone should recognize
 One power and one head which has authority over him.
 In this way the universe is formed, continues and is governed
 From its first creation, and in this way it is preserved.
 All creation acknowledges one leader and creator,
 In heaven, and on earth, and the whole of nature
 Obediently offers itself and bows its head,
 To one divine kingdom, set above all.
 From which, in imitation of the first monarchy,
 Which governs all things with divine solicitude,
 From its first beginning the world has been subjected
 To one first leader, and thus it has been conserved.
 Each nation received its own authority,
 And yielded to it with ultimate obedience;
 To avoid the many wretched consequences
 Of anarchy, or government by the many.
 And this the law of nature teaches,
 With very many examples it makes it abundantly clear.
 Sailors subject themselves to a captain,
 And all the dwellers in a house to one master of the house,
 And if obedience is lacking, both in house and ship,
 Then in the end destruction is certainly expected.
 And even the illogical animals are led by nature itself,
 Without being led they do not move.
 With a leader bees govern their lives,⁹⁰
 And flocks follow the leading ram,
 Such an order is apparent in the things that move,
 The relation between the leader and the led.
 How much then thinking creatures are obliged
 To live with obedience and discipline to the sovereign.
 He is, after God, their ruler,
 The controller of their possessions, and guardian of their lives.
 Both divine and human laws sternly command,
 Summon great and small to faith and obedience.
 Above all, say the Scriptures, we should praise
 Our sovereigns always and for ever,
 And again that we should obey the sovereign powers,
 As having authority by divine command.
 And whoever resists such authority,
 Clearly opposes the divine command.
 And once again, because the heart of the sovereign is in the hand of God,
 And even with one nod of the head the sovereign acts, and not otherwise.
 Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's, it proclaims
 And to God that which is God's, it enjoins without fail,
 Honour to Him that deserves honour, that which is due to Him that merits it,
 And let every member render fear to him.
 Hear then, beloved, as an article of our faith,
 We should fulfil our proper obligation.
 And all fellow-countrymen, since from our beginning,
 We never lacked submission,
 Let us intensify our faith from the heart.
 With absolute obedience and with eagerness,
 For we are indebted for all the mercies,
 Which we enjoy, both old and young,
 Not only to offer everything we possess

But also to despise every anarchy.
 This is the will of God, this is salvation,
 Certainly, this is the true salvation.
 And whoever will think otherwise is despairing,
 And clearly abandoned by God.
 Settlers, all temporarily sojourning in this life,
 For this reason, not even do we have a lasting dwelling,
 But we warmly seek the future city.
 If we have patience so as to become worthy of it
 Let us preserve these things, let us fear God.
 And let us submit ourselves faithfully to our sovereign,
 Not acting according to foreign examples at all,
 Knowing full well that all these are but a deception,
 All those doing this, steadfastly standing firm
 We shall receive both, we shall live certainly
 This temporary life and the life eternal,
 As it is meet for those who hope for the heavenly kingdom.

1. (C. Eliot), *Turkey in Europe*, London, 1900, 277.
2. *Geschichte Griechenlands . . .*, Leipzig, 1870, i, 18.
3. Anon., *Elliniki Nomarkhia, itoi logos peri eleftherias*, 'Italy', 1806 (ed. G. Valetas, Athens 1948-49) 182.
4. An VII (1799), iv trimestre, 218-25.
5. London, 1814, 193-95. More recently T. H. Papadopoulos has published extracts of the Greek text with an English translation in his informative *Studies and Documents relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, Brussels, 1952, 142-46. See also S. G. Chaconas, *Adamantios Korais, A Study in Greek Nationalism*, New York, 1942, 85-89.
6. The Venezuelan revolutionary leader Miranda gives a list of the French military experts whom he encountered in Istanbul during his visit in 1786, *Archivo del General Miranda, Viajes . . .*, ii, Caracas, 1929, 156. He also met a renegade Scotsman named Campbell who, some twenty years previously, had turned Turk and adopted the name Mustafa ağa. He was now inspector of artillery (kumbaracı başı) and held in high esteem, *ibid.*, 155. Cf. (Konstantios), *Konstantinias palaia te kai neotera . . .*, Venice, 1824, 136. For Selim's military reforms and his employment of French military experts see S. J. Shaw, 'The Established Ottoman Army Corps under Selim III (1789-1807)', *Der Islam*, xl (1965), 142-184.
7. B. Lewis, 'The Impact of the French Revolution on Turkey, Some Notes on the Transmission of Ideas', *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, i (1953), 120. See also the same author's *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, London, 1961, 59-72. No equivalent study has yet been made of the impact of the French Revolution on Greek society.
8. G. Lebel, *La France et les Principautés Danubiennes . . .*, Paris, 1955, 63-64.
9. J. Reyhman, '1794 Polonya İsyanı ve Türkiye', *Belleten*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, xxxi (1967), 89-90.
10. On the French press in Istanbul see L. Lagarde, 'Note sur les journaux français de Constantinople à l'époque révolutionnaire', *Journal Asiatique*, ccxxxvi (1948), 271-76.
11. E. de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor*, xix (pt. 1), *Corespondență Diplomatică și Rapoarte Consulare Austriace (1782-1797)*, ed. I. I. Nistor, Bucharest, 1922, 814-16. The brothers Poublios and Georgios Poullos took an active part in the publication of Greek journals in Vienna during this period. Some of the younger boyars seem to have acquired a taste for French authors, including Voltaire: 'les ouvrages de M. de Voltaire se trouvent entre les mains de quelques jeunes Boyards; & le goût des Auteurs français seroit aujourd'hui un objet de commerce dans ces contrées, si le Patriarche de Constantinople n'avoit menacé de la colère du Ciel, tous ceux qui liroient des livres *Catholiques Romains*, & particulièrement ceux de M. de Voltaire (Jean Louis Carra), *Histoire de la Moldavie et de la Valachie, avec une dissertation sur l'état actuel de ces deux provinces . . .*, Jassy, 1777, 219. Cf. F. J. Sulzer, *Geschichte des*

transalpinischen Daciens . . . , Vienna, 1782, pt. 1 vol. iii, 46–47. The general level of culture, however, in the Principalities seems to have been rather low, see Carra, *ibid.*, 207 and (F. W. von Bawr), *Perigrifi tis Vlachias* . . . , Bucharest, 1789, 21.

12. P(ublic) R(ecord) O(ffice), F(oreign) O(ffice) 78/18: Spencer Smith to Grenville, April 16, 1797. Extracts from documents in the Public Record Office are published by permission of the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office. The Smyrna 'rebellion' has not yet been adequately studied but cf. N. K. Kh. Kostis, 'Smyrnaika Analekta. To en Smyrni rebellion tou 1797 kata neas anekdhotous pigas', *Dheltion tis Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etairias*, vi (1901–05), 358–72 and N. A. Veis, 'To "Megalo Rebelio" tis Smyrnis (Martios tou 1797) kata neotatas erevnas', *Mikrasiatika Khronika*, iv (1948), 411–22.

13. P.R.O., F.O. 78/18: Werry to Spencer Smith, July 17, 1797.

14. *Ibid.*, Spencer Smith to Grenville, June 26, 1797. One of Smith's agents in Bucharest, Maréchal, proposed a campaign of germ warfare to overthrow the republican régime in France. A royalist emigré, he also composed for Smith anti-French propaganda which was to be translated into Turkish and circulated in the coffee-houses of the capital. See N. Daniel, *Islam, Europe and Empire*, Edinburgh, 1966, 510.

15. E. Lunzi, *Storia delle Isole Jonie sotto il reggimento dei Repubblicani francesi*, Venice, 1860, 38–39. Cf. P. Pisani, 'L'expédition russo-turque aux Iles Ioniennes en 1798–99', *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, ii (1888), 195.

16. E. Rodocanachi, *Bonaparte et les Iles Ioniennes* . . . , Paris, 1899, 52.

17. E. Z. Karal, 'Yunan Adalarinin Fransizlar tarafindan işgali ve Osmanli-Rus münasebatı, 1797–1798', *Tarih Semineri Dergisi*, i (1937), 111.

18. G. E. Mavrogiannis, *Istoria ton Ionion nison* . . . , Athens, 1889, i, 92–93, E. R. Rangabé, *Livre d'Or de la noblesse ionienne*, i, Corfu, 1925, 19.

19. P. Kmiotis, *Istoria tis Eptanisou kai idhios tis Zakynthou* . . . , Corfu 1863, 589, F. Mihalopoulos, *Kathimerini*, April 1, 1935. Cf. K. G. Makhairas, *Politiki kai diplomatiki istoria tis Lefkadhos, 1797–1810*, Athens, 1954, 26. In his preface, addressed to the 'Grecs libres de la Mer Ionienne', to *Les Caractères de Théophraste*, published in Paris in 1799, Adhamantios Korais enthusiastically claimed that 'une grande nation, conduite par les lumières, & marchand sur les pas de nos ancêtres, vient de briser vos fers. Elle vous offre avec la liberté tous les moyens de devenir les émules, peut-être même les rivaux des anciens Grecs'. Details of the activity of the French revolutionary press in Corfu may be found in E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Ionienne* . . . , Paris, 1910, i, 167–72.

20. S. de Viazis, 'Eptanisiot Poitai, Antonios Martelaos', *Nea Zoï*, v (1908–09), 354, 362. Anagnostis Tzetzonis recalled having seen a performance in Corfu of Voltaire's tragedy *Brutus* in circa 1790, *Ermis o Logios*, 1820, 376, cited in A. Camariano, 'Le théâtre grec à Bucarest au début du XIXe siècle', *Balkanica*, vi (1943), 412. Cf. A. Soutzos's poem, 'Paidheia elliniki pro tou 1821' in *Apothiki ton ofelimon gnoseon* (Izmir), no. 7 (July 1837), 105.

21. Kmiotis, *op. cit.*, 559.

22. L. I. Vranousis, 'O "Patriotikos Ymnos" tou Riga kai i elliniki "Karmaniola"', *Eis mnimin K. Amantou 1874–1960*, Athens, 1960, 312.

23. K. N. Sathas, *Istorikai dhiatrivai . . . I Alipasias tou Tourkalvanou Khatzi Sekhreti*, Athens 1870, 200–03, 213. Cf. F. C. H. L. Pouqueville, *Histoire de la régénération de la Grèce* . . . , Paris 1828, 134–36. On the power and virtual independence of Ali Pasa and the Anatolian *derebays* at a later date (1808) see the report of the French ambassador to the Porte, Sébastiani, quoted in L. Mile, *Sur le caractère du pouvoir d'Ali Pacha de Tépélène*, Tirana, 1966, 34–35.

24. *Moniteur Universel*, I messidor an 6 (June 19, 1798).

25. E. Legrand, *Documents inédits concernant Rhigas Vélestinlis* . . . , Paris, 1892, 12.

26. K. Amantos, *Anekdhota engrafa peri Riga Velestinli*, Athens, 1930, 45–82.

27. The full text of the Constitution is printed (in French) in N. Botzaris, *Visions balkaniques dans la préparation de la Révolution grecque (1789–1821)*, Geneva, 1962, 183–205.

28. A. Elian, 'Sur la circulation manuscrite des écrits politiques de Rhigas en Moldavie', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, i (1962), 491.

29. Legrand, *op. cit.*, 70.

30. G. G. Pappadopoulos and G. P. Angelopoulos, *To kata ton . . . Grigorion ton E . . .*, Athens 1866, ii, 498–9. A similar injunction to guard against Rigas's writings was sent to the Metropolitan of Paros and Naxos, P. G. Zerlentic, 'Patriarkhon

grammata dhiataktika pros tous nisiotas peri dhoulíkis upotagis eis tous kratountas', *Dheltion Istorikis kai Ethnologikis Etairias*, ix (1926), 100.

31. Botzaris, op. cit., 33 and A. Camariano-Cioran, *Revue des Études sud-est européennes*, iv (1966), 663.

32. (D. and N. Stephanopoli), *Voyage . . . en Grèce pendant les années V et VI*, Paris, 1800, i, 72.

33. P. Eliade, *De l'influence français sur l'esprit public en Roumanie . . .*, Paris, 1898, 200.

34. J. Godechot, *La Grande Nation, l'expansion révolutionnaire de la France dans le monde de 1789 à 1799*, Paris, 1956, i, 198.

35. E. Z. Karal, 'Yunan Adalarinin Fransızlar tarafından işgali . . .', 113 ff. cited by Lewis, op. cit., 120.

36. Z. Mathas, *Katalogos istorikos ton . . . patriarkhon . . .*, Nafplion, 1837, 264.

37. *Moniteur Universel*, 3, 14 and 25 pluviôse (January 22, February 2 and 13), 8 floréal, 5 prairial, 4 and 17 messidor (April 27, May 24, June 22 and July 5) an vi (1798). E. de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor*, suppl. 1, vol. ii, 1781–1814, *Documente culese din Archivele Ministeriului Afacerilor Străine din Paris*, ed. A. I. Odobescu, Bucharest, 1885, 189.

38. K. M. Apostolidhis, 'O apo Silyvrias Filippoupoleos Mitropolititis Paisios', *Thrakika*, iii (1932), 25–26. Cf. M. Gedheon, 'Eikosin eton Ethniki Istoria katopin thuellis (1791–1811)', *Theologia*, v (1927), 291 and the same author's *Kanonikai Dhiataxeis*, Istanbul, 1888, i, 304–05.

39. *Katikhisis eleftherou anthropou . . . metafrastheisa . . . pros koinin tou filatou genous tou khrisin*, A Papadopoulos Vretos, . . . *Catalogue des livres imprimés en Grec moderne . . .*, Athens 1845, 33 no. 322. An Italian version, *Catechismo Francese*, was published in Rimini in 1797.

40. Mathas, op. cit., 280.

41. Pappadhopoulos and Angelopoulos, op. cit., ii, 496. For an example of the patriarchal licence to print see i, 171–73. The procedure envisaged by Gregory V does not appear to have been rigidly adhered to, nor did it prevent the printing at the patriarchal press some 20 years later of a number of religious tracts of a markedly Protestant character, see the author's 'Some Protestant Tracts printed at the Press of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople: 1818–1820', *Eastern Churches Review*, ii (1968), 152–164.

42. 13.

43. B. Lewis, op. cit., 121–22, translated from Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Vekayi-i Devlet-i Aliyye*, vi, Istanbul, 1877, 311 ff. The similarity in language and thought between Ahmed Atif's memorandum and the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* is striking.

44. J. Kabrda, *Quelques firmans concernant les relations franco-turques lors de l'expédition de Bonaparte en Égypte (1798–1799)*, Paris, 1947, 23.

45. P.R.O. F.O. 78/18. *Moniteur Universel*, 14 fructidor an vi (August 31, 1798).

46. *Moniteur Universel*, 23 fructidor an vi (September 9, 1798).

47. M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question 1774–1923*, London, 1966, 26–27.

48. *Moniteur Universel*, 12 fructidor an vi (August 29, 1798), Kabrda, op. cit., 24. A fascinating picture of French influence among the upper strata of Greek society in the capital is given in a satirical poem of 1794 by Alexandhros Kalfoglou Vyzantiou:

' . . . And in the City [i.e. Istanbul] many young men have begun
to be enlightened,

Openly to be taught atheism by Frenchmen,

And everywhere fugitive Frenchmen teach us Enlightenment,

The 'wisdom' of their country has brought utter destruction . . .'

G. P. Kremos, *Epistolai . . . kai Ethiki Stikhourgia A. K. Vyzantiou*, Leipzig, 1870, 65. In 1780 Iosipos Moisiadhakas wrote that 'these days all the well-bred youths of Constantinople are busy learning Italian or French', *Apologia*, Vienna, 1780, i, 32,

quoted by K. Th. Dhimaras, 'Epafes tis neoteris ellinikis logotekhnias me tin angliki (1780–1821)', *Frontismata*, 1962, 39. On the influence of Voltaire in Greek lands at this time see K. Th. Dhimaras, 'La fortune de Voltaire en Grèce', *Mélanges Octave et Melpo Merlier*, i, Athens, 1956, 199–222. Cf. J. J. Björnsthöhl, *Briefe auf seinen ausländischen Reisen . . .*, vi, Leipzig 1783, 95. As an indication of what he termed the 'Unwissenheit und Barbarey' of supposedly educated Greeks, Björnsthöhl cited the prejudice of the Greek clergy against the Freemasons whom they believed to be a religious sect holding Deist and Voltairean beliefs, *ibid.*, 89–90.

49. P.R.O. F.O. 78/20. Cf. E. Z. Karal, *Halet Efendinin Paris Büyük Elçiliği* (1802–1806), Istanbul, 1940, 56. Halet Efendi complained that books extolling the benefits of republicanism and liberty had been translated into Greek, Armenian and Turkish and circulated in the Ottoman dominions. Shortly after the outbreak of war with Turkey the Directory set up at Ancona a 'commercial agency', whose objective was to call the Greeks to insurrection and 'to create a diversion in Albania, Epirus, and the Morea in favour of the Egyptian army'. It was staffed by Emile Gaudin, a former attaché at the French embassy in Istanbul, Constantine Stamaty and Michel de Mangourit, a professional revolutionary, M. A. B. de Mangourit, *Defense d'Ancône, et des départements romains, le Tronto, le Musone et le Metauro . . . aux années VII et VIII . . .*, Paris, 1802, i, 21. For Stamaty see E. Legrand, *Lettres de Constantin Stamaty à Panagiotis Kodrikas sur la Révolution française* in J. Lair and E. Legrand, *Documents inédits sur l'histoire de la Révolution française*, Paris, 1872.

50. P.R.O. 78/19.

51. E. Fanourakis, 'Anekdhota ekklesiastika engrafa . . .', *Kritika Khronika*, i (1947), 499–500.

52. T. Kh. Kandhiloros, *Istoria tou ethnomartyros Grigoriou tou E*, Athens, 1909, 56–57.

53. Lewis, op. cit., 122, citing E. Z. Karal, *Fransa-Misir ve Osmanli imparatorluğu (1797–1802)*, Istanbul, 1938, 108 ff.

54. D. M. Sarros, 'Grammata anaferomena eis tous agonas tou Souliou kai tis Pargis', *Epeirotika Khronika*, ii (1927), 278.

55. P.R.O. 78/19. K. Nikolopoulos related the publication of the tract with the execution of Rigas in June 1798. 'Après cet événement funeste, Anthime, patriarche de Jérusalem, doyen des prélats grecs . . . publia . . . par ordre de la Porte, une circulaire paternelle adressée à tous les Grecs . . .', 'Notice sur la vie et les écrits de Rhigas', appended to M. Raybaud, *Mémoires sur la Grèce, pour servir à l'histoire de la Guerre de l'Indépendance . . .*, Paris, 1824, 492.

56. The best account of the problems surrounding the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* is A. Camariano, 'Spiritul filosofic și revoluționar francez combatut de Patriarhia Ecumenică și Sublima Poartă', *Cercețări Literare*, iv (1941), 114–36. Cf. also the same author's *Spiritul revoluționar francez și Voltaire in limba greacă și română*, Bucharest 1946, 29 and D. V. Oikonomidhis, 'Athanasios o Parios', *Epetiris Etairias Kykladhikon Meleton*, i (1961), 377–91. Accepting the tract as a work of Athanasios Parios, Oikonomidhis devotes a considerable part of his interesting study to a discussion of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*. A useful brief account of French influence in the Greek world at this time and of Orthodox reaction to it may be found in E. Zakhariadhou, 'Enas satirikos dialogos tou 1807' in *Stathmoi pros tin nea elliniki koinonia*, ed. K. Th. Dhimaras, Athens, 1965, 51–58.

57. E.g. B. Knös, *L'histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, Uppsala, 1962, 528.

58. E.g. M. Gedheon, 'Peri tis Fanariotikis koinonias mekhri ton arkhon tis enestosis ekatontatiridhos', *O en Konstantinoupolei Ellinikos Filologikos Syllogos*, xxi (1887–89), 67, although Gedheon later allowed that Anthimos might have been the author. Cf. the view of the French hellenist D'Ansse de Villoison that the work was written by an impostor in G. C. Harles, ed., I. A. Fabricius, . . . *Bibliotheca graeca . . .*, xi, Hamburg, 1808, 563. Villoison was, however, an early mentor and friend of Korais, and would have accepted Korais's judgement in the matter.

59. T. H. Papadopoulos, op. cit., 146. For Makraios's original account see his *Ekklesiastiki Istoria* (1750–1800) in K. N. Sathas, *Mesaioniki Vivliothiki*, iii, Venice, 1872, 394. Papadopoulos's views as to the authorship of the tract are shared by S. Runciman in 'The Greek Church under the Ottoman Turks', *Studies in Church History*, ii, ed. G. J. Cuming, London, 1965, 51–2 and in *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, 394. Runciman believes that Anthimos's views were 'not unreasonable for a devout prelate who believed that the Church should be kept free from politics and who from the terms of his own appointment had solemnly sworn to guarantee the loyalty of his flock to the Sultan's government, and who for humanity's sake wished it not to run the risk of self-destruction', *ibid.*, 395–6.

60. Cf. T. A. Gritsopoulos, art. 'Sergios Makraios', in *Thriskeftiki kai Ethiki Enkyklopaideia*, viii (1966), col. 513 and the same author's *Patriarkhiki Megali tou Genous Skholi*, Athens, 1966, i, 432–44.

61. Nathaniel Neokaisareos (published pseudonymously), *Antifonisis pros ton paralogon zilon ton apo tis Evropis erkhomenon filosofojn dheiknusa oti mataios kai anoitos einai o talanismoj opou kanousi tou genous mas kai dhidhaskousa poia einai i ontoj kai alithini filosofia. Toutois prosetiethi kai parainesis ofelimotati pros tous adheos pempontas tous uiouj ton eis tin Evropin kharin pragmateias . . .*, Trieste, 1802, 38. Passages from this work are given in translation in J. L. S. Bartholdy, *Bruchstücke zur nähern Kenntniss des heutigen Griechenlands . . .*, Berlin, 1805, 327–35. According to Bartholdy, who was presented with a copy by the abbot of Megaspilaion, the *Antifonisis* had been widely circulated. Cf. also Athanasios's *Alexikakon Farmakon . . .*, published posthumously in Leipzig in 1818. It is interesting to find Korais writing in the introduction to his translation of Beccaria's *Dei delitti e delle pene*, published in Paris in the same year (1802) as the *Antifonisis*, 'glory and honour to those prudent (Greek) youths who travel through Europe, gathering like bees the beneficial flowers to braid the crown with which both their heads and their Fatherland are to be garlanded', ix–x. Cf. Leake, op. cit., 187.

62. *Antifonisis*, 15. Cf. A. Angelou, *Platonos tukhai, i logia paradhosi stin Tourkokratia*, Athens, 1963, 96. Among the European luminaries regarded by Athanasios as potential sources of 'spiritual corruption' for young Greeks were the British scientists and philosophers Collins, Woolston, Newton and Toland, *Antifonisis*, 45. Hobbes was grouped among the 'shameless, babbling, atheistical freemasons' who lay at the root of spiritual and bodily destruction by Antonios Manouil in his *Tropaion tis Orthodoxou Pisteos . . .*, Vienna, 1791, 276. It is difficult to image that Athanasios or Antonios had in fact ever read any of the writings of these supposed apostles of atheism. In an encyclical of 1793 the Patriarch Neophytos had condemned Voltaire, the Freemasons, Rousseau and Spinoza. See C. Mango, 'Byzantinism and Romantic Hellenism', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xxviii (1965), 35, where the persistence of Byzantine modes of thought during the *Tourkokratia* is strikingly illustrated. Profound suspicion of all non-theological writings was a deep-rooted tradition among the Orthodox hierarchy. Cf. *Petri Bellonii . . . plurimarum singularium & memorabilium rerum in Graecia, Asia, Aegypto, Iudea, Arabia . . . observationes . . .*, Antwerp, 1589, 86–87.

63. On this point see D. M. Nicol, 'The Byzantine View of Western Europe', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, viii (1967), 334–35.

64. E.g. K. N. Sathas, *Tourkokratoumeni Ellas . . .*, Athens, 1869, 632–33, Mathas, op. cit., 266 and I. Kh. Konstantinidhis, art. 'Anthimos', *Thriskeftiki kai Ethiki Enkyklopaideia*, ii, col. 775. Athanasios's authorship has been accepted among others by K. Amantos, 'I paidheia eis tin Tourkokratoumenin Khion (1566–1822)', *Ellinika*, iii (1930), 401, D. V. Oikonomidhis, op. cit. and A. Dhaskalakis, *Korais kai Rigas*, Athens, 1961, 14.

65. Jerusalem, 1855, vol. i, i–xvii. K. N. Sathas's biographical note, in his *Neoelliniki Filologia*, Athens, 1868, 585–6, is based on Kleopas.

66. The British Museum's copy of this work was presented to the eccentric philhellene and bibliophile Frederic North, Earl of Guilford, by Polycarp, Anthimos's successor as Patriarch of Jerusalem, at whose expense the edition was printed. Another copy from North's library is now in the Gennadeion Library, Athens.

67. 81. There is a copy of this very rare book in the British Museum (869.e.29.). Cf. S. Salaville and E. Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika, Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, i (1584–1850), Athens, 1958, 115, where the passage is reprinted.

68. British Museum, Add. MSS. 27,604, 120–21. Cf. G. M. Arabatzoglou, *Fotieios Vivliothiki . . .*, Istanbul, 1933, pt. 1, 223–25, and P. Hunt, 'Asia Minor', in R. Walpole, *Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey . . .*, London, 1817, 85.

69. A. Anghelou, 'J. D. Carlyle's Journal of Mount Athos', *O Eranistis*, iii (1965), 56.

70. Chardon de la Rochette, op. cit., 219. Chardon de la Rochette, a close friend of Korais must have known that he was the author of the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia*, although he pretended ignorance, suggesting that the author was a young priest. The text of the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia*, prefaced of course by the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, has been reprinted by G. Valetas, Athens, 1949. Although Valetas did not have access to the text of the original edition of Anthimos's work, the text as published by Korais differs only in certain very insignificant points from the original. M. Gedheon, noted that the two works were reprinted in Athens in 1852, 'Ekklisia kai epistimi kata ton 18 aiona', *Ekklisiastiki Alitheia*, viii (1887–88), 284. The re-edition of this date is recorded in D. S. Ghinis and V. G. Mexas, *Elliniki Vivliografia*, Athens, 1941, ii, 327, no. 5617.

Copies of the original 1798 edition and the 1852 reprint of the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia* may be found in the Gennadeion Library, Athens (C. 127 and C. 128).

71. K. N. Sathas, *Neoelliniki Filologia*, 641, Valetas, *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia*, 8. Although Anthimos's tract provoked such a powerful retort by Korais, and has been regarded by many historians, both Greek and Western, as the very epitome of Orthodox reaction, it is rather surprising to find a contemporary Western historian of Orthodoxy apparently upholding Anthimos's view that 'the new Western "system of freedom" which was invading Greece was no more than a liberty to pursue conflicting interests—a subjection, in fact, of man to his most selfish appetites, and thus not justice, but an anarchy and a disorder in which each exploits the other for his own gain', P. Sherrard, *The Greek East and the Latin West*, London, 1959, 105. Since this article went to press Aikaterini Koumariou has discovered a complete MS. of Athanasios Parios's *Neos Rapsakis* and thrown much interesting light on the reasons why this was never in fact published, 'O "Neos Rapsakis"', *O Eranistis*, vi (1968), 1–18. The reason the work was not published was not, as Valetas has suggested, the strength of Korais's rebuttal of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*, but rather because the manuscript was filched from the person who was to oversee its printing in Trieste by two Greek youths who sent it to Korais as an indication of 'the perversity of the wretched monks who, . . . under the pretext of defending religion, seek the perpetual enslavement and ignorance of our nation'. When he learned their identity Korais thanked the youths not on his own behalf, but 'on account of the honour of the nation', and Athanasios does not seem to have made further efforts to get it published. The full text of the *Neos Rapsakis* is to be published by L. I. Vranousis in 'Agnosta patriotika fylladia kai anekdhotia keimena tis epokhis tou Riga kai tou Korai', *Epetiris Mesaionikou Arkheiou*, xv. It is clear from the extracts published by Mrs Koumariou that Athanasios repeats many of the arguments put forward by the author of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki*. Athanasios accuses the author of the *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia* of asserting that it was 'good and acceptable to God for slaves to kill their masters' and of using scriptural texts to lead the 'simple-minded' into rebellion against the Ottoman Empire, which he described as a 'helpful means and a saving medicine' for preserving Orthodoxy from the dangers of popery. It is interesting to note that Athanasios buttresses his arguments with appeals to the 'national' philosophers Socrates and Plato. Predictably he concludes that since 'we are the soldiers of the heavenly kingdom let us not dream of a vain and temporary kingdom on this earth'. Further weight is added to the argument that Athanasios is not the author of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* by Mrs Koumariou's conclusion that the language of the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* differs from that of the known works of Athanasios Parios.

72. G. Valetas, ed., *Elliniki Nomarkhia . . .*, 174–75, 152, 168, 176. Another, less satisfactory, edition by N. Tomadhakis was published in Athens in 1948.

73. 'Kritonos Stokhasmoi', *Eranos eis Adhamantios Korain*, Athens, 1965, 140–41.

74. N. P. Dhelialis, *Katalogos entypon Dhimotikis Vivliothikis Kozanis . . .*, Thessaloniki, 1948, i (1494–1832), 26, no. 95. I am grateful to Mr V. Sampanopoulos for letting me examine this copy. According to Alkis Angelou two copies survive in the Library of Parliament, 'I "Tragou Katargisis"', *Eranos eis Adhamantios Korain*, Athens, 1965, 192. I am grateful to Dr Francis Walton for drawing my attention to the recently acquired copy, in excellent condition, in the Gennadeion Library.

75. Valetas, *Adhelfiki Dhidhaskalia*, 5, *Ermis o Logios*, 1820, 481.

76. I. Bianu, N. Hodoş, and D. Simonescu, *Bibliografia românească veche (1508–1830)*, iii, Bucharest, 1912–36, 391, no. 1148. See also Camariano, 'Spiritul . . . revoluţionar francez combatut de Patriarhia Ecumenică . . .', 135.

77. Camariano, *ibid.*, 135–6.

78. R. R. Florescu has recently written of the Phanariots in the Rumanian Principalities that 'those who were sincere in their desire of implementing Western ideas met with the stubborn opposition of the leaders of their church, who wished to preserve Orthodoxy from all dangerous ideas whether they came from Catholicism, Protestantism or the *philosophes*. This indiscriminate opposition to all Western ideas is best expressed in that standard anecdote of the infuriated Wallachian bishop who fulminated in his pulpit against the "papist theories of Voltaire"', 'The Uniate Church: Catalyst of Rumanian National Consciousness', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, xlv (1967), 327. Cf. *La Valachie, la Moldavie, et de l'influence politique des Grecs du Fanal*, Paris, 1822, 31.

T. Stoianovich has written that a section of the Orthodox higher clergy was 'in many ways more open to the values of the Enlightenment', 'The Social Foundations of Balkan

Politics, 1750–1941’, in C. and B. Jelavich, eds., *The Balkans in Transition. Essays on the Development of Balkan Life and Politics since the Eighteenth Century*, Berkeley, 1963, 306. This section seems, however, to have been very small although M.-P. Zallony (Zallonis) reported the claim of four influential members of the Orthodox hierarchy that the reactionary and obscurantist stance of the hierarchy had been imposed by the Phanariot aristocracy. In the course of a conversation in 1818 with four members of the Holy Synod, the Metropolitans of Nicomedia, Derkoi, Sofia and Thessaloniki, he was told that Phanariot educational policy was determined by the need to preserve the hegemony exercised by the aristocracy and clergy over the Christian *raya*. ‘Si on eût laissé à nos Grecs’, the Metropolitans assured Zallony, ‘la faculté de s’instruire, c’en était fait de notre influence et de celle des Princes du Fanar. Aussi avons-nous toujours été attentifs à ne pas laisser pénétrer trop de lumières dans les écoles. C’est d’ailleurs, la volonté formelle du Gouvernement et celle des Fanariotes’. This reasoning lay behind the decision to permit only religious books in the schools to the exclusion of scientific works, in particular those which ‘auraient pu enflammer l’imagination des élèves, en leur rappelant la gloire et les faits héroïques de leurs ancêtres’, *Essai sur les Fanariotes . . . suivi de quelques réflexions sur l’état actuel de la Grèce*, Marseilles, 1824, 162. It should be borne in mind, however, that Zallony was eager to attribute every kind of villainy, treachery and obscurantism to the Phanariots. I am grateful to Professor C. Mango for this last reference. The first two, at least, of the four Metropolitans with whom Zallony conversed can be identified with a faction in the hierarchy that was relatively progressive in educational matters. Cf. the letter (1812) of K. M. Koumas, one of the principal teachers at the *Filologiko Gymnasio* in Smyrna, an important centre of the ‘Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment’, to the editor of the Greek journal *Logios o Ermis* in Vienna, published by N. A. Veis, ‘Symvoli eis ta skholika pragmata tis Smyrnis’, *Mikrasiatika Khronika*, i (1938), 220, 234–36. One or two members of the Orthodox hierarchy in the period before 1821 did take positive steps to ensure the spread of ‘enlightenment’ (ta fota) among the faithful. Among these was Ignatios, Metropolitan of Wallachia, who was instrumental in the foundation in 1810 of the *Filologiki Etairia* of Bucharest. Ignatios, an admirer of Adhamantios Korais and a champion of the use of spoken Greek in the diffusion of useful knowledge among the people at large, expressed the hope that Greeks and Rumanians might unite in the Society in order to spread ‘enlightenment’ in Greece and ‘Dacia’. See N. Camariano, ‘Sur l’activité de la “Société littéraire gréco-dacique” de Bucarest (1810–1812)’, *Revue des Études sud-est européennes*, vi (1968), 39, 44–45.

79. A. Camariano, op. cit., 119–23. According to A. Camariano, V. A. Urechîa, in *Istoria Românilor*, Bucharest, 1900, x, pt. i, 440, maintained that the original of the *Apologia* had been compiled by St John Chrysostom! Cf. D. Popovici, *La Littérature roumaine à l’Epoque des Lumières*, Sibiu, 1945, 94, and A. Dușu, ‘Un livre grec sur “Les Lumières” occidentales traduit en roumain en 1819’, *Revue Roumaine d’Histoire*, iv (1965), 982–83.

80. E.g. A. Dhaskalakis, *O Adhamantios Korais kai i eleftheria ton Ellinon . . .*, Athens, 1965, 94. Cf. Gedheon, ‘Eikosin eton ethniki istoria . . .’, 290.

81. G. G. Ladhas and A. Dh. Khatzidhimos, *Elliniki Vivliografia: symvoli sto dhekato ogdhoo aiona. Prosthikes, dhiorthoseis kai sympliroseis stin Elliniki Vivliografia tou Emile Legrand, Louis Petit kai Hubert Pernot*, Athens, 1964, 212. Some of the ornaments used in the *Dhidhaskalia Patriki* are, however, found in the *Tou nafsklirou efimerini eis to pelagos praxis . . .*, published at the patriarchal press in 1803, and in a number of other works published at the press during this period.

82. See the reproduction of a broadsheet headed ‘Novas coblas a la nació Catalana per animarlos a pendrer las armas, en defensa de nostre Deu, Lley, Patria, Rey, Personas, Bens, Familias, y Casas. Contra los malvats Francesos’, in A. Ossorio (y Gallardo), *Historio del pensamiento político catalán durante la guerra de España con la República francesa (1793–1795)*, Madrid, 1913, 177. Cf. R. Herr, *The Eighteenth-century Revolution in Spain*, Princeton, 1958, 201–35. For a discussion of anti-revolutionary thought in Western Europe at this time see K. Epstein, *The Genesis of German Conservatism*, Princeton, 1966, 434–546, and J. Godechot, *La Contre-révolution. Doctrine et action 1789–1804*, Paris, 1961, 7–147.

83. P. F. Sugar, ‘The Influence of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution in Eighteenth Century Hungary’, *Journal of Central European Affairs*, xvii (1958), 353–4. Cf. F. Kutnar, ‘La critique de la Révolution française dans les brochures tchèques d’alors’, *Le Monde Slave*, xii (1935), 131–58.

84. R. Hofstadter, *Anti-intellectualism in American Life*, New York, 1963, 120.

85. I am grateful to Prof. J. J. Tierney and Mr A. Dimaras for assistance in translating this work and to Prof. C. Mango and Mr V. G. Kiernan for reading a draft version of this article. Such errors that remain are my own responsibility.

86. If Anthimos was born in 1717, as his biographers have believed, he would have been 81 in 1798.

87. Cf. Prokopios Peloponnisios, *Vivlion kaloumenon elenkhos kata atheon kai dhyssevon . . .*, 238–39.

88. Cf. (Athanasios Parios), *Khristianiki Apologia*, 34.

89. These verses were not compiled by Anthimos but by Iakovakis, the *protopsaltis* of the Patriarchate. See Mathas, *op. cit.*, 267, Gedheon, 'Peri tis Fanariotikis koinonias' *op. cit.*, 67, and G. Kordhatos, *Istoria tis neoellinikis logotekhnias . . .*, Athens, 1962, i, 106–07.

90. Cf. the versified dialogue between Voltaire and Diogenes in Agapios's *To Fanari tou Dhiogenous . . .*, Athens, 1863, 18 (first published in 1803).