

ALBERT KHARATYAN*
*Doctor of Historical Sciences,
Corr. Member of NAS RA
lraber@sci.am*

THE ARMENIAN PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE 18TH CENTURY

Key words: the Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople, All Armenian Catholicosate, the Catholicosate of Cilicia, the Patriarch Hovhannes Kolot, the Patriarch Hakob Nalian, ferman

Introduction

In the 18th century the Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople continued to function as a supreme religious organization for the Armenians of Ottoman Turkey, thus strengthening its position among the national religious institutions. The expansion of patriarchate dioceses (since 1612), its existing relationships with the Armenian ecclesiastic centers as well as the individual or diocese independence contributed to patriarchate's nationwide popularity. The Ottoman government's policy led to strengthening of the patriarchate not only among the Armenian population of Constantinople but also in the Armenian dioceses that were under the government's jurisdiction. In the Empire the internal and external factors conditioned the rulers' policy towards the adherents of different faith among who were the Armenians. Here it should be noted that the unobstructed process of tax collection relied on the common religious institutions of the Empire's subjects. Their resigned submission to the superior religion – Islam and to the political and economic might of the Muslim state remained the cornerstone of the Ottoman policy all along the 18th century. Moreover, to secure the constancy of the latter, the Empire was interested in preserving the homogeneity and stability of millets. This was seen as a precondition for the Empire to have relationships with them.

* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 10.07.20, գրախոսվել է 16.07.20, ընդունվել է փապագրության 14.08.20:

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

The alarming issue of the European political pressure also existed. Ottoman Turkey while confronting Europe, recorded defeats and the consequences of these failures were seen in the country itself. It is common knowledge that the Ottomans made economic concessions to the European states, thus gradually expanding the list of capitulations which were largely favorable for these countries and partly beneficial for the Ottoman interests. The European policy was also visible in terms of foreign religious penetration into the millets which gained strength and popularity along with the military political pressure of external powers and their recorded victories. The aforementioned penetration into the Armenian society was fulfilled via expansion of Catholic and Protestant preaching. The Ottoman state preferred to fight it through the religious unity of millets and administrative organization, in other words via the only tactics that it had mastered unobjectionably which, however, couldn't avert the alarming exacerbation of the cracks caused by either of them. New approaches to keeping order were required, thus it led to a new stricter policy on part of the Ottoman government towards the religious and administrative organization of millets in this case towards the Armenian (not only Armenian) patriarchate in Constantinople.

The Patriarchate during the Patriarchy of Hovh. Kolot and H. Nalian

At the beginning of the 18th century the Constantinople patriarchate was to cope with the religious controversies in its community which under the circumstances of political pressure either escalated or abated. The patriarchs, driven by the desire to counteract the Ottoman government's pressure and quite often acting under the directive of the government, resorted to certain measures against the Armenian Catholics or those who had pro-Catholic proclivities. At the end of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th centuries this to some extent led to the unfolding struggle and instigation for the Patriarchate throne between Patriarchs Meliksedek Suphi, Yeprem Ghapantsi, Avedik Yevdokitsi.

In the Ottoman capital the spread of French influence was carried out via strengthening Catholicism, which, subsequently, targeted the Ottoman conservatism. The Ottoman conservatism, being manifested in its attempts to make the millet system more centralized should be interpreted in light of these circumstances. The unification of the Jerusalem and Constantinople patriarchates, having taken place in July, 1702 during Avedik's rule can be accounted for by the

given factor¹. This resulted in aforementioned Avedik's venturesome abduction from Tenedos and his confinement in Bastille prison.

Before 1706 Hovhannes Kolot (1715–1741) succeeded some quite unremarkable patriarchs (Mardiros Kulhanchi, Sahak Apuchekhtsi, Hovhannes Gandzaketsi) who had earlier replaced Avedik. With his leadership the prestige of the Constantinople patriarchate was notable even beyond the boundaries of Ottoman Turkey. It is worth singling out the eminent patriarch's initiatives to settle the issues related to Jerusalem monastery. The aforementioned unification of the Jerusalem and Constantinople patriarchates did not safeguard the former from the discreditable behavior and willfulness on part of some Western Armenian secular and ecclesiastic individuals due to which, Saint Hakobian monastery was heavily in debt. The unification had a counter effect; the looming danger for the monastery to lose its property in the Holy Land became more imminent. Hovhannes Kolot with Grigor Shghtayakir's (the Patriarch of Jerusalem) selfless support managed to free the monastery of its heavy debts, through finding the correct solution. The resolution consisted in returning the Jerusalem patriarchate its autonomy through separating it from the Constantinople patriarchate. A canonical treaty was signed between the two patriarchates, which emphasized the autonomy of Saint Hakobian monastery, securing the right of the eparchy to elect the Jerusalem patriarch (the so called Hanna's damnation).

The military victories of Ottoman Turkey over Persia also strengthened the prestige of the Constantinople patriarchate. The Turkish conquest of Etchmiadzin and Yerevan in 1724 led to the Ottoman state's inevitably greater legal influence on the election of the All Armenian Catholicos. The election of Karapet Ulentsi as Catholicos in Ortakyo Church of Constantinople (August 1726) was conditioned by this factor which simultaneously emphasized the greater religious significance of the Constantinople patriarchate in the system of the national ecclesiastic centers. The current state of affairs contributed to Hov. Kolot's success recorded in such important issues as Armenian - Greek religious matters as well as normalization of the tense relationships with the Armenian Catholics. The patriarch's activity greatly boosted the development of the Armenian enlightenment. Of special worth are the religious and natural scientific works which were translated and printed during his rule. In 1715 the patriarch himself along with philologist-translator

¹ Օրմանեան 2001, 3228:

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

Ghukas Kharberdtsi and Gaspar Sebastatsi delivered lectures at Skutar school which had been founded by the patriarch. Secular, philosophical knowledge, grammar and logic were taught at this school (later renamed as Mayr Dpratur - Mother Seminary). During his rule the famous Matenadaran at Mother Church of Kum Kapu was founded.

The given intellectual and cultural movement initiated by Hovh. Kolot was subsequently developed by his disciple Hakob Nalian (1741–1749, 1752–1764) who succeeded him on the throne of the patriarchate. Nalian was a known theologian and as such he authored many remarkable works like “Vem Havatoy”, “Meknutin Nareki”, “Zen Hogevor” etc., wrote the preface to Yeznik’s work published in Smyrna. Thanks to Nalian’s prudent and well-thought ecclesiastic government in Jerusalem, the balanced relationships with the Greeks and eparchies of other faith continued. At the beginning of 1730s the tense relationships with the Greeks over Holy Land were normalized, when at the end of the same decade Armenians, Greeks and Catholics gained their status in Jerusalem with special decrees, certifying their property².

Patriarchal Rights and Responsibilities: the Armenian Community of Constantinople

During Grigor Pasmachian’s patriarchy (1764–1773) some changes were visible in the Armenian elite of Constantinople. Due to noticeable economic changes in the Ottoman Empire, the Armenian amira class of Constantinople strengthened its position during this epoch, achieving important success in the financial system. In the second half of the 18th century the height of amira class as a special layer of society is characterized by the secular elite’s influence on the patriarchal authority in the Armenian community of Constantinople which as a result meant the expansion of supervision. Not only during the patriarchy of Grigor Pasmachian but also during the leadership of a more independent patriarch – Zaqaria Kaghzvantsi (1773–1781, 1782–1799) the Ottoman state’s intervention into the unfolding religious conflicts in the Armenian community got much stronger in particular, its stance on the Armenian Catholics got tougher. This was conditioned by the ongoing conflict of European states with the Ottoman government as the Empire considered the Catholic propaganda to be the cause of the disintegration of the millets. In accordance with this course of events, during

² Օրմանեան 2001, 3228: Պարթենիոս Աթենացի 2008:

Zaqaria's rule the religious conflicts escalated greatly in the Armenian community. Not only the Ottoman authorities but also the European ambassadors interfered in these conflicts. In the given as well as collateral processes it was the patriarch who acted as a central and responsible figure between the Armenian community and the Ottoman government – (as the patriarch had his state entitled rights and duties being ratified in the two 18th – century patriarchal fermans)³. The first one (and the oldest to have been preserved) was the ferman given to Grigor Pasmachian in 1764 and the second one was handed to patriarch Zaqaria Kaghzvantsi in 1773⁴. First of all we should mention that the fermans given to the Armenian patriarchs by sultans, in essence included the same list of duties and rights ratified in similar decrees and were handed down from previous centuries. In these fermans the norm of precedent continued to preserve its traditionality with conservative constancy, of course with some modern accentuations and interpretations. Thus, in this respect the abovementioned two fermans which were issued within a nine – year time gap were almost similar in terms of their content. We would like to enumerate some patriarchal rights – unobjectionable handling of issues related to religion and rituals (the appointment or dismissal of ecclesiastic leaders, vardapets, the management and supervision of the church vakfa property, the unobstructed realization of clerical duty in places of worship, the unobtrusive settlement of such issues as wills, heritage, marriage, remarriage). The patriarch, his major-domo along with fifteen other clergymen were free from jizya, avariz, tekelif taxes. The patriarch's duties consisted in paying 100.000 akce to the state treasury after his appointment. As an intermediary between his people and the Ottoman authorities, the patriarch was also to pay an annual sum of 140.000 akce, he was to represent the former in the existing relationships and take care of the church property. The patriarch was also responsible for the public rest in the millet headed by him, in other words he was to secure the loyalty of the subjects. Another noticeable common feature between the two fermans was the government's intolerant attitude towards the people of Catholic faith. The latter in both cases were characterized as villains who disintegrated the traditional bases of the Armenian millet. In the ferman⁵ given to Grigor Pasmachian it was written: "Not a single pasha, a mutesellim (pasha's deputy in

³ A manifesto.

⁴ Փափազյան 1999, 182–185, 241–246:

⁵ Փափազյան 1999, 182–185, 241–246:

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

the sphere of taxation – **A.Kh.**), kadi, voyevoda or any other public official had right to take away the churches and monasteries, belonging to the Armenian enlightened rayahs and give them to people of other creed, including to the so called Catholic insurgents.”In the ferman given to the patriarch Zaqaria the same was said in a more comprehensive way. In both cases the patriarch was legally entitled to punish the Armenian Catholics⁶.

In the 18th century the so called annual tax *mukataa* was collected from the Armenian community and the patriarchate dioceses. Since the 17th century the tax remained unchanged, making 100.000 akce (or *stak miri*). The tax became more significant, when leasing system was expanded, contributing to the social changes in the Armenian community of Constantinople. The Armenian amiras also grabbed these leasing opportunities, increasing their wealth as well as their influence on the patriarch. It was the patriarch who instated the *mutevellis* (the trustees of *Waqf*) who, being elected in the community councils, undertook the profitable job of handling *Waqfi* properties. *Mutevills* in their turn appointed 4–12 vicars (*nazirs*) who handled the daily church matters of the districts. The given system lasted up until 1847 and was abolished during the rule of the patriarch Matteos (1844–1848)⁷. It should be mentioned that the patriarch’s rights in instating and dismissing the *mutevills* were limited in favor of state functions where the kadi of Constantinople was more efficient and to whom the *mutevill* aspirants made petitions (*hoget*). There were known petitions made to kadi during H. Nalian’s and Gr. Pasmachian’s rule which dwelt on cases of *mutevill*’s resignation or instating their substitutes.

In the 18th–19th centuries the taxes paid by the Armenian community mainly remained unchanged. However, as a result of akce devaluation some changes detrimental for the population were visible. Due to occasional, emergency tax collection on part of the government, the tax burden was becoming unbearable for the non-Muslim population. However, the taxes paid by the Armenian patriarchate remained the same as in the previous century. In a ferman handed to the patriarch Nerses Varzhapetian (1874–1881) the court tax, the patriarchate tax and “the money appropriated by the patriarchate”⁸ were mentioned.

⁶ Փափազյան 1999, 245:

⁷ See Կարապետեան 1935, 79, 85:

⁸ Ալպոյաճեան 1910, 97–98:

The multi-layered elements of the community had their special social role and significance in the formation and activities of the patriarchate. Naturally, they had different degrees of influence and varying opportunities in terms of directing the patriarchate's policy. In terms of his intercommunity functions the patriarchate basically relied on the social classes, consisting of craftsmen and merchants. It carried out the supervision of tax collection, following law and order in line with the state laws and its own religious, moral norms. These classes were included in crafts unions, representing the capital's large segment of the Armenian population. The Armenian craftsmen of corporate unions worked in the conditions of deeply specialized production. Judging by the multiplicity of the Armenian crafts in Constantinople and the variety⁹ of the production, we can affirm that they were part of the corporations, where members of their own faith as well as Muslim representatives were involved. Describing the interethnic crafts unions, we should also consider the religious discrimination on part of the Turkish professional elite against the followers of different faith, including Armenian craftsmen¹⁰.

M. Ubcini divided the Constantinople Armenian community of late 18th and the first half of the 19th century into four classes (not without some basic generalizations) – the clergy, money-changers (shroffs), literary and professional class, craftsmen and merchants¹¹. Except for the clergymen, representing the church all other classes were involved in the state ratified professional unions. The wholesalers were involved in the Levant goods turnover, supplying the European countries with the Middle Eastern agricultural merchandise.

In the second half of the 18th century the money-changers which included the amira¹² class were indeed new phenomena for the Armenian community of Constantinople. In terms of their function they continued the same line as that of the 15th–16th centuries' usurers. However, in terms of their course of action and financial means the latter were much more powerful and influential than the former. They were a newly formed social class which handled governor-pashas' land and property affairs. The emergence of the given class was indebted to the

⁹ Դիւան հայոց պատմութեան 1912, 336–338:

¹⁰ On the manifestations of the aforementioned discrimination and its divulgence see Անասեան 1995, 221–256:

¹¹ Ubcini 1856, 310.

¹² See the expert description of the amiras' special significance in Constantinople's Armenian community in Barsoumian 2007, 92–139.

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

disintegration of timar (a strategic domain that yielded some profits) as well as to the tenant system (iltizam) which devoured timar part by part (the system emerged in the second half of the 17th century). In contrast to the former celepins, the second half of the amiras were again the inheritors of the past capital. They were heads of craft unions, who had amassed fortune due to the state contracts. Still in the 17th century the latter manifested their social power when a certain Sargis Ekmekci who was a baker and the head of crafts union even managed to seize the patriarchate throne¹³ (1679–1680). However, there was another layer of amiras that included really talented people who came to Constantinople from provinces (Akn, Caesarea). The latter either with the help of their compatriots, using their own talent or as result of their contacts with the sultan's court managed to gain fortune and position. No less noteworthy were the amiras who occupied public posts. Their positions were hereditably handed down from generation to generation throughout a century (from the first half of the 18th century up to the 50s–60s of the 19th century)¹⁴. From such amira families were the Dadians, the Tyuzians, and the Palians. The Dadians were usually heads of court owned gunpowder mills (barucubasi), the Tyuzians were the heads of mint, while the Palians were the court architects. These amira houses to a certain extent were instrumental in the development of the Ottoman economy, politics and arts. Such baseborn amiras as H. Pezchian, M. Chezyirian etc., also had the same contribution.

The amiras had a positive impact on the history of the Constantinople Armenians. They were conducive in meeting the community's financial and spiritual requirements. Their positive impact is seen in both their personal donations as well as in their efforts to gain all the possible guarantees from the Ottoman authorities for the protection of the community properties. They also aimed to use the property profit for the common good. The financial means of the amira elite enabled them to influence the patriarch and handle the community matters. At the end of the 18th century up to 1846 the chief of the nation was

¹³ See Պէրպլընեան 1963, 334:

¹⁴ This traditional hereditary right is also visible inside the esnaf (professional, crafts union) when the elective positions were passed on to the members of the same family. The same can be said about the election of mutevills in the Armenian community of Constantinople, when this position was handed down from father to son.

considered the most influential amira and as A. Alpoyachian writes¹⁵, “The inferior amiras would join forces with him and he would chair the amira meeting, handling the national issues.”

The Patriarchate’s Relationships with the Catholicosate of Etchmiadzin

In the 18th century the Constantinople patriarchate traditionally had diverse ties with such national religious institutions as the Holy See of Cilicia, the Jerusalem patriarchate, the Holy See of Etchmiadzin and the Catholicosate of Aghtamar. In parallel with the Constantinople patriarchate’s strengthening and gaining national significance, its influence over the Caesarian and Jerusalem dioceses was becoming more noticeable, especially in terms of non-existent political obstacles and the fact that the Ottoman government acknowledged the patriarchate’s status. Under these circumstances the Constantinople patriarchate, which along with Cilicia and Jerusalem, functioned within the borders of the same country was indeed to receive that country’s support, for the Constantinople patriarchate was deemed as predominant in terms of existing relationships with these patriarchates. Meanwhile, the Constantinople patriarchate in its turn got adapted to the internal and external policy of the state and to the ongoing changes, taking place in the country.

As far as the relationships between the Constantinople patriarchate and the Holy See of Etchmiadzin were concerned, the issue was of a more complicated nature, especially if we consider these ties in light of their fight for dioceses. The Catholicosates of Etchmiadzin starting from Pilipos Aghapaketsi, Hakob Jughayetsi and ending with Simeon Yerevantsi, Ghukas Karnetsi insistently defended the rights of the Holy See in the dioceses situated in the Ottoman territories. If the first Catholicosates mainly clashed with the Cilician and Jerusalem dioceses in order to strengthen Etchmiadzin’s status in these dioceses or recover the lost dioceses, then during the rule of Simeon Yerevantsi and Ghukas Karnetsi the preservation of dioceses caused rifts with such new opponents as the Constantinople patriarchate and contra-diocese of Aghtamar Catholicosate. It is common knowledge that Simeon Yerevantsy fought hard to keep the Smyrna diocese under his jurisdiction.

The Smyrna patriarchate with its comparatively affluent status and wealthy merchants was to become an apple of discord between the Holy See of

¹⁵ Ալպոյաճեան 1910, 302:

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

Etchmiadzin and the Constantinople patriarchate since the rule of the Patriarchs Kolot Hovhannes and Hakob Nalian. Due to Simeon Yerevantsi's efforts in the tax list of *mukataa* (which the Catholicosate paid for its dioceses located in Turkey) the Smyrna diocese was to be mentioned with a separate line (a special reference was to be made to Izmir)¹⁶. In this way the Smyrna diocese was appropriated to Etchmiadzin once and for all.

Since Karapet Ulnetsi's election the Etchmiadzin Catholicoses were confirmed by sultan fermans (berat)¹⁷ which were based on the solicitation of the Armenian patriarch in Constantinople. This was also the violation of Etchmiadzin's rights that could not be submissively swallowed by the proud author of "Jambr". The Turkish conquest of the former Persian provinces in 1724 led to the reinforcement of the Constantinople patriarchate and to the dwindling of Etchmiadzin's might and magic. This was a decisive factor in Etchmiadzin's inclusion in the Ottoman tax system, laying legal foundation for strengthening the Constantinople patriarchate's influence on the Catholicosate. Simeon Yerevantsi's antagonistic even defiant objections to patriarchs Kolot and Nalian can be traced here. He made bold and explicit attempts to recover Etchmiadzin's influence over the Constantinople patriarchate to reinforce its standing and name in the innermost and holy dioceses. Certainly these aspirations would be really grounded when in 1735 the Persian rule over Eastern Armenia was reinstated and Etchmiadzin exited from the political, hence, tax system of the Ottoman Empire. Nonetheless, irrespective of the given fact the Constantinople patriarchate continued to maintain its influential ties with Etchmiadzin at least as far as Catholicos' elections were concerned, when in the Ottoman capital after Karapet Ulnetsi (1726 Catholicos), Alexander B (1753), Sahak Ahagin (did not acknowledge his election in 1756) and Hakob Shamakhetsi were proclaimed as Catholicoses.

In 1764 the elected Catholicos Simeon Yerevantsi took active measures in order to put the rivaling patriarchate into its place and to upgrade its moral superiority to an actual dominance. He suggested that his compatriots of Constantinople should establish suffragan's institution that in fact would carry out Etchmiadzin's supervision of the patriarchate. In the face of strong opposition on part of the Ottoman authorities and amiras, the initiative would naturally fail.

¹⁶ Սիմէոն Կաթողիկոս 237:

¹⁷ Օրմանէան Մ. 3454:

Bishop Astapatsi who was the Catholicos's representative, head of the Smyrna diocese was simply banished from Turkey's territories. Moreover, the weak-willed vardapet Grigor Pasmachain, obeying resignedly the amiras' orders resorted to a peculiar demarche. He suggested that the Catholicos should grant him the competence of bishopric ordaining. However, such competence was Etchmiadzin's entitlement, and now it was Etchmiadzin's turn to reject¹⁸.

In the 18th century due to Turkish-Persian military confrontations and interstate conflicts in general, the ecclesiastic entitlements of Etchmiadzin underwent serious tribulations in Ottoman Turkey. The Ottoman state, pursuing centralized policy supported the Constantinople patriarchate's active involvement in the religious communities outside the capital, particularly and foremost in the provincial ones. This was to expand the scope of the Constantinople patriarchate rights at the expense of Etchmiadzin's long- established entitlements. Writing to the patriarch Hovhannes Kolot, Simeon Yerevantsi, the adherent of Etchmiadzin's rights describes these facts with furious lines. While the latter forced by his official position was to get adapted to the Ottoman government's changing policy towards Etchmiadzin. In this regard, defending Kolot from Catholicos's attacks M. Ormanean with his inherent prudence states: "Under no circumstances would Kolot want to violate the rights of the Holy See, his only duty was that of an intermediary nothing else"¹⁹.

However, M Ormanean in his turn introduces Simeon Yerevantsi's unambiguous characterization, ignoring that Catholicos's vocation consisted in defending Etchmiadzin's rights in Turkey. Moreover, after Sahak Ahagin's election (was elected as Catholicos in February, 1756 in Constantinople, resigning afterwards)²⁰ owing to political circumstances Simeon Yerevantsi managed to avoid the looming danger of holding election Catholicos' in Constantinople on regular basis. Nevertheless, S. Yerevantsi did not succeed in reclaiming former rights. Etchmiadzin expressed its deep displeasure with the state of affairs which had drastically changed the conventional nature of its relationships with the Constantinople patriarchate to the detriment of the former of which the "grief-stricken" Catholicos was complaining.

¹⁸ Դիվան Կարապետ արքեպիսկոպոսի թղթի 163, պլ. 369:

¹⁹ **Օրմանեան** 2001, 3294:

²⁰ **Օրմանեան** 2001, 3453:

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

Etchmiadzin's struggle for the church dioceses with the patriarchate and Aghtamar continued during Ghukas Catholicos's leadership and in this case we cannot say that Eychmiadzin only recorded defeats. Up until then not only had Simeon Yerevantsi returned the Smyrna diocese to Etchmiadzin but also managed to acquire the Kars diocese in Ottoman Turkey. However, these were occasional achievements, reflecting the controversial nature of the phenomenon and by no means the state of affairs. Driven by the principle to protect the millets from foreign intervention, Turkey pursued drastic policy to have an absolute and sole authority over all the millets, including the Armenian ones. In the second half of the 18th century the emergency measures taken against the spread of Catholicism in the country, led to greater persecutions and supervision on part of the government. The state's tighter grip on the leaders of millets and national administrations testified to Turkey's policy to achieve absolute power.

Conclusions

The study of the issue carried out within the frames of the given research leads to several interrelated conclusions which single out the characterization of the Ottoman state's policy towards the Armenian patriarchate in Constantinople from the perspective of overall millets system, highlighting the functions and activities of the patriarchate during the era in question. The elucidation of such factors as the elevation of patriarchate's national significance as compared to other religious institutions, the noticeable changes in the patriarchate's relationships with the latter and the characteristic features of the Constantinople Armenian community, being the social basis of the patriarchate is vital as well. In the 18th century the Ottoman Empire was determined to maintain the stability of all the millets (including the Armenian ones) since it was seen as basis for the Empire's relationships with them. In parallel with its unfolding conflicts related to the European policy, the Ottoman court was to follow a more novel and stricter course of action to ensure stability. This was reflected in the Ottoman conservatism that consisted in preserving the system of millets within the traditional boundaries. Hovhannes Kolot's and Grigor Shghtakir's success in separating the Armenian patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople (and securing the former's entitlement in electing a patriarch) can be accounted for by these factors.

The 18th century fermans at hand (the first ferman given to the patriarch Grigor Pasmachain in 1764 and the second one handed to the patriarch Zaqaria Kaghzvantsi in 1773) reflect the main policy of the Ottoman conservatism towards the Armenian millet. In the aforementioned context these fermans have basically the same distinctive features. Furthermore, they were to repeat the basic points of the fermans issued in the previous centuries (15th–17th centuries), especially in terms of the Armenian millet's duties and rights as acknowledged by the state.

The craftsmen and especially the wealthy elite – the amira class (since the second half of the 18th century) played an important role in the multi-layered community, directing the patriarchate's activities and policy. If the patriarchate functioned as state authorized partly civil intermediary between the Armenian community and the state itself, then the amiras represented the real power to whom the secular matters of the community management, including the control over the patriarch were handed.

In Ottoman Turkey the relationships between the Constantinople patriarchate and All Armenian Catholicos in fact were realized through the donation institution (the institution itself was divided into purely donative and donative- ecclesiastic types), being supervised by the Catholicosate. This is how Etchmiadzin preserved its authority over the dioceses under its jurisdiction in Ottoman Turkey. Since Karapet Ulnetsi's election (in 1726) the institutional superiority of the Constantinople patriarchate over Etchmiadzin Catholicosate was noticeable in this country, which was aimed at counterbalancing the moral, ecclesiastic dominance of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin. In Ottoman Turkey, since the aforementioned period the Catholicoses were not acknowledged as such without the solicitation (the latter functioned as sultan ferman) of the Armenian patriarch in Constantinople.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ալպոյաճեան Ա. 1910, Ազգային սահմանադրութիւնը, իր ծագումը և կիրառութիւնը. Ընդարձակ օրացոյց Ս. Փրկչեան հիանդանոցի հայոց, Կ. Պոլսի, էջ 76–528:

Անասեան Յ.Ս. 1995, Թուրքական ֆոյթովկաթը եւ հայերը, «Հասկ» հայագիտական տարեգիրք, Անթիլիա-Լիբանան, հրատ. Կիլիկիո կաթողիկոսութեան, էջ 221–256:

Դիան հայոց պատմութեան 1912, Գիրք Ժ, հրատ. Գիւտ Քահ. Աղանեանց, Թիֆլիս, 602 էջ:

Կարապետեան Պ. 1935, Հնգդարեան հիշատակարան Սամաթիոյ Ս. Գէորգ եկեղեցւոյ, Ստամբուլ, 350 էջ:

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

Մաշտոցեան մատենադարան, Դիան կարապետ արքեպիսկոպոսի, թղթ. 16, վավ. 369:

Պարթենիոս Աթենացու 2008, Պաղեստինի Կեսարիայի մետրոպոլիտի պատմություն, հ. Ա, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ պատմության ինստիտուտ, Երևան, 170 էջ:

Պերպերեան Հ. 1963, Կ. Պոլսոյ Հայ պատրիարքներու գաւազանագիրքը ըստ Մաղաքիա դպիր ճէվահիրճեանի (Հանդէս ամսօրեայ, 1963, N 7-9, էջ 325–341):

Սիմէոն կաթողիկոս 1873, Զամբռ գիրք, որ կոչի յիշատակարան, Վաղարշապատ, 304 էջ:

Փափազյան Ավ. 1999, Թուրքական վավերագրերը. Հայաստանի և հայերի մասին (16–19-րդ դարեր), ՀՀ ԳԱԱ արևելագիտության ինստիտուտ, Երևան, 291 էջ:

Օրմանյան Մ. 2001, Ազգապատում, հ. Բ, Մայր Աթոռ Ս. Էջմիածին, 3893 էջ:

Barsoumian H.L. 2007, The Armenian Amira Class of Istanbul, American University of Armenia, Yerevan, 181 p.

Ubicini M.A. 1856, Letters from Turkey: Account of Religious, Political, Social & Commerical Conditions of the Ottoman Empire, Part II, London, J. Murray, 450 p.

ԿՈՍՏԱՆԴՆՈՒՊՈԼՍԻ ՀԱՅՈՑ ՊԱՏՐԻԱՐՔՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

XVIII դ.

(ակնարկ)

ԽԱՌԱՏՅԱՆ Ա.

Ամփոփում

Բանալի բառեր՝ Կ.Պոլսի հայոց պատրիարքություն, Ամենայն հայոց կաթողիկոսություն, Կիլիկիայի կաթողիկոսություն, Երուսաղեմի հայոց պատրիարքություն, Հովհաննես Կոլոտ պատրիարք, Հակոբ Նալյան պատրիարք, ֆերման:

XVIII դ. Կ. Պոլսի հայոց պատրիարքությունը համազգային հեղինակության հասավ իր թեմերի ընդլայնման, ազգային եկեղեցական կենտրոնների համակարգում իր տեղի և փոխհարաբերությունների հստակեցման շնորհիվ: Դրան նպաստեց նաև միլիթների նկատմամբ օսմանյան պահպանողական քաղաքականությունը, որ մի կողմից նպաստում էր հայ համայնքի դավանական ամբողջականությանը, մյուս կողմից՝ խորացնում հակասությունները տարադավան հայերի միջև:

1715–1760-ական թթ. միջև բավական ցայտուն զգացվում է պատրիարքության գործնական նշանակության և հեղինակության բարձրացումը հայ

եկեղեցական կենտրոնների համակարգում՝ մասնավորապես Հովհաննես Կոլոտ և Հակոբ Նալյան պատրիարքների գործունեության շնորհիվ: Կարգավորվեցին պատրիարքության փոխհարաբերությունները Երուսաղեմի հայոց պատրիարքության, Կիլիկիայի աթոռի և Ամենայն հայոց կաթողիկոսության հետ: Կ. Պոլսի պատրիարքության ազդեցության ուժեղացման արդյունքներից էր Օսմանյան Թուրքիայում կաթողիկոսի ճանաչումը պատրիարքի պարտադիր միջնորդագրի միջոցով: Հանուն Օսմանյան Թուրքիայում գտնվող թեմերի նկատմամբ իր իրավունքների պահպանության, Էջմիածինը հարկադրված էր ճանաչելու պատրիարքի այդ արտոնությունը, որի դեմ ուղղված խորին դժգոհությունն ենք տեսնում կաթողիկոս Սիմեոն Երևանցու «Ջամբո» աշխատության մեջ:

АРМЯНСКОЕ ПАТРИАРШЕСТВО КОНСТАНТИНОПОЛЯ В XVIII В. (очерк)

ХАРАТЯН А.

Резюме

Ключевые слова: Армянское патриаршество Константинополя, Католикосат всех армян, Киликийский католикосат, Армянское патриаршество Иерусалима, патриарх Ованес Колот, патриарх Акоп Налян, фирман.

В XVIII в. общенациональный авторитет константинопольского армянского патриаршества возрос в силу расширения епархий и уяснения роли патриаршества и его взаимоотношений в системе национальных церковных центров. Этому способствовала также османская консервативная политика в отношении миллетов, которая, с одной стороны, способствовала религиозной целостности, а с другой – усугубляла противоречия среди армян разных конфессий.

В 1715–1760 гг. весьма четко прослеживалось практическое значение и возрастание авторитета патриаршества в системе армянских церковных центров, в частности, благодаря деятельности патриархов Ованеса Колота и Акопа Наляна. Были налажены взаимоотношения патриар-

The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 18th Century

шества с армянским патриаршеством Иерусалима, Великим домом Киликийским и Католикосатом всех армян. Результатом усиления влияния патриаршества стало также признание католикоса в Османской Турции посредством обязательного письменного ходатайства патриарха. Дабы сохранить свои права в отношении епархий, находившихся в Османской Турции, Эчмиадзин вынужден был признать эту привилегию патриарха, вызвавшую недовольство у католикоса Симеона Ереванци, что нашло отражение в его труде «Джамбр».