

Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi
54, 2 (2014), 167-192

GREEK ORTHODOX PATRIARCH CYRILLOS LOUKARIS AND HIS CONNECTION WITH THE DUTCH REPUBLIC¹

Mustafa GÜLEÇ*

Abstract

This study concerns the connections of the Greek Orthodox Christian Patriarch of Istanbul with the Dutch State early in the 17th century through the mediation of the First Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul. In the presence of Patriarch Loukaris and Ambassador Haga, it discusses the relation of religious conflicts of the 17th century with political and diplomatic questions, which would have a certain impact on religious and social reforms in the long run. The contact of Loukaris as a progressive soul in the Orthodox community with the Dutch Republic, which symbolizes religious and social reforms of the period concerned, is analyzed mainly on the basis of the memories of Haga and the concept of social transformation is argued in this context.

Keywords: *Cyrillos Loukaris, Greek Orthodox Patriarch, Ottoman Empire, Cornelis Haga, Dutch Republic, Protestant, Catholic, Religious and Social Reform Movements.*

Öz

Yunan Ortodoks Patriği Cyrillos Loukaris'in Hollanda Cumhuriyeti ile İlişkisi

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu topraklarında İstanbul Rum Ortodoks Patriği olarak görev yapmış Cyrillos Loukaris, 17. Yüzyılın başında İstanbul'a gönderilen ilk Hollanda Büyükelçisi Cornelis Haga üzerinden, o dönemde Protestan kimliğini yapılandırma sürecinde olan Hollanda Cumhuriyeti ile yakın bir etkileşim içine girmiştir. Bu çalışma, Patrik Loukaris ve Büyükelçi Haga arasındaki iletişimi, birincil tarihsel kaynaktan yani Haga'nın İstanbul'a vardığı ilk günden itibaren tuttuğu günlükten yararlanarak, dinsel ve toplumsal dönüşüm hareketlerine uzun vadede etkide bulunabilecek dönemin dinsel çatışmalarının siyasi ve diplomatik sorunlarla olan bağlantısını çözümlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Söz konusu kaynaklar

¹ Some parts of this study have been presented at the University of Bologna, Italy during the International Conference "Trame Controluce Il Patriarca 'Protestante' Cirillo Loukaris" organized by the University of Bologna & Padova on 11-12 April, 2013 in Bologna and Padova.

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, Hollanda Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı; mustafagulec@hotmail.com

ışığında, Patriğin ve ona bağlı Ortodoks cemaatin, 17. Yüzyılın ilk yarısında, Katolik-Protestan güç ve nüfuz çekişmesinin merkezinde yer aldığını gözlemliyoruz.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Cyrillos Loukaris, Rum Ortodoks Patriği, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Hollanda Büyükelçisi Cornelis Haga, Hollanda Cumhuriyeti, Protestan, Katolik, Dinsel ve Toplumsal Reform Hareketleri.*

1. Introduction

The 17th century is generally considered as the Golden Age in the Dutch history. The main reason for that is the fact that some major transformations within the Dutch society had begun in that era in terms of economic, political and social change. The Dutch Republic of the Seven United Provinces was a pioneer in the early modern European history with regard to the application of the republican model as an administration form in terms of modern participatory democracy. Even before the 17th century, we can observe some republican tendencies, when the Netherlands were under the Burgundian rule. (cf. Israel, 1998: 28). For instance, as a result of the Flemish pressure, a considerable privilege (*Grand Privilège* of 1477) was given by the Burgundian government to the States General (a general assembly of the confederation of the Netherlands) the right to gather on their own initiative whenever they considered as suitable and curbed the power of the ruler to levy taxes or exert military force, without the consent of the provinces. Based on the analysis of Blockmans and Van Peteghem, Israel argues here that constitutionally speaking there were definite affinities between the revolt of 1477 and the later great Revolt against Spain. It is alleged that there was a certain tension between the general movement and attempts of the provinces to combine, by means of the States General and particularism of individual provinces. In this regard, according to Israel, Flanders both took the lead on behalf of the common cause and on the other hand sought to reinforce her own provincial autonomy in the second half of the 15th century. Thus, it is therefore hard to find similar examples in the history of early modern Europe. So the Dutch republic was actually not born out of necessity in 1581 as many scholars argue in this direction. However, it was more or less a natural result of intensive commercial, political, economical and cultural activities (cf. Israel, 1998: 19-34 and 788 for an extended discussion).

For example, the success of the Dutch in extraverted trade relations ensured them to create a new social class other than aristocracy (nobility), clergy and peasants, i.e. bourgeoisie. This new class, which had already

gained a considerable economic power as a result of the global trade, began to play a gradually increasing decisive role in religious war against the catholic oppression, the revolt against the Spanish Habsburg (i.e. the Catholic superpower of that period and the rival of the Ottoman Empire), in redesigning government of the country, striving for more autonomy in internal and external policies. These successive changes were of paramount importance in regard to the nationbuilding process of the Netherlands today.

The Dutch bourgeoisie, which enjoyed benefits of the commerce overseas, had therefore a word to say against the feudal and religious class² in the homeland and abroad. Not only a word, but also they had more than enough money to use, a military and political power to exert. This shift in the status perception has yielded to take new diplomatic and economic steps towards the improvement of the position of the Dutch Republic as a global actor in the early modern age.

Thus, the Dutch Parliament i.e. the States General tended to combine the growing economic power with political, military and diplomatic actions. At the same time, the global powers of the period concerned such as the Spanish Habsburg and the Ottoman Empire were obviously aware of this change. Ottoman Admiral, Chief of the Naval Forces, Halil Pasha sent a letter in 1610 to the States General asking a permanent Dutch ambassador in Istanbul. Eventually, Cornelis Haga was received in the audience as the first ambassador of the States General of the Dutch Republic of the Seven United Provinces by Sultan Ahmet I on the 6th of July, 1612 (cf. Haga, 1612) and he gained capitulations from the Ottoman ruler, which mean very advantageous trade privileges for Dutch merchants in the Ottoman territory. As of this date, diplomatic relations between the Dutch Republic and the Ottoman Empire were officially started.

Thus, Haga, as a Calvinist (Protestant) ambassador, was commissioned to work in a country, where his opponent in the religious conflict i.e. the Catholic Church was co-existing in peace with the Orthodox Church under the Muslim administration. One may argue here that England as being rather on the protesting side as Haga and his country (i.e. the Dutch Republic) was, however, against the settlement of Haga in Istanbul as a official business representative of the Republic. Eventually they had to accept the existance of one another somehow witihin the Ottoman territory, as both powers had officially been recognized by the Ottoman authority. Haga got in touch with the head of the Orthodox Church i.e. Patriarch Cyrillos Loukaris. By the

² What I here mean by the concept “religious class” is simply clergy and people, who were under direct influence of the unquestioned authority of the Catholic Church.

mediation of Haga and surprisingly the British ambassador to Istanbul, the Patriarch remained in close contact with Protestant countries. These data suggest us inevitably the supremacy of financial and commercial interests over religious and social ties in an international political setting.

This paper investigates the connections and interactions of the Orthodox Christian community in Istanbul with the Dutch Republic in Haga's person mainly based on the memories of Haga as formulated by himself. It aims to give an answer to the question where the Orthodox Church stands with regard to the Catholic-Protestant Conflict in early 17th century and how this stance in the period concerned might have effected the international balances, religious and social movements within the Orthodox community.

1.1. Cornelis Haga (1578 - 1654)

The first Dutch diplomat in Istanbul, Cornelis Haga was born in Schiedam. His father was merchant, member of the Town Council and organist of the church. Haga went to the Latin School. He studied law at Leiden University afterward. He began his diplomatic service as Dutch envoy in Stockholm mainly in order to negotiate with the Swedish authorities regarding taking back confiscated ships of some Amsterdam-based merchants. He was officially commissioned by the States General. However, all his travel costs were reimbursed by the merchants concerned (Van Der Sloot & Van Der Vlis, 2012: 9).

After this successful mission, he was promoted and appointed by the States General as ambassador from 1612 to 1639 in the Ottoman Empire. When he took this important task, he went to Istanbul with some prominent people in his delegation: Cornelis Pauw (son of Reinier Pauw, the mayor of Amsterdam), Ernst Brinck, Cornelis Sijms (sons of regents), Andries Suyderhoeff and Lambertus Verhaer (the only person in the group, who already had been to Istanbul as goldsmith; cf. Haga, 1612). As mentioned above, Haga was a skilled negotiator, which made him ambassador at an important, but difficult post i.e. İstanbul. The reason is that powerful states of the time such as France, England and the Venetian Republic had already gained some commercial advantages from the Ottoman sultan and that they were not willing to share them with a new player joining the game. Due to the fact that the Ottoman Empire was a rival and enemy of the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs; the Dutch Republic, which was then in revolt against

Spain³, became a natural ally of the Ottomans through the principle ‘the enemy of my enemy is my ally’. This implicates that Haga had a relative advantage in this respect, but also a hard time embedding his mission and the interests of the Dutch Republic into the Ottoman arena. French and Venetian ambassadors in particular (but also British) did their best to prevent the permanent Dutch diplomatic presence in Istanbul (cf. Haga, 1612).

For the aforementioned Western powers, everything that could be of value to manipulate with regard to the wide ranging interests within that vast Ottoman territory, would be put in use to shift the status quo in their own benefit. Meanwhile, the Orthodox Christian community in the Ottoman Empire had therefore been always right in the middle of the religious, political and economic conflict between the Catholic and Protestant camp. In the eyes of these two blocks, the Orthodox population concerned was presumably considered as underdeveloped, poor, low-educated and less-enlightened in general. Each of them was trying to pull the Orthodox Christians towards their side (cf. Haga, 1612; Heeringa, 1917).

This case was also a matter of negotiation even 159 years ago⁴ from Haga’s time (i.e. 1612) during the Fall or the Conquest of Istanbul (it depends on how readers approach the issue), when Konstantinos Paleologos asked for military support in 1453 from Yanos Hunyadi, Alfonso V (King of Aragon and Naples), various Italian cities and even from Pope Nicolaus V, who eventually put forward the reunification as the first and the most important precondition for the help. The Eastern Romans (or the Orthodox) were insisting on the military support against the Ottoman army, gathering of a new council and finally the reunification. The western Romans (or the Catholics), however, were avoiding the second proposition of the Orthodox and were dictating that the first proposition (i.e. support) would be the reward of the application of the third one (i.e. reunification) on a voluntary basis only (cf. Nicol, 2013: 56; Gibbon, 1900: 97).

As the highest official representative of the rising Protestant power i.e. Dutch Republic, Haga exerted his diplomatic skills well and had a good

³ Although there was the Twelve Years’ Truce between Spain, Southern Netherlands and the Dutch Republic, a definitive peace was unfortunately not in horizon, due to the ongoing escalating clash of economical and commercial interests. One can analyse the situation better in the light of social and political camps such as *Hoeks* and *Kabeljauwen*, *Arminians* and *Gomarrians* in the Dutch history.

⁴ This particular discussion here has nothing to do with the later conflict between the Catholics and the Protestants in the 16th and 17th century.

contact with the Orthodox patriarch in Istanbul i.e. Loukaris⁵. It was such a close dialogue that the opposite camp (Catholics; Jesuits in particular) was starting to suspect that Loukaris became a protestant church member, converted from the Orthodox faith. Consequently, they were trying to prevent that the Orthodox Christian community would fall into the sphere of influence of the Protestant camp by dislodging Loukaris from his office. As a result of his remarkable performance in Istanbul, Haga became the best paid employee of the Dutch Republic abroad with 12.000 Dutch guilders per year (Van Der Sloot & Van Der Vlis, 2012: 11). As stated above, Haga received the trade capitulations of the Ottoman sultan. This commercial and political prerogative permitted the Dutch Republic to trade with the Ottoman Empire under their own jurisdiction. The sultan also granted the Dutch several privileges, including exemption of certain taxes and limited autonomy within the Ottoman territories. With the power of the capitulation, Haga could found various consulates at the most important trade cities and ports in the Empire such as Tunis, Algiers, Aleppo, İzmir, Thessaloniki, Athens and Patras.

After his successful mission, Haga returned to the Dutch Republic in 1639. He became the representative (a deputy for the States General) of the Dutch provinces, Holland, Zeeland and Friesland till his death in 1654. He was buried in the Great Church of Schiedam. His fellow citizens or compatriots appreciated his service to the country very much and paid tribute to him by adding an inscription to his grave, reading “*Foris ac domi et de patria bene meritus fuit*” (Both at home and abroad, he served his country well).

1.2. Cyrillos Loukaris (1572 – 1638)

Orthodox Christian Patriarch Loukaris was born in Candia (Heraklion) on the island of Crete in 1572, when this island was under the rule of the Venetian Republic. İnalcık gives us a picture of that time by explaining that on islands such as Crete and Cyprus, a small minority of Latin feudal lords (French and Venetian) seized Orthodox churches and lands. Then they drove the Orthodox clergy to villages. The orthodox farmers had to work for their feudal lords as slaves on their own ground. When Loukaris was born, the patriarch in Istanbul sent a message to his community on Cyprus not to show any resistance to the Ottoman soldiers, who were fighting against these feudal lords. The farmers avoided therefore to support Venetians in the war.

⁵ The appointment of Loukaris to Istanbul was after 1620 and till that year he was the patriarch of Alexandria. We know however that Haga got in touch with Loukaris prior to his mission to Istanbul.

When the Ottomans captured the Island, they restored the Orthodox Church, they gave the farmers their land back and set so-called *pareikos* i.e. Orthodox slaves free. In 1571 there was no Orthodox state on Cyprus for instance and the Ottomans were received as liberator by the local orthodox population (İnalçık, 2011: 205-206).

Loukaris studied theology in Padua and Geneva. He occupies a remarkable position in the conflict of the great Confessions to which the Reformation gave rise. He is the counterpart of his more learned and successful, but less noble, antagonist, Leo Allatius (1586–1669), who openly apostatized from the Greek Church to the Roman, and became librarian of the Vatican (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/creeds1.v.v.html>).

Loukaris was sent to Poland in 1596 by the Patriarch of Alexandria (Meletios Pegas) to lead the Orthodox opposition to the Union of Brest-Litovsk, which contained an annexation of Kiev (Orthodox Church) with the Catholic Church (Rome). The Church in the west (i.e. the Catholic Church) with regard to the Orthodox Church did not allow the Ottoman Christian delegation (Loukaris and his friends) to participate in the 2nd Union meeting. In order not to be stigmatized as a “Ottoman spy”, he escaped by a hair’s breadth from being arrested and executed. Unfortunately his friends were arrested and executed in Lvov (Karpát, 2006: 356-7). He served as professor of the Orthodox Academy in Vilnius for 6 years. His ultimate goal was in the long run to reform the Orthodox Church along Calvinistic lines. He sent many Greek theologians to the universities of Switzerland, Northern Netherlands and England. Several times he was dislodged and banished temporarily as a result of accusations of his Orthodox opponents and the Catholic French and Austrian ambassadors, while he was supported by the Protestant Dutch and English ambassadors to the Ottoman capital city (cf. Haga, 1612)⁶.

According to the Orthodox Church, Hieromartyr Loukaris was Patriarch of Alexandria as Cyril III from 1601 to 1620 and Patriarch of Istanbul as Cyril I for five different periods from 1620 to 1638. In 1612 (i.e. when Haga was officially dispatched to Istanbul), Loukaris was *locum tenens* of the Church of Istanbul for a short time. On the 4th of November, 1620, the Holy Synod of Istanbul elected Cyril Patriarch of Istanbul. His patriarchate was broken into five different periods: 1620 to 1623, 1623 to 1633, 1633 to 1634, 1634 to 1635, and 1637 to 1638, by intrigues involving the papacy, reformists, Jesuits and the Ottoman sultan that included conspiracies against

⁶ We read in the diary of Haga that he contacted Loukaris even right after his arrival in Istanbul in 1612. he had some encounters with him there.

Cyril to discredit him by spreading rumors that he was a Calvinist. After each deposition, Patriarch Loukaris was re-elected by the clergy supported by the Orthodox population in the city.

The crucial part of the maintenance of his post was probably formed by the fact that his community was in the middle of a clash of interests and power. He was obviously supported by Protestant diplomatic representatives in Istanbul. This vulnerable position was making him obviously a target of all kinds of intentions.

For instance, according to Philippe de Harlay, the Catholic Count of Césy and the Ambassador of Louis XIII to Istanbul (1619 – 1639), “it has not yet been possible to sow the unfortunate dogmas of Calvin and several other heretics, whom since that time did not fail to slip into the weak and ignorant minds of the poor Greeks by the whole Church of the East and six or seven ambassadors being here Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Transilvania and Prince Palatine, said Cyril in a solemn feast to the Ambassadors of England and Holland, altogether attended the Mess seated in a chair and covered...” (cf. Harai, 2011: 56). Hering argues that the first deposition of Loukaris was in 1623 by means of a bribe, 40.000 Thalers paid off to the Grand Vizier Mere Hüseyin Pasha by the Count of Césy. However, this corrupt Ottoman official was in such secret and intimate relations with the Dutch ambassador, that Haga could call him his old family friend (*myn ouwe familiare vrint*). Hering also confirms that there is no doubt that the Dutch ambassador got the patriarch under his protection and tried to do everything to turn his disastrous destiny around (Hering, 1965: 77-78). Many times he was deposed and put back upon his religious post by the effect of the clashing western European powers concerned. Between 1620 and 1638, the Protestant (Haga, Roe and Wyche) and the Catholic (Césy and Schmid) ambassadors had spent a considerable amount of money to protect and depose Loukaris. In this context, Harai provides us an interesting overview of the famous bribe traffic going around the Patriarch Cyril Loukaris (cf. Harai, 2011⁷: 63):

⁷ This particular study of Harai has also a very interesting title: “a chair at auction”.

Table 1 – Bribes, which were paid pro and contra Loukaris between 1620 and 1638 (from Harai, 2011)

| | Dépenses protestantes pour C. Lucar | | | Dépenses catholiques contre C. Lucar | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | monnaies européennes | aspre (argent) | sultanin (or) | monnaies européennes | aspre (argent) | sultanin (or) |
| 1620 (novembre) | [15.000] thalers | 1.050.000 | 7.000 | | | |
| 1622 (avril) | | | | 20.000 thalers | 1.400.000 | 9.333 |
| 1622 (septembre) | [40.000] thalers | 2.800.000 | 18.666 | | | |
| 1623 | [45.000] thalers | 3.150.000 | 15.000 | | | |
| 1624 (mars) | 10.000 thalers | 700.000 | 2.258 | | | |
| 1633 | 50.000 ducats | 6.000.000 | 27.272 | 12.000 écus | 5.280.000 | 24.000 |
| 1634 | | | | 60.000 réaux | 6.600.000 | 30.000 |
| 1634 (avril) | 10.000 piastres | 1.100.000 | 5.000 | | | |
| 1635 (mars) | | | | 60.000 piastres | 6.600.000 | 30.000 |
| 1637 (mars) | [40.000] ducats | 8.800.000 | 36.666 | | | |
| 1638 (juin) | | | | 50.000 ducats | 11.000.000 | 45.833 |
| Total | | 23.600.000 | 111.862 | | 30.880.000 | 139.166 |

The left column in Table 1 refers to months and years between 1620 and 1638. There are three categories of money in Table 1. European currency Thaler is on the second column from the left. The French term *en aspre* means here *gümüş akçe* in Turkish, which refers to silver Ottoman currency and the *sultanin* is *altın akçe* in Turkish, which is gold Ottoman money.

The first three columns as from the second from the left indicate the money, which was spent by the Protestants to protect Loukaris and the last three columns by the Catholics to send Loukaris away from his highest religious function.

Table 1 demonstrates clearly that Loukaris constituted the central position of a violent power game between various European potentates of the era. In so far as he was backed up by the English and Dutch ambassador, he was seen equally evil and dangerous by the French, Austrian ambassadors, Jesuits and Capuchins in Istanbul.

Loukaris was frequently shown as target of attack, which was also attributed as “sacred”, if anyone would kill him. All means for this purpose were legitimate (e.g. threats, use of violence, buying off Ottoman authorities

and pro-Catholic clerics in the Orthodox circles, producing texts which put blame on Loukaris, slanders in which the patriarch was provoking foreign powers against the Ottoman Empire). Patrinellis argues that the Austrian Embassy planned the death of Loukaris or his exile to Italy. They eventually persuaded Sultan Murat IV, who was preparing a war campaign to Persia, that the patriarch was simultaneously collaborating with the enemies of the Sultan.

In contrast to the explanation of Patrinellis, Hering argues that the Sultan had a particular respect for his Orthodox subjects probably due to the fact that his mother Anastasia (or her Ottoman name is Kösem Mahpeyker) was actually the daughter of an Orthodox priest. The Venetian bailo Contarini tried many times to ensure the deposition of Loukaris by using defamation about him to the Grand Vizier Bayram Pasha. However, Kontares i.e. the rival cyril against Loukaris, wished to accomplish a death penalty on Loukaris with severe slander and defamation, through which he wanted to incite Bayram Pasha against Patriarch Loukaris (Hering, 1965: 311⁸).

According to Hering, probably one of the Catholic brothers, who was recommended by the Catholic envoy, Cornelio da Cascia, got to win the favour of one of the Sultan's wives (her name is not mentioned) for the Catholic cause. The calumny, that Loukaris would be cheating on his own country, appeared to the Sultan so outrageous that he finally gave his consent to the arrest and execution of the alleged traitor. On the 29th of June, 1638, the Kaymakam Musa Pasha ordered the arrest of Loukaris by four janissaries to the fortress Rumeli Hisarı, which served as prison for persons of high rank (Hering, 1965: 316-317). He was then strangled by the janissaries. This action is in fact not something uncommon in the Ottoman history, when we consider that sultans were getting even their own sons strangled in the process of a power struggle (e.g. Sultan Soliman the Magnificent did the same to his son Mustafa).

2.The contact of the Patriarch with the Dutch Ambassador

When Haga was in the East in 1602 for the first time, Loukaris became already the Patriarch of Alexandria. They met there first. When Haga became the Ambassador of the Dutch Republic to the Ottoman Empire in 1612, Loukaris was there too coincidentally. Loukaris paid a quick visit to Haga. In the following weeks he came now and then to inform him about the

⁸ I cordially thank Melahat Örtülü for the provision of this archive material at the library of the University of Vienna.

intrigues of the French and Venetian ambassadors directed to him (Heeringa, 1917: 119). In his memorial, Haga conveys his arrival in Istanbul as the Ambassador of the Dutch Republic (Haga, 2014: 147⁹):

“...With the help and mercy of God I had arrived sane and safe in *San Stefano* (T.N: today *Yeşilköy*) on the 14th of March 1612, approximately one hour distance from Constantinople and I had already gone ashore there. On the 15th of March in the morning I had sent Lambertus Verhaer with letters addressed to the Captain named Halil Pasha and the *kaymakam* first vizier at the Sublime Porte to inform His Excellency (H.E.) of my arrival and to request an accomodation arrangement for me...”¹⁰

We infer from his notes that Loukaris was one of the first persons, with whom Haga contacted immediately after his settlement in the city (Haga, 2014: 151):

“...On the 21st (T.N: March, 1612) in the morning the patriarch Cyrillus of Egypt has come to me. He was at that moment in Constantinople. By means of the friendship that His Highness has already had with me, he has come to visit me. On the same day Halil Pasha has presented me his horses¹¹. In case I would like to visit someone, particularly the kaymakam and other pashas at the Sublime Gate, then his horses will be at my service...”¹²

⁹ The notes of Haga have been translated by me from the original text i.e. the 17th century version of the Dutch language into Modern English.

¹⁰ The original Dutch version:

“..Door de hulpe ende genade Godts op den 14en Martij 1612 met goede gesontheyt gearriveert sijnde tot Sant Stefano, omtrent een ure van Constantinopoli, ben aldaer te lande gegaen, ende heb op den 15en ‘s morgens gesonden L. Verhaer, met brieven, soo aen den capiteyn, genaempt Challil bassa, als de chahimacham, primo visir alla Porta, haere E. E. adverterende van mijn compste, voorts om een logement voor mij te bestellen...”

¹¹ We have to note here that no one was allowed to ride on a horse in the city of Istanbul in the 17th century except the highest rank Ottoman officials i.e. the Grand Seigneur (Sultan), Grand Vizier, viziers in the Divan, religious and judicial authorities.

¹² The original Dutch version:

“...Op den 21 ‘s morgens is tot mijn gecomen den patriarch Cyrillus van Egipte, op dien tijt tot Constantinopolen sijnde, dewelcke mijn overmits de vruntschap, tevoren met S.H. gehadt, besocht heeft. Op denselvigen dach heeft Challil bassa mijn doen aendien, dat S.E. paerden tot mijn dienst soude wesen, soo menichmael als ick soude oorsaeck hebben ijemant te besoecken, principalijck in het visiteren van de chaimacham ende andere bassas aen de Porta sijnde...”

We further observe that one can surely speak of a close contact and cooperation between the Patriarch and the Dutch ambassador. This closeness implicates that they mutually shared with one another all kinds of problems, which they were facing while executing their duties (Haga, 2014: 184):

“...The patriarch of Alexandria has also visited me on the same day [April 29th, 1612]. Among other things His Excellency has told me that he has on the sly obtained information surely by means of his friend from the dragomans of the Venetian bailo about when I would kiss the hand of the Grand Seigneur (G.S.; i.e. the Sultan: translator’s note). One of the dragomans has responded regrettably: *‘Potrebbe essere ch’ancora non bacciasse gli piedi’* (It could be so that he might not yet have kissed his feet)...”¹³

3. Intrigues over Haga and the Dutch Republic

Not only Loukaris did have to deal with a lot of difficulties, setbacks and problems; Haga also had really a hard time finding a decent position in the diplomatic and economic battle field of Istanbul and settling down into the market, where there was a real religious competition among the zealous players of the game i.e. the Catholics and the Protestants. Loukaris seemed to back him up with all possible means (Haga, 2014: 184):

“...H.E. (his excellency) has also explained me that he surely has the information concerning the correspondence of the French ambassador with the Pope and Mr. de Brèves, an ambassador for the Majesty of France to Rome and to the Sublime Porte prior to that. The French ambassador tries to delay the case deliberately till he gets an answer. There is no doubt that he expects a commission from them in order to spend money in large amount, so that they would send me back to the Netherlands. Furthermore, H.E. has told me that this ambassador has brought a Neapolitan, allied with the Pope and the King of Spain (there is no doubt that also the Pope and the King of Spain are spying here with their followers; their favourites, who are surely not

¹³ The original Dutch version:

“...Den patriarch van Alexandria heeft mijn oock op dito besocht, onder andren relaterende, hoe dat S.E. bedecktelijck door seker sijn vrunt hadde doen vernemen van de drogeman van den bailo van Venetia, wanneer ick de handen soude cussen van den G.S. , ende dat een van de drogeman daerop hadde gehandwoordt seer spijtelijck: *“Potrebbe essere ch’ancora non bacciasse gli piedi”*...”

few here, help them in this matter as much as possible) in a Greek monk's robe, whom the ambassador has made him stay by the Patriarch of Constantinople. In this manner he tries covertly to move Greeks to obey to the Pope. When H.E. has heard about that, he has warned his community openly in his preach against this threat. The French ambassador tries to persuade H.E. with nice words, so that he would let this monk explain the Sacred Scripture according to the God's word. H.E. has also informed me that these Jesuits have incited, stimulated him extremely towards this case in the house of the same ambassador. It [the propaganda] was so intense that even H.E. could have almost believed more in them than in God...¹⁴

These notes of Haga give us a picture of the time, in which the Orthodox Church comes to the fore as the central point of the power struggle between the two religious camps concerned. Thus, we get the impression that the Orthodox community within the Ottoman territory had been the main target in terms of broadening the sphere of influence.

3.1.A conspiracy case

The memorial that Haga kept written during his duty in Istanbul and that he sent regularly to the States General provides us today a very interesting historical insight concerning the state of the art in that period. We are informed about a conspiracy case in order to incite the Ottoman Empire against the Dutch Republic, so that a war could break out between the two

¹⁴ The original Dutch version:

“...S.E. heeft mijn mede verclaert seeckere kennisse te hebben, hoe den ambassadeur van Vranckrijck van dese mijne coempste alrede aen den paus ende Mr. de Brèves, een ambassadeur voor de Majesteyt van Vranckrijck tot Roma, ende hiervoor geweest aen dese Porta, geschreven heeft, souckende de sake te treineren, totdat hij soude antwoort hebben, sonder twijfel enige commissie van daer verwachtende om een grote somme gelts te spenderen, opdat men mijn mocht teruggesenden. S.E. mijn voorts verclaerende, hoe desen ambassadeur met hem gebracht heeft een Napolitaen, gegaigeert van den paus ende coninck van Spangiën, onder het habijt van een Griecxe caloger, denwelcken hij bij den patriarch van Constantinopolen heeft doen woenen, arbejdende bedectelijck de Griecken tot de gehoorsaemheyte van den paus te bewege, en dat S.E. sulx vernomen hebbende, openbaerlijck het volck in sijn predicatie daervoor gewaerschouwt heeft, den ambassadeur van Vranckrijck souckende S.E. met schone woorden te induceren, dat hij desen caloger soude laten de Heylige Schrifture conform Godts woort uuytleggen. Mijn mede verclaerende, dat dese Jesuyten in't huys van denzelven ambassadeur hem ten hoochsten tot dese saecke waeren oprockenende, ende dat S.E. meer in haer als in Godt was gelovende...”

countries and the Dutch Ambassador would be sent back by the Ottoman authorities to his country with empty hands (Haga, 2014: 226 - 227):

“...On the 15th of October (1612) Halil Pasha has called me in by means of my dragoman to talk about some letters, which H.E. has got the hold of. The letters concerned have been sent from England by a Greek bishop¹⁵, who had fled from here to England. One of them is addressed to H.E. as admiral of the sea and makes known that some of the most prominent Greeks here in the city have already reached an agreement with H.P.E. Maurits van Nassau (translator’s note: His Princely Excellency) in order to come in Morea with a huge armada of ships and to capture those lands. The Greeks would then help them in attaining this target. H.E. also is prepared with four hundred ships to do this exploit. Therefore, one should beware of him and a good observation should be conducted as well etc. The others with the same content, which were addressed to the name of the G.S. have fallen into the hands of one of the Granadines, banished from Spain. Supposedly he would have brought the same from England and he would have been commanded to find some ways to be able to hand them over even to the G.S.

When I have heard about the content, I have been afraid of a betrayal and yet again another conspiracy of the enemies. So I have immediately sent my dragoman to Halil Pasha. The aforementioned letters have caused much trouble. They were addressed to the G.S. However, H.E. has got a hold of it. He has opened it and sent it immediately to me in order to investigate where it could have come from. The letter, which is directed to the G.S. is written in Italian characters and Turkish words. The other one, which is addressed to Halil Pasha, is written in Greek characters and Turkish words. This has made me ponder and led me to many suspicions. Therefore, I have immediately made a call to the patriarch of Alexandria –albeit a very late hour in the night-, who lives next to my lodging house, by requesting him to come secretly to my place –as H.E. lives there with other Greeks and it is not advisable to go to H.E. at that hour of the day- in order to avoid all other suspicions. Afterwards, the best friends of H.E.

¹⁵ It is not clear which bishop specifically is the issue here.

are Greeks and this issue concerned prominent Greeks of Constantinople, who are particularly specified in the letter to the G.S. I have ensured that the letters have been read in the presence of the esteemed patriarch of Alexandria and that the letters have been translated by my dragoman. The content was as the one, which has been sent to the G.S. The name of such people has been mentioned in the text as the bishop of Morea and some other Greek monks of Chio, who would have sent a letter to Count Mauritio in order to come in Morea with an Armada. The time is ripe now. For this target H.E. also has prepared 400 galleons to conduct the operation concerned. Therefore he would like to warn H.M. to be careful and not to trust in Greeks, but to drive them away from Constantinople to Arabia or somewhere else etc...¹⁶

¹⁶ The original Dutch version:

“...Op den 15en dito heeft Challil bassa mijn door mijn drogeman doen aendienē, hoe dat in handen van S.E. gecapiteert waren sekre bryeven gesonden uyt Engelant door een Griexschen bisschop van hier voor desen gevluht, den eenen geadresseert aen S.E. als admirael van de zee, vermeldend, hoe dat sommige van de principaelste Griecken alhyer een accord hadden gemaect met S.P.E. Mauritio de Nassau, ten fijne S.E. met een groote armada van schepen in Morea soude comen ende die landen innemen, daertoe de Griecken dan soude helpen; dat oock S.E. al gereet was met vierhondert schepen, om dit exploit te doen; dat men derhalven wel soude voor hem sien; dat oock goede wacht mocht gehoude werden etc.; den andren van denselvigen inhoud, gesuperscribeert aen den G.S., die noch in handen was van een van de Granatinen, uuyt Spangiēen gejaecht, die dezelve uuyt Engelant soude gebracht hebben, ende hem bevolen enige middelen te vinden, om die aen den G.S. selffs te behandigen.

Twelck verstaen hebbende ende beduchtende enich verraet ende comploict van de vijanden opnieuw voorhanden te zijn, heb datelijck mijn drogeman aen Challil bassa gesonden ende sooveel te wege gebracht, dat den voornoemden bryeff, geschreven aen den G.S., in handen gecomen is van S.E., die datelijck, deselve opengebroke hebbende, aen mijn gesonden heeft om t'onderzoucken, vanwaer sulcx soude mogen comen. De bryeven waren geschreven, die aen den G.S. Ytaliaensche characteren ende Turcxsche woorden, ende aen Challil bassa met Griexsche characteren ende Turcxsche woorden, 'twelck mij veelderly bedencken heeft gegeven. Ick heb derhalven datelijck, alhoewel enige uyren in der nacht sijnde, den patriarch van Alexandryen, woonende naest mijn logement, doen versoucken, dat soude belyeven secretelijck bij mij comen – S.E. gelogiert sijnde bij andre Griecken, ende derhalven niet geraetsaem in sodanige tijd tot S.E. te gaen, om alle andre suspicie te vermijden – nadyen dese saecke S.E. beste vrinden, Gryecken sijnde ende de principaelste van Constantinopoli, in den bryeff aen den G.S. met name gespecificeert, was aengaende. Ick heb de bryeven in presentie van den welgedachten patriarch van Alexandria doen lesen ende door mijn drogeman doen translateren, den inhoud sijnde van den eenen, die aen den G.S. geschreven was, dat sodanige luyden als daerin waren vermeldet, mitsgaders den bisschop van Morea ende enige andre Griexsche calogers van Chio, gesonden soude hebben aen Conte Mauritio, ten fijne met een armada in Morea

What we firstly infer from the citation above is that Loukaris was temporarily staying with some colleagues in a house in Istanbul, next to the residence of Haga in 1612. Thus, the connection between Haga and Loukaris may have first started in 1602 in Alexandria, however, it surely continued on a rather regular basis as of the arrival of Haga in the Ottoman capital city in 1612.

Haga states clearly in the quotation above, that there was a close support and cooperation between the Ottoman Grand Vizier, the Commander of the Navy Halil Pasha, Loukaris and himself. Otherwise, this serious diplomatic crisis would not be solved that easily. Halil Pasha acts as a natural ally of Haga, informs him on time about problems around him and guides him efficiently about what to do in order to solve a particular problem. Apparently, Haga found many times a true partner in Loukaris' presence in terms of clarifying conspiracy cases. In this particular matter as well, they investigated the subject together and the contribution of Loukaris to the clarification of the conspiracy case was invaluable (Haga, 2014: 227 - 228):

“...We have consented to investigate the issue, whether it has all been made up here or it has been written with a bad purpose by the same Greek bishop to bring the aforementioned people in difficulty. We have therefore decided to discuss this issue with a Greek called Diamanti (whose name is also mentioned in the letter; an agent of the Prince of Moldavia), who knows this bishop very well and has been a steward of the Patriarch of Constantinople, when the bishop was removed from his diocese (episcopate). That is why we have called him the same night to my house in order to investigate and to discover the truth of this issue... We have asked Diamanti whether he would recognize the hand writing of this bishop, if not, whether he could find us a way to attain some letters or writings of him to be sure of collation (verification) of letters, whether the letter has been sent by the same person or has been invented here, of which I am suspicious very much. As we could not recognize the hand writing or we could not have any other way to discover that and we have inferred from

soude comen, ende dat het nu den bequamen tijt was; dat tot dyen fine S.E. oock vierhondert galioenen gereet hadde om het voorschreven exploict te doen; dat hij derhalven S.M. daarvan hadde willen adverteren om daerop tel etten ende de Griecken niet te betrouwen, maar haer uuyt Constantinopoli na Arabia off elders relegeren etc...”

the circumstances of some issues in the past, as well as the collation of the brand of the papers in these countries, we have reached a joint opinion that the letter has been sent indeed by the bishop from England. He has headed only for the aforementioned individuals to ruin them, who are very big enemies of this bishop and who aspired the patriarchship of Constantinople. They have not only dismissed him from his diocese (episcopate) but also exiled him from here... In the morning I have got the letters copied and sent the original version back to Halil Pasha. Afterwards I have let him know about what we have observed in the letters and I have requested H.E. to dispose of the letters in order to make life good for the poor people, whose names have been mentioned in the letter. They are nothing but slander and false charges. The vizier, who is extremely cruel and covetous would not have any better occasion than this to capture what these people have. H.E. has also judged the case wisely as we have. H.E. has advised to keep the text as nothing more than a piece of literature (pasquille)....¹⁷

¹⁷ The original Dutch version:

“ ...Wij hebben goetgevonden de sake te ondersoucken, off sulcx soude mogen hier geïnvteert sijn off uuyt Engelandt door denselven Griecxschen bisschop calumnieuselijck geschreven om de gemelte personen in swaricheyt te brengen, derhalven geresolveert de saecke te communiceren met een Gryeck, genaempt Diamanti, oock in den bryeff gemeldet, sijnde agent van den prins van Moldavia, ende met desen bisschop seer wel bekend, als geweest sijnde hoffmeester van den patriarch van Constantinopoli, ten tijde van sijn bisdom affgeset werde. Wij hebben derhalven hem noch van denselven nacht t’ mijnen huise ontboden ende ondersocht, om de waerheyt van dese saecke te ondecken, off desen Diamanti de hant van den gemelten bisschop was kennende, ende zoo niet, off hij niet en soude middel vinden om enige bryeven off schriften van hem te becomen, om door collatie van letteren versekert te sijn, off oock den bryeff van denselven mocht gesonden sijn, off hier geïnvteert, ‘twelck ick grotelijcx suspecteerde, dan de hant niet kennende off oock geen ander middel daertoe wetende, hebben soo uuyt de circumstantie van enige saecke, teyooren gepasseert, als oock door collatie van de mercke van de papieren deser landen, gesamentlijk geoordeelt, dat den bryeff inderdaet van den voornoemden bisschop uuyt Engelandt gesonden was, tenderende alleen om de personen, daerinne gementioneert, te ruïneren, als wesende seer groote vianden van dito bisschop, dien sijluydens, ambieerende het patriarchaetschap van Constantinopoli, oock van sijn bisdom niet alleen hebben doen priveren, maer oock van hier bannen.. Ic heb ‘smergens de bryeven doen copiëren ende d’originele aen Challil bassa wederomgesonden, S.E. adverterende, wat wij daeruit hadden cunnen mercken, ende versouckende dat S.E. diezelvige soude willen supprimeren, als niet anders sijnde als calumniën, om d’arme luydens, daerinne gementioneert, om leven ende goet te brengen; dat den visyr, die zeer wreet is ende geltgierich, geen beter occasie soude mogen voorcomen, om dese luydens

As we see in the descriptions of Haga, Halil Pasha played a crucial role in overcoming crises, eliminating slander and false charges. It seems as if Halil Pasha, Haga and Loukaris formed a very well organized trio, that determined the task distribution efficiently. Eventually with the technical support of Loukaris, Haga managed to solve this huge diplomatic crisis. This contribution deserved a reward. Among the presents, which were sent by the Dutch Republic for the granting of the capitulation, there were also some very precious theological works of the church fathers (from the 3rd and 4th century, i.e. modern editions, as well as books of Calvin, Melanchthon, some less wellknown protestant theologians and a Greek translation of the Bible. They were all given to Loukaris, who sent a letter of gratitude to the States General. He praised the service of Haga in his country very much. At the same time he started the correspondence with the famous Dutch theologian Uytenbogaert. He was then in Walachia. Shortly after this he returned to Alexandria presumably (Heeringa, 1917: 120). This type of incidents indicate that Loukaris had begun to draw more attention in the Catholic community of Istanbul as he gave them the impression that he took sides in the ongoing religious conflict of the 17th century.

4. The Role of Jesuits

Loukaris could not preserve his dignity for long, as his opponents (supported by Jesuits and helped by the French ambassador with money) managed to make him banished by the Ottoman government to Rhodes in 1622. As mentioned earlier, there was also an opposition, which was backed by the Catholic league in his own community. Thus, the going got tough for the patriarch as he could not make his ideas clear regarding the reform of the religious and social conditions in the Orthodox society. This was, however, for a short while, because Haga had the influence and managed to get money, which was necessary to get the exile decision revoked. Haga was deeply convinced, that Jesuits had a feature to bring the whole world into confusion and that they had done together with the French ambassador their utmost best to kill Loukaris (Heeringa, 1917: 123).

They thought he had sympathy for Calvinists and they should disqualify him. Loukaris wrote once that some Islamic ideas would not be accepted by Christians. The Jesuits brought these texts to the Grand Vizier in 1627 by accusing him of being a traitor and anti-government activist. The Vizier asked then the opinion of the *Şeyhülislam*, who declared that Christians are

van het haren te beroven. S.E. heeft oock wijselijck sulcx geoordeelt, ende geraden geacht deselvege, niet anders sijnde als een pasquille, bij hem te behouden.....”

free to express their opinions, even if these opinions are against Islam (Karpat, 2006: 357).

5. The language use in the Greek Orthodox Church

When I mention the concept 'reform', I refer to some type of social transformation with regard to the educational and intellectual level of the Orthodox Christian society, which would be starting from the perspective of the Enlightenment ideals in the sense that man should be able to use his own understanding without the guidance of another¹⁸. In concreto, that would mean the following: the church life of Greeks was formal, because the language of the church was old Greek, which was not understood by the majority of the population. Due to the fact that the church did not use the vernacular, it could not contribute much to the spiritual development of the masses.

However, Jesuits saw this gap well and they prepared written materials (grammatical explanations and terminology lists), which served their propaganda, in a very comprehensible vernacular to show the eminence of the Roman Catholic doctrine. Their insight was also shared by Martinus Crusius (an educated literary man and theologian from Tübingen), who studied new Greek language and corresponded with respectable Greeks in order to bring them to the union with the Reformed Church (Heeringa, 1917: 117).

Within the context of these motives and arguments, one could speak of a serious brainstorming between Haga and Loukaris about the means, with which the Reformed doctrine could be disseminated and the Jesuitic one could be contested. Haga discussed these issues with Loukaris in detail. In this regard, he explained the patriarch that it would be desirable to spread the catechism in the Greek vernacular. In 1627 Loukaris worked on its transformation. Thus, to this aim, the plan was to publish it with the Confession of Faith. They would make use of printing press, smuggled by a Greek monk from England and set up in a house rented by the British Ambassador (Thomas Roe). By means of the books to be published in this

¹⁸ As Immanuel Kant put it in his description of Enlightenment, which is man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity. The immaturity concerned is the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another. In this case, these ideals would be linked with the approach that Greek community could be able to read and understand the Bible in contemporary Greek language without any mediation of another. I have argued elsewhere that initial forms of the (full) Enlightenment idea and ideals could be observed even in the Western Europe of the 17th century; cf. Israel, 2010 and Güleç, 2014 for a detailed discussion.

house, Haga hoped that Greek children would be kept away from Jesuit schools and could be raised within ‘the true doctrine’ (Heeringa, 1917: 123-124). However, the fate of the publishing house did, unfortunately, not turn out to be as brilliant as one had initially expected.

The protestant propaganda did not experience much pleasure with this house. Especially some anti-catholic writings were published. Heeringa states, however, that soon the Jesuits made the Turks wise by telling them that a text of Loukaris contained statements against Jews, in which utterances of the prophet Mohammed were criticized, the Turks sent in their first fury a gang of Janissaries to the house. Initially they destroyed a lot. But afterwards, they got the content of the books checked in detail by a couple of Greeks, who converted to Islam; and they discovered that the accusation was unfounded. Thomas Roe hit back much harder on his turn and got to attain a decree, in which the residence within Istanbul was forbidden for Jesuits (Heeringa, 1917: 124).

Regarding the foundation of a suitable school, catechism and its translation into the Greek vernacular for the purpose concerned (i.e. reform in the Orthodox community), Antoine Leger (a preacher from Piemonte) came to Istanbul in 1628 in order to work in this field. He was immediately informed by Haga that he should not flatter himself with the possibility of a fruitful propaganda. Leger found out soon that the overwhelming majority of Orthodox people and clergy were ignorant, without any eagerness to receive further education, more shy and reserved to participate in a Reformed religious practice than in a Catholic one (Heeringa, 1917: 125). In 1629 these three leaders of the reformation movement set up an action plan. Haga wrote in a letter to professors and preachers in Geneva that 3 things were necessary: a school, a catechism in the Greek vernacular and a translation of the New Testament into the Greek vernacular. Loukaris would work on the school and the catechism in the vernacular, while Haga would take on the translation and its publishing in a Christian country (Heeringa, 1917: 125). But before they put them all into action, they needed to have the support and consent of the Orthodox clergy. Heeringa argues that this had absolutely to be done in this long term enterprise in terms of taking a sound step. Thus, Leger sent letters to various prelates. The answers have been indeterminate. Only the patriarch of Alexandria wrote back in detail, but he perceived the case totally different than three leaders in Istanbul. He saw danger in a union with the heterodox, unless these new friends would like to join the Orthodox Church. He approved schools provided that the educators stick strictly to the Orthodox doctrine. He was not afraid of Jesuits so long as the Church would avoid any novelty and finally he disapproved the translation of the New

Testament into the Greek vernacular. In his ears and not only in his ears, the New Greek Language sounded vulgar (Leger gave him a linguistic example: the language of the New Testament was also the vernacular of the first century A.D.). According to Heeringa, this action begot much turmoil, because the authority of the Bible was put above the authority of the Church by Loukaris. Due to various problems (dispatch route, storage location) the translated New Testaments remained in Geneva for about 100 years. Only 400 copies could have been sent on time to Istanbul (Heeringa, 1917: 126-128).

6. The help of Haga

In 1634 Loukaris was once again exiled to Bozcaada (Tenedos) on false accusations, which were brought to the G.S. Within a month Haga managed to get the anti-patriarch (i.e. the rival of Loukaris) exiled to Scio and to put his friend back on his post. But when Leger left the city in 1636, Haga could control the field much less. (Heeringa, 1917: 133-134).

As stated above by quoting from Hering, probably as a result of the propaganda of the Catholic camp, the *Kaymakam* brought an accusation against Loukaris that he corresponded with the Cossacks and he was a spy for them, undermining the Ottoman state. Upon that Haga thought: “a fiery and venomous arrow from a Hellish sleeve of the Jesuits to kill this good man”. He heard also that the Polish king had threatened at the instigation of Jesuits to deprive the Russians in his territory of their Greek bishops and churches, unless they would reject the obedience to the seat of Istanbul, so long as this was occupied by a heretic (Heeringa, 1917: 133-134). After all these difficulties and the turbulence, it did not seem to Haga that things have settled down even to some extent. Haga thought therefore then more advisable if a third person, who was totally dependent on him and respected by everyone, was selected in place of the good old lord (i.e. Loukaris). Loukaris came back from exile, but a new person i.e. Neophitus became the new patriarch. However, according to Heeringa, Neophitus turned out too weak to resist the group of Cyril of Berrhoea. So the Ottoman government wished the reappointment of Loukaris. The sultan declared on this occasion (1637) that he would no longer want to hear any change in the patriarchate, so long as Loukaris lived (Heeringa, 1917: 133-134).

But when Sultan Murat IV left the capital city for a Bagdad military campaign, the opponents of Loukaris saw the chance to fabricate false letters, through which abetment of Cossacks by Loukaris seemed to be plausible. The letters followed the Ottoman army and by means of money they could get the support of the Grand Vizier Bayram Pasha, who explained

the case as such to the Sultan. Then a command was given to capture the poor patriarch immediately and to strangle him 8 days later. That happened in the ship that carried him again to another exile place (Heeringa, 1917: 133-134). In this case, the explanation of Hering above is slightly different than that of Heeringa, as Hering argued that Loukaris was kept in fortress Rumeli Hisarı and that he was not sent to exile this time most probably due to the fact that the time had come for Loukaris to disappear from the world scene for ever. Hering adds that the death of Loukaris had given the Catholics such an undisguised joy, that the Austrian ambassador Schmid stated in a quite satisfied manner: “So this Holy Catholic Church has terminated the satanic life of his enemies with an ignominious death through the God’s righteous judgment” (*Also hatt dieser der hailligen Cattolischen Kirchen gewester feinde durch Gottes gerechtes Urteil mit eim schmählichen todt sein bosshafftiges leben geendt*; Hering, 1965: 322).

7. Zeitgeist during the reign of Murat IV

McCarthy presents us the general situation of the Ottoman government, which gave some known reflexes to the indications of the decline of a state at that time. The reflexes concerned can also be read as ‘traditional reforms’ i.e. harshly taken measures. Sultan Murat IV was the exemplar of what has been called ‘traditional reform’. His reform of the operation of the Ottoman state stymied (prevented) Ottoman enemies, reinvigorated the Empire for a time, and allowed it to continue much as it had been for centuries, a strong, traditional Middle Eastern empire. Murat’s reforms did not, however, change the fundamental flaws that were to make the Ottomans the prey of European imperialists (McCarthy, 1997: 177). Murat’s primary solution for problems of bribery and malfeasance in office was execution. Provincial governors, janissary leaders and officials of the bureaucracy were all held to a high standard. Those who fell from grace were killed. Thousands were so punished. In the Empire, rebels and bandits were ruthlessly eliminated, sometimes by government-supported vigilante actions (McCarthy, 1997: 178).

8. The bitter fate of a progressive patriarch

As we have shortly observed, the life of Loukaris had been in general with many ups and downs, filled with controversy, conflicts and problems. In so far as his life had been the centre of various contrasts, even his death is obviously a point of discussion. Although many European (Catholic) writers adopted the idea that the Ottoman government sent Loukaris to exile and had him killed there, it is again the same case here, because in general the opposite of the most of the accusations directed to Ottomans with regard to

religion is true. If we take into account the fact that Loukaris was elected 5 times as patriarch from 1621 to 1638 and that the Orthodox Church condemned (*anathema*) him, his *Confession* and his followers even years after his death (in 1638, 1642 and 1672) by means of a Synod Declaration, we see that there was nothing in these documents to disturb and activate the Ottoman administration. Under the pressure of the Christian community leaders, the protectors of the Catholicism French and Austrian Embassies and the activities of Jesuits, Loukaris was sent away and his publishing house was closed.

According to Berkes, Loukaris was most likely poisoned and killed by the Jesuits on Rhodes (Berkes, 2004: 60). Berkes defends this argument by referring in his footnote to the following publications: Aloysius Pichler, 1862, *Der Patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris und seine Zeit*, München; Arnold J. Toynbee, 1954, *A study of History*, Oxford; Georgios A. Hadjiantoniou, 1961, *Protestant Patriarch: The life of Cyril Lucaris*, London. This standpoint is however discussed and not adopted by Hering, as we have seen some indications above, that Austrians were actively working on the complete elimination of Loukaris.

Conclusion

If we look at the spirit of the time in general, when the Patriarch Loukaris and Haga met in a multicultural city such as Istanbul, we can clearly see that these two men originate culturally from two different camps with similar problems (i.e. Protestant and Orthodox communities, which were subject to constant Catholic pressure), but that these two leading figures had a similar way of thinking concerning ignorance, religious oppression, individual and social development.

As mentioned above, the life of Loukaris can of course be described politically as a pivotal location in the battle between different spheres of influence. However, political matters are in general at the second position of any agenda in terms of occurrence order and these matters are generally derived by initially psychological and then social gaps. The fact that religious and social reform movements, which were initiated by Loukaris, Haga, Leger and the British ambassador in the Orthodox community failed, has presumably to do with the idea that these were basically top-down movements. Because these were not bottom-up initiatives as being dependent on the very nature of the subject matter, so the community concerned was naturally rather reluctant, not open, not prepared and not familiar towards new ideas and plans presented to themselves. In this respect, Van Der Sloot & Van Der Vlis summarize the endeavour of

Loukaris by quoting the description of D.C. Hesseling from his book *Uit Byzantium en Hellas*, (1911. Leiden; cf. Van Der Sloot & Van Der Vlis, 2012: 200):

Loukaris was neither Luther nor Calvin. He was not the representative of ideas, which lived among his people. He had to make their dislike regarding the Religion of Westerners a separate subject of an independent investigation. For this purpose, also the most brilliant powers perhaps, but the time for sure would be lacking.

As a result of this analysis, we understand now much better that all religious and social reforms need to have firstly a sound basis and a wide platform, on which new ideas can be built and perceived. As being free from space and time, we see also that religion constitutes probably the most sensitive structure of any social system and it is universally the center of political power struggles all along ages. We have observed that the Orthodox-Muslim-Protestant league created a considerable balance against Catholic pressure in early 17th century. However, any coooperation initiative of this kind goes in general very quickly into separation and containment, which are the typical indication of a power game, when things begin to get more political content. Thus each dominating structure tries inevitably to transform or absorb the less powerful other into its own dictating and controlling system. This yields eventually a subjugation, which is obtained by force or manufacturing consent and this can be called persuasion (Table 1 demonstrates a vivid and concrete proof for that).

Therefore, perhaps, Haga's continuous support and target-based approach, which has obviously a political nature, made a significant, but a rather temporary difference for the position of Loukaris and was presumably decisive for Loukaris' tragic end, as maybe Loukaris was simply a heterogeneous drop in the robust homogeneous ocean (see Israel, 2010 and Güleç, 2014 for a discussion on early forms of the Enlightenment ideals in the first half of the 17th century).

Enlightened souls that are as objective and critical as possible and free minds are always required in a society where law, order, justice and freedom (which would lead societies to the Full Enlightenment) are equally applied on all individuals. However, to put the force of law (religious or secular) above the authority of an institution always yielded political tension everywhere.

'One Loukaris' (also Haga and Leger) is not enough to make a positive change (or to initiate the Full Enlightenment). The society concerned should

also be ready and willing to make effort and sacrifice for that purpose to be able to have the right to pick the fruits of that endeavour in the future. One can obviously say that Loukaris as a leading intellectual, ahead of his society was simply trying to implement some improvement and modernizations steps in order to ensure that his cultural heritage would not go extinct, rather than making a sectarian option within Christendom.

Corruption and bribery is a soft abdomen of any society. If the aforementioned law and justice do not dictate, then some ‘traditional reforms’ will surely have impact on the weak (or vulnerable) elements of any society in any sense.

Ignorance and being reluctant to receive further and qualitative education (remarks of Leger) produce vulnerable individuals and societies even today, open to any kind of manipulation as a center of power struggle. As Harlan Ellison puts it adequately: “You are not entitled to your opinion. You are entitled to your *informed* [knowledge based] opinion. No one is entitled to be [remain] ignorant”...

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berkes, N. 2004. *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma*. Yayına Hazırlayan: Ahmet Kuyaş. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Gibbon, E. 1900. *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Ed. by J.B. Bury, 7 Volumes. London: Methuen.
- Güleç, Mustafa. 2014. “Hollanda’da Aydınlanma Düşüncesi ve Spinoza” in: *Batı Kültür ve Edebiyatlarında Aydınlanma*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 401, p. 281-327.
- Haga, C. 2014. “Annex 1 – Memoir Book of Cornelius Haga (1578 – 1654) The First Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul (The Ottoman Empire)” in: *Four Centuries of Diplomatic and Economic Relations Between Turkey & The Netherlands (1612 – 2012), In memory of Cornelius Haga, First Dutch Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire*. Translated from the 17th Century Dutch to Modern English by Mustafa Güleç. Rotterdam: Panteia Press.
- Harai, Dénes. 2011. “Une chaire aux enchères: Ambassadeurs Catholiques et Protestants à la Conquête

- du Patriarcat Grec de Istanbul (1620 – 1638)” in: *Revue d’Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, 2011-2 (no: 58-2), p. 49-71.
- Heeringa, K. 1917. *De Eerste Nederlandsche Gezant Bij De Verheven Porte*. Utrecht: Oosthoek
(Oosthoek’s Historische Bibliotheek onder leiding van Dr. K. E. W. Strootman).
- Hering, Gunnar. 1965. *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik. Kyrillos Lukaris und die christlichen Staaten (1620 – 1638)*. Vienna: unpublished ph.d. thesis at the University of Vienna.
- Israel, Jonathan I. 1998. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477 – 1806*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Israel, Jonathan I. 2010. *Radicale Verlichting: Hoe radicale Nederlandse denkers het gezicht van onze cultuur voorgoed veranderden*. Franeker: Uitgeverij Van Wijnen.
- İnalçık, H. 2011. *Kuruluş ve İmparatorluk Sürecinde Osmanlı: Devlet, Kanun, Diploması*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Karpat, K. 2006. *Osmanlı’da Değişim, Modernleşme ve Uluşlaşma*. Translated by Dilek Özdemir. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- McCarthy, J. 1997. *The Ottoman Turks: An Introductory History to 1923*. London: Longman Publishing.
- Nicol, Donald M. 2013. *Konstantinos Paleologos, Ölümsüz İmparator, Romalıların Son İmparatoru*. Translated by Efe Kurtluoğlu. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Van Der Sloot, H. & I. Van Der Vlis. 2012. *Cornelis Haga 1578 – 1654 Diplomaat & Pionier in Istanbul*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Boom.