

The decline of the Christian church in Turkey in the
15th and 20th century: a church historical study

NKwi Soon Kim : B.A.Hons (Theology)

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of master of arts in church and Dogma History at the
(Potchefstroom Campus) of the North-West university

Supervisor: Dr.John Newby
Co-Supervisor: Prof.Rikus Fick

March 2010

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the reasons that contributed to the decline of the Christian population during the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires. Furthermore, the study compares the differences and similarities in the causes of the decline of Christianity in the land of Turkey during the Medieval and modern eras.

In the Byzantine Empire, especially during the late periods of the 11th –15th centuries, the Eastern Church was not independent. Most of the time, the Church subordinated herself to the state. This subordination led to compromise with the political power and spiritual deterioration. The clergymen, for instance, lived a loose lifestyle and neglected their responsibilities. Moreover, the Church's original eschatological expectation and apocalyptic ideas dissipated. The teaching of the Scripture was ignored.

The Church in the Ottoman Empire existed under the Muslim authority. Christians became second-rate citizens, and lived in restricted situations under the Islamic law for about four hundred years. Many Christians became Muslims because of various advantageous options that were given by the Muslim rulers during the 15th – 17th centuries. Like the Byzantine Church, the Church in the Ottoman Empire was also corrupted by the financial greed of the bishops who had political ambitions.

With the coming of missionaries in the nineteenth century, the Christian minority lived energetic lives for a century. However, when nationalism arose among the minorities, the Church got deeply involved in politics and suffered with their parishioners. As a result, numerous Greeks, and over one million Armenians paid their lives for their earthly freedom from the Ottoman Empire during the 19th and 20th centuries. The Christian population shrank. Sadly, only a handful of Christians have remained. The study concludes that although various reasons contributed to the decline of Christianity and Christian population, the main reason was the Church herself.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie verhandeling ondersoek die oorsake wat bygedra het tot die afname van die Christenbevolking onder die Bisantynse en die Ottomaanse Ryke. Die studie vergelyk verder die verskille en die ooreenkomste in die oorsake vir die agteruitgang van die Christendom in Turkye gedurende die Middeleeue en die moderne tyd.

Onder die Bisantynse Ryk was die Oosterse Kerk nie onafhanklik nie, veral gedurende die elfde en vyftiende eeu en het sigself grootliks aan die staat onderwerp. Dit het gelei tot talle kompromieë met die politieke magte en tot geestelike agteruitgang. Die kerkamptenary het byvoorbeeld 'n liberale leefstyl gehandhaaf en hulle verantwoordelikhede verwaarloos. Die kerk se oorspronklike eskatologiese verwagting en apokaliptiese visie het mettertyd vervaag en die onderrig van die Skrif het ook in die slag gebly.

Die kerk onder die Ottomaanse Ryk het onder Moslemgesag gestaan. Die Christene het tweederangse burgers geword en vir ongeveer 400 jaar in benouende omstandighede onder Moslemwetgewing voortbestaan. Baie Christene het gedurende die vyftiende tot sewentiende eeu Moslems geword veral weens die voordele wat die Moslem-owerhede aan diesulkes gebied het. Soos die geval met die Bisantynse Kerk, is die kerk onder die Ottomaanse Ryk ook gekorrumpeer deur die finansiële gulsigheid van biskoppe met politieke ambisie.

Met die koms van die sendelinge in die negentiende eeu het die Christenminderheid vir ongeveer 'n eeu 'n aktiewe lewe gelei. Toe nasionalisme egter onder hierdie minderhede begin posvat, het die kerk intens betrokke geraak in die politiek wat ernstige gevolge gehad het. Groot getalle Grieke en meer as 'n miljoen Armenane het gedurende die negentiende en twintigste eeu met hulle lewens geboet vir vryheid van die Ottomaanse Ryk. Die Christenbevolking het drasties afgeneem; slegs 'n handjievol Christene het oorgebly. Hierdie studie kom tot die gevolgtrekking dat verskeie faktore bygedrae het tot die agteruitgang van die Christendom en die afname van die Christenbevolking. Die Kerk was uiteindelik self grootliks hiervoor verantwoordelik.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our heavenly Father is wonderful. He has granted to me an opportunity to study the church history of Turkey, which previously was only a dream. He knew that I was exhausted and needed to be physically refreshed as well as to update my biblical knowledge after 14 years of work in Turkey. I have been revived and greatly enjoyed my theological studies, especially the ecclesiastical studies, at the Bible Institute and the George Whitefield College. From time to time, during the three years of this study, I have felt God's guidance and grace. I am grateful to God that I am able to finish my study. At the same time, I am grateful to various people who were involved in the process of writing this thesis.

I thank my supervisors ^{Dr.} John Newby and Prof. Rikus Fick, who guided this study and made many helpful suggestions for improvement.

2. I also thank Mr. Fielding, my colleagues Henock, Ben and many of my angels who were sent by God for editing my English.

3. I thank the Korea Harbour Evangelism / World Concern Korea and Dr. Kiman Chio for encouraging me and supporting me in prayer as I wrote this thesis.

4. I also thank the Shinsung Presbyterian Church, the Kumsung Presbyterian Church, and Sinmuk association; without their contribution, I would not have been able to do this research.

5. I thank my faithful friend Sookja for her encouragement and financial assistance.

6. I really thank God for my mother, Mrs Chio, who has taught me to walk in the ways of the Lord, for encouraging me to finish this study.

7. Finally I give glory and honour to the Lord my Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Key words and Abbreviations

KEY WORDS

Armenian, Byzantine Empire, Christendom, Constantinople, Christianity, Eastern Church, Greek, Kurds, Muslim, Orthodox, Ottoman Empire, Missionary, Mission, Protestant, Syrian, Turkey, Turks

ABBREVIATIONS

ABCFM	The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions
BCC	Bible Correspondence Courses
CMS	Church Missionary Society
LOMS	The Lutheran Orient Mission Society
MBP	Muslim background Protestant
NIV	New International Version
OBP	Orthodox background Protestant
OM	Operation Mobilization Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Opsomming	iii
Preface and acknowledgements	iv
Key words and Abbreviations	v
Table of contents	vi
1.0 Introduction to the Dissertation	1
1.1 Background study	1
1.2 Problem Statement	3
1.3 Aim and Objection	5
1.3.1 Aim	5
1.3.2 Objectives	5
1.4 Central Theoretical Argument	5
1.5 Method of Research	6
1.6 Chapter Divisions	7
2.0 Christian Church in the Byzantine Empire during the 11th -15th centuries	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 General Survey	9
2.2.1 Political aspects	9
2.2.2 Economic aspects	10
2.2.3 Social and Cultural aspects	12
2.3 The imperial power together with the Eastern Church leaders brought about the weakening of the Eastern Church, before 15 th century	13
2.3.1 Before the storm and stress of the Great Schism	13
2.3.1.1 The Iconoclastic controversy (726-842)	14

Contents (continued)

2.3.1.2 The great Schism	15
2.3.2 The role of the church fathers in the Eastern Empire: 11 th –15 th centuries	16
2.3.2.1 Patriarchy	17
2.3.2.2 Theology	18
2.3.2.3 Monasticism	21
2.3.2.4 Evangelization	23
2.3.3 Conclusion	25
2.4 The populace of the Byzantine Empire remained so passive in the face of pagan invaders at the end of the Byzantine Empire	
2.4.1 Did the political leaders serve the people as the servants of God?	
2.4.2 The effect of the Church leaders on parishioners	
2.4.2.1 The character of clergymen deteriorated	
2.4.2.2 The Christian character deteriorated	
2.4.2.3 Disproportionate in Christian life	
2.5 Summary and Conclusion	
3.0 Christianity in the Ottoman Empire with emphasis on the 19th - 20th	
3.1 Introduction	
3.2 The minority Christians in the Ottoman Empire	
3.2.1 The Church under the Islamic authority	41
3.2.1.1 The Greek Orthodox Church	43
3.2.1.1.1 Theological controversy	46
3.2.1.2 The Armenian Church	48
3.2.1.2.1 Doctrine of the Armenian Church	50
3.2.2 Revolution ages of 19th and 20th centuries	51
3.2.2.1 Greeks	52

Contents (continued)

3.2.2.2 Armenians	53
3.2.3 Conclusion	59
3.3 Missionary work in 19 th –20 th centuries	59
3.3.1 Roman Catholic mission	59
3.3.2 Protestant missions	61
3.3.2.1 The dawn of evangelizing to the Near East	62
3.3.2.2 Missionary work for the minority Christians	63
3.3.2.3 Missionary work for non-Christians	65
3.3.2.4 Missionaries were hard pressed on every side	68
3.3.3 Conclusion	70
3.4 Summary and Conclusion	70
4.0 A Comparison between two periods of the Christian Church History of Turkey: The 11th –15th and 19th –20th centuries	72
4.1 Introduction	72
4.2 The differences between the two periods	72
4.2.1 The Socio-Political aspect of the Church	72
4.2.2 Context in the Church	74
4.3 The Similarities between the two periods	76
4.3.1 The two aspect of Church history: Religion and Politics	76
4.3.2 Deterioration of the Church	80
4.3.3 Theological stagnation	80
4.3.4 Conclusion	83
4.4 A biblical reflections on the Church in the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empire	83
4.4.1 The relation of Church and Politics	84
4.4.1.1 The view of theologians	85

Contents (continued)

4.4.1.2 The biblical view	87
4.4.1.3 The different tasks of the Church and State	90
4.4.2 The role of clergyman	91
4.4.2.1 The right character of clergyman	92
4.4.2.2 The task of clergyman	93
4.4.3 The character of Christians	97
4.5 Summary and Conclusion	98
5.0 Recommendations and conclusion	100
5.1 Introduction	100
5.2 Research Conclusions	100
5.3 The contemporary Protestant Church in Turkey	105
5.4 The impact of the study on the contemporary Church of Turkey	107
5.5 Final Conclusion	109
Bibliography	111

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE DISSERTATION

1.1 Background of Study.

In New Testament times, Paul embarked on three missionary trips throughout what is now the Republic of Turkey. There are many books (Acts, Galatians, Ephesus, Colossians, and Revelation) in the New Testament addressed to the believers in cities, which were on Turkey's Mediterranean Sea coast. However, most of the Byzantine churches fell into ruins or became mosques after 1453.

This attempt to make a study of Turkish Church History is, on the whole, motivated by my personal experience. As a missionary in Turkey, I often wondered how a former Christian country could transform and become a Muslim country. The statistics (A.D. 2000) tell us that 99.64% of the population of Turkey is Muslim and that 0.32% is Christian and 0.04% is Jewish (Johnstone & Mandryk 2001: 633). The handful Christians bring to mind the “*remnant*” which Isaiah prophesies of: “Once more a remnant of the house of Judah will take root below and bear fruit above” (Isa. 37:31, NIV).

Actually, the contemporary Republic of Turkey became a Muslim country as far back as 1453. The encounter between Islam and Christianity in Turkey, in general, is up to this date not without tension. However, conversion from Christianity to Islam was not forced directly during the Medieval Ages. A large number of Christians became Muslims out of their own free will and went through indirect pressures of discriminatory taxation and the inferior social statuses (Latourette 1974a: 290).

The conversion of Turkey to Islam is astounding, considering that Turkey was home to one of the first Christian churches and played a key role in the development of Christianity. The Christianity rapidly out on every side after the decree giving religious freedom in 313. Many Church Councils were held in Turkey, including Nicea 325, which laid the groundwork for the

doctrines regarding the Person and work of Christ. Nicea was a major milestone in the development of Christian doctrine. The seven churches of Revelation were to be found in Turkey.

All the above factors have given me pause for deep thought and much questioning. What occurred in the Eastern Church, especially after the schism of 1054? What measures did the church fathers take in the Eastern Empire, before the invasion of the Muslims? Why were the believers and church leaders so passive in the face of the Ottoman army; the Muslim invaders?

At the same time, I would like to examine why modern missionary endeavour lasted such a short time in Turkey. After a long silence, during Ottoman's rule about four hundred years, I am convinced that God was concerned with the people of this nation. During the 1820s, Protestant missionaries were sent to the Ottoman Empire, where the majority of residents were Muslims. According to Kieser (2002:391-393), Christianity was reintroduced by missionaries to the Turks, Armenians, and Kurds who lived in Ottoman Asia Minor.

The Anatolian *Alevi*s, descendants of an ethnically mixed heterodox rural people were the first to hear the gospel from the missionaries in the 1850s. Protestant missionaries, belonging to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), entered the closed lands of Ottoman Asia Minor and worked passionately. The missionaries focused on evangelism and establishment of a number of schools and hospitals. Ottoman rulers and inhabitants of the Empire praised the missionaries because of the benefits of their work for civil society (Kieser 2002:391-393).

However, the government of Turkey ended all missionary works in 1923, even though Mustafa Kemal, later to be known as Atatürk, led Turkey to establish itself as a secular state after the First World War (1914-1918). As a result, all Christian mission works were suddenly ceased and the government deported all missionaries. Disturbingly, therefore, the Church, which was awakened from its long sleeping, went back to its silence.

In view of the above, I am spurred on to undertake research into the Medieval and modern history of the Church in Turkey. I will analyze what happened to the church in Turkey during these two periods: The 11th –15th centuries and the 19th –20th centuries. The focus will be on the reasons for the decline of Christianity during both periods and there will also be a comparison

between the two periods of history. It is expected that the research will provide some pointers to the future development of the Church in the referred location.

1.2 Problem Statement

Some of the reasons for the paradox of the church history of Turkey have been mentioned above. Under this section we would analyze additional factors, which contribute to the problem statement.

Church historians give various reasons for the question at hand. Latourette (1974a: 224-225, 290) lists the reasons for in restricting of expansion of the Eastern Christianity:

1. Military invasion was one of the most potent causes. Eastern Christianity was often faced with many invaders, e.g. the Sassnian, with their strong espousal of Mazdaism.
2. Phenomenal spread of Islam should also be noted. Eastern Christianity bore much of brunt of the Muslim attack. Muslims believed that theirs revelation was a later and higher one than that of Christianity.
3. During the Byzantine Empire, the relationship of Church to state was not one of equality. The Eastern Church was controlled by the state. Religion was ancillary to its political purposes.
4. The East thought of itself as Christian and gloried in its orthodoxy.

Furthermore, Hansen (2004:1) argues that one of the causes of decline was a doctrinal conflict between the Eastern churches and Greeks from the time of Council of Ephesus 431. The Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorianism, this was followed by the Council of Chalcedon and the dismissal of Monophysitism in 451. These theological offshoots advanced further, the Greek churches attempted to subjugate the Eastern churches, the hegemonic rivalry thus incurred eventually wore the Church down.

On the other hand, Latourette (1974c: 46-47) says that during the 19th and 20th centuries Christian communities in Turkey were a strong minority and there were also many Greek Orthodox Christians in the cities on the west coast. Many Armenians lived among their Muslim neighbours throughout Turkey. Catholic Christianity also existed during this period.

Catholic missionary work advanced as far as being responsible for instigating change in the Ottoman Turkish law. These laws, which *inter alia* enforced the traditional death penalty for conversion from Islam to Christianity, were abrogated and Moslems were legally permitted to receive baptism. Many Armenians also converted to Catholicism. Catholic Armenians have long been in existence. However, one of the reasons that contributed to the decline of the Church in Turkey was the “Armenian Genocide.”

Balakian (2003:180-190) indicates that the tragic “Armenian Genocide” contributed to the decline of the Church in Turkey during the 19th and 20th centuries. Balakian (2003:181) quotes what Esref Kuscubasi wrote: “the new bureau’s focus was on the non-Turkish and non- Muslim races and nationalities.” According to Balakian (2003:196) “the death range from 1915 - 1922 was over a million to a million and half.” Many Christians, who were persecuted, fled from their Turkish neighbours to Syria, Iran, Iraq and Western countries.

Kieser (2002:393,407) states that the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission, worked with the Assyrian, Armenian, and Greek minorities in the Ottoman Empire before evangelizing the non- Christian population. Their efforts during the 1860 and 1870s led to an increase in Christianity among a minority group of inhabitants. Yet, he argues that though Protestant missionaries passionately undertook various projects and contributed to the uplift of the inhabitants’ social life and education, they did not succeed in establishing a genuine Turkish church. Kieser significantly concludes that the results were far from being what the missionaries had originally hoped and worked for.

Thereupon the main research question arises from the perspective of the above explanation: What were the factors that contributed to the decline of the Christian Church in Turkey during the Medieval and modern eras? From the major research question arise some sub questions:

- To what extent did the imperial power together with the Eastern Church leaders contribute in weakening of the Eastern Church during the 11th –15th centuries, before the invasion of Muslims?
- What happened to the minority groups of Christians and missionary activities in modern Turkey during the 19th and 20th centuries?

- What were the similarities and differences between the two eras: The 11th–15th centuries and the 19th–20th centuries?

1.3 Aim and Objectives

1.3.1 Aim

The aim of this proposed study is to investigate why a former Christian country transformed and became a Muslim country. Knowledge gleaned from this study will be of benefit to those who are interested in future ministry in Turkey and also to the furtherance of the kingdom of God in that country.

1.3.2 Objectives

In order to reach the aim, the following focal objectives should be attained:

- To analyse and discover how the imperial power together with the Eastern Church leaders contribute in weakening the Eastern Church during the 11th–15th centuries, before the invasion of Muslims
- To observe and evaluate the minority groups of Christians and missionary activities in the Ottoman Empire with emphasis on the 19th and 20th centuries.
- To examine what the similarities and differences between the two eras, and draw lessons for the future church in Turkey.

1.4 Central Theoretical Argument

The central theoretical argument of this study is that in these two specified periods (the 11th–15th centuries and the 19th–20th centuries) of church history, in the land, which is now called Turkey, Christianity declined due to the hostile actions of the Muslims and the greed and carelessness of Christians.

1.5 Method of Research

This research will be done from the protestant point of view and it is based on a comparative literary study. It focuses on:

- Chapter 1 will introduce the scope of the research.
- In chapter 2, information will be gathered through research and investigation of published and unpublished literatures, of the 11th-15th centuries Christian church history in the Byzantine Empire. Research documents relating to state, politics, economics, cultural aspects and religious accounts/surveys will be consulted, in order to analyze the reasons for the stagnation and decline of Christianity during the Byzantine period. Primary documents, such as official correspondence and personal letters, will be used if available.
- Chapter 3 will be a study of why the minority groups of Christians in the Ottoman Empire (modern Turkey) rapidly declined in 19th and 20th centuries, and will look at the reasons why missionary work ceased in the Republic of Turkey. The facts will be gleaned from research and a comparative literature study. The statistical method is used in this section, if available. Recent studies, diaries, and organizational/official documents/letters will be used, if available. These sources will be used to analyze and evaluate missionary activity during the period of history under study. Further information will be sought through the political and Islamic surveys with emphasis on the 19th and 20th centuries' history of the church in Turkey.
- Chapter 4 will consist of analysis and comparison of the Christian Church from 11th - 15th centuries' period of the Byzantine Empire and the later 19th – 20th centuries of the Ottoman Empire. Further, to draw lessons for the future church of Turkey. Research and a literature study, of other researchers' information will be used. The biblical and theological aspect of the study will be covered using commentaries, theological literature, journals, missiological/evangelism literature.
- Chapter 5 will draw recommendations for the future church in Turkey, and then final conclusion will follow.

Scripture quotations are taken from the Holy Bible: New International Version.

1.6 Chapter Divisions

1. Introduction to the dissertation
2. The Christian Church in the Byzantine Empire during the 11th -15th century
3. Christianity in the Ottoman Empire with emphasis on the 19th - 20th centuries
4. A Comparison between two periods of the Christian Church History of Turkey: The 11th – 15th centuries and the19th –20th centuries
5. Recommendations and conclusion

CHAPTER 2

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE DURING THE 11th -15th CENTURIES

2.1 Introduction

The era of Byzantine Empire is traditionally defined as falling between the years AD 395 to 1453 (Diehl 1957: 4-5). There is no consensus on when the Byzantine period began. However, the changeover was gradual and by 330, when Constantine I made Byzantium his new capital, the process of hellenization and Christianization was well underway

It was an Empire that dominated the world in all spheres of life for over 1000 years. It had its basis in Christian thought. The Byzantine Empire was the only state in the world where the transition from the ancient to the mediaeval way of life was achieved smoothly by slow and steady evolution. The Empire played an important role in Christian history as is evidenced in the fact that it hosted seven Councils: Nicaea (325), Constantinople 1 (381), Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), Constantinople 11 (553), Constantinople III (680), and Nicaea (787). These councils worked, *inter alia*, on defining the doctrine of the Trinity.

Given the above, it is startling that eventually the capital city of the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople, fell to the Moslem Ottoman Turks. Thus the splendid Christian era of a thousand years ended. What caused such a strong Christian legacy to surrender to the non-Christian attackers?

In seeking the answer to the above question, this chapter focuses on the church history of the 11th – 15th centuries of the Byzantine Empire. Firstly, the Empire will be examined broadly, in terms of politics, economics, social, and cultural issues. Secondly, we will examine the Christian Church's activities before the final dissolution of the Byzantine state in the 15th century. We will also try to discover why Christians in the Byzantine Empire were so passive in the face of the pagan invaders.

2.2 General survey

We will examine the Byzantine era in its entirety, in order to gain a deeper understanding of life in the Empire. Much of the information gleaned comes from Diehl's well-known writings "Byzantium" (1957).

2.2.1 Political aspects

In terms of politics, Diehl (1957: 25, 27, 29) remarks, "Few rulers in the world have been more powerful than the Emperor of Byzantium." The reason for this was that Byzantium had a strong and absolute form of government; admirably served by a well-organized army, which for a long time was able to defend the monarch. The emperor of Byzantine had an "absolute" conception of monarchical authority. As it was believed in the Roman tradition, the Emperor was the Chosen of God (Diehl 1957: 29). From Justinian the Great, emperors dreamed continually of restoring the ancient Roman Empire. This imperial policy was continued through the houses of Macedon and Comneni (Diehl 1957:176-181).

Along with this great ambition, the government was strictly centralized by its administration and skilful diplomacy. The policy of administration was that of national unity: through Hellenism and through Orthodoxy. It was a government that could govern twenty different nationalities, which contained different races and languages. The slogan was "One master, one faith" (Diehl 1957: 71).

This centralized administration helped to spread the influence and uphold the prestige of the Byzantine Empire throughout the world for a long time. They also preserved Latin as the official language and relegated Greek to being merely the language of the ordinary people, until the seventh century when Greek became the official language (Diehl 1957: 64-65). Consequently, one can see that the Byzantines persisted in regarding themselves as the only "civilized nation", and lawful heir of Rome.

The Byzantine diplomacy relied upon financial power. According to Diehl (1957: 55), this policy brought prosperity without the need for bloodshed and contributed to the strength of the Empire. The barbarians served the best interests of the Empire by submitting to Byzantine influence and accepting the suzerainty of the Empire as vassals and subjects. Barbarian princes who received

subsidies from the Emperor undertook to put a certain number of men at his disposal. Along the whole length of the frontier, there were vassals and allies, who formed a first line of defense against invasion. That is why Diehl (1957: 54, 61) emphasizes the fact that Constantinople always preferred clever diplomacy to cruder methods of violence. This Byzantine diplomacy contributed to the advance of imperialism through the attraction by its wealth and splendor. Thus the barbarians were assimilated into the Empire, at the same time creating of them nation states.

The military policy was that the defence of the country and the welfare of the troops (Diehl 1957:40). The Byzantine Empire experienced numerous civil wars. Strong military powers defended the empire against the constant threat from neighbours. Before Moslem invasions, there were other invasions from Eurasian land and sea nomads. This was during the period between the fifth and the eighth centuries, one of the great periods of nomadic irruption. These nomads were pastoral horsemen; relatively few in number, but fierce and mobile, who threatened to overthrow the settled civilizations of the Byzantine Empire (Roper 1965:73-75).

The Emperor preferred a mercenary system to recruitment from among the citizens of the Empire in Roman times. Diehl (1957: 41-42) explains that mercenaries came from every part of the world. The Emperor willingly bestowed land upon those who enlisted under his banner. This land was registered and protected by statute, it was inalienable and hereditary and fiefdoms were created, whose owners bore the title of knight. The Emperor believed that well-paid mercenaries were more surely his, and that they were beyond the reach of anti-imperial influences.

In the thousand years of the Empire, there were those who favoured military power and those who favoured civilian leaders (i.e. bishops and the Church). Politics, however, was also influenced by individual greed, the presence or absence of competence, and by pressure from outside forces, notably the new invader: the Seljuk Turks. On the whole, we may say that the Byzantine Empire was governed by a strongly centralized administration and by clever diplomatic methods; local authorities were allowed a “part” in this government, though of a much smaller magnitude.

2.2.2 Economic aspects

The Byzantine Empire long enjoyed unprecedented economic prosperity, despite its heavy expenditure on the upkeep of the army, incessant warfare, ruinous diplomatic practices, the

extravagance of the court, and the magnificent buildings. Byzantine diplomats always regarded money as being an irresistible commodity when negotiating and it was used indiscriminately. The Emperor granted annual subsidies and gave magnificent presents to foreign nations and to his mercenaries. As Diehl (1957: 79-80, 83, and 93) says, "The Byzantine economy was based on both trade and agriculture." This was the firstly due its geographical situations in that it lay at the meeting-point of Asia and Europe, or the East and the West. The Empire controlled coasts where all the great trade routes of the world passed. The Empire's navy added to her prosperity for centuries. Its vessels patrolled the sea and the active and hardworking people of the Empire took full advantage of this. As a result, Constantinople became a great commercial center, with a huge market where people of every nation came together to do business.

According to Diehl (1957: 84, 89), "The characteristic feature of Byzantine industry was trading in luxuries and it operated in a paradise of monopoly, privilege, and protectionism." The Empire meticulously controlled the economy and all industrial works were supervised by the State. There was no room for independent work or individual initiative. The Empire's industrial policies were to make enormous profits. It imported precious goods from all over the Eastern world; such as the precious stones, spices and aromatic herbs from India, silk from the far east and China, and silken garments, fine wine, and rich carpets from Baghdad and Syria.

From the North, Russia and the Balkans, Serbs and Bulgars supplied the Empire with wheat, salt fish, salt, honey, wax, caviar, flax, furs and pelts. There was some re-exporting, along with trade in Byzantium's own products, which were gold, silver, pearls, gorgeous silks dyed brilliant purple or dark violet by the artisans and craftsmen. There were also the monopoly and glory of Byzantine workshops, especially the goldsmiths' workshops, which produced sparkling jewels containing stones and pearls. Enamel was produced for the adornment of reliquaries, icons, clothes, and metal. In those days the Greeks had such undisputed supremacy that their currency was accepted in every market in the world, just as the American dollar is in world markets today. The foreigners were startled by the wealth, splendor, and prosperity of Byzantium. Villehardouin (Diehl 1957: 82) says, "One could not believe there was so rich a city in the entire world."

The Byzantines modeled their taxation system on the old Roman system, which included taxes on land, buildings, and tribute in kind, and services of every sort. There was no indirect taxation.

A number of groups were, however, exempt. Church property, military fiefs and fiscal groups, were classified in public record, and as such were exempt from taxation. Estate tax was exacted from agricultural enterprises and this tax became one of the most productive sources of income for the national fiscal (Diehl 1957: 69).

The reason was that the majority of the inhabitants of the provinces worked on the land. The plains of Thrace yielded abundance of wheat and in many of the provinces of Asia Minor, the Cilician plain and Cappadocia; there were also winegrowers and cattle breeders, who all produced various agricultural products. As agriculture was the backbone of the economy it sustained the Empire and fed the army; so it was protected by the State. From the 11th century, economical power declined along with territorial losses, which were the result of economic rivalry between Byzantine and Venice and numerous invaders. The loss of this vital income led to the loss of the ability to pay for troops and also the inability to keep Byzantium united.

2.2.3 Social and Cultural aspects

Lifestyles changed gradually in the Byzantine Empire. By the fifth century Christianity had become the faith of the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants. Consequently, Latin culture and Hellenism were smoothly assimilated into Christianity. Byzantine culture blended and clashed with Hellenistic and Oriental culture respectively. The culture which, to date, had dominated the Mediterranean world was breaking up and the Christian faith was replacing it. Contemporary church theology strongly influenced Byzantine art and music and there were certain Christian influences to be seen in Byzantine literature (Meyendorff 1982: 124-126). This was evident in the arts, architecture and mosaics of the churches of the Empire. A great social and intellectual upheaval occurred in the region during this period.

According to Sherrard (1967: 135), the intellectual and artistic effects of the empire were reflected not only in the Christian Church, but also in the literature and the arts for almost eleven centuries. Life in the Byzantine Empire was immensely elegant and sophisticated. The upper classes possessed power and were passionate about learning and aesthetics.

They therefore believed they were educated, whilst all barbarians were ignorant. The richness of private houses was no less impressive than the magnificence of the imperial palaces.

Constantinople resembled a princess adorned with gold, brilliant silks, flowers, medallions and enamels. Festivals, receptions and displays were popular and the Byzantines were well versed in pageantry. Diehl (1957:274-275) concludes that Byzantium's contribution to the history of civilization is great in literature, art, law, science, medicine, and religion. The whole East, Slavs, Arabs, and Armenia received intellectual benefit from Byzantine Empire.

2.3 The imperial power together with the Eastern Church leaders brought about the weakening of the Eastern Church, before 15th century

In this discussion we focus on the years 1054 to 1453 A.D. The reason for this is the major historical event that took place in 1054. After a long doctrinal controversy, the Great Schism marked the separation between the Roman Catholic Church in the West and the Orthodox Church of the East in this period (Douglas1974: 323).

2.3.1 Before the storm and stress of the Great Schism

Comby (1985:131) observes that even after 1054, the two parts of Christendom, the Eastern Church and the Western Church, continued in friendly accord. However, real unity between the two branches of the Church was not possible, given the significant differences in dogma, politics, and culture. The Byzantines were enclosed by their own world of ideas and the West was also not willing to meaningfully integrate with the East.

Dogma also developed very differently in the East and West. Latin influenced Roman law, so that its approach was practical; on the other hand, Greek was more speculative, being amongst other things concerned with the understanding of theology – Galli (1997: 12) indicates one of their major doctrinal differences to be in the teaching of Christology.

The Western Church's view of Christ was as the Victim of the Cross and that led them to talk more about redeeming sinners. On the other hand, the Eastern Church emphasized the victory of Christ over death and the deification of humanity through believing in Christ. Cunningham (2000:90-91) states that there were some practical differences: the Eastern Church allowed married clergy, had different rules about fasting and used leavened bread in the Eucharist. On the

other hand, the Western Church insisted on priestly celibacy and unleavened bread. The Western Church declared that Rome was the Apostolic See, which was centralized in the Papacy. Whereas, the East acknowledged the Pope as the first bishop of the church but saw him as only the first among equals.

2.3.1.1 The iconoclastic controversy (726-842)

The Eastern Orthodox theology reached its climax of tension in the great iconoclastic controversy of the eighth century. By the early eighth century, Constantinople and other cities of the Byzantine Empire were overflowing with icons. Iconography was a major industry, especially among monks. People worshipped and meditated before the icons. For this reason, leaders from both church and state feared that this practice was getting out of hand (Olson 1999:301-302).

Thus a conflict erupted between the iconoclasts (anti-icon) and the defenders of iconography, the iconophiles. There were three Iconodule leading theologians: John of Damascus (655-749), Theodore of Studios (759-826) and Nicephorus of Constantinople (758-828) (Nassif 1997:22). The Eastern Church argued that icons played a crucial role as “windows into heaven” and were used as a point of contact in praying to the Trinity or to the saints. Saints were regarded as accessible intercessors, which could take living Christians’ petitions to God. This was endorsed by the opinion of the early Church Fathers: Epiphanius, Eusebius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Chrysostom.

The hero of the Orthodox Church, John of Damascus, defended the use of icons in worship by making a subtle but important distinction between actual worship of a person or object and mere veneration. Damascus insisted that the holy images were sacramental channels of the Divine energy. The iconoclasts countered with the argument that images of Christ violated the spirit of the biblical prohibition of idolatry and that the practice implied a defective Christology (Olson 1999:301-302). The Byzantine emperor Leo III prohibited icon worship in 726 and ordered his second edict in 730, which commanded the removal and destruction of all icons throughout the empire. The conflict lasted for decades and led to rioting among monks, martyrdoms, and turmoil and confusion throughout the Byzantine Empire and church (Schaff 1885: 457, 459).

At the Council of Constantinople in 754, which was attended by three hundred and thirty subservient bishops, it was declared that the worship of icons was against the Scripture (Ex. 20:4; Rom. 1: 23, 25; Jn.4: 24) (Schaff 1885: 457, 459). Hence public and private worship of sacred images were condemned and forbidden in 754, on pain of deposition and excommunication.

This controversy had a profound impact on the second Council of Nicaea in 787. The Council now condemned the iconoclasts and concluded that the holy images-icons- must not be rejected and indeed ought to be used in Christian worship. On the 19th of February, 842, the icons were again introduced into the churches of Constantinople, where bishops, archimandrites and priests returned to the practice of kissing the sacred icons (Schaff 1885: 464-465).

The Eastern Church and the Roman Catholic Church have never regarded icons as idols (Ware 1964:214), and this long controversy not only weakened the Eastern churches, but also gave momentum to the process of estrangement between the churches of Rome and Constantinople. The use of the sacred icons, the Iconoclasts claimed, tended to stress the human nature of Christ as against the divine nature (Deanesly 1973:73-74).

2.3.1.2 The Great Schism

The fundamental cause of the great schism was an “Intellectual alienation.” The West leant on Augustinianism, whilst the East looked to Irenaeus, Athanasius, Origen, and the Cappadocian fathers as well as theologians steeped in a kind of mystical, speculative theology. They also began to attach themselves to different church fathers (Pelikan in Olson 1999:305).

Olson (1999:301-302) sheds light on some additional differences: “The West insisted on the sole sovereignty of grace and allowed modified monergism, whereas the East insisted on free will and a synergistic view of salvation.” In other words, the Eastern Church was more mystical and speculative and emphasized the liturgical worship, popular piety, and the informal and unwritten accumulation of Eastern Christian tradition. The Western Church was more legalistic and practical, and emphasized the authorities of written codes and objective norms. The Western Church firmly believed that the bishop of Rome stood as Peter’s successor in apostolic line (Mt. 16:18-19). Thus all bishops of Rome have had primacy over the entire church of Jesus Christ.

Even imperial power over the church was resisted and it was believed that all should bow to the authority of the Pope in spiritual obedience. On the other hand, the Eastern Church considered every Orthodox bishop as a true successor of Peter, but equal in dignity. This position was derived from the view of Origen (Olson 1999:305). There were two major areas of controversy, which emerged from the great schism: the question of papal authority, and questions relating to divergences in theologies of the two Churches.

The main topic of debate was the Western Church's inclusion of the Latin word "*filioque*" in the Nicene Creed, an extra phrase, which indicated that the Holy Spirit proceeded "from the Father and the Son". The addition of the "*filioque*" clause came about as a reaction to Arianism and it helped emphasize the full divinity of Jesus Christ. However, for the Eastern Church this idea was rooted in Augustinian thinking of the Trinity, and they considered it heterodox (Meyendorff 1982: 28, 30, 157).

The Easterners opposed this idea of the Trinity, saying that the Spirit did not proceed, or obtain his existence, from both the Father and the Son; rather, he was eternally revealed through the Son. According to Galli (1997:15-16), the other reason why the Eastern Church rejected the Western Church's view was that the Creed is the common possession of the whole church, and therefore if any change were to be made to it, the whole church at an ecumenical council would be required to sanction the change. The various differences between the two Churches continued and at last, they excommunicated one another from the Great Universal Church.

Schaff (1885:313), however, clearly condenses the ultimate separation with three reasons: firstly the politico-ecclesiastical rivalry of the patriarch of Constantinople under the Byzantine Empire and the bishop of Rome in connection with the new German empire. The second cause was the growing centralization and overbearing conduct of the Latin Church in and through the papacy. The third cause was the stationary character of the Greek and the progressive character of the Latin Church during the Middle Ages. Consequently, by 1054, the Eastern and Western churches had effectively split. After the Schism the relationship between the eastern and western churches was no longer one of mutual understanding.

2.3.2 The role of the church fathers in the Eastern Empire: 11th –15th centuries

Questions relating to the power of the Patriarch and how he obtained this power are considered. Then we will analyze how he used that power to serve the Lord.

2.3.2.1 Patriarchy

The Patriarch was very rich and controlled the vast resources of the Church and his power derived as much from his authority over the innumerable monks of Constantinople as from his influence on the laity (Diehl 1957: 163). Cross (1988: 40), illustrating the power which the Patriarch possessed, quotes St. Cyprian who said, ‘You must realize that a bishop is constituted by his church and a church by her bishop; whoever is not with his bishop is not in the church.’ The power of the bishop is the power of the apostle; it is a power of grace that sacrifices to God, heals and sanctifies human activities and gives them glory by absorbing them into the kingdom of God. The Eastern Church was firmly united to its bishop who had the power of apostolic authority.

Similarly, the nature of the relationship between State and Church: the Church was usually subordinated to political considerations and was trammled by secular connections. The Byzantine Empire esteemed religion as being ancillary to its political purposes. Emperors controlled the Church and made it an organ of the state. Even though the State intervened, from time to time the Eastern Church could defend herself against the State (Latourette 1974a: 224-225).

Under the leadership of Michael Cerularius the Patriarch, some revolutionary movement occurred, and he compelled Michael VI, the Emperor, to step down. He made Isaac Comnenus the new Emperor in 1057. Cerularius boldly outfaced the Emperor, “I raised you up, you imbecile; but I’ll break you” (Diehl (1957: 134, 173). Ware (1964:49-50) also says that whenever serious theological questions of principle arose, or when the Emperor interfered unwarrantedly in ecclesiastical matters, the authority of the Church quickly showed that it had a will of its own. This was seen in the controversy over icons. Iconoclasm was vigorously championed by a whole series of Emperors, yet for all that the Church successfully rejected it.

In the course of time, the quality of Church leadership degenerated. The emperor, Leo VI, rebuked the bishops' misadministration of Church revenues, calling them "Powerful men who robbed the poor." Diehl cites the phrase of a fourteenth century historian, that the church leaders "had nothing about them of the priest save the pastoral staff and the habit." The ambitions of Church leaders caused continual trouble with their taste for politics (Diehl 1957:172, 174). In the East, the Church and State were closely interdependent; Patriarch and Emperor shared power, even though antagonism between priesthood and Empire prevailed frequently. Along with this enormous power, the Church also possessed abundant property. Further, the ambitions and encroachments of the Patriarch contributed to the weakening of the monarchy (Diehl 1957:174).

2.3.2.2 Theology

Throughout the Byzantine Empire, ecclesiastical battles were waged against various heresies such as Monophysitism, Monothelitism, Iconoclasm, and Nestorianism. Thus the Church spent much time giving birth to new doctrines, constantly defending Orthodoxy with doctrinal weapons, and engaging in polemics against paganism and Judaism. In his study of the Eastern theology, Bosch (2005:194) underlines that when the early Church fathers defined the faith and systematized doctrine, they were deeply indebted to Greek philosophy: for example the relation between eternity and time. God is referred to as the Supreme Being, substance, principal, and unmoved mover.

It reflected on what God is in himself rather than what God does for His people, and the relationship in which people stand to God. Ontology became more important than history. Therefore Bosch (2005:195) says, "Salvation in the Eastern Church is to be found in the original idea of knowledge through experience than in rational knowledge." Various reasons are given for the theological differences between the East and the West. One of them was the view of God. Gregory & Frederica (1997:31) point out that Western believers did not encounter God directly, but rather through creation and especially through the sacraments. On the contrary, the Eastern theologians continually elaborated on the "experience of God" by speaking of two separate aspects of God: the God-divine essence and divine energies. For them, this idea of "experience of God" was a direct knowledge of divinity, unmediated and uncreated.

There are three emphases of Eastern theology: the Trinity, the Incarnation, and Repentance. The sacraments and worship of the East focus on the Triune God. For this reason, the Bishop, vested in the *sakkos* (outer garment) and symbolizing the divine splendor of Jesus Christ, moves, acts and prays, in the liturgy, as one who manifests the presence of the Holy Trinity (Cross 1988: 26).

Concerning the doctrine of God, the Eastern Christians understanding of God emphasizes paradox. God is radically unknowable, yet has made himself known. God is the unapproachable, yet he has approached mankind. In other words, God is the transcendent 'other,' yet he is the immanent 'thou.' Hence the Eastern Church believes in God's self-revelation, which has taken place in its utter fullness in the mystery of the Incarnation, in the person of Jesus Christ. They firmly say that the unknowable had become known in Jesus Christ (Cross 1988:29).

Concerning the Doctrine of Christ, in Orthodox theology, the Incarnation took place in terms of God's philanthropia: even if man had never fallen, God in His love for humanity would still have become man. The true God and true man, one person in two natures, is not only an act of love but also an act of salvation. Jesus Christ, by uniting man and God in His own person, reopened for man the path to union with God (Ware 1964:230).

Concerning the Holy Spirit, in the Eastern tradition, he is described as God's Good, Holy and Life-Giving Spirit, whose activity is embodied in the Eucharist, whilst he sustains the church, and is the source of all men's love, prayer and good works. The Spirit is also understood as a presence, and is experienced personally, according to the Scripture (Ac 8:29; 10:19; 11:12; 13:12; 15:25; II Cor 13:14) (Bosch 2005:195; Meyendorff 1982: 154-155).

Concerning the view of Holy Scripture, the Orthodox Christians firmly believe that the Bible is the supreme expression of God's revelation to man and that Christians must always be the 'People of the Book' (Ware 1964:207). However they believe that the Bible should not take precedence over Church tradition. The Scriptures are sacramental in Orthodox thinking, in that they make the mystery of Jesus present to the believer. The Bible is regarded as a verbal icon of Christ. The Seventh Ecumenical Council decreed that holy icons and the Books of the Gospels should be venerated in the same way (Cross 1988:48). The East placed tradition above the Scripture. Concerning the doctrine of salvation, Ware (1964: 226-229) gives a clear explanation

of why most Orthodox theologians reject the idea of 'original sin'. In the Orthodox view, men automatically inherit Adam's corruption and mortality, but not his sin; they are only guilty in so far as, by their own free choice, they imitate Adam. Eastern Christians believe that man's greatest need is to be saved from corruption. The work of Christ is therefore a work of the restoration of the image of God in man. This view we see in Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons AD 177, who held to a doctrine of "recapitulation" which teaches that, by entering into every human experience, Jesus has purified man, and as the Head of a new humanity he has restored humanity to its former perfection (Potgieter 2006: 54).

To the Eastern Church, man possesses free will because man is made in God's image; after the fall man still possessed free will and was capable of doing good actions. Yet they believe that man's sin blocked the path to union with God, so that God became man. The Orthodox Church uses the term '*synergy*' which is interpreted from Paul's words; "We are fellow workers with God" (1 Cor. 3:9) (Ware 1964: 226, 230).

The doctrine of the church is one among many other points of the Eastern Orthodox belief; they understand the church as the meeting place of all mysteries. For them, church is "a sacramental communion with God in Christ and the Spirit" (Cross 1988:33, 40), whereas Protestants would answer that the church is the Body of Christ, the People of God (Grudem 1994:853). Orthodoxy does not see the Gospel as a disembodied ideology.

Further the aim of the Christian life is to be defined in terms of *deification* (Greek, *theosis*). The Greek fathers brought this idea from Paul's "sharing" and John's "perfectly one". Paul expresses the sharing, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, though he was rich, yet for your sake became poor, that you through his poverty, might become rich" (2 Cor. 8:9). And John states, "I have given them the glory...that they may be one as we are one: I in them and you in me... to let the world know that you sent me" (Jn17: 22-23). Greek theologians argued that if man is to share in God's glory or to be perfectly one with God, man must be deified and infinite joy must fill his heart (Phil. 4:7). This idea is summed up as "union with God", that is, not only spiritually, but also experience with whole body, which is transfigured by grace of God (Ware 1964: 28, 132). This view developed into mysticism and was examined by the intricacies of prayer.

For instance, Chrysostom and Cassian of Marseilles¹ in the fourth century, introduced the idea that holiness attended upon the ceaseless repetition of the prayer from the Psalms, 'O God, make speed to save: O Lord, make haste to help me' (Payne 1958:298). Then the stream of mystical theology continued through those who distinguished themselves in this field: such as Maximus the Confessor in the seventh and John of Damascus in the eighth centuries. In the eleventh century, Symeon the New Theologian summed up the whole mystical tradition, which was derived from mysterious statements by collecting the existing mystical traditions and practices in detail (Payne 1958:300). In the twelfth century, Euthymius Zigabenus, Nicholas of Methone, and Nicetas Acominatus did the same thing. Especially in the fourteenth century there were the champions of Eastern mysticism: Palamas, Cantacuzenus, and the two Cabasilas (Diehl 1957: 244-245).

In our discussion above we have observed the Eastern Church's theology and the influence of the Church Fathers throughout the centuries. As Cross (1988:51) points out, the East's attitude to theology was always regarded as the experiential way of union with God, which is probably understood as the theology of prayer. For this reason, Eastern theology gradually developed as mysticism. Diehl (1957: 246) also comments that it should be recognized that Byzantine theology began to stagnate from the ninth century onwards: theologians went on attacking heresy in the old way, rebelling against the teaching of Western Scholasticism and bringing a strange narrow-mindedness to all they did. Religious eloquence and hagiography alone preserved some semblance of life, though Western theology developed with new Scholasticism.

2.3.2.3 Monasticism

Christian monasticism originated from a form of monasticism begun by Anthony, an Egyptian, who was born about A.D.250. He developed coenobitic monasticism, which spread throughout the Christian East. Monasticism was not peculiar to Christianity. It existed in the religions of India, among Jews, Greeks and Egyptians. Throughout the Middle Ages, monastic tradition

¹ Cassian John (360-435) was an Eastern monk and theologian, was educated in a monastery of Bethlehem. He then made a pilgrimage to the Egyptian hermits during his youth years. He was sent by Chrysostom as ambassador to Rome, and then he settled at Marseilles and established religious houses for men and women. He firstly introduced Eastern monasticism to the West. He wrote two important books "Conferences" and "Institutes" which describe his earlier experiences of monastic life and rules for the monastic life (Knight 2009).

incorporated personalities and communities firmly within the framework of the Eastern Orthodox Christianity (Walker 1944:136-137).

Macrina who was the sister of Basil the Great, founded the first women's monastery in Caesarea near Cappadocia, the modern *Kayseri* in Turkey. That was the beginning of the monasticism of the Byzantine Empire in the fourth century (Payne 1958: 140). This "solitary tradition" continued to increase and expanded throughout the Byzantine Empire. Newby (2001:56) comments on two reasons for the emergence of Christian monasticism, one was the need for the monk to escape the world and the other was the need to "embrace all." Many monasteries practiced *hesychia*, literally 'solitude' or contemplation. This practice became a fundamental part of the Byzantine ascetic's life. It was based on the belief that even though some monks and nuns could engage in education, evangelism, and charitable work, their primary vocation was prayer. The goal of prayer and of all monastic life was union with God (Chryssavgis 1997:24).

From the early times the monastic life was held in honour. The people venerated monks who renounced the world to become "citizens of heaven" which held great attraction for all classes of society. The "solitary tradition" continued to increase and expanded throughout the Byzantine Empire. Thus monasteries multiplied beyond just Constantinople, and this movement rapidly spread out to the whole Empire: Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Sinai Peninsula, Cappadocia, Olympus in Bithynia, and Latros near Miletus (Diehl 1957: 164).

Starting in the tenth century, Mount Athos became the centre of large religious communities; its twenty ruling monasteries produced 26 Patriarchs and 144 bishops with forty thousand monks. It also contained a large number of smaller houses, as well as *hermits'* cells (Ware1964: 47). The law also helped the expansion of the monastic life in that monastic property was largely exempt from taxation. Neither monks nor their tenants were liable to military service. The monks had great influence on the people, owing to the miraculous and prophetic powers attributed to them, and vast tracts of land came into the monks' possession (Diehl 1957: 164).

After the Iconoclastic Controversy, the monks were acquisitive, and possessed vast tracts of land. They also intervened in political matters and joined the ranks of the powerful man. Phocas observes (Diehl 1957:169), "The monks possess none of the evangelical virtues, all their energies

are devoted to their own enrichment, and their life in no way differs from that of people living in the world.” Moreover the monastic institutions had fallen since the end of the eleventh century. The monks were more covetous than ever of money and states, and more concerned to expound the principles of efficient husbandry than to save souls. Worldly life invaded the monasteries; seclusion, communal life, discipline- all had gone. By the end of the eleventh century, they infested the roads, ravaged the countryside, and robbed wayfarers (Diehl 1957:169-171).

2.3.2.4 Evangelization

Until A.D. 313 Christians had always been at a disadvantage. Christians suffered discrimination in many ways and were suspected of disloyalty to the state. After the so-called edict of Milan the situation was changed drastically. Even emperors personally involved themselves in evangelizing projects, in which religious and political aims were intertwined (Bosch 2005: 202). As evangelism is part of the mission of the church, Schmemann (1961:251) points out that the Orthodox understanding of evangelizing can be seen from the doctrine of the Church. Liturgy is the key to the Orthodox viewpoint on evangelism. It proclaims the gospel through doxology and liturgy (Bria 1975: 248).

For this reason, mission is centripetal rather than centrifugal, organic rather than organized. Indeed, in the Orthodox tradition, the Eucharistic liturgy has a basic missionary structure and purpose (Stamoolis 1986: 207). It was in the Byzantine Empire that Orthodoxy took the place of national unity; the profession of a common faith; that is the reason why the emperors actively supported the Church’s evangelization. It was firmly believed that the State was charged with the mission of spreading the true faith throughout the world, “One God is announced to all” Eusebius wrote in the fourth century (Diehl 1957:74, 185).

Its climax was Justinian the Great (A.D.527-565), who effort on behalf of Christianity in that he founded forty churches in Constantinople and its suburbs (Freely 1996:82). He not only extended the territory of the empire, but also endeavored to extend Christianity beyond the borders of the Empire. John of Ephesus, who, as a missionary, was sent by Justinian, claims to have converted many thousands, and destroyed pagan temples in western Asia Minor (Latourette 1974a: 227). It is remarked that he stamped out the remaining traces of paganism in the empire (Freely 1996:

85). Orthodox missions advanced mainly among the Slovenian people and even more particularly into the vast expanses of Russia and its hinterland. The reason Latourette (1974a: 236) gives us is that after Moslem conquests practically put an end to the spread of Christianity from the southern shores of the Mediterranean, the Byzantine Church then turned to the north, the Balkans and Eastern Europe. When the Byzantine Church was freed at last from the long struggle against the Iconoclasts, it turned its energies to the conversion of the pagans who lay beyond the North West and east, the lands of the Black Sea: Moravia, Bulgarians, Romania, Serbs, and Russians (Ware 1964:82). The king of Moravia asked the Emperor Michael III for a teacher who could preach the Christian faith in Slavic language to his subjects (Sherrard 1967:28).

In response to this, in 863 Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople sent two brothers, Thessalonians, named Cyril, and Methodius. They invented a Slavic alphabet, and developed a Christian literature in the Slavonic language (Latourette 1974a: 244; Ware 1964:82-83). German missionaries were against using the Slavonic language in Church services instead of Latin, because the policy of the Roman Church allowed only Latin. However, in 868 two brothers obtained an agreement from Pope Adrian II to use the Slavic language in religious services, and the Slav Christians enjoyed hearing the Gospel in their own language.

Later on, Pope John VIII (872-882) also consented to use a Slavic liturgy with reluctance, yet soon the Slavic liturgy was abolished because of regional conflicts and the Latin took place (Schaff 2006: 129-130; Walker 1944:214). It was the beginning of the missionary expansion of Christianity in Slavic countries, and by the tenth century other Slavic countries had joined the Orthodox fold through successes of the two brothers. The Bulgarian Church especially grew rapidly; Bulgaria created the first national Church of the Slavs in 945. The two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, have deserved the title “Apostles of the Slavs” (Ware 1964:85). In the East large proportions of the major missionary work were initiated or at least actively supported by the State. In the West, on the other hand, it arose more from individual Christians and non-political Christian groups (Latourette 1974: 225). For the Orthodox, the Great Schism of 1054 had far reaching consequences. The Orthodox Church saw its mission altered from evangelism to a search for Christian unity. In the later Mediaeval Ages, especially after the fourth Crusade, and with a dwindling empire, the Eastern Christians more focused on themselves: escaping from the

world and embracing God's experience in the cells and monasteries (Stamoolis 1986: 86-102, 110). They founded more monasteries, and magnificent works of art were produced for the Church. The Eastern Christians looked for the Lord more through mystical traditions; the *hesychast* mysticism became most popular after the restoration of 1261. The last years of the Byzantine Empire also marked the period when bishops played an even more important role at court as ambassadors for the preservation of the empire and the Church (Hill 2007:154).

2.3.3 Conclusion

Above all, we have observed that leaders of the Eastern Church had enormous power within the secular realms. They made much effort to clarify the Christian faith and defend the heresies. The Eastern Church leaders led their flocks to grow their faith to the experience of God through mystical traditions, rather than exposing the biblical truth to the parishioners. They approached the Scriptural commentaries timidly and devoid of breadth, with criticism, or curiosity (Diehl 1957: 246). Thankfully, the Eastern Church strove not only for those who lived in the Empire, but also made an effort to evangelize beyond its borders. Eastern Christianity was not unsuccessful in propagating itself, and it was assisted by the State. The Lord used the Eastern Church whose great efforts promoted the expansion of Christianity towards the Balkan Peninsula countries through their own liturgy services and mystical theology (Latourette1974a: 262).

2.4 The populace of the Byzantine Empire remained so passive in the face of pagan invaders at the end of the Byzantine Empire

The Byzantine Emperors considered themselves Vicars of God on earth and were eager to spread Christianity to the whole world (Diehl 1957:29). At the same time, the Eastern Church produced significant canons, doctrines to teach the true faith, and they guided their parishioners in the way of salvation through mystical traditions. We therefore ask what the relationship was between the people and their political leaders as they lived in Christendom in the Middle Ages. Also what relationship existed between church leaders and their parishioners in the Eastern Empire? Then we will look at which factors contributed to the Eastern Christians' passivity in the face of the infidel invaders.

2.4.1 Did the political leaders serve the people as the servants of God?

The Byzantine emperors dreamed of restoring the Christian character of the realm to the ancient Roman Empire. Their plan was to embrace the world in one imperial and Christian whole, so that they declared, “One master, one faith” (Diehl 1957: 71). Justinian the Great in the sixth century spent much of his time working, and deserved his nickname of “The emperor who never sleeps.” People of Byzantium admired his achievement of extending their territory by the conquering of the ancient Roman Empire and also admired his exemplary devotional life. One of his famous achievements was the rebuilding of the church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople in 537, surmounted by an enormous dome, which was the largest the world had ever seen (Diehl 1957: 38, 178). To the Byzantines, the church on earth was a reflection of the church in heaven. From this developed the understanding of the church building itself being the place where God was most present. In earlier years, throughout the whole city of Constantinople, grand services were held as the procession, headed by emperor, marched through the city, holding services at special locations along the way. However after Justinian the Great, these celebrations of the city’s life and faith were discontinued (Hill 2007:134).

We will look at how political leaders of the Byzantine Empire lived and governed through some illustrative accounts from the eleventh century. Freely (1996:122-123) cites what Psellus² wrote in 1034; the patriarch Alex presided over the wedding of the empress Zöe to her lover and crowned Zoë’s new husband as Michael IV. This was despite the fact that everyone was convinced that the empress and her lover had killed Romanus, the emperor, whose body still lay uncovered beside the pool in which he had drowned.

The life of one of the emperors in the eleventh century through the writings of Psellus: that the emperor Constantine VIII, who had been co-emperor for half a century, had played virtually no part in the governing of the empire, devoting his life exclusively to pleasure- the theatre, horseracing, gladiatorial combats, hunting, wild animal combats, and gambling- for which he neglected even the most important affairs of state. Psellus deplored the excessive expenditures of the members of the Macedonian imperial house (late 9th- 11th centuries), “The imperial treasury

² Psellus was the Byzantine philosopher, historian, theologian, and statesman. He was imperial secretary to Michael V (1041-2), and secretary of state Constantine IX (1042-54) (Cross & Livingstone 1974:1141).

was opened up and the gold kept there was allowed to pour forth like a river” (Freely 1967:122). The royal families vied with one another in building increasingly extravagant memorials to their reign (Sherrard 1967: 161).

Other accounts come from the Comnenus house: Manuel I (1143-1180), like Justinian, dreamed of restoring the Roman Empire and he launched attacks on Italy itself, though without sustained success. Sherrard (1967:162) says that Manuel’s reckless extravagance and the expense of his military enterprises brought the State to the verge of bankruptcy. This wholly passed over the tax burden on the citizens’ and peasantry mounted. The majority of peasants came face to face with higher payment of taxes, financial difficulties, and the fulfillment of military duties. Large rural populations forsook their fields and took refuge in the towns or monasteries in order to escape the fiscal tyranny of the twelfth century. For this reason the lower class/peasantry of the Empire struggled and rose up against the wealthy and the state. It also meant that the great estates were often only indifferently cultivated and contained a large proportion of barren land (Diehl 1957:92-93).

This shows clearly that the rulers of the empire neglected their real responsibilities with a lack of moral consciousness. The cost of the emperors’ inordinate ambitions to re-establish the ancient Roman Empire not only brought financial and military exhaustion, but also brought calamity upon the Empire itself. At the end of the Empire, even though surrounded by enemies on all sides and weakened military power and economic difficulties, endless conflict continued in the royal family (Diehl 1957: 184).

This was evident between the Young Andronicus and his grandfather, Andronicus, during the period 1321-1328; between John Palaeologus and Cantacuzenus in 1350-1354; between John Palaeologus and his eldest son Andronicus in 1373-1391; between John VII and Manuel II in 1391; and in a rebellion of the emperor’s brother Demetrius against the emperor John VIII in 1442 (Freely 1967:162, 164-165, 170-171). The first conflict of the fourteenth century arose from the object of Young Andronicus’ affections, and inevitably led to a civil war.

The Young Andronicus III neglected his wife and took a mistress, who aroused his jealousy by carrying on with another lover. He hired assassins to do away with his rival, but by mistake they

killed his own younger brother Prince Manuel. The Emperor Andronicus, his grandfather, was furious at all this and disinherited his grandson, the young Andronicus. There followed a series of internal conflicts between the grandfather and his grandson, which lasted for seven years (1321-1328) (Freely 1967:157-159). This political demoralization would bring the Byzantine Empire to the brink of ruin during the remainder of the fourteenth century. Another internal conflict began in 1341 that differed from any other civil war in the Byzantine Empire.

Freely (1967:160-163) demonstrates that it almost immediately developed into a struggle between social classes. The landowning aristocracy supported Cantacuzenus who was accused of planning to seize the throne for him and the ordinary people of the cities and the serfs in the countryside supported John V. Palaeologus, the co-emperor. The horrors of this civil war lasted for six years that was a great benefit to the Turks. How this tragic civil war occurred, John Cantacuzenus wrote in *Historia*: "All the cities joined in this rebellion against the aristocracy, and those that were late in doing so made up for their lost time by excelling the example set them by others...all manner of inhumanity and even massacres" (Freely 1967:163).

It is clearly shown how the royal family of the Byzantine Empire loved intrigue, but lacked moral foundations. Therefore this political demoralization was frequent source of revolution and anarchy. When the Crown was weak, when imperial authority seemed to slip through the hands, rivals sprang up on all sides, and anarchy prevailed (Diehl 1957:125). On the other hand, not only did the royal family's demoralization make the lower classes turn with disgust upon the emperors, but also behaviour of the powerful landed aristocracy similarly affect peasants and serfs. The feudal nobility was persuaded that they were "those whom God had appointed to rule" (Diehl 1957:152-153).

Naturally, the power of the landed aristocracy was enhanced by the dignity of State appointments, and salaries and gifts added to the wealth they derived from their estates. The Emperor chose his officials and generals, and their wealth and power accumulated from generation to generation. In the course of time, the powerful landowners regarded the poor as their prey, fretting when they could not seize their goods. Big landowners used their power to enlarge their domains at the expense of the smallholder. Further, they took possession of their poorer neighbours' land by compelling them to sell at a low price or by annexation through intimidation or by force.

The result of the feudal system was the “disappearance of freemen and the swallowing –up of small independent estates” (Diehl 1957:152). Huge estates grew up for the enrichment of all-powerful lords. Thus real social problems had arisen between the two classes, the powerful and the poor. “The great number of peasants is a sign that public needs are being met, through payment of taxes and the fulfillment of military duties.” Taxation was, however, burdensome for the peasantry. Also in the twelfth century, people abandoned their fields and moved to cities or entered into the monasteries because of heavy burden of taxation. Farming languished and the countryside became depopulated. The lower class/peasantry of the Empire from time to time rose up against the wealthy and the state through the Middle Ages (Diehl 1957: 92-93).

It was inevitable that the democratic movement was created, because of the class struggles between aristocracies that could not forgive the tyranny it had so long endured in the fourteenth century. This class warfare contributed to the loss of Asia Minor in the 11th and 14th centuries owing to the arrival of the Turks. The “disease of the purple” was endemic and a scourge (Diehl 1957:162).

During the era of the Byzantine Empire, of the 107 sovereigns only 34 died in their beds, and 65 revolutions occurred in the palace, streets, or barracks (Diehl 1957:128). The fact was that most of the royal families had lower moral standards, rather than being exemplary political leaders as the Vicars of God on earth. Their extravagant ambitions of reconquering the lost dominions of the Roman Empire not only ruined their own life, but also disillusioned the people. As far as we can see, court functionaries were also not ecclesiastics. Also both emperors and aristocracies or landowners did not reign by the grace of God.

2.4.2.The effect of the Church leaders on parishioners

2.4.2.1 The character of clergymen deteriorated

The Byzantine bishop was not only a distant figure who attended Councils; he was a friend and protector to whom men confidently turned when in trouble. The Church in the Byzantine Empire did not overlook its social obligation, and one of its principal functions was charitable work (Ware 1964:254-256). The Medieval Church advanced the clergy as superior to the laity, the clerical magistrate to the lay magistrate. They reformed their system in a shape of political form,

which was a monarchy. Originally the Church had not been monarchical; but later on an essential disharmony was created between clergy and laity (Roper 1965:134). The bishops were among the powerful men who robbed the poor, and misgoverned the Church's revenues. Their intention only benefited the clergy in order to get support from them to play an important role in politics, instead of being content with their authority in the Church (Diehl 1957: 174). We could imagine how Church leaders neglected their duties through what Diehl (1957:174) cited of a fourteenth century historian, that they "had nothing about them of the priest save the pastoral staff and the habit."

Then we see how church leaders compromised, and how this led to riots of Eastern society after the sack of Constantinople. After the restoration of Constantinople, Michael VIII, the emperor of Byzantine wanted to save the empire through religious power in order to get peace with the West. Under the emperor's pressure, the Eastern Church accepted what the Western Church wanted: the primacy of the Pope, and the Union of the two Churches at the Council of Lyons in 1274. Especially they agreed the addition of the *filioque* in the Creed, which caused to divide the Church into West and East in 1054. It immediately brought fierce anger to the majority of the Eastern people (Galli 1997:19).

The overwhelming majority of the Eastern Christians fiercely rejected the Union. The emperor's sister remarked, "I would rather see the Muslim turban in the midst of the city than the Latin mitre" after the Council of Lyons in 1274 (Ware 1964: 81). The Unification of Lyons touched off so alarming a crisis in the Byzantine Empire that the successor of Michael VIII, Andronicus II denounced it in 1282 (Diehl 1957:223).

A second reunion was held at Ferrara in 1438. Both the West and the East Churches attempted to heal the rift. However the real reason for this was not the religious matter but the political, for significant needs against the Turks. Diehl (1957: 174) comments that the emperor of the Eastern Empire, John VIII, appealed to the West for help, but they would only consider sending aid in return for reuniting the Churches. The Eastern Patriarch, Joseph II, and the delegation considered their national situation because the empire became desperate. The only hope of defeating the Turks lay in help from the West. Thus the Eastern delegations once again accepted the papal claims; the doctrine of purgatory, the *filioque* and using unleavened bread in the Eucharist.

Therefore the two Churches were declared to be officially reunited at the Council of Florence in 1439 (Galli 1997:19). The West celebrated their victory, whereas those of the Orthodox persuasion would not accept Roman Catholicism. After the delegates returned, most of clergy and laity of the East were totally opposed to the decree of union (Freely 1967:172-173). The people of Constantinople hooted at and insulted the prelates who had signed the convention, accusing them of having “sold their Church and their country for a little gold.” The thirteenth and fifteenth century’s attempts at reunion were of purely political character. It is clear that the Eastern Church leaders concerned themselves with political issues, to the detriment of their spiritual calling (Diehl 1957:223). Lastly, we should consider the significant matter of Islam.

Interestingly the Eastern Church did not take seriously Islam as a theological issue. John of Damascus warned and Theodore Abu Qûrra formulated the standard apologetic arguments against Islam in the eighth century. However it seems that the Eastern Church leaders could not see the danger of Islam against the Church. Thus they treated Islam lightly as ‘one of Christian heresies’ (Pelikan 1978: 243). Yet the Latin theologians recognized and identified Islam out rightly as “pagan”. They discovered its distractive character starting in the twelfth century and Peter the Venerable translated the Koran into Latin and said, “The heresy of Mohammed” as “The dregs of all heresies” (Pelikan 1978:242).

- The Byzantine Empire -



Map 1- Source: Encarta. *Map of Byzantine Empire*. The map shows us how the Byzantine Empire declined. Christians lived with the Ottoman Turks in Asia Minor since late of the 11th century, and was captured by the Ottoman Turks in 1453.

It was a serious mistake that Byzantines were more concerned about the territorial expansion of the Turks rather than the religion of Islam's expansion. In view of the results, the Eastern Church leaders did not teach the parishioners what Islam was, though many Byzantines have lived with Moslem Turks in Asia Minor from the late eleventh century (Freely 1996: 133). If they had awaked to a sense of the teachings of Islam, they would not have had to face the tragic scene of Christian young men fighting their Christian brothers in their homeland.

From the Christian point of view, it was tragic that Mehmet, the Conqueror of the Ottoman Turks diligently trained his janissaries from among those who were born to the Sultan's Christian subjects. Every Christian family in Turkish dominions was forced to hand over any male child demanded by Sultan's officials, who were then brought up as Muslims. Most of them were destined for the Sultan's guard regiments. They had their own barracks, were forbidden to marry, and constituted an *élite*, religious military fraternity, with ideals of service. By the time of the last conflict with the Byzantines, the Sultan Mehment placed the converted Christian young men at the front of the Ottoman army as janissaries to kill their own brothers (Sherrard 1967: 167-168).

2.4.2.2 The Christian character deteriorated

It is not difficult to find out why Christianity was hated in the medieval era. Historical records show us how it was served as a vehicle for one of the most tragic events that happened in the history of the Church, the Crusades, which was designed and carried out by the Church leaders such as Pope Gergory VII, Pope Urban II and Bernard of Clairvaux (Sherrard 1967:164-165). They called it a Holy War, which was generated to rescue the holy places in Palestine and defend Christians of the East against Muslims (Latourette 1974a: 317).

However, it is significant that as Roper (1966: 112,120, 131) states, the social background of the Crusades was not religion; religion only consecrated and canalized a great movement of social expansion. The real cause of the Crusades should be understood in terms of one expression 'new dynamism', which emerged from the explosion of population, the exploitation of new resources, and the sudden expansion of feudal monasticism during the period of 1050-1250. The Byzantine emperor, Alexius I made an appeal for help to the East to Pope Urban II early in the 1090s because Muslims had conquered large areas of the Byzantine Empire.

The West responded to it in 1095; Pope Urban II exhorted the West at the Council of Clermont to act against the Muslim invaders (Galli 1997:17). Then all classes of the society united and launched Crusades against the opponents of which Peter the Hermit led the First Crusade in 1096 (Sherrard 1967:164-165).

The Holy war continued for centuries. However, the Fourth Crusade of the 1204 in which the Western Christians left an unforgettable memory in the life of the Eastern Christians. The Fourth Crusade, which was ordered by Pope Innocent III in 1203, originally dispatched for Egypt and the Holy Land, was diverted to Constantinople (Sherrard 1967:165). The first reason for the diversion was that the Venetian businessmen, who helped finance the crusade and wanted to destabilize the Byzantine situation for their own gain, persuaded the Crusaders. The second reason came from the Byzantine emperor, Alexius IV Angelus who wanted to restore himself and his father to the Byzantine throne (Freely 1966: 144-145). But the Western intervention did not go well. This is because the Westerners were disgusted with Byzantine politics, lost patience and they sacked Constantinople in three days. Galli describes the terrible days of Constantinople:

“Mobs of soldiers rushed down the streets and through the houses, they snatched everything that glittered and destroyed whatever they could not carry-neither monasteries nor churches nor libraries were spared. In the Hagia Sophia, the most glorious church in Christendom, drunken soldiers tore down silk hangings and pulled the great silver iconostasis to pieces. For three days, the appalling scenes continued, till the great and the beautiful city was a shambles” (Galli 1997:18).

We surely understand why the people of Byzantium hated those who came to them in the name of Christ and destroyed their life. People suffered at the hands of their fellow Christians. The Crusade was begun in the name of the Lord; but it was ended with unforgettable wounds. Galli (1997:18) cites what Steven Runciman wrote; “The Crusaders bear the Cross of Christ on their shoulders, but brought not peace but a sword.” The people of Byzantine said after the fourth Crusade, “Even the Saracens [Muslims] are merciful and kind (Ware 1964: 81).

That is why Latourette (1974a: 318) says that the Crusades both hindered and facilitated the advance of Islam and proved both help and an obstacle to the spread of Christianity. The Crusades probably accentuated the bitterness between Muslims and Christians and led to the identification of Christianity with military and imperialistic ambitions. It was “the military process did not belong to the Christian doctrine” (Pelikan 1978: 243).

Moreover we agree with Roger Bacon who said, “The infidel should be converted, not attacked” (Latourette 1974a: 319). One of the reasons why the Byzantine Christians were so tolerant towards Islam comes from the attitude of the Muslims to Christians. They showed courtesy to Christians. During the Crusades, Christians often experienced how Muslims were tolerant (Latourette 1974a: 318). Acceptance of the Islam meant the end of heavier taxes under the empire and more relaxed about human nature than was the Puritanism within Orthodox, which encouraged the total renunciation of the world (Edwards 1997:117).

Furthermore, the Byzantines had been in close contact with the Muslims in political and commercial ties during the Palaeologus period. At times the Byzantine Emperors asked Ottoman Turks for advice, established an alliance, and intermarried with royal families (Freely 161, 165).

2.4.2.3 Disproportionate in Christian life

The Eastern Church leaders led their parishioners to the mystical way of Christian life. This is apparent specifically in the area of the doctrine of eschatology. According to Bosch (2005:197), in the subsequent centuries, the original eschatological expectation was further devitalized by mysticism. The reason was that apocalyptic expectations were thwarted by the delay of the *parousia*. Then the primitive Christians’ ardor for vital Christian living in the expectation of Christ’s coming dissipated. Thus the preachers usually chose their topics such God’s immanent reign and the proclamation of the only true and universal religion of mankind (Rütti 1972:128). And God’s promises yet to be fulfilled were replaced by faith in the already consummated eternal kingdom of Christ (Bosch 2005:196).

The early Church Apologists such Papias, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr did not appeal to Paul. Hellenistic Christians heard only Paul’s moral injunctions, not Paul’s apocalyptic hermeneutic. As the result of this theological mood, the historical continuity between the Old and the New Testaments was disregarded and inherent historical hermeneutical connection between the two testaments ignored. Historical thinking increasingly made way for metaphysical categories, which meant that believers were no longer concerned about the distinction between “this age” and “the age to come” (Beker 1980:342). Within this process, Origen interpreted the reign of God in terms of the apprehension of a spiritual reality, or as the seeds of truth implanted in the

soul. Preaching came to focus on the topic of God and the individual soul, without having anything to say about the relation of the gospel to nature and the structures of this world (Bosch 2005:197). The biblical doctrine of eschatology and expectations about the future encounters nearly disappeared. From the Eastern point of view, to escape the perpetual threat of hell, many good deeds had to be performed, many prayers poured forth, and the intercession of many saints invoked (Bosch 2005:198). Much of this development manifested during the Medieval Age. In Eastern Christian practice, meditation and contemplation were the paths to knowledge of God, rather than the accomplishment of a prescribed course of academic study of Christian teaching. For the Eastern Church, knowing God means communion with Him.

In other words, living in mystical devotion to God is the only pathway to knowing God. For this reason Evagrius says, “If you are a theologian, you will pray truly. And if you pray truly, you are a theologian” (Payton 2007:60). It was obvious that the climax of mystical theology took place in the Palaeologan period, the last dynasty of the Byzantine Empire. The Christians grasped the mystical traditions, and paradoxically as the empire shrank into a fraction of its former territory due to the relentless expansion of the Turks, revived cultural and spiritual movements. According to Cunningham (2000: 102), numerous texts were composed or rewritten during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries: Eulogies, spiritual treatises, letters and sermons. Also many spiritual teachers appeared such as Theodore Metochites, Theolptos of Philadelphia, and Nikephoros Gregoras.

The so-called Palaeologan renaissance produced numerous examples of icons, ivories and beautiful fresco and mosaic decorations. Monasteries flourished and magnificent Churches were built in this period. Cenobitic houses for both men and women existed as havens and many lay people received spiritual advice from monastic spiritual fathers or mothers. The Eastern Christians looked for the Lord through the mystical traditions; the *hesychast* mysticism became most popular after the restoration of 1261 (Hill 2007:154). It seems that Christians lost their identity because of the political situations and found a refuge for themselves in mysticism. Hesychasts dedicated themselves in contemplation and the constant prayer of “Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me” for experiences of union with God (Meyendorff 1982: 167). The Eastern Church forgot the original eschatological expectation and apocalyptic ideas dissipated. Church fathers led their parishioners to a radical spiritualization of the Christ event, in that Jesus’

resurrection and exaltation was a completed event. Hence believers more focused on heaven rather than on this world and God's involvement in history (Bosch 2005:196). The perception of urgent and immediate crisis was disregarded. Preachers did not mention the cosmic expectation of "a new heaven and a new earth." Whilst the biblical story is the account of God in real human history and expectations of future encounters, the Christ event is rooted in God's history with Israel and the coming of Jesus is God's eschatological act that has already been inaugurated, yet incomplete. Jesus' resurrection and exaltation signify just the beginning of the universal fulfillment still to come (Bosch 2005:196-197). The Church leaders ignored their contemporary situations and guided their flocks to escape from the reality. This is because the period of Palaeologan dynasty, the society of the empire was so mixed and full of holy lunatics, who were living well on charity. Freely (1996: 138-139) cites what John Tzetzes (1110-1180) wrote in twelfth century:

"Every disgusting and thrice-accursed wretch like you only has to put on a monastic habit or rope or chain around his neck- in short to dress himself up to look self-effacing in an ostentatious and highly calculated air of artless simplicity. Immediately the city of Constantinople showers him with honours and the rogue is publicly feted as a saint above the apostle, above the martyrs."

Freely (1996: 161) also cites what John Cantacuzenus wrote in his *Historia* in 1341:

"All the cities joined in this rebellion against the aristocracy, and those that were late in doing so made up for their lost time by excelling the example set them by others. They perpetuated all manner of inhumanity and even massacres. Senseless impulse was glorified with the name of valorous and lack of feeling or human sympathy was called loyalty to the emperor."

It is clear that the Eastern Church fathers did not teach their parishioners according to the whole view of Scripture and balanced theological teachings (Latourette 1974a: 442; Edwards 1997:118). They taught their parishioners whatever they thought was appropriate and seemed to be compatible with mysticism. Furthermore, bishops and clergy did not teach their juniors who should live according to the teaching of the Word of God and should overcome the difficult situations as disciples of Jesus Christ. The Christians in the Byzantine Empire preferred to run away from the real world and attempted to attain individual goodness through the "Lord's prayer" in the cells or caves, instead of to live as "the salt of the earth and the light of the world" (Mt. 5:16). As Christians they were supposed to play their part to reform the decomposing society, but they failed. They satisfied themselves by their union with God in their mystical traditions.

2.5 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter we have attempted to find reasons for the decline of Christianity during the 11th - 15th century. We saw that the Eastern Church was not independent; it was subordinate to the state. This, unfortunately, led some Church leaders to compromise with the political power for personal gain. The compromised Church leaders wielded enormous power. This power caused their spiritual deterioration as they neglected their responsibilities. Clergymen's life was no different from that of the non-believing community. They were accused that their intentions were not evangelical virtues, but were devoted to their own enrichment. The teaching of the whole of Scripture and balanced theological teachings were ignored. The Eastern Church avoided the original eschatological expectation and apocalyptic ideas dissipated. Church leaders led their parishioners to a radical spiritualization of the Christ event. Faith in God's promise yet to be fulfilled was replaced by faith in the already consummated eternal kingdom of Christ. Further, the true meaning of the gospel in which they explained why God and the Christ came to earth became lost. The Eastern Church leaders approached the scriptural commentaries timidly lacking criticism or curiosity. They believed the Bible as a verbal icon of Christ. This lack of teaching of the Scripture led to the weakening of their faith. . .

We also have seen how the Eastern Church could not recognize the right character of the children of God, and how Christianity could be expanded. The Church leaders did not make efforts to feed themselves and other believers under their care spiritual food or even to correct the low moral standards as God's chosen ones. The church leaders made a tragic decision that the expansion of Christianity must be through fighting against the Muslims, which is called 'Crusades'. The Crusades disgraced Christianity. The Christians hated each other; Byzantines hated the Western Christians who destroyed Constantinople in the name of Christ. In addition, they welcomed the Muslims saying, "I would rather see the Muslim turban in the midst of the city than the Latin mitre" after the Council of Lyons in 1274. That is the reason why scholars firmly say that expanding Christianity ought to be through evangelizing, but not the process of military. Therefore, even though the Byzantines geographically had various military invasions, and Muslims advance, the Eastern Church herself was deteriorated inwardly. It seems that this was the major reason to the decline of Christianity in the Byzantine Empire.

CHAPTER 3

CHRISTIANITY IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE WITH EMPHASIS ON THE 19th - 20th CENTURIES

3.1 Introduction

After the Ottoman Turks conquered the Byzantine Empire, the situation in the country changed dramatically. When Sultan Mehmet II made his triumphal entry into Constantinople, the conqueror rode directly to Hagia Sophia, the Great Church where he fell to his knees towards Mecca and worshiped *Allah*, the Muslim god in the afternoon of Tuesday 29 May 1453. He then declared that the Great Church was converted to Islamic worship under the name of Aya Sofya Camii Kabir and the name of Constantinople also changed into Istanbul³ (Freely 1996:181). It was a sign that the splendid Christian era had ended and that the Islamic period of dominance had begun in the land of Turkey.

This chapter will focus on how the minority of Christians lived and will also observe the missionary works in the late Ottoman Empire during the 19th –20th centuries. Therefore we will take a look at the minority Christians in Ottoman Empire and analyze the cause of the decline. At the same time we will also try to discover what kind of work missionaries did and why the missionary work ceased early in the 20th century.

3.2 The minority Christians in the Ottoman Empire

The Christian communities were radically affected within the Ottoman Empire. It had not been easy for the Greeks to accept the situation that had been granted as God's providential dispensation, but now the 'God-protected city' had fallen, and the Greeks were under the rule of the infidel. Paradoxically, the Christians would endure the dishonorable situation by the Muslim Turks who treated their Christian subjects with remarkable generosity (Ware 1964:96). The Christians also remembered that the Muslims were far more tolerant towards Christianity than

³ Although the Conqueror Mehmet II had changed the city's name, under the Ottoman Empire the city went through several name changes such Konstantiniye, Polis, Istimpol, Estanbol,. The name was officially changed to Istanbul in 1930 (Istanbul Tours 2004). The name "Constantinople" will be used throughout this study.

Western Roman Christians towards the Muslims during the Crusades (Latourette 1974a: 318). The reason for this was that Islam regards the Bible as a holy book and Jesus Christ as a prophet. From the Muslim's point of view, the Christian religion was incomplete but not entirely false. Christians were being 'People of the Book', and should not be treated the same as mere pagans (Ware 1964: 96). Before the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the Greeks had called Sultan Mehmet II 'the precursor of Antichrist and the second Sennacherib', yet they found that the practice of his rule was very different in character than what they had imagined. The Christians were able to continue without interference in the observance of their faith and were to undergo no persecution. Thus they submitted quietly to the power of Islam (Ware 1964:97).

The Ottoman Empire governed the non-Muslims with two systems: (1) *devşirm*, (2) *millet*.

(1) The *devşirm* system: From the Christian point of view, one of the most damaging practices of the Ottomans was the *devşirme* system; Walters (1999:285) states that "*devşirme* was the compulsory regular enrolment of Christian boys into the military and administrative service of the empire. They were required to become Muslims and learn Turkish, and were not allowed to marry." Although it was widely resented, many of poor families sent their children because these young men could rise to the highest positions in the civil service or in the government. Most of them were destined for the Sultan's guard regiments. Paradoxically, they supported Islam more fanatically than the Turks themselves (Latourette 1974b:71).

(2) The *millet* -nation- system: This was the system that "a millet was a religio-political community defined by its adherence to a religion", each headed by its own religious leader. Soon after Mehmet II conquered the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Emperor, he encouraged the return of those Greeks who had fled from Constantinople before the city fell. He showed how Christians were assured a definite place in the Turkish order of society. Indeed, the sultan established a new system in terms of *millets*, which was continued to the end of the Ottoman Empire and became an instrument of government policy for the multi-ethnic character of the Ottoman state. There were four major millets in the Ottoman Empire: the Muslim millet, the Greek millet, the Armenian millet, and the Jewish millet (Freely 1996:182-183). From the Islamic point of view, there was no distinction between religion and politics. If Christianity was to be recognized as an independent religious faith, it was necessary for Christians to be organized

as an independent political unit. Therefore Mehmet II appointed patriarchs who were granted social and civil governing rights over their *millets* in specific areas. The Armenians *en masse* were brought from Bursa and Asia Minor, giving them their own quarter in Samatya, making them a counterbalance to the Greeks in the capital (Papazian 1987:9). Thus Ware (1964: 98) identifies the *millet* system as “Empire within Empire”.

The founder of Islam, Muhammad, instituted the *dhimmi*⁴ and power of Islam. Within the *dhimmi* law, they created a concept of *dhimmīs*. It usually specified that the conquered “people of the Book” (Jews and Christians) were protected by the state on the conditions of contract in these areas: life, religion, and property. Thereupon the *millets* lived in those areas, which were near the Muslim communities so that they could carry out societal responsibilities for the Muslim neighbours (Papazian 1987:9). The Ottoman Empire ruled that non-Muslim communities essentially had a contract. The basis of the contract was the recognition by the *dhimmīs* of the supremacy of Islam and the dominance by the state. They must accept a position of subordination, symbolized by certain social restrictions and by the payment of a poll (*jizya*) tax to which Muslims were not subject (Lewis 1995:210-211).

According to *dhimmīs* system, non-Muslims were not allowed to have weapons, which made them easy prey for Turks and Kurds, and were not allowed to ride horses when a Muslim was passing by or build houses taller than any Turk’s or ring their church bells (Waterfield 2004: 328). There were more burdens for the Armenians, who must allow, in terms of the *kishlak*- (winter-quartering obligation) - Kurds and Turks to quarter themselves, their families and cattle in Armenian homes during the long winter months (Balakian 2003:9-10).

As Ware (1964:97) says, the Christians soon realized that Christianity under Islam became a second- class religion, and its adherents’ second-class citizens. As second-class citizens, non-Muslims were in important respects worse off than free Muslims; rulers gave them a sense of inferiority, which they were not allowed to forget. They could not testify before Muslim courts; like slaves and women they were viewed as inferior to Muslims. The *millets* were not allowed to serve in the army as a Christian, were forbidden to marry Muslim women, and wore distinctive

⁴ Based upon the Quran, the concept comes from *dhimma*, which means covenant. The term *dhimi* means a covenanted person of Allah by which their legitimate right shall be safeguarded. (Badawi Jamal 2006:2).

dress. Muslims usually looked at them contemptuously, and slightly called Christians *gavur*, meaning “infidel” and “unbeliever” (Balakian 2003:26). The transition from Christianity to Islam had already begun from the fifteenth century and seems to have reached its height in the seventeenth century. The converts to Islam were drawn from all sections of society. Many from the ruling classes abandoned the Christ for the Prophet. Among them were several members of the imperial family of the Paleologi. A large number of the clergy became Muslims. Throngs from the lower and middle classes made the exchange of faith. Eventually the process of the attrition of the Eastern Christian churches by Islam was evident everywhere in the seventeenth century (Latourette 1974b: 72).

3.2.1 The Church under the Islamic authority

In this discussion, we will briefly examine the Church under the Ottoman Empire in order to gain a deeper understanding of the Christian Church during the 19th – 20th centuries. Much of the information gleaned comes from Ware (1964). Like the Byzantine Emperor, the Ottoman Sultan himself became a protector of the Orthodox Church. As a champion of Islam, he ceremonially invested himself with his pastoral staff, taking over the role once exercised by the Christian Emperor. Mohammed II appointed patriarchs and the Orthodox Church became a civil as well as religious institution. The ecclesiastical structure was taken over in *toto* as an instrument of secular administration. Thereupon the bishops became government officials. The Patriarch was not only the spiritual leader of the Church, but also the civil head of their nations and was responsible for family affairs, marriage, public instruction, charities, worship, clergy, and ecclesiastical administration. The civil and political life organized completely around the Church (Ware 1964: 97-98).

Later on this ecclesiastical structure made parishioners confused between Orthodoxy and nationalism. The office of Patriarch was vacant, so Sultan Mehmet II deliberately chose a monk, Gennadius, and placed him on the Patriarchal throne because he had anti-Latin conviction. When Gennadius was consecrated, the sultan personally escorted him at the beginning of the procession to the church of the Holy Apostles. Then Mehmet II declared an imperial decree that ‘no one should vex or disturb him’.

The Gregorian bishop of Bursa, Hovakim, governed the Armenian *millet* and the first chief rabbi was Moshe Capsali. Likewise, Genoese were also allowed to worship as they pleased and to retain their Roman Catholic Church (Freely 1996:184). Although the Ottoman political policy divided the subjects along lines of the three religions - Islam, Christianity, and Judaism - the Christians were also divided into two broad and inclusive groups based on their profession of faith (Papazian 1987:9).

- 1) The Greek Orthodox Church; Patriarch was appointed from their own *millet* of Greeks, and bore the responsibility for churches including the Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbians, Syrians, Melkites and Arabs.
- 2) The Orthodox monophysites; the Armenian Patriarch bore the responsibility for churches comprising of the Armenians, Syrians Chaldaeans, Copts, Georgians, and Abyssinians.

The Christian Church under the Ottoman Empire was faced with two serious matters: Firstly, the Christians were allowed to exist in peace, but limitations were placed on their activities. The Church was restricted with all kind of religious affairs from which Church buildings and monasticism being restricted: church members could repair old churches but not build new ones for worship (Walters 1999: 286).

The Church was allowed to undertake no evangelical works and theology lost originality and vigour. It was a crime to convert a Muslim to the Christian faith. Moreover charitable and educational work was reduced to a minimum, and many parish clergy were illiterate. There was every inducement for a Christian to apostatize to Islam (Ware 1964:97).

Secondly, the *millet* system caused confusion between faith (Orthodoxy) and nationalism among the Christians. The *millet* system made possible the survival of Greek nationalism as a distinctive unit through four centuries of alien rule. It was also impossible to distinguish between Church and nation for the Greeks (Ware 1964: 98). For the other *millet* of Armenians, in the late nineteenth century, the Armenian Church also actively played a political part in establishing the Armenian National Constitution in 1863(Papazian 1987:10). It was inevitable that the church governed the community because of the *millet* system. It would bring the tragedy of the first Armenian "Genocide" in the 1890s (Balakian 2003:53).

3.2.1.1 The Greek Orthodox Church

Gennadius, the first Greek Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople in the Ottoman Empire, took office on 1 January 1454. He was undoubtedly chosen because of his opposition to the policy of a union with Rome in the later years of the Byzantine era. The sultan offered him the privilege of being unmolested, tax-free, unoppressed by an adversary; he was to be primary in all the bishops. However, under the authority of the Ottoman Empire the Greek Church was not the same as during former eras. The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate time after time moved before it settled in its present quarters at the church of St George in Fener, the Greek quarter (Freely 1996:184).

The patriarchate became part of the institutionalized corruption under the Ottoman system. The bishops of the Greek Church fell prey to ambition and financial greed, being involved in worldly affairs and political matters. Each new Patriarch required a *berat*⁵ from the sultan before he could assume office, and he was obliged to pay heavily for this document. The Patriarch recovered his expenses from the episcopate, by exacting a fee from each bishop before instituting him in his diocese; the bishop in turn taxed the parish clergy, and the clergy taxed their parishioners who bore the final burden (Ware 1964: 99).

Thus everything was for sale in the Ecumenical Patriarchate under the Turks who virtually sold the throne of Patriarch to the highest bidder. That was the reason why the patriarchal throne was removed and reinstated with kaleidoscopic rapidity. Out of 159 Patriarchs who have held office between the fifteenth and the twentieth century, the Turks have on 105 occasions driven Patriarchs from their throne; there have been 27 abdications, often involuntary; 6 Patriarchs have suffered violent deaths by hanging, poisoning, or drowning; and only 21 have died natural deaths while in office. The same man sometimes held office on four or five different occasions, and there were usually several ex-Patriarchs watching restively in exile for a chance to return to the throne.

The extreme insecurity of the Patriarch naturally gave rise to continual intrigues among the Metropolitans of the Holy Synod who hoped to succeed him, and the leaders of the Church were

⁵ Berat is a kind of document issued by the Ottoman emperors in order to grant a privilege, or to confer the right to possession of a property belonging to the state. This Islamic term appears in the Quran twice and the meaning is salvation, immunity or kind of warranty (Gök 2001).

usually separated into bitterly hostile parties (Ware 1964: 99). The Greek Patriarchs in Constantinople engaged in trade and were relatively rich. They were therefore able to buy all the lucrative ecclesiastical and civil appointments open to Christians in the Ottoman Empire, using ecumenism as a cover for promoting ecclesiastical Hellenism. The office of Patriarch was soon obtainable only by means of a massive bribe to the grand vizier, and although Patriarchs theoretically enjoyed tenure for life, the sultan replaced them at whim. In the seventeenth century the office changed hands some 60 times. Therefore the Patriarchate of Constantinople suffered an inward decay, and its power had never been extended (Walters 1999: 286-287).

Further, the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire were denied the heroic ways of witnessing to others of their faith because of unrelenting social pressure. Indeed, the policy of the Ottoman state strongly contributed to the diminishing of the Christian population. It was a significant issue that Christians frequently stood at the crossroad because conversion to Islam was an alternative to torture and death during the Ottoman period. Thus little by little the religious profile of Asia Minor was altered. By the fifteenth century many Greek priests who lived in Asia Minor fled to the safety of Constantinople and over 90 percent of the population in Asia Minor was made up of Christians converted to Islam (Riddell & Cotterell 2003:93,109).

As Constantelos (2004:3, 4) indicates, “There were political, economic and social motives”, which contributed to apostasy from Christianity to Islam. All three motives were related to the organizational structure of the Ottoman State. There was a noticeable phenomenon; a number of Christians were converted to Islam on their own initiative. Islam's simple and direct monotheism, its unphilosophical theology, and its doctrine of predestination, as well as the sensuous promises of heaven, might have appealed especially to the simple-minded.

Numerous Christians saw the military triumph of the Turks as a sign that God might be on the side of the Prophet, and that the Muslims were right in their claim that their faith was superior to Christianity. It seems that many of those who were nominal Christians welcomed the economic, political, and social opportunities as well as the other promises of Islam to make them convert to Islam. We are shown how Christians who lived in the Ottoman era, even though legally “the people of the Book” –Jews and Christians- were to be tolerated (Latourette 1974b: 71). Constantelos (2004:5) tells us a tragic episode quoting from a French traveler Antoine Galland:

“Today the Turks did a perfidy to a young Greek (Nicholas of Karpenision) who was tutored by a Turk. ...They asked the Turkish teacher to turn a book over to his young student asking him to read it aloud. They wanted to learn for themselves whether the young Greek could read Turkish fluently. Unsuspicious of the trick, the youth read the paper aloud. No sooner had he finished than the Turks immediately seized him and took him before a judge. They testified that the Greek youth had read in their presence the Moslem creed, the *Salabati*; therefore, he was expected to become a Moslem. In protest the young man answered ...that he had no intention of changing his Christian faith: The judge ordered that the youth be put to torture... he was thrown into prison where he was kept for a month, refusing to apostatize. He must have been between the age of 18 and 20 when he was beheaded on September 2, 1674.”

Religion was not merely an expression of individual faith, but also a definition of human behaviour and a manifestation of the individual's place in the state. Thus Islamization meant Turkization. A convert to Islam who decided to return to the Christian faith was perceived not only as an apostate, but also as a traitor to the Ottoman state (Constantelos 2004:4).

From the conquest of Constantinople to the last phase of the Greek War of Independence, the Ottoman Turks condemned to death 11 Ecumenical Patriarchs of Constantinople, nearly 100 bishops, and several thousands of priests, deacons and monks. Many preferred martyrdom to apostasy, and of the above thousands, several have been canonized and raised to sainthood by the Greek Orthodox Church. (Constantelos 2004:3).

It was a fact that Ottoman Empire's advance was not only at the expense of Eastern Christians, but also the Ottomans reigned as the supreme heads of the Muslim domains in the Near East. Sunni Muslims everywhere looked to the authority of the caliph in Constantinople, a city undergoing a metamorphosis from its former identity as Christian Constantinople. From the conqueror Sultan Mehmet II, emperors of Ottoman Empire founded numerous mosques, and *külliyes*- the mosque complexes- that consisted of medreses (theological schools), hospice, public kitchen, hospital, caravanserai, primary school, library, public bath, market, and a graveyard. One of well-known complex is the Eyüp mosque, which is the third most sacred place in the Islamic world after Mecca and Jerusalem (Freely 1996:185-186).

From the Christian point of view, it was a sad account that Atik Sinan, whose Greek name was Christodoulos and who converted to Islam, founded a number of famous mosques and transformed churches into mosques during the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries (Freely 2000:185, 355).

3.2.1.1.1 Theological controversy

Under the Ottoman Turks, two opposite tendencies appeared in the Greek Orthodox Church: “conservatism” and “westernization”. On the one hand, the great aim of the Greek Orthodox Church was survival; to conserve Orthodoxy in hope of better days to come through Paul’s words “Guard the deposit: keep safe what has been entrusted to you” (1 Timothy 6: 20). They were usually content to repeat accepted formulae, to entrench themselves in the position which they had inherited from the past. Though seeking to maintain the Orthodox tradition substantially unimpaired, inevitably they were influenced by the western theology, during the 17th-18th centuries (Ware 1964:100-101).

Greeks who wished for a higher education were obliged to travel to the non- Orthodox world and to maintain a good standard of scholarship under Ottoman rule. Among the distinguished Greek theologians who were self-taught, the majority of them had been trained in the west under Roman Catholic or Protestant schools. The Greeks students in the west read the early Church Fathers under the non-Orthodox professors (Ware 1964:101-102). Thus Gregory Palamas was still read, for his spiritual teaching, by the monks of Athos. Inevitably, theological confusion emerged from the Greek Orthodox Church. The reason for this was that those who studied in the West looked at theology through western spectacles, whereas the great majority remained fundamentally Orthodox. Thereupon Orthodox theology divided into two broad groups that were the ‘Latinizers’ and the ‘Protestantizers’ in the Ottoman era.

Tradition was at times distorted by being forced into alien moulds, but not wholly destroyed. The influence of westernization in the Orthodox Church was not only from those who studied outside of their homeland, but also from in the Ottoman Empire itself. The forces of the Reformation Movement reached to the borders of Russia and the Turkish Empire. Many missionaries have worked in the Ukraine and Istanbul with both Roman Catholics and Protestants since 1573 (Ware 1964:102-103).

Latourette (1974b: 77) sheds light on the religious complexion of Europe and expansion of Christianity, which spread outside of Europe between A.D. 1500 and A.D. 1800. Calvinism also temporarily affected the Greek Orthodox Church under the Patriarch Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638).

He devoted his full time to combating the Roman Catholic influence when he became Patriarch of Constantinople, and created conflicts in the Church as he was leaning on Calvin's doctrine. Cyril first published "*Confession*" at Geneva in 1629, which was distinctively Calvinist in much of its teaching (Ware 1964:106). Then Orthodox hierarchs immediately repudiated his Calvinism, and his distinctive work of *Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith* was condemned as "the wicked new iconoclast" at Constantinople in 1638 (Pelikan 1974: 285). The local Councils condemned the view of Cyril no less than six times between 1638 and 1691. Turkish janissaries finally strangled Cyril Lukaris after he had been five times deposed from office and five times reinstated.

In a violent reaction, two fellow theologians of Cyril, Peter of Moghila and Dositheus of Jerusalem, debated with him and produced *Confessions*. Peter wrote *Orthodox Confession* in 1640, which was based on Roman Catholic manuals. Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, also answered Cyril's *Confession* point by point with conciseness and clarity, and the Council of Jerusalem in 1672, ratified his "Confession" (Ware 1964:106-107). Dositheus relied heavily upon Latin sources in his writings (under the circumstances), but the faith that he defended with these Latin terms were not for the Roman Catholic, but Orthodox. Thus his *Confession* is regarded as a document of primary importance in the history of modern Orthodox theology.

However, this ongoing theological conflict forced Eastern theologians and churchmen to reaffirm the traditional dogmas, but more accurately (Ware 1964:108). The Eastern confessions of the seventeenth century recapitulated several major doctrines and attached their additional formulations to this recapitulation. As a result, the Eastern doctrine during the seventeenth century was the repetition of ancient truths in ancient words by Maximus Confessor or John of Damascus and the response to contemporary challenges in words appropriate to them (Pelikan 1974: 287).

The Orthodox was forced to think more carefully about the sacraments, and about the nature and authority of the Church that the seventeenth century Councils achieved. At the end of the eighteenth century, an important spiritual revival occurred on the Mount Athos. A monk, Nicodemus of the Holy Mountain, compiled an anthology of spiritual writings called the *Philokalia* with the help of Makarius, published at Venice in 1782 (Ware 1964:109).

It was a gigantic work of 1,207 folio pages, containing authors from the fourth century to the fifteenth, and dealing chiefly with the theory and practice of prayer, especially the 'Jesus prayer'. His remarkable work, Ware (1964:110) says, is "one of most influential publications in Orthodox history, and has been widely read not only by monks but also by many living in the world". The Ottoman period, although there were innumerable discouragements and many cases of apostasy to Islam, the Orthodox Church never lost heart. The Greek Christians were not lacking in martyrs, who were honoured in the Church's calendar with the special title of New Martyrs (Ware 1964:111).

3.2.1.2 The Armenian Church

The history of the Armenian Church and nation is somewhat different from that of others. Throughout its history, Armenians have suffered centuries of wars over their original homeland. This is because of their geographical position between the Eastern world and Western: Persian or Arab and Byzantium, they were subjected to a dual influence (Diehl 1957:273). Inevitably the Church also moved in response to successive invasions and foreign occupations of Armenia over the centuries, from which divided into two catholicisates, one at Echmiadzin in the Armenia and one in Cilicia (Walters 1999:289).

The head of the Armenian Church is called Catholicos. It is derived from the Greek word *Katholikos*, which means Universal. St. Gregory the Illuminator, the first Catholicos of all Armenians was still subordinate to the See of Caesarea in Cappadocia and the chief bishops of Georgia and Albania, although dependent on the Catholicos of Armenia (Tchilingirian & Onany 1996:9, 13). The scale of the hierarchy: 1) clerks; 2) deacons; 3) priests; 4) archpriests; 5) archimandrites or doctors; 6) bishops; 7) patriarchs; and 8) catholicos (Atiya 1968:347).

Indeed, Armenia is the oldest Christian country in the world. They had officially adopted Christianity in A.D.301. According to Armenian tradition, the Armenian Church is one of Apostolic Succession and was established by the Apostles Bartholomew (an Apostle) and Thaddeus (one of Seventy) (Papazian 1987:3-4). The Armenian Bible was completely translated, which were the Old Testament from the Greek Septuagint and the New Testament from the Syriac Peshitta in 433 (Atiya 1968:325, 347). The Armenian Church struggled with the Byzantine Orthodox Church in a significant matter of Christology since the Council of Chalcedon in 451,

where the dispute concerned the way in which the natures of Christ were properly described. The Armenian Church argued that the language of Chalcedon, defining the person of Jesus Christ as "in two natures," destroyed the unity of divinity and humanity in Christ (Crego 1996:2). The reason for the refusal to accept the decision of Chalcedon was political rather than theological. This was mostly because it resented the lack of support from the Roman Empire when Persians invaded Armenia. The Armenian Church was not so much supporting Monophysitism in fact, but struggling against Byzantine hegemony. Thereafter the Armenian Church renamed itself 'Apostolic' and independent from the Universal Church. Under the Ottoman rule, the Armenian community of Constantinople grew rapidly and came to include all classes of society (Gonzalez 2004:343).

Armenians in the Ottoman Empire had been among the more favored subject race as the *Ermeni millet*. This was because of the Ottoman policy, on which the Ottoman government brought Armenians to Constantinople from Bursa and Asia Minor in order to make the Greek millets parallel with the Armenian community. The leadership was in the form of the Orthodox patriarch, governing the Christian community under the hegemony of the Sultan and his court officials. In 1461, the Sultan, Mehmet II appointed Georgian bishop Hovacim, whom he called from Bursa to take up residence in Constantinople as Armenian Patriarch over his millet, with privileges similar to those accorded the Greek Patriarch (Atiya 1968:336).

There had been no precedence of an Armenian bishopric in Constantinople predating Ottoman occupation of the city. During the Byzantine period, the Armenian Catholicos had not been allowed to operate in Constantinople, because the Greek Orthodox Church had regarded the Armenian Church as heretical (Diehl 1957:76).

Within the non-Muslim policy of Ottoman state, Armenians were more influential than in just their own community. They prospered with trade in the various metropolitan trade centers in the Ottoman Empire, and throughout the world- Iran, India, Russia, Poland and Egypt. Even though they lived in restricted circumstance as second-class citizens, many of them enjoyed their social, economic, cultural, and religious life particularly in Constantinople. Thereupon the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople became *per force* the most influential ecclesiastic in the Armenian Church and held spiritual primacy of all Monophysites Churches, which were the Syrians,

Chaldaeans, Copts, Georgians, and Abyssinians (Papazian 1987:9). Armenians had always played an important role in the Ottoman period in which they were active in construction, industry, medicine, money changing, such as goldsmith, and jewelers, and their traders had a strong hold on eastern trade (Shaw 1976:200). At the same time, individual clerics and church leaders did heroic work keeping alive the Armenian Christian consciousness and a spark of learning in Armenia and eastern Turkey. Yet many Armenians suffered under grinding poverty and increasingly horrifying misrule in the eastern Anatolia (Papazian 1987:9-10).

During the first 150 years of its existence, the importance of the Church was restricted to the city and its environs. Like the Greek Patriarchate, the Armenians suffered severely from intervention by the state in their internal affairs. Although there have been 115 pontificates since 1461, there have only been 84 individual Patriarchs. Karapet II served five separate pontificates (1676-79, 1680-81, 1681-84, 1686-87 and 1688-89) (Seraphim 1999:2). The rapid turnover of bishops deprived the patriarchate of political or practical significance to Armenians at large.

Even though the Church struggled with various internal problems in addition to state interference, the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople ruled over forty-five dioceses before the era of the massacres. The Armenian Church also worked hard in that they published religious literature, of which the earliest one was in 1513 at Venice. Afterwards the Armenian printing project extended from Venice and Rome to Amsterdam, Constantinople, and Etshmiadzin in Turkey.

The Catholicos Michael I sent Abgar of Tocat to Venice in 1566 in order to help with the printing of church books, and an Armenian Psalter. After two years, the Calendar, Hymnal, Horologion, and Missal were printed in Constantinople. Bishop Volskan printed the first Armenian Bible in Amsterdam in 1666. In the following century, John Golod issued more than ninety volumes of Armenian religious classics, including Gregory of Datev's *Book of Questions*. Mekhitarists also founded their press for substantial services to Armenian letters in 1729 (Atiya 1968:346, 349).

3.2.1.2.1 Doctrine of the Armenian Church

The faith of the Armenian Church is transmitted through the Church's Holy tradition which contains the Bible, liturgy and worship, writings of the church fathers, church councils, saints, canons, religious art and rituals--organically linked together- and thus form the Holy tradition of

the Church (Tchilingirian & Onany 1996:8). Just like the Greek Orthodox Church, the Armenian Church also has had theological differences and disagreements with the Church of Rome (Catholics) in the following issues such as the Filioque, Papal Supremacy and Infallibility. There are also other minor differences between these two branches of churches, such as the rules of fasting, namely a total of 157 days a year; unleavened bread at holy communion; manner of conferring confirmation; celibacy of clergy; divorce; prayer for the dead, though they do not believe in purgatory; and celebrating Christmas on January 6 (Atiya 1968:345).

The main difference between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Armenian Church has been on the issue of the Divine and Human natures of Christ. The Armenian Church fundamentally has been in line with the Alexandrian Theological School (Tchilingirian & Onany 1996:9-10). As non-Chalcedonian, the Armenian Church has recognized the first three Councils of Nicaea in 325, Constantinople in 381 and Ephesus in 431. In addition, the Armenian Church has still used a curtain to veil the sanctuary, while the Greeks have an iconostasis (Papazian 1987:5-6).

3.2.2 Revolution ages of the 19th –20th centuries

The Ottoman Empire entered a long decline both militarily against the European powers and internally, leading to an increase in corruption, repression and inefficiency since the unsuccessful campaign against Vienna, in 1683. This provoked discontent which led to disorders and occasionally rebellions (Freely 1996: 242, 247-249).

The visible decline of Ottoman power raised new hopes for the minority of non- Muslims who were also stimulated by the movement of the French Revolution. The French Embassy in Constantinople became a center of propaganda. Revolution literature was translated into the various languages of the Empire-Turkish, Arabic, Greek, and Armenian- and imported from France or printed in a press set up in the embassy grounds. Inevitably, two potent ideologies of patriotism and nationalism emerged from this new movement in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the eighteenth century (Lewis 1995: 318, 320).

With the influence of revolutionary France, the Catholic and the Protestant missionaries contributed to the minority's awakening of their identity and cultural revival in the early nineteenth century. Minority Christians could develop their own culture, languages, and

publishing the Bible in literary languages with the assistance of missionaries. It also led subjects of the Ottoman state to democratize under government pressure (Shaw 1976a: 202). The impact of European ideas of nationality was naturally stronger and more immediate among not only Christians in the Ottoman Empire, but also the Jews, the smallest and least disaffected of the non-Muslim minorities, who in time developed their own nationalism. The Christian minorities in the Ottoman state pursued three different and ultimately irreconcilable objectives during the nineteenth century. First, they sought equal citizenship in the Ottoman state. The second was independence or at least autonomy within a national territory of their own.

The third objective was the retention of the privileges of the old poll tax and renaming of the military service exemption tax, which was applied under the old order (Lewis 1995:323). The Ottoman government eventually promulgated an internal reform program. What was known as the *Tanzimat* (reorganization) reform program took place from 1839 until 1876 in order to resolve the critical situation, made apparent by numerous military defeats. There were many dangerous tensions that could lead to conflicts and demands for autonomy in the empire. It was also designed to make the civil service more accountable and efficient. Reformists hoped that the *Tanzimat* program might save their country and understood why the empire was growing weaker while neighbouring countries were growing stronger (Kjeilen 1996:1).

It was a period that replaced the *millet* system in an attempt to create more equality among the *millets* through the *Tanzimat* reform program. The first imperial edict of the *Tanzimat*, Hatt-I Sherif of Gulhane made an official declaration that everyone was to be treated equally and with respect. The second edict, Hatt-I Humayan promised equal opportunity in the administration of justice, taxation, military service, education, and government appointments including such clauses, as no one was to be permitted to assail the honour of any one. In short it promised to end prejudice and discrimination against non-Muslims (Balakian 2004:5).

3.2.2.1 Greeks

In the stream of European revolution, the position of educated and privileged Greeks within the Ottoman Empire improved in the 17th and 18th centuries. Their travels to Western Europe as merchants or diplomats brought them into contact with advanced ideas of liberalism and

nationalism. It was among the Phanariotes that the Modern Greek nationalist movement was born. A new age of independence was initiated at the beginning of 17th century in many Ottoman occupied Greek cities and towns (Walters 1999: 303; Lewis 1995: 325). A movement for Greek independence had been gathering force through the activities of a secret philhellenic organization, or Society of Friends (Freely 1996: 262-263).

The Greeks finally raised the banner of revolt against the Turks at the monastery of Ayia Lavra in the Peloponnesus on 25 March 1821. The result of this revolt was that the ecumenical patriarch Gregory V was killed by the Turkish authorities on 2 April 1821, Easter Sunday, along with some 30,000 Greeks (Walters 1999: 304). With the European powers, Russia declared war on Turkey in support of the Greeks in 1828. Eventually, Greeks obtained freedom from the Ottoman Turks in 1830, leading to the establishment of the first Greek kingdom three years later (Freely 1996: 266; Lewis 1995: 281).

Other Greek Orthodox millets -Bulgarian, all of Montenegro's people, Serbian, and Romanian- also obtained their independence according to the Treaty of Berlin 1878 (Freely 1996: 283). Yet Bulgaria paid much to the Ottoman Empire for their freedom. Some fifteen thousand Bulgarians were massacred in 1876 because of the Bulgarian uprising. Early in the twentieth century, a separate agreement between Greece and the Republic of Turkey provided for a compulsory population exchange of their minorities, in which some 1.3 million Greeks went over to Greece according to the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Nowadays, less than 3,000 Greeks live in Constantinople, and its environs (Freely 1996: 297,302).

3.2.2.2 Armenians

Armenians were the largest Christian minority living in Anatolia, and long desired greater freedom in respect of for security, honour, and prosperity. The rising tide of progressive ideas about liberty, human rights, and equality came from the Armenian intellectuals in Russia and from a long-standing intellectual relationship with Europe and its Enlightenment (Balakian 2004: 12, 35). When the first reform program of *Tanzimat* was declared in 1839, Armenians were encouraged. Even though many of Armenians in Constantinople lived prosperously with higher positions and occupations, there were serious problems in all the provinces in which Armenians

lived among the Muslim majority. As a Christian minority, Armenians were in fear of their neighbours, the Kurds and Circassians (Lewis 1995: 326-327). As the head of the Armenian *millet*, the Armenian patriarch sent 537 notes to the Sublime Porte (office of the grand vizier), requesting and pleading for protection from the daily abuses of violence, social and political injustice between 1850 and 1870 (Balakian 2004:5). Throughout much of its history, the Armenian Orthodox Church has been concerned with the Armenian nation's survival. The Armenian Church played a significant role in the succession of Muslim empires in which its faithful were located. The Armenian Patriarch was deeply involved in socio-political matters in order that the Armenians should be made responsible for their communities during the Ottoman period (Ware 1964: 97-98).

The Armenian Patriarchate made efforts to obtain Armenian independence in the nineteenth century after the achievement of independence by Greeks, Bulgaria and Serbia. Three factors appear to have contributed to the consolidation of ecclesiastical and political control by the patriarchate: 1) Growth in the Armenian population in and around Constantinople. 2) The strengthening of the economic role of the growing community in local trade, international commerce, and government finances. 3) The appearance of a primate who commanded respect and expanded the role of the patriarchate in Armenian communal life (Freely 1996: 182, 202, 284). The key figure was Mugerditch Khrimian in the nineteenth century (Bardakjian 2001:2).

With Russia's encouragement, Armenians hoped to gain more security through the San Stefano Treaty, which stated that Russian troops would evacuate Kurds and Circassians from all the Armenian provinces and guarantee their security in 1878, but this soon fell into disuse. Then the very same year, the popular former patriarch, Mugerditch Khrimian went to Berlin regarding the "Armenian question" with a delegation of Armenians, but they were ignored as they stood outside the Congress hall in Berlin (Lewis 1995: 288, 293-294; Freely 1996:284)

Further, all Armenians were disappointed with the "Berlin Treaty", which nullified and reserved the Treaty of San Stefano, authorized the return of just two Armenian provinces without any protection. Armenians formally protested, "The Armenians had been deceived and their rights had not been recognized." Khrimian also gave a sermon "Ah, dear Armenian people, could I have dipped my Paper Ladle in the cauldron it would sag and remain there! Where guns talk and

sabers shine, what significance do appeals and petitions have?” After 1878, social and political conditions for the Armenians grew worse in the Ottoman Empire (Balakian 2004:6, 7, 12). The international concern about the Armenians increased after the Treaty of San Stefano and the Russo-Turkish War in 1876-78. With this support, there were also three political parties who gave voice to Armenian aspirations: the Armenakan Party in Van in 1885; Dashnaksutium (Armenian Revolutionary Federation) in Tiflis in 1890; Yaftas (placards) which addressed the Muslims around the world asking them to stand up to the sultan, an incompetent oppressor by 1893 (Balakian 2004:6, 7, 15).

In response to this, Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909) made a decision and began to implement his solution. Balakian (2004:35) cites what Arminius Vambery wrote; “the only way to eliminate the Armenian question was to eliminate the Armenians themselves.” From 1890, and 1895-6, the grim cycle of rebellion and repression, terror and massacre raged in eastern Turkey including Trabzon, Erzurum, Van, and even in the capital, Constantinople, great numbers of Armenians were killed, many of them by the Hamidiye, a locally raised irregular force authorized by the Sultan Abdulhamid II to deal with Armenian insurgents.

It became raiding and warfare between Christians (Armenians, Syrians) and Muslims (Turks, Caucasians and Kurds) (Lewis 1995:327). Muslim clerics played a perpetual role in the massacring of Armenian; imams, and *saftas* who were the students of theological colleges would often rally the mob by chanting prayers, and mosques were often used as places to mobilize crowds, especially during Friday prayers. Christians were killed in the name of *Allah* (Balakian 2004:112). In 1894, a horrible event occurred in Sasun, near Diyarbakir, the remote highland of the eastern Turkey. Turkish and Kurdish Muslims massacred thousands of Armenians during 1890s. Balakian (2004:112) says, in the autumn of 1895, “The map of Armenian in Turkey went up in flames.” In 1896, a group of Armenians, who had studied in French came to Constantinople, seized the Ottoman Bank in Galata so that they could give voice to their independence. This led to reprisals in which some 6,000 Armenians were killed in Constantinople (Freely 1996: 287).

By the end of 1896, the sultan’s campaign had taken the lives of about two hundred thousand Armenians-approximately one hundred thousand killed by direct massacre and the rest dying of disease and famine (Balakian 2004:35, 53, 59, and 62). Thus the series of the 1890s events has

been recognized as mass killing or genocide by the social psychologist Irvin Staub (Balakian 2004: 114). Meantime, nationalism and agitating for independence was increasingly growing among the Armenians. There were four large Armenian volunteer units in 1914 and three more in 1915 formed, primarily Armenians who lived in Russia. All Armenians in Ottoman Empire rose in armed rebellion, notably in Van in the eastern Anatolia and Zeytun in Cilicia. The situation was significant, Ottoman Empire confronted two attackers around the Anatolian provinces; Russian in the east, and another British force advancing on Baghdad, and in addition, an internal rebellion of Armenians who were supported by Russia. Thus the Ottoman government decided on the deportation and relocation of the Armenian population of Anatolia (Lewis 1995: 339-340).

However, the plan to eliminate the Armenians was not only motivated by the pan-Turkism influenced by European nationalism but also came out from the ideology of *jihad*, with its Islamic roots. The other social reason was a disproportionate number of Armenians were successful in business and commerce. They were more prosperous than Turkish and Kurdish Muslims; the economic imbalance was also due to the envy of their Muslim neighbors. With the coming of the missionaries, the Armenians' standard of living rose above that of the Muslims; a new class of educated and intellectual Armenians had emerged as an academic elite (Balakian 2004:183).

It showed how Armenians were interested in education that when the population of Armenian was 1,294,831 (Shaw 1976:241), there were 1996 schools and 451 monasteries all over Turkey by 1914 (Balakian 2004:233). Like the sultan of Ottoman Empire, the Young Turks (1908-1918) were nationalists too, and attempted to solve the problem of the Armenian question. They proclaimed the Temporary Law of Deportation in 1915. Thus the tragic account was not finished that permanently dehumanized Armenians in a developing process that would culminate in the greatest level of deportation since 1915. The Young Turks believed that the empire was too dependent on non-Muslims and that Turks were losing control of their own empire. Their nationalistic policies led to harsh treatment of non-Muslims (Balakian (2004: 181-182).

The scene of deportation was a tragedy; Balakian (2004: 185, 237) describes how Armenians were deported; "they were forced from their homes and organized into caravans to be marched out of town, and the men were separated from the women and children and taken out into the

fields outside their towns and villages and shot en masse by the gendarmes, the provincial police. “A band of deportees from Erzurum, mostly women, arrived in Harput ...all the men of their party had been butchered and some of them had been left absolutely naked.” Many of them died during the deportation, of which event Davis Balakian (Balakian 2004: 245) was an eyewitness and said “thousands of corpses half buried had been imprisoned before deportation.” In the middle of the second tragic event between 1915-1916, Talaat Pasha (general), reported “We have already disposed of three quarters of the Armenians; there are none at all left in Bitlis, Van, and Erzurum...we have got to finish with them.” He continued bluntly “We will not have the Armenians anywhere in Anatolia”. However he confessed, “Innocent Armenians were killed”.

The Armenian massacres of 1894-96, 1909, and 1915-16 effectively wiped out the Armenian population of Turkey, an estimated one million died (Balakian 2004:351, 373- 374). Papazian (1987:11) also estimates it at 1.5 million. Estimates vary considerably, but as Lewis (1995: 340) says “there can be no doubt that at least hundreds of thousands of Armenians perished; perhaps more than a million...many suffered appalling hardships, disease and exposure.”

Likewise, among the Armenian Orthodox millets; some 250,000 Syrians died (Blincoe 1998:126), and a great number of Catholics, Caldeans and Protestants were also deported and killed by the Turks between 1915 and 1918 in a series of unprovoked massacres, from which only a few thousand survived (Ware 1964: 256, 320). In 1914 the Armenian Patriarchate exercised authority over 55 dioceses or territorial districts, comprising some 1,778 parishes, 1,634 churches and an official membership of 1,390,000. This included the dioceses of Cyprus, Bulgaria, Romania and Greece. By 1922, the Armenian population of Turkey had shrunk to 281,000, of whom 100,000 lived in Constantinople (Seraphim 1999:3). The Armenian Church was greatly affected by the tragedy of massacres in Turkey in which only a remnant remains, around 75,000 (Papazian 1987:11; Balakian 2004:375).

Therefore, the population of the Christian minority in Turkey prominently declined at the beginning of the twentieth century, with some 1.3 million Greeks crossing over to Greece, numerous Armenian Diasporas scattered on every side: Russia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, European countries, and North America (Papazian 1987:12). The statistics show us how the population of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey has changed:

Table 1.1

The population of Constantinople by percentage				
Year	1477	1535	1886	1924
Muslims	74.26	53	53	61
Greeks	13	*32	21	26
Armenians	5.46		21	7
Jews	1.22	10	3	6

(Freely 1996: 188, 202, 302).

This sign * the population of both the Greeks and the Armenians.

Table 1.2

The population of the Ottoman Empire by religion; percentage				
Year	1897	1906	1914	2000
Muslim	74.07	74.26	81.23	99.64
Greeks	13.49	13.56	9.68	*0.32
Armenians	5.47	5.46	6.99	
Bulgars	4.36	3.65	0.08	
Jews	1.13	1.22	1.01	0.04
Catholic	0.64			
Protestants	0.24	0.25	1.01	
Others	0.6	1.60	1.01	

(Shaw 1976b, c: 240, 241) and *Operation World* by Johnstone & Mandryk 2001: 633.

This sign * means all Christians.

Nevertheless, the Lord was concerned for His people as the “*remnant*” (Isa. 37:31), and many missionaries worked among the Christian minority in the Ottoman Empire during the 19th and 20th centuries. We are going to see how God provided for those who willingly shared His grace with the people of the Ottoman Empire.

3.2.3 Conclusion

All the above debates recognize that the minority Christian Church in the Ottoman Empire struggled with central government of which they also deteriorated according to be promoted to a higher positions. A number of Christians apostatized from their faith because of the Muslim policy and suffered for their faith. They deeply involved in politics because of influence of the French Revolution and the European Enlightenment from the 19th century. The Christian minority would have solved the problem of daily life and national freedom through secular power of political methods, but not biblical way of seeking God. Church leaders also did not lead their parishioner right way of biblical teachings, and urged them to use the political forces.

3.3 Missionary work in the 19th –20th centuries

God had been sending those who were zealous of evangelizing to the people of the Ottoman Empire since the 16th century: Catholics entered into the Empire after the Council of Trent, as the forerunners. Then Protestant missionaries, who followed the Catholics, came from Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Denmark, and America. They worked actively in Asia Minor since the nineteenth century. They were profoundly influenced by the Enlightenment, and worked actively motivated by their postmillennialism, in Asia Minor since nineteenth century (Bosch 1991:262, 282). The missionaries created an organized network of institutions, which helped them to achieve a great result in missions (Balakian 2004: 25). We now briefly describe the Roman Catholic missionary work, and then observe the Protestant missionary work in detail.

3.3.1 Roman Catholic mission

Although other branches of Christianity (Russian Orthodox Church and Protestant Church) were

involved in the work of missions, the Roman Catholic Church was the one that played the biggest role in the extension of Christianity in the Ottoman Empire during the 16th - 19th centuries (Latourette 1974b: 24-26). There were many mission organizations that existed from the late sixteenth to the early eighteenth century: Franciscans, Jesuits and Dominicans were some of them. Lazarists replaced them late in the eighteenth century. The reason for this was the active monastic movement, and aggressive propagation of the faith by the chief monks. In addition, as the Roman Catholics regarded Protestantism as heretical and a departure from the true faith, they were motivated to undertake extensive mission work (Latourette 1974b: 29).

The Roman Catholic Church had used two opposing mission policies: the first one was converting the subjects by force, and the second was evangelizing through peaceful attempts at proselytism and managing to win over one of the enlightened Armenian ecclesiastics (Atiya 1968: 338-339). The Roman Catholic missions enjoyed a marked expansion in the nineteenth century. Many missionaries worked in various provinces of Asia Minor, notably Smyrna. They were involved in different activities, such as teaching, inviting or to visit local people (Latourette 1974c: 48). Eventually, the Armenian Roman Catholics were given their own Patriarch in the Ottoman Empire because of the French influence, as the Roman Catholic *millet* in 1830 (Atiya 1968: 338-339).

The Catholic Church contributed remarkably to Christianity in the Ottoman Empire; so much so that the Sultan abrogated the traditional death penalty for conversion from Islam to Christianity, and Muslims were legally permitted to receive baptism in 1856, which was the result of Franco-British co-operation with Turkey in the Crimean War (Latourette 1974c: 48). Thus the movement of Christianity advanced, and the number of Christians increased. New bishoprics and vicariates were created, and a large part of the growth was in the various Uniate bodies.

Pope Leo XIII founded a college in 1883 in Rome for the purpose of training Armenians in order to provide Armenian monks and 'sisters' (Atiya 1968: 338). A small body of Greek Uniates came into being in the second half of the nineteenth century, and this group was given its own bishop (Latourette 1974c: 49). Using their missionary zeal, the Roman Catholic Church used them as pioneers in missions to the Ottoman Empire. As a result, certain Armenians, some with high motives, accepted the Roman Catholic faith through French missionaries in order to enjoy

French protection (Papazian 1987:10). Missionary activities in the Empire were inevitably intertwined with political ambitions and commercial activities; because these activities were supported by princes and diplomats of the Western European countries (Latourette 1974b: 81). The Roman Catholic missionaries brought the Eastern Christians in touch with the new life that had come with the Catholic Reformation, and so added something of vigour. It was a significant result: Latourette (1974c: 49) also says that even though missionaries served in various areas such as schools, and medical services, they did not gather much fruit in terms of the conversion of indigenous people to the Roman Catholic faith.

3.3.2 Protestant missions

In keeping with their commitment to the New Testament, Protestants believe that the proclamation of the Christian message throughout the earth is the primary task of the Church. However, they were hardly in touch with non-Christian people until the 17th and 18th centuries (Latourette 1974b: 25, 29). Their voices were starting to be heard in the early 19th century. The most prominent Protestant missionary organization in Turkey was the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). Like Catholics, Protestant missionaries also approached minority Christians, mainly among the Armenians (Latourette 1974c: 49). These were the only Christians whom the rulers of the Empire permitted to exist among the non-Muslim population (Reid s.a: 205). The other significant reason was Turks themselves, who feared their authorities and feared for their families; they were threatened with death when they converted to Christianity. Thus missionaries directed their attention toward the minority of Christians: the Armenians, the Greeks, and the Syrians (Balakian 2004: 27).

Missionaries did not want to convert Muslims to Christianity or set up a new ecclesiastical structure, but rather to bring the truth of the gospel to the Eastern churches and purify them (Latourette (1974c: 49). Thus they focused on modernizing the existing Christian cultures of the Near East and converting some Armenians and Greeks to Protestantism (Balakian 2004: 26). Although Protestants and Anglicans agreed on educational and social services, their mission policy was different. The American Board went forth with the object of proselytizing the Armenians, whereas the Anglicans intended to help the churches of the East to attain reform (Atiya 1968: 339).

Nevertheless, it was the turning point for Christianity in the land of Turkey when two pioneers, Fish and Parsons entered into Smyrna in Asia Minor in 1820. Then, the ABCFM established continuing enterprises in Constantinople, Asia Minor, and Armenia in the 1830s. Eli Smith and H.G.O. Dwight, who made an extensive tour from Malta through Asia Minor and Armenia in 1830–1831, followed that. The first missionary to Turkey from ABCFM, William Goodell, came to Constantinople in 1831 (Latourette 1974c: 49). Generally, in the early 19th century, missionaries worked so vigorously that they were able to open new centres in various cities of Asia Minor and Anatolia, and the Bible was translated into Armeno-Turkish (Latourette 1974c: 50).

3.3.2.1 The dawn of evangelizing to the Near East

Balakian (2004: 25) discusses how the Western missionaries came to Turkey in the 1830s. God raised up some deeply dedicated people who laid the foundation at home and offered themselves for foreign missions in the early nineteenth century. The motivation for the American missionary movement emerged from the Second Great Awakening, which was a response to growing secularization in American life. Among the dynamic clergy, the Calvinist, Samuel Hopkins was noteworthy. He founded Andover Theological Seminary to train missionaries in cross-cultural missions. On the other hand, Samuel Mills formed the Society of Brethren at Williams College in 1806, and took his society to the newly founded Andover Theological Seminary, renaming his society the ‘Society of Inquiry on the Subject of Missions’.

Hopkins believed: “Christian spirit and duty should inspire evangelists to convert non-Christians around the world”; this missionary zeal led Americans to Turkey. Along with the Andover Theological Seminary, many theological Seminaries trained people in cross-cultural mission work: Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, and Union. There were also numerous colleges who followed this great movement. Many of them worked in the Armenian provinces. The foreign missions movement was motivated from the perspective of the millennial view. They hoped that the conversion of the world to Christianity would bring about the Second Coming of Christ and thus the fulfillment of history (Balakian 2004: 26). Moreover, by 1812, the ABCFM had been founded in Boston by Congregationalists, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed churches.

Then the American Board sent two missionaries, Levi Parson and Pliny Fish who were Middlebury College classmates, on an exploratory mission to the Ottoman Empire in 1819. They arrived in Smyrna, the home of various races, Jews, Palestinians, Turks, Arabs and Orthodox Christians, with the millennial hope of converting of the Near East in 1820 (Balakian 2004: 26-27). In the same year the Anglicans also sent the Reverend George Tomlinson on an exploratory visit to Athens and Constantinople (Atiya 1968: 339).

The Lord inspired not only male missionaries, but also female missionaries in this period. Women had not only provided the major support for missions in the modern era but also recognized the need to found their own societies and sent their own missionaries. Mary Lyon founded the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary in 1837 for training foreign missionaries. It formulated feminist ideas about education, with much focus on women in foreign lands. Lyon believed that women should be independent, intellectually rigorous, and capable of professionally sustaining themselves (Balakian 2004: 29).

Within Lyon's motto of "Go where no one else will go, do what no one else will do", her graduates were fast creating the first generation of American women teachers, and were sent to foreign lands. By 1888 Mount Holyoke had sent 178 graduates to work in foreign missions. They worked as activist educators in Turkey. Their greatest impact was in the production of a large number of able and educated women, especially in Armenia, who could fill the major roles in the professions and in church leadership, rather than listen to leaders. (Balakian 2004: 29). Kieser (2002: 406) also observes that the files of the Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 showed how young women had a more holistic orientation than men. Their understanding of the deeper concerns of missionaries was generally better. They were more able to translate spiritual contents into social lives.

3.3.2.2 Missionary work for the minority Christians

As the biggest mission organization of the Ottoman Empire, missionaries belonging to the ABCFM aimed at four goals, with an eschatological view: (1) the global spread of the gospel; (2) the return of the Jews to Palestine and their 'restoration'-acceptance of Jesus Christ-; (3) the fall of the Pope; and (4) the collapse of Islam. Thus the first step of Protestant missionary work was

to bring about the spiritual and educational revival of the flaccid Eastern churches before moving on to evangelizing non-Christian populations (Kieser 2002:393). According to Parsons and Fisk (Balakian 2004: 27), Armenians seemed the most welcoming to the Protestant mission. This was because the fertile ground for mission work was already there. There was a reform movement afoot in the Armenian Apostolic Church. The ABCFM established missions for Armenians in Smyrna and Constantinople in 1831. The first American missionaries, Mr and Mrs William Goodell, opened a shop in Constantinople later that year.

Within twenty-five years after the establishment of mission work, the ABCFM had opened missionary stations throughout the empire. Missionaries emphasized the importance of learning, and their educational projects including translating the Bible into modern Armenian in 1834. Meanwhile, relying on numerical strength and political influence, Protestant missions had attained the *millet* status by 1847 (Atiya 1968: 339).

By the end of the nineteenth century, the ABCFM had twelve stations and 270 outstations in Asiatic Turkey. There were 150 missionaries and 114 organized churches had already made more than thirteen thousand converts to Protestantism in the Ottoman Empire. Protestants more focused on the social and educational institutions such schools, colleges, and hospitals, and witnessed to Muslims, though few Muslims became Christians. Missionaries taught more than six thousand students in their 132 high schools and eleven hundred elementary schools, and ran six colleges and various theological academies. The activities of missionaries not only established schools and colleges, but also promoted Sunday School, Bible study, prayer meetings, and youth organizations (Balakian 2004: 27).

Women missionaries made big efforts to enhance women's status. They stressed the idea of equality for women in their educationally progressive curricula. The results of these efforts were that women's schools and colleges had sprung up in Armenian cultural centers from Constantinople to wherever Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire by the later part of the nineteenth century. Armenian women teachers who graduated from American missionary schools taught at most of the Armenian elementary schools by the end of the nineteenth century (Balakian 2004: 29-30). At the same time, missionaries awakened the Christian minorities – Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian, and Syrian- to an awareness of nationalism, new liberalism, and the

cultural values attached to them. Robert College, the Christian college in Constantinople, was able to hold public debates on such progressive topics as “Christianity and Patriotism,” “Free Thought,” “Representative Government,” and “Violation of Popular Rights” in 1881 (Balakian 2004: 30). Missionaries displayed numerous acts of heroism towards those suffering under the lack of diplomatic protection of their own states during the 1890s and from 1915 to 1917. There are only two accounts here: the first is that throughout the massacre in Urfa, the American missionary, Corinna Shattuch, undertook extraordinary work under enormous stress in an environment close to despair. She hid Armenians and gave them shelter. She administered relief and obtained food for the survivors in 1896 (Balakian 2004: 83).

The second account describes a riot in Adana, where two thousand Armenians had been killed. Missionaries tried to help the victims, and to protect churches and schools. Missionaries also gave their lives for their beloved people. Vice-Consul Doughty Wylie, an eye-witness, said: “I found that five Turks killed two missionaries when they had been gallantly working to put out a fire at their school in the second week of April 1909” (Balakian 2004: 151-152). Missionaries helped sufferers in the tragic events, in their sending country. Americans provided large amounts of money to the Armenian provinces of Turkey. Many organizations made their greatest efforts to aid the Armenian and Syrian victims of genocide through the National Armenian Relief Committee in 1895. This relief work was done under the auspices of the Red Cross. A Near East Relief Organization was established to help rescue survivors of the second massacre of Armenians and Syrians in 1919 (Balakian 2004: 64, 68, 70,310).

3.3.2.3 Missionary work for non-Christians

Although it was difficult evangelizing the Muslims, missionaries never lost hope of converting them. The American Board had the most extensive of missions in Turkey; however, there were also other mission organizations at work. An example is the Basel Mission in the 1820’s and 1830’s. The London Society for Promoting Christianity also evangelized the Jews in Constantinople and gained a number of conversions during the 1840’s (Latourette 1974c: 52). One of the remarkable achievements of the missionaries’ works was that the Ottoman Empire granted freedom of religion throughout the whole of Turkey in 1856. In fact, the Sultan was forced to do so by the French and British powers because of support for the Crimean War (1853-

1856). Thus missionaries freely approached Muslims, even though they enjoyed the optimistic time for only about eight years (Pikkert 2006: 64). The Church Missionary Society (CMS) inaugurated, in Constantinople, an enterprise for Muslims in 1856. The CMS was first sent to care for German settlers in that region, and then they sent four missionaries to Turkey in 1858. One of these was the famous Karl Gottlieb Pfander who served as a missionary to the Muslims. Karl Gottlieb Pfander published *The Balance of Truth*, which brought violence on the Muslim converts, and made direct work with Muslims difficult. The CMS ceased missionary work to the Muslims in 1877 (Latourette 1974c: 52-53; Meyer 1986:49). In this short period of years, many Muslims became interested in the Christian faith, and many of them bought Bibles during and immediately after the Crimean War (1854-1856).

Goodell wrote in 1859 that some twenty Muslims had been baptized in Constantinople. One of these, Selim Efendi changed his name to Edward Williams. He and his wife were given certificates by the government, stating they had become Christians of their own free will (Pikkert (2006:98). Missionary work revived among the Turks and Kurds after the Young Turks' revolution of 1908. They had a good relationship with the Young Turks who tried to regain power in the Ottoman Empire once they had worked their way through the new intellectual movement springing from European knowledge. Missionaries were invited as speakers and gained prestige as 'pioneers of progress', yet their influence came to an end very quickly (Kieser 2002: 392,398).

The Lutherans, who belonged to the Lutheran Orient Mission Society (LOMS) worked among the Kurds following the recommendation of a committee at the Edinburgh Conference of 1910. The LOMS missionaries focused on minority Muslims under a project called the "Great Experiment". They turned their attention to the Kurds who lived in the area of southeastern Anatolia (Blincoe 1988: 139-140). L.O.Fossum became the leader of this new and challenging project. LOMS made institutional efforts without using the existing Christian minority as an intermediary in the 19th century. They worked from 1911 to 1916. Fossum worked remarkably well and produced a Kurdish grammar. He also translated into Kurdish the four Gospels, Luther's Smaller Catechism, a hymnbook containing 100 hymns, and a Lutheran liturgy (Pikkert 2006:84). We now examine how Missionaries worked among the minority Muslim groups of Alevis and Yezidisi using Kieser's two writings (2000a, 200b).

By the 1850s, the missionaries of the ABCFM could reach the people of Alevis⁶, Yezidisi⁷, and particularly the poorer classes. They were classified as heterodox in companion with other Muslim sects (Kieser 2002: 394). The Anatolian Alevis are the descendants of an ethnically mixed heterodox rural people, and they were called Kızılbaş because of their red headgear. The Ottoman rulers regarded them as dangerous and used propaganda to revile them as immoral unbelievers without holy books, because they dared to deviate from the Quran. They had to live at the edge of society and in remote regions; their villages had djems instead of mosques (Kieser 2002: 394-395).

As a minority among the Muslims, the Alevis were made up of the *Zaza* or *Kumandj* speaking Kurds and small groups of Turks. They lived in the heartland of the Ottoman Empire, in Mesopotamia. Missionaries worked among them passionately and many of the Alevis became interested in Christianity. It seemed to them that Christianity was the same faith as their belief, so that they willingly participated in prayer meetings and Bible study groups (Kieser 2000: 2).

Ali Gako was a powerful Kurdish Kizilbaş chief, but had converted to Christianity through Armenian neighbours, without ever having been in direct contact with the mission, and proclaimed himself a Protestant. With Ali Gako, other Kizilbaş in the regions of Harput and Sivas began to call themselves Protestants. They had mostly learned from their Armenian neighbours about the new Protestant movement. Ali Gako protected missionaries and Christians when they were persecuted by the local officials and Sunni neighbours, especially in the region of Sivas during 1860-1870 (Kieser 2002: 395). Even though the Alevis were confronted with many difficulties, a handful of their children attended the mission schools. Many Alevis in the eastern provinces of the Empire boldly declared that they were “Protes” (Protestants). Some sisters of the German *Hilfsbund* in Marash successfully built bridges between Protestants and Alevis. However, the government expelled them in 1933 (Kieser 2000: 3, 10).

⁶ Alevis are a branch of the Shi'a, and their only common belief is the *Love of Ahl-i Bayt* (Prophet Mohammed, Caliph Ali, Fatima-wife of Prophet, Hasan & Husain-the two latter ones being the sons of Ali). Also, Alevism bears many Central Asian Turkoman traditions, and nearly all of the Alevis are Turkmens. Alevis are the lighter Turkish version of Shiites (Önder 2002).

⁷ The Yezidis are one sect of a group of religions called the Cult of the Angels, or Yazdani who are mostly Kurds. Yazdan is also the Yezidi name for the Supreme Being (Jenkins 2005).

3.3.2.4 Missionaries were hard pressed on every side

For the Armenian Church, the missionaries created further complexity and often damaged their community. The Armenian Church leaders expected missionaries to improve their Apostolic Church, and were not interested in abandoning it. Missionaries' imperialistic attitudes and zeal for converting Armenians to the Protestant way became agents of divisiveness in the church (Balakian 2004: 27-28).

Thus Armenian Church leaders and the wealthy Armenian community felt that missionaries were a threat to their authority. This was because, within the Armenian Church, a following arose which favoured the missionaries and their message. The conservatives were averse to what seemed to them new and heretical doctrines, and also feared that, because of these, the unity of the Armenian communities would be disrupted, and the opposition to the Turks and to Islam would be weakened (Latourette 1974c: 50).

Eventually, the Armenian Apostolic patriarch proclaimed "the expulsion of Protestantism from the land." Some Armenians who converted to Protestantism were imprisoned or exiled. By 1846 the first Protestant Evangelical Armenian Church of Constantinople was founded. It made the Armenian patriarch so enraged that he decreed the excommunication of all Armenian Protestant evangelicals. The sultan also became angered because the American missionaries were "turning the world upside down" in 1847. And then the Ottoman rulers and Turkish families punished or even killed those who showed an interest in Christianity. Therefore the missionaries were hard pressed on every side, and the relationship between the new Protestantism and the Armenian churches remained tense throughout the nineteenth century (Balakian 2004: 27-28).

The Armenian nationalists argued that American missionaries remained an important force in the Armenian renaissance; yet the Protestant missionaries embodied the dual nature of imperialist attitudes: Protestantism damaged Armenianism (Balakian 2004: 27). Missionaries awakened Armenian society and culture. Even though they were blamed as arrogant about their superior role in the so-called backward parts of the world, they joyfully worked in the wilderness; they brought beneficial change and reform to the Armenians, and they were so dedicated to helping people that they became oblivious to the dangerous situation (Balakian 2004: 31).

Inevitably, serious conflicts occurred between missionaries and Alevis, especially conflicts with *dedes* (hereditary priests) who felt uneasy vis-à-vis Puritan self-assurance. However, these conflicts appear to have occurred only seldom. "Superstition" was, however, a frequent matter of discussion, and attendance at missionary schools led to tensions within families (Kieser 2000: 3). Missionary activity was also blamed for prompting violence against religious minorities, such as the massacre of Nestorian Assyrian Christians by Kurds in 1843, and the assaults against the Alevis in eastern Turkey later in the nineteenth century (Doumato s.a: 2).

However, the final missionary works were forbidden from the land of Turkey by the new government, after the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1922. Including Islamic practices, all religious activities were forbidden and religious schools closed by the new law of the Republic of Turkey on 20 April 1924 (Freely 296-297, 299). Actually, persecution had started before the new government was established. Protestantism had become the main ideological enemy in the eyes of the Sultan. He thought that the missionaries both brought about the renaissance of Armenian and Syrian self-consciousness and also influenced the ideological potential to initiate the Alevi renaissance.

During and after the Armenian genocide, the government stopped all missionary work, and all Christian missions left Turkey (Kieser 2002: 392, 396). Within other mission organizations, the ABCFM's adaptation to nationalist Turkey in the 1920s was painful. There were the tragic years in which the Turkish government took care to expel all missionaries remaining in the eastern provinces. For the governors, missionaries were dangerous observers. The missionaries were all experienced men and women who had deep local knowledge and very different ideas. They had lost everything. Most of 'their' people had perished. Survivors either lived on the margin of society, or were abroad without a home (Kieser 2000: 10).

The American Board inevitably held its significant decisive vote for a continuation of missionary work in Turkey in January 1923. The reason was that the new law forbade religious teaching, and required employment of Turkish teachers who were paid compulsorily high salaries, higher than Turkish schools. This law placed a heavy financial burden on the Board, and in addition they were not allowed to have contact with the poor in the provinces any more. In spite of restriction on their work in Turkey, the ABCFM continued part of its work in the provinces with reduced

staff and without its stations in the east (Kieser 2002: 403). The Turkish government accused the missionaries of jeopardizing the national sovereignty. One of the missionaries in the twentieth century, Henry Riggs, wrote circa 1940, "Enver Pasha who was the Unionist wartime leader said that the American missionaries were 'the fighters and representatives of the whole of America'. He believed that America, by entering World War I, aimed "to destroy Turks and Muslims, in order to save Christianity in the East". He accused the missionaries of setting Armenians, Kurds, and Syrians against their rulers. This was because missionaries boldly condemned the massacres and horrors of the Armenian genocide, and called on the Turks to repent as the one hope for a better day in Turkey in 1923. Enver urged that Turkey should profit from the state of war to eradicate the ABCFM (Kieser 2000: 13-14).

3.3.3 Conclusion

From all the above, we have to admire the missionaries' work in Turkey and the impact that it had. The missionaries much worked for the minority Christians of Armenians, Syrians and Greeks. Their service in the fields of social and medical care to the people has been enormous. Their contribution to education, health, and the raising of the standard of living has also been tremendous. The American Board alone in its ninety-six years of service in Turkey spent around twenty million dollars on mission work. They confronted the massive pressure of powerful Islamic and nationalist groups; yet they did not succeed in establishing a genuine Turkish church (Kieser 2002: 407).

3.4 Summary and Conclusion

In conclusion, the era of the Ottoman Empire was a dark age for the Christians who had been in the majority, but became the minority. They lived in restricted situations under the Islamic authority, and these restrictions led them to the situation in which "the great aim was survival – to keep things going in hope of better days to come" (Ware 1964: 100). However, when Ottoman rulers offered various advantage options, they "abandoned the Christ for the Prophet" (Latourette (1974b: 72). It is clear that the weakness of knowledge of Scripture caused a number of the clergy and numerous Christians to go over to Islam during the 15th to 17th centuries. Both Churches – the Greek and Armenian- were usually content to repeat what early Church fathers

taught, mysticism, even though they were influenced by the Western theology of Catholics or Protestant. Like the Church in the Byzantine Empire, the Church in the Ottoman period was also corrupted by the financial greed of the bishops because of the political ambitions. With the coming of the missionaries in the nineteenth century, Christian minority lived energetic lives for a century. Most of missionaries preferred to work among the Christian minority, rather than directly evangelizing the non-Christians, with more focus on the education or social activities.

During the 19th and 20th centuries, both Churches were deeply involved in secular politics, actively representing their *millet's* civil affairs against the central government following the influence of the French Revolution. It is obvious that the Church did not sacrifice for the gospel, but many paid their lives for their earthly nations. The Church leaders did not lead their parishioners to overcome their difficulties through faith in eternal life, that is, the heavenly hope, but wanted to help them with gaining earthly freedom from the Ottoman Empire. Thus the Church suffered with their parishioners greatly. Many of Greeks died, and 1.3 million Greeks moved to Greece from Asia Minor. The Armenians, over one million people, gave their lives for their independence, and many more were scattered around the world.

Therefore the Christian population gradually declined from the 1890s onwards. Eventually, according to the new law, evangelizing could not continue since 1923 by which all foreign missionaries were expelled. And sadly, only a handful of Christians have remained.

CHAPTER 4

A COMPARISON BETWEEN TWO PERIODS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH HISTORY OF TURKEY: THE 11TH -15TH AND 19TH - 20TH CENTURIES

4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters the writer has observed two different Church histories within two empires: the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires. The result of chapters three and four, it is noticed that there were some differences and similarities between these two Churches. Therefore, this chapter will focus on what were the differences and similarities between these two Church histories. This will be done by carefully analysing the differences and similarities in both periods, as they have been described in chapters two and three. The two Churches' contribution to and relevance for wider church history will be examined. Thus we hope to arrive at a legitimate evaluation and a brief conclusion.

4.2 The differences between the two periods

In the Byzantine Empire, the relationship between State and Church was close- as long as Christians were free to pursue their interest in eternal salvation. On the other hand, the context of the Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire was completely different after 1453. The relationship between Church and State in any local community was affected by state policy, in terms of Islamic law.

4.2.1 The Socio-Political aspect of the Church

The Byzantine Empire was the first attempt to apply religion to the government of a whole society. In fact, Christianity was more than a religion for the Byzantine Emperors; the Church on earth was a reflection of the Church in heaven, and it was the very foundation of their empire. The Byzantine Emperors declared themselves as “the Anointed of the Lord” and were eager to spread Christianity to the whole world (Edwards 997:87; Diehl 1957:28).

Even emperors were personally involved in evangelizing projects (Bosch 2005: 202). The Church and the State had the same aim throughout the empire; Eusebius wrote in the fourth century, “One God is announced to all” (Diehl 1957: 185). The Byzantines developed their apologetic and dogmatic defense of the faith in response to an atmosphere of sophisticated intellectual debate, especially proclaiming Christology to the whole world through the Councils (Bosch 1991:194). Therefore, the Church was protected and supported by the State.

Consequently, the Church and State were interdependent, such that the Patriarch and the Emperor shared power. Most of the citizens were deeply impressed by the magnificence of the Orthodox liturgy on Sundays, and enjoyed the Church festivals at the public meeting- places such as the Hippodrome. All classes of Byzantine society had a passion for theological disputation (Diehl 1957:143, 236). The Byzantines freely founded religious buildings such as churches and monasteries because of the support of the State (Diehl 1957: 164). Furthermore, the purification of the faith and evangelism took place during the 11th- 12th centuries. The Byzantine emperors and Church had been repressive towards heretical movements such as Bogomilism, which denied the basic doctrines of the Orthodox Church, including the incarnation of Christ. Alexis, as the protector of the Orthodox, intended to reassert the importance of a strong and unified Orthodox Church for the Byzantine polity (Freely 1996: 134; Cunningham2000: 92-93).

The minority Christians in the Ottoman Empire were radically affected under Islamic socio-political influence, although the Muslim Turks treated their Christian subjects with remarkable generosity when they conquered the Byzantines (Ware 1964:96). The Church under the Ottoman Empire became head of both civil and religious institutions, a domestic self-governing entity under the hegemony of the Sultan and his court officials. The bishops became government officials (Ware 1964: 97-98).

The Ottoman Empire, which ruled non- Muslim communities, essentially operated in terms of a “contract”. The basis of the contract was the recognition by the *dhimmīs* of the supremacy of Islam and the dominance of the state. Such minorities had to accept a position of subordination, symbolized by certain social restrictions and by the payment of a poll (*jizya*) tax, to which Muslims were not subject (Lewis 1995:210-211).

Christianity under Islam had become a second-class religion, and Christians became second-class citizens. Non-Muslims suffered under a number of disadvantages, one of which was that they could not testify before Muslim courts. The *millets* were not allowed to serve in the army because they were Christians, were forbidden to marry Muslim women, and wore distinctive dress (Ware 1964:97).

Muslims usually looked at them contemptuously, and referred to Christians as *gavur*, meaning “infidel” and “unbeliever” (Balakian 2003:26). Christian social life was also endangered because of the Islamic law that non-Muslims were not allowed to have weapons. This law made them easy prey for Turks and Kurds. In addition, they were not allowed to ride horses when a Muslim was passing by. There were more burdens for the Armenians. They had to allow, in terms of the *kishlak* or winter-quartering obligation, Kurds and Turks to quarter themselves, their families and cattle, in Armenian homes during the long winter months (Balakian 2003:9-10).

Furthermore, the Christian Church under the Ottoman Empire was faced with the serious difficulties that through the Christians were allowed to exist in peace, limitations were placed on their activities. The Church’s religious activities were severely restricted. Church building and monasticism were restricted: church members could repair old churches, but not build new ones for worship. The Church was not allowed to undertake any evangelical work, and theology lost originality and vigour (Walters 1999: 286). It was crime to convert a Muslim to the Christian faith. Moreover, charitable and educational work was reduced to a minimum, and many parish clergy were illiterate. There was every inducement for a Christian to convert to Islam (Ware 1964:97).

4.2.2 Context in the Church

In the Byzantine Church there developed a mystical theology that expounded the experiential way of union with God (Cross 1988:51). The stream of mystical theology also made its mark on Orthodox Christianity with Symeon the New Theologian in the early eleventh century. He formulated the idea of ‘deification’, making a distinction between God’s essence and His energies (Meyendorff 1982:168-169; Payne 1958:300). Then the mystical theology climaxed in the Palaeologan period (1261-1453), the last dynasty of the Byzantine Empire.

Numerous texts were composed or rewritten during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries: eulogies, spiritual treatises, letters and sermons. Many spiritual teachers came forward, such as Theodore Metochites, Theolptos of Philadelphia, and Nikephoros Gregoras. In the fourteenth century there were Palamas, Cantacuzenus, and the two Cabasilas (Diehl 1957: 244-245). The so-called Palaeologan renaissance produced numerous examples of icons, ivories and beautiful fresco and mosaic decorations (Cunningham 2000: 102). Especially, Palamas arose with astonishing skill to defend the mysticism of the East against the rationalism of the West, and was also proclaimed as ‘the greatest among the fathers of the Church’ after his death (Payne 1958:301).

After the fourth Crusade, and with a dwindling empire, the Eastern Christians became more ‘other-worldly’: escaping from the temporal affairs, they elaborated on the “experience of God in cells. Monasteries flourished and magnificent Churches were built in this period. Cenobitic houses for both men and women existed as havens, and many lay people received spiritual advice from monastic spiritual fathers or mothers. Hesychasts dedicated themselves to contemplation and the constant prayer of “Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me” for experiences of union with God (Meyendorff 1982: 167). It is shown that the Eastern Church leaders led their parishioners to the mystical way of Christian life (Stamoolis 1986: 86-102, 110).

In the course of the 19th –20th centuries, it seems that both the Greek and the Armenian Churches were more of a political than a theological and ecclesial entity. When the European Reformation movement reached the minority Christians, especially through the influence of the French revolution, they were awakened to an understanding of their lost freedom and identity. One must also mention a process of secularization of ecclesiastical life, and a heightened survivalist mentality (Walters 1999: 289,302).

The Greek Orthodox Church worked for their parishioners actively. The Phanariots and rich Greek merchants supported the establishment of schools and the publishing of books. They sent many young Greeks to the West, where they came across the kind of revolutionary ideas that developed into the concept of Greek nationalism (Waterfield 2004: 344). Supporting a movement for Greek independence, the Archbishop of Patras, the leader of the Friendly Society in Greece, blessed the Greek flag when they set out from the Ayia Lavra monastery for their war of

independence on 25 March 1821 (Waterfield 2004: 347). Church leaders and parishioners gave their lives for the temporary world, but not for eternal life (Walters 1999: 304).

On the other hand, the Armenian clergy also paid attention to their national identity during the Ottoman period. Some notable clergymen came to the fore, and awakened Armenians to the importance of Thomas of Medsoph's *History of Timur Lane* in the fifteenth century, and Araqil of Tibriz's *History of the Persian Invasions* in the seventeenth century. There was a time of advancement for Armenian national and ecclesiastical life that Catholicos Abraham of Crete's *History* in the eighteenth century had awakened (Atiya 1968: 349).

The religious basis of nationalism emerged among the Armenian community in the nineteenth century. The outstanding figure was Mugerditch Khrimian who attracted attention through his sermons, which raised national interests in Armenians. He was elected as the Armenian Patriarch in Istanbul in 1869. Other important figures of patriarchs followed him that were Nerses Varzhapetian (1874-1884), Matteos Izmirlian (1894-1896), and Maghakia Ormanian (1896-1908) (Adallan2009: 3). Therefore, the Church in the Ottoman Empire focused more on temporal than eternal issues.

4.3 The Similarities between the two periods

In the Byzantine Empire, emperors had one great power. This power enabled them to dominate the Patriarch, head of the Orthodox Church. They guided debates and formulated articles of faith. They also charged those who opposed them, as being enemies of the faith and of God (Diehl 1957: 165-165). Although the Church under the Ottoman Empire was completely different from the former eras of the Byzantine period, the Ottoman Sultan himself was a protector of the Orthodox Church. The sultans governed religious institutions, and appointed patriarchs to the Orthodox Church, who, inevitably, subordinated themselves to the State (Ware 1964: 97-98).

4.3.1 The two aspect of Church history: Religion and Politics

The relation of Church to the State in the Byzantine period was usually subordinated to political considerations, and was trammled by secular connections. That is why one could say, "Nothing

must be done in the Church that is contrary to the will and commands of the Emperor” (Diehl 1957:165). The Byzantine Empire regarded religion as being ancillary to its political purposes (Latourette 1974a: 224-225). As Meyendorff (1982:68) points out, “at no time did Byzantium renounce the Roman idea of a universal empire.” Byzantines reflected the political ideology that they expressed the power of Christ, and attributed this power to Emperors during the liturgical celebrations. They expressed this power through hymns, which continued each year, particularly on Christmas day or during major church festivals.

Eusebius of Caesarea interpreted one of the most famous of these hymns as follows:

When Augustus reigned alone upon earth, the many kingdoms of man came to an end; and when Thou wast made man of the pure Virgin, the many gods of idolatry were destroyed; the cities of the world passed under one single ruler; and the nations came to believe in one sovereign Godhead (Meyendorff 1982:68).

Within this imperial ideology of a unique and universal Christian empire as the norm for the political theory, Church and State worked together whenever a national crisis occurred. Showing the co-operation of Church and State in the eleventh century was the Crusades, which was called a Holy War that was generated to rescue the holy places in Palestine to defend Christians of the East against Muslims (Latourette 1974a: 317). However, it occurred for somewhat political reasons: the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I provoked the tragic events because of territorial restoration of the ancient glory of the Eastern empires. The Byzantines were concerned that Ottoman Turks, who were settled in a large area of Asia Minor, would get a chance to attack Constantinople. This large-scale settlement led to an appeal for help to the East from Pope Urban II early in the 1090s (Galli 1997:17).

Thus the Church and state together carried out the Crusades, which were the unforgettable events in Christian history for centuries (Sherrard 1967:164-165). During the continuing tragic events, the whole Christian world willingly supported the hostilities in the name of the Lord. However, they failed to achieve what they intended; neither their territory was restored nor the glory which the Emperor Alexius IV Angelus wanted for the Byzantine throne was regained. The Crusades also showed how church and political leaders co-operated in order to save the Eastern Empire. Although Byzantines regained Constantinople, their capital city from Roman control in 1261, enemies on all sides surrounded the Byzantine Empire.

On the one hand, many of European monarchs (Sicilian, Genoese, Venetians) had one aim: “the destruction of the Greek city, race, and name” and re-establishing the shattered Latin empire (Diehl 1957:222- 223). On the other hand, the Turks who had emerged as the nightmare before the Easterners because they relentlessly attacked the capital city, Constantinople, had already existed in Asia Minor since the late eleventh century. That was the reason why the State and Church again co-operated to save the empire through religious power twice of in 1261 and 1439 (Meyendorff 1982:78; Galli 1997:19; Freely 1967:172-173).

The Eastern Church accepted what the Roman Church wanted: the primacy of the Pope, and the Union of the two Churches under the Roman Church including the addition of the *filioque* in the Creed, the doctrine of purgatory, and using unleavened bread in the Eucharist, in exchange for the significant help need that was to defend the Turks (Galli 1997:19). This compromising of the Eastern Church, for political purposes, greatly angered the majority of the Eastern people, (Ware 1964: 81; Diehl 1957:223). This means that the thirteenth and fifteenth century attempts at reunion were purely political in character. The Eastern Church leaders were entangled in political affairs, and their influence in the spiritual arena gradually faded.

Christians under the Ottoman Empire were radically affected by the *millet* system through which the central government controlled the multiethnic society. The concepts of “religious institute” and “state” changed. The ecclesiastical structure was mixed with secular administration, and the bishops carried on their holy orders along with secular affairs. This caused confusion between faith (Orthodoxy) and politics among the Christians (Ware 1964: 98). The Greek and Armenian Churches inevitably became deeply involved in politics for their *millet* (Walters 1999: 303; Lewis 1995: 325).

Further, the two Churches, the Greek and Armenian, organized ‘the independence project’, and became centers of political activities. As the “Empire within Empire”, many Greeks and Armenians who were educated in Europe, had their hopes in terms of liberty, human rights, and equality by the French Revolution movement in the 17th and 18th centuries. Thus two potent ideologies of patriotism and nationalism emerged from this new movement in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the 18th century (Lewis 1995: 318, 320). A movement for Greek independence had been gathering forces through the activities of a secret philhellenic

organization, or Society of Friends (Freely 1996: 262-263). They finally raised the banner of revolt against the Turks with the blessing of the Archbishop of Patras at the monastery of Ayia Lavra on 25 March 1821 (Waterfield 2004: 347). The result of this revolt was that the ecumenical patriarch Gregory V was killed by the opponents' attack on 2 April 1821, Easter Sunday, along with some 30,000 Greeks (Walters 1999: 304). Eventually, Greeks obtained freedom from the Ottoman Turks in 1830, leading to the establishment of the first Greek kingdom three years later (Freely 1996: 266; Lewis 1995: 281).

The Armenian Patriarchate also made efforts to obtain Armenian independence in the nineteenth century after the attainment of independence by Balkan countries. Like the Greeks, the new class of the Armenian merchants and rich traders supported the Church and the national intellectual endeavours (Panossian 2006: 71; Manuelian 2001:3). When the first reform program of *Tanzimat* was declared in 1839, Armenians were encouraged, and the Armenian Church played a political part in establishing the Armenian National Constitution in 1863 (Papazian 1987:10).

The head of the Armenian *millet*, the Armenian patriarch, sent 537 notes to the Sublime Porte (office of the grand vizier), requesting and pleading for protection from the daily abuses including violence, as well as social and political injustices between 1850 and 1870, yet social and political conditions for the Armenians grew worse (Balakian 2004:5). After 1878, the Armenian Patriarchate became more actively involved in working for their independence, Mugerditch Khrimian and the Patriarch Malachia Ormanian being the key figures in the nineteenth century (Bardakjian 2001:2).

The missionary activities of both Protestant and the Roman Catholic Church in the Empire were intertwined with politics, because all their activities were supported by princes and diplomats of the Western European countries (Latourette 1974b: 81). Through political influence, the Catholic Church contributed remarkably to Christianity in the Ottoman Empire: the Roman Catholics were firstly allowed their own Patriarch in the Ottoman Empire through the French influence as the Roman Catholic *millet* in 1830 (Atiya 1968: 338-339). And then the Ottoman government abrogated the traditional death penalty for conversion from Islam to Christianity, in 1856. This concession was the result of Franco-British co-operation with Turkey in the Crimean War (Latourette 1974c: 48).

The Protestant mission that followed the Roman Catholic mission, worked slightly different during the 19th and 20th centuries. However, Protestants also from time to time leaned on the political power of the French or British. One of the remarkable achievements of the missionaries' work was that the Ottoman Empire granted freedom of religion throughout the whole of Turkey in 1856. In fact, the Sultan was forced to do so by the two European powers, France and Britain, in order to gain support for the Crimean War (1853-1856). Thus missionaries were recruited for converting the Muslims.

However, they enjoyed this optimistic 'spike' for only about eight years (Pikkert 2006: 64). Missionaries became much more sensitive to the awakening of nationalism, new liberalism, and the cultural values of the Christian minorities: Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian, and Syrian (Balakian 2004: 30). During and after the Armenian genocide in the Asia Minor, the government stopped all missionary work, and all Christian missions left Turkey in 1922 (Freely 296-297, 299; Kieser 2002: 392, 396). Missionaries were accused of setting Armenians, Kurds, and Syrians against their rulers (Kieser 2000: 13-14).

4.3.2 Deterioration of the Church

In the course of time, the quality of Church leadership degenerated in the Byzantine Empire. Religious freedom combined with the supporting of various emperors enabled the Patriarch to become very rich. His power derived as much from his authority over the innumerable monks of Constantinople, as from his influence on the laity. Monks also were acquisitive, and possessed vast tracts of land and intervened in political matters (Diehl 1957: 163-164). Moreover, the monastic institutions had been falling into disarray since the end of the eleventh century. Worldly life invaded the monasteries.

By the end of the eleventh century, monks infested the roads, ravaged the countryside, and robbed wayfarers (Diehl 1957:170-171). Even the emperor, Leo VI, rebuked the bishops' maladministration of Church revenues, calling them "Powerful men who robbed the poor." Their action benefited only the clergy in order to get support from them to enable the bishops to play an important role in politics, instead of being content with their authority in the Church. Diehl cites the phrase of a fourteenth century historian, that the church leaders "had nothing about them

of the priest save the pastoral staff and the habit” (Diehl 1957:172, 172, 174). During the Ottoman period, civil and political matters were thoroughly mixed in the Church because of Islamic law. Later this mixture would lead the patriarchate becoming part of the institutionalized corruption under the Ottoman system (Ware 1964: 97-98). The bishops of the Greek Church had political ambitions and financial greed, being involved in worldly affairs and political matters. No man could get a position as a clergyman without a bribe. The matter of simony inevitably emerged. This was cyclical; each new Patriarch needed a large amount of money for his throne. The Patriarch recovered his expenses from the episcopate, by exacting a fee from each bishop before instituting him in his diocese. The bishop, in turn, taxed the parish clergy, and the clergy taxed their parishioners who bore the final burden (Ware 1964: 98).

In the seventeenth century the office of the Patriarch changed some 60 times. “Everything was for sale in the Patriarchate under the Turks who virtually sold the throne of the Patriarch to the highest bidder”(Ware 1964:98). Out of 159 Patriarchs who held office from the 15th to the 20th centuries, on 105 occasions, the Turks drove the Patriarchs from their throne. There were 27 abdications, often involuntary. Six Patriarchs suffered violent deaths by hanging, poisoning, or drowning; and only 21 died natural deaths while in office.

The extreme insecurity of the Patriarch naturally gave rise to continual intrigues among the Metropolitans of the Holy Synod who hoped to succeed him, and the leaders of the Church were usually separated into bitterly hostile parties (Ware 1964: 99). The office of Patriarch was obtainable by means of a bribe to the grand vizier (Walters 1999: 286-287). Therefore, the Patriarchate of Constantinople suffered an inward decay, and its power had never been extended.

4.3.3 Theological stagnation

Throughout the Byzantine Empire, the Eastern Church avoided rational structured systematization and gradually developed the idea of mysticism (Cross 1988:51). From the start of the eleventh century, mystical theologians appeared. Symeon the New Theologian summed up mysticism by collecting the existing mystical traditions and practices (Payne 1958:300). In the twelfth century, Euthymius Zigabenus, Nicholas of Methone, and Nicetas Acominatus did the same thing. Especially in the fourteenth century, there were the champions of Eastern mysticism:

Palamas, Cantacuzenus, and the two Cabasilas (Diehl 1957: 244-245). However, in the later Byzantine era, the Eastern Church's theology repeated what the Church Fathers had taught. The leading Church Fathers were Maximus the Confessor in the seventh century and John of Damascus in the eighth century (Hill 2007:154). It should be recognized that Byzantine theology began to stagnate from the ninth century onwards: theologians went on attacking heresy in the old way, rebelling against the teaching of Western Scholasticism, and bringing a strange narrow-mindedness to all they did. Religious eloquence and hagiography alone preserved some semblance of life (Diehl 1957: 246).

Under the Ottoman Turks, the great aim of the Greek Orthodox Church was survival. The Church was usually content to repeat the accepted formulae, to entrench itself in the position which it had inherited from the past. Though seeking to maintain the Orthodox tradition substantially unimpaired, inevitably the Church was influenced by western theology. Two opposite tendencies appeared in the Greek Orthodox Church: “conservatism” and “westernization” (Ware 1964:100-101). The movement towards “westernization” was also divided into the ‘Latinizers’ and the ‘Protestantizers’ (Ware 1964:102-103).

Therefore, theological confusion dominated in the Greek Orthodox Church. The reason for this was that those who studied in the west looked at theology through western spectacles, whereas the majority remained at home were fundamentally Orthodox (Ware1964: 110). Among the distinguished Greek theologians were Cyril Lucaris, Peter of Moghila, Dositheus of Jerusalem, and Nicodemus. They were either self-taught or had been trained in the west under Roman Catholic or Protestant schools, where they had read the early Church Fathers. Thus Gregory Palamas was still read, for his spiritual teaching, by the monks of Athos (Ware1964: 101-110).

At the end of the eighteenth century, an important spiritual revival occurred on Mount Athos. A monk, Nicodemus of the Holy Mountain, compiled an anthology of spiritual writings called the *Philokalia* with the help of Makarius, published at Venice in 1782. It was a gigantic work of 1,207 folio pages, containing authors from the fourth century to the fifteenth. It dealt chiefly with the theory and practice of prayer, especially the ‘Jesus prayer’. His remarkable work is “one of most influential publications in Orthodox history, and has been widely read not only by monks but also by many living in the world” (Ware 1964:110).

The Armenian Church was able to publish a considerable body of religious literature, even though the Church strove for Armenian nationalism. Catholicos Michael I sent Abgar of Tocat to Venice in 1566 in order to help with the printing of church books, and the Armenian Psalter. After two years, the Calendar, Hymnal, Horologion, and Missal had been printed in Constantinople. Bishop Volskan printed the first Armenian Bible in Amsterdam in 1666. In the following century, John Golod issued more than ninety volumes of Armenian religious classics, including Gregory of Datev's *Book of Questions*. Mekhitarists also founded their press in 1729. Through this press they were able to render substantial services to Armenian letters (Atiya 1968:349, 350).

The Armenian Church had a revival period, yet they did not develop theology significantly. The Church repeated ancient truths in ancient words taken from St. Basil's liturgy, St. Gregory the Illuminator, and St. John Chrysostom during the Ottoman Empire. On the whole, both the Greek and the Armenian Church stagnated during the Ottoman period because the two Churches focused on their freedom and on conflict with the central government of the Ottoman Turks. Therefore, both Churches in the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires had differences and similarities; this is illustrated in the diagram below.

4.3.4 Conclusion

The writer has given attention to the differences and similarities in the Churches of the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires. This discussion naturally leads to an answer about the cause of the decline of the Churches in both Empires. Even though the contexts of the Churches were different, they had similar experience: misguided involvement in secular politics. In this way, their lives were corrupted. In addition, the church leaders, especially in the Ottoman period, were more concerned with their identity than with spiritual life, which led their parishioners, to concentrate on their history, and on nationalism. This concentration contributed to massive suffering, and caused the decline of the Christian population from the late 19th to the early 20th century.

4.4 A biblical reflection on the Church in the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empire

The purpose here will be to find out the answer to the question how the Church should perform biblically in terms of its relationship to state. The character of clergy and other Christians will

also be examined in accordance to biblical perspective and some theologians thought. Issues will be discussed from the Protestant point of view.

4.4.1 The relation of Church and Politics

From the time of Jesus, Christians have discussed the relationship between church and state (Mt.22: 16-22; Jn 18:33-40). This discussion developed various conceptions of relationship, yet even through drawing a distinction between church and state, they typically have not conceived the church as separate or apart from the state. The two Churches under discussion here, the Church in the Byzantine Empire and the Church in the Ottoman period, were also interwoven with secular political institutions.

Since the time of Constantine, the association of religion and politics was a symbiotic relationship that the Church was subordinate to the state during the Byzantine period. This interdependence between church and politics contributed a great deal to the weakness of the Eastern Church from the eleventh century of the Byzantine Empire onward. One of the reasons for the restricting of expansion of Eastern Christianity was that the relationship of Church to state was not one of equality during the Byzantine Empire (Latourette 1974a: 224).

With the Church under the Ottoman rulers, the situation was complicated in that the Church became a bridge between her *millet*- nation-, which was given political power over the laity and central government. Naturally, the patriarchs of Constantinople were more concerned with their parishioners' social claims. In their struggle for their independence from the Ottoman Turks, they were led to secular politics, in terms of liberalism or nationalism. The Church inevitably represented her parishioners as the first line of fighters to the central power of Ottoman government from the nineteenth century onward (Ware 1964: 97-98).

However, the historical development of the church's role in the relationship between church and state has gradually changed. According to Calvinist thinking, the State may be defined as a political community that is naturally formed from a social impulse, and placed in man by God since the entrance of sin into the world. On the other hand, the Kingdom of God that perfect State, will alone be realized by Jesus Christ. This role confers special grace on the Church.

The state, however, belongs to the sphere of common grace. Therefore the Church must be distinct from the State, which is not called to do the work of the Church (Meeter 1960:101-105 and 112). Further, the church is directly related to Christ for the exaltation of the Mediator (Jn. 15:1-7), and the state is related to Christ in a more indirect way (Runia 1995:252). Therefore, we will examine the right relationship between secular power and religious institutions through the biblical view, with selective use of material from some theologians.

4.4.1.1 The view of theologians

Augustine (d.ca. 430)

Augustine attempted to answer the question: “What is the right relationship between church and state?” Yet he did not develop a systematic theory of the proper relationship in detail. Augustine provided the foundation using the two opposed cities in his argument: the state with the earthly city is evil, and the church with the city of God is as good as Jerusalem, contrasted with Babylon in his ‘*De Civitate Dei*’ (The City of God). For him, church and state have to be distinguished in this world because they are absolutely antithetic, yet go parallel to the end. They are interwoven in this earth, namely in *saeculum*, and the state exists not simply in opposition to God but as a divine instrument for the welfare of humankind. The opposed two cities are “respectively ruled by Christ and by Satan, and will be separated on the Day of Judgment” (Ahn (s.a): 16- 20).

Martin Luther (1483–1546)

Luther describes the church and state as two different kingdoms: one under the law, and the other under the gospel. In Luther’s three Sermons on the 23rd Sunday after Trinity (2000: 146-175), he sharply distinguishes between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world using Mathew 22:15-22. For him, God has two ways of ruling, known as the two spheres—the law and the Gospel. He continues that “each of these has its own purpose and function, so neither infringes upon the other” (Luther 2000: 146). His argument is based on Augustine’s two cities. Just as Augustine’s two cities were influenced by the oppression of the Roman emperors of the Christians, Luther further develops his view in reaction to the problems of the medieval hierarchical system, with its confusion of power, and partly in reaction to the Anabaptist movement (Sinnema 1995:73).

The Anabaptists held that church and state must be separated, as did Luther. Yet the Anabaptists went further. They insisted on the church as being a voluntary community, and society should not be forced to join the church. For the Anabaptists, pacifism is an essential element in Christianity so that they would not take oaths or offer military service. They also believed that the Sermon on the Mount must be obeyed literally. Therefore, they would not take up arms, even if their country was endangered by the Turks who constantly threatened them during the sixteenth century. However Luther argues that as being under the law, the state can take up arms when circumstances and justice demand it for self-defence (Gonzalez 2004: 36, 54).

Along with Luther, the Dutch reformer Bray also warned his adherents in the Belgic Confession in Article 36 that “We detest the Anabaptists and other seditious people...who reject the higher powers and magistrates and would subvert justice...which God has established among men” (Beets 1929: 266). The two kingdoms in Luther’s argument represent the right and the left hand of God, and are ordained by God. This argument is not found in Augustine. Luther emphasizes that the spiritual realm refers to the church only in the limited sense of the rule of the clergy over spiritual matters, and the temporal government refers to the state. Christians must be obedient to the temporal rulers who are also God’s servants (Rom. 13:1) (Sinnema 1995:75, 77). Thus he argues for a rigorous separation of church and state because the state has different priorities and different concerns.

John Calvin (1509–1564)

Calvin owes his doctrine of two kingdoms to Augustine and Luther (Sinnema 1995:88-89). Calvin discusses the distinction between spiritual government and political government in his book “Institutes of the Christian religion.” He systematically analyses the subject of two governments in book four, chapter 20. For him, it is not difficult to make a distinction between these two. Calvin describes this significant theory making a distinction between body and soul, and then he relates this theory to the similar matter of distinguishing between this present fleeting life and a future eternal life. Likewise, Christ’s spiritual Kingdom and civil jurisdiction are completely distinct. Calvin says that these two governments (spiritual and political) are different organizations, yet they are not antithetical; rather it is a mutual relationship (Calvin 1973: IV. 20.1-2). He clearly states that God ordains this magistracy. The duties of magistracy

are to keep citizens' property safe and sound; men may carry on blameless intercourse among themselves. It must be recognized that political government is directly connected with religion. The civil government is obligated to support citizens to enable them to worship God in peace and to prevent idolatry, sacrilege against God's name, and blasphemies against his truth (Calvin 1973: IV. 20. 3-4). Calvin repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the duty of obedience to magistrates; i.e. that the subjects should prove their obedience towards their rulers by obeying their proclamations, or by paying taxes, or undertaking public offices. He cites what Paul says, "be subject to the higher powers" (Rom. 1-2), and reminds us "to be ready for every good work" (Tit. 3:1).

It seems that Calvin had the Anabaptists in mind, when he stated "war is a thing lawful for Christians", and taxes are the lawful revenues of princes for using to meet the public expenses of their office (Calvin 1973: IV. 20. 11-13, 23). Bray, who was deeply influenced by Calvin, published a Confession. This is called "The Belgic Confession" or "The Reformed Confession of Faith". In Article 36 of the Confession, he clarified his view that civil government is appointed by God, and the civil state "is not only to have regard unto and watch for the welfare of the civil state, but also to protect the sacred ministry" (Beets 1929:266). Bray also indicates that subjects should show due honour to and respect for the magistrates: to pay tribute and obey them in all things that are not repugnant to the Word of God (Beets 1929:266).

In 1541 Calvin could practise what he had stated about the theoretical separation of church and state in Geneva. Calvin, as a reformer, worked with Protestant leaders, particularly Farel, who became Calvin's main collaborator and support (Gonzalez 2004:65). Then Calvin dramatically changed the Ecclesiastical ordinances, since he rejected Medieval Church systems and introduced the Apostolic model of the church in which there were to be no bishops. All ministers were equal. The government of the church in Geneva was placed mostly in the hands of the Consistory, whose members were the pastors, and twelve lay elders. The government of Geneva at the time of Calvin consisted of three councils: the Small Council of twenty-five, the Council of sixty, and the Council of two hundred (Parker 1975:83). Even though Calvin understood church and state to be coterminous, some doubted whether Calvin considered the church to control the magistrates, because he seemed to be involved in many affairs. The reason was that the pastors tried to influence the making and enforcing of good laws, especially having a great

concern for morals and decency on the part of the church (Graham 1988: 277-279,280). During the first twelve years of his ministry in Geneva, the Consistory and the government of the city disagreed repeatedly. Although Calvin was not fully supported by the citizen of Geneva, his remarkable efforts enabled Geneva to become the most influential city in the Protestant movement. This movement contributed to the new educational system, the Geneva Academy, which was established in 1559. This Academy educated numerous students, who came from various parts of Europe, according to Calvinist principles (Gonzalez 2004:67, 68).

Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920)

Kuyper, as a Calvinist, also builds up the relationship between Church and State based on what Augustine and Calvin taught. After the French Revolution, which refused God's Sovereignty, he attempts to recreate a Christian perspective on politics and society within Calvinistic political theory. He believed that God's power is all over the world, and that nature can show God's workings: "the Sovereignty of the Triune God over the whole Cosmos." He then argues for three realms of sovereignty in integral wholes or "spheres": (1) the State, (2) the Society, and (3) the Church (Kuyper 1994: 79, 87). For him, only God is possessed of sovereign rights. Politics, Kuyper argues, was created by man's sin. God alone created the nations by His Almighty power, and rules them with ordinances. He stresses free citizenship and that man never possesses power over his fellow man in any way than by an authority, which descends upon him through the majesty of God (Kuyper 1994: 82-83).

In terms of politics, he proposes three duties to be performed by the state: (1) to draw a boundary between the different social spheres to avoid social conflict. (2) To defend individuals and weak elements within each sphere. (3) To coerce all the separate spheres of society to support the state and uphold its legitimate functions (Kuyper 1994: 85). He emphasizes that the Church should be free from political power. He also argues that the state should honour the complex of the Christian Church. As the State itself stands before the Lord, it also has responsibility to God. Both State and Church must have their own spheres: obey God and serve His honour. The sovereignty of the state and Church exist side by side, and they mutually limit each other (Kuyper 1994: 104, 106-107).

4.4.1.2 The biblical view

The Old Testament gives many accounts of how God ruled over earthly kingdoms and religious institutions. It is obvious how the first king of the nation Israel appeared. When the people of Israel asked God for a king, God reluctantly allowed them to have a king, like the neighbouring nations (1Sam 8:4-21). Afterwards the monarchic state and religious institutions went along hand in hand. Yet most of the kings were corrupt, and even good ones sometimes ended up misusing their power, until the southern nation of Judah fell to Babylon in 586 B.C (Merrill 1994:5).

Before the Israelites were given a monarchy, God had already given them clear laws about kingship: (1) what character every ruler should have. (2) How the ruler should rule his subjects. (3) What to do as a king following the instructions of Moses (Deut 16: 18-20; 17:14-20). At the same time God gave a long sermon, through Moses about rules for priests as religious leaders, in Leviticus 21:1- 22:31.

However, many theologians refer to the biblical view of “the state as a divine institution” from Rom.13: 1, and 1 Per. 2:13-14 (Runia 1995:249). The Protestants believe that the authority of the state must derive from God Himself (Proverbs 8:15, 16; Psalm 2:10, 11; 72:10, 11; Jn 19:11 and Rom 13). This belief was formulated by means of the following quotation at the Scottish Confession of 1560: “We confess and acknowledge that empires, kingdoms, dominions, and cities are appointed and ordained by God” (Runia 1995:250).

At the same time, the idea that there should be a separation between the “secular” and the “religious” is based on Jesus’ command to “Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s” (Mt 22:21; Mark 12:17). It is also clear that when people expected Jesus to set up a worldly political kingdom, He declares, “My kingdom is not of this world” (Jn 18:36). Jesus emphasizes the distinction between secular kingdoms and the heavenly kingdom, which is linked up with the concept of the church that Jesus expressed to Peter “I will build My church...I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Mat.16: 18-19).

4.4.1.3 The different tasks of the Church and State

The writer will now briefly discuss the task of state and church. The Lord established the Church (Mt. 16:16) because he does not dwell among us in His bodily presence (Mat. 26:11), but He rules through Christ's special grace, which is operational in the church (Meeter 1960: 105). The purpose of the church is (1) ministry to God; in terms of worshiping Him (Col. 3:16; Eph. 1:12; 5:16-19). (2) Ministry to believers (Col. 1:28; Eph. 4:12-13). (3) Ministry to the world (Mat 28:19) with merciful heart (Lk 6:35-36; Act11: 29; 2 Cor. 8:4; Jn. 3:17). (4) These three purposes should be kept in balance for a Christian life (Grudem 2005: 867-869).

The role of the church with the state is that the church should: (1) honour and respect the secular authorities (1 Peter 2:17). (2) Be submissive to the providence and the power of God represented by the magistrates, (3) Pray not only for those who are good rulers, but also those who are bad, so that God may change wicked men into good (1 Tim. 2:2; Isa 49:23) (Rooy (1995:151-152). On this point Calvin (1973: IV 20. 24-27) emphasizes that obedience is also due to the unjust magistrate, which is described in Scripture (Dan 2:21, 37; 4:17; Ch 4:14; Ez 29:19-20).

Further, we are encouraged to obey and pray whenever we live under foreign rulers on their behalf, for in their peace will be our peace until God will give us release from our captivity as the people of God (Jer 27:5-8, 17). Matthew also says that we should pray for our persecutors, rather than protest or to be in conflict with the state (Mt. 5:44). This is because God will deal with those who have displeased him as evildoers, "*Tekel*: You have been weighed in the balances and found wanting... that very night Belshazzar, king of the Chaldeans, was slain" (Dan. 5:27, 30).

(4) Admonish those who govern as to their duties and obligations (2 Sam 12:1-12; 2 Ch 10: 6-8; Ps 82:3-4; Am 8:4; Ps 82:2, and Ez 11:1-2) (Rooy 1995:152-153). It is worthy to remind ourselves about what Calvin (1975: IV. 20. 32) says: like Daniel and his three friends should be obedient to man, yet must not become disobedient to God (Dan. 3:11-31; 6:22-23). The New Testament also shows us how we should respond to difficult moments, as Peter and the other apostles determinedly declared; "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). As the Belgic Confession indicates, in terms of the origin of the civil government in Article 36, the state is a mechanical scheme, appointed by God (Rom 13:1-4) in His common grace (Beets 1929:266,268).

Thus governors should work on behalf of God, Church and individuals. It should be recognized that God is the Supreme Ruler, and that the state rules the subjects according to God's ordinances as God's servant (Kuyper1994: 103). The Scriptures show us how the civil state or authorities must serve their subjects because judgment is not for man, but for God (Deut. 1:14-16). The first task of government is to administer justice, which is to defend the majesty of the law in human society (Jer 21:12, 22:3; Psalm 82; Rom 12:8; 13:1-4), and to promote of the general welfare of the state and of its citizens (Meeter 1960:125; Rooy 1995:150-151).

Furthermore, the Belgic Confession declares that one of the important duties of the government is "not only to have regard unto and watch for the welfare of the civil state, but also to protect the sacred ministry" (Beets 1929:266). Calvin firmly believes that making a distinction between church and state must not lead us to think that the state structure is "a thing polluted" that Christians shun. Therefore the Church gives moral support to the State, while the State gives temporal support to the Church (Mckim 2001:163, 165).

The major role for civil governors is to serve the people, yet not rule over the religious institutions. It was a serious view that God would not permit the rule of political power over the religious institutions. For example, it occurred in Uzziah's reign that he was a remarkably successful king, but when he proudly extended his power over the religious institutions, God did not allow him to do so and he perished with a leprous disease (2 Ch. 26:3-21). Religion and politics should not be mixed; but that does not mean that the Church never has contact with the outside world. Indeed, they go hand in hand all the time. Christians live in this world within the community where societies and political institutions are formed inevitably. However, the two different organizations have distinct duties that both authorities are given by God. The state is formed for civil service with Christ's common grace, and the church works for the spiritual interests and the worship of God through the special grace of Christ.

4.4.2 The role of clergyman

Some scholars of church history recognize that one of the causes of the decline of the Church was the Church herself. According to Hansen (2004:1), the doctrinal conflict between the Eastern churches and Greeks contributed to the weakening of the Church. From the time of the Council

of Ephesus 431, these theological offshoots advanced further. The Greek churches attempted to subjugate the Eastern churches. In this hegemonic rivalry the Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorianism. This was followed by the Council of Chalcedon and the rejection of Monophysitism in 451. On the other hand, from time to time both Church leaders in the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires compromised with central political power, by which they were corrupted (Diehl 1957: 163-166, 174; Ware 1964: 97-98). The Church leaders especially in the Palaeologan period (1261-1453), the last dynasty of the Byzantine Empire, did not lead their parishioners to overcome difficult situations through faith, but led them to look the other way, which was mysticism (Stamoolis 1986: 86-102, 110).

In the Ottoman period, the church leaders were more concerned with their national identity than with spiritual life. This concern led their parishioners remarkably towards concentrating on their history, in other words nationalism (Atiya 1968: 349). Two questions arise here: 1) what is the right character for a clergyman? 2) What is the task of clergyman? Answers to these questions are elicited from the biblical sources with some theologian's views as well. These answers will be challenged by those who work in the field of church ministries.

4.4.2.1 The right character of clergyman

In the Byzantine period, the character of clergymen was considered very important. Some accounts are quoted from Diehl's "Byzantium". The Patriarch's interest "was always, albeit indirectly, the arbiter of public affairs" (Diehl 1957:164). The "monks possess none of evangelical virtue...all their energies are devoted to their own enrichment, so that their life in no way differs from that of people living in the world" (Diehl 1957:169). Up to the last days of the Byzantine era, the monks were more covetous than ever of money and estates... to expound the principles of efficient husbandry than to save souls" (Diehl 1957:170-171). It was also a significant image that "a man who is walking slowly with his eyes downcast, wore a ragged habit and had a shaven head, a long, unkempt beard, and bare, dirty feet, his edifying appearance was enough to become a good monk" (Diehl 1957: 171). Similar accounts also arose during the Ottoman Empire. The clergymen had two different duties; the bishops carried on their holy orders along with secular affairs. They had political ambitions and financial greed, being involved in worldly affairs and political matters later on (Ware 1964: 97-98).

From the biblical point of view, however, we know that Jesus established the Church to be a worshipping assembly before him. The Church proclaims the Word of God, and communicates with all true believers (Mat16: 16-18; Eph 5:25). Then He calls those who minister the secrets of God as His stewards (1Cor. 4:1) to care for the needs of all believers. Paul defines the servants of God as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (Eph. 4:11), overseers, and deacons (1Tim.3: 1, 8). Calvin also practically divides three kinds of ministers in the Church: (1) Pastors and teachers. (2) Those involved with censure and correction of morals. (3) The deacons for care of the poor and the distribution of alms (Calvin 1975: IV. 20.1). Paul gives us specific instructions about what kind of personality clergymen ought to have.

The first qualification is morality: In the first book of Timothy, Paul repeatedly describes how church leaders should have integrity of character; a good conscience and should lead an exemplary life style in speech, in love, and in purity all the time (1Tim. 1:19; 3:9; 4:12; 6: 11, 14). Therefore, the leader in any church is expected to be as follows: “an elder must be blameless, the husband of but one wife...not quick-tempered, not given to drunkenness, not violent, not pursuing dishonest gain, and must be hospitable” (Tit. 1:6-8). Paul warns strongly on this point: “Love of money is a root of all kinds of evil” (1Tim. 3:3; 6:10).

The second qualification is spirituality: spiritual leaders (clergymen, the pastor or minister) must show satisfactory evidence of their knowledge of the Scripture, and soundness in doctrine in accordance with the purity of the gospel. They should not be corrupted by ignorance or heretical teachings (1Tim.4: 13, 15) (Schaff 1892:477-478). It is not only for preaching and teaching but also “You will save both yourself and your hearers” (1Tim.4: 16). This is Paul’s repetition of the warning, “be diligent in these matters...so that everyone may see your progress... those who oppose him may be ashamed because they have nothing bad to say about him” (1Tim. 4:11). Nevertheless, the most important character a clergyman should have to be a servant: to feed their flocks with humble, merciful hearts, and sacrificial love like Jesus (MacArthur 1995:28-29).

4.4.2.2 The task of clergyman

The character of the Eastern Church can be defined as follows; liturgy is the key, proclaims the gospel through doxology (Bria 1975: 248), and mysticism. In the course of time, apocalyptic

expectations were thwarted by the delay of the *parousia*, which led Christians to largely lose their sense of urgency, and to forget their original eschatological expectations. Likewise, the original eschatological expectation was further exchanged for mysticism. The teaching of whole view of Scripture and balanced theological teachings were ignored (Latourette 1974a: 442; Edwards 1997:118). Further, the true meaning of the gospel in which they explained why God and the Christ came to earth faded. Faith in God's promise yet to be fulfilled was replaced by faith in the already consummated eternal kingdom of Christ (Bosch 2005:196,197). This theological view led them to disregard the historical continuity between the Old and the New Testaments, and the inherent historical hermeneutical connection between the two testaments was ignored. Believers were no longer concerned about the distinction between "this age" and "the age to come" (Beker 1980:342). The focus was more on heaven rather than on this world or God's involvement in history (Bosch 1991:197). For this reason, Eastern theology gradually developed into mysticism.

The Eastern Church leaders, both in the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires, naturally led their parishioners to the mystical way of Christian life, rather than exposing the parishioners to the biblical truth. It is significant from the Protestant point of view that the Eastern Church leaders approached the Scriptural commentaries timid and devoid of breadth, criticism, or curiosity (Diehl 1957: 246). The Eastern Church believes that the Bible is the supreme expression of God's revelation to man (Ware 1964:207), yet they believe that the Bible should not take precedence over Church tradition. The Bible is regarded as a verbal icon of Christ, and the East placed tradition above Scripture (Cross 1988:48). This weakness of knowledge of Scripture led clergymen to easily give up their belief or abandon their parishioners, and flee to safety (Latourette 1974b: 72; Riddell & Cotterell 2003:93,109).

Church leaders in both the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires were involved in politics. In addition, clergymen in the Ottoman Empire paid much more attention to political matters. It is surely significant that clergymen of the Greek Church gave their lives for their Independence: death came to 11 Ecumenical Patriarchs of Constantinople, nearly 100 bishops, and several thousand priests, deacons and monks (Constantelos 2004:3). Throughout history, the Armenian Church has worked more for the Armenian nation's survival. Leaders of the Armenian Church also sacrificed their lives for independence from the Ottoman state, but not for evangelizing.

Furthermore, missionary work in the 19th century was considerable. The educational, social, and medical efforts of missionaries showed very disappointing results. People who lived in the Ottoman Empire responded minimally to the Gospel via the medical and educational outreaches into which so much money and energy had been poured, even though the justification for Christian institutions on the field clearly does not lie in the number of baptized converts (Watson 1947:19). They were admired for their contributions of social, educational, and cultural developments to those who lived in the Ottoman Empire (Balakian 2004: 31; Kieser (2002:393,407).

From the Protestant point of view, this is a list of activities within the life of the church that clergymen usually carry out with their parishioners: Teaching of the Word, Baptism, The Lord's Supper, Prayer for one another, Worship, Church discipline, Spiritual gifts, Fellowship, Evangelism, and Personal ministry to individuals (Grudem 2005: 951). For Calvin, (1) the Word of God is entrusted to the bishops, presbyters, pastors, and ministers (Tit 1:7; 3:1; Ac 20:17; 20:28; Eph 4:11). (2) Governors are charged with the censure of morals and the exercise of discipline along with the bishops (1Cor.12: 28). (3) Deacons care for the poor. Their duty should be to distribute alms and care for the poor and sick (Rom.12:8) (Mckim 2001:133).

Nevertheless, the primary task of spiritual leaders is undoubtedly teaching of the Word of God. Since Luther's reformation, the Protestants believe that the Word of God is above popes and councils. Luther emphasized that the Bible led you to the source, which is the cross of Christ so that Christ is at once the centre of Scripture and the Lord of Scripture. The Scriptures are to rule and govern the faith and practice of the Church as well as the thinking and reason of men (George 1988:79-83). Actually God was stressed from the ancient time of Moses, who received the laws from God for the people of God (Ex.34: 28). Moses gave a long sermon to the Israelites before he died.

In the Book of Deuteronomy, he especially commands "Hear, O Israel...you may learn them and be sure to follow them" (Deu. 5:1), and "these commandments...you shall teach them diligently to your children... you shall bind them as a sign on your hand (Deu. 6:7-8). Psalms tells us that the Word of God gives direction and guidance as a "lamp" and a "light" to our way (Ps. 119:105). In the New Testament, Paul also emphasizes that teaching of the Word of God is "profitable for

doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness (1Tim. 3:15). Paul depicts how the Word of God is important: “the gospel is the power of God to salvation for everyone” (Rom. 1:16), and the Word of God that “is able to build you up” (Ac. 20:32). The Word of God discovers what is sin, and turns those who are chosen by God to righteousness (Rom 3:23; Act 4:12; Jn 3:16). It is noteworthy that pastors ought to expound a passage of Scripture honestly and clearly in its context and in relation to the Bible as a whole (Cranfield 1985: 14).

The most famous title of a servant of God, one giving spiritual leadership is metaphorically described in the Bible as a shepherd (Isa 40:11; 44:28; Psa 28:29; Jer 17:16; Eze 34:2-10, 23; Jn10: 11; 1Pet 5:2; Heb 13:17). The primary objective of shepherds is to feed their flocks, even though sometimes they need a stick or staff because sheep wander off to other fields or die of starvation. Sheep cannot feed themselves; they must be conducted to water and pasture. Jesus forcefully asked Peter to “feed my sheep” (Jn. 21:17) (Macarthur 1995:28-29).

As Luther emphasized, the clergymen are only God’s servants in the exercise of spiritual government (Sinnema 1995:75). Spiritual leaders should not busy themselves with earthly matters. They should not focus on social or educational ministries; rather they should preach the Word of God in season and out of season with great patience (2 Tim. 4:2). According to Scripture, Christians should not fight against their overlord, but rather suffer wrong or injustice and determines the Christian manner of lifestyle (Mt 5:44; Rom 13:1) (Sinnema 1995: 86).

This teaching should not be confused with the statement that “the pastoral leadership is to guard and shepherd the flock of God, which includes all that it takes to bring the church to maturity”(1 Pet.5: 1-4; Jn. 21:15-22) (Montoya 1995:287). Therefore, any spiritual shepherd’s aim is not to favour the sheep, but to feed them with substantial meals of solid biblical truth and keeping them, “exercising oversight” (1Pe. 5:2). God entrusted them with the authority and responsibility of leading the flock (Heb. 13:17). The most important point of spiritual leadership is the power of an exemplary life (Macarthur 1995:29).

4.4.3 The character of Christians

The Christian life in the Byzantine Empire was no different from the non-believing community (Diehl 1957:169). Further, Christians, who lived in the Byzantine period, tried only to keep their

faith in the monasteries, rather than spreading the gospel to the world during the 11th to 15th centuries. On the other hand, minority Christians in the Ottoman Empire fought against and was in conflict with their rulers in the 19th and 20th centuries. Thus the question “what is Christian life?” must have arisen.

The meaning of the word “Christian” is defined as (1) someone who believes in Jesus Christ with all his heart as personal Lord and Saviour (Ac 16:31; Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 12:3; Eph 2:8-9; Phil 2:11). (2) It must be confessed that Jesus died on the cross for his sin (Rom 5: 8; Col 2:13-14; Heb 9:12; 1 Pe 1:19) and rose again. (3). It must be shown that the Christian is seeking the kingdom of God and shows a heartfelt personal devotion that expresses love, gratitude, loyalty, and the glory of God (Deut 6:5; Mt 5:48; 6:9; 6:33). (4) As a result, those who truly believe in Jesus as Christ have eternal life, and must prepare for the second coming of Christ by proclaiming that Jesus is the Lord and Saviour (Jn 1:12; 3:16; 5:24-25; Lk 12:40; Ac 1:11; Mt 28:18-20), and ought to be the salt of the earth and light of the world (Mt. 5:13, 14). Therefore, Christian life must be distinguishable from the world.

The Scripture tells us why Christians must be distinguished from others and emphasizes that they are chosen by God (Lev. 18:1-30), and “the Lord brought ...out of the iron-smelting furnace...to be the people of his inheritance” (Deut. 4:20). Christians are supposed to be holy: “Be holy because I, the LORD your God, am holy” (Lev. 19:2). There are a number of exhortations by which Christians ought to live in the world. However, Jesus sums up the Christian’s character by making a link with Moses’ law: “Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with your entire mind” (Deut. 6:5).

And “love your neighbour as yourself” (Lev 19:18; Mat19: 19; 22:38-40). This teaching is developed in Luke 6:27-28 “Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you”, and “love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you” (Mat.5: 44). Jesus clearly explains why we should love our enemies so that, “you may be sons of your father in heaven” (Mat. 5:45). The practice of love is the most fundamental element of the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 22:37-40), and the vital Christian life must be accomplished by “faith and actions working together” (Jm. 2:22). In addition, Christians are supposed to overcome difficulties or trials through faith. Many accounts have been given to us through the Scripture (Jr 27:2-8; Dn

2:21; Ez 29:19-20; Mt5: 44; Ac 7: 59-60). Jesus firstly shows himself how he endured sufferings as a “faithful witness” (1:5; 3:14). The testing of our faith develops perseverance, which leads us to be mature and complete. Jesus’ followers need not fear if they are called upon to suffer, for in that way they too will conquer (Heb. 10:32-36). Believers are frequently called to be “overcomers”, who conquer temptation and remain faithful to Christ in the midst of all the pressure and persecution.” God will reward those who overcome, as promised in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 2:7, 10, 17; 3:21; 22:7).

4.5 Summary and Conclusion

In conclusion, the significant lessons have been learnt from our study of Byzantine and Ottoman Empires church history. Their similarities and differences have been examined. Although they existed in different contexts, they exhibited similar experience, that is, their involvement in politics. Christian faith does not depend on having earthly power. However, the Church in the Byzantine Empire enormously engaged in political power play to the extent that the leaders had forgotten why the Lord established the Church in the world.

Furthermore, the Church in the Ottoman Empire, during the 19th to 20th century, was more involved in politics on behalf of their parishioners for their independence than being concerned for spiritual life. This means that they made much effort to save their people from the earthly power of the Ottoman Empire, but did not make effort to attend to the spiritual needs of their flock. In this way their lives deteriorated. We have also seen that the Church lacked sound biblical doctrine.

Therefore, many strongly committed Christians tried to avoid real situations and sought to get the comfort of being ‘union with God’ in the monasteries and through the Lord’s Prayer, while numerous nominal Christians went over to Islam. Through our evaluation we have learned that as time passed, the leaders of both Churches did not recognize why the Lord established His Church in the world. It seems that they did not pay attention to what the right character of a servant of God was, and the Christian character faded. It is clear that the Church should work in accordance with the whole Scripture and be separated from secular politics. Likewise, the Church leaders should behave themselves as God’s servants and develop sound doctrines for their parishioners

for which they are called by the Lord (Jn. 21:15). The Christian life is defined as loving the Lord heartily (Dt. 6:5), and loving our neighbour as ourselves (Lev 19:18; Mat19: 19; 22:38-40). Children of God are called to be the light of the world and the salt of the earth (Mt. 5:13-14). Furthermore, we are surely urged to overcome our difficulties through faith in God's promises (Mt 10:39-41; Rev 2:7).

CHAPTER 5

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks, firstly, to draw conclusions from the research. Secondly, it briefly examines the contemporary Church in Turkey. Finally, it attempts to show how this study impacts on the contemporary Church in Turkey.

5.2 Research Conclusions

In Chapter one, the goal of this study was to find out the factors that contributed to the decline of Christianity in the land, which is now called Turkey. Some scholars believe that the causes of the decline were military invasion, the spread of Islam, and the relationship of Church to state. Others say that the essence of the decline was the Church herself.

Thus, our study focus has ensured that the Church in the Byzantine Empire has been carefully observed, and that this study has examined the Church in the Ottoman Empire as well. In this study, two central issues are explored: Firstly, why a former Christian country was transformed, and became a Muslim country. This research on the Church in the Byzantine Empire emphasizes the late periods of the 11th –15th centuries. Secondly, a study is made of how the Church in the Ottoman Empire existed under Muslim authority, and what role it played, as the Christian minority among the majority Muslims. Within this context, missionary work is explored, especially during the 19th and 20th centuries.

In Chapter two, the writer has attempted to understand and describe the decline of Christianity in modern-day Turkey. As seen from the study, the Eastern Church in the Byzantine Empire was not independent, but most of the time it subordinated itself to the state. The emperors took the leadership of the Church, as a result of the state's policy of imperialism. Inevitably, the leaders of the Church bowed down to the authority of the empire. This, unfortunately, caused the Church leaders to compromise with the political power, and the life of the Church deteriorated. The Patriarch controlled all the Eastern churches in the empire, and had enormous power, which

made the Church rich. However, with the clergymen's lives under little discipline, they neglected their responsibilities. A Christian's life was no different from that of the non-believing community (section 2.3.2.3). The Eastern Church forgot the original eschatological expectation, and apocalyptic ideas dissipated. Church fathers led their parishioners to a radical spiritualization of the Christ event. "Faith in God's promise yet to be fulfilled was replaced by faith in the already consummated eternal kingdom of Christ". Hence believers focused more on spiritual life in the monasteries, rather than on being the salt and the light of God in this world. The teachings of whole view of Scripture as well as balanced theological teachings were ignored (section 2.4.2.3).

Further, the true meaning of the gospel, which explained why Christ had come to earth, faded. From the Protestant viewpoint, it is significant that the Eastern Church leaders approached commentary on Scripture timidly. Their approach was devoid of breadth, criticism, or penetration. The Eastern Church believed that the Bible is the supreme expression of God's revelation to man; yet they also believed that the Bible should not take precedence over Church tradition (section 2.3.2.2). Thus their insufficient knowledge of God led to the weakening of their faith. When Christians were faced with difficulties, they did not understand its appropriate Christian response, either ethically or evangelistically. Hence, the church leaders made a tragic decision that the expansion of Christianity should be achieved through fighting against the infidels who were Muslims. These fights were called 'Crusades'. They neither restored the Holy Land nor regained Asia Minor from the Muslim Turks.

Furthermore, there was hatred among Christians; Byzantines hated the Western Christians who had destroyed Constantinople in the name of Christ. They never forgot the events of the Crusades after the fourth Crusade in 1261. They welcomed the Muslims saying: "I would rather see the Muslim turban in the midst of the city than the Latin mitre" after the Council of Lyons in 1274. A Christian interpretation of this situation might be that the expansion of Christianity should be through evangelizing, rather than through the process of military action (section 2.4.2.2). Also, even though the Byzantines geographically suffered various military invasions and Muslim attacks, the Eastern Church herself was corrupted inwardly. It seems that this was the major reason for the decline of Christianity in the Byzantine Empire.

In Chapter three, we found that the Christian Church had a more difficult time in the Ottoman Empire than during the former period. The ruler of the country was no longer a Christian who protected them, allowing them to worship God freely. Christians became second-rate citizens, and lived in restricted situations under Islamic law. It was the Ottoman Empire's administration policy that the Church worked not only on spiritual matters, but also had to concern herself with the civil affairs of the parishioners (section 3.2). Christians were divided into two groups: the Greek Orthodox Church, and the Armenian Apostolic Church.

Under the authority of the Islamic government, they could neither build new church buildings or monasteries nor evangelize non-believers for about four hundred years. These restrictions made them aim at survival, to keep their faith, in the hope of better days to come (section 3.2.1.1.1). However, many Christians became Muslims because of the various advantageous options that were given by the Muslim rulers. Numerous Christians abandoned Christ for the Prophet. By the fifteenth century, at the very beginning of the Ottoman Empire, many Greek priests who lived in Asia Minor had fled to the safety of Constantinople. The converts to Islam were drawn from all sections of society. As the writer mentioned in chapter two, the weakness of knowledge of Scripture led many clergymen, and over 90 percent of the Christian population in Asia Minor to convert to Islam (section 3.2; 3.2.1.1).

It was also a sad admission that the Church had been corrupted by the financial greed of the bishops, who had political ambitions. It seems that they had not learnt from the Church in the Byzantine Empire. The matter of simony was so widespread that no one was promoted to a higher position in the Church without money. This dishonesty has also shown by the fact that the office of Patriarch changed hands some 60 times in the seventeenth century. This extreme insecurity of the Patriarch naturally led to a separation of bitterly hostile parties in the Church (section 3.2.1.1). They were concerned about the outward appearance of the Church, not spirituality.

Like the Church in the Byzantine Empire, theology also did not develop. Both Churches were usually content to repeat what early Church fathers taught, namely mysticism, even though they were influenced by the Western theology of Catholics or Protestants. With the coming of missionaries in the nineteenth century, the Christian minorities lived energetic lives for a century.

However, the French Revolution provoked the minorities' liberalism, and the church leaders were influenced by the thought with their parishioners. This inevitably led them to secular politics, in terms of nationalism. At the same time, the Church leaders did not concern themselves with their parishioners helping them to overcome their difficulties through faith in eternal freedom of heavenly hope. Rather, they were deeply involved in earthly freedom from the Ottoman Empire. Missionaries also encouraged the Christian minority to 'open their eyes', which contributed to their recognition of this identity as nationalists (section 3.3.2.2).

The clergymen stood in the first line of battle against the central government of Ottoman Turks for the achievement of their freedom (section 3.2.2.2). It seems that their first duties would have been to save their *millet* from earthly problems, but they did not care about spiritual matters from the nineteenth century onward. During the 19th and 20th centuries, both Churches did not make sacrifices for the gospel; however many Christians gave their lives for their earthly nations. Throughout the struggles for independence; on the one hand, numerous Greeks died, and the rest moved to Greece from Asia Minor. On the other hand, the Armenian Church actively worked for printing of religious literature: Bible translations, hymnbooks and church calendars. However, during the 19th and 20th centuries, over one million Armenians paid with their lives for their independence, and were deported from their homeland. The Christian population shrank, and missionaries were expelled because of the Turkish law of 1923. Sadly, only a handful of Christians have remained (section 3.2.2.1; 3.2.2.2).

In chapter four, differences and similarities between the Churches in the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires are compared. This discussion naturally shows the answers for the causes of the decline of the Churches in both Empires. The context of the two Churches was completely different. The Church in the Byzantine Empire was supported by the state, and Christianity was more than a religion. The State and the Church evangelized together, and citizens freely founded religious houses and monasteries (section 4.3.1.1).

However, the Christians under the Islamic authority were radically affected under Islamic socio-political influence and became second-class citizens. They were charged with a number of disadvantages. Further, they could not build new religious buildings, and evangelizing ceased (section 4.3.1.2). The Christian perspective during these two periods was also different one from

the other. Christians who lived in the Byzantine Empire had focused above the reality. Many of them would not see the real circumstances of a deteriorated Church or dwindling empire. They were, rather, comforted by the heavenly Father through the tradition of a solitary *hermits'* life (section 4.3.2.1). Yet many of church leaders and Christians in the Ottoman Empire focused more on temporal issues. They looked for answers to problems from earthly forces than from spiritual sources (section 4.3.2.2).

However, even though both Churches existed in different contexts, they had similar approaches: secular methods of political involvement. Both Churches show how their theological focus that Christians should looked for the Lord more through mystical traditions, than through exposure to Scripture or doctrinal development. The Church leaders of both Churches compromised in their positions by working with the central political powers. In this way, their lives were corrupted. The church leaders, especially in the Ottoman period, were more concerned with their identity than with spiritual life. This concern led their parishioners, to concentrate on their history and on nationalism (section 4.2).

Evaluation from the Protestant point of view leads to the following conclusion: understanding of the purpose why the Lord had established His Church in the world faded in the course of time. One significant point from this fading is that the nominal Christians were turned to Islam due to lack of right understanding of foundational biblical doctrines. The Orthodox Christians reject the idea of original sin. For them, men automatically inherit Adam's corruption and mortality, but not his guilt. The work of Christ is to restore the image of God in man, which led them to the concept of 'union with God' (section 2.3.2.2). In other words, man's greatest need is to be saved from corruption. This doctrine implies the need of moral purity. That is why when Muslims showed their good behavior, and then Christians abandoned Christ for the prophet (section 2.4.2.2; 3.2).

The biblical character of a clergyman and the Christian character also faded. It is clear that the Christian Church should work in accordance to the whole view of Scripture, and set itself apart from secular politics. Likewise, the Church leaders should maintain characters befitting servants of God, and develop sound doctrines for their flocks (Jn. 21:15). The Christian character is defined as to love the Lord with all their hearts (Dt. 6:5), and to love their neighbour as

themselves (Lev 19:18; Mat19: 19; 22:38-40). Children of God are called to be the light of the world and the salt of the earth, not to fight against their enemies, or those who hate them (Mt. 5:13-14). Furthermore, Christians are urged to overcome their difficulties through faith in God's promises (Mt 10:39-41; Rev 2:7).

5. 3 The Contemporary Protestant Church in Turkey

Since 1923, various changes have been taking place in Turkey. Firstly, Islamic law was changed to secular law, which stipulated the status of religious minorities by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. However, the handful of Christians lived in constant fear of attack by the majority Muslims. Only about 10 Turkish Protestant denominations existed during the 1950s (Pikkert 2006: 232,233). The law was revised in 1960. It offered greater freedom of thought and religion. God immediately sent His faithful servants into the isolated land of Turkey. Roger Malstead and Dale Rhoton, who belonged to Operation Mobilization (OM), were the first missionaries in the modern period of Turkey. They entered Istanbul in 1961 (Malstead 2000:1). Soon after that, some mission organizations and independent missionaries followed the OM (Gunduz 2001: 47).

From the Protestant point of view, this was the turning point for Christianity in modern days of evangelizing in the country. This time, the missionaries directly evangelized the non-Christians, focusing on one-to-one evangelism, and developed Christian literature (Meyer 1986:68). That is why the Christian population gradually increased, even though Turkey was still the world's largest unreached country in 1978. There were barely 1000 Protestants. These were made up mostly of Orthodox background (OBP), and 50 from a Muslim background (MBP) (Johnstone 1978:153).

There were pressures on Christians from every side of society, although religious freedom was officially ratified. All who converted from Islam to Christianity faced many difficulties, and in the years between the 1974 and 1986 more than a hundred missionaries were expelled without being found guilty on the charge of making illegal religious propaganda (Pikkert 2006: 235). Even nowadays the situation is not better than in the past; obtaining legal permission for mission work is almost impossible. For a missionary there is always a risk of being deported from the country (Kim 1992-2005). There was only a Turkish speaking service at the Bible House in

Istanbul in 1971. The MBP churches have grown significantly from late 1970s. In fact, missionaries changed their strategies; they tried to evangelize through various approaches such as “tentmaking”, short-term trips, media, and Bible Correspondence Courses (BCC). There were about 6000 Christians in 1986, and 75000 Turks contacted the BCC to receive a free New Testament and other Christian literature in 1995.

In 2003, almost half of the Turkish believers were converts from Islam to Christianity through correspondence courses (BCC brochure, 2005). From the 1970s, Christian literatures were produced for evangelizing, which was climaxed in the 1990s. One of them was a Bible translation, which contributed highly to the growth of the Christian population. The modern Turkish New Testament was translated in 1987 and 1988; it is named “Mujde” and “Incil”. In addition, the Bible Society published a new modern Turkish Bible in 2001 (Kim 1992-2005).

Many short-term missionaries made use of it, and presented the Bible to Muslims. There were a number of cassettes, videos, and DVDs produced. These immensely contributed to spreading the gospel all over the Middle East (Pikkert 2006: 241). Many radical Muslims have been attacking Protestant churches and believers. In fact, citizenship is still not equal. While the Muslims have been “we”, the non-Muslims have been categorized as “the other” (Punsmann 2008:2).

However, God used all these opportunities for spreading the gospel. One case occurred on January 1, 1993. There was a bombing at the Zeytinburnu church in Istanbul, yet it did not explode. This became the top news story that day through all the media. This was an announcement that the Protestant Churches did exist in Turkey (Kim 1992-2005). God has obviously been using some extraordinary methods for the expansion of His kingdom in Turkey.

Another opportunity of evangelization was the earthquake on August 17, 1999, which killed more than 14,000 and made 200,000 homeless (Brunner 2007:1). The Protestant Church, both MBP and OBP actively helped the victims with food, medical supplies, and clothing. This helped to show the love of God to the Muslims. Numerous worldwide Christian relief organizations joined in, and worked with indigenous Turkish churches. One of them was “Tusamo” (love of Turkey) which was immediately established by the Korean churches in Korea when the tragic event happened. They came and worked with the local government, and built a township,

including a cultural centre for victims, in Yalova in western Turkey. This cooperation of all churches in Turkey, and worldwide Christians has yielded wonderful fruits so that many Muslims developed a positive view of Christianity. Visibly, many new small fellowships emerged, and a new church was established in Izmit (Kim 1992-2005). The numbers of Christians in Turkey have been to approximate 2500-3000, and there are 90 churches, which were mostly tiny house groups in 2005. Indeed, the result is still small, in spite of over 1300 missionaries serving with some 50 agencies evangelizing in Turkey (Silas 2005).

However, it is a step in the right direction that the first Turkish Protestant Church has been constructed according to the law of Vakif (Health and Education Foundation) in 2006, but not according to the religious law. The Evangelical Protestant Church in Turkey is like the breaking of dawn. Muslim background Protestants (MBP) has still been threatened by radical Muslims. In 2007, three faithful believers and a missionary paid their lives for the Lord in Malatya (Punsmann 2008:8).

5.4 The impact of the study on the contemporary Church of Turkey

As described in previous chapters, the goal of this study is to find out the cause of the decline of churches in the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires. This research has showed that the church could stand only if she acted according to the Scripture. Further, it is also significant that church leaders behave according to the biblical truth. Indeed, most of the churches in Turkey do not belong to any denomination, but only to the Turkish Protestant Union. There is also no official theological college, and many church leaders were trained through correspondence/ distance courses or informal institutions in Turkey. Despite this hard situation, many church leaders are caring for their flocks and there is expansion of the kingdom of God.

Our evaluation of the past church histories does yield some lessons for the contemporary church in Turkey. Firstly, we need to recognize that the head of the Church is Jesus Christ, not any other person or the church herself. It has been stressed that the church must focus on spiritual matters, primarily on worshiping God. Within this context, attention should be paid to caring for church members by giving appropriate spiritual food, to admonishing those who govern or fulfill their duties or obligations and to proclaiming the gospel to the perishing world with compassion heart.

It is clear that the Church should work in accordance with the Scripture without mixing her duty with secular politics. However, this does not mean that the Church must never have any contact with the outside world. Indeed, Christians live in this world within the communities. The reality, on the ground in Turkey, shows that Christians live with Muslim neighbours, where they often talk about politics because the country is experiencing polarization ideologically as well as other issues such as racial conflict. The Bible, however, describes how the church should honour and respect the secular authorities without immersing herself deep into politics.

Obedience is also due to the unjust magistrate, yet without being disobedient to God (section 4.4.1.3), as Daniel and his friends and the apostles did. The Church should pray not only for good rulers, but also for those who are bad, so that God may change the wicked. We believe that God will deal with those who have displeased him. The Church leaders should recognize themselves as God's servants, and should not busy themselves with earthly matters.

From the Protestant viewpoint, the primary task of spiritual leaders is undoubtedly teaching the Word of God. We ought to be reminded that Christians who lived in the Byzantine Empire did not believe that salvation comes from faith in Jesus Christ (section 2.3.2.2). This could be seen from the fact that because of lack of solid teaching, numerous nominal Christians converted to Islam during the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries (section 4.4.2). They were much influenced by the Muslims' good behaviour, which was one of the central doctrines of Islam (Miller 1976:60).

In addition, church leaders are supposed to develop sound doctrines for themselves and their parishioners. They should promote the Christian characteristics of righteousness, gentleness, hospitality, endurance, and manage their families well. In Scripture, church leaders are metaphorically described as shepherds (Isa 40:11; Jn10: 11; Heb 13:17). This implies that one of the key roles of church leaders (pastors) is to guard and shepherd the flock of God, which includes all that it takes to bring the church to maturity (1 Pet 5: 1-4; Jn 21:15-22).

Therefore, the shepherd should feed them with the solid biblical truth and keep them by "exercising oversight" (1Pe. 5:2). God entrusted into their hands the authority and the responsibility of taking care of their flocks in every respect (section 4.4.2.2). One of the significant reasons for the failure of Christian life, both in the Byzantine and Ottoman periods,

was lack of Christian character. This fact implies that sound Christian character is important for believers. It must be taken into consideration that Christians are distinct from others as they are chosen by God, and they are supposed to be holy: “Be holy because I, the LORD your God, am holy” (Lev. 19:2). Christians, firstly, seek the kingdom of God (Deut 6:5; Mt 5:48; 6:9; 6:33). They must prepare for the second coming of Christ by keeping their faith and proclaiming that Jesus is the Saviour (Ac 1:11; Mt 6:33, 28:18-20).

Further, children of God ought to live in the world as a salt and light. Christians who live in Turkey need to recognize that Muslims look at their behaviour because one of the five pillars of Islam is performing good deeds (Miller 1976:81-82). Many MBP Christians witnessed that they were influenced by Christians’ good deeds (Kim 1992-2005). Jesus sums up the central Christian teaching as loving the Lord heartily, and loving our neighbour as ourselves.

Moreover, Jesus commands “Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you”, and “love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you”. He clearly explains why we should love our enemies so that, “you may be sons of your father in heaven”. The practice of love is the most fundamental element of the kingdom of heaven, which means that Christian life must be accomplished by “faith and actions working together”(James. 2:22).

In addition, Christians are supposed to overcome difficulties or trials through faith, not hiding themselves in cells or monasteries. There are a number of temptations that press Christians to compromise their beliefs. Economic difficulties, family problems, and social pressure are some of them. However, Christians should follow the model of Jesus as he endured sufferings as a “faithful witness” (Rev.1: 5; 3:14). The testing of our faith develops perseverance, which leads us to be mature and complete. Believers are frequently called to be “overcomers”, who conquer temptation and remain faithful to Christ in the midst of all the pressure and persecution. We believe that God will reward those who overcome, as promised.

5.5 Final Conclusion

This research has clearly shown that it is important for the church to be Christ-centred. The cause of decline of the Church in the Byzantine Empire was clearly self-centredness. The leaders

concentrated on earthly things, which benefited them in terms of material wealth and fame. In other words, they were not committed to spiritual matters; rather, they were busy with government politics and other issues. The Church in the Ottoman Empire had a similar experience. The spiritual life of church leaders deteriorated as they focused on the temporary world. From this study we have learned that although various reasons contributed to the decline of the Christian population, the main reason was the Church herself. We should remember why the Lord established the Church on earth. Leaders of the Church need to behave and undertake all their activities according to Scripture; because Christians are meant to be the salt and light of the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADALIAN, R. P.(s.a). Armenian millet. [Web:] <http://www.answers.com/topic/armenian-millet> [Date of access: 8 Jan.2008].
- ANON. 2004. Istanbul History. Istanbul tours. [Web:] http://www.istanbultoursonline.com/istanbul/istanbul_history.htm. [Date of access: 17 Aug.2009].
- ATIYA, A.S. 1968. A history of Eastern Christianity. London: Methuen &Co Ltd
- BALAKIAN, P. 2003. The burning Tigris. London: William Heinemann.
- BARDAKJIAN, K. 2001. The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople: Its rise and role. [Web:] <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/history/centers/armenian/source111.html> [Date of access: 8 Jan.2008].
- BEETS, H. 1929. The Reformed Confession explained. Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans.
- BEKER, J. C. 1980. Paul the Apostle: The triumph of God in life and thought. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- BIBLE. 2004. Life application study Bible: New International Version. Michigan: Grand Rapids.
- BLINCOE, R 1988. Ethnic realities and the Church: Lessons from Kurdistan. A history of mission work, 1668-1990. Pasadena: Presbyterian Center for Mission Studies.
- BOSCH, D.J. 2005. Transforming Mission. New York, USA: Orbis Books.
- BRIA, I. 1975. The Church's role in Evangelism: Icon or Platform? *Journal of International Review of mission*, 64: 243-250.
- BRUNNER, B.2007.Earthquake Factsheet. [Web:] <http://www.infoplease.com/spot/earthquake-turkey1.html>. [Date of access: 19 Oct.2009].
- CALVIN, John. 1973. Institutes of the Christian Religion: Books III.xx to IV.xx. Edited by Mcneill: Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- CHRYSSAVGIS, J. 1997. The Spirit bearers. *Journal of Christian History*. 54: 24-25

- CHRYSSAVGIS, J. 2000. The dictionary of historical theology. Michigan: Patnerary Press.
- CLENDENIN, D. B. 1997. What the Orthodox believes. *Journal of Christian History*. 54: 32-35.
- COMBY, J. 1985. How to read Church history: Volume 1 from the beginnings to the fifteenth century. London: SCM Press.
- CONSTANTELOS, D. 2004. Altruistic suicide or altruistic martyrdom? Christian Greek Orthodox neo-martyrs: Christian Greek Orthodox under Islam rule: Archives of suicide research, 8(1). [Web:] http://www.myriobiblos.gr/texts/english/constantelos_altrouistic_4.html [Date of access: 25 May. 2009].
- CRANFIELD, C.E.B. 1985. The Bible and Christian life. Edinburgh: T&T.Clark Ltd.
- CREGO, P. Armenian Church. [Web:] <http://www.answers.com/topic/armenian-church>. [Date of access: 25 May. 2009].
- CROSS, F.L & LIVINGSTONE, E.A, ed. 1985. The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CROSS, L. 1988. Eastern Chrianity: The Byzantine tradition. Newtown, Australia: E.J.Dwyer Pty Ltd.
- CUNNINGHAM, M. B. 2000. The Orthodox Church in Byzantium. (In Hastings, A., ed. A world history of Christianity. London: Eerdmans. p. 66-109.)
- DEANESLY, M. 1973. A history of the medieval Church 590-1500. London: Methuen.
- DIEHL, C.1957. Byzantium: Greatness and decline. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- DOUMATO, E.A. (s.a). Protestantism and Protestant Missions. [Web:] <http://www.answers.com/topic/protestantism-and-protestant-missions>[Date of access: 3 Jul.2009].
- DOUGLAS, J.D. 1974.Dictionary of the Christian Church. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- EDWARDS, D. L.1997. Christianity: The first two thousand years. London: Cassell.
- ENCARTA. (s.a). Map of Byzantine Empire. [Web:] <http://www.encarta.msn.com/encnet/media-461516887/byzantine-empire.html> [Date of access: 5 Jan.2008].
- FREELY, J. 1966. Istanbul: The imperial city. London: Penguin Books.

- GALLI, M.1997. The great divorce. *Journal of Christian History*, 54: 12-17.
- GEORGE, T. 1988. *Theology of the Reformers*. Leicester: Brodman Press.
- GONZALEZ, J. L. 2004. *The story of Christianity*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- GÖK, N.2001. Introduction of the Berat in the Ottoman diplomatics: Bulgarian historical review. [Web:] [http// www.bilkent.edu.tr/~ngor/makale/bulgarian_1.pdf](http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~ngor/makale/bulgarian_1.pdf). [Date of access: 5 Jun. 2009].
- GRAHAM, W.F. 1998. Church and society. (Mckim, ed. *Readings in Calvin's Theology* Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers. Chapter 16).
- GREGORY & GREEN, F .M. 1997. Impact prayers. *Journal of Christian History*. 54: 28-31.
- GRUDEM, W. 1994. *Systematic Theology*. England: Inter Varsity Press
- GUNDUZ, M. 2001. A study of the history of the Protestant mission to Turkey (1800-present). Unpublished masters thesis. Seoul: Presbyterian College and Seminary.
- HANSEN, C. 2004. The vanishing act of the Church in Turkey. [Web:] <http://www.churchianitytoday.com/ch/news/2004/oct14.html>[Date of access: 8 Aug.2008].
- HILL, J. 2007. *The history of Christianity*. Oxford: Lion Hudson Plc.
- JENKINS, O. B. 2005. The Yezidis: An Angelic Sect. [Web:] <http://orvillejenkins.com/peoples/yazidi.html> [Date of access: 7 Jul.2009].
- JOHNSTONE, PJ. 1978. *Operation World*. Bromley, Kent: STL Publications.
- JOHNSTONE, P. & MANDRYK, J. 2001. *Operation World*. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster lifestyle.
- KIESER, H. L. 2000. Some Remarks on Alevi Responses to the Missionaries in Eastern Anatolia (19th-20th cc.). [Web:] <https://www.cc.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/conf/mei01/kih01.html>[Date of access: 29 Jun.2009].
- KIESER, H. L. 2002. Mission as factor of change in Turkey (nineteenth to first half of twentieth century). *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, Vol. 13, No.4, Carfax Publishing Co.

- KIM, K.S. 1992-2005. Personal observations by thesis writer in the course of 14 years of missionary service in Turkey.
- KJEILEN, T. 1996. Tanzimat. [Web:] <http://looklex.com/e.o/tanzimat.htm>. [Date of access: 15 Jun.2009].
- KNIGHT, K. 2009:1. John Cassian. [Web:] <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03404a.htm>. [Date of access: 6 Sep.2009].
- KUYPER, A. 1994. Lectures on Calvinism. Michigan: WM .B. Eerdmans.
- LAKE, D. M, *ed.* 1974. Dictionary of the Christian Church. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House Grand Rapids.
- LATOURETTE, K. S. 1974a. The thousand years of uncertainty, Volume 2: 500A.D to 1500 A.D. Michigan: Zondervan.
- LATOURETTE, K. S. 1974b. A history of the expansion of Christianity, volume 3: Three Centuries of Advance: 1500 A.D. to 1800 A.D. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- LATOURETTE, K. S. 1974c. A history of the expansion of Christianity, volume 6: The Great Century - North Africa and Asia. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- LEWIS, B. 1995. The Middle East. London. Weidenfeld & Nicolson. The Orion Publishing Group Ltd.
- MACARTHUR, J. 1995. Rediscovering pastoral ministry: Dallas: Word Publishing.
- MALSTEAD, R.H. 2000. Papers of Roger Henry Malstead- Collection 337. [Web:] <http://www.wheaton.edu/bgc/archives/GUIDES/337.htm>. [Date of access: 20 Oct.2009].
- MCKIM, D.K. 2001. Calvin's Institutes. Ed. London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- MEETER, H.H. 1960. The basic ideas of Calvinism. Michigan: Grand Rapids.
- MERRILL, E.H. 1994. An exegetical commentary: Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Chicago: Moody Press.
- MEYENDORFF, J. 1982. The Byzantine legacy in the Orthodox Church. New York: St.Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- MEYER, K. 1986. A clash of swords. Grand Junction, Co: Friends of Turkey.

- NASSIF, B. 1997. Kissers and smashers. *Journal of Christian History*. 54: 20-23
- NEWBY, J. 2001. Explore the Medieval Church. Cape Town: George Whitefield College.
- OLSON, R. E. 1999. The story of Christian theology. Leicester: I.V.P.
- ÖNDER, A. T. 2002. Religion–Islam: The Alevi sect. [Web:]
<http://www.simaqianstudio.com/forum/lofiversion/index.php?t370.html> [Date of access: 7 Jul.2009].
- PANOSSIAN, R. 2006. The Armenians: The Armenians: from kings and priests to merchants and commissars. New York: Columbia University Press.
- PAPAZIAN, D. R. 1987. Armenians (September 8, 1987). [Web:]
<http://www.umd.umich.edu/dept/armenian/papazian/armeia.html>[Date of access: 8 Aug.2008].
- PARKER, T.H.L. 1975. John Calvin. London: J.M.Dent & Sons Ltd.
- PARRY, K. 2000. The dictionary of historical theology: Trevor A.H.ed.Michigan: Paternoster press.
- PAYNE, R. 1958. The Holy fire. London: Skeffington & Son Ltd.
- PAYTON, J.R. 2007. Light from the Christian East. [Web:]
http://books.google.co.za/books?id=khL2qJ7gLPwC&pg=PA32&lpg=PA32&dq=theologian+%22Payton%22&source=bl&ots=FGYzLcMYF-&sig=gned4y3gq_i99gXEmeK2R_DGvbM&hl=en&ei=9vSKSuLjIN6ZjAeliMle&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1#v=onepage&q=&f=false[Date of access: 19 Aug.2009].
- PELIKAN, J. 1974. The Christian tradition: 2. The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700).
- PELIKAN, J. 1978. The Christian tradition: 3. The growth of medieval theology (600-1300). Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.
- PIKKERT, P. 2006. Protestant missionaries to the Middle East: Ambassadors of Christ or culture? (Dissertation DTh: University of South Africa).
- POTGIETER, R: 2006. The Person of Christ. Cape Town: Bible Institute.

- PUNSMANN, B.G. 2008 Religious freedom in Turkey: Situation of religious minorities. Brussels: European parliament. [Web:] <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies.do?language=EN>. [Date of access: 19 Oct.2009].
- RIDDELL, P. G & COTTERELL, P. 2003. Islam in context: Past, present, and future. Michigan: Baker Academic.
- REID, J.J. (s.a). Crisis of the Ottoman Empire: Missionary work in Ottoman Empire. [Web:] http://books.google.co.za/books?id=zgg6c_Ndtu4C&pg=PA20t&1pg=PA205&dg=missionary+work+of+Roman+Catholic+in+Ottoman+Empire&source=bi&ots=3zr+tkkeEM&sig[Date of access: 23 Jan.2009].
- ROPER, H. T. 1965. The rise of Christian Europe. Norwich: Thames and Hudson.
- ROOY, S.H. 1995. Political power: A reformed model. (In Orientation, *ed.* Confessing Christ in doing politics Potchefstroom: IRS. Chapter 9).
- RUNIA, K. 1995. The Biblical view of the state. (In Orientation, *ed.* Confessing Christ in doing politics Potchefstroom: IRS. Chapter 13).
- RÜTTI, L. 1972. Zur Theologie der Mission: Kritische Analysen und neue Orientierungen. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- SCHAFF, P. 1885. History of the Christian Church: Volume 4. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- SCHAFF, P. 1892. History of the Christian Church, Volume 8: The Swiss Reformation 1519-1605. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- SCHMEMANN, A. 1961. The missionary imperative in the Orthodox tradition. London: SCM Press.
- SERAPHIM, A.1999.The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople.[Web:] http://www.hyeetch.nareg.com.au/religion/h_see_p8.htmlUpdated 30 August 1999 [Date of access: 8 Jan.2009].
- SHAW E.K. 1976a. History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. London: Cambridge University Press. [Web:] [www.http://books.google.co.za/books?id=A1ET_7j7YAC&printsec=frontcover&dg=editions:ISBN0521291631#PPA202.M1](http://books.google.co.za/books?id=A1ET_7j7YAC&printsec=frontcover&dg=editions:ISBN0521291631#PPA202.M1). [Date of access: 11 Jan.2009].

- SHAW E.K. 1976b. History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. London: *Cambridge University Press*. [Web:] [www.http://books.google.co.za/books?id=MIDQooVS-oyC&printsec=frontcover&dg=editions:ISBN0521631#PPA240.MI](http://books.google.co.za/books?id=MIDQooVS-oyC&printsec=frontcover&dg=editions:ISBN0521631#PPA240.MI). [Date of access: 11 Jan.2009].
- SHAW E.K. 1976c. History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. London: *Cambridge University Press*. [Web:] [www.http://books.google.co.za/books?id=AJET_7j7YAC&printsec=frontcover&dg=editions:ISBN0521291631#PPA241.M1](http://books.google.co.za/books?id=AJET_7j7YAC&printsec=frontcover&dg=editions:ISBN0521291631#PPA241.M1). [Date of access: 11 Jan.2009].
- SHERRARD, P. 1967. Byzantium. Amsterdam: Time-life International N.V.
- SILAS Ministry Report. 2005. Unpublished Report, Silas Ministry. Turkey.
- ROOY, S.H. 1995. Political power: A reformed model. (In Orientation, *ed.* Confessing Christ in doing politics Potchefstroom: IRS. Chapter 9).
- SINNEMA,D. 1995. Luther and Calvin on Christianity and politics. (In Orientation, *ed.* Confessing Christ in doing politics Potchefstroom: IRS. Chapter 6).
- STAMOOLIS, J. J. 1986. Eastern Orthodox mission theology today. Maryknoll, NewYork: Orbis Books.
- TCHILINGIRIAN, H & ONANY, V. 1996. The Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church. [Web:] http://www.armeniapedia.org/index.php?title=Armenian_Apostolic_Church [Date of access: 9 Jan.2009].
- WATSON, C.R. 1947. Higher educational institutions and their influence Moslem world, Vol. XXXVII (1): 16-22.
- WALTERS, P. 1999. A world history of Christianity: edited by Hastings, A. London: Eerdmans.
- WALKER, W. 1944. A history of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- WARE, T.1964. The Orthodox Church. Middlesex, England: Penguin book.
- WATERFIELD, R. 2004. Athens: A history. London: Macmillan Ltd