

# Byzantium in Greek Church Historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century: Between German Protestant Influence and Greek Orthodox Confession

## The use of Byzantium as a paradigm in the description of the relationship between Church and state in Greece after 1833

After gaining its independence in 1830, the Greek state was restricted territorially to Thessaly. Most other Greek-speaking areas were still under Ottoman rule. The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, which until then had preserved the religious identity of all Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire, was also subject to Ottoman rule. Therefore, some Greek intellectuals, with Adamantios Korais as the most prominent representative of the Greek Enlightenment, believed that a free state should also have a free Church<sup>1</sup>. The Greek Church should no longer fall under the ecclesiastical authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople<sup>2</sup>. The Greek Church achieved its independence in 1833, during the reign of the first king of Greece, Otto of Bavaria. The decision for independence was also a decision promoted by England and France in order to cut off the Orthodox clergy of the newly established Greek state from Russian influence, of which they considered the Ecumenical Patriarchate to be a bearer<sup>3</sup>. The Ecumenical Patriarchate did not accept the autocephaly of the Greek Church until 1850.

According to the royal edict of 1833, the king of Greece was now the head of the Greek Orthodox Church. Thus, the Catholic Otto and his council, including the protestant Georg Ludwig von Maurer, who was actually, together with Theoklitos Farmakides<sup>4</sup>, the ideological instigator of the autocephaly of the Greek Church, were able to make important decisions in ecclesiastical matters. In all the synods of the

Greek Church, a royal commissar was to supervise every decision on the part of the Church<sup>5</sup>. The state thus made many drastic changes within the Church. In subjects like marriage, divorce, the training of the clergy, the ownership of the monasteries and even the ordination of priests, the state had to have the last word. In this way, the Church became dependent on the state. Many monasteries were closed by the state and their property confiscated, in order to raise funds, among other purposes, for schools and the newly established university<sup>6</sup>.

In his Church history of 1898, the Athenian theologian Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos wrote the following on this matter: »The relationship between the Church and the state was designed in such a way that neither was the state oppressing the Church, nor was the Church a state within a state. The state leaves the Church free to act according to its spiritual power, only acting in a supervisory capacity, as it would towards everything else that happens in the state in the common interest. It offers protection and assistance and works with the Church, intervening only in cases in which the worldly, material interests of the citizens are at stake. Their relationship is not like the relationship between state and Church in the Byzantine era, where the Church was subject to the state«<sup>7</sup>. In the footnotes, he also explains that the system in which the Church was subject to the state had existed in late antiquity and in the Byzantine era<sup>8</sup>.

Some years later, the clergyman of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and theologian of the Theological School of Chalki, Filaretos Vafeides, had this to say on the subject of the autocephaly of the Greek Church:

1 Therianos, Korais ρλα: 'Ο κληρος του εως της σημερον απελευθερωθεντος μερους της Ελλάδος δεν πρέπει να αναγνωρίζη πλέον εκκλησιαστικόν αρχηγόν τον Πατριάρχη των Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, εφ' ὅσον ἄρχουσιν αὐτόθι Ὀθωμανοί. ὀφείλει δὲ να κυβερνάται ὑπό συνόδου ἱερέων, ἐκλεγομένης ἐλευθέρως ἐξ ἱερέων και κοσμικῶν, ὡς ἐποίει ἡ ἀρχαία ἐκκλησία και ἐπὶ μερους ποιεῖ ἐτι και νῦν ἡ ἐκκλησία των Ρώσων. Cf. for example also Stamatopoulos, Church 37-38; Frazee, Greece 102-103.

2 Cf. Vafeides, Nea istoria 510. – Kyriakos, Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>2</sup> III, 154.

3 Stamatopoulos, Church 34-35. – Stamatopoulos, Metarruthimise 367-370. – Stamatopoulos, Minorities 257. Regarding the relations between the European powers and of Russia with the Patriarchy of Constantinople and what kind of role does the Autocephaly of the Greek Church play in this situation cf. also in detail

Frazee, Greece 89-124 and from a theological point of view Metallinos, Paradosē 227-257.

4 About Farmakides cf. Mpallanos, Istoria 5-6. About the king as a leader of the church administration of the Greek state, cf. Metallinos, Paradosē 233. Regarding the autocephaly of the Greek Church there are many works. Cf. for example in detail Stamatopoulos, Church 34-64; Frazee, Greece 101-124; Wittig, Griechenland 79-140 and from a theological perspective Metallinos, Paradosē 227-257; Moschos, Kirche 77-79.

5 Cf. also Stamatopoulos, Church 35.

6 Cf. Vafeides, Nea istoria 500-514. In contrast to Vafeides, Kyriakos, 3. Istoria 156-158 does not criticise the state for these policies.

7 Kyriakos, Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>2</sup> III, 156.

8 Ibidem 156.

»The people who developed this innovative state-Church-system and its supporters did not stop proclaiming that by the constitution of 1833, the relationship between Church and state was designed in such a way that neither was the state oppressing the Church, nor was the Church a state within a state, though they admit of course that the synod is selected by the king and it is under the guardianship of the government through the royal commissar, who controls everything. [...] We find such a subjection of the Church to the state neither under the Byzantines nor during the Ottoman period. It is not true when it is said that matters concerning marriage, divorce, the inventory of monasteries and training of the clergy were solved with the help of the state. Because the state provided only protection to the Church, the relationship between the two was like tangent circles [i. e. circles that intersect in some points but are not congruent]. If Byzantine emperors interfered in Church business, which is to say not only its worship and life but also in matters concerning dogma, then the Church protested through its spiritual shepherds and put an end to such abuses«<sup>9</sup>.

The second passage by Filaretos Vafeides – who believes that the Church of the newly established Greek state is subject to the state, but not the Church in the Byzantine period to the Byzantine state, as Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos claimed – functions like an answer to and review of the latter's text<sup>10</sup>. Nevertheless, what is particularly noteworthy and of great significance here is how the two theologians used the Byzantine paradigm for the construction of their theological and historical interpretations in this narrative context. The use of the Byzantine paradigm in these Church historiographical discourses constitutes a very interesting issue, which has not yet been examined, even though a lot has been written about the autocephaly of the Greek Church and its Western European or Russian influence, the position of the patriarchate of Constantinople and the issue of nationalism<sup>11</sup>.

In what follows, I would like to analyse the historical context in which the two theologians lived in order to understand their diametrically opposed opinions and their use of the Byzantine paradigm. Second, I shall discuss Byzantine history in the Church historiographical work of Filaretos Vafeides and Diomedes Kyriakos. For this reason, I will also focus on

the different sources they used and the different academic environments where they completed their study.

## University education and Theology in 19<sup>th</sup> century Greece

After the establishment of the first university of Athens in 1837 and throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the opinion was widespread in Greek society that people who had studied in Germany were better qualified for academic positions than others. Therefore, there was a tendency for professors at the Athenian university to have studied in Germany. The German government of the Greek state promoted the study of young men at German universities. The professors of the Athenian University proudly referred to their academic degrees gained in Germany and preferred to draw upon German literature in their works<sup>12</sup>.

This was also the case with Greek theologians. Their contemporaries and later scholars often criticised them for having been influenced by the West and adopting foreign ideas and beliefs uncritically<sup>13</sup>. According to Timothy Ware, it was also possible to tell from the works of the Greek theologians if they had graduated from a Catholic or a Protestant university<sup>14</sup>. Most of them had, in fact, completed their PhDs at German Protestant faculties<sup>15</sup>.

Among these theologians, we find Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos, who studied from 1863 to 1866 at the universities of Erlangen, Leipzig and Vienna, and later became professor at the University of Athens<sup>16</sup>.

Filaretos Vafeides, the second theologian to be discussed here, completed his PhD in Leipzig in 1875 and afterwards held a position in the administration of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. At the same time, he was professor at the Theological School of Chalki until 1888<sup>17</sup>.

## Byzantium in Greek Church Historiography

### Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos

Diomedes Kyriakos, who said that it was impossible for a theologian of his time not to be familiar with German theology, exemplifies Greek admiration for German scholarship. Even

9 Vafeides, *Nea istoria* 512-513, esp. 502: ἡ τε Ἐκκλησία καὶ ἡ Σύνοδος τοῦ βασιλείου τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατεδουλώθησαν τῇ πολιτικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ. Regarding Church events of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Greek state in Vafeides's description cf. *Ibidem* 498-522.

10 There are also some other passages by Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos regarding the independence of the Greek Church that Filaretos Vafeides tries to refute (cf. Vafeides, *Nea istoria* 498-499, 510), but here I restrict myself to the Byzantine passages, since this is the subject of the present article.

11 A great deal has been written concerning the ecumenical ideology of the patriarchate of Constantinople, its pan-Orthodox role and the preservation of the old imperial model in the face of the fragmentation of the millet and the creation of the different nation-states and national churches, especially the Church of Greece. Characteristic works include the following: Stamatopoulos, *Discourse* 64-72; Stamatopoulos, *Millet* 201-241; Kitromilides, *Communities* 149-192; Kitromilides, *State formation* 31-50.

12 On the organisation of the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens according to the models of German protestant faculties cf. Giannaras, *Orthodoxia* 303-305; Metallinos, *Einflüsse* 83-91. On the German influence on the University of Athens, cf. Tsirpanles, *Ausbildung* 250-272. Moschos also mentions the German influence on the Church historiographical production: Moschos, *Blinkwinkel* 90. On the use of German literature and references to their studies in Germany cf. Fasoulakes, *Katavoles* 102.

13 Giannaras, *Orthodoxia* 305-308.

14 Ware, *Eustratios* 15-16.

15 Cf. for example Mpalanos, *Istoria* 4-19 regarding the education of the professors of the University of Athens; Moschos, *Blinkwinkel* 90.

16 Cf. Mpalanos, *Istoria* 8-9.

17 Regarding the studies of Filaretos Vafeides cf. Staurides, *Chalki* 175; Sawides, *Vafeides* 18-21; and briefly Moschos, *Blinkwinkel* 92.

though for Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos a dogmatic unification between the Protestant and the Orthodox Churches was a utopia<sup>18</sup>, »the German nation was the nation of the great thinkers and philosophers of the modern age, as the Greeks had been for the classical period«<sup>19</sup>. In the first and second volumes of his Church history, published in 1881, Diomedes Kyriakos used especially the German Protestant authors Karl von Hase, – whom he also called »the Thucydides of Church historiography« and regarded as the best church historian of all time<sup>20</sup>, – Johann Matthias Schröckh, August Neander, Johann Karl Ludwig Gieseler and Johann Heinrich Kurtz as his main sources<sup>21</sup>.

When we look more closely at his Church historiographical work, the split of the Church due to dogmatic and Christological disputes and the continuous interference of the state in ecclesiastical matters characterizes the Church from the time of Emperor Constantine until 860. The mob and the monks were involved in the disputes, and the government, instead of trying to stay out of these problems, interfered and supported first one side and then the other, making things worse, an instrument of the court theologians and eunuchs. Emperors arbitrarily ruled on Church dogma. The patriarchs, who usually depended on the emperors and were forced to give in to their wishes, were deposed and installed according to the emperors' will. The interference of the emperors continued throughout the Byzantine period, until the fall of Constantinople in 1453<sup>22</sup>.

Although Diomedes Kyriakos makes some important changes in the second edition of his work almost twenty years later, which are due to incorporating Karl Krumbacher's work on Byzantine literature, his opinion regarding the relationship between Church and state remains completely the same, as we will see in what follows.

## Filaretos Vafeides

Like the Athenian theologian Diomedes Kyriakos, the theologian Filaretos Vafeides of the Theological School of Chalki draws, among other sources, on the protestant German Church historians of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, August Neander, Johann Karl Ludwig Gieseler, Heinrich Ernst Ferdinand Guericke, Karl von Hase and Johann Heinrich Kurtz in his work<sup>23</sup>.

The influence of Kurtz on Filaretos Vafeides' work has already been remarked on in the research literature, albeit very briefly<sup>24</sup>. There has not yet been a detailed analysis and comparison of the two texts. Many passages by him are indeed simply translations of the German theologian. Of great importance, however, is Vafeides' treatment of the relationship between Church and state. After a careful comparison of the two, it emerges that this chapter is the only one to have been drastically changed by the Greek theologian. Here he gives an opinion completely contrary to that of Kurtz.

According to Filaretos Vafeides, state and Church were two distinct and independent powers. There were some efforts by the emperors to control the Church and impose their views and will, but political power faced the protest and resistance of the Church<sup>25</sup>. The Church, as Filaretos Vafeides puts it, was not subject to the state. »Then, the state's illegal interference in Church matters was neither accepted by the Church, nor did it succeed in making decisions regarding dogma, as some modern [German] theologians believe. Such interventions were repelled by the Church's worthy clerics«<sup>26</sup>.

This opinion, expressed with very careful and precise formulations towards his German models, covers the whole of Byzantine history. We have plenty of examples of his defensive attitude vis-à-vis the German theologians when speaking about »our Church« and »our« Church Fathers<sup>27</sup>. When, for instance, he speaks about mediaeval Church history, he argues that »our Eastern Church, due to various adverse conditions, did not act as efficiently and was not as rich as before, but it is neither dead nor decadent, as the theologians of the West claim«<sup>28</sup>. The Athenian theologian Diomedes Kyriakos, for example, nowhere expresses such an opinion.

Thus, the work of Filaretos Vafeides has an apologetic and defensive tone with regard to his German models. By contrast, his Athenian colleague Diomedes Kyriakos never defends the Byzantine state and Church so explicitly. He shows the Byzantine Church, as we have seen before, being subjected to the state, which is in constant decadence in a context of political corruption. The moral decadence of society, the fanaticism of the monks and the almost stagnant level of theological production and religious worship after the fifth century are the other elements of the picture, exactly as it is drawn in the Protestant theological works of the 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>29</sup>.

18 Kyriakos, *Protestantismus* 149.

19 *Ibidem* 148.

20 Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>2</sup> III, 358: Ὁ Χάτζε εἶναι ὁ Θουκυδίδης τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστοριογραφίας. His words are also mentioned by Heyer, *Emanzipation* 221.

21 Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>1</sup> II, ε. For the time 1-860 he uses also the Catholics Johann Baptist Alzog and Ignaz von Doellinger and for the time 860-1453 also Alloys Pichler.

22 *Ibidem* 201. 214. 248. 273. 341-343. 373-375. 384.

23 Vafeides, *Archaia istoria* ε, 8. – Vafeides, *Mesē periodos* ε.

24 Janin, *Constantinople 705*. – Sawides, Vafeides 293. – Staurides, Chalki 176. – Moschos, *Blinkwinkel* 92.

25 For example Vafeides, *Istoria* 62. 90. 94. 113. – Vafeides, *Archaia istoria* 274.

26 *Ibidem* 274.

27 About »Our Church« and »Ours« cf. for example Vafeides, *Istoria* 107-109. 116. 122. 137.

28 *Ibidem* 79.

29 For example Kyriakos, *Dokimion* 115. 128. 142. 160. 172-174. – Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>1</sup> II, 201. 214. 248. 273. 315. 341-342. 373-374. 384. – About the Protestant theologians cf. Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* 479-480. 484-485. – Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte* 12-13. 395. – Gieseler, *Lehrbuch* 664. 667. – Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte* 19-20. 24. 71-72. 74-75. 77-78. 100. 106. 438-439. 441. 542. – Kurtz, *Lehrbuch* 30-31. 199-200. 204. 215-216. 226-227. 266. 327-328. 343. – Hase, *Kirchengeschichte* 21. 135. 150-151. 155. 158-162. 285. 287. – Neander, *Geschichte* 73. 277-278. 280-281. 285. 287. 323-325. 327-328. 351-353. 364-365. 375. 389.

## Comparison of Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos and Filaretos Vafeides

Thus, even though both Greek theologians under investigation obviously admired the German church historians of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they treated their German sources differently. Their respective positions may help explain why: Diomedes Kyriakos was a professor at the first university of the Greek state, which was secularized and under the control of the German-dominated government of Greece<sup>30</sup>. The Theological School of Chalki, on the other hand, was a Church institution under the supervision of the patriarchate of Constantinople. The Theological School of Chalki made a great effort to preserve the common religious identity of the ecumenical Balkan Orthodox community and thus of all the Orthodox subject peoples of the Ottoman Empire. This was also the goal of the patriarchate of Constantinople, which during the 19<sup>th</sup> century encountered attempts on the part of different national groups on the Balkans to cultivate their own ethnic identity. Therefore, they demanded the independence of their Churches. The Church of Greece was the first to do so, and the Churches of Romania (1865), Bulgaria (1870) and Serbia (1870) followed.

I return to the topic discussed in my introduction, the autocephaly of the Greek Church, in order to make some remarks regarding the use of Byzantium as a paradigm in this narrative context. After the historical explanation just given, it is now possible to understand why Filaretos Vafeides tried to defend the position of the patriarchate of Constantinople and therefore the relationship between state and Church in the Byzantine Empire. However, if we investigate the historical context of the patriarchate and the criticism Filaretos Vafeides levelled against the new model of the Greek Church more precisely, further explanations emerge.

The second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was a time of reform not only in the Ottoman Empire, but also in the patriarchate of Constantinople. The reforms carried out in the Ottoman Empire during this period (1839-1876), the so-called *Tanzimat*<sup>31</sup>, aimed to promote equality between the different religious communities or *millets*<sup>32</sup> of the Ottoman Empire. After the Crimean war, the Ottoman edict *Hatt-ı Hümayûnu* of 1856 – in part dictated by the British, French and Austrian ambassadors – tried with its reforms to exclude every possibility of foreign policy and thus of Russian intervention in the Ottoman Empire after the Crimean War<sup>33</sup>.

However, *Hatt-ı Hümayûnu* also promoted the reorganisation of the *millets* and demanded the separation of temporal

from spiritual jurisdictions in the patriarchate of Constantinople through the abolition of Gerontism and the participation of laymen in the administration according to the »General Regulations«<sup>34</sup>. Consequently, the absolute power of the patriarchate as a spiritual and political leader of the *rum millet*, as *milletbaşı*, as an ethnarch, could be restricted and disputed and the political administration of the Ottoman Empire could find opportunities to interfere with the patriarchate. Thus, even though it was a time of reform in the patriarchal administration, some reforms sparked opposition on the part of the clerics in the course of the century, or at least were treated with scepticism. Most of the time, the introduction of reforms within the administration of the patriarchate depended on feelings of the patriarch towards Russia.

Moreover, Filaretos Vafeides completed the first volume of his Church history in 1884, writing in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a time of dispute regarding the privileges of the Church of Constantinople. The privileges were first given to the patriarch of Constantinople, Gennadios Scholarios, after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 by Sultan Mehmet II and were recognized by subsequent sultans. These privileges related to the rights that Orthodox Christians in the *rum millet* had in the largely Muslim society of the Ottoman Empire. They remained valid throughout the centuries, unaffected by the various Ottoman edicts. However, after Abdul Hamid II became sultan in 1876, the policy of the Ottoman state towards the *millets* changed. In 1883 – the year before Vafeides published his first volume – Sultan Abdul Hamid II questioned and tried to rescind these privileges and transfer power from the patriarchate to the Ottoman state, thus reducing the freedoms of the orthodox Christians, the *rum millet* of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, a new period of problems started between the Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman rulers. Within the Orthodox clergy of the patriarchate, there also appeared a split between those who sympathised with the Russians and the Slavic peoples of the Balkans and those who held nationalist ideals and were against Russian influence<sup>35</sup>. All these conflicts within the patriarchate and during the crisis in the relationship with the Ottoman Empire led to the fall of Patriarch Ioakeim III in 1883. Ioakeim was a patriarch known for his »pan-Orthodox« policies and thus well-disposed towards Russia. His fall was a result of opposition among nationalist circles within the patriarchate, which reacted to Ottoman efforts to challenge the privileges of the patriarchate in the first phase of the controversy 1883-1884 and who accused Ioakeim III of being overly friendly towards Russia and failing in his duty to defend the privileges<sup>36</sup>. It may be supposed that Vafeides was against

30 Podskalsky, *Theologia* 203. – Metallinos, *Einflüsse* 84-85.

31 Stamatopoulos, *Minorities* 256; Stamatopoulos, *Metarruthmise* 19-20. – On the doctrine of equality of the Christians with the other confessions in the Ottoman Empire during the *Tanzimat* period, cf. Davison, *Attitudes* 844-864.

32 Cf. for example Stamatopoulos, *Minorities* 253-255. Regarding the Orthodox millet seen as a power network within the Ottoman Empire cf. Stamatopoulos, *Networks* 83-86.

33 Cf. Davison, *Attitudes* 850. 857. – Stamatopoulos, *Minorities* 258-260.

34 Cf. esp. Stamatopoulos, *Politeia* 183-220. – Stamatopoulos, *Metarruthmise* 35. 37. 67. 70.

35 Cf. Stamatopoulos, *Minorities* 265-266.

36 About Ioakeim III and his policy in the Patriarchate, especially to the Privilege issue and the Russian influence on him and his spiritual father Ioakeim II cf. Stamatopoulos, *Ioakeim* 189-224. About the correspondence of Ioakeim III cf. also Kardaras, *Ioakeim III* 15-285 and esp. its historical context 15-55.

the abolition of the privileges of the patriarchate and used the text to criticise the patriarchate, including Ioakeim III, for its handling of the issue<sup>37</sup>.

The presence of a royal commissar at the synod of the Greek Church, as discussed above, was actually a Russian practice dating from the 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>38</sup>. Filaretos Vafeides' claims thus constitute an indirect attack not only on the changes in the newly established Greek Church, but also on the Russian model. Vafeides' anti-Russian stance is connected with Russian foreign policy, which changed after the Crimean War. It tried to interfere in the affairs of the patriarchate of Constantinople, but not in order to protect the Christians, as had been its intention before the war, but as part of its policy of Pan-Slavism, in order to increase its power and support the Slavs of the Eastern Balkans, particularly the Bulgarians<sup>39</sup>. To sum up, Vafeides belonged to the conservative circles of the patriarchate, which were opposed to the reforms of privileges and to Russian interference in its affairs.

All this happened only one year before the first of Filaretos Vafeides' books of Church history appeared, in which he described state and Church during the Byzantine period as two distinct and independent powers. This was also, as already shown, his thesis relating to the whole Byzantine period. In this way, he wanted first to criticise the Church of Greece, which followed the Russian model. Second, he wanted to say that this exemplary relationship between state and Church, which started in the Byzantine Empire and continued until the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, had been interrupted by the abolition of patriarchal privileges by Sultan Abdul Hamid II.

That is why Filaretos Vafeides, even though he plagiarized Johann Heinrich Kurtz in almost every chapter, tried to set himself apart from his German models and propounds the Orthodox Church's official opinion concerning the relationship between Church and state, the claim of »symphony«, of the harmonious coexistence between Church and state. In accordance with this, his goal was to show the important role of the Church, and hence of the ecumenical patriarchate of Constantinople, for the preservation of Orthodox Christianity, from the Byzantine through the Ottoman Empire up to his own day, despite the administrative changes made within the patriarchate but also by the sultans of his time.

For Filaretos Vafeides, then, as an employee of the patriarchate of Constantinople, the story of Church and state during the Byzantine period was fundamentally linked to the story of the patriarchate of Constantinople in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and beyond. In his capacity as a cleric and professor of the patriarchate he expressed not only his scepticism regarding the new national Church of Greece, but he was also able to

examine and interpret the ecclesiastical changes made by the Greek state's German government in a different and more critical way than Diomedes Kyriakos.

Diomedes Kyriakos, however, belonged to the non-conservative theologians of Athens, who were in favour of the independence of the Greek Church. Like the intellectuals of the Greek Enlightenment in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries who had been under Western influence, he viewed the Byzantine state as despotic and decadent.

This negative perspective, however, was already out of date. It had been fashionable in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, almost 50 years before Kyriakos published his *Compendium of Church history* in 1872 (second edition 1878) and the first edition of his larger three-volume work of Church history in 1881<sup>40</sup>. But in the middle of 19<sup>th</sup> century, Byzantine history had already become part of Greek history through the efforts of Greek national historiographers. Byzantium was used in Greek national historiography in order to construct Greek national identity in a positive way. Diomedes Kyriakos did not attempt to do this. Even more impressive is the fact that he knew and sometimes referred to the work of the Greek national historian Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos. Nonetheless, he was not influenced at all by Paparrigopoulos' historical interpretations and generally by his whole historical ideology.

Thus, in the first edition of his work Diomedes Kyriakos does not understand Byzantium as a part of his own national history, of Greek history. If his work does contain some efforts to construct a national identity and a national character for the Greek Church, they certainly were not based on Byzantine history. Instead, he rather tries to distance himself from Byzantium. In his description of the fall of Constantinople in 1453 for example, he remarks that – unlike the Byzantines – the Greek population emerged from the revolution and war against the Ottomans in 1821 poor and illiterate, but with a fighting and patriotic spirit<sup>41</sup>.

To Diomedes Kyriakos, the Byzantine state was something resembling the Ottoman Empire. Both meant foreign rule for the Church, which functioned as a mechanism of Ottoman authority to control its Christian subjects. That is why he supported the national character of his state as well as his Church. After all these contradictions or anachronisms in his work, it seems that Diomedes Kyriakos just used the theses of his German theological models about Byzantine history uncritically and without trying to compare them with the Greek national historiographical works of his time and hence revise them. Already in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the theologians of the University of Athens were criticised for reusing German works and obtaining academic positions at the University

37 According to Savvides, Vafeides 22-29, Vafeides was initially in favour of Ioakeim III but probably against his policy after 1904. Cf. also Vafeides' description of Ioakeim's personality: Vafeides, *Nea istoria* 251-252 and his description concerning the reforms within the Patriarchate, like the General Regulations, and some criticism of the Russian policy and of Ioakeim III: Vafeides, *Nea istoria* 227-229. 236-240.

38 Frazee, *Greece* 113-114.

39 Cf. Stamatoopoulos, *Metarruthmise* 102-103. 113. 116. – At this point, I would like to thank Prof. D. Stamatoopoulos for the kind remarks regarding the policy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the relevant possible interpretation of the text by Filaretos Vafeides.

40 Unfortunately, I was unable to find the first edition of the third volume.

41 Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria* II, 48.

of Athens just because they had studied in Germany<sup>42</sup>. The case of Diomedes Kyriakos was quite similar, since he too had studied in Germany and used his German sources quite freely.

Yet a dramatic change seems to have taken place in the second edition of his work, published in 1898. Diomedes Kyriakos, probably influenced by his academic environment, now tries to ascribe a Greek national character to Byzantium, a feature entirely absent from the first edition. The transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire to the East was followed by the Hellenisation of the Empire<sup>43</sup>. When he speaks about the great Church fathers of the first centuries, the Three Holy Hierarchs – Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom –, he speaks about the importance of their work for Greek literature and theology<sup>44</sup>.

When speaking about Hagia Sophia, he says: »Within this magnificent church the most important memories from the political and religious life of the Greeks from the present to the future [...] are joined [...]. For 400 years the Greek population has remained in hope and anticipation that it will sing again in Greek the divine service<sup>45</sup>«.

When speaking about the crusades, he claims that the Franks had destroyed this strong and »flourishing« state, and that only »its shadow survived«<sup>46</sup> – a state which in Kyriakos' previous descriptions had been described only as decadent and corrupt. Therefore, whereas the picture of the Byzantine Empire in the first edition is one of decadence, the second edition tells of a past of which the Greek nation could be proud.

Only at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, specifically in 1898 did the Byzantine past become a part of the national consciousness and of the Greek Nation in the work of Diomedes Kyriakos. This perhaps due to the Greco-Turkish War one year previously, in 1897, and the nationalist movement that followed in its wake. Diomedes Kyriakos could probably not stay indifferent to all this and was led to edit his work for a second time. Thus, Kyriakos actually reflects the paradigm shift, albeit very late compared to other contemporary historians. However, his opinion about the relationship between Church and state remains completely the same: during the Byzantine era, the Church remained subject to the state. Kyriakos does not hesitate to describe its emperors as despotic, arbitrary rulers, who interfered in the Church matters and controlled the decisions of the bishops, who became the emperors' »instruments«. These parts of his descriptions give a picture starkly contrasting with that of the glorious time of the Byzantine Empire and of the Greek nation.

For Diomedes Kyriakos, »the Church in the Byzantine time was subject to the state. What happened in the East was the

very opposite of what was happening in the West. In the West, the Church subjugated the state, (where) the powerful popes imposed their will on countries by installing or unseating the emperors [...]. Both systems, that of the subjection of the Church to the state as well as that of the state to the Church, are absurd, as is the complete separation of Church and state as it happens nowadays in America. The right regulation of the relationship between the two, according to the logical nature of the things, is that the Church should be free in a free state. The rule should thus be that the church be completely free in its spiritual sphere and the state not depend on the Church in order to perform its political duties. The state [...] should have the right only to supervise the Church, and only in matters concerning both the state and the Church should it have the possibility and the right to work with the Church, like in the case of marriage«<sup>47</sup>.

In this passage, Kyriakos remains loyal not only to his German church historical models, but also to his contemporary German government of Greece, which he, like many other professors of the Greek University of Athens, supported. In this respect, he adheres to his earlier principles, as discussed above.

However, one may wonder why the interference of the Byzantine state in Church affairs was supposedly a sign of a decadent and corrupt state whereas the interference of the German government in the secular and free Greek society of the 19<sup>th</sup> century could be explained as legal and just.

Based on the Church historiographical works of the Greek theologians Filaretos Vafeides and Diomedes Kyriakos, we have seen the complexity of the perception of Byzantium, its many contradictions, forms and functions during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. We have dealt with two historiographical discourses that interpret the Byzantine past in opposite ways. Then the paradigm of Byzantium could function as a vehicle for different political ideologies and historical beliefs. It was legitimized and politicized in different historical and ideological contexts, as well as in narrative hermeneutics, between the national centre of Athens and the patriarchate of Constantinople, which was the de facto centre of the Empire.

Filaretos Vafeides' work shows how the legitimization of the Byzantium paradigm could be used to support the pan-Orthodox role of the patriarchate of Constantinople, which sought to prevent the division of the millet into different nations, and which had to strike a balance between the Ottoman Empire, the Greek state, Russia and the Great Powers<sup>48</sup>. Vafeides' work defends the patriarchate of Constantinople against the supporters of the national character

42 Cf. for example Fasoulakes, *Katavoles* 102 and Vernardakes, *Elegchos* 411-415.

43 Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>2</sup> I, 239. Some examples about the Greekness of the Byzantine Empire and its importance: *Ibidem* 239. 311-312. 356-360. – Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>2</sup> II, 35. 54-55.

44 Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>2</sup> I, 356-360.

45 *Ibidem* 490.

46 Kyriakos, *Ekklesiastikē istoria*<sup>2</sup> II, 35-36: Ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν Φράγκων τότε κατάληψις τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ κατάλυσις τῆς βυζαντινῆς αὐτοκρατορίας καὶ διαρπαγῆ

τῶν χωρῶν αὐτῆς ὑπῆρξε μεγάλη συμφορὰ τῷ ἔθνει ἡμῶν καὶ προπαρασκευάσε τὴν τελικὴν τοῦ κράτους καταστροφὴν διὰ τῶν Τούρκων μετὰ δύο αἰῶνας. Οἱ Φράγκοι ἐπῆνεγκον τότε κατὰ τῆς βυζαντινῆς αὐτοκρατορίας τοιοῦτον καίριον τραῦμα, ὥστε ἐκ τοῦ ἄλλοτε κραταιοῦ καὶ ἀκμαιοτάτου κράτους δὲν ἔμεινεν εἰ μὴ μόνον σκιά τις.

47 *Ibidem* 127-128.

48 Cf. Stamatopoulos, *Metarruthmise* 363.

of the Church of Greece and its independence from the Patriarchate.

In Diomedes Kyriakos' work, the first edition rejects Byzantine heritage as a part of national identity, but in the second edition, published shortly after the war of 1897, we can witness a paradigm shift regarding the national character of Byzantine history. The relationship between Church and state,

however, remains negative in his work, in order to justify the independent character of the Greek Church as well as the actions of the German-dominated government during the Bavarian regency over Greece. All this took form and shape through the adoption and modification of German church historiographical models of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

## Bibliography

- Davison, Attitudes: R. H. Davison, Turkish Attitudes Concerning Christian-Muslim Equality in the Nineteenth Century. *The American Historical Review* 59/4, 1954, 844-864.
- Fasoulakes, Katavoles: S. Fasoulakes, Γερμανικές καταβολές του Ελληνικού πανεπιστημίου και Ελληνικές αμφισβητήσεις του Γερμανικού πανεπιστημίου. In: Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς συμποσίου «Πανεπιστήμιο: Ιδεολογία και Παιδεία» 1 (Athēna 1989) 99-104.
- Frazer, Greece: Ch. A. Frazer, The Orthodox Church and independent Greece 1821-1852 (Cambridge 1969).
- Giannaras, Orthodoxy: Ch. Giannaras, Ορθοδοξία και Δύση στη Νεώτερη Ελλάδα (Athēna 1992).
- Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte: J. C. L. Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte 1 (Bonn 1831).
- Kirchengeschichte: J. C. L. Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 2,1 (Bonn 1846).
- Lehrbuch: J. C. L. Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte 2,2 (Bonn 1848).
- Hase, Kirchengeschichte: K. von Hase, Kirchengeschichte. Lehrbuch zumal für akademische Vorlesungen (Leipzig 1854).
- Heyer, Emanzipation: F. Heyer, Die Orientalische Frage im kirchlichen Lebenskreis. Das Einwirken der Kirchen des Auslands auf die Emanzipation der orthodoxen Nationen Südosteuropas 1804-1912 (Wiesbaden 1991).
- Janin, Constantinople: DHGE 13 (1956) 626-768 s.v. Constantinople (P. R. Janin).
- Kardaras, Ioakeim III: C. D. Kardaras, Ιωακείμ Γ΄ – Χαρ. Τρικούπης, Η αντιπάρθεση. Από την ανέκδοτη αλληλογραφία του Οικουμενικού Πατριάρχη (1874-1884) (Athēna 1998).
- Kitromilides, Communities: P. M. Kitromilides, »Imagined Communities« and the origins of the national question in the Balkans. *European History Quarterly* 19/2, 1989, 149-192.
- State formation: P. M. Kitromilides, The Orthodox Church in Modern State Formation in South-East Europe. In: A. Mungiu-Pippidi / W. Meurs van (eds), Ottomans into Europeans. State and Institution Building in South-East Europe (London 2010) 31-50.
- Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte: J. H. Kurtz, Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte von Konstantin dem Großen bis zum zweiten trullanischen Concil 1,2 (Mitau 1853).
- Lehrbuch: J. H. Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende (Leipzig 1890).
- Kyriakos, Protestantismus: A. D. Kyriakos, Das Verhältnis der griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche zum deutschen Protestantismus. *Jahrbuch für protestantische Theologie* 16, 1890, 148-157.
- Kyriakos, Dokimion: A. D. Kyriakos, Δοκίμιον ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας χάριν τῶν περὶ τὴν θεολογίαν σπουδάζοντων (Athēnai 1878).
- Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>1</sup> I: A. D. Kyriakos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρύσεως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ἐκ διαφόρων πηγῶν ἔρανισθεῖσα 1: 1-860 μ.Χ. (Athēnai 1881).
- Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>1</sup> II: A. D. Kyriakos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρύσεως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ἐκ διαφόρων πηγῶν ἔρανισθεῖσα 2: 860-1453 μ.Χ. (Athēnai 1881).
- Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>2</sup> I: A. D. Kyriakos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρύσεως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ἐκ διαφόρων πηγῶν ἔρανισθεῖσα 1 (Athēnai 1898).
- Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>2</sup> II: A. D. Kyriakos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρύσεως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ἐκ διαφόρων πηγῶν ἔρανισθεῖσα 2 (Athēnai 1898).
- Ekklesiastikē istoria<sup>2</sup> III: A. D. Kyriakos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρύσεως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ἐκ διαφόρων πηγῶν ἔρανισθεῖσα 3 (Athēnai 1898).
- Metallinos, Paradosē: G. Metallinos, Παράδοση και αλλοτρίωση. Τομές στην πνευματικὴ πορεία του Νεώτερου Ἑλληνισμοῦ κατὰ τὴ μεταβυζαντινὴ περίοδο (Athēna 1986).
- Einflüsse: G. Metallinos, Das Problem der deutschen Einflüsse auf die griechische akademische Theologie in der Gründungsphase der Athener Universität. *Orthodoxes Forum* 3/1, 1989, 83-91.
- Moschos, Kirche: D. Moschos, Die Kirche von Hellas. In: Th. Bremer / H. R. Gazer / Ch. Lange (eds), Die Orthodoxen Kirchen der byzantinischen Tradition (Darmstadt 2013) 77-84.
- Blinkwinkel: D. Moschos, Kirchengeschichte aus dem Blinkwinkel der Orthodoxie. In: W. Kinzig et al. (eds), Historiographie und Theologie, Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte im Spannungsfeld von geschichtswissenschaftlicher Methode und theologischem Anspruch (Leipzig 2004) 87-101.
- Mpalanos, Istoría: D. S. Mpalanos, Ἐκατονταετηρὶς 1837-1937. Α΄. Ἱστορία τῆς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς. Ἐθνικὸν και Καποδιστριακὸν Πανεπιστήμιον Ἀθηνῶν (Athēnai 1937).
- Neander, Geschichte: A. Neander, Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche 2,1 (Hamburg 1828).
- Podskalsky, Theologia: G. Podskalsky, Οι γνώσεις για τὴν Ἑλληνικὴ θεολογία στη Γερμανία και ἡ ἐπιρροή τῆς Γερμανικῆς θεολογίας στην Ἑλληνικὴ Ὀρθοδοξία. In: E. Chrysos (ed.), Ἐνας νέος κόσμος γεννιέται. Ἡ εἰκόνα του ἑλληνικοῦ πολιτισμοῦ στη γερμανικὴ ἐπιστήμη κατὰ τον 19<sup>ο</sup> αι. (Athēna 1996) 191-206.
- Savvides, Vafeides: S. Savvides, Ο Φιλάρετος Βαφειδης. Βίος και ἔργο [unpubl. Diss.] (Thessalonikē 2011).

- Stamatopoulos, Ioakeim: D. Stamatopoulos, «... δε γίνεται να μην είναι Φαναριώτης στην ψυχή του...»: Οικουμενισμός και Εθνικισμός από την πρώτη στη δεύτερη πατριαρχία του Ιωακείμ Γ'. In: T. I. Dardavesis (ed.), Ιωακείμ Γ' ο Μεγαλοπρεπής. Ο από Θεσσαλονίκης οικουμενικός πατριάρχης και η εποχή του (Thessalonikē 2012) 189-224.
- Millet: D. Stamatopoulos, Ecumenical Ideology in the Orthodox Millet (19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> Century). In: L. T. Baruh / V. Kechriotis (eds), Economy and Society on Both Shores of the Aegean (Athens 2010) 201-247.
- Politeia: D. Stamatopoulos, Η Εκκλησία ως Πολιτεία. Αναπαραστάσεις του ορθόδοξου μιλλέτ και το μοντέλο της συνταγματικής μοναρχίας (δεύτερο μισό 19<sup>ου</sup> αι.). Μνήμων 23, 2001, 183-220.
- Networks: D. Stamatopoulos, From Machiavelli to the Sultans: Power Networks in the Ottoman Imperial Context. *Historein* 5, 2005, 76-93.
- Minorities: D. Stamatopoulos, From Millets to Minorities in the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Ottoman Empire: an Ambiguous Modernization. In: S. G. Ellis / G. Hálfadanarson / A. K. Isaacs (eds), Citizenship in historical perspective (Pisa 2006) 253-273.
- Metarrhythmise: D. Stamatopoulos, Μεταρρύθμιση και εκκοσμίκευση. Προς μια ανασύνθεση της ιστορίας του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου τον 19<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα (Athēna 2003).
- Church: D. Stamatopoulos, The Orthodox Church of Greece. In: L. N. Leustean (ed.), Orthodox Christianity and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Southeastern Europe (New York 2014) 34-64. 213-225.
- Discourse: D. Stamatopoulos, The »Return« of Religious and Historiographic Discourse: Church and Civil Society in Southeastern Europe (19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries). *Journal for the Study of religions and ideologies* 8, 2004, 64-75.
- Staurides, Chalki: V. Staurides, Ἡ ἱερά θεολογική σχολή τῆς Χάλκης (Thessalonikē 21988).
- Therianos, Koraes: D. Therianos, Ἀδαμάντιος Κοραῆς 3 (Tergestē 1890).
- Tsirpanles, Ausbildung: Z. N. Tsirpanles, Die Ausbildung der Griechen an europäischen Universitäten und deren Rolle im Universitätsleben des Modernen Griechenland (1800-1850). In: R. G. Plaschka / K. Mack (ed.), *Wegenetz europäischen Geistes. Wissenschaftszentren und geistige Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Mittel- und Südosteuropa vom Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts bis zum ersten Weltkrieg* (München 1983) 250-272.
- Vafeides, Istoría: F. Vafeides, Ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων (1-1900 μ.Χ.) πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν Ὀρθόδοξων Ἑλληνικῶν ἐκπαιδευτηρίων (En Kōnstantinoupolei 1902).
- Archaia istoria: F. Vafeides, Ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων, Τόμος πρῶτος: Ἀρχαία ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία (1-700 μ.Χ.) (En Kōnstantinoupolei 1884).
- Mesē periodos: F. Vafeides, Ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων. Τόμος δεύτερος: Μέση ἐκκλησιαστική περίοδος (700-1453 μ.Χ.) (En Kōnstantinoupolei 1886).
- Nea istoria: F. Vafeides, Ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων (1-1900 μ.Χ.), Τόμος τρίτος: Νέα Ἐκκλησιαστική ἱστορία (1453-1908), II: Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ ΙΗ. αἰῶνος (1700) μέχρι τῶν ἡμερῶν ἡμῶν (1908) (Alexandria 1928).
- Vernardakes, Eleghos: D. Vernardakes, Ψευδαττικισμοῦ ἔλεγχος ἦτοι Κ. Σ. Κοντοῦ γλωσσικῶν παρατηρήσεων ἀναφερομένων εἰς τὴν Νέαν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν Ἀνασκευῆ (Tergestē 1884).
- Ware, Eustratios: T. Ware, Eustratios Argenti. A Study of the Greek Church and Turkish Rule (Oxford 1964).
- Wittig, Griechenland: A. M. Wittig, Die orthodoxe Kirche in Griechenland. Ihre Beziehung zum Staat gemäß der Theorie und der Entwicklung von 1821-1977. Das östliche Christentum, N. F. 37 (Würzburg 1987).

## Summary / Zusammenfassung

### Byzantium in Greek Church Historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century: Between German Protestant Influence and Greek Orthodox Confession

Both Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos, professor of theology at the newly established University of Athens and Filaretos Vafeides, professor of theology in the School of Chalki, which belonged to the patriarchate of Constantinople, studied at Protestant German universities in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Their analysis of Church historiographical work was influenced by German historians. In this text, I examine how the two theologians, under German influence, described the relationship between state and Church in the Byzantine period in their work. I also analyse the way they interpret the relationship between state and Church in the newly formed Greek state of the 19<sup>th</sup> century by using the Byzantine paradigm. This provides an analysis of their historical context and how they reached their interpretations.

### Byzanz in der griechischen Kirchengeschichtsschreibung des 19. Jahrhunderts: zwischen deutschem protestantischem Einfluss und griechisch-orthodoxem Bekenntnis

Sowohl Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos, Professor für Theologie an der neu gegründeten Universität Athen, als auch Filaretos Vafeides, Professor für Theologie an der Schule von Chalki, das zum Patriarchat von Konstantinopel gehörte, studierten im 19. Jahrhundert an protestantischen deutschen Universitäten. Ihre Auswertungen kirchenhistoriographischer Arbeiten wurden von deutschen Historikern beeinflusst. In diesem Text untersuche ich, wie die beiden Theologen, geprägt von deutschem Einfluss, die Beziehungen von Staat und Kirche in byzantinischer Zeit beschrieben. Außerdem analysiere ich, wie beide unter Verwendung des byzantinischen Paradigmas das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche im neu gebildeten griechischen Staat des 19. Jahrhunderts interpretierten. Der Artikel zeigt, in welchem historischen Kontext sie arbeiteten und wie sie zu ihren Interpretationen gekommen sind.