THE COMMUNAL CHARACTER
OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY
IN CYPRUS UNDER OTTOMAN RULE

1. The purpose of the present paper is to trace and illustrate the communal character of Church land administration in Cyprus under the Ottomans. I am going to study an example of joint exploitation of church property by church and peasants. This is provided by the Archiepiscopal Register No XLII, p. 53. According to this, in the village of Vavatzinia in the year (α) "αψνς' [1756] ἐδιαμοιράσθησαν ἡ ἀνωθ(εν) ἐλιαῖς εἰς τοὺς χωριανούς κατὰ τὸ ὑπερ ἐπεδόθη τούτων κατάστιχον κατὰ μέρος διωρισμένας νὰ τὰς καλλιεργήσουν, καὶ ὅταν σὺν Θεῷ γίνη μαζοῦλιν νὰ πέρην ἡ ἐκκλησία δύο καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ὡς ὑπεκχέθησαν."

We are here confronted with a sort of association between the church of Vavatzinia and the parishioners of that village community. The association concerns the cultivation and exploitation of a number of olive-trees belonging to the said church. The trees-in-question being the capital, were 'distributed,' for how long it is not specified, obviously by the church authorities, to the parishioners for cultivation. A special 'register' was handed over to them—no doubt to one of them acting on their behalf. This 'register,' in fact a contract, recorded the number and location of the olive-trees-in-question as well as the terms of distribution. According to the latter, the produce of the trees would be divided into three shares, two for the church offering the capital, and one for the parishioners offering the labour, which would have certainly included the collection and transportation of the olives from the trees. Who would pay the taxes is not stated. It is equally unknown who would provide the means of cultivation, water, tools, manure, etc.: It is to be presumed that all these except tax would burden the villagers.

2. Sociologically speaking this association falls under the category of direct co-operation, i.e. "activities in which people do like things together," 1 or "communal relations involving a sense of collective participation." 2

From an institutional point of view despite the omission of any mention of means of cultivation and tax the said association seems to be similar to the *colonia partaria* of the imperial Roman period, the Byzantine *μορτή* (fructuum partitio inter Dominum fundi et agricolam), otherwise *ἐπίμορτος* καλλιέργεια, the medieval *métayage* or *medietaria* or *moitoieria* or *moieterie* of


Western Europe, and the Islamic-Ottoman muzara'a and musâkât, i.e. ἀγροληψία and δενδροκομία, especially the latter.

“The essential feature of métayer tenancy [in W. Europe] is the payment to the landlord of an agreed or customary proportion of the produce, commonly a half (whence, indeed, the name)." The means of cultivation should, in the West, be usually supplied by the owner of the property, and this is the case with present-day métayage there. But in the Byzantine and Muslim East the capit-
al goods needed for cultivation could be supplied either by the landlord or by the métayer peasants. In Byzantine law the former category of peasants were termed ἡμισειασταί and took half of the produce, while the latter were the μορτίται who took 9/10. In present day Cyprus, particularly in the plain of Messaria, in Paphos district and in the Western section of Limassol district, there is a type of métayage system called φουμουσιαρκά—elsewhere πομισιαρκά—, according to which the landowner offers the land and the seed and also pays all taxes, while the ‘hirer’—tenant supplies the labour and the live stock required for cultivation. This recalls no doubt, the Byzantine ἡμισειασταί and occurs often in church registers of the Ottoman period.

4. Now from the legal point of view the character of métayage is much disputed: (a) some take it to be a partnership or a ‘deficient partnership’;
(b) others take it to be a *locatio conductio operarum* and *operis*; (c) a third group consider it an 'anonymous exchange,' and (d) a fourth one consider it a *locatio conductio rei*—renting or farming. Though the latter view seems to have prevailed, especially on the ground that, according to Roman Law, the rent of a rural property can consist (either in money or) in a part of its produce, and, consequently, that the tenant has to allow the landowner’s supervision of operations, still it can by no means explain or nullify the partnership element of *métayage* which can best be defined as “à la fois un mode d’association et un mode de loyage.” This double identity may produce some ambiguity, but cannot destroy the partnership element in *métayage*, which, however, does not at all imply a joint ownership of the property between the landlord and the tenant, but just an association concerning the produce, a part of which will be given to the tenant as reward for his work. This was especially true of the Byzantine *ήμισειασταί*, but none the less of the *μορτίται* too.

5. Which is the origin of the *métayage* attested in Vavatzinia in 1756? A definite answer is impossible. What can at present be provisionally stated is that it may have been a traditional usage in Cypriote church law, going back either to the Byzantine or to the Latin period, and fitting well into the Muslim...
law introduced in Cyprus after 1570. Unfortunately neither the amount of rent to be discharged by our χωριανοί — 2/3 as against 1/3 that would be reserved for them — nor the omitted terms of “distribution” (=grant, lease) concerning the means of cultivation and tax, may offer any help in determining the origin of the institution under consideration.

The amount of rent, 2/3, recalls the Ottoman muzara 'a and musăkăt. According to both, the peasant-associate would enjoy 1/2 or 1/3 of the produce, the exact rate being fixed in the contract.21 This contrasts the κολλιγιά in Modern Monembassia, where 3/4 of the produce go to the peasant-associate, and the επιμορτος καλλιέργεια in Andros, where the peasant receives either 2/3, in the case of cereals, beans etc., or 3/4, in that of wine, oil, etc.,22 i.e. amounts approaching the 9/10 enjoyed by the Byzantine μορτίται.

Concerning the amount of rent, 2/3, our Vavatzioniotai associates cannot have been μορτίται if, however, they had to pay for the cultivation expenses, as we have assumed (§ 1), then they would appear to be a variety of that class, while the rate of rent would rather approach them to the ήμισειασταί, or to the métayers.

that it had been part of the legal tradition of the island during both periods, whose law provided for this as for other sorts of association including the κολλιά or Κολλιγιά (cf. Kyrris, in Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici, N. S. 4 [XIV], Roma, 1967, p. 133 ftn. 1). For some cases of association - not métayage - in Lusignan Cyprus see Jean Richard, Chypre sous les Lusignans. Documents Chypriotes des Archives du Vatican (XIVe et XVe siècles), Paris, 1962, pp. 115-117, doc. II, 1319, 1er mars: ... Mauricio ... generali preceptori Hospitalis ... ac medietatis bonorum et reddituum eiusdem Hospitalis in regno Cipri; L. de Mas Latrie, Histoire de l'Ille de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan, III, Paris, 1835, p. 379 ftn. 4: a document of 1474, IV Juni: ... cum conditione partis dimidii ...; p. 380: a document of 28. III. 1474: ... solvendo dimidium nostro dominio juxta formam partis.

21. Nikolaides, 'Οθωμανικοί Κώδικες, I, cit., p. 717 art. 1435 (muzara'a); p. 719 art. 1444 (musăkăt). The chose between 1/2 and 1/3 would depend upon whether the seed and means of cultivation were provided by the owner or by the peasant, cf. ibid., p. 716 ftn. 1 and p. 717 ftn. 1.

22. Zepos, J.G.R., VIII, pp. 461-462. Note that in Andros the κολλιγιάς = peasant associate does also several jobs for the owner without any salary, offers him a number of yearly presents and acquires a number of hereditary rights of possession on the property in association with the owner, at whose expense the cultivation is done. For other cases of κολλιγιά μορτή see George A. Petropoulos, Νομικά 'Εγγραφα Σίφνου τής Συλλογής Γ. Μαρίδακη (1684-1835) μετά συμβολών εἰς τήν ερευνάν τού Μεταβυζαντινού Δικαίου, ἐκδιδόμενα ὑπὸ Γ.Α.Π., fasc. 1, Athens, 1956 (= Μνημεία τῆς 'Ελληνικής Ιστορίας, Vol. III, fasc. 1, edited by the Academy of Athens), pp. 97-109 doc. 26a, 1805 (20.X), cf. p. 188 doc. 44, 1740.
6. So we are confronted with a mixed local kind of ἐπίμορτος καλλιέργεια, possibly of Byzantine origin, with, perhaps, both Latin and Moslem influences in details. This would fit into the general pattern of survival of Byzantine Law in Cyprus under Latin occupation in the Bourgeois Assises, the Church Law and the Customary Law of the island, though not without various impacts on it. That such a survival would be extended into the Ottoman period is to be expected and is amply attested in several ways. The very reference to a κατάστιχον handed over by the Church authorities of Vavatzinia to the villager associates (§1), points to the well known constitutive importance of βρέβια (= Registers, κατάστιχα) and of written contracts, in Byzantine sale and transaction law. There is no trace of any paroikian status in the said associates, who, like the Byzantine μορτίται and ήμισειασταί, are free men. This may point to the survival of a free peasantry in Cyprus from the Byzantine period, although it is also possible that our μορτίται and ήμισειασταί may have been the descendants of ancient paroikoi whose feudal obligations (corvée, rent etc.) were converted into métayer dues under Ottoman rule.

7. However, what is to be stressed in the case under consideration is, beyond the institutional point of view, the collective, specifically communal spirit attested in the association between Church and rural population. This spirit was not limited to Vavatzinia or to μορτί: it covered many aspects of the maintenance,
preservation and administration of ecclesiastical property. So, in Register XLIII, p. 8 occurs the following entry:

(β) “Παλαιόμετοχον,
αψογ’ [1749] νοεμ(βρίον) β’ εξετασθείσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ταύτης
οὐδὲν εὑρέθη αὐτῇ, ὑπεσχέθησαν δὲ οἱ ἐγκωφοι εἰς τὸν καιρὸν νὰ κάμουν ἀπό
μίαν σκάλαν χωράφι καὶ να δώσουν καὶ ἀπὸ ἐν κτηνόν. ἐπίτροπος κατέστη ὁ
κύρ άντζουλής.”

The village church was found to be in extreme poverty. To make it good, the parishioners offered each one to till one acre of its land and to donate one animal to it: they did this as a duty towards their local church, which meant and means so much for them, being a supra-human entity, a symbol of transcendental contact with God, and a power offering protection and services.

8. Similar examples are provided by the following entries, in Register XLII, p. 194:

(γ) “Τοῦ Ριζοκαρπαστοῦ
αψογ’ [1755] προσετέθη διὰ κοινῆς ἄγορᾶς τῶν χωριανῶν χωράφι τοῦ στεφάνη
εἰς τὴν ἄγιαν θέκλαν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς δυστυχίας σκάλ(ες),8” and in
Register XLVI, p. 50:

(δ) “Τοῦ Ἁγίου Νικολάου Δαυλόν....
(αψογ’) [1773] ....... ἔτερον [ἐσσωπέρβολον] εἰς τὸν Δαυλόν μὲ νερόν, εἰς κάθε
δ ἡμέρας ἐν νυχθῆμερον μὲ τὴν θέλησιν τῶν χωριανῶν.”

9. Such ‘common purchases’ and ‘common donations’ of property by villagers for their church do, like the innumerable individual donations to and ‘purchases for the sake of’ churches and monasteries, point to the communal character of church property — in pure theory — and also throw ample light on the ways and means by which that property was excessively increased during Ottoman rule. And, although this is beyond the scope of the present paper, it may be added here that, among the motives of such donations and accretion, through purchases, were piety, the collective or communal spirit and, also, the wish of villagers to secure their property from Turkish rapacity by entrusting it to the Church, whose property was relatively safer than that of individuals under normal circumstances.

10. One step further was the communal control of the management of ecclesiastical property 27 such as appears in entries like the following:

(ε') Register XLIII, p. 380:

"Όμορφία, αφφε' [1755], α'.

Παρατηθέντος τοῦ πρὸ χρόνου ἡδὴ ἵκανῶν ἐπιστατοῦντος ἐπιτρώπου κἂν ἀντώνη ... Ἑδωρίσθη μὲ γνώμην ὅλων τῶν χωριανῶν ὁ κυριαρχῶς."

(στ') Ibid., p. 353:

"Γιαλούσα. αφφα' [1771] 2|24 Δεκεμβρίου 24. Κατὰ τὴν σήμερον ἔμπροσθεν τοὺς Χωριανοὺς ὁμολόγησαν ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ ὅ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκκλησίας ταύτης Ἐπίτροπος γέρο Τζουφρής εἰς δόσων νικολόν τίνι @ (άσπρα) 30.15 εἰς τὸν νικολόν τοῦ @ 30.15 καὶ εἰς τὸν γαμβρόν τοῦ ἑφοδιάκονον @ 26. καὶ ὁ Μαυρομάτης ἀσπρα 40' καὶ ἐδωρίσθην μετ' αὐτοῦ [apparently by the parishioners' assembly] ὁ νικολόν τοῦ νικολοῦς εἰς ἐν δόθη καὶ κατάστηκαν. Τὰ δὲ τοῦ μαυρομάτη ἐπιληφθήσαν εἰς καὶ εἰς ἐν κομμ(άτι) περιβόλ(ι) ὁ μοίως καὶ τοῦ νικολοῦ τά 15. εἰς ἐν βόδιν καὶ μένουν ἄλλα 15."

(ζ') Ibid., ρ. 177:

"Άθνα. αφφα' [1753], Ιούλ. (105) ἵδ'. Μετὰ τὴν φυγήν τῶν χωριανῶν, εἰς τὴν ἱερᾶς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτρώπην ... κατὰ τὸν πατὰ εἰς τὴν ἐπιτρώπην ..."

(η') Ibid., p. 205:

"Μουσουλήτα. αφφα' [1776] νοεμ[(βρίου):... κοινὴ γνώμη ἐδωρίσθη αὐτῷ αὐτοῦ [τοῦ Ἀντώνη Καρτίκκη] κύρ Νικόλαος τοῦ παπά εἰς τὴν ἐπιτρώπην ..."

(θ') Ibid., p. 260:

"Ἀγίος Μέμνων, (see 259) ... ἐξετασθέντος τοῦ λογαριασμοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χωριανῶν διὰ τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἐξάρχου παναρέτου ...")

28. For the written contract see above text and ftn. 24 in § 7.

29. This case is mentioned in Costas P. Kyrris, Ἰστορία τῆς Μέσης Ἑκπαίδευσης τῆς Αμμοχώστου 1191-1955 ἰδίως δὲ τοῦ Ε.Γ.Α., Ἐκδόσεις Λάμπουσα, Nicosia-Cyprus, 1967, p. 25α.
"Αγιος Σέργιος .... αψθ' [1759].... (when the ἐπίτροπος Χατζή Τζιά died in 1759, he was succeeded by his son) Γεώργιος Τζιας, κοινή γνώμη ἐπίτροπος." This Georges had also been serving as ἐπιστάτης = inspector of church property before 1759.

11. So, at least some of the ἐπίτροποι administering ecclesiastical property under Ottoman rule appear to have been appointed by or with the consent of and in some way to have been acting as trustees for the community and the church authorities, to both of whom they were accountable. I stress "some," because in almost all other cases the ἐπίτροποι appear, at least as far as the texts indicate, to have been appointed by the church authorities alone, i.e. usually by an archimandrite acting on behalf of the prelate. E.g. see (ιβ) Register XLIII, p. 167: Ὅρμηδία, αψν' [1750] ανγ(ονστου) κά(τι), εδιορίσθη από τῆς σήμερον ἐπίτροπος τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας δι' ἡμετέρου γράμματος (of the archbishop) καθηγούμενος τῆς ἁγίας νάπας κυρ νικηφόρος εἰς δν ἐδόθη καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατάστιχον τῶν τε πραγμάτων καὶ τοῦ λογαριασμοῦ."

(ιτ') Cf. Ibid., p. 191

"Βατηλή ..... φυξο [1760] δεκ. ἱγ' ἐπίτροπος καὶ αὐθίς ὁ αὐτὸς (κυρ νικολάς) διωρισθεὶς νὰ γράψη τα τε ἐξοδα καὶ τα ἔσοδα, καὶ νὰ ἀποδείχῃ καὶ τὸν κουραμα τοῦ χωρίου." This ἐπίτροπος was also, like others, charged with assessing the Kurama of the village, sort of collective tax (miri?), therefore he was in fact a communal clerk responsible to the church authorities, who were, as well known responsible to the Saray for all matters relating to the taxation of the rayahs. 30

(ιδ') Cf. ibid., p. 115:

"Πολιτικόν. αψθ' [1754] σεπτ(εμβρίου) ..... ἐπίτροπος ἀντὶ τοῦτο θυτέτη ὁ ἄλλος φιλιπποῦς Τζαμέτης."

(ιε') Cf. ibid., p. 364:

Τοῦ ἁγ(ίου) Ἀντωνίου Μαρωνιτῶν (in Kythrea) αψθ' [1765] ψεβ. β' ἐδωριόθη ἐπίτροπος εἰς τὴν αὐτήν ἐκκλησίαν ὁ φαντατζέσκος μαρωνιτής. Εἰς δὲ παρεδόθησαν τὰ δυσά φαΐνονται γεγραμμένα εἰς τὸ ὅπερ ἐπιφέρει κατάστιχον."
12. In fact in the vast majority of entries relating to the appointment of ἐπίτροποι there is not the slightest hint to a popular participation in it. How are we to explain this contradiction to the cases indicating such a participation (9–10, [ε'] – [ια'])?

It we stick to the letter of the documents we have to accept that there was a distinction in the methods of appointment of ἐπίτροποι: a few of them were elected by the community and the church authorities acting jointly, and others, the vast majority, were appointed by the latter alone.

Still, the question arises: why and how did that distinction emerge? Was election a novelty opposed to the long-established procedure of appointment? Or was it in fact another way of stating the latter procedure?

A definite answer is not easy. In view of the well-known miserable status of the rural population of Cyprus and of the whole Ottoman Empire at that time, and also in view of its bad need for guidance, of its being swayed by its notables and of its limited social initiative and actual illiteracy, it would appear improbable that really democratic procedures were or came to be familiar with it.

13. What can safely be assumed is this: The appointment of ἐπίτροποι was in fact always made by the church authorities, usually through a letter such as that mentioned in 1/2 (ιβ'), but it was subject to the more or less theoretical approval of the parishioners concerned. That there might occasionally arise differences of opinion or even conflicts between the authorities and their flock in matters of such appointments is possible, 32 but these could by no means have been the rule.

Nonetheless it can hardly be denied that at least in some cases (§§ 9–10) a façade of ‘democratic’ procedure in such matters is attested. Such a procedure fitted well into the communal spirit mentioned above, it did obviously stress the communal character of church property and contributed to the gradual exercise of more control by the community upon the management of church property.

31. For some more cases see Kyrris, op. cit., pp. 24β - 25α. Abundant evidence can further be found in the Church Registers, passim.

32. E.g. see a conflict in Famagusta - Varosia in 1870-1871 between two groups of citizens, actually two parties, one of them the School Committee, concerning the person of the teacher: Kyrris, op. cit., pp. 36β - 37β.
It was from this procedure that the present day system of direct election of the ἐπίτροποι by the parishioners developed.\footnote{Hackett-Papaioannou, 'Ιστορία, op. cit. below ftn. 33, pp. 50, 55f. 58 ff.}

14. This procedure was paralleled by the equally 'democratic' method of election of the Cypriote metropolitans (bishops) under Ottoman domination, i.e. by the people of their diocese, although subject to the approval of the Holy Synod and the confirmation by a berat from the Government, and although "the elections came in the eighteenth century to be dictated by the Sultan or by the Turkish governors and the heads of the Greek community or Kojabashis." \footnote{John Hackett, 'Ιστορία της Ὀρθόδοξου ἕκκλησιας της Κύπρου, transl. by Charilaos I. Papaioannou, Παραθέματα, Πάτρα 1927, pp. 39-40; Loizos Philippou, "Εκλογή δραχμικόκοπων ἐν Κύπρῳ." Κυπριακά Σπονδαί, Ψ, 1943 (1945), pp. 123-125: Γ' περίοδος (1571-XXth century); N.G. Kyriazes, "Εκλογή καὶ ἐνθρόνισις Μακαρίου ὡς δραχμικόκοπου (1854)," Κυπριακά Χρονικά, VI, 1929, pp. 309-311, especially p. 310. At least in some cases the laity are not mentioned as taking part in archiepiscopal elections: e.g. see Hill, op. cit., pp. 353-354: election of archbishop Chryssanthos (January 1768) simply by the votes of the Bishops and clergy. In the very early years of the Ottoman occupation the people were not, it seems, participating in the elections; but the laity as a constitutive factor were represented by ἄρχοντες, obviously ex officio or by virtue of their social influence: Philippou, op. cit., p. 123. The same happened in the Latin period, when the laity taking part in an election were "ἀξιόπιστοι καὶ λόγιοι ἄνδρες τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐνορίας" see C. Hadsipsaltes, "Εκ τῆς Ἱστορίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Κύπρου κατά τὴν Φραγκοκρατίαν," Κ.Σ., ΧΧΙΙ, 1958, 14, 15, 16. Cf. below, ftn. 38α.}

There is no doubt that the said kojabashis were also the dominant element in the bodies of ἐπίτροποι of church property as well as in all other communal offices, which in fact they held hereditarily and nepotically. \footnote{E.g. see above, § 9 (στ'), (η'); cf. reference in ftn. 31.}

Such a domination was usual in Cyprus under the Ottomans \footnote{E.g. see I. Antiphon G. Sykoutres, 'Μοναστήρια ἐν Κύπρῳ, Α', 'Ἀμασγοῦ, Κυπ. Χρον., II, 1924, p. 116: Τὸ κοινωνικό τοῦ ἐν Κύπρῳ, Α', 'Ἀμασγοῦ, Κυπ. Χρον., II, 1924, p. 116: The metropolitan of Nemessos and Kourion, Leontios, together with three 'lay notables' of Limassol, Τζάν Φιλίππου, Λοΐζου and Ἀντζουλῆ, donate a monastery to the Patriarch of Alexandria in 1633 or shortly before. Those notables were θρονικοὶ ἐπίτρο­ποι, as the current terminology calls them today. There is no point in citing more evidence and literature to illustrate this well-known social phenomenon.}

and has equally occurred in other Hellenic provinces occupied by them, where the magistrates of communities were elected by a general assembly—of all social classes—as a rule "from among the rich and intelligent people." \footnote{Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, Ιστορία τοῦ Νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ, B1, Τουρκοκρατία 1453-1669, Οἱ ιστορικὲς βάσεις τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς κοινωνίας καὶ οἰκονομικὰς, Θεσσαλονίκη, 1964, pp. 285-287, οf. op. cit., Α' 'Ἀρχες καὶ Διαμορφωσις του, Θessaloniki, 1961, p. 200.}
a short period in the mid-XVIIIth century, when the popular masses and especially the guilds of Constantinople were admitted by Patriarch Cyril V to the administration of church affairs, the high offices of the Ecumenic Patriarchate were normally held and its affairs conducted or dominated by the ruling classes, as from the late XVIIIth and early XIXth century the Phanariots, and this despite the formal either direct or indirect participation of the laity (κοινού λαού) in the Synod convoked to elect a Patriarch. Such a participation had occurred in Morea in 1500, in the Greek Community in Venice during the XVI-XVIIth centuries and possibly in Cythera in 1636.

15. What is striking in the cases of communal approval or participation in the administration of church property occurring in Cyprus (see above, § 9 - § 10) is their temporal proximity to the “council elected by the Greek people [of Constantinople], charged with the superintendence and management of the ecclesiastical funds” that was instituted through an Act of September 1755 by Patriarch Cyril V of Constantinople. The council - in - question was elected by “an assembly of the people and clergy,” who “agreed upon ... measures for ... cooperation,” and was “composed of distinguished members of the Greek Community,” i.e.: “(i) three Metropolitans, (ii) three eminent Greeks occupying high State positions, and (iii) ten members taken from each of the professional guilds of Constantinople.” This unique institution in the

annals of the Greeks under Ottoman domination," as termed by the first scholar who drew attention to it, Mr Theodore Papadopoullos, "was doomed not to survive as it is the case with early experiments of this kind... It was abolished by Imperial Order issued immediately after Cyril's deposition in 1757, and at the instance of his successor and enemy, Kallinicos III," supported by the Metropolitans and the Phanariot officials who feared that the control of church affairs would thus escape their hands and pass to the guilds' people being the majority in the Council. Nevertheless this was "the first realistic attempt at reforming the Synod; indeed, its object was to transfer a large part of administrative authority, all the material part of it, from the hands of the Synod, practically under the domination of the Phanariots, to a body formed out of lay elements." Although this Cyril's initiative is said to have been due to the fact that "he had to rely on popular contribution for a possible alleviation of the financial burden weighing heavily on the Oecumenic Church," still it must be viewed within the context of that Patriarch's close alliance with the popular masses and also as part of the wider, dramatic, tormenting and contradictory process of development of mediaeval and modern Greek society towards a democratic structure and communal management of its affairs.

16. Now, can there have been any relation between Cyril V's 'experiment' and the similar procedures attested in Cyprus?

The oldest case of communal participation in church administration cited above is one of 1754 (§ 10), but the same procedure occurred in December 1755, in 1759, 1771 and 1772 § 10, ε', α', γ', θ') in parallel with mere appointment of επιτροποι by the church authorities § 11, 1750, 1760, 1754, 1766, etc.). Cyril's 'experiment' lasted from September 1755 until January 1757 (see § 15). So it could not, on first sight, have served as precedent for Cyprus, whereas the Cypriote practice may have been known to him: in fact

40. See fn. 37.
Cyril’s first deposition in May 1751 was caused by his alleged participation in or instigation of troubles occurring at that time in Cyprus. Although this accusation does not seem to have been true, it does possibly point to the Patriarch’s interest in the affairs of our island; an interest which may have continued during his second Patriarchate (7. IX. 1752 - 15. 1. 1757), when a delegation of Cypriote Metropolitans visited Constantinople (1754) and persuaded the Grand Vezir to moderate his demands on the island and have a Khatt-i Huma-yun issued by the Sultan and firman appointing the Bishops Kojabashis of the Rayahs of Cyprus.

17. However, it is rather improbable that Cyril would have followed a practice of Cyprus in his reform, even if he knew it in detail. Nor is it probable that the Cypriote prelates were influenced by the mass movement recorded in Constantinople and around during the period before Cyril’s re-instatement (7. IX. 1752) and after, a movement whose logical consequence was the institution by Cyril of the Council for the management of ecclesiastical funds in September 1755. To accept such an influence would not mean that the Cypriotes overtook Constantinople by establishing elected committees but they were inspired by the tendency of affairs in the capital.

Though Philotheos, during whose tenure of office (1734-1759) elected committees appear for the first time, was a generous, liberal-minded and charitable man. I would hesitate to ascribe the said novelty to these qualities of his alone. What would seem more probable is that the novelty - in - question was a natural local product of the communal concepts relating to church property that have been mentioned above (§§ 7, 8, [β’], [γ’], [δ’], 1749, 1755, 1773 respectively; cf. § 1, [α’], 1756).

The maintenance of the procedure of communal elections under Philo-
theos’ successors, Païsios (1759-1768), Chrysanthos (1768-1810) and the rest up to the present day, points to the integration of this institution in the wider complex of structural developments of our Church.

It does also point to the organic nature of that institution rather than to its having been imported from abroad, and this particularly in view of its disappearance in Constantinople after only two years of life (1757).

It was, in any case, a parallel development that occurred in two different though inter-communicating Orthodox Churches, that of Cyprus and that of Constantinople, at about the same time. It must, no doubt, be ranked among the several—not few—"edifying features" presented by the Church of Cyprus under Ottoman domination. In a wider, national context, it anticipated the Reforms of 1838 according to which "the notables summoned to the annual Assembly [responsible for the administration of the island] must be regularly authorized representatives of each town." In a still wider perspective it should be considered as a notable recent contribution to the democratic heritage of humanity by a country where democratic concepts were born at times most remote from ours and have never died ever since.

Nicosia, Cyprus
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