

**POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ACTIVITIES OF THE ORTHODOX “RUM” ARCHBISHOP
OF CYPRUS DURING THE SULTAN MAHMUD II PERIOD**

**SULTAN II. MAHMUD DÖNEMİNDE KIBRIS ORTODOKS “RUM”
BAŞPİSKOPOSUNUN SİYASİ VE SOSYAL FAALİYETLERİ**

Haydar Çoruh

Assoc. Prof., Mustafa Kemal University, Department of History of Science and Literature, Hatay, Türkiye
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7632-9721

ÖZET

Sultan II. Selim döneminde Latinlerin zulmünden kurtarılarak yeniden ihya edilen Kıbrıs Başpiskoposluğu yeni bir organizasyona tabi tutuldu ve 1572 yılında 4 piskoposluğa bölündü. Bu piskoposluklar Lefkoşa, Baf, Limasol ve Magosa olarak belirlendi. Böylece Latinler döneminde kesilmiş olan İstanbul Fener Rum Patrikliği ile olan ilişkiler de yeniden kurulmuş oldu. 1600'lü yıllarda başlayan iktisadi bunalım, Kıbrıs'ta da kendini gösterince Osmanlı Devleti ağırlaşan ekonomik şartların etkisini hafifletmek ve adadan başlayan göçleri durdurmak istedi. Adaya dışarıdan yapılan müdahaleleri ortadan kaldırmak isteyen devlet, Kıbrıs Başpiskopos'unu reayanın koruyucusu ilan etmek zorunda kaldı. Kıbrıs Başpiskoposluğu'nda başlayan bu yükseliş kısa bir zaman sonra piskoposların hiçbir aracıya gerek duymadan İstanbul ile bağlantı kurabilecek siyasi yetkilere de sahip olmasını sağladı. Bu siyasi yükseliş piskoposluğun nüfuz alanını genişletmiştir. 19. Yüzyılın başlarına kadar 4 piskoposluk bölgesine sahip olan Kıbrıs Başpiskoposluğu, bu tarihten sonra 2 piskoposluk bölgesi daha ilave edilerek genişlemesini sürdürdü. Buna karşılık yetkileri bir kez daha genişletilmiş olan reaya vekilliği, Sultan II. Mahmud tarafından başpiskopos ve yardımcısı metropolitlere verildi. Sultan II. Mahmud döneminde reaya vekilliği yapan 3 başpiskopos ve 3 piskopos tespit edilebilmektedir.

Bildirimiz reaya koruyucusu olarak görevlendirilen bu 3 başpiskoposun Sultan II. Mahmud döneminde Bab-1 Ali nezdinde yürüttükleri siyasi ve sosyal politikaları üzerine olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kıbrıs, Ortodoks, Osmanlı, Patrik, Reaya, Rum

ABSTRACT

The archbishopric of Cyprus, which had been liberated from the tyranny of the Latins during the reign of Sultan Selim II, was subjected to a new organization and divided into four bishops in 1572. These bishops were identified as Nicosia, Paphos, Limassol and Magosa. Thus, relations with the Istanbul Fener Greek Patriarchate, which had been cut in the Latin period, could be reestablished. The economic crisis that started in the 1600s wanted to mitigate the effects of the economic conditions that were heavily influenced by the Ottoman state in Cyprus and to stop migrations starting from the island. The state, which wanted to remove the interventions from the outside of the island, had to declare the Protector of the Archbishop of Cyprus. This rise, which began in the

Archbishop of Cyprus, soon led to the bishops having political authority to connect with Istanbul without needing any intermediaries. This political ascent broadened the bishop's influence. The Archbishop of Cyprus, which had four bishopric regions until the beginning of the 19th century, continued to expand by adding two more bishops' regions. In turn, the Archbishop's authorities were once again enlarged by Sultan Mahmud II, and they were given the title of reaya vekili. As the Archbishop of Cyprus assisted in fulfilling this task, they had made a separate delegation of three members, Girinye, Baf and Tuzla (Larnaka) metropolids, to make it a commodity.

In this text, it will be given information about the political and social activities of these three archbishops, who were delegated as safeguard protectors, carried out in Sublime Porte during the reign of Sultan Mahmud II.

Keywords: Cyprus, Orthodox, Ottoman, Patriarch, Reaya, Greek

1. INTRODUCTION

The following information is available in a source belonging to the Eighteenth Century about the mission and the position of the Archbishop of Cyprus and its metropolitans on the island:

Although the Archbishop settled in Nicosia, his religious jurisdiction was extended to Famagusta, Mesaria, Degirmenlik, Dağ and Karpaz.

The Paphos bishop settled in Paphos and ruled the regions of Piskobu, Evdim, Kukla and Hirsofu.

The bishop of Kiti or Kitium sometimes resides in Tuzla (Larnaca) and sometimes in Limassol. However, Tuzla, Limassol and Gilan's spiritual rector was not the bishop of Kitium, but the bishop of Girne.

Other than his main spiritual region, the bishop of Girne, would also be engaged in the religious and secular affairs of the Lefke, Omorfo and Pendaye districts (Gürkan, 2000: 159-160).

Only three names of Archbishops of Cyprus, who were lived in the reign of Sultan Mahmud II, could have been identified (Bedevi, 1966: 149).

Chronologically these are Archbishop Hrisantos (1809-1811), Archbishop Kyprianos (1811-1821) and Archbishop Panaridos (1831-1840) (Bedevi, 1966: 149).

The Archbishop of Cyprus which had comprised four regional bishoprics during the eighteenth century had increased to totally six regional bishops in the nineteenth century by adding two of them, Lefkoşa, Girne, Magosa, Tuzla, Kitima and Limassol (Purcell, 1969:170)¹.

2. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Administrative changes have been occurred in the Archbishop of Cyprus towards the end of the eighteenth century. After these changes, state affairs of the non-Muslims were carried out by the

¹ Purcell defines these four bishops and jurisdictions in Cyprus in the eighteenth century as follows: Nicosia and Karpaz, Famagusta and Mesaoria, Kyneria and Pendaye, Paphos and Soli, Citium) And Limassol.

metropolitan bishops and the “kocabaşı”, which is used to call the headmen of Christian villages, in addition to the Archbishop, which is known as “Reaya Proxy” in rural areas.

However, the sovereignty of the Archbishop of Cyprus on the island has been continued per se and this status has not been overlooked by the foreign observers. For this issue, Franz Georg Maier says, " Cyprus has being managed in a semi-autonomous status since the half of a century. Both the Bishop and the State Translator (Dragoman) is the absolute administrators in the island. Turks has fallen to second place in the administration. The island under the command of Captain Pasha is ruled by the bishops. (Göktürk, 2015: 300; Franz Georg Maier, 1968: 120) " Another observer, Sir Harry Luke, points out that " The Orthodox church, which has been oppressed during 300 years, reached the highest status in terms of its authority after coming under the domination of Turks and its status became higher than the Turkish pasha (Şahin, 2005: 81-82). At the beginning of the nineteenth century the authorization of these officials were increased for a special reason and some improvements were made to their personal rights(Şahin, 2005: 81-82).

In line with these improvements, the political duties of the Archbishop of Cyprus can be summarized as follows:

2.1 Reaya Proxy (Reaya Vekilliği)

The Archbishop of Cyprus of the Ottoman Empire, Kipriyanos Nikephoros and his three metropolitans raised and authorized the protection before from 1796. The state aimed to prevent foreign interference and to increase the loyalty of non-Muslims to their countries while this decision was made (Şahin, 2005: 66-67). However, the corruption allegations about both the metropolitan bishops and the muhassıl, lead to be taken the duty, reaya vekilliği, from their hands in 1796. Afterwards, this duty was given to the Cyprus Dragomans. This has made it easier for the Archbishops to turn to other forces over time and to infiltrate external forces into the island. Archbishop Kipriyanos, participated in all the secret activities of the independence of Greece in cooperation with Ethnic Eteria, founded in 1814. Then, Archbishop Kipriyanos and his accomplice metropolitan bishops were arrested and they were executed because of confessing their crimes (Yeniçeri, 2005: 17-18; Munro-Khuri, 1984: 89). In contrast, the state continued to grant certain administrative rights to the Archbishop of Cyprus and its metropolises(Munro-Khuri, 1984: 83).

The Archbishop of Cyprus continued to be not only the greatest spiritual leader of the Greek Cypriot community, but also the most important representative of the community after that period. The position in the hierarchy was the second after the Governor (Alasya, 1977: 106-107).

2.2 The conflict among Muhassıl and Dragomans

The archbishops could propose intentional statements and slanders to remove communication between the state and the reaya in order to regain financial administration.

Halil Aga, a Cyprus Muhassıl, was asked to be formed a delegation which its members were coming from the districts and the villages in a petition who sent to İstanbul. The mission of this delegation were to examine the situation of the poor people (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA), *Hatt-ı Hümayûn* (HAT)., nr. 46030). In contrast, the Archbishop of Cyprus requested to be taken the financial administration away from the hands of Dragoman, Yorgaki, instead of constituting

such a delegation. Thus, the Archbishop of Cyprus aimed to cut off the relationship between Bab-ı Ali and reaya (BOA, *Hatt-ı Hümayûn* (HAT)., nr. 46030).

Despite of the prevention of the Archbishop, the non-Muslim community came into contact with Bab-ı Ali and declared to that they would had to leave the island in case of not being constituted this delegation. Eventually, many qualified people had to leave due to the oppression and this fact led to lost an important part of tax in Cyprus made (Şahin, 2005: 84).

The Archbishop of Cyprus, who is responsible for the welfare and well-being of the community, should bring back the people who fled from the island in a turmoil or he should give security. Otherwise he would have to pay the tax debt of the taxpayers himself. The archbishop of Cyprus, however, tried to get rid of this obligation by a different way. He was rumored about men who left the island such as "they will be gone for no reason". The congregation argued that these rumors were the slanders of the Archbishop and declared that they never betrayed the state. According to them he was a liar (BOA, *Hatt-ı Hümayûn* (HAT)., nr. 46030).

The bishops play an important role in the selection of the muhassıls. The Archbishop of Cyprus, who was aware of this, rarely would express about muhassıls appreciation. Ali Ruhi Efendi was an exception who the Archbishop expressed about himself. Ali Ruhi Efendi was one of the few muhassıls who built and repopulated Cyprus. He was an administrator who won not only Muslims but also non-Muslims' heart (BOA, *Bâb-ı Defterî Başmuhasebe* (D.BŞM), nr. 42001, pp. 4, h. 1, 24 Nisan 1829).

The Archbishops of Cyprus acts as sole administrator time to time and it is seen that they could oppress to the reaya (Şahin, 2015: 349). Since the state can penalize them, they could quickly leave its position to muslims and argued that the mission of church was not related with these administrative tasks (BOA, HAT., nr. 3375-C)².

2.3 The Ending of Dragomans' Duty (Reaya Vekilliği)

The tasks, which were related with Greek Cypriot community, were conducted by Dragomans until 1815. After that year, they were carried out by the Archbishop, the metropolitans and the council. Indeed, the Archbishop of Cyprus wanted to have the power for all tasks. In order to be dismissed, Dragoman, he decided to be renewed his "atik emr-i âlî" and he applied to Bâb-ı âlî on 28 August 1836.

Panaridos, the Archbishop of Cyprus, demanded in his application that the Reaya Vekili's tasks should be conducted by the metropolitan bishops who were under his command (BOA, D.BŞM., nr. 42001, pp. 27, h. 2, 28 Ağustos 1828). The request came in the process of Hüsrev Mehmed Pasha's first captain. Eventually, the fee which should be paid to be a dragoman was increased from 100 to 250 piastre, the archbishop took charge on his tasks and no new dragoman was appointed (BOA, D.BŞM., nr. 42001, pp. 27, h. 2, 28 Ağustos 1828; Kazasker Mehmed Hafid, 1952: 64³; Çelik, 2013: 129).

² 1804 yılında Kıbrıs'ta ortaya çıkan ihtilâl Mersin (İçel) Valisi Seyyid Ahmed Paşa tarafından bastırıldı. Bunun üzerine Kıbrıs Başpiskoposu Ahmed Paşa'yı bir sonraki dönemin muhassılı/vergi tahsildarı olarak işaret etmiştir.

³ Hüsrev Mehmed Pasha's First Pail, 1811-1818 [Aralık 1811 (Zilhicce 1226)-Şubat 1818 (Rebiülâhir 1233)]

3. SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Three great revolts which were taken place in 1804, 1821 and 1833 years in the island led the majority of reaya to migrate to the safer areas increasingly due to the administrative system has been some more corrupted during each rebellion. On the other hand, the state calls both the bishops and the headmen (Kocabaşı) to the capital after a revolt starts in order to request information about the reaya, and then an investigator is sent to elucidate the causes of the events (BOA, Hatt-ı Hümâyûn, nr. 538/26518).

3.1 Collecting state taxes

Monetary relations of the Cyprus Muhassıl with the bishops and the moneychangers (Sarraf) developed mainly within the knowledge of the Archbishops. In the case that a problem arose between the parties, the bishops were testified. In 1809 Hacı Hüseyin Efendi, a Cyprus muhassıl, had given request for payment on both the money (mal-ı mîrî) which he should pay to the state and the interest (esham) which should be paid to the shareholders, to his moneychanger, who located in İstanbul. However, the requested amount was so high. The moneychanger wanted to pay this sum by collecting from some bishops, headmen and a merchant which he had previously given in parts to them. The bishops demanded a few installments and added that they would not pay their debt if the moneychanger persisted to pay the money in advance. Thereupon, the Archbishop, after informing muhassıl, sent the collateral bills which drawn up by the bishops of Girinye, Tuzla and Baf to his moneychanger to go them to the treasury of the state (BOA, *Cevdet-Maliye*, nr. 22317, 12 Eylül 1808).

The Archbishops of Cyprus could be entitled to spend money, which was called the name of the country expense (memleket masrafları), as well as having authority to take on debt. But this right should only be used after informing the Muslim rulers of the locality about the issue. Additionally, the bills could only be valid if the seals of the archbishop, the bishops, and the muhassıl could be seen on them. Nevertheless, just with the signatures of the Archbishop and headmen, it could be taken on debt from the strangers spending for a long time under the name of the country expense was made and be paid them back to the reas. As the tax burden on the Reaya gradually increased in this way, on 20 June 1827 (25 Zilkade 1242), the state was asked the Archbishop to give information about the issue. It was understood that the bishops and the chamberlains (kethüda) had used fake seals and done forgery signatures on bills. Therefore, the bills which are drawn only by the bishops has been prohibited unless the seals which belong to muhassıl, the rich people (eşraf) and the archbishop were seen (BOA, Hatt-ı Hümâyûn, nr. 489/24004, 20 Temmuz 1827).

The state demanded a certain amount of money from the reaya in order to be used for the protection of island. On the other hand, this money would be appropriated by the reaya proxies and they argued some excuses not to pay them to the state. Instead they preferred to draw new bills providing muhassıls as a guarantee (BOA, *Cevdet-Maliye*, nr. 6459, 6 Temmuz 1809)⁴. As the foremost within the reaya proxies, the Archbishop was not only satisfied with this and he claimed that they did not have to pay their debts based on the orders which are written on their 'Berat's (Gürkan,

⁴ The Cyprus renaissance has been a tradition since the age of eight. The amount of this waitress was about 281620 guruh.

2000: 160-161)⁵. Further he wanted to be taken the sum of money from his moneychanger. The state, however, would send an inspector to be able to collect debts because of not finding a payer (BOA, Kamil Kepeci (KK), nr. 24, h. 4, 1 Ekim 1810).

3.2 Confiscation Procedures

Since the Archbishop of Cyprus had all kinds of knowledge about the community, it would be consulted to him before the confiscations (BOA, *Maliyeden Müdevver Defterleri* (Mad.df), nr. 9726, 22 Ağustos 1809, pp. 102)⁶.

However, it was well known that the information which was given by the Archbishop did not always reflect the truth. For instance, on 11 October 1810 it was asked for help from Hrisantos, the Archbishop of Cyprus, to confiscate the asset of Serkiz, who was one of the richest moneychanger located in Cyprus.

Yet the man, who was given debt by Serkis, was the Archbishop himself. It is understood that the Archbishop had concealed this fact during the confiscation of Serkiz's assets. He had even tried to wipe of his debt as well as the ones of the surrogate (Naip), headman and mufti (Müftü) (BOA, KK., nr. 24, pp. 189, h. 1, 11 Ekim 1810)⁷.

The state did not take a position in the transactions related to the confiscation of assets, nor did it depend on the persons. In this respect, the state was confiscating the assets of the bishops and the grandfathers as well as the public as often (BOA, Mad. df., nr. 9726, pp. 288, 24 Mayıs 1811)⁸. However, the treasury needs were taken into consideration when such transactions were carried out. For this reason, sometimes the confiscation is required to be finalized very urgently, and sometimes it may be necessary to spread the transactions over a long period of time, taking into consideration the state of the property. The seizure procedures were generally applied on the property of officers who were dismissed and died. Their assets were determined by the nature of the place they were in, sometimes under the supervision of a bureaucrat who had been sent, and a delegation consisting of muhassıl, archbishop, ayan and martial artist, who were sometimes local administrators. Due to the death of Cypriot Archbishop Hrisantos on May 24, 1811 and the distress he had in his treasure, the

⁵ When these provisions were examined, the income of the Archbishop could reach up to 10000 kuruş annually. It is understood that this increase is caused by a tax from wheat, barley, cotton and other products produced in villages and townpp. This tax was not in the form of pension but in the form of certain taxes placed on some land. The bishops would go through this income. However, every bishop had the authority to collect revenues from his own region. The Paphos bishop's income ran 1500-2000. The income of Larnaca or Kiti and Girinye was 3000-4000 dry. In extraordinary times, it has been determined that the reave couples, who have the habits of peeling their own people, collect 40000 kuruş duties illegally. It is also known that while the Archbishop received 100 cent pennies per year from the bishops, the bishops received an additional tax of 10 to 15 cents per year in addition to this amount from each village and city. However, such taxes could reach up to 40-50 cents in places like Larnaca .

⁶ The lack of money in the treasury / monetary base caused the state to occasionally confiscate various sources of income. These sources of income could sometimes be mukataa / lease flows, and sometimes rich assetpp. If it were decided to confiscate the property, it would not have been possible to see whether the person was immoral, bishop, ridicule or ulema. During the confiscation, the state was more concerned with the size of the income to be revealed than the people. When there were grounds for confiscation, the state, the Muslim, or the non-Muslim wanted to be fully charged, without making any distinction.

⁷ Unexpectedly, the accounts of the muhallefat began to be made unexpectedly by the heirs of Serkiz, one of the famous merchants of Cyprupp. However, it is understood that some of the muhallefat was seized by officialpp. It has been found that Cypriot Nabi spent 25000 kuruş, müftüsü 15000 kuruş and 5000 kuruş embezzlement.

⁸ Archbishop Christianus, who was from the bishops of Cyprus and expelled to the Eubrian cemetery, died here. For this reason, the confiscation was decided to seize.

presence of commodities in Cyprus and in monastery rooms were confiscated (BOA, Mad. df., nr. 9726, pp. 288, 24 Mayıs 1811)⁹.

There were clear provisions in the berats about what the property of the bishops would have been. These provisions anticipated that the presence of property would be transferred to newly appointed bishops. In response to the state's attempt to seize this property, The newly appointed bishops pointed out that the existence of the old bishop's goods had been recorded (vech-i muharrer) BOA, Mad. df., nr. 9726, pp. 288, 24 Mayıs 1811).

The state was also able to confiscate the assets of the bishops, whose wealth was determined. The bishops, who knew this, tried to prove that the property belonged to churches and monasteries, not to themselves, though they knew that they were involved in the bishops' custody. The bishops were trying to convince the state that there was no property that could be confiscated. In such cases, the state, taking into account the provisions of the Berat, abandoned the property in question to the appointed bishops, and tried to make sure that the matter did not become more disturbed BOA, Mad. df., nr. 9726, pp. 288, 24 Mayıs 1811).

3.3 Transformation from "Reaya Vekilliği" to Tax Redemption and Tax Savings

The Archbishop of Cyprus was obliged to collect all the taxes and taxes that were to be paid to the state in the name of the Treasury. These taxes were sometimes collected on the rates set by the state due to negligence or negligence of the local authorities. In such cases, the Archbishop and the bishops would intervene and be obliged to inform the state. Sometimes the delegations were sent to the center to solve the problems and the situation of the resignation was noted (Alasya, 1977: 107)¹⁰.

Due to these kinds of complaints coming from the east, the government has developed various methods in order to find the complaints on the spot and to find out the remedies. One of these methods is population and real estate counts. At the beginning of these appearances, tax and military problems came up. Thanks to the state census, the aphrodisians were able to determine the welfare level of the ahalin and the purchasing power on the spot.

These censuses made it possible to address taxation, exemptions and population-based problems. Muslims and non-Muslim activists were in great need of keeping the census healthy. The bishops also worked with local managers to make these censuses accurate, timely and complete. The consequences of the accusation are assessed, particularly if there are some criteria for taxation. When the Cypriot census was carried out in 1831, the outlook on taxation was much higher than the resident's payout power. For this reason, the bishops and the metropolitans had asked the delegations they sent to the center to correct this matter (BOA, Hatt-ı Hümâyûn, nr. 708/33940, B-C, 6 Temmuz 1831)¹¹.

⁹ Upon the death of Archbishop Christiansen, the new Archbishop accompanied by the allegiance of the muhassil and wuchu sealed the rooms of Christantos in the Monastery and accompanied him to the identification of the clothes and monuments of the bishops and monks who had been seized with cash and clothed in cash.

¹⁰ See the Archbishop's attitude on tax collection.

¹¹ For information on correcting tax rates.

The Archbishop of Cyprus, collecting the taxes of the reayan, collectively determined through taxpayers and metropolises that the accidents would pay. Later, according to the tolerance of the villagers, this tax was divided per household and an agreement was reached on what amount each village could pay. It was the duty of the church to keep such records constantly. In 1826, the control of the church on island revenues was limited and the authorities were narrowed because of the transfer of the Cyprus insurgency to Tersane-i Amire. On this account, the state aimed to break the increasing power of the Archbishop on the island and to create new balances instead (Ursinus, 2002: 295)¹².

The taxation of the Cypriot rule to pay the state was proportionate to the population density. Until 1824, 1/3 of the tax was paid by Muslims and the rest was paid by non-Muslims. This was caused by the famine that had been taking place since the beginning of the year, and by the waves of the islanders who had developed due to the Greek uprising of 1821. Between 1824 and 1828, a new arrangement was made on taxation in order to remove this situation, so that the Muslims would have to pay one-fifth of the salary and the rest would pay the remaining four-fifths. Since such adjustments are closely related to the population density, the 1828 tax rate of the Muslim population, which is reduced to 1/8, is set to suit that point. The corruption of the population balance in this way to the Muslims has led to the collapse of the taxpayer on the rally.

The Archbishop of Cyprus sent a delegation of 24 June 1832 to Istanbul in order to correct the tax imbalance. This increase in the tax rates of the Archbishop was intended to be expressed in the Divan-ı Hümayun. The task of the delegation was to ensure that the collective collection of the Cypriot tax was carried out as far as it was concerned. A second point which was asked to insist on the reaya vekiller sent to Divan-ı Hümayun was to arrange separate book for each community in the population and tax counts and to prevent the taxation from intermingling (BOA, *Hatt-ı Hümayûn*, nr. 708/33940, B, C, 24 Haziran 1832; Ursinus, 2002: 295)¹³.

Although this committee consisting of Reaya's representatives reached agreement on eight articles on the meeting held with the Minister of the Tophane, there was no development related to the tax rate of the repatriate. The reconciliation arrived briefly as follows (BOA, Hat, nr. 538/26518, lef: 1):

1. The current situation in the collection of taxes, that is to say the provisions on collecting the tax collectively, will be maintained.
2. The tax payment will be made for the payments of Muslims and non-Muslims taking into consideration the state and tolerance of everyone.
3. In the distribution of the tax, an exception was made for all Muslims, alliance, for the Muslims who have fallen in popularity by leaving the island for various reasons.
4. Muslims would continue to pay only 1/8 of the vet as it used to be.

¹² Michael Ursinus, "The Tersane and the Tanzimat, or How to Finance a Salaried Fleet", *The Kapudan Pasha his Office and his Domain*, (Ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou), Rethymnon 2002, pp. 295.

¹³ Ursinus, gives the date of 4th May 1830 regarding the dispatch of these 4 deputies to Istanbul, and Ali Ruhi Efendi is at the forefront.

The Rea's deputies returned empty-handed from Istanbul. This trip ended in a mania of the authority of the Archbishop of Cyprus on the reevaluation. According to the agreement reached, the parliament, which was formed by the deputies and the elders, was commissioned to reform. On the contrary, the Archbishop of Cyprus was not listed. More importantly, the election for the parliament was not consulted by the Archbishop consent (Ünal, 2002: 616)¹⁴.

According to another ruling, tax collectors would be elected by the church council and the parliament. This collector would only be responsible for collecting state taxes. He had no right to intervene on another matter. In return, the collector's salary would be paid by the state. With the 1830 population and taxation regime imposed immediately following this viewpoint, the Vatican's revenues were turned into tax collectors, from the archbishop to the smallest priestess (Ursinus, 2002: 295).

The arrangements made deepened rather than solving the problems. In 1833, the failure to meet taxation caused a new uprising to take place. This revolt was also the result of the dominance of the church built on the island.

So after the rebellion, all the authority of the church was brought to an end and the Archbishop and the metropolitans were tried by the execution. Because of this rebellion, the church wanted to compromise with the state, losing all authority over the reaya. The Cyprus Church sent another delegation to Istanbul in October 1837 to ensure that a new arrangement was made by putting the rights granted to him in 1830. When the delegation returned to the island, a new meeting was held with all the elders and rejoinders. Reaya has been reorganized. According to this (Ursinus, 2002: 296-297)¹⁵:

1. The second article of the 1830 regulation was given a new shape. The Archbishop was again included in the tax regulations.
2. An agreement on a fixed tax was reached. Thus, the decisions taken at a meeting of Kapudan Pasha, bishop, muhassil and other officers alleviated the burden on the shoulders of the rebel.
3. Taxes will be collected by the monthly officers. The salaries of these officers ranged from 1200 to 2000 kuruş.
4. The entire salary will be paid by the treasury. More importantly, as a compensation for these salaries, the taxpayers' annual payments were raised by two pennies.

4. RESULT

For the first time since the foundation of the Archbishop of Cyprus, the Ottoman Empire was predestined and recognized as an authority on the renaissance. However, this acceptance has over

¹⁴ The Ottoman State wanted to strengthen the people's commitment to the state by subjecting the places they took to the administration to a different administration that is far from decentralization. This is especially true in places where non-Muslims live. In this process called Demogerondia, a 12-member parliament elected by the people was in charge and this parliament was looking at the mosque servicepp. These councils were also interested in religious and sectarian affairs of the community, and they looked after their education. However, it should be noted here that there is no available data on the application of this system in all regions.

¹⁵ The arrangement on salaries continued until the time of Husband Kyrees (1838). However, due to a new application, the island parliament paid these salaries from the state treasury, not from the local treasury. In this period, he was interested in the salaries of the reaya vekillers, as never before.

time threatened the authority of the Ottoman State over the island. The Archbishop of Cyprus had taken care not to deal with the dictatorship and order of their own communities, but rather to take steps to purge the island from the Turks, especially through Mora and volunteers from Europe, taking into account the mobilizations in Mora.

When the Greek Rebellion of 1821 was viewed from the point of view of Cyprus, it became another initiative, which was included in the archbishop and metropolitans of Cyprus. The Archbishop and the rebels who wanted to carry a similar resemblance to this rebellion were abolished by violent punishment and the entire dominion over the reign of the church was terminated. After 1833, however, a new arrangement was made to allow the Archbishop of Cyprus not to be ruled, and some authority was granted to the Archbishops of Cyprus.

REFERENCE

Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives (BOA)

Cevdet-Maliye (CM), nr. 22317, 6459,

Bab-1 Defteri Başmuhasabe (D.BŞM), nr. 42001.

Hatt-ı Hümâyûn (Hat), nr. 538/26518, 538/26518, 3375, 46030, 489/24004, 708/33940.

Kamil Kepeci (KK), nr. 24.

Maliyeden Müdevver Defterleri (Mad.df.), nr. 9726.

Published Works

ALASYA, H. F. (1977). *Kıbrıs Tarihi ve Kıbrıs'ta Türk Eserleri*, Ankara.

ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, S. (2002). "Les rapports de l'Eglise Orthodoxe avec le Kapudan Pacha (fin du XVIIIème-début XIXème siècle)", *The Kapudan Pasha his Office and his Domain*, (Ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou), Rethymnon.

BEDEVİ, V. (1966). *Başlangıcından Zamanımıza Kadar Kıbrıs Tarihi*, Lefkoşa.

ÇELİK, Y. (2013). *Şeyhü'l-Vüzerâ Koca Hüsrev Mehmed Paşa -II. Mahmud Devrinin Perde Arkası-*, Ankara.

FEDAİ, H. (2000). *Kıbrıs Müftüsü Hilmi Efendi- Şiirler-*, Lefkoşa.

GÖKTÜRK, T. B. (2015). "Rum Ortodoks Kilisesi'nin Kıbrıs'ta Karar Alma Sürecine Etkisi", *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, XV/30 (Bahar): 295-345.

GÜRKAN, H. M. (2000). *Tarih İçinde Kıbrıs*, Kıbrıs.

KAZASKER MEHMED HAFİD (1952). *Sefnetü'l-Vüzerâ*, (Nşr. İsmet Parmaksızoğlu), İstanbul.

MUNRO, J.& -Khuri, Z. (1984). *Cyprus: Between Venus and Mars*, Lübnan.

PURCELL, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*, New York.

ŞAHİN, İ. (2005). *Kıbrıs Başpiskoposluğu (1571-1821)*, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, A.Ü, SBE), Ankara.

ŞAHİN, İ. (2015). “Geçmişten Günümüze Kıbrıslı Rumlar: Dil, Din ve Kimlikleri”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Cilt: 8 Sayı: 39, Ağustos: 340-353.

URSİNUS, M. (2002). “The Tersane and the Tanzimat, or How to Finance a Salaried Fleet”, *The Kapudan Pasha his Office and his Domain*, (Ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou), Rethymnon.

ÜNAL, A. (2002). “XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Cezâyir-i Bahr-i Sefîd (Akdeniz-Ege Adaları ya da Kapudan Paşa Eyaleti)”, *Türkler*, Cilt: IX, (Ed. H.C. Güzel), Ankara 2002.

YENİÇERİ, Ö. (2005). “Viyana'dan Kıbrıs'a Topyekün Gerileme”, *Global Strateji Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Yıl: 1, Sayı: 2, İstanbul.