

The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age

Cyprus Historical and Contemporary Studies

Cyprus, a full member of both the Commonwealth and the European Union, has had an eventful and troubled history for such a small island state. From antiquity to modern times, Cypriots have formed an interesting *melange*, where different peoples, in terms of race, religion, ethnicity, class, language and other determinants, have shared a common homeland, collective experiences, popular traditions and often social, political and economic inequalities and hardships. Cyprus and its inhabitants have had a multi-faceted relationship with various ancient, medieval, and modern civilisations and empires. This relationship has sometimes been fraught and at other times fruitful, resulting in interesting legacies and influences. The mission of *Cyprus Historical and Contemporary Studies* (CHCS), as the first and only peer-reviewed academic book series to specialise in presenting scholarly research and debate on any period of the history of Cyprus, is therefore vitally important. CHCS aims to publish quality research on all periods and in all areas of the history of Cyprus. Aside from historians, CHCS publishes work from other disciplines, recognising that scholars other than historians contribute to the understanding of the histories of Cyprus. The series also focuses on setting Cyprus' experience in the wider scene by publishing books that place the island in its Mediterranean, European, Near Eastern, and global contexts. It also publishes on any contemporary theme, including the Cyprus 'Problem'. CHCS is committed to excellence in scholarship, stringent refereeing of book proposals and manuscripts, and is inclusive and apolitical, priding itself in publishing cutting edge scholarship from all scholars, irrespective of affiliation, that goes beyond deterministic and nationalistic accounts. CHCS is an ambitious book series, publishing the most current and exciting research on Cyprus.

**Series Editor,
Dr Andrekos Varnava,
School of International Studies,
Flinders University of South Australia.**

The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age:
The Changing Role of the Archbishop-*Ethnarch*,
their Identities and Politics

Edited by

Andrekos Varnava and Michalis N. Michael

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age:
The Changing Role of the Archbishop-*Epimarch*, their Identities and Politics,
Edited by Andrekos Varnava and Michalis N. Michael

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2013 by Andrekos Varnava, Michalis N. Michael and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4929-4, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4929-6

I dedicate this book to my father Varnavas Michael Varnava, born in
Frenaros, Famagusta, and resident of Melbourne since 1952.
—Andrekos Varnava

I dedicate this book to the memory of my father Nicos Michael.
—Michalis N. Michael

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	ix
Series Editor Introduction.....	xi
Acknowledgements	xiii
Chapter One.....	1
Archbishop- <i>Ethnarchs</i> since 1767	
Andrekos Varnava and Michalis N. Michael	
Chapter Two.....	17
Chrysanthos, 1767-1810: Grappling with the Vicissitudes of Ottoman Power	
Theoharis Stavrides	
Chapter Three	41
Kyprianos, 1810-21: An Orthodox Cleric ‘Administering Politics’ in an Ottoman Island	
Michalis N. Michael	
Chapter Four	69
Panaretos, 1827-40: His Struggle for Absolute Power during the Era of Ottoman Administrative Reforms	
Michalis N. Michael	
Chapter Five.....	88
Makarios I, 1854-65: The <i>Tanzimat</i> and the Role of the Archbishop- <i>Ethnarch</i>	
Kyprianos D. Louis	
Chapter Six	106
Sophronios III, 1865-1900: The Last of the ‘Old’ and the First of the ‘New’ Archbishop- <i>Ethnarchs</i> ?	
Andrekos Varnava	

Chapter Seven	148
Kyrillos II, 1909-16: The First Greek Nationalist and <i>Enosist</i> Archbishop- <i>Ethnarch</i> Andrekos Varnava and Irene Pophaides	
Chapter Eight	177
Kyrillos III, 1916-33: Between Sophronios III and Kyrillos II Irene Pophaides	
Chapter Nine	211
Leondios and the Archiepiscopal Question, 1933-47: The Demise of an Apolitical <i>Ethnarchy</i> ? Alexis Rappas	
Chapter Ten	240
Makarios III, 1950-77: Creating the <i>Ethnarchic</i> State Sia Anagnostopoulou	
Chapter Eleven	293
Chrysostomos I, 1977-2006: Makarios III was 'A Difficult Act to Follow' Andrekos Varnava	
Contributors	311
Selected Bibliography	314
Index	322

LIST OF IMAGES

Front Dust Jacket: Collage of Figures, 1, 2, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20.	
Figure 1: Portrait of Archbishop Chrysanthos at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus....	40
Figure 2: Portrait of Archbishop Kyprianos at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus....	64
Figure 3: Portrait of the Ethno-Martyr, Archbishop Kyprianos. Source: Postcard, Toufexis, Series 2, no. 81, 1906: Courtesy of the Laiki Group Cultural Centre Photographic Archive	65
Figure 4: Memorial to the Ethno-Martyr, Archbishop Kyprianos. Postcard, Toufexis, Series 2, no. 89, 1906: Courtesy of the Laiki Group Cultural Centre Photographic Archive	66
Figure 5: Kyprianos' statue at the Archbishopric. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2006.	
Figure 6: Inscription on Kyprianos' statue at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2008.....	67
Figure 7: Portrait of Archbishop Sophronios III at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus.....	141
Figure 8: Signature of Archbishop Sophronios III, on letter to Grand Vizier, 27 May 1867. Source: HR.TO/449/6, 27 May 1867: Courtesy of Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri (BOA)	142
Figure 9: 'Greek Priests Blessing the British Flag at Nicosia'. Source: <i>Illustrated London News</i> , 18 August 1878	143
Figure 10: Archbishop Sophronios III taken in 1878 by Max Ohnefalsch-Richter. Source: Magda Ohnefalsch-Richter, <i>Greek Customs and Traditions in Cyprus</i> , 1913: Courtesy of the Laiki Group Cultural Centre Photographic Archive.....	144
Figure 11: Archbishop Sophronios III's statue at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2008.....	145
Figure 12: 'Sophronios behind bars', statue of Archbishop Sophronios III at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2008	146
Figure 13: Inscription on Sophronios' statue at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2008.....	147
Figure 14: Portrait of Archbishop Kyrillos II at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus.....	176
Figure 15: Portrait of Archbishop Kyrillos III at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus.....	210
Figure 16: Portrait of Archbishop Leondios at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus..	239
Figure 17: Portrait of Archbishop Makarios III at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus.....	290

Figure 18: Vandalised Statue of Makarios III at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2008.....	291
Figure 19: New Marble Statue of Makarios III at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Andrekos Varnava, 2008.....	292
Figure 20: Portrait of Archbishop Chrysostomos I at the Archbishopric in Nicosia. Source: Archbishopric, Nicosia. Courtesy of the Holy Archbishopric, Nicosia, Cyprus.....	310

SERIES EDITOR INTRODUCTION

For centuries, certainly since the onset of Ottoman rule, and in particular the mid-18th Century, the archbishops of the autocephalous Cypriot Orthodox Church have wielded a great deal of political power. Most people in their fifties and beyond would remember the bearded monk who became a politician, Archbishop Makarios III, and indeed his presence at Madame Tussauds is a reminder of his stature. But were all Cypriot archbishops so politically mindful and powerful? Were they all Greek nationalists? This study is the first ever to explore the peculiar role of the archbishop-*ethnarch*, and in so doing offers valuable historical and political insights into the phenomenon.

The idea for the edited volume was born out of a discussion Michalis Michael and I had in Adelaide in 2009 on how Greek and Greek Cypriot researchers tended to be uncritical and biased in favour of their own ethnic identities. We decided to do a project that combined Michalis' expertise in Church history, with my interest in the impact of political modernity on Cyprus. Much of the preparation has been done while both of us have lived and worked in different parts of the world, and this is no easy task.

This edited volume has, therefore, been a long time in the making, and dare I say, long overdue. Despite the very prominent political, social and economic roles of Cypriot archbishops since Ottoman times, very little work has been published on them, and when there is some, it usually takes the form of hagiography. Meanwhile, it has only been in recent years that work linking the development of political modernity in Cyprus to the political, social and economic development of the island has appeared. Combining these two themes will hopefully show that the role of the archbishop-*ethnarch* has been far from static, and indeed has taken on different forms throughout the last three centuries.

This book is not an attack on the Church of Cyprus nor is it anti-Church of Cyprus; in fact, on the contrary, it seeks to restore the historical record, and offer the Church a starting point from which to reassess its past and move forward. The Church of Cyprus, as with all other churches in the Western world, has a social and spiritual role to play in society. Therefore, this book should be read first and foremost as a political history of religious

authorities, and secondly as a work of how nationalist politics evolved and was co-opted by religious authorities in order to re-obtain political authority from a secular colonial power. It was with these themes in mind that we selected the world class contributors. This is the type of exciting research that this series purports to offer, and I hope that other scholars follow our lead in putting forward ideas of similar importance.

**Series Editor,
Dr Andrekos Varnava.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume has been in the making for over two years and has had a number of trials and tribulations. We would not have produced it without the hard work of many people and the help of many others. First and foremost we would like to thank our contributors for accepting the invitation to contribute to this volume and for producing such excellent contributions. We would like to single out two of the contributors for going beyond the call of duty: Haris Stavrides for his work on the chapter by Sia Anagnostopoulou, and Irene Pophaides for arranging permissions and taking the photographs from the Holy Archbishopric. In this last connection we would like to thank the Archbishop of Cyprus, Chrysostomos II, and the archivist of the Holy Archbishopric of Cyprus for granting us this permission. Our universities, beyond paying our salaries, also provide many other support services that both of us used to produce this volume. We must also thank the team at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their patience and also their professionalism, and Dominic Thompson for a great job proofreading the entire manuscript. Finally we would like to thank our families for their patience and understanding.

**Andrekos Varnava,
Senior Lecturer in Imperial and Military History,
Flinders University.**

**Michalis N. Michael,
Assistant Professor of Ottoman History,
University of Cyprus.**

January 2013.

CHAPTER ONE

ARCHBISHOP-*ETHNARCHS* SINCE 1767

ANDREKOS VARNAVA
AND MICHALIS N. MICHAEL

Soon after being controversially ‘elected’¹ Archbishop of Cyprus in October 2006, Chrysostomos II announced that the giant statue of Archbishop Makarios III, which stood in the Archiepiscopal grounds in old Nicosia, would be removed, cleaned (it was vandalised in September 2008 with red paint) and re-erected at the Throne of the Virgin Mary three kilometres west of Kykkos Monastery – one of the wealthiest monasteries of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the world – where Makarios was buried, upon his own request, in 1977.² Was this the beginning of the demystification of the Makarios legend? No. This move was merely an attempt at a re-invention, since ‘Big Mac’ was replaced with a more life-like (at least in terms of size) and pious (it is made of luminous white marble) statue, thus shifting the terms of his glorification from one of archbishop-*ethnarch* and political father of the ‘Greek nation in Cyprus’ to spiritual father of his religious flock as well, although it is hard to see such a shift succeeding given his hero/cult like status in the Greek Cypriot political and popular consciousness.

Many Western readers of a generation or two ago would be familiar with Archbishop Makarios III, the President of Cyprus from 1960 until his death in 1977, and before that during the 1950s the political leader of the *enosis* (union with Greece) movement. During the 1950s he was called, amongst

¹ Chrysostomos was controversially elected because he barely received 10 per cent of the people’s vote in a very complicated and ultimately undemocratic election process. *Sunday (Cyprus) Mail*, 5 November 2006. For these elections see also: Victor Roudometof, ‘Orthodoxy and Modernity in Cyprus: The 2006 Archiepiscopal Elections in Historical Perspective’, *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, XXIV, 2, 2009, 189-204.

² *Cyprus Mail*, 24 January 2007; *Sunday (Cyprus) Mail*, 22 June 2008; *Cyprus Mail*, 24 October 2008; *Sunday (Cyprus) Mail*, 14 December 2008.

other names, 'Black Mac', and portrayed as a religious fanatic Rasputin-like figure that approved of EOKA (1955-59) terrorism in the name of *enosis*.³ Then in the 1960s and early 1970s, he became the 'Castro of the Mediterranean', a trouble-maker for the West because he kept Cyprus in the neutral camp during the Cold War, which for many in the West, particularly successive US governments, effectively meant that because he was not 'with us' he was 'against us'. Today his presence in the West lives on as a wax dummy at Madame Tussauds. Makarios was the embodiment of the spiritual and temporal leader in the age when such leaders hardly existed anywhere else, certainly not in the West, and before they developed in some Islamic countries.

Makarios was instrumental in placing Cyprus on the map, yet for reasons that for many people were not good, since much of the international community, even those sympathetic to the *enosis* movement, associated the island with terrorism and with a leader who combined his spiritual role as head of the Church with his temporal – *ethnarchic* – role as the head of the government, which was an alien concept to Western societies, where church and state had been separated for centuries. Thirty-five years after the death of Archbishop Makarios III, the time has come to debate his role and the role of other archbishops of Cyprus as archbishops and as *ethnarchs*, that is, as leaders who combined their spiritual responsibilities as heads of the Cypriot Orthodox Church, with their roles as political leaders of the Cypriot Orthodox community. Did other archbishops of Cyprus before and after Makarios III combine their roles as 'archbishop-*ethnarchs*' in the same way as he did? Were they also nationalist leaders, who claimed the Cypriot Christians were Greeks, and demanded *enosis*?

The word *ethnarch* has had a very interesting historical development according to the entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, although always referring to a leadership title.⁴ In Antiquity the title of *ethnarch* was used in the Levant to refer to rulers of vassal kingdoms who did not rise to the level of a monarch. With the split in the Roman Empire, the Eastern Roman Empire retained the title to refer to the rulers of foreign tribes or realms outside the empire. By the 10th century the term had changed again, acquiring a more local and technical bureaucratic meaning for high-ranking commanders of foreign mercenaries serving in the Byzantine army. When the Ottoman

³ S. L. Carruthers, 'EOKA and the Struggle for Enosis in Cyprus, 1955-59', *Winning Hearts and Minds: British Governments, the Media and Colonial Counter-Insurgency, 1944-1960*, Leicester University Press, London, 1995, 239-44.

⁴ A. P. Kazhdan, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, II, Oxford University Press, New York, 1991, 734.

Empire took control of the Near and Middle East there was much continuity with its Byzantine predecessor, and this was no different for the title *ethnarch*. The title was now bestowed on the heads of the religious groups (*millets*), the non-Muslim communities, the Orthodox Christians, Armenian Christians, and Jewish communities, since the system divided society along religious lines. The term had been inverted: the spiritual and political leaders of the non-Muslim populations of the Ottoman Empire were now designated by the term *ethnarch*, which had formerly been associated with foreigners inside or outside the Byzantine Empire.

The historiography of the term *ethnarch* in its modern or Ottoman context, and that of the archbishops of Cyprus, is weak, and both are dominated by studies focussing on Archbishop Makarios III. Essentially there are two lines of thought: one that accepts the twin role of the archbishop-*ethnarch* as a historical and God-given right, in much the same way as monarchs in pre-modern Western Europe, and which therefore has been a constant from time-immemorial as the torch-bearer of Greek national identity and liberation from foreign (Latin and Ottoman) rule in the island; and a second which allows for more grey amongst the very black and white first interpretation, which considers how the role changed over time to the different needs of the church and society and within the different political and social structures in place (during Latin and Ottoman rule). This book offers a more nuanced portrait of the role of the archbishop-*ethnarch* within the appropriate historical and theoretical contexts.

The first school of thought, the ‘deterministic school’, is well represented by Greek and Greek Cypriot authors, as well as favourable Western biographers. In 1967, Theodore Papadopoulos, the then director of the Cyprus Research Centre, in the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Cyprus, published an interesting (despite being largely forgotten) article in the *Journal of Contemporary History* titled ‘Orthodox Church and Civil Authority’.⁵ He argued that ‘the present status of the head of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus as an *ethnarch* and political chief has been, so to speak, devolved upon him by history’. In other words, as with *ancien regime* monarchs, the Cypriot archbishop-*ethnarch* had a God-given historical passage to his status and power. This status, Papadopoulos claimed, was also pre-determined by history, which, in his words, ‘prescribes that *ethnarchic* policy must keep in harmony with national aspirations’ and ‘the policy of the head of the church qua *ethnarch* cannot contradict those aspirations without

⁵ Theodore Papadopoulos, ‘Orthodox Church and Civil Authority’, *Journal of Contemporary History*, II, 4, October 1967, 201-9.

entailing the criticism attaching to an *ultra vires* action'. So from time-immemorial the Cypriot archbishop-*ethnarchs* have represented the nationalist interests of the Greek Orthodox people of Cyprus, and these nationalist interests, judging from Papadopoulos' entire article, centre on Hellenism, keeping it alive during Ottoman rule, and advocating for *enosis* during British rule and even in post-colonial Cyprus, despite the consociational constitution precluding it. Thus the role of the Cypriot archbishop-*ethnarchs* has been a constant, while the Eastern Orthodox Christians of the island have always been politically active and had an ethnic national awareness as 'Greeks'. Finally, one is left wondering whether Papadopoulos was conveying a veiled warning to Archbishop Makarios III against wavering over *enosis*, a warning that was not heeded, since in November 1967, a month after Papadopoulos' article appeared, Makarios announced a new policy on the 'Cyprus question', the policy of what was 'feasible' (independence) rather than what was 'desirable' (*enosis*), meaning that *enosis* was possible, but not feasible now.⁶

The works of P. N. Vanezis belong to the same school of thought. In a trilogy of monographs, published between the years 1971 and 1979, Vanezis praises Makarios and his overall political action.⁷ He also perceives the political role of the Church of Cyprus as something natural without wondering when, why and in which historical framework this political role became a reality, and how it managed to remain constant throughout long periods of relative peaceful rule under Franks, Venetians, and Ottomans. Characteristically, in his first work about Makarios, titled *Makarios: Faith and Power*, Vanezis implied that the political role of the Archbishop of the Church of Cyprus dated back to the Byzantine period, and so there was 'nothing unprecedented or original in the career of Archbishop Makarios'.⁸ Projecting this stereotypical portrait of the ecclesiastical leader who is also the 'father' of the *ethnos*, Vanezis basically remains within the framework of the prevailing historiography in relation to the political role of the archbishop of Cyprus and especially that of Makarios, thus reinforcing the absence of scientific

⁶ See Richard A. Patrick, *Political Geography and the Cyprus Conflict: 1963-1971*, University of Waterloo, Ontario, 1976, 142-6; Halil Ibrahim Salih, *Cyprus: The Impact of Diverse Nationalism on a State*, University of Alabama Press, Alabama, 1978, 60-1;

⁷ P. N. Vanezis, *Makarios: Faith and Power*, Abelard-Schuman, London 1971. Same author, *Makarios: Pragmatism v. Idealism*, Abelard-Schuman, London 1974 and *Makarios: Life and Leadership*, Abelard-Schuman, London 1979.

⁸ Vanezis, *Faith and Power*, 37.

work on Makarios himself, but also on the institution of the archbishop during the colonial era.⁹

Most recently, an article by Christos Kassimeris and Andreas Philaretou appeared, attempting to explain the charismatic leadership of Makarios III, which also falls within this school of thought.¹⁰ With the exception of the interesting use of theory, the article essentially regurgitates the views of Papadopoulos and Vanezis, and, in an hagiographic fashion, absolves Makarios of any crimes committed by the Greek Cypriot government or semi-government paramilitary forces in the 1960s and 1970s, while accepting that the respect, support and reverence of the Cypriot people for Makarios was automatic and holistic. Thus, this article as well, can only be seen as deterministic on the issue of the archbishop-*ethnarch*.

The exception to the rule is the article by Paul Sant Cassia, at the time in 1982 a young Maltese anthropologist, titled 'The Archbishop in the Beleaguered City'.¹¹ Sant Cassia was far more liberated than Papadopoulos, Vanezis and Kassimeris and Philaretou; he was not a Cypriot or a Greek, nor did he work in Cyprus, and also Makarios had died five years earlier. He focussed on explaining the popularity of Makarios III, arguing that it centred on an 'abstract ideal', that of Greek nationalism, and his oratory on his 'contradictory roles as Churchman and Politician, *and* his attempts to deal with the problems which that entailed'. In trying to explain the historical circumstances of this twin role and the presence of Greek nationalism, Sant Cassia allows that there were some grey areas but essentially, as with Papadopoulos, the Cypriot archbishop-*ethnarchs* represented the Greek nation in Cyprus. He differs from Papadopoulos in that he does not accept the origins of the dual role of the Cypriot archbishop-*ethnarchs* as God-given or pre-ordained, and claims this was 'because it (the Cypriot Orthodox Church) had for centuries been a religion of subject peoples [and] had not (with the exception of Russia) been faced with the problem of defining and separating where the State ends and the Church begins (as occurred in Western Europe)'. This book will take this explanation further by placing it

⁹ Robert Holland, 'The Historiography of the Late Colonial Cyprus: Where do We Go from Here?', H. Faustmann, N. Peristianis (eds), *Britain in Cyprus. Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*, Bibliopolis, Mannheim 2006, 446.

¹⁰ Christos Kassimeris and Andreas Philaretou, 'Playing Politics with Charisma: Archbishop Makarios III and the Cyprus Issue', *Politics, Culture & Socialization*, I, 4, 2010, 337-352.

¹¹ Paul Sant Cassia, 'The Archbishop in the Beleaguered City: An Analysis of the Conflicting Roles and Political Oratory of Makarios', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, VIII, 1982, 191-212.

more firmly in its Ottoman socio-political and socio-economic contexts, and it will show how the power of the Ottoman archbishop-*ethnarch* was reduced under British rule, forcing the archbishop-*ethnarch* into adopting a new method by which to exercise political power in a modern world and under a British colonial system.

The role of the Archbishop of Cyprus as *ethnarch* of his people is both a controversial and misunderstood phenomenon. It was misunderstood during British times by many British civil servants, politicians and administrators because it was anathema for them that a religious leader should also be a political leader, owing to the separation of church and state in their society. One person who understood the term well was Harry Luke, who combined two 'hats', as both a colonial service official in Cyprus between 1910 and 1919, and a historian of Ottoman Cyprus and a commentator on contemporary Cyprus (writing travel accounts, memoirs and commentaries on Cyprus). In his classic *Cyprus: A Portrait and an Appreciation*, Luke, unlike most other commentators, firmly situated the twin role of archbishop-*ethnarch* in its Ottoman roots, and questioned the 'nationalist' dimension of the role, by emphasising its Ottoman political and legal context.¹² Luke found the role of Makarios III as archbishop-*ethnarch* ironic because the archbishop 'affected to maintain an Ottoman practise long after the constitutional basis of the practise had vanished'.¹³ This was a most perceptive observation, as will be seen in this book, and especially in the chapter on Makarios III.

Yet despite the aggravation of many a colonial service officer in Cyprus over this curious combination, they all acquiesced and many even accepted what the historian William Miller claimed in 1922 that 'nearly all Eastern Churchmen are politicians'¹⁴ without ever attempting to understand why and how. Most accepted the local position that this role was determined by circumstance and was God-given. Not only had this ignorance prevailed, but during the twentieth century, when the Church of Cyprus co-opted ethnic nationalism and *enosis* in order to re-establish their political power, which had diminished under British modernity, the British also accepted that the Church had always been this way – that, in the words of a more contemporary historian, 'the survival of the Church (of Cyprus) and that of a

¹² Sir Harry C. Luke, *Cyprus: A Portrait and an Appreciation*, Harrap, London 1957 (revised 1965), 78-9, 182-3.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 182-3.

¹⁴ William Miller, *A History of the Greek People (1821-1921)*, Methuen, London, 1922, 281.

Hellenic “nation” on the island was indissolubly connected in the same way as the Catholic faith of the Gael of Ireland’.¹⁵

This acceptance accords with the beliefs of most Cypriot and Greek Orthodox Christian people that the Archbishop of Cyprus was (and for some still is) a particular type of *ethnarch*. They believe that during Latin rule the Church was suppressed and persecuted and that little changed during Ottoman rule, with the exception that the Church was acknowledged as the representative of the ‘Greek’ Orthodox Cypriots. They believe that the archbishop purposefully led a policy to preserve the ‘Hellenic character’ of Cyprus in order that one day he would re-awaken the ‘Hellenic spirit’ within all Orthodox Christians of Cyprus. For this reason numerous hagiographic biographies and biographical works have appeared on Archbishop Kyprianos, the ‘ethno-martyr’ and on Makarios III,¹⁶ while virtually nothing has been published on those perceived as less ‘nationalist’ archbishops, such as Chrysanthos and Sophronios III, even though they were the two longest serving archbishops in the modern era. Nationalism dictated that nationalist discourses of the past needed creating. Archbishop Kyprianos was a logical target, given that he had been executed by the Ottomans in 1821 after being accused of links with members of the ‘Friendly Society’ that was leading the Greek revolt and of trying to spread the revolt to Cyprus. As will be seen in the chapter on Kyprianos, his creation as an ethno-martyr was a nationalist project of revision of the past, since Kyprianos, as one of the most powerful archbishop-*ethnarchs*, had been loyal to the Ottoman state, yet, according to Ottoman documents, too powerful for the local governor, who saw a way of removing him.¹⁷ Another example of nationalist revision of history in order to create a script of the ‘Greek’ nation in Cyprus was the long-held fabrication that Archbishop Sophronios or Bishop Kyprianos of Kitium welcomed the first high commissioner of Cyprus in 1878 with declarations of

¹⁵ Robert Holland, *Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus, 1954-1959*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1998, 6.

¹⁶ On Kyprianos see Paraskevas Agathonos (ed.), *Αρχιεπίσκοπος Κύπρου Κυπριανός: Ο μάρτυρας της πίστεως και της πατρίδος* (The Archbishop of Cyprus Kyprianos: The Martyr of Faith and Homeland), Machairas Monastery, Nicosia, 2009; On Makarios see Panos Myriotis, *Μακάριος το Φλογισμένο Ράσο* (Makarios the Flaming Cassock), Nicosia, 1977; *Ο Εθνάρχης Μακάριος 1913-1977* (The Ethnarch Makarios 1913-1977), C. A. L. Graphics, Cyprus, 1977; George Christodoylou Mouskos, *Ο Μακάριος Όπως τον Έζησα* (Makarios How I Lived Him), Nicosia, 1984; Alexandros K. Karapanagopoulos, *Ο Αρχιεπίσκοπος και Εθνάρχης Μακάριος III. Στιγμές Αγών και Αγωνίας, Ιστορικό Χρονικό από Πηγές Αφευδείς*, Athens, 1996.

¹⁷ Michalis N. Michael, *Η Εκκλησία της Κύπρου κατά την οθωμανική περίοδο (1571-1878): Η σταδιακή συγκρότηση της σε θεσμό πολιτικής εξουσίας*, Cyprus Research Centre, Nicosia, 2005, 215-40.

loyalty contingent on the British ceding Cyprus to Greece. It has since been shown that no such speech was made.¹⁸ Both cases of revising the past for nationalist purposes aim to portray an archbishop-*ethnarch* as one who represented the 'Hellenic character' of the Orthodox Christians of Cyprus and an *enosis* advocate.

The overarching aim of this collection is to revise what was a revisionist re-interpretation of the role of the archbishop-*ethnarch* by authors influenced by nationalism and to therefore set the record straight through systematic scientific historical methodology. As a whole, this collection will argue that the role of the archbishop-*ethnarch* was not a constant in the pre-modern and modern eras – that is, from the period of the Enlightenment and the later stages of Ottoman rule, through to British rule and the postcolonial period of independence. So this book aims to explore the changing role of the 'archbishop-*ethnarch*' within Cypriot society, economics and primarily politics, across three distinct periods in Cypriot history (Ottoman, British and independence), which therefore sees Cypriots evolving from being an Ottoman millet, to British colonial subjects, and finally to citizens in an independent republic. In a broader context, this was also a period of profound historical change, upheaval and conflict for Europeans (from the French Revolution, the two World Wars, to the European Union), and the question that must be asked is how did this broader context impact upon Cyprus and the questions this book seeks to answer. Did all archbishops try to combine the spiritual and political offices of the role in the way nationalist discourses have claimed? Were all the archbishops firebrand nationalists? The book explores the differing approaches of various archbishops to how they saw and implemented their leadership style based on the different historical contexts and personal approaches. Thus this book focuses on the relations between the various archbishops and those powers either dominating or influencing Cyprus, whether these forces were external or internal, and their relations with the Cypriot people. In this sense, this volume is just as much a social history as it is a political history.

This book explores these themes through the changing roles of the archbishop-*ethnarchs* of Cyprus, their identities and their politics from Chrysanthos in the 18th century to Chrysostomos I into the 21st century. It therefore covers the period between the years 1767, the year of Archbishop Chrysanthos' enthronement, to the year 2006, when Archbishop

¹⁸ Rolandos Katsiaounis, *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*, Cyprus Research Centre, Nicosia 1996, 25-8; Andrekos Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*, Manchester University Press, 2009, 152-79.

Chrysostomos I died and the current archbishop, Chrysostomos II, was enthroned. During these two and a half centuries, the island, consecutively, passed from Ottoman to British rule, and finally to independence with the creation of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960. The desire for the Church of Cyprus and especially of the higher clergy to be politically involved remained a constant throughout this period, yet the nature of the political involvement was always shaped by the dominant political framework that existed. This varied. So the process of integration into the Ottoman ideological and political framework shaped the political role of the Church during Ottoman times; during British colonial rule, after failing to continue the strategy pursued during Ottoman times, the Church evolved into an institution of opposition to the imperial power and its ideological and political framework, even though it attempted to manipulate this framework to achieve its ends; while finally, after leading the movement that overthrew British rule, and in doing so established itself both as an 'other' in relation to both the British colonial rulers and settlers, as well as the Turkish Cypriot community and other national minorities, such as the Maronite and Roman Catholics, and Armenians, it evolved into a repressive force against the Turkish Cypriot community, which it was supposed to share power with in the post-colonial consociational government.¹⁹ Throughout these two centuries the Cypriot Church was relatively effective in adapting to the changing broader and local political circumstances affecting the island and its political role. This edited volume provides a study of ten archbishops of Cyprus and how they went about trying to exercise political, social and economic power across the last 250 years.

The first case, authored by Theoharis Stavrides, studies Chrysanthos, archbishop from 1767-1810. His long tenure spanned the final three decades of the 18th century and the first decade of the 19th century, a period of political instability and financial duress for the Ottoman Empire generally and particularly for its periphery, as it was challenged by various external powers, such as Russia in the Black Sea, and the French in the eastern Mediterranean. The Ottoman pre-occupation with foreign threats to its territorial integrity may have contributed to the increased power and

¹⁹ Andrekos Varnava, Nicholas Coureas, & Marina Elia (eds.), *The Minorities of Cyprus: Development Patterns and the Identity of the Internal-Exclusion*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2009; Christalla Yakinthou, *Political Settlements in Divided Societies: Consociationalism and Cyprus*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2009; Andrekos Varnava & Christalla Yakinthou, 'Cyprus: Political Modernity and the Structures of Democracy in a Divided Island,' in *The Oxford Handbook of Local and Regional Democracy in Europe*, (eds.) John Loughlin, Frank Hendriks and Anders Lidstrom, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 455-77.

authority of the Church of Cyprus, since it experienced a cultural renaissance and economic wealth. Meanwhile, Chrysanthos was able to establish a practise of nepotism and clientelism that has largely remained the norm, not only in the structures of the Cypriot Church, but more broadly in Cypriot society.²⁰ This increased authority was seen in the archbishop's successful struggles against powerful Ottoman governors, whose dismissal Chrysanthos managed to obtain, most notably the notorious Haci Baki. However, the last decades of the 18th century were marked by the rise of Dragoman Hadjigeorgakis Kornosios, who was closely connected to Chrysanthos, but who also challenged the primacy of the Church in the local political stage. In the early years of the 19th century, the Cypriot Church, led by an aged and ailing Chrysanthos, was increasingly overshadowed by the Dragoman's power. Chrysanthos' close ties with Hadjigeorgakis, who was executed in 1809, as well as the backlash against his perceived nepotism, led to Chrysanthos' downfall and replacement by Kyprianos, a new and dynamic cleric, in 1810.

Michalis N. Michael addresses the role of Archbishop Kyprianos (1810-21), an important person in the history of the island, especially for nationalist narratives. He analyses Kyprianos' life and course under the Ottoman ideological and political framework of the beginning of the 19th century and the nature of his political power as it evolved after the near four decades of Chrysanthos' *ethnarchy* and the more recent dominance of Hadjigeorgakis. Michael focusses on the relations between the Ottoman imperial centre, which was trying to decentralise its administrative structures, and the Cypriot Orthodox Church, which had become an even more authoritarian political institution in Ottoman Cyprus under Kyprianos. All these factors compose the framework under which Kyprianos was raised to the archbishop's throne of Cyprus in 1810, and explain his own execution, and that of hundreds of other Cypriot notables aligned to him, in July 1821, an event from which Kyprianos emerged as an ethno-martyr, especially later in the 19th century, at least according to nationalist historiography.

Michael also authors the chapter on Archbishop Panaretos (1827-40) whose primacy ends with the start of a new era for the Ottoman Empire; that of the *Tanzimat*. As Michael shows, Panaretos was fighting to preserve his political power in an Ottoman Empire that was dramatically changing and entering a complex period of reformation. During his primacy the first

²⁰ On Cypriot clientelism generally see Hubert Faustmann, 'Clientelism in the Greek Cypriot Community of Cyprus Under British Rule', *The Cyprus Review*, X, 2, Autumn 1998, 41-77.

important administrative reformations in Cyprus took place, nine years before the official proclamation of the *Tanzimat*. Additionally, Panaretos had been on the throne during the establishment of the Greek Kingdom, a new ideological pole for Orthodox elite, while the vigorous presence of the rich Orthodox in Larnaca foreshadowed the effort of the laity to enter the sphere of power of the Church. The consequence of all these developments was the loss, to some degree, of the Church's absolute control, while the reforms of the *Tanzimat*, which were officially announced in 1839, a year before the removal of Panaretos from the Archbishop's throne of Cyprus, changed the administrative and political structures in the island.

Kyprianos Louis, the author of the chapter on Makarios I, archbishop from 1854-65, shows that what change there was since Panaretos was due to the implementation of the second *Tanzimat*. The political, economic and social context in which any modernisation efforts transpired was determined by various factors, but above all by the desire of the leadership of the Cypriot Orthodox Church to maintain and secure its powerful and privileged position in the Ottoman bureaucracy. In order to do this it willingly accepted the formalisation of its political role through the new legal mechanisms, even if this meant including secular elites. This gave it additional power and prestige, which it used in order to control the education system that the Ottomans now encouraged. In this way they were able to implement an education system that combined the new secular curriculum with their desire to create model Ottoman subjects, those being moral Christians who respected all their neighbours regardless of religion. So overall Archbishop Makarios I was a man emblematic of the *Tanzimat* reforms.

Andrekos Varnava writes on the difficult and complex period of transition from the Ottomans to the British under Archbishop Sophronios III, archbishop from 1865-1900. Sophronios's life and actions during his long primacy of thirty-five years are analysed in the framework of the important ideological and administrative changes of the second half of the nineteenth century. Varnava argues that Sophronios was the last of the 'old' and the first of the 'new' archbishop-*ethnarch*s. He was the last of the 'old' because he wanted to continue the practise of church co-option by the state under the British as it had been practised under the Ottomans, which had given the church a privileged political, social and economic position. Yet Sophronios was the first of the 'new' because he saw the church as a modernising agent, urging the British to introduce judicial equality and supporting representative institutions. Yet he was not 'modern' enough, hence his neglect in the historiography and the successful fabrication of his legacy by nationalist politicians and clergy soon after his death. He was a very different 'new' to

the 'new' as represented by his eventual successor, the firebrand Hellenic nationalist Kyrillos Papadopoulos. Sophronios wanted to maintain the power of the high clergy of both Christians and Muslims, through cooperating with the British, while at the same time he wanted the British to introduce equality before the law for both Christians and Muslims. Sophronios was a far more complicated *ethnarch* and a rare intellectual for the Church of Cyprus for many reasons, but in particular because he appreciated the potential damage of nationalism, namely Hellenism, for the Cypriot people, since he did not have a Greek national identity, and wanted to retain the Ottoman system of religious national identities.

The chapter on Archbishop Kyrillos II, who started his primacy after the end of the Archiepiscopal Question in 1910 and lasted only six years, was co-written by Andrekos Varnava and Irene Pophaides. They note that in Cypriot historiography and Cypriot national consciousness Archbishop Kyrillos II is treated well because there has been no ambivalence to him being a Greek nationalist that championed *enosis*. The authors show that Kyrillos II was the first Greek nationalist and *enosist* archbishop-*ethnarch* and the first political brawler. He adapted to and used the British introduction of political modernity by reconfiguring the political power of the church, not through Sophronios' failed co-option efforts, but through positioning the church as a political and ideological opposition to the British. He also used the British introduction of political modernity, such as the encouragement of 'Greek' and 'Turkish' identities in the areas of education, to further his *enosist* aims. Yet despite his obsession with *enosis* and his brawling nationalist tactics, once he became archbishop he moderated his tactics to attempt to achieve his ends. Nevertheless, Kyrillos II was the first archbishop to mould his role as *ethnarch* into the nationalist political leadership that most people have come to associate with the role.

Irene Pophaides writes on his successor, Archbishop Kyrillos III (1916-33), a prelate that according to the author was indisputably an important figure in the history of *ethnarchy* in Cyprus. Pophaides argues that Kyrillos III saw his role as an archbishop-*ethnarch* as encompassing the dual duty of leading his community spiritually and politically. She argues that Kyrillos, during his seventeen-year office, faced and responded to a number of challenges of a religious, ecclesiastic, political and nationalist nature, his handling of which revealed his perception of the authority and role of the *ethnarch* as something between the approaches and perceptions of his two predecessors, although progressively moving closer to his immediate predecessor, with whom, ironically, he had had a very bitter and even violent struggle between 1900 and 1910 as to who would succeed Sophronios.

Undoubtedly, as is mentioned in this chapter, Kyrillos III has not been surrounded by the glory of a national martyr, yet his archiepiscopacy substantially contributed to the subsequent progress of the *enosist* struggle along increasingly less moderate lines and to the nationalist *ethnarchic* tradition as opposed to the co-operative tradition of Ottoman and earlier British times.

Archbishop Leondios (1947) and the 'second' Archiepiscopal Question (from 1933-47) are studied by Alexis Rappas, who notes that although officially Leondios served the shortest term as archbishop in the history of the Cypriot Church, he was a towering figure having led the Church through fourteen difficult years as *Locum Tenens* before his enthronement. Following island-wide Greek Cypriot demonstrations and the burning down of the governor's residence in October 1931, Cyprus was subjected to a very atypical, compared to Malta for example, authoritarian rule severely restricting freedom of speech, movement and assembly, and other civil liberties. Leondios, as *Locum Tenens*, worked hard to reclaim the archbishop's moral title to *ethnarchy* and his brand of nationalism often clashed with that of shrewd conservative politicians who expected him to take a stronger stand against the rising left-wing. The chapter focuses on the 'Archiepiscopal Question', the tug-of-war between the Orthodox clergy and colonial authorities regarding the filling of the archiepiscopal throne's vacancy following the incumbent's death in 1933. It argues that the Church, which had been weakened following the 1931 events, maintained itself as the main pole of nationalist politics in Cyprus despite the rise of different ideologies and also different views on *enosis* and British rule, largely because of Leondios' confrontational attitude towards colonial authorities. The author points out that in the late 1930s Leondios was 'fabricated' as a national leader of a much different sort than what he himself intended his role to be, and concludes by highlighting the relative marginalisation of Leondios' agency in the context of an increasingly intense rivalry between the conservative right and the progressive left among Greek Cypriots during and soon after World War II.

The most well-known archbishop-*ethnarch* of Cyprus, Makarios III (1950-77) and the complex period of his primacy are studied by Sia Anagnostoupoulou. She notes that in the historiography on Makarios little attention has been paid to the role that he laid claim to and even placed above that of the President of the Republic of Cyprus: the role of *ethnarch*. Anagnostoupoulou contrasts the role of the archbishop-*ethnarch* as it evolved from a collaborationist political leader under the Ottoman system, through the irredentist ideology of the Greek state that was adopted after British modernity side-lined the archbishop-*ethnarch*, with that of the President of the

Republic of Cyprus, a modern, secular, and bi-communal state. The Church of Cyprus, the author argues, was organized during the colonial period as an *ethnarchic* Church, that is, it led an 'ethno-religious people' struggling for its incorporation into the imagined 'national body'. The Archbishop of Cyprus was *ethnarch* to the extent that the Church was *ethnarchic*. With Makarios, however, the *ethnarchism* of the archbishop became gradually autonomous from that of the Church. In this chapter, the author explores how Makarios changed the traditional *ethnarchic* role in relation to the 'national centre', *Enosis*, and the *ethnarchic* Church, but mostly how it became synonymous with the *ethnarchic* state that Makarios created as the president of a post-colonial and independent republic. This helps to explain the first partition of the island in 1963-4 after a civil war between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and the second partition after the Turkish military intervention of 1974.

The last chapter, again by Andrekos Varnava, focuses on Archbishop Chrysostomos I (1977-2006) and how he saw his role as the archbishop-*ethnarch* in the aftermath of the death of Makarios in 1977. In interpreting Chrysostomos' approach to being the archbishop-*ethnarch*, the author underlines his efforts to follow in his predecessor's footsteps and his failure to realise this. According to the author, following on from Makarios' *ethnarchic* state, Chrysostomos believed that it was his duty to be actively involved in all facets of the Cyprus 'problem', and there was still no desire on the part of the church and some political elites to see a division of church and state. Makarios' success in dominating all aspects of Greek Cypriot life, whether supported or not, influenced Chrysostomos' attempt to mimic Makarios rather than attempt to forge his own path. That is why Chrysostomos always referred to Makarios to promote or justify his ideas and policies. Another factor that decisively influenced Chrysostomos' course as archbishop-*ethnarch* was how he reacted to the war of 1974. The author shows that in many ways Chrysostomos' reactions to the aftermath of the war and the political problem that resulted were based on the *ethnarchic* state that Makarios had created. His approach was understandable for someone who not only succeeded Makarios, but who was also a product of Makarios' *ethnarchic* state, as well as of the war of 1974 and the policy of blaming the international community and the Turks and Turkish Cypriots for the outcome of that war.

This chapter has introduced the reader to the historiography, theories, themes and scope of this volume, and in the absence of a concluding chapter it now offers a few remarks on the results. This volume shows that, although all archbishop-*ethnarchs* in Cyprus across the last 250 years endeavoured to dominate the politics, society and economics of the island, two types of archbishop-*ethnarch* emerge. The first type, only seen during Ottoman times,

looked to the East, that is, to the Ottoman imperial centre, from which the power of the archbishop-*ethnarch* was derived. Thus cooperation (or some might say collaboration) with the imperial centre and its officers in the periphery, was the only strategy possible to maintain their political, social and economic power in the island. Cyprus was therefore considered to belong to the 'East' and therefore within the religious collective identity espoused by the Ottoman state, which happened to be a continuation of the Eastern Roman Empire. The second approach looked 'West' and to the modernity of the Enlightenment and in particular the emerging nationalist project. This approach took root only in the 20th century and came to dominate the approaches of all 20th century archbishop-*ethnarch*s, largely because the previous approach no longer maintained the power of the archbishop-*ethnarch* or the higher clergy within the British colonial system. Looking to the modernity of the West and to a higher authority than the imperial centre and its officers in the periphery, this new approach appealed to the 'imagined community' or to the 'dream-nation' for prestige and power.²¹ This approach resulted in the 'Eastern' looking political elites and the peasant, and later labouring, classes transforming into members of the extended Greek nation in Cyprus. This culminated in the political violence of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, and Makarios' *ethnarchic* state. This is of course rather ironic given that the concept of the '*ethnarch*' was fundamentally 'Eastern', even though the cooption of local elites was a common practise of many imperial systems, especially the British. The only exception to these two types was Sophronios' long period as archbishop-*ethnarch*, where he looked both 'East' and 'West', but mostly 'East'. He looked 'West' in so far as he wanted equality before the law for all members of society, although he still wanted the Church to have a privileged position as protected and protector of the state and the policies of the imperial centre, as it had had in Ottoman times. Also, Sophronios did not look 'West' in relation to collective identity and rejected nationalism as an evil that would jeopardise the peace between Christians and Muslims in the island.

This is the first book to deal with the unique and complex phenomenon of the archbishop-*ethnarch* and thus has great significance for contemporary Cyprus. It presents ten cases, across various periods of 'modern' history, and therefore from different historical contexts. It has found that although the various archbishop-*ethnarch*s have maintained the same desire to hold political, social and economic hegemony, they have used different methods

²¹ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London, 1983; Stathis Gourgouris, *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization, and the Institution of Modern Greece*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1996.

to do so, and have had varying rates of success. Therefore, not only does this book say a great deal about the nature of religious and political leadership during the transition from pre-modern to modern political and social awareness, but it also says a great deal about the local political and social problems (including the phenomenon of nationalism as it developed in Cyprus) that Cyprus has faced and still faces, not least of which is the division of the island. It can only be hoped that in moving forward towards reunification, that the Church also evolves in the necessary direction so that a bi-zonal, bicommunal state might be successfully realised. This book can represent a significant turning point for the Church of Cyprus, since it aims to understand the past role of the Church in the political life of the country. Readers will interpret the evidence and arguments presented in this volume as they deem fit; some, mostly nationalists, will be critical of those archbishops' who worked with the Ottoman and British authorities, while others will praise (or at least understand) this, and criticize the nationalism that has prevailed over the last century, that yet gave rise to violence and war, and the partition of the island and separation of its two main communities. In light of the results of this book the reader must ask, can the Cypriot Church play the constructive role needed to reconcile the Cypriot people and reunify the island? Can it play the role of a Cypriot Church, as it evidently did pre-1900, or will it continue to represent a chauvinist brand of Cypriot Hellenism?