

Political Theology in the Confrontation between the *Fatherly* and the *Brotherly Teaching* (1798-1821): God of Freedom or Subconscious Servility under a Phil-Orthodox Pretext?

By Konstantinos Georgiadis*

A. Introduction: Pre-revolutionary Environment of Modern Greek Thought and Political Theology

The *Fatherly Teaching* and its responsive *Brotherly Teaching* are approached as a classic point of reference of a pre-revolutionary dialogue on Modern Hellenism which is updated to this day¹. This is true regardless of the issue of authorship of the *Fatherly Teaching*, which, as will be seen below, is not the essential one². Besides it expresses a unanimous political

* PhD in Dogmatic Theology of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Lawyer (MA) and Director of the 1st Lyceum of Kavala.

1. Although a sufficient number of original copies of the *Fatherly* and *Brotherly Teaching* survive today, digitalized or not and they are now republished in fragments or entirely, without the reasonable concern of their critical edition until the recent *Πατριάρχης Ιεροσολύμων Ἀνθιμος – Ἀδαμάντιος Κοραΐς, Πατρική καὶ Ἀδελφική Διδασκαλία*, M. Papageorgiou (ed.), iWrite Publications, Thessaloniki 2021, the references of this article are made to: a) Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, in: Adamantios Korais, *Ἀδελφική Διδασκαλία*, G. Valetas (ed.), Pigi Publications, Athens 1949, pp. 15-20, 21-39, and b) in: Adamantios Korais, *op.cit.*, pp. 41-64.

2. Valetas in *ibid.*, p. 5, refers to testimonies, particularly to the prestige of a K. Oikonomou, that show that the *Fatherly Teaching*, is a genuine work of Anthimos of Jerusalem, with questioning starting through the *Brotherly Teaching* of Korais. Professor Mantouvalou also argues the same in: Maria Mantouvalou, «Ἀνθιμος Πατριάρχης τῆς Ἀγίας Πόλεως Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης καὶ τὸ ἔργο του: Διδασκαλία Πατρική», *Second International Conference on the theme “Holy Places and Romiosyni”*, the NGO “Romiosini” (affiliated with the Patriarchate of Jerusalem), May 30, 2010, see <http://>

theology of the highest ecclesiastical leadership of the Genos at the time. On the contrary, for the *Brotherly Teaching* there is no question whether it is by the pen of Korais, but perhaps for his next probable work, the *Ελληνική Νομαρχία*³. Although the relevant textual production of the time is very extensive, these first two works summarize the content of a specific confrontation within a single collective consciousness

www.romiosini.org.gr/7F70EBB3.print.el.aspx, pp. 10-11 [27.07.2021]. However, Valetas himself in Adamantios Korais, *op.cit.*, pp. 5-6, points out that Sergios Makraios, the right hand of Anthimos, testifies in his *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία* that the *Διδασκαλία Πατρική* was a work of Gregory V of Constantinople, affirming that even Anthimos had condemned it “as a preaching of anti-national and anti-Christian servility”. Valetas however concludes that the *Fatherly Teaching* was written in the name of Anthimos, by the hand Athanasios Parios in *op.cit.*, pp. 8-9. Similarly see Ap. V. Daskalakis, *Ὁ Ἀδαμάντιος Κοραΐς καὶ ἡ ἐλευθερία τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, E. G. Vagionakis Publications, Athens 1979, p. 98; G. Metallinos, «Ἡ Κολλυβαδικὴ ἀποψη γιὰ τὸν Διαφωτισμό», *Σύναξη/Synaxi* 54 (1995), p. 26. In any case, the existence of a common pole between Anthimos of Jerusalem, Gregory of Constantinople and Athanasios Parios is in no way disputed.

3. We refer to the edition of Anonymous the Greek, *Ελληνική Νομαρχία*, N. B. Tomadakis (ed.), E. G. Vagionakis Publications, Athens ²1948, where the problem of the authorship of the work is examined on pages 7'-18'. The fact that the author of the work is Korais himself is strongly supported in Maria Mantouvalou, «Ὁ συγγραφεὺς τῆς “Ελληνικῆς Νομαρχίας”», *Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν/Praktika tis Akadimias Athinon*, *Συνεδρία τῆς 20 Ἀπριλίου 1978/April 20, 1978*, pp. 248-253, see <https://digitallibrary.academyofathens.gr/archive/item/17732?lang=el> [27.07.2021], where it is clarified: “in order to substantiate this view the title and the content of ‘Ελληνική Νομαρχία’. According to the attempted analysis, the identification of the ideas of Νομαρχία with those that are written in the works of Korais is very easy and helps, to clarify the political views of Korais, within the limits of Korais studies”. Similarly see Maria Mantouvalou, *Ἀδαμάντιος Κοραΐς, ὁ συγγραφεὺς τῆς “Ελληνικῆς Νομαρχίας”*, Afoi Tolidi Publications, Athens 1996. The whole discussion, of course, is renewed to this day. See indicatively M. N. Katsigeras, «Ἡ “Ελληνική Νομαρχία”, ἓνα φιλολογικὸ θρίλερ», *Ἡ Καθημερινή/Hi Kathimerini*, 3 Ἀπριλίου 2016/April 3, 2016. <https://www.kathimerini.gr/culture/books/855071/i-elliniki-nomarchia-ena-filologiko-thriller>, while “a reference by the Research Director of the Academy of Athens Despina Vlami during the International Conference ‘The Historical Communities of the Greeks Abroad and the Greek Revolution, 25-27.06.2021’ ‘sparkled’ new interest in the identification of the author and whether the mystery surrounding his identity could be unraveled”, for which see ΑΠΕ-ΜΠΕ, «Τὸ μυστήριο τῆς ταυτότητας τοῦ συγγραφέα τῆς “Ελληνικῆς Νομαρχίας”», *Ἡ Ναυτεμπορικὴ/Hi Nafteboriki*, June 27, 2021. What is not disputed is that any “writer of ‘E.N.’ is a someone, a Greek of Ottoman occupation, with developed patriotism, with pain for the liberation of the homeland...”, in: V. Kremmydas, «Ἀνώνυμου τοῦ Ἑλλήνου, *Ελληνική Νομαρχία* μιὰ ἀπόπειρα ἐρμηνείας», *Μνήμων/Mnimon* 35 (2016), p. 320.

between “Genos” and “Nation”, where unfortunately division will not be prevented.

The dialogue concerns more broadly education as well as the polity of the emerging modern Hellenism, under the weight of a humanity that is fundamentally changing, focusing on the great revolutions of America and Europe. The motto is well known: from the *Middle Ages* and the *religious dogma* we move to *modernity* and *scientific rationalism*, where the root of the trouble is that it is called “Church”. Although for some the change would concern only the Western world, either Roman Catholicism or Protestantism, for others it is also communicated to the *Genos* of the Orthodox and its successor after the Ottoman occupation modern Greek nationalism. It is therefore assumed that two conflicting poles are categorized: On the one hand, the *Greek Enlighteners*, and on the other hand, the *Christian Scholars*, or at least the official ecclesiastical leadership of the latter⁴. The tension will culminate in the immediately preceding and subsequent period of the Greek Revolution, with source of conflict not just new political and scientific theories but a radical state worldview of European origin, linked to an equally radical epistemology and gnoseology with the heliocentric system as a landmark.

However, such a categorization between *Greek Enlighteners* and *Christian Scholars* cannot stand but only as an unfounded generalization, according to another rationale for substantiating and interpreting the historical data⁵. In the first place, in each one of the opposing schematizations there is an argumentation which is both of a scientific and theological nature⁶. Secondly, what boundary between ecclesiastical obscurantism

4. See M. Papageorgiou, *Ἡλιοκεντρικὸ Σύστημα καὶ ζωὴ στὸ Διάστημα τὸ 1821*, iWrite Publications, Thessaloniki ²2020; Id., *Ἡ μαύρη Βίβλος τοῦ 1821*, iWrite Publications, Thessaloniki ²2021.

5. See Soutana Lefkopoulou, *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπανάσταση καὶ Ὁρθόδοξη Ἀνατολή – Ἡ περίπτωση τοῦ 18ου αἰῶνα* (Diploma thesis), School of Social Theology and Christian Culture, Faculty of Theology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki 2015.

6. Although the same problematic applies first in the case of Galileo in: M. A. Finocchiaro (ed.), *Galileo on the World Systems: A New Abridged Translation and Guide*, University of California Press, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1997, pp. 2-3, where it is noted that “even a cursory reading of the relevant documents shows that many churchmen were on his side and many scientists were on the opposite side; thus, there was a split within both science and religion, along the lines of what may be called conservation and

and anti-ecclesiastical enlightenment could be maintained, when in both these parts, are equally protagonists personalities of the Clergy, from which partial and temporary confrontations cannot take on the dimensions of an absolute rupture?

In any case, modern research will bow to the highest level of education of each part, to the erudition and scientificity of each Scholar, his knowledge of the Greek language and at the same time his polyglotism, as long as he moves on the prototype of *homo universalis* and especially of the “Greek or Romios cosmopolitan”. In this sense, there can be no reason for a gap between pre-existing obscurantism and the coming enlightenment.

Nevertheless, an undeniable reality is a series of official committees and texts of the Orthodox leadership⁷, otherwise known as the Phanari, from the *Brotherly Teaching* of 1798 to the *Ἐγκύκλιος* of Patriarch Agathangelos in 1828, according to which, on behalf of the Sultan and repeating the aphorism of the Philikoi, the exchange of the political freedom of the Greeks with the general amnesty of the Sultan was sought⁸. Phanari, therefore, appears in the most official way not only cut off from the emerging new European world at the time and therefore from the revolutionary vision of Hellenism, but integrated into the opposing camp, as it was part of the Ottoman administration. A sample of its writing will be given for the first time through the *Fatherly Teaching*, to the extent that the painful impression of Korais will be such that he considers it pseudonymous⁹. Therefore, the formation of a reactionary pole with a sign of conservatism and Phanari as the epicenter, even, for a period of a few decades before and after the Greek Revolution, is a given¹⁰.

innovation; so the real conflict was between a conservative attitude and a progressive one”, the institutional consolidation of the *Holy Inquisition* in Roman-Catholicism, otherwise known as the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, is the key point of essential split with Orthodoxy.

7. For a multitude of such texts and commentary see M. Papageorgiou, *Ἡ μαύρη Βίβλος τοῦ 1821*, *op.cit.*, pp. 23-141.

8. See Agathangelos of Constantinople, «Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ Πατριάρχου καὶ τῆς Ἱερᾶς Συνόδου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀπὸ 20 Φεβρουαρίου 1828», in: M. Papageorgiou, *Ἡ μαύρη Βίβλος τοῦ 1821*, *op.cit.*, pp. 128-137.

9. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, pp. 17-18, 43-44.

10. However, it does not concern the Church in its ontological dimensions, unless it is seen in the narrow context of its sometimes normal and other times distorted

B. Subjects and Field of Dialectical Confrontation

B1. Main Issues of Friction

The fundamental issue between *Fatherly* and *Brotherly Teaching* is the precise conceptualization of “freedom”, focusing from the “internal” to the “external” and especially the “political freedom”. In the year 1798, the right of self-determination of the Genos was updated on the occasion of the recent arrest and death sentence of Feraios. While in this series of events the supreme ecclesiastical leadership of Constantinople can only function as an organic part of its Ottoman administrative authority, *Fatherly Teaching* will undertake its ideological cover, under the guise of the orthodox theology, so that the reaction of the *Brotherly Teaching* to follow.

The central issue of political freedom will be divided into the questions of whether and how it is legitimate to acquire it. The relative cautiousness of *Fatherly Teaching* is attempted to be justified by placing the concept in its wider ontological dimensions. Thus, political freedom goes back to the more general concept of “natural freedom” otherwise known as “free will” according to God. It is not worth it if man acquires his political freedom against authoritarian regimes without the subsequent freedom of his soul against his perishable *stained* nature¹¹. At the same time, however, it is also a correlation between the concepts of politics and national freedom, using invalid analogical reasoning, false separation between induction and rhetoric. Generally, political freedom cannot by itself abolish natural freedom.

In the whole published confrontation between *Fatherly* and *Brotherly Teaching*, no one can be certain of what is really going on behind the scenes. Considering, on the one hand, anonymous complaints from one

institutional form. But even in such a narrow view things are different. The Church while sometimes condemning people even with excommunication, is the same one that can subsequently and synodically vindicate them, reaching the other extreme, of their canonization. The example of the conflict between Phanari and Kollyvades saints is entirely contemporary with the era of Modern Greek Enlightenment. In this case, which side can be characterized as ecclesiastical and which as anti-ecclesiastical, especially when occasional personal confrontations have nothing to do with dogma?

11. See Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, op.cit., pp. 33-35.

side to the other, such as about simony in the highest ecclesiastical offices¹², and on the other hand, the recent historical research, the conflict of interest of the ecclesiastical leadership will be attributed in relation to the Ottoman authority, while for Korais in relation to his Napoleonic environment¹³. However, in any conduct of a “trial of intentions”, we are unable to ignore the rule of the common religious and national self-consciousness, that applies to all, often reaching the point of spending life as the highest offering to the Genos. In this sense, any hetero-determination of each was probably due to a different view or even simply an assessment of the moment on how the common purpose of the Genos could be achieved¹⁴.

For anyone who is well acquainted with the political theology that prevails in the Ecumenical Patriarchate, mainly after the agreement between Gennadios Scholarios and Mehmed II the Conqueror on the Orthodox *millet*, the subsequent anti-revolutionary policy of a Gregory V of Constantinople emerges as its natural development¹⁵. Similarly, the “Frankish-Greek” vision of Korais does not necessarily mean less patriotism but rather the belief that this is the best way to serve the main

12. Specific testimonies, such as in Anonymous the Greek, *Ἑλληνικὴ Νομορχία*, *op.cit.*, p. 128, feed a historical dialogue about the extent of the simony of Hierarchs in relation to the Ottoman authority. The question is whether simony was institutionally established by simple corruption of persons. Korais focuses on the problem, which is the major one for the Church during the Ottoman occupation, so that one can speak secondarily of Catholicizing or Protestant tendencies, στὸ Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, pp. 49-50, in order to respond to Anthimos’ accusation “as lame in the affairs of religion” («ὡς χωλαίνοντα εἰς τὰ τῆς θρησκείας»), in: *op.cit.*, p. 48.

13. Maria Mantouvalou, «Ἄνθιμος Πατριάρχης...», *op.cit.*, pp. 1-13.

14. Especially for Korais and his consultations behind the scenes with Napoleon’s environment, for which see *op.cit.*, p. 4 *et seq.*, and as long as in only in a period before the fall of the French leader he urges a Greek-French alliance, how can it be supported that he operates with the French as the first motive and not the Greeks? Why, too, if someone believes that a “Greek-French” nation is preferable to a nation of “Greek-Turks”, should be considered an opponent of both Hellenism and Orthodoxy?

15. In Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, pp. 29-30, as a special chapter of the divine dispensation, from Adam to the pre-revolutionary times, the fall of Byzantium as well as the Ottoman occupation are introduced. Thus, “the almighty Lord established over us this exalted empire [of the Ottomans instead of that of the Romans]”, so that “it may be for the Westerners like a bridle, and for us Easterners a source of salvation”, in: *op.cit.*, p. 29.

purpose of regeneration. However, in each of these cases the national and religious identity of the Genos is preserved intact. However, it remains to choose its wider cultural environment, Ottoman or European in which it would acquire a free space of development.

B2. Process of Reasoning and Dialogue

During the process of reasoning and dialogue, the author of the *Fatherly Teaching* attempts to establish his views invoking the qualities of the *charismatic* from God theologian, the Hierarch and the wise due to his age *Elder*¹⁶. He uses the invalid *argumentum hominem*, where one from the authority of his person alone tries in advance to convince himself and his interlocutor of his correctness¹⁷. On the contrary the related *argumentum ad verecundiam* where one invokes a general authority, is validated in the synodical tradition of the Church¹⁸. Prophets, apostles and saints as “*vessels of the Spirit*” reveal authentic God to the world. And here too, there is the danger of theological error, consequently in ecclesiastical tradition the criterion of the “authoritative father” is added as to this or that issue, in balance with the *consensus partum*.

For that reason, in the theological dialogue, Korais, although a laic, comes as an equal interlocutor. Not being deprived of his Orthodox identity, by his word he proves *de facto* his great theological education. His phrase “either he misinterprets or he presents [the testimonies of Holy Scripture] in a fragmentary way”¹⁹, at the expense the author of the *Fatherly Teaching* reminds us of the primary criterium of correctness of the Church of the Seventh Ecumenical Councils: What is important is not *what someone says*, but *who is the one who says it* and *to what extent*, that is, whether it is a word of prophets, apostles or fathers of the Church. It was only the heresies that made fragmentary use of these

16. See *op.cit.*, pp. 23-24.

17. He is not entitled to derive his correctness only “from his most holy apostolic and patriarchal throne, let alone according to the “it is written, law shall proceed from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem”, in: *op.cit.*, pp. 23-24.

18. K. Georgiadis, «Ἡ Θεολογία καὶ δὴ ἡ Δογματικὴ ὡς ἱστοριοφιλολογικὴ καὶ νομικὴ ἐπιστήμη κατὰ τὸ συνοδικὸ πρότυπο», *Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμάς/Gregorios ho Palamas* 851, 4 (2015), pp. 101-112.

19. Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, pp. 17-18.

ecclesiastical sources. From this point onwards, Korais is entitled to a further development of the theological discourse. Essentially, it will be seen that he does not basically express an ideologized or Calvinistic theology, but an Orthodox ecclesiology of substance with biblical foundation and implications in political life.

Regarding the argumentation of essence either of the *Fatherly* or the *Brotherly Teaching*, the theology itself is unfortunately absent, that is, the depth of Trinitarianism and Christology, which would provide symbolisms of divine life, of how the Triune God of freedom and love reflects on human reality as a model of likeness. Neither side benefits from a liberal political theology introduced into the new Greek State through its national symbols, such as the Cross, the flag and the invocation of the Holy Trinity on the frontispiece of every modern Greek Constitution.

In a proposal for a future council to definitively bridge the above confrontation and –why not– the official lifting of the patriarchal anathemas against the Greek Revolution, the theological reasoning and dialogue would be developed on the basis of pre-existing synodical principles. Since we speak literally of Theology, where the object of science is only God, no “dogma” in the sense of “axiom” is confirmed, except as the final conclusion of “probative theological reasoning”²⁰. The thought here is mathematical, as it is generally found in the synodical tradition, while it is explicitly pointed out and systematized in fathers of the prestige of a Gregory Palamas²¹. From the outset, Korais²² hastens to point out that the “rational Logos” our “holy religion” and the “glory of the Eastern Church” are identical. The side of Anthimos does not simply indicate the “rational Logos” but explicitly invokes it for the documentation of its words²³.

20. The syllogism can be *inductibe*, where an initial dogma as an axiom, such as that of the two natures of Christ, is proven through historical experience, in this case the *αἰσθησιν* of “miracles” and at the same time of the “sufferings” of the one and the same person of the God the Word. The syllogism is sometimes *productive*, where the dogma is produced by another and already established synodically dogma. See K. Georgiadis, «Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς: Θεὸς καὶ Θεολογία στὰ ὅρια τοῦ Λόγου», *Θεολογία/Theologia* 87, 3 (2016), pp. 48-49.

21. See *op.cit.*, pp. 39-42, 46-50.

22. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφική Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 18.

23. See indicatively «Στίχοι Πολιτικοί», in: Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πα-*

*B3. Investigation of Essential Theological
and Philosophical Arguments*

Without underestimating the worst sin of simony, the Hierarchs, according to Korais, validate their titles as “Most Holiness, Most Blessed” etc., only as a) they do not exert coercion on their flock, according to *1 Pet.* 5, 2 («ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλ’ ἐκουσίως»/“Tend the flock of God that is your charge, not by constraint but willingly”)²⁴; b) treat equally every member of the Church, according to *Col.* 4, 1 («οἱ κύριοι τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε»/“Masters, treat your slaves justly and fairly”), since as a whole the fullness of the Church cannot lose its immediacy towards the one Lord and God²⁵ from any intermediate Hierarchy; c) they themselves become in practice a model of resistance to any tyrannical establishment²⁶, symbolically “salt and light”, according to *Matth.* 5, 13-14.

The subsequent formulation of the *Fatherly Teaching* and particularly in terms of a Christian life that since Apostolic times has been defined as “legislated by commandments and laws, both political and spiritual”²⁷, is impressive. It implies that Christianity acquires a character of political ideology. It would only be considered deliberately said as a theological axiom, if on the basis of this in the following paragraph the royal monarchy was not characterized as “authority from God”, contrary to the “new ways of state and administration”²⁸ of the time. To this axiom is added even worse: Any political power, liberal or tyrannical, comes from God, therefore every person must tolerate it; with the addition of

τρικῇ, *op.cit.* p. 38: «Εἶναι ὁμολογούμενον εἰς ὅσους διακρίνουν μὲ τοῦ νοὸς τὸ λογικὸν τὰ πράγματα καὶ κρίνουν, τὸ πόσον εἶναι ἄφευκτος καὶ πόσον ἀναγκαῖα ἡ φρόνησις ἡ ἀκριβὴς εἰς ὅλα τὰ πρακτέα. Ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος ἀπαιτεῖ καθέναν νὰ γνωρίζῃ μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ κεφαλὴν» (“It is acknowledged by all who discern with the reason and exercise judgement, how inevitable and how necessary precise wisdom is in everything that must be done. Right reason requires that each person knows a single principle and head”).

24. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 20.

25. See *op.cit.*

26. See *op.cit.*

27. Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρικῇ*, *op.cit.*, p. 24.

28. *Op.cit.*, p. 24; for more details, see *op.cit.*, pp. 31-33.

the estimation that the Ottoman yoke is as mild as the “yoke of Christ” (mean the ecclesiastical canons)²⁹, the demand for freedom loses its basis.

In the above positions, the rhetorical question is refuted from the outset: In which biblical or patristic source, and generally when in the history of the Church was this or that regime absolutized? What preceded it in Byzantium is another issue of Roman origins, which, however, is not due to an ideological-political Christianity that was not imposed anyway. Besides, if there was only one rule, is the one given by Christ Himself in *Matth.* 22, 37-40: «ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου [...] ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν», with the mention that «ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται κρέμονται».

At this point, liberalism and Christianity, although with different starting points, meet. While Orthodoxy is placed at the supra-constitutional level of *symbols of the nation*, inalienable individual rights are safeguarded, mainly religious freedom, exactly because the founders of the Greek State, having Orthodox conscious, could not think and act otherwise³⁰. It is thus that is explained the logical contradiction of every pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary Greek Constitution: While it even has a neutral religious character, it has already been drafted in the name of the *Holy Trinity*³¹.

In the context of this political theology with an Orthodox sign Korais goes deeper. Referring to *1 Kings* 8, 11-18 he will mention the anti-monarchic exhortation of God to the Jews, at the end of the time of Judges, “to dissuade them from this irrational desire” («διὰ τὸ τοῦς ἀποτρέψῃ ἀπὸ τὴν ἄλογον ταύτην ἐπιθυμίαν»)³². Pointing out that

29. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, pp. 44-45.

30. K. Georgiadis, “Political Theology in Recent Case-Law on Religious Education in Greece: ‘Religious Consciousness’ vs ‘Religious Conscience’ within the Greek Constitution”, *Social Cohesion and Development* 15, 2 (2020), pp. 163-164.

31. See *Πολιτικὸν Σύνταγμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, Troezen 1827, pp. 1-2: In the name of the “Holy and Indivisible Trinity” and already from the first article of the most mature form of the first Greek Constitution, that of Troezen, centuries before the modern Constitutions, it is solemnly provided that “Everyone in Greece practice his religion freely and has equal protection for his worship”.

32. Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 51.

while the Jews themselves “sought a king expatriate and legitimate” («ἐζήτουν βασιλέα ὁμογενῇ καὶ νόμιμον»)³³, again the divine anti-monarchic exhortation remained. It is therefore concluded how much more intense this exhortation would have been for an Orthodox *millet* which was called by its ecclesiastical authority to endure “a barbarian and foreign tyrant” («βάρβαρον καὶ ἀλλογενῇ τύραννον»)³⁴.

Subsequently, Korais will explain that “this is what God said to the Jews, to teach them, that by creating man free and with free will, His will was to always remain so, subduing only to these laws, and never to the wills of the people who were like him”³⁵. From this particular sentence it becomes clear that the main problem for Korais was not the model of regime itself, that is, whether it is a democracy or a monarchy. What is most important is freedom which as God’s gift is provided to every person. From this alone, otherwise the equal agreement of all citizens in the form of a “social contract”, each authority is institutionally established, even if it is a constitutional monarchy “by and for the people”. This is how, genuine democracy is given meaning, as isonomy coming from and applied to every citizen without discrimination on the basis of the classical Pauline saying «οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος, οὐδὲ Ἑλλήν, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος, οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος...»³⁶, as well as of parallel biblical passages³⁷.

Therefore, the freedom that God Himself provides and guarantees precedes everything, posing the type of government as an incidental issue, when it would be the free choice of a collectivity according to its own cultural identity. However, this sanctity does not only concern the initial constitution of the *social contract* but also to the subsequent discipline in it. This is precisely the meaning, according to Korais, of the biblical «πειθαρχεῖν Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις»³⁸. Obedience to the *social contract* means obedience to God. Besides, laws, as free expression

33. *Op.cit.*

34. *Op.cit.*

35. *Op.cit.*, p. 52.

36. *Gal.* 3, 28.

37. See *op.cit.*, pp. 52-53.

38. *Acts* 5, 29; *op.cit.*, p. 54.

of human conscience, are an expression of the divine will itself, since the voice of God is nothing else than the voice of conscience.

According to the above reasoning, and with the contribution of other biblical and Patristic sources is interpreted exactly what Apostle Paul means by the term “authority” in his phrase «οὐκ ἔστι ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ»³⁹. On this issue, which on the part of the *Fatherly Teaching* would be the only essential biblical argument in support of the Ottoman authority the confrontation with the *Brotherly Teaching* culminates. This absolutization did not always seem to have been true in a communicated political theology of Phanari at the time, which also extended to the type of government⁴⁰. In any case, the *Brotherly Teaching* will respond to the theological provocation before it: fatalistic obedience to any authority as God’s command. It was a pseudo-Orthodox obsession which would be invalidated by the very relevance of *Rom.* 13, 3: «οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν»⁴¹ or even the corresponding annotation of a holy Chrysostom⁴². According to Korais, «εἰς μόνους τοὺς νομίμους ἡγεμόνας εἶναι χρεωστούμενη ἡ ὑποταγή.

39. *Rom.* 13, 1.

40. In the year 1798, in the same year of writing the *Fatherly* and *Brotherly Teaching*, at the height of Napoleonic danger for monarchical Europe and the execution of Feraios, when the Ottomans, Russians, and British recognized the Ionian State as guarantor powers, Gregory V wrote to the Ionian people: «Πληροφοροῦμεν ὑμᾶς διὰ προσταγῆς καὶ βουλῆς ἀμεταθέτου τῆς κραταιᾶς ταύτης Βασιλείας, ὅτι θέλετε ἔχει κάθε πληρεξουσιότητα εἰς τὸ νὰ ἐκλέξητε ὁποῖον τρόπον διοικήσεως θέλετε κρίνει εὐλογον», in: Gregory V of Constantinople, *Ἐγκύκλιος πρὸς τοὺς Ἑπτανησίους*, in: M. Papageorgiou. *Ἡ μαύρη Βίβλος τοῦ 1821*, *op.cit.*, p. 28.

41. *Op.cit.*, p. 45.

42. Patristic fidelity to Korais’ theology is given by the interpretation of Chrysostom in «οὐκ ἔστι ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ» (*Rom.* 13, 1). See John Chrysostom, *Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὴν Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Ἐπιστολήν*, *Ὁμιλία ΚΙ*, α’, PG 60, 615AB: «οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἶπε, Πειθέσθω, ἀλλ’, Ὑποτασέσθω... τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ταῦτα διατετάχθαι. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία, φησὶν, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Τί λέγεις; πᾶς οὖν ἄρχων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κεχειροτόνηται; Οὐ τοῦτο λέγω, φησὶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν περὶ καθ’ ἕκαστον ἀρχόντων ὁ λόγος μοι νῦν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος. Τὸ γὰρ ἀρχᾶς εἶναι, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄρχειν, τοὺς δὲ ἄρχεσθαι, καὶ μηδὲ ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀνέδην ἅπαντα φέρεσθαι». Therefore, when Apostle Paul speaks of “authority of God” he means the institution of the State itself, which consists mutually between rulers and ruled, and not any political ruler, who, supposedly, as sent by God, must be endured. For the whole political theology of Apostle Paul, as authentically interpreted by Chrysostom, see *op.cit.*, PG 60, 613-622.

εἰς ἐκείνους, λέγω, ὅσοι ἀκολουθοῦντες τοὺς νόμους, κολάζουσι τὴν κακίαν, καὶ ἐπαινοῦσι τὴν ἀρετὴν»/“it is only to legitimate leaders that submission is due. To those I say who follow the laws, punish wickedness and praise virtue”⁴³.

However, if we examine the approach of the *Fatherly Teaching* to “authority” in *Rom.* 13, 1, as a whole, it is worth wondering when and how a political theology of Lutheran nature infiltrated in an Orthodoxy during the Ottoman occupation. We are referring specifically to a theory that resembles to that of the “two kings”⁴⁴, where the Christian recognizes God as his heavenly king and at the same time as earthly any dominant ruler, with the perception that the latter, who can be from a Caesar to a Hitler, in this case the Sultan, carries out the plan of the former.

The essential theological confrontation between *Fatherly* and *Brotherly Teaching* continues on the occasion of the attempt of the former to integrate the Ottoman perspective into the plan of the divine dispensation. The conflict occupies opposing assessments in the history of the Genos from the end of Byzantium onwards, as also for the kind of relationship of the Genos either with the Ottomans or with the Latins or even the later Europeans from the Age of the Enlightenment.

The first point of friction would be the evaluation of the degree of servitude of the Genos to the Ottomans. According to Anthimos, “the yoke is as light as the yoke of Christ”⁴⁵, while “subordination to this administration does not cause an obstacle or harm to the salvation of the soul”⁴⁶. On the contrary, according to Korais Christians are destined “either to plagued and slaughtered without mercy by tyrants as irrational beasts, or to embrace Mohammedanism”⁴⁷. Although, that while the

43. Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 45.

44. For more details see D. Vandrunen, “The Two Kingdoms Doctrine and the Relationship of Church and State in the Early Reformed Tradition”, *Journal of Church and State* 49, 4 (2007), pp. 743-763; W. J. Ouwenel, *The World is Christ's: A Critique of Two Kingdoms Theology*, Ezra Press, Toronto, 2017; R. Higginson, “From Carl Schmitt to Dorothee Sölle: has political theology turned full circle?”, *Churchman* 97, 2 (1983), pp. 132-134.

45. Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 45.

46. Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, p. 32.

47. Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφικὴ Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 45.

side of Anthimos focuses the problem on the Latin-focused direction, that brought the Ottoman conquest as God's providence⁴⁸, the side of Korais does not cling to that but extends to other timeless weaknesses of Byzantium, focusing on the "Greek-Roman emperors"⁴⁹. Moreover, while the former reacts to the new political ideas and values that the recent French Revolution brought to Europe, the latter not only adopts them, but also seeks the alliance of the Genos with the then powerful Napoleon.

Evaluating these views with a more mature look nowadays, the Ottoman dominion and only with the subordination of the Genos to a secondary millet, let alone its impoverishment, does not in any way justify the lenient view of Anthimos. But, if one were to go back to the early years after the Fall, where the independence of the Genos had already been lost by the Crusades, and therefore the Genos was struggling between Scylla and Charybdis, the anti-Latin and therefore the pro-Ottoman stance could be justified. It was an assessment of the lesser harm that one "rapist" would cause in compared to the other. In other words, the Latins, did not remain at the level of heartless neutrality until the Fall of Constantinople by the Turks. They were the other pole in the tug of war of the "foreign and of other religion" conquerors. Against the Ottomans in particular, who with any barbarity put an end to the freedom of the Genos, the Latins, without bringing less violence, would remove the Orthodox faith through Unia.

Korais does not seem to disagree with the historical assessments up to this time limit. However, the environment of the West after the Reformation and especially after European Enlightenment has radically changed. It is certainly anti-papal, and therefore the persistence of the Orthodox Leadership in generalized anti-Western fierceness would not be justified. On the other hand, the question is whether Korais side is proceeding with its absolutizations against the new European world system. The modern political perception of Europe would not have been the problem, especially when it fed the Greek Revolution and State. However, on the part of the *Fatherly Teaching* the dispute will focus on the

48. Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, p. 29.

49. See Ad. Korais, *Αδελφική Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, pp. 47-48.

authenticity of the then Napoleonic movement⁵⁰. But even if the opposite was true, in an international environment where each nation operates on the basis of its own interests, who would guarantee that for the sake of a “Frankish-Greek” vision the French would sacrifice themselves for the Greeks? No one else has done it, not even the Orthodox Russians with the Orlov Revolt proving that everyone’s freedom is won through their own efforts.

However, the Russians for this very self-activity, are set as a model for the Greeks, who are of the same religion, in two directions: either *servility* or the support of hope in the foreign factor. According to Korais, the Russians also had to face a Latin threat from the west and an Islamic one from the south⁵¹. However, they did not face divine providence fatalistically, but took the opportunity that it gave them.

The following question is whether the fight for freedom, even an armed one, is justified “for faith”, if it is not even recommended. The resistance to injustice is normal, on the basis of the greatest virtue of love. Besides, it is not a fight of Christianity against Islam, but exclusively a defense of the highest value of man, as it is evident from the provisions of the first Greek Constitutions “in the name of the Holy Trinity”⁵². For Korais the rebelliousness of the Christian escalates according to the principle of *proportionality*, from the mildest to the strictest means⁵³. Therefore, according to *Matth.* 10, 23 flight is the first reaction⁵⁴, while according to *John* 18, 23, *Acts* 23, 3 and *Acts* 23, 25 follows the assertion of the right on the basis of the available legal context⁵⁵. With the failure of these means, one resorts to armed fight under the protection of the Church, which will pray and swear him in the name of God. About it, the examples of the Maccabees in ancient Israel or the ceaseless prayers of the Church for its Roman kings, centered on “Save O Lord, Thy People”, («Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου...»), are characteristic⁵⁶.

50. See Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, pp. 28-29, 32-34.

51. See *op.cit.*, pp. 50-51.

52. See *Πολιτικὸν Σύνταγμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, *op.cit.*, pp. 1-48.

53. See *op.cit.*, pp. 54-55.

54. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφική Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 54.

55. See *op.cit.*, p. 46.

56. See *op.cit.*, pp. 51, 55.

In the conclusion of the *Fatherly Teaching*, the theological discourse is explicitly attempted to extend to philosophy. The problem is not a demarcation between sciences, since mainly philosophy, like theology, is not a separate science next to the others, but the interdisciplinary bridge, the post-scientific principle and extension of each one of them. However, the exhortation of Anthimos: “let us define freedom more scientifically” («ὅς τεχνολογήσωμεν καὶ ἐπιστημονικώτερον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτὸ τῆς ἐλευθερίας») provokes research⁵⁷. In this light, the ironic call “philosopher”⁵⁸, against him will be expressed, obviously meaning not the leap into another scientific field, but the failure of his general, logical thought, after his total failure in his main theological capacity.

In the first place, it defies common sense for someone to appear “pro-Turk” and at the same time “pro-papal”⁵⁹. Secondly, even the negativity in approaching the then new political ideas of Europe could not possibly embellish the extreme barbarity of the Ottomans. On this, the phrase of Korais about the author of the *Fatherly Teaching* is characteristic: “All the evils that by slandering impudently he attributes to the recently liberated European nations, are in reality all in Turkish territory”⁶⁰. Therefore, characterizations in favor of the Sultan such as “Rector of the goods” on the part of the *Fatherly Teaching*⁶¹, at the height of an abuse and therefore mangling of terms and concepts of Orthodox theology, cause such surprise to Korais, that he believes that the work is spurious⁶².

What the “philosopher” is attempting is the reference of the political freedom to the ontological dimensions of the world and man⁶³. No one, not even Korais, theologically questions that man’s “free-will” depends on the commitments that his very created nature sets, let alone his stained

57. See Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, p. 33.

58. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφική Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 58.

59. See *op.cit.*, pp. 57, 64.

60. *Op.cit.*, p. 60.

61. See Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, p. 38.

62. See Ad. Korais, *Ἀδελφική Διδασκαλία*, *op.cit.*, p. 64.

63. According to Korais, political freedom is defined as the «ἐξουσία τὴν ὁποίαν ἔχει πᾶς ἓνας πολίτης νὰ πράττῃ ὅσα οἱ νόμοι δὲν ἐμποδίζουν», and where «ἄλλον δὲν εἶναι ὁ νόμος, πλὴν ἡ κοινὴ θέλησις διαφόρων ἀνθρώπων συνελθόντων προσωπικῶς, ἢ διὰ τοποτηρητῶν, μὲ σκοπὸν τοῦ νὰ συστήσωσι πολιτείαν», *op.cit.*, p. 61.

nature by Adam. Here the biblical phrase: «τί γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἄνθρωπον ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, καὶ ζημιωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ;»⁶⁴, is annotated in order to point out that even if one acquires his external freedom, it has no value, if existential freedom from the bonds of his perishability and mortality does not follow⁶⁵.

Apart from the fact that political freedom alone cannot negate natural freedom, the author of the *Fatherly Teaching* involves the issue of freedom's recognition with freedom itself, which does not acquire additional content than declaring only the uncommitted; as "free will" is only the starting point either towards holiness or depravity. However, its restriction alone, which not even God Himself exercises, already deprives it of this starting point, identifying itself with hell.

C. Deepening into Principles of Thought: Indirect Voluntary Servility or Subconscious Servility in the Political Theology of Phanari?

By the research and interpretation in the texts and the wider environment of *Fatherly* and *Brotherly Teaching*, a subconscious pro-Ottoman servility is ascertained, which during the times of the Revolution was already established in the Orthodox *millet* as its tradition⁶⁶. The question is whether it was rooted as its Holy Tradition⁶⁷. However, it is betrayed

64. *Mark* 8, 36.

65. See Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, p. 32.

66. Otherwise, we would be talking about conscious voluntary servitude, which with the multitude of Neo-martyrs and National-martyrs, often from within the ranks of the Clergy, cannot be accepted. According to Chr. Yannaras, however, the problem lies in the conflict between a pre-existing worldview completely different from the narrow nationalistic edifice of the Enlightenment where Korais and Athanasios Parios did not represent respectively a progressive and a conservative pole, but two different visions where each one was corresponding to a different type of Hellenism, in Chr. Yannaras, *Ὁρθοδοξία καὶ Δύση στὴ νεώτερη Ελλάδα*, Domos Publications, Athens 1994, p. 187. It is as if it is supported that the one problem has been solved and we move on to the second, generally that «οἱ Ἕλληνες ἔπαψαν νὰ εἶναι ραγιαῶδες καὶ ἐλεύθεροι συνδιαλέγονται γιὰ τὸ ἂν θὰ πορευτοῦν μὲ τὴ Δύση ἢ τὴν Ἀνατολή».

67. The "Political Verses", in: Anthimos of Jerusalem, *Διδασκαλία Πατρική*, *op.cit.*, pp. 37-39, especially the order of the verses «ὥς δόγμα πιστεῶς μας, πρέπει νὰ

through the *Fatherly Teaching* and in fact expressed as a separate chapter of the *divine dispensation*, escalating in time as follows:

1. “Greek-Roman” kings, morally and politically corrupt, become the cause of the collapse of Byzantium⁶⁸.

2. In this gap and between Latin and Ottoman conquerors, where to the equal violence of the former is added the removal of the Orthodox faith, the latter are tolerated on the throne of Constantinople with relief. This is obviously how the «κρειττότερόν ἐστι εἰδέναι ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει φακιόλιον βασιλεῦον Τούρκων ἢ καλύπτραν Λατινικήν»⁶⁹.

3. Gennadios Scholarios comes to an agreement with Mehmed II on the establishment of the Orthodox *millet*. As long as the new polity of the Ottoman Empire is shaped by the *Great Church of Constantinople* (like so many other fundamental cultural loans of the until then “uncivilized” Ottomans) it is certainly internalized both on Canon Law and in the Dogma of the Orthodox Church.

4. While the existing conditions favored the Genos for some time after the Fall⁷⁰, compared to the then papal West, they cannot be unchanged

ἐκπληρώσωμεν τὸ χρέος τὸ ἰδικόν μας» and «πρύτανις τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ φύλαξ ζωῆς» regarding the Sultan, shows exactly what is the *ραγιαδισμός/servility* that is internalized in Canon Law, and therefore the Dogma of the Church during the Turkish occupation. 68. However, even these kings are an expression of a respectively corrupt people. The deadly sin is the abandonment of the compulsory military service, that is that one must sacrifice oneself for the free and dignified life of one’s relatives, without ceding this debt of his to any mercenary. When, for example, Constantinople fell, the problem was not whether some, few or many, had become monks, so for this reason they did not fight. In any case, in Byzantium, generally after the 13th-14th century, there was not conscripted army. With their financial vigor our ancestors put mercenaries to fight on their behalf, while when they began to understand that “the fairy tale was ending” they fled again with their wealth in the West. On the basis of this and in simple words, what the Turks would say to our ancestors is this: “Do you want us to fight for you, in your civil wars or to protect you from the Franco-Latins? However, your ‘coins’ are not enough for us. Since we are in danger of dying for you, and even for this reason you do not fight with us, let us govern you, providing, at least often, our braver fighters the ‘janissaries’, the best ‘offspring’ of your own families”.

69. N. V. Tomadakis, *Περὶ Ἀλώσεως τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (1453), P. Pournaras Publications, Thessaloniki 1993, p. 28.

70. See Th. Zisis, «Ἡ ἄλωση τῆς Πόλης κατὰ τὸν Γεννάδιο Σχολάριο», *Θεοδορομία/Theodromia* 8, 2 (2006), pp. 219-220: “Under the pretext of help, the Westerners would essentially conquer Constantinople again. And one is conquest and the other; however,

for ever, particularly after the radical changes of the European Enlightenment and the chain democratic revolutions. In these the anti-papist, and at the same time anti-monarchist-anti-Ottoman times, Orthodox Church instead of profiting on the basis of the common enemy and in a mission of its own towards the modern world, it insists on an introversion that prevents it from seeing what in reality the *divine dispensation* holds in store for the Genos: its self-determination through the Greek Revolution and the State. It refuses to get on the train of history and imbue the modern world with the faith of “the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church”.

5. According to this spirit, it can hardly be accepted that in the crucial moments of an excommunication of Ypsilantis and Soutsos by Gregory V or the systematic condemnations of every revolutionary movement for more than twenty years, culminating in Rigas Feraios the prevailing motive was a policy of appeasement of the Ottomans accompanied by behind-the-scenes assistance in the struggle of the national uprising⁷¹.

in the conquest under the Turks the advantage of national dignity would remain, that is, that the Nation did not sacrifice...Orthodoxy, which was the most essential element of its national identity. Moreover, the great cultural superiority over the Turks and the complete dissimilarity of religion were unfavorable factors for the complete Islamization, while unlike the fellow believers Franks Latinization was easier”. The point of view of Saint Kosmas the Aetolian is particularly important, and as an original source, in: Io. V. Menounos, *Κοσμά τοῦ Αἰτωλοῦ Διδαχῆς (καὶ Βιογραφία)*, Tinos Publications, Athens 1979, Διδαχὴ Ε', pp. 105-106, 269-270: «Ὑστερα τὸ ἐσήκωσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ βασίλειον ἀπὸ τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς καὶ ἤφερε τὸν Τοῦρκο μέσα ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν καὶ τοῦ τὸ ἔδωκε διὰ ἐδικὸν μᾶς καλόν... Καὶ διατί δὲν ἤφευρεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄλλον βασιλέα, ὅπου ἦτον τόσα ρηγάτα ἐδῶ κοντὰ νὰ τοὺς τὸ δώσῃ, μόνον ἤφερε τὸν Τοῦρκο μὲσαθε ἀπὸ τὴν Κόκκινην Μηλιᾶ καὶ τοῦ τὸ ἐχάρισε; Διατί ἤξευρεν ὁ Θεὸς πῶς τὰ ἄλλα ρηγάτα μᾶς βλάπτουν εἰς τὴν πίστιν, καὶ ὁ Τοῦρκος δὲν μᾶς βλάπτει, ἄσπρα δῶσ' του καὶ καβαλλίκευσέ τον ἀπὸ τὸ κεφάλι. Καὶ διὰ νὰ μὴν κολασθοῦμεν τὸ ἔδωκε τοῦ Τούρκου καὶ τὸν ἔχει ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Τοῦρκο ὥσάν σκυῖλλον νὰ μᾶς φυλάῃ». However, the «ἄσπρα» did not seem enough to save him from hanging nor of course the Turks turned out to be «σκύλοι ποὺ μᾶς φυλοῦν», but in crucial moments the «λύκοι ποὺ τρῶνε τίς σάρκες μᾶς».

71. The theory that the excommunication of Ypsilantis and Soutsos by 72 ecclesiastical and political leaders of the Orthodox *millet*, with Gregory V being the leader, is due to reasons of appeasement of the Turks, is reinforced by the argument of the already recognized irregularity of the excommunication, as well as by the fact that its authors participated themselves actively in the Revolution, in: P. A. Georgantzis, *Ὁ ἀφορισμὸς τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρου Ὑψηλάντη: ἱστορικὴ καὶ θεολογικὴ διερεῦνση τοῦ θέματος*, Parousia

Was it possible for the persons of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to work for a peaceful Revolution from within against the Ottoman Empire, which would sooner or later Hellenize it⁷²? Of course, their whole stance does not negate their devotion to the Genos, that reaches the point of death.

Consequently, the Church of the Genos is “*in captivity*” not so much of the Sultan, but of itself. This is true even when the struggle for freedom shows such a dynamic that even reaches the restoration of the Byzantine empire. Because of its dogmatic obsessions, the ecclesiastical leadership ends up turning a blind eye to simple historical assessments of the times. Instead of the self-evident admission of the Ottoman barbarity continues to connect it with the history of *divine dispensation* even after the *divine miracle* of the Greek Revolution and State⁷³.

Thus, it stands in the way of a political theology of another level, with Orthodox origins, which, although it is wrongly by-passed by research today, is included, for example, in the invocation of the Holy Trinity, in the Greek Constitution in “Fight for faith and homeland” of Ypsilantis or in the symbolic phrase of Kolokotronis “God put his signature on Greece’s freedom and does not take it back”. What is now included in the plan of divine dispensation is not the Sultan, but the miracle of the regeneration of the Greeks. Kapodistrias points this out as the first Governor of the Greeks before Agathangelos of Constantinople, calling him to study: «ἐπὶ φιλοθέου ἀναχωρήσεως τὰ θαύματα δι’ ὧν ὁ Κύριος

Publications, Kavala 1988.

72. Besides, this had its precedent with the Hellenization and later Christianization of the Roman Empire, but it was not certain that it would be repeated again. Without the issue being hypotheses, but the demand for freedom in the “here” and “now” of the Hatt-i Humayun of 1856, which after decades developed into a fiasco of genocides in Asia Minor, is indicative of whether the barbarian can change.

73. The wording is indicative: «πολλοὶ τόποι εὐρίσκονται εἰς τὴν πλάνην. Ἐν τοσούτῳ οἱ κάτοικοι ἐγνώρισαν ὅτι, ὡσάντις ἔδωκαν ἀκρόασιν εἰς ἀλλοτρίας ὑποσχέσεις, ἠπατήθησαν καὶ ὅτε ἠθέλησαν ν’ ἀπομακρυνθῶσιν ἀπὸ τὴν γραμμὴν τῆς ὑποταγῆς καὶ τῆς ὀφειλομένης εἰς τὴν νόμιμον Ὀθωμανικὴν δύναμιν πίστεως, τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντελλομένης...», in: Agathangelos of Constantinople, «Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ Πατριάρχου...», op.cit., p. 130, and «ἡ πρόνοια τῆς Ἐκκλησίας θέλει νὰ μιμηθῇ κατὰ τοῦτο τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ ποιμένος τὸ παράδειγμα καὶ νὰ ζητήσῃ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς καὶ νὰ τὸ εἰσαγάγῃ εἰς τὴν πολιτικὴν καὶ πνευματικὴν ποίμνην, ἀπὸ τὴν ὁποίαν ἀπεμακρύνθη, ὥστε ν’ ἀναπαυθῇ εἰς αὐτήν, ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν τῆς βασιλικῆς εὐσπλαχνίας καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν πρόνοιαν τῆς βασιλείας», in: op.cit., p. 131.

κατὰ τοὺς οἰκτιρμοὺς αὐτοῦ πάντοτε, μάλιστα δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων τούτων χρόνων, ἔσωσε τὸν λαὸν τοῦτο»⁷⁴, adding also that while the ecclesiastical congregation chose not to “surrender to the yoke” of the Ottomans, its, «οἱ πατέρες αὐτοῦ κατεκάμφθησαν, μηδέποτε ἐπιστέρξαντες»⁷⁵. Meaning here the non-participating and even opposed to the Revolution highest ecclesiastical leadership, it is reasonable that an Anthimos of Jerusalem through his *Fatherly Teaching* or a Gregory V excommunicating Ypsilantis could not have done otherwise⁷⁶. Their institutional official role would not allow them to do so, not so much towards their Ottoman authority but towards the patriarchal holy tradition associated with it. However, the issue is whether another historical role of them towards God and people created a rift against this servile political theology with origins before Gennadios and what they finally did according to it.

D. Conclusions

After highlighting the logical contradictions within almost every reasoning proposal of the *Fatherly Teaching*, a theology unsubstantiated in its own biblical patristic and synodical sources, it is difficult for

74. Ioannis Kapodistrias, «Ἀπόκρισις πρὸς τὸ γράμμα τοῦ Πατριάρχου καὶ τῆς Συνόδου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως», in: M. Papageorgiou. *Ἡ μαύρη Βίβλος τοῦ 1821*, op.cit., p. 139.

75. Op.cit., p. 140. Regardless of whether the policy of the Patriarchs expresses a servile ambiguity, Kapodistrias strives to ensure that the relationship between Hellenism and the *Mother Church of Constantinople* is never broken. As for what he believed about the *Ark of the Genos*, as well as for how and to what extent he struggled for it, the remarks are characteristic in: f. Georgios Metallinos, «Ἰωάννης Καποδίστριας (Ὁ πολιτικός-μάρτυρας τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας καὶ τοῦ ἐλληνισμοῦ)», *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* 85, 8 (2008), pp. 607-608.

76. The question is how could this contradiction of qualities and roles of revolutionary and at the same time anti-revolutionary action be justified. The logical explanation is the co-existing clerical and historical role of a sole person. Just as, for example, today a civil servant acts as an organ of the state, but he can also disagree with a specific act he performs, as long as he has the status of a citizen, likewise a Patriarch in his official role obeys his Ottoman authority, but at the same time according to his historical role he can bypass it. A sample of writing gives Anthimos of Arta, who while he co-signing the excommunication of Revolution, takes an active role in it. Besides, even chieftains and kotsampasides, before the critical moment of taking over the Greek arms, did not they also function as an organic part of the Ottoman State?

anyone to believe that the author of the work is pretending, exercising a policy of appeasement on the side of the Ottoman authority and on the side of the national rebellion of the Greeks a behind the scenes contribution. It operates on the basis of a political philosophy and theology in which he truly believes. Even in the condemnation of Rigas Feraios by connecting him with the new political perception brought by the French Revolution, he consciously follows a firm line, which culminates in the exact same philosophy in the excommunication of Ypsilantis and Soutsos, two decades later, and consequently in the *Encyclical* of Agathangelos of Constantinople for the return of the newly independent Greece in the bosom of the Sultan. It was therefore a unanimous ethnarchic political theology of Phanari with origins from the times before the Fall. Consequently, even if the *Fatherly Teaching* was not directly written by Anthimos of Jerusalem, but by Gregory V of Constantinople or Athanasios Parios, he would also express himself, so that the work would not be essentially spurious, as Korais seemed to believe. Moreover, his counter-revolutionary direction does not seem to concern unilaterally a *Franco-Greek* alliance which was in the works on the part of Korais predestined to act levelly for the spiritual and political interest of the Genos. On the contrary, it cannot be moderated by the scandalous apotheosis of the most extreme other pole, the Sultan, amid his characterizations such as “Rector of the goods”.

It is probable, however, that whoever was at the helm of the ecclesiastical leadership during the times of the Greek Revolution, he would have not acted differently, than according to the ethnarchic theory he inherited from his predecessors. In the years before the Fall and in a total inability to maintain the independence of Greeks between the Latins and Ottomans, the former acted so destructively especially spiritually, that the latter, as a counter-balance appeared as a “lifeline”. Consequently, according to the agreement between Mehmed II and Gennadios Scholarios, the Genos of the Orthodox was now an enslaved *millet* of a single Ottoman administration, within the context of a polity that was essentially internalized in the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church. Therefore, the agreements evolved into a tradition of the Genos, with the question of whether they were also transformed into a Holy

Tradition. It would not be an exaggeration to support the last view. The ecclesiastical leadership according to its own peculiar ethnarchic policy, and in its zeal to maintain a self-consciousness of the Genos, involves all the armor of its Canon Law even the penalty of excommunication in issues of politics and education completely irrelevant to dogma and heresy. It was not simply about respecting a tradition, but of absolutizing it, even as an idol instead of the true God. Subjugated to its anti-Western phobic syndrome, the ecclesiastical leadership did not see that Europe was changing radially, emancipating itself even from the common deadly enemy, the Papacy, so as to seize the unique historical opportunity to converse with it instead of condemning it in advance.

Thus, thought is trapped in a Holy Tradition, repeating phenomena of ritualism of the pharisaic type of the time of Christ. From this emerges the substantial alteration of even self-evident passages of Orthodox Theology, focusing on man's "*free will*". In this obsession with tradition, and regardless of whether this was justified in earlier historical conditions in order to avoid the Latin danger, servility is identified as eternal servile submission, otherwise the voluntary servitude of the highest ecclesiastical leadership of the Orthodox *millet*, which is preserved even in the critical times of the Revolution. Otherwise, we do not want to believe in the prevalence of voluntary servitude of another kind, entanglement with the Ottoman authority due to personal interest, although to a greater or lesser extent it is not excluded.