

2011

# Administrating the Non-Muslims and "The Question of Jerusalem" after the Young Turk Revolution

Bedross Der Matossian

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, bdermatossian2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historyfacpub>



Part of the [European History Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Islamic World and Near East History Commons](#), [Military History Commons](#), and the [Political History Commons](#)

---

Der Matossian, Bedross, "Administrating the Non-Muslims and "The Question of Jerusalem" after the Young Turk Revolution" (2011). *Faculty Publications, Department of History*. 181.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historyfacpub/181>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Department of History by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

## CHAPTER 11

# ADMINISTRATING THE NON-MUSLIMS AND THE 'QUESTION OF JERUSALEM' AFTER THE YOUNG TURK REVOLUTION

BEDROSS DER MATOSSIAN

The historiography on the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 in general has mainly concentrated on the impact of the Revolution on the Ottoman Turkish society. Rarely do we see works that deal with the impact of the Revolution on the non-dominant groups in the Empire from a comparative perspective. How did the different ethnic groups view the Revolution? How did the Revolution influence the dynamics of power inside these groups? What were the relations between the Revolution and the religious groups within the Empire? How did the local/central government view the transformations taking place among the non-Muslim communities in the provinces? These and other questions still preoccupy historians of the Ottoman Empire and the modern Middle East. This article discusses the impact of the Young Turk Revolution on the different ethno-religious groups residing in one of the most contentious cities of the Ottoman Empire: the Old City of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 led to a radical upheaval in the dynamics of power within the ethnic groups in the Ottoman Empire.

Jerusalem, with its Armenian and Greek Patriarchates and the Chief Rabbinate, became a focal point of a political power struggle among Jews, Armenians, and Greeks. The importance that the ethno-religious and secular leadership in Istanbul gave to the crisis in Jerusalem demonstrates its centrality in the Empire's ethnic politics and shows how the question of Jerusalem became a source of conflict between the different political forces that emerged after the Revolution. The Revolution gave the dissatisfied elements within these communities an opportunity to reclaim what they thought had been usurped from them during the period of the *ancien régime*.

Hence, in all three cases studied in this article these communities internalized the Revolution by initiating their own micro-revolutions and constructing their own *ancien régimes*, new orders, and victories. This chapter illustrates the commonalities and the differences between the three cases and contends that post-Revolutionary ethnic politics in the Empire should not be viewed solely through the prism of political parties. Rather these ought to be examined in the light of ecclesiastic politics, which was a key factor in defining inter and intra-ethnic politics. While the Revolution aimed at the creation of a new Ottoman identity, which entailed that all the ethnic and religious groups be brothers and equal citizens, it also required that all the groups abandon their distinct religious privileges. This caused much anxiety among the ethnic groups whose communities enjoyed the religious privileges bestowed on them by the previous regimes. Thus, despite its proclaimed aim to undo ethno-religious representations, the Revolution nevertheless reinforced religious politics in Istanbul as well as in Jerusalem.

In the Jewish case, the center of power remained within the Chief Rabbinate (*bashambaşlık*). The election of Haim Nahum as the Empire's Chief Rabbi in 1909 strengthened the *hamambası*'s role as the ethno-religious representative of Ottoman Jewry, but this became increasingly difficult in a period where new actors entered the public sphere. In order to oppose the influence of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* (AIU) in Istanbul, based on its extensive educational system, the Zionists founded their own institutions like the Maccabi gymnastic club branch, which became an important society that gained momentum

in the post-revolutionary period.<sup>2</sup> The Zionists, who aimed at winning over the public opinion of the Sephardic Jewry for their activities, were considered an undesirable element by the Chief Rabbinate and by some other prominent Sephardic figures who feared that Zionist national activity in Palestine would enrage the Turkish and Arab populations. Haim Nahum, with the aid of David Fresko, the editor of *El Tiempo*, a Ladino daily published in Istanbul, became the main opponents of Zionist activities in the Empire. Fresko wrote a series of articles attacking Zionism, which were later published in a booklet.<sup>3</sup> Concomitantly, however, the Chief Rabbinate's predisposition against the Zionists was also the result of the ongoing rivalry between various Jewish institutions such as the strife between the Zionists and graduates of the AIU schooling system.

In the Armenian case, the Revolution brought about a change of leadership and the transfer of power from the Armenian Patriarchate in Istanbul to the *Armenian National Assembly* (ANA), which became the representative of the Gregorian Armenians in the Empire.<sup>4</sup> The downfall of Patriarch Maghakia Ormanian whose 'regime was nothing more but a miniature Ottoman *ancien régime* in the national arena',<sup>5</sup> represented the beginning of a new era. This is because the Armenian *ancien régime* was embodied in one person: Patriarch Ormanian. The editor of the Armenian daily newspaper in Istanbul, *Puzantion* named after the editor's first name, described his dominance in the community this way: 'He was everything and as Louis XIV said "*l'état c'est moi*" Ormanian also could have declared more accurately that "I am the Patriarch, Patriarchate, Religious Council, Political Council, Economic committee, financial trustee, judicial committee, and educational committee"'.<sup>6</sup> In fact, Ormanian was criticized by the Armenian revolutionary groups for his policies in general and his 'collaboration' with the Yıldız Palace. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation's official organ, *Droshak* [flag], hailed the collapse of Ormanian and heavily criticized him by calling him the 'Tatar Patriarch', who was mourning the Revolution like his superior, i.e. the Sultan.<sup>7</sup> Thus, the Revolution became a milestone in defining intra-ethnic relationships in the Armenian *millet* of the Empire. It resulted in a micro-revolution, culminating with the reinstatement of the Armenian National Constitution,

the (re)opening of the Armenian National Assembly, and the election of Madteos III Izmirilyan as Patriarch. Unlike the Jewish case, the ANA during the post-revolutionary period included representatives of most of the Armenian political currents (the Dashnaks, Hunchaks, and Ramgavars), and became a battleground between the different Armenian political groups. In addition, the Revolution also paved the way for the strengthening of Armenian political groups in the Empire, most prominently the Dashnaks, which, by propagating their significant role in the Revolution, attempted to strengthen their status in Armenian circles and claimed to be the representative of the Armenian ethnic group in the Empire.

Finally, the Revolution caused some erosion in political and social stability in the Empire's Arab provinces by challenging the politics of notables. In some areas it succeeded in changing the dynamics of power by creating new political actors, such as the *za'ims* of Beirut. In other geographical regions such as Damascus, however, it was unsuccessful, as local notables and the *'ulema* remained the most influential elements of society. In general, though, the Revolution seems to have had more impact on Arab Christians, specifically the Arab Orthodox community of Palestine, the third group examined in this chapter. In particular, it led to the emergence *al-Nahda al-Urthuduksiyya* [the Orthodox Revival] and led growing numbers among the Orthodox community to identify themselves with the Arab National movement. This Orthodox Revival would not have taken place without the existence of cultural nationalism among the Palestinian Christian elite at the end of the nineteenth century. This cultural nationalism was a by-product of the reforms in the nineteenth century specifically in the fields of law and education, missionary activities, and the development of print capitalism in Palestine that shaped 'an imagined community that came to describe itself as Palestinian'.<sup>8</sup>

### The Revolution of 1908 and 'La Kestyon del Gran Rabino de Yerusalayim'

The impact of the Revolution on the Jews of the Empire should be analyzed from two perspectives. One pertains to the micro-revolution

that occurred inside the Jewish *millet*, whereas the other pertains to the increased Zionist activities in Istanbul after the Revolution. The Revolution paved the way for Jewish movements in the Empire to start not only reforming its own communities, but also to take an active part in the political and economic life of the Empire. However, unlike in the Armenian case, the transition of power in the Jewish case met with resistance by people loyal to the former regime of Moshe Halevi. It is worth noting here that the Chief Rabbinate of Istanbul was created in 1835 by the appointment of Avraham Levi as the Chief Rabbi. His position was recognized by the Ottoman government, making him both the temporal and the spiritual leader of the Jewish community. However, this newly created position remained marginal until 1860. In 1872 Moshe Halevi was appointed as the *kaymakam* [substitute] of the Chief Rabbinate. The historian Avraham Galanté argues that Halevi was not a person of initiative and action and that he did nothing, because his patrons kept him under their control, and that this ultimately resulted in disorder in the administration and recklessness in finances<sup>9</sup>. Moshe Halevi did not hold elections until the Young Turk revolution, thus demonstrating his reluctance to bring about change within the Jewish community of the Empire.

After the Revolution, Haim Nahum was appointed the *kaymakam* of the Chief Rabbinate in Istanbul.<sup>10</sup> This led to an uproar among those who remained loyal to the previous administration in the Jewish *millet*. The tensions emanating from this appointment should be viewed as the outcome of the tensions existing between the Zionists and the AIU. In one letter, while commenting on maneuvers by the German Orthodox Jews during the elections, Nahum clearly states: 'In any case, if I am elected, it will really be a victory for the Alliance, because a very strong campaign is being conducted against our society'.<sup>11</sup> This tension was fueled by the rivalry between Germany and France, which aligned with the Zionists and the Alliance respectively for influence over the Jews of the Empire.<sup>12</sup>

Shortly after the July Revolution, on 24 January, 1909 Haim Nahum was elected *bahambaşı* by 74 votes.<sup>13</sup> His opponents challenged the election arguing that only three quarters of the delegates had voted.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, David Fresko's *El Tiempo* announced

that the results were received with joy and happiness from all the provinces of the Empire, as evidenced by the numerous telegrams, letters and articles that the newspaper received.<sup>15</sup>

Immediately after his accession letters began to pour into the office of the *bahambaşı* from the provinces demanding the dismissal of their spiritual heads.<sup>16</sup> 'It is to be noted with regret', claimed *The Jewish Chronicle* from London, 'that, with the exception of Salonica, which has a worthy spiritual chief at its head in the person of Rabbi Ya'akov Meir, all the Jewish communities in Turkey are administered by Rabbis who are not cultured, and are imbued with ideas of the past'.<sup>17</sup> Rabbi Nahum mentions this in a letter addressed to Jacques Bigart the secretary general of the AIU in Paris:

Feelings are still running very high, and I receive telegrams every day from the different communities in the Empire asking me for the immediate dismissals of their respective chief rabbis. Jerusalem, Damascus, and Saida [Sidon] are the towns that complain the most about their spiritual leaders. I am sending Rabbi Habib of Bursa to hold new elections in these places.<sup>18</sup>

Demonstrations against their respective rabbis were held in the Jewish communities of Damascus, Sidon, and Jerusalem.<sup>19</sup> In Damascus, the people demanded the removal of Rabbi Mercado Alfandari 'who has a mentality and an education that is not at all compatible with the new order of things'.<sup>20</sup> In Sidon the people demanded the removal of the Chief Rabbi under 'whose administrative tyranny the population suffered for many years'.<sup>21</sup> In Jerusalem, letters were sent to the Grand Vizierate and the Ministry of Interior demanding the removal of Rabbi Panigel who was only appointed provisionally.<sup>22</sup> The governors of these localities also telegraphed the Sublime Porte arguing in support of the demonstrators. In response, the Minister of Justice wrote to the *kaymakam* demanding that he take action without delay. On 3 September, 1908 the Secular Council (*meclis-i cismani*) convened under the presidency of the *kaymakam* Rabbi Haim Nahum and decided to dismiss these three Rabbis.<sup>23</sup> Of these dismissals, the question of the Chief Rabbinate of Jerusalem was the most important.

It is a good illustration of the ways the different factions within the Empire's Jewish community competed with each other after the Revolution.<sup>24</sup> The question of Jerusalem was high on the agenda of the Chief Rabbinate of Istanbul, not only because of its strategic position, but also because of the infighting there between those who supported the AIU and those who supported the Zionists.

The struggle over the position of the Chief Rabbinate of Jerusalem began after the death of Chief Rabbi Ya'akov Sha'ul Elyashar.<sup>25</sup> In 1906, the governor of Jerusalem, Reşid Paşa, appointed Rabbi Shlomo Mani as *kaymakam* and ordered him to hold elections for the post of *bahambaşı*. Two groups were in the running. One supported the candidacy of Haim Moshe Elyashar,<sup>26</sup> the son of the deceased, whereas the second backed the candidacy of Ya'akov Meir, a graduate of the AIU.<sup>27</sup> The latter group was composed of liberals such as Albert Antebi (the representative of the AIU in Palestine)<sup>28</sup> and Avraham Almaliach,<sup>29</sup> while the former was headed by well-established Sephardi families who wanted to maintain the status quo. Most of the other oriental Jewish groups (Yemenites, Bukharians, Persians) supported Rabbi Ya'akov Meir with the hope that if elected, their political status would improve. Local Jewish newspapers took opposing stances. *Habazeleth*, for instance, supported Elyashar, while *Hasbqafa* supported the candidacy of Ya'akov Meir.

The elections were held and Rabbi Ya'akov Meir emerged as the winner. The Ashkenazi community did not participate in the elections and complained to the *kaymakam* in Istanbul Rabbi Moshe Halevi that Albert Antebi had influenced the governor and prevented them from casting ballots. Rabbi Moshe Halevi in turn annulled the elections and removed Rabbi Ya'akov Meir. However, as Rabbi Meir was on good terms with the incumbent governor of Jerusalem he did not leave his post until the arrival of the new governor 'Ali Ekrem Bey, after which he left for Salonica.<sup>30</sup> Rabbi Moshe Halevi then appointed Rabbi Eliyahu Moshe Panigel, Elyashar's father-in-law, to be the *kaymakam* of Jerusalem and oversee the elections for the new Chief Rabbi.<sup>31</sup> The *kaymakam* of the Istanbul Chief Rabbinate, Rabbi Moshe Halevi, along with the conservatives, backed Rabbi Panigel.<sup>32</sup>

With the appointment of Rabbi Panigel the struggles once more began between the two camps. The Ashkenazi community of Jerusalem supported Rabbi Panigel whereas the supporters of Rabbi Ya'akov Meir opposed him. Those who supported him presented his incumbency as an era when the community and its institutions had flourished. However, Rachel Sharaby notes that according to the newspaper *Habazelet* he mismanaged the affairs of the community.<sup>33</sup> He raised the taxes of his opponents and marginalized the Yemenite Jews who were supporters of Rabbi Ya'akov Meir. Panigel became close to the German-Jewish *Ezra* society<sup>34</sup> in order to counteract the efforts of the AIU in Jerusalem.<sup>35</sup> However, the situation changed with the Revolution, the election of Haim Nahum as the *kaymakam* of the Chief Rabbinate of Empire and the appointment of a new governor of Jerusalem. This was a great boon for the opposing camp in Jerusalem, the supporters of Rabbi Ya'akov Meir. Rabbi Haim Nahum agreed to the demand of Albert Antebi and his movement to dismiss Rabbi Panigel and on the 4 November, 1908 he sent a telegram to Rabbi Panigel ordering him to resign and appoint a new *kaymakam* who would oversee the election of the Chief Rabbinate of Jerusalem.<sup>36</sup> This move caused much excitement in the city's Jewish community.

Haim Nahum appointed Hezkiya Shabatai, the Chief Rabbi of Aleppo as the *kaymakam* of Jerusalem and ordered him to hold elections.<sup>37</sup> However, he failed to do so because the Panigel camp refused to cooperate.<sup>38</sup> For their part, the Ashkenazi leadership refused to take any side, partly because of their disappointment with Panigel. Unable to hold elections, he returned to Aleppo and appointed his friend Rabbi Nahman Batito as the *locum tenens* in Jerusalem.<sup>39</sup> However, Batito as well was unable to hold elections, despite the fact that five candidates were nominated. Once more, the whole issue was stalemated because of the pro-Panigel and the anti-Panigel movements. This led Rabbi Haim Nahum to pay a special visit to Jerusalem to force a compromise in which Rabbi Ya'akov Meir would be appointed Chief Rabbi and Rabbi Panigel would be his deputy. However, the Jewish community of Salonica made sure that Rabbi Meir did not leave his position there. The situation stagnated until Rabbi Haim Nahum removed Batito

from his position and appointed the Rabbi of Rhodes, Moshe Yosef Franco, as chief Rabbi of Jerusalem.<sup>40</sup>

To conclude, the Revolution led to a serious crisis within the Jewish community of Jerusalem. It resulted in the escalation of inter-communal tensions over the elections of the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem. Unlike the Armenian case, however, the struggle within the Jewish community of Jerusalem divided the community into two camps: One camp (the liberals) supporting the candidacy of Ya'akov Meir and the other camp (the well-established Sephardi families) supporting the candidacy of Elyashar and Panigel. The battles between these two camps also reflected the struggle between different interest groups that intensified after the Revolution.

### **The Question of Jerusalem (Erusaghēmi khntirē) and Armenian Attempts of Centralization**

The Armenian presence in Jerusalem dates back to the Byzantine period in the fourth century when an influx of Armenian pilgrims came to the city after the discovery of the Holy Places of Christianity, traditionally ascribed to Saint Helena, the mother of Emperor Constantine I.<sup>41</sup> The current Patriarchate came into existence in the first decade of the fourteenth century when the Brotherhood of St. James<sup>42</sup> proclaimed its head, Bishop Sargis, as patriarch. Eventually the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem exercised its authority in Palestine, southern Syria, Lebanon, Cyprus and Egypt. During the Ottoman period and after the creation of the Armenian Patriarchate of Istanbul, the Ottoman state forced all the Armenian ecclesiastic centers in the Ottoman Empire to obey the newly created religious order in the capital. This subordination was mainly characterized by administrative affairs and did not encompass the recognition of the Patriarchate of Istanbul as a higher religious authority. The Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem had no choice but to adapt itself to the new situation. However, the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem may have actually benefited from this situation because it received financial assistance from the Patriarchate of Istanbul as well as the support of the wealthy Armenian *Amira* class in its struggle to preserve its rights in the Holy Places.<sup>43</sup>

When the ANA was established following the promulgation of the Armenian National Constitution in 1863 [as part of the *Tanzimat* reforms], it took on the right to elect the Patriarch of Jerusalem from an initial list of seven candidates presented by the St. James Brotherhood. In addition, it had the right to supervise the finances of the Patriarchate. In the second half of the nineteenth century the Patriarchate of Jerusalem opposed these measures. Sultan Abdülhamid II seemed to have shared the same views as the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and in 1888 he issued an edict in which he confirmed the election of Patriarch Haroutiun Vehabedian and restored the autonomous status of the Patriarchate.<sup>44</sup>

In the pre-Revolutionary period, during Patriarch Haroutiun Vehabedian's reign (1889–1910), the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem was in disarray. Some members of the Patriarchate's Brotherhood, taking advantage of the Patriarch's old age, ran the affairs of the Patriarchate by appropriating huge sums of money.<sup>45</sup> Prior to the 1908 Revolution, Patriarch Maghakia Ormanian (1841–1918) sent an investigative commission to Jerusalem to put things in order.<sup>46</sup> Though the commission did not achieve any substantial results, it led to the banishment of many members of the Brotherhood to areas outside Jerusalem. The disorder and chaos continued until the Revolution.

The Revolution brought with it hopes of freedom, equality and justice, and ushered in a new era by getting rid of the *ancien régime*. It was in this new era that the majority of the members of the Brotherhood of St. James saw the Revolution as the ultimate opportunity to reform the Patriarchate. In their quest for reform the members of the Brotherhood were also able to mobilize a segment of the Armenian community of Jerusalem. On 25 August 1908 the Brotherhood convened a Synod and decided to call back all the exiled priests of the Patriarchate to remedy the situation.<sup>47</sup> After several failed attempts to convince the Patriarch, the Brotherhood sent another letter, this time with the signatures of 23 priests from the Synod informing the Patriarch that the Synod has decided on the return of the exiled priests.<sup>48</sup>

However, when the third letter from the Synod also went unanswered, the Synod drafted a request for the dismissal of the Grand Sacristan [*Lusararpet*], father Tavit, who according to them was not qualified to fulfill his duties.<sup>49</sup> Members of the Synod argued in this

letter that in addition to failing to protect some important Armenian rights in the Holy Places, he was the main reason for the banishment of many members of the Brotherhood.<sup>50</sup> When all these efforts failed, the Synod appealed to the ANA in Istanbul, and the 'question of Jerusalem' (*Erusaghēmi klm̄tirē*) became one of the most important subjects of debate in this body, a fact which highlights its policy to centralize the administration, as will be seen below.

As tensions between the local lay community and the Patriarchate intensified, Avedis, the aid of the Patriarch, complained to the local government that members of the lay community were going to attack the Patriarchate. The local community, for its part, appealed to the governor of Jerusalem and requested the removal of Avedis.<sup>51</sup> As a result, the Patriarch's deputy, Father Yeghia, sent a letter to the *locum tenens*<sup>52</sup> in Istanbul, Yeghishe Tourian, the president of the ANA, in which he denounced the underhanded activities of Avedis and the Grand Sacristan Tavit. The governor of Jerusalem investigated the situation and, in order to mollify the local population, ordered the Patriarch to remove Avedis from his post.<sup>53</sup> In response the Patriarch banned two priests to Damascus, an act which led the members of the Brotherhood to send a letter of protest to the ANA. In addition, they demanded the expulsion of father Sarkis, Tavit, and Bedros who had exploited the administrative incompetence of Patriarch Haroutiun.<sup>54</sup>

The reading of the letter in the ANA fueled a heated debate among the deputies as to what needed to be done. Deputy Shahrighian Efendi explained that the issue was two-fold, the first pertaining to the reorganization and the second pertaining to finding a remedy for the deteriorating situation in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Deputy Djivanian answered that there were more essential issues to tackle than the Jerusalem problem and protested the interference of the local government in the affairs of the Brotherhood.<sup>55</sup> Meanwhile, the chairman stated that a letter had arrived from the Patriarch of Jerusalem arguing that members of the priesthood had attacked the Patriarchate and that he was resigning from his position.<sup>56</sup> Deputy Manougian responded that the National constitution obliged the Armenian National Assembly to exert its authority as regards the Jerusalem Question when the matter dealt with national jurisdiction and financial losses.

Archbishop Madteos Izmirilyan, who was presiding over the Assembly, proposed that a letter be sent to Patriarch Haroutiun indicating that the ANA would deal with the issue of Jerusalem.<sup>57</sup> After much debate,<sup>58</sup> the Assembly elected a Jerusalem Investigative Commission on 5 December, 1908.<sup>59</sup> The commission that left for Jerusalem was composed of three members, one priest and two lay people, a choice which reflects the extent to which laymen were able to play important roles in ecclesiastic politics in the aftermath of the Revolution.

However, the members of the Jerusalem Brotherhood opposed the recommendations of the commission. When the members of the commission felt that their lives were under threat from the Patriarch and his clique they returned to Jaffa. On 1 December 1908, Patriarch Haroutiun sent a letter to the ANA saying that the Synod had agreed on the return of all exiled priests.<sup>60</sup> In February 1909, the ANA received two letters from the Jerusalem Patriarchate. The first indicated that the investigative commission had not yet presented their recommendations to the Synod and had left for Jaffa. The second argued that there was no need for an investigative commission when peace and order prevailed in the cathedral.<sup>61</sup> These contradictory statements from Jerusalem elicited much agitated debate in the Assembly.<sup>62</sup>

On 22 May the Report of the Investigative Commission was read in the ANA after which Patriarch Izmirilyan gave his farewell speech.<sup>63</sup> The Commission criticized the Brotherhood, the Synod and Father Ghevont who was regarded as responsible for the appropriation of huge sums of money. In addition, the report found Archbishop Kevork Yeritsian, the former representative of Jerusalem in Istanbul, responsible for the deteriorating situation in Jerusalem, and considered him an agent of father Ghevont. On 5 July, the Political Council of the ANA decided to depose the Patriarch of Jerusalem Archbishop Haroutiun Vehabedian according to the nineteenth Article of the Armenian National Constitution and elect a *locum tenens* from the General Assembly.<sup>64</sup> A commission was formed which decided to remove the Patriarch from his position and replace him with a *locum tenens*.<sup>65</sup> The General Assembly supported the decision of the Political Council and decided to appoint Father Daniel Hagopian as a *locum tenens*. The position of the Patriarch in Jerusalem remained vacant from 1910 to 1921.

In 1921 Yeghishe Tourian<sup>66</sup> was elected Patriarch under the regulations of the Constitution of 1888, except that confirmation was given by the British crown, not by the Sultan.<sup>67</sup>

The Revolution led to radical changes in the dynamics of power within the Armenian Quarter of Jerusalem. The micro-Revolution taking place in the Armenian community of Istanbul prompted the Armenian laity and the Armenian clergy of Jerusalem to initiate their own micro-Revolution by bringing down their own *ancien régime* and creating their own new order on the model of their counterpart in Istanbul. Thus, as a result of the transformations taking place in the Empire in general and in the Armenian community of Istanbul in particular, the Armenian community of Jerusalem (both laity and clergy) found the Revolution a valuable opportunity to root out those whom they accused of unjustly controlling the affairs of the local Armenian Patriarchate. When the efforts of the clergy failed they appealed to the ANA, demanding its intervention in the crisis. After the revolution, the ANA became the most important Armenian religious-political center in the Empire. However, when the ANA decided to take the matter into its own hands by sending an investigative commission to Jerusalem, the Jerusalem Patriarchate with its brotherhood, feeling that their autonomous status was endangered, immediately resolved their differences and opposed any such encroachments.

### Patriarch Damianos, the Synod, and the 'Arabophone Question'

As of the early years of Christianity the Arab Orthodox community has existed in the region of Greater Syria. Throughout the course of history they have concentrated in such cities as Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Haifa, Jaffa, and Nazareth. In addition, they formed the majority of the Christians in the Arab villages of the Galilee. As a result of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 AD, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was established, and given jurisdiction over Palestine and the east bank of the Jordan River. During the Byzantine period the Patriarchate of Jerusalem became the head of a hierarchy that included in it five metropolitans, sixty episcopacies, and hundreds of monasteries stretching

all the way from the southern to the northern parts of Palestine. Thus, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem along with the other Orthodox Patriarchates (Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch) became one of the most important spiritual centers for the Orthodox world. Though the Patriarch of Constantinople was an ecumenical patriarch, it had no spiritual domination over the other patriarchates. However, mainly due to its strategic position as the head of the Greek *millet* in the Ottoman Empire and its proximity to the central government, beginning in the sixteenth century the Patriarchate of Constantinople exerted its influence over the other patriarchates, including Jerusalem. Due to this influence, the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher was exclusively made up of the Greek-speaking monks.<sup>68</sup>

When the Balkan states, starting from Greece, obtained their independence from the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century they established their own national churches as a response to growing Hellenism and the influence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.<sup>69</sup> Concomitantly, the Arab Orthodox elements within the greater Syria area were influenced by these transformations and also voiced their discontent with Hellenism and the ways the Greek clergy were controlling the affairs of the Patriarchate. This came at a time when the Arab Orthodox elements argued that their congregations were neglected by the Greek Patriarchate, excluded from the administration of the patriarchate, and were prevented from taking any part in the Patriarchate's decision making processes.

The first manifestation of this discontent took place in 1872 with the deposition of Patriarch Cyril in the form of protests and demonstrations outside Jerusalem.<sup>70</sup> A council called the National Orthodox Association was set up to represent the grievances of the local population, but subsequently these tensions declined. The second phase of the struggle would continue after the Revolution. Interestingly, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Orthodox Russians joined the fray and influenced the Arab Orthodox community through the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society established by the Russian mission.<sup>71</sup> This Society was sympathetic to the Arab Orthodox contentions and aimed at improving their condition through education. By 1895, the Society had 18 schools with 50 teachers and more than 1,000 pupils in

Palestine. These schools were divided into three types: boarding school, day schools in which Russian was taught, and village schools under the control of an Arab teacher where studies were conducted in Arabic. It was from these institutions and other Western Missionary educational institutions, such as St. George's School (1899) and the Collège des Frères (1875) in Jerusalem, that a new generation of Arab orthodox intellectuals would emerge demanding reforms within their communities and a greater say in the affairs of the local Greek Patriarchate.

Hence, the situation regarding the Greek Patriarchate in Jerusalem was more complex than that of the Armenians or the Jews. The impact of the Revolution on the Greeks should be viewed from two perspectives: one involves the internal struggles within the Patriarchate between the Patriarch and the Synod, and the other to the resurfacing of the 'arabophone question' challenging the dominance of Hellenism.<sup>72</sup> To the Orthodox Arabs of Jerusalem the Revolution meant a greater share in the affairs of the Patriarchate. This was also the period in which young educated figures within the community such as Khalil al-Sakakini (1878–1953; an important Palestinian educator),<sup>73</sup> 'Isa al-'Isa and his cousin Yusuf al-'Isa (both editors of the influential newspaper *Filastin*),<sup>74</sup> and Khalil Beidas, played a dominant role in the formation of *al-Nahda al-Urthuduksiyya* by identifying themselves with the Arab National movement.

Al-Sakakini, for instance, was born into an Arab Orthodox family in Jerusalem on 23 January, 1878. After attending the Greek Orthodox School in Jerusalem, he continued his education at the Christian Mission Society (CMS) College founded by the Anglican Bishop Blyth, and at the Zion English College, both situated in Jerusalem. Later he travelled to the United Kingdom and from there to the United States where he stayed until the Revolution translating and writing for Arabic literary magazines on the East Coast and also doing translations for Professor Richard Gottheil at Columbia University. When the constitution was proclaimed in 1908, al-Sakakini along with some other intellectuals residing in exile returned to their hometowns. In Jerusalem, al-Sakakini worked as a journalist for the Jerusalem newspaper *al-Asma'i* [named after the famous Medieval scholar al-Asma'i] and taught Arabic at the *Salabiyya* school (Ste. Anne).

ʿIsa al-ʿIsa, born in 1878, was a close friend of al-Sakakini and was the editor of *Filastin* that was first published on 14 January, 1911 in Jaffa. He studied at the École des Frères in Jaffa and then graduated from the Greek Orthodox school and seminary in Kiftin in northern Lebanon in 1897.<sup>75</sup> In 1908 al-ʿIsa played an important role through his articles in the press that stressed the need to increase the role of the Arab Orthodox community in managing the affairs of the Greek Patriarchate.

Khalil Beidas, who was born in Nazareth in 1874 was one of Palestine's foremost intellectuals in the early twentieth century. He studied at the Russian Orthodox School and the Russian Teachers' Training center in Nazareth and graduated from there in 1892 and became a senior Arabic teacher at the Anglican St. George's School in Jerusalem. After travelling to Russia at the end of the nineteenth century he became influenced by the ideas of the major Russian cultural nationalists such as the writers Fyodor Dostoyevsky (1821–1881), Maxim Gorky (1868–1936), and Leo Tolstoi (1828–1910). Upon his return to Palestine, he embarked on translating the works of major figures in Russian literature. Beidas had very strong connections with the Russian Orthodox Church and as a result he became a leading figure in the Arab Orthodox community of Palestine and represented their interests to the Greek Patriarchate. In addition, through his journal *al-Nafa'is al-ʿAsriyya* [Modern Treasures], Beidas became a key proponent of the Palestinian national movement. The Young Turk Revolution was a turning point for these intellectuals, who saw the period as one in which they could represent the interests of the Arab Orthodox community in a more active way.

The Constitution that was reinstated after the Revolution contained a provision which became the source of all subsequent tensions between the Arab Orthodox community and the Patriarchate on the one hand, and the Patriarch and the Synod on the other. It gave the Arab Orthodox community the opportunity to have a greater say in its own affairs as well as those of the Patriarchate, as attested in the diaries of Khalil al-Sakakini.<sup>76</sup> The provision found in Article 111 of the restored Ottoman Constitution stated that in each *qada* [district]

there would be a council of each community residing in the area. The duties of this council included:

- 1) The administration of the revenues of immovable and capital sums subject to pious endowments (*waqf*) according to the stipulations of the founders and consistent with previous customs.
- 2) The use of properties designated for philanthropic aims complying with conditions prescribed in the endowment deeds relating thereto.
- 3) The administration of the properties of orphans in compliance with the special regulations on this subject.

On 15 September, 1908 six priests and fifteen lay notables of Jerusalem announced the election of a council of forty with the aim of carrying out the provisions of Article 111. On 25 September, 1908 the request was submitted to Patriarch Damianos<sup>77</sup> by father Khalil. Al-Sakakini explains in his memoirs:

The Patriarch said: 'For four or five generations the Church has adhered to a well-a known policy necessitated by conditions and situations. Now that there is a new constitution this policy should be changed but we do not know what measures will be taken until the Parliament convenes. For that reason I cannot give you a positive or a negative response. It seems to me that you moved too quickly and it would be much better if you waited until Parliament convenes, since by then we might be able to initiate a gradual reform.'<sup>78</sup>

Al-Sakakini mentions that the deputation told the Patriarch that it was not its intention to undermine the rights of the Patriarchate, but rather to attempt to restore the usurped rights of the community.<sup>79</sup> The Patriarch explained to the deputation the legal position of the Patriarchate and proposed the appointment of a mixed committee to discuss it.<sup>80</sup> The committee met several times to discuss the implications of the provisions, but during the third meeting its lay members put forward eighteen demands. On 22 October, 1908 the

Patriarch rejected these demands but it was arranged that a mixed committee would look into the matter.<sup>81</sup> On 1 November the committee presented a demand to the Patriarch in the form of an ultimatum in which it called for the formation of a Mixed Council to be chosen annually. The Mixed Council would consist of six members of the clergy and six members of the lay community. This demand, which was based on the recently established model that existed in the Patriarchate of Istanbul, was rejected by the Patriarch, a situation leading to increased tensions within the community.<sup>82</sup> The Patriarch sent letters to the central government in Istanbul asking for their intervention. The church of St. James near the Holy Sepulcher, which was frequented by the Arab Orthodox clergy and community members of Jerusalem, was closed in order to avoid disturbances during the feast of St. James. On 24 November the local Arab Orthodox population organized a demonstration and it was decided to send a deputation to Constantinople.<sup>83</sup> The tensions between the lay Arab-Orthodox community and the Greek clergy rapidly spread to other cities of Palestine such as Jaffa and Bethlehem.<sup>84</sup> Some five thousand members of the community went on a religious strike, boycotting the churches. Due to the fact that St. James was closed they conducted their service in the Cemetery of Zion.<sup>85</sup> Meanwhile the Patriarch submitted a petition to the Grand Vizier in which he represented the position of the Patriarchate and further argued that the local community was already benefiting from the church's revenues and thus there was no need to form such a committee.

Members of the Synod of Jerusalem, mostly consisting of Greeks, were not happy with the way the Patriarch was handling the issue. They thought that he was sympathetic to the demands of the Arab laity and accused him of working without the approval of the Synod.<sup>86</sup> His decision to compromise rather than make a clear decision in favor of the Patriarchate was perceived as highly dangerous. In an official meeting the Synod decided unanimously that the Patriarch should resign and if he refused to do so he would be deposed. However, when the Patriarch refused to resign two members of the Fraternity were sent on the night of 26 December to the governor to announce his deposition. The Synod pronounced him incapable of assuming the burden of

his office.<sup>87</sup> The deposition (*pavsis*) was approved at the general meeting of the Brotherhood the next day, and Archbishop Tiberias was elected as the *locum tenens* (*Topoteretes*).<sup>88</sup>

When the Brotherhood saw that the depositions did not work they resorted to *kathairesis* which implied that it 'altogether and permanently extinguishes the clerical character of the person affected'.<sup>89</sup> The Patriarch, nevertheless, did not relinquish his responsibilities and it was decided to postpone the *kathairesis* until after Orthodox Christmas. The main problem was that the *locum tenens* was recognized by the government only on 2 February, 1909. This in itself implied the deposition of Damianos. As a result the local Arab Orthodox population reacted negatively to the decision in the cities of Bethlehem (especially during Christmas), Jaffa and Ramle. Upon hearing the news in Jerusalem the community members occupied the Patriarchate in Jerusalem.<sup>90</sup> The Patriarch refused to comply with the deposition order and demanded that the central government send an investigative commission. The government consented and after some delay dispatched a committee of three members, under the presidency of Nazim Paşa, the Governor of Syria – a clear sign of the conflict's significance. On 8 February the committee reached Jerusalem and tried in vain to bring about a compromise.<sup>91</sup> This coincided with political changes in Istanbul when Hilmi Paşa became the Grand Vizier. He decided to summon both the Patriarch Damianos and the two Archimandrites who were responsible for the movement against him to Istanbul. The Patriarch, however, did not travel to Istanbul, claiming ill health. Things became worse when the *locum tenens* died, and the Synod elected a new *locum tenens* who was never recognized by the government. On 1 March, Nazim Paşa announced that 'he would not be responsible for the safety of anyone unless the Synod and the Brotherhood on that day recognized Damianos'.<sup>92</sup> The Synod thereupon capitulated and passed a resolution recognizing Patriarch Damianos. It was only on 25 July, 1909 that the Ecumenical Patriarch of Istanbul recognized him as Patriarch.<sup>93</sup>

On 8 March, 1909 the Synod reversed its previous decision to reduce the rental allowances of the Orthodox Community. On 26 July representatives of local lay community visited Istanbul to discuss the demands of the community. On 12 October the committee returned

to Jerusalem. In November it became obvious that the government's response would be favorable to the Patriarchate, a fact which caused agitation. The substance of the decision was announced in December 1909, but it was not until 30 May 1910 that the full text was published.<sup>94</sup> The laity had six principal demands: to have a constitution for the communal councils in accordance with Article 111 of the Ottoman Constitution, a mixed council on the model of Istanbul, admission of native Arab Palestinians to the monasteries and their promotion to all ecclesiastic ranks, increased representation of local inhabitants in the election of patriarchs, bishops required to live in their Dioceses, and finally monks to be prohibited from engaging in secular occupations.

In general the government's decision was very favorable to the Brotherhood, as most of the demands of the community were rejected. These demands, which entailed greater participation of the laity in the affairs of the Patriarchate, were considered a threat to the Hellenic and ecclesiastic nature of the Brotherhood. However, one concession was made: the establishment of a Mixed Council for certain purposes and the assignment of one-third of the revenues of the Patriarchate to the Council. Some Christian Arabs viewed the report with dismay and cynicism. On the other hand others saw it as a source of hope that by means of their influence in the newly constituted Mixed Council the educational rights of their children might at last be recognized.<sup>95</sup> Subsequent controversies took place afterwards. It was only in 1913 that all the tensions were dissipated during a visit by Acmi Bey, the Ottoman Minister of Justice. In 1914 the Orthodox church of St. James was opened again to public service and the Patriarch celebrated mass there.

### Conclusion

In an era of rising nationalisms, nation states, and increased global communication, ethnic politics in the Ottoman Empire intensified after the Revolution of 1908 and became one of the major catalysts in the precipitation of inter-ethnic tensions, culminating in the dissolution of the Empire. Despite the fact that the Revolution opened new horizons and new opportunities for the ethnic groups, it also created

severe challenges both for the architects of the Revolution and the ethnic groups. The post-Revolutionary period became the litmus test for the endurance/sustainability of the main principle of the Revolution: the creation of an Ottoman identity based on equality, fraternity and liberty, whose allegiance would be to the Empire. Achieving this goal was extremely difficult in a period when all ethno-religious groups in the Empire began projecting their own perception of what it meant to be an Ottoman citizen. Many of these ethnic groups viewed the Young Turk Revolution as the beginning of a new era in which the emphasis was to be more on national identity, a byproduct of modernity. In this equation of modernity, it was hoped that ethnic groups would be represented based on their universal/national identity rather than on an ethno-religious basis. Ottomanism was to be the title of their book with their particular identities as the subtitles. However, as seen, the outcomes of the Revolution were contradictory in that it was not able to eliminate religious representation. On the contrary, the government's open support for all the religious leaders illustrates its reluctance to emphasize the separate national character of these communities.

The contested city of Jerusalem provides a good case study of the struggles and complexities of the post-Revolutionary period. In the confines of the old city walls the echoes of the Revolution brought hope to the disenchanted elements in these communities. In all the three cases discussed in this chapter the Revolution prompted major changes in the dynamics of power within these communities. The waves of micro-revolutions taking place within these communities in Istanbul echoed in Jerusalem. What followed was an internal struggle between the different elements of these communities, a struggle that can be best understood as one taking place between secularism/religion on the one hand and localism/nationalism on the other.

In the Armenian case, when the ANA of Istanbul, representing the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire decided to take the matter into its own hands, the Jerusalem Patriarchate with its brotherhood felt that their autonomous status was endangered and immediately resolved their differences and opposed any such external encroachments. In the Jewish case the struggle between the pro-Panigel and

anti-Panigel factions became a microcosm of struggle between the different political and social trends emerging in the Empire. The case of the Greeks was unique in that unlike the Jews and Armenians, the community was ethnically different from that of the religious hierarchy. The Revolution thus proved to be a defining moment for the Arab-Orthodox communities in Palestine to achieve what they had aimed for, namely to abolish the Hellenism that had ruled the Patriarchate for centuries and to take on a dominant role in the affairs of the Patriarchate. The reluctance of the Ottoman government to support the Arab Orthodox laity and their open support for the established religious hierarchy reveals the contradictory dimension of the Revolution, which ostensibly sought to undermine religious representations and create a secular Ottoman citizenship. One explanation for this behavior is that the central government did not want to encourage the Arab-Orthodox community which was going through a process of national revival because of their direct involvement in the Arab national movement. It should be borne in mind that at the time members of this community played an important role in the rise of Arab nationalism in general, and Palestinian nationalism in particular. The growing national sentiments among the Arabs as well as other ethnic groups were considered by the Young Turks as a threat to the integrity of their vision of the Empire. In order to undermine the development of these identities they were apparently ready to jettison the major ideals of the Revolution.

### Notes

1. Alexander Schölch estimated the number in 1914 to be 70,270 Muslims, 32,461 Christians, and 18,190 Jews. According to the British Mandate census of 1922 Jerusalem had 13,300 Muslims, 14,700 Christians, and 34,100 Jews. See Schölch, Alexander, 'Jerusalem in the 19th century', in Asali, K.J., (ed.), *Jerusalem in History* (Brookline, N.Y., 1990), p. 232.
2. See Tziper, Daniel, *Ha-Degel ha-Tzioni Me'al ha-Bosphoros: Ha-Maccabi be-Kushia beyn Tzionut le-'Otmaniyut 1895–1923* [The Zionist Flag over the Bosphorus: the Maccabi in Istanbul between Zionism and Ottomanism 1895–1923] (Jerusalem, 2000) [in Hebrew].
3. Fresko, David, *Le Sionisme* (Istanbul, 1909).

4. In the second half of the nineteenth century, until the reign of the Armenian Patriarch of Istanbul Maghakia Ormanian (1896–1908), the Armenian National Assembly became an important political venue for the Armenians through which they discussed the social, political, and economic affairs pertaining to their community. Thus, the Assembly became the first non-traditional institution (a mini-parliament) in conventional politics was the rule, including elections, voting, hearings, debates, exchange of ideas, and decision-making process.
5. Aslanian, Dikran, 'Hosank'ner ew nerhosank'ner' [Currents and Undercurrents], *Puzantion*, 22 August, 1908, 3610, p. 1 [in Armenian].
6. Puzant Kecheyan, 'Ankum Pateriak' Ōrmaneani' [The Fall of Patriarch Ormanian], *Puzantion*, 30 July, 1908, 3591, p. 2.
7. 'Ōrmaneani Tapalumē' [The Collapse of Ormanian], *Droshak*, July 1908, No.7 (195), p. 105 [in Armenian]. By using the word 'supreme', Droshak is referring to the Sultan.
8. Khalidi, Rashid, *Palestinian Identity: the Construction of Modern National Consciousness* (New York, 1997), p. 88.
9. Galanté, Avraham, *Histoire des Juifs d'Istanbul* (Istanbul, 1985), Vol.1, pp. 258–9.
10. Benbassa, Esther (ed.), *Haim Nahum: A Sephardic Chief Rabbi in Politics, 1892–1923*, translated from French by Miriam Kochan (Tuscaloosa and London, 1995).
11. Nahum to J. Bigart (11 January, 1909) AAIU, Turkey, XXX E. in Benbassa: *Haim Nahum*, p. 154.
12. On the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* and their politics in the Ottoman Empire see Rodrigue, Aron, *French Jews, Turkish Jews: The Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Politics of Jewish Schooling in Turkey, 1860–1925* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1990).
13. Raphael Shimon received 9 votes, Moshe Haviv 2, and Avraham Danon 1. For detailed information on the elections see 'La Eleksyon del Gran Rabinato de Turkiya: La junta del ayer del Mejlis 'Umumi' [The Elections of the Chief Rabbinate of Turkey: The Yesterday Gathering of the General Assembly], *El Tiempo*, 23 January 1908 [in Ladino]. For Haim Nahum's reaction to the election in the Ladino press in Palestine see 'Rabbi Haim Nahum Gran Rabino de Turkiya' [Rabbi Haim Nahum Chief Rabbi of Turkey], *El Liberal*, 29 January 1909 [in Ladino].
14. Eighty five delegates out of a hundred and twenty, from the provinces participated in the elections.
15. 'La Eleksyon del Gran Rabani de Turkiya: La Impresyon en el payis y en el estranyrro' [The Elections of the Chief Rabbi of Turkey: The Impression in the Country and Abroad], *El Tiempo*, 3 February 1909 [in Ladino].

16. For the letters sent to the *bahambast* see HM2 8639; HM2 8640; HM2 8641 in The Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem (CAHJP).
17. 'Turkey: The Chief Rabbinate in the Empire', *The Jewish Chronicle*, 4 September 1908.
18. Nahum to J. Bigart, (Constantinople, 6 September 1908) AAIU, Turkey, XXXE in Benbassa: *Haim Nabum*, p. 146.
19. On the struggles in Damascus before and after the Revolution see Harel, Yaron, *Between Intrigues and Revolution: The Appointment and Dismissal of Chief Rabbis in Baghdad, Damascus, and Aleppo 1744–1914* (Jerusalem, 2007), pp. 231–5 [in Hebrew]. On the situation of the Jews in Baghdad after the Revolution see *ibid.*, pp. 306–327.
20. 'Las Komunidades Israelitas de la Provensya: Destitusyon de los grandes rabinos de Yerusalayim, de Damasko i de Sayda' [The Jewish Communities of the Provinces: The Dismissal of the Chief Rabbis of Jerusalem, Damascus and Sidon], *El Tiempo*, 2 September 1908.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Rabbi Panigel was appointed provisionally and charged with convening an assembly of the heads of the community to plan elections for the chief Rabbi within three months.
23. 'Las Komunidades Israelitas de la Provensya: Yerusalayim, Damasko i Sayda' [The Jewish Communities of the Provinces: Jerusalem, Damascus and Sidon], *El Tiempo*, 4 September 1908.
24. On the struggles over the Jerusalem Rabbinate in general see Sharaby, Rachel, 'The Chief Sephardic Rabbinate, 1906–1914: Conflicts and Personalities', *Cathedra* 37 (1985), pp. 106–112 [in Hebrew]; Haim, Abraham, 'The Hakham Bashi of Istanbul and the "Rabbinate Controversy" in Jerusalem', *Pe'amim* 12 (1982), pp. 105–113 [in Hebrew].
25. On Rabbi Elyashar, see Efrati, Nathan, *Mishpabat Elyashar be-Tokhekhay Yerusbalayim: Prakim be-Toldot ha-Yishuv ha-Yebudi bi-Yerusbalayim ha-Me'ot ha-Tesha'-Esreh veka-Esrim* [The Elyashar Family in Jerusalem: A Chapter in the History of the Jewish Community in Jerusalem in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century] (Jerusalem, 1974) [in Hebrew]; see also Gaon, Moshe David, *Yehudei ha-Mizrah be-Eretz Yisra'el: Avar ve-Hove* [The Oriental Jews in Eretz Yisra'el-Past and Present] (Jerusalem, 1937), pp. 61–8 [in Hebrew].
26. On Haim Moshe Elyashar see *ibid.*, pp. 59–60.
27. On Ya'akov Meir, see *ibid.*, pp. 361–71; *idem*, 'Rabbi Jacob Meir', *Le Judaïsme séphardi*, VIII (June, 1939), pp. 81–3.
28. On Antebi and the role of the AIU in Palestine during that period see Lazare, Lucien, 'L'Alliance Israélite Universelle en Palestine à l'époque de la

- révolution des "Jeunes Turcs" et sa mission en Orient du 29 October 1908 au 19 Janvier 1909', *Revue des Études Juives* CXXXVIII/3-4 (juill.-déc. 1979), pp. 307-335.
29. Almaliach was the editor of the Ladino newspaper *El Liberal*, published in Palestine, which had an anti-Panigel policy. See for example, "Et la-davar: La Kestyon del Gran Rabino de Yeruslayim" [The Time Arrived: The Question of the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem], *El Liberal*, 19 March 1908.
  30. On the 10 July 1907 Ekrem Bey, the governor of Jerusalem, sent a letter to the Grand Vizier in Istanbul expressing the opinion that Ya'akov Meir 'was not worthy of being appointed Rabbi through general elections given the seditious activities of the above mentioned Antebi'. Ekrem Bey to the Grand Vezir, 13 July 1907 document 13 in Kushner, David, *A Governor in Jerusalem: The City and Province in the Eyes of Ali Ekrem Bey, 1906-1908* (Jerusalem, 1995), p. 97 [in Hebrew]. On Ekrem's point of view on the elections of 1907; see document 14, pp. 98-100.
  31. On Moshe Eliyahu Panigel, see Gaon: *Yehudei ha-Mizrab*, pp. 527-30.
  32. See Friedman, Isaiah, 'The Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden, The German Foreign Ministry, and the Controversy with the Zionists, 1901-1918', *Catbedra* 20 (July 1981), pp. 97-122 [in Hebrew].
  33. Sharaby: 'The Chief Sephardic Rabbinate', p. 109.
  34. Ezra Society was formed in Berlin in 1901 to promote Jewish education in Palestine and Eastern Europe.
  35. On the relationship of Rabbi Panigel with Ezra see 'Li-Sh'elat behirat haham bashi li-Yerushalayim' [On the Question of Electing a Chief Rabbi for Jerusalem], *Habazeleth*, 28 December 1908 [in Hebrew].
  36. See 'La Kestyon Rabinika en Yeruslayim' [The Question of the Rabininate in Jerusalem], *El Tiempo*, 11 November 1908.
  37. 'Hezkiya Shabatai', *Hazewi*, 13 December 1908, 51, p. 2; 'Yeruslayim' [Jerusalem], *Habazeleth*, 9 December 1908 [in Hebrew].
  38. 'Yerushalayim' [Jerusalem], *Habazeleth*, 20 January 1909; 'Yerushalayim', *Habazeleth*, 25 January 1909.
  39. 'Yerushalayim', *Habazeleth*, 17 February 1909; 'Yerushalayim', *El Liberal*, 19 February 1908. On his life see Gaon: *Yehudei ha-Mizrab be-Eretz Yisra'el*, pp. 141-2.
  40. On Rabbi Franco see *ibid.*, pp. 567-8.
  41. Most of the historiography written about the Armenians of Jerusalem in the twentieth century is in Armenian. In English see Antreassian, Assadour, *Jerusalem and the Armenians* (Jerusalem, 1969); Hintlian, George, *History of the Armenians in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1976); Azaria, Victor, *The Armenian Quarter of Jerusalem: Urban Life Behind Monastery Walls* (Berkley,

- Calif, 1984); Rose, John H. Melkon, *Armenians of Jerusalem: Memoirs of Life in Palestine* (London and New York, 1993); Sanjian, Ara, 'The Armenian Church and community of Jerusalem', in O'Mahony, Anthony (ed.), *The Christian Communities of Jerusalem and the Holy Land: Studies in History, Religion and Politics* (Cardiff, 2003).
42. The Brotherhood is a monastic order of the Armenian Church in Jerusalem.
  43. Sanjian: 'The Armenian Church', p. 63.
  44. Ajamian, Shahe Bishop, 'Sultan Abdul Hamid and the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem', in Ma'oz, Moshe (ed.), *Studies on Palestine during the Ottoman Period* (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. 344–7.
  45. This included the steward of the Patriarchate, Father Ghevont, who had appropriated huge sums of money and the servant of the Patriarch, a layman called Avedis Tashjian.
  46. On Ormanian's commission, see Maksoudian, Ghevont Father, *Erusaghēmi Kbandirē* [The Question of Jerusalem], Vol. I (Istanbul, 1908) [in Armenian].
  47. A synod is a council of a church convened to decide on issues pertaining to doctrine, administration or application.
  48. The twenty three members of the Synod to Patriarch Haroutiun Vehabedian, 28 August 1908. A copy of the letter appeared in the daily *Arevelk*, 3 October 1908 [in Armenian].
  49. The Grand Sacristan is the second most powerful figure after the Patriarch. His duties include the administration of the entire Brotherhood.
  50. Members of the Synod to Patriarch Haroutiun Vehabedian, 14 October 1908. A copy of the letter appears in M.D.S, *Erusaghēmi verjin dēpk'erē*, pp. 12–14.
  51. 'Al-Quds al-Sharif' [Holy Jerusalem], *al-Muqattam*, 29 October 1908 [in Arabic].
  52. Locum tenens is a Latin phrase which means place-holder. In the Church system the Locum tenens is a person who temporarily fulfills the duties of the Patriarch until the election of a new Patriarch.
  53. 'Spasavor Avedis Erusaghēmi Vank'en Vedarwats' [Servant Avedis Expelled from the Monastery], *Jamanag*, 11 November 1908 [in Armenian]. 'Ba-mahane ha-armeni' [in the Armenian camp], *Hazewi*, 23 November 1908.
  54. Father Vertanes and Father Karekin to the Chairman of the ANA Torkomian Efendi, 7 November 1908, a copy of the letter appears in the minutes of the ANA. See *Azgayin Ėndhanur Zboghov*, Nist Ė [Session VII], 7 November 1908, p. 79 [in Armenian].
  55. Ibid.

56. 'Erusaghēmi Vichakē kē 'Tsanranay' [The Condition of Jerusalem Gets Worse], *Jamanag*, 20 November 1908.
57. See Azgayin Ĕndhanur Zhoghov, Nist Ĕ [Session VII], 7 November 1908, p. 80.
58. Ibid., Nist T' [Session IX], 21 November 1908, pp. 121–27.
59. Ibid., Nist Zh [Session X], 5 December 1908.
60. From Patriarch Haroutiun to Madteos II Izmiriliyan Patriarch of Istanbul, 1 December 1908, 157. A copy of the letter appears in *Azgayin Ĕndhanur Zhoghov*, Nist ZhG [Session XIII], 26 December 1908, p. 183. This caused confusion in the meeting because in his previous letters Patriarch Haroutiun had expressed apprehension about Archbishop Kevork Yeritzian, but was now advocating his return.
61. On the letters see *Azgayin Ĕndhanur Zhoghov*, Nist ZhZ [Session XVI], 13 February 1909, pp. 230–31.
62. Ibid., p. 231.
63. Archbishop Madteos Izmirilyan was reelected as Patriarch of Istanbul on 4 November 1908. 'Amen T.T. Matt'ēos Izmirliyan Verēntrwadz Patriark' T'urk'yo Hayots' [His Beatitude Madteos Izmirliyan Re-elected as Patriarch of Armenians of Turkey], *Arevelk*, 5 November 1908; *Azgayin Ĕndhanur Zhoghov*, Nist E [Session V], October 22, 1908. For the report see *Teghebagir Erusaghēmi Hashuots' K'nnich' Khorhrdaranakan Handznazhoghovoy, matuts'uat's Azgayin Eresp', Zhoghovin: 1909 Mayis 22i IA nistin* (K. Polis, 1909).
64. *Azgayin Ĕndhanur Zhoghov*, Nist IB [Session XXII], 5 June 1909, p. 361.
65. See 'Teghebagir Erusaghēmi S. Patriark'in dēm Eghadz Ambastanut'iants' K'nnich' Khorhrdaranakan Hants'nazhoghowoy', in *Azgayin Ĕndhanur Zhoghov*, Nist IZ [Session XXVI], 17 July 1909, pp. 434–7.
66. For a complete biography of Patriarch Turian see Koushagian, Torkom Arch., *Eghishe Patriark' Durean* [Patriarch Yeghishe Turian] (Jerusalem, 1932).
67. In the Ottoman Empire it was the Sultan who confirmed the elections of the heads of the *millets*.
68. The Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher is the Orthodox Monastic Fraternity that for centuries has guarded the Christian Holy places in the Holy Land.
69. Shea, John, *Macedonia and Greece: The Struggle to Define a New Balkan Nation* (Jefferson, N.C., 1997), p. 173.
70. Bertram, Anton Sir and Harry Charles Luke, *Report of the Commission Appointed by the Government of Palestine to Inquire into the Affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem* (Humphrey Milford, 1921), p. 72.
71. Hopwood, Derek, *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine 1843–1914: Church and Politics in the Near East* (Oxford, 1969).

72. Ibid; Bertram and Charles: *Report of the Commission*; Mahony, Anthony O., 'Palestinian-Arab Orthodox Christians: religion, politics, and church-state relations in Jerusalem, c. 1908–1925', *Chronos* 3 (2000), pp. 61–87; Katz, Itamar and Ruth Kark, 'The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and its congregation: dissent over real estate', *The International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37 (2005), pp. 509–534; Vatikiotis, P. J., 'The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem between Hellenism and Arabism', *Middle Eastern Studies* 30/4 (1994), pp. 916–29; Clogg, Richard, 'The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire', in Braude, Benjamin and Bernard Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. I, p. 185 (New York, 1982).
73. See Al-Sakakni, Khalil, *The Diaries of Khalil Sakakini: New York, Sultana, Jerusalem, 1907–1912*, Volume I, edited by Musallam, Akram (Jerusalem, 2003) [in Arabic]. The diaries of Kahalil al-Sakakini are an important source for reconstructing the history of Palestine during the Late Ottoman and the British mandate periods. The diaries, an eight-volume series in Arabic began to be published in 2003. To date six volumes of the diaries have been published by the Khalil Skakakini Center (Ramallah) and the Institute of Palestine Studies (Beirut and Jerusalem).
74. See Ayalon, Ami, *Reading Palestine: Printing and Literacy* (Austin, 2004) and Khalidi: *Palestinian Identity*.
75. For a detailed study on 'Isa al-'Isa see Bracy, Michael *Building Palestine: 'Isa al-'Isa, Filastin, and the Textual Construction of a National Identity, 1911–1931* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation: University of Arkansas, 2005).
76. Al-Sakakni, *The Diaries of Kbalil Sakakini*, p. 291.
77. Damianos was the 132nd Patriarch of Jerusalem. He was born and educated in the Island of Samos, nowadays in Greece. In July 1897 he was elected Patriarch by the Holy Synod. Previously he had been the Titular Archbishop of Philadelphia (Amman). See Dowling, Archdeacon, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem* (London, 1909), p. 17.
78. Al-Sakakni, *The Diaries of Kbalil Sakakini*, p. 298. On these demands see Metaxakis, Meletios, *Les exigences des Orthodoxes Arabophones de Palestine* (Constantinople, 1909).
79. Al-Sakakni, *The Diaries of Kbalil Sakakini*, p. 291.
80. Ibid., p. 304.
81. Bertram and Luke: *Report of the Commission*, p. 252; al-Sakakni, *The Diaries of Kbalil Sakakini*, p. 320.
82. Bertram, Anton and J.W.A Young, *Report of the Commission on Controversies between the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Arab Orthodox Community* (London, 1928), p. 252.
83. Al-Sakakni, *The Diaries of Kbalil Sakakini*, p. 342.

84. Bertram and Young: *Report of the Commission*, p. 253.
85. Bliss, Frederick Jones, *The Religions of Modern Syria and Palestine* (New York, 1917), p. 70.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 255.
87. *Ibid.*
88. Bertram and Young: *Report of the Commission*, p. 256.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 257.
90. *Ibid.*, p. 258.
91. Bertram and Young: *Report of the Commission*, p. 258.
92. *Ibid.*, pp. 260-1.
93. *Ibid.*, p. 264.
94. For the full demands and the response of the government see *Ibid.*, pp. 265-9.
95. Bliss: *The Religions of Modern Syria and Palestine*, p. 72.