

CONCEPTION OF THE UNION
IN THE
ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE OF ANTIOCH
(1622 - 1672)
HISTORICAL PART

by Abdallah Raheb

Doctor of Theology
Licentiate in Philosophy
Diploma in German Letters
Professor of Ecumenical Sciences at the University of Kaslik

Beirut 1981

translated by Nicholas J. Samra

To their Beatitudes the five Patriarchs,
Orthodox and Catholic, who bear the title of
the city of God, Antioch.

In commemoration of the second
Ecumenical Council held in 381 in
Constantinople, the General Council that
inspired a new ecumenical spirit in the
universal Church of Christ invigorated by
the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the
Father.

Table of Contents

Page

Initials and Abbreviations

Sources and Bibliography:

I. Sources:

- 1) Unpublished
- 2) Published

II. Bibliography

Introduction

Historical Context

Chapter I: A Questionable Patriarch in the Patriarchate of Antioch (1619-1628)

Chapter II: The Patriarchate of Antioch Under Ignatios III Atieh (1682- beginning of 1634)

- 1) Synod of Ras-Baalbek (June 1628)
- 2) Ignatios III and Rome
- 3) Death of patriarch Ignatios III
- 4) Latin Missionaries at Work

Chapter III: From Metropolitan (1612-1634) to Patriarch (8 months) Karmeh First Martyr of the Union of Antioch With Rome

- 1) Meletios Karmeh: Metropolitan of Aleppo (February 1612-April 1634)
- 2) Euthymios II Karmeh, Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch (May 1, 1634-January 1, 1635)
- 3) Patriarch Karmeh Martyr of the Union
- 4) The Latin Missionaries at Work

Chapter IV: The Patriarchate of Antioch Under Euthymios III, Originally from Chios (1635-1647)

- 1) A Timid Patriarch
- 2) Beginning of a Roman Crusade in the Patriarchate of Antioch

Chapter V: The Patriarchate of Antioch On the Way to Catholicization Under Macarios III Zaim (1647-1672)

- 1) The “Zaim” Macarios III of Aleppo
- 2) Macarios III and the Orthodox World (1647-1660)
- 3) Macarios III and His Ecumenical Mission (1661-1672)
- 4) The Greeks of Antioch on the Way to Catholicization under Macarios III

Chapter VI: Antiochian Conception of the Union According to the Studied Accounts

(This chapter will be the subject of another part)

- 1) Place of the Council of Florence in These Transactions
- 2) Privileged Place of Rome
- 3) Autonomy of Antioch and Inter-Orthodox Collegiality
- 4) Living the Union in Collaboration with Local Visibly Separated Churches
- 5) Possibility of Being in Communion with Rome without Breaking with its Orthodox Brothers

Conclusion

INITIALS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- AAS = Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Rome 1909 ff.
Acta = Cf. Unpublished Sources.
Al-Maçarrat = Arabic Review of the Greek Melkite Catholic Patriarchate, Harissa 1910 ff.
Al-Machreq = Arabic Review of the University of St. Joseph in Beirut 1898 ff.
Bacha, Voyage = Cf. Published Sources.
Bessarione = Bessarione, Rome 1901 – 1923.
Besson = J. Besson, La Syrie et la Terre Sainte au XVII siècle, Poitiers-Paris 1862.
(The first edition of 1660 has the title: La Syrie sainte).
BZ = Byzantinische Zeitschrift, Leipzig 1892 ff.
Collectio Lacensis = Cf. Published Sources.
Collectanea = Cf. Published Sources.
Congr. = General Congregation of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.
CP = Cf. Unpublished Sources.
CSCO = Cf. Published Sources.
DAFC = Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique, Paris 1909 – 1931.
DDC = Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, Paris 1935 ff.
De Martinis = Published Sources.
DHGE = Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique, Paris 192 ff.
DThC = Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Paris 1903 – 1950.
EO = Echos d'Orient, Kadlikoy-Bucarest-Paris, 1897 – 1942.
ERM = Encyclopédie Religieuse et Morale (in Greek), I-XII, Athens 1963 – 1968.
Fondo di Vienna = Cf. Unpublished Sources.
Grumel, Chronologie = V. Grumel, Traité d'études Byzantines, I (Chronologie), Paris 1958.
Kilzi = Cf. Published Sources.
Kimmel = Cf. Published Sources.
Le Quien = M. Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, II, Paris 1740 (Nouveau triage anastatique: Ganz 1958).
Le Lien = Bulletin of the Greek-Melkite Catholic Patriarchate beginning in 1968 (before this date it was al-Maçarrat).
LThK = Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (2nd edition), Freiburg, 1957 – 1964.
Macarios of Aleppo = Published Sources.
Mansi = Cf. Published Sources.
Michalescu = Published Sources.
Musset = H. Musset, Histoire du Christianisme spécialement en Orient, vol. II, Jerusalem 1948.
Nasrallah, Chronologie = J. Nasrallah, Chronologie des Patriarcats Melchites d'Antioche de 1500 à 1634, Paris 1959.
Nasrallah, Notes et Documents = Cf. Published Sources.
NRTh = Nouvelle Revue Théologique, Tournai-Paris.
OC = Orientalia Christiana, Rome 1923 – 1934.

OCA = Orientalia Christiana Analecta, Rome 1935 ff.
OCP = Orientalia Christiana Periodica, Rome 1935 ff.
PG = Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus, Greek series, Paris-Montrogne 1856 – 1866.
PL = Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus, Latin series, Paris-Montrogne 1844 – 1864.
PO = Graffin-Nau, Patrologia Orientalis, Paris 1930 ff.
POC = Proche-Orient Chrétien, Jerusalem 1951 ff.
Rabbath = Cf. Published Sources.
Radu = Cf. Published Sources.
REB = Revue des Etudes Byzantines, Paris.
REG = Revue des Etudes Grecques, Paris.
RO = Roma e l’Orient, Rome 1910 – 1921.
ROC = Revue de l’Orient Chrétien, Paris 1895 – 1946.
RThL = Revue Théologique de Louvain, Louvain 1970 ff.
Rustum = Rustum, Asad (Historian of the Apostolic Throne of Antioch, died in June 1965), The Church of the City of God, Great Antioch (I Arabic), vol. III (1453-1928), Beirut not dated (surely after 1960, cf. p. 378 of this volume).
SC = Cf. Unpublished Sources.
SOCG = Cf. Unpublished Sources.

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

1) Unpublished: (What directly or indirectly concerns the Greeks of Antioch in the Archives of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith).

- *Acta* = Acts of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith: volumes: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, (vol. 40 has two books), 41, 42, 43.
- *CP* = Congregazioni particolari: volumes 20, 21, 30, 48.
- *Fondo di Vienna* = vol. 32 (1661-1679).
- *SC* = Scritture Riferite nei Congressi: Greci Melchiti, 6 Miscellanea; Greci, vol. 1 (1622-1700); vol. 2 (1701-1736); Maroniti, Miscellanea vol. IV.
- *Scritture non riferite* dal 1622 a tutto 1707, Maroniti.
- *SOCG* = Scritture Originali Riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali: volumes 59, 62, 64, 99, 103, 104, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120m 121, 122, 123, 128, 130, 135, 147, 149, 150, 151, 153, 156, 159, 162, 163, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171, 174, 175, 177, 180, 181, 195, 196, 197, 210, 221, 222, 225, 235, 238, 240, 253, 263, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 282, 284, 291, 293, 361, 363, 370, 379, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 394, 395, 396, 307, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417.

2) Published:

- *Bacha, Voyage* = C. Bacha, Extract from the Travels of Patriarch Macarios the Aleppian (in Arabic), Harissa 1912.
- *Collectio Lacensis* = Acta et decreta Sancorum Conciliorum Recentiorum, Collectio Lacensis, Frigurgi Br., 1870 ff.
- *Collectanea* = Collectanea Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 2 volumes, Rome 1907.
- *CSCO* = Corpus scriptorium christianorum orientalium, Catholic University of America and Université Catholique, Louvain 1952 ff.
- *De Martinis* = R. De Martinis, Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide, Second part, Rome 1909.
- *Golubovich* = Golubovich G., Bibliotheca Bio-Bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente Francese, Series I, vol. II, Quaracchi 1913.
- *Febuve N.* = (Capuchin John Baptist of St. Aignan or was he John Lefebvre who in 1671 transmitted the letters of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to the Capuchins of Aleppo, cf. *Acta*, vol. 41, fol. 28r) Théâtre de la Turquie, Paris 1682. (T. Jock in his book, *Chouérites et Jésuites*, Central falls 1939, p. 9, says that it was Capuchin Father Justinien of Tours).
- *Kilzi* = L. Kilzi, Life of the Patriarch of Antioch Euthymios Karmeh the Hawawite written by his disciple Patriarch Macarios of Aleppo (in Arabic: according to Manuscript No. 24 of Deir esh-Shir, Lebanon) in Al-Maçarrat 1913, pp. 41-47; 81-89; 137-144.

- *Kimmel* = E.J. Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis*, 2 vols., Jena 1850.
- *Macarios of Aleppo* = Macarios III Zaim (Patriarch of Antioch from 1647 to 1672), *Small Collection* (in Arabic: *Magmu' Latif*), 1637. This is a unique manuscript found at Deir esh-Shir (Lebanon) of which chapter 104 (pp. 619-633) of the manuscript was published by J. Nasrallah in: *Chronologie des Patriarches Melchites d'Antioche de 1500 à 1634*, Paris 1959, pp. 75-81.
- *Mansi* = J. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, vols. 46 and 37.
- *Michalcessu* = J. Michalecsu, *Die Bekenntnisse und die wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der griech. — orient. Kirche*, Leipzig 1904.
- *Nasrallah, Notes et Documents* = J. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents pour servir à l'histoire du Patriarcat Melchite d'Antioche*, Jerusalem 1965.
- *Rabbath* = A. Rabbath, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du christianisme en Orient*, 2 vols., Paris 1905-1910.
- *Radu* = B. Radu, *Travels of Patriarch Macarios of Antioch*, in *PO*, XXII (1930), pp. 3-18 (= introduction, Paris December 29, 1926) and pp. 19-200; XXIV (1933), pp. 442-604; XXVI (1945), pp. 603-720.
This Arabic text published with a French translation is that of Manuscript 6016 of the National Library of Paris, collated with that of the British Museum (No. 802-805) and that of the Asiatic Museum of Leningrad (No. 33) of the year 1700.
- Vat. Arab. 48, 401, 618, 679, 689, 1339 (in part).
- Vat. Lat. 5528 (in part).
- Vat., *Epist. ad princip.*, vol. 64 (in part).

II. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALEXANDROS (Patriarch of Antioch): *Geschichte und gegenwärtige Lage der Kirche von Atiochien*, in *Ekklesia*, Leipzig 1941, Band X (46) 82-91.
- ALONSO C., *Los Mandeos y las Misiones Catolicas en la primera mitad del s. XVII*, in : *OCA* (no. 179), Rome 1967.
- 'ATA Gr., *The Greek Melkite Catholics, Historical Handbook* (in Arabic), Beirut 1848 (published by C. Batlouni by distorting the original work; Cf. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, pp. 7-8, 34.
- BACHA C., *History of the Greek Melkites* (in Arabic), I and II, Saida 1938 and 1959.
- BACHA C., *Extract of the Travels of Patriarch Macarios the Aleppian* (in Arabic), Harissa 1912.
- BACEL P., *A l'origine des Basiliens Chouérites*, in *Echos d'Orient*, VI (1903).
- BALFOUR C., *Travels of Macarios, Patriarch of Antioch*, (English translation from Arabic), 2 vols., London 1936.
- BARDY G., *L'Eglise d'Antioche*, Paris 1918.
- BAROZZI N. and BERCHET G., *Relazioni degli Stati Europei lette al Senato degli ambasciatori Veneti nel secolo decimosettimo*, Venice 1856-1877.
- BATLOUNI C., *Abrégé de histoire des Roméos-Melkites catholiques* (cf. 'ATA Gr.).
- BESSON J., *La Syrie et la Terre Sainte au XVII siècle*, Poitiers, Paris 1862 (The first edition of 1660 has the title: *La Syrie sainte*. An Italian translation was made by G. Anturni SJ, censored and approved by the Provincial on March 4, 1661 and

- published in Rome in 1662: “Soria Santa overo racconto breve di varij avvenimenti curiosi, e pij accaduti do pochi anni in quà in Soria, specialmente in Aleppo, Damasco, Sidone, Tripoli e Monte Libano.” This Italian edition contains many variants).
- BOUMAN CA., *Les Eglises de rite byzantin dans l’Empire Ottoman*, in *Nouvelle Histoire de l’Eglise*, III, Paris 1968.
- BRAIK M., *History of the Patriarchate of Antioch* (in Arabic). This book, written around 1767 by BRAIK M., was published in Cairo in 1903 by Salim KAB’IN but with many distortions. Porphyrios OUSPENSKIJ knew of a Greek translation of it that he published in Russian (Troudou Akademia of Kiev 1857).
- CARAYON A., *Relationes inédites des missions de la Compagnie de Jésus à Constantinople et dans le Levant au XVII s.*, Paris 1864.
- CHARON C., (= Korolevsky, Korolevskij, Karalevskij) *Histoire de Patriarcats Melkites*, III, Rome 1911. (An English translation edited by +Nicholas J. Samra, *History of the Melkite Patriarchates*, Eastern Christian Publication,).
- CERRI U., *Etat présent de l’Eglise romaine dans toutes les parties du monde*, Amsterdam 1716. (In 1677, Urbano Cerri presented this account, then a manuscript to Pope Innocent XI, Cf. *Statistica*, p. 5).
- CHARRIERE E., *Négotiations de la France dans le Levant ou correspondances, mémoires et actes diplomatiques de l’ambassadeur de France à Constantinople*, vol. 4, 1849 -1860.
- CHEBLI M., *Une histoire du Liban à l’époque des Emirs (1635-1841)*, Beirut 1955.
- COCCOPALMERIO F., *La partecipazione degli acattolici al culto della chiesa cattolica nella pratica e nella dottrina della Santa Sede (di Roma) dall’inizio del secole XVII ai nostri giorni*, Brescia 1969.
- CRIVELLI C., *Protestanti e cristiani orientali*, Rome 1932.
- DARBLADE J.B., *L’Euchologe arabe Melkite de Kyr Mèlèce Karmi*, in *POC*, VI (1956) 28-37.
- DA SEGGIANO I., — *Documenti inediti sull’Apostolato dei Minori Cappucini nel Vicino Oriente (1623-1683)*, Rome 1954 (extract of “Collectanea Franciscana,” 18 (1948) 118-224; 22 (1952) 339-386; 23 (1953) 295-338).
— *L’opera dei Cappucini per l’unione dei Cristiani nel Vicino Oriente durant il seculo XVII*, in *OCA* (no. 163), Rome 1962.
- DA TERZORIO C., *Le missioni dei mniori cappucini. Sunto storico*, III-VII, Rome 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1925.
- D’AVRIL B., *Documents relatifs aux Eglises d’Orient considérées dans leur rapport avec le S. Siège de Rome*, Paris 1862.
- DEDOUVRES L., *Le P. Joseph de Paris, Capucin*, 2 vols., Paris 1932.
- DE GONZAGUE L., *Les anciens missionaries capucins de Syrie et leurs écrits apostoliques* (extract of “Collectanea Franciscana,” Assisi 1931-1932).
- DE LA CROIX, *L’état present des nations et de l’Eglise greque*, Paris 1695.
- DE MONI, *Histoire critique de la créance et des coùtumes des Nations du Levant*, Frankfort 1684.
- DE VRIES W., — *Das problem der “Communicatio in Sacris cum dissidentibus” im Nahen Osten zur Zeit der Union (17. und 18. Jahrh)*, in: *Ostkirchliche Studiem*, VI (1957) 81-106.

- *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg 1963.
- *Communicatio in Sacris*, in *Concilium* I (1965, IV, 23-24) [French edition].
- *Die Haltung des Heiligen Stuhles (von Rom) gegenüber den getrennten Hierarchen im Nahen Osten zur Zeit der Unionem*, in *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie* 80 (1958) 378-409.
- *Il problema ecumenico alla luce delle unioni realizzate in Oriente*, in *OCP*, vol. 27, I (1961) 64-81.
- *La S. Sede (di Roma) ed i Patriarcati cattolici d'Oriente*, in *OCP*, vol. 27 2 (1961) 313-361.
- *Der selige Papst Innozenz XI und die Christen des Nahen Ostens*, in *OCP*, 23 (1957) 33-57.
- EDELBY N., *Les Eglises Orientales Catholiques*, Paris 1970.
- FAMIN C., *Histoire de la rivalité et du protectorat des Eglises chrétiennes en Orient*, Paris 1853.
- FLICHE A. and MARTIN V., *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos jours*, vol. 18-19, Paris 1960 and 1955-1956.
- GEANAKOPOLOS G.I., *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Age and Renaissance*, Oxford 1966.
- GENNADIOS A., (Metropolitan of Heliopolis), *The Particular Laws of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Its Attitude Concerning Other Orthodox Churches* (in Greek), Constantinople 1931.
- GHALEB P., *Le protectorat religieux de la France en Orient, etude historique et politique*, Avignon undated.
- GODEFROY DE Paris P., — *Notes et documents pour servir à l'histoire du P. Pacifique de Provins, Etudes Fransiscaines* 1933.
- *Un grand missionnaire, le P. Pacifique de Provins*, Assise 1935.
- GOYAU G., — *Une capitale missionnaire du Levant: Alep dans le 1 moitié du XVII siècle*, in: *Revue d'histoire des missions*, Paris 1934, pp. 161-186.
- *Un précurseur, François Picquet, Consul de Louis XIV à Alep et évêque de Babylone*, Paris 1928.
- *François Picquet, Consul de Louis XIV en Alep*, Geuthner 1942; cf. also *Revue d'histoire des missions*, 12 (1635) 161-198.
- GRUMEL V., — *Macaire, patriarche grec d'Antioche*, in *Echos d'Orient* 27 (1928) 68-77.
- *Le Patriarcat et les patriarches grec d'Antioche sous la seconde domination Byzantine* in : *Echos d'Orient* 33 (1934) 129-147.
- *Traité d'études byzantines*, I, (chronology), Paris 1962.
- HAJJAR J., — *Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. 3 (Paris 1968) and vol. 4 (Paris 1966).
- *Les chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient*, Paris 1962.
- *L'apsotolat des missionaries latins dans le Proche-Orient sous les directives romaine*, Jerusalem 1956.
- HERING G., *Oekumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik (1620-1638)*, Wiesbaden 1968.
- HITTI P.K., *History of Syria*, London 1951.

- HOFMANN G., — *Neue Quellen zur inneren Kirchengeschichte des griechischen Ostens im dritten Jahrzehnt des XVII Jahrhunderts*, in *Revue d'Etudes Byzantines* 1953, 165-174.
 — *Il beato Bellarmino e gli Orientali*, in *OCP* (no. 33) Rome 1927.
 — *Griechische Patriarchen und Römische Päpste*, in *OC* 13, 15, 19, 20, 25, 30, 26 (1928-193).
 — *Byzantinische Bischöfe und Rom*, in *OC* 22 (1931) 139-144.
 — *Memoriale al Card. Bandini*, in *OC* 30 (1933) 31-32.
- HOMSY B., *Les capitulations et la protection des chrétiens au Proche-Orient aux XVI, XVII, XVIII siècles*, Harissa 1956.
- HOPKO T., *Reflection on Uniatism*, in *Diakonia* 3 (1968) 300-311.
- KAB'IN S., *History of the Birth of the Church Called Greek-Catholic* (in Arabic), Cairo 1902.
- KALOZYMES K., *The Papacy and the Eastern Orthodox Church* (in Greek), Leipzig 1887.
- KARMIRIS J.N., *The Schism of the Roman Church*, extract of "*Theologia*" vol. 21, Athens 1960.
- KHOURY A.T., *Les théologiens byzantins et l'Islam*, Louvain 1969.
- KOROLEVSKIJ C., (= Charon = Korolevsky = Karalevskij = Haissa Boustani) article "Abel," "Alep," "Antioche" and "Beyrouth" in *DHGE*, vol. I, II, III and VIII.
 — *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites*, III, les institutions, Rome 1911. (English translation edited by +Nicholas J. Samra, *History of the Melkite Patriarchates*, III/1 and III/2, Eastern Christian Publications).
 — *Le clergé occidental et l'apostolat dans l'Orient Asiatique et greco-slav*, in *Revue Apologétique* 1923.
 — *L'uniatisme*, in *Irénikon* 1927, pp. 127-190 (English translation...).
 — *Notes sur l'uniatisme*, in *Irénikon* 1928, pp. 233-260.
- KRAJCAR J., *Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santoro and the Christian East*, in *OCA* (no. 177), Rome 1966.
- LAMMENS H., *La Syrie: précis historique*, 2 vol. Beirut 1921.
- LAMY E., *La France du Levant*, Paris 1900.
- LAOUST H., *Les gouverneurs de Damas sous les Mamelouks et les premiers Ottomans (1156-1744)*, 1952.
- LAURENT V., *L'âge d'or des missions latines en Orient (XVII – XVIII siècle)*, in *L'unité de l'Eglise* 1934, Paris, pp. 217-224; 251-255; 281-288; 380-384; 411-416; 444-448; 475-484; 570-576; 637-640; 757-763; 784-789.
- LEGRAND E., *Relation de l'établissement des PP. de la Compagnie de Jésus en Levant*, Paris 1869.
- LEMAN A., *Urbain VIII et la rivalité de la France et de la Maison d'Autriche de 1631 à 1635*, Lille-Paris 1919.
- LEMMENS L., — *Acta S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide pro Terra-Sancta*, Quaracchi 1921, I.
 — *Hierarchia Latina Orientis 1622-1922, mediante S. Congr. De Propaganda Fide instituita*, *OC*, I-II (1923-1924).
 — *Geschichte der Franziskanermissionem*, Munster 1929.
- LE QUIEN M., *Oriens Christianus*, II, Paris 1740 (cf. Initials and Abbreviations).

- LEVENQ G., — *La première mission de la Compagnie de Jésus en Syrie (1625-1774)*, Beirut 1925.
 — *Athanase III d'Antioche* in *DHGE*, IV (repeats the same errors committed by Korolevsky in his article "Antioche," III, by adding others).
- MOURAVIEV A.M., *Relations de la Russie avec l'Orient au sujet des affaires ecclésiastiques*, Petrograd 1858.
- MUSSET H., *Histoire du Christianisme, spécialement en Orient*, 3 volumes: vol. III, Jerusalem 1948; vol. I – II, Harissa 1948-1949.
- NACCHI, *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrits des missions étrangères*, I, Toulouse 1810.
- NASRALLAH J. — *Catalogue raisonné des manuscrits de la BIBL. Or. De l'U.S.J.*, in *POC*, 1958, pp. 130-136; and in: *Oriental Library*, Leiden 1968, pp. 308-309.
 — "Euthyme Saïfi," "Euthyme II Karme," "Euthyme III de Chio," in *DHGE*, XVI (1967).
 — *Notes et Documents pour servir à l'histoire du Patriarcat Melchite d'Antioche*, Jerusalem 1965.
 — *Chronologie des Patriarches Melchites d'Antioche de 1500 à 1634*, Paris 1959.
 — *Les imprimeries melchites jusqu'à la fin du XVIII siècle*, in *Al-Maçarrat* 1948, pp. 438-440.
 — *Histoire du Mouvement littéraire dans l'Eglise Melchite du V au XX siècle*, vol. 4, *Période ottomane 1516-1900*, Book 1 (1516-1724), Louvain-Paris 1979.
 — *Euthyme II Karme, patriarche Melkite: son oeuvre littéraire et liturgique*, in *POC* 1959, pp. 24-30.
- NECTARIOS (Patriarch of Jerusalem) *About the Primacy of the Pope* (in Greek), Jassy 1682.
- NOURADOUGHIAN G., *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'empire Ottoman*, Paris 1897.
- ORIENTE CATTOLICO, Vatican City 1962 (a cura della S. Congr. Delle chiese Orientali).
- PAPADOPOULOS C., — *Notices about the Church of Antioch* (in Greek) Athens 1938.
 — *The History of the Church of Antioch* (in Greek), Alexandria 1951. (V. LAURENT in "le corps des sceaux de l'empire byzantin," Paris 1965, vol. V/2, p. 350 judges this book very critically).
- PAPADOPOULOS K.A., *Library of Jerusalem* (in Greek), 5 volumes, Petersburg 1891-1915.
- PAPADOPOULOS T.H., *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, 2 volumes, London 1952.
- PARTHENIOS, *Parthenii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani decretum synodale super Calvinistis dogmatibus, quae in epistola Cyrilli nomine ante annos aliquot edita, falso Graecorum et Orientalium consensa recepta ferebantur. Quae omnia damnantur ab iisdem et anathemate notantur*, Paris-S. Cramoisy 1643.
- PATACSI G., *Anciennes et nouvelles concernant les Eglises Orientales et unies à Rome*, in *Irénikon*, np. 1, 1968.

- PATRIARCAT GREC-MELKITE-CATHOLIQUE d'Antioche et de tout l'Orient, d'Alexandrie et de Jerusalem: *Catholicisme ou Latinisme? A propos du patriarcat latin de Jerusalem*, Harissa 1961.
- PAUL OF ALEPPO, *Pontechestivie Antiokhijskago Patriarhka Makaria v Rossiou*, 3 vols. Moscow 1898 (translated from Arabic by MARKOS). Cf. the French translation of B. RADU in PO, XVII, 3-200; XVIV, 443-604; XXVI, 603-720.
- PASTOR L.V., *Storia dei Papi dalla fine del Medio Evo*, vol. 13 and 14, Rome 1931-1932.
- POULET, *Les nouvelles relations de Levant*, 2 vol., Paris 1667-1668.
- PRECLIN E. — JARRY E., *Les lutes politiques et doctrinales aux XVII et XVIII siècles*, in: FLICHE-MARTIN, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. 19/2, 539-563, (Paris 1956).
- RAPHAEL P., — *Le role du college maronite dans l'Orientalisme aux XVII et XVIII siècles*, Beirut 1950.
— *Le role des Maronites dans le retour des Eglises Orientales*, Beirut 1935.
- REY F., *La protection diplomatique et consulaire dans les échelles du Levant et de Barbarie*, Paris 1899.
- RICAULT, *Histoire de l'Eglise Greque et de l'Eglise Arménienne*, Amsterdam 1710.
- RISTELHUEBER R., *L'établissement des missionaries français au Liban*, in: *Etudes* 138 (1917), pp. 703-718.
- RONCAGLIA M., *Les franciscains et les grecs catholiques (1625-1805)*, in *Studia Orientalia Miscellanea*, 2, Cairo 1957. (It concerns a compilation copied by C. KOROLEVSKY, cf. J. Nasrallah, Notes et Documents, pp. 125-127).
- ROUSSEAU F., *L'idée missionnaire au XVI et XVII siècles. Les doctrines, les méthodes, les conceptions d'organisation*, Paris 1930.
- RUSTUM A., *The Church of the City of God* (in Arabic), (cf. Initials and Abbreviations).
- RYCAUT P., *The History of the Turkish Empire from the Year 1623 to the Year 1677*, London 1687.
- SABBAGH A., *Resume of the History of the Greek-Melkites of Aleppo* (in Arabic), in *Al-Fihris* np. 78 (manuscript of the 17th century which is found with the heirs of Rizquallah BASILE at Aleppo).
- Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Memoria rerum: 350 ans au service de Missions*, vol. I/1 (1622-1700), Ed. Herder 1972.
- SAMNE G. *La Syrie*, Paris 1920.
- SAVRAMIS D., *Oekumenische Probleme in der neugriechischen Theologie*, Leiden 1964.
- SBATH, *Al-Fihris*, 1939.
- SIDAROISS S., *Les patriarches dans l'Empire Ottoman et spécialement en Egypte*, Paris 1906.
- SMURLO A., *Le Siège (de Rome) et l'Orient Orthodoxe*, Prague 1923.
- STATISTICA *con cenni storici della Gerarchia e dei Fedeli di rito orientale*, Vatican City 1931 (a cura della S. Congr. per le Chiese Orientali).
- TAOUTEL F., *Historical Documents about Aleppo* (in Arabic), I (1606-1827), Beirut 1958.
- THEODOLOU N., *Ek tes historias tes ekklesias Antiochias*, in *Ekklesiastikos Pharos*, Alexandria 1927, pp. 218-233, 344-352, 463-469.
- TERZI B., *Siria Sacra*, Rome 1695.

- TOURNEBIZE F., *Le catholicisme à Alep au XVII siècle*, in *Etudes* 134 (1913), I, p. 351 ff.
- TSOURKAS C., — *Les premières influences occidentales dans l'Orient orthodoxe*, in *Balkania*, V vol., Bucarest 1944.
— *L'enseignement philosophique et la libre pensée dans les Balkans. La vie et l'oeuvre de Theophile Corydalée (1570-1646)*, Thessalonica 1967.
- TUTUNJIAN T., *Du pacte politique entre l'Etat Ottoman et les nations non musulmanes de la Turquie*, Lausanne 1904.
- 'UJJAIMI Y., *Taktikon* (in Arabic), Paris 1748.
- VAILHE S., *Constantinople (l'Eglise de)* in *DThC* 3/2, 1307-1519.
- VAN DEN STEEN DE JEHAY F., *De la situation des sujets ottomans non musulmans*, Brussels 1902.
- VON SACHSEN J. G., *Monumentale Reste frühen Christentums in Syrien*, Aachen 1920.
- ZANANIRI G., *Pape et Patriarche*, Paris 1962.
- ZAYAT H., — *The Greek-Melkites in Islam* (in Arabic), Harissa 1953.
— *Was Patriarch Macarios Catholic?* (in Arabic) in *Al Machreq* 1932, pp. 881-892.
— *Libraries of Damascus and Surrounding Area* (in Arabic), Cairo 1902.
— *History of Saidnaya*, Harissa 1932.

INTRODUCTION

After the Great Schism of 1054, the Patriarchate of Antioch was the only one of the strictly speaking Orthodox patriarchates¹ that entered into communion with the See of Rome, a communion remaining until today.² However, the entire patriarchate did not accept the union movement, and a sorrowful division took place within it;³ this division had painful consequences and these remain until now. Moreover, even those who accepted the union always had problems with the See of Rome for most of the time Rome was skeptical about the purity of their Catholicism and even treated them as Gallicans and “half schismatics.”⁴ This dissertation, which does not pretend to be exhaustive, could shed some light on the reasons for this mutual misunderstanding throughout the more than 250 years of union. This study is limited to a very important period in the upheaval of religious ideas in the Near East. This period began in the 17th century when all the successive partial unions had fermented.⁵ More precisely it began with the exposure to

¹ These patriarchates officially kept ecclesiastical communion with the see of Rome until 1054; they are four in number: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem after that of Rome. Cf. Council of Nicea I, canon 6; Council of Constantinople I, canons 2 and 3; Council of Chalcedon, canon 28. The other Orthodox patriarchs are later and were part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the first millennium. Do not confuse these Orthodox patriarchates properly speaking with those born after the Christological heresies, Monophysism, Nestorianism and Monothelism. Properly understood these patriarchates were not in ecclesiastical communion with the five patriarchal sees of the first millennium, that is, neither with the see of Rome nor with the four Orthodox Eastern sees. Very significant on this subject are the last studies of W. DeVries on the structure of the Church after the Ecumenical Councils of the first millennium: “Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem III. Konzil von Konstantinopel (680-681),” in *Volk Gottes*, Freiburg Br. 1967, pp. 262-285; “Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem II, Konzil von Nicäa (787),” in *OCP*, 33 (1967) 47-71; “Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem IV, Konzil von Konstantinopel (869-870),” in *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 6 (1968) 7-24; Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem Konzil von Chalkedon (451),” in *OCP*, 35 (1969) 63-122.

² This was the election of a “fully” Catholic patriarch, Cyril Tanas in 1724. Rome’s confirmation arrived in 1729 after long deliberations. The pallium was only granted in March 1744. Rome’s hesitation was due precisely to the less canonical or less evangelical manner in which the election and consecration was done. Cf. *SC, Greci Melchiti, Miscellanea*, “Causa dei Greci Melchiti 1743.” Compare with the futile controversy (little informed on the question) between P. Bachel and C. Bacha. Basel considered the election of this patriarch as “anticanonical” and Bacha on the other hand affirmed its canonicity, in *EO* 9 (1906) 283 and 10 (1907) 206.

³ A week after the consecration of Cyril Tanas, this was the definitely Orthodox candidate who was consecrated at Constantinople on September 27, 1724: it was Sylvester the Cypriot who was juridically recognized by the Sublime Porte by obtaining the firman. Cf. *Rustum*, pp. 143-151; *Rabbath*, II, pp. 415-420; C. Bacha, *Histoire des Grecs Melkites* (in Arabic), II, pp. 152-154.

⁴ Cf. for example the sentiments of Rome on the subject of Metropolitan Germanos of Aleppo (1776-1809), Patriarch Maximos III Mazloom (1833-1855) and Patriarch Gregory Yousof (Sayour) (1864-1897). Maximos Mazloom had to accept a forced residence in Rome from 1823 until 1831, and Gregory Yousof had the privilege of his head “shaded” by the foot of Pius IX because he had resisted the promulgation of papal infallibility in 1870. Moreover Patriarchs Maximos IV and Maximos V suffered for it. Cf. *Le Lien* (Bulletin of the Greek-Melkite Catholic Patriarchate) 1969, Nos 3-4, 5-6; *Voix de l’Eglise en Orient*, Freiburg 1962; *L’Eglise grecque-melkite au Concile*, Beirut 1967; Y. Congar, in *Les Eglises Orientales Catholiques*, Paris 1970, p. 14 (of preface); O. Rousseau, “Rome et l’Orient à Vatican I,” in *Irenikon* 43 (1970) 430-431.

⁵ Cf. for example W. De Vries, “Die Haltung des Heiligen Stuhles (von Rom) gegenüber den getrennten Hierarchen im Nahen Osten zur Zeit des Unionem” in *Zeitschrift für kath Theologie*, 80 (1958) 378-409.

the Latin missionaries in the East after the foundation of the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.⁶ From the reports that the missionaries addressed to it, this Roman Congregation noticed that the Patriarchate of Antioch happened to be in a unique situation in comparison to the other Churches of the East. It was not very hostile to the Holy See of Rome and its separation with this see had never been sanctioned by a formal act of excommunication, although it had followed the capital of the Byzantine Empire and later the Ottoman Empire in its Eastern stance in the second millennium. The conciliatory attitude of this Orthodox patriarchate was very clear in 1054, when Patriarch Peter III of Antioch (1053-1056) wished to assume the role of arbitrator between Rome and Constantinople.⁷ When an occasion of dialogue presented itself, the Patriarchate of Antioch did not give a deaf ear. Patriarch Theodosius IV Villehardouin (1275-1283/1284) consented to the union proclaimed at the Council of Lyons (1274).⁸ Patriarch Dorotheos I (1434-1451) seemed to have welcomed the decisions of Florence,⁹ and the retired Patriarch Michael Sabbagh (1577-1580 died in 1592) sent a profession of Catholic faith with a letter of submission to Pope Sixtus V and another letter to Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santoro di Santa Severina (May 1586).¹⁰

Despite its conciliatory attitude, the Patriarchate of Antioch had not accepted to bend before the western theological “bombardment” which lasted nearly one century of the missions, either Roman or Protestant.¹¹ In fact, the result was the splitting of the

⁶ Pope Gregory XV founded this Congregation at the beginning of 1622; its principal goal was determined in the Encyclical of January 15, 1622 and the Constitution of June 22, 1622: To keep the Catholic faith of the faithful, to convert heretics, schismatics and infidels, and finally to prevent the progress of heretical preachers. Cf. *Collectanea I* (a. 1622-1866), pp. 1-2.

⁷ Cf. *DThC*, X, col. 1698 fol.; Musset I, pp. 270 fol.; Will C., *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo XI composite exsunt*, Leipzig 1861, pp. 168-178; Cf. also Fortescue A., *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, London 1929, pp. 188-192.

⁸ According to Le Quien (Vol. II, p. 764) this patriarch of Antioch was Theodore V; compare with the article “Antioche” in *DHGE III* (1924) col. 699 and 620-621.

⁹ Cf. J. Nasrallah, *Chronologie des Patriarches melchites d’Antioche de 1250 à 1500*, Jerusalem 1968, pp. 28-31. The author affirms (p. 47): “it does not seem possible for us to doubt the catholicism of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria from the 13th century to the 16th century since H. Zayat published a series of texts coming from the Mamluke chancery.” These texts appear in a book *Les grecs-melchites dans l’Islam* (in Arabic), Harissa 1953. But is it possible to make such an affirmation without examining the kind of catholicism professed by these patriarchs? If this issue was so simple, why then did the missionaries have to work so long in the 17th century to be successful to a partial union of the patriarchate of Antioch and a fleeting union of the patriarchate of Alexandria? If it concerned the orthodox catholicism of the first millennium, the issue would be easier to prove. But if it concerns the Roman Catholicism of the second millennium, the Latin missionaries of the 17th century tell us about the resistance of these patriarchates to this kind of catholicism. Cf. *OCA*, No. 181: “I patriarchati orientali nel primo millenion,” Rome 1968.

¹⁰ Cf. *Vat. Arab. 48*, fol. 68r-69r and 66r where we find 2 original letters, and *Vat. Arab 1482*, fol. 1r-2v where we find the profession of faith. Cf. also *Oriente Cattolico*, Vatican 1962, p. 251. For the role of L. Abel in this affair, cf. Nasrallah, *Chronologie des Patriarchats Melchites d’Antioche de 1500 à 1634*, Paris 1959, pp. 43-44. Cf., also *DHGE*, article “Abel” col. 70-71. On the subject of the role of Cardinal G. Antonio Santoro, cf. J. Krajcar, “Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santoro and the Christian East,” *OCA*, No. 177, Rome 1966.

¹¹ It concerns the dynamic period of 1625, the date when the first Capuchin and Jesuit missionaries arrived at Aleppo until 1724 when Cyril Tanas began the juridically Catholic series of patriarchs of Antioch. Cf. De Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg 1963, pp. 82 ff.

patriarchate into Catholic and Orthodox branches (1724), while leaving some followers to the Protestants.

Our study is limited to the first fifty years of the life of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to better understand the concept of union in this patriarchate before the deep rooting of the ideas of primacy and union that the missionaries brought with them. This first fifty year period coincides with the death of the great Patriarch of Antioch, Macarios III of Aleppo (1647-1672), who certainly was aware of the new conceptions mentioned, but was also from the pre-missionary generation. He was the disciple of Karmeh and later his successor in the episcopate of Aleppo in 1635.¹² Beginning with the successor of Macarios of Aleppo we observe the presence of numerous students from Capuchin and Jesuit¹³ missionaries and even students of the Roman College for the Propagation of the Faith¹⁴ who were bearers of a new conception of Catholicism that was foreign to traditional Orthodox ecclesiology. This brought about the collision between these two ecclesiological conceptions that inevitably caused the dismemberment and division of the patriarchate, and which also caused uneasiness in the juridically Catholic branch.

Our research will consist of an exposé of the life of this patriarchate and its relations with other Christians at that time in order to trace the conception that it had for union with Rome, a conception which could perhaps better regulate the relations between the Roman Church and the Eastern Churches today.

¹² Cf. Kilzi, "Life of Patriarch of Antioch Euthymios Karmeh the Hamawite written by his disciple Patriarch Macarios of Aleppo" (in Arabic), in *Al-Maçarrat*, 1913, p. 41-42. Compare with *Rustum*, p. 49.

¹³ Of which was the future founder of the Missionaries of Holy Savior Euthymios Saifi, who had a decisive role in the ritual innovations and the propagation of new ecclesiastical ideas on the patriarchate of Antioch. Cf. the letter published by C. Bacha, *Histoire des Grecs-Melkites*, I, Saida 1938, pp. 466 ff. Compare with the article "Euthyme Saifi" in *DHGE* 14 (1967), col. 64-74.

¹⁴ Of which was the first juridically Catholic patriarch of Antioch, Cyril Tanas, nephew of Euthymios Saifi. Cf. *Musset* II, p. 174' article "Antioche" in *DHGE*, 3 (1924) col. 647; C. Bacha in *EO*, 10 (1907) 200-206.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

While the Christian West was torn apart by the Thirty Years War for already four years,¹⁵ the East was suffering from a regime of absolute power¹⁶ and did not know how to rid itself of the overwhelming yoke of the Ottomans, who had conquered Syria (1516) and Egypt (1517) after the conquest of Constantinople (1453).

It is true that a certain tolerance existed at the beginning of this conquest but the conquerors' thirst for money became more and more fiery. This thirst was quenched only by exactions and deliberate rebuffs imposed on the destitute Christians.¹⁷ The painful situation of Christians was complicated by the interplay of western rivalries, imported in all its acuteness in the center of the Ottoman Empire, Constantinople, in order to develop political and commercial influences on one hand, and to find support in Eastern Orthodoxy on the other hand. The first deposition of Patriarch Cyril I Lucaris in 1623 was a very eloquent sign of these political-religious rivalries which the western ambassadors brought to Constantinople.¹⁸ These rivalries and divisions were very favorable to the interests of the Ottomans: they allowed them a free field.

The deposition and enthroning of prelates procured good sums of money for the Ottomans. Speaking only about the patriarchs of Constantinople, there were thirty-two patriarchs enthroned during the fifty years we are studying.¹⁹ Christianity under the Ottoman yoke slowly became more impoverished and consequently tried to survive its extermination while waiting for its liberation. This oppression forced many eastern prelates to turn themselves toward the Christian West or Russia and request help from the

¹⁵ Cf. especially M. Ritter, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges*, 3 vols., Stuttgart 1889-1907. One can get a very condensed general idea of it in *Nouvelle Histoire de l'Eglise*, Vol. 3, Paris 1968, pp. 256-272 (by H. Tüchle). Cf. also E. W. Zeeden, "Grundlagen der Konfessionsbildung im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe," in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 185 (1958) 249-299.

¹⁶ Cf. the glance on the political history of the 17th century in *Musset*, II, pp. 94-97.

¹⁷ Cf. Nasrallah, "Vie de la Chrétienté melkite sous la domination turque," in *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, 80 (1948) 95-98. Also C. A. Bouman, "Les Eglises de rite byzantin dans l'Empire Ottoman," in *Nouvelle Histoire de l'Eglise*, III, Paris 1968, pp. 435-469.

¹⁸ Cf. G. Hering, *Oekumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik* (1620-1638), Weisbaden 1968. While the author is content with the texts of the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (Propaganda) published by G. Hofmann (in *O.C.* 7 (1929) 55-72), this book shows a notable scientific progress in the knowledge of this very complicated period of religious and political history. Cf. on the subject of this deposition the succinct relationship made by the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith Ingoli in *SOCG*, vol. 20, fol. 71r (cf. also fol. 41r-47r); "Euthimio Archimandrita di Constantinopoli da Roma con lettere generali dirette all'Ambasciatore di Francia, se n'andò à quella Città per procurare la deposizione di Cirillo (Lucar), ove assistendo al sudetto Ambasciatore, e cooperando à Hieracudio Greco rinegato, e nemico di Cirillo et al Sboraschi Residente di Polonia, ch'era dal medesimo Cirillo offeso; perche procurava di disturber la pace trà turchi, e polachi. Si venne alla deposizione di esso Cirillo (12 April 1623) per mezzo di Marechusin primo Visir, e si passava anche più inanzi sin à levarli la vita, se l'Archimandrita, che non voleva che si introducesse tal costume d'uccidere li patriarchi, non s'opponeva..."

¹⁹ Cf. in *Grumel (Chronologie*, p. 438) a list of the patriarchs of Constantinople very precise for this period (1622-1672). Cyril I Lucaris, who attained the patriarchal throne of New Rome 6 times, had to pay very dearly at each new enthronement.

tsar and Christian princes.²⁰ Others had relied heavily on the influence of semi-autonomous princes such as those of Mount Lebanon at that time,²¹ but this sometimes cost them a blind obedience. The assistance brought by the missionaries after the foundation of the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith²² could only have been applauded by Eastern Christians. As priests of the Church of Christ, these missionaries were sent to them by the Lord to be liberators of the oppressed.

²⁰ To give only an example of voyages to Russia, cf. *Nasrallah, Chronologie*, pp. 46-50. We remark that the voyages of Joachim Daou, Patriarch of Antioch (1580-Nov. 1592) and of Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople (then third time on this throne) resulted in the creation of the Patriarchate of Moscow on January 26, 1589. These patriarchs had to be included to the ambitions of their benefactor! Compare with the article "Antioche," in *DHGE*, III (1924), col. 637-638.

²¹ The popes themselves sometimes recommended to the Maronite patriarchs to ask for aide from these princes. Paul V, for example, in 1610 exhorted Patriarch John Makhlouf (1609-1634) to ask for help from Emir Fakhr-ed-Din II, to whom the same patriarch had already addressed himself at his election in 1609. Cf. E. Douaihy, *History of the Times*, 1095-1699 (in Arabic) Beirut 1951, p. 201. Also the Greek Patriarch Ignatios III Atieh (1619-1634) was the protégé of this Druze emir. Cf. Chapter I of this study.

²² A first attempt of the foundation of this Congregation took place at the time of Pope Clement VIII (1592-1605). This is why the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, founded definitively in 1622 (cf. note 6 of the introduction), decided in its first gathering on January 6 of this year: "quod scibatur Archiepiscopo Cosentino ut scripturas tempore Clementis 8 confectas circa Propagationem fidei in simili Congregatione tunc temporis erecta, et apud ipsum existents Secretario consignaret" (Acta, vol. 3, fol. 2r). Also this first volume of the Acts of this new Congregation begins with number 3, by attaching the Acts of the times of Clement VIII in order to make the first 2 volumes. But it has nothing.

CHAPTER I

A QUESTIONABLE PATRIARCH IN THE PATRIARCHATE OF ANTIOCH (1619-1628)

In 1622 the Patriarchate of Antioch had two canonically consecrated hierarchs: Ignatios III Atieh and Cyril IV Dabbas. Both had been consecrated patriarchs of Antioch on the same day, Sunday of the Samaritan Woman, April 24, 1619;²³ Atieh was consecrated in Constantinople and Dabbas in Amioun, near Tripoli, Syria [present day Lebanon].

This division of the patriarchate of Antioch was caused by the pretensions of the preceding patriarch, Athanasios II Dabbas. He had promised that once he was elected patriarch he would pay what was lacking of the kharage tax for the Greeks of Damascus.²⁴ His election took place in September 1611²⁵ but the promise was never upheld. Then the tragedy began. Athanasios II traveled across the country and arrived in Constantinople in 1614. He demanded that the Ecumenical Patriarch, Timothy II, depose Meletios Karmeh whom the same Athanasios had consecrated on February 12, 1612 as Archbishop of Aleppo.²⁶ Meletios joined him in Constantinople and with his remarkable wisdom reconciled himself with his patriarch and returned to Aleppo three months later.²⁷ Patriarch Athanasios was not able to complete the unpaid kharage tax for the year 1619. He was brought before the pasha of Damascus who imprisoned him²⁸ until he paid a large ransom; he was then permitted to travel to Tripoli where he died.²⁹

²³ Cf. *Kilzi*, pp. 89 and 135; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 626; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 129; *Radu*, p. 38.

²⁴ *Macarios of Aleppo*, pp. 626-627. It appears that the candidates to the patriarchate were very numerous. The Damascenes preferred the one who would promise to pay annually the deficit of the tax required of the Christians by the Turks.

²⁵ *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 627: "7119 of the creation of the world." Compare with the article "Athanasios II" in *DHGE*, vol. IV-V, col. 1369, where G. Levenq follows Korolevsky in his article "Antioche" in the same *DHGE* III, col. 640, but without checking documents. Korolevsky also put 1612 by making a mistake in the calculation, but he indicates the year 7119. Levenq indicates very simply 1612. We know that the year 7119 of the creation of the world would not correspond at all to the Christian year 1611 and never to 1612. Besides a colophon of *Vat. Arab* 401, fol. 172v gives us this date: mid-September 1020 H (=1611 AD).

²⁶ *Kilzi*, pp. 46 and 84. *Macarios of Aleppo* p. 627. It happened in the "third year" of the episcopacy of Karmeh and not after 3 years of episcopacy. We do not see why *Musset* (II, p. 159) puts 1615 as the date of this event. The dismissal of Karmeh whom Patriarch Athanasios II had wished to detain at Constantinople seemed to have had financial reasons or even because of his first contacts with the Franciscans of Aleppo. Likewise Cyril IV, brother of Athanasios II, also had his quarrels with Karmeh, as we will see.

²⁷ *Kilzi*, p. 84. This is the first official contact between Karmeh and the patriarch of Constantinople, which we know about from his biographer Macarios of Aleppo, who added for this occasion that "all the people of Constantinople) marveled at his wisdom and intelligence."

²⁸ *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 627; *Kilzi*, pp. 88-89; article "Antioche" in *DHGE* vol. 3, col. 640; *Rustum*, p. 37. Levenq in "Athanasios II" cited above, has this take place in 1620. Even so he cites Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 1740, II, p. 771 (rather col. 772), in which we read: "Athanasios III vir, si Jacobo Gualterio in chronologia ipsius credimus, apprimè catholicus, qui quum anno 1618 Antiochenaee ecclesiae praeesset, anno insequenti (i.e. 1619) vivere desiit." Concerning the Catholicism of this patriarch, cf. C. Charon, "L'Eglise grecque Melkite Catholique," *EO* 4 (1900-1901), p. 274; Gr.'Ata, *The Greek Melkite Catholics, Historical Handbook* (in Arabic), Beirut 1884, p. 19, where the author adds the existence of a pro-Catholic synod in 1617. All this is based on a narrative of J. Gauthier, (*Tables chronologiques de l'estat du*

Meanwhile, the Damascenes, unhappy with their shepherd, sent the Metropolitan of Saida, Ignatios Atieh to Constantinople to have him consecrated Patriarch of Antioch by the hands of Timothy II.³⁰ The consecration took place on the same day that Athanasios II's brother, Cyril IV Dabbas, Metropolitan of Bosra,³¹ had himself consecrated at Amioun.

Since Ignatios III Atieh had Timothy II of Constantinople on his side, Cyril IV Dabbas requested the support of another patriarch, Cyril Lucaris of Alexandria, who was then very influential. In fact, Dabbas returned to Alexandria around the end of 1619 and concelebrated there with the Alexandrian patriarch. This patriarch exhorted the Damascenes to receive Cyril IV Dabbas as their patriarch but the response of the faithful only irritated Lucaris.³²

christianisme, Paris 1621, p. 848), that Le Quien cites unreservedly. The authentic documents tell us only that Patriarch Athanasios II wanted to depose Metropolitan Karmeh in 1614, most probably because of Karmeh's philo-catholic tendencies. Moreover in the same year (April 4, 1614) he had imprisoned in Damascus by Hafez Ahmad Pasha two priests and three laity, all Maronites because they had followed the Gregorian calendar adopted by their patriarchs since 1606. Athanasios II had also suffered imprisonment. When released he went to Constantinople. Cf. *Nasrallah, Chronologie*, p. 55. We can even compare these two facts to see more clearly the reason of the complaint that he took to Constantinople against Karmeh: Karmeh was not only in contact with the Franciscans who were in Aleppo since 1571, but he was also the friend of the Maronites. On this last point we could say that Karmeh collaborated with them. Perhaps here there was a change with Athanasios II after his reconciliation with Karmeh! But from there until the Roman conception of Catholicism in the 17th century there was a greater difference!

²⁹ *Kilzi*, p. 89; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 627; *Vat. Arab.*, 689, fol. 129r. Death came during Lent of 1629. Athanasios II was buried in the Monastery of Our Lady of Kiftin near Tripoli (Syria). Cf. also C. Bacha, *Extract of the Voyage of Macarios the Aleppian*, (in Arabic) Harissa 1912, p. 36. He notes that Patriarch Athanasios II is called "Athanasios III" by *Le Quien* (col. 772). C. Charon (= Korolevsky) follows it in his article mentioned in *EO* as well as *Rustum* much later (p. 37). But Charon corrected this in his article "Antioche" in *DHGE* III, col. 640 where we nevertheless find the wrong designation of Kaftoun instead of Kaftin.

³⁰ *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol.129v; *Kilzi*, p. 89; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 627; *Rustum*, p. 38; Ignatios Atieh was the secretary of Emir Fakr-ed-Din II before becoming Metropolitan of Saida in 1605. This also explains the protection that he had always found with this former patron. Cf. C. Bacha, *History of the Greek Melkites* (Arabic) I, Saida 1938, pp. 87-95; *Nasrallah, Chronologie*, pp. 56-67. We see that the law of appeal to the Patriarch of New Rome was not a legend, for the Damascenes no more.

³¹For the consecration Cyril IV, the Pasha of Tripoli, Ibn Sifa, forced Metropolitans Simeon of Hama, Lazaros of Homs and Dionysios of Hosn to come, all three finding themselves under his obedience. His bursar, the Greek Melkite Salomon added a great role in this affair. Cf. *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 627; *Kilzi*, p. 135; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 129rv. For the date of consecration we see that the year 1620, held to by Korolevsky in his article "Antioche" of *DHGE*, has no foundation (it is the continuation of false calculation, cf. previous footnote 25).

³² Cyril IV wanted to make the Damascenes obey by having his cousin George buy the firman at Constantinople, and a decree of banishment to Cyprus for his competitor Ignatios III. But the Damascenes did everything possible to support Ignatios. Then Cyril IV addressed himself to the Patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril Lucaris (around the end of 1619), who wanted to reprimand the Damascenes by exhorting them to accept Cyril IV as their patriarch. But the response of the Damascenes only exasperated Cyril Lucaris: "we do not want Cyril IV," they wrote to him, "and we will not accept him as our patriarch. As for you, occupy yourself in your own affairs. You do not have to oblige us or judge us in anything." Cyril Lucaris then recognized Cyril IV as Patriarch of Antioch by concelebrating with him. Cf. *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 629; *Kilzi*, p. 136; *Rustum* p. 38.

The Patriarchate of Antioch thus found itself between two equally powerful and equally legitimate obediences. On one side, Ignatios III was supported by the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Emir of Mount Lebanon, Fakhr ed-Din II Maanide; on the other side, Cyril IV was supported by the Patriarch of Alexandria and the pasha of Tripoli, Ibn-Sifa.³³ The baraat of the sultan would be successively accorded to the highest bidder, and the Greek-Melkite faithful of Antioch had to pay the expenses of it.³⁴ This is exactly what happened a little later for the patriarchs of Constantinople, the only difference being that support did not come much from non-Christian governors, but from Christian ambassadors themselves who had disputed the Calvinization or Romanization of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.³⁵

Ignatios III was less ambitious than his competitor. He remained close to his protector, Fakhr ed-Din and always occupied himself with his works which were under the domination of this emir, whereas Cyril IV on several occasions had recourse to secular hands in an attempt to obtain obedience from all the bishops who had not approved him.³⁶ The typical case was the Eparchy of Aleppo which at the first remained far from all this dissention.³⁷ But the archbishop of this city, Meletios Karmeh, who had previously been on bad terms with Athanasios II Dabbas, was not satisfied with the situation of the divided patriarchate or with Cyril IV Dabbas, brother of his predecessor.³⁸ He expressed his dissatisfaction by refusing to be in communion with Cyril IV who spent forty-two days in Aleppo without being able to concelebrate with the local bishop.³⁹ From Aleppo, Cyril IV returned to Constantinople. There he again met his old colleague of Alexandria, Cyril Lucaris, who had become ecumenical patriarch on November 4, 1620 and who had returned to be enthroned in Constantinople after his first deposition.⁴⁰

³³ Macarios of Aleppo notes that the diocese of Aleppo was neutral before these rivalries (*Kilzi*, p. 136). This is why Karmeh, then Metropolitan of Aleppo, did not commemorate in his Divine Liturgy either of the two competitors until the solution of the problem at the Synod of Ras-Baalbek (June 1628). And it was only beginning August 6, 1629 that the diocese of Aleppo began to insert the name of Ignatios III in its diptychs. Cf. *Kilzi* p. 141.

³⁴ George, the cousin of Cyril IV, took the road to Constantinople several times to get the secular arms of the Turks to accept the rights of his cousin at Damascus. The Damascenes had to pay so much (as did the Aleppians from 1624 to 1627) that they could no longer resist the pretensions of Cyril IV in 1627. Cf. *Kilzi*, pp. 139-140; *Rustum*, p. 38; *Radu*, p. 38.

³⁵ Cf. on this subject the precious work of G. Hering, *Oekumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik* (1620-1638), Wiesbaden 1968. Cf. also *SOOG*, vol. 270, fol. 71r, fol. 139r, fol. 237rv and 240r; vol. 115, fol. 82r; vol. 117, fol. 5r; vol. 389, fol.274rv and 28er; vol.195, fol. 135r, fol. 448 and fol. 496r-497r. We find here very eloquent testimonies of what took place at Constantinople in order to have philo-Calvinists or philo-Roman patriarchs.

³⁶ This explains the attitude of the bishops of the Patriarchate of Antioch who were unanimously in favor of Ignatios III in June 1628.

³⁷ Cf. footnote 33 above. In fact Aleppo began to be harassed by the pretensions of Cyril IV only beginning August 28, 1624, as we will see.

³⁸ Cf. *Nasrallah, Chronologie*, pp. 57 ff; *Kilzi*, p. 84.

³⁹ Karmeh did not hesitate to say why he did not want to concelebrate with Cyril IV; there were “two patriarchs” for the same patriarchate. *Kilzi*, p. 136.

⁴⁰ After the deposition of Cyril Lucaris on April 12, 1623, two patriarchs succeeded on the throne of Constantinople, Gregory IV of Amasia (April 12-June 18, 1623) and Anthimos II of Adrinople (June 18-September 22, 1623). Supported above all by the Ambassador of Holland to Constantinople, Lucaris occupied the ecumenical throne again by pushing aside his competitors. Cf. *Grumel, Chronologie*, p. 438;

Cyril IV went to Valachia and Moldavia to collect money for his patriarchate with letters of recommendation from Cyril I Lucaris.⁴¹ This collection permitted him to pay for a new order to have his competitor Ignatios III deposed,⁴² while drawing from the new moral force by concelebrating with his old friend Cyril I Lucaris in Constantinople.⁴³

Cyril IV returned to Aleppo on August 28, 1624.⁴⁴ He asked the bishop of the city to concelebrate with him even though he had refused to accommodate him in the Greek Melkite archiepiscopal residence.⁴⁵ But Meletios Karmeh refused to concelebrate with him because of the divisions he created in the Patriarchate of Antioch and because he had even appealed to Turkish authorities to affirm his authority.⁴⁶ Some Greek faithful who were dissatisfied with their bishop regrouped around Cyril IV and the diocese of Aleppo was divided in two: part for the local bishop, Meletios Karmeh, and part for Patriarch of Antioch, Cyril IV.⁴⁷ Cyril, supported by the rebels and some favorable elements of the other Christian communities of Aleppo, usurped all the rights of the local bishop.⁴⁸ He even hosted a great banquet gathering the notables of all the rites and all the religious communities of Aleppo in the presence of the Armenian and Jacobite patriarchs and some official representatives of European countries. He forced the archbishop of Aleppo to come to the dinner that night (14 November 1624) and intimidated him in front

G. Hering, *Op. Cit.*, pp.433 and 425; W. De Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg 1963, p. 76. Cf. also footnote 18 and *Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 56r, 38r, 63v and 73r.

⁴¹ *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 629, specifies that Lucaris had shown joy on the arrival of Cyril IV of Antioch and that in Moldavia and Valachia he was well received.

⁴² This commandment of the sultan not only exasperated the clergy and faithful of Damascus, already exhausted by the exactions that the Ottomans submitted them to in order to allow Ignatios III as patriarch. Often all the clergy of Damascus were hiding, so much so that no priest could be found to administer the last sacraments to the dying (*Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 629). Thus Patriarch Ignatios III preferred to remain near his protector Emir Fakr-ed-Din at Beirut or Saida (*Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 629; *Kilzi*, p. 136).

⁴³ Cyril Lucaris twice recognized the legitimacy of Patriarch Cyril IV of Antioch by concelebrating with him and by the acceptance of his ecclesiastical communion, despite the manifest opposition of the Damascenes and most of the bishops of Antioch: the first time around the end of 1619 when he was Patriarch of Alexandria, the second time in 1624 as Patriarch of Constantinople. Cf. *Kilzi*, p. 136; *Macarios of Aleppo*, pp. 628-629; J. Nasrallah, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 56-57.

⁴⁴ This was the eve of the feast of the Finding of the Head of John the Baptist. *Kilzi*, p. 136; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 630.

⁴⁵ *Macarios of Aleppo* adds that the accommodations had been refused because the episcopal residence was not yet finished (*Kilzi*, p. 137). But it is necessary to note that Karmeh wanted to know nothing of Cyril IV who remained for him always a usurper of patriarchal rights. Cyril VI resided with an notable of the Armenian Orthodox (*Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 630).

⁴⁶ We understand by this the profound sense of the participation at the same table of the Lord: to concelebrate was to recognize each other reciprocally as members of the same ecclesial body with all the prerogatives that each appropriated. We remark that Karmeh never solicited communion with Cyril IV, while Cyril IV used all his means to have it with the local bishop of Aleppo.

⁴⁷ The same expression is used in *Kilzi* (p. 137) and *Macarios of Aleppo* (p. 630): "All those who hate Meletios are lined up (literally go: dhahaba) with Cyril." Knowing that Meletios Karmeh was a holy man conscious of his episcopal duties, this hatred can be attributed to jealousy that provoked the goodness of this bishop who worked day and night to translate and compose books of piety to correct his faithful (cf. *Kilzi*, pp. 46-47 and 81-88) and to lead a life of prayer and fasting as Fr. Besson, S.J. also describes (pp. 23-24): "a very Catholic man and a very austere life..." perhaps even because of his relations with the Franciscans of Aleppo (for the other missionaries were not there before 1625) as we will see.

⁴⁸ *Macarios of Aleppo* specifies that Cyril IV "seized the Church of Aleppo with his revenue by doing all that he wanted" (*Kilzi*, p. 137).

of the whole assembly in order to make him concelebrate with him. However, the archbishop, on the pretext of being ill, excused himself and left the dinner.⁴⁹ The patriarch did everything possible to gain the favor of the local bishop, but Karmeh left the diocese to the patriarch by permitting his priests to concelebrate with him.⁵⁰

On the feast of Pascha 1625, the bishops of Hama, Homs and Paneas concelebrated with Patriarch Cyril IV in the cathedral of Aleppo.⁵¹ The next day the four met together and signed a document which the Greek Melkite priests of Aleppo were forced to sign with some lay people. This document solicited the patriarchal tax of twelve years from Meletios Karmeh.⁵² This took place on May 11, 1625 before the Pasha of Damascus, Mustafa, who went to seize Aleppo.⁵³ The archbishop received eighty lashes and spent twelve days in prison until the faithful paid two thousand ecus, and until he himself would sign a document in which he declared his willingness to concelebrate with Cyril IV.⁵⁴ But Karmeh would not do it: he took refuge in the home of a notable Muslim and only a few people knew of his refuge.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ Kilzi, *Ibid.*, and *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 630. Since November 15, 1624, Karmeh no longer went to celebrate the Divine Liturgy at the Greek Church of Aleppo. He only returned there on March 31, 1627 after his trip to Constantinople. Cf. *Kilzi*, pp. 137-139. Between August 29 and November 14, 1624, while Cyril IV was in Aleppo at the home of a notable Armenian, Karmeh went to celebrate the Divine Liturgy during the week and Cyril IV on Sundays and feasts, *Kilzi*, pp. 136-137.

⁵⁰ *Kilzi*, p. 137. We can note that the concelebration of Cyril IV with the priests of Aleppo did not represent a true problem for Karmeh, eparchial bishop of the place. The true problem was recognizing Cyril IV not only as one of the bishops of the patriarchate, but also as Patriarch of Antioch. And Karmeh never wanted to recognize such.

⁵¹ Simeon of Hama, Lazaros of Homs and Ignatios of Paneas. Cf. *Kilzi, Ibid.* By this act Patriarch Cyril IV wanted to show the Aleppians that he was recognized as such by the other bishops of the Patriarchate of Antioch. The first two bishops participated in the consecration of Cyril IV in 1619 at Amioun. This is what makes us think that these two at least were not forced by Ibn Sifa to consecrate him, since they came freely then to Aleppo to concelebrate with him. Cf. footnote 31.

⁵² With *Macarios of Aleppo* (p. 631) and *Kilzi* (p. 138) there is no trace of the work “kharaje” that Nasrallah (*Chronologie*, p. 58) uses in a French translation of a passage from *Magmu’ latif* (A small collection). These 2 manuscripts literally say “the money of twelve years” which we can consider as the patriarchal rights on each diocese of the patriarchate. Besides, it was Cyril IV who exacted the money and not the pasha!

⁵³ Cf. H. Laoust, *Les Gouverneurs de Damas sous les Mamelouks and les premiers Ottomans* (1156-1744), Damascus 1952, pp. 199 ff.

⁵⁴ *Kilzi*, p. 138; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631; *Radu*, p. 41. The first manuscript specifies that Karmeh was forced to sign a document in which he would have been in accord to concelebrate as we read in the same manuscript.

⁵⁵ *Kilzi, Ibid.*; *Macarios of Aleppo, Ibid.* A letter of Maronite Gaspar surnamed “Pellegrino,” who was in Nicosia at this time, left us a very significant letter that relates these facts. It is dated April 30, 1626 and is found in *SOCC*, Vol. 112, fol. 415r: “Alli 22 di Marzo (1626) ho ricevuta una scritta da Roma alli 8 d’Ottobre 1625 per conto del Arcivescovo d’Aleppo (Meletios Karmeh), il quale secondo che ho inteso non si sà dove si trova perche un certo Greco prima Patriarca (Cyril IV Dabbas), ma dopo non so perche deposto, ha fatto tanto per mezzo de Turchi con li denari ch’ha rihavuto il Patriarcato di Soria o come vogliono Antiocheno et senza andar prima a pigliar il possesso in Damasco dove ordinariamente risiedono li patriarchi Grechi et rimover l’altro Patriarca (Ignatios III Atieh, who was not then at Damascus but rather at Beirut!) che ivi risiede et comanda a tutte le Chiese Greche do Soria; ha cominciato ad esercitar la iurisdittione in Aleppo, dove gli hà costato piu mille reali oltre le battiture et depositione et gli conviene andar nascosto fuggendo dove puo meglio declinare il furor del detto Patriarca (;) pero penso ch’habbi il detto Arcivescovo carestia di vivere, non che di pensar a me che poco so, e posso...” Even if this letter lacks precise information, nevertheless it proves the facts related in the Manuscript of Deir esh-Shir

On March 31, 1626 there was a large assembly of the notables of all the Christian communities of Aleppo. Cyril IV invited Karmeh to concelebrate with him but the archbishop refused a second time. The next day, which was Palm Sunday, Karmeh went to the cathedral where he cried before the people and the patriarch himself.⁵⁶ Immediately he left and settled himself in the home of a great functionary of the Ottoman Empire in order to return to Constantinople on April 10. Some time later, Cyril IV followed him to the home of the Ecumenical Patriarch, Cyril I Lucaris; both presented their complaints to him. After some never-ending discussion, Lucaris and his synod agreed with the wise Archbishop of Aleppo.⁵⁷

Karmeh returned to Aleppo by way of the sea and passed through Cyprus and Tripoli. On March 30, 1627 he was in Aleppo where he celebrated Pascha the next day to the joy of all the faithful of the city.⁵⁸ But the drama did not end there. For on October 3, Cyril IV Dabbas also arrived in Aleppo armed with new orders from Constantinople and put Karmeh, with twenty-seven persons, priests and laity, in the prison of Moutassellem. The case was taken before Moutassellem in the absence of the pasha of Aleppo who was in Mosul.⁵⁹ Again the Aleppians paid the ransom for the prisoners and Cyril IV lived on, abandoned and hated by the Christians of Aleppo. He even sensed that he would be assassinated. He fled at night to Damascus where the faithful received him only after he paid a considerable amount to free himself from the exactions and the deliberate rebuffs which the cousin of the patriarch made him submit to.⁶⁰ He remained there until the feast of Pascha (13 April 1628) after which he presented himself to Emir Maanide, Fakhr-ed-Din II, insisting on the necessity of convoking a synod of all the bishops of the patriarchate to settle once and for all the question of the legitimate patriarch, in dispute

published by Kilzi and of which we have taken many of the details. On Gaspar Pellegrino one should go to Chapter III of this study where they will find the question of the relations of Karmeh with the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.

⁵⁶ *Kilzi*, pp. 138-139. For a bishop 54 years old to cry before the assembly of the faithful at the same cathedral, it is necessary to presuppose that the vexations and the injustices overwhelmed him so much that he could not control himself at all before the impartial judge who is the people of God.

⁵⁷ *Kilzi*, p. 139; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631; *Radu*, p. 41; *Rustum* (p. 39) places these events in 1628 while the first cited manuscript clearly says that Karmeh left for Constantinople on March 10, 1626 and returned to Aleppo March 30 7135 of the creation of the world (=1627 AD). Cyril I Lucaris, who appeared twice in favor of Cyril IV of Antioch (end of 1619 at Alexandria and 1624 at Constantinople), now proved to be in favor of Karmeh. Cf. footnote 43. As the note of the *Kilzi* manuscript (p. 139) says, this was due in support of "presents" there and to their disapproval of the conduct of Cyril IV of Antioch. A testimony of Archimandrite Euthymios of Constantinople reveals to us Lucaris' attitude before 1626 toward this patriarch of Antioch: "Cyrillus Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus...quendam alium *Cyrillum* nomine haereticum, haereticum iam ac vitae dissolutissimae, instructum prius magis, quam erat haeresibus pluribus, eiectoque legitimo Patriarcha (=Ignatios III Atieh) Antiochenae Ecclesiae praefecit et confirmavit. Unde ad paesens duos Antiochenos Patriarchos una Ecclesia habet..." (*SOCG*, vol. 270, fol. 97r-98r).

⁵⁸ *Kilzi*, p. 139. The fact that Karmeh returned to Aleppo by sea and passed by Cyprus makes us suspect that he paid a visit to his friend, the Maronite priest Gaspar Pellegrino, who was at Nicosia during that time and to where the letters of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to the Greek Metropolitan of Aleppo were sent. Cf. footnote 55.

⁵⁹ *Kilzi*, *Ibid.*; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631; *Rustum*, p. 39.

⁶⁰ *Kilzi*, pp. 139-14; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631. In these two manuscripts we find the same Arabic expression to describe the faithful of Damascus: "Idmahalla Haluhom." Exhausted, they could no longer resist the pretensions of Cyril IV.

since 1619.⁶¹ He soon regretted making this request because he knew very well that the majority of bishops were already tired of this dispute between the two patriarchs. More importantly he knew they were tired of the deliberate rebuffs of the Turks that Cyril IV and his cousin aroused each time a diocese did not want to receive him. Moreover, he had not forgotten that his competitor, Ignatios III Atieh was the protégé of the Emir and the candidate of the Damascenes.⁶²

The Synod gathered on June 1, 1628 at Ras Baalbek where the Druze Emir Fakhr-ed-Din was then living. All the bishops of the patriarchate were present with Ignatios III himself; only Cyril IV Dabbas was not present because he sensed his end.⁶³ Dabbas was chained and taken by force from Damascus to Ras-Baalbek, but a decision had already been made: Ignatios III Atieh was proclaimed the only legitimate patriarch and Cyril had to disappear. When Dabbas arrived he was assassinated by the soldiers of the Druze emir and thrown into Ain-ar-Raheb near Hermel.⁶⁴ Ignatios III Atieh and the clergy who were faithful to him were accomplices in this wrongdoing; their involvement remained concealed.⁶⁵

CHAPTER II

THE PATRIARCHATE UNDER IGNATIOS III ATIEH (1628 – BEGINNING 1634)

1) Synod of Ras-Baalbek (June 1628)

⁶¹ Cyril IV lost his best friend Cyril Lucaris, who was very powerful at Constantinople. Losing him and the civil support (after the death of Ibn Sifa in 1624) and ecclesiastical support (after the attitude change of Lucaris in 1627), Cyril IV had only one solution: the legitimate voice of the synod. He even proposed to the Druze emir that the one who would be deposed would only have an eparchy, of which he could live. *Kilzi*, p. 140; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631, *Radu*, pp. 38-39; *Vat. Arab*, 689, fol. 129v.

⁶² *Kilzi*, pp. 140-141; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631; *Radu*, p. 39.

⁶³ The date, June 1, 1628 is given to us by a manuscript, extracts of which H. Zayat had published in his book: *Histoire de Saidnaya*, pp. 240 and 258. This date is proved by the manuscript published by *Kilzi*, (pp. 139-141) and by the second manuscript of *Macarios of Aleppo* (p. 631) where it is said that in October 7136 of the creation of the world (=1627), Cyril IV was then at Aleppo. According to *Kilzi* (p. 140) we know that soon after he ran away “to Damascus where he remained until Pascha” in the year 1628. The bishops who met were eleven, without counting Ignatios III Atieh. Cf. the names of these bishops in Nasrallah, *Chronologie*, pp. 58-60.

⁶⁴ *Kilzi*, p. 141; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632; *Radu*, p. 39; *Rustum*, p. 39. It is necessary to note that *Radu* (p. 38) only repeats without verification the error of *DHGE*, vol. III, col. 640 and 700, by simply reporting: “Cyril Dabbas, anti-patriarch, May 10/24, 1620 -1627.” No one can find any note on the date 7135 of the world (=1627 AD) that the manuscript of Paul of Aleppo has, and which is manifestly false. Besides, for this general part of the history of the Patriarchate of Antioch Paul only copies his father, Patriarch Macarios of Aleppo. Cf. preceding note. Also *Vat. Arab*. 689, fol. 129v also has the date 7136 of the world and not 7135.

Cyril IV was deposed for two main reasons: he was consecrated patriarch without the consent of his eparchy Damascus; he caused much damage and evil in the entire Patriarchate of Antioch. Cyril IV was executed before the end of the synod that condemned him.

⁶⁵ This is not revealed to us by any of the manuscripts mentioned above. But it comes only from an account given by Capuchin Andrien of Brousse, missionary at Beirut, to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, an account which we will study later.

The extraordinary Synod of Ras-Baalbek in June 1628 which deposed Cyril IV Dabbas by recognizing Ignatios III Atieh as the only legitimate patriarch occupied itself with several other urgent questions of the patriarchate. It promulgated twenty canons reproving bad habits which had been slowly introduced among the clergy and laity.⁶⁶

The first six canons related to the election and enthroning of the patriarch. This synod of bishops established the inalienable law of electing three candidates with the consent of the people. All the gathered bishops would have to draw lots for one of these three candidates without the laity interfering in it. When the candidate was chosen he would be consecrated patriarch by the gathered bishops and then civil confirmation would be procured. Recourse to the governor to have the patriarch named without the consent of the synod of bishops was categorically reprovved, and all those who did not follow these norms were excommunicated.⁶⁷

The seventh canon treated the question of simony which was very wide spread among all the hierarchs mainly because of the enormous sums of money the Ottomans exacted on the occasion of each new patriarchal election.⁶⁸

The patriarch obtained his money from his bishops, they from their pastors, pastors from the faithful. The best occasion for this was certainly that of the administration of the sacraments.⁶⁹

The other thirteen canons relate mainly to bad customs which had infiltrated among the Christians from contact with non-Christians who surrounded them.⁷⁰ All this

⁶⁶ According to Paul of Aleppo (*Radu* p. 38), the minutes of this synod are found in the patriarchal library and also with him. Nasrallah (*Chronologie*, p. 60) implies that these documents were lost in 1860 when the churches of Damascus were ransacked. *Rustum* (pp. 40-43) had published the 20 canons, a manuscript of which H. Zayat said he possessed (cf. his work: *Histoire de Saidnaya*, Harissa 1932, pp. 240 and 258; and Bacha, *Voyage*, p. 38). Another example of the year 1839 is mentioned by C. Bacha, *History of the Greek Melkites* (in Arabic), I, Saida 1938, p. 88.

⁶⁷ *Rustum*, pp. 40-41. We see that these canons were inspired by the recent events in which Cyril IV Dabbas had relied on Ibn Sifa of Tripoli in order to be consecrated patriarch. Compare with the election and consecration of the first definitely "Catholic" patriarch in 1724. Cf. on this subject J. Hajjar, *Nouvelle Histoire de l'Eglise IV*, Paris 1966, p. 247; C. Bacha, *History of the Greek Melkites* (in Arabic) I, pp. 6-7 and 23; J. Nasrallah, *S. B. Maximos IV et la succession apostolique de siege d'Antioche*, Paris 1963, pp. 57 ff; article "Antioche" in *DHGE*, III, col. 647; *Musset*, II, pp. 174-175; Bacha, *Voyage*, p. 48; *S.C. Greci melchiti, Miscellanea "Causa de Greci Melchiti 1743,"* fol. 35v-38v.

⁶⁸ *Rustum*, p. 41. In this canon appears simony that the patriarch and bishops practiced in order to confer major orders on clerics. This simony is considered by the fathers of the synod a sacrilege worse than the treason of Judas Iscariot and the heresies of Apollinarius and of Macedonius.

⁶⁹ This was practiced everywhere else at that time, but with more or less regularity according to the needs and honesty of those who did it. For example, besides the heresies attributed to Cyril I Lucaris, he was also held as a simoniac. Cf. *SOCC*, vol. 270, fol. 139v: "et anche vien tenuto per Simoniaco conferendo li vescovati e Beneficij ecclesiastici e concendendo Brevi d'Indulgenze massime in Articolo Mortis per denari..." In 1664 Maronite Patriarch George Bseb'eli (1657-1670) conferred priestly ordination to a bigamist after having touched a sum of money. Cf. *SOCC*, vol. 240, fol. 35r and 110v.

⁷⁰ *Rustum*, pp. 41-43. The 8th canon determined the qualities of the candidate for priesthood, the 9th prohibited illegitimate marriage, the 10th ordered the simplify of festivities after baptism, the 11th determined the dowry in marriages, the 12th prohibited priests getting drunk at wedding receptions, the 13th

seems to give us more or less a clear view on the life of the Christian in the Ottoman Empire, conveyed by the relationship between laity and clergy, clergy and government.⁷¹

The reason for all these decisions was certainly the continuous repetition of abuses committed by the clergy and the exactions which the Christians suffered because of the Ottomans.⁷² But what seems most decisive in these resolutions is the new pressure exerted by the Latin missionaries since 1625. Touraine Capuchins arrived in Aleppo (Syria) in 1625⁷³ and founded a monastery there.⁷⁴ The Jesuits and Carmelites also established houses in 1627⁷⁵ although two Jesuits were unsuccessful in the first

prescribed that the ceremony of marriage only take place inside the church, the 14th excommunicated those who practiced magic, the 15th prohibited “mixed” monasteries, the 16th banished heretical books, the 17th rejected demanding money as penance under the pretext of giving this money to the poor, the 18th prohibited wandering priests seeking money without the authorization of the patriarch, the 19th prescribed dimissorial letters to ordinands and the 20th rejected the so-called patriarchal vicars who were from the laity.

⁷¹ It is necessary to admit that many of these usages rejected by the synod are still in practice today in the Near East. The secular neighborhood with non-Christians could not have influence on Christian life just as it has on the lives of the non-Christians.

⁷² Cf. J. Nasrallah, “Vie de la Chrétienté Melkite sous la domination Turque” in *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, 90 (1948) 95-98. (Extract, Paris 1949).

⁷³ It concerns the Capuchins of the old ecclesiastical Province of Touraine of which Tours was the episcopal residence. It was Fr. Pacific of Provins who prepared this mission. Cf. De Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg 1963, p. 82. The secretary Francesco Ingoli wrote: “cum proposuissem Relationem, datam à Patre Pacifico à Scala (also called “Scaligero”) cappuccino Gallo circa populos Orientales, per quos transivit in itinere suo Hierosollymitano, Sanctissimus (the pope), et Patres decreverunt, ut infrà: primo quod sex capuccini mittantur ad Urbem Aleppi...” (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 27r).

⁷⁴ Cf. G. Goyau, “Une capitale missionnaire du Levant, Alep, dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle” in *Revue d'histoire des Missions*, XI, Paris 1934, pp. 161-186; C. De Terzorio, *Le Missioni dei Minori Capuccini, Sunto storico*, V, pp. 16 and 48; H. de Barenton, *La France Catholique en Orient Durant les trois derniers siècles, d'après les documents inédits*, Paris 1902, pp. 93 ff.

⁷⁵ De Vries, *op. cit.*, p. 82. The entire house of the Carmelites served mainly as a hospice for their missionaries who went to Bassora in Persia. Cf. *Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 15r: “equatuor Patres... una cum alio viro optimo à Civitate Venetiarum cito discessuri errant, navigaturi in Aleppum, et inde transituri in Persiam ad fidem catholicam propagandam.” The stable mission of the Carmelites at Aleppo was not yet founded. Cf. the decree of foundation in *Acts*, vol. 3, fol. 233v: “ut facilius, et commodius missionarij *Persiae*, et Bassorae ad loca eis destinata se transferre possint, S. Congregatio censuit constituendum esse in Aleppo Syriae hospitium pro Carmelitis discalceatis, in quo semper duo fratres degerent, qui missionarios praedictos euntes et redeuntes in eo recipere.” The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith recommended the Carmelites to the French and Venetian Consuls at Aleppo.

foundation in 1625.⁷⁶ The British Capuchins already had residences in Saida (1625) and Beirut (1628) and were attempting to influence the local hierarchy there.⁷⁷

2) Ignatios III and Rome

The influence of the Latin missionaries is revealed to us above all by the solicitation made by the Capuchin, Adrian of Brosse, missionary in Beirut, in favor of Patriarch Ignatios III Atieh and his clergy.⁷⁸ This missionary requested the Roman

⁷⁶ The first two Jesuits, Gaspar Manilier and John Stella, arrived in Aleppo around the end of July 1625 (on July 16 they were at Alexandretta). But the Franciscans, installed there since 1571, prohibited them to administer the sacraments and even to say Mass in the chapel of the French Consul or in the Maronite church. It was especially Franciscan Father Adrian of Barbantia who waged war with them by accusing them to the Ottomans as “nemici del gran Turco, perturbatori degli stati, venuti da paesi nemici.” The qadi of Aleppo ordered them to leave Aleppo in 3 days. The two Jesuits left to Alexandretta after spending more than 3 months in Aleppo. There they were incarcerated. When released they had to leave to Malta from where they took the route to Constantinople to get authorization from the sultan. On April 21, 1627 they were definitely installed at Aleppo. Cf. SOCG, vol. 195, fol. 159r-167r: “Relatione della missione d’Aleppo della compagnia di Giesù. Sall’anno 1625, insino al fine dell’anno 1629.” This account was made by J. Queyrot on December 26, 1629.

⁷⁷ Cf. SOCG, vol. 196, fol. 76r-77v: letter of Fra Egide de Loches, superior of the Capuchins at Saida (October 7, 1627); vol. 197, fol. 55r-57v: “Brevis descriptio locorum Missionis Capucinatorum provinciae Britannicae in paribus Syriae et Palaestinae.” After the foundation of a residence in Saida and another in Beirut, these British Capuchins also founded a third in Tripoli (1634), a fourth in Damascus (1637) and a fifth in Abbay (1645). G. Hering (Oekumenisches Patriarchat..., Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 153-154) confused Touraine Capuchins and British Capuchins. Those of Toruraine only had a residence in Aleppo Syria. Cf. SOCG, vol. 196, fol. 109v.

⁷⁸ *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 90v: “Referente eodem Emin. D. Card. Ubaldino instantiam, quam per Missionarios capuccinos Aleppi faciebant Patriarcha Antiochenus Graecus, eiusque complices episcopi sacerdotes, diaconi pro absoluteione à Censuris et dispensatione ab irregularitate incursis ob assassinium mediantibus percunijis per Turcas commissum in Personam Patriarchae itidem Antiocheni (Cyril IV Dabbas) in Patriarchatu Antiocheno graeco competitoris: Sac Congregatio censuit, non esse petitioni *oratorum* annuendum, nisi prius cum Sancta Romana Ecclesia *uniantur* iuxta praescriptum Sac. Conc. Florentini et postea Sanctitati Suae supplicent.” Note that the “Oratores” were not the Greeks but the Capuchins, and the Congregation for the Propagation of Faith understood that they were the Greeks themselves! Cf. the content of the account of Capuchin Adrian of Brosse in: SOCG, vol. 195, fol. 266v. Also it did not concern the Capuchins of Aleppo who had never know Patriarch Ignatios III Atieh because he was always in or around Beirut near his protector Fakhr-ed-Din II (cf. *Kilzi*, p. 142; SOCG, vol. 195, fol. 266r). We must certainly excuse the confusion of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on this subject, for Aleppo was the center of all the missions in the Near East and all that was done in other small villages of Syria could be easily attributed to Aleppo! This is why we believe necessary the control of what came to be reported in the Acts from the “*Scrittura Originali*” which were often more precise. But this confusion persisted in an inexcusable manner among some of our specialists in this matter who were content nearly always with the Acts of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith without any control with the original documents. In fact C. Korolevsky made a typewritten directory (of which the first owner is J. Nasrallah) titled: *Index des documents concernant l’histoire des Patriarcats Melkites renfermés dans les Archives de la Sacrée Congrégation de la Propagande*. M. Roncaglia made a copy of the part concerning “the Franciscans and the Greek-Melkite Catholics” and published it under his name in *Studia Orientalia Christiana*, Collect. No. 2, Cairo 1957, pp. 121 ff. The only historical confusion that Korolevsky committed in his cited Index (not in his article “Antioche” DHGE, col.640) was taken by Roncaglia who seems to have not known either Cyril IV Dabbas or Ignatios III Atieh. In fact he wrote: “the Melkite Patriarch Cyril IV Dabbas, having put to death by the Turks his competitor Igantios III Atieh, requests absolution from Rome... These facts are reported by a letter from the Capuchins of Aleppo.” We see that these 3 lines continue 4 historical mistakes: it was Ignatios III who had his competitor put to death and not the contrary; by the soldiers of the

Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for the faculty to absolve the patriarch and his accomplices for the assassination of Cyril IV Dabbas.⁷⁹ He also solicited grants for the Greek patriarch of Antioch to deal with the irregularities of simony among the Greeks, in case they wished to unite to the Roman Church⁸⁰ for Patriarch Ignatios III with his accomplices had shown a certain disposition to “conversion.”⁸¹

This request of the Capuchin Adrian of Brosse was misunderstood at the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and surprised the Roman cardinals who naturally posed the union of the whole Greek Melkite Patriarchate of Antioch as a precondition⁸² since no member of the patriarchal clergy had officially requested this absolution. Truly it was the initiative of the British Capuchins of Beirut who wanted to

Druze Emir Fakhr-ed-Din and not by the Turks; it was the missionaries who asked for the authorization to absolve while the patriarch made no official request, and these facts are reported by a Capuchin of Beirut, Adrian of Brosse, and not by the Capuchins of Aleppo. J. Nasrallah (*Notes et documents*, pp. 125-126) denounces the plagiarism and corrects only the first of the 4 mistakes.

⁷⁹ Adrian of Brosse wrote to the Congregation (without date): “Essendo duoi Competitori per rispetto del Patriarcato d’Antiochia, liquali havessero dato dinari per il detto patriarcato, secondo l’usanza de’ Greci, si litigano lo spazzo d’un anno (rather 7 years, cf. Radu, p. 38) con scisma grande in quella natione, alcuni vescovi, Sacerdoti ed altri d’una parte ed altri dell’altra, vedendo il presente patriarca (i. e. Ignatios III Atieh) che non poteva surmontare ne vincere il suo competitore per rispetto de’ amici potentissimi che teneva, procura col i suoi dal far amassare, e diederono diece mille ducati al principe di Syria (i.e. Fakhr-ed-Din II) il quale lo mando chiamar in Damasco, ed il detto competitore (mortuo) (sic) dubitando dell’intentione del detto principe, non volse andare, ma il principe mando al Bascia di Damasco che li mandasse o per amore o per forze, e fu fatto come ordinava, ed il detto competitor caminando per strada per venir trovare il principe, *gli soldati del detto principe* l’amassarono; e questo fu dopo havere tentato ogni maniera del far’amassare come io ho visto per lettere scritte di quello chi tiene hogie la Sedia patriarcale; fato conosciuto da tutte natione, e per l’estessa ragione il detto patriarca non po habitare piu in Damasco come soleva, per che la sorella del mortuo s’è fatta Turcha e maritata con uno potente di Damasco il quale voglie amassare questo e vindicarsi della sudetta morte. Ed hogie si *è qualche dispositione alla conversione* del detto patriarca e sono molti vescovi e sacerdoti liquali sono in la stessa dispositione liquali hanno stati compagni nella procuratione della morte del sudetto competitore” (*SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 266r).

⁸⁰ Cf. *SOCG*, Vol. 195, fol. 268: “Considerata circa simoniam Graecorum” that the Capuchin Adrian of Brosse wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to show how the Greeks bought the patriarchal charge from the infidels. The Congregation meeting 144 (in presence of the pope) of July 5, 1631 also had a word to say on this point: “referente eodem Em. D. Card. Ubaldino Instantiam Missionariorum Capuccinorum Aleppi (rather Capuchin Adrian of Brosse, missionary in Beirut), ut aliqua provisio fieret in Patriarchatu Antiocheno Greco (and not of the Greek “Nation!”) ne ecclesiastici ob solvendas Turcarum angarias cogantur vendere Sacramenta, et dignitates ecclesiasticas. Sac. Congregatio dixit prius agendum esse de eorum unione” (*Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 91r).

⁸¹ Cf. footnote 79. We can clearly see that it only related to “arrangement” that the Capuchin Adrian had sounded out with the prelates. But it would be better to be covered with the personal arrangement for the request of absolution of Rome!

⁸² Fr. Ingoli, Secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith commented on this request in writing: “Di due case consulta il Padre Andriano la Sac. Congregazione per potere senza errori provvedere alla salute di molte anime. Il primo è del patriarcha d’Antiochia de Greci... Parendoli (i.e. to Fr. Adrian) che quando voglia unirsi colla Sede Apostolica (of Rome) colli vescovi partecipi in quel fatto, si possa con esso lui e colli detti vescovi et altri ecclesiastici dispensare, essendovi probabile speranza che per mezzo logo s’uniranno li popoli al detto patriarcha e vescovi soggetti; essendo li popoli soliti di seguirar li loro prelati (this is the impression of Ingoli and not the post-Florentine experience!), comme le pecore il pastore... Non videtur concedenda gratia nisi totus patriarchatus redeatur ad unionem cum Sta. Romana Ecclesia, et hoc quoad forum externum et internum. Quoad vero ad iterum tantum non videtur deneganda, si ei uniantur cum Santa Romana Ecclesia, et velint recipere paenitentias salutares, easque graves attenda delicti gravissimi qualitate” (*SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 268v).

hasten the global union of this patriarchate with Rome.⁸³ After speaking about it on 5 July 1631, neither the missionaries nor the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith mentioned it again.⁸⁴ For such a grave question, everyone wanted to do everything possible to bring it to good terms; in all seriousness we see that the request was very pretentious on the part of the Capuchins.⁸⁵

3) Death of Patriarch Ignatios III

Despite this whole question, agitated by the Capuchin Adrian of Brosse, the name of Patriarch Ignatios III began to be commemorated in the diptychs of the Eparchy of Aleppo on August 6, 1629.⁸⁶ The patriarch did not dare return to Damascus where the family of the deceased Patriarch, Cyril IV Dabbas, was very influential.⁸⁷ He remained in Beirut and its surrounding area until the beginning of the Ottoman war against Emir Fakhr ed-Din II in 1633.⁸⁸ With the defeat and capture of the emir, Ignatios III Atieh was deprived of his powerful protector and had to flee from the Ottoman authorities.⁸⁹

⁸³ Adrian of Brosse also gave very interesting considerations on this subject: “Considerata, circa illa quae possunt opponi, ne concedatur autoritas dispensandi super Irregularitate in casu particulari proposito:

1) Ad id quod potest dici, quod sit homicidium voluntarium. R.: verum esse, licet non manu propria, aliena, tamen mediante pecunia turcis data, perpetratum.

2) Quod sit manifestum et publicum. R.: primo respectu patriarchae Graecorum (i.e. Ignatios III Atieh) talem rumorem in partibus illis universalem esse; neminem tamen de hoc testificare posse certo. Secundo respectu Episcoporum, Sacerdotum, diaconorum etc esse occultum; qui, enim tale homicidium procuraverint, et cum dicto Patriarcha convenerint ignorantur; quosdam vero tantum suspicari non est dubium.

3) Quamvis in detrimentum Sanctae Ecclesiae Romanae verti videatur si tales homicidae acceptentur. R.: potius gloriae illi fore; si consideretur quod a Schismaticis extra ipsam Ecclesiam tale homicidium perpetratum fuerit, et cum, veniam talis praediciti, in sua Ecclesia non esse arbitrati sint, ad S. Pontificem tamquam Vicarium Christi, et ad matrem, Ecclesiam recurrunt, ut illos culpam agnoscentes et verè poenitentes recipiat, et ob seclus commissum, misericorditer indulgeat. Si dicatur quod tantum ad Missionarios recurrant. R.: illos nihil aliud in persona Missionariorum, quam S. Pont. considerare, et ad salutem suarum animarum procurandam misso arbitantes, omnium auctoritatem a S. Pont. ipsis concessam, ad id peragendum, credunt.

4) Bonum et utilitas indè proveniens attendatur; quia licet reunio totalis ob id non fiat; cum illa ijs diebus tam cito non possit fieri, tamen, inde successione temporis, labore Missionariorum, auxiliantibus Episcopis et conversis, et Deo iuvante, speratur. Quod si talis autoritas non concedatur, erit dictae reunioni impedimento” (*SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol. 267r). We see that the entire question revolves around “authority” which the Capuchins wanted to have beside the local ecclesiastical authority!

⁸⁴ In fact we see no trace of this question in the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith after that date!

⁸⁵ It goes without saying that it was often the missionaries who went before the desires of the non-Catholic prelates to attract to the union by permitting them books printed in Rome, subsidies, etc... and even absolutions! In fact in everything that Adrian of Brosse wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith we see nowhere that Patriarch Ignatios III Atieh or one of his prelates requesting an absolution from Rome!

⁸⁶ *Kilzi*, p. 141. It was the day after the re-entry of Karmeh to Aleppo after the Synod of Ras-Baalbek. Since 1619 neither of the 2 competitors were commemorated officially in the eparchy of Aleppo.

⁸⁷ Cf. the account of Fr. Adrian of Brosse, footnote 79.

⁸⁸ Fakhr-ed-Din II was put to death at Constantinople in 1635. Cf. A. Ismaïl, *Histoire du Liban du XVII siècle à nos jours*, I, Paris 1955, pp. 5 ff; A. Al-Khalidi, *Lebanon at the Time of Fakhr-ed-Din II Maanide* (in Arabic), Beirut 1936, pp. 32ff; E. Douaïhy, *History of the Times: 1095-1699* (in Arabic), Beirut 1951, pp. 201-229.

⁸⁹ *Kilzi*, p. 142; *Radu*, p. 40; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 129v.

Atieh happened to be in Saida assisting at the death and burial of the local bishop, Mark; he attempted to return to Beirut at night in a military disguise. On the way he was ambushed by the Druze who mistook him for a soldier and struck him down from his horse and killed him. He was buried in a church near the Damour River near Choueifat.⁹⁰ This was probably in January 1634.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Nasrallah (*Chronologie*, p. 62) gives a poetic description of it: “which was the astonishment of the partisans of Fakhr-ed-Din by recognizing in their victim the former secretary and protégé of their master! Some among them who were Christians recognized their patriarch.” In *Macarios of Aleppo* (p. 632), *Kilzi* (p. 142), it concerns a not specified “certain people” who killed Ignatios III. In *Vat. Arab.* 689 (fol. 129v) and *Radu* (p. 40), it was the Druze who did it.

⁹¹ *Vat. Arab.* 689 (fol. 130v) gives 7142 of the creation of the world for the date of his death and counts 7 years of the patriarchate (since the Synod of Ras-Baalbek in June 1628), thus it is the year 1634 AD. *Radu* (p. 40) gives 7143 of the creation of the world as the date of death (according to *Manuscript 6016 of the National Library of Paris*) and 7142 (according to *Manuscript 33 of the Asiatic Museum of Leningrad*). We clearly see that 7143 is without doubt wrong because it corresponds to the period from September 14, 1634 to September 13, 1635. We know that on May 1, 1634 Karmeh had already been consecrated Patriarch of Antioch after the death of Ignatios III Atieh (*Kilzi*, p. 142). *Macarios of Aleppo* (p. 632) speaks of a 14 year patriarchate and of 7141 as the date of death for Ignatios, which corresponds to 1633 AD. Moreover, we know that the successor of Ignatios, the Metropolitan of Aleppo, Karmeh, was already at Damascus for consecration on April 23, 1634 (*Kilzi*, p. 142). We have to remember the distances and the manner of communications in that era: news of the death had to arrive from Beirut to Damascus; the Damascenes had to decide on the candidate: they had to reach Aleppo to convince Karmeh to come with them; then again go from Aleppo to Damascus. Considering all these factors we see that the date of the death of Patriarch Ignatios III could only have been after January 1634. Compare with Nasrallah (*Chronologie*, p. 62) who puts it in April 1634 and Korolevsky (article “Antioche” of *DHGE*, col. 640) “around April 1634!”

4) Latin Missionaries at Work

According to the directives of the recently established Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the Latin missionaries had two distinct purposes, both conducted for the edification of the kingdom of God. On one hand they were obliged to affirm the Catholics and preserve them from the dangers of schism, heresy and apostasy; on the other hand to convert the schismatics, heretics and infidels.⁹² The Catholics of Syria at that time were the Maronites who had been totally united to Rome since the Crusades⁹³ but were no less suspect of errors and heresies.⁹⁴ Along with these united Easterners, there were a good number of Latins mainly in the large cities such as Aleppo, Saida, Tripoli and Damascus. Most of them were there for business reasons or for diplomatic functions, thus only temporary.⁹⁵ The work of the Latin missionaries was geared more toward conversion by combating Calvinist infiltrations which were already made in the north of the Ottoman empire and especially in Constantinople.⁹⁶

⁹² Cf. *Collectanea* I (a. 1622-1866), pp. 1-2: “la cura della fede cattolica, essendo intorno ad essa due opere necessaire, l’una di conservarla né fedeli constringendoli etianodio con pene a ritenerla fermamente, l’altra di spargerla e propagarla negl’infedeli... hora che per divina misericordia pare, che si aprano pet tutta la christianità di ampie porte alla conversione degli eretici et infedli... consideri attentamente tutto quello, che potesse utilmente farsi, cosi per la conversione degli heretici, o scismatici, o di altri infideli, come per ritenere i popoli che maggiormente non s’infettassero, et insieme per impedire i progressi ai ministri e predicatori heretici...” (*Litterae Encyclicae S.C. de Prop. Fide 15 Ianurarii 1622, ad omnes Nutios Apostolicos*).

⁹³ Cf. K. As-Salibi, “The Maronites” (in Arabic) in *Documents An-Nahar*, Beirut 1970, pp. 15-16. The union of the Maronites with Rome, according to this Lebanese author, took place around 1180 after intermittent connections since 1099. *De Vries* (p. 76) gives 1180 as the date for the formal union of the Maronites with Rome (cf. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 201, 855-856). With precision K. As-Salibi describes the dissensions between the two partisans of this union: one pro-unionistic part and another anti-unionistic, at least between 1180 and 1283 (*op. cit.*, pp. 18-22). Compare with Dib, *Histoire de l’Eglise Maronite*, Beirut 1962, pp. 19-58. Cf. also K. As-Salibi, “The Maronite Church in the Middle Ages and Its Union with Rome,” *Oriens Christianus* 42 (1958) 92-104. According to these writings we see that it was not only westerners who only spoke about the late union of the Maronites with Rome!

⁹⁴ Cf. the account of the Milanese priest Leonard, sent by Pope Gregory XV August 2, 1622 with a bull to the Maronite Patriarch John Makhlof (1609-1634), in: *SOCC*, vol. 196, fol. 56v. The patriarch complains “de Gesuiti, che habbino contro ogni verità in voce et nelle stampe chimata la natione de Maroniti Heretica.” In 1629 Capuchin Adrian of Brosse, missionary in Beirut, in a letter dated November 10, 1629 to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, enumerated the “depraved” rites of the Maronites of which he had not written “senza il comandamento della Congregazione) (*SOCC*, vol. 115, fol. 281r). Also on July 14, 1683 the complaints of the Maronite Victor Accurensis were examined at the Congregation’s general meeting 179 (in presence of Pope Urban VII): “Vittorio Accorensis Maronita espone humilmente à Vostra Santità com’alcuni Auttori latini han scritto, e srampato, che I Maroniti sono heretici Dioscoriani, Montoliti (for “Monoteliti”), et anco Nestoriani; è stato forzato comporre un libro, de duabus in Christo naturis...: *SOCC*, vol. 393, fol.187r).

⁹⁵ Soon the missionaries began to for a bishop for the Latins especially in Aleppo. In 1645 we find a residential Latin bishop designated for this city “ob mercatores in ea degentes, vel ad illam confluentes!” Cf. *SOCC*, vol. 196, fol. 89r; vol. 197, fol. 47r.

⁹⁶ G. Strinopoulos, “Die Beziehungen der Orthodoxen Kirche zu den anderen Kirchen” in *Ekklesia*, Leipzig 1939, Band X (45) 114-159. Cf. particularly the chapter “Calvinismu als Orthodoxie” in G. Hering, *Oekumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik (1620-1638)*, Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 176-206. Compare with *SOCC*, vol. 270, fol. 237rv, and vol. 398, fol. 274rv.

The springboard from which these missionaries had to throw themselves into the Greek-Melkite, Jacobite, Armenian and Nestorian communities had to be the chapels of the consuls and particularly the Maronite churches.⁹⁷ But the work was not so easy because these Christians were linguistically and ethnologically different than the Latins.⁹⁸ There were also spiritual, intellectual and national rivalries among the workers themselves.⁹⁹

The Franciscans could in no way tolerate that intruders would gather what they had sowed for centuries.¹⁰⁰ In fact, the affair of the first two Jesuits who arrived in Aleppo in 1625 was only the prelude to so many other episodes requiring the repeated intervention of the Roman Congregation by the intermediary of the superior generals and the consuls.¹⁰¹ There were many who wanted to divide the Eastern Christian communities among the different Latin orders who had sent their missionaries there.¹⁰² Quarrels were sometimes so violent that they scandalized the non-Latin Christians and even the

⁹⁷ This is what Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers reported to Cardinal Borgia in a letter written at Aleppo on December 28, 1629: “Quello ch’o io gia scritto alla Sacra Congregazione che quasi l’unica strada di ridurre gli scismatici è di *predicar ai Maroniti*, petche il piu grand errore di questo paese è l’ignoranza laquale cacciata sarebbono convertiti, e quando si predica in una chiesa di Christiani o Maroniti o Grechi o Armeni o Suriani concorrono gli altri anco alla predica... e pian piano *insinuare* ne i loro animi la salutare dottrina della S. Chiesa” (*SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 325v).

⁹⁸ It is true that most of the Christians of Syria understand Arabic. But among the Armenians there are those who only know Armenian (even today!), among the Greek Melkites those who only know Greek, among the Nestorians those who only know Chaldean... Besides, even if the Syrians, Maronites and Greek Melkites are of the same race, it is also necessary to take account of the Armenian nation, the Nestorian nation and the Hellenic colony who each have its own particular customs and mentality. For what concern the Greek Melkites, cf. C. Karalevskji (Korolevsky), “L’origine ethologique des Melkites” in *EO*, 11 (1908) 82-89, and also the same author in *DHGE*, vol. III, col. 585-589

⁹⁹ Besides the spiritualities and devotions proper to each religious order represented by these missionaries, do not forget the difference of intellectual preparation proper to each order and the rivalries particularly between the missionaries of French and Spanish origin. For the majority among them see the affirmation of De Vries, *op. cit.*, p. 83: “Die Missionare kamen durchweg ohne jede spezielle Vorbereitung in den Nahen Osten” without forgetting those who followed the course of the controversy at Rome.

¹⁰⁰ In fact they were in the Holy Land and in Beirut since the 13th century and in Aleppo since 1571. Cf. article “Beyrouth” of *DHGE*, 9, col. 1324-1325; Goluboviteh, series I, vol. II, Quaracchi 1913, p. 264; compare with *DThC*, vol. X, col. 1881 and 1973. At Saida they were intermittently the chaplains of the French consuls until 1626 when the Capuchins replaced them: cf. *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 76r-77v. In Tripoli they claimed their former rights usurped by the Capuchins who founded a residence there in 1634: cf. *Acta*, Congregation meeting 127 of March 13, 1668, fol. 35rv.

¹⁰¹ Concerning the Jesuits see footnote 76. A quarrel between the Capuchins and the Franciscans was also set off on the occasion of a sermon by Capuchin Father Agathange at the Maronite Church of Aleppo where the faithful were dismissed by the Franciscans and the preacher remained all alone in the church! Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 15, fol. 273r, 278v 313rv. Another quarrel began between the 2 branches of this same order of St. Francis on the subject of the chapel of the French consul in Saida (cf. *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 122r-123r), and on the subject of the administration of the sacraments at Tripoli (cf. *Acta* of the year 1668, fol. 35rv, cited in the previous footnote).

¹⁰² For example the doctor of the Venetian consul at Aleppo, Louis Ramiro, who was at the same time “consultor” (responsalis) of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for the missions of Syria, wrote to this Congregation in April 1629: “per mantenere questa concordia (among the missionaries of Aleppo) sarebbe bene di dar la cura della Nation Greca alli padri Gesuiti, dell’Armenia alli capucini, delli Nestoriani à Minori Osservanti e de Giacobiti et altre nationi alli Carmelitani Scalzi...” (*SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 5r), also the meeting of the Congregation itself (cf. *Acta*, general meeting of November 30, 1629, fol. 360v-361v).

Muslims.¹⁰³ Yet little by little their presence became necessary, either for the instruction of the people or for the moral and spiritual support of these Christians.¹⁰⁴ The Greek-Melkite clergy and people of Antioch gained the sympathy of the Jesuits and Capuchins while, before the arrival of the new wave of missionaries in 1625, the Franciscans had already won some recruits in Aleppo including their bishop Meletios Karmeh.¹⁰⁵ The work of missionaries began to take root in Syria mainly through this Greek Melkite metropolitan of Aleppo because he never wanted to distinguish between Jesuits, Capuchins or Franciscans. Essential for him was the spiritual good of these Christians who were suffocating because of Ottoman oppression and total ignorance.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 289r, 299v. Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers wrote from Aleppo on November 12, 1629: “che diranno gli Scismatici e Infedeli, qual esempio a loro se veddano esser gelosia tra gli religiosi!” (*Ibid.*, fol. 276r).

¹⁰⁴ Metropolitan of Aleppo Meletios Karmeh himself asked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, sending Fr. Thomas Obicini de Novare, as well as other experts in the Greek and Arabic languages (*SOCG*, vol. 181, fol. 35r). Even Patriarch of Antioch Euthymios III the Chiot called Fr. Jerome Queyrot to Damascus for the teaching of the Greek language (*SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 44r).

¹⁰⁵ The Franciscans, who were in Aleppo since 1571, had a lot of relations with Metropolitan Karmeh since his accession to the episcopate in 1612. And it was with the custodian of the Holy Land who was visiting Aleppo that he sent his delegate, Protosyncellos Absalon to Rome in 1621, as we will see in the next chapter.

¹⁰⁶ This could be noted in most of the letters that this metropolitan sent to Rome. See, for example, the letters contained in *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 35v and 43 v; vol. 181, fol. 35r and 36r.

CHAPTER III

FROM METROPOLITAN (1612-1634) TO PATRIARCH (8 MONTHS) KARMEH, FIRST MARTYR OF THE UNION OF ANTIOCH WITH ROME

1) Meletios Karmeh: Metropolitan of Aleppo (February 1612 - April 1634).

Born in Hama (Syria) in 1572,¹⁰⁷ the young Abdel-Karim Karmeh received religious education from his father, Houran, a priest, and his mother Saadat who kept herself busy with him after the assassination of his father.¹⁰⁸ At an adult age he made a pilgrimage to the Holy Places with his friend Barlaam¹⁰⁹ and became a monk in a monastery in Jerusalem where he remained two years.¹¹⁰ Upon the request of his fellow citizens he returned to Hama and placed himself in the service of the local bishop. Simeon ordained him deacon¹¹¹ and then much later priest¹¹² and kept him in his service in Hama.¹¹³ This young priest, a flower of the Hamawites, was directed by Providence to

¹⁰⁷ *Kilzi*, p. 42 and p. 144; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 130v; *Radu*, p. 40. Karmeh was not Aleppian as Korolevsky (Korolevskij) says in his article “Antioche” in *DHGE*, III, col. 639-640. This error was corrected by J. Nasrallah in his article “Euthyme II Karmé” in the same *DHGE* col. 53. *Rustum* (p. 44) puts the date of Karmeh’s birth in 1586! This has no foundation.

¹⁰⁸ *Kilzi*, pp. 42-43. His biographer and disciple, *Macarios of Aleppo*, adds that Karmeh “was elected for God from the womb of his mother.” His father was killed by thieves when he was traveling from Tripoli to Hama.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* This Barlaam became a monk of St. Sabas in Jerusalem and then later from St. Sabas to Jassy that Macarios of Aleppo visited on January 25, 1653, cf. *Radu*, p. 4, p. 160 ff.

¹¹⁰ The date of Karmeh’s entrance to the monastery is also unknown. We only know that he entered there “when he attained the height of his youth.” Moreover the *Vat. Arab.* 401, fol. 172v has a colophon by the hand of Abdel-Karim Ibn al-Khourī al-Hamawī that ends the transcription of the book “Spiritual Paradise” (in Arabic) on February 17, 7112 (1604) in the Monastery of St. Michael in Jerusalem. This shows us the imprecision of the data of Macarios of Aleppo for the first period of the life of Karmeh. In fact, according to the biographer of Karmeh, he had been ordained a deacon at the age of 29 (which corresponds to the year 1601) after having spent two years at St. Sabas Monastery! (*Kilzi*, pp. 43-44). The presence of Abdel-Karim Karmeh at St. Michael Monastery in Jerusalem in February 1604 leads us to think that it was his entrance to the monastery that took place when he was 29 and not his diaconate. Besides, Macarios of Aleppo had only known his teacher Karmeh from Aleppo where Macarios became a priest in the first decade of the 17th century. It is from the accounts of his teacher that he wrote this biography after his accession to the patriarchate in 1647 (cf. *Kilzi*, p. 144). Thus some confusion could well have slipped in particularly in the period when Macarios of Aleppo did not live near his teacher. Cf. *DHGE*, 14 (1967), col. 35. St. Michael Monastery was an annex to the great Monastery of St. Sabas described by Paul of Aleppo! (*Radu*, p. 49).

¹¹¹ This is Archbishop Simeon ibn al-Qalla, who in 1619 was one of the three bishop consecrators of Cyril IV Dabbas as Patriarch of Antioch, and one of the bishops who went to Aleppo in 1625 to celebrate Pascha with this same patriarch whom Karmeh had never recognized as the true patriarch. Cf. *Kilzi*, pp. 135 and 137; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 129r; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 628. He was also present at the Synod of Ras-Baalbek which condemned his friend Cyril IV. Cf. the preceding chapter.

¹¹² Macarios of Aleppo does not specify but he says that Karmeh served his bishop “many years” (“muddat kathirat”) after his diaconate (*Kilzi*, p. 44).

¹¹³ We see that Karmeh had been at Hama at least until 1605, as well as the 2 years he spent in Jerusalem. Thus the “very sure” suppositions of Korolevsky on his accounts of Karmeh in Aleppo with the representative of Pope Gregory XIII, Leonard Abel, have no historical foundation. Cf. his article “Antioche” in *DHGE*, III, col. 439-441; and Gatti-Korolevskij, *I riti e la chiesa Orientali*, I, Genova 1942,

Aleppo to regulate some civil formalities on behalf of his fellow citizens whose esteem and confidence he had earned.¹¹⁴ The Aleppians were very perceptive of the eloquence of the young priest and his virtue and begged him to remain with them as their shepherd after fifteen years of widowhood.¹¹⁵ Thus he was consecrated Metropolitan of Aleppo on February 12, 1612 by the imposition of the hands of Patriarch Athanasios II Dabbas in Damascus.¹¹⁶ Immediately he went to work; he contacted the Franciscans in Aleppo to find the means to instruct the ignorant people and to print liturgical books in Arabic. The only language the majority of the Greeks of the Patriarchate of Antioch understood at that time was Arabic.¹¹⁷ In 1585 the Greek-Melkites of Aleppo witnessed negotiations between the Latin Bishop Leonard Abel and their retired Patriarch Michael Sabbagh who had made his profession of faith.¹¹⁸ The faithful were already suspected of “Roman” sympathies more than the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Antioch and even those of other Orthodox patriarchates.¹¹⁹ The establishment of cordial relations between Metropolitan Karmeh and the Franciscan commissioner in Aleppo only confirmed these suspicions. This motivated Patriarch Athanasios II to go to Constantinople in 1614¹²⁰ to obtain the deposition of Karmeh.¹²¹ But the metropolitan was able to defend himself before Patriarch Timothy II and his counselors and returned three months later to Aleppo;¹²² there he continued his reforms in all the areas ordered by the Synod of Ras-Baalbek in 1628.¹²³ Besides this he continued the translation of liturgical books, which he had begun when he became bishop. In September 1612 the Typicon of Saint Sabas had already been

pp. 430-440. Moreover Karmeh was only 13 years old in 1585, date of the visit of L. Abel to Aleppo! Cf. article “Euthyme II Karmé” in *DHGE*, 14 (1967) 55.

¹¹⁴ Macarios of Aleppo recounts that “this year a vizier went to Aleppo to fight the Persians” (*Kilzi*, p. 45). This vague note does not allow us to find the exact date of the coming of Karmeh to Aleppo.

¹¹⁵ Since 1597 Aleppo only had a patriarchal administrator in the person of the bishop of Marmarita, Simeon. Cf. *Kilzi*, p. 45. Nasrallah in “Euthyme II Karmé” (*DHGE*, 14, col. 53) affirms: “after the death of Simeon, former bishop of Marmarita, transferred around 1590 to the see of Aleppo, Aleppo was without its pastor.” This appears to us as an erroneous fact because the Archbishop of Aleppo, Macarios Ibn Khalaf, only died in 7104 of the creation of the world (i.e. 1596 AD) and Simeon the bishop of Marmarita was named patriarchal vicar of Aleppo by Patriarch Joachim Ibn Ziade (1593-1603) in 1597 (and not 1590!). Simeon remained at Aleppo 15 years and at the election of Karmeh he retired in his own eparchy where he died. Cf. *Kilzi*, *Ibid.*; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 625.

¹¹⁶ *Kilzi*, p. 46; *Rustum*, p. 44; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 130v; *Radu*, p. 40. Karmeh, whose name was Abdel-Karim, took the name Meletios, the name of the saint of the day.

¹¹⁷ This is what Fr Jerome Queyrot reported several years later when he arrived in Aleppo. He knew Greek very well but he could no longer preach there in this language as he had done in Smyrna. Karmeh himself wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in October 1631: “we have translated the Euchologion from Greek into Arabic because there are among us priests who do not understand Greek...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 75r). What to say at that time for the people.

¹¹⁸ Cf. article “Abel;” in *DHGE*, I, col. 70-71; “Euthyme II Karmé,” *art. cit.*, col. 55; *Oriente Cattolico*, Vatican 1962, p. 251; Nasrallah, *Chronologie*, pp. 43-44; *Rustum*, pp. 27-30; Bacha, *Voyage*, pp. 33-35; *Rabbath*, I, pp. 183-186.

¹¹⁹ The profession of faith of Michael Sabbagh, made at Aleppo in May 1585, constituted also a persuasive argument for Jesuit Father Possevino, delegate of Pope Gregory XIII to Tsar Ivan III, cf. *Musset*, II, p. 48.

¹²⁰ Cf. Chapter I of this study; *Kilzi*, p. 84; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 627.

¹²¹ This was not realized as we saw previously.

¹²² *Kilzi*, *ibid.*

¹²³ Cf. Chapter II of this study. Comparing the reforms made by Karmeh at Aleppo (*Kilzi*, pp. 46-47; 81-85) and the decisions of the Synod of Ras-Baalbek (*Rustum*, pp. 39-43), we could not affirm that it was Karmeh who was the first promoter of these reforms in the Patriarchate of Antioch.

translated into Arabic as well as the Sticherarion and a Liturgicon.¹²⁴ The other liturgical books followed but there were few copyists and little money. Karmeh then resolved to ask assistance from the Franciscans of Aleppo,¹²⁵ whose commissioner wrote a letter to Rome in 1617. In this letter the commissioner congratulated the dispositions of the Greek-Melkite Metropolitan of Aleppo for union with Rome.¹²⁶ Around 1619 the metropolitan himself wrote directly to Pope Paul V (1605-1621) informing him of the situation of the Christians under the Ottoman yoke, of their ignorance and the lack of professors and books. He asked for specialists in the Arabic and Greek languages to instruct the Christian children and to help him with his translations from Greek into Arabic.¹²⁷ The pope responded very favorably by stimulating the teaching of Arabic in Europe which had been instituted by Pope Clement V in 1311 in the universities of Rome, Paris, Oxford, Salamanca and Bologne.¹²⁸ The metropolitan of Aleppo considered the response of the pope like the dove, which announced the end of the flood to Noah; this was the end of ignorance and the destruction of its tyranny.¹²⁹ Since he foresaw the financial difficulties which would follow, in 1621 he sent his Protosyncellos Absalon to Rome with a letter addressed to Pope Paul V to obtain his grants.¹³⁰ Absalon was

¹²⁴ A manuscript of this Typicon of St. Sabas is found in the Library of Deir esh-Shir (without a number), described by Kilzi (pp. 87-88). Cf. *Rustum*, pp. 44-45. For the other liturgical books see Charon (Korolevsky), *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites*, III, Rome 1911, pp. 47-54; J. Nasrallah, "Euthyme II Karmé (1572-1635), patriarche melchite. Son oeuvre littéraire et liturgique" in *POC*, 9 (1959), pp. 25-30; L. Cheikho, *Catalogue of Manuscripts of Arab Christian Authors since Islam* (in Arabic), Beirut 1924, pp. 34-35; *al-Maschreq*, p. 683 and 1936, p. 374; P. Sbath, *Al-Fihris*, II, Cairo 1939, manuscripts 1733-1744; G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, II, Vatican 1947, pp. 496 and 631-633; as well as III, Vatican 1949, pp. 91-93. On the original compositions of Karmeh see article cited "Euthyme II Karmé" in *DHGE*, col 54, as well as the same author, *Histoire de Mouvement littéraire dans l'Eglise Melchite du V au XX siècle*, vol. 4, Ottoman Period 1516-1900, Bk. 1 (1516-1724), Louvain-Paris 1979, pp. 70-86.

¹²⁵ They were there since 1571. Cf. "Alep" in *DHGE*, II, col. 104.

¹²⁶ *Archives Vat., Fonds Borghèse*, series II, vol. 403, fol. 173-174. Cf. cited article "Antioche" of *DHGE*, col. 639.

¹²⁷ This is revealed to us in the letter of Karmeh which Protosyncellos Absalon carried to Pope Paul V in 1621: "We have sent a letter to Your merciful "part" in which we give you the situation of the Christians in the Arab countries as well as their manner of instruction, professors and books. And we have informed Your Lord that we need professors who know Arabic and Greek to teach science to the children of the Christians and to assist us in the translation of books from Greek to Arabic so that we follow the religion according to the Orthodox books" (translated verbatim from the original Arabic letter in *SOCCG*, vol. 181, fol. 35r).

¹²⁸ Cf. *Collectanea*, I, pp. 5-6. There even was a bull of Pope Paul V relative to this teaching, *op. cit.*, *Ibid.*, *Acta*, 3 Congregation meeting 8 of June 3, 1622, fol. 11r.

¹²⁹ "Your letter of mercy has reached us, in which it is said that you will accomplish our desire, and we thank the almighty God for your goodness and piety, by comparing your letter to the dove who announced to Noah in former times in the ark; in fact it announces the end of the deluge and this is the end of ignorance and of tyranny" (translation of Arabic: *SOCCG*, vol. 181, fol. 35r).

¹³⁰ Thomas Obicini de Novare (1585-1632) was sent to the Holy Land in 1612. He then worked among the Nestorians and was elected guardian of Jerusalem in March 1620. In June 1621 he was in Aleppo where he knew Metropolitan Karmeh and from where he left immediately for Rome with Karmeh's delegate. Cf. S. Raimondo, "L'Unione della Chiesa Caldeea nell'opera del P. Tommaso Obicini da Novara," in *Studia Orientalia Christiana, collectanea* no. 5, Cairo 1960, p. 367; *art. cit.* "Euthyme II Karmé" in *DHGE*, col. 55 (where this Franciscan is called: "Tommaso Obicini da Novaro"). The letter addressed to Pope Paul V (who was no longer alive at the time of the arrival of its bearer in Rome in March 1622) was written in Arabic and bore the signature of Meletios Karmeh, Metropolitan of Aleppo (cf. The first part of this letter in footnotes 127 and 129): "...But you understand some expenses are necessary for professors whom you

accompanied by the Franciscan Father Thomas Obicini de Novare, Guardian of Jerusalem. Absalon was well received and well heard. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith assigned him twenty five ecus on his arrival to Rome and fifty ecus for the journey, and prescribed that he purchase three collections of the Greek general councils and some books of the Greek Fathers¹³¹ with fifty copies of the Bellarmine's Catechism printed in Arabic.¹³² The grants that Karmeh had solicited from Rome were not mentioned. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had reservations about translating the Bible into Arabic since the fourth rule of the Index prohibited its translation into vulgar languages.¹³³ However, the Congregation had

will send and for the cost of Arabic books as well as for copyists who would transcribe the Arabic and Greek because everything needs money. And we have sent to Your generous part our brother the monk ("raheb") Thomas the Guardian and our brother the hieromonk Protosyncellos Absalon. If you accept him, deign to give your servants annual alms... which would be transmitted by our brother Thomas the Guardian by creating him steward in this charitable affair, so that he would receive the money and pay it (to the copyists), because he is a good and active man, knowledgeable in Arabic literature and intelligent: he sows love in the hearts of the Christians and everyone loves him... Thus be the head and he will be "the hands" and your servant the dust on the feet, and also we will be a perfect person in Christ" (*SOCCG*, vol. 181, fol. 35r).

¹³¹ Congregation meeting 5 of April 11, 1622 was occupied with the mission of Absalon. The rescript foresaw two points: "1. quod dentur quidam libri arabici, qui impressi reperiuntur in Bibliotheca Vaticana, et quod de re huiusmodi agatur cum illmo Bibliothecario. 2. Quod pro nunc eidem Oratori dentur scuta 25, et postea viaticum cum dono Imaginum pro Archiepiscopo" (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 7). Congregation meeting 7 of May 13, 1622 has for result: "fuit expeditus Pater Absalon Orator Archiepiscopi Aleppi (Karmeh), eique fuerunt decreta 50 scuta pro viatico, et loco imaginum fuit dictum ut emerentur tria corpora Conciliorum Generalium Graecorum et aliqui patrum Graecorum codices ut posset secum ferre hos libros simul cum 50 doctrinis christianis arabicè impressis habitis ab illmo Bibliothecario" (*Ibid.*, fol. 11r).

¹³² Bellarmine's catechism was published in Arabic the first time in 1613, A second edition was made by the printing press of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1627, one year after its foundation: this was the first Arabic book produced by this press. Cf. P. Raphael, *La Rôle du college Maronite romain dans l'Orientalisme aux XVII et XVIII siècles*, Beirut 1950, pp. 65-69.

¹³³ Besides the letter addressed to the pope, Absalon also carried an oral message for the printing of some Arabic books and especially the Bible, the translation of which Karmeh wanted to unify because partial versions were found in the east here and there. On this subject a letter addressed to the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had to be written by Absalon himself with the assistance of Thomas Obicini de Novare who accompanied him. It was thus that the request of Karmeh was examined at the Congregation meeting 7 of May 13, 1622 (cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 382, fol. 52r and 59v). It was Cardinal Ubaldini, prefect of the province of Syria (12th province of the earth, according to the divisions of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of March 8, 1622: cf. *Acta*, vol. 3 fol. 3r-5v), who exposed it: In ea (=Congregation of May 13, 1622) fuit primo proposita per Card. Ubaldium necessitas et utilitas impressionis Bibliae in lingua Arabica pro Christianis Orientalibus et pro Infidelibus videl. Gentilibus et Maumetanis, nam Orientales Christiani aut non habent biblia ob ompressoriae artis defectum in illis partibus, aut si habent, cprrupta sunt et heresibus scatent. Gentiles autem et Maumetani, si Biblia impressa haberent, ea legendo non mediocriter ad Dei veri cultum, et christianae fidei susceptionem disponderentur. Sed aliqui Card. moverunt difficultatem, quod qua ratione prohibuit regula quarta Indicis in Ecclesia Occidentali Biblia Sacra in Vulgari lingua ne ignari lectores per eorum lecturam pervertantur potius quam instruantur, eadem ratione non debent Biblia Sacra in Arabica aedi lingua maximè cum Orientales sint Occidentalibus rudiores (good compliment!). Verum replicatum fuit quod illa Ecclesia quae linguam latinam non callet, non debet carere Bibliis Sacris maximè in idiomate ultissimo, ut est Arabicum. Quod omnes fere Orientales loquuntur et intelligunt. Quamobrem cum patres non convenirent, et multi dicerent difficultatem propositam gravissimam esse, communi consensu decretum fuit ut formaretur dubium super hoc, an videl. liceat edere Biblia Sacra in Arabica lingua, et si liceat, an expediat, et quod dubium transmitteretur per manus in alia Congregatione maturius discutiendum" (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 10v).

reassured Father Absalon that the Bible would be translated into Arabic and printed.¹³⁴ In a later letter addressed to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith,¹³⁵ Metropolitan Karmeh proposed five conditions for the success of this translation: 1) to send the Maronite priest, Gaspar al-Gharib of Nicosia to Aleppo;¹³⁶ 2) to also send Fr. Thomas Obicini de Novare, Guardian of Jerusalem;¹³⁷ 3) to teach the missionaries that Rome intended to send him, Arabic as well as Greek books;¹³⁸ 4) to finish the translation

¹³⁴ This was the message that Protosyncellos Absalon had to take to his bishop Karmeh as well as the decisions of the Congregation meeting 8 of June 3, 1622: “Circa dubium de editione Bibliorum Arabicorum, quod similiter per manus fuerat transmissum ex varjis resolutionibus Congregationum Inquisitionis, et Indicis, quas retulit Ill.mus Millinus S. Con. decrevit *posse, et debere Biblia Sacra* benè correcta *pro Ecclesijs Orientalibus imprimi*.

Quia fuit relatum huiusmodi Biblia iam impressa fuisse in Leida à Thomas Erpenio, S. Congregationi placuit literas ad Nuncium Belgij dare, quibus ei praeciperetur, ut aliquos codices Romam mitteret ad eos conferendos cum Vaticano; et ut curaret, ne venderentur, usquequo codices praedicti per deputatos à S. Congregatione probarentur. Et insuper fuit R.mo Vives iniunctum, ut idem Serenissimae Infantae Belgij scriberet.

Circa studium linguae Arabicae facta relatione per ill.um Ulbaldinum, S. Cong. decrevit, quod Guardianus Hierosolim (Th. Obicini de Novare) in Montis Aurei Monasterio linguam Arabicam doceret Theologos suae Religionis per Generalem seligendos, et per S. Cong. approbandos iuxta ordinationem Conc. Viennensis et Bullae fel. dec. Pauli Papae V.

Decretum etiam fuit quod omnibus Generalibus Religionum intimetur, vel scribatur, ut Vienesi Concilio et Bullae f. P. Pauli Papae V de studijs linguarum in suis monasterijs erigendis pareant saltem in Monasterijs, seu conventibus Romae constitutis, idque efficiant, perficiantque per totum mensem Octobris presentis anni 1622. Quod Card. Zoller scribat Haebipolim (= Würzburg in Germany) pro Iuvene calente varias linguas, et praesertim Arabicam, ut Romam veniant (sic for “veniat”), suosque libros secum deferat, cui assignabuntur scura 10 pro quolibet mense, et scuta centum pro Viatico” (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 11v-12r). We can only say that Karmeh’s delegate had the power to throw a bomb as part of the Congregation to assign everywhere the promotion of the teaching of the Arabic language and particularly the printing of the Arabic Bible.

¹³⁵ This letter was addressed to “seven responsible columns of the Religion and the seven stars of the Congregation of the Faith, the Lord Cardinals Salui, Ludovisi, Ubaldini, Barberini, di Santa Susanna, Bardini and Millini, as well as to other stars Lord Cardinals of the Congregation of the faith, responsible for the Christian Churches” (*SOCG*, vol. 181, fol. 36r). Karmeh emphasized to them the reception of the message that Protosyncellos Absalon gave with the Greek and Arabic books sent by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Ibid.*).

¹³⁶ Gaspar al-Gharib was known in Rome by the name “Gasparo Pellegrino” (a “figurative” translation of his name!) when he was a student at the Maronite College. He even signed his letters “Gasparo Pellegrino Maronita” (*SOCG*, vol. 112, fol. 415r). In the catalogue of students of this college he was known by the name (Perregrinus) (cf. *Vat. Lat.* 5528, fol. 31v). He was one of the first 2 students of the Maronite College in Rome when not officially erected. He arrived in Rome June 8, 1579 and the college itself was only founded March 12, 1584. At his arrival he already knew Greek and Syriac which he had learned in Cyprus where he was born. In Rome he learned Latin, Italian and Arabic. Cf. P. Raphaël, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-58. Compare with Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 135 in footnote.

¹³⁷ The one who accompanied Karmeh’s delegate to Rome in 1622. Cf. footnote 130. On April 25, 1622 he was already named professor of Arabic in Rome “ad docendam linguam arabicam Patribus Theologis suae Religionis, et alijs Regularibus volentibus eam addiscere” (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol 9r). Compare with P. Raphaël, *op. cit.*, p. 65 where he was named as such only in 1623! The nomination was reconfirmed June 3, 1622 (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 11v). Karmeh asked the Congregation for him in these words: “We ask you to send (in the company of Fr. Gaspar) our brother and dear father, the monk Thomas, Guardian of Jerusalem, because he is a good man, perfect and loved by all the Christians (of Aleppo)” (*SOCG*, vol. 181, fol. 36r).

¹³⁸ Since Greek was no longer used in practice in Syria in the 17th century, it was however necessary for the translations that Karmeh intended to make from Greek to Arabic, and for some Greek speakers who were also there to supervise the Arabic speaking Orthodox who would be more flexible to understanding with the “Franks!”

before his death and the death of the old Fr. Gaspar;¹³⁹ and finally 5) that the work of translation would be done in Aleppo and then sent to Rome; there it could be compared with other manuscripts and then printed. Karmeh also asked for the printing of seven liturgical Greek books.¹⁴⁰

On September 4, 1623, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith examined Karmeh's requests in its first gathering under the new Pope Urban VIII and accepted to send him Fr. Gaspar while creating a commission in Rome for the Arabic Bible.¹⁴¹ It communicated its desire to Father Gaspar of Nicosia who excused himself in a letter of 1625, stating that he was not able to go to Aleppo because of his infirmities, his advanced age and the little harmony that existed between Greeks and Maronites. The Roman Congregation accepted his regrets¹⁴² but pursued the correspondence with Karmeh through its intermediary.¹⁴³

Meanwhile the Capuchins and the Jesuits arrived in Aleppo.¹⁴⁴ Karmeh, who never recognized Cyril IV Dabbas as Patriarch of Antioch,¹⁴⁵ was unable to iron out the differences which had arisen with Cyril IV. On May 11, 1625 he had to appear before Pasha Mustapha at the request of Cyril IV.¹⁴⁶ He was beaten, thrown in prison and was not released until the May 23.¹⁴⁷ On April 10, 1626, he went to Constantinople to appeal to Patriarch Cyril I Lucaris who agreed with him this time despite the sympathies Lucaris

¹³⁹ At that time Karmeh was 51 years old (he wrote in 1623) and Gaspar al-Gharib was over 60. In fact Gaspar arrived at Rome in 1579 at the age of 17. Cf. *Vat. Lat.* 5528, fol. 31v, and footnote 136 above.

¹⁴⁰ *SOCCG*, vol. 181, fol. 36r.

¹⁴¹ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had purchased the Greek books requested by Metropolitan Karmeh to send to him and "Gasparo Maronitae scribi mandavit, ut ad eundem Archiepiscopum se transferret, fratrem autem Thomam Romae detinendum pro studijs Arabicis censuit, Biblia vero arabica *melius Romae* expurgari posse dixit per Archiepiscopum Damascenum Maronitam, et alios à Congregatione iam deputatos, quam per Archiepiscopum Aleppi, et dominum Gasparum, et fratrem Thomam" (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 57r). The commission for the Arabic translation of the Bible was composed of the titular Archbishop of Damascus, Serge Rizzi (remained in Rome from 1606 until his death in 1638): cf. P. Raphaël, *op. cit.*, p. 95), with Fr. Thomas Obicini de Novare, Fr. Hilarion Rancati and Maronite Victor Accurensis (cf. *Acta*, vol. 3, Congregation meeting 18 of November 5, 1622, in presence of Pope Gregory XV). The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith decided on September 4, 1623 to have another Maronite, Gabriel Sionite, come from Paris to assist them in this work (cf. *Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 54v). The commission began to meet twice a week at the beginning of December 1624 but without Gabriel Sionite who remained in Paris (*Ibid.*, fol. 164v).

¹⁴² It was Congregation meeting 44 of October 3, 1625 (and not of October 30 as Nasrallah states in *Notes et Documents*, p. 135), that examined this question by urging the disalced Carmelite Fathers who went to found a hospice in Aleppo "ut dicto Archiepiscopo praesto essent, eumque in catholicis dogmatibus instruerent iuxta illius petitionem" (*Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 269r), what Karmeh had never requested for himself, one who was very learned in "Orthodox-Catholic" doctrines!

¹⁴³ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith communicated its new decisions of the Congregation meeting of October 3, 1625 to Fr. Gaspar of Nicosia and to Metropolitan Karmeh by the letters written on the following October 8. It sent everything to Fr. Gaspar, who on April 30, 1626, responded to the Congregation informing it of the painful situation between Karmeh and Patriarch Cyril IV Dabbas who was in Aleppo. Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 112, fol. 415r; see the first chapter of this study.

¹⁴⁴ As we saw in chapter II, this was in 1625. Driven out 3 months after their arrival, the Jesuits returned here permanently on April 21, 1627.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. all of Chapter I of this study. Cyril IV was killed in June 1628.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. *Kilzi*, p. 138; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631.

¹⁴⁷ *Kilzi*, *ibid.*; *Macarios of Aleppo*, *ibid.*, *Radu*, p. 41; *SOCCG*, vol. 112, fol. 415r.

had for his old friend, Patriarch Cyril IV Dabbas.¹⁴⁸ Strengthened by the support of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Karmeh returned to Aleppo on March 30, 1627 and peacefully occupied his eparchy and pursued his translations.¹⁴⁹ The Capuchins of Aleppo asked him immediately to send a testimony of their apostolate in Aleppo to Rome. Karmeh gave it without hesitation. On May 19, he addressed a letter to Pope Urban VIII manifesting his desire to see him personally as well as his joy concerning the arrival in Aleppo of the Capuchin, Father Pacifico Scaligère and his confreres whom the Christians of Aleppo loved and venerated.¹⁵⁰ He even asked for a letter of blessing which would honor him and bring him closer to Christ.¹⁵¹ But the Jesuit Fathers who had returned to Aleppo 12 April 1627, this time with an order of the Sultan, were not mentioned in this letter.¹⁵² In fact he took into consideration the recommendations of Cyril I Lucaris who was hostile to the Jesuits.¹⁵³ Nevertheless, Karmeh came to an agreement with the new arrivals concerning the education of the Greeks at his residence. During his absence from Aleppo (April 1628-August 1629) Father Queyrot opened a school in the residence Greek Melkite headquarters in Aleppo and the number of Greek students increased immediately to thirty-four.¹⁵⁴ Meanwhile the Synod of Ras-Baalbek took place and deposed Cyril IV Dabbas.¹⁵⁵ Karmeh made a short trip to the large towns under Emir Fakhr ed-Din II; his intention was to study the subject of all the existing Arabic versions of the Bible and to convey this information to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.¹⁵⁶

¹⁴⁸ *Kilzi*, p. 139; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 631; Radu, *Ibid.*; Note here the flexibility that Cyril I Lucaris began to show towards the Roman Church after it sent him Canacchio Rossi to Constantinople. Cf. *Acta*, vol. 4, Cong. Meeting 56 of May 4, 1626. Between 1625 and 1626 there were very serious talks on the union, not only with the Patriarch of Constantinople but also with that of Alexandria and of Jerusalem. Cf. *Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 266r, 282v-283r; vol. 4, fol. 166r. Most probably because of these new dispositions of the Orthodox patriarchs, Karmeh had convinced the prelates of Constantinople concerning his relations with Rome and the Latin missionaries of Aleppo.

¹⁴⁹ Returning to Aleppo, Karmeh passed through Cyprus where he probably met Maronite Gaspar al-Gharib, whom he had requested of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to help him in the translation of the Bible at Aleppo. Cf. *Kilzi*, p. 139; *Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 57r and 268v.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. the original letter in SOCG, bol. 181, fol. 20v and 22r. A Latin version is found in the same volume, fol. 21r. This letter persuaded the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to send to Karmeh some copies of the Arabic gospel printed at Rome in 1591 (Cf. *Acta*, vol. 4, fol. 291v).

¹⁵¹ Karmeh began his letter by kissing “the apostolic feet and proud hands” of the Holy Father Urban VIII (cf. *Ibid.*).

¹⁵² Moreover in all his correspondence with Rome we see no mention of the Jesuit fathers while his relations with them were very frequent.

¹⁵³ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 270, fol. 237v where the Greek Archbishop of Naxos, Jeremiah Barbarigo wrote to Arcudius dated August 12, 1627 on the subject of Cyril Lucaris: “i poveri Padri Gesuiti non puo ne vedere ne sentire.” See *De Vries*, p. 76. *J. Besson* (p. 24) is clear on this point: “it is necessary to remark also that the Patriarch of Constantinople had corrected him from using a Frank religious to teach the Greeks in his episcopal home; this great man (Karmeh) always even to himself, did not let the children of the Greeks take instruction from the Father (Queyrot) in our house.” This is what came after the closing of the school opened by Karmeh, as we will see.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. “Relatione della missione d’Aleppo della compagnia de Gesu. Dell’anno 1625 insino al fine dell’anno 1629” in *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 159r-167r, particularly fol. 166r.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Chapter I of this study.

¹⁵⁶ On May 12, 1629 Karmeh wrote a letter addressed to the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in which he proposed that they send someone to the east to purchase the various versions of the Arabic Bible which were found, one in Tripoli, another in Beirut, a third at Damascus, the fourth in Egypt, the fifth at Sinai and the sixth in Jerusalem, while he himself possessed a seventh copy.

In Aleppo, the Greek Archdeacon Michael had very good relations with the Capuchin Fathers. In April 1629 he wrote two successive letters to Pope Urban VIII in which he took pride in having taught Turkish and Arabic to Father Pacifico and his companions who were going to Persia. He added that he was starting to teach Arabic to the Capuchin, François-Marie de Paris and his companions, who cared for their salvation and that of the Christians of Aleppo among whom they had sowed charity and concord. That, he said, is why all the Christians of Aleppo were content with their conduct.¹⁵⁷ Michael asked for several Arabic and Greek books: a book of Avicenna and a New Testament in Arabic and an Old Testament in Greek.¹⁵⁸ The young archdeacon also manifested his desire to personally see the pope, whom the Capuchins spoke about abundantly, but noted that distance and other factors prevented him from making the voyage.¹⁵⁹

The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith thanked the Greek Orthodox archdeacon for his kindness toward the Capuchins of Aleppo.¹⁶⁰ It even sent him the books he requested and exhorted him to attempt “diligently to bring his nation to the holy union.”¹⁶¹

Upon his return to Aleppo, Metropolitan Karmeh wrote to Cardinal Borgia and other cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith asking them to thank the pope in his name for his kindness and to commend his Archdeacon Michael to those

Thus his thinking was to compare them to make one good Arabic version which could replace all these more or less erroneous versions (*SOCCG*, vol. 181, fol. 208r). This letter was not written at Aleppo because Karmeh only returned there August 5, 1629 (*Kilzi*, p. 141). It is necessary to note that he again asked for Fr. Thomas Obicini de Novare who, nevertheless had rejected in January 1627 to go to Aleppo “ob infirmam eius valetudinem” (*Acta*, vol. 4, fol. 180r). The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith responded to Karmeh through the intermediary of his archdeacon Michael: “della Biblia Arabica dirà à Monsignor Arcievescovo che non occorre far li diligenti ch’egli scrive. La Sac. Congregatione farà far la Vulgata cioè la latina antica l’Oriente habbia la medesima parola di Dio che usa et adopera questa chiesa Romana che per special prerogativa annessali N. S. Giesu Christo non puo errare...” (writing of Ingoli in *SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 97v).

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 92r and 9r of which a Latin version is found in the same volume, fol. 90r cf. also fol. 86r-88r.

¹⁵⁸ Note that the Arabic copies of the New testament sent by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in September 1627 only arrived in Aleppo ruined by the waters of the sea (cf. *Acta*, vol. 6, fol. 302v).

¹⁵⁹ *SOCCG*, vol. 189, fol. 87v. Note that it was about this Archdeacon Michael when Fr. François Marie de Paris wrote to Aleppo on October 21, 1628, who had had a discussion of the subject of Purgatory “cum quodam Archidiacono Graeco, cuius literas Arabicè scriptas ad S. Congregationem misit” (*Acta*, vol. 6, fol. 303r).

¹⁶⁰ Ingoli, Secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, wrote to him after Congregation meeting 113 of August 7, 1629 (in presence of Pope Urban VIII): “la Santità di N. S. hà sentito parlar contento dell’affetto che V.S. mostra verso questa S. Sede e la S. Congregazione, volendo ch’ella tratta volentieri con li pardi capucini Missionarij e con questa Chiesa Romana...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 97v).

¹⁶¹ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith sent him (*Acta*, vol. 6, fol. 315v) “Avicenam Arabicum, et Evangelia Arabica, et Genadium. Ac Concilium florentinum.” The secretary Ingoli gave him this recommendation: “Ella farà ogni diligenza per tirar alla Santa Unione la sua Natione” (*SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 97v).

who sent him the books he had requested.¹⁶² On this occasion, Michael himself wrote and acknowledged the receipt of the Congregation's letter and manifested himself ready to remain "in the service of Cardinal Borgia and our lord, the pope in order to obey God and in view of the reintegration of the Christians and their fusion in the love of Christ."¹⁶³ But it seems that the Capuchins had set him against the Franciscans of Aleppo, especially on the occasion of a sermon which the Capuchin Father Agathange wished to preach in the Maronite Church of Aleppo. The Venetians and the Franciscans were in concert with each other so that the sermon would not take place.¹⁶⁴ Michael said that all the Christians of Aleppo had been scandalized by this fact, especially since everyone knew the reason for which the missionaries had been sent by the pope into the Arab countries: "to preach and instruct the Christians."¹⁶⁵ This scandal was created among the Christians of Aleppo by the dissension of the missionaries, and the Capuchins themselves had exploited it to attack their Franciscan confreres.¹⁶⁶ Thought was given to dividing the Christian communities of Aleppo among the Franciscans, Capuchins, Jesuits and Discalced Carmelites.¹⁶⁷ The account of the Jesuit Father, Jerome Queyrot of December 26, 1629 proved that all these quarrels, which took place in Aleppo, were true.¹⁶⁸

According to the Capuchins the scandal made three bishops of Aleppo, already won over to the Union, "return to schism,"¹⁶⁹ yet, the Greek-Melkite Orthodox metropolitan maintained his good relations with the Latin missionaries and the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The Congregation even confided to him

¹⁶² The letter bears the date of the 2nd decade of December 7138 of the creation of the world which corresponds to the year 1629 AD (cf. *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 95 r), but the Latin translation's date is 70138! (*Ibid.*, fol. 93v).

¹⁶³ The response to the letters of Archdeacon Michael written in April 1629 was sent to the Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers who received it on the following September 14 and delivered it to whom it was addressed (cf. above footnote 161; also *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 325r-326r). Michael's letter of the 2nd decade of December 1629 is found in *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 96r, a Latin translation of which (fol.93r) bears this indication which reveals the sentiments of the translator (?): "quoniam praemium huius epistolae totum est adulatorium et pharisaicum ideo relictum est." It was this translator who also wrote at the end: "die decembris anno 70138 Patris nostri Adami" (sic) for the Arabic original which had "2nd decade of December 7138 of the creation of Adam." The secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Ingoli, took the note of the translator (*Ibid.*, fol. 94v, 95v, 96v): December 70138 ab Adamo"(!).

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, fol. 96r. Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 273r, 312rv.

¹⁶⁵ Archdeacon Michael showed his astonishment to this fact and added that none of the Aleppians could understand "why the Venetian consul had disobeyed his orders to the pope," and prohibited the Capuchins from going to preach among the Maronites! (*SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 964). Even Louis Ramiro, consulter of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and doctor of the Venetian consul at Aleppo, lost his function as consul through the instigation of the Franciscans (Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 300r-307r and vol. 196, fol. 118r), who called him "Explorator Apostolicus, ac Reipublicae Venetae rebellis" (*Acts*, vol. 4, fol. 278v).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. for example the letters of Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers, superior of the Capuchins in Aleppo, of November 12 and December 29, 1629 in *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 276r and fol. 273r. Cf. also: *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 76r.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. footnote 102 of this study.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 159r-167r.

¹⁶⁹ *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 289r. It concerns most probably Greek Metropolitan Meletios Karmeh, Cyril, bishop of the Jacobites, and the bishop of the Armenians, all at Aleppo (cf. *Ibid.*, fol. 275v and *Acta*, vol. 8, fol. 45r).

and to his Archdeacon Michael the revision of the Arabic catechism,¹⁷⁰ which it had sent to them by the intermediary of Protosyncellus Absalon in 1622,¹⁷¹ and the Gospel Book sent in 1629.¹⁷²

In October 1631, Karmeh thanked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for the “spiritual bread, i.e. the holy books” which he had received from the hands of the Capuchin Fathers of Aleppo.¹⁷³ He wrote, “the one to whom Christ said, ‘feed my lambs,’ always occupies himself with the lambs that Christ bought by his blood.”¹⁷⁴ At the same time he let them know he had already translated the Greek Euchologion and Horologion into Arabic because some Greek Orthodox priests did not know Greek. He wished to have the books printed in Rome since the Christians of the countries in the East were poor and they could not pay the cost of the transcription.¹⁷⁵ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith examined the question on April 26, 1632 and accepted to print them after their revision from the old manuscripts of the Greek Euchologion and Horologion. They requested that Karmeh send these Greek manuscripts with the Arabic version¹⁷⁶ because the Latins had discovered mistakes in the administration of the sacraments among the Italo-Greeks of Calabria and of Pouilles. Because of the mixture of unknown languages and less orthodox ceremonies the validity of the sacraments among the Greeks was suspect.¹⁷⁷ Karmeh did not become discouraged. In 1632 he sent the first five chapters of Genesis,¹⁷⁸ carefully corrected with the assistance of Capuchin Father

¹⁷⁰ Secretary Ingoli wrote to Carmelite Prosper of the Holy Spirit after the Congregation meeting 124 of June 15, 1630: “che faccia veder la dottrina Christiana Arabica dal Mutran Carme (=Karmeh) l’Arcivescovo d’Aleppo e dal Sig. Archidiacono Michele con pregarli che scrivino al loro senso in materia della frasi arabica usata dal traslatore et insieme li preghi anche à riveder gli evangeli arabici, et se nella lingua vi sarà alcun errore, overo nel’ortografia li notino, accio si possa far il “corrigere errata” in 400 e più volumi, ch’hà copie la Sac. Congregazione” (*SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 340v). On this occasion, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith insisted on sending him the Arabic book of Avicenna which it had promised to Archdeacon Michael (*Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 75rv).

¹⁷¹ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 3, fol. 11r.

¹⁷² The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith sent Karmeh some volumes of the Arabic gospel in September 1627 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 4, fol. 291v). But Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers informed the Roman Congregation that these volumes were destroyed by the waters of the sea (cf. *Acta*, vol. 6, fol. 302v). At the Congregation meeting 112 of August 7, 1629 (in presence of Pope Urban VIII) it was decided to send a copy to Archdeacon Michael (*Ibid.*, fol. 315v).

¹⁷³ In a letter (undated) arriving to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on February 20, 1631, and addressed to Cardinal Ludovisi, Karmeh also wrote that he had never received the books promised by the Congregation. However, he manifested his joy on the subject of the Arabic Bible which would be printed in Rome. Karmeh preferred to have the text of this edition in both Greek and Arabic. (Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 35v and 66v; Latin version: fol. 57rv and 36rv). It was in another letter of mid-October 1631 that Karmeh emphasized reception of the books sent by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Ibid.*, fol. 75r).

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, also the Latin version of this letter (fol. 74r) which contains some mistranslations.

¹⁷⁵ Letter addressed to Cardinal Borgia bearing the date of mid-October 1631 (*Ibid.*, fol. 75r).

¹⁷⁶ Besides sending him the Greek Bible with a Greek dictionary, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith “iussit ad eundem Archieposcopum scribi, ut Horologium, et Eucologium graeca, et arabica ad Urbem transmittat, et quod graeca illa potissimum transmitti curet, quae fuerint an iquiora ut possint revideri, et imprimi in Arabica lingua iuxta illius petitionem” (*Acta*, vol. 9, fol. 63v-64r).

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 134; Gatti-Korolevskij, *I riti e le Chiese Orientali*, I Genova 1942, p. 502.

¹⁷⁸ In the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith are found 4 or 5 of these mentioned chapters with a very beautiful Arabic script in black and red punctuation separating the verses (*SOCG*, vol.

Agathange who Karmeh testifies already knew the Arabic language well. Other experts of Aleppo were consulted and tried to render the text as close as possible to the Vulgate. Sometimes, however, they had to correct certain expressions which they had compared to the Hebrew texts and translated them according to the rules of the Arabic language.¹⁷⁹ Karmeh excused himself from “daring” to do it since the experts of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith were (according to his own expressions) “more learned and more virtuous” than he. He added that he understood it was only for “the good of the Christians and nothing other.”¹⁸⁰

In the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on July 4, 1633, Cardinal Ubaldini showed the other cardinals that the Arabic version of Genesis which was sent by the Greek metropolitan of Aleppo contained improper words and some notable differences with that of the Vulgate.¹⁸¹ The secretary, Francesco Ingoli, prepared two letters concerning this matter, one to the Greek Metropolitan Karmeh and the other to Capuchin Father Agathange.¹⁸² In the first letter he thanked the metropolitan for his “diligence in the revision of the five chapters of the Arabic Bible which he had sent them.” He thanked him also “for the new version which was given to some intelligent persons and confirmed what the Capuchin Father Agathange said to him. As for the Greek dictionary and the Greek Bible, the order had been given to send them to him.”¹⁸³ In the second letter, Ingoli exhorted Fr. Agathange to show the Orthodox metropolitan “that it was not advisable to use elegant words in the sacred books because they could easily lose their meaning. This is why the Latin version as well as the Greek version had been made with simple words and ordinary phrases. Besides it was not good to borrow the Alexandrian and Antiochian versions too much because they were very ancient...”¹⁸⁴ Ingoli read a speech on the translation of the Vulgate in Arabic in front of Pope Urban

180, fol. 67r-72v). According to the Acts of this Congregation we see that Karmeh had only translated these 5 chapters of Genesis while correcting the New Testament (cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 130v). Compare with Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 136: “in his humility Karmeh also assisted in the version of the Sacred Bible which was preferred to his version that never saw the day.” Besides we do not know of any manuscript copy of this one (!). We do not see on what Nasrallah bases his statement, writing in *DHGE*, 16 (1967), col. 55: “Before 1622 Karmeh completed the translation of the Bible. He requested a publication of this at Rome in the same year.” If he had completed it before 1622, why did he ask in 1623 for Fr. Thomas Obicini de Novare and Fr. Gaspar al-Gharib to assist in this translation! (Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 181, fol. 36r). On the other hand Gabriel Sionite was never part of the Roman commission for the Arabic Bible (cf. P. Raphaël, *op. cit.*, p. 78).

¹⁷⁹ Karmeh notes that Fr. Agathange “carries with him the Vulgate of the Hebrew Bible” (*SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 69r).

¹⁸⁰ It is necessary to admit the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had already decided to publish the book of genesis on December 5, 1631 (in the presence of the pope), adding to it the variations of the Babylonian, Alexandrian and Antiochian texts in a final appendix. And instead of 2 columns, Greek and Arabic, as Karmeh requested, it decided to print the Vulgate text with the Arabic text. We saw that the Congregation sent Karmeh the 5 chapters of the Bible out of courtesy and intended to change nothing that the Roman commission did for the Arabic Bible. It is necessary to note that the members of this commission knew all the languages required for this translation, except Greek!

¹⁸¹ Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 63v; *Acta*, vol. 8, fol. 268rv.

¹⁸² *SOCCG, Ibid.*

¹⁸³ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 8, Congregation meeting 157 of April 26, 1631, fol. 63v in which it was decided to send him a Greek dictionary with the Greek Bible. Cf. footnote 176.

¹⁸⁴ *SOCCG, Ibid.*, “...e di più non è bene apportarsi tanto dalle traslationi Alessandrina, et Antiochena per esser molto antiche...” (sic!).

VIII¹⁸⁵: “the Bible, which is printed in France,¹⁸⁶ could not respond to the needs of the Eastern Churches represented by Matran Karmeh, Archbishop of the Melkites of Aleppo; its price would be so high that only an insufficient number of copies could be sent to these Churches. Besides, the text whose printing was in progress there was one of six Arabic versions used by the above mentioned Churches. It was filled with errors, as the previously mentioned archbishop had remarked several times. It is necessary then that our master (the pope) order our Vulgate version be followed by the translators who used it there until the present for various reasons...”¹⁸⁷ The principal reason is that “if one sends our Vulgate to the East, without doubt the six Arabic versions full of errors would disappear.”¹⁸⁸

The Capuchin Father, Bonaventure of Loudes, describes for us Karmeh’s reaction to the reading of the Congregation’s letter in Aleppo. When his confrere, Agathange, was not in Aleppo, Bonaventure opened the envelope which contained the two letters and gave one to Karmeh, who felt “a little frustrated,”¹⁸⁹ but with the reasons given by the secretary of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith in the letter addressed to Fr. Agathange, Karmeh “was satisfied.”¹⁹⁰ Fr. Bonaventure informed the Congregation of it on December 9, 1633.

2) Euthymios II Karmeh, Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch (May 1, 1634 - January 1, 1635)

The metropolitan of Aleppo soon became the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch. At the death of Ignatios III Atieh¹⁹¹ the Greek Orthodox of the Patriarchate of Antioch did not hesitate to choose Karmeh as their shepherd and patriarch,¹⁹² despite his “Roman” tendencies which were well known in the East.¹⁹³ He was chosen because he was a man of God wanting only the best for his flock and for all Christians of the East

¹⁸⁵ *SOCG*, vol. 293, fol. 488r-489v: “Discorso à N.S. Papa Urbano intorno alla traslatione della Vulgata in Arabico, e delle persone ch’attendono a quest’opera. Del Sefretario Ingoli” (cf. fol. 490v).

¹⁸⁶ This concerns the Polyglots Bible that Cardinal de Perron and M. de Thon intended to publish at Paris and which Michel Le Jay with Antoine Vitré brought to a good end in 1645. Note that this edition began to be published at Paris in March 1628. See the contribution of Gabriel Sionite to this Polyglots Bible of Parish in : P. Raphaël, op. cit., pp. 78-84.

¹⁸⁷ Ingoli, secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, gives five reasons, cf. *SOCG*, vol. 293, fol. 488v-489r.

¹⁸⁸ “Perchè se si manda la Volgata nostra in Oriente senza dubbio s’estingueranno le sei traslationi arabiche piene d’errori” of which Karmeh had informed the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in his letter of May 12, 1629 (*SOCG*, vol. 181, fol. 208r: cf. above.)

¹⁸⁹ “Il quale hebbe un poco digusto” (*SOCG*, vol. 104, fol. 243r).

¹⁹⁰ “Ma colle ragioni de. V. Signoria Em.ma è restate sodisfatto” (*Ibid.*). By this we see that the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith wanted to persuade Karmeh that the Arabic translation of the Vulgate was the best one could have, and for want of other means he had to accept it despite the contribution that he wished to make for this translation, thanks to his vast knowledge of Greek and Arabic.

¹⁹¹ See above, chapter II.

¹⁹² Cf. *Kilzi*, p. 142; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632; *Radu*, pp. 40-41.; *Vat. Arab.* 689, fol. 139v.

¹⁹³ His quarrels with Cyril IV Dabbas because of his favorable attitude to the Latin missionaries was well known. It was even known in Cyprus (*SOCG*, vol. 112, fol. 415r). Even Cyril I Lucaris took him back again because he employed Fr. Queyrot to teach in his own home (Besson, p. 24).

without distinction> He was a holy and educated man and that was enough for the sheep of Christ.¹⁹⁴

The Damascenes, who generally did not look favorably on those from the capital of northern Syria,¹⁹⁵ hastened to Aleppo to lead him to Damascus where he arrived on April 23, 1634.¹⁹⁶ The Greek metropolitans who were waiting for him there consecrated him patriarch on May 1.¹⁹⁷ As he preached in Aleppo, he did the same in Damascus and sent encyclicals to all the faithful of the patriarchate exhorting them to always remain faithful to their Christian vocation.¹⁹⁸

As we have seen, the episcopate of this great man began when he sent his protosyncellos, Absalon, and the Franciscan father, Thomas Obicini de Novare to Rome.¹⁹⁹ When Karmeh arrived to the patriarchate he prepared a new delegation, but this time more decisive. With the visit in Aleppo of the Maronite Bishop of Tripoli, Isaac Shiadraoui,²⁰⁰ he prepared an expedition which began from Damascus in August 1634. The new Orthodox Patriarch, Euthymios II Karmeh delegated Protosyncellos Pachomios for the serious mission which awaited him.²⁰¹ He entrusted to him not only letters and Arabic translations of the Euchologion and Horologion, but also his own seal. Pachomios was to renew the union of Florence by signing it and applying the patriarchal seal in the name of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch.²⁰² The delegation arrived in Rome in the beginning of January 1635.²⁰³ The secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation

¹⁹⁴ Cf. the testimonies of Macarios of Aleppo and Jesuit Father Queyrot on the holiness of this Greek prelate (*Kilzi*, pp. 42-47, 81-84, 142-143); *SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol. 165r-167r).

¹⁹⁵ This is a religious-political rivalry which remains a little in the blood of these peoples.

¹⁹⁶ *Kilzi*, p. 142.

¹⁹⁷ Macarios of Aleppo does not specify the name of those who consecrated him: “and the archbishops consecrated him patriarch May 1,” 1634 (*Ibid.*). Karmeh took the name Euthymios. Rustum (p. 43) calls him Euthymios III and assigns him “1635-1636” as duration of his patriarchate!

¹⁹⁸ *Kilzi*, p. 143.

¹⁹⁹ See above, particularly *Acts*, vol. 3, fol. 7r and 11r.

²⁰⁰ In May 1633, Isaac Shiadraoui (or Sciadrensis) was in Aleppo as his letter written in Aleppo on May 3, 1633 to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith reveals to us: “Io al presente mi ritrovo in Aleppo per far la visita, rappacificare et rimediare à certi disordini et inconvenienti che occorsero questo anno nel nostro popolo (maronita), si come feci un'altra volta quattro anni fà...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 103, fol. 191r). Note at that time there were no residential bishops there for the Maronites. Cf. for example the letter of recommendation of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to Maronite Patriarch George Amira (1634-1644) in order that he (Amira) concede to Isaac, bishop of Tripoli “residentiam in Aleppo, aut Damasco aut Barutti, aut in alio loco ubi sunt maronitae ne inutiliter tempus transigat!” (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 343v-344r: Congregation meeting 210 of November 12, 1635).

²⁰¹ Very probably this expedition was prepared to Aleppo before the accession of Karmeh to the patriarchate, particularly after the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had accepted to have the Euchologion and Horologion published in Arabic (cf. *Acta*, vol. 8, fol. 63v-64r). But the delegates lasted leaving Damascus while Karmeh was already patriarch, since he remained in Damascus after his patriarchal consecration and his delegate, Protosyncellos Pachomios, traveled to the patriarchal residence of Damascus (Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 41r).

²⁰² Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 41r.

²⁰³ In fact before the Congregation meeting of January 7, 1635, secretary Ingoli wrote: “il Patriarcha d'Antiochia ha mandato a Roma per far l'unione” (*SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol.38v).

of the Faith, Monsignor Francesco Ingoli,²⁰⁴ who knew how important the union of the Greek-Melkite Orthodox Patriarchate with Rome would be, gave us an account which no ecumenist of our day should ignore.²⁰⁵ He writes, “When Euthymios Karmeh became Patriarch of Antioch he took charge of printing the Euchologion and the Horologion of the Greeks. With great diligence and fatigue for fifteen years, he had translated them into Arabic and corrected them according to the ancient manuscripts. By offering printed copies of these books to all his churches, he had intended to attach his archbishops, bishops, priests, and his people to the holy union. This affair was very important *because this Patriarch is one who could truly be called Patriarch of Antioch. In fact, he succeeds those who intervened in the general councils, whereas the other councils, those of the Maronites, Jacobites and Nestorians,*²⁰⁶ *were more national than general.*”²⁰⁷ “Besides,” continued the eminent Roman prelate, “in view that the people of Asia are without instruction, a better method to bring them to union could not be found than to correct and print their cultural books. The costly manuscripts would disappear and with time the printed corrections would be arranged; they would be instructed in Christian doctrine and would no longer question their heresy. Union would be made and restored without losing anyone among them.”²⁰⁸ The same secretary, Francesco Ingoli, was well aware of the role which Euthymios had played; after the arrival of the Capuchins and Jesuits to

²⁰⁴ Although some historians wanted to minimize the value of this first secretary of the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, one could not praise his vast knowledge on all the historical and ecclesiastical questions of the east, in which few of his successors could equal him. The scholarly remarks that he wrote on the back of letters he received demonstrate this erudition. Cf. for example J. Grisar, “Francesco Ingoli über die Aufgaben des kommenden Papstes nach dem Tode Urbans VIII” in *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, Rome, 5 (1967), pp. 289-325; J. Metzler, “Francesco Ingoli und die Indianerweihe” in *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, 1969, pp. 262-272.

²⁰⁵ These are the remarks that Ingoli wrote on the subject of the request made by the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch for the printing of the Euchologion and Horologion In Arabic (SOCCG, vol. 180, fol. 46v).

²⁰⁶ “Hora fatto patriarca d’Antiochia, (Euthymios Karmeh) hà preso alla mano di stampare l’Euchologio de greci et il loro Horologio traslato in arabo e corretto con antichi manuscritti, con molta diligenza e fatica de 15 anni, sperando con darne copie stampate à tutte le sue chiese di affezionar li suoi Arcivescovi, vescovi, e sacerdoti e li popoli alla santa Unione. Questo negotio importa grandemente, *perchè questo patriarca è quello, che veramente si puo dire patriarca d’Antichia*, perchè succede à quelli che intervennero ne generali concilij, essendo gl’altri de marnoniti, Giacobiti e Nestoriani più tosto Nazionali, che Generali” (*Ibid.*). Note that the Nestorian Patriarchs never bore the title of Antioch.

²⁰⁷ This distinction, which appears to us very important to understand the Christian east and to continue a fruitful dialogue with the Orthodox properly speaking (cf. our Introduction) had not been respected at Vatican Council II which placed all the patriarchs on one level without distinction (cf. “*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*,” no. 8: “Patriarchae Ecclesiarum Orientalium licet alii aliis tempore posteriori, omnes tamen aequales sunt”!). Compare with de Vries (*op. cit.*, p. 287) which shows how “für den Kardinal Ledochowski war der melkitische der einzige, Patriarcha Maior,” among the patriarchs united with Rome. However it is necessary to admit that Vatican II could have done differently without creating useless disputes.

²⁰⁸ “Di più essendo li popoli dell’Asia senza studi, non si puo trovar miglior modo per farli unire, che correggerli loro libri cultici, e stamparglieli perchè s’aboliranno li manuscritti che costano tanto, e col tempo restandoli li stampati corretti, ed instruiti nella dottrina christiana senza entar in dispute di quello che non sanno più dell’Heresia loro, sarà fatta l’unione et guarita, senza pericolo d’alcun di loro” (*SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 46v). It is necessary to say that the secretary Ingoli was very optimistic! But his method was also followed after three and a half centuries of “mission,” in order to enter after Vatican Council II into the phase of “ecumenism” with the separated Christians.

Aleppo, this Orthodox metropolitan²⁰⁹ had now become Patriarch of Antioch. For the Congregation's meeting on January 7, 1635, Ingoli prepared a text on the necessary way of acting to coordinate the reprisals that the king and princes of the Christian west wished to exert against the Greek "schismatics" in order to have them return the sanctuaries of the Holy Land which they had usurped.²¹⁰ He inserted a very significant phrase on the subject of the Greek Patriarch of Antioch, requesting that he and the Greeks of his patriarchate be protected from these reprisals released against the Greeks. In fact, he wrote: "this patriarch had sent (some delegates) to Rome to make the union; he always had good dispositions toward this Holy See (of Rome), and he had favored our missionaries when he was archbishop of Aleppo."²¹¹

This already shows the ambiance in which the delegate of the patriarch of Antioch found himself when he arrived in Rome. The three letters which he took to Pope Urban VIII as well as to the cardinal of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith said nothing about union²¹² but they expressed a total confidence in the kindness of the Roman authorities. Patriarch Karmeh addressed himself to Pope Urban VIII as the

²⁰⁹ "Questo patriarca d'Antiochia è quell Meletio già Arcivescovo de Melchiti d'Aleppo, ch'hà per lo spatio di 10 anni (rather 15 ans: cf. Congregation meeting 5 of April 11, 1622 where it concerns his delegate at Rome, Protosyncellos Absalon), trattato colla Sac. Congregazione, e colli suoi missionarij mostratosi inclinato all'unione" (*SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 49v). Ingoli seems to have forgotten the relations of this Metropolitan of Aleppo with Pope Paul V before the definitive foundation of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1622 (cf. above).

²¹⁰ The question of the Holy Places tormented the entire East in the 17th century, prolonging the harmful effects of the Crusades of which we suffer today with the presence of the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. On this question see the brochure prepared by the Greek-Melkite Catholic Patriarchate of Antioch: "*Catholicism ou latinisme*," Harissa 1961 (particularly pp. 20-78). On our question of the 17th century, see *Musset*, II, pp. 181-188; OC, no. 84 (1933). Cf. also *SOCCG*, vol. 149, fol. 240r-241r; vol. 195, fol. 82r where we read the "ricordi del Padre Vandsome per Terra Santa": "Piacere a V.S. Ill.ma e R.ma ricordarsi di... rappresentare al Em.mo Signor Cardinale nostro protettore che per rimediare prontamente e facilmente alli presenti travagli di Terra Sanra bisognava ordinare a corsarij di Fiorenza e di Malta di far ogni diligenza di pigliar in mare o in terra alcune persone notabile di quei paesi vicino Gierusalem a quali no 'srà dato speranza d'altro recotto ne ranzone se no' la restitutione delli luoghi Sartti usurpati dalli greci..." Compare with fol. 93r, 94r, 94r-97r and 103r of the same volume.

²¹¹ "Parere del segretario Ingoli del modo che s'hà da tenere per ordinare le represalie contro li Greci Scismatici: Mi pare che sia necessario di far sapere la resolutione presa circa le Represalie (cf. The Decree of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of November 21, 1634 in the meeting held in the presence of the pope: *SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol. 71rv) alli due Patriarchi Cyrillo di Constantinopoli e à Theofano di Gierusalemme... che risponderanno circa la restitutione de Santi Luoghi... si darà ordine alli Vascelli de Principi christiani che li spogliano (the Greeks) di quanto ritroveranno nelli loro Vascelli e li vadino anche ad infettare nelle loro habitationi sinche si faccia detta restitutione... Bisognarebbe quando non s'havessero gl'intoppi detti di sopra, eccettuare li Studditi delli due Patriarchi Alessandrino et Antiocheno, perche oltre non esser concorsi all'usurpatione dei Santi Luoghi, il Primo s'è portato bene in material di Religione recusando d'unir il suo Patriarchato cogl'heretici di settentrone (i.e. the Calvinists), com'era invitato dall'Ambasciatore d'Hollanda ad istigazioni di Cyrillo (Lucaris). Il Secondo (i. e. Euthymios Karmeh) ha mandato a Roma per far l'unione, e sempre è stato con buona dispositione verso questa Santa Sede, et hà favoriti li nostri Missionarij mentre era Arcivescovo d'Aleppo" (*SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol. 38r-39r).

²¹² Again Ingoli notes this in *SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 39r and vol. 395, fol. 295r and 296v. The letters themselves, all three written in Arabic, are found in vol. 180 of *SOCCG* (fol. 41r, 42r and 43r) with their Italian translation (fol. 52r-53r; 47r-48r, 55v). The restoration of the Arabic letters was made since one part of one letter was glued to a part of another letter! Seeing the deteriorated state of these letters we had great difficulty reconstituting the original.

steward of our Lord Jesus Christ.²¹³ He reminded him of his relations with the holy popes, Paul V (1605-1623) and Gregory XV (1621-1623), and asked him to have the Arabic Euchologion and Horologion which Pachomios brought printed in sufficient quantity for the whole Patriarchate of Antioch.²¹⁴ In his letter to the Congregation he also asked the cardinal to have the two mentioned books printed, not only for the usage of the eparchy of Aleppo but for the whole patriarchate of the East for which he was delegated.²¹⁵ But the most significant letter is the third, addressed to the pope and Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.²¹⁶ Patriarch Karmeh, who called himself “the minor disciple who loves the highest,”²¹⁷ at first cites the phrase of Christ: “ask and it will be given you, seek and you shall find; knock and it will be opened” (Lk 11:9; Mt 7:7). He applied this counsel by asking the “generosity of the pope, our venerable master, and for the reverend Sacred Congregation to *have the books printed for the Church of which Christ is the founder and the foundation and the base.*”²¹⁸ He reminded them that they had asked him to quickly send the manuscript versions to have them printed in Rome. For this, he says, through his “reverend confrere, Matran Isaac²¹⁹ and through his disciple, Protosyncellos Pachomios from the patriarchal residence, he had sent two books, the Euchologion and the Horologion, which he had translated from Greek into Arabic as best he could from a printed Greek copy and several manuscripts.²²⁰ He added two rules

²¹³ Patriarch Karmeh addressed himself to the pope in these words: “Hadrat Sayyidi dhou-errai-essahih al-Baba Urbano Wakil Rabbina wa Sayyidina Yasu’a al-Masih” (to my Orthodox Master Pope Urban. Steward of our Lord Jesus Christ). Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 43v.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.* We see that Karmeh had never interrupted his relations with Rome since his accession to the episcopate in 1612 (with Paul V) until his death as Patriarch of Antioch.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 42r. Cf. also the Italian version (fol. 47r-48r of the same volume).

²¹⁶ This letter begins with these words: “From the poor servant Euthymios to our magnificent Master and to the excellent Holy Congregation with the Lord Cardinals, may God perpetuate their goodness” (*Ibid.*, fol. 414 in Arabic).

²¹⁷ “At-Tilmid al-Asghar wal Mouhib al-Akbar” (*Ibid.*).

²¹⁸ The Italian translation has this meaningless word: “l’impressione d’alcuni libri ecclesiastici, de quali è fondamento e base Christo!” It is clear that in the original Arabic it concerns the foundation and base of the Church and not books! (“Taba’ baad Kutob li Kanissat al-Masih alladhi houa Yasouha”: *Ibid.*) Compare with the Italian translation fol. 42r of the same volume.

²¹⁹ Cf. footnote 200 above. Isaac Shiadraoui, student of the Maronite College in Rome since 1603, was consecrated bishop of Tripoli in 1629 and sent on a mission to Aleppo. The second mission to Aleppo from 1633-1634 was concluded with his departure to Rome with the delegate of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch. It is interesting to note that P. Raphaël, who chanted the glory of the Maronite Nation in his pamphlet “*Le rôle du Collège Maronite Romain dans l’Orientalisme aux XVII et XVIII siècles*” (Beirut 1950) says not one word about this serious mission which this Maronite bishop made (cf. pp. 102-105). Besides even his predecessors (De La Roque, J. Assemani, Debs, Cheikho and Chebli) did not know about this affair (*op. cit.*, p. 105).

²²⁰ *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 41r. It is interesting to know that it was the Capuchin Michel de Rennes who composed the dedication of these 2 books in Latin which was then translated into Arabic: “S.mo D. N. Urbano Octavo Communi omnium credentium parenti, Pontifici O.M. et universalis Ecclesiae praesuli. ... hoc tandem opus meae sub Suavissimo Ecclesiae Romanae Iugo obedientiae singularisque benevolentiae argumentum, nec non urbanitatis erga me tuae oviculam gregis tui monumentum, sed et meorum primitias ac primordia studiorum, tibi meo communique omnium credentium parenti toto cordis ac mentis affectu dico, dedico conferoque; tibi inquam. mortalium Dignissime, quippe qui Christi Domini Sacerdotum omnium principis personam praefers, qui Beatissimi Petri Ecclesiae clavigeri, tum in aperiendis tum in claudendis Ianuis coelestibus, sive ligando sive solvendo vices geris, qui, denique (ne longius prosequem) coeterorum Apostolorum potestate praevalens, privilegiis gaudes, autoritate superemines...” (*SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 205v).

which should be observed so that the edition of these two books be “useful and correct,” and asked for a thousand or so of each book.²²¹ All these letters were signed: “Euthymios the poor, Patriarch of Antioch.”

The presence of the Maronite Bishop Isaac in this delegation was significant. He had not informed his patriarch of this mission,²²² but was a friend of Karmeh since his first mission in Aleppo in 1629.²²³ In fact, the Greek Patriarch of Antioch could not write everything he thought about on the subject of the union with Rome without running the risk of losing his life and attracting all the persecutions which were possible and imaginable against his clergy and faithful.²²⁴ This was the solution: the letters said nothing about this union in case they fell into the hands of the Turks. Father Pachomios represented the patriarch in Rome for the printing of the mentioned books and mainly to sign the union in the name of the patriarch. For this reason he carried the patriarchal seal. The Maronite Bishop Isaac, well known at the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, had to be the witness of this union and above all, to testify to the authenticity of the mission of Pachomios. All this was understood by Rome. Bishop Isaac addressed a letter to the secretary, Francesco Ingoli, exposing the meaning of his mission and added that, by the printing of the Euchologion and Horologion in Arabic, the Greek Patriarch of Antioch wanted to unite “his whole flock with the Apostolic See” of Rome.²²⁵

The question was treated at the Congregation’s meeting of January 19, 1635²²⁶ but was not that simple to be resolved in the course of one session. On March 19, 1635

²²¹ *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 41e. Karmeh proposed here among other things the kind of paper, the color of the text, the manner of binding the books, etc...

²²² This is the letter of Patriarch George Amira read at the Congregation meeting 208 of September 24, 1635 (in presence of pope) which reveals to us that this Maronite bishop “sine licentia Patriarchae eiusdem nationis nuperrime defuncti (i.e. John Makhlof) Roman venit.” The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had decided to dismiss “quamprimum dictum Archiepiscopum Cypri (rather: Tripoli) Isaac, et etiam Georgium Maronium Archiepiscopum Cyopri ad eorum residentias” (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 318v-319r).

²²³ Cf. footnote 219 above.

²²⁴ Cf. H. Zayat, *The Greek Melkites in Islam* (in Arabic), Harissa 1953, p. 75; *Revue de l’Eglise Grecque Unie*, 2 (1890), pp. 409-410. It is sufficient knowing as if “allied with the Franks,” that is to say the westerners, in order to merit death.

²²⁵ “Isac Sciadrense Arcivescovo di Tripoli di Soria espone humilmente a V. Eminenza com’in virtù delle lettere della S. Congegazione de Propaganda Fide Eutimio Patriarca d’Antiochia della Nazione de’ Greci hà commesso all’oratore, che portasse seco certi libri d’orationi ecclesiastiche trasferite dal Greco in arabico per stamparle in Roma ben corrette in lingua arabica con speranza d’unirsi non solamente il suddetto Patriarca ma tutto il suo grege alla sede Apostolica (of Rome) come dalle qui accluse lettere, e dal Monacho (Pachomoios) che percio col oratore è stato mandato...” (*SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 46r). It was on the back of this account (fol. 46v) that secretary Ingoli notes: “questo patriarcha è quello, che veramente si puo dire patriarcha d’Antiochia...” (cf. footnote 206 above).

²²⁶ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 174rv: “referente eodem Em.mo D. Card. Barberino instantiam R.mi D. Isaac Archiepiscopi Tripolis Syriae Nationis Maronitarum, et Patris Pachomij Nuntij Euthymij Patriarchae Antiocheni antea Meletij Archiepiscopi Aleppi, ut Euchologium et Horologium Graecorum è greca lingua in Arabicam translata imprimerentur, et impressa ad praefatum Patriarcham transmitterentur, quia cum illis sperabat suos Archiepiscopos, Episcopos et Sacerdotes ad Unionem cvum S.R. Ecclesia perducere. Sacra Congregatio petitioni eorum annuendum sese censuit, et P. Vincentium Richardium Theatinum, et Patrem Philippum Guadagnolum deputavit ad examinandos praedictos duos libros prius in latinum transferendos, ut possint cum Graecis exemplaribus conferri, et ab erroribus, si opus fuerit, expurgari” (cf. also *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 49v).

the same question was studied in the presence of the pope.²²⁷ Cardinal Capponi gave his account in these words: “Patriarch Euthymios of Antioch sent us Father Pachomios, his archpriest, with the order to unite himself in the patriarch’s name to the Apostolic See (of Rome), by accepting the Council of Florence; he gave him his seal as well to use as his signature. Once this approbation would be signed, he should seal it with the aforesaid seal on which is engraved in Arabic: Euthymios, Patriarch of Antioch. In the letters which the aforesaid patriarch wrote to Your Holiness and to the Sacred Congregation he said nothing of this detail because, I believe, he feared that the letters would fall into the hands of the Turks. However, he approved it through his nuncio and envoy, the aforesaid Pachomios, who affirms that the patriarch told him to subscribe in his name to all that the pope and congregation said by sealing it with his seal and in particular to say that he accepted the Council of Florence. Nevertheless it is necessary that Your Holiness order a public act of union drawn up for this patriarch who was won over by the missionaries of Aleppo, so that the aforesaid Father Pachomios may take it with him and have it ratified by the Patriarch.”²²⁸

Pope Urban VIII saw the importance of the question and wanted to institute a particular meeting to study it better before taking the final decision.²²⁹ It is noted, however, that the pope insinuated the possibility of concluding the union through the delegate of the patriarch. So that this union with the “reception” of the sacred Council of Florence be canonical, it would be necessary that he should make a public act in the name of his patriarch.²³⁰ The particular meeting which would examine this question would be held in the presence of Cardinals Cremona, Ginetto and Antonio, as well as Fathers Herera, Horace Giustiniano and the Théatine Vincent Richardo.²³¹ It took place on July

²²⁷ *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 207r-208r; SOCG vol. 180, fol. 39r, and vol. 395, fol. 295r and 296v. We note that even the Capuchin Bonaventure de Loudes sent letters of recommendation on the subject of this mission. This is what was reported to the Congregation meeting 201 of February 28, 1635: “retulit idem Em.mus D.mus Card. Caponius literas Patris Bonaventurae Capuccini Missionarij in Aleppo de R.mo Isaac Tripolitano Archiepiscopo, et de Patre Pachomio misso ab Euthimio Patriarcha Antiocheno Graeco, quorum negotia, de quibus in alij huius Sac. Cong.nis Decretis, commendabat” (*Acts*, vol. 10, fol. 187v).

²²⁸ “Il patriarcha Euthimio d’Antiochia hà mandato qui il padre Pachomio suo Arciprete com ordine ch’in nome suo s’unisca colla Sede Apostolica (of Rome) con accettar il sacro Concilio di Fiorenza e per segno gli hà dato il suo signillo, accio dopo haver sottoscritta tal accettazione, la sigilli col detto suo sigillo, sul qual in Arabico sono scritte queste parole Euthimius patriarcha Antiochenus.

Nelle lettere che`scrive detto patriarcha à V. Santità, et alla Sac. Congregazione non dice cosa alcuna di questo particolare, credo perche hà dubitato, che le lettere non capitassero in man de Turchi, approva pero per uno suo Nuntio, e messo il detto padre Pachomio, il qual asserisce, che il patriarcha gl’hà detto, che tutto cio, che dirà il papa e la congregazione ch’egli faccia lo sottoscriva in suo nome, e lo sigilli col suo sigillo, et in particolare, che dica che accetta il Concilio di Fiorenza.

Pero è necessario, che V. Santità dia qualche ordine per far qualch’atto publico d’l’unione di questo patriarcha guadagnato dalli missionarij d’Aleppo, accio il detto padre Pachomio lo porti seco e glielo faccia ratificare.” This is what secretary Ingoli had prepared (cf. *SO CG*, *Ibid.*) for Cardinal Caponni. We see in it the role that Ingoli played in all the works of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith even if the final decision depended on the pope and cardinals!

²²⁹ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol.308r.

²³⁰ “Tractetur de modo faciendo in recipiendo praedictum Patriarcham ad Unionem, et de actu publico per illum Patrem Pachomium, nomine memorati Patriarchae faciendo” (*SO CG*, vol. 180, fol. 40r; compare with *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 308r).

²³¹“S.D.N. ut Unio p.ta et receptio praefati Sac Concilii canonicè a memorato Patre Pachomio, huic quo supra, fiant, Congregationem particularem instituit coram Em.mo D.no Card. de Cremona habendam, cum

16, 1635 in the palace of Cardinal Cremona and in the presence of all those who were expected; also present was Abbot Hilarion.²³² The question of this union was discussed and then Bishop Isaac of the Maronite nation and Fr. Pachomios “monk of Saint Basil and archpriest of the patriarch” in question were allowed to enter. They listened to them again and their petition was authenticated by the seal which Pachomios showed them.²³³ After sending them out, the congregation rejected the petition, since the delegates did not bring special letters or at least letters of witnesses, nor even the profession of Catholic faith of the patriarch.²³⁴ It was then decided to write to the patriarch and ask him to make a profession of faith according to the recently corrected formula which was imposed on all Easterners in the presence of two or three missionaries, or better yet, in the presence of the monks of the Family of Jerusalem. The patriarch himself had to sign it in his own hand and send it to Bishop Isaac either with his special letters of union or with the letters of witnesses. It would be better to send Father Pachomios again to Rome with these documents.²³⁵ To reinforce the union it was proposed that the patriarch send some young Greek boys to be educated in Rome and be the promoters of the union once concluded.²³⁶ These decisions were approved by the general congregation held in the presence of the pope on the following July 30.²³⁷

Em.mis D.mis Cardinalibus Ginetto et Antonio, et RR. PP. Magistro Sac. Palatij, Herera, Horatio Justiniano, et P. Vincentio Richardio Theatino” (*Ibid.*).

²³² It concerns Abbot Hilarion Rancati, Cistercian, was part of the commission for the Arabic Bible, Cf. Raphaël, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

²³³ *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 270r-271r: “Introductis in Congregationem R.mo D. Isaac Archiepiscopo Tripoplis Syriae Nationis Maronitarium, et P. Pachomio S.ti Basilij monacho eiusdem Patriarchae Archipresbytero audiaque iterum eadem instantia per praefatum Archiepiscopum et Monachum latius explicata, et per Sigilli eiusdem Patriarchae exhibitionem, et ostensionem confirmata; quo dixerunt, se uti Nuntios eius speciales, et cum sigillo predicto more orientalium mandato speciali aequivalente, unionem praefatam, quoquomodo admissa fuerit, eiusdem Patriarchae nomine facturos, et sigillo p.tum munituros.”

²³⁴ “Congregatio dimissis praefatis Nuntijs post maturam deliberationem censuit, non praemissa per eundem Patriarcham Catholicae fidei professione, et non exhibitis eius literis specialibus, aut saltem credentialibus ut in Unione Iacobitarum observatum fuit in Sacro Concilio Florentino, instantiam praefatam non esse admittendam” (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 271r). According to the example of the union with the Jacobites that the Congregation also wanted to follow in the case of a completely Orthodox patriarch, we see how the distinction between Orthodox and pre-Chalcedonian began to die out in the western vision of the Church: all that was eastern knew heresy, a profession of catholic faith was then necessary and imposed on all easterners without distinction, while since the pontificate of Gregory XIII (1572-1585) there was a profession of faith proper to the Greeks and one proper to all other easterners. Cf. De Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg 1963, pp. 308-309.

²³⁵ “Propterea scribendum esse eidem Patriarchae, ut iuxta morem, et consuetudinem hactenus in S.R.E. observatam, prius professionem iuxta formulam, pro orientalibus nuper editam, faciat, praesentibus duobus, aut tribus missionarijs, aut Religiosis familiae Hiersolomytanae; eamque propria manu subscribat, et transmittat, cum suis literis vel specialibus super Unione, vel credentialibus ad p.tum Archiepiscopum, aut eundem Patrem Pachomium, cum similibus literis ad Urbem denuo mittat” (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 271rv). For the recently edited formula cf. *Acta*, vol. 8, fol. 232rv and 235v. This formula was also imposed little by little on the Italo-Greeks of Ancones (July 30, 1635: *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 280r) and on the Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople, Athanasios Patellaros and Cyril of Berrhea (November 17, 1635: *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 347r and 348r).

²³⁶ “S. Congregatio censuit ad Unionem p.tam postquam facta fuerit, conservandam necessarium esse, ut aliquot Iuvenes Syri (Greek rite) à praefato Patriarcha, eiusque successoribus mittendi, in aliquot Collegio Romae instruantur, et bene instructi, Patriam remittantur, ad iuvandos suos, Unionemque manutenendam” (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 271r).

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 287r: S. Congregatio probavit et iussit...” Cf. also *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 54.

The Euchologion and Horologion sent by Patriarch Euthymios II Karmeh with his delegate Pachomios were submitted to Rome for a first censorship. The result was that the desire of the patriarch could not be satisfied because the books contained the same “errors” which were in the Greek books from which they were translated. It was necessary to correct the Greek text and then compare it with a Latin translation of the text of Patriarch Karmeh.²³⁸ But this could take quite some time and it was feared that this would never finish, “if the habitual way of the congregations was followed.”²³⁹ According to the views of Ingoli, the correction of these books was very important because they could be of service to the “Greek Catholics” themselves,²⁴⁰ since the Greek Euchologia printed in Venice had “some heresies, many Judaic ceremonies, altered prayers of the Greek Fathers and various troparia and prayers of the new schismatics and heretics...”²⁴¹ Patriarch Karmeh was informed that his Arabic versions would be translated into Latin by Bishop Isaac of Tripoli so that they could be reviewed by the Roman theologians and corrected, if needed, in the questions of Catholic faith.²⁴²

²³⁸ Ingoli notes in *SOCC*, vol. 180, fol. 51rv: “non si puo dar sodisfattione al sud.o Patriarcha, se prima non s’emendano li greci (i.e. the Euchologion and Horologion) che hanno molti e gravi errori come si vede dalla censua venuta di Spagna...” Here this concerns the complaints of some Latin bishops against the Italo-Greeks and the Italo-Albanians who lived in the Kingdom of Naples and of Sicily. These complaints were taken to Rome by the king of Spain, Philip IV, sovereign of the kingdom there also. (Cf. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 134). Congregation meeting 200 of January 19, 1635 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 174r) had appointed Father Vincent Richard and Philip Guadagnolo “ad examinandos praefatos duos libros prius in latinum transferendos, ut possint cum graecis exemplaribus conferri, et ab erroribus, si opus fuerit, expurgar.” The special Congregation meeting of July 26, 1635 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 271v) “mandavit R.mo Isaac Archiepiscopo (Maronite of Tripoli), ut Euchologium, et Horologium Graecorum in lingua Arabica, à praefato Patriarcha transmissa, ut imprimerentur typis Arabicis, in Latinum transferat, ut possint corrigi in pertinentibus ad fidem catholicam, iuxta eiusdem Patriarchae instantiam, et deinde imprimi iuxta Decretum in Sac. Congregatione de Prop. Fide editum.”

²³⁹ It is Ingoli who notes (*SOCC*, vol. 180, fol. 51rv): “poiche in emendar li codici greci, e poi accomodar, e stampar gli arabici si anderà gran tempo, e forse non se ne vedrà mai il fine, se si piglierà la strada solita delle Congregazione, come s’è visto nel rispondere al libro dogmatico de Persiani, che mai colla Cong.ne ordinata si terminava, s’il Padre Filippo Guadagnolo non si poneva già à far egli prima la risposta, e poi farla rivedere: la quale essendo riuscita così felicemente come s’è visto pare che si potrebbe tener la medesima strada circa questi libri...” Thus Ingoli, who was already secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for 13 years, had anticipated the sad end of the Arabic Euchologion which only saw the light of day in 1851, not according to Karmeh’s translation, but that of the Greek “Catholic” Euchologion published for the first time in 1754 under Benedict XIV! Cf. Nasrallah, *Notes and Documents*, pp. 131-135; compare with C. Korolevsky (Karalevskij), *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites*, III, Rome, 1911, pp. 48-50; J.B.Darblade, “L’Euchologe arab-melchite de Kyr Méléce Karmet,” in *POC*, 6 (1956), pp. 28-37.

²⁴⁰ This concerns the Greeks who were under the Latin jurisdiction, and who also used the Greek language in their religious ceremonies.

²⁴¹ “Negli euchologij greci stampati in Venetia si contengono dell’eresie, molte cerimonie giudaiche, si leggono le orationi de Padri Santi Greci alterate e diversi troparij et orationi de moderni Schismatici et heretici, e molti altri particolari degni d’emendatione...” (Ingoli wrote this in *SOCC*, *Ibid.*.)

²⁴² The response was prepared by Ingoli in these words: “A Monsignor Euthimio patriarcha d’Antiochia della natione greca, Dal Padre Pachomio Arciprete di. V.S. si sono ricevute Sue lettere insieme coll’Euchologio et Horologio Arabici che Ella desidera che si stampino; s’è dato ordine à Monsignor Isaac Arcievescovo di Tripoli, che li trasferisca in latino, accio si possino da nostri theologi rivedere et emendare se sarà di bisogno nelle materie pertinenti alla fede cattolica” (*SOCC*, vol. 180, fol. 56v).

In August 1635, Protosyncellos Pachomios returned home to his patriarch with the letters of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and some examples of the Arabic Pentateuch which had been recently printed in Rome.²⁴³

3) Patriarch Karmeh, Martyr of the Union

Since his accession to the episcopate (1612), Karmeh never wanted to conceal his enthusiasm for the union of the Greek Orthodox Church with Rome, in view, above all, for the safety of Christians in the midst of Muslims.²⁴⁴ But to appreciate the courage of an Orthodox prelate who openly declared himself in favor of those who were called “Franks,” it is necessary to consider the political and social conditions in which the Christians of the Near East lived under the Turkish yoke during the 17th century.²⁴⁵ In all probability, an Orthodox prelate such as Karmeh, with such a conciliatory attitude toward the Roman Church, would never have been able to survive for ten years with the Turks on one side and the Greek speaking people on the other side.²⁴⁶ Yet, for twenty-two years Karmeh had resisted all the attacks and persecutions which were inflicted on him by the Turks and the Greeks. His martyrdom began soon after 1614²⁴⁷ and ended with “a malady

²⁴³ Pachomios only left Rome after the Congregation meeting 206 of July 30, 1635 which took place in the presence of Pope Urban VIII (cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 287r). For the Arabic Pentateuch cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 150r-151r; vol. 8, fol. 215v-216r. This Arabic version had nothing to do with the new Arabic version of the first 5 chapters of Genesis made by Karmeh in 1632 (cf. above, particularly *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 63v). This same Congregation meeting decided that “Pentateuchum praefatum esse mittendum Prientales partes, ut antequam ulterius in impressione praefactorum Bibliorum Arabicorum procedatur, experientia fiat, an Ecclesiae Orientales illum recipiant” (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 288v).

²⁴⁴ Cf. above his letters to Popes Paul V and Urban VII.

²⁴⁵ Cf. H. Zayat, *The Greek-Melkites in Islam* (in Arabic), pp. 74-78; *Revue de l’Eglise Grecque Unie*, 2 (1890), pp. 409-410.

²⁴⁶ Cf. for example *SOCG*, vol. 270, fol. 3v in which Ingoli notes concerning Cyril I Lucaris: “Ha accusato al Gran Visir l’Arcivescovo di Smyrna che fù poi carcerato e l’Arcivescovo d’Edessa... Hà avvelentati, et annegati da 6 Metropolitì” most of whom appeared inclined to union with Rome. Also see the end of Cyril II of Berrhea in *SOCG*, vol. 119, fol. 36r.

²⁴⁷ Cf. above, the first trip of Karmeh to Constantinople to defend himself before Timothy II against the accusations of the Patriarch of Antioch, Athanasios II Dabbas, who wanted to depose him from the see of Aleppo (Kilzi, p. 84).

of famous water” which attacked him suddenly.²⁴⁸ He died on January 1, 1635, the feast of Saint Basil.²⁴⁹

The sad news of his death reached Rome in September 1635 in a letter sent to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith by the new patriarch of the Maronite nation, George Amira.²⁵⁰ Rome manifested its visible sorrow when it heard about it, for “it had hoped that by his intermediary, the whole nation of the Greeks of Syria and adjoining provinces would unite with the Apostolic See” of Rome.²⁵¹

Karmeh was not able to receive his delegate, Pachomios, on this earth²⁵² or formally sign the act of union drawn up by the group of Roman theologians who had

²⁴⁸ It is only Paul of Aleppo who used this expression (*Radu*, p. 42): “Marad Maïn Mash’hour” while his father, Patriarch Macarios, only speaks of a grave illness (*Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632; *Kilzi*, p. 143) in order not to attract the anger of the Greek-speaking people of his patriarchate or those of other Greek patriarchates. H. Zayat (*op. cit.*, p. 79) refers to a document of a Jacobite who affirmed quite simply that Patriarch Karmeh had been poisoned. Jesuit Father John Amieu also affirms this public opinion of his times (*Rabbath*, I, pp. 397-398) and that the successor of Karmeh, Euthymios III, feared having the same death as his predecessor if he declared his union with Rome (*Rabbath*, I, p. 402). Capuchin Michael of Rennes also affirms that Patriarch Euthymios III had told him: “nisi vererer Constantinopolitanum patriarcham et alios refragantes palam profiterer me Romanae subiectum Ecclesiae, Svd id si publicassem nec decem mille aurei hanc professionem essent solvendo, ipse autem non ignorat idcirco venenum suo propinatum fuisse predecessori, hoc est patriarcha Carmi” (*SOCG*, vol. 20, fol. 28v). also Cf. vol. 196, fol. 212v and vol. 119, fol. 112r. All this could strengthen the thesis of H. Zayat (*op. cit.*, p. 78-80), even if Fr. Pachomios and the brother of Patriarch Karmeh said nothing about the circumstances of this provoked death (cf. *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 101r and 99r).

²⁴⁹ *Kilzi*, p. 143; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632; *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 99r. Korolevsky (“Antioche” in *DHGE*, col. 641-642) takes pleasure in recounting a history copied from Le Quien (col. 772): Patriarch Karmeh “was on route when the pasha of Damascus, before demanding of Euthymios II (Karmeh) a sum which he had to pay, forced him to retire at Aleppo where he renounced the patriarchate and designated a Greek hieromonk of Chios as his successor...” This account has no foundation (cf. preceding footnote). Macarios of Aleppo mentions no trip of Karmeh to Aleppo after his elevation to the patriarchate (*Kilzi*, p. 143; *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632) and Thalget, brother of the deceased patriarch, affirms that Karmeh died in Damascus and not in Aleppo (*SOCG, Ibid.*). Besides, Korolevsky seems to have ignored the “provoked illness” of the patriarch!

²⁵⁰ *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 318v-319r.

²⁵¹ “S. Congregatio doluit de morte praefati Euthymij, quia sperabat eo mediante, nationem Graecorum Syriae, et convicinarum Provinciarum cum Sede Apostolica (of Rome) unitam iri” (*Acta, Ibid.*).

²⁵² Pachomios left Rome after the Congregation meeting 206 of July 30, 1635 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 287r) and his trip back to Damascus lasted six and one half months (cf. letter of Pachomios to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 101r). Thus he reached Damascus around mid-February 1636 while Patriarch Karmeh died on January 1, 1635 (cf. footnote 249).

Even Ingoli wrote on the back of Thalget’s letter: “questo patriarcha Euthimio d’Antiochia mando il suo Arciprete per far l’unione colla Sede Apostolica (Rome) conforme al Sac. Concilio Fiorentino, fù aggiustata quest’unione con detto Arciprete che fu spedito inditro con li ricapiti necessarij, e mentre era in viaggio mori questo patriarcha...” (*SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 108v). We see that there were more than 13 months between the death of Patriarch Euthymios II Karmeh and the return of Pachomios to Damascus. Thus the letter of Pachomios dated March 19, 1636 could not have been written “before the death of Meletios” (rather Euthymios), as J. Nasrallah wrote (*Notes et Documents*, footnote on p. 131)! Besides the copies of the Arabic Pentateuch which had been sent to Tripoli, Aleppo and Egypt in view of an examination, were brought by Pachomios himself (*Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 271v) and the responses of those who had to examine them were awaited. This is why Euthymios III the Chiot (successor of Karmeh) did not want to respond to the letters of Rome until having received the response of the examiners. J. Nasrallah avoided speaking of this in *DHGE*, vol. 16 (1967), col. 56, but unfortunately he commits another confusion

gathered in the particular congregation on July 26, 1635.²⁵³ However, he had the power to give the example to those after him who fought for the reconciliation of Christians at the risk of losing all, and also left a testament which he wrote on his deathbed.²⁵⁴ In this testament he asked his brother, Thalge, who was living in Aleppo, to announce his death to the pope and to ask His Holiness to remember him in his prayers so that Our Lord Jesus Christ may pardon him his sins.²⁵⁵ Because of his constant concern for the instruction and spiritual good of his faithful, he foresaw the days after his death. He prayed the pope greatly as “steward of God to all men,”²⁵⁶ to send the Euchologion and Horologion to Aleppo when they had been printed at his expense. From Aleppo they would be distributed among the churches of the East under the control of the Father Guardian in order to avoid some priests doing business.²⁵⁷

The Congregation’s meeting 222 of November 11, 1636 learned about the testament of the deceased patriarch,²⁵⁸ although the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith itself knew of his death since September 1635.²⁵⁹ It is very significant to note the attitude of the Congregation in the remarks which its secretary, Ingoli, wrote on the back of the letter of Thalge: “this patriarch, Euthymios of Antioch, sent his archpriest (Pachomios) to unite with the Holy See (of Rome), conforming to the Council of Florence. This union was clarified by the aforesaid archpriest who had returned with the necessary letters, but soon after he left,²⁶⁰ this patriarch died. It is piously believed that he was saved: for he gave full authority to the archpriest to accept the Council of Florence.”²⁶¹ It is known that the Euchologion was confided to Bishop Isaac of Tripoli to translate it into Latin.²⁶²

by writing: “the latter (Karmeh) did not respond immediately, for he waited for other letters from Rome (letter of Pachomios to Cardinal Fr. Barberini, published by H. Zayat in *Histoire de Saidnaya*, 171) (sic), and he died meanwhile.” In fact Karmeh could not have responded because he was dead (13 months before the return of Pachomios to Damascus)! And the letter of Pachomios mentions no expectation of “other letters from Rome!” And this letter was addressed to Fr. Ingoli and not to Cardinal Fr. Barberini! Cf. the original letter in *SCOG*, vol. 180, fol. 101r and its Italian version in the same volume, fol. 101r.

²⁵³ Cf. above, *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 270v-272r.

²⁵⁴ In fact he never hid his desire for union with Rome until his death (Cf. *Rabbath*, I, pp. 410-402). And his last will and testament which Thalget, brother of Patriarch Karmeh, mentions in his letter to the pope, examined at the Congregation meeting 222 of November 11, 1636 (cf. *SCOG*, vol. 180, fol. 99r).

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.* “My brother, Patriarch Euthymios of Antioch, who was the Metropolitan of Aleppo had been quickly suffering from “the arrow of death” and was taken into the neighborhood of the Lord of creation on January 1, 1635 AD at Damascus-Sham, ‘may Your holy head remain saved.’ And he sent to Your servant in his testament that I announce to Your Holiness his death, praying you to remember him in your Divine Liturgy and asking Our Lord Jesus Christ in your prayers that he receive him in his hands and pardon him his sins and guilt” (literally translated from the original Arabic).

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*: “Antom Woukala Allah lil Anam.”

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*: “fear of one of the priests who considered priesthood as a business, not monopolizing them and not selling them.”

²⁵⁸ *SCOG*, vol. 180, fol. 108v.

²⁵⁹ Cf. above, *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 318v-319vr.

²⁶⁰ Cf. footnote 252. Pachomios was at the point of arriving at Rome.

²⁶¹ *SCOG, Ibid.*: “questo patriarcha si puo credere piamente che sia salvo: perche diede piena autorità ad detto Arciprete di accettare il concilio de “Fiorenza.” Note that, according to Ingoli, acceptance of the Council of Florence by an Orthodox suffices to be saved!

²⁶² Cf. above. But Isaac probably did not have the necessary time to accept it (cf. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, footnote p. 132).

Thus ended the “ecumenical” mission of this holy prelate who had no enemies other than the enemies of the Church of Christ, and who patiently accepted their persecutions until his martyrdom. The accounts of the missionaries and other Eastern prelates, who had known him and all his students, are unanimous in proclaiming him a saint. The Jesuit Father, Amieu called the Orthodox-Catholic patriarch a “saint, a true Roman Catholic.”²⁶³ The union which so profoundly began with this holy patriarch did not die with him: his martyrdom was the blood shed for the reconciliation of his brothers. This is proven to us by the attitude of his students and successors in the patriarchate, Euthymios III of Chios and Macarios III Zaim, who perhaps did not have the same courage of their teacher.

4) The Latin Missionaries at Work (1625-1634)

Under the impetus of the definitively erected Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith,²⁶⁴ all the large missionary orders of the west tried hard to respond to its wishes. Since Aleppo was then the capital of commerce in the east, it also became important for the “merchants of the Gospel.”²⁶⁵ Among the cities of Syria, Aleppo had the largest percentage of Christians²⁶⁶ and to it quickly came the Franciscans who were there since 1571, the Capuchins, Jesuits, and Discalced Carmelites.²⁶⁷ The harvest was great and the newly arrived workers were very numerous and made a good harvest but their excessive

²⁶³ *Rabbath*, I, p. 401. P. Besson (p. 24) calls him “a very Catholic man and recounts how “the archbishop (Karmeh) and the fathers (Jesuits) argued about the price of abstinence, with this difference nevertheless, that this virtuous prelate supported for many years, which our missionaries did not suffer for so long a time.” Patriarch Macarios of Aleppo (*Kilzi*, pp. 143-144) wrote that at the death of Karmeh “all the faithful wept in an indescribable manner and that his tomb produced various kinds of miracles and cures even until our day” (in 1670). Capuchin Michael of Rennes wrote in 1641: Karmeh “erava Vescovo Catholico, et con quanto zelo haveria procurator l’ogmentatione (sic) della chiesa romana se non fusse stato prevenuto della morte sei (rather 8) mesi doppo che fu creato Patriarcha Antiocheno” (*SOCC*, vol. 196, fol. 205r). The secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith wrote on October 27, 1640: “il metran Carme finalmente si fece e mori catholico” (*SOCC*, vol. 119, fol.67v). Cf. also the judgment of this same secretary in footnote 261. Even the Dominican scholar Le Quien (col. 773) affirmed: “Charne Romanam in Syria communionem fovens...” Nevertheless, Karmeh was in good relations with the other Orthodox bishops of Antioch and even with the Patriarch of Constantinople to whom he had recourse twice! He never made the profession of faith imposed by Rome!

²⁶⁴ In 1622. Cf. above. On the precedents of this Congregation, also see V. Peri, “La Congregazione dei Greci (1573) e i suoi primi documenti,” in *Studia Gratiana*, 13 (1967), pp. 129-137.

²⁶⁵ “Fra tutte le città dell’Imperio Orientale soggette al dominio turchesco, Aleppo celebre per il traffico; mà non meno hà da stimarsi dà mercantanti (sic) evangelici, che da quelli del secolo, per l’opportunità che vi è d’impiegarsi al guadagno dell’anime” (J. Queyrot in his “Relatione della missione d’Aleppo della Compagnia di Giesù. Dall’anno 1625 insino al sine dell’anno 1629,” in *SOCC*, vol. 195, fol. 159r).

²⁶⁶ J. Besson wrote in 1660: “I consider in this large number of two hundred thousand souls, that the city of Aleppo has forty thousand Christians, namely: five thousand Armenians, ten thousand Greeks and 10 thousand Syrians as well as Nestorians or Maronites” (p. 37).

²⁶⁷ Between 1625 and 1626. See above.

zeal and mediocre preparation²⁶⁸ left the Christians perplexed as they witnessed discord and quarrels among the missionaries.²⁶⁹

In 1629 all Europe knew that the Capuchins of Tourane had won over three archbishops of Aleppo to the Catholic faith, those of the Greeks, Armenians and Syrians. But soon it was learned that they returned to schism because of the Franciscan Fathers who were, according to the Capuchins, the origin of all evil.²⁷⁰ The “Responsalis” of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to Aleppo, Doctor Louis Ramiro, had attracted the anger of the Franciscans because he condemned their less evangelical attitude toward the other missionaries of Aleppo and so informed the Congregation. This obliged the secretary Ingoli to prepare a defense of the zeal of this doctor and ratify it at the Congregation’s meeting 85 of December 17, 1627.²⁷¹ Peace was proclaimed at the beginning of 1629²⁷² but new complaints were heard at the beginning of December 1629.²⁷³ Various solutions regulating these differences were thought of but none bore lasting fruit.²⁷⁴ It is sufficient to look at the attitude of these missionaries a century later in 1724, when there were two patriarchs of Antioch, one clearly “Roman” (Cyril Tanas) and the other clearly “Byzantine” (Sylvester of Cyprus).²⁷⁵ But the most flagrant scandal was the interdiction that the Franciscans made against the Capuchins, prohibiting them to

²⁶⁸ Cf. De Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, op. cit., p. 83: “Die Missionare kamen durchweg ohne jede spezielle Vorbereitung in den Nahen Osten.”

²⁶⁹ On these quarrels see the preceding chapter. In general the quarrels took place between the Franciscans on one side and the other missionaries on the other side. A résumé of these quarrels are found in SOCG, vol. 197, fol. 50r-51v.

²⁷⁰ Cf. the letter of Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers of December 28, 1629 in SOCG, vol. 115, fol. 325r-326r.

²⁷¹ SOCG, vol. 196, fol. 118r: “l’ingiusta persecuzione fatta dal suddetto frà Francesco (Guaresmi, Guardian of Aleppo) al Ramiro, che con tanta fedeltà, e senza offesa della Religione francescana hà servito da 3 anni incirca, con sua spesa e fatica la stessa Sac. Congregazione.” This Louis Ramiro presented his resignation in 1631 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 94v) and was replaced by Gaspar della Chiesa (cf. *Acta*, vol. 8, fol. 128v). The “Responsalis” of Aleppo informed the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith about the situation of the missions in the entire Near East.

²⁷² Cf. the account of Louis Ramiro of the month of April 1629 in SOCG, vol. 196, fol. 5rv. Cf. also, vol. 115, fol. 237rv. It concerns the peace after the sad events of the installation of the Capuchin, Jesuits and Discalced Carmelites in Aleppo. Cf. Besson, p. 19; SOCG, vol. 386, fol. 54r, fol. 131rv, and fol. 240r.

²⁷³ Cf. SOCG, vol. 115, fol. 273r-375v, fol. 312rv, fol. 325r-326r.

²⁷⁴ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, 147r-149v and 152rv; SOCG, vol. 196, fol. 5rv. Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers was against the idea of the division of Eastern rites among the various religious orders. On November 12, 1629 he wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith “E stato alter volte proposto alla Sacra Congregazione per tratener la pace di dividere tra gli missionari le sette (!) come la setta di Nestoriani ai R.P. Osservanti, gli Greci o Armeni ai Capucini. Ma questo non mi pio parer buono, primo perche, benche par la gratia d’Iddio tutte le nationi siano affettionate a noi, nondimento si trovera tra gli Grechi verbi gratia un uomo piu inclinato a praticar con noi e un altro inclinato a loro, o l’uno o l’altro sara forzato di communicar della sua salute contra la sua inclinatione, secondo sarebbe dare piu gran cagione alle contentioni, perche l’uni direbbono forse come gli Corintij, Ego sum Pauli, Ego Appolo, Ego vero Cepha, tertio e principalmente perche non nasce il divortio della pratica co I schismatici ma d’un altra banda (the Franciscans!) che si copre del pretesto di lughj Santi e che mancano le lemosine al S.mo Sepolcro alla proportione che si fanno a noi” (SOCG, vol. 115, fol. 276r; Cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 10v). We see how for this mission superior all the easterners were heretics of the same standard and even formed “sects!”

²⁷⁵ In fact, even after 100 years of common work, some were for Cyril Tanas and others for Sylvester of Cyprus. Cf. *Musset*, II, pp. 173-176: “In Aleppo the election of Sylvester had been welcomed with favor even by some missionaries” (p. 175, see also the very significant footnote).

preach in the Maronite Churches; for this they invoked the authority of the Maronite patriarch.²⁷⁶ Preaching in the Maronite Churches was the only means the Capuchins had to contact the other Christians of Aleppo and the Franciscans wanted to stop them.²⁷⁷ The letter of Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers to Cardinal Borgia on December 28, 1629²⁷⁸ gives us an idea of what took place in the capital of the missions in the 17th century. After relating that all the dissensions were due to the “hypocritical attitude” of the Franciscans who wanted to chase the Capuchins out of the East at any price, Fr. John Chrysostom proposes some solutions:

1) “As I have already written to the Sacred Congregation, what should be done to reduce the schismatics is to preach to the Maronites because the biggest problem of this country is ignorance; when ignorance is driven out, they will be converted. When we preach in a Christian church, whether Maronite, Greek, Armenian or Syrian, the other groups come to the sermon... and little by little we can infiltrate the salvific doctrine of the holy Church into their spirits.

2) “It is necessary to consider the fact that the Franciscans only lived in these regions for three years and in this brief time did not strain themselves to learn the Arabic language. The Maronites remain so ignorant that they know nothing about questions of the Holy Faith.

3) “The division provoked in this case begins as a small fire but could be amplified enough to make a new schism..., and some poor Maronites would say: we are less subjects of the pope than the patriarch... The Greeks confirm this in their sect by saying: where there is love there is God and He is not with them (the missionaries) since they do not have love among themselves... The Greek Archdeacon Michael said: Those who have posed such an obstacle cannot be Catholics or even Christians.”²⁷⁹

²⁷⁶ Cf. the résumé on this question made by Ingoli according to several letters that he had received between December 1629 and January 1630 (*SOCCG*, vol. 115, fol. 312rv): “Li padri Giesuiti si portano da veri missionarij attendendo alle loro funtioni, ma li Carmelitani e Capuccini volendosi intromettere nella Nazione Maronita contro gl’ordini del Patriarca che vuol che soli li minori Osservanti ne habbino cura, turbano ogni cosa, et avenue un giorno, che volendo predicare un cappuccino (Fr. Agathange) in arabo nella Chiesa de’Minori Osservanti piena di Maroniti, questi in essecutione dell’ordine del Patriarca si partirno dalla Chiesa, e lasciarono il cappuccino solo.” (Cf. also fol. 285r-333v of the same cited volume).

²⁷⁷ Cf. above. See especially *SOCCG*, vol. 115, fol. 273r (it is Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers who wrote on December 29, 1629): “in quel caso ha grand interesse per la salute delle anime, e per l’esaltatione della S.ma Chiesa di tener mano forte accio non si taglino le speranze che davano notre missioni a tutta la Christianità, che senza dubio sono tagliate se si levi a nostril Missionarij l’autorita di predicar secondo l’intento di Padri Osservanti come appare per i loro fatti in Baruth e monte Libano e in questa Citta...” (cf. fol. 278v of the same volume).

²⁷⁸ *SOCCG*, vol. 115, fol. 325r-326r.

²⁷⁹ “1) Quello ch’io gia scritto alla Sacra Congregazione che quasi l’unica strada di ridurre gli schismatici è di predicar ai Maroniti, perche il piu grande errore di questo paese è l’ignoranza laquala cacciata sarebbeno convertiti. E quando si predica in una Chiesa di Christiani o Maroniti o Grechi o Armeno o Suriani concorrono gli altri anco alla predica... e pian piano insinuare ne i loro anima la salutare dottrina della S.ma Chiesa.

2) E da considerar che gli P. Osservanti passano in questi parti solo per tre anni ciascuno e per un cosi piccolo pezzo di tempo sdegnano d’affaticarsi nel imparar la lingua Arabica, e cosi restano gli poveri Maroniti tanto ignoranti che non sanno niente delle cose della Santa Fede.

In 1627, the Carmelites already had a house in Aleppo for their fathers who were on route to Persia;²⁸⁰ they were less ardent in their missionary zeal. They were in good relations with the other missionaries, especially the Jesuits,²⁸¹ and they began mainly to introduce western devotions to the Virgin Mary and visits to the Blessed Sacrament²⁸² without discussing problems of faith with the Christians of Aleppo. Those who worked more radically and very silently were the Jesuits.

After the foundation of the school in the home of the Greek Metropolitan Karmeh in January 1629,²⁸³ the Jesuit Father Jerome Queyrot soon had thirty-four students; all were Greeks with the exception of one Maronite.²⁸⁴ This school functioned for sixteen months, after which they had to leave there and establish another school which could accommodate the students of all the Christians of Aleppo.²⁸⁵ This took place in 1633 and a Muslim property was used for the school. In his account of December 26, 1629, Queyrot explained “the reduction” of Greeks to “the obedience of the Holy Roman Church,” mainly because of the good dispositions of their Metropolitan Karmeh. Karmeh accepted the doctrine of the Fathers of the Church and proposed some cases of conscience to the Jesuit fathers for their opinion.²⁸⁶ The Jesuits tried to explain the erroneous opinions about “communicatio in sacris,” the books on the index, and the authority of the pope over the east which was not recognized by these Easterners.²⁸⁷

3) Che la divisioni fatta in questo caso è un piccolino fuoco nel suo principio ma che puo infiammarsi fin a far un Incendio d'un nuovo scisma... , che qualche Maroniti poveri dicevano noi non simo tanto bene del Papa quanto del Patriarca... Gli Grechi si confermano nella loro setta (!) dicendo dove è Dio Lui è la Carita, Dio dunque non è con questi poiche non hanno carita tra loro... L'Arcidiacono Greco il S.r Michail Chamas (cf. above his letters to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) disse quelli che hanno posto tal impedimento non possono essere Cattolichi anzi non sono Christiani.” (*Ibid.*, fol. 325v; *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 76r: Congregation meeting 124 of June 15, 1630).

²⁸⁰ Cf. above.

²⁸¹ “... hanno sempre mostrato molta carità a'Padri della Compagnia...” (It was Fr. Queyrot who wrote on December 26, 1629: *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 166r).

²⁸² *SOCG*, vol. 115, 336r-337r (it was Carmelite Prosper of the Holy Spirit who wrote from Aleppo on May 8, 1630).

²⁸³ Cf. above, particularly *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 166r.

²⁸⁴ For the good reason that the other Christians of Aleppo did not want to go to the homes of the Greek Orthodox (*Ibid.*, fol. 166v): “Se i Patri fuori della casa del Metropolita greco, e ch'havessero una propria, gli altri christiani, massime i Maroniti e gli Armeni manderebbero ancor da loro I suoi figliuoli, il che non faranno mentre staranno dove stanno.”

²⁸⁵ The school in Karmeh's home was opened on January 15, 1629 and closed its doors before May 8, 1630 (cf. *SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 336r and vol. 195, fol. 166r; compare with Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 136). Concerning the interritual school of 1633 see the letter of Fr. Jerome Queyrot of December 26, 1636 in *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 598r.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, fol. 167r: “Aggiungo per conclusione che il Metropolita di questi Greci essendo di buona mente, e desiderando di veder la sua chiesa provveduta di persone letterate, e mostrando di far conto della dottrina de'Padri a cui di quando in quando egli propone dubii intorno alle cose appartenenti alla coscienza domandano il parer loro, cio agevolerà non poco la santa impresa della reductione di questo popole all'ubbidienza della S. Chiesa Romana.”

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 164r: “I padri Giesuiti ad Aleppo hanno disingannato molti togliendo loro certe opinioni erronee, che per l'ignoranza grande che prima regnava in questi parti, ... s'erano abbarbicate ne' loro fievoli intelletti, come per esempio, ch'ogn'uno puo salvarsi nella sua religione Iddio non havendo creato gli uomini per dannarli; ch'egli è lecito... fuor di necessità, e utilità di praticare con tutte le persone di

With the foundation of the “interritual” school of 1633, the work of the Jesuits in Aleppo became more intense. This urged Father Queyrot to request a third father for this mission; he attempted to engage an Armenian professor so that he could finally establish a seminary in Aleppo.²⁸⁸ Instruction of the young men would prepare the future generation for formal unions at a later time.²⁸⁹ We cannot forget the activity of the College of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome which exercised its influence over the Maronite, Syrian and Armenian communities rather than over the Greeks of the Patriarchate of Antioch. Much later, even the Greeks of Antioch had their “native-born missionaries” instructed in Rome.²⁹⁰

It is important to note that Capuchins and Franciscans agreed about the identity of the Christians of Aleppo: if they were “outside of the Church,” it was only because of ignorance, materially not formally.

In November 1629, the Capuchin John Chrysostom of Angers said that many were Catholics without knowing they were “converted.”²⁹¹ In the words of the Guardian of Aleppo, Antoine de Veglia, in May 1634, many who communicated from the missionaries at Pascha were of the “Greek Nation” and yet were Catholics.²⁹²

In other regions of Syria where Capuchins and Franciscans were found, the situation became critical until the explosion. A typical example is the analysis of the situation in Saida. The British Capuchins had seized the chapel of the French consul and

qualsi voglia religione, ch’egli è lecito di tenere e leggere ogni sorte di libri; che la potestà del Papa non si stende sopra le chiese et i fedeli di Levante.”

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 598v-599r: “Gia i nostri Scolari sono arrivati al numero di quarantatre di diversi riti e nationi, Maroniti, Greci, Armeni e Francesi; nell’ammaestramento de’ quali c’impieghiamo due Sacerdoti della Conpagnia che qui siamo, e n’aspettiamo di giorno in giorno un tezo che il Nostro R.P. Generale hà ordinato che si mandi quanto prima, e quando sarà venuto pensiamo di dividere la nostra Scuola in quattro ordini o classi di modo c’haverà forma d’un picciol Collegio principiata... e cosi si potrebbe fare una quinta classe (by making an Armenian language professor come), alle quali dopo alcuni anni con l’aiuto e favore di Sua divina Maestà e dell’Eminenze Vostre potrebbe aggiungersi una scuola di Filosofia, et un’altra di casi di coscienza per aiuto di quelli che saranno chiamati da Dio per servido nello stato Ecclesiastico...”

²⁸⁹ To speak only of the formal union of the Greek Patriarchate of Antioch with Rome in 1724, see for example *DHGE* 16 (1967) col. 64-65 and the work of T. Jock, *Jésuites et Chouérites*, Central Falls (USA) 1939, pp. 11-14.

²⁹⁰ For example the first Greek patriarch of the “catholicized” series of Antioch, Cyril Tanas, who was the student of the Roman College of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Cf. *Musset*, II, p. 174.

²⁹¹ *SO CG*, vol. 115, fol. 275r: “interrompiamo quel studio (of the Arabic language) alle volte per praticar con gli sciasmatici e veramente troviamo gran dispositione in loro per la fede cattolica perche mi paiono piu fuori della chiesa per Ignoranza che per militia, piu materialmente che formalmente. Non sapendo quello ch’è da credere credono tutto quello che sono insegnati da loro padri, ma havemo Esperienza che facilmente crederanno la salutare dottrina della S.ma Chiesa Romana quando l’insinuaremo nei loro spiriti non disputando ma insegnando senza controversia la loro Ignoranza nelle prediche e esortationi, credo che assai di loro gia sono senza nessuno errore per questo espediente e si trovano catolici senza sapere esser stati convertiti.”

²⁹² *SO CG*, vol. 104, fol. 216r: “Do conto anchora à V.S.R.ma come un missionario, taccio il nome per buono rispetto, hà comunicato in questa pasqua (1634) molte persone le quali se bene sono di natione greca, non dimeno sono catholiche...”

the Franciscans did not tolerate it.²⁹³ In September 1627, Franciscan William Lombard of Avignon wrote that he had been chased out of the chapel of Saida by the Capuchin Egidius de Loches. On the door of the chapel Egidius had written: “those who want to gain indulgences (published beforehand) must confess himself to the Capuchin Fathers and none others.”²⁹⁴ In October 1627, Father Egidius replied that he had never found enemies so “perfidious” than the Franciscans. Even the schismatics and the Muslims had witnessed that they never saw men so “impious.”²⁹⁵ To this he added their quarrels on the subject of the Maronites. The Capuchins located some errors in the depraved rites of the Maronites and informed the Congregation for the Propagation of Faith about them; the Franciscans called these Capuchins “spies.”²⁹⁶ The Jesuits as well were poorly viewed by the Maronite Patriarch Jean Makhlouf (1609-1634) because they had spread, even in writing, that the “Maronite nation was heretical.”²⁹⁷

From this account we see that the progress of the missions in Syria outside of Aleppo remained very limited until the definite departure of Fr. Queyrot in 1643 to Damascus. There, as in Saida, some Greek prelates inclined to union would be found.²⁹⁸

²⁹³ On the origin of the conflict see *SOCG*, vol. 197, fol. 463r where the French ex-consul of Saida, Baptiste Tarquet, wrote to the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to show how since 1616 he was served by a Maronite priest, then a Franciscan and finally by a Capuchin for his chapel.

²⁹⁴ *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 122v-123r: “detti padri Capucini (of Saida) havendo publicato i Scriptis una indulgenza, e nella carta di detta indulgenza, che affissero sopra la porta della Chiesa di Sayda vi erano scritte queste parole quelli che volean prendere detta indulgenza gli era necessario che si confessassero da detti Padri Capucini, e non da altri...!”

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 76r: “cum de Vestro mandato ad has Infidelium partes iam ab anno et fere medio advenerim, multos sane nominis christiani perfidos inimicos reperi: multos tamen inveni qui vestros missionarios tanta cum animi acerbitate affigunt uti Patres de Observantia illis infectantur... Quid illic ab ipsis Patribus passi sumus, testis est Deus, testes Angeli, testes catholici, testes schismatici, testes et ipsi Mahometani, qui se nunquam tam ipios homines videlicet palam et publice profetibantur.” Fr. Egide was destined for the mission in Egypt and replaced by another Capuchin (cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 88r).

²⁹⁶ It was Adrian pf Brosse, missionary in Beirut who wrote on November 10, 1629: “Manda una lettera per il cardinale (prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith), et alcune ceremonie di Maroniti vedute colli proprij occhi, con avvertir, che non si sappia, che vengono da capucini essendo chiamati da’padri osservanti li spioni dell’attivitã de’ Maroniti e cosi potrebbe nocere grandemente se si sapesse quello che non havrebbe scritto senza il Comandamento della Congregazione la qual mi comanda, che cerchi un libro di dette ceremonie, et usanze, ma non l’ho potuto havere” (*SOCG*, vol. 115, fol. 281r). It is this same missionary who arrived in Rome before March 27, 1631 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 39r) for certain requests in the name of the Capuchins of Syria (*Ibid.*, fol. 73r-74v: Congregation meeting 141 of May 31, 1631). He also had asked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for authority to absolve Patriarch Ignatios III Atieh and his accomplices in the cooperation of the killing of Cyril IV Dabbas (see above, Chapter II). Adrian of Brosse had little after returning to Syria with 8 other companions (cf. *Acta*, vol. 7, fol. 132v).

²⁹⁷ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 56v. See above.

²⁹⁸ Note that this was not Patriarch Euthymios II Karmeh who “took Fr. Queyrot with him to Damascus” as Korolevsky affirms in his article “Antioche” of *DHGE*, III, col. 641. But it was Euthymios III the Chiot who did it long after the death of Karmeh as we will see (cf. *Besson*, p. 68; Nacchi, *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des missions étrangères*, I, Toulouse 1810, p. 132; *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 44r; compare with *Musset*, II, p. 61 in footnote and *DHGE*, vol. 16 (1967), col. 57). Since Saida depended then on the pasha of Damascus (until 1660), it is very clear that a reciprocal ecclesiastical influence could easily be exercised in these two cities which would last for a long time after.

CHAPTER IV

THE PATRIARCHATE OF ANTIOCH UNDER EUTHYMIOS III, ORIGINALLY FROM CHIOS (1635 – 1647)

1) A Timid Patriarch

Sensing that his death was near, in December 1634, Euthymios II Karmeh designated his successor in the person of Meletios of Chios who had been a hieromonk of Saint Sabas of Jerusalem and an iconographer.²⁹⁹ The chirotonia of the new patriarch of Antioch took place soon after the death of Karmeh (January 1, 1635).³⁰⁰ It was Patriarch Euthymios III³⁰¹ who received Protosyncellos Pachomios when he returned from Rome after accomplishing the mission Euthymios II Karmeh had confided to him.³⁰² But the

²⁹⁹ *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632; *Kilzi*, p. 143; *Le Quien*, II, col. 773. Le Quien notes the source of his error by calling this patriarch Eutybios: this was the catalogue of Assemani. Rabbath, I, p. 401, repeats the same mistake by adding another to it: for him Meletios was only a deacon before becoming patriarch while Macarios of Aleppo had known him as papas! Historical mistakes of this kind are unfortunately repeated in some recent publications: cf. for example, Leslie Cole, “The Melkite Church: A Historical Survey” in *Chrysostom*, vol. II, No. 7 (1970), p. 102. Meletios of Chios went to the Monastery of St. Sabas in Jerusalem at the request of Euthymios II Karmeh in order to decorate the Church of Damascus with icons. And it was Karmeh himself who gave him the name Euthymios before dying (*Radu*, p. 42). The circumstances of the death of Karmeh called for the choice of a patriarch of Hellenic origin (cf. above, Chapter III, footnote 248)! Karmeh was conscious of it when he recommended him to the Greeks of Damascus: “Elect this Chiot to be patriarch after me; you could not have anyone better” (*Rabbath*, I, p. 401. J. Queyrot regretfully wrote on December 26, 1636: “Un Monaco che non ha altra qualità o perfettione più eminente che il saper dipegnere viene a esser creato Patriarca Antiocheno”! (*SCOG*, vol. 195, fol. 599r).

³⁰⁰ The ordainers were Philotheos, Metropolitan of Homs, Simeon, Metropolitan of Saidnaya and Joachim, Bishop of Zabadani (*Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632). It was not Karmeh himself who performed the chirotonia as Paul of Aleppo affirms (*Radu*, p. 41). Macarios of Aleppo, who knew of him more than his son Paul (who was 8 years old in 1635 and who learned these facts from his father), expressly distinguishes the designation of Meletios of Chios by Karmeh and his chirotonia by the three mentioned bishops (*Kilzi*, p. 143 and particularly *Macarios of Aleppo*, p. 632). Moreover, Paul of Aleppo makes another error by putting the date Kanoon-al-awwal 7142, which corresponds to December 1633 AD, a date when Karmeh himself could not have become patriarch! Compare with *DHGE*, vol. 3 (1924), col. 642, and vol. 16 (1967), col. 57.

³⁰¹ *Rustum* (p. 45) calls him Euthymios IV!

³⁰² Cf. above, Chapter III, footnote 252, Pachomios, who reached Damascus between mid-February and mid-March 1636, describes how he was received by the new patriarch: “We entered the home of our master patriarch, we kissed his hands and showed him the books and letters. Our return gave him great joy. As for the copies of the (Arabic) Pentateuch, we sent one to Tripoli and the rest we sent to Egypt, to Aleppo and to (other) countries so that they could be compared and looked at. And so, by examining them, one would be content with them, we will send you the exact response. We brought home with us the books (Horologion and Euchologion) whose publication your great efforts accomplished, and the Lord (Jesus) Christ will reward you. The patriarch (Euthymios III) would have written to you but he waits for a response on the Pentateuch from the countries and then he will respond to you in detail. Kissing (sic in singular) at your place the hands of the Cardinals Francesco Barberini and Antonio (Barberini)...” Pachomios adds in the margin of this letter addressed to secretary Ingoli the following note on the subject of the deceased Patriarch Euthymios II Karmeh: “we have written to you when we arrived and we would have written on the subject of the deceased patriarch who died in the mercy of the most high God, but we knew that you already knew this news” (letter written in Arabic on March 19, 1636 in *SOCCG*, vol. 180, fol. 101r. An Italian translation is found in the same volume fol. 100r). Compare with the anachronisms of Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, pp. 131-132, and *DHGE*, vol. 16 (1967), col.56.

new patriarch did not have the courage of his predecessor to see through what Karmeh had begun.³⁰³ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith learned about the death of Karmeh in September 1635³⁰⁴ and wanted to continue its relations with the Greek Patriarchate of Antioch and its new patriarch through the intermediary of Pachomios. The Congregation's meeting 219 of August 4, 1638, held in the presence of the pope, decided to "write again to Father Pachomios, in order to process a union with the new patriarch, to be made according to the profession of faith that he had brought for Patriarch Euthymios (Karmeh). He should solicit the response of learned men on the subject of the Arabic Pentateuch and he was informed that part of the Arabic Euchologion had already been translated into Latin and that now the cardinals and theologians would diligently correct the Greek Euchologion so that it could be printed in Greek and in Arabic."³⁰⁵ This exhortation of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith received no written response from the new patriarch.³⁰⁶

Despite this, in 1636, the two nephews of Euthymios III of Chios were students of the Jesuit Fathers in Aleppo³⁰⁷ as well as other Greek boys who learned Greek in the school of Fr. Queyrot.³⁰⁸ The Jesuits proposed opening a seminary in Aleppo³⁰⁹ while the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith intended to assure the instruction of the young boys in Rome itself. Soon afterwards, the Cardinal of St. Honophrius established scholarships in Rome in the College of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith; there were twelve students: two each from the Georgians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Copts,

³⁰³ Cf. above, Chapter III, 3 "Patriarch Karmeh, Martyr of the Union." Even though Karmeh had written good letters to Roman popes and cardinals, Euthymios the Chiot never had the courage to write a word to Rome, as we will see.

³⁰⁴ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 318v-318r.

³⁰⁵ *Acta*, vol. 12, fol. 141v-142r and *SOCG*, vol. 180, fol. 107v: "Referente eodem Em.mo D. Card. Brancatio literas Patris Pachomij de morte Euthymij Patriarchae Antiocheni Nationis Melchitarum, et de Arabicis Pentatheuchis distributes inter viros doctos pro eorum sententia habenda, et demum de Euchologio Arabico, et Horologio Romae relictis, eorumque impressione. Sacra Congregatio iussit praefato Patri Pachimio rescribi, ut cum novo Patriarcha agat de unione facienda iuxta professionem fidei, quam secum detulit pro Patriarcha Euthimio (Karmeh) et ut sollicitet responsum doctorum virorum circa Pentatheucum Arabicum, et denique illi signetur Euchologij Arabici partem iam esse in latinum translata, et nunc Graeci Euchologij emendationi diligenter per Cardinales et Theologos incumbi, ut postea, et Graecum, et Arabicum imprimi possunt."

³⁰⁶ We have not found any trace on this question in the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith although Euthymios III had promised the missionaries in Syria to write to the Pope of Rome. The research of Korolevsky in this sense produced the same result. Cf. *DHGE*, vol. 3, col. 642. Besides, the account of Fr. J. Amieu for the year 1650 confirms the fact that this patriarch never wrote to Rome: "and as I said to him one day: 'Master, when would you give testimony to Rome in your own hand that you are Roman Catholic, would there be anything bad in it?' 'Unfortunately,! Father,' he said to me, 'we Greeks, zealous with an indiscreet zeal, have spies here, and I do not want to earn what my predecessor earned.'" Cf. *Rabbath*, I, pp. 401-402.

³⁰⁷ John Amieu wrote from Aleppo on December 18, 1636 to the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith: "Docemus duos nepotes nuperi Patriarchae Graecorum,... aliosque non paucos bonae Indolis et Ingenii, wui si se sinerent coli... multos Europaeos superarent, in facie plusquam quinquaginta millium christianorum" (*SOCG*, vol. 106, fol. 224rv).

³⁰⁸ Cf. the letters of Fr. Queyrot to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, written at Aleppo on December 26, 1636 and March 13, 1637, in *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 598rv and vol. 106, fol. 224rv.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 195, fol. 599r.

Melkites and Persians (?).³¹⁰ Jesuit Jerome Queyrot and the Franciscan Antonio de l'Aquila were charged to recruit these students mainly from Aleppo and to send them to Rome. This was not very easy.³¹¹ Patriarch Euthymios III promised to send his two nephews to Rome,³¹² following the example of Patriarch Metrophanes of Alexandria. On May 25, 1637, this patriarch of Alexandria had requested two places in the Greek College for two young Greek boys whom he wanted to send immediately.³¹³ But Euthymios III was well aware what had happened to his predecessor and what would take place in Constantinople at this time;³¹⁴ in no way could he submit to the desires of Rome.³¹⁵ The letters of the Franciscan Antonio de l'Aquila are very significant on this subject. On November 10, 1639, this missionary in Aleppo wrote to the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith with bitterness: "I have not failed to execute what your most illustrious eminences asked of me in the letters of December 4 of last year (1638) and of July 16 (1639)... I am still very surprised about the patriarchs of the Melkites and Jacobites. The one of the Melkites who resides in Damascus immediately received and greatly welcomed the opinion of the Sacred Congregation with the brief. He said that he wanted to send his two nephews to the new college but lately he responded that he feared

³¹⁰ *Acta*, vol. 12, fol. 330v: "Em.mus D. Cardinalis Sancti Honuphrij Alumnatum erigisse hic Romae in Collegio de Prop. Fide pro Georgianis Nestorianis, Iacobitis, Cophtis, Melchitis, et Persis, ad quem poterunt praefati Patres (Queyrot and Amieu) duodecim Adolescentes 15 aut 16 annum agentes, duos scilicet ex qualibet praefatarum nationum ad Urbem mittere, qui sine dubio recipiuntur in p.to Alumnatu, de cuius erectione iam expeditae sunt Bullae, quae latinè, et arabicè imprimuntur, et transmittuntur ad eos, et alios missionarios, uti Patriarchis, ac Archiepiscopis, et Episcopis p.tarum nationum communicuntur, ut possint iuxta contenta in dictis Bullis Adolescentes cum qualitatibus in eis expressis suis temporibus Romam mittere, ut hic instruantur in scientijs et bonis moribus, ac instructi ad eosdem remittantur." The enumeration of these "nations" shows us what knowledge the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had for their identity and their orthodox or heterodox faith!

³¹¹ In fact, Fr. Queyrot wrote from Aleppo on August 8, 1638: "Pensavamo di mandar un solo Greco ch'havevamo bastevolmente ammaestrato nelle lingue Arabica, Greca e Latina; ma i di lui parrenti non si sono lassati persuadere, anzi l'hanno ritirato dalla scuola per applicarlo a un'arte. Il R.P. Guardiano di S. Francesco (Antoine d'Aquila) s'è anch'egli adoperato conforme al suo santo zelo, accio si mandassero alcuni altri figliuoli christiani alla nostra scuola, per esser poi quindi costà (at Rome) inviati, ma è stato senza effetto" (*SOCG*, vol. 118, fol. 115r).

³¹² Cf. above footnote 307; *SCOG*, vol. 119, fol. 106rv.

³¹³ Cf. *SCOG*, vol. 107, fol. 189r: it concerns a letter written in Greek and addressed to Cardinal A. Barberini. A Latin translation of the letter is found in the same volume, fol. 109r. Moreover, Patriarch Metrophanes of Alexandria was viewed well by Rome, in fact "placuit Patribus constantia Metrophanij Alexandrini Patriarchae in recusatione subscriptionis capitulorum Haereticorum Cyrilli Lucari" (*Acta*, vol. 13, fol. 123v); also it was pointed out in Rome "Patriarcham Alexandrinum Graecum literas scripsisse pro eius Unione cum S.R.E. saltem privata, easque Patri Archangelo de Pistorio Missionario in Aegypto deferre ad Urbem" (*Ibid.*, fol. 63r).

³¹⁴ In fact Cyril II of Berrhea, who occupied the see of Constantinople three times in the space of six years (October 4-11, 1633; March 1/10, 1635 – mid-June 1635, June 20, 1638 – end of June, 1639), had a sad death because of his secret adhesion to the Roman Church, without counting the dreadful kind of Greek bishops who were inclined to Rome before the assassination of Cyril Lucaris on July 7, 1638. Cf. *Grumel*, p. 438; G. Hering, *Oekumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik* (1620-1638), Wiesbaden 1968, passim especially p. 313; *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 135r, 448r-449v and vol. 270, fol. 304r-306v; *DThC*, Book III, col. 1429; *Musset*, II, pp. 138-142.

³¹⁵ This is according to the repeated letters of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to the missionaries of the Levant that the Greek-Melkite Patriarch of Antioch was warned about: letters of July 20, 1637, December 4, 1638, July 16, 1639, September 17, 1639. Cf. also the responses of the missionaries in *SOCG*, vol. 118, fol. 115rv; vol. 119, fol. 105r-107r. Compare with *Acta*, vol. 12, fol. 330v and vol. 13, fol 358rv.

the tyranny of the Turks if he sent the young men of his nation to a Christian country. Despite all this, since there are still some in Aleppo who want to leave with the permission of their parents. The patriarch would give them permission, provided that their archbishop (Meletios Zaim), who appears somewhat inclined to this holy project, would write to him about this matter. The Jacobite patriarch who resides in Mardin has not responded... At present we have one Melkite and one Jacobite who wish to go and their parents are also agreeable. The Jesuit fathers advise me to send them without waiting for another permission from their prelates which will never arrive.”³¹⁶

On May 1, 1640 the same Franciscan missionary wrote another letter from Aleppo: “Conforming to the new notice of September 17 (1639) that your eminences sent me,³¹⁷ I have continued to do everything possible to solicit the two patriarchs of the Jacobites and Melkites for students for the College of the Cardinal of St. Honophrius. But in fact we see ingratitude and the bad reply of these patriarchs, who, since last year received the letters of the Sacred Congregation with the briefs. They have yet to take charge of finding some students, nor have they responded. Their excuse is the fear of their enemies who will inform the Turks that they have relations with the Christians of Europe. I myself have found some students but their parents are not willing to entrust them unless one religious conducts them to Rome.”³¹⁸ In a third letter of April 19, 1640, Antonio de l'Aquila added: “according to the general opinion of the Capuchins, Jesuits and other missionary fathers, recruitment of students by the intermediary of the patriarchs will never come to completion, since the facts are already very visible. However, I will very diligently find them in another way.”³¹⁹ In spite of all the difficulties, on December

³¹⁶ *SOCCG*, vol. 119, fol. 106rv: “non ho mancato eseguire quanto V.S. Ill.ma m'accenna nelle sue di 4 dicembre del'anno passato (1638) et di 16 Luglio (1639)... Resto assai meravigliante de' Patriarchi de' Melchiti e Giacobiti. Quello de' Melchiti che risiede in Damasco ricevette nel principio con grand'accoglienza l'avisò della S. Congregatione con il breve dicendo di voler mandare due suoi Nipoti al nuovo Collegio; ma alla fine ha risposto che teme succedergli qualche tirannia de' Turchi per mandare giovani dalla sua Nazione in paese di Christiani, con tutto cio trovandosi soggetti qui in Aleppo che vogliono andare con sodisfatione di parenti, esso darà licenza, purchè il loro Arcivescovo (Meletios Zaim), quale anco si mostra poco inclinato a questa santa impresa, gli scriva per questo negotio. Quello de' Giacobiti, che risiede in Merdino non hà risposto... Hora habbiamo un Melchita, et un Giacobita, che desiderano venire, e si contentano anco I loro parenti; I Padri Gesuiti mi consigliano che gli mandi senza aspettare altra licenza di loro Prelati, che mai s'arriverà.”

³¹⁷ It concerns the Rescript of the Congregation mentioned above of September 12, 1639: “S. Congregation iussit rescribi Guardianò Aleppi, ut omni diligentia, et studio curet, ut Patriarchis et Archiepiscopis, pro quorum nationibus erectus fuit ab eodem E.mo Card. Sancti Honophrij Alumnatus, literae, et Bulla erectionis praesententur, ac sollicitentur ut Alumnos suos Romam mittant” *Ibid.*, fol. 358rv.

³¹⁸ *SOCCG*, vol. 119, fol. 105r: “Non sono restato di fare ogni diligenza possibile a sollecitare li dui Patriarchi, de' Giacobiti e Melchiti per gl'alumni del Collegio del Signor Card. S. Honofrio conforme al nuovo aviso dalle 17 di settembre (1639) inviatomi dalle SS. VV. Em.me; ma si vede in effeto l'ingratitude e mala corrispondenza di detti Patriarchi, che havendo ricevuto insin dal'anno passato le lettere della Sacra Cong. ne con li brevi non si curano, di trovar gl'allumni, ni di rispondere, con scusari per il timore di suoi inimici, cge gl'accusano a Turchi, di haver corrispondenza con Christiani di Europa. Io havevai trovato alcuni figliuoli, ma i loro parenti non vogliono consegnarli, se non si conducono in Roma per qualche Religioso.”

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, fol. 112r: “Ricevo di novo aviso dal P. Fr. Antonio di Portogallo Minore Osservante, che da quel Patriarcha de'Melchiti, che risiede in Damasco non si puo avere risposta della lettera, e delli due giovani per il novo collegio; scusandosi il Patriarcha haver timore, che la nazione l'accusi, e che resti privato dal suo officio per la corrispondenza con Christiani di Europa... Conforme al parer comune di questi PP.

24, 1640, the Franciscan missionaries landed at Livourne with six boys;³²⁰ among them was the young Greek-Melkite Aleppian, Peter Dib.³²¹

Meanwhile, Patriarch Euthymios III visited the Eparchy of Aleppo where he remained from August 7 until November 22, 1640.³²² He returned to Damascus with one of his nephews³²³ and Jesuit Father Jerome Queyrot;³²⁴ there this Jesuit father began to

Missionarij Cappucini, Gesuiti, et altri il trovar gl'Alumni per mezzo di Patriarchi, mai s'arriverà al fine, come già si vede in effetto. E pero faccio ogni diligenza trovargli per altra strada." It is necessary to admit that the greatest difficulty of the Greek Melkites to send their children to Europe was the common persuasion, besides not far from reality, since in Europe one could change rite! It was Queyrot himself who tell us this in a letter of December 26, 1636: "gli Scismatici (i.e. the Greek-Melkites) s'imaginano che o loro figliuoli andando in christianità siano per mutar rito e religione, e farsi franchi come essi dicono" *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 599r.

³²⁰ Fr. Antoine de l'Aquila made the request to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for him to be reimbursed the cost of the travels. According to this request we know that "il Padre frat'Antonio dell'Aquila comparse a Livorno alli 24 Dicembre 1640 con sei giovani (Ingoli adds this: 'Arabi cioè 4 arabi e due maroniti) Maroniti, e di quivi partinno per Roma alli 25 Gennaio 1641" (*SOCG*, vol. 404, fol. 402r). Ingoli ordered that the 2 Maronite be sent to Ravenna (*Ibid.*, fol. 415v).

³²¹ The request of Pietro Dip (sic) reveals to us he took a course in painting after having finished 7 years of studies at the College of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1647, when he was 23 years old (*SOCG*, vol. 413, fol. 218r, 219r, ss0r, 221r, 222r, vol. 417, fol. 504v). Secretary of the Congregation Ingoli who knew this young Greek-Melkite and who supported him to follow the course in painting for 6 months, wrote for the Congregation meeting 80 of March 23, 1648: "Desiderando detto Pietro che stà fuori del Collegio per imparar la pittura ritornar alla patria con occasione della compagnia, che avrà dell'Agente del Patriarcha de Maroniti supplica la Sac. Cong. per il viatico, e per una somma di San Thomaso, et un catechismo, e per alcuni psalterij e grammatiche cosi latine come greche disignando arrivato alla patria di apir una schola per la sua numerosa Nazione de Melchiti, colla quale spera far gran frutto anche, nell'istruire li suoi compatriotti nella fede catholica e perche possa far quest'utile essercitio, e non sia necessitato d'applicarsi à qualche essercito per vivere supplica, che se le assegni una provisione competente almeno per un triennio, sinche si possa ordinare dal metropolitano d'Aleppo secondo il Rito Greco della sua nazione, et haver poi la missione dalla Sac. Cong. poichè se non s'ordina cola non sarà ricevuto da suoi per sacerdote ben ordinato" (*Ibid.*, fol. 494r). By this we see the affirmation of Korolevsky and all those who followed him (F. Taoutel, J. Nasrallah...) in writing: "the first Melkite student of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Wahbe (Theodore) Daoud, received in 1661, was from Aleppo," needs to be corrected. In fact in 1641, Greek-Melkite Peter Dib was already among the students of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith! Compare with: F. Taoutel, *Contribution à l'histoire d'Alep. Les Documents maronites et leurs annexes depuis 1606 jusqu'à nos jours*, I, 1606-1827, Beirut 1958, p. 34; Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 137.

³²² *Radu*, p. 46. On this occasion Euthymios III consecrated as bishop the priest Joseph the Aleppian whom he sent to Russia to collect money for his patriarchate, but he died at Putivl near Moscow. Cf. *Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice*, Bucharest, V (1912), p. 113 (cited by Radu on the subject of Putivl).

³²³ Cf. above footnote 307. This was the future Patriarch of Antioch, Neophytos the Chiot (1672-1682; died in 1686). Cf. *DHGE*, "Antioche," col. 700; C. Bacha, *History of the Greek Melkites* (in Arabic), Saida 1942, p. 65; *Musset* II, p. 164.

³²⁴ We remark that Paul of Aleppo said nothing about the relations between the Greek-Melkite prelates and the Latin missionaries. It appears that he had severe recommendations from his father, Macarios, who also remained silent about them! For the Hellenes sometimes understood Arabic! *Musset*, II, p. 161 notes the confusion on this point of *DHGE*, 3, col. 641 without dispelling it. It is clear that this was Euthymios III the Chiot who took Fr. Queyrot with him to Damascus, and not Euthymios II Karmeh. But what year? Levenq and d'Aultry (cf. *Musset*, I, *op. cit.*) affirms that it was in 1641, while Besson (p. 68) states that it took place "at the beginning of the year 1643" and the Italian translation of Besson's book gives the year 1645! *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 43r-46v, conforming with A. Carayon (*Relations inédites des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus à Constantinople et dans le Levant au XVII siècle*, Poitiers-Paris 1864, p. 152), with Besson (p. 68) and his Italian translation, with Levenq (*La Première mission de la Compagnie de Jésus en*

teach Greek to the Greek-Melkite boys.³²⁵ Soon the patriarch was abandoned by Queyrot, since he had no power against the harshness of the Hellenes in Damascus.³²⁶ However, he remained in contact with the Latin missionaries whom the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Francesco Ingoli, exhorted to meet with this patriarch.³²⁷ Ingoli himself really wanted these transactions with the Greek-Melkite Patriarch of Antioch, and wrote about the indecisiveness of the Guardian of Jerusalem: “The Maronite priests in Damascus are not capable of teaching their Maronite (faithful) the way of salvation and literature and even less capable of dealing with the patriarch (Euthymios III). It is ‘simpliciter’ necessary to send there two fathers. One of them should know the Arabic language to be able to frequently deal with this patriarch, whose predecessor, Matran Karmeh, finally accepted to be a Catholic and died as a Catholic. If this prelate could be reached, there would be fruit on the part of his students. If one of the students learned the Italian and Latin languages it would not be difficult to have other students who would do the same. Father Sansverini would be the best person to send to Damascus to this patriarch. He should bring (letters) of his mission so that he could deal with this prelate with the authority of this Holy See (of Rome) and its spirit. May Your Paternity order this mentioned father to go and write for (obtain his letters of) his mission with one or two companions for all of Syria and I will send the missionaries to these Christians. Give the order that, above all, courses in Italian and Latin languages be given in each

Syrie, Beirut 1925, p. 20) and finally with Radu (pp. 46-47), we state that J. Queyrot was brought by Patriarch Euthymios III when he left Aleppo on November 22, 1640 and arrived at Damascus in the beginning of 1641. He remained there until August 1641 (Carayon, *op. cit.*, p. 152) to return to Aleppo (*SOCC*, vol. 196, fol. 44r). At the beginning of the 1643, Queyrot was again in Damascus until October of the same year when Euthymios III left Damascus to visit the dioceses of his patriarchate and collected money to pay 7000 ecus exacted by the Turks (Besson, p. 68; Radu, p. 46; Macarios of Aleppo, p. 632; compare with Le Quien, II, col. 773 who wrongly attributed this event to Patriarch Karmeh). After the return of Euthymios III to Damascus (Radu, p. 47, Macarios of Aleppo, p. 632), Queyrot also returned there, probably at the beginning of 1645.

³²⁵ Fr. J. Amieu wrote to Fr. Aultry on August 16, 1641: “the Patriarch of Antioch who brought (Fr. Jerome Queyrot) promised him to live in the patriarchate (in Damascus) and to give him the convenience to instruct the (Greek) boys and to make the functions of the Company” (A. Carayon, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-153). Fr. Thomas Vitale of Monteregale, Provincial of the Dominicans of Armenia write in 1643 in his “*Relazione della missione d’Aleppo, e di Damasco*”: “Il P. Gerolamo (Queyrot) oltre la lingua arabica sà perfettamente la lingua greca litterale; fu chiamato a Damasco da quell vescovo (especially patriarch) molto affettionato a’ cattolici et il Papa, accio insegnasse la lingua à i greci istessi, vi ando, io ve lo trovai nel mio ritorno di Gerusalemme” (*SOCC*, vol. 196, fol. 44r; cf. *Acta*, vol. 15, fol. 293v).

³²⁶ It is the same Fr. Thomas Vitale who relates it: “Il P. Gerolamo era maltrattato nel vivere, e poi non solamente non volevano I greci che celebrasse nella chiesa loro, ma neanche privatamente in una stanza della casa del Vescovo (i.e. Patriarch Euthymios III) ove si tratteneva; e Monsignore per la durezza di coloro (i.e. the Greeks) non poteva rimediare; gia il Padre s’era amalato e allora stava poco bene. Io gli dissi che à lavar las testa à gli animi si perde il sapone, e l’essortai a ritornarsene in Aleppo e cosi fece finalmente, e ritorno à leggere et insegnare à dodici scolari” (*SOCC*, *ibid.*). In this we see why Euthymios III could not quickly have amicable relations with Rome and its missionaries in the east, despite the affection he had toward the latins and the pope.

³²⁷ This is what the letter of the Guardian of Jerusalem, Andre d’Arc, reveals to us, written to Ingoli on August 15, 1640: “In Damasco vi è un’ Arciprete con diversi sacerdoti Maroniti, che hanno vigilante cura dell’anime della lor’ natione, et noi altri per ordinario diciamo messa nella loro chiesa, che pero per quello fine (i.e. treating with the Greek-Melkite Patriarch of Antioch) non han’bisogno di sacerdoti latini, verdo nondimeno mandar’ivi due Padri, ch’attendino alla lingua (arabica) et al tentavio che lei pretende (*SOCC*, vol. 119, fol. 65r). We see that this Latin missionary wanted to allow the Maronite priests of Damascus the care of dealing with the Greek Melkite Patriarch of Antioch. But Ingoli was of another opinion.

procuracy (of the missionaries) so that they may teach the young men Christian doctrine and piety. In this way in time there will be great progress.”³²⁸

An interesting account of the Capuchin Father Michel de Rennes gives us an idea how the Latin missionaries dealt with Euthymios III around the year 1640. After long discussions with a Greek bishop of Nazareth visiting Damascus,³²⁹ de Rennes had an interview with the Patriarch of Antioch. The patriarch explained what he thought about the primacy of the Apostolic See of Antioch,³³⁰ and according to Michel de Rennes ended by saying: “I confess and I know that the Roman pontiff is the head of the Catholic Church, and I hold all his beliefs as true; and, if I did not fear the other Greeks, I would myself extol before all, that I am subject of the aforesaid Roman Church, but ten thousand écus would not be sufficient to pay the evils which Constantinople would give out.”³³¹ Euthymios III promised that he would write to the pope of Rome to show that he held the same belief of his predecessor Euthymios II Karmeh, but he did nothing.³³² He

³²⁸ It is the back of the letter mentioned in the preceding note which Ingoli wrote on October 27, 1640 to Fr. Andre d’Arc: “Li preti maroniti in Damasco sono tanto poco atti ad insegnar alli loro maroniti la via della salute, e le lettere, e meno per trattar col patriarcha (i.e. Euthymios III) ch’il mandar cola due padri è necessario simpliciter, e tra quelli ne dovrebbe essere uno che sapesse la lingua arabica, per potere frequentemente trattar con quell patriarcha, il cui Antecessor Metran Carme finalmente si fece e mori catholico, e quando si guadagni quell prelato, s’avranno frutti degl’alunni, e quando si facino scole di lingua Italiana, e latina, non sarà difficile haver quanti Alunni si vorranno. Il padre Sanseverini sarebbe ottimo per mandar in Damasco presso quell patriarcha, e se li farà la missione accio prelato V. Paternità ordini al detto padre che vi vada e scriva per la missione di lui con uno, o due compagni per tutta la Soria che le manderò le speditioni, e sopra il tutto in ogni Capellaria comandi che si facino scuole de lingua italiana, e latina con far istruir la Gioventù nella dottrina christiana, nella pietà, che per questa strada si faranno gran progressi col. tempo” (*Ibid.* fol. 67v).

³²⁹ We will come back to this later because these discussions show how one conceived controversial points between Latins and Greeks in Syria during this epoch. However, we remark here that this missionary had to make the Greek prelate confess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son “per modum unius principii totalis et aequati: and that the pope is the first among the patriarchs (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 212rv).

³³⁰ “Il Signor Patriarcha si diceva maggiore dal Sommo Pontefice Romano, imperoche S. Pietro fu premieramente pontefice in Antiochia et quelli del Oriente furono gli primi convertiti, donche il patriarcha Antiocheno è primo in ordine” (*Ibid.*, fol. 212v).

³³¹ In fact Michael of Rennes wanted to convince him by presenting all kinds of arguments on Roman primacy. And the patriarch seemed to have said: “Io confesso il Pontefice Romano et lo conosco capo della Chiesa Cattolica et tengo vera tutta sua credenza et se non avessi paura d’altri greci io mi glorificarei a tutto il mondo d’essere soggetto della detta chiesa Romana ma dieci milla scudi non sarebono bastandi per pagare le ruine che mi sareboro procurate in Constantinopoli” (*Ibid.*). Compare this text with another account of the same missionary made in Latin around 1641: “Patriarcha Antiochenus pro graecorum natione post aliquas cum nobis in materiis fidei controversias quando profectus sum Damascum missionem ibi fundaturus, mihi tandem protestatus est se cognoscere Romanum Pontificem verum divi Petri successorem ac Christi Domini Vicarium; addiditque haec verba; nisi vererer constantinopolitanum patriarcham et alios refragantes palam profiterer me Romanae subiectum Ecclesiae. Sed id publicassem nec decem mille aurei hanc professionem essent solvendo, ipse autem non ignorat idcirco venenum suo propinatum fuisse predecessori hoc est patriarcha Carmi” (*SOCCG*, vol. 120, fol. 28v).

³³² “Il Patriarcha mi prometto spesse volte di scrivere a Sua Santità qualmente esso tiene l’istessa credenza del suo predecessore il Patriarca Carma già nominato; ma l’ubbedientia mi chiamo in altre parti et pero (= perciò) lasciai la cosa in questo punto; tuttavia il medesimo prelato m’a in ogni occorrentia sempre fatto dopoi parere un grandissimo affetto verso la Chiesa Romana et promesso di scrivere come sopra ma non si è presentata alcuna occasione per farsi commodemente” (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 212v). Compare this account of Capuchin Michael of Rennes with that of Jesuit Fr. J. Amieu of 1650. Cf. *Rabbath*, I, pp. 401-402.

wanted to consecrate one of the missionaries of Damascus a bishop³³³ and asked Fr. Michel de Rennes to send him the writings of the Greek Fathers, promising to pay him for them.³³⁴

Even if Euthymios III never wrote on the subject of his philo-Roman sentiments, he nevertheless put them in concrete form by his relations with the missionaries. Despite his first failure to keep Father Queyrot in Damascus,³³⁵ he did not hesitate to make him come in the beginning of 1643, “for the instruction of the young (Greeks), namely his nephew, and for the composition of his circular letters and his Greek and Arabic trading licenses.”³³⁶ In view of the Turkish exactions which obliged the patriarch to go make collections in the dioceses of his patriarchate³³⁷ and in view of the “secret persecutions which were jealously excited against a Frank religious who was employed in the most important affairs of the patriarchate,”³³⁸ Fr. Queyrot remained in Damascus for some time, and left only after the return of Euthymios III to his residence in the summer of 1644.³³⁹

³³³ This Orthodox Patriarch “Catholicos tum latinis tum maronitis singulari amplectitur benevolentia, nobisque in omnibus tantopere favet ut aliquem ex nostris missionaries voluerit quasi per vim suum consecrare Episcopum, aliquem nobis obtulerit gratiarum actione dignissima” (Account of Michael of Rennes in 1641: *SOCCG*, vol. 120, fol. 28v).

³³⁴ *Ibid.* However the Capuchin missionary asked the Congregation to send them to him complimentary, in view of his “benevolentia” toward the Latin missionaries.

³³⁵ Cf. above footnote 324.

³³⁶ Besson, p. 68; *SOCCG*, vol. 197, fol. 346v; Levenq, *op. cit.*, p. 20; Rustum, p. 46; C. Bacha, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

³³⁷ Macarios of Aleppo, p. 632; Radu, p. 51; Besson, p. 68. Compare with Le Quien II, col. 773 and *DHGE*, vol. 3, col. 641. The words of Besson “But the patriarch, having been obliged to leave Damascus for the payment of the sum of seven thousand ecus that the Turks demanded of the Greeks according to their custom...” made Le Quien and Korolevsky think that the patriarch left Damascus to run away from the request of the Turks, whereas he left to find the required money. Moreover he returned to Damascus and died there three years later, whereas his successor was only consecrated patriarch on November 11, 1647 (Macarios of Aleppo, p. 663; Radu, pp. 53-54). It was in Aleppo particularly that Euthymios III found the necessary money during his last trip to Aleppo between the first of February and May 17, 1644 (Radu, p. 51). Note that the future Syrian Catholic Patriarch Akhi-Jean (sic in Arabic) made his profession of Catholic faith in Aleppo on April 7, 1644, while the Greek patriarch was in this very city! (*SOCCG*, vol. 123, fol. 285r-286r).

³³⁸ Besson, p. 68. To have an idea about these persecutions, let us report the description given by Dominican Fr. Thomas Vitale on the attitude of the Hellenes of Damascus on the first trip of Fr. Queyrot to Damascus in 1641 (see footnote 326 above). It is in this context that it was necessary to see why the Maronites of Damascus had to flee to Mount Lebanon in 1643. Fr. Queyrot could only celebrate Mass in the churches of the Maronite, who consequently were considered allies of the Franks. The persecution of the Maronites of Damascus in 1643 passed to Tripoli in 1644 (cf. Letter of Brice of Rennes of September 12, 1643 and that of Michael of Rennes of February 22, 1645, in *SOCCG*, vol. 123, fol. 253rv and vol. 62, fol. 97rv and 114r).

³³⁹ Radu, p. 51: “the father and master Kyr Euthymios collected easily (rather “in peace” = “bi salam”) the tithe from his subjects (in Aleppo) according to custom and departed one hundred days later. He headed with haste toward Hama and Tripoli on May 17 (1644) and then returned to Damascus. Probably the patriarch did not remain long in Tripoli before going back to Damascus because of the Turkish persecution against the Maronites of Tripoli.

This Orthodox patriarch stayed away from all those came into the Orthodox world in his time³⁴⁰ and never officially dared to declare his union with Rome.³⁴¹ He finally succumbed to a grave illness in September 1647 and died on the following October 11, leaving the patriarchate to the Metropolitan of Aleppo, Meletios Zaim.³⁴²

2) Beginning of a Roman Crusade in the Patriarchate of Antioch

The missionaries were well established in the large city of Aleppo but could not shine forth in the other cities of the Patriarchate of Antioch. It was the Capuchins and Jesuits, who little by little, founded residences in Damascus, Saida and Tripoli³⁴³ where they had direct relations especially with the Greek prelates and with their faithful.³⁴⁴

³⁴⁰ Rustum, p. 46, bases himself on *DThC* (X, col. 1070-1081) to affirm that the Patriarch of Antioch Euthymios “commended Meletios Syrigos for his attitude toward the confession of Peter Moghila, Metropolitan of Kiev, on the subject of Orthodox doctrine maintaining the Epiclesis in the sacrament of the transformation and rejecting Purgatory, by participating with his confreres, the 3 patriarchs, in 1643 in order to accept the confession of Moghila after its correction.” Le Quien (II, col. 773) wrote somewhat differently: “Anno itaque 1643 Euthymio, ut fert Vaticanus codex, vel potius Eutychio Chiensis patriarchatum eripuit Macarius Haleppensis qui eodem anno Constantinopoli agens, una cum Parthenio seniore Patriarcha Constantinopolitano, Joannicio Alexandrino et Paisio Hierosolymitano Patriarchis, ‘confessionem ecclesiae Orientalia,’ à Petro Moghila Russiae metropolitan delineatam approbavit, hunc in modum suscribens, ‘Makarios, Eleo Theou, Patriarches Tes Meghales Theou Poleos Antiochias,’ Macarius Patriarcha magnae Theopolis Antiochiae.” We know no Orthodox prelate of the Patriarchate of Antioch who had signed this confession (cf. J. Aymon, *Monumens authentiques de la Religion Grecque...*, La haye, 1708, pp. 358-362, where the Calvinist author had also once attached the “ignorant Patriarchs” of Antioch as he states further pp. 457-460, against Patriarch Macarios of Antioch who signed a profession of Orthodox faith against the Calvinists on December 5, 1671!) Besides, Macarios of Antioch was called Meletios in 1643 and was the Metropolitan of Aleppo (Radu, pp. 49-51; Macarios of Aleppo, pp. 632-633); moreover no voyage of this metropolitan to Constantinople is mentioned before his accession to the patriarchate in 1647 (Radu, p 4 and 84). All the more so since the 2 other patriarchs, Joannikios of Alexandria and Paisios of Jerusalem mentioned by Le Quien (*loc. cit.*) and Kimmel (I, pp. 53-54), only became patriarch in 1645! (cf. *ERM*, 2 (1963), col. 76; 6 (1965), col. 842; 8 (1966), col. 1240-1242). On the subject of the Confession of Moghila, cf. *EO*, 26 (1929) 414-430; *OC*, no. 39 (1927); J. Karmiris, *The Confession of Peter Moghila* (in Greek), Athens 1953; Bapheides, *Ecclesiastical History* (in Greek), III, 1st part, pp. 146 ff. Note that Euthymios III of Antioch was no longer present at the great synod of Constantinople on September 24, 1638, which had gathered the other 3 Orthodox patriarchs. Cf. *DThC*, III, col. 1429.

³⁴¹ See above footnotes 306 and 318. The “*Relation pour l’an 1650*” of Jesuit J. Amieu shows us how Euthymios III always feared the fate of his predecessor, Euthymios II Karmeh. The account of Capuchin Michael of Rennes in 1641 confirms the first and reveals the state of mind of Euthymios III who reflected the other Orthodox of Antioch under the Ottoman yoke. Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 402; *SOCG*, vol. 120, fol. 28v and vol. 196, fol. 205r-215r.

³⁴² Radu, pp. 52-53; Macarios of Aleppo, p. 663. Before the “amazement” of the Greek clergy of Damascus while their patriarch was dying, because of his designation of the Metropolitan of Aleppo as his successor, one could wonder if his life had not been shortened in order to have had better relations with the Latin missionaries!

³⁴³ The Capuchins founded their residences in 1632 at Saida, in 1634 at Tripoli and in 1637 at Damascus (cf. *SOCG*, vol. 197, fol. 55r-57r; “Brevis descriptio locorum Missionis Capucinatorum provinciae Britannicae in partibus Syriae et Palestinae”). The Jesuits had their residences in 1643 in Damascus (Besson, p. 68), in 1645 in Saida and Tripoli (cf. J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiens Uniates du Proche-Orient*, Paris, 1962, p. 219; *SOCG*, vol. 197, fol. 102r).

³⁴⁴ In fact, the majority of Christians of Damascus, Saida and Tripoli were Greek-Melkites.

During the patriarchal reign of Euthymios III of Chios (1635-1647) the missionaries continued to gain the sympathy of the Christian people in Aleppo and even made some individual conversions.³⁴⁵ Their missionary work was directed mainly toward the Christians rather than the Muslims or Jews of Aleppo.³⁴⁶ On one side, they had some theological discussions with the local educated clergy who were little prepared for the speculation of the Franks.³⁴⁷ On the other side they instructed the people, mainly the young boys, in their schools.³⁴⁸ Their influence became so great that the Christian people of Aleppo began to leave their legitimate pastors and joined the missionaries.³⁴⁹ The Maronite patriarch himself had to intervene with his synod to keep the unity of his faithful in Aleppo who were “divided in four parties,” one group with the Capuchin Fathers, the second with the Carmelite Fathers, the third with the Jesuit Fathers and the rest of the people with the Maronite priests.³⁵⁰ This radical intervention of a Catholic prelate against the equally Catholic missionaries alarmed those who risked disappearing

³⁴⁵ Cf. Besson, p. 16: “The people of Aleppo are naturally good, and the Gospel it seems would not be disheartened if the door in was open. The people love the Franks and do not hate the Christians at all, the number of which is around one fifth of the city for which I wish the accomplishment of a good name of Hierapolis which some authors call it. Outside of individual conversions among the Jacobites, Nestorians and Armenians of Aleppo (cf. for example *SOCCG*, vol. 413, fol. 145v; vol. 416, fol. 324r; vol. 128, fol. 89r, 96r and 99r), we have found no trace of “conversion” among the Greek Melkites at that time. The missionaries affirmed the “reduction” of some Greeks to the Catholic faith, who promised to make a written profession of faith without ever making it (cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 62, fol. 80r and vol. 196, fol. 205r).

³⁴⁶ It was Capuchin Michael of Rennes who recounts only how he had discussions with the rabbi of Aleppo by converting some Jews and some Turks to the catholic faith! (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 206rv).

³⁴⁷ Queyrot wrote on December 26, 1636: “tutti i Sacerdoti e Vescovi o Metropolitani di questi paesi, altro non sanno che leggere e scrivere” (*SOCCG*, vol. 115, fol. 599r). However, when we read the works of Karmeh, Macarios of Aleppo, Paul of Aleppo, etc..., this judgment appears very exaggerated to us.

³⁴⁸ Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 118, fol. 115rv and vol. 106, fol. 224rv. In 1636, the students had reached the number 43 (*SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol. 598v). Compare with *Acta*, vol. 12, fol. 33or; *De Vries*, p. 320.

³⁴⁹ Cf. the letter of Bonin, Consul of France in Aleppo, dated June 1, 1645, in *SOCCG*, vol. 62, fol. 129rv.

³⁵⁰ Michael of Rennes wrote to Ingoli on February 26, 1645: “Il Signor Patriarcha Maronita (Joseph Akouri newly elected) mandera quanto prima un Oratore pro pallio quale condura seco li alunni per Ravenna. Il detto patriarcha ha fatto ultimamente certa congregazione delli soi vescovi et sacerdoti, la principal propositione d’essa fu in certa maniera contra li missionarii quali essendo in gran stima et honore da tutto il popolo li preti della detta nazione vedendosi come dispregaiti rapresentarno in qualche maniera quello che disse l’evangelio: ‘quid facimus quia hic homo multa signa facit. Si dimittimus eum sic omnes sequentur eum et venient Romani et tollent locum nostrum et gentem,’ cosi costoro persuasero con tanta efficacia al detto Signor Patriarca che se tollerava li missionarij con l’autorita delle Bulle Apostoliche loro nessuno si veria piu confessare a essi (perche sono ignorantissimi et cupidissimi di pecunia) (sic) che finalmente il detto Signor Patriarca fece un decreto dove scomunica quelli ch’ascoltrano le misse di franghi le domeniche et feste et ogni uno che si confessara o comunicara alli Religiosi franghi, senza licentia in scriptis, quale licentia non vol dare a nessuno come l’habbiamo esperimentato essendo andati trovarlo et ingenochiati alli soi piedi con ogni instantia non l’ha voluto concedere nence (= neanche) in casu necessitatis...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 62, fol. 105rv). Having had the right to explain himself before the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the Maronite Patriarch wrote on April 26, 1646: “Non si è fatta questa prohibitione se non la disunione de Popolo, et per la mutatione delle nostre usanze et per altre necessità,... anzi s’era disunito il nostro popolo de Maroniti principalmente in Aleppo, et divisio in quarto parti, una parte con li Padri Cappucini, con li Padri Carmelitiani una parte, con li Padri Gesuiti un’altra, et il resto del popolo con li nostrri Sacerdoti, et haveano mutato l’usanze della nostra Natione, nessun’honore, et rispetto portando alla nostra Sedia, et alli nostri Arcivescovi...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 128, fol. 45r).

and also alarmed those whom they had won over from the other non-Catholic Christians.³⁵¹

In order not to lose ground in the large missionary city of the Near East, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith quickly named a Latin bishop of Aleppo “for the Latin merchants who lived there and who passed through there.”³⁵² This nomination of a Latin bishop in Aleppo in 1645, which had a precedent in 1638 in Baghdad,³⁵³ took the missionaries away from the growing jurisdiction of the archbishop of Goa,³⁵⁴ and assisted in the creation of autonomous Latin missionaries for the conversion of their nations.³⁵⁵ This did not pass unnoticed by the Maronites who were also Catholic and who had their own hierarchy there: the same diocesan territory could not have two equally Catholic jurisdictions!³⁵⁶ But the spirit of the crusaders and the

³⁵¹ The Carmelite Thomas of St. Joseph wrote to Ingoli on October 5, 1645: “Credo Sua Signoria Ill.ma haverà inteso il grande impedimento ch’ha mess oil nuovo Patriarcha de Maroniti al bene dell’anime della sua gente, con prohibire sotto pena di scomunica a tutti sui di confessari o comunicarsi da Missionarij franchi; andando tanto innanzi che hà scomunicato anche i missionarij che confesseranno o comunicheranno alcuni de sui, il che ha caggionato grand.mo scandalo min questa povera natione quale camminava tanto bene che era beneditione di Dio... Gl’altri christiani Scismatici vengono liberamente et questi che sono della Chiesa non ardiscono; sarebbe buono che la S. Congregatione vi mettesse ridemio, altrimenti li altri vescovi scismatici proheberanno similmente i sui...” (*Ibid.*, fol. 74rv; cf. also *SOCCG*, vol. 62, fol. 129rv).

³⁵² “Ob mercatores in ea degentes, vel ad illam confluentes” (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 89r). It is true that the nomination of a Latin bishop in Aleppo did not have a direct relation with the excommunication made by the Maronite patriarch, but the missionaries themselves already knew that a similar thing would have to come one day or another for all the Christian prelates of Aleppo. A Latin prelate could serve them well as someone to lean on in case they were rejected by the others.

³⁵³ Cf. R. Janin, “Bagdad,” in *DHGE*, VI, 199.

³⁵⁴ Ingoli wrote for the Congregation meeting 5 on January 23, 1645: “De episcopo in civitate Aleppi constintuendo: ... Conviene far questi vescovi nell’Asia perche come si vede dalla lettera del Padre Ignatio Carmel. Scalzo, l’Arcivescovo di Goa si v`a facendo padrono dell’Asia, e vuol cacciar le missioni de nostri Italiani da Bassora, non ostante, che sia giuridicamente del Vescovo di Bagdat facendo pertutto li suoi vicarij, come con più lettere è stata avvisata la Sac. Congregatione” (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 98v).

³⁵⁵ Cf. “Positione per servitio de’ Christiani d’Aleppo” in *SOCCG*, vol. 407, fol. 335r: “Altre volte s’è trattato in questa S. Congregatione di far’ un Vescovo in Aleppo Città populatissima con tutte le sette d’Oriente, ove sono 4 Missioni, cioè de’ Minori Osservanti, Carmelitani Scalzi, Capucini e Gesuiti, per seguitar l’ordine incominciato di far’ un Vescovo in ciascun Regno del’Infedeli: perche le Missioni sono sterili, e non ponno far sacerdoti del Paese, li quali, come s’è visto per isperienza nelle conversioni dell’Indie, hanno fatte molte più, che li nostril Sacerdoti Europei.” The Decree of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of December 28, 1644 also gives this reason: “Ob mercaturam incolentium, vel ad illas (= cities of Syria) confluentium qui indigent Episcopo ob sacramentum Confirmationis, olea sacra, et sacros ordines” (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 89r).

³⁵⁶ In fact the Maronite bishop, Isaac Sciadraoui wrote to Rome in 1647 to protest in the name of the Maronite hierarchy against these new measures: “Isaac Maronita Alunno della Santa Chiesa Romana Arcivescovo di Tripoli di Soria notifica S. Santità che il suo Patriarca insieme con l’altri Prelati della Natione Maronita si dolgono e non hanno à caro che s’ordinino nelle loro Residenze altri Prelati latini, gia che li Vescovi Maroniti sono nativi del Paese e sopportano li travaglij e Tirannie de’ Turchi, essendo tanto obedienti alla S. Chiesa Romana, e cattolici li Prelati Maroniti quanto li Prelati latini, et una chiesa non puole havere insieme doi capi. Di più notifica S. Santità che li frati e Religiosi Missionarij nelle parti di Levante propria auctoritate ministrano li Sacramenti senza licenza del Patriarca e de’ Vescovi; per il che predetto Arcivescovo per l’ordine che ha dal suo Patriarca e dalli Prelati della sua Natione supplica Sua Santità si degni dar’ordine che non si facciano Vescovi latini nelle Residenze delli Vescovi Maroniti, e che li Missionarij, secondo li canoni ecclesiastici non amministrino li Sacramenti se non con la licenza del

prevalence of the Latin Church over the Eastern Churches awakened once again the idea about having a resident Latin patriarch in Jerusalem on whom all the Latins of the Near East would depend.³⁵⁷

Before the nomination of a residential Latin bishop in Aleppo, the Jesuits had already considered establishing a seminary.³⁵⁸ But the uncertainty, in which the Christian schools in the Ottoman empire lived, obliged the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to establish a college in Rome for the Orthodox or non-Chalcedonian Easterners of the Near East.³⁵⁹ The preoccupation of the missionaries was to prepare candidates to go to Rome,³⁶⁰ but the result was not always fortunate for the Greek-Melkites of the Patriarchate of Antioch.³⁶¹ Before the difficulty of transferring these young men into Europe, the missionaries themselves were transferred.

The Jesuits provisionally established their first school in Damascus in 1641 and then definitively in 1643.³⁶² The nephew of Euthymios III who later became Patriarch of Antioch in 1672,³⁶³ was formed there as well as hundreds of Greeks who presided over

Patriarca o del Vescovo del luogho. Che altrimenti ci sara della dissensione e delli inconvenienti grandi, quali prohibendoli remediara S. Santità” (*SOCCG*, vol. 413, fol. 123r). But the congregation meeting 57 of April 26, 1647 responded: “Ubi sunt latini catholici, mixti cum aliis catholicis diversi Ritus à Latino, Latinis datur episcopus latinus, ob duas potissimas rationes: p.o ne successu tempore latini ad Ritus aliarum nationum transeant; 2.o ad evitandam confusionem Rituum, à Sacris canonibus et constitutionibus pontificijs prohibitam” (*Ibid.*, fol. 123v).

³⁵⁷ According to Ingoli the Latin rite was “più sicuro e più approvato degli altri, che sono stati da patriarchi heretici corrotti” (*Ibid.*, fol. 126v). As for the creation of a Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, it was the guardian of this city, François de Como, who anticipated in 1646 what Pius IX did two centuries later for other reasons. In fact in a letter of January 28, 1646, this Franciscan missionary wrote to Ingoli: “Dico che s’appartenesse a me tal disposizione (i.e. to create Latin bishops in the East), al fine del mio triennio eleggerci qualche uomo di pezzo per mio successore, et in quello solo trasferirci detti Vescovati (of Cairo and Aleppo), con qualsivoglia altro dell’Oriente; acciochè come Metropolita o Patriarca commune a tutti li secolari contraditione tutti indirizzare, reggere e governare con tranquillità, e pace...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 128, fol. 14r).

³⁵⁸ Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 195, fol. 598r-599v and 602r. It concerns the letter of Fr. Jerome Queyrot written in Aleppo on December 26, 1636, in which he affirms: “Hora il vero rimedio a così gran male (= the ignorance of the local clergy) secondo il mio poco giudizio sarebbe d’instituire in queste parti qualche seminario nel quale a spese S. Chiesa Romana ch’è capo e Madre di tutte l’altre, s’allevassero et ammaestrassero nella virtù e nelle lettere alcuni giovanetti di buona espettatione... Non credo che si possa trovar luogo più a proposito per instituire un Seminario, che questa Città (= Aleppo) parte per la vicinanza de’luoghi ove Monsignor il Patriarca de’ Maroniti, et il Patriarca *Antiocheno* de’ Greci fanno la loro residenza; parte per la moltitudine de’ Christiani d’ogni rito e nazione che qui si ritrova” (fol. 599rv).

³⁵⁹ This was the famous school of the Cardinal de S. Honophrius. Cf. *Acta*, vol. 12, fol. 330rv (Congregation meeting 233 of July 20, 1637).

³⁶⁰ Cf. The letters cited above of Fr. Queyrot and of Fr. Antoine de l’Aquila. Cf. also *De Vries*, p. 320. It is necessary to teach Latin to the Greeks along with Greek and Arabic (*SOCCG*, vol. 118, fol. 115r).

³⁶¹ Until 1647 we know only the name of Peter Dib who remained 7 years at the college of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and 6 months after with a Roman painter to return to Aleppo without any ecclesiastical order. Cf. above footnote 321.

³⁶² Cf. above footnote 324. According to the attestation of Capuchin Theophile Rhedonensis, the Jesuits of Damascus had around 1647 between 20 and 30 Greek boys in their school (*SOCCG*, vol. 197, 346v).

³⁶³ This was the first Greek Patriarch of Antioch who had been the student of the Jesuits. This was the beginning of a new conception of union with Rome propagated in the ranks of the Greek prelates of Antioch. Cf. *Musset*, II, pp. 164-169.

the destinies of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch.³⁶⁴ In 1637, the British Capuchins established a residence in Damascus near the school of the Jesuits in order to have direct contact with the resident patriarch and any visiting Greek prelates.³⁶⁵

Little by little the Jesuits installed themselves in Saida near the Franciscans and British Capuchins; several years later the Capuchins established a school there.³⁶⁶ The Capuchins established themselves in Tripoli in 1634 and before them the Franciscans; several years later the Carmelites and Jesuits arrived.³⁶⁷ In all these Syrian cities the missionaries were very successful despite the discord and jealousy which existed among them from time to time.³⁶⁸ Michael de Rennes bragged that he had been able to confuse a Greek bishop of Damascus by converting the patriarch of the Greeks himself.³⁶⁹ From Tripoli on March 6, 1641, Brice of Rennes wrote: “regarding what we do for the Greeks, most of them believe in the Roman Catholic Church and recognize His Holiness (the pope) as its pastor and true successor of Saint Peter. I myself have often preached in their church,³⁷⁰ and they listened to me and respected my words as if they were Roman

³⁶⁴ There was, among others, Patriarch Athanasios III Dabbas who sent his profession of Catholic faith to Rome around the end of 1686 (cf. *Rabbath*, II, pp. 106-107; *Mansi*, vol. 46, col. 116) and the Metropolitan of Tyre, Euthymios Saifi who also sent his profession of Catholic faith immediately after his accession to the episcopate in 1683. The nephew of Euthymios Saifi, Cyril VI Tanas, was the first catholicized Patriarch of Antioch. Note that Saifi had no connection of relationship or thought with Karmeh whose Catholicism was more Orthodox than that of Saifi. Cf. *Mansi*, Vol. 46, col. 129-138; C. Bacha, *History of the Greek-Melkites* (in Arabic), I, Saida, 1938, passim. Compare with *DHGE*, vol. 3, col. 645 where several errors are superposed.

³⁶⁵ Cf. *SOCG.*, vol. 197, fol. 55r-57v; vol. 196, fol. 46r and fol. 205r-215r.

³⁶⁶ Capuchin Michael of Rennes wrote from Saida on December 24, 1642: “Fanno in circa quindici giorni che ho instituito in cotesto hospitio una scola di studianti tanto maroniti quanto greci et n’habbiamo di gia dieci, li quali ogni giorno vanno motiplicando et si io volessi inanzi che fusse un mese credo che n’haverei piu de cinquanta ma non habbiamo luogo bastante...” (*SOCG*, vol. 122, fol. 130v). The Jesuits bought themselves a house in Saida on May 7, 1645. Cf. J. Hajjar, *Les Chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient*, Paris 1962, p. 219.

³⁶⁷ Cf. *DHGE*, “Beyrouth,” VIII, 1309; *SOCG*, vol. 197, fol. 110r and 346v. The Carmelites sent two fathers, the Jesuits only one, who on April 26, 1645 took possession of the two rooms in the Khan of the port.

³⁶⁸ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 128, fol. 126rv where Capuchin Michael of Rennes asked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to send a bishop to visit the missions in the east, adding: “Lodato Iddio, li capuccini non hanno ancora cacciato via alcuno visitatore Apostolico come fecero quelli (= the Franciscan Fathers of Jerusalem) per due volte il detto monsignore (= Peter Vespa, Bishop of Paphos in Cyprus), et l’havessero cacciato per la terza volta se io non l’havessi aiutato, perche cotesti padri non vogliono patire alcuno altro nel Oriente, etiamche nessuno di essi si travaglia in maniera alcuna alla missione o alla conversione delle anime anzi ruinano tutto per le discordie loro con li christiani Orientali come si vede giornalmente...” (letter written at Saida on August 21, 1645).

³⁶⁹ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 196, fol. 205r-215r, and vol. 120, fol. 28v. It concerns the Greek bishop of Nazareth passing through Damascus, who died 6 days after the discussion with Fr. Michael, because he had not accepted the infallibility of the pope. Also he had been “castigato quasi miracolosamente da Dio per sue bestemmie contro la Chiesa Romana” (fol. 212r of vol. 196 cited). The patriarch in question is Euthymios III the Chiot who never confessed in writing his tendencies for union with Rome. Cf. above footnotes 306 and 332.

³⁷⁰ Note that it concerns a Greek Orthodox Church where the Latin missionary could freely preach to the faithful of this church! Cf. the reaction of other missionaries before this “cumunicato in sacris” in *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 333rv. One could wonder on the other hand how these Catholics could also frequent an Orthodox Church! The question was posed to the missionaries of Aleppo since 1638: “Se un christiano Scismatico venendo as un missionario per confessarsi ed abiurare la sua setta, ed heresia, deve doppo la

Catholics. We preached on the procession of the Holy Spirit and demonstrated that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, as one single principle; everyone believed my words and not one of them said anything against me. Every time we discussed with them the preeminence of the great pontiff, the pope, they remained confused and did not know how to respond; convinced, they recognized him as vicar of Christ and true successor of Saint Peter.³⁷¹

In view of these satisfying results, the British Capuchins could not tolerate the superficial presence of other missionaries who came after them to harvest what they had sowed!³⁷² They wanted a new crusade of the Christian princes of Europe to crown their spiritual crusade with a temporal one.³⁷³

professione della fede sottraerlo, ed allontanarlo d'ella Sua Chiesa, e riti, venendo, sempre dopo detta professione a Catholici per il Sacramento di penitenza, il che essendo sarebbe causa d'el odio dalla Sua Nazione e d'elle Avanie de' Turchi" (*SOCCG*, vol. 118, fol. 69r). And Ingoli responded: "non debet si Ritus non involvat heresim vel quid illum pro sancto aliquis hereticus honoretur" (*Ibid.*, fol. 69v).

³⁷¹ "Per il bene, che facciamo con gli Greci, è che la piu grande parte di lori credono a l'Ecclesia Catholica romana et cognoscono gla Sua Santità il Suo Pastore per vero Successore di S. Pietro, io ho predicato assai volte nel Ecclesia loro et mi oscultanno, et fanno stima del le mie parole come fossero catholici roamani, et predicando a lori sopra la processione del Spiritu Santo, et provando che procede del Padre et del Figlio come d'uno principio, ciascuno credeva al le mie parole et nessuno mi diceva il contraio, quando assai volte venimo al la disputa con lori sopra la preeminentia del Summo pontifice Il Papa, restanno confusi, et non sanno che rispondere et restanno convinti, ricognoscendolo Vicario di Christo et vero Successore di S. Pietro" (*SOCCG*, vol. 120, fol. 42r). For most of the missionaries in the east this represented the principal object of their preaching among the Orthodox.

³⁷² In an account of Capuchin Theophile Rhedonensis, written around the year 1647, we read: "(we see coming) in illam missonem nostrum Palestinae et Syriae RR. Patres Carmelites discasos et Jesuitas, quibus possent dici verba Christi Domini Nostri, quod missi fuerunt metere quod non laboraverant, Patres enim nostril spinas eccllerant et ipsi in labores eorum introierunt... Sunt etiam R. Patres Observantes ex Jerusalem et Jersuitas in Sydone et Damasco, sed nulli eorum Missionem faciunt..." (*SOCCG*, vol. 197, fol. 346v).

³⁷³ One was convinced that "se li franchi hanno da venire pigliare queste parte, se non vi si trovano Missionarij nel medesimo tempo non se portra far fruttto" (*Ibid.*, fol. 110r). And Michael of Rennes wrote: "Certo si il Signor Idio stabilisse buono pace tra principi christiani con una *crociada* si vederia quanto profitto nostril missionarij hanno fatto costa" (*SOCCG*, vol. 196, fol. 206v).

CHAPTER V

THE PATRIARCHATE OF ANTIOCH ON THE WAY TO CATHOLIZATION UNDER MACARIOS III ZAIM (1647-1672)

1) The “Zaim,” Macarios III of Aleppo

Following the example of Euthymios II Karmeh who designated his successor before his death, Euthymios III of Chios, while he was dying in Damascus from May to September 1647, also chose his successor: Meletios Zaim, Metropolitan of Aleppo.³⁷⁴

According to the account of Father Queyrot, Meletios Zaim was a weaver before becoming metropolitan of Aleppo.³⁷⁵ He was a married priest who lost his wife around 1627, the same year in which his famous son, Paul was born. Paul became archdeacon of the patriarchate and biographer of his father.³⁷⁶ Before becoming patriarch, Metropolitan Karmeh promoted Zaim to sacred orders; Zaim had been a disciple of Karmeh.³⁷⁷ On October 27, 1635, Euthymios III of Chios consecrated Zaim Metropolitan of Aleppo in Damascus and also made him *catholicos*, “supervisor,” of the whole patriarchate and exarch for the region of Diarbaker and Antioch where he had permission to celebrate the Divine Liturgy.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁴ It was his son, Paul of Aleppo, who left us a witness of his famous “*Voyage du Patriarche Macaire d’Antioche*.” Radu (p. 52) made a mistranslation in his French version: “the priests and clergy met, they gave him (= Euthymios) the sacred unction and asked him who should replace him if he died. He responded to them by telling them his wish and intention: ‘If you want a clever organizer do not put another person as patriarch other than the Metropolitan of Aleppo.’ He finished this judicious advice by the excellent word of the holy Gospel: ‘the disciple will be considered like his master.’ He was made like his predecessor, that is to say the one who had consecrated him. He chose (my father) (sic) metropolitan.” The Arabic text (Radu, p. 52) which it is necessary to admit is very complicated, rather has another sense in the second part of this paragraph: “for this judicious advice fulfilled the excellent word of the holy Gospel ‘the disciple will be considered like his master,’ because he had made like his predecessor, that is to say like the latter (= Karmeh) had designated and chosen him, also the former (= Euthymios of Chios) had elected and made the Metropolitan of Aleppo (= Meletios Zaim).”

³⁷⁵ *SOCG*, vol. 195, fol. 599r: “E cosi tra Greci un Tesitor d’Armesini (purple) tirato dal Telaio viene a esser fatto Metropolita d’Aleppo” (letter of December 26, 1636). We clearly see that Meletios Zaim had never studied with the Latin missionaries of this city, but we know that he was son of the priest Paul, son of priest Abdel-Massih Zaim of Aleppo, and from his infancy he was the disciple of Karmeh, whom he succeeded in the episcopate and patriarchate (Radu, p. 42; Rustum, p. 49).

³⁷⁶ Radu, pp. 51 and 57; Rustum, *Ibid.* Paul of Aleppo became a reader (and not “deacon” as Radu translated) on May 8, 1642. On February 17, 1644 he had (!) to get married and on November 21, 1647 he was ordained “archdeacon of Damascus, Aleppo and all the Arab countries.”

³⁷⁷ Radu, p. 42: “from his youth he was his student, he ordained him deacon, priest and pastor by raising him to the rank of confessor.” Compare with the version of Radu. Let us remark here that the article “*Makarios Antiocheia*” in *ERM*, 8 (1966), col. 485 contains several errors that the author could have avoided by consulting the article “*Antiochia*” in the same *ERM*, 2 (1963), col. 899-900 and 908. For example he affirms that Patriarch Macarios had the name Meletios before entering into the clergy and that he remained patriarch from 1641 to 1688, even though he was named John before becoming Metropolitan Meletios of Aleppo and that he was patriarch from 1647 until 1672!

³⁷⁸ Radu, pp. 43-44. It was the clergy and people of Aleppo who chose their new Pastor and sent him to Damascus for episcopal chirotonia. It was not Karmeh who consecrated his successor on the See of Aleppo

During his episcopate which lasted twelve years, the city of Aleppo witnessed the blossoming of its Christians and the breathtaking activity of the Latin missionaries. Father Queyrot was so enthusiastic that he proposed to open a seminary in Aleppo.³⁷⁹ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith counted so much on the mission of Aleppo that it appointed a Latin bishop there in 1645 after the one in Baghdad in 1638.³⁸⁰ The Greek Eparchy of Aleppo was so rich that Patriarch Euthymios III of Chios went there twice to collect the necessary money to pay to the insatiable Ottomans.³⁸¹ Under the episcopate of Meletios Zaim a great number of his faithful made a pilgrimage to the holy places of Jerusalem; there Patriarch Theophanes hastened to receive them with “all attention and all honor.”³⁸² In Jerusalem, the metropolitan of Aleppo met the catholicos, Maximos of Georgia who accompanied him to Damascus and Aleppo in May 1642.³⁸³ Zaim was on such good terms with his patriarch that the patriarch ordered him to celebrate the Divine Liturgy pontifically and to preach in his place in the Cathedral of Damascus.³⁸⁴

In September 1647, Meletios Zaim left Aleppo to hide at Killiz³⁸⁵ “because of the prejudice of the governor (of Aleppo), Qara Hassan Pasha, who committed numerous injustices.”³⁸⁶ A messenger from the Damascenes went to Killiz to ask the metropolitan

as Rustum thinks (p. 49), because Karmeh died on January 1, 1635 and Zaim was consecrated ten months later by Euthymios III the Chiot. Besides the text reproduced by Rustum says the contrary of what this author affirms! Meletios Zaim had many titles and prerogatives to support his weak patriarchate, Cf. Chapter IV above.

³⁷⁹ *SOCC*, vol. 195, fol. 599v.

³⁸⁰ Cf. L. Lemmens, *Hierarchia latina Orientis*, in *OC*, 2 (1924) 296-300. Always sick, Dovara never returned to Aleppo until his resignation in 1650. In Aleppo one always knew about this nomination on which the French consul Bonin congratulated the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on May 28, 1646 (cf. *SOCC*, vol. 128, fol. 90r).

³⁸¹ The first time he remained there from August 9 to November 22, 1640; the second time from February 1 to May 17, 1644 (Radu, pp. 46-47 and 51). We see that the patriarch had the right of receiving the tithe in all the eparchies of his patriarchate without any resistance of the local bishop.

³⁸² Radu, pp. 47-49. Paul of Aleppo notes that he had wanted to remain longer with Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem.

³⁸³ Radu, p. 49. The affection of Zaim with the Georgians bore fruit when he became Patriarch of Antioch with whom the Georgians identified as subjects. See the eulogies of the missionaries further down, in *Acta*, Congregation meeting of November 29, 1666. Cf. Le Quien II, col. 686. The affirmation of Musset II, p. 162, on the subject on the envoy of Zaim in 1642 in Georgia, is based on the words of V. Grumel: “In 1641-1642, (Meletios Zaim) going to Jerusalem where he met Maximos, Catholicos of western Georgia resulted in renewing relations of the Church of Antioch with this country. In fact, on return to Syria, he was named by Patriarch Euthymios III Exarch of the region of Amida (Diarbekir)” (*EO*, 27 (1928), p. 68. More precisely, Meletios Zaim had been in Jerusalem for Pascha 1642. The Catholicos of Georgia accompanied him to Aleppo by passing through Damascus (from May 1 to 8, 1642). Cf. Radu, pp. 48-49. But Meletios Zaim was exarch of Diarbekir since his accession to the episcopate on October 27, 1635 (Radu, p. 44). And what is the relation of Diarbekir with Georgia? When becoming patriarch, Zaim needed to consecrate a bishop for the eparchy of Diarbekir and to designate an exarch for Georgia, two different things (cf. Radu, pp. 57-58 and 62-63)!

³⁸⁴ This was reserved to the patriarch uniquely when he was in Damascus. Cf. Radu, *Ibid.* Compare with Le Quien, II, col. 773.

³⁸⁵ Killiz is 60 km north of Aleppo.

³⁸⁶ Radu, pp. 52-53. Macarios of Aleppo, p. 633. The version of Radu lends confusion. The metropolitan was at Killiz and it was the messenger who looked for him in other localities before finding him.

of Aleppo to come to Damascus because the dying patriarch and the clergy of Damascus wanted him as successor, but the metropolitan declined the invitation, “especially when he knew the gravity of the illness which had affected the patriarch.”³⁸⁷ In view of the displeasure of the patriarch and the arrival of a second messenger, Meletios “sent a response that he would arrive without delay.” He then headed for Damascus “despite himself” in the company of his son, Paul.³⁸⁸ On the way he learned that the patriarch had died on October 11, 1647. Meletios was consecrated the new patriarch on November 12, 1647 by four metropolitans of the Patriarchate of Antioch who came to Damascus for this purpose.³⁸⁹

2) Macarios III and the Orthodox World (1647 - 1660)

Macarios III spent the time immediately after his elevation to the patriarchate raising the finances of his church which was weighed down with debts since 1644 under Euthymios III of Chios.³⁹⁰ He convoked a synod in Damascus to examine the financial situation and it was certified that the patriarchate was in debt 6000 piastres,³⁹¹ without counting the new expenses “to obtain the firman of the pasha in the name of the new patriarch according to custom, plus that which had been spent to make this a legal act with the consent of all.”³⁹² Recognizing this situation, the patriarch had only to extend his hand to generous Christian countries. He made two trips to the Orthodox world, from 1652 to 1659, and 1664 to 1669 to collect funds.

Before leaving on his first trip, he carefully provided all the eparchies with bishops who were worthy of their function as pastors of souls. He even designated an exarch in Georgia, who returned three years later to inform his patriarch about the situation there.³⁹³ In June 1650 he had to deal with some Greeks of Gaza who came to him complaining against the exaggeration of some taxation on the part of the Ottomans. They had declared themselves at the point of passing to Islam, following the example of other confreres, who found it impossible to pay the kharage, and who renounced their Christian faith.³⁹⁴

³⁸⁷ Radu, p. 53. Did he perhaps have this “grave illness” which Euthymios II Karmeh suffered and which Euthymios III the Chiot now suffered? It seems that that he also died of poisoning! (cf. Rustum, p. 103).

³⁸⁸ Radu, *Ibid*; Macarios of Aleppo, *Ibid*. Nevertheless Le Quien (II, p. 773) affirms: “anno itaque 1643 Euthymio ut fert Vaticanus Codex, vel potius Eutychio chiensi patriarchatum eripuit Macarius Halepensis.”

³⁸⁹ Radu, pp. 53-54; Macarios of Aleppo, *Ibid*.; Rustum, p. 48. The metropolitans were: Meletios of Hama, Philotheos of Homs, Youasaf of Qara and Gregory of Hauran.

³⁹⁰ Cf. Radu, p. 51.

³⁹¹ Radu, p. 55. To have an idea on the importance of this amount, it is sufficient to remark how the patriarch could only obtain the 6000 piastres after having collected the tithe from all the eparchies of his patriarchate, by visiting them from July 6, 1648 until February 11, 1650 (cf. Radu, pp. 58-64). But meanwhile the interest accumulated and it was necessary all over again!

³⁹² Radu, pp. 56-57. Paul of Aleppo thinks that the debt surpassed thirteen thousand piastres. That’s why the patriarch had to pawn the four patriarchal crowns which the eparchy of Damascus possessed.

³⁹³ It concerns the Aleppian Deacon Gabriel who became archimandrite in 1648 under the name of Gerasimos and who, after the return from his mission in Georgia, was consecrated Bishop of Furzol on May 6, 1651 by Macarios himself. Cf. Radu, pp. 57-58 and 68; Rustum, p. 53.

³⁹⁴ It is clear that Gaza was part of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Even so the faithful of this eparchy did not hesitate going to request help from the great Patriarch of Antioch, Macarios (cf. Radu, pp. 65-67). The

On January 6, 1651, Macarios III consecrated a catholicos whom he designated several months later as vicar general of the patriarchate during his absence.³⁹⁵ Then he left Damascus on February 11, 1652 after consulting the clergy and people of Damascus.³⁹⁶ He traveled north, at the invitation of the Voivode Basil Lupa, Prince of Moldavia.

He arrived in Constantinople on October 20, 1652 and remained there until January 10, 1653.³⁹⁷ There he concelebrated with Patriarch Paisios³⁹⁸ and participated in the local synod which was held against the deposed Patriarch Joannikios II.³⁹⁹ Macarios III of Antioch also hurled the anathema against the unworthy patriarch of Constantinople who poisoned the metropolitan of Corinth and usurped four episcopal sees before claiming the patriarchate. Macarios signed this anathema in the acts of the synod.⁴⁰⁰

Macarios III continued his voyage passing through Constantsa, Galatz and Jassy where he went to the Monastery of Saint Sabas and had an interview with Voivode Basil Lupu.⁴⁰¹ On November 29, 1653 he was in Targoviste where he was very well received by Prince Matthew Bassarab and Metropolitan Ignatios. There he celebrated the feast of Pascha in 1654 and left the following June for Kiev. His entrance to Moscow took place

future Archbishop of Gaza, Paisios Ligarides, who looked for extracting money by all means, wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on January 16, 1653: "Aiutali (= the Christians of Gaza) molto il presente patriarcha di Antiochia, detto Macario, persona molto devota, e di grand giuditio, il quale tanto ha saputo negoziare, con li governatori, che ha sminuito molto li charahi (=kharage), spesse pero gran denari, con il consenso della citta di Gaza, et hora rimane indebitto di 1500 reali, linquali vanno giornalmente crescendo (sic for "crescendo"), con le usure turchesce, a grandissimo danno, e pericolo delli habitanti christiani di Gaza" (*SOCG*, vol. 197, fol. 197r). In a preceding letter written by the same Ligarides on November 6, 1652, we read: "Il patriarcha di Antiochia molto agiuto questi di Gaza, con farli scancelar tanti Carazi (sic), per liquali molti si fecero turchi, per liverarsi dal aggravio" (*Ibid.*, fol. 204r). But Paul of Aleppo shows that these Christians of Gaza were ungrateful toward the Patriarch of Antioch (cf. Radu, pp. 66-67).

³⁹⁵ This was the Aleppian Salomon, son of the priest Farjallah, who took the name Sylvester (Radu, pp. 67-68). Soon after, Sylvester died of the plague. The Patriarch replaced him by Gerasimos of Furzol. Cf. above footnote 393. See Rustum, p. 54.

³⁹⁶ Radu, pp. 68-70. Macarios was accompanied by his son Paul and by a large retinue.

³⁹⁷ Radu, pp. 84-146.

³⁹⁸ Paisios I of Larissa was elected in July and enthroned August 1, 1652. He was driven out of the Patriarchate at the beginning of April 1653. He returned around mid-March 1654 to be expelled again in March 1665 (cf. Grumel, I, p. 438).

³⁹⁹ Joannikios II was Patriarch of Constantinople the first time from November 16, 1646 until October 29, 1648, the second time from the beginning of June 1651 until mid-June 1652, the third time from the first decade of April 1653 until the beginning of March 1654, and the last time from March 1655 until mid-July 1656 (*Ibid.*). It was Paul of Aleppo who describes the details of this synod by mentioning the principal ideas of the discourses of Sergios, of Paisios I and of his father Patriarch Macarios who "pronounced a sermon in Arabic for one hour" (Radu, pp. 134-138).

⁴⁰⁰ Radu, pp. 138-139: "He anathematized him and all those who offered him their assistance while he wore the stole and omophorion." Radu has the anathema against Cyril Lucaris, although it pertains here to Patriarch Joannikios II who lived at the time of the synod.

⁴⁰¹ Cf. Radu, pp. 147-200 and 443-524. While Macarios was also in Moldavia, there had been a decisive battle between Basil Lupu and George Etienne who took him. This latter one allowed the Patriarch of Antioch leave for Vallachia.

on January 26, 1655.⁴⁰² He was received by Tsar Alexis and paid a visit to Patriarch Nikon who quickly invited him to celebrate a Liturgy with the Serbian archbishop also visiting Moscow. On September 1, 1655 he celebrated the feast of Saint Simeon the Stylite of Aleppo in Novgorod and returned to Moscow where he concelebrated again with Nikon on Christmas Day.⁴⁰³ During his sojourn in Moscow a synod for liturgical reforms took place. It was undertaken by Nikon, and Macarios of Antioch had a large part mainly because he brought with him the new recension of the Euchologion made by Karmeh and other liturgical books of the Patriarchate of Antioch.⁴⁰⁴ From April 1656 the patriarch of Antioch had assumed the role of arbiter between the Patriarch Nikon of Moscow and Tsar Alexis, at the express invitation of the Tsar.⁴⁰⁵ When everything quickly returned to normal, Macarios concelebrated several times with Nikon. He participated again in a synod in which the question of the baptism of Polish people was discussed. Macarios wrote a small treatise on this subject in Arabic proving that the baptism of the Polish people was valid according to the canons of the Orthodox Church. The Russian version of this treatise was approved by Nikon and his synod. There had been an imperial law, which “prohibited rebaptism of Polish Latins or Frank partisans of the pope because they were the closest to us among all the sects.”⁴⁰⁶ Macarios left Moscow on May 29, 1656 and passed again through Kiev, Jassy, Targoviste, Bucharest, Galatz and Aleppo. He arrived in Damascus on July 1, 1659.⁴⁰⁷ There he paid five thousand piastres toward the debt and offered three thousand piastres to the pasha and notables of Damascus.⁴⁰⁸ Soon he convoked a synod of seven metropolitans to condemn the abuse of Athanasios Ibn Amish, Metropolitan of Homs, who, during the absence of the patriarch, took upon himself the prerogatives of the patriarch. The synod deposed this metropolitan and reduced him to the lay state.⁴⁰⁹ In 1660 Macarios devoted himself to the preparation of the Myron necessary for his patriarchate because the last patriarch who had made it was Joachim Ibn Ziadeh in 1594.⁴¹⁰ On May 7, 1661 he was in Aleppo, his city of birth, where he began openly to approach the Latin missionaries and the French consul. During his episcopate (1635-1647) he remained very reserved toward the

⁴⁰² V. Grumel (*EO*, 27 (1928), pp. 68 and 70) speaks of the synod of Moscow at which Macarios III took part. He placed it in 1654, while Macarios did not arrive until 1655!

⁴⁰³ Cf. Radu, pp. 525 ff.

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. *EO*, 27 (1928), pp. 68-73, where we can find a general idea on the literary work of Macarios III Zaim and on his role in the Synod of Moscow of 1655. The Euchologion concerns the version made by Karmeh and sent to Rome in 1634 with his Protosyncellos Pachomios. Cf. above Chapter III.

⁴⁰⁵ In fact while Macarios III was at Bolkhov to celebrate Pascha, “he received a letter from Alexis dated the evening of April 4 (1656) in which he was invited by the emperor to return to Moscow, the emperor having had on Holy Friday a discussion with Nikon on the attitude of the latter toward him” (Radu, pp. 8-9).

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. Bacha, *Voyage*, p. 74. It was Paul of Aleppo who commented in the cited passage. For the question of rebaptism among the Orthodox, cf. *OC*, no. 39 (1927), pp. 155-158.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. Radu, pp. 9-10. In all the cities that he visited, Macarios III celebrated the Divine Liturgy in all solemnity. He was received everywhere as the great Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, and the faithful as well as their leaders appeared very generous to him.

⁴⁰⁸ Rustum, pp. 54-55.

⁴⁰⁹ The synod took place on August 28, 1659 at Damascus. Cf. the acts of this synod in Rustum, pp. 55-56.

⁴¹⁰ Rustum, pp. 56-59; Nasrallah, *Chronologie*, p. 50; Radu, p. 37.

missionaries and their projects,⁴¹¹ even though he voluntarily accepted the services of the Jesuit Fathers who looked after him when he was sick in Aleppo. He did not forget their care when he became patriarch in 1647. Jesuit Father Amieu wrote in his account for the year 1650: “he had visited Seyde (Saida) and saw me as good oil, and had clearly preached that it was necessary to love the Catholics and not to flee them: this was a great change for the Greeks of Seyde. He also came to Tripoli where I was, and I heard him in his church; and if he became more knowledgeable, he also had better sentiments. Very often he visited our Fathers in Damascus, who supported him in his good wishes, and because of this the fathers are better accepted by the Greeks.”⁴¹²

3) Macarios III and his Ecumenical Mission (1661-1672)

Some months after the martyrdom of David, a Greek Aleppian, Patriarch Macarios III arrived in Aleppo to relieve his faithful in their distress.⁴¹³ In view of the tireless charity of the missionaries during the months of the 1661 famine, he publicly praised the Roman Church and “invited the consul (Picquet) and the missionaries to his church to listen to the Liturgy and allow his people to see that the Franks were in the true path of salvation, as he noted in the sermon which he preached in Arabic.”⁴¹⁴ He also sent a letter (dated September 30, 1661) to Consul Picquet and asked him to personally give it to Pope Alexander VII. The letter was sent with Arabic manuscripts of the Euchologion and Horologion so that they could be printed at the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith printing press.⁴¹⁵ The consul was in Rome before May 22, 1662. On that date the contents of this letter were communicated to the general assembly of the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith: “The patriarch of the Greeks of Antioch expressed a great desire of (coming) to see His Holiness the pope, but since

⁴¹¹ Franciscan Antoine de l’Aquila wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on November 10, 1639 on the subject of sending two Greek candidates to the college of S. Honophrius in Rome: “Il loro Arcivescovo anco si mostra poco inclinato a questa santa impresa” (*SOCCG*, vol. 119, fol. 106r).

⁴¹² Rabbath, I, p. 402. Here it concerns the visit that Macarios made to Saida on July 6, 1648 and to Tripoli on October 18, 1648 which he left on February 15, 1649 after having covered all of Mount Lebanon and visited all his Greek faithful as well as Emir Melhem. Cf. Radu, pp. 58-62; Rustum, pp. 50-51.

⁴¹³ David, age 50, was beheaded by the Ottomans on July 28, 1660 after 3 months in prison. His son Wehbe (or Theodore) entered the college of S. Honophrius of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on December 29, 1661 and finished by being a Carmelite and then named then Apostolic vicar at Smyrna with the title of “Archbishop of Cyrene.” He died April 18, 1715. Cf. L. Lemmens, *Hierarchia Latina Orientis*, in *OC*, I (1923) 253. Wehby David was called here David Daud (=David)! Compare with Rabbath, I, p. 457; *L’Unité de l’Eglise*, 81 (1936) 748-789; Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, pp. 137-138. It was Consul Picquet who left us a moving account of the martyrdom of this Greek-Melkite in Aleppo. Cf. G. Goyau, *Le rôle religieux du Consul François Picquet dans Alep (1652-1662)* in *Revue d’Histoire des Missions*, 12 (1935) 161-198; *Archives of the Roman V. Emanuele Library*, Varia 275, pp. 7-20: “Breve relatione della gloriosa morte di David Greco martirizano nella città di Aleppo a 28 Luglio 1660.”

⁴¹⁴ Cf. Rabbath, I, pp. 456-459: “*Brève relation de la Mission d’Alep in 1662 adressée aux âmes dévotes par les Supérieurs des Missions des RR.PP. Capucins, Carmes et Jésuites*” Cf. Rustum (p. 99) which corrects the erroneous Arabic translation of this text made by Bacha (*Voyage*, pp. 119 ff).

⁴¹⁵ “Knowing that the Consul (Picquet) had to leave to Rome and France, he (patriarch) sent him a letter asking him to give it directly to the hand of His Holiness, in which he manifested recognizing the pope as sovereign pontiff of the Orthodox Church, and promised that he would do his utmost to reunite his nation to the Roman Church from which pride had separated it” (Rabbath, I, p. 459). These affirmations need to be rectified by comparing them with the true contents of Macarios’ letter (also nowhere to be found) exposed in *Acta*, vol. 31, fol. 100r-101r.

distance did not permit him, he prays that God bring to a good conclusion his belief on the subject of the union of the Holy Church, wishing that it would be easy with the help of God and the Holy Virgin, although it seems to be difficult (to realize). He also asks His Holiness to pray for the poor Christians who are reduced at the present time to extreme misery. He compares the flourishing situation of the ancient Church of the East to its actual very disastrous state and attributes this great change to the fact of being separated from the Roman Church. Now he has the resolve to finding all the ways for reunion because this separation had not been caused by any heresy, but by haughtiness. It is true that it is necessary to proceed secretly in order to avoid many disturbances. For these reasons he says that Mr. Picquet will expose his designs to His Holiness. He praises the rare virtues (of this consul), particularly his piety toward the poor, his zeal and his efforts for the conversion of heretics, and he declares that if this virtuous man was left there (in Near East), he would arrange the union of the nations to perfection.”

He adds that Patriarch Euthymios⁴¹⁶ “had already requested from Urban VIII to print some (translated) books necessary for religion in the Greek and Arabic languages,⁴¹⁷ since the pope had ordered them to be printed. But this patriarch had died⁴¹⁸ before this was done. (The present patriarch) renewed the request and selected two from among the ten books which the latter had asked for,⁴¹⁹ the Euchologion and Horologion.

“He explained the misery in which these people were living under the tyranny of the local governors because it was very difficult to appeal to the sultan who was very far away. If this tyranny lasted ten years, all the Christians of this country would be exterminated. For this reason, if His Holiness was willing to persuade the King of France to send Mr. Francois Picquet as his ambassador to Constantinople, it would be the only remedy for this evil. The Christians, besides, would be very disposed to the obedience and love of His Holiness if they saw that he cared for them. In the meantime, they waited to be consoled by a letter of blessing.”⁴²⁰

⁴¹⁶ The manuscript bears the word “Chirentichio!” It concerns Euthymios II Karmeh who, in 1634, sent his delegate Protosyncellos Pachomios to Rome with the patriarchal seal to sign the union of the Greek Patriarchate of Antioch with the Roman Church.. Pachomios also took with him two Arabic manuscripts of the Euchologion and Horologion. Cf. above, Chapter III.

⁴¹⁷ The manuscripts has: “dalla lingua greca nell’Armena,” and further “in lingua siriaca!” One easily confused Arabic with Armenian and Syriac!

⁴¹⁸ Karmeh died January 1, 1635. Cf. above Chapter III.

⁴¹⁹ Karmeh had never asked for ten books to be printed at Rome, but only the Arabic Bible with the Euchologion and Horologion. Cf. above, chapter III.

⁴²⁰ *Acta*, vol. 31, fol. 100r-101r: “Il Patriarca de greci di Antiochia accenna il desiderio grande, che hà di veder S. Santità , mà già che non gli è permesso dalla distanza de luoghi, prega Dio, che conduca a fine i suoi pensieri, che hà intorno all’unione della S. Chiesa, e benche paia cosa difficile, spera, che si renderà facile coll’aiuto divino, e della Beatissima Vergine. Supplica poi S. Santità voglio pregar Dio per quei poveri christiani hoggi ridotti in estrema miseria, e paragonando lo stato florido dell’antica Chiesa d’Oriente a quello, che prova adesso tanto calamitoso, attribuisce si gran mutatione all’essersi essa separata dalla Chiesa Romana. Hora è risoluto di cercar tutti i mezzi per riunirla, perche questa separatione non proceduta da heresia alcuna, mà dalla superbia, è ben vero, che per evitare molti disordini è necessario di procedere con *segretezza*, percio dice, che esporrà à S. Santità i suoi disegni il Sr. Francesco Picquet, di cui loda le rare virtù, e particolarmente la pietà verso i poveri, il zelo, e l’industria usata per la conversione degli heretici, e dice che se questo virtuoso, huomo fusse rimasto in quelle parti haveria ridotta à perfettione l’unione delle nationi.

Picquet had spoken with the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Mario Alberici, suggesting to him that it was sufficient at that time to have the two requested books printed and to respond to Patriarch Macarios, observing how he would behave before conceding another favor to him.⁴²¹ The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith decided to print the Euchologion and Horologion after they were corrected, to ask the pope to respond to the patriarch, and to write to the Discalced Carmelites of Aleppo “so that, if the patriarch had made the profession of Catholic faith, they should transmit it to Rome in order that it be kept in the registers of the Congregation.”⁴²²

Macarios was sure that the two books requested would be printed immediately. To the preface of the two manuscripts he added that he sent this significant note with Picquet: “this book was printed in the city of Rome, at the time of the excellent in holiness, Macarios, Patriarch of Antioch, by the care and costs of our master, Pope Alexander VII, full of virtue. May God keep His Excellency in the favor of men and may he elevate the edifice of his virtues and his favors, for all in general and each in particular. May God reward his favors with a magnificent prize and an eminent position in this life and in the next. In the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ 1662.”⁴²³

The Congregation’s meeting of July 7, 1662 examined again the question of the Euchologion and the Horologion and found that it was presently difficult to reconstitute the commission for the Euchologion.⁴²⁴ Five days later, Pope Alexander VII responded to

Aggiunge, che il Patriarca Chierentichio (= Euthymios) fece istanza ad Urbano VIII che li fossero stampati alcuni libri dalla lingua Greca nell’Armena (!= Arabic) necessarij per la Religione, et il Papa decreto che si stampassero, mà perche essendo venuto à morte il Patriarca non fù eseguito, replica egli il medesimo, e frà dieci libri (!), che chiedeva quello, esso ne sciegle due soli, cioè l’Euchologion, e l’Horologion.

Rappresenta la miserie, in che sono condotti quei popoli per le tirannie, ch’essercitano I Governatori perche è difficilissimo il ricorrere al Sultano, atessa la troppa lontananza, e dice, che se dureranno ancora per dieci anni, sarà l’ultimo estermio di tutti i christiani di quei Paesi, e che percio se paresse à S. Santità di persuadere al Rè di Francia, che mandi per suo Ambasciatore in Constantinopoli il Sr. Francesco Picquet, sarebbe l’unico rimedio di questo male, oltre che quei christiani si disporrebbero maggiormente all’obedienza, et all’amore di S. Santità, vedendo, che si degna di tener cura di loro. Intanto aspettano d’esser consolati con una lettera di beneditione.” Despite the lacuna of this account, we prove only what satisfies us of its content, since the original letter in Arabic is no longer found.

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, fol. 101r: “Monsignore Segretario dice, che il Sr. Piquet stima che per adesso basti compliacerlo della stampa di questi due libri, e risponderli, et intanto osservar come si porti per usarli poi quando lo meriti qualche altra dimonstratione.” After leaving Rome, Piquet changed his opinion and wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith “che si mandi loro (to the two Patriarchs, Greek and Armenian) qualche cosa” (*Ibid.*, fol. 152r).

⁴²² *Ibid.*, fol. 101e: “Imprimantur libri transmissi postquam fuerint diligenter recogniti, et si opus erit, expurgati, ut si supplicetur Sanctissimo, ut benignè respondeat; scribatur etiam Patribus exalceatis, ut si professionem fidei catholicae emisit, transmittant ad Urbem, ut possit asservari in Regestis S. Officij.”

⁴²³ Korolevsky, *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites*, II, p. 122.

⁴²⁴ From 1636 until 1645 there were 82 meetings of the particular commission for the correction of the Greek Euchologion. But with the “grave controversies which arose among the members of the commission” the work was abandoned. Cf. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, pp. 134-135. After the Congregation meeting of May 22, 1662, we see that the interpreter of the Congregation for the Propagation

Patriarch Macarios with the reassurance that the two requested books would be examined and printed as soon as possible. From this letter we could guess the oral message that Macarios had confided to Consul Picquet when he gave him the letter to take to the pope: “From everything in the letter of Your Fraternity of September 30 of last year, and the oral message of our dear son Francois Picquet, we have understood that you not only firmly follow the truth of the Orthodox faith and recognize the Roman Church as head and master of all the other Churches, but that you also display that you will do everything possible, with the blessing of the Lord, to bring back all the Churches and people who are your subjects into the unity and to communion with this Apostolic See; this we have apprised as certain with great joy...”⁴²⁵

Meanwhile the enthroning of the first Syrian Catholic Patriarch, Andre Akhi-John was being prepared in Aleppo.⁴²⁶ On August 20, 1662, after receiving the order of the pasha, Patriarch Macarios went to assist in the enthroning ceremonies in the Jacobite

of the Faith, Abraham Ecchellensis saw the Euchologion sent by Macarios and made it conform to the Greek. Thus the suppressed commission needed to be reconstituted. The cardinals wrote this rescript on July 17, 1662: “Instituatur denuo Congregatio particularis super Eucologio per Em.mos Barberinum, Brancaccium et Albitium, nec non.”

⁴²⁵ *Archiv. Vatic., epist ad princip.*, vol. 64, fol. 224rv: Venerabili Fratri Macario Patriarchae Graecorum Antiocheno Alexander Papa VII.

Venerabilis frater salutem. Cum ex literis fraternitatis tuae die 30 Septembris Anni praeteriti datis, cum ex voce dilecti filii Francisci Piquet intelleximus, te non solum orthodoxae fidei veritatem firmiter sequi, et Ecclesiam Romanam aliarum omnium Caput et Magistram agnoscere, verum etiam omnibus mentis tuae viribus in eo totum esse, ut Ecclesias et Populos tibi subiectos omnes benedicente Domino ad eiusdem Apostolicae sedis Unitatem et communionem adducere queas quod ingenti sane cum animi gaudio audivimus, cum nihil gratius, aut optatius Nobis accidere possit, quam tot Animarum pretioso Iesu Christi sanguine redemptarum ad sinum amantissimae Matris post aevi tanti vetustatem reductio, et salus. Quare praecipuo Pontificae Caritatis affectu te quidem, ac zelum praeclarum tuum in Domino complectimur, utque in adeo pium, et in comparabilis in utraque Vita gloriae plenum opus toto pectore constanter incumbas, te etiam atque etiam hortamur, atque rogamus. In hanc profecto causam cuncta, quae pro re ac tempore poterunt, officiorum ut auctoritatis adiumenta conferre, et Misericordiarum Patrem Deum precibus enixis adire nunquam desinemus. Caeterum florentissimae quondam Ecclesiae istius afflictionibus, et calamitatibus ex intimo sensu Cordis Paterni compatimur, easque S.R.E. Cardinalibus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda fide mandavimus, et libros pro usu Sacerdotum, et profectu Populorum a te petitos quamprimum recognosci, et imprimi curret, quaemadmodum ex illorum literis omnia melius percipere poteris. Interim laboribus, et optatis piis tuis Ven. Fr. Adiutorem et Protectorem Omnipotentem Deum oramus, Apostolicamque benedictionem ab eo praemanter impertimur. Datum Romae apud S. Mariam Maiorem sub Annulo Piscatoris Die 22 Julii 1662 Pontificatus Nostri Anno Octavo.” This document was published in part by Tamarati (*Istoria katholikobisa karthvelltha scioris*, Tiflis 1902, pp. 636-637) and entirely by Grumel (*EO*, 27 (1928), p. 75). Compare with Musset, II, p. 163 which affirms very simply: “Pope Alexander VIII had the liturgical books that he had requested sent to him (=Macarios)!”

⁴²⁶ This concerns the Syrian Archbishop of Aleppo, Dionysios Akhi-John, who had been raised in the Maronite College of Rome and had received priestly ordination as well as the episcopate from the hands of Maronite Patriarch John Safrawi (1648-1656). In August 9, 1656 he was enthroned as Archbishop of the Jacobites of Aleppo. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith considered him “Maronite” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 41r). At the death of Jacobite Patriarch Simon of Tour Abdine, the Catholics of Aleppo aligned themselves at the side of Akhi-John to proclaim him patriarch. Cf. Rabbath, I, pp. 95-96 and 453-465; Musset, II, pp. 220-223; De Vries, p. 321; A. Hayek, *La relazioni della chiesa Siro-Giacobita colla S. Sede dal 1143 al 1656* (unpublished doctoral thesis which was sustained at the Oriental Institute of Rome in 1936).

Church in Aleppo.⁴²⁷ Six days later, French Consul Baron gave a banquet honoring the new Catholic Patriarch and invited Macarios with the Armenian Patriarch Khachadour. On this occasion Patriarch Macarios “drank to the health of His Holiness the pope by pronouncing words with very Catholic sentiments; the other two patriarchs as well as their clergy approved by standing with heads uncovered.”⁴²⁸ Rome learned about this in February 1663. In view of the enthusiasm and optimism of the consul and the missionaries in Aleppo,⁴²⁹ the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Mario Alberici, informed the pope and the cardinals about the ill-fated consequences of installing Catholic prelates by paying money to Turkish authorities: this could bring more sorrow than good to the Catholic faith.⁴³⁰ The missionaries were

⁴²⁷ The French Consul Baron, successor of Picquet at Aleppo, while the missionaries of this city gave an account to Rome where it was read in the presence of Pope Alexander VIII: “Il nuovo Patriarca è stato accolto con molte cortesie dall’istesso Bassà con esibitione ancora di reprimere quelli, che se gli opponessero, et anche da gli altri due Patriarchi de Greci, e de gli Armeni, che ambedue sono intrinsecamente cattolici, come apparisce dalla lettera, che il primo scrisse alla Santità Vostra l’anno passato (cf. above footnotes 420 and 425), e da quella che il secondo invia hora onde *per comandamento del Bassà andaromo* in Chiesa insieme col nuovo Patriarca à far le solite cerimonie...” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 41v-42r). Cf. Le Quien, II, col. 774. Compare with Rabbath, I, p. 466, where it is said that the two patriarchs, Greek and Armenian, with the brother of Andrew consecrated bishop a little before in the same ceremony, “he (Akhi-John) said the ordinary prayers which are suitable at the establishment of patriarchs.” And the people cried out: “Today the Holy Spirit descends on the Church of the Syrians.” It even seems that all three patriarchs “gave the blessing to the people.” Can we conclude that it concerns a “Communicatio in spiritualibus” among a Catholic, Orthodox and Monophysite? For these patriarchs, the essential was to belong to the Church of Christ.

⁴²⁸ *Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 42r: “Tre giorni doppo (6 das later: Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 466) il console invito à pranzo tutti tre I Patriarchi con i loro cleri, et havendo quello de greci fatto un brindisi alla salute della S.V. con parole di sentimento molto cattolico, fù fatta ragione dagli altri due, e da loro cleri con la testa scoperta, et in piedi.” Rabbath, I, pp. 466-467, recounts this fact and reports the words that Macarios had pronounced at this banquet: “To the health of our Holy Father the Pope, head of the Church, and I pray God that there be only one flock and one shepherd as in the past.” It is necessary to admit that these words are not as clear as some think they are (cf. *EO*, I c., p. 74; Musset, II, pp. 162-163; Bacha, *Voyage*, pp. 119-123). What did he mean by “Church?” What “Shepherd” was he speaking about? How did he see “in the past?” Let us not forget the other part that “our Holy Father” is used much in the Greek Liturgy to designate priests and bishops: for example “Pater hagiè,” “Dhi Evkhon ton hagian Pateron imon...” etc...

⁴²⁹ “Sperano il Console, et i Missionarij, che da questo successo debba presto sortir l’unione, di tutte quelle tre nationi Orientali (= Syrians, Greeks and Armenians) alla S. Sede perche quanto à i Soriani quei, che prima per paura del Patriarca eretico erano catolici occulti, hoggi si sono manifestati cattolici. Si spera il medesimo di quei pochi, che restano... E quanto poi à gli altri essendo i Patriarchi Cattolici non consacreranno Vescovi, che non sian tali, ne questi promoveranno al Sacerdotio gli heretici, dal che ne seguirà anche la riduzione del Popolo...” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 42rv). This is the tactic that later would be applied by Euthymios Saifi in Saida and Damascus. Cf. C. Bacha, *History of the Greek Melkites* (Arabic), Saida 1938, pp. 466 ff. See *DHGE*, 16 (1967), col. 67: “Saifi sent his religious to preach in most of the eparchies of the patriarchate. He used this same tactic as well to designate one of them to be near the bishop of the diocese, to assist him, counsel him and when needed to take his place, and to succeed him.”

⁴³⁰ “Suggerisce riverentemente Monsignor Segretario, che quei Missionarij con la solita ardenza della Natione non contenti di aiutar la fede con gli ordinarij mezi spirituali, van procurando col denaro i mezi straordinarij con l’autorità del Turco, e veduto, che riusci bene à Monsù Picquet il far dare per questa strada il Vescovo Cattolico à Soriani come si è detto nella relatione si sono con l’istessi mezi avanzati à farlo fare Patriarca, mà da persone pratiche degli usi dell’Oriente, questo modo è sommamente biasimato; e se ne temono pessimi effetti, perche havendo con questo introdotto il turco à por le mani in queste materie, il che non haveva fatto sin’hora co’Cattolici, avverrà loro quello, che à tutte l’hore avviene à gli altri scismatici, Greci, Armeni, e Soriani, che frà poco si vederanno molti Vescovi, e Patriarchi deposti, e forse anche fatti morire, e posti in sedia hora un cattolico, hor’un Scismatico, secondo le maggiori offerte, che saran fatte da

alerted to the views of the secretary when he responded to their request to confirm the new Syro-Maronite Patriarch.⁴³¹

Carmelite Father Jerome of St. Therese went to Rome to obtain this confirmation and asked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for a chalice for Patriarch Macarios and one for the Armenian Patriarch Khachadour.⁴³² He informed the Roman authorities that these patriarchs were disposed to send two bishops to Rome to “render obedience” to the pope.⁴³³ On April 2, 1663 the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith responded to the desire of the Carmelite and ordered that the requested chalices be sent; they approved the idea that the Carmelites would send him the two bishops.⁴³⁴ However, the promised bishops were never sent.⁴³⁵

una parte, e dall'altra... Con questa medesima intentione insistono continuamente che si mandi denaro per sovvenir quei cattolici, et allettar con questo gli altri; ma se gli è sempre riposto, non giunger nuovo alla Congregazione, che con questo mezzo si convertirebbero tutti I Popoli dell'Oriente, che non sapendo communiemente quell che si credano, sono indifferenti à qualunque fede, alla quale poi di gran lunga antepongono l'interesse; mà ne questo modo, ne altro detto di sopra de Vescovi esser punto conforme all'Institutio Evangelico, che professa la Congregatione, ne alle sue forze, che devono abbracciar tutto il mondo, mà non se rendono capaci si come con fatica arrivo à capire l'istesso Picquet, quando fù qui, che per quel, che l'intende da persone di qualche prudenza hà con la sua larga pietà apportato in questo più danno, che utile, poiche havendo allettati quei Cattolici con questi sussidij, hoggi che non li ricenovo, se ne sdegnano, e si alienano da i Missionarij” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 43r-44r. Also see the attitude of Franciscan Fr. Lambert, Guardian in Aleppo and commissioner of the Holy Land in Syria, in *Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 44rv).

⁴³¹ “Concedatur Pallium, et Breve confirmationis pro novo Patriarcha cum solitis clausulis sanationis nullitatum... Moneantur prudenter (Missionarii) iuxta id adnotata à Secretario...” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 44rv).

⁴³² This Armenian patriarch who lived in Aleppo at this time sent a letter of obedience to Pope Alexander VII in 1662 (cf. footnote 427). In November 1666 he arrived in Rome with his son, his two nephews and a priest to make the profession of Catholic faith after having made it in writing one year earlier (*Acta*, vol. 35, fol. 320r-321r).

⁴³³ “Fr. Girolamo de S. Teresia Carmelitano Scalzo mandato quà dal nuovo Patriarca de Soriani per ottenergli la confermatione da S. Santità espone le seguenti istanze:

1) Che à i due Patriarchi de greci, e degli Armeni si mandino due calici. Dice Monsignor Segretatio (Mario Alberici), che il Signor Console Picquet fù vario in questa materia, quando si tratto d'invviare un regalo al Patriarca de Greci, perche prima disse, che non bisognava, e poi scrisse, che si, e la varietà nasce, perche il farlo unitamente con la risposta della lettera d'obediencia che scrivono, par che deroghi qualche poco al decoro della materia, e possa da Scismatici malignarsi di venalità quell'atto di obediencia che i Vescovi rendomo, all'incontro poi si sà, che con li Orientali non vi è miglior mezzo di questo per mantenerli in fede (cf. the response of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to the Maronite Patriarch George Bseb'eli (1637-1670) who had requested pontifical vestments, in *Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 100rv).

2) Che i medesimi Patriarchi hanno *pensiero* di mandar due Vescovi à render'obediencia à S. Santità, mà perche sarebbe forse difficile à rimandarli sodisfatti, come accade con gli Orientali poco capaci di ragione (beautiful compliment for the easterners who lived in Rome), quando la S. Congregatione non l'approvasse, esso ne parlà avvisato i Missionarij di Aleppo, i quali procuraranno destramente di dissuader-negli” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 63rv). Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 467. It seems that this same Carmelite Jerome also carried letters of the three Patriarchs, Syrian, Greek and Armenian, to Louis XIV. Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 477. New letters were confided to Consul Baron for the French king in February 1663. Cf. Rabbath, I, pp. 468-476. Macarios is content with exposing the misery in which the Christians of the east are found. Cf. *EO*, 27 (1928), p. 76; Musset, II, p. 163; Hajjar, op. cit., pp. 224 and 234; Rustum, p. 99.

⁴³⁴ “Quoad primum mittantur Calices petiti. Quoad secundum non impediuntur si velint aliquem hùc mittere” (*Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 64r).

⁴³⁵ Korolevsky (*DHGE*, III, col. 643) affirms: “Macarios decided in 1662 to write to Rome, waiting to hear if he should perhaps send two bishops carrying his profession of faith, which he did in fact in 1664.” Grumel (*EO*, 27, (1928), pp. 76-77) repeats this without verification. Musset (II, p. 163) bases himself on Korolevsky (*loc. cit.*) affirms: “Macarios had this profession of faith carried to Rome by two of his priests!”

Patriarch Macarios thought so much of the missionaries in Aleppo that he defended them against the Maronite Patriarch, George Bseb'eli (1657-1670) who had prohibited his faithful from receiving the sacraments from these missionaries. They were also not allowed to enter the Maronite Church in Aleppo.⁴³⁶ The Syrian and Armenian patriarchs followed the example of the Greek patriarch.⁴³⁷ The Greek patriarch was surprised by the unjustifiable measures of the Maronite Catholic Patriarch and wrote to him: “Since you have been one with the Franks for a long time, may Your Paternity with your faithful, follow the Franks in their feasts; since the aforesaid Frankish monks have always had ‘open eyes’ to assist and do good to Maronites especially in Aleppo. I can truly say that all the other nations respect yours because the Frankish monks are considered by all these nations as disciples of Jesus Christ — since Your Paternity, I say, forms a single entity with them, how is it possible that you have believed (some) ignorant words, and that you have separated yourself from them and that you now are the cause of trouble among the Christians of Aleppo...!”⁴³⁸ Macarios recognized the solidarity of all the Christians of his patriarchate, despite the diversity of the denominations. Even Calvinists in the East formed a single block with the other Christians in the event of calamity or deliberate slights, while in Europe the events were different at this time.⁴³⁹ The missionaries manifested their gratitude toward the Greek patriarch by asking the

Nasrallah (*Notes et Documents*, p. 138) wrote that “Macarios had to follow (the letter examined on May 22, 1662) with another, since the Congregation meeting of April 2, 1663 took note that Macarios was disposed to send two bishops to make the profession of faith in his name.” To reassure our historians, it is certain the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith only knew about two letters from Macarios from 1647 until 1672 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 17-43): that dated September 30, 1661 addressed to Pope Alexander VII (cf. footnote 425) and the other of December 14, 1663 addressed to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith that we will analyze later. Macarios never wrote on the subject of sending two bishops or two priests to Rome. It was the Carmelite Jerome of St. Therese who spoke of a “pensiero” which had the two patriarchs, Armenian and Greek, send two bishops to render obedience to the pope (cf. *Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 63v). Armenian Patriarch Khachadour went personally to Rome in November 1666 (cf. footnote 432). The Greek Patriarch Macarios sent no delegate to Rome. To affirm this we have consulted all the acts of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith from 1647 to 1673 (one year after the death of Macarios) as well as the *SOCG* correspondents.

⁴³⁶ We find in the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Scritture non riferite dal 1662 a tutto il 1707, Maroniti*, fol. 122r-123r) a “Copiah della lettera dell Ill.mo e Rev.mo Patriarcha de Greci all’Ill.mo e Rev.mo Patriarcha de Maroniti” from June 1638. This letter gives us a very exact idea on the situation of the Christians of Aleppo during the visit of Macarios to his native city beginning May 7, 1661. Cf. *Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 19r-20r.

⁴³⁷ *Scritture non referite*, vol. cit., fol. 124r-125r (that of Armenian Patriarch Khachadour of June 4, 1663) and fol. 126r-127v (that of Syrian Patriarch Andrew Akhi-John of June 15, 1663).

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 122rv: “Macario per là Misericordia di Dio Patriarcha de Greci e del resto dell Levante al virtuoso fratello nostro là gloria di tutti i Patriarchi suoi simili (!) Giorgio Patriarca de Maroniti là santità della quale voglia Dio moltiplicare. ... Essendo V.P. essendo (sic) dà longo tempo una *stessa cosa con i franchi*, essendo che V.P. et i suoi seguitano i Franchi nelle loro Feste, et altre cose, et i detti Religiosi Franchi havendo sempre gl’occhi aperti per dar soccorso, e far bene a’ Maroniti specialmente in Aleppo, e posso con verità dire che tutte a’ altre nazioni rispettavano là vostra per causa de detti Religiosi Franchi, i quali tutte quante le riguardavano come discepoli di Giesù Christo hora come V.P. stà una cosa con loro, come è possibile che Lei habbi dato fede alle parole di detti Ignoranti, e che Lei dà loro si sia separata, e che Lei addresso sij il soggetto d’una pace turbata frà tutti I christiani d’Aleppo...!”

⁴³⁹ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 211v: “Vien rappresentato dal Procuratore de Carmelitani Scalzi, che nelle parti di Levante quegli Eretici di Europa, che vi sono, si uniscono in difesa de Cattolici, fanno loro delle limosine...” The political rivalry separated them but evangelical charity united them.

Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith again for the printing of the Euchologion.⁴⁴⁰

These good relations between Macarios and the missionaries of the Roman Church had been so successful in mutual understanding that on December 14, 1663, Macarios wrote a letter to the Roman Congregation of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith which was thought to be more cordial than ecumenical.⁴⁴¹

“Glory to God always. Macarios, by the mercy of most High God, Patriarch of Antioch and all the East, to the Sacred Congregation excellent in virtue. ‘Salaam’ of our Master and God, our Lord Jesus Christ who took on Himself the salvation of our souls, and the grace of his Holy Spirit, conferred upon his holy disciples, the most pure apostles in the holy cenacle. May this divine peace and this very blessing descend always⁴⁴² on the souls and bodies of the spiritual brothers and fathers, the most reverend cardinals, heads of priests, accredited by God and authorities of the Holy Congregation in the city of Rome, mother of the Holy Cities. May the Lord God bless them and their actions by the most perfect celestial blessings, protect them, guard them by his strong arm and preserve them⁴⁴³ from all evil and heavenly or earthly calamities. May God grant all that we supplicate for these dear (persons) in our evening and daytime prayers and in the Divine Liturgies, through the intercession of our pure Lady and ever Virgin Mary, of the great Apostle, St. Peter, Coryphaeus of the Apostles,⁴⁴⁴ and all the saints. Amen.

“Besides this, we bring to the knowledge of Your Kindness and Holiness, first our great desire of seeing you. Then, if you deign, to inform you on the subject of our humble person, thank God and thanks to your prayers we bring you ourselves in good health. Lastly, we inform you that we received your letter which merits respect and honor,⁴⁴⁵ and we rejoiced greatly in it. Thanks to the translation of the brothers, Father Sylvester the Capuchin⁴⁴⁶ and Father John the Carmelite,⁴⁴⁷ we have understood its content, rendering

⁴⁴⁰ “Il Procuratore delle Missioni de Carmelitani scalzi supplica di ordinare, che si stampe in questa stamperia il libro delle orationi in Arabo del Patriarca de Greci di Aleppo, ch’è esaminato, e visto da Abramo Ecchellense.” The rescript was “Nihil.” (*Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 198r). In June 1663 the Latin version of this Arabic Euchologion was already finished (cf. *Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 121r).

⁴⁴¹ This is the second letter that Macarios wrote to Rome after that of September 1661 addressed to Pope Alexander VII (cf., footnote 425). It was written in Arabic and signed by the Patriarch on December 14, 1663. It is found in *SOCG*, vol. 240, fol. 44v-45r. An Italian version of this letter is found in the same volume fol. 42rv. We attempt to give here a French version, the most literal possible, of which one should excuse the semiticisms.

⁴⁴² The original Arabic adds: “and continues all month long, the through the centuries and years” which we have omitted for simplicity.

⁴⁴³ The original says: “by his strong right hand and preserve their kindness.”

⁴⁴⁴ We find in the original text the Greek word “Apostoloi” written in Arabic: “Zaim arrousol al-apostolie.” It concerns an intentional repetition to underline the word “apostle.”

⁴⁴⁵ Letter of Pope Alexander VII of July 22, 1662, perhaps signed also by the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Cf. footnote 425.

⁴⁴⁶ It concerns the famous Sylvester of S. Aignan who was a missionary in the east since 1630. Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 197, fol. 107r-112v.

⁴⁴⁷ This is Fr. John of Lyon who translated the same year (1663) from Latin into Arabic a resume of the councils from Nicea until Florence and title it: “Kitab al-Misbah allameh fi targamat il-Magameh.” We find a description of this manuscript of Deir esh-Shir (Lebanon) in *Al-Maçarrat*, 1923, p. 736.

thanks to the most High Creator for your good health, and we thank Your Kindness, who wishes to console us by this letter which is a great joy to us. In it you mention that you were apprised from the mouth of Consul Picquet⁴⁴⁸ of our great love for the Apostolic See, our application and all our intentions for the holy union: union of the Eastern Church to the Roman Church.⁴⁴⁹ Yes, we maintain our word and this profession until the last breath of our life, why not!⁴⁵⁰

“You have perhaps learned about our great love for your disciples, the brothers, the Capuchins and Carmelites, their continual frequenting of our church and their visits in the homes of our Greek faithful, to whom they preach and teach. We are pleased with all this and we have been waiting for it for a long time.⁴⁵¹

“Yes, we ask our Lord Jesus Christ, source of every good thing and of all holiness, to destroy the wall,⁴⁵² the barrier of enmity erected between us and you by the (diabolic) enemy of all good. In fact, since this separation,⁴⁵³ the affairs of the Christians of the Eastern Church have declined to dispersion and to destruction. This is what we admit and confess. This is what we always preach and instruct our flock.

“You have observed that the Roman Church is mother of all the faithful, that it loves the children of the Greeks for whom it has built a college⁴⁵⁴ and that it loves the Christians of the East for whom it always cared for by sending priests to enlighten them and instruct them. We understand that, my brothers. For this reason we implore our Creator and our Lord Jesus Christ, head of the Holy Church, that He strengthen the

⁴⁴⁸ François Picquet arrived in Rome in May 1662 carrying the letter of Macarios with the 2 Arabic manuscripts of the Euchologion and Horologion. Cf. Acta, vol. 31, fol. 100r-101r.

⁴⁴⁹ We see that there was a great difficulty between the oral message that Macarios had confided to Picquet and what he let Rome know. In fact the letter of Pope Alexander VII of July 22, 1662 affirms that Macarios recognized “Ecclesiam Romanam aliarum omnium Caput et Magistram” (cf. footnote 425).

⁴⁵⁰ Macarios clearly shows his irrevocable intention to reconcile the two Churches, Eastern and Western. He professes the future union and not the present!

⁴⁵¹ Macarios found very normal that the priests of the Roman Church could frequent the Orthodox churches and instruct the Greek faithful. He even found it recommendable since he waited for it a long time.

⁴⁵² Same expression in Vatican II decree “Unitatis Redintegratio,” No. 18: “Sacrosanta Synodus sperat fore, ut sublato pariete occidentalem orientalemque Ecclesiam dividente, unica tandem fiat mansio angulari fermata lapide, Christo Jesu, qui faciet utraque unum” (cf. Council of Florence, session VI (1439), Definition “Laetentur Coeli,” in Mansi, vol. 31, col. 1026 E).

⁴⁵³ Macarios sees himself integral with the separation of 1054 between Rome and Constantinople, even if no official bilateral excommunication exists between Rome and Antioch!

⁴⁵⁴ This is the College of St. Athanasius of Rome, founded in 1576 by Pope Gregory XIII. Cf. Fr. De Meester, *Le Collège Pontifical grec de Rome*, Rome 1910. Compare with C. Tsourkas, *Les débuts de l'enseignement philosophique et de la libre pensée dans les Balkans*, Thessalonica 1967, p. 21. Z. Tspirpanlis, *Le Collège Grec de Rome et ses élèves (1576-1700). Contribution à l'étude de la politique éducative du Vatican*, Thessalonica 1980. Around 1630 we find a Greek Melkite from Tripoli, Giovanni Elia, who completed 4 years of study in this college. But the Greek Melkites of the Patriarchate of Antioch began to frequent the College of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1640 after the foundation of the School of S. Honophrius. It is necessary to wait for the year 1743 to examine the question of sending the Greek Melkites to the Greek College, after it was discovered that they had the same rite as the Greeks! Cf. SC, *Greci Melchiti, Miscellanea*, vol. IV, A. 3, art. XIV of “Ristretto delli Dubij da esaminarsi nella Congregazione Particolare de Propaganda Fide deputata dalla Santità di N.S. Papa Benedetto XIV intorno alle materie de' Greci melchiti.”

Roman Church, elevate its grandeur, consolidate it for the end of ages and guard our master and our father, the honored pope, its head and our head over all,⁴⁵⁵ wishing that you be always preserved from all evil. Amen

“Brothers, we have asked you not to forget us in your prayers, because we have many concerns and pain each day, especially because of debts, their interest and continual humiliations. This is why we have neither tranquility nor stability, and we are anxious and sad. Since the Apostolic Roman Church, solid and rich, gave innumerable alms, we ask it to think of us in its continuous benefits. In fact, since children always have the habit of asking for nourishment from their mother, we also ask our mother to think of us in her mercy, as it is said in the holy law: it is the duty of the rich church to aid the poor church. We do not have the right to submit this to Your Fraternity, but necessity and love have obliged us to address ourselves to you without any obstacle.

“As for Mr. Consul Baron⁴⁵⁶ who is in Aleppo, we thank you for his generosity because he has been very useful to us, and he continues to assist us by his benefits, especially in the difficult times. May our Lord Jesus Christ repay him in his heavenly kingdom after many and happy days for his efforts and generosity toward us. We thank you also for the beautiful chalice which we received.⁴⁵⁷ May God guard you and multiply your goodness. We wish that you continue your benevolence towards us by pursuing the printing of the Arabic books⁴⁵⁸ and sending them to us, because they are a great good and always a memorable gift for these poor priests.

“We have ended the present address to Your Kindness. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be always with you. Amen. Amen. Amen. With our wishes.

“Written December 14, one thousand six hundred sixty-three A.D. in the God-protected city, Aleppo.”⁴⁵⁹

This letter had remained in Aleppo at least until the month of April 1664⁴⁶⁰ so that it could probably be sent with a formulary of profession of faith signed by Macarios himself.⁴⁶¹ On January 19, 1665, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith

⁴⁵⁵ Macarios makes a distinction between the head of the Holy Church who is Christ and the head of the Roman Church, the pope.

⁴⁵⁶ Successor to Picquet of Aleppo since the end of 1661.

⁴⁵⁷ This is the chalice requested by Carmelite Jerome of St. Therese when he went to Rome in April 1663 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 32, fol. 63r-64r).

⁴⁵⁸ The Euchologion and Horologion, See footnote 448.

⁴⁵⁹ The letter bears the traditional signature of the Patriarchs of Antioch, in imposing Greek letters and difficultly comprehensible.

⁴⁶⁰ In fact this was the vicar of the Carmelites of Aleppo, François of the Passion, who sent this letter to Rome with another of the Syrian Patriarch Akhi-John dated March 4, 1664, three others of Syrian Archbishop Behennam dated April 3, 1664 and the profession of faith of these prelates. Cf. *Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 203r-205r; *SO CG*, vol. 240, fol. 38v-53r. Compare with *Acta*, vol. 34, fol. 3v.

⁴⁶¹ After Korolevsky (*DHGE*, III, col. 643), many have affirmed that Macarios sent his profession of Catholic faith to Rome, carried by two bishops or two priests (cf. Musset, II, p. 163; F. Taoutel, *Contribution à l'histoire d'Alep*, I, Beirut 1958, p. 35; Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, p. 138). What is excluded definitely is that this delegation of Macarios never existed. It was Carmelite Father François of

learned about the philo-Roman sentiments of this Orthodox patriarch and was content to note: “Monsignor Macarios, Patriarch of the Greeks in Aleppo, wrote, having made his profession of faith and sent a copy of it. He relates the difficulties in which he is found with the Greeks because of taxes and some charges which must be paid and he asks to be helped. He praised the piety of Consul Baron who helped him by some benefits and finally was thankful for the chalice sent by the Sacred Congregation.”⁴⁶² The complete profession of faith of Macarios was sent to the Holy Office.⁴⁶³ Those in charge of this Congregation did not react in any way to this profession of faith of Macarios, while the same formulary signed by the Armenian Patriarch Khachadour in 1664 aroused their review; this obliged the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to ask Khachdour for a new profession of faith, the one reserved to Eastern bishops.⁴⁶⁴

the Passion who was charged to send to Rome the letter of Macarios of December 14, 1663 with those of the Syrian prelates (*SOCG*, vol. 240, fol. 50r and 41v). What remains ambiguous is Macarios’ profession of faith. On August 2, 1664, Capuchin Sylvester of St. Aignan wrote to M. Gazil, superior of foreign missions: “Fr. Jerome, Carmelite, sent to Alexander VII to obtain the confirmation of Andrew, carried a formula of profession of faith to have it translated into Syriac, Arabic and Armenian, and to have it signed the three whom you know (i.e. Syrian, Greek and Armenian patriarchs), and that they had made voluntarily and have constituted Fr. Jerome their procurer to the pope (rather Fr. François of the Passion).” Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 467. This account agrees with the “copy of profession of faith” that the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith said to have received. But neither the letter of Macarios nor the four letters of the Syrian prelates mention the existence of such a profession, while the Syrian Patriarch clearly wrote: “Mando all’Eminenze Vostre la mia professione di fede, et il giuramento di fedeltà, insieme con la professione di fede del mio fratello Arcivescovo, quale fece nelle mie mani. Et ambidue habbiamo sodisfatto à questi nostri obblighi innanzi al Santissimo Sacramento in presenza de PP. Missionarij Carmelatani Scalzi, e Capuccini” (*SOCG*, vol. 24, fol. 48v-49r). Meanwhile the pro-secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Antonio Manfroni, notes on the back of Macarios’ letter: “Lettera del patriarca de’Greci in Aleppo scrive d’haver fatta la sua professione della fede, e ne manda Copia.” Thus there are two different things: a letter and a copy of the profession of faith (cf. *Ibid.*, fol. 46r). All this leads us to say that Macarios secretly signed the formula carried by Carmelite Jerome at the beginning of 1664. This formula had been prepared in 1633 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 8, fol. 235v) and signed among others by the Patriarchs of Constantinople Athanasios Patellaros and Cyril of Berrhea in 1635 (cf. *Acta*, vol. 10, fol. 347r and 348r).

⁴⁶² *Acta*, vol. 34, fol. 3v; *SOCG*, vol. 240, fol. 46r: “Monsignor Macario Patriarca de Greci in Aleppo scrive d’haver fatta la sua Professione delle fede e ne manda copia. Dà parte de travagli, ne quali si trova insieme con i greci per l’impositioni e gravezze, che patiscono, e supplica d’esser sovvenuto. Commenda la pietà del Console Barone per haverli aiutato con le sue carità e finalmente ringratia del Calice mandatogli dalla S. Congregatione.”

⁴⁶³ The letter on which is written the summary of Macarios’ letter bears these words: “19 Jan. 1665. Ad S. officium Manfronus Prosecretarius” (*Ibid.*, fol. 47v). What corresponds to the rescript of the Congregation meeting 91 of the same date (*Acta, loc. cit.*). Korolevsky wrote (*DHGE*, III, col. 643): “this profession was given back to the Holy Office: the absolute secrecy which surrounds this Congregation, even for purely historical matters, does not allow us to know the continuation of what was given to this approach.” In 1970 we presented on our behalf an official request to this Congregation. No response was given to us! Perhaps the not so comprehensible signature of Macarios remains difficult to identify, if however the profession of faith exists! In 1670 Capuchin Joseph Antoine Romano, missionary in Georgia, made this request to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith: “che le sia mandato l’originale o copia della Professione della fede, che il Patriarca d’Antiochia mando anni sono al”EE.VV. per poter rendere capaci in Principi della Giorgia, e li Vescovi, che non sono cosi ostianti come gl’Armeni.” The Congregation meeting of May 30, 1672 wrote this rescript: “Annuerunt” (*Acta*, vol. 42, fol. 127v-128r). It is certainly a matter of the ordinary formula imposed on Eastern bishops who unite with Rome. This text shows that the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was convinced that Macarios had made the profession of faith!

⁴⁶⁴ “Arrivo in Roma li giorni passati (November 1666) Monsignor Kacciaturo Patriarca degl’Armeni in Aleppo con un figliolo, due Npoti, et un Perte, che gli serve d’interprete, e si trattienne à S. Maria

Meanwhile, Macarios went to Moscow with Patriarch Paisios of Alexandria at the invitation of Tsar Alexis to depose the dauntless Patriarch Nikon in 1667.⁴⁶⁵ In 1665 and 1669 he passed through Georgia where the Orthodox hierarchy recognized a certain patriarchal jurisdiction in him.⁴⁶⁶ In Moscow he tried to ask the King of Poland, John Casimir, to be the intermediary between the Roman Church and the Eastern Church in view of union,⁴⁶⁷ while the first Greek edition of the *Orthodox Confession* was prepared at Amsterdam with the signature of four Eastern patriarchs.⁴⁶⁸

Eglittiaca... La cagione della sua venuta dice esser satat per prestare personalmente obediencia à S. Santità, il che havena di già fatto l'anno passato con la professione della fede che trasmise, mà essendosi questa trasmessa al S. Offitio, vi hanno i Qualificatori notato alcune parole in margine, che pero se gli farà far di nuovo conforme alla solita formola de I Vescovi Orientali” (*Acta*, vol. 35, fol. 320rv).

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. P. Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, IV, Paris 1907, p. 42. Patriarch of Constantinople, Dionysios III, who feared traveling to Moscow in order not to have the same fate as Parthenios III who was hung on March 24, 1657, sent Macarios as his representative. Present also were Ananias, Archbishop of Mount Sinai (cf. De la Croix, *Etat présent des nations*, Paris 1695, pp. 120-122) and Paisos Ligarides, Archbishop of Gaza (cf. P. Pierling, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-48; C. Tsourkas, *op. cit.*, p. 146; SOCG, vol. 442, fol. 233r; Arch. Prop., Congr. Part. 1667 etc., vol. 21, fol. 143r-144v). On the subject of this synod see Rustum, pp. 59-60.

⁴⁶⁶ A letter of Capuchin Charles-Marie de S. Marino, missionary in Georgia, informed the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1665 “che i Giorgiani osservano il Rito Greco scismatico in lingua Giorgiana, e professano tutti gl’errori de Greci, riconoscendo per loro superiore immediato il Patriarca di Antiochia secondo i canoni del Concilio Niceno” (*Acta*, vol. 34, fol. 250v-251r). Note that the Council of Nicea did not clarify the area of the territory of Antioch. It was only around the end of the 5th century that the new ecclesiastical organization, undertaken under King Vachtang, imposed on the Catholicos of Georgia to receive his chirotonia (ordination) at Antioch (cf. article “Georgia,” in *Enciclopedia Cattolica*, 6 (1951) 65). Besides the baptisms that he administered to many Georgians, Macarios inspired there a great sympathy toward the Roman Church. Thus the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Jerome Casanate, referred the matter on November 28, 1667: “Monsignor Arcivescovo d’Iscanio in Giorgia di Rito Greco, il quale d’ordine do N. Signore (pope) è trattenuto da alcune settimane in questo Collegio, hà fatto la Professione Cattolica avanti il Signor Cardinal Barberino, et io ho havuto ordine d’introdurlo da S. Santità. Dovendo egli pertanto partire di ritorno in Giorogia, sicome egli desidera di fare quanto prima, rappresenta all’EE. VV. che per mantenerlo ben’affetto alla Chiesa Romana e perche possa difendere i Missionarij della S. Congregatione dalla persecutione de’ Vescovi Scismatici, converrebbe di dargli qualche dimonstratione, benche’egli non domandi sè non qualche cosa di devotione, et i seguenti libri per sua instruttione...” (*Acta*, vol. 36, fol. 245rv). And in 1670 the missionaries in Georgia hoped: “che quel Regno alla morte d’un certo tiranno Patriarca, che và ricinoscendo il Patriarca d’Antiochia, sendo del rito Greco, sia per farsi tutto cattolico. Che pero supplica (Fr. Joseph Antoine Romano) le sia mandato l’originale o copia della Professione della fede, che il Patriarca d’Antiochia mando anni sono all’ EE. VV. per poter rendere capaci i Principi della Giorgia, e li Vescovi, che non sono cosi ostinati come gl’Armeni” (*Acta*, vol. 43, fol. 127v). Even Capuchin Sylvester of St. Aignan was convinced that “il Patriarca delli greci è andato in Giorgia ove con la sua prudentia e zelo catolico và confermando appresso quei popoli il bene principiato dalli nostri missionarij (= Capuchins)” (*SO CG*, vol. 240, fol. 59r). Moreover, French Consul of Aleppo Baron wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1666: “Quello (= Patriarch Macarios III Zaim) dei Greci era andato in Giorgia, dove havera operato molti beni” (*Acta*, vol. 35, fol. 320v). “*The History of the Conversion of the Georgians to Christianity*” (*Vat. Arab.* No. 689) written by Macarios on his return from Georgia in 1669, was published by O. Lebedev (Rome 1905). On the subject of the travels of Macarios in Georgia see Le Quien, II, col. 774; T. Jordania, *Chronicles* (in Georgian), II, Tiflis 1893, p. 482. Concerning the “catholicizing” influence of Macarios in Georgia, see *EO 27* (1928) 77; Musset, II, p. 163; Rustum, p. 60 where we find the titles used by Macarios of Antioch: “Patriarch of Antioch, of the Syrian countries and all the Georgian and eastern regions”!

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. P. Pierling, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-48; *Arch. Prop. Congr. Part.* 1667 etc... vol. 21, fol. 139v-140v. It is the Nuncio of Poland Pignatelli (future Pope Innocent XII) who wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1668: “Mi dicono d’avantaggio i sudetti Ambasciatori (= Stanislas Beniewski and Cyprian

On his return to Syria, Macarios continued his good relations with the Latin missionaries without making any public act of union with the Roman Church.⁴⁶⁹ At the request of the French Ambassador, De Nointel and the insistence of the anti-Calvinists, on several occasions he signed some documents manifesting the Orthodox faith in order to corroborate the proofs of the perpetuity of the Catholic faith.⁴⁷⁰

Neither Macarios nor his delegates were at the Synod of Jerusalem on March 20, 1672.⁴⁷¹ On June 12 of the same year, the great Patriarch of Antioch died in Damascus, truly poisoned like his teacher Euthymios II Karmeh.⁴⁷² From then on, the students of the

Brestowski, both Polish), che quand' essi s'abboccarono con l'accennati Patriarchi (= Macarios of Antioch and Paisios of Alexandria) d'esser stati da medesimi pregati à voler ricavar dal Rè (= John Casimir) qualche dichiarazione per lettera se voglia esser mediatore presso la Sede d'Apostolica, accio da essa siano ricevuti all'Unione della Santa Romana Chiesa." Pignatelli also does not believe it! (*Ibid.*, fol. 141v). Cf. also *Acta*, vol. 43, fol. 315r-317r; Korolevsky, *Manuel d'Histoire Russe*, Paris, 1948, pp. 161-180.

⁴⁶⁸ The orthodox confession of Moghila, corrected in 1642 by Syrigos, remained "more than twenty years buried in the archives of the Patriarchate" of Constantinople and was not seen until 1667 at Amsterdam. It was the famous Panagiotis who printed it with the signatures of the four eastern patriarchs, Parthenios of Constantinople, Joannicos of Alexandria, Macarios of Antioch and Paisios of Jerusalem with the date of March 11, 1643. It was this date that several authors kept for the signature of the four patriarchs (cf. Malvy-Viller, *La Confession orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila*, OC, 10 (1927) p. LXII; Jugie, in his article "Moghila" in DThC; T. Ionesco, *La vie et l'oeuvre de Pierre Movila*, Paris 1944, p. 173; B. Schultz, article "Moghila" in *Enciclopedia cattolica*, 8 (1952) 1206-1207; J. Karmiris in *ERM*, 8 (1966) 1240-1242). Others place the approbation of Patriarch Macarios on March 13, 1663 (cf. Grumel, *EO* 27 (1928) 77; H. Zayat, *Al-Machreq*, 30 (1932) 884; Musset, II, p. 163). We have shown above that the approbation of Macarios of Antioch could not have taken place in 1643 (cf. above Chapter IV, footnote 340). Moreover, on March 13, 1663 Macarios did not participate in any synod of Constantinople since he was then in Aleppo (see footnotes 437 and 441), and no historical witness shows us that a copy of the Confession of Moghila was given to him to sign! The letter of the Ambassador of Nointel of September 29, 1671 to the Port Royalists gives some explanations on the signers of the approbation of this confession. Macarios of Antioch is not mentioned here; Parthenios of Constantinople is Parthenios the Younger, raised to the patriarchate in 1644 (cf. Malvy-Viller, *op. cit.* pp. LXXVII-LXXVIII) and not Parthenios the Elder (July 1, 1639- before September 8, 1644); cf. Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 438)! Panagiotis compiled the names of the eastern patriarchs well known in the west without realizing if they were contemporary of if they were patriarchs in 1643!

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. The testimony of Jesuit Nau in Rustum (p. 98). In 1670 Capuchin John Baptist of St. Aignan praised the patriarch of the Greeks (*Acta*, vol. 39, fol. 104v). On August 3, 1671, the account of Carmelite Joseph Ange di Gesu Maria, missionary in Aleppo, was read at the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith: "I Patriarchi delle tre nazioni, greca, armena, e maronita, i quali si stendono in Aleppo sono cattolico. I primi due *secretamente* ne han fatto la professione; l'ultimo con pubblicità la professa" (*Acta*, vol. 41, fol. 253v). Macarios, with his clergy of Aleppo, was even present at the funeral of the famous missionary Sylvester of St. Aignan (*Ibid.*, fol. 28rv).

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. Le Quien, II, col. 773 where two anti-Calvinist witnesses of Macarios are mentioned, from October 20 and December 19, 1671 (citing the book of *la Perpétuité* of the Port-Royalists). Aymon (*op. cit.*, pp. 457-497) cites the orthodox witness of Macarios of October 20, November 15 and December 5, 1671, by treating it because of this "ignorant and extravagant." Rustum (pp. 67-74 gives the original Arabic text of the two witnesses, written and pointed out by Macarios on October 20 and November 15, 1671. Cf. also A. Rabbath in *Al-Machreq* 1907, pp. 766-773 and 795-802.

⁴⁷¹ Cf. Rustum, p. 74; C. Papadopoulos, *Dositheos in Nea Sion* 1907, pp. 97- 168. Rustum (pp. 75-96) gives the Arabic version of the confession of faith of Dositheos. Cf. the Greek text in Kimmel, I, pp. 325-488.

⁴⁷² Cf. Rustum, p. 103. Euthymios II Karmeh and Macarios III Zaim were metropolitans of Aleppo, Patriarchs of Antioch and victims of their philo-Roman tendencies. See above Chapter III. The grandson of

missionaries began to occupy the patriarchal throne of Antioch, finally allowing a student of the College of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to take the throne in 1724. This date inaugurated the split of the Patriarchate of Antioch into two branches.⁴⁷³

4) The Greeks of Antioch on the way to Catholicization under Macarios.

A year before his death, Francesco Ingoli, the first secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, delivered to the cardinals of this congregation the fruit of his long experiences on the conversion of some Christians of the East. He believed it was necessary to instruct the young men by opening schools, especially in the large cities of Aleppo, Diarbaker and Aspahan, for through them a new generation could be prepared.⁴⁷⁴ The views of Ingoli had the greatest success that the history of the missionaries had known. In 1660, Jesuit Father Besson related: “Father Queyrot left several heirs of his virtue, among whom are one thousand excellent students, who brought the Catholic religion to blossom in the midst of schism, and notably changed the face of these Churches.”⁴⁷⁵ Henceforth, the missionaries could count on the young Greeks who were formed by them in the large cities of Syria: Aleppo, Damascus, Saida and Tripoli.⁴⁷⁶ This was not enough: it was necessary to convert the older and more influential people so that they would not have the time to destroy what the missionaries had built. All the more, the missionary activity in the east was now being defamed in the west and the appearance of *Holy Syria* by Fr. Besson in 1660 was necessary to calm the spirits.⁴⁷⁷

Macarios, the future Patriarch Cyril V Zaim (1682-1720), wrote to Pope Clement XI on August 20, 1716 on the subject of the philo-Roman tendencies of his grandfather who wanted to go to Rome after his return from Russia in 1669 to “establish charity and peace,” but he feared being considered “Frank” by the Greeks and did not go (Rustum, pp. 120-123).

⁴⁷³ Cf. “*Antioch*,” *DHGE* III, col. 643-650; De Vries, pp. 88-91; Rustum, pp. 103-151; Musset, II, pp. 164-181; Nasrallah, *S. B. Maximos IV et la succession apostolique du siege d’Antioche*, Paris 1963, pp. 36-90; compare with: *SC, Greci Melchiti, Miscellanea “causa de’Greci Melchiti 1743,”* fol. 2v-16v where we find the “serie storica delle perturbazioni occorse nel Patriarcato Antiocheno de’Greci.”

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. *SOCG*, vol. 24r and 28v: “Positione per far tre collegietti” of March 16, 1648. For the foundation of these three colleges he gives the following reasons: “perche questi giovani ben addottrinati farebbero più frutto colle loro nationi, che ne fanno li missionarij forestieri, da quali subito pensano esser ingannati, e con difficoltà, e con avversione vengono sentiti... Delli giovani in detti collegietti si potrà far scielta di soggetti di miglior ingegno, e questi istrutti nella lingua latina mandarli agl’Alunnati del Signor Car. Di S. Honofrio... Quanto alli collegietti, si potrà far la prova per adesso in 3 città cioè in Aleppo in Diarbecher et in Aspahan Città grandissime e di popoli diversi” (cf. also in the same volume, fol. 494r and 503v). The instruction of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in the year 1659 reflects the ideas of Ingoli. Cf. *Collectanea*, I, p. 43.

⁴⁷⁵ Besson, p. 72 (cf. the Italian translation of 1662, p. 59). Besson adds to page 157: “of 1000 students we have formed in our school of Damascus and who are today (in 1660) the flower of Christina youth, not perverted, although the attacks are strong and the persecutions very violent.” (Compare with the translation of Anturini, p. 125).

⁴⁷⁶ Cf. above Chapter IV: “Beginning of the Roman crusade.” See especially De Vries, p. 320. A rich bibliography is found here. Note this perspicacious consideration of the author: “Sehr bezeichnend ist es, dass die Missionare in den Schulen, die sie gründeten, auch in den einfachen Elementarschulen, der Jugend sofort die lateinsche Sprache beibrachten. Das war für sie also ein notwendiges Mittel, um an das echte Christentum, das lateinische, heranzukommen.”

⁴⁷⁷ Soon the translation of G. Anturini saw the day. It bears a very long title: “Soria Santa overo racconto breve di varij avvenimenti curiosi, e pij accaduti da pochi anni in quà in Soria, specialmente in Aleppo, Damasco, Sidone, Tripoli, e Monte Libano.” We find several variants here. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was not current on these publications until the moment when they received the

Individual conversions of the Greeks in Aleppo were very rare until 1651, because the people feared the excommunication of the bishop and the accusation to the Turks.⁴⁷⁸ In 1653, French Consul Picquet arrived in Aleppo. Until 1661 he favored the Latins, Maronites and new converts to Catholicism among the Jacobites and Armenians.⁴⁷⁹ Among the Greeks there were only sympathizers who assisted from time to time in some dogmatic discussions and agreed with the Latin missionaries.⁴⁸⁰ In 1660 and 1661, the general distress and the martyrdom of the Greek David brought the Greeks and Latin missionaries together.⁴⁸¹ The presence of Patriarch Macarios in the Church of the Jacobites at the enthroning of the Catholic Patriarch, Andre Akhi-John, had a great effect on the Greek clergy and faithful present.⁴⁸² These clergy and people received the

accusations of other missionaries against the writings of the Jesuit Fathers who attributed to themselves all the glory of the conversions in the east. Cf. Congregation meeting of March 14, 1672 and that of September 23, 1673. Once cannot deny that the Jesuits were particularly instrumental in the conversion of the Syrians and Armenians of Aleppo (Cf. *Acta*, vol. 43, fol. 326r-327v). Thus the entire part concerning the Greeks in the book of Besson remains worthy of faith.

⁴⁷⁸ Sylvester of St. Aignan wrote from Aleppo on May 22, 1651: “gli Patriarchi delli Syriani et Armeni sono molto ignoranti e vilani. Gli patriarchi delli greci sono piu litterati, benche tutta la scienza loro consista nel leggere e scrivere, son piu cortesi e polliti che tutti gli altri. Quanto al frutto che si po far tra lorj, dico a S.S. Em.ma che delli greci pochi si convertino, perche hanno paura delli Vescovi loro lequali subito che sanno che qualch’uno si è fatto catholico lo minacciano della excommunicata et accusano alla giutitia Turchesca e percio non ardiscono di farsi catholici. Con tutto cio ve ne sono qualch’uni” (*SOCCG*, vol. 197, fol. 108r). Two years later, Jesuit Nicolas Poiresson gave an account to Fr. François Annat, Provincial of the Province of France, in which he wrote: “The Greek heretics remain. Although in the past more contrary to the Franks, nevertheless under a metropolitan (metropolitan who succeeded Zaim on November 21, 1647: cf. Radu, pp. 55 and 63-64) more affectionate who speak of the pope with honor, without however declaring himself Catholic, there are some converted this year (= 1652).” Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 56.

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. J. Hajjar, *Les Chrétiens Uniates du Proche-Orient*, Paris 1962, pp. 222-223; G. Goyau, François Picquet, *Consul de Louis XIV en Alep*, Geuthner 1942. On June 29, 1656, Piquet succeeded to make Akhi-John bishop of the Syrians of Aleppo by the Maronite patriarch (Rabbath, I, pp. 94-96 and 453-454). Cf. also V. Cerri, *Etat present de l’Eglise Romaine dans toutes les parties du monde*, Amsterdam 1716, p. 153.

⁴⁸⁰ On June 11, 1656, Carmelite Joseph of Santa Maria, missionary in Aleppo, wrote to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to manifest the affection that the Christians of Aleppo had toward his confrere, Fr. Bruno of Sant’Yvone. Even the Greek metropolitan and his clergy wanted to keep this Carmelite in Aleppo by affirming: “il Padre Bruno insegnava la purità dell’evangelio alle sue genti” (*SOCCG*, vol. 197, fol. 149rv). On this occasion Fr. Joseph made this judgment on the city of Aleppo: “D’Aleppo accenno in compendio quanto passa, perche quivi è il fior delle missioni per la varietà, è moltitudine grande de popoli, che vi si trovano, essendo per voce commune delle prime città di tutta l’Asia senza eccezione veruna” (*Ibid.*, fol. 176r). In this era Aleppo counted more than 15 thousand Greek Melkites. Concerning the discussions between the missionaries and Greeks there, see *Acta*, vol 29, fol. 307v-309r. In 1660 the Syrian Archbishop of Aleppo Akhi-John had a discussion with the clergy of Aleppo on the incarnation. After this discussion remained “solo due sacerdoti Soriani, due altri Armeni e tutti li Greci, li quali di accordo confessarono, che l’Arcivescovo havera riportata la vittoria contro gli heretici, con che dice (Consul Picquet) restar quelle nationi con *altro concetto* di quell, che havevano prima della fede cattolica” (*Ibid.*, fol. 308r); compare with Rabbath I, pp. 453-454. “We recognize here the truthfulness of the Catholic doctrine on the incarnation and the qadi himself, by an official piece, established this victory of the archbishop!” (Musset, II, p. 222). Note that the qadi was Muslim.

⁴⁸¹ Cf. above footnote 413; Rustum, p. 99. The missionaries with Consul Picquet assisted the Christians of Aleppo very much during the persecutions. The effect of this evangelical charity was translated by the letters of thanks sent to the pope and King of France (see above footnotes 415 and 420). Cf. also *Arch. Prop., Scritture non riferite dal 1622 a tutto 1707, Maroniti*, fol. 122rv.

⁴⁸² Cf. above footnotes 426 and 427. In fact Macarios was accompanied by the clergy of Aleppo and by a “large group of the people” (Rabbath, I, p. 466).

missionaries into their homes and often saw them present in their churches.⁴⁸³ The letters of Macarios, sent from Aleppo to the pope and King of France,⁴⁸⁴ did not have a great effect in Aleppo, since all was done secretly in agreement with the missionaries.⁴⁸⁵ Several times they asked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to print the Euchologion and Horologion sent to Rome by Macarios in order to be a good sign to the clergy of Aleppo, but their requests were doomed to failure.⁴⁸⁶ In 1664 they began to lose a little prestige with the Roman Church in view of the ordination of a bigamous Maronite, since the Maronites were considered of the Roman Rite.⁴⁸⁷ It was in 1674 that a Greek Aleppian archpriest made his profession of Catholic faith.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸³ Cf. above the letter of Macarios to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of December 14, 1663. Macarios himself knew about it and approved it.

⁴⁸⁴ Letters of November 29, 1663 and February 15, 1663 to the King of France, and those of September 30, 1661 and December 14, 1663 to Rome. (Cf. Rabbath, I, pp. 473-476; *Al-Machreq*, 30 (1932), P. 882; *EO*, 27 (1928), p. 75).

⁴⁸⁵ The missionaries of Aleppo had expressed this recommendation: “to prevent that he may speak in any public memory of the letters of these patriarch (=Greek and Armenian) and of their reunion to the Holy See” (Rabbath, I, p. 476).

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 31, fol. 152rv; vol. 33, fol. 198r; vol. 37, fol. 94r-95r. In 1668 the superiors of the missions of Aleppo, Jesuit Nicolas Poirresson, Capuchin Sylvester of St. Aignan and Carmelite Anselm of the Annunciation wrote two letters on this subject, one to the pope and the other to the Cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith: “Postulamus ad eiusdem fidei tuitionem et amplificatonem non parum profuturum in primis vero ut typis mandentur incunctanter imperio suo (= of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) et sacri senatus cura prelatorii libri duo, Patriarchae Graecorum Antiocheni quos Romam ante plures annos et misit et excudendos epistola (= that of Pope Alexander VII of July 22, 1662) illinc allata accepit; favet enim ille ipse *ac graecus populus prope universus* rei catholicae in dies magis eoque beneficio Sanctae Sedis obstrictior facta ecclesia graeca, Romanae eiusque Capiti auscultabit proclivius...” (*SOCCG*, vol. 40, 240, fol. 196r). The second: “Ecclesia Roamana, qua Divino iure Universalis toto orbe exporrigi debet, reapse ubique floreat et late dominetur. Aget et ipse quo mandetur executioni gratia repromissa Graecorum Patriarchae Antiocheno, do excludendo typis uno et altro volumine ecclesiasticarum precum, ut si necdum opus inchoatum, aut si coeptum non perfectum usque est, adlaboretur hoc studiosus quod iam quinque anni (rather six years) current ex quibus libri Romam transmissi, pauciores quidem ex quibus rescriptum illinc est, annuendum petitionis eius, qui primariae dignitatis inter Patriarchas Orientis, haud parum Sanctae Sedis devotus Venerationi, non videatur contemnendus quin imo eo pluris faciendus quo amplius profuturus aut obfuturus orthodoxis in quamcumque partem, aequus aut iniquus inclinaverit” (*Ibid.*, fol. 190v). But it was necessary to wait until 1885 for the Arabic Great Euchologion of the Greek Catholics to appear (Jerusalem 1885). Cf. Nasrallah, *Notes et Documents*, pp. 132-135.

⁴⁸⁷ On July 26, 1664, Franciscan Lamberto Benedetto wrote a letter addressed to the pope: “Non potui Ego celare diutius Sancititatem Vestram, quin me incredibilis dolor urat, quod Maronita quidam bigamus, supersite altera uxore, eaque thori consorte, consecratus sit in Sacerdotem, dataque ipsi a Patriarcha suo Missae coram celebrandae facultas. Sic enim Maronitarum gens, prius venerationi habita ob catholicae Romanae fidei sinceritatem, iam probro est omnibus plane nationibus, indeque ab hereticis blasphemandi in Romanam Sedem, quasi licentiae huiusmodi suffragatricem ansa sumitur, impediturque non mediocriter tam gravi scandalo fidei propagatio” (*SOCCG*, vol. 20, 240, fol. 35r; cf. also the letter of the Maronites of Aleppo to pope on November 24, 1664, *Ibid.*, fol. 110rv). The Greeks told the Latin missionaries: “You are of the same race (Fard chi) as the Maronites who have repealed the law and who are included among the Nestorians”! Concerning the Maronites of Roman Rite, see G. Anturini, *Soria Santa*, Rome 1662, p. 158.

⁴⁸⁸ In 1671, Carmelite Joseph Ange di Giesù Maria informed the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith that at Aleppo the Greek were “per lo più scismatici.” On April 23, 1672 the Greek Archpriest Michael made his profession of Catholic faith (Rabbath, I, p. 87).

In Damascus, Greeks and Jesuits understood each other very well despite the intrigues which they made from time to time against openly philo-Roman prelates. Patriarch Macarios and his vicar, Archbishop Gerasimos, encouraged the young Greeks to profit from the teachings given by the missionaries.⁴⁸⁹ It was with the missionaries in Damascus that the young Saifi, who would be the future bishop of Saida, was formed⁴⁹⁰ as well as the nephew of Euthymios III of Chios, who immediately succeeded Macarios in 1672.⁴⁹¹ The murder of a Greek by the Turks in Damascus in 1671, only provisionally hid the philo-Roman sentiments of the Damascenes. Soon a large number of them were clearly won over to the Roman Church.⁴⁹²

After the visit of Macarios to Saida in 1648,⁴⁹³ the Jesuits soon won over Metropolitan Jeremiah who allowed them to preach in his church.⁴⁹⁴ But the quarrels between the Capuchins and Franciscans continued⁴⁹⁵ and this retarded the progress of the

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. Rabbath, I, p. 402; Besson, p. 72” “These past years we are very old, said (=before 1659) Jerasimos (=Gerasimos of Furzol, cf. Radu, p. 68), archbishop, patriarchal vicar (during patriarch’s absence in Moscow: 1652-1659), to take a new tincture; but instruct our youth who are given into your arms, capable of all good things and will be a seminary of perfect Christians. Words that he will say before these same youth, to animate them to use what they possess with advantage.”

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. *DHGE*, 16 (1967), col. 64-65; H. De Barenton, *La France catholique en Orient durant les trois derniers siècles, d’après des documents inédits*, Paris 1902, p. 152; C. Bacha, *History of the Greek Melkites* (Arabic), I, Saida 1938, pp. 105-106. On the innovations of Saifi, see P. Bachel, *Les innovations liturgiques chez les Grecs Melchites au XVIII siècle*, in *EO*, 9 (1906) 5-10.

⁴⁹¹ Rustum, p. 46; Besson, p. 68; *SOCCG*, vol. 187, fol. 346v. Before accession to the patriarchate he was Bishop of Hama (cf. “Antioche,” in *DHGE*, col. 643).

⁴⁹² “Che sendo stato in Damasco trovato un Greco à celebrare fù cagione del Vino (prohibited in Syria since June 1671) ucciso all’ Altare con tale spavento de Sacerdoti che sono ridotti à dire la messa la notte dentro i luoghi segreti” (*Acta*, vol. 42, fol. 42v). Cf. H. Zayat, *The Greek Melkites in Islam* (Arabic), Harissa 1953, pp. 75-76.

⁴⁹³ Radu, p. 58. Amieu wrote on this occasion: “The patriarch of the Greeks visited Sayde (= Saida) and was seen with good eyes, and he preached clearly that it is necessary to love the Roman Catholics as brothers, and not to avoid them: this made a great change for the Greeks of Seyde” (Rabbath, I, p. 402).

⁴⁹⁴ Jesuit G. Rigault, missionary of Saida, gave this account in 1652: “I must say some things about the Greeks, who are those who most frequented me. I have gained them and made friends, not only by caresses and civility with those I received, but also by the means of mathematical instruments such as globes, spheres, maps, triangular glasses, of which they are interested. They come to me ordinarily to see the feast days and Sunday, bringing me also all those who come again to this city from Beirut, Tripoli and Damascus. I give them Christian instruction of the duties that most ignore.

The bishop (= Jeremiah), being sick, appealed to me, witnessed a great confidence in me, protesting that my faith was theirs and gave me the subject of belief that he was Catholic in his heart. I did good to assist him with a French chirurgien of sorts that he would return to good health” (Rabbath, I, pp. 61-62). Besson (p. 160) added in 1660: “This Catholic prelate opened his church and his heart to us very voluntarily... and testifies well to us of the affection he received, even in his pulpit, those we bring to him; as if our only affection was a just approbation.” In 1670 It was known in Rome the Greek Metropolitan of Saida (who died in 1682) “si professa cattolico, confessando pubblicamente il Primato della Chiesa Romana” (*Acta*, vol. 39, fol. 77v).

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 197, fol. 243rv, 248r, 278rv, s80r-288r. “Detti cappuccini (of Saida) non contenti di osservare dalli PP. Gesuiti, et Carmelitani Scalzi missionarij similmente deputati da questa S. Congr.ne, hanno procurato da principio rendersi Parochi assoluti, et independenti non solo dal Guardiano predetto (of Jerusalem), ma etiamedio da questa S. Cong.ne e dalla Sede Apostolica con scandalo grandissimo di quelli orientali...” (*Ibid.*, fol. 297r).

other missionaries. However, a philo-Roman nucleus was slowly formed and spread to Beirut where some Greeks were called Catholics since the end of 1659.⁴⁹⁶

The Capuchins and some Franciscans quarreled in Tripoli⁴⁹⁷ where the Greek majority had very little relations with the missionaries. The missionaries then turned themselves more toward the Maronites of Mount Lebanon.⁴⁹⁸ Yet people soon got used to the teaching of the missionaries and a nucleus formed in the monastery of Balamand. The first Greek monks who worked for the union of the Patriarchate of Antioch with Rome came from this monastery.⁴⁹⁹

Beside the pastoral activity of the missionaries in the Patriarchate of Antioch and the constant efforts of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to implant a Latin hierarchy there, which temporarily failed,⁵⁰⁰ most of the promoters of the Catholicization of the East intended to win over all these Christian people and their pastors by the means of money, especially after the successful enthroning of the first Syrian Catholic Patriarch.⁵⁰¹ Thus some collectors traveled Europe and especially France

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 29, fol. 37r. It concerns Karam Deham (or Dahhan!) from the city of Beirut “christiano cattolico del rito Greco” who asked for letters of recommendation for the Grand Duke of Genes and the Grand Master of Malta, in order to recuperate his goods taken by the pirates of Livourne and of Malta.

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 36, fol. 34v; vol. 37, fol. 35rx; vol. 42, fol. 191v-192r and 311v-312r.

⁴⁹⁸ At the time of his visit to Tripoli in 1648-1649, Macarios exhorted the Greeks not to avoid the missionaries who should be loved as brothers (Rabbath, I, p. 402). Fr. Amieu went often to Kannoubin “to maintain the affection of this prelate” (*Ibid.*, pp. 68-69). Cf. Besson, pp. 93 and 151. Sometimes the Jesuit fathers preached to the Greeks of Tripoli but only “in the episcopal courtyard” or in a Maronite chapel hollowed out of a rock.

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. “*Hayat wa 'Amal*” (*Revue de l'Ordre Basilien Alépin*), 11 (1949) 25-30. It is true that most of the Greeks were Aleppians, but the presence of the missionaries in Tripoli was for them a great profit for theological formation.

⁵⁰⁰ Latin Bishop Dovara, designated for Aleppo in 1645, resigned five years later. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith never accepted his resignation and named no one in his place despite the multitude of candidates (cf. *SOCCG*, vol. 197, fol. 43r-52r, 90r, 105r, 128r, 146r-159r; *Acta*, vol. 20, fol. 82r). In 1670, Capuchin John Baptist of St. Aignan wrote on the subject of the necessity of creating a bishop in Syria, “attestando che gl'istessi Patrirci, e Vescovi Scismatici concepirebbero maggior stima de missionarij, e più facilmente si ridurrebbero al grembo della Chiesa” (*Acta*, vol. 39, fol. 104v-105r). After being informed besides by Picquet, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was content to respond that the bishop of Baghdad-Babylon could supply for want of a bishop in Syria (*Acta*, vol. 41, fol. 26v-27v). In the particular Congregation meetings of July 19 and August 4, the necessity and usefulness of creating Latin bishops was discussed, especially throughout the world and among others at Aleppo: “questa multiplicazione de Vescovi per ragione dell'Apostolato cioè per mandarli ne'luoghi, e Paesi del'Eretici, et Infedeli non solo hora non è superflo, mà necessario, onde perciò la Sede Apostolica (of Rome) è solita quando non vuol far nuova institutione de mandar i Vicarij Apostolici con carattere Episcopale dandogli il titolo di Chiesa occupata de Scismatici, o pure affatto estinta...” (cf. *Cong. Part.* 1667, vol. 21, fol. 215r-224r). It was only in 1762 that a Latin Apostolic Vicar was found in Aleppo.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. *Acta*, vol. 32, fil. 41r-44r; Rabbath, I, pp. 252-454 and 456. The new Syrian Catholic Patriarch received an annual stipend from Rome. On December 16, 1664, “il Procuratore delle Missioni de Carmelitani scalzi supplica di ordinare che se gli paghi anticipata la provisione di Monsignor Patriarca de Soriani in Aleppo cominciato di Novembre passato per sovvenirlo ne bisogni, ne quali si ritrova per le persecuzioni patite dagli Heretici tanto maggiormente per esservi l'occasione del Vicario de Carmelitani Scalzi d'Aleppo (= François of the Passion), che deve in breve ritornarvi.” The Rescript was: “S. Congregatio annuit” (*Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 198v).

to find the necessary funds to pay the Turks and the converts.⁵⁰² Despite the condemnation of this method by some missionaries and by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith itself,⁵⁰³ this new campaign would continue until the installation in 1724 of a Greek patriarch on the apostolic throne of Antioch who was completely Catholicized.⁵⁰⁴ The essential thing for these promoters of the union was to submit all the Churches of the East to the authority of the Pope of Rome by sinking them into the post-Tridentine mold of the Western Counter-Reformation.⁵⁰⁵ However, these Churches had only intended to be assisted in their misery and their ignorance by a very rich and very flourishing Church (=Roman Church) according to the example of the primitive Church.⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰² “In 1627, Capuchin Sylvester of St. Aignan was sent as a representative to Paris to collect the sum of twelve thousand ecus, from which to buy the government of Mount Lebanon, to form a Christian state and protect the Maronites and those who professed the religion of the Franks” (J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiens Uniates du Proche-Orient*, Paris 1962, p. 223; also see pp. 225-226). On November 17, 1664, Carmelite Jean-Pierre of the Mother of God, vicar of the disalced Carmelites in Aleppo, asked the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for letter of recommendation to go collect money from the Duchess of Aiguillon (*Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 175v). After a year of collecting they had four thousand ecus (*Acta*, vol. 35, fol. 33r).

⁵⁰³ “E capitata una lettera di Fr. Lamberto Guardiano de Minori osservanti d’Aleppo, e commissario di Terra Santa in Soria, nella quale disapprova molto il propagare, e mantenere la Religione cattolica nel Dominio del Turco nel modo, ch’essi (= the missionaries of Aleppo) han tenuto, cioè à forze di denari, e di violenza contro le persone delli stessi heretici, portando seco questi mezzi grandissimi incomodi, e dando occasione di continue avanie contro i Christiani. Aggiunge... che li detti Missionarij per far denari sono asttetti à pigliarli dalli Hebrei à rigorissima usura, che in due o tre anni agguaglia il capitale, e procurano di trovarli in altri modi, li quali saputisi dagli Heretici facilmente credono che le cose della Religione si trattino per mezzo di denari... che avanti s’intraprendesse questa strada de Missionarij, benchè il profitto nella conversione dell’anime fosse minore, era pero più sicuro, perche non havevano alcuna speranza di mercede, o altra cosa.” (*Acta*, vol. 33, fol. 204rv). One year later (February 22, 1663), the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Mario Alberici, also disapproved these new methods of the missionaries and the French Consul, but the French Consuls wanted to quickly see the fruit of their work in the east and gave a deaf ear to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith!

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. *SC, Greci Melchiti, Miscellanea “Causa de Greci Melchiti 1743,”* fol. 35v-38v; Rustum, pp. 141-142; J. Hajjar, *Nouvelle Histoire de l’Eglise*, Paris 1966, p. 247.

⁵⁰⁵ Of course in the missions of the Levant, it is necessary to aspire particularly to return the bishops to obedience to the Holy See” (Besson, p. 55). Some French ambassadors in the east thought on the contrary “the question of the supremacy of the pope by which the missionaries began must be reserved perhaps for the latter, or at least to be treated with great delicacy” (B. Homisy, *Les capitulations et la protection des chrétiens au Proche-Orient aux XVI, XVII et XVIII siècles*, Harissa 1956, p. 317). What concerns the new profession of faith imposed on the Greeks and their latinization, see: *Acta*, vol. 37, fol. 5r; *Collectanea*, I, p. 52; De Vries, p. 319: “Die lateinischen Ordensleute kamen mit einem starken Ueberlegensheitsbewusstsein in den Osten und waren geneigt, bei den Orientalen überall Irrtümer und Missbräuche zu entdecken. Bei dieser Einstellung ist es kein Wunder, dass sie einfach ihre lateinische Geistigkeit den Orientalen als das einzig Richtige aufdrangten.”

⁵⁰⁶ What concerns the attitude of the Greeks of Antioch in comparison with the activities of the missionaries, we could have from this period the most eloquent testimony of Patriarch Macarios III Zaim in his letter to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of December 14, 1663 (cf. above pp. 153-159 our version of this letter).

CONCLUSION

Following the exhortation of the Ecumenical Council, Vatican II, in the decree “Unitatis Redintegratio” of November 21, 1964 on the subject of the research in the relations between the Catholic Church and the Eastern Churches in view of the restoration of full communion between them,⁵⁰⁷ we have attempted to provide a stepping stone which would perhaps serve for the reconstruction of the One Church for which Christ prayed for in a particular way “that the world believe” (Jn 17:21).

The paradoxical situation of the Eastern Catholic Churches in general and of the Greek-Melkite Catholic Patriarchate of Antioch in particular⁵⁰⁸ has urged us to study the relations between this patriarchate and the Church of Rome before the deep rooting of the new ideas brought by the Latin missionaries to the East. For the fifty years between 1622 and 1672 we have noted how prelates, clergy and Orthodox people could live as Catholics and Orthodox at the same time without any direct intervention of Rome or Constantinople in the internal affairs of this patriarchate. On one side people lived in a disciplinary, liturgical, spiritual and theological autonomy; on the other side they recognized the privileged place of the Church of Rome whose head remained the steward of God toward men, to whom Christ once said in the person of Peter: “If you love me more than the others, feed my sheep.”

But, since the installation of a distinct Catholic hierarchy of this Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch, they were excommunicated by Constantinople, they were condemned to social and liturgical isolation, and finally they lost their disciplinary, spiritual and theological autonomy. Since then, this Catholic branch never knew how to find its equilibrium in the womb of Orthodoxy of which it was a part.⁵⁰⁹

We cannot deny that this Catholic branch of the Patriarchate of Antioch represents one of the greatest difficulties for the dialogue with Orthodoxy. The dialogue has been

⁵⁰⁷ “Sacrosancta Synodus omnes quidem, sed praesertim eos exhortatur qui in instaurationem plenae communionis optatae inter Ecclesias orientales et Ecclesiam catholicam incumbere intendunt, ut debitam considerationem habeant de hac peculiari condicione nascentium crescentiumque Ecclesiarum Orientis et de indole relationum, quae inter eas et Sedem Romanam ante separationem vigeant atque rectam de his omnibus existimationem sibi efforment. Haec accurate servata ad dialogum intentum summopere conferent” (*Unitatis Redintegratio*, No. 14). Although the formal separation between Rome and Constantinople had been sanctioned since 1054, that with the Orthodox Church of Antioch was not totally consummated until 1724 (cf. De Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens*, Freiburg 1963, pp. 88-89, where we find different hypotheses on this subject). This is why our study could stand before this total sorrowful separation.

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. E. Lanne, article “Chiese Orientali cattoliche,” in *Dizionario del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II*, Rome 1969, col. 835: “gli Orientali cattolici sono degni dunque d’ogni rispetto, perchè essi per fedeltà duplice, sia alla comunione romana sia alle avite tradizioni orientali, hanno avuto da soffrire dell’incomprensione di entrambe le parti: latini ed Orthodoxi. In seno alla comunione romana, la loro situazione rimane paradossale.” Also see C.J.Dumont, *Le future Concile general des Eglises Orthodoxes: attente et espoirs de l’Eglise catholique-romaine*, in Documents “Omnis Terra,” November 1969, pp. 29-37.

⁵⁰⁹ It is sufficient to scan Mansi, vol. 46 and vol. 37 to realize it. Cf. for example, vol. 46, col. 387-389; 493-508; 915-950; 1181-1184 etc.; Cf. also *Collectio Lacensis*, II, 555-557.

profoundly injured by an act of domination on the part of some missionaries who wanted to impose their post-Tridentine theology down to its last corollaries to constitute a community by no means heretical but orthodox and apostolic within one local Church. We can no longer deny that this Catholic branch is an object of shame which we do not dare present to the Orthodox Churches as a sample of what they could be one day if they intended to restore the union according to the principles mentioned by some uniformist theologians.⁵¹⁰ But fortunately after the Vatican Council II the way opened.

Vatican Council II promised the safe-guarding of the liturgical and spiritual patrimony of the Easterners⁵¹¹ and the restoration of (all) the rules and patriarchal privileges which were in vigor at the time when union existed between east and west.⁵¹² It also found that “communicatio in sacris” in some opportune circumstances, and with the approbation of the ecclesiastical authority, is not only possible with the Orthodox, but even recommended.⁵¹³ Without returning to the first millennium where the situation of the Patriarchate of Antioch was very confused, especially after Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Monothelitism, the Arab invasion and iconoclasm, we strongly feel that the period studied in this text should be considered as one of the models of the Orthodox-Catholic life in the Patriarchate of Antioch, either in the collaboration between Latins and Orthodox, or in the autonomy vis-à-vis the new and ancient Rome, or finally in “communicatio in sacris.” Since it would be desirable that after the lifting of the excommunication of the Catholic branch and after the approbation of the Orthodox branch, “Communicatio in sacris” would be the normal state between the still separated brothers of this same patriarchate and that its interdiction be an exception, so that brothers would recognize each other as such after a sorrowful “estrangement” of more than 250 years. In fact, before breaking “the wall of separation between east and west” it would be desirable to lift it in each local Church by living the union daily, especially when it is not agitated by heresy but rather by a separation of pride. The durable union of the holy universal Church would not come uniquely from the summit or the experts, because the Church is not only the hierarchy.⁵¹⁴ The desire that Pope Paul VI expressed for the Church of Alexandria on January 21, 1969 could be accomplished even for the Church of Antioch: “We do not have in our heart the desire more lively and the will more

⁵¹⁰ Cf. N. Nissiotis, *Qu'est-ce qui nous sépare encore de l'Eglise Catholique romaine? La réponse d'un Orthodoxe*, in: *Consilium*, April 1970, No. 54, pp. 21-30 and particularly p. 29; Fairy von Lilienfeld, *Römisch-katholische und Orthodoxe Kirche nach dem zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil und “Orientalium Ecclesiarum,”* in *Materialdienst des Konfessionskundlichen Instituts*, March/April 1969, pp. 21-27 and particularly p. 24 where we can read: “Darum macht sich bei römischen Oekumene-Experten die Tendenz bemerkbar, diese unierten Kirchen, wenn es um das direkte Gespräch zwischen Rom und Vertretern der Orthodoxie geht, beseitezuschieben.” The author adds a footnote: “So Z.B. von Roberto Tucci, SJ auf einer Abendveranstaltung in Uppsala am 9.7.1968.” See also C.J. Dumont, *art. cit.*, p. 33; K. Ware, *Primacy, Collegiality, and the People of God*, in *Eastern Churches Review*, III (1970) 18-29 and particularly 27.

⁵¹¹ “Orientalium Ecclesiarum,” Nos. 5-6.

⁵¹² *Ibid.*, No. 9. Note that the word “all” is not found in the text, although in the decree of Florence, “Laetentur Coeli,” it was inserted with the approval of the Latins (of course with difficulty). See the chronological evolution of the text of Vatican II in N. Edelby, *Les Eglises Orientales catholiques*, Paris 1970, pp. 349-352.

⁵¹³ Cf. “Unitatis redintegratio,” No. 15; “Orientalium Ecclesiarum,” Nos. 26-29; Ecumenical Directory “Ad totam ecclesiam,” Nos. 39-54.

⁵¹⁴ Y. Congar says the same of “a declericalized church” (*L'Eglise de Saint Augustin à l'époque moderne*, Paris 1970, p. 477).

closed than to explore all the possibilities, of seizing all the occasions, of putting into work all the means which would permit us to reestablish between the Church of Rome and the Greek Orthodox Church of Alexandria, the full communion of faith, sacramental life, and hierarchical fraternity.” On April 1, 1969 he added to his message: “Docility to the Holy Spirit will permit us, to us who are already united by the very intimate links of faith and sacramental life, to also deepen more the signification and the exigencies of this unity which we already possess, and to value it more.”⁵¹⁵

⁵¹⁵ Cf. Pantainos (official organ of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria), 61 (1969), 65-67 and 124-125.