

1/20

The Ottoman State , Jerusalem Christians, Status Quo and Foreign Capitulations in the 19th Century

A research by Dr. Fatima Saleem at-Tarawnah,
Assistant professor,
Petra University, Amman, Jordan

Introduction:

No city in the world has witnessed a succession and co-existence of Heavenly Messages as Jerusalem had. This to some extent explains its spiritual standing for the followers of the three Heavenly Messages; Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

While Judaism and Zionism have always done and are still doing the best they could to exploit the standing of the city of Jerusalem of the for the followers of Jewish faith for political purposes, those of the Christian faith, particularly the Arabs, have always adhered to its religious standing, though they were somehow influenced by interventions by some European states such as France that managed to conclude a treaty with the Ottoman State in 1740 AD (1153 AH). The contents of that treaty provide capitulations for France that reflected positively on the European community associated therewith and negatively on the relationship between this community and basically the Greek Orthodox faction. Moreover, this treaty had tangible effects on the Christian-Christian relations as well as on their relations with the Ottoman State, European states, particularly Czarist Russia, Britain, Germany and other European countries.

It was European intervention that opened the door to the entry into Jerusalem by many European missions, by obtaining foreign capitulations and offering protection for Christian section there. This was a prelude to the Eastern Question in late 18th Century.¹ These capitulations arose with the low ebb of Ottoman expansion from Europe and the growing trend by Ottoman to lose their military superiority over European states, particularly Russia and Austria. These were influenced by three factors: growing weakness of the Ottoman State, emergence of a number of minor Christian nationalisms in the Balkan Peninsula and protracted internal

1-

[http://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A9_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%AB%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%8A%D8%A9-](http://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A9_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%AB%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%8A%D8%A9)

[cite note-](#)

[.D8.A7.D9.84.D9.85.D8.B3.D8.A3.D9.84.D8.A9 .D8.A7.D9.84.D8.B4.D8.B1.D9.82.D9.8A.D8.A9-](#)
132

seditions in some provinces. All these factors allowed European powers to interfere in and steer the internal affairs of the state to their own interests. An example of such interference was the Christian- Christian disputes over Jerusalem in the 19th Century; with France interfering under the pretext of protecting Catholics and mainly the Latins and Russians under the pretext of supporting the Orthodox. Britain got involved and thus fell into disputes within Christian sects (Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, Copts and Maronites).

The Crimean War that started between Russia and the Ottoman Empire in 1854 marked one of the most significant stages of the Eastern Question and an one offshoot of European interference in Jerusalem with the object of settling dispute over Christian Holy Places there. This war pushed international relations towards a crisis. It was also brought about a shift in political alliances, with Britain and France standing by the side of the Ottoman Empire in defense of its territorial integrity against the Russians. The war was staged when the Russian Tsar Nicholas I thought he could radically settle the Eastern Question and expressed his intention to share the territories of the Ottoman State. He offered to split these territories with Britain. When the latter refused, he tried to offer France the same enticement, but it also turned down the offer. Russia then threatened to occupy the Phosphorus and Dardanelles unless the Ottoman Empire returns to the Russian Empire the right to protect Orthodox Christians, which it had lost under the Straits Convention. On the other hand, France and Britain took advantage of the frequent disputes and the Jerusalem Christians at that time and the *Status Quo* issued by the Ottoman Empire to enter Jerusalem and acquire land there under the pretext of protecting this or that sect. But as Britain and France promised the Sultan to defend his state against any potential attack, he gave no heed to the matter. As Russia put its treat into effect, the Ottomans allied themselves with Britain, France, Austria, the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and Sweden. The allies shelled Russian fleets in the Crimean Peninsula, ruined many castles and raided Russian ports on the Black Sea. The allied forces penetrated deeply into Russian territories until they asked for peace.

European influence penetrated into Jerusalem under the pretext of protecting Christians and settling disputes among them. The first instance of such penetration was the establishment in the first third of the 19th Century, of a Russian consulate in Java, to protect the Orthodox sect, followed by the Prussian consulate in 1838. Catholics had an earlier existence in Lebanon; i.e. one century ago, when many

Maronites converted to Catholicism. In 1854, when the British consul arrived in Jerusalem, he found none of Christians to protect, but a minority of poor Jews, who happily welcomed British assistance. However, none of them converted to Christianity, which was the real motive of the British consul.

The Ottoman State, Jerusalem Christians, Status Quo and Foreign Capitulations in the 19th Century

The Ottoman State's policy and relationship with Jerusalem Christians were clearly expressed in the sect system "Nizam Millet"² that was applied to followers of the other two Heavenly Messages. This system was firmly established since Sultan Muhammad the Conqueror granted peace the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople that was later developed into a sectarian independence system within the Ottoman State.³

The system of classifying non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman State on the basis of ² their respective religious doctrine rather than race, nationalism or language. *Milla* (in Arabic) or *millet* (in Turkish) means a religious doctrine or creed and refers to *zimmis* (non-Muslims or Christians and Jews). The term was not used to refer to a specific race or sect . The word "ta'ifa " (sect) was also used in registers to refer to sects such as the Greek sect or European sect, for example. So the word "ta'ifa " is closer to "*milla*". This word appeared in the 13th century Hijri | 19th Gregorian. After the conquest of Constantinople, there

were three *millas*: the Greeks, Armenians and Jews.

1236 هـ / 1820 م، ص 229؛ س.ش 304، ربيع الأول 1236 هـ / 1820 م، ص 51؛ أنظر:

الشناوي، عبدالعزيز محمد، 1974، الدولة العثمانية دولة إسلامية مفترى عليها، ط1، مكتبة الأنجلو المصرية، القاهرة، جـ 1، ص 1 الشناوي، الدولة العثمانية؛

فارج، فيليب، كراج، ويوسف، 1994، المسيحيون واليهود في التاريخ الإسلامي العربي والتركي، ترجمة تيسير السباعي، ط1، سينا للنشر، القاهرة، ص 148-149. سيشار إليه تاليا: فارج، كراج، المسيحيون؛ القضاة، نصارى القدس، ص 9-10، 63.

Ursinus, M.O.H, 1993, "Millet", The Encyclopedia Of Islam, New York, , Vol.7 , pp. 61-62. Subsequently Cited As: "Millet", The E I2

3 جب وبوين، المجتمع الإسلامي، جـ 2، ص 396.

H.Davison, Roderic, 1982, "The Millets As Agents Of Change In The Nineteenth Century Ottoman Empire" ,In..Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis, ,Christians and Jews In The Ottoman Empire ,Holms Meir Publishers ,NewYork , Vol.1 , PP.320-321. Subsequently Cited As: H.Davison, "The Millets", Cohen, Amnon, 1982, "On The Realities Of The Milliet System Jerusalem In The Sixteenth Century", In.Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis, Christians and Jews In The Ottoman Empire ,Holms Meir Publishers ,NewYork , Vol.2 , PP.8-9. Subsequently Cited As: Cohen , On The Realities of The Milliet System Jerusalem.

The *nizam millet* (sect system) regulated the inter-relationships between Christian sects as well as with the Ottoman State⁴. It meant new capitulations to Christian sects in the Ottoman State, including Jerusalem and entailed a policy of treatment for those sects according to new dimensions. The *nizam millet* granted Christians a set of religious and civil rights⁵. However, this did not rule out the adoption by the State of a specific policy towards them, given that, being a Muslim State, it had to treat them ultimately as *zimmi*s (non-Muslims in Muslim territory), as enjoined by the teachings of Islam.⁶

The Ottoman State issued *firman*s (decrees) to regulate Christian-Christian, Muslim-Christian as well as Christian-Ottoman relations. Although the Ottoman State's policy towards Christians was based on the teachings of Islam, Europe pressed for further capitulations within Jerusalem, which were later exploited in opening consulates and opening the door for Zionists to establish their state in Palestine. The last of these capitulations was the "Status Quo decree issued in 1852 by the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Mejid freezing the rights of worship and possession of the religious communities in the Holy Places of Christendom."⁷

The Ottoman State regulated the affairs of Christian sects without any bias regardless of doctrinal differences between Orthodoxy and Catholicism.

⁴ س.ش 15,295 شعبان 1226هـ/1811م، ص 37؛ بروكلمان، كارل، 1961، تاريخ الشعوب الإسلامية، نقله للعربية نبيه أمين فارس ومنير البعلبكي، ط1، دار العلم للملايين، بيروت، ص 488 - 491. سيشار إليه تالياً: بروكلمان: تاريخ الشعوب.

⁵ العزاوي، قيس جواد، 1994، الدولة العثمانية قراءة جديدة لعوامل الإنحطاط، ط1، دار العربية للعلوم، بيروت، ص 84-85. سيشا إليه تالياً: العزاوي، الدولة العثمانية.

⁶ Braude, Benjamin, 1982, "Foundition Myths Of The Milliet System", ,In. Benjamin Braude & Bernard Lewis, ,Christians and Jews In The Ottoman Empire ,Holms Meir Publishers ,NewYork , Vol.1 ,PP.69-71. Subsequently Cited As: Benjamin Braude , Foundition Myths Of The Milliet System.

⁷ Polidori, Fr. Alfredus, 1961 , Le Status Quo Et Les Rites Orientaux , imprimatur , Traduit De L Italien , PP.1- 7..Subsequently Cited As , Alfredus , Le Status Quo , , Paschal, 1918 , The Question Of The Holy Places , Roma , PP.155 - 159..Subsequently Cited As: Baldi, TheQuestion

Foreign capitulations:⁸

Foreign, and specifically European, capitulations date back to the capitulation given by Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent to France⁹ in 1535 AD (942 AH)¹⁰, which paved the way for France and other European powers to interfere in the internal affairs of the Ottoman State and its subjects, taking advantage of the sectarian disputes over the Holy Sanctuaries. This was reflected in their religious concern and enthusiasm and interference in the affairs of the Christian subjects of the Ottoman State in Jerusalem. This was clearly manifested in the support given by b European states to Christian sects and their demands to the Ottoman State for capitulation treaties giving them the right to protect the Christian sect that follows the prevailing creed of this or that country.¹¹

Then the capitulation system was carried so far beyond that the Ottoman State found itself under pressure to introduce administrative and political reforms to prevent European interference in its internal affairs. As a result of such interference, some Christians turned their allegiance to Europe or to that European state that sponsors them.¹² The multiplicity of Christian sects in Jerusalem augmented disputes among European states, each of which claimed protection for a specific sect, justifying its

⁸ The foreign capitulation system started in 1535 AD (942 AH) following the capitulation referred to above between France and the Ottoman State and lasted until revoked after the Lausanne Treaty in 1932 .

⁹ France, before all other European powers, obtained capitulations from the Ottoman State, following the military and political alliance between both countries, when the former asked the latter for help in fighting Austria. The alliance was crowned with France securing a capitulation treaty from the Ottoman State. As Qais al-Azzawi (cited here in Arabic) says , instead of receiving capitulations from France against his services rendered thereto, Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent volunteered them to France.

¹⁰ العزاوي، الدولة العثمانية، ص 19 .

¹¹ نوار، وثائق، ص 142

Ben Arieh, Yehoshua, 1979 ,The Rediscovery of The Holy Land In The Nineteenth Century , The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, P.161 .Subsequently Cited As: Ben Arieh ,The Of The Holy Land. Rediscovery

¹² المحامي، الدولة العلية، ص 200.

interference with the object of protecting the integrity of eastern Christians,¹³ which was already preserved under the Ottoman State that treated them in conformity with its policy as a Muslim state.¹⁴

Of all the Christian sects in Jerusalem, the Europeans were the most favored, being the object of support by the rich European communities and states.¹⁵ As early as 1622 AD (1032 AH), they had enjoyed French support, exemplified by their entitlement to the Holy Places at the expense of the Greeks, who had, since long, held that right.¹⁶ Notably, they were empowered to re-build some religious places. The Franciscans also re-build parts of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and thus gained a religious standing as prominent standing as that of the Greeks and Armenians¹⁷.

France emerged as a protective power for Europeans at a time when disputes over religious places were growing among various Christian sects in Jerusalem and their sponsor states. These culminated in France successfully eliciting, in 1740 AD (1153 AH), support for its rights to the Holy Places in Jerusalem and to the protection of the European sect. According to a treaty (Article 33) signed between France and the Ottoman State, the former was given several capitulations with regard to the Holy Sepulcher. Article 1 allows "Latin visitors freedom to enter the Holy Sepulcher"; Article 2 allows "all sects to visit the Holy Places under the French banner"; Article 33 prohibits opposition to French monks inside and outside Jerusalem; Article 34 "prohibits disruption to any person who wants to convert to the Latin doctrine"; Article 82 allows "Latins to make repairs to churches and places under their control"¹⁸ and to set times

¹³ That interference was translated into occupation by European powers of Arab countries under the pretext of protecting Christians there, as France did in Lebanon under the pretext of protecting Lebanon's Christians against Druz. العزاوي، الدولة .

العثمانية، ص. 27

¹⁴ نوار، وثائق، ص 142

¹⁵ Paschal Baldi , The Question of The Holy Land , Pp.62.

¹⁶ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΣ·ΚΡΟΚΙΔΑ , ΙΕΤΟΡΙΑ ΟΘΩΜΑΝΙΚΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙΑΣ
γΠο Ι ΧΑΜΜΣΡ ΣΕΣΛΛΗΝΙΣΘΕΙΣΑ ΑΔΘΗΝΑΙ
, ΤΤΠΟΙΣ.Χ.Ν.ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΕΩΣ, 1874, ΤΟΜΟΣ ΕΚΤΟΣ VI.PP.292 296. Subsequently
Cited As , ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΣ·ΚΡΟΚΙΔΑ , ΙΕΤΟΡΙΑ ΟΘΩΜΑΝΙΚ

¹⁷ آر مسترونج، كارين، 1998، القدس مدينة واحدة ثلاث عقائد، ترجمة فاطمة محمد ومحمد

عنان، ط 1، د:ن، القاهرة، ص 554-555. سيشار إليه تالياً: كارين، القدس مدينة واحدة.

¹⁸ قزاقيا، تاريخ الكنيسة الاورشليمية، ص 137.

for them to visit and place candles and candelabras at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher (Resurrection) .¹⁹

The Greek Orthodox was confident of their rights to own most Holy Places in churches and monasteries. They defended their rights against the Europeans, who claimed title to the place referred to.²⁰ However, the Ottoman State's generosity to France enabled it to be the first state to obtain, in 1740, the right to protect Catholics in Jerusalem.²¹ This situation aroused problems between the Europeans and various sects such as the Greeks and Armenians²² ; thus making the Europeans one of the most powerful sects there. As a result of this treaty, the Europeans obtained the right to add new buildings to their monasteries²³ and European visiting pilgrims were granted protection as well as a dragoman to help and take care of them.²⁴

Perhaps, it was those capitulations that were obtained by France and Christian sects under those agreements²⁵ that drove Muslims to combat the Bonaparte Expedition in 1798, as it represented the Catholic France, the protector of Europeans.²⁶ Originally destined to the Levant, the Expedition entered into Palestine as planned.²⁷ At that time, the Ottoman State was involved in war with Russia, which

س . ش 243 ، 16 ربيع ثاني 1171هـ/1757م ، ص 113 .¹⁹

²⁰ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΣ·ΚΡΟΚΙΔΑ,ΙΕΤΟΡΙΑ ΟΘΩΜΑΝΙΚΗΣ
pp.292

المحامي، تاريخ الدولة العلية، ص 150، تيميلس، اليونان والفرنسيكان، ص 5.²¹

²² العارف، المفصل، ص 425 .

س.ش.242، أواسط شوال 1171هـ/1757م، ص 42.²³

س.ش. 241، 1167هـ/1753م، ص 17.²⁴

العارف، تاريخ القدس، ص 149.²⁵

²⁶ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΣ·ΚΡΟΚΙΔΑ,ΙΕΤΟΡΙΑ ΟΘΩΜΑΝΙΚΗΣ
pp.292

العورة، تاريخ ولاية سليمان، ص 292 – 293 ؛ الشهابي، تاريخ ولاية أحمد باشا الجزائر، ص 506.²⁷

encouraged France to take advantage of the situation to control the dominions of the Ottoman State by occupying Egypt.²⁸

Although the registers of the Shari'ah Court of Jerusalem contains no information on the entry by Bonaparte Expedition into Palestine, historical sources report that the Expedition entered into Palestine through Java, Ramleh and Acre, but they did indicate that it entered into Jerusalem that was at that time part of Acre.²⁹ The residents of Jerusalem had expected that Bonaparte, having headed towards Java and Ramleh, would enter into Jerusalem³⁰. In March 13, 1799, the French army had reached the outskirts of Java³¹, and then headed towards Acre³². But it did not try to control Jerusalem³³. No indication was made as to why Bonaparte refrained from attacking Jerusalem, but, as author "Arif al-'Arif maintains, there was some indication that he wrote to Jerusalem Christians demanding surrender, but they responded that they were subjects of the

²⁸ Stanford And Kural, Ezal ,1977, History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Cambridge , PP.236-237.Subsequently Cited As Show, History of the Ottoman Empire.

²⁹ العورة، تاريخ ولاية سليمان، ص 292 - 293 ؛ الشهابي، تاريخ ولاية أحمد باشا الجزائر، ص 506، العبد، حوادث بلاد الشام، ص 48، 52.

³⁰ العبد ، حوادث بلاد الشام، ص 52، 48؛

Douwes, Dick, 2000 ,The Ottomans In Syria, I. p Tauris. Publishers, New York, PP.56-57. Subsequently Cited As, Douwes ,The Ottomans In Syria

³¹ حسني أدهم جرار، 1990م، أسرار حملة نابليون على مصر وبلاد الشام، دار الضيافة، عمان، ص 104، ص 117 - 120. سيشار إليه تالياً: جرار، اسرار حملة نابليون ؛ الدباغ، بلادنا فلسطين، ج 4 ق 2، ص 149 - 150

³³ الدمشقي، تاريخ حوادث الشام، ص 24، 47 ؛ كرد علي، خطط

الشام، ج 3، ص 13. حلوش، عاكف، 1993، "الأطماع الأوروبية والصهيونية في القدس في العهدين المملوكي والعثماني 1250-1917"، الندوة العالمية حول القدس، الرباط، ص 170-171. سيشار إليه تالياً: حلوش، الأطماع الأوروبية ؛

Arieh , The Rediscovery Of the Holy Land, PP.21-33.

province of Acre and they did not want to go into war in a country, where they live³⁴.

The fact that Bonaparte did not actually or did not try to enter into Jerusalem does not mean the Ottoman State had no stance towards or did not anticipate for Bonaparte's entry into Jerusalem. Actually, the Ottoman State had taken a set of precautionary measures in this respect, including, as the Greek monk Neuvetus of Marsaba monastery, that he held some Christian monks unharmed within the Church of Resurrection³⁵. The governor (Wali) of Damascus was ordered to equip the Jerusalem garrisons with weapons. Neuvetos adds that monasteries were attacked and monks taken hostages lest they should collaborate or correspond with Bonaparte³⁶. However, the French Expedition failed following the failure of the siege of Acre³⁷, partly thanks to the efforts of Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar.³⁸

It seems that Bonaparte had decided not to head towards Jerusalem because France thought that such act would bring about protests by all European powers, which could subject it to attack, given that all European powers were covetous of Jerusalem and had been pressing the Ottomans for capitulations as appropriate to their respective Christian sects. France realized that it would not be able to serve its purpose through the Bonaparte Expedition, as long as diplomatic means would serve its purpose.

Meanwhile, the Greeks were at loggerheads with the Europeans over religious places, as the Europeans managed to share the Greeks in the Holy Sepulcher³⁹. France also encouraged the Franciscans to

³³ الدمشقي، تاريخ حوادث الشام، ص24؛ الدارندلي، عزت حسن أفندي، 1999م، الحملة الفرنسية على مصر في ضوء مخطوط عثماني / ضيامة الدارندلي، دراسة وترجمة جمال عبد الغني، الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب، القاهرة، ص25. سيشار إليه تالياً: الدارندلي، الحملة الفرنسية؛ نيوفيتوس، حوليات فلسطين، ص33

³⁴ العارف، تاريخ القدس، ص106.

³⁵ نيوفيتوس، حوليات فلسطين، ص33

³⁶ الدمشقي، تاريخ حوادث بلاد الشام، ص22

³⁷ Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar was busily engaged in preparations for rebuffing the Expedition following the outbreak of the plague among French soldiers. He defended

restore the Holy placed with support from Pope Clement XIII, who wrote messages to Catholic princes urging them to exert effort and use their influence with The Sublime Porte to defend the rights of Europeans. Paschal Baldi says that the Franciscan monk P. Thomas Morawieskij carried papal messages to European kings and princes. He went to Naples and Lisbon, then to King Emmanuel III's court in Turin. Later, he proceeded to France, Britain, Poland and Vienna. This shows the success of Europe's efforts to impose its sway over the Ottoman State, taking advantage of its declining conditions⁴⁰. The Ottoman State issued a *firman* granting Europeans places inside and outside the Church of Resurrection and following their growing dispute with the Greeks, gave them the right to perform their mass. After establishing relations with France, the Ottoman State granted the European sect places inside and outside the Church of Resurrection, the right to perform mass, to visit the Holy Sepulcher and keep a guard there in line with the Greeks⁴¹.

Thanks to French interventions, the Ottoman State issued another *firman* ordering that no taxes other than non-Muslim head tax or customary taxes payable by Europeans⁴² should be levied and that tax paid in excess be refunded. In fact it did happen; the normal yearly tax was 7000 piaster and one year the tax was raised to 20,000 piaster, upon which the State ordered the excess tax to be refunded⁴³

the city strongly, asking for help from Nablus, thus aborting the 70-day siege of Acre. See

: الدمشقي، تاريخ حوادث بلاد الشام، ص 22؛ الدارندلي، الحملة الفرنسية، ص 217-218؛ جرار، أسرار حملة نابليون، ص 104، 117-120.

الدارندلي، الحملة الفرنسية، ص 200-218؛ الجبرتي، عبد الرحمن، 1996، مظهر التقديس بذهاب³⁸ دولة الفرنسيين، تحقيق حسن محمد ومحمد الدسوقي، دار البيان، القاهرة، ص 59-60. سيشار إليه تالياً: الجبرتي، مظهر التقديس؛ الترك، المعلم نقولا، 1990، ذكر تملك جمهور فرنسا والأقطار المصرية والبلاد الشامية أو الحملة الفرنسية على مصر وبلاد الشام، حققه ياسين سويدان، دار الفارابي، ط 1، بيروت، ص 70. سيشار إليه تالياً: الترك، الحملة الفرنسية.

³⁹ أنظر النزاع بين الروم والإفرنج ص 79-84 هذا الفصل

⁴⁰ Baldi, The Question Of The Holy Land, Pp.65

س. ش 295، 15 شعبان 1226هـ/1811م، ص 37⁴¹

س. ش 301، 19 ذي القعدة 1232هـ/1816م، ص 16⁴²

س. ش 247، 15 رمضان 1177هـ/1763م، ص 31⁴³.

س. ش 288، 1221هـ/1806م، ص 5؛ س. ش 254، 10 محرم 1185هـ/1771م، ص 51-52⁴⁴

. The State also provided protection for European monks within and outside Jerusalem⁴⁴, thus aggravating tension among various sects. ⁴⁵ Although France managed to elicit capitulations for the Europeans in Jerusalem, their situation once again aggravated following the burning of the Church of Resurrection in 1808. While Franciscan monks were to no avail trying to attracting the attention of heedless Europe to their appeals to help the deserted Catholics, as Paschal put it, the Greeks secured a *firman* allowing them to rebuild the Church of Resurrection that was burned in 1808 ⁴⁶. But a serious blow was leveled to the Europeans in 1828, when the Armenians managed to obtain the State's recognition of Armenian Catholic sect. Sultan Mahmoud granted recognition of the Armenian Catholic sect headed by bishop Aghoup following their cession from the Greek Catholic church in 1828⁴⁷. In 1829, the Armenians obtained a *firman* allowing them "to carry their candles and icons into the Church." The Europeans and Greeks protested, but to no avail. Thus, the Armenian became partners to the Europeans and Greeks; " like them, they had seven lanterns in the church, held as much as they did within and outside the church and started since to sweep and wash whenever their turn comes." ⁴⁸ France kept demanding for more holy places in Jerusalem and for restituting their ownership to European clergymen, thus endorsing the status quo in favor of Catholics.

France pursued its efforts to ensure that the treaty remained in effect and the Ottomans were aware of that. The French ambassador refused to discuss the treaty documents. After 1850, France even demanded the restitution of Europeans' ownership of the religious places. A committee was set up to examine the actual status of Holy Places, to which the Ottoman State agreed provided that the committee should have a representative of the Greek Patriarch as member⁴⁹.

اللحام، مارون، 2005، بطاركة القدس الإفرنج في العصر الحديث، منشورات المعهد الأكليريكي، مطبعة ⁴⁵

البطريركية الإفرنجية، بيروت، ص 20 - 21. سيشار إليه تالياً: اللحام، بطاركة القدس.

⁴⁶ Baldi, The Question Of The Holy Land, Pp- 69

⁴⁷ رستم، كنيسة مدينة الله، ص 176.

⁴⁸ نيوفيتوس، حوليات فلسطين، ص 40.

⁴⁹ Baldi, The Question Of The Holy Land, Pp74 -75

⁵⁰ رافق، بلاد الشام ومصر، ص 300 - 305.

In 1874, the balance of power tilted so seriously in favor of Russia in its war with the Ottoman State that it lay in jeopardy⁵⁰. While France was recognized for more than a quarter of a century (1740 – 1774) as a protector of the Catholic Europeans, Tsarist Russia was looking forward to similar capitulations as those acquired by France in Jerusalem.⁵¹ Russia could obtain this recognition from the Ottomans in 1774, when it signed the Kucuk Kaynardja⁵² Treaty with the Ottoman State, whereby the latter ceded some Ottoman-controlled dominions to Russia and gave the Russian the right to protect the Greek Orthodox. According to the two most significant articles of the Treaty⁵³, i.e. Articles 7 and 8, " The Ottoman State promises permanent protection to the Christian religion and shall grant the ambassador of the State of Russia license to produce various understandings, whenever needed, whether related to the Church mentioned in Article 14, located in the well-guarded city of Constantinople or to protect its guards..."⁵⁴

According to Article 2, "Full license shall be granted to monks and subjects of the State of Russia to visit al-Quds al-Shareef (Jerusalem) and all places worthy of visit. Travelers and tourists shall not be required to pay any kind of tax (head-tax (*jizya*), outlying area tax (*karaj*) or *werko*) in all places and shall be granted *firman*s as appropriate together with road orders given to subjects of all countries, resident in the territory of " my Sublime State". In no way, they shall be subject to molestation or interference, but shall be accorded full protection by dint of the provision of Shari'a (Islamic Law) ". So, there reigned an air of satisfaction among the Greek Orthodox. In 1788, the Ottoman State endorsed its recognition of Russia's right to protect the Greek Orthodox and the right of Russian pilgrims to visit the Holy Land free of tax.⁵⁵

⁵¹ المحامي، تاريخ الدولة العلية ص 163 ؛

Davison, Roderic H, 1990, Essays in Ottoman And Turkish History 1774-1923, Saqi Books , U.S.A, p p.34-35 . Subsequently Cited As , Davison, Essays in ottoman

كجك قينارجه بلدة شمال شرق بلغاريا وهي المكان الذي حصلت فيه المعاهدة المشار إليها : انظر: ⁵²

Heywood, C.J., 1983" Küçük Kaynardja" In The Encyclopedia of Islam ,New Edition, Leiden, Vol v , pp312-313. Subsequently Cited as , Heywood," Kuguk Kaynardja" ,En2

⁵³. المحامي ، تاريخ الدولة العلية ، ص 163 .

⁵⁴. المرجع نفسه ، ص 163 .

المرجع نفسه ، ص 163 ؛ رستم ، كنيسة مدينة الله ، ص 200.⁵⁵

⁵⁶ المحامي ، تاريخ الدولة العلية ، ص 178

Acquisition by Russia of those capitulations within Jerusalem really meant removal of French influence there as well as a political imbalance between Russia and France in Jerusalem. This situation spurred France to exert efforts to renew and re-affirm the 1740 capitulation. In 1788, France obtained from the Ottoman State re-affirmation of the 1740 capitulation, reading " as regards the practice of the rites of the Christian Catholic religion in the Ottoman State, the freedom of its priests and adherents, the right to maintain and repair its churches, the freedom of worship and worshippers and frequenting (holy) places and pilgrimage, according to the rule of restoring things to their earlier status, all privileges granted to the Catholic religion shall be reinstated ⁵⁶ .

While both Armenians and Europeans were pressing for control of more religious places in Jerusalem at the expense of Greeks, the Russian took well care of and provided moral and material support to Greek Orthodox in Jerusalem. When the Church of Resurrection was burned in 1808, the Russians provided material support to Greek Orthodox as well as assistance and protection to pilgrimage en route to Jerusalem. During the period 1809- 1819, the number of visitors to the Churches of the Cradle and Resurrection remarkably increased⁵⁷. Russia also provided assistance to the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher ⁵⁸ , when the Greek Orthodox incurred heavy debts as a result of the burning of the Church of Resurrection. The Russian also sought to raise funds to build accommodations for Russian pilgrims in Jerusalem. Moreover, due to frequent molestation by the Catholic of Russian pilgrims, in 1820 they set up a consulate in Jerusalem to take care of Greek Orthodox affairs. According to Hopwood, the Russian consulate in Jerusalem took care of the Greeks as well as Russian pilgrims, being their liaison point with Russia. Since 1811, Russia had appointed Joureus as a consul in

س . ش 232 ، 1156هـ/1743م ، ص 236 ، 186 ؛ س . ش 295 ، 15 شعبان 1226هـ/1811م ، ⁵⁷ ص 37.

⁵⁸ أخوية القبر المقدس أسست من أجل الإهتمام بشؤون الأرثوذكس بغض النظر عن الجنس ، ودعم البطريركية في القدس ، والحصول على المساعدات المادية ، والحفاظ على أملاك الرعية . أنظر :
هو اويني ، رفايل ، 1893 ، لمحة تاريخية في أخوية القبر المقدس اليونانية ، نشر تحت اسم مستعار وهو الشيخ عبد الأحد الشافي ، بيروت ، ص 10 - 13 . 68 - 87 . سيشار إليه تالياً : هو اويني ، لمحة تاريخية .

⁵⁹ رستم ، ، كنيسة مدينة الله ، ص 200 ،

Hopwood Derek, 1969 , The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine 1843-1914 , Church and Political in the near East , oxford . P.13-15. Subsequently Cited As:
Hopwood, The Russian Presence

charge religious interest in Jerusalem, where he maintained good relations with all Christian sects.⁵⁹

Following the Russian support for the Greek Orthodox, the Europeans sought to control more holy places in Jerusalem by pressing European ambassadors in Constantinople for Sultanic *firmans*. On one Palms Sunday, the Europeans attacked the Greek Orthodox during mass, plundering and wrecking the church's furniture and holy utensils. The Pope also tries to force the Greek Orthodox to convert to Catholicism.⁶⁰

As a result of the establishment of the Russian consulate in Jerusalem, the number of visitors rose to 100. However, the Europeans managed to control the Church of al-Raawat Aalrtozxip, but the Greek Orthodox restored it in 1820 and with Russian support the Holy Sepulcher and al other holy destinations remained the property of all the Orthodox. Nevertheless, Russia could not support the Greek Orthodox in Jerusalem in 1821, when they experiencing economic distress following the Revolution of the Ottoman Greece (Mop war). The economic distress goes back to 1808, when the Church of Resurrection and the Greeks exhausted all resources they had to rebuild it⁶¹. Historical sources make no reference to the stance of Russia as the protector of the Greek Orthodox on their economic distress that was caused by increased taxes and financial costs. Nor had the Greek Orthodox resort to Russia for help, as it was deeply involved in war with the Ottomans. They rather borrowed money from Jews, Armenians and Muslims⁶² and as a result, they suffered wide-spread poverty, distress and indebtedness. Naturally, the Armenians took advantage of this situation to control more religious places in Jerusalem. The princes of Romania and Moldavia and other while their protector Russia could not intervene because of its war with the Ottoman State, Orthodox regions provided material support to the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher to cover their annual expenses. The pilgrimage season was also affected because of that

س.ش 301 ، صفر 1233هـ / 1817م ، ص 49.⁶⁰

س . ش 293 ، 25 جمادى الآخرة 1224هـ / 1809م ، ص 21 شحادة ونقولا خوري ، خلاصة تاريخ كنيسة اورشليم ، ص 186-187

س . ش 293 ، 25 جمادى الآخرة 1224هـ / 1809م ، ص 21 شحادة ونقولا خوري ، خلاصة تاريخ كنيسة اورشليم ، ص 186-187

نيوفيتوس، حوليات فلسطين ، ص 33 ؛ مشافة ، منتخبات من الجواب على اقتراح الاحباب ، ص 80 ؛
القس أسعد ، تاريخ الناصرة ، ص 65 - 69 .

war., as the number of Orthodox visitors to Jerusalem declined. Even the Orthodox monks themselves were not in a position to travel around to brief Russian official on their situation. The Catholics took advantage of Russia' involvement in the war⁶³ to position themselves as the Number 1 sect, at the expense of the Greek Orthodox.⁶⁴

Russia had put no specific limit to the dispute over the Holy Places; rather it was keen on stressing its moral dominance over millions of Orthodox subjects, pressing the Ottoman State for rights, capitulations and immunities for churches, religious institutions and Orthodox clergy, located within Ottoman territories. The Ottoman State came under heavy pressure by Russia that was not confined to Jerusalem, but exceeded far beyond to the Sultan's sovereignty. The Holy Places turned into the Eastern Question. The Archbishop of Paris called for prayers for France's victory over Russia in acquiring the Holy places in Jerusalem. However, the Question of the Holy Places remained within " Status Quo" , particularly following dispute, in 1841, between the Russians and French over the re-building of the Grand Dome of the Church of Resurrection that was about to collapse . Both countries France and Russia were interested in re-building the Church of Resurrection, but the latter could obtain from the Sublime Porte that right. France objected; adding a new factor and a direct cause for the eruption of the Crimean War.⁶⁵

Other European countries lagged behind in enjoying foreign capitulations but they were still in contact with the Christians of this holy city that was part of the Ottoman State as well as Christian pilgrims that had been frequenting it since the fourth Gregorian century. European intervention into Jerusalem had increased since the division between the Christian Orthodox and Catholics.⁶⁶

Like the rest of European countries, Germany sought to find a foothold in Jerusalem in order to protect its own interests and their pilgrims, taking advantage of Sultan Mahmoud II's dependence on the German to develop the Ottoman army. In 1813, Germany started

⁶³ نيوفيتوس، حوليات فلسطين، ص 33، 42، 63

⁶⁴ القس أسعد، تاريخ الناصرة، ص 66

⁶⁵ Baldi , The Question Of The Holy Land , PP. 81 -83 , Alfredus, Le Statu Quo, PP.7-15, P18

⁶⁶ نوار، وثائق، ص 205 - 206؛ العزاوي، الدولة العثمانية، ص 21.

to encourage German Christians to migrate to Jerusalem and many of them, particularly hardliners, settled there⁶⁷.

Britain too sought to improve its relations with the High Porte at the expense of France, since 1579, it could accede the Treaty of Capitulations. Particularly following the Bonaparte Expedition to Egypt and the Levant, Britain had been expanding out in the East in fear for its colonies there; hoping that the Ottoman State would fall apart and it would capture its dominions.⁶⁸ However, concerned over continued flow of its pilgrims into Jerusalem, Britain made a peace treaty with the High Porte, leading to the Ottoman State issuing a *firman* granting protection from molestation to English visitors, be they pilgrims, traders or travelers.⁶⁹

Spain also provided political support to the Franciscans to obtain religious spaces in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.⁷⁰

Rivalry among European countries over the right to protect Christians within Jerusalem took international dimensions. Austria also claimed the right to the right to protect Christians within Jerusalem. In August 14, 1792, it signed with the Ottoman State a treaty granting more freedom to Christians within the Ottoman State in view the wide spread of Catholicism after some Christian sects kept converting from Orthodoxy to Catholicism. Therefore, Article 12 of that treaty provided for "the practice of the rites of the Christian Catholic religion in the Ottoman State, the freedom of its priests and adherents, the right to maintain and repair its churches, the freedom of worship and worshippers and frequenting and protecting (holy) places and pilgrimage..."⁷¹ The Ottoman State replied, " The Sultan hereby decides and affirms that according to the rule of restoring things to their earlier status, all privileges

⁶⁷. نوار ، وثائق ، ص 205 - 206.

⁶⁸ المحامي، تاريخ الدولة العلية ، ص 178 ، العزاوي ، الدولة لعثمانية ، ص 21 .

⁶⁹ س . ش 292 ، 11 ربيع الثاني ، 1224هـ/1809م . ص 90 .

⁷⁰ Paschal , The Question Of The Holy Land , PP. 81, Ben Arieh, Yehoshua, 1984 , Jerusalem In The 19Th Century The Old City , St.Martins Press. New York, P.16. . Subsequently Cited As: Ben Arieh , , Jerusalem.

⁷¹ Paschal , The Question Of The Holy Land , PP. 81, Ben Arieh, Yehoshua, 1984 , Jerusalem In The 19Th Century The Old City , St.Martins Press. New York, P.16. . Subsequently Cited As: Ben Arieh , , Jerusalem.

granted to the Catholic religion shall be reinstated , pursuant to Article 9 of the earlier treaty and all issued *firman*s and decrees⁷² .

Later, waves of pilgrims flocking into Jerusalem increased and the Balkan countries started to send their Catholic pilgrims to Jerusalem as the Franciscans secured protection for them in the Holy Land. This gives the impression that they were denied access to the Holy Land because of the Balkans revolts and problems with the Ottoman State.

This had opened the door wide for European Christian missionary expeditions to be launched to Jerusalem and other dominions of the Ottoman State. Each of Germany, Prussia and Switzerland sent Christian missionaries to promote their religious doctrines, leading to increasing fragmentation of Christians within Jerusalem, and growing rivalries over control of religious places.⁷³ The United States also sent missionaries to Jerusalem, notably Levi Parsonter and Jonas King.⁷⁴

While disputes among European states over the Holy Places increased, their respective interventions into the internal affairs of the Ottoman State also rose. The situation was further exacerbated by the establishment of European consulates since 1842.⁷⁵

⁷¹ . المحامي ، تاريخ الدولة العلية ، ص 178 ..

⁷² . المرجع نفسه ، ص 178 .

⁷³ خضر، بشارة، د:ت ، أوروبا وفلسطين من الحروب الصليبية حتى اليوم ، ترجمة منصور القاضي ومراجعة جورج صالح ، ط1 ، مركز دراسات الوحدة العربية، بيروت ، ص 90 - 91 . سيشار إليه تالياً : بشارة ، أوروبا وفلسطين .

⁷⁴ . بشارة خضر ، أوروبا وفلسطين . ، ص 91 .

⁷⁵ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΣ·ΚΡΟΚΙΑΔΑ , ΙΕΤΟΡΙΑ ΟΘΩΜΑΝΙΚΗΣ, pp. 293 , Alfredus , Le Status Quo, PP.7-15, P18

