

AKSUM

THYATEIRA

A Festschrift

For

Archbishop Methodios
of Thyateira and Great Britain

General Editor

DR. GEORGE DION. DRAGAS

1985

THYATEIRA HOUSE

London W. 2

A Festschrift

In Honour of Archbishop METHODIOS of Thyateira and Great Britain, (1985).

Patrons:

Archbishop Robert Rancie of Canterbury
Cardinal Basil Hume Archbishop of Westminster
Metropolitan Meletios of France

Editorial Committee:

Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra, Istanbul.
Archbishop Basil of Brussels
Sir Steven Runciman, Dumfriesshire, Scotland., F.B.A.
Metropolitan Antony of Surozh.
Metropolitan John of Helsinki.
Prof. Gordon Rupp, Cambridge, F.B.A., D.D.
Prof. F. F. Bruce, Manchester, F.B.A., D.D.
Prof. T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh, F.B.A., D.D.

General Editor:

Protopresbyter Dr. George Dragas, Durham, England.

PATRIARCH JEREMIAS II AND THE PATRIARCHATE OF MOSCOW

By

Sir Steven Runciman

It has too often been the fashion, even amongst the Orthodox, to dismiss all the Patriarchs who reigned in Constantinople during the centuries of the Turcocracy as men of small moral fibre whose main talent was for intrigue. The charge is unjustified. Had not some of them shown courage, devotion and a fine political sense, it is unlikely that the Patriarchate could have survived.

Of the Patriarchs reigning in the sixteenth century none was more remarkable than Jeremias II¹. Jeremias Tranos was born at Anchialos in about 1530 and educated at the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople. Not much is known of his earlier career, which was mainly spent as a priest in Constantinople, where he won a great reputation among the faithful for his zeal, his integrity and his administrative gifts. When the Patriarch Metrophanes III was deposed by the Holy synod in 1572, popular clamour demanded the election of Jeremias. But he always had enemies in the Synod, who resented his reforming energy and his battle against corruption. In 1579 they managed to secure his deposition; and Metrophanes was reinstated. But the popular outcry was so great that after nine months Jeremias was restored. In 1584 a renegade Greek who had acquired a post at the Sultan's court denounced him for hoarding wealth, while a prelate, Theoleptos, who aimed at the Patriarchal throne, so successfully bribed the Sultan's ministers that Jeremias was again deposed and was sent into exile in Rhodes. After two years Sultan Murad, who seems to have had a certain respect for Jeremias and none for Theoleptos, insisted on the former's return to the Patriarchate. But when he returned he found that the Sultan had just annexed the Patriarchal church of the Theotokos Pammakaristos and its surrounding buildings and had conver-

ted into the Fethiye Cami, the Mosque of Victory, to celebrate a successful campaign against the Persians. He was told that he must build a new Patriarchal church and offices. In the meantime he had to make use of the small church of Saint Demetrios Kanabou, lent to him by the Patriarch of Alexandria, to whom it belonged.²

A new church would be costly, and the Patriarchal funds were low. Help must be found from outside. Jeremias decided that it must come from Russia. It was a shrewd decision; for he knew that he could offer something in return that the Russians were eager to obtain.

The fall of Constantinople had left the Great Prince of Muscovy the leading Orthodox sovereign in the world. The King of Georgia was only of local importance. The Princes of Wallachia and Moldavia, despite a brave struggle, were soon obliged to accept a vassal-status under the Sultan. But Russia had been expanding under the Muscovites. Tartar suzerainty had been thrown off before the end of the fifteenth century; and in 1498 the Great Prince Ivan III had been crowned by the Metropolitan of Moscow as 'Tsar, Great Prince and Autocrat of All the Russias'. As the Tsars' dominions increased, so did the number of his Orthodox subjects. Not unnaturally he began to see himself as the heir to the Byzantine Emperor. Early in the sixteenth century the theory was circulating in Russia that Moscow was the Third Rome.³

In such circumstances it seemed to the Russians wrong that the head of their Church should be only a Metropolitan, under the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In fact, since the middle of the fifteenth century the Great Prince had appointed the Metropolitan of Moscow without reference to the Patriarch; and Russia's refusal to accept the Union of Florence had given him some justification. In 1470 Ivan III had declared that the Patriarchate was deprived of any

1. For Jeremias II see C. Sathas, *Βιογραφικὸν Σχέδιασμα περὶ Πατριάρχου Ἰερεμίου Β'* (Athens 3870) and L. Petit, 'Jeremie II Tranos' in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. Vacant & Mangeot, VIII, 1, coll. 886-894. the history of his reign is given in *Historia Patriarchica*, (ed. Niebuhr, Bonn, 1849), pp. 173-191 and in Dorotheus of Monemvasia, *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, (Venice, 1818,) pp. 439-440. Dorotheus disliked Jeremias and accuses him, unreasonably, of being dullwitted.

2. M. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*, (Constantinople, 1890), p. 530.

3. See S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 321-5.

rights over the Russian Church.* But tradition died hard; the Metropolitan of Moscow still liked to have his title confirmed by Constantinople. The Tsar, too, liked to be recognized as Emperor by the Patriarch. In return for generous alms, the Patriarchate was ready to comply. But a gentle suggestion, made by the Patriarch Joasaph II in 1561, that he ought to be crowned again by a legate representing the Patriarchate, was firmly ignored by Ivan IV⁶.

Ivan IV, the Terrible, was determined to keep the Russian Church under his sole control. A synod that he convoked in 1551 decreed that Russian ritual usages that did not conform with those of Constantinople were wholly correct; and the Tsar, while copying the Byzantine formulae that called him the 'son' of the Church, claimed an authority over it that no Emperor in Constantinople would have dared to claim. When in 1569 the Metropolitan Philip ventured to criticise Ivan for his monstrous cruelty, he was arrested and put to death. The Patriarchate, grateful though it was for generous gifts from the Russians, was not in such circumstances eager to raise Moscow to a Patriarchate.⁶

Ivan IV died in 1584. His son and heir, Feodor, was a mild man, dominated by his pious Tsaritsa, Irene, and her brother, Boris Godunov. In 1585 Joachim, Patriarch of Antioch, came to visit Moscow in search of alms. It seems that in his conversations with the Tsar and the Tsaritsa they suggested that the time was ripe for seeking the elevation of the Moscow Metropolitanate.⁷ As a preliminary gesture, the Tsar rescinded the decree of 1551 that proclaimed Russian ritual usages to be solely correct. Before an assembly of boyars at which Joachim was present he spoke of his wishes for a Patriarchate; and Joachim promised to consult with his fellow-Patriarchs and the authorities of the two holy mountains, Athos and Sinai,

to see what could be done. The Tsar seems to have asked that the Moscow Patriarchate should rank third, after Constantinople and Alexandria, but before Antioch and Jerusalem. It is not known how the Patriarch of Antioch reacted to that suggestion.

Whatever he may have thought, on his way home he stopped in Constantinople and told the Patriarch Jeremias of the Tsar's request. It was not an unreasonable request; and it could be granted without damaging the current theory that the Church should be governed by a Pentarchy of Patriarchs. Rome, which had been the senior Patriarchate, had fallen into the Apollinarian heresy by unilaterally inserting the word *Filioque* into the Creed. There was thus a vacancy, which could be filled by Moscow, which, as the seat of the greatest Orthodox potentate, could be regarded as a Third Rome, though not *the* Third Rome.

Jeremias at once sent a Greek priest called Nicholas to Moscow, to say that he was consulting with his fellow Patriarchs about arrangements for granting the Tsar's request and suggesting that the Patriarch of Jerusalem might go to Moscow with full authority to perform the necessary ceremony. The choice of the Patriarch of Jerusalem may well have been a hint that the new Patriarchate would have to rank at the bottom of the five, below Antioch and Jerusalem; but it may also have been due to practical reasons. Jeremias had only just been re-instated in the Patriarchate. He had many administrative problems to settle, after the inefficient rule of Theoleptos, in particular the finding of temporary accommodation for the Patriarchate; and it was not always easy for a Patriarch of Constantinople to obtain leave from the Sultan to go abroad. A Patriarch of Jerusalem, with only a small see to administer and being of no great political significance, was far freer to travel.

We do not know what answer the priest Nicholas brought back from Moscow. He was perhaps told that the Patriarch of Jerusalem did not command sufficient prestige to be welcome. In any case, Jeremias, whose need for money to build his new church buildings was urgent, decided to make the journey himself. In the spring of 1588, rather to his surprise, he obtained permission from the Sultan to go abroad to collect alms. He wisely set out at once, lest the permit might be withdrawn; but he had no time to warn Moscow of his coming.

In May of that year the Tsar received a dispatch from the governors of the frontier town of Smolensk, announcing the arrival there of the Ecumenical Patriarch, accompanied by the Metropolitan of Monemvasia and the Archbishop of Elason, and a large suite of monks, merchants and servants. They enclosed a letter from the Patriarch himself, asking to be allowed to visit Moscow. The Tsar at once ordered that His Holiness should be sent on with every honour to Moscow. But being, like all Russians down the ages, highly suspicious of fo-

4. Acts collected in the libraries and archives of the Russian Empire by the Archaeographical Expedition of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, (in Russian), 4 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1836), I, I, no. 80.

5. The letter is given in *Russian Historical Library*, (in Russian) St. Petersburg, 1908, XXII, 1, coll. 67-75.

6. For the Council of 1551 and its decrees, known as the *Stoglav*, (the Hundred Chapters), see W.K. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, (Geneva, 1952), pp. 107-113. For the martyrdom of the Metropolitan Philip, see S.M. Soloviev, *A History of Russia from the Earliest Times*, 29 volumes, (in Russian, St. Petersburg, 1851-78), VI, col. 171.

7. The negotiations, letters, speeches and accounts of the ceremonies connected with Jeremias's visit to Moscow are given in the *Collection of State Charters and Treatises*, ed. A. Malinovsky, 4 vols., (in Russian, Moscow, 1813-28), II, pp. 95-103. A full account in English is given in A.N. Mouravieff, *A History of the Church of Russia*, trans. R.W. Blackmore, (Oxford, 1842), pp. 289-324. Unfortunately the author does not make it clear when he is quoting from the sources or adding his own commentary. See also N. Kapterev, *Character of Russian Relations with the Orthodox East in 16th and 17th centuries*, (in Russian, Moscow, 1885,) pp. 53 ff.. An account of the visit, written in verse by the Archimandrite Arsenios, who was on Jeremias's staff, is published in C. Sathas, *op. cit.* pp. 35-84. It does not add anything of importance.

reigners, he first reproved the governors for not having found out that the Patriarch was approaching; and he told them to find out carefully from His Holiness and his suite whom they had met on their journey, particularly in Lithuania. He also wrote to the Patriarch welcoming him, but asking pertinent questions. He wished to know what was happening in Lithuania and, still more, information about the Sultan's foreign commitments: also, where was the ex-Patriarch Theoleptos now? The Tsar clearly wanted to be re-assured that Jeremias had not come because he had been again deposed or that he was not likely to be deposed again in his absence from Constantinople. The answers must have been satisfactory, as the Patriarch was sent slowly and honourably on his way to Moscow. The journey from Smolensk took ten days. On 13 June, at the outskirts of the capital a Commissioner of State met the party and escorted in to the palace of the Archbishop of Riazan, which had been prepared for its reception. Orders were given that none of the party was to meet any foreigners or any Russians other than those appointed to look after it, at least until the Patriarch had been received by the Tsar.

This solemn ceremony took place on Sunday, 21 June, in the Kremlin, in the Golden Hall of the Sign Manual. The Russian sources describe in detail the splendour of the scene, the Tsar seated enthroned, wearing his crown and holding his sceptre and orb, in the midst of his gold-clad boyars. The Tsar condescended to rise to meet his guest. Then there were formal speeches, with interpreters present, as the Patriarch did not speak Russian, and then an exchange of gifts. The Patriarch's gifts to the Tsar consisted of icons and fragments of the holiest relics in the Patriarchal collection, taken from the True Cross and the instruments of the Passion, with some relics of female saints, destined for the Tsaritsa. The Tsar's gifts to his visitors were pieces of plate, silks, velvets and sables, and some cash.

When the formal reception was over, the Patriarch retired to a small audience chamber, to hold discussions with the Tsar's chief minister, his brother-in-law Boris Godunov. To him Jeremias reported on the situation in Constantinople and on his experiences on his journey. They then held discussions in private, no doubt in connection with the establishment of a Russian Patriarchate.

On receiving his brother-in-law's report the Tsar consulted with the Tsaritsa and announced a new proposal to his boyars, which was forwarded to the Patriarch. This was that the Ecumenical Patriarch should remain in Russia, with his residence at the former capital, Vladimir. It seems that the Tsar wished to have the Ecumenical Patriarchate within his own dominions, but did not wish it to interfere in the affairs of the Russian Church, which would remain under the authority of the Metropolitan of Moscow. It was hardly a practicable plan. It would have created

great administrative difficulties; and it left the future of the Orthodox within the Ottoman Empire uncertain and precarious. Was there to be a new, but junior, Patriarch of Constantinople, or was the Patriarch expected to administer the whole see from a Russian city?

Not unnaturally, Jeremias rejected the scheme. He politely pointed out that it was his duty and his wish to return to his flock in Constantinople and Ottoman lands. He did not know the Russian language; and he thought that it would be wrong for a Patriarch not to be in close contact with the Imperial authority. He seems tactfully to have insisted on the last point, so as not to give the impression that he had no wish to live in Russia; but he probably knew that the Tsar would not want so high-powered a hierarch to be resident in Moscow. The Metropolitan Job, whom he trusted and could control, suited the Tsar better. He therefore rejected the idea that Jeremias should stay in Moscow. At the same time he was annoyed that Jeremias would not accept the plan; and to punish him he forbade the Patriarch to leave Russia.⁸ But Jeremias held firm, though clearly he was increasingly eager to return home. Months passed. Some time in the autumn the Tsar begged Jeremias, if he would not stay in Russia himself, to appoint and consecrate a Russian as Patriarch to reside at Vladimir. Jeremias clearly thought this to be administratively unsuitable for the Russian Church. Eventually, on 13 January, 1589, Boris Godunov came to see Jeremias with a request from the Tsar that he would consecrate a Patriarch for All the Russias, apparently indicating that the Patriarchate should be sited at Moscow and bestowed upon Job, the actual Metropolitan of Moscow. Jeremias replied that as the Tsar was now 'the sole pattern of a Christian monarch', Rome having fallen into heresy and Constantinople into the hands of the infidel, this great work should be accomplished, adding a request that he then be allowed to return home.

On 19 January a synod of all the leading ecclesiastics in Russia met in Moscow; and the Tsar informed it of his wish to have a Patriarch for Russia and of the Patriarch Jeremias's consent. When the Synod had given its approval, the Tsar sent to Jeremias to ask him about the correct procedure for the consecration of a Patriarch. If the Russian sources are to be credited, Jeremias's reply did not accurately describe the procedure at Constantinople. Circumstances were too different. Russia did not have a Holy Synod of Metropolitans, meeting regularly and forming the supreme administrative authority in the Church; and in any case the elevation of someone to occupy an entirely new Patriarchal throne was unprecedented.

8. It is not clear whether the Tsar actually intended to move the Ecumenical Patriarchate to his own dominions or whether he wished Jeremias to become the Patriarch for Russia. In either case Jeremias clearly could not accept.

Jeremias composed a ritual to suit the situation, in which the Patriarch elect made it clear that he owed his throne to the Patriarch of Constantinople as well as to the Tsar. The Tsar himself then slightly altered the ritual, to make it conform closer to the ritual followed by his father when appointing a Metropolitan of Moscow; but the alterations do not seem to have affected the rôle of Constantinople.

The ceremony of consecration took place on Thursday, 23 January, in the church of the Immaculate Virgin. When the bishops were all assembled, two of them, the bishops of Suzdal and Riazan, went to escort the Patriarch to the church, to the ringing of bells throughout the city; and other groups of bishops met him as he approached the church and again on its steps and at the entrance. Having blessed the assembly on his entry he moved to the chapel of the Praise of the Mother of God, followed by all the bishops, who took their seats there; and a document was passed round for their signatures, announcing the selection of three candidates, Job of Moscow, Alexander of Novgorod and Pskov and Barlaam of Rostoff and Yaroslave, to be Patriarch. Three candidates were also nominated for the sees of Novgorod and of Rostoff, the actual incumbents heading the list.

When all had signed the document the whole company moved in procession to the Palace, with the Patriarch at its head. The Tsar came to the door of the Golden Hall to greet the Patriarch who was given a chair next to the throne. The secretary of the synod then began to read out the names of the candidates chosen for the new Patriarchate; but the Tsar stopped him at the name of Job, whom he declared to be elected. Messengers were then sent to fetch Job from the cell where he was waiting. When he arrived at the Palace the Tsar met him at the door of the Golden Hall, and led him up to receive the Patriarch's salutation, telling him not to lay aside his crozier, as he was now of equal standing. His election was then formally announced, together with those of the Archbishops of Novgorod and Rostoff, the candidates at the top of the list being chosen.

When the ceremony was over the Tsar conducted the two Patriarchs to the outer hall of the Palace, and the ecclesiastics returned to the church. Jeremias had suggested that Job should then read out his thanks to the Patriarch of Constantinople and to the synod. But this was not done, presumably on the Tsar's instructions. Jeremias and Job merely exchanged kisses and left by separate doors.

Next Sunday the same church was decorated for the actual consecration of the new Patriarch. On a raised dais in front of the apse the Tsar's throne was placed, covered in gold cloth, and on either side thrones covered in black cloth for the Patriarchs. When the procession entered the church, the Tsar and Jeremias went to their thrones, and Job stood at a lectern shaped like an eagle and made his confession of faith.

He then was blessed by Jeremias and did obeisance to the Tsar, and retired into a chapel. After the divine service had begun he appeared at the Royal Gates, and Jeremias joined him and laid his hands on him and held the Gospel over his head before repeating the whole order for the consecration of a bishop, to show that he was now a bishop of bishops. The two Patriarchs then celebrated the liturgy together. When it was over Job seated himself on his throne; and Jeremias gave him the holy staff of the Russian saint, Peter the Wonder-worker, and the Tsar robed him in costly vestments, making him a speech of welcome.

After the end of the service the two Patriarchs were invited to a great banquet at the Palace, where the tables were loaded with precious plates of all sorts, the splendour of which, we are told, astounded the Greek visitors. We are also told that they were given Cyprus and Malmsey wines to drink. After the meal sumptuous gifts of equal value were handed by the Tsar's treasurer to each Patriarch.

Next day the Patriarch Jeremias was invited to dinner by the Patriarch Job. But before the banquet both Patriarchs were summoned to be received by the Tsaritsa, along with the bishops of the synod. The only other men present at the interview were the Tsar and the Tsaritsa's brother, Boris Godunov. The Russian sources describe in detail the splendour of her reception hall and the beauty of her robe and her jewels. Behind her were ranged the wives of the boyars, according to their husbands' rank, all clad in white, holding their hands crossed in front of their breasts. When all were assembled the Tsaritsa herself presented to the Ecumenical Patriarch a golden chalice studded with gems, and her brother then gave both Patriarchs gifts of equal value, plate, silks and sables and a hundred gold roubles. Jeremias made a speech of thanks, and he and Job gave her gifts in return; and the Tsaritsa replied, closing with a moving appeal for the Patriarchs' prayers that she and the Tsar might be vouchsafed a son and heir; for the Imperial couple were childless. After the Patriarchs had taken leave of the Tsaritsa they went on to the banquet given by the Patriarch Job, in the course of which he presented his own gifts to Jeremias.

With this banquet the ceremonies were ended; and Jeremias asked for permission to return to Constantinople. But the Tsar pointed out the difficulties of travel in mid-winter and begged him to remain in Moscow till after Easter. Jeremias could not well refuse the invitation. He spent the intervening time paying a visit of several days to the great monastery of the Troitsa, close to the capital, and in helping Job to re-organise the Church in Russia, creating and re-arranging bishoprics to suit the needs of the time. Both Patriarchs took part in the Easter celebrations; and at last, in early May, Jeremias was allowed to depart.

His final reception by the Tsar was, we are told, marked by even greater splendour than his previous rece-

ptions. The Tsar personally handed him a mitre of great beauty and value; and there were gifts for every member of his entourage. Elaborate arrangements were made for his comfort during his journey through Russian lands; and the Lithuanian authorities were requested by the Russians to give him every amenity. When he reached the Russian frontier he was overtaken by a messenger from Moscow, bringing a letter from Boris Godunov, in which, after expressions of gratitude for his work in Russia, he was asked to report on the situation in Lithuania. Boris also enclosed a letter from the Tsar to Sultan Murad, for the Patriarch to deliver on his arrival in Constantinople. In it the Tsar asked the Sultan to give his special protection to Jeremias and the whole Orthodox community in the Ottoman Empire. Also, most usefully for Jeremias, the sum of a thousand gold roubles was given to him, to be specially devoted to the erection of a new Patriarchal church. Jeremias sent back formal thanks to the Tsar; and he was soon able to assure Boris that there was a new friendly government in Lithuania, where he had been well received.

Jeremias was back in Constantinople by midsummer. He found that nothing had gone amiss during his absence and that he still enjoyed the goodwill of the Sultan. Indeed, it is likely that Murad approved of his mission; for the Sultan and the Tsar shared in common a fear of the strength of the Polish-Lithuanian kingdoms.

With the funds that he had brought from Russia Jeremias was able to start work on the erection of a new Patriarchal church and offices for his Court. But he had a further duty to perform with regard to the Russian Patriarchate. He had consulted with his fellow-Patriarchs before going to Moscow; but in elevating and consecrating the new Patriarch he had perhaps acted beyond his legal powers. It was necessary to have the formal approval of all the Orthodox Church. He therefore summoned the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to Constantinople to attend an Ecumenical Synod. Joachim of Antioch and Sophronius of Jerusalem were both present; but Sylvester of Alexandria died before he could obey the summons. It seems, however, that amongst the forty-two metropolitans, nineteen Archbishops and twenty Bishops who attended the Synod the Alexandria Patriarchate was well represented. The Synod acknowledged and ratified the appointment of the Lord Job as Patriarch of Moscow and ordained that he should take his place in the prayers for the Patriarchs after the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

The Synod then nominated Dionysios, Metropolitan of Tirnovo and Archbishop of Bulgaria, a man who claimed kinship to the Palaeologue and Cantacuzene dynasties, to go to Moscow to inform the Tsar of the Synod's decision. Dionysios arrived there in the summer of 1590. The ceremonies arranged for his reception, with the speeches and the letters that were exchanged and the gifts that were made, are all des-

cribed fully in the Russian sources. Naturally there was not quite the same lavish splendour as was displayed for the visit of the Ecumenical Patriarch; and it is noticeable that Dionysios was kept waiting for some time before he was given an audience with the Tsar. This can be ascribed to the letter that he sent to the Tsar on his arrival, in which the Synod's placing of the Moscow Patriarchate below that of Jerusalem was announced. The Tsar had not given up his hope that Moscow should rank after Alexandria. It seems that Jeremias during his visit had avoided the issue. If it arose he would doubtless have said that it was a matter on which an Ecumenical Synod must decide. Now the Tsar seems to have understood that he could not dispute the ruling of the Synod and let the matter drop.

In a letter which Dionysios handed on to the Tsar Patriarch Jeremias announced that he had spent six thousand gold pieces on buying and clearing a site for the Patriarchal church and offices. He begged the Tsar to reimburse him. The Tsar in his reply seems to suggest that he thought the Patriarch to have been rather extravagant. He did not send him cash but merchandise which could be sold for the benefit of the church. The consignment consisted of sixteen hundred sable skins, twelve hundred marten skins, ten ermine skins and fifteen pounds, (roughly two hundred and fifty kilograms,) of walrus ivory. Dionysios was also entrusted with gifts of a mitre, plate, cloths and sables for each of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. There were gifts for the monastery of Panteleimon on Mount Athos and the monastery of Saint Sabbas in Palestine, and a special sum to Sophronius of Jerusalem for the erection of a church at Gethsemane. Dionysios and the members of his suite were also beneficiaries of the Tsar's bounty. Dionysios left, laden with all these gifts, in February, 1591, and was safely back in Constantinople by Easter.

One point was left unresolved. Dionysios had asked the Patriarch Job to appoint some Greek bishop to act as his legate at the Patriarchal Court in Constantinople. Job replied that he must consult the Tsar about it; and no appointment seems to have been made.⁹

Jeremias lived on till 1595, when he died in office, deeply respected even by the Ottoman Court. His new Patriarchal church was not ready for use till some ten years after his death, chiefly owing to the financial difficulties of the Patriarchate. His own pre-occupation in his later years was a reform of the Patriarchal Academy, broadening and modernising its curriculum. He had shown his diplomatic skill early in his reign, when he had to deal with the German Lutherans who were eager to form some sort of union with the Orthodox. He was able to convince them

9. For Dionysios's journey see Mouravieff, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-245.

that union was theologically and ecclesiastically impracticable, without losing their goodwill. His diplomacy was needed again in his later years, to combat the formidable attempts of the Polish kingdom to force the Orthodox in the Ukraine into admitting the supremacy of Rome. But his supreme diplomatic achievement was the establishment on the Russian Patriarchate. It was clearly right that the large and increasing congregations of the Orthodox in Russia should be granted religious autonomy under a suitably exalted head. Indeed, it would have been far more difficult to combat the encroachments of Rome into Russian lands had there not been a Patriarchate in Moscow. But traditions must be maintained. The new Patriarchate could not be allowed to rank before the ancient Patriarchates of the East, reduced and impoverished through they had become; and it must be made clear that Constantinople still unquestionably held the primacy. But at the same time the Orthodox were in need of a lay protector; and the Tsar of Muscovy was now the one great Orthodox potentate. Jeremias was therefore ready to recognize him as the heir to the Emperors of Rome and Byzantium, as the holy Emperor, the head of the Christian community. He was ready to accept the theory of Moscow as the Third Rome to this secular extent. He was, indeed, anxious that the Tsar should thus regard himself as responsible for the welfare of the Orthodox throughout the world, as the protector of the Orthodox living under alien rule, rather as the Emperor in Constantinople had been for the Orthodox congregations living in the lands of the old Caliphate. The Tsars were prepared, when they could, to accept this responsibility. Indeed, in later centuries they were to be too eager, involving the Greeks in acts of disloyalty against their Ottoman masters. But so long as Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire were on friendly terms, this worked well, and was certainly of material benefit to the Eastern Patriarchates.¹⁰

For Russia the establishment of the Moscow Patriarchate was of high importance and was to prove of the greatest value in the troubled years that were to come. Tsar Feodor died in 1598. The prayers of the Patriarchs that he might have a son were not granted; and his only daughter died in infancy. His young half-brother Dimitri died under mysterious circumstances in 1591; and it was generally believed that Boris Godunov had arranged for his murder. The old dynasty was ended. Boris, who had in fact ruled the country in his brother-in-law's name, was elected Tsar, to find that an upstart Tsar did not enjoy the same respect as did the minister of a monarch of an ancient dynasty. When he died in 1605, the tragic, haunted figure known to us from Pus-

hkin's drama and Moussorki's opera, most of the nobles were intriguing against him, while a False Dimitri, backed by the Polish army, was advancing triumphantly on Moscow. During the next few years, with two False Dimitris on the throne, interrupted by the brief reign of the boyar Vassily Shuisky, it was the Church that preserved Orthodoxy and headed the national identity against the Poles. The Patriarch Job was forced to retire, blind and enfeebled, when Boris died. His successor Hermogenes, appointed after a hiatus, by Shuisky, maintained the struggle till he was starved to death in prison by the partisans of the second False Dimitri.¹¹ When eventually order was restored with the election of Mikhail Romanov to be Tsar in January, 1613, he appointed his own father to be Patriarch, Philaret, born Feodor Romanov, whose aunt had been Tsar Feodor's mother. It was not till 1619 that Philaret was released from captivity in Poland to take over the Patriarchate. Thenceforward, being the young Tsar's physical as well as spiritual father and having a far stronger character, he in fact ruled the country till his death in 1633, raising the Patriarchate to a greater political power than even any Patriarch of Constantinople had enjoyed.¹² The Patriarch Nikon, who succeeded to the Patriarchal throne in 1653, after two less noteworthy reigns, attempted to extend his power even further; but that was more than either the Tsar or public opinion could stand. After a reign of six years he was deposed.¹³ The next Patriarchs were of a less formidable calibre. But in 1700, on the death of the Patriarch Adrian, Peter the Great only appointed an 'exarch in charge of the Patriarchate'; and in 1721 the Patriarchate was formally abolished and the whole Church put under a Holy Synod, which was in fact a department of state. Strictly speaking, with the Patriarchate abolished, it should have returned to the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. But in fact the other Patriarchs considered the Metropolitan of Moscow as still enjoying Patriarchal rank.¹⁴ Eventually the Patriarchate of Moscow was re-established, without reference to Constantinople, in 1917, during the early months of the Russian revolution.

But all that was hidden in the far future when Jeremias returned from his journey to Moscow. What he had achieved there had been wise and practical and beneficial both to the Russian Church and his own congregations. In his conduct there, as in his other works, he had shown his worthiness to be considered as one of the most admirable of the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

11. See Soloviev., *op. cit.*, VIII, *passim*, for the whole time of troubles.

12. See Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-141.

13. See Madlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-191.

14. Mouravieff, *op. cit.*, pp. 413-415. The Eastern Patriarchs could not well afford to offend the Tsar by not recognising the Synod.

10. In fact, owing to the troubles in Russia, the Church of Constantinople did not receive any material benefits from the Tsars till well into the seventeenth century.