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In his \textit{monodia} on the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453, Andronikos Kallistos, an eyewitness and one of the last writers of the Byzantine era, lamented the fall of Constantinople and cried out:

Where are the hospitals (\textit{nosokomeia}), the hospices (\textit{xenones}), the homes for the poor (\textit{ptochokomeia}), the homes for the aged (\textit{gerokomeia}), the
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houses for poor girls (*semneia*), and the convents (*parthenones*) for which the city was very proud? With the sack of Constantinople all lost—the elderly lost those who looked after them; the poor lost a city which fed them; the prisoners of war lost their emancipator; the destitute lost a city which provided for them; the farmers lost their distributor of justice; the orphans were deprived of a mother and the widows lost their protector.²

Andronikos Kallistos did not exaggerate and his *monodia* was not a rhetorical eulogy. Primary sources such as historical accounts and patriarchal documents, legal enactments and epigraphical evidence, seals and inscriptions, *typika* of monasteries, and last wills confirm beyond any doubt that Constantinople had many philanthropic institutions.

For nearly one thousand years (A.D. 1453), church and state, episcopal headquarters and monastic communities, and churchmen and laypersons of the Byzantine Empire had established and maintained numerous philanthropic institutions—hospitals, orphanages, hospices, (xenones), homes for the elderly (*gerokomeia*), reformatory establishments, and more. Philanthropy was practiced extensively in the form of daily charities and distributions to the poor and needy, and as institutionalized agencies and foundations.³ But how many of those institutions survived the desolation of the city? We do not really know. We assume that some were confiscated and turned into Islamic *awqaf*(pious foundations). It is believed that Byzantine philanthropic institutions became models for emulation by the Ottoman Turks.⁴ Others were burned and destroyed as Kallistos indicates.

It is well known that for three days the captors of Constantinople engaged in unrestricted pillage and plunder. "They slew everyone that they met in the streets, even women and children without discrimination. The blood ran in rivers down the steep streets ... toward the Golden Horn... Many of the lovelier maidens and youth and many of the richer-clad nobles were almost torn to death as their captors quarreled over them. ... Women were distributed among the captors [while] some of the younger nuns

---


preferred martyrdom to dishonor.... When the three days ended "there was little left to plunder." Nearly all the churches had been thoroughly sacked and desecrated. Treasures were snatched from churches and institutions and most of the books in monastic and private libraries, both secular and religious were burned.... "The city was desolate, lying dead, naked, soundless, having neither form nor beauty."5

Special privileges given to the Church through Patriarch Gennadios by the "generosity" of the conqueror, Mehmet II, were soon forgotten. Mehmet ordered the elimination of all the leading officials of the Byzantine Empire who had survived the three-day onslaught and one by one the old Christian churches were taken from them to be converted into mosques. Since philanthropic institutions in Byzantium were next to churches, it is reasonable to think that when Turks seized Christian churches, they seized along with them the adjacent charitable institutions, transforming them into Islamic pious foundations.

The relevant "generosity" promised by Mehmet to Patriarch Gennadios changed dramatically after 1464 when the conquest of the Kingdom of Trabzon was completed. A few years after the fall, Patriarch Gennadios wrote, 'We have neither a country nor a free church." He indicates that there was anything but toleration on the part of the conquerors. Because of the prevailing conditions, including much poverty, Christians lost heart, compromised and surrendered beliefs and traditions for the sake of survival. Poverty was so great that many walked around in rugs.6 Poverty remained a standard feature of the Church under Islamic Ottoman Turkish rule.

A synodic tome issued by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate on October ro, 1474, confirms that the church of Constantinople was in great poverty. No sooner had Mehmet II completed his conquest of the last Byzantine province, he forgot his pledges and imposed upon the Patri-
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archate an annual tax \textit{(kharad;)} of two thousand gold \textit{nomismata}. The tax was a heavy burden for a church that was still mourning its losses in terms of both manpower and wealth. How is it possible "for the Church of Christ to sustain such a heavy burden" finding itself "in such a poverty?"\textsuperscript{7} As the years passed, the financial burden increased to the extent that by 1621 the tax to the Sultan was six thousand gold \textit{nomismata}, and another amount of some four thousand given to different Ottoman officials. It was for this reason that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was always in debt. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that, in general, Ottoman policies toward the Church varied according to circumstances, time, and space.

The revenues of the Patriarchate, the source of its stewardship, depended on the generosity of merchants and traders, on laymen who entered the administrative machinery of the Patriarchate, on contributions of metropolitans and eparchial bishops, on gifts of priests upon their ordinations, and on a form of tax that the Patriarchate could impose upon its flock. Ultimately the Patriarchate came to rely greatly on the generosity of \textit{adelpsha}, brotherhoods or guilds of various trades, including merchant marine owners and sailors.\textsuperscript{8} Thus it should not surprise us that the earliest indications of the Patriarchate's stewardship are mentioned in the sources of the first quarter of the sixteenth century. The theoretical foundations, the theology about philanthropy and \textit{agapitic} stewardship, were never absent from the life of the Church, but it was the lack of funds that delayed its application.

The question is: Who looked after the physical needs of the Greek Orthodox under Ottoman rule? Pious fellow Christians and the organized church as a whole is the answer. The Orthodox Patriarchate became not only the spokesman, the guardian, the administrator, and the spiritual guide but also the dispenser of charities and the founder of philanthropic institutions. Whether through the humble parish priest, the anonymous working monk, the wealthy merchant or ordinary artisan, the bishop's residence or the monastery, the church continued its philanthropic social work. "The grand achievement of the Patriarchate was that in spite of humiliation and poverty and disdain, the Church endured . . . as a great

\textsuperscript{7}Demetres G. Apostolopoulos, \textit{O Eros Kodix tou Patriarcheiou Konstantinoupoleos sto miso tou you Aion a} (Athens: Ethnikon Idryma Ereunon, 1992), 91.

spiritual force" in the words of Sir Steven Runciman, one of the most authoritative scholars of the subject. Its spiritual obligations were dispensed not only through sacramental services, the liturgy in particular, but also through the daily practice of philanthropy. Under adverse circumstances, the Patriarchate proved itself a spiritual power in diakonia.

During the early four hundred years of Ottoman rule the church assumed the role of the protector, the apologist, and the defender of its people. Patriarchs, bishops, and priests became the guardians of social justice and the advocates of a more humane treatment of the poor, the persecuted, the orphans, the prisoners, and others in need. Philanthropic concern was both the Patriarchate’s policy and a local communal responsibility. The Greek nation under the Ottoman Empire included both wealthy and poor, but there was no sharp division between social classes, for all were second-class citizens under Turkish law and Islamic custom. The more affluent among the Orthodox Christians had consideration for the less fortunate among their brethren while the latter had accepted willingly the paternalism of the former. Under the circumstances, Greek Orthodox Christians, whether wealthy or poor or masters or servants, were forced to develop bonds of unity and mutual assistance. Law did not enforce the philanthropic spirit, but it was a manifestation of a long-standing benevolent tradition. It was this spirit that sustained the Greek people, united under a foreign and hostile system. The role of the community and the contributions of the individual parish in promoting a sense of unity with reciprocal rights and responsibilities are increasingly appreciated by modern scholars of the Ottoman centuries.

As a rule, the social philanthropy of the Church in this period was not manifested on a systematic or organized basis; it was not a social or well-constructed establishment as we know it today, but an everyday activity, the result of mutual concern, mercy, and compassion; a conscious participation in the sufferings and the needs of all. The Church had understood its social mission as one of religious philanthropia rather than as social welfare, i.e., an expression of Christian agape. Following a long-standing tradition inherited from the Byzantine experience of philanthropy, the Church fostered social justice and perpetuated the Christian vision of the human being as an image and likeness of God.

9Runciman, op. cit., 412; see also Timothy Ware, Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), r-5, 41-42.
Though we find several organized philanthropic institutions, of which we shall speak shortly, the Church emphasized individual virtue and goodwill, a practice that expressed its theological and ethical philosophy. The philanthropic activity of the Church as a community of believers and as individuals was done as a rule not on the basis of a planned program or as a predetermined effort, but as an obligation of a believer to a fellow believer. The philanthropist clergyman or layman gave higher value to the needy as an individual, as a person. Thus, altruistic love was much of the background of the Church’s charitable work. The clergy treated their subjects as children of God who had been entrusted to them, while the wealthy believers were urged to consider the poor and needy as their brethren. The sermons of leading men of this period, such as Elias Meniates (1669-1714), Nicephoros Theotokes (1731-1800), and Kosmas Aitolos (1714-1806), reveal that the rich were advised against a self-centered wealth and were urged to see themselves as stewards of possessions belonging to God for the service of men everywhere.\(^\text{10}\)

It was the task of the clergy to awaken in their flocks a love and compassion, and activity and involvement for the improvement of the lot of the less fortunate. Bishops in particular made numerous appeals on ethical but also eschatological grounds for orphans, widows, the sick, and the release of prisoners. Contributions for dowries of poor or orphaned girls, donations for the release of people imprisoned because of debts to a tyrannical state, and other humane measures which were encouraged by the Church, indicating that in the practice of philanthropy, the Church was motivated more by religious and humanitarian principles than by sociological considerations.

While social justice is subject to laws, *philanthropia* in its Graeco-Christian connotation is a free manifestation of love, a spontaneous and natural overflow of concern for the welfare of one’s fellow human being, perceived as the ideal, harmonious development of all human values and potentialities-grounded upon faith in God as the Supreme Being, the source and creator of all, and upon faith in the human being as the crown of creation and the spiritual likeness of the Creator. Thus emphasis was
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placed on a *philanthropia* that would embrace the totality of the person-framed in miseries and glories and strength and weaknesses.

The underlying concepts of the Church as well as the political circumstances during the Ottoman subjugation made philanthropy a movement, an everyday awareness and activity. It was practiced for purely religious reasons, because without applied charity there is no salvation. The clergy viewed philanthropy as an obligation toward one's fellow human being, accompanied by almsgiving, guidance, sympathy, altruism, and selfless concern. St Kosmas the Aitolian, an eighteenth-century champion of the poor, writes: "I have a loaf of bread to eat, while you do not; love tells me: do not eat it alone, but give some to your brethren and you eat the rest. I have clothes; love tells me: give one to your brother and you wear the other one." St Kosmas upbraided those who exploited the weak and poor and advised repentance and philanthropic action. The early and medieval Christian view, that philanthropy must be exercised in order to please God and receive forgiveness of sins and achieve eternal life, was repeated like a refrain by church fathers. Philanthropy is not only contributions of money to needy individuals but also a response to spiritual or psychological hunger, to the human being's thirst for love, guidance, certainty, and restoration of personal dignity. Churchmen made exhortations on the basis of the Scriptures but also of Greek and Roman classical authors, of Byzantine emperors and Jewish kings.

Prayers, fasting, and spiritual exercises must find an outlet in good works, while memorials for the deceased must be accompanied by charities. Such a combination on the part of the faithful is so powerful that even pagans can be saved. St Thecla succeeded in freeing from hell the pagan and unbaptized Phalkonila. St Gregory Dialogus saved the soul of the pagan emperor Trajan. Patriarchs and bishops appealed for support to wealthy constituents but also to princes and friends in foreign lands. For example, Meletios Pegas, Patriarch of Alexandria (1601), in several letters to Theodore Ivanovitch (d. 1584-1598) the "king of Moscow and emperor of all Russia," solicited assistance for the poor of his jurisdiction. His arguments are very much like those of Byzantine times. He writes: "Imitate God the merciful, who desires mercy and not sacrifices." The Russian emperor responded, sending him help for which the Patriarch acknowledged the
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7IICavamos, op. cit., 192.
king's generosity. Theodore had helped the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Other Russian tsars had assisted the Greek churches to free themselves from debts and continue their philanthropic work.\footnote{Meletios Pegas, *Epistles*, No. 2. ed. by W. Regel, *Analecta Byzantina-Russica* (St Petersburg, 1898), 95.}

There were several forms of philanthropy. Wealthy laymen took initiatives and conducted drives for public works such as bridges and schools in their villages or provinces. A certain pious man named Photos conducted *eleemosynary* drives and built the bridge of Kremmenitza in Epiros. Bessarion of Larissa (sixteenth century) became renowned for his efforts to emancipate prisoners, to feed the hungry, and to assist the poor. He was honored as a great benefactor of the province of Thessaly. Through his efforts several bridges were built in Thessaly and other parts of Greece\footnote{Spyridon Lambros, *Neos Hellenommemon*, vol. 13 (Athens, 1916), 135; for other philanthropists see vol. 5 (Athens, 1908), 293.},\footnote{William Plomer, *The Diamond of Ioannina* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970), 72.} specific mention is made of two bridges at Leukopotamos and at Acheloos Rivers. Anastasios Argyris of Ioannina had made a sizable fortune through trade with Western Europeans. He used much of his wealth for the welfare of his compatriots. Among his philanthropic contributions were the establishment of a hospital, the distribution of funds to poor prisoners (in addition to money, he sent a hot dinner to every prisoner each Sunday), widows, and orphans. Furthermore, he built roads and bridges. But his wealth and his generosity caused the jealousy and envy of Ali Pasha of Ioannina. Upon Argyris' death, the Pasha took advantage of the weakness of Argyris' son, Nicholas, and through perfidies and various pretexts, Argyris' wealth was decimated. Ali Pasha's policy and legacy were renowned: "When any rich citizen died, Ali's hands itched to take hold of the dead man's estate."\footnote{Constantine I. Amantos, *Mikra Meletemata* (Athens, 1940), 42-43.}

There were numerous Orthodox Greeks in the diaspora who supported their fellow countrymen living under the Ottoman Turks. They erected churches, schools, and libraries and redeemed prisoners and proved themselves pillars of the Orthodox Church and the Greek nation. An orphanage that existed in the city of Moschopolis in the eighteenth century might have been the work of the great family of benefactors who were descendents of the priest George Sina. It might have been the first such institution in the Christian East of modern times. The orphanage was known as *Orphanodioiketerion*.\footnote{Meletios Pegas, *Epistles*, No. 2. ed. by W. Regel, *Analecta Byzantina-Russica* (St Petersburg, 1898), 95.}
Ordinary clergymen and lay people became instrumental for benevolent institutions in provincial towns and islands. Theophilos Kaires (b. 1784) erected an orphanage on the island of Andros; Philothee Benizelou built outside of her monastery in Athens a hospital and a hospice for poor visitors. Her community became renown for philanthropic services to the poor and the persecuted. Her religious commitment and philanthropic principles led her to extend protection to four persecuted women sought by the Turks. They had been apostates to Islam, but later on they repented and returned to their ancestral Christian faith. Apostasy from Islam carried the penalty of death. Thus they sought protection in Philothee's monastery. Philothee paid for her act of philanthropy with her own life.  

We know of several hospitals during this period in cities other than Constantinople. A hospital was erected in Adrianople around 1752 through the generosity of Demetrios Ioseph. Nicholas Karayianes, past president of the Greek community in Venice (1727-1733), established a hospital in Jerusalem around the year 1714. The hospital was opened to clergymen, monks, and laymen alike. The Church maintained a hospital in Smyrna and perhaps other institutions in other major cities. It also maintained a hospital in Mytilene, built in the year 1691, known as xenodocheio and located across from the Church of St Therapon (i.e., "Healer"). A church hospital existed in Heracleion (c. 1800), Crete, which was transformed into a teacher's college and later into a grammar school.

Thus, the Ecumenical Patriarchate had developed an extensive program of philanthropic activity in Constantinople, including the establishment of hospitals, old age homes, orphanages, asylums, and reformatory homes. However, it is not known whether any of Constantinople's many philanthropic institutions survived the onslaught of May 29, 1453. Andronikos Kallistos, who witnessed the sack of Constantinople, implies that many of the capital's philanthropic institutions were destroyed by the conquerors. Pierre Gilles, a Frenchman, indicates that two major institutions of the Byzantine era, the hospitals of Sampson and Eubolos, were not in existence when he visited Constantinople in 1544.19

What about philanthropia and institutionalized philanthropy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople proper? The theoretical principle
for the application of philanthropic stewardship remained the same: “God is love and love is from God . . . If God so loved us, we in turn are bound to love one another” (Jn 7-n). The gospel pericope read on the third Sunday of the Triodion had a telling effect on the faithful everywhere.

A common feature of sermons and admonitions of the church was an analysis of the words of Christ concerning the Last Judgment. He will save those who when he was hungry they gave him food; when thirsty, they gave him drink; when he was a stranger, they took him into their home; when naked, they clothed him; when he was ill they came to his help; when in prison they visited him. Those who fail to serve the needs of the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the sick, and the poor strangers will be eternally damned (Mt 25-31-43). Personal charity was widely practiced. The same ethical principles led some wealthy individuals, including clergymen, to found or endow philanthropic institutions.

Established in Constantinople through the generosity of a certain Petros Sophianos, the earliest church hospital appears to have been erected in 1517 in the district of Galata. Sophianos requested in his last will and testament that Orthodox and non-Orthodox Christians who happened to fall sick while in Constantinople could be treated in his institution. The establishment was endowed with sufficient funds for distribution among the patients, a nurse, a priest, an undertaker, and for the maintenance or replacement of furniture and utensils. A monk named Joseph was the founder of a xenon (hospital) in Constantinople during the patriarchal tenure of Jeremiah II Tranos (1572-1579; 1580-1584), but we know nothing else about it.

By the close of the eighteenth century, around 1794, the Greek community of Constantinople supported three hospitals. All three were under the aegis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate but received the support of the whole Greek community. The first hospital was established in 1753. Some years later it was destroyed by an unknown cause and rebuilt by the patriarch Neophyto the Seventh in 1793. The hospital included a chapel in honor of the physician-saints Cosmas and Damian, "the unmercenary,“ and it was located not far from the Seven Towers of the Great Walls. This hospital ultimately evolved into a major philanthropic complex, and at one time, it included the largest hospital in the Balkans. It survives to the present day.

as the hospital of Baluokle. The union of the Greek grocers of Constantinople built the original hospital.

The second hospital was built ca. 1762, and it was located in the district of Galata. It was also known as the Nautilon Nosokomeion because it was for sailors and sea merchants. This hospital, too, had been burned down before 1814, and it was rebuilt through contributions of the Greek community under the Patriarchate of Patriarch Kyrillos the Sixth.

The third hospital was built ca. 1780 and located in the district of Staurodromion-Beyoglu. Each hospital had its own constitution and administration but all three were under the supervision of one board of trustees whose members were appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarch.²¹

In addition to these three hospitals, the Greek community supported an old age home for men, another old age home for women, an asylum for insane men and another asylum for insane women, a reformatory institution for girls, and an orphanage. All were under the supervision of the Church, and they became known collectively as Ethnika Philanthropika Katastemata-National Philanthropic Establishments.²²

As to hospitals, every one of them had a major philanthropist whose name appears on inscribed plaques. Hospital archives and records reveal that the Greek hospitals were open to all and offered their services to patients of various religious beliefs and ethnic origins: Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Oriental Christians of the Armenian and Coptic Churches, and Muslims and Jews; Greeks and Bulgarians, Albanians, Romanians (Vlachs), Russians, Austrians, Illyrians (Serbians or Albanians), Arabs, Persians, English, Germans, and Dutch. The Greeks are named on the basis of the city’s or the province’s name from which they came. Greeks were from Constantinople, Thrace, Macedonia, Epiros, Thessaly, Anatolia, the Aegean Islands, and Greece proper (Central Greece-Attica-Boeotia-Acarnania) and Peloponnesos.²³

²¹The hospitals of the Greek community in Constantinople under the aegis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate are conveniently discussed by Eugenios, E Zoodochos Pege kai ta hieron antistes prosknymemata (Athens, 1886), 139-183 and more fully in Aristoteles K. Stavropoulos, Ta Nosokomeia kai e Neseleitikes politikes Ellenikes Ethnouetas stin Konstantinopole (Athens, 1984), esp. 92-95.

²²Ibid., 154; T. Siofis, ”Ethnika Philippopika Katastemata,” Hemerologion 1906 (Constantinople, 1905), 83-94.

²³Information on the ethnic and religious background, the number of patients treated, the nature of illnesses, and salaries of physicians and staff is provided by the annual reports of the philanthropic institutions. Cf also Stavropoulos, op. cit., 135-173.
Hospital records also indicate that there were twelve sources of revenue, including individual donations and private charities; donations from bishops, who were obligated to contribute to the hospitals upon their ordination to the episcopal office; the product of the special collection boxes stationed in every parish church; special gifts from the Greeks of the diaspora, especially the Greek communities in Romania, Austria, and Hungary; from rentals of houses which had been donated to the hospitals by wealthy individuals; and the interest from endowments.

In order to systematize its philanthropic policies, maintain a just distribution of its charities, and have all parish churches and provincial dioceses contribute their share, in 1791 the Patriarchate established a common treasury. All churches were expected to maintain "sacred boxes" known as hiera kouteia, or kivotia eleous. The collections were used to support local needs but also the philanthropic obligations of the mother church in Constantinople. Ioannes Kallimaches served as the first supervisor of this program. Nevertheless, much of the responsibility was left in the hands of each local community: each congregation was responsible for support of local orphans, deserted children, and for the procurement of dowries for poor girls. Often, the local parish was called upon to contribute toward the redemption of prisoners of war and to use the income of the "poor boxes" for medical expenses of the poverty-stricken. It was not uncommon that the annual income of a certain church or shrine was set aside exclusively for the benevolent program of the Patriarchate.

Certain community churches had been charged with the responsibility of looking after the needs of insane people, such as the church of Panagia taw Kyrou in Egrikapio. In the year 1780, the Ecumenical Patriarchate imposed new financial obligations upon the churches of Constantinople in order to support the hospital at Stavrodromion. This hospital had been designated for a time to receive victims of plagues. The income of the prosperous Zoodochos Pege shrine after 1794 was set aside for the maintenance of all three hospitals.

The Patriarchate dispensed annual contributions for the relief of prisoners. Local churches took special offerings several times during the year for those who were in prison because of debt or for some other reason.

26 Eugenios, op. cit.
committees were established, and each one was in charge of some philanthropic project. On the other hand, all trade unions of Orthodox Christians in Constantinople-tailors, grocers, moneychangers, and others—had their own funds for charitable purposes.27

The philanthropy of the Church was extended to include education and educational institutions. Through the generosity of individuals, the Church maintained schools for poor children. For example, a certain George Kastoriotes had undertaken all the expenses for the establishment of a school at Kastoria where education was free of charge and available to all. Kastoriotes endowed sufficient funds for the salaries of two teachers. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem maintained a representative in Constantinople whose responsibility was to collect funds for schools in Palestine. Kastoriotes paid the wages of two laymen and several clergy in Palestine for the instruction of Greek and Arabic to children of Orthodox Christians. But philanthropy and education is a major subject that cannot be treated extensively here.28

The Christian commandment about "diakonia" (servanthood) was taken seriously by the Church whether in Constantinople or elsewhere. The Church was close to its people, and the people remained faithful to their Church amidst persecutions, pressures of proselytism, and other tragedies. In essence, the Church was where life was: in the capital and in provinces; in cities and villages; on the mountains and in the valleys; at the bedside of the sick at home and in the hospitals; in prison with the fallen or the hard pressed; and close to individuals unjustly persecuted—present where even the needs of the faithful called.

There were several other considerations that contributed to philanthropic stewardship in major cities. For example, in Constantinople the Greeks settled in certain specific districts such as Galata, Psamathia, and Fanar, the latter of which became the nucleus for the Greek community at large. The compactness of these districts encouraged intensive socialization and facilitated personal relationships and extensive cooperative networks. No person in need went unnoticed, and frequent church services enhanced the Church's knowledge of people in need—whether material or moral. Loyalty to the Church and constant contact with priests and bishops fostered philanthropic concern and activity. Cooperative activities, economic independence, and self-respect through economic achievement always

27Ibid.
have been encouraged in the Greek community which, however, acknowledges that not everyone can become self-sufficient and financially independent. Thus the need to put to practice the biblical injunctions: help the sick, protect the orphan and the widow, assist the elderly, and clothe the poor. The priest of the community had an obligation and even a personal economic interest in addressing the well-being of his poor parishioners and the generosity of the well-to-do families.

This neighborhood, or enoria, philanthropic stewardship was an individualized, spontaneous, and generally very caring phenomenon. A common heritage, the use of a common language, theological teachings and religious traditions, and social cohesiveness and humanitarian instinct became binding factors, reinforcing and strengthening the Greek community-at-large under Ottoman Turkish rule.

**SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY**


