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Chapter I
The Introduction

Constantinople was a city of churches. It was the seat of the Byzantine Christian Empire for over one thousand years and in the course of the Middle Ages had over five hundred churches. Of these, “about thirty have survived in varying degrees of ruination, that is, less than ten percent.”¹ The architectural and social history of these churches tells a story of communities in transition and the lives of Muslims and Christians living together. The city of Constantinople, that is now called Istanbul, and the Byzantine Empire, that succumbed to the Ottoman Empire in 1453, was, and is, a major centre of Eastern Christianity and the touch point between the powers of Christianity and Islam. More to the point, however, is the power of the city itself to tell the story of the interaction of Christians and Muslims. How did the Christian community represent itself to its new occupants? The Byzantines had a highly developed artistic style that represented their specific theological concerns and religious life. What story does the Christian community’s transition to Ottoman rule tell us of how they adapted to life in the Ottoman Empire? And how the Ottomans adapted to living with Christians? Byzantium created hundreds of churches, yet we have the remnants of only thirty such structures. What does this tell us of the life of the Eastern Christians and the Muslim state? The policies and practices of the ruling powers of the Ottoman Empire expresses in part the attitudes concerning Christians, yet so does their imitation and use of Christian forms in Islamic buildings.

The aim of this project is to better understand the relationship of the primary Christian community in Istanbul with the Islamic world in which it lived after 1453. The method used to examine this relationship is through the representation of the community in their church buildings. This examination must rely on the scant physical remnants of the buildings

themselves, the pattern and tradition of Eastern Christian religious art and architecture in Istanbul/Constantinople, the documentation and political context of the Church in relation to the Empire, and the textual evidence of mainly liturgical and literary sources. These sources reveal stages in the transformation of churches from the early Byzantine to late Ottoman periods that reflect and gauge the relationship between the Christian community and the Muslim community in which they lived. These stages cover the development of the Christian identity as Christians in relation to their churches, to the use of churches in Byzantine history, the transformation of Constantinople to a Muslim state and the subsequent stage of the Ottoman period under which the church buildings represented the line between the Christian community and the Muslim state.

In particular, the Orthodox Patriarchate itself, which has gone through five separate locations since 1453, will be analyzed in each of its stages from an aesthetic and functional lens to demonstrate how it represents a vital part of the identity of the Christian community in the context of its religious and political situation. This includes the current St. George’s Cathedral, which will be examined to understand how the identity of the community and its relationship with its surroundings have grown out of its past and now represent the face of the church in Istanbul. St. George’s Cathedral, as the seat of the Orthodox Patriarchate, is an example of how the Church has transitioned into new contexts without leaving its past behind: neither the history of Byzantium or the history of life as a minority is forgotten or unrepresented in the church.

The Church’s physical history in Istanbul represented by the form, function, and history of its churches, in particular the current Church of St. George in the Phanar, demonstrates the identity of the Christian community and their relationship with the Muslim majority.

There is a difference between dialogue and relationship in Muslim-Christian interaction. Dialogue is the open sharing and discussion available with a relationship, but the relationship is
the key part of this interaction. How Muslims and Christians live together in daily life and represent themselves to the other holds the key to understanding how the two communities can share the same space. Formal dialogue between the Christian and Muslim populations in Istanbul/Constantinople has only recently begun to emerge, but there has been much in the way of relationship: “In the past it was not possible for Orthodox Christians and Muslims to sit together to discuss openly and honestly their respective faiths.”\(^2\) It is impossible to be objective about the similarities and differences of Christianity and Islam when you are in the midst of a cultural and political battle for power or even survival in an empire. Orthodox Christians and Muslims may have lived side by side for centuries, but actual discussion on a theological level was rarely done due to the overriding social and political factors. These social and political factors will be discussed throughout this paper, but so will one of the elements that represent that silent interaction between the two communities: how churches represent, through their architecture and their treatment by Christian and Muslim powers, the invisible and symbolic line between Christians and Muslims in a political state.

Tracing identity from physical representations cannot be done without a dialogue with textual, political and religious history. Some of what we know about the Christian community is available from the artistic styles, methods of construction, topographical evidence and context of their churches, yet this picture can be enriched from the liturgical history, political relationships and literary heritage of the Christians and Muslims who lived their lives in and around the churches of Constantinople/Istanbul. Architectural historian Robert Ousterhout argues that, “We should be able to read a building, just as we read a text, as a historical document, for it can tell us

much about the society that produced it.” I would only add to this that living in and around a building, whose function is religious and ceremonial in nature, produces emotions and expressions that are preserved in textual records, as well as the resulting political and social results of these emotions, that speak out as if from the building itself.

The first section of this paper deals with a history of the Byzantine Church and politics, and especially with the foundations of Byzantine architectural and aesthetic forms. The future life of the Christian community under Islamic rule and its architectural representation cannot be understood in isolation from a thorough understanding of this background, especially considering the importance of the Christian tradition to Eastern religious life. The second section is a history of the transition into the Ottoman era of Istanbul. This change brought about a drastic and sudden shift in the structure and power of the church, but not everything was changed at once, nor did this change come at the height of Byzantine power in the region. The coming of the Ottomans did, however, represent a new life for church buildings themselves that reflected the new situation of the Christian community. The third section of this analysis is a case study of the Orthodox Patriarchate and in particular, St. George of the Phanar. This church is in the figurative shadow of St. Sophia, which ruled the skyline of Constantinople and was certainly not left to the Christians by the new powers in 1453. But St. George and its predecessor churches which all acted at one point as headquarters of the Patriarchate reflect the new nature of the church and their history demonstrates the life of the church within an Islamic community.


4 The Christian tradition of the Byzantine Empire is not even close to homogenous. There are many churches in the East and many traditions within the Byzantine tradition. However, in this paper, references to the Christian tradition in Byzantine refer to the Byzantine state church, which is also known as the Greek Orthodox tradition now. This is the church that was predominant in Constantinople and is within the frame of reference for this study. The importance of this Christian tradition is, in some texts, referred to in a formal sense with a capital in Tradition, but I have not used this distinction in this paper as it vastly complicates the argument and is not the main point of argument. It is enough to know that the Christian tradition in the East is important enough to merit a formalized reference because of its centrality to Eastern Christian self-understanding.
Chapter II

An Overview of Byzantium: History, Architecture and Heritage

The city of Istanbul emerged from Constantinople just as Constantinople emerged from Byzantium, the Greek colony situated at the mouth of the Bosphorus. This was and remains a highly strategic position for political and military control of the region. Constantine chose it as his capital in 324 CE and it was the capital of Christendom long before the Church in Rome formalized its division from the East in 1054. The mentality of greatness, in other words, was not lost and for centuries neither was the reality of greatness. The church of Constantinople held itself in union with the Empire in a way that is not familiar to our western senses, especially as the West did not even have anything resembling an empire until the emergence of Charlemagne. As a result, the church was also in a position of power due to its position within the structure of the Empire. This mentality lived in tension with the Christian experience of Christ held in the monastic and popular traditions. The church buildings themselves reflect this tension through their grandeur and use within the Orthodox liturgy.

The history of churches in Byzantium had two phases. The early classical age was when the forms and structure of the tradition were formed. The later periods are characterized by the influence of economic and political forces that pushed the church into the position of cultural preserver. This first section of the paper is divided into three parts that deal first with the classical foundations of Byzantium, then outlines the characteristics of the spiritual tradition of Orthodoxy relating to physical space and identity, finally the developments of the latter centuries leading up to 1453 that shaped the Christian identity heading into the Ottoman period. The

---

Church and churches followed the Empire through its high and low points, and from this journey it is possible to begin to understand the role of churches in the identity of the Christian community.

* * *

The rise of Constantine resulted from a complex brutal political and physical struggle the details of which are not necessary to be accounted of here, but the combination of these political maneuvers with the potent religious symbolism of Christianity as a state religion laid the foundations for the classical Byzantine understanding of Christianity and the Church. As an early 6th century historian, Zosimus, reminds us, the oft-labeled “divine” ascendency of Constantine must be held in context with, “the brutal and opportunistic maneuvering of ambitious men which characterized the politics of the later Roman empire.”

6 The impact of Constantine’s rule, however, changed the role of the church forever. The fact that this new empire was founded on a completely worldly basis was not lost to the Christians of the time who, probably rightly, bemoaned the loss of their counter-cultural position. While the transition to Christianity was by no means a swift process (it lasted centuries), the symbolic value of a “Christian Emperor” as declared by intellectuals such as Eusebius of Caesarea would in fact effect a rapid transition of Christianity itself from a persecuted to influential religion. The center of Christendom was still heavily balanced to the Greek speaking East and South at this point as the Latin church was still developing and pagan religions ruled in the West. The empire’s new headquarters, therefore, in the newly renamed Constantinople would have a great effect in its recognition of the wealth and populace of the East at this time in history as well as the role of the Church in the East.


When Constantine inaugurated Constantinople in 330, he embarked on an ambitious rebuilding and updating of the city, which worked to physically accumulate into one location the empire’s architectural and material wealth. Byzantium had already been a classical Greek city including the standard hippodrome, acropolis, temples, public baths and amphitheatres, but Constantine gave these features the characteristics of Rome, including the eventual expansion of the city over seven hills as Rome did, the division of the city into fourteen regions in imitation of Rome, and the building of a Capitolium to serve the same function as Rome’s Capitoline Hill.⁷ One aspect in particular was included, however, that Rome did not specifically have: a cathedral complex including the churches of Hagia Eirene (Holy Peace), Hagia Sophia (Holy Wisdom) and several smaller churches including the patriarch’s residence.⁸

The time after 330 CE and the dedication of the new eastern capital was a new era for Christianity and church building. Under the previously pagan Roman Empire, few Christian communities had specific buildings for worship. Meeting in converted houses or separate buildings was common. The Christian attitude towards art has been described by Cyril Mango as “indifferent and even hostile”, yet I would disagree and say that Christians merely had a different focus and function for their art.⁹ Early Christianity had a definite eschatological focus and their faith lives revolved around the sacraments as a communal act. This was related to their persecuted and outsider position, but also to the way the church formed as a strong communal body. This did not entirely change in the new Empire, but the activities and sacraments of the

---


⁸ Ibid., 19.

church did receive a new political element of power and symbolism. This was because of the new status of Christianity as the favored religion of the new Roman Empire under Constantine that must now be shown to support the power of the empire they had always abhorred. The liturgy would remain an important factor in the artistic design of churches, but the focus and function now included imperial influences and this necessitated a move into the architectural world that had previously held a small role in Christian art.

In the new Constantinople, churches were built with imperial money, temples were converted into churches and even public and secular buildings were decorated with Christian symbols to reflect the new position of Christianity in the Empire. Surely the aim was the establishment of a Christian power base in Constantinople, thus the use of the church building itself as a symbol the Empire. The new churches were to display, “magnificence appropriate to a triumphant religion.” In the old imperial order, the temple occupied the most prominent place in the city, now church buildings held that position of influence and the architectural grandeur had to reflect this new prominence.

The transition from primarily Roman to Byzantine architecture was not a precise movement. Even after the capital was established in Constantinople, the area never totally absorbed the Roman styles even if they did use Rome’s symbols and many of its forms. The intermixing of Roman and Hellenistic styles with forms from farther eastern areas began developing in the 4th century and would culminate in the era of Justinian in the 6th century. This is best represented by the emergence of art in glass mosaics as wall décor in buildings. The Romans had used mosaic in their flooring, but the Byzantines took this further and created their

---

own forms of mosaic that took advantage of the curves and domes of their churches and combined the linear Hellenism with the other-worldliness of the Eastern traditions. The tradition of Byzantine art and architecture came from a combination of influences, but the conflicting desires of innovation and desire to retain a link to the past was evident at an early stage as artists used traditional mediums to create new effects and styles.

Any history of this period of church architecture in Constantinople must mention the Hagia Sophia, the Church of Holy Wisdom. This church was, in its pre-Justinian or Justinian form, exempting the time of the crusader occupation, the seat of the Patriarch from 398 to 1453. The history of the Hagia Sophia shaped Byzantine church life and power and would play an equally important symbolic role in the transition to the Ottoman Empire, though Cyril Mango also describes it as the “white elephant” in that it was costly to maintain and too much for the community of the Middle Ages to keep up. Thus this building will be briefly discussed, but only in relation to its role in shaping the pattern of churches and Christian life in the East.

The first rendition of the Hagia Sophia, or St. Sophia, was built ominously with wooden beams under Constantine, dedicated in 360 and predictably, as with many wooden structures of the time, burned to the ground in 404. The second St. Sophia was dedicated a mere 11 years later in 415, but also succumbed to fire in the riots of 532. It is the third St. Sophia that would last into the present age. The Emperor Justinian jumped at the chance to rebuild a church of such magnificence and scale, which would have the potential be a centerpiece of his imperial Christian empire. And he did just that. The new structure was inaugurated after only five and a half years in 537. The new church used many known architectural designs, but they had never

---

13 Mango, Byzantine Architecture, 61.
been put together in this combination. The largest innovation, in literal and figurative terms, was the dome. Byzantine architecture is familiar with the dome, but never before on this scale and seemingly unsupported as it floats high above the ground in the center of the church.

In addition to its structural feats, the way the Hagia Sophia was built represents the building methodology of the Byzantines and presents a paradoxical paradigm by which churches were perceived as ways to innovate in art and technology, but they are also used as vital preservers of Christian tradition. The architects of the Great Church clearly had a theory and mathematical calculations on how to begin, but it seems that once begun, the continuation was frequently improvised and updated. Within the main church there are uneven heights of columns, differences in spacing on the upper and lower levels, transverse arches on the exterior that do not match the inner walls, and a major misalignment in the doors from the narthex into the sanctuary: “Within the broad guidelines of the overall design, there is endless variation and improvisation – at times even sloppiness. This confers on the building a feeling of life, of the unexpected.” The “unexpected” is what makes the space alive and this creativity is seen in other Byzantine structures. It is not clear how often architectural plans were used as none survive from these early buildings. And while it is possible that they had these documents at the time, there is a certain degree in which it is highly probable that, plans or not, design and construction were one and the same. Indeed, historian Robert Ousterhout noted that the church must have

---

14 Previous churches followed patterns set by Roman secular buildings as communal meeting spaces such as the basilica. Common architectural features would include domes, apses etc. but only in set combinations and on smaller scales. Ibid., 61.
15 This new type of dome structure rests on four pendentives that distribute the weight. A dome of this size with only four pendentives instead of eight or solid wall supports was unheard of at that time. The Hagia Sophia dome is one hundred feet wide and collapsed in 558 after which it was restructured and actually made higher. After this it suffered only minor disturbances in 989 and 1346, Mango, Byzantine Architecture, 64.
16 Ibid., 65.
17 What we know of early church plans is largely based on archaeological excavations, churches that exist as mosques today and newer churches that are based on earlier churches. Ousterhout, Later Churches of Constantinople, 247.
been begun on theoretical grounds because nobody with a practical background in architecture or science would have even attempted it.\textsuperscript{18}

The Hagia Sophia, in addition to its architectural innovation, would have a lasting effect on the standard and level to which churches would be held. The average user and visitor to St. Sophia could not have missed the influence of this central church on other churches in the Empire: “Byzantine clergy, architects and worshippers must have valued the strong relationship immediately evident between these [other] buildings and the Great Church…they must have been impressed by strong and obvious features.”\textsuperscript{19} The central dome, sense of unity and use of effortless grace made possible by advanced engineering, which was ambitiously planned if not executed and allowed the building to work despite its lack of structural organization, were all aspects that would reflect the image of the ideal church to be imitated and glorified. The pride in such a church was not always positive. The sheer size of the Great Church in Constantinople was so grand that successive generations concluded that it could not be outdone in size.\textsuperscript{20} Therefore large churches would never become a feature of later Byzantine designs. The pride held in Constantinople’s church and its loss in 1453 thus became a significant feature of later church mentality.

The building of the second Hagia Sophia under the Emperor Justinian was the highpoint and end of the Roman classical phase in Constantinople. The crumbling of the former Roman power is noticed in population fluctuations and a lack of security from invading powers. A plague in 542 decimated the city’s inhabitants as the population declined from nearly 500,000 to


\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 41.
perhaps 40,000 in the mid-eighth century. Major, and many minor, building projects practically ceased between 600 and 800 CE and were drastically different when resumed in the 9th century. The new pattern neglected the building of public or civic structures and only the upkeep of many churches was done. The major trend of building projects became that of family monasteries, “essentially private foundations that split up the urban space into a multiplicity of walled cells, each endowed with commercial properties and estates in the provinces.” The building boom of the early Empire would not return, and the city would undergo Latin control in the crusader period and a slowing of fortunes that could not revive the previous greatness on the same scale, though it did continue in a different manner as will be seen. The change in the fortunes, social and political situation of the city was thus reflected in the architectural structure of the city. The classical age set the stage for the mentality towards churches and their role in the Empire and the Christian community of Byzantium.

* * *

Eastern Orthodox spirituality developed alongside Byzantine churches as a motivation and reflection of the space used in the Divine Liturgy. Eastern spirituality was not, however, without the influence of Empire. The relationship between the Church and state as established under Constantine developed alongside the Christian tradition and informed the relationship with churches. The relationship between Church and state in the Byzantine Empire would come to play a role in the relationship of the Church to the Empire after the Muslim conquest in 1453.

---

22 Many of these would be taken for parish churches after 1453. At least two were used by the Patriarchate. Ibid., 70.
23 The architectural changes were, as mentioned, largely based on monastic developments. This was largely due to the lack of money and power in the government. The monasteries were modest in their innovations, but this period generally reflected more growth in the rural areas than in cities, therefore it is outside the scope of this project. For more on the architectural developments in this period, SEE: Ruggieri, Vincenzo. *Byzantine Religious Architecture (582-867): Its History and Structural Elements*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 237 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991).
Political considerations are briefly considered here, but the spiritual development within this tension of church and state is more important to the role of the church in Christian identity.

As the church developed within the Empire the Christian tradition became embedded in an imperial structure that was absorbed into its very fibers. The church and state in Byzantium went through phases of influence on each other: “When the state was strong, it aided the church; when the state was weak, it was aided by the church.”24 In the first centuries of Byzantium, religion held the Empire together and gave it legitimacy. Unity of religion meant unity of state. Between the 8th and 13th centuries, this unity of state and church was questioned in the political battles of iconoclasm25 and increased pluralism of the Empire. In the final centuries before 1453, when the state was in decline and was threatened by outside forces, the church became synonymous with the Greek culture and nationalism in order to hold the people together.26 This latter relationship of church, culture and nation would carry over into the Ottoman period as a way for Christians to identify themselves as a nation27 of Orthodox Christians and hold onto the orthodoxy and traditions passed down through the centuries.

The task of theology in the Byzantine Empire was the safeguarding of the sacred mystery of faith preserved in the church. The endless struggles over doctrine, especially in the

25 The iconoclastic controversy concerned the veneration of icons and whether or not this act should be considered idolatry. The rise of Islam in conjunction with political movements were likely harbingers of this movement and it was largely emanated from the upper class and theologians as the monastic communities and the overwhelming population clung tightly to icons as a part of their spirituality. The results of the controversy were, however, widespread as it contributed to the eventual division of the East and West as various theological battles were tied to this issue over the centuries. "Iconoclastic Controversy" The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone. © Oxford University Press 2005. The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church: (e-reference edition). Oxford University Press. Luther Seminary. (1 May 2012) <http://www.oxford-christianchurch.com/entry?entry=t257.e3449>.
26 Geanakoplos, 98.
27 A political term that was, ironically, to be founded on religious identity. Such a combination of religious and political identity was not unique to Byzantium, but it was a central feature of their understanding of the relationship between the Church and the state.
Christological debates of Chalcedon and Nicaea, were battles for the preservation of the truth. The incarnation is what enables humankind to become what we are supposed to be in the image of the God who became man, and this truth of the union of God and humanity is central to the tradition of Byzantine Christian theology. Indeed, “In the Byzantine setting, theology was above all the work of expressing, defending, and preserving Tradition…No Byzantine theologian sought, or claimed to seek, originality… ‘innovation’ is synonymous with ‘heresy.’” Indeed, tradition was sought after not because of its intrinsic good, but because of its truth in conveying the total union with God through the incarnation of Christ. All theology within the tradition aims to preserve the possibility of the human becoming God because God became human. And this union is achieved in the liturgical act within a space that supports this union.

The role of monasticism in the Byzantine Christian Church cannot be ignored. The ascetic ideal was firmly in place in the early church and while the Church itself was closely allied with political powers following the Constantinian model, the monasteries exerted an independent influence in the Empire. In the West, monasteries were organized into a hierarchy of orders that were isolated by strict rules and discipline, but the Byzantine model moved in the opposite direction toward more independence and freedom within the wider community. In general, the focus was less on the communal isolation of the monastic community, and more on the spiritual qualities of the monks and nuns associated with the monastery and living within the

---

28 This aversion to innovation and its relegation to heretical terms is also true of Islam, which has always been against innovation (bid’ah in Arabic) in religious matters. Perl, Eric. “…”That Man Might Become God”: Central Themes in Byzantine Theology.” *Heaven on Earth: Art and the Church in Byzantium* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998): 39.
29 The Eastern Church has been intent on preserving this Tradition throughout its existence. From their apostolic foundation with St. Andrew to the power of the church within the Empire, the emphasis on continuity with Christian orthodoxy has been sought. The church councils of at Nicaea and Chalcedon in the fourth and fifth centuries, even through the iconoclasm debates and schism with Rome in the eleventh and twelfth centuries are evidence of this devotion to orthodoxy.
local community. There were monastic communities that cut themselves off from the world and from the Church in Constantinople in particular, but often the individual and community worked in tandem and it was a more casual and free community than the ordered life of the Western cloistered monastics. While monasteries were commonly rural, they also existed within cities. The first monastery within Constantinople was that of Dalmatos that was begun in the late fourth century. The monastic communities were responsible for a majority of the Medieval churches in Constantinople and would become more important after 1453 as centers of Christianity.

The influence of the monastic life in the East on the life of the Church was largely in the spiritual life to which the Christian aspired. The development of individual devotional patterns based on the holy men and women of the ascetic monastic way of life became the norm of a pietistic trend in Byzantine religion. The relic and icon were devotional tools that could aid the believer in his/her spiritual closeness with God. The focus of worship was on the individual’s within these symbols that could point to the greater truth. The monasteries were influential in this pietistic trend and, especially after 1453, would play a large role in the preservation of these spiritual qualities that affected the way in which churches supported the community.

The Byzantine Church had a different relationship to images than that of the West. The power of images in religious life of the Christians of the East was monumental. Byzantine religious life interacted in deep and meaningful ways with its surroundings: “The church was God’s dwelling place among men and women…Because the aim of Byzantine worship was theosis, the actual deification or divinization of humanity, churches were an essential link

---

32 Kazhdan and Epstein, 95.
33 Sometimes this was difficult to manage, especially as religious imagery became associated with the imperial cult at an early date, thus spurring often-violent controversies over the appropriateness of images in worship life. Safran, Linda. Heaven on Earth: Art and the Church in Byzantium. (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998): 5.
between the terrestrial and divine realms." There is an intimate connection between the person and the Church, and the Church as unified with Christ. Origen, in his work on *The Song of Songs*, implies an entrance into the mystery of the Church, and in this action of living and thinking according to the Church, the individual becomes a disciple of Jesus. The spiritual entrance into the church building for worship in the Divine Liturgy is to enter the divine and experience heaven on earth. This image guided the Byzantine understanding of the role of the church, as community and as space, and this mystery is therefore experienced in their architecture.

A literary example of the mystical understanding of spirituality is seen in an account of St. Basil, the Cappadocian Father, who describes the movement of the believer into the spiritual order:

If you want to speak or hear about God, leave behind your own body, your earthly senses...; under yourself make a layer of air, overtake the times...surpass the stars with the mind...raise up the mind over them and consider the divine nature.

This poetic description of the euphoric state of spiritual closeness with God is in line with the Byzantine theological patterns of mystic experience of the divine, but is also a very physical description. The person transcends the material world and is captured in a world of light that epitomizes the divine. Such a relationship with light and spiritual experience is echoed in the description of the dome of St. Sophia in the *Ekphrasis on St. Sophia* of Paul the Silentiary:

---

34 Ibid., 4.
36 Basil, Hom. de fide, PG 31, 465A-C.
37 The silentiary was the one appointed to keep silence and order in the court. Paul the Silentiary held that post in the court of Justinian I in the 6th century when the Hagia Sophia was built for the third time in its current form.
You will mark how everything is clothed in splendor, everything astounds the eye; words cannot clarify this evening brightness…In this fashion evening fires circle through the temple and sparkle with joyful lightning.\textsuperscript{38}

The experience of the church is the experience of the soul in relation to God. Paul is recreating the experience of architecture in words and in doing so using the same imagery of supernatural beauty as Basil in relation to the spiritual experience of the believer. The church is a physical location wherein this divine-human relationship takes place. And the relationship is played out in the liturgical functions of the Orthodox rites. In other words, the spiritual relationship between the Christian believer and God as experienced in the Divine Liturgy is reflected in the experience within the physical realm that includes location within a sacred space: “In the Byzantine liturgy, nothing is left as an abstract idea. All truth is incarnate, made flesh. There is no idea without a concrete, visible, audible, tangible expression. And conversely, all the objects of the senses are filled with meaning, that is, with light.”\textsuperscript{39}

The relationship felt between the Divine Liturgy and the church itself is summarized by Germanus who served as Patriarch of Constantinople in the first half of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century and who deserves to be quoted at length as he describes the role of the various elements of the church in the life of the Christian story:

The Church is the temple of God, a holy place, a house of prayer, the assembly of the people, the body of Christ. It is called the bride of Christ…The church is an earthly heaven in which the supercelestial God dwells and walks about…The apse corresponds to the cave in Bethlehem where Christ was born, as well as the cave in which he was buried…The holy table corresponds to the spot in the tomb where Christ was placed…The holy table is also the throne of God…The ciborium\textsuperscript{40} represents here the place where Christ was crucified…it similarly corresponds to the ark of the


\textsuperscript{39} Perl, 54.

\textsuperscript{40} A large canopy over the altar table consisting of four columns and a roof.
The ambo manifests the shape of the stone at the Holy Sepulchre proclaiming the resurrection of the Lord. The church physically corresponds to the story of Christ as it is lived out in the ritual life of the Church. The elements of the church such as the apse, holy table, ciborium, ambo, etc., are not only a part of the building, but represent “hierarchical steps intended for the access into the living mystery accomplished therein.” The church symbolizes spiritual existence within the Divine Liturgy. The physical church acts as a medium for the relationship of the Christian with God and its aesthetic reflects the community’s ideal of this relationship.

As the physical form was so important to the representation of Byzantine Christian life, an outline of its major elements is required, though the technical considerations will be omitted as they are a study unto themselves. The elements of a Byzantine church follow the pattern of the liturgy as described above and while a level of individuality can be ascertained; most churches strove for a similar pattern following the focus on tradition and what was considered true. Thus there is a transition of space from the outer world into the holy space of the nave through a narthex, side aisles or atrium. The orientation is to the east as Scripture says that Christ will come from the east in the Second Coming and the altar is the throne that awaits him. Thus the naos, bema altar and semi circular apse where the clergy sat are directed eastwards in preparation. A stereotype that we carry from the Hagia Sophia is a sense of large and grand

41 Large oval platforms, supported by eight columns, located near the center of the nave. Litanies and readings were proclaimed from it.
43 Ruggeri, 137.
44 See Figure 2.1
45 For more on technical aspects of Byzantine construction, see: Mango, Byzantine Architecture.
46 Ousterhout, The Holy Space, 84.
47 Similar to a nave in Early Christian churches, but nave refers more to longitudinal churches, whereas Byzantine churches were centrally planned. It is the space in which the congregation gathered for worship.
48 Central area of the nave where the altar resides and behind the templon or iconostasis.
spaces, yet Byzantine spirituality was personal in nature and most churches were on a smaller than average scale conducive to intimate worship settings and smaller communities of faith.\textsuperscript{49} The mystery of the liturgy was also preserved by the templon or iconostasis that separated the altar from the laity, thus keeping the mystery of the Eucharist among the ordained with highly orchestrated revelations to the congregants at specific points in the service. These screens were often highly decorative and provided a devotional function as well as a liturgical one with their orders of icons.

The most obvious feature of the church is the central dome above the naos that creates a vertical axis that in many Byzantine churches with a central plan de-emphasizes the horizontal axis.\textsuperscript{50} The longitudinal plan of Early Christian cathedrals and those of the West was based on a processional liturgy, which was replaced in the Byzantine church with one focused on the interaction of the bema and naos through a series of appearances for the reading of Scripture or distribution of sanctified bread.\textsuperscript{51} The worshipping community would be led through this space in the Divine Liturgy. Everyone had their place from the bishop to the presbyters, deacons, lectors, janitors, and laity, who should sit according to gender and age. A writer in the third century likened this organization to that of a ship turned toward the east, or a sheepfold where all the animals had their areas.\textsuperscript{52} The central plan with the focus on the dome organized this menagerie of actors in the divine rite according to the tradition of the Church. While there may

\textsuperscript{49} This would be especially true after 1453 when no large churches existed. Ibid., 91.
\textsuperscript{50} See Figure 2.2 and 2.3
\textsuperscript{51} The distinction was not universal, but the development of worship practices in the East and West played a role in the differing perspectives on the use of space in church plans. Ibid., 95.
have been numerous variables\textsuperscript{53} in the layout of individual churches, the focus on serving the liturgy and creating a vertical access to God was the concern of Byzantine church architecture.

The plan of the church was only a portion of the experience of the church. Highly specified mosaics or frescoes decorated the different elements of the building according to the established tradition of the Church. The decoration and architecture should work together to achieve the complete effect.\textsuperscript{54} As in European churches, the decorations served two purposes, as devotional foci, and as educational art for the congregation. Thus scenes from the Old and New Testaments and of the saints all held their traditional locations within churches.\textsuperscript{55} Domes, vaults and flat spaces were chosen for specific scenes based on their location and symbolism. For instance, the eastern semi-apse over the altar was the focus for worship and thus often used for an image of Christ enthroned with the rounded surface being indicative of a heavenly surrounding. The flat spaces in the narthex may tell a longer biblical story, or be used for images of the patrons of the church. Iconography also played a role in the organization of space through the approaches to particularly venerable icons or access to locally loved saints etc. There is always a close relationship between the work of the artist and architect in melding the elements of the church because, “A Byzantine church did not simply house events and ceremonies, but became an intimate part of them. It molded the liturgical service and responded to it, both

\textsuperscript{53} Variations included additions of side chapels, naves, and apses or even additional narthexes and courtyards. See Figure 2.4
\textsuperscript{54} See Figure 2.5. There are three typical zones of hierarchy in images common to Byzantine church décor and still imitated in Greek Orthodox Church design today, when possible, as part of the Eastern tradition. The Pantokrator, the Ruler of All - Christ, occupied the heights of the dome that was often in mosaic as the curved surfaces lent themselves to the mosaic medium. The location of Christ in the dome implies his embracing or envelopment of the congregation in the church. The second zone is in the curved wall of the apse where images of the Virgin Mary with Christ and surrounded by angels is often located. This second zone around the apse, vaults of the cross-arms, and narthex may also be used for narrations from the life of Christ, or the Feast Cycle as it also follows the celebrations of the church. The third zone is the Choir of Saints including sainted priests, church fathers, patriarchs, emperors and often patrons. They are presented at the level of the congregation in the naos in order to surround the congregation in the community of saints. Ousterhout, “The Holy Space”, 97-98.
\textsuperscript{55} Cited by St. Nilus of Sinai in his Letter to Prefect Olympiodorus concerning the use of paintings in churches; Mango. The Art of the Byzantine Empire: Sources and Documents, 32-33.
through the development of new plans and through its interaction with the figural
decoration…Above all, Byzantine architecture was a responsive architecture.”56

The main points to be taken from this historical survey of the architectural theory of
Byzantium is that the Church was devoted to both tradition and being responsive to the needs of
the worship of the Divine Liturgy, and this developed within a Church structure that was heavily
influenced by the Empire. Perhaps this is not incongruous at all. The tradition of the Church
became the core around which the life of the community revolved including its buildings. The
buildings thus in their own context responded to the life of the community participating in both
the life of the liturgy and the Empire. The life of the community outside the church could not,
and did not, however remain the same as in the growth of the Byzantine Church. As mentioned,
the fortunes of the Empire began to change after 600 and it is in this period that a new religious
community began to announce itself to the world, which made the Church cling ever more
strongly to its core, and shaped the identity of the church which would confront Islam in a few
short decades.

*   *   *

The seventh and eighth centuries were not kind to the Byzantine way of life. These
centuries would shape Byzantine Christians leading up to the Ottoman takeover in 1453. The
political and military security of the Byzantine Empire was under constant threat and the social
upheaval and economic regression stressed every level of society. The first major external threat
was from the Arab and Bulgar armies attacking from the south, north and east. By 641, parts of
Persia had already fallen to the Arab Caliphate and Byzantium was excessively vulnerable.57 By
the year 780, nearly 140 years of fighting had gone by, but neither the Arabs nor the Bulgars had

managed to conquer the Byzantines, though they had lost Syria, Egypt, northern Mesopotamia, Armenia, North Africa, most of Italy and the Balkans to these Arab and Bulgar armies. It also lost the cities of Alexandria and Antioch, leaving Constantinople as the only major metropolis in Byzantine control and it was greatly reduced in size because of a lack of resources and population as well as an inability to defend such a large space. Despite such great changes, the superstructure of the Roman Byzantine state remained in its tax system, professional army, civil service, system of schools and monetary economy.\textsuperscript{58} This system compared favorably with that of the Arab caliphate system, so that after 1453 the system they faced was not unknown or difficult to understand.

The changes in Byzantium as a failing political entity would come to tie the Christian population to the remaining power structure in the Church. The Church compensated for the loss of leadership from the government by becoming the preserver of Byzantine culture. This struggle between the innovation and creativity in their art with the need for consistency with the tradition became a defining factor in this period, especially as Latin and Muslim cultures began to influence the culture increasingly heavily.

The rise of Islam in the Arabian Peninsula displayed a magnitude and speed that had never been seen before. In less than a century, the Muslim nation stretched over an area from Spain to India. The spread of Islam under the caliphate was seen as a divine sign that their mission was according to God’s will.\textsuperscript{59} Islam is a very practical religion. It understands the revelation in the Qur’an to be the definitive point of reference because it is literally God’s word. Submission to God means submission to the revelation in the Qur’an that will bring about peace in the world. Thus peace is the vision for all lands, but this is only possible when they submit to

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 142-150.
\textsuperscript{59} Irvin and Sunquist, 355.
God. The means for this vision of peace is under a Muslim rule, thus the idea of the *dar al Islam*, the house of Islam. The *dar al Islam* is comprised of those lands that are under the Muslim political umbrella and thus run according to the will of God for the world. Those lands that have not recognized the Muslim leadership are in the realm of the *dar al Harb*, the house of war. This is an idea of the frame of reference to which the Muslim armies adhered. With Islam would come peace.

Tradition was an increasingly strong factor in the remnants of the Byzantine Empire moving into the medieval period. The majority of the ancient Christian communities in Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch were under Muslim control by 780. This period would also mark a new phase in the tensions with the Western Church as the crusades were unleashed in the 10th and 11th centuries, and Constantinople was directly in the way of these forces. The remnants of respect in the West for Constantinople as the symbolic head of Empire and Church in the new Roman Empire was lost in practice when Charlemagne declared, through the invented *Donation of Constantine*, that the imperial responsibility had transferred to Rome.60 Thus the superiority of the crusaders in their destructive march through the city and subsequent dominion over the region was overtly felt. The occupation by the Latin forces from 1204 to 1261 was the only period before 1453 in which the Hagia Sophia did not serve as the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The submission of their greatest architectural symbol to the Latin powers was a blow to the Empire, but their will was not subdued as they saw the crusaders as inferior to their own heritage. Anna Comnena, the daughter of the Emperor Alexius, wrote in the early 12th

---

60 Magdalino, 169. This had been a long time in coming. The churches had been growing apart for centuries, though specific issues festered. The roots can be found in the political and theological divisions of the fourth and fifth centuries, though the official schism did not happen until 1054. For more, see: Congar, Yves. *After Nine Hundred Years: The background of the Schism Between the Eastern and Western Churches.* (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 1959).
century of the “Latin arrogance” and their “usually greedy” behaviors. The tradition of the Byzantine Empire was not going to submit to Arab, let alone Latin culture.

The insistence of outside culture, however, could not be ignored, especially as the Empire began to shift its borders and be engaged with new empires in its trade and military exploits. The influence of these “outsiders” on the decorative and architectural arts is difficult to discern as much of it was related to secular and not church architecture, and very little of this architecture remains. It is clear that specific trends began appearing in the 11th and 12th centuries from Armenian and Arab traditions, such as the use of script in art and changes in some church plans. With the division of the Empire into principalities, the architectural heritage becomes far more dependant on regional differentiation. In Constantinople, however, less change is noticeable. Under the Latin occupation, there was very little done in terms of developing new buildings or churches. The changes in the cultural predominance seems to have mainly affected the volume of new buildings and had much less of an effect on the buildings themselves. This indifferent expansion would last until the 13th and 14th centuries when the Empire was exposed to Latin and Turkish powers in a greater measure and a wave of Byzantine cultural innovation had a final showing before 1453.

The era of the crusades signals the slow dismemberment of the former Empire. This does not mean that the Byzantine culture was in decline, but its association with the powerful empire of the past was more of a memory and less of a reality. The economic and political upheaval of

62 These changes were not localized in Constantinople, but can be observed in the former Empire as a whole. Kazhdan and Epstein, 181.
63 Mango, Byzantine Architecture, 141. Though many Latin Churches were built in this time that had an entirely different fate than the Byzantine churches due to the policies of the Ottomans concerning these Western areas. Due to the limitations of this paper, they will not be explored here. For more, see: Marmara, Rinaldo. The Istanbul Latin Community and its Church since the Age of the Byzantine Empire to the Present. (Istanbul: Kitap Publishers, 2006). AND Girardelli, Paolo. “Architecture, Identity, and Liminality: On the Meaning of Catholic Spaces in Late Ottoman Istanbul.” Muqarnas. 22 (2005): 233-264.
the last 250 years of the Byzantine Empire is, in fact, in stark contrast to the achievements made in art, architecture and scholarship. This era, known as the Palaiologan after the ruling family, began in 1260 and ended in 1453. This period of renaissance was a reaction to the influence of outside cultural forces, but also a sign of a society trying to revive their own identity that was preserved in the cultural arts, including those of the Christian tradition.

The two cultural blocs of the Latin West and Islamic East each had advanced forms of architecture that were technologically more advanced than the Byzantine at this point. The Seljuk mosques in Persia and cathedrals of Romanesque and Gothic Europe were swiftly surpassing the achievements of size and style that had been done under Justinian in the early Byzantine world. This may have galvanized the efforts of the Byzantine artisans of all mediums to re-embrace elements of their glorious past, but with the addition of new techniques. The new buildings being erected in Constantinople after the 12th century were a fusion of Byzantine and Latin styles. In Constantinople the Italians built their own churches, castles and mansions. The things the Byzantines saw in the Latin architecture and imitated in their own included the belfry, pointed arch, decorative machicolations, and even some examples of stained glass. These elements advanced the architectural forms available to the Byzantine Church, but did not change the relationship between church and liturgy based on their Tradition.

In conclusion, the history of the architecture of the Byzantine world, and the identity and relationships it represents, cannot be separated from its development alongside of the Church,

---

65 Mango, Byzantine Architecture, 141.
67 A definite secular influence – the machicolation was a projecting gallery at the top of a castle wall, supported by a row of corbelled arches and it had openings in the floor through which dangerous materials could be poured on attackers.
68 Ibid., 302.
theology, politics and social life of the Eastern world. This world was placed in the midst of a cultural highway from east to west, yet the Byzantine foundations in their Roman heritage would remain a constant factor in their self-image as portrayed in their churches. The core of their religious life was still based on the tradition of the Church, which relied on the Divine Liturgy and the relationship to the space within the worshipping area. The invasions of the Arab and Latin forces throughout the latter half of the Byzantine era and finally the encroachment of the Turks can be seen in both positive and negative lights. The positive includes the influence of new ideas and methodologies that were often rejected, but sometimes accepted into the renewal of Byzantine forms. The negative influence included the instability and poverty imposed on the Empire that made building projects and even upkeep of already existing structures difficult to maintain or develop.

Chapter III

1453, Muslims, and the Consequences for Byzantine Churches & Christians

Fatih Mehmed was 19 years old when his Turkish armies attacked and conquered the capital of the Byzantine world. The fall of Constantinople on May 29th, 1453 was the beginning of a new era for the Church. However, this new era was ushered in through defeat and occupation. The fall of Constantinople was eulogized in Byzantine memory by the remaining Christian population: “Their spirits tingled and their courage rose as they told of the last Christian Emperor standing in the breach, abandoned by his Western allies, holding the infidel at

69 Though most of the former Empire was already in Turkish hands at this point as the process was begun as early as the 13th century. Reinert, 280-83.
bay till their numbers overpowered him and he died, with the Empire as his winding-sheet.”  

The end of the Byzantine Empire could only mean that the culture, which did not disappear, had to learn to live in a new context. This new context was unlike anything Christians had dealt with since the founding of the Empire under Constantine in the fourth century. Islam had arrived in Constantinople, now Istanbul, and Christians would eventually hold a minority status in the population. In terms of policy, Christians were a minority from the beginning of the new Empire. The new status quo has shaped the relationship between the Muslim and Christian communities in Istanbul and this is reflected in the way the Byzantine churches were treated by the Ottomans as well as in how the churches were used by the Christian community.

This section delves into the effects of the 1453 transition of power and its effects on the Christian community their churches and the Muslim state. The minutia surrounding the events of May and June 1453 had lasting effects on the subsequent centuries of church decisions in Istanbul and thus helped to define the relationship of the Christian and Muslim communities. It is important, therefore, to begin with the capture of the city before moving on to speak of the conditions of the Christians and the status of their churches in the Ottoman period. I have tried to remain reasonably chronological, but this was not always possible. After describing the events of 1453, I move into consideration of the Christian leadership, policies of the Ottomans, and finally the role that churches have played in this process.

The events immediately surrounding the battle for Constantinople in 1453 have been subjected to myth and hypothesis allowing for any number of interpretations, but the major movements of the siege and battle have been traced with reasonable certainty. We are fortunate to have the account of the Greek George Phrantzes, an educated Byzantine citizen, on which

---

much of the details of the take-over is based. The advancing armies of Fatih Mehmed were seen on April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1453, the day after Easter Sunday.\textsuperscript{71} The hope of those defending the city rested on their strong walls and the coming of aid from Venice. The negotiations between Sultan Mehmed and the Emperor, Constantine XI were, on the whole, civil. Mehmed, who was a good Muslim, offered three overtures of peace because it was wrong to fight unless the infidel absolutely refused to surrender.\textsuperscript{72} The options were to surrender and pay a hefty tribute, die, or convert. This offer was rejected by the Byzantine leaders and the city fell a short time afterwards. The Italians had come eventually, but were more of a hindrance than help as they refused to surrender when it would have been prudent.\textsuperscript{73} The Emperor had in fact, planned on surrendering, but the Western forces refused, thus enacting the subsequent disaster within the city.

The plunder and slaughter that ensued was in line with similarly horrific scenes of invasion from history. The numbers of those killed and taken captive are imprecise, but it could have been as many as 30,000 taken captive and 5,000 killed. The armies swiftly realized the economic benefit of taking slaves and the subsequent distribution of the families to locations all over the Empire meant that most families would never see each other again. The treatment of priests and monastic communities was the same as the lay communities, but after the fact, the noble families, high ranking church leaders and government ministers were saved from slavery through amnesty by the Sultan or being bought and freed by Western friends or family.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 86.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 123.
\textsuperscript{73} The tenuous relationship with the West was rarely to the advantage of the Byzantines. The Venetians were not concerned with their homes and families, but trade and thus did not see the point in settling to that advantage. Inalcık, Halil. “The Policy of Mehmed II Toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City.” \textit{Dumbarton Oaks Papers}. 23/24. (1969/1970): 232.
members. But the general population was mainly dispersed into captivity or allowed to return to their homes, which were rendered unfit to live in by looters.

On the other hand, the transition as judged in the context of history could have been far more destructive. Mehmed II did not want the city to be destroyed to the point that it would be uninhabitable. This would have been a poor way to found the future capital of his empire. Therefore it is useful to note that while the trauma and grief of the conquest were deeply felt, many Christians passed into the new empire with their lives and much of their wealth intact. At this point in Constantinople’s history, the city only held around 60,000 people and a century later this population was over 500,000 with at least one-third being Christian. In fact, Christians of this period in Spain and elsewhere can hardly claim so generous a record when dealing with their minority populations. For example, the reconquista in Spain scoured the land of Muslim monuments along with the Muslim and Jewish populations.

Mehmed and the Ottomans, as will be seen later in the definition of the Rum Milleti, did not precisely follow the traditional pattern of control for a conquered people. The general Islamic pattern, however, was this: The Muslim Holy Law, the shari’a, declares that if a population surrenders willingly, they are considered dhimmi, ensuring the safeguarding of their lives, possessions and right of religion. However, if the city is conquered by force, legally ‘anwatan, then the Holy Law allows for three days of pillage and destruction. Meanwhile the population is treated as mushriks, or polytheists; their children are sold to slavery, their property is forfeit and

74 The fate of these nobles varied widely, many were also later killed. Runciman, Fall of Constantinople, 149.
75 Many Christians were later forcibly transferred to the city for repopulation purposes. Karpat, Kemal. “Ottoman Views Towards the Orthodox Church.” Greek Orthodox Theological Review. 31.1-2 (Spring-Summer, 1986): 134.
76 A dhimmi is a non-Muslim under Muslim rule. The guidelines, protections and restrictions, for these people, which first included only Christians and Jews but has since expanded to other religious groups, were established in the Pact of Umar with the Christians in Syria in the 7th century.
77 Inalcik, Policy of Mehmed II, 234.
they have no rights. All of this depended on the manner of the surrender of the city. While the course of events in Constantinople could not be changed, in the coming centuries, the rights of the Christians were often debated according to the legal nuances between the forms of surrender. The property in the city was itself divided between movable and immovable goods; movable goods being payment for the troops and immovable goods being the property of the state treasury. It is reported that the Sultan explicitly described the rules as such: “The stones and the land of the city and the city’s appurtenances belong to me; all other goods and property, prisoners, and footstuffs are booty for the troops.”

Thus the Emperor guarded the buildings and property that would serve the new Empire as in foundations of his new realm; especially the Hagia Sophia

Mehmed II would immediately turn the Hagia Sophia into a mosque upon his arrival in the city. It is reported that upon entering the church, the Sultan officially proclaimed the city to be called Istanbul and for it to be rebuilt as the capital of his new empire. The strategic and symbolic import of this spot began with the Hagia Sophia. This was based on the inheritance of the power of the Caesars to rule over these territories. Occupying and absorbing the symbols of that Roman Empire was a political and strategic move to legitimize the upcoming Ottoman power. The church of St. Sophia was, therefore, rewritten into Ottoman history in such a way to justify its coming into the Muslim hands and becoming a mosque. One account relates that,

---

78 Ibid., 231-2.
79 This would come into play when churches were allowed to stay or be converted into mosques, also in the judgments concerning new church buildings. Arnakis, G. Georgiades. “The Greek Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire.” The Journal of Modern History. 24.3 (Sept. 1952): 240-41.
80 Inalcik, Policy of Mehmed II, 233.
81 The name “Istanbul” was used even before the conquest to refer to the city and has two different etymological roots for the Greeks and the Turks. It could be a shortening of the Greek term “eis ten polin,” which means “to [or into] the city.” The Turkish and official religious view is that Istanbul is a form of “Islam bol” or “full of Islam” – city of Islam. That said, Constantinople was still used as a name for the city even into the 17th and 18th centuries. It is still commonly used in the Church today and by Greek Christians. The name of the city became a political and social marker could carry any number of meanings. Etingü, Bente and Edith Oyhon. Churches in Istanbul. (Istanbul: YKY, 1997): 23.
“when the half-dome of the apse collapsed on the night of the Prophet Muhammad’s birth, it
could only be repaired with a mortar composed of sand from Mecca, water from the well of
Zemzem, and the Prophet’s saliva.”82 The addition of minarets, a minbar, and mosque
furnishings was a physical assumption of appropriation, but the overall aim of the legends,
religious signs, and physical remodel was to establish the Muslim Ottoman Empire as the natural
successor of this Eastern power according to God’s will. Islamic tradition does not negate the
contributions of former civilizations and religions, but it does allude to these contributions as
pointing to Islam in the first place.83

Despite such attempts of the Ottomans to overtake this symbol in Istanbul, the memory of
its status as the Church of Byzantium could not be entirely erased. The knowledge that the
building was formerly a church was not appealing to all Muslims. A decree, or firman, issued in
1573 concerning the preservation of the mosque reflects reservations and even opposition to the
use and upkeep of a building built by non-Muslims.84 On the Christian side, a healthy dose of
optimism and perhaps apocalyptic longings gave rise to the legend that when the church was
stormed by the invading army, a few priests grabbed the holiest vessels and brought them to the
southern wall of the sanctuary which miraculously opened for them and closed behind them;
there they will remain until the Hagia Sophia is a church again.85 The two stories of this space
thus show us an example of the differing perspectives that the transition from Christian to
Muslim control of this symbolic building had at the time.

82 The apse did collapse around that time, but no factual evidence exists for this claim. Quoted from The Life of an
Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia after Byzantium by Gülru Necipoglu in Ousterhout, “Ethnic Identity and Cultural
Appropriation.” 49.
83 The Qur’an states, “Surely he [Mohammad] has brought the truth, confirming those who were sent before”
(37:37). The truth of Islam was present in previous prophets and they are respected in Islam, but the revelation to
Mohammad is the culmination of this process.
84 Ousterhout, Robert. “Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture.” Muqarnas 12
85 Runciman, Fall of Constantinople, 147.
Not all of the churches in Constantinople were plundered. The city had, over the course of the last several centuries, deteriorated into a series of villages separated by open spaces. When the main walls had fallen by force, the various sections of the city rushed to the Sultan with their tokens of surrender, thus saving them from the legal plunder of a city taken by force. These areas included the regions of Petrion, Psamathia, Studium, the area by the Sea of Marmara, and Phanar, which would later prove to hold the last remaining churches from the Byzantine era. The Church of the Holy Apostles, while on the route of the pillaging army, must have been preserved by the command of Fatih Mehmed who envisioned this church as the second largest in the city to replace Hagia Sophia as a gesture to the Christians, thus he sent guards to this church to protect it. The future of these churches was not as certain after the Ottomans settled in to the city, but many lasted for years after the conquest.

The population of the city had declined significantly in the last century of Byzantium, and after the conquest this number sank even lower. In order to build a capital for his empire, Fatih Mehmed needed to quickly repopulate the beleaguered neighborhoods. He first tried to build up the Muslim neighborhoods by requiring each district to construct a mosque complex with schools and public kitchens. When this rendered little result, Mehmed II in 1459 requested that the Greeks who had left as refugees or slaves should return and be given land and homes, these properties being under the control of the state as per the regulations of Islamic law. This was, in reality, less of a request than an order and the governors of the outlying areas were subsequently required to provide a certain number of Greeks for resettlement in Istanbul. These Greeks should be craftsmen or wealthy citizens and if the governors were found to be sending

---

86 Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, 153.
87 Ibid., 153.
poor or unskilled people, they were punished politically.\(^{89}\) The selection process and the favorable conditions under Mehmed II allowed the Greek population to do fairly well in the capital. This would, however, turn against their favor under subsequent rulers because of their influential role in trade and their accumulating wealth that exacerbated tensions with the Muslim community. In the 16\(^{th}\) century it would become necessary to obtain a \textit{fatwa}, the written opinion of the \textit{mufti}, in order to protect the Christian community.\(^{90}\) The Greek Christians were too valuable to the Empire to be eradicated or made to follow strict \textit{dhimmi} policy. Around 1500, the historian Idris commented, “In leaving these Christians undisturbed the Sultans had had in view the prosperity of the world and of the Muslim religion.”\(^{91}\)

The Byzantine Greeks were an important part of the new Ottoman Empire. They could not be ignored in the Empire’s future plans, though the Greek Christians retained only a core of their former numbers. The actual transition of Christians to a minority status did not happen overnight. It actually began in the rural regions long before 1453. The Muslim encroachment on the former Byzantine inner lands began in the 11\(^{th}\) century. Just as the conversion of pagans to Christianity had taken centuries, so the conversion to Islam took centuries, and it was not universal by any means. Christians under Islamic rule found themselves diminished and isolated, but not overrun or shattered. They eventually would learn how to live under Muslim political control, but the Church was their own domain and it could be a force to be reckoned with in its own right among the Christians and even for the Muslims at times.

\* \* \*

\(^{89}\) Ibid., 238.
\(^{90}\) Christians often requested legal protection under these situations: sometimes it was granted, sometimes not. Ibid., 248-49.
\(^{91}\) Ibid., 249.
In the time after the conquest, Fatih Mehmed quickly implemented a plan for the establishment of leadership and control of the Greek Christian population. It was in the interest of the Sultan to sever any relationships with the Western Church, as having Christians under his control that paid allegiance to Rome would have been a political nightmare. Fortunately, the Eastern Church had a large faction from which to choose a Patriarch that would be against any unification with the Pope. The Eastern Church still lived with the memory of 1204 and the Latin conquest burned into their memory. Mehmed II chose a former monk named Gennadius to be the new Patriarch of Constantinople and even offered him one thousand florins as a sign of trust and thanks. The patriarch has always had the role of mediator between the Church and the state under the Ottoman Empire, and this role could quickly become overwhelming due to the tensions between the two communities. The accompanying stresses in this role and the corruption it inspired also meant that very few Patriarchs lasted beyond a few years or even months. A lack of consistency plagued the Christian leadership in this way.

The organization of the church under the Ottoman political system was fairly independent on paper, yet it could not escape the tensions inherent in the policies of the Islamic state towards a Christian minority. The level of influence that the Ottomans had on the Church itself varied from sultan to sultan, but it also depended on the strength of the patriarch in his leadership and protection of the Christian community. The tradition of church leadership from the final centuries of Byzantine rule was thus helpful in giving the church authority in the eyes of the

---


93 This Patriarch would be the only one directly appointed by the Sultan, but a confirmation was necessary and the standard for succession until the 17th century when the process was delegated to the grand vizier. At this point, the thousand florins offered to the patriarch had been reversed and now the new patriarch would have to offer a gift of money for the confirmation. Needless to say, this system spiraled out of control such that the position was open to the highest bidder and the office of the patriarch was unstable and politically charged. Arnakis, “The Greek Church of Constantinople,” 237.
Christian population. The tradition in the East was to associate religion with nationality. Unlike in the West, the title “Christian Orthodox” or “Greek Christian” overcame the actual Greek, Serbian, or Bulgarian national titles, which would only become prevalent in the 19th century. The same was true for Muslims who put their religious identity ahead of their national one. This religious identity would guide the relationship between the Christians and Muslims within a state context.

As previously mentioned, the Ottomans did not follow the Islamic dhimmi pattern exactly as they did not directly govern the minority populations themselves. Prior to 1453, when previous cities in the region were conquered as the Turks worked toward Constantinople, the Christian populations newly under Ottoman rule were governed subsequently by the religious authority, usually a bishop, who was appointed by the patriarch in Constantinople. This system was now transferred to the Empire as a whole, with all the Greek Christians under the patriarch in Istanbul; thus was the Rum Milleti or Orthodox nation formed. Under the Byzantine Empire, the patriarch had great authority over church matters and the clergy, but under this new system, the patriarch was also the governor of the laity; “he was the ethnarch, the ruler of the millet.” The office of the patriarch collected taxes through local headmen and acted as legal authority. The Church also retained the duties of issuing marriage, death and birth certificates. In sum, in the standard Muslim manner, the millet was generally left to its own religious governance as long as it paid its taxes, which were heavy indeed. And this religious governance did not include

---

94 Karpat, 139.
95 Runciman, “Rum Milleti,” 2.
96 Rum Milleti is literally translated as the Roman Nation as what we call Byzantium had never lost its status as the legitimate Roman Empire in the eyes of the East. It was the Roman Empire and therefore its citizens were Roman.
97 Ibid., 3.
98 Excepting those cases that involved a Christian and Turk, which would go before the Ottoman courts.
the external signs of religion, such as wearing crosses or even having beards, not to mention the appearance and use of churches.

The roots of the Muslim treatment of non-Muslims goes back to the first century conquests of Mohammad in the *Pact of Nadjran* in 631 and the *Pact of Umar with the Christians of Syria* around the same time. 99 These documents presented Muslims with a pattern or framework for their dealings with non-Muslims, but these traditions were left to the various schools of Muslim thought to interpret in reality. The Hanefite school of Islam, a tolerant interpretation of these Islamic traditions that was predominant in the Ottoman Empire, provides a general guideline as to the treatment of Christians and Jews under Muslim control that, as previously mentioned, leaves the millet generally under its own governance, but with many restrictions concerning life in the greater society. Much of what we know comes from *berat*, literally “diploma, honor, distinction, privilege,” documents issued in regard to the millet granting certain amenities or rights to the community. 100 The history of these *berats* can be traced throughout the Ottoman reign, and while they were constantly violated in practice, they followed five general principles:

I. Freedom of conscience was respected – Nobody could be converted by force.
II. Administration and discipline of the church was safe from interference as long as taxes were paid and no treason was suspected.
III. The property of churches, monasteries, and institutions of social welfare (usually, but not always including schools) was held and administered by the patriarch. The Church could also impost its own taxes.
IV. The personal status of Orthodox Christians remained under the sole jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. This included family and inheritance law, and some aspects of criminal law. 101

---

100 These could be about anything from a personal bequest or favour, allowing for the repair of a church or the allowance for annual Easter celebrations within the courts of the Patriarchate. For an example of a *berat*, see Appendix A. Arnakis, 237.
101 The patriarchate also issued punishments, usually flogging, and had a prison on its grounds until the nineteenth century.
Symbols of authority were allowed to church officials. This included the right to carry a staff, ride a horse, have a bodyguard, and travel in boats of a certain size. At celebration of Easter, the wearing of festive clothing, dancing and singing on the grounds of the Patriarchate was also allowed.\textsuperscript{102}

The consistencies of these guidelines varied according to the sultan and were especially threatened and revoked during Selim I, the grandson of Fatih Mehmed.\textsuperscript{103} The daily restrictions of Christians included what they could wear, where they could live and even, in some cases, their profession. The taking of one male child from each family to be raised Muslim and join a special Janissary military unit was perhaps the most grievous of these policies. The relationship of the state and the Christian church, therefore, was complex, multifaceted and constantly changing. The whims of the sultan could change the fate of the Greek Christians. But the prominent role of the church allowed it to protect the remnants of Christendom and its culture in the East.

The transition of political power was not mirrored in an immediate cultural transition. In fact, with this system of governance within the bounds of the Church, wherein the patriarch was the authority of the Greek Christian community, the loss of Byzantium was a political one only. The culture and religiosity remained, carefully preserved by the Church: “The imposition of Ottoman rule meant the preservation of ‘Byzantinism’.”\textsuperscript{104} As mentioned earlier, the system of governance within the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires was very similar. Thus the governmental structure in which the average citizen lived was close enough to the Byzantine one to feel the similarities, but far different enough to make it uncomfortable. The roles of the Greek Christians were completely reversed. The class of people who had held government office in the Byzantine Empire now turned to business and trade. The Church hired lawyers to deal with their new role

\begin{footnotes}
\item[102] Ibid., 242-43.
\item[103] Selim I wanted to force conversion to Islam on all of the minority populations, but was fortunately compelled to reason by his advisors who pointed out the impossibility of this venture and the lack of legal groundings in Islamic Law. Instead, he instituted a mass conversion of churches into mosques and curtailed many of the freedoms of the Christian and Jewish communities during his reign.
\item[104] Jeffreys and Mango, 294.
\end{footnotes}
in the penal system. These shifts in the outer life of the community made it cling even more strongly to the inner traditions that defined it as Byzantine.

Greek Christians may have preserved their Byzantine heritage, but the context within a Muslim state was very different from before 1453 and the interactions of the two communities followed new guidelines. The subject Christian populations remained for the most part segregated from their Muslim neighbors.\textsuperscript{105} This segregation of the communities allowed for very specific points of contact that were often visual in form. The Christians wore certain clothing, lived in certain parts of the city, could not have beards, worshipped in churches that looked a certain way. The interaction of a minority Christian community within the larger Muslim Ottoman state, especially in Istanbul, was guided by symbols. For example, we know that some Christians were successful business people, but they would never flaunt their wealth in case they were falsely accused of corruption or treachery so that they would be heavily fined.\textsuperscript{106} The care with which one presented oneself could have a strongly positive or negative consequence for the interaction of the various communities within the city. Thus the presentation and care for their churches as symbols of their identity would be a constant concern for the Christian communities.

\textasteriskcentered

One aspect of the patriarchate’s role would include the maintenance and building of churches. This was made difficult by the fact that the patriarchate did not have a direct influence on how or when buildings could be built in the capital of Istanbul.\textsuperscript{107} If a new church was allowed to be built, it had strict restrictions on it, thus making new projects small, humble and

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 294.
\textsuperscript{106} Runciman, “Rum Milleti,” 10.
very few in numbers. Most old churches fell into disuse or disrepair or were converted into mosques. By the eighteenth century, only three pre-1453 Byzantine shrines remained in Christian control: St. Mary of the Mongols,\textsuperscript{108} and the tiny chapels of St. Demetrius Kanavou (later to spend a brief tenure as the Patriarchate) and St. George of the Cypresses.\textsuperscript{109} Any newer buildings were built according to specific unobtrusive building codes put in place by the Ottomans to make the churches less distinct or noticeable. It was through the use and upkeep of the pre-1453 architectural style and role of churches in the liturgy that the impact of the Christians on the architecture of the city was felt.

It is impossible to list a set of rules or policies by which new churches were to be allowed or repairs to occur as what guidelines did exist were invariably interpreted and used differently according to the balance of power between the Church and the Empire; or more specifically, between the sultan and the patriarch, or the local bishop and local kadis, the Ottoman official in charge of religious affairs of Muslims and Christians in a certain area.\textsuperscript{110} The relationship of the communities themselves was important as any protesting Turkish family could spell destruction for a Christian building project, and this was often worked out in widespread bribery.\textsuperscript{111} A vigilant community member might report to the central authorities a breach of law that would

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{108} Preserved by special decree of Mehmed II as a favor to his favorite architect, Christodulus the Greek.
\item \textsuperscript{109} Runciman, \textit{Fall of Constantinople}, 157.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Evidence from petitions for repairs shows a general trend that reflects the power relations between the local churches and the \textit{kadis} and Imperial Divan. The Muslim authorities sought to control and balance the needs of the Christian community and the demands of the Muslim community. Engagement with the Ottoman state authorities was a necessary part of the maintenance of churches in Istanbul. Leal, 264.
\item \textsuperscript{111} Karen Leal offers a detailed examination of the \textit{berats} of the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries that are able to demonstrate the subtle differences in the relationship of the Christian and Muslim communities over this span of time. For instance, in the early \textit{berats}, the petition is formulated around basic permission for the repair itself, however as time goes on, the \textit{berats} are more specifically asking for evidence that the \textit{dhimmi} community has the right to make the repairs in the first place. This change suggests that the repairs are being questioned and perhaps even resisted by the greater Muslim community. Leal 243-64.
\end{itemize}
have been overlooked by the authorities otherwise. Bribery became a key element in the building process and the maintenance of good relations. And while this perhaps reflects a lack of neighborly affection, the number of successful berats indicates that the system worked in many cases.

The range of policies actually enacted extended from permission to build new churches to prohibitions of repairs and restoration, to the destruction and confiscation of churches entirely. The decisions were often based less on the stipulations of the Pact of Umar or any Islamic legal assertion than on the size of the Muslim community and importance of the location for symbolic occupation by the authorities; political and utilitarian motivations often trumped religious ones. It is such secular considerations that gave rise to the battle over the existence of churches and the display of Christian symbols that might represent improper imperial ambitions due to the memory of the close relationship of the Byzantine state with the Church. While crosses on churches were often allowed to stay until complaints were issued and thereafter never restored, the bells and outward expressions of Christian liturgy such as processionals or the wearing of crosses were reviled by the Muslim communities and nearly all disallowed.

The policies concerning churches also depended on the demographics of a neighborhood. Purely Christian settlements could sometimes build new churches, whereas the presence of a mosque in a neighborhood was grounds for the removal of the Christian community entirely.

---

112 Gradeva, 28; It is possible that minor repairs could have taken place with only the permission of local authorities, but if a Muslim neighbour or citizen complained, then it is likely that the appeal had to go before the Imperial Divan in order to proceed. Any step in the process could be hindered or stopped by the Muslim community. Leal, 262.
113 Ibid., 17.
114 Ibid., 19, 34.
115 The most famous case was the Panagia Pammakaristos, which was serving as the Patriarchate at the time and thus was under greater political pressure than other churches. A breakdown in relations between the Patriarch and Sultan of the time may be why the cross was ordered down. However, while it was uncommon to have to remove the cross, once down, it was in no case allowed to be restored.
New Christian construction in a mixed area was absolutely forbidden, but if the Christians could prove prior occupation and that the area had fallen in 1453 according to an agreement instead of force, then restoration could be sought: “In fact, the numerous inscriptions in churches relating of the ‘construction’ of some sanctuary should not always be taken literally but as meaning that the church had undergone considerable repair, or reconstruction from the foundations.” Any church that was not in use or had fallen into ruins could be confiscated and likely turned into a mosque site. If this was the case, it could not be returned as any church that was turned into a mosque could not be reverted under any circumstance. This was a difficult position for Christians as their neighborhoods became more mixed over time and they could not maintain congregations in all their former neighborhoods.

In later generations, for example, whenever an Ottoman victory over a Christian population occurred and whole communities were transported to the capital in purely Christian settlements, the sultan would then allow the community to build a church for themselves through a one-time only offer. Grants for repairs were also offered when the royal family celebrated happy events such as the birth of a prince. Only in the 19th century, as the Ottoman Empire declined in the face of secularism, would it become possible to build a church without an imperial firman granting permission. The flexibility and often arbitrarily made nature of these decisions reflects the flexible boundaries between Christians and their neighbors, as well as the

116 Ibid., 26; Decrees from repair berats confirm the desire for churches to remain in their original location and form. A common phrase used is: “with the condition to do nothing in excess to the original building.” This is a reminder that from the state’s perspective, the aim of any construction or repairs was to return the building to “its ancient (former) arrangement. There was little to no room for new construction, so innovation had to happen in other ways. Leal, 255-56.

117 In contrast, if a Christian community began to move into a Muslim area, especially into the vicinity of a mosque, then they may be forcibly evicted as the mosques trumped the presence of Christians who were not always welcome in areas if they consumed alcohol or ate pork. Leal, 264-266.

118 Arkanis, 246.

119 Ibid., 247.
importance of maintaining civil discourse despite the inequality of status between the two communities. If it can be said that forbearance and endurance marked the relationship of Christians and Muslims in the Ottoman Empire instead of equality and toleration, that was still far closer to the modern mindset than how the Catholics and Protestants or Christian and Jews or even Protestants among themselves, were dealing with each other in Europe at the same time.\footnote{120}

As mentioned, the building codes and policies for Christian buildings were rarely consistent over the centuries. While Mehmed II had set a liberal precedent after the conquest,\footnote{121} the subsequent Sultans were less generous. A clear example of a change in mood happened after the great fire of 1660 that ravaged two-thirds of the city, killed over 40,000 people and forever changed the appearance of Istanbul.\footnote{122} It was at this point in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century that the Islamization of the city was completed as 98\% of the Byzantine churches were destroyed or converted and the building policies for reconstruction were such that the replacement churches did not visibly distract from the dominant forms of the mosques. The decision to clamp down on the rebuilding of churches at this point goes against the common practice of ignoring the standard Islamic laws, but these laws were used in the Ottoman structure more for political means than piety.\footnote{123} Increasing the strictness of the law could distract the population from other social ailments or foreign wars, gain favor with the pious elements of the Empire, or simply to cater to political interests. The fire in 1660 was the beginning of a new era of Islamization that demonstrates a clear shift in the enforcement of policies under certain circumstances or rulers. The Christian population had to learn to live with these fluctuations in policy.

\footnote{120}{It is useless to use our modern standards of human rights as a judge of history. Dealing with minorities within a judicial system, even if it was biased and unequal, was a great step forward in history. Gradeva, 35-36.}
\footnote{121}{This was perhaps done as a political power move but it was nonetheless effective.}
\footnote{123}{Ibid., 174.}
It should be noted, however, that church building development in Constantinople was very different from that of the outer regions of the Empire. The building of new churches in many places was not forbidden, though it was systematically discouraged through legal loopholes, social pressures and corruption. Despite these hurdles, there were hundreds of churches built in the outer regions during the Ottoman occupation.\textsuperscript{124} The foundation for most of these churches was in the monasteries that maintained an exclusive rule within their precincts. Many of these monasteries remained under the direct jurisdiction of the patriarchate in Constantinople, thus they maintained independence from the local bishops and were able to act as islands within the region.\textsuperscript{125} The churches of Constantinople, being under much stricter scrutiny and occupying a position in the heart of Ottoman power, were not of great use in terms of innovation and influence to the churches of these outer regions. Thus a high level of regional differentiation took place that makes any kind of generalization of little use. What is important to note, however, is the contrast between the isolated nature of the regions and the immediate or close contact necessary in the capital between the Muslims and Christians. The pressure was greater in Istanbul because of its symbolic value as the capital and the necessity of interaction between the two communities.

In both cases, urban and rural, nothing in the way of architecture or building could have been considered without the support of patrons. And a study of patrons can help discern the role of the church in the community. Thus the role of patrons in the building of new churches and religious institutions cannot be ignored. Gratitude for this patronage is seen in wall painting dedications or portraits of the patrons done above the entrances to the naos. In the Byzantine Empire, patrons had been aristocrats, emperors, state officials and wealthy families who would

\textsuperscript{124} Bouras, 107.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., 108.
pay for the erection of new monasteries and churches, the painting of new icons, or gift of new liturgical vessels. After 1453, patrons included high church officials, priests, or even entire communities and humble members of the congregation. A clear example of this transition can be seen in the examination of the requests for repairs over the years. In the 17th and 18th centuries, they were largely submitted by groups of dhimmis rather than specifically named individuals. This would seem to indicate that lay members were working together to repair their worship spaces and that the church was important to the community as a sign of their identity. Later in the 18th century, there is evidence to suggest that for merchants and craftsmen, being a church donor was a prestigious manifestation of success. The community was proud of the efforts to maintain their identity and chose to express this through their worship space. Whoever supported the churches, these patrons must also have a strong will and clever political senses in order to guide the project through the various levels of bureaucracy and bribery necessary to construct or repair a church.

The difficulty of new constructions or repairs done to the Christian churches was, in comparison to the numerous projects of the Ottoman Turks, a symbolic subjugation of the Christian community. Yet this does not mean that the churches were degrading symbols from the Christian perspective. The care in which repairs were made is only one example of this devotion as has already been discussed. Another perspective of the Christian community’s relationship with their churches is in relation to their faith life. Their faith was the foundation of their entire lives: where they lived, what they did, what they wore, who they knew, how high their taxes were. Beyond being the core of their relationship with God, being Christian was also central to

126 Bouras, 109.
127 Leal, 249.
128 Gradeva, 35.
their relationship to the world and this was enacted in the Divine Liturgy, which was held within the holy space of the church that accommodated and served this relationship with God. Thus while the degrading context in which the churches were located seemed to diminish their role as symbols of the community because of the overpowering of the Muslim buildings, the churches themselves could not be diminished because of their role in the place of the Christian identity. The interpretation of churches as symbols represents the perspectives of the two communities and the role of the churches in this relationship.

* * *

The position of the churches within the Muslim Ottoman Empire cannot be thoroughly evaluated without an understanding of the wider city in which these deteriorating churches were set. In addition, the other fate of churches beyond disrepair must be considered: the conversion of churches into mosques and the motivations of the Turks in doing so. In studying the patterns of church appropriation alongside the continuity of Byzantine forms in Ottoman architecture, it can be seen how deeply the two communities related to one another.

The Ottoman Turks overcame the Arabs as the dominant power in the Middle East in the 13th to 15th centuries after their swift rise from northwest Anatolia to the wider Mediterranean area. There is little evidence for a native architectural style. The Ottomans seem to have borrowed from the surrounding styles at first, especially that of the Seljuks of central Anatolia and the local Byzantine forms. Their own forms were derived from these backgrounds, but were often blended with the styles of the areas in which they moved. The use of forms from the

---

129 The Ottomans are named for their founder, Osman (in Arabic, Othman), who declared independence from the Seljuks in 1299. For more on the rise of the Ottoman Empire, see: Shaw, Stanford. History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Volume I, Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire 1280-1808. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

130 Contrary to popular thought, the Ottoman Turks were not descendants of the Arabs, but of the Persian culture. Ousterhout, Robert. “The East, the West, and the Appropriation of the Past in Early Ottoman Architecture.” Gesta. 43.2 (2004): 167.
late Byzantine era can make the transition into early Ottoman architecture difficult to pinpoint. This is not to mention the use of *spolia*\(^{131}\) from previous buildings in the construction of new Ottoman buildings, which makes identification an investigative process indeed; Even the *spolia* that the Byzantines had used from the Roman and Greek temples were again reused in the Ottoman buildings. The idea was to create a continuity that indicated both a connection to the past and a legitimization of the new power.

Continuity with the past can be a powerful asset in the administration of an empire, but to show a historical fulfillment of the Muslim faith in this new enterprise required there to be both continuity and surpassing of these styles. Thus new buildings in Istanbul, and especially the mosques, used Byzantine forms, but added to and innovated the designs to reflect a surpassing of the Greek skill. A clear example of this is the mosque of Fatih Camii that was built in the late 15\(^{th}\) century to replace the Church of the Holy Apostles abandoned by the patriarch in the late 1450’s. This mosque was not as large as the Hagia Sophia, but it was the largest Ottoman mosque to that date and larger than anything the Byzantines had attempted since the sixth century.\(^{132}\) The design echoed the great Hagia Sophia, which created a reflection of the heritage of the city being taken to new levels. Even the addition of the mausoleum to the mosque is a continuation of the role of the Church of the Holy Apostles where the Emperor Constantine had been buried over a millennium before. Thus the context in which the Christian churches existed was one that was familiar and foreign; familiar in that their own building techniques and styles were being imitated, but foreign in that the purpose and grandness of these buildings were beyond their experience.

\(^{131}\) *Spolia* included the parts of old buildings reused in new constructions. This could include everything from columns and capitals to bricks and stonework. The styles and forms of these elements were therefore efficiently integrated into the new construction.

\(^{132}\) Ibid., 170.
The Turkish architectural styles had their own roots and symbols that were Islamic and foreign to the Byzantine Christian tradition, but there was also much overlap that developed as the two communities learned from one another and worked together. Robert Ousterhout has termed this new architecture, “Byzantine-Ottoman ‘overlap’ architecture.”\footnote{133} The fact is that the region as a whole was rarely wholly Byzantine or wholly Ottoman. Parts of it had been transferring into Ottoman hands for centuries leading up to 1453 while after 1453 many outlying areas and regional centers remained largely under Byzantine control for decades. In this period of transition, the borders were fluid and Muslims and Christians frequently lived together whether under Byzantine or Ottoman control. There was great opportunity for the interaction of building styles and symbols over the course of this drawn out transition of power and culture.

One hypothesis for the “overlap” thesis is that the Ottomans used indigenous Byzantine builders for their new projects; both churches and mosques may have even been built by the same workshops.\footnote{134} Evidence for this claim is found in the use of the “recessed brick” technique in Ottoman buildings that was a trademark of the Byzantine style. In this technique the bricks were alternately set back from the surface of the wall and then covered with a thick slab of mortar. This meant that the bricks could be used more efficiently as broken bricks could be inserted as needed, the mortar would dry more quickly, and the wall was stabilized in case the mortar was weak. The technique was also invisible from the outside, so it had to have been learned in a workshop setting.\footnote{135} This means that even if the Byzantines were not the builders, the builders of the Ottoman projects would have had first hand experience in Byzantine shops.

\footnote{133}{Ousterhout, “Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation,” 50.}
\footnote{134}{Ibid., 53.}
\footnote{135}{Ibid., 58.}
The achievement of architecture that the Ottomans eventually came to dominate was largely based on their adaptation of Byzantine churches. The vast majority of Byzantine churches were eventually turned into mosques or allowed to fall into ruination. As previously mentioned, only one church and two tiny chapels of Byzantium remained in Christian hands even into the 17th century. A great number of the early mosques in Istanbul were therefore churches at one point, or used so much *spolia* of churches in their construction that they appear to be former churches.\footnote{In a classic example, the capitals at the Haci Özbek Camii, an early mosque in Istanbul, had crosses in their designs thus confusing the identification of the building as a mosque or church. See Figure 3.1. Ousterhout, “Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation,” 52.} The process of this conversion happened differently under each successive sultan. Under Mehmed II, there were only two major churches converted by the state into mosques, St. Sophia and the Church of St. Theodore. The officers who had distinguished themselves in the battle for Constantinople were also given neighborhoods, *mahalle*, in which to live and govern. Within these districts they always built a mosque or masjid for communal prayer and community life, and if there was a Byzantine church that was convenient, then this was used.\footnote{Kirimtayif, Süleyman. *Converted Byzantine Churches in Istanbul: Their Transformation into Mosques and Masjids*. (Istanbul: Ege Yayinlari, 2001): 2-3.} Thus many other smaller churches were converted for convenience, but not by any kind of imperial mandate or policy.

The second stage in the conversion process came when the city had been repopulated and the *mahalle* were growing with a new class of viziers and dignitaries. It is at this point in the late 15th century that the larger and more impressive Byzantine churches were converted so that appropriately magnificent mosques to be built.\footnote{Ibid., 3.} In the succeeding generations of sultans, the conversion rate of churches again slowed down and new acquisitions were largely due to the fact that the community surrounding the church had become heavily Turkish and since there were no
Christians in the area, the conversion was seen as inevitable. The rate of conversion had slowed down after the 15th and 16th centuries, and by the 17th most churches were already mosques or in ruins. It is important to note that after the first wave of conversions, the main reason for a transition of a church to a mosque was because it reflected the community around it that was slowly transitioning from Christianity to Islam.\(^{139}\) Thus while the symbolic value of conversion was still significant, the practical and political reasons for the transitions of these buildings included the sudden need for mosques and schools after the conquest, the spread of *mahalle* and the subsequent decline of the Christians in these quarters, as well as the perspective that this transition was logical and in line with the natural order of the world in which Islam would replace Christianity.

The physical conversion of the churches into mosques did not always necessitate a large change in the building itself. The churches often still looked like Byzantine churches but with minarets attached and this was part of the point; as a symbol of the rightful succession of Islam, there should be a clear recognition that this building had once been a church and was no longer.\(^{140}\) The conversion of churches as a practical need for mosques was therefore given an additional meaning for the purpose of empire building and the spread of Islam; in this case the building of an Islamic empire. The symbolic value of this subordination cannot be doubted; there are numerous cases of Christian holy sites being appropriated for Islamic use. In cases even the holy significance of the site was appropriated. This occurred less with formal worship places like churches and more with holy springs, *tekkes*, or *zaviyes*.\(^{141}\) The syncretization of these elements by the general population is not surprising, especially considering the overlapping of saints and

\(^{139}\) Another possibility is that the community had become mixed and tensions had arisen forcing the Christians to relocate. Ibid., 5.

\(^{140}\) Ousterhout, “The East, the West, and the Appropriation of the Past,” 170.

\(^{141}\) Site of a Sufi brotherhood or grave of a saint in Islam; Gradeva, 34.
prophets in Christianity and Islam. Thus the conversion of churches into mosques is an indicator of the level of integration occurring on many levels between Islam and Christianity that did not necessarily include the integration of the communities themselves.

The steps taken to convert a church were fairly simple. A minaret, or several depending on the size and import of the mosque, was generally added near to the western corner. The minaret was often the only exterior sign of conversion from church to mosque. On the inside, the apse of the church was usually used as the mihrab niche, or a niche would be carved into the wall if there was not an appropriate apse.\textsuperscript{142} With the square cross form of the Byzantine churches, most had apses on at least three axis, thus finding the qibla wall, or direction of Mecca to the south from Istanbul, was not usually a problem. Any kind of mosaics or frescos were plastered over, but rarely destroyed so that it is possible to find many examples of Byzantine art still in existence if the mosque is no longer in use today. Other minor adjustments were common including fenestration, the walling up or covering of unwanted windows and doors, also outer narthexes were occasionally replaced by Turkish porticos and repairs to the mosque may have replaced the Christian columns or arches with Turkish piers and pointed arches.\textsuperscript{143} These changes were not, however, to make a significant mark on the overall appearance of the building. The resulting mosques had the same plans and forms as the original churches, and were still places of prayer, but with a new community.

The Muslim Ottoman methodology concerning churches can, therefore, be said to follow two paths. One path is the appropriation of churches into mosques that was symbolic in nature for political, religious, and practical ends. The other path is through continuation of Byzantine building styles and the use of spolia that sought connection to the positive aspects of Byzantine

\textsuperscript{142} SEE Figure 3.2. Kirimtayif, 5.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 5.
power. Differentiating between appropriation and continuity in terms of their significance for the relationship between the Greek and Turkish communities relies on understanding the subliminal messages being given through architecture: “The actual functional appropriation of important Byzantine buildings was symbolically significant and would have been clearly understood by the contemporary viewer, but the continuation of Byzantine forms into Ottoman architecture had a different and more subtle message.”

Instead of an overt domination of the church, the continuation of building styles was a sign of continuity of power and legitimization of governance. Reaching back to the pre-Byzantine roots was even sought to signify the power of the new empire. Using the past in the new architecture of the Ottoman Empire lent the Ottomans a sense of gravitas in their position. The eventual development of a singular mosque style apart from the appropriation or continuation of the Byzantine architectural forms would not appear in full until the 17th century, and even then it was in direct linear relationship to the Byzantine roots to which the Ottomans had always adapted. The influence of the Byzantine church was a significant factor in the architectural life of the Ottoman Empire.

*   *   *

The nation building trends of the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe would eventually come to the Ottomans. The political and social events among the Turkish and Greek populations that led up to the process of secularization is a study unto itself, but suffice to say in brief that the consequences of this transition for the Patriarchate was nearly as dramatic as the conquest in 1453. Along with nation building came national churches, which meant that the new states were pushing for the independent authority of the churches in Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia among

---

others that were traditionally under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch in Constantinople. While the Patriarchate in Constantinople would retain its final authority, the structure of the eastern churches was dramatically altered with the separation of the empire’s Christian population into different nation-states.

The revolution in Greece in 1821 was the beginning of the end for the extensive reach of ecclesiastical power over the Christian populations. The secular nationalistic movements in Turkey sought to imitate Greece by removing the various privileges that were given to the Church under previous Ottoman governments. Ironically, these changes were made in berats; one of which was issued in 1882 that allowed the patriarch, bishops and clergy to be legally tried in Turkish courts instead of their ecclesiastical courts. The Patriarch fought back and was able to recapture some of these privileges, but after the turn of the century, there was little to be done. The secular Young Turkish revolution resorted to forceful assimilation of the previously protected minorities including the take-over of the Greek schools and requirement of civil marriages. The Allied occupation from 1918-1922 restored the powers of the Church, but this would be for the last time. After the forced evacuations of the Greeks following the Greco-Turkish war ending in 1922, the reforms of Mustafa Kemal would, “abolish all traces of theocracy and restrict the Greek Patriarchate to its purely religious functions within the city of Constantinople, henceforth called exclusively ‘Istanbul.’ With the death of the Ottoman Empire, the privileged position of the Greek church came to an end.”

In sum, the transition to the Ottoman Empire created a new space for Christians that presented different challenges and tasks for their religious, social, and political lives. The

---

145 Arnakis, 248.
146 Ibid., 249.
147 Ibid., 250.
148 Ibid., 250.
readjustment to the Muslim rule was reflected in the new situation of their churches, which were treated as symbols of the domination of Islam over Christianity. But for the Greek Christians, their churches were symbolic representations of their identity as Christians who follow the tradition passed down to them through the apostolic community of Christ and the theology enacted in the Divine Liturgy. The establishment of the millet system in the Empire created a voice for the Christian community through the Patriarch, who would help to preserve the Byzantine culture in his role of authority. The gradual decline in the numbers of Christians in the Empire was not unforeseen, based on Islamic pressures to convert, but the community that remained held onto the tradition tightly. So tightly did they cling to the past, that the future of secularization was a complete surprise. The loss of political power left the Church to focus on its identity as a Christian tradition. While the Greek Christian community was trying to find its place in a new world of secular Turkey, their churches would remain as reminders of the tradition that has now been shaped by both the Muslim and modern worlds.

Chapter IV

Case Study: The Patriarchate and the Church of St. George in the Phanar

On the appointment of Gennadius to patriarch in early 1454, it is reported that the new patriarch mounted a horse, a gift of the sultan, and rode in procession to the Church of the Holy Apostles, the newly appointed seat of the Patriarchate. No patriarch would ever again be consecrated in the Hagia Sophia. The traditional role of the Church in conjunction with the state in the Byzantine Empire was gone, but the Patriarchate would come to play an entirely different function.

---

149 Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, 155.
role in the Ottoman Empire that included partial governance of the Christian population, but also preservation of the tradition of the church; a tradition that included the vital role of the Divine Liturgy in the life of the faithful and the corresponding need for sacred spaces in which to experience the Liturgy. Istanbul was not, however, an ideal location for the symbols befitting this office. Of all the places in the Empire, Istanbul was the most heavily regulated when it came to Christian buildings. Thus the story of the churches of the Patriarchate is a story of the Christian community struggling to identify itself as a Church in a new context while remaining true to the tradition that defines its past and future.

The history of the Orthodox Patriarchate under the Ottoman rule is a history of Christianity in a Muslim world: “Consequently, a correct appraisal of the history of that Patriarchate after 1453, of its legal, political, and social status in the Ottoman world and of its relations with the government, should shed light on the true situation of the Orthodox Christians.”150 As the face of Christendom in the Ottoman Empire, the Ecumenical Patriarchate151 shouldered the brunt of the interactions between Christianity and Islam. Some of this history has already been covered, but not the history of its architectural journey as a reflection of this relationship with Islam. An appraisal of the five churches that served as the seat of the Patriarchate itself sheds light on the interaction of the Christian community with its wider Muslim community.152 Gennadius rode away from the Hagia Sophia and began a journey of the Patriarchate that has lasted over five centuries and gone through five different churches.153

150 Karpat, 132.
151 The Church in Constantinople has always considered itself ecumenical, but the nature of that role has changed in the modern world. For more, SEE: House, Francis. The Ecumenical Significance of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. (Geneva: Ecumenical Review, 1957).
152 For a list of these churches see Appendix B.
153 SEE Figure 4.1 for a map of the Patriarchal church locations.
The first location for the Patriarchate was the Church of the Holy Apostles, at that time the second largest church in Constantinople besides St. Sophia. The historical trajectories of St. Sophia and the Holy Apostles were very similar, but the two churches held different purposes for the Byzantine Empire. Constantine built himself a mausoleum at the site of the Holy Apostles in the fourth century, which was located on the main thoroughfare towards the western end of the city. The church itself was built after the mausoleum and then rebuilt again under Justinian, but the role of the site as an imperial burial place was continued. The motivation for the name and connection to apostolic lineage becomes clear in light of this imperial association; a church dedicated to the lives and deaths of the Holy Apostles seemed fitting for the successors of a Christian Empire. The church remained in use until the Ottoman conquest, but inconsistencies in the documentary evidence of the late-Byzantine period suggest that it had been falling into disrepair for at least several decades by the time Mehmed II gave it to Gennadius for the location of the Patriarchate. Thus this gift was one of symbolic, if not practical, value.

The roving nature of the Patriarchate was always directly or indirectly linked to the policies or directives of the Ottoman state, and sometimes it was simply expedient to move. The Church of the Holy Apostles was in a hopeless state of disrepair when the Patriarch was given the church in 1453 and would have cost a fortune to restore, not to mention the bribes that would be necessary to even begin the process. The district of the church was distinctly Turkish after 1453 and its residents resented the presence of the church. Patriarch Gennadius therefore took action: “One day, probably in the summer of 1454, the corpse of a Turk was found in its

---

156 Dark and Özugmüs, 396.
court yard. It had doubtless been planted there; but its presence justified the Turks in making
hostile demonstrations. Gennadius prudently asked permission to move his seat.” And he was
granted just that. He collected all the relics and treasures remaining and moved to the convent
church of the Panagia Pammakaristos in the Phanar district. The Patriarchate holds 1456 as the
date of the move, which would mean that they occupied the church for barely one year. Other
sources, however, put the date of the move closer to 1461. It is possible that 1461 is the date
given for the destruction of the church and it was assumed that the Patriarchate left at the earlier
time; it is entirely possible that it remained empty for those five years. In either case, the
construction of the Fatih Camii Mosque on the site was under way by 1463.

Whether the occupation of the Church of the Holy Apostles was one year or five is a
matter of nuance in its role as the seat of the Patriarchate as the difference perhaps mirrors a
desire to reflect on the importance of the Church of the Holy Apostles to the formation of the
Patriarchate in Ottoman rule. It is difficult to determine whether the choice of the Holy Apostles
was a suitable compliment or a thinly veiled insult to the Christian community. Giving a church
that is unusable and unable to be repaired may seem like a poor gift, but the Sultan showed no
open hostility to the Christian community. In all likelihood, the choice of the Church of the Holy
Apostles was a sign of good faith and esteem as it held nearly as much imperial significance as
St. Sophia and was still the second largest religious institution in the city. The fact that it had to
be abandoned was a decision that had to be made under the circumstances and the decision was
made by the Patriarch on his own terms rather than face a later eviction, which could well have
happened. So while the Patriarchate only used the Church of the Holy Apostles for one year, the

157 Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, 158.
158 Most documents will list either 1456 or 1461, but rarely any other date.
use of this church with all of its symbolic value can be seen as a positive foundation from which to base the Christian-Muslim relations, even if these relations did not always remain so positive.

The next location for the Patriarchate would remain somewhat stable for nearly 130 years, the dates depending on when exactly the Church moved into this former convent church of Panagia Pammakaristos, the Church of St. Mary the All-Blessed. The attached nunnery to the Pammakaristos had been undisturbed in the battle for Constantinople and the nuns were moved to the nearby St. John in Trullo before the Patriarchate took over the church and attached convent for their use. Notable contributions of the Pammakaristos to the history of the Patriarchate include several run-ins with the Turkish authorities under the succeeding sultans to Mehmed II.

In 1490, Sultan Bayezit II demanded the surrender of the Pammakaristos. The Patriarch at the time, Dionysius I, was able to prove that the church had been given by Mehmed II to the Church, and Bayezit II retreated after taking a parting shot and ordering the cross on the dome to be removed. Mehmed’s grandson, Selim I, was a great antagonist of the Christian population. He was advised against his wishes that a forced conversion was impracticable, but confiscating churches was his next greatest ambition. The Patriarch, Theoleptus I, was again able to intervene with warning from the vizier. To provide the necessary protection, three “tottering janissaries swore on the Koran that they had been in the Conquering Sultan’s bodyguard when he was waiting to enter the city in triumph, and they had seen a number of notables from various parts of the city come to him bearing the keys of their quarters as a sign of surrender.” This testimony
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160 See Figure 4.2
161 Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, 200; The nuns were able to keep the church at St. John in Trullo until the 1590’s when the Patriarchate was also moved. At this time it was turned into the Ahmed Pasa Masjid, which still survives, and the nuns were again relocated, Kirimtayif, 61.
162 Ibid., 200.
163 Quoted from Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, 201; G. Arnakis adds that this story is likely to be fictitious, and it probably is to a certain degree the story that the Turks used to explain why some churches were left in Christian control. Runciman also later adds that the specific story that the janissaries told may have been invented, but that the
would, of course, make the terms of governance of the Christians based on the terms of surrender and not of conquer, thus making their religious spaces sacrosanct under Muslim law. The Pammakaristos was therefore saved from this attack. The same line of defense worked with less dramatic flair under Suleiman the Magnificent who meticulously followed the legal advice of the Sheikh ul-Islam who admitted that the city had been taken by force, but that it was surrendered by capitulation, thus protecting the churches. The precedent set by Suleiman is of significance in its careful legal deliberation and by its lasting power as a precedent for Christian churches.

These three threats to the Panagia Pammakaristos demonstrate the constant level of threat under which the Patriarchate remained in its Byzantine church. The surrendering of the cross removed the offensive sight from the Muslim population, but the dome and architectural characteristics of this functioning Christian church made it a target for dislike on the part of the Turkish officials and perhaps the general Muslim population as well. The Pammakaristos was a physical sign that the Christian community was not going anywhere soon. The tensions between the Muslim and Christian communities waned and waxed in this period. The resentment at Christian churches was paired with friendly relations within mixed communities. It is also important to note that the Christians did not always get along with each other. Indeed, it was unspecified dissensions among the upper administration of the Greek Christians and the subsequent loss of relations between the patriarch and the sultan that led to the final loss of the Pammakaristos.

---

legal decision of surrender by capitulation made under Suleiman the Magnificent was based on reliable sources saying that the city had both been taken by force and surrendered – each being true for certain areas as previously discussed in section II of this paper, Arnakis, 240-41; Runciman, Fall of Constantinople, 204-5.

164 Ibid., 201.

165 Arnakis, footnote 44 on page 246; The problem could have been involved in the succession of intrigue of Patriarch Jeremiah II by Theoleptus II who was in less favor with the sultan, Runciman, Steven. The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986): 190.
The Pammakaristos was annexed by Murad III in 1586 in the same year that the
Ottomans conquered Georgia, thus giving the subsequent mosque the name *Fethiye*, conquest.\(^{166}\)
As the Pammakaristos still exists as the Fethiye Mosque today, the building is less of a mystery
than the vanished Church of the Holy Apostles. Some portions of the church, including the side
chapel, were even restored by the Byzantine Institute of the United States and Dumbarton Oaks
in the 1960’s, a process that uncovered the Christian mosaics and replaced missing columns.\(^{167}\)
The “north church” is now the mosque and it this restored section of the side chapel, or the
“south church,” that is currently a museum.\(^{168}\) The mosque and museum are divided by a wall,
but peacefully co-exist in this building. It is perhaps ironic that this particular church that was
one of the most disputed residences of the Patriarchate should now share its building between the
Christian and Muslim interests.

The next two churches that housed the Patriarchate were small, poor, and somewhat
insignificant churches that were gracious enough to welcome the Patriarch into their
neighborhoods despite the subsequent risks it might bring. This trend, however, makes these two
churches excellent examples of the different trajectories that Byzantine churches have taken
under Ottoman rule.

The first was the Church of the Virgin Mary of Vlahseraion, otherwise known as the
Panagia Paramythia or Church of the Virgin of Consolation.\(^{169}\) This church was located in the

\(^{166}\) Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, 201; Kirimtayif, 65.
\(^{167}\) Kirimtayif, 65.
\(^{168}\) The side-chapel that has now been restored into the museum section was in fact built by a female patron in
honour of the memory of her husband in 1315. Evidence of the role of the church as a means of protection from
external threats is indicated in the dedication that reads: “Oh, my husband, my light, the breath of my life. I salute
thee. Take this from thy wife. As a lion vigilant in battle, death has found thee rather than peaceful seclusion in thy
lair. But I have built for thee this house of stone that the army in finding thee, trouble thee not.” The use of the
church as a place of refuge is clear in this tribute. The significance of this refuge is felt in the identity of the church
as a place of peace and rest – which was not always possible under Ottoman rule; Etingü and Oyhon, 42-43.
\(^{169}\) SEE Figure 4.3
Phanar, which was one of the districts that had kept its churches after the conquest in 1453. The Patriarch was only at this location for ten years between 1587 and 1597. The rulers of Wallachia, whose palaces, the “Saraya of Vlachia,” had once stood nearby, once owned the district in which the Panagia was located. Thus the church was known as “Vlach Saray” after this secularly inspired name. This association may also help explain why this location was chosen for the Patriarchate, once again demonstrating the strong association that churches played in the Christian leadership. When the Patriarch, at this time Jeremiah II, was removed from the Pammakaristos, he appealed to Moscow for help and financial aid. The Russians, with their influence at the Vlach Saray, helped the Patriarch in his relations with the Sultan. In return, the Patriarch had little choice but to declare the autonomy of the Russian Orthodox Church and install the first Russian patriarch in 1589 at the Church of the Panagia Paramythia or rather Vlach Saray. This church had, therefore, always held a particularly influential role in the connection of the Patriarchate with the Russian Orthodox Church and demonstrates the relationship that Constantinople had with its outlying churches under the Orthodox banner.

Historians do not know much about the construction of the church or the time in which the Patriarchate stayed here. The reason for this is that the church burnt down in 1640, was rebuilt, burnt down in 1729, rebuilt again in 1730, burnt at the end of the 18th century, rebuilt in the mid 19th century and finally burnt completely in 1970. The fact that it was able to be rebuilt so many times is testimony to the power of the Phanar district as a Christian enclave that is protected under Muslim law by the actions taken in 1453 and the legal precedent set by
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172 Kalandai, “Church of the Virgin Paramythia.”
Suleiman the Magnificent. The ruins of the church may still be found and there is still hope by
the Church today that the church will be rebuilt yet again.

The Church of St. Dimitrios in Xyloporta was used by the Patriarchate for about the same
amount of time as that of the Church of the Holy Apostles, yet it was perhaps significantly less
symbolic of a move for the Church. The church was only used as the Patriarchate from 1597 to
1600 and virtually nothing is known of the original church. When intrigue in the synod made the
move out of Vlach Saray necessary, the Patriarch of Alexandria allowed the Constantinople
Patriarchate to move in until their new headquarters could be arranged. A.G. Paspatis writes
that St. Dimitrios was known as ‘tou Kanavi, or Kanavou, and “was an ancient church with a
dome, its interior decorated with mosaics. This church was destroyed and the present timber-
roofed building was erected in the early years of the 18th century.” No other source mentions
the ancient Byzantine church specifically, though there is a current version of the church that
exists there. The Church of St. Dimitrios that still exists today can only be linked to the
Byzantine church of the same name through the Kanavi name that links it to a patrician who was
associated with the church during the time of the crusader occupation in 1204. The difficulty
in identification is made difficult by the renovations in 1730, 1835, 1933, 1960 and 1995.
However, it can be fairly certain that the church that burnt in the 18th century was Byzantine in
origin and one of the last three to exist in Constantinople. The short occupation and mysterious
history of St. Dimitrios makes it indicative of so many Byzantine churches that vanished without
any record at all.

173 SEE Figure 4.4
174 Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity, 190.
patr.org>.
176 Ibid.
177 Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity, 191.
The final resting place of the Patriarchate that has lasted to the present day is the Church of St. George in the Phanar.\textsuperscript{178} Construction on the current location in the Phanar began shortly before 1600 and the Patriarchate was able to move in 1601 to its new location, though still in the Phanar, which is now simply a way to refer to the patriarchate at St. George – “The Phanar.” Like the Panagia Pammakristos, St. George was originally a monastery, though it has been described as “one of the small churches which the Turks had not taken.”\textsuperscript{179} Despite this observation, Patriarch Matthew II took advantage of this small church in his new construction and the site is now sometimes also known as “The Great Monastery.”\textsuperscript{180} The new construction was not done at once; indeed many reconstructions and repairs would be done over the centuries. The general principle, however, was to maintain an appearance that was, “drab on the exterior,” with no exteriorly visible dome or prominent crosses.\textsuperscript{181} The actual exterior is not necessarily drab, but it now presents a neo-classical form that is not in line with the Byzantine ideal of churches that was evidenced in the pre-1453 buildings.

There is little of St. George that remains from the 1600 building. As mentioned, the “new construction” was not much more than a rebuilding of the smaller church, which itself had probably been built under special dispensation under the Ottoman rule. Thus refurbishment and enlargement was begun again as early as 1603 and 1614 under Patriarch Timothy II.\textsuperscript{182} One record written by a later Patriarch at the turn of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century tells a story that the church had partially burned in this early period between 1603 and 1617 and that Sultan Ahmed I, who was building a large mosque near the hippodrome, sent the apprentice builder with a crew of

\textsuperscript{178} See Figures 4.5-4.8
\textsuperscript{179} Arnakis, 246.
\textsuperscript{181} Runciman, \textit{The Great Church in Captivity}, 191.
Christian craftsmen to rebuild the church at the same time.\textsuperscript{183} This would explain the special permission given to Patriarch Timothy II that actually expanded the church. It is also an example of the interactions and circumstances that could govern the relationships between the Christians and Muslims in their daily lives.

The special relationship that the Patriarch, Jeremiah III, held with the Sultan in 1720 was what allowed the church to be rebuilt after it was completely destroyed by fire. It is unclear exactly when this fire occurred as it has been dated anywhere from 1701 to 1720, but much of the Phanar was destroyed, including the Patriarchate’s surrounding buildings to the church. In the reconstruction, the Church was even able to add a dome during this construction, though it did not last long before it fell down – an event, which did tend to happen now and again, though the cause in this case is unclear.\textsuperscript{184} The relationship of Jeremiah III with the sultan and Turkish authorities was likely a large factor in the permission to rebuild, and he expressed this in a letter to the Metropolitan of Arta:

By the mercy and will of the All-Good God, the lords, may God grant them long life, were moved and they gave us permission to rebuild from the very foundations the holy church of our Patriarchal and Ecumenical Throne, and so we have started this building with the help of God.\textsuperscript{185}

While this may also have also been a plea for financial support, the significance of being granted the right to build such a magnificent church with a dome could not have been lost on his fellow church leaders. On the other hand, the financial need was great and the donors were listed in traditional patron manner above the doorways of the church.\textsuperscript{186} Need was also seen for a house for the Patriarch and a general complex from which to conduct the numerous responsibilities of

\textsuperscript{183} Paliouras, “The Patriarchal Church of St. George.”
\textsuperscript{184} Arnakis, 246.
\textsuperscript{185} Paliouras, “The Patriarchal Church of St. George.”
\textsuperscript{186} For the inscriptions listed in full see Appendix C. Chryssavgis, 26.
the church, not to mention a place set apart from the public in which to celebrate Christian holidays and feasts. In this case, the mansion of the local archontes, likely a district governor, was bought for the use of the Patriarch and a compound was plotted out in alignment with the old monastery plan.\textsuperscript{187}

Later fires again damaged the church in 1738, but this time the reconstruction was slow to commence. It was not until 1797 when major repairs were again undertaken and not until 1836 that the church was reconstructed in its present form under Patriarch Gregory VI (1835-1840).\textsuperscript{188} This form did not follow the classical square-cross plan, but rather the basilica with three aisles and a lengthy nave.\textsuperscript{189} This is not uncommon in Byzantine construction; this plan is less conducive to the traditional order of the Liturgy, which was not based on processional elements, while being more conducive to the space of the Patriarch’s compound. The compound is also such that the lateral walls of the church are not straight and both form an angle that is noticeable from the plan, but does not affect the regularity of the worship space.\textsuperscript{190} Tradition was, however, carefully observed in that the church faces the east with three semi-circular apses on the eastern end and a narthex transverse to the western end. It is a simple plan, but one which is able to conform to the needs of the Orthodox community.

A general overview of the layout of Byzantine church elements was given with the symbolic meanings in section one of this paper.\textsuperscript{191} I will now use that general outline to describe in detail the elements of St. George and how these features shape the worship experience. It is a short jump from architectural features to relics and icons, and neither could function without the

\textsuperscript{187} Palouras, “The Patriarchal Church of St. George.”
\textsuperscript{188} Chryssavgis, 26.
\textsuperscript{189} See Figure 4.6
\textsuperscript{190} See Figure 4.6 and 4.8.
\textsuperscript{191} Pages 18-21.
other, but only a brief overview will be given here, as the use of the space and visual perception of a space is the topic of this particular study.

Approaching from the front of the church, one is faced with a broad neo-classical façade that does not betray any religious significance beyond a single cross motif directly under the roofline and the emblem of the Patriarchate directly above the door. The style fits with early 18th century modes of secular buildings with rounded arches over the three main doors and three windows. Indeed, it could pass as a government office in a provincial town. The exterior is what faces the world, not necessarily God, but it is also how the community of faith expresses itself. The limitations put on the Greek Orthodox in Istanbul has made this expression different for them and perhaps what they would have chosen, but this restriction itself shapes the community. The focus is drawn inward to what happens on the inside where the Divine Liturgy occurs. The façade with its plain but stately appearance draws attention to the many roles of the Patriarchate as a leader of the Christian community but it also acts as a mask that is leery of what it might show to the world. This was not always the case for the Greek Church, but it is a symptom of a church that is trying to figure out how to present itself in a modern world.

On the inside, however, the Church knows exactly who and what it is. The visitor enters into the narthex, which is filled with the plain clear light of the façade windows. There are no mosaics or frescos, but there are several icons and portraits of patrons lavishly surrounded by golden frames. It is a compromise of permanence with tradition. As previously mentioned, the plan of the church is that of a basilica and not a cross-form. The three aisles of the main naos run east towards the three apses screened by a massive golden iconostasis, or chancel screen or templon, effectively shielding the sanctuary from the world. The iconostasis is the greatest
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192 SEE Figure 4.5
193 SEE Figure 4.7
artistic focus of the church with its rows of icons and engravings. The utter elaborateness of the screen marks the respect and mystery of the Eucharistic act carried out by the altar. The tradition of the office of the Eucharist, while firmly held, is not completely known due to its essential mysterious theological nature and the Eastern churches have enshrined and elevated this mystery in their church design. The rest of the church is not covered in frescos or mosaic like the early Byzantine fashion, but the pendentives, ceiling, balconies, and pillars are made of swirling marble and stone intarsia of flowers, stars, and crosses. The unearthly quality is typical of a space that seeks to be heaven on earth and enable an experience of becoming one with God because God became one with us. The interior of St. George is a statement of identity within the Christian tradition that it has been valued and protected under all circumstances.

The relics and icons of the Patriarchate are a book unto themselves. Their role in the experience of St. George, however, is a reflection on the spirituality of the Eastern Church in Istanbul. The veneration of icons and relics is designed to be an individual experience and a way for the supplicant to connect to God. The three zones of icons that were common to Byzantine design were laid out in section one. St. George does not have the architectural ability to host that particular pattern, but it does contain the three zones within the arrangement of the icons on the templon. The Pantokrator enthroned is to the right of the main doors to the altar and the Virgin Mary is on the left. Surrounding these two on either side in a proscribed order are the archangels, apostles, saints of the Church, and especially St. George slaying the dragon. The upper rows of icons represent images from the life of Christ and the acts of the prophets and apostles.\textsuperscript{194} Thus zone one is still the central focus and all-encompassing role of Christ in the worship experience. Zone two, the life and works of Christ, is set above the viewer as a sign of their transcendence.

\textsuperscript{194} Ibid., 38-39.
And zone three keeps the saints close to the people where they are easily accessed for veneration. The community of saints and tradition of icons keeps the worshipping community grounded in their identity in Christ.

The compound and surrounding buildings of the Patriarchate besides St. George are equally full of tradition, but of a historical and political nature.\textsuperscript{195} The Patriarchate has by no means been the most saintly of institutions despite its role in the church of Christ, but it does present a face to the world that is emblematic of Christianity in the Muslim world. The buildings in the compound include the Patriarchal House, library, tower, guesthouses, Pavillon of the Holy Myron, the Evgenidio and Constantiniana.\textsuperscript{196} Most of these buildings have been rebuilt in the last two centuries and even the Patriarchal House was completely rebuilt in the 1980’s. The building codes for such purposes are much less demanding than for churches, yet the resources to construct the necessary environment to reflect the needs of the Church were often difficult to acquire. The slow acquisition of the various buildings over four hundred years is proof enough of this. The desire of the Patriarchs to present a Church that was appropriate for the stature of the Church in Constantinople is evident in the design of the compound, though the practical needs of the Church have also played a role and have changed dramatically in the last two hundred years.

\textsuperscript{195} \textit{SEE Figure 4.8}

\textsuperscript{196} These final two edifices are really groups of buildings built by different Patriarchs for offices, the Patriarch’s residence and small chapels. They are named after the Patriarch Constantine V and the patron Efstathios Evgenidis and were built in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries; Chryssavgis, 47.
Chapter V

The Conclusion

In the chaos and political feuding leading up the Greek War of Independence in 1821, the role of the Patriarchate in Constantinople began to change. They lost their authority in Greece once the national Church was born, and because of the freedom of this arrangement, many Greeks in the Ottoman Empire began to look to Greece for leadership. After the Greco-Turkish War and the exchanges of Turkish and Greek populations, very few Christians were left under the purview of Constantinople at all. The division of power among the patriarchates left Athens and Russia in control of Eastern Europe and Greece, Jerusalem and Antioch covering Asia, Alexandria over Africa and Constantinople has canonical leadership over the vast areas of the Americas, Western Europe and Australia. Thus it is known as the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which is an ancient title and formerly was due to the centrality of the Patriarch’s leadership over the vast areas of both the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires, and now to its role as a leader among the Patriarchates and as a mediator in bringing the Churches together under the banner of Orthodoxy. As such, it is also the leader in interfaith efforts and its art reflects this.

Above the door of the Patriarch’s house next to St. George, there are three mosaic panels. The middle panel is of Christ enthroned welcoming and blessing all who enter. The panel to the right of Christ is St. Andrew, the founder of the Church of Constantinople, who is handing the Gospel to the first bishop of Byzantium, St. Stachys. And to the left of Christ is an image of Sultan Mehmet II handing a pastoral staff and fermand, imperial edict, to Gennadios, the first
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197 Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity, 410.
Patriarch after 1453, thus depicting the transfer of privileges to the Orthodox community. The span of the Church is represented in these panels and they reflect the nature of the Patriarchate in the Eastern Christian community. The center is naturally in Christ, but beyond that, their legitimacy and authority have been granted by first apostolic succession and secondly through the mutual respect and generosity of a Muslim leader. Granted, Mehmed II was a rare and diplomatic asset to the Christian community directly after the fall in 1453, but the sentiment is not lost: the Greek Orthodox Church in Istanbul is dependant upon relationships with its neighbors, with other Patriarchates, with Rome, with Protestants, and especially with Muslims. The Patriarchal Church of St. George is a physical manifestation of these relationships while also being a living conduit for the Tradition of the Church based in the life, death and resurrection of Christ lived through the Divine Liturgy.

While the Church did inherit the name of St. George from the monastery it took over in 1600, the name is strangely fitting for this manifestation of the Patriarchate, as St. George is strongly associated with martyrdom. Persecution and division from within and without have shaped the Eastern churches, like the early church. Living under such pressures has shaped Orthodox spirituality and identity. The Eastern Church has classified these different martyrdoms into “red martyrdom” and “white martyrdom” to reflect the outward suffering versus the suffering conscience of the heart, such as that of the monastics. This is a strong point of parallelism with Islam. Some have classified jihad as the sixth pillar of Islam, and as the Orthodox do, Islam differentiates between the external and internal jihads representing different struggles with the world and the self. St. George and the Christian focus on martyrdom, as an
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199 Chryssavgis, 28.
200 Ibid., 28.
internal and external reality defining its existence is not alone in this struggle. It is a mark of the religious life that a community of believers should struggle to define themselves within the world as well as within themselves. The Patriarchate has embodied that struggle in St. George as a mascot and as a church located within a wider community of believers who are asking similar questions of identity, but with a different history and context behind them.

The long subjugation of the Christian population under Muslim rule has left a deep and lasting scar on the community in the East. The classic struggle in Byzantium between innovation and Tradition was unresolved in 1453 and is still unresolved today: “Religion in Byzantium, as elsewhere, was a conservative force, marked by a desire for continuity with the past...However, Byzantium did not survive for more than a thousand years without undergoing significant transformations spurred by social change, economic exigencies, and contacts with its neighbors.”201 The Church and its struggle within itself over innovation and tradition in its identity were not done in isolation from its post-1453 context. This struggle in the Eastern Church in Constantinople/Istanbul is seen in the evolution and continuity of its church buildings that resulted both from the Tradition of the Church and the position of the Christian community alongside and within a Muslim context.

The physical history and policies concerning the churches in Istanbul that was developed during the Byzantine era and innovated under Muslim Ottoman reign can, in conjunction with the historical context, tell us of the identity of the Christian community and their relationship with their surrounding Muslim community. This relationship was rarely about equality in our modern sense, but it did include toleration and a certain level of respect. Certainly there were intimate relationships between Christians and Muslims, but the general picture can be taken from

201 Safran, 8.
the way that the communities were represented, and for the Christians, this was partly through their church buildings.

When Constantine established New Rome at Constantinople and embraced the Christian tradition as a foundation of his Empire, that Church grew up in a city that knew the power and symbolism of buildings. The evolution of the Eastern spirituality and use of the Divine Liturgy shaped this Tradition around the churches in the Byzantine Empire. The relationship of the Church with the state and the eventual influence of other surrounding cultures forced Christianity to both cling to the Tradition, but also to make that Tradition a part of the political and cultural identity of the Greek Christians. This is made more evident after 1453 when the Christians were defined politically by their religious identity. The policies toward the Christians and their buildings is reflected in the history and form of these buildings and can be read in the history of the Patriarchate as it moved through five different churches to end in St. George of the Phanar. And the journey is not over. The Orthodox churches in the east continue to reflect tradition and innovation, Christian identity and Muslim context, politics and spirituality. Questions remain as to the future of the Church in modern Turkey and the growing gap between fundamentalism and secularism. What can be asserted, however, is that the history of the Church will continue to guide and shape Christianity in the East, and this will be reflected in their churches.

If Constantinople was a city of churches, then Istanbul is as well because the Christians have not vanished. On the contrary, they are at home in this city and in their churches that still represent who they are and how they live, even in a Muslim world.
Glossary of Terms

Ambo – Large oval platforms located near the center of the naos from which litanies and readings were proclaimed.

Apse – A semi-circular recess covered with a semi-dome. In churches, apses are focal points and the altar area is nearly always in the central eastern facing apse, though a church may have many apses.

Archon – (plural: archontes) Greek term for “ruler” or “lord” that is often meant for a specific public office and can be used for any number of levels of government. Byzantines used the term to describe foreign rulers but inside the Empire, it was more often a provincial or regional governor.

Basilica – Latin term for the Greek stoa, the basilica was a public building, usually in the forum, of cities in the Roman Empire. As the basilica was a public gathering place with few previous religious connotations, Christians often adapted this form for their early churches and the term developed into a specifically Christian reference.

Bema – Raised platform. In Byzantine terms, the bema is the raised platform of the sanctuary that includes the areas behind the templon by the altar and an area in front of the templon from where the deacons lead the litany.

Berat – A document issued by the Ottoman authorities, usually the sultan himself, to grant a privilege or confer specific rights of property. It can be a document of approval of an act, an order for compliance with an act or a notification of regulations pertaining to another grant.

Bid’ah – Can refer to a number of different English translations, such as: innovation, novelty, heretical doctrine, or heresy. It can have both positive and negative connotations, but bid’ah religious matters it is always negative.

Ciborium – Can refer to the cup of the Eucharist, but in architectural terms, the ciborium is a freestanding canopy in the church that covers a specific area. This is usually the altar, though it can be the pulpit or tombs, and it can be covered with curtains to veil the area from the public.

Dar al Harb – “House of War” An Islamic term for countries not under Islamic rule. This term has been used for a variety of purposes over the centuries, but it generally refers to areas that struggle against or are in opposition to the will of God.

Dar al Islam – “House of Islam” Also known as the Dar al-Salam or “House of Peace.” This term refers to land under Muslim control and seen as being compliant with the will of God.

Dhimmi – “One whose responsibility has been taken” The dhimmi is a general term for non-Muslim subjects of a Muslim state. Dhimmi are allowed to keep their faith and residence with conditions that include heavy and numerous taxations. This status has evolved and changed in each context and state in which it is used, though in theory Islamic law sets the parameters common to all Muslim nations.

Fatwa – A legal ruling concerning Islamic law issued by an Islamic scholar, a mufti. The nature of the fatwa varies depending on the tradition so that they may be considered as legal opinions or binding edicts depending on the context.

Firman – A royal decree or mandate issued by the sovereign of certain Muslim states including the Ottomans.

Icon – A work of art that in the Orthodox tradition is often painted but can be engraved, woven, carved in wood or stone, done in fresco, mosaic, but not sculpted. The Eastern tradition has given a special role to icons in their spirituality as mediums for worship.
Iconoclasm – “Image breaking” The controversy over the use of icons in religious life. The first iconoclasm lasted from 730 to 787 and the second iconoclasm was from 814 to 842. While it was largely in the hands of the emperors and theologians, the effects of these periods would be widespread in society as the general population and monastic community rebelled against the accusations of idolatry.

Iconostasis – SEE Templon.

Imperial Divan – The highest level of advisors and ministers to the sultan who counseled on matters of import to the empire. The members of the divan were viziers and they were led by the Grand Vizier.

Kadis – Provincial Muslim governors who ruled over districts, kazas. The Kadis represented the legal authority of the sultan and were in place as a check on the local beys, military leaders, as acts of punishment could not be carried out without approval of both.

Mahalle – “Neighborhood, district, quarter” These were the smallest administrative units in the Ottoman system. They were strongly connected to identity as people in these mahalle shared religious institutions, schools and every other neighborhood amenity.

Mihrab – Niche in the qibla wall facing Mecca indicating the direction for prayer.

Minaret – A tall tower or spire connected to a mosque from which the muezzin (caller) sounds the call to prayer five times daily. Minarets have distinctive architectural potential and are defining features of many mosques.

Minbar – The pulpit in the mosque where the imam stands to deliver sermons, usually at midday on Friday. It is located to the right of the mihrab (niche pointing to Mecca) and is a symbol of authority.

Mufti – Sunni Islamic scholar who interprets Islamic law, shari’a and fiqh.

Mushrik – Islamic term for the sin of being a polytheist, pagan, idolater, disbeliever in the Oneness of Allah. This is an unforgivable crime in Islam. Christians are considered mushrik because of their belief in the trinity of God.

Naos – The central place of the liturgy. Can compare to the nave of western churches but in Byzantine architecture, the naos was used to describe the area in the center of the typical square-in-cross plan.

Narthex – Entrance area of the church located at the end of the naos or nave and separated from the church by doors. This area was often used for those not eligible to enter the general congregation and often includes the baptismal font so that believers could be baptized before entrance into the church.

Pact of Nadjran – This treaty was made at the end of a conference held in Medina in 631 between Mohammad and a group of Christians from Narjan to the south. The pact outlines the protections, religious, economic and social, due to Christians as people of the Book.

Pact of Umar with the Christians of Syria – This pact was made between Caliph Umar and the Christians of Syria at a time in the 7th century when Muslims were trying to determine how to govern non-Muslims under their control. The pact outlines the system of dhimmitude and much of the terms which would later be held as standards for non-Muslim governance.

Palaiologan – The name of a period ruled by the Palaeologus family, which was the last ruling family of Byzantium. This was the longest dynasty in Byzantium and the era represented a renaissance in artistic design before the final downfall in the 15th century.

Pendentives – Construction devices that allow for a circular dome on a square or rectangular space. The pendente is a triangular segment of a sphere that is tapered at the bottom and then
expands upward to support the round dome. The bases are often supported with massive pillars or solid walls with buttresses to support the weight of the dome.

**Qibla** – Direction that should be faced when praying towards the *Kaaba* in Mecca. All mosques contain some indication of the qibla, often simply a wall, and the *mihrab* is on this wall.

**Rum Milleti** – “Roman Nation” The Ottoman term for the Christian nation which was still seen as being Roman and just as Constantinople was Rome. The Rum Milleti was also the general term for the Christian community in the Muslim Empire that included personal law and religious administration. It can be considered the Ottoman version of dhimmitude that was different from the classical dealings with dhimmi.

**Shari’a** – Islamic law and moral code of Islam that covers religious and many secular areas of life. Interpretations of the shari’a vary widely. The sources of shari’a are primarily the Qur’an and Sunnah (life of the Prophet).

**Spolia** – Literally, spoils, the reusing of earlier building materials in new constructions.

**Templon** – The barrier in Byzantine churches separating the naos from the altar area. The modern versions of the templon are called iconostasis because they are high walls if icons and religious paintings that evolved from the earlier templon models that were usually lower and more similar to altar rails.

**Theosis** – Deification or divinization that is both a transformative process as well as the goal of that process. The goal is to attain union with God and this is done through purification of mind and body.

Appendix A:

**Example of a berat for repairs:**

A decree to the ka’immakam and kadi of Istanbul

The zimmi group came to the Sultan’ court and made it known that the tiles of the roof of the renowned ancient church known as Kanlı Kümbet Church, which is located in ‘Atik Nisancı Ca’fer Çelebi in Fener Kapusi in Istanbul, had, with the passage of time become broken and ruined by raindrops. Since, as was required by the noble fetva [fatwa] issued by the one and only Seyhülislam [Sheikh], they requested my imperial edict so that no one might prevent them from repairing the roof tiles of the aforementioned church, it is my command (emir) that, as long as no external [That is, no new materials added] stone and wood are laid down, there be no interference in the restoration of the tiles according to their ancient arrangement. First ten days of Safer, 1103 (October/November, 1691).\(^{202}\)

---

\(^{202}\) Leal, Appendix B.
Appendix B:

Pre-1453 Patriarchates:
- A church (underground cave) in Argyroupolis (Findikli), 38-144.
- The Church of the Holy Seven Children and the Holy Eleazar in Elaion, 148-166.
- A church in Sykais (Galata) until 272.
- The pre-Constantine Church of St. Irene until 398, today located in the first garden of Topkapi Palace.
- The pre-Justinian Church of St. Sophia, 398-537.
- Justinian’s Church of St. Sophia, 537-1204.
- The Church of St. Sophia in Nicaea (Iznik), 1204-1261.
- Justinian’s Church of St. Sophia, 1261-1453.

Post-1453 Patriarchates:
- The Church of the Twelve Apostles (Fatih Mosque), 1453-1456.
- The Church of Panagia Pammakaristos (Fethiye Mosque), 1456-1587.
- The Church of the Virgin Mary of Vlahseraion in the Phanar, 1587-1597.
- The Church of St. Dimitrios in Xyloporta (Ayvansaray), 1597-1600.
- The Church of St. George in the Phanar, 1601-present.

Appendix C:203

An inscription on the lintel of the south door of the narthex records the great work of the reconstruction of the patriarchal church under Jeremiah III:

This holy patriarchal church was rebuilt from its foundations in the patriarchy of the Most Reverend Patriarch Jeremiah, at the expense of the devout Christians and under the superintendence and supervision of the Right Reverend Metropolitans Paisius of Nicomedia, Gerasimus of Nicaea, Parthenius of Chalcedon, Cyrillus of Brusa, Callinicus of Varna, with the assistance of the most honourable archontes Kyr Konstantinos the Great Ecclesiarch and Hatzi Kyr Konstantinos former Governor of Ungro-Wallachia. 18th December 1720

A second, small, inscription on the inner side of the main entrance reads:

Remember, Lord, Thy servant Konstantinos, Governor of Moldavia and Wallachia, at whose expense this doorway was built in the year 1720.

A third, stone-carved, inscription on the right jamb of the main doorway tells us that the floor of the church was paved with slabs in the same year (1720):

This floor was paved at the expense of the most honorable archon Athanasakis Kiourtisibasis in his remembrance. 3rd December 1720

---

203 Paliouras, “The Patriarchal Church of St. George.”
Figure 2.1 – An eighteenth century drawing from the monastery at Mt. Athos showing the service in progress done by a Ukrainian pilgrim. The highly orchestrated nature of the worship is evident from the details. The animals represent classes of people and their positions within the ship of the church – a common metaphor for the Divine Liturgy. Ousterhout, Robert. “The Holy Space: Architecture and the Liturgy.” Fig. 4.28.
Figure 2.2 – Side-cut of the Myrelaion in Constantinople. The cross-in-square plan allows all the exterior apses and domes to radiate and cascade down from the central structure. This gives a unified and central feel to the building with the raised drum in the middle as the focal point.

Figure 2.3 – Plan of Myrelaion, Constantinople. Example of a cross-in-square church with nine bays arranged in a square around the naos and three apses to the east to balance the narthex at the west. Ousterhout, Robert. “The Holy Space: Architecture and the Liturgy.” Fig. 4.13.

Figure 2.4 – Examples of cross-in-square plans from Bulgarian Byzantine churches that are typical of Byzantine church architecture in general. These examples show the diversity of plans based on the cross-in-square model. Ousterhout, Robert. “The Holy Space: Architecture and the Liturgy.” Fig. 4.16.
Figure 2.5 – Church of the Virgin tou Arakos in Cyprus, 1192. This image of a preserved Orthodox chapel shows the levels of iconography that utilizes the architectural space to enhance its power and symbolism. Sevcenko, Nancy Patterson. “Illuminating the Liturgy: Illustrated Service Books in Byzantium.” Fig. 7.49.
Figure 3.1 – Haci Özbek Camii in Istanbul. This mosque is deceptive in its appearance as it kept its Byzantine outlook after it was converted into a mosque and has puzzled many archaeologists by the crosses on its pillars and classical Byzantine style. This photo was taken before its destruction in the early 20th century. Ousterhout, “Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation.” Fig. 5.

Figure 3.2 – Christ of the Chora Church, now Ka’riye Camii in Istanbul. This converted church clearly shows the addition of the mihrab niche off center in the main apse of the former church. The addition of the minbar to the right, the removal of all other furniture and the covering of the icons on each side of the apse demonstrate the elements of conversion. Matthews, Thomas. *The Byzantine Churches of Istanbul: A Photographic Survey.* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976). Fig. 8-21.
Figure 4.1 – Map of the Patriarchal churches in Constantinople/Istanbul, including St. Mary of the Mongols, the seven hills, main mese (streets) and Byzantine forum/hippodrome.

Figure 4.3 – Church of the Virgin Paramythia or “Vlach Saray.” The ruins still exist in the Phanar district in Istanbul. Kapandai, Ismini. "Church of the Virgin Paramythia - 'Vlach Saray'." <www.ec-patr.org>.
Figure 4.4 – Church of St. Demetrius Xyloporta. Kapandai, Ismini. "Church of St. Demetrius Xyloporta." <www.ec-patr.org>.

Figure 4.5 – Façade of the Patriarchal Chruch of St. George in the Phanar. Building to the left is the Pavilion of the Holy Myron. “The Patriarchal Church of St. George.” <http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/stgeorge>.
Figure 4.7 – Interior view of the nave at St. George of the Phanar. The golden templon is clearly visible in front of the central apse. “The Patriarchal Church of St. George.” <http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/stgeorge>.
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