

# The Patriarchate of Constantinople During the Sixteenth Century. Byzantine Pathways through Ottoman Space

## A Byzantine Institution

For the Ottoman Empire the sixteenth century, especially the reign of the Sultan Süleyman I the Magnificent, was a time of expansion, consolidation, and great achievements in various fields of Ottoman civilization. During this exceptional era, a Byzantine institution continued to operate in the Ottoman capital, a highly important institution that survived amid the new circumstances which surged after the Fall of Constantinople in 1453: the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The re-establishment of the Patriarchate in January 1454, only a few months after the Fall of the East Roman Empire, which we conventionally call Byzantine, marked the beginning of a new, long chapter in the age-old history of the institution. The new political reality posed many challenges on a practical, political and ideological level, as the representatives of the institution were confronted with the need to handle its Byzantine legacy with new objectives, within a framework that required flexibility and adaptability. In recent decades, historians of various disciplines have been studying in depth and from multiple aspects the Patriarchate of Constantinople of the early modern period<sup>1</sup>. The new knowledge verified *inter alia* the accuracy of the »continuity and change/breaks and continuities« concept, indicating that maintaining balance between old and new was a permanent endeavor throughout the Patriarchate's history.

This paper focuses on the Byzantine characteristics of the institution that were still present during the sixteenth century. In this context I also investigate to what extent the implications of this Byzantine legacy were tangible, by arguing that they had a specific spatial imprint on the Ottoman capital, which turned the Patriarchate into a prominent and lively hub with a whole world moving around it.

## The Re-Establishment in Context

Before referring to the sixteenth century, it is necessary to mention briefly the context of the re-establishment of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the middle of the fifteenth century, when it entered the new period of its history.

As it is well known, on 29 May 1453 Mehmed II conquered Constantinople after a long siege, inflicting the final blow to the Byzantine Empire. At the time of the Fall, the Ecumenical Patriarchate was headless, as the last Patriarch, the unionist Gregory III Mamme, had left Constantinople since August 1450 and had settled in Rome<sup>2</sup>.

A few months later, on 6 January 1454, Sultan Mehmed II re-established the Patriarchate of Constantinople, designating Gennadios Scholarios as the first Patriarch. Gennadios was a well-known person: in the conflict that broke out after the Council of Florence (1438-1439), which had stipulated the Union of the Churches, Gennadios was the head of the Anti-Unionists<sup>3</sup>. With this symbolic act, the Conqueror aimed at the following targets: to legitimize himself in the conscience of the Orthodox Christian populations of the Empire as the successor of the Byzantine Emperor; to exclude the possibility of his Christian subjects forming an alliance with the Catholic Church against the Ottomans; to attract Christian populations to Constantinople, as part of his project to repopulate the deserted city and to transform it into the new capital of the Empire<sup>4</sup>.

According to sixteenth-century Greek chronicles the church that Mehmed II originally granted Gennadios for the settlement of the patriarchal headquarters was the Holy Apostles. Some months later, in the summer of 1454, the Patriarchate was transferred to the Byzantine monastery of the Virgin Pammakaristos, located towards the north-east

1 The bibliography on the institution of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and its status within the Ottoman Empire is extensive; see indicatively a selection of mainly recent studies, with previous literature: Apostolopoulos, Hieros; Zachariadou, Deka; Konortas, Othomanikes; Zachariadou, Church; Papademetriou, Render; Çolak/Bayraktar-Tellan, Church; Kotzageorgis, Found; Apostolopoulos, Survival; Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Institutions; Gara/Olar, Confession-Building.

2 On Gregory III Mamme – or Mam(m)as – see Harris, Patriarch. Regarding his surname cf. Laurent, Sunom.

3 On Gennadios Scholarios see the detailed monograph of Blanchet, Scholarios, with previous literature; among the more recent works, see Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Appealing; Blanchet, Réaction; Apostolopoulos/Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Praxeis 49-75. 99-104. 111-115; Necipoğlu, Gennadios.

4 Yerasimos, Epanoikese; Zachariadou, Constantinople; Apostolopoulos, Survival. On the reliability of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Greek chronicles relating these events see the comments of Blanchet, Scholarios 17-18. 83 n. 106 and the bibliography cited therein.

of the city, near the shore of the Golden Horn, following Gennadios' request, because the neighborhood around the Holy Apostles was unsafe for Christians<sup>5</sup>. The extant sources confirm that Gennadios was indeed active in the church of the Holy Apostles in the early days of his mandate. This Christian monument was still very prominent in fifteenth-century Constantinople. Besides, thanks to the tombs of the Byzantine emperors the site accommodated, it was a locus that represented the millennial succession of Byzantine emperors. Even though the exact status of the Holy Apostles at that time needs further documentation, the connection of the first Patriarch after the Fall with this prestigious monument was highly symbolic for the identity of the Patriarchate in the new chapter of its history<sup>6</sup>.

On 15 January 1454, only nine days after the accession of Gennadios to the patriarchal throne, the Venetian Senate was discussing the conditions set by Mehmed II within the framework of the ongoing peace negotiations that had started in the autumn of 1453 in Constantinople. The Sultan had requested *inter alia* that the rights and the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople over the Orthodox Christian subjects of Venice should remain as they were at the time of the [Byzantine] Emperor<sup>7</sup>. The Venetian Senate agreed and therefore the clause became part of the treaty that was concluded in April 1454, establishing the privileges of the Venetian communities and consuls in the Empire<sup>8</sup>. Mehmed's intervention in this issue obviously confirmed the authority of the newly appointed Patriarch. At the same time, it served the Sultan's own political needs, namely his intention to exercise control over the Christian populations in the Venetian territories<sup>9</sup>.

A few months later, in October 1454, Patriarch Gennadios sent an encyclical to the Christians of the Empire, giving them

advice and announcing his imminent resignation (he remained on the patriarchal throne until January 1456). A piece of advice he addressed to his flock was that they should »... preserve the golden commandments of the Gospel and the rules of the Holy Mother Church and the laws implemented in the most pious state of Christians...«, namely the church canons and the laws that had been in effect during the Byzantine period<sup>10</sup>. This explicit formulation originating from the Patriarch himself, in a patriarchal document that was not classified – on the contrary, it was meant to circulate widely – presupposes and attests to the fact that the Sultan recognized and legitimized the use of the Byzantine legal system in the Orthodox Church.

This attitude of the Sultan vis-à-vis the Byzantine law and the Orthodox Christians' religious practices is indicated by one more testimony. The berat issued by Mehmed II for the appointment of Patriarch Maximos III in June 1477 includes the following stipulation: »However, if he [the Patriarch] acts in contravention of their rite, he shall be inspected by all the metropolitans and if he is found worthy to be dismissed, another Patriarch whom they elect shall be appointed«<sup>11</sup>. The specific clause refers to the Holy Synod's role in the process of designating the new Patriarch, reflecting a reality that was more in accordance with Byzantine practices than with the legal order of the time<sup>12</sup>.

From the above it becomes obvious that Mehmed II recognized and legitimized the Patriarchate of Constantinople as the heir to the Byzantine past through institutional means and symbolic actions. Moreover, he used this Byzantine legacy as a base to support specific claims regarding Christian populations living outside the Ottoman borders, as demonstrated by the negotiations in January 1454 with the Venetians.

5 See the relevant testimony provided by the Greek chronicle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century "Εκθεσις Χρονική: Ecthesis 19,7-22; Philippides, Emperors 56. Gennadios was installed in the monastery of the Pammakaristos in the summer or in early autumn of 1454; therefore the transfer from the Holy Apostles can be dated to the summer of 1454: Blanchet, Scholarios 94 n. 50.

6 See the recent study of Melvani, Gennadios, where the author examines the issue of the short-term installation of the Patriarchate in the Holy Apostles through the extant sources of 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries. On the Greek chronicles of the 16<sup>th</sup> c. see also Patrinelis, Proime 65 f.

7 »... les droits et la jurisdiction du patriarche grec de CP. sur les sujets grecs de la Seigneurie restent ce qu'ils etaient au temps de l'empereur«: Thiriet, Délibérations 194-195 (summary in French of the deliberations registered in Archivio di Stato di Venezia (ASV), Senato Secreti reg. 20, fols 4<sup>ra</sup>).

8 For the peace treaty of 1454 see Romanin, Storia 528-535, specifically 533: »Item che le intrade che havea et Patriarcha de Constantinopoli in tuti i luogi dela Illustrissima deta Signoria de Venexia in tempo del Imperator de Costantinopoli cussi haver le debia de presentex«; Theunissen, Diplomats 125 n. 46; Pedani, Consuls 8.

9 Zachariadou, Deka 47; Konortas, Symvivasmos 89. The assumption that it was the patriarch Gennadios who had asked Mehmed II to impose the aforementioned condition on the Venetians is plausible. Besides, approximately thirty years later, in January 1480, the then Patriarch Maximos III addressed a similar request to the Doge Giovanni Mocenigo, asking him to show solidarity towards the Orthodox Christians of his territories and to allow the envoys of the Patriarchate, which was striving to survive, to collect from them the customary contributions in cash or in kind; see Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Apostolopoulos, Episema 173-179; Apostolopoulos/Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Praxeis 186-187.

10 For the encyclical letter see Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Apostolopoulos, Episema 47-51 specifically 49 l. 38-41: »... φυλάττειν τοὺς χρυσοὺς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου νόμους καὶ τὰς τῆς ἁγίας μητρὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας διατάξεις καὶ τοὺς κρατήσαντας νόμους ἐν τῇ τῶν χριστιανῶν εὐσεβεστάτῃ πολιτείᾳ...«; Apostolopoulos/Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Praxeis 64-65; Apostolopoulos, Anaglypha 162. I thank my colleague Nikolaos Livanos for translating this paper's Greek quotations into English.

11 For the transliteration and the translation in English of the berat's text see Çolak/Bayraktar-Tellan, Church 67-68. 195 [2].

12 Konortas, Othomanikes 124-125. It should be noted though, that the aforementioned clause had not been included in the text of the oldest extant berat, the one issued by Mehmed II for Patriarch Raphael I in February 1476. It was probably added after Raphael's mandate, as a measure to control the patriarch's authority; see Kotzageorgis, Found 10. We find the same stipulation in the berat issued in April-May 1483 by Bayezid II for Patriarch Symeon I (Çolak/Bayraktar-Tellan, Church 69-70. 196-197 [2]). Nevertheless, no reference to the Holy Synod can be found in the extant patriarchal berats of the period from 1483 until mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, when the Ottoman legal order recognized the power of the metropolitans, and hence the Synod, within the Patriarchate of Constantinople through the establishment of the system of Elders (Γερωντισμός); on this subject see Konortas, Othomanikes 127-143; Çolak/Bayraktar-Tellan, Church 43. 244-250. 280-286. 298-322. For the participation of the Holy Synod in the Patriarchate's administration during the second half of 15<sup>th</sup> century, see Apostolopoulos, Prattein 203-208.

## Byzantine Practices in Sixteenth-Century Governance

During the sixteenth century, the Patriarchate continued to operate along the path lined from the second half of the previous century. It remained the supreme institution of the ecclesiastical administration of the Orthodox Christians, preserving its core Byzantine characteristics.

From the point of view of its administrative structure, the principal administrative agents of the Patriarchate were the Patriarch, the permanent synod (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα / *synodos endemousa*) of prelates, and the officials (ὄφφικιάλιοι) of the patriarchal court. The synod was usually formed by the prelates who resided temporarily or permanently in Constantinople. On rare occasions, when the Church had to make extremely crucial decisions, the Patriarch convened a plenary synod, in which all the prelates under his jurisdiction were supposed to participate, in person or through a representative, along with the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Although in the Byzantine period the officials were exclusively clerics, in the Ottoman period these posts were increasingly assigned to lay persons, and some of them became very influential in the administration of the Patriarchate. The basic unit of the ecclesiastical administrative structure was the metropolis. Some metropolitan provinces included smaller ecclesiastical peripheries in their territory, namely the bishoprics. These provinces were ruled by bishops under the local metropolitan. Some bishops were placed under the direct jurisdiction of the Patriarch, without the interference of the local metropolitan; they were called archbishops. Besides, there were small areas comprising a small number of villages or islands that were also directly ruled by the Patriarch, the patriarchal exarchates<sup>13</sup>.

In the Byzantine period, the Patriarch of Constantinople was responsible for matters related to doctrine, worship, and liturgy, namely for whatever referred to the core principles of the faith and to the practice of religion by his flock. In addition, the Great Church traditionally regulated matters of marriage and inheritance for Christians. In the new Ottoman reality, the matters under the jurisdiction of the Church were expanded. In particular, the Synodal Court of the Ecumenical Patriarchate acquired, explicitly or implicitly, jurisdiction over civil disputes between members of the clergy or the laity, with cases referred to it for arbitration, as well as over dowry disputes<sup>14</sup>.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople also had a department essential to any administrative institution, the Patriarchal Chancellery. Headed by an official called *megas chartophylax*, the chancellery was responsible for recording the decisions of the Patriarch and the Synod. During the sixteenth century, the rules of the Byzantine bureaucratic tradition were maintained at all levels.

First of all, the personnel of the chancellery kept an official codex where they recorded the decisions taken by the Patriarch and the Synod, so as to refer to them whenever it was necessary. This codex was called the «Sacred Codex». It is well known that in the middle of the sixteenth century the ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire in Istanbul Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq (in Istanbul from 1555 to 1562) brought to Vienna two fourteenth-century manuscripts that had been part of the of the Byzantine official register (covering the period 1315-1402). The manuscripts were subsequently integrated into the imperial library (Vind. hist. gr. 47 and 48)<sup>15</sup>. A recent study has proved that these two units of the Byzantine official codex of the Patriarchate of Constantinople were still lying in the Patriarchal Chancellery in the post-Byzantine period, until the middle of the sixteenth century. Furthermore, during this period the texts of the Byzantine patriarchal acts included in the two manuscripts continued to serve as examples for the composition of new patriarchal letters<sup>16</sup>.

Apart from the recording and classification in the official codex, the chancellery also had the obligation to disseminate the patriarchal decisions, sending patriarchal documents to those directly concerned (monasteries, lay persons, priests, prelates, etc.). Depending on the nature of every decision, the officials of the Byzantine chancellery chose specific types of letters. These types can be traced in the period under examination as well.

For example, in the sixteenth century the Patriarchate continued to issue official letters of the type of the patriarchal *sigillion* granting privileges to monastic foundations; the Patriarch continued to communicate with various addressees using the patriarchal *pittakion*, a type of informal, more familiar letter; the Patriarchate continued to issue a synodical *praxis* for the newly elected prelates, an official document describing their tasks and jurisdiction in their ecclesiastical province; the Patriarchate continued to send encyclical letters as well, in order to inform the Christians about decisions of general application<sup>17</sup>.

13 For the administrative structure of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the first centuries after the re-establishment of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1454 see indicatively Patrinelis, *Ekklesia* 101-102. 103-105; Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Institutions* 121-125. Specifically for the institution of the patriarchal exarchate see Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Exarchia*.

14 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Apostolopoulos, *Kataktese* 80-86; Apostolopoulos, *Co-existence*.

15 For the two extant units of the Byzantine register of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, namely the ms Vind. hist. gr. 47 and 48, see Gastgeber, *Diplomatics* 246 n. 6,

274-277 and the bibliography listed therein. On Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq and his Greek manuscripts see the recent study of Gastgeber, Ogier. For the extant fragments of the «Sacred Codex» from the second half of 15<sup>th</sup> c. see Apostolopoulos, *Hieros*.

16 Apostolopoulos, *Puier*.

17 For the practices of the Byzantine and post-Byzantine Patriarchal Chancellery, see Hannick, *Tradition*; Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Grapheis*; Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 13-19; Gastgeber, *Diplomatics*; Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 23-27.

## The Byzantine Legal System in the Ottoman Environment

Among the words of advice Patriarch Gennadios addressed to the Christians in October 1454, before his intended resignation from his mandate, he urged them to observe the canons of the church and the laws of the Byzantine state. Regarding the law, the Patriarch's wish was consistent with the will of the Sultan who had appointed him, who had connected the legitimation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople with the preservation of the tradition, namely of the Byzantine legal system.

Undoubtedly the implementation of the Byzantine legal system in the Ottoman context was not a simple issue. For this reason, the Church was very often required to make adaptations, and to invent solutions in order to legally regulate some realities that had not existed during the Byzantine period<sup>18</sup>.

Nevertheless, the presence of the Byzantine legal system in the post-Byzantine period was not theoretical. On the contrary, it was an indispensable part of the administrative and judicial practice of the Patriarchate, as it constituted its regulatory framework. Patriarchal decisions were based on the laws of the Byzantine emperors, the canons of the church, Late Byzantine law compilations, etc. In fact, the texts of many patriarchal letters include passages from these legal sources, that were integrated to establish the legitimacy of the decisions<sup>19</sup>. For the same reason, the patriarchal letters usually contain mentions of earlier documents that had been issued on the same subject, either from the lay authority (imperial documents/*chrysoboulla*)<sup>20</sup> or by the ecclesiastical authority (Byzantine patriarchal *sigillia*, etc.)<sup>21</sup>, as well as passages from Holy Scripture.

The predominance of Byzantine law in the Ecumenical Patriarchate's operation has been confirmed by a recent finding of scientific research: a law compilation constituted by

the Great Church in 1564 and named the »Nomimon of the Great Church«<sup>22</sup>. More specifically, Patriarch Ioasaph II (summer 1546 – January 1556) entrusted a learned high-rank official, the *mezas logothetes* Hierax, with the task of compiling a law collection, which was inaugurated in January 1564. The compilation constituted the official legal manual of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 1564 until 1592/1593, a fact that reveals that its composition responded to a permanent need of the institution within the framework of its administrative and judicial operation<sup>23</sup>.

The compilation includes legal sources, the majority of which date from the Byzantine period (6<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries: collection of laws of Byzantine emperors, Byzantine material on matrimonial law (degrees of kinship), the manual »Ekthesis Nea« of the Patriarchal Chancellery from the fourteenth century, *Taktika* (lists and hierarchical rank of ecclesiastical provinces, officials, etc.), and material from the period 1474-1498 and from the sixteenth century)<sup>24</sup>.

### Safe-keeper of the True Faith, Heir to an Imperial Past

In the Byzantine period, the Patriarch of Constantinople was the supreme hierarch of the Orthodox Church, bearing the title »ecumenical«, namely of the whole universe (οἰκουμένη/ecumene): »... ἐλέξω Θεοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Νέας Ῥώμης καὶ οἰκουμηνικός πατριάρχης« (by the mercy of God Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch). In the post-Byzantine period the ecumenical Patriarchs continued to use the same title, except for Gennadios, who preferred to sign as »Ὁ δοῦλος τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ταπεινὸς Γεννάδιος« (Servant of God's children, the humble Gennadios)<sup>25</sup>.

As a leading ecclesiastical institution, the Patriarchate of Constantinople had the mission to preserve the doctrinal pu-

18 For example, from the first period after its re-establishment, the Great Church had to deal with matrimonial issues posing serious dilemmas, as the strict implementation of the Byzantine law could compromise the faith and the coherence of the Christians. On this subject see indicatively Papagianni, *Nomologia* 120-124; Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Gamoi*. Besides, the plenary synod of the Eastern Orthodox Church that was convened in Constantinople in 1593 by the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias II introduced a significant novelty regarding the ecclesiastical penance of defrocking. Specifically, the synod decided, *inter alia*, that the prelates who did not pay their financial contributions to the Patriarchate in due time would henceforth be defrocked. For the financial obligations of the patriarch *vis-à-vis* the Imperial Treasury and the pressing circumstances of the last quarter of the 16<sup>th</sup> century that led to this novelty see Evangelou, *Kathairese*. On both the above issues see Evangelou, *Challenge Management*.

19 In a letter of confirmation issued in May 1499 by Patriarch Ioakeim I for the dependency Prospheion of the Vatopedi monastery on Mount Athos, we find the following passages from the private law collection *Procheiron nomon* or *Hexabiblos* of Constantine Armenopoulos (1345): »Φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς νόμος· εἴτε δικαία εἴτε ἀδικος ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ αἰρετοῦ δικαστοῦ ψήφος, ἐμμένειν αὐτῇ δεῖ. Καὶ αὐθις, ὁ αἰρετοῦ κριταῖς δικασθέντες μὴ ἐκκαλεῖσθωσαν· καὶ πάλιν, ἔάν πλανηθῇ ὁ αἰρετός ἐν τῷ ψηφίζεσθαι, οὐ διορθοῦται· ψηφισάμενος γὰρ πέπτωται εἶναι δικαστής« (»For the holy law says »Whether the vote of the elected judge is just or unjust, it must be sustained. And further, »those who have been judged by an elected judge are not to appeal; and also »if an elected judge is misled in his vote, (the vote) cannot be corrected; for once he has been voted he is no longer a judge«); for the text of the patriarchal letter see

Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 61-63 specifically 62 l. 11-13. The synodical decision of Patriarch Ioasaph II, of December 1564, regarding the dispute between two monasteries of Meteora, contains a passage from the official law collection *Basilika* (9<sup>th</sup> c.), a stipulation that was later integrated in the private law collections *Procheiron Auctum* (1300) and *Syntagma kata stoicheion* of Matthew Blastares (1335): »... ὁ νόμος ταῦτα ἡμῖν δίδωσι τὰ παραγγέλματα καὶ ἐντέλλεται ὀρθῶς βιοῦν, ἕτερον μὴ βλάπτειν καὶ ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἴδιον ἀπονέμειν δίκαιον...« (»... the Law gives us these orders and demands that we live properly, that we do not harm another, and that we administer equal justice to each...«); *ibidem* 459-461 specifically 460 l. 4-5.

20 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 69-71 esp. 70 l. 17-18. 22. 25, patriarchal letter of [March 1501] for the monastery of Timios Prodromos near Serres; 151-155 esp. 152 l. 8, patriarchal letter of 1 September 1529-31 August 1530 for the dependency of Kato Volvos that the Athonite monastery of Iviron possessed in Kalamaria, etc.

21 *Ibidem* 73-75 esp. 74 l. 3-4. 9. 11-12. 19, patriarchal letter of May 1501 for the monastery of Koutloumousiou on Mount Athos; 433-435 esp. 434 l. 9. 14, patriarchal letter of March 1561 for the monastery of Saint John the Theologian on Patmos, etc.

22 For the reconstitution, publication and the photographic reproduction of this valuable source, see Apostolopoulos, *Nomimon*.

23 Apostolopoulos, *Nomimon* I, 15-19. 21. 25-28.

24 For the contents of the »Nomimon of the Great Church« see Apostolopoulos, *Anaglypha* 87-158; Apostolopoulos, *Nomimon* I, 19-21.

25 Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Institutions* 121 n. 11.

city of the Orthodox Christian faith, whose main tenets had been established during the Byzantine period. In this context, in the period 1573-1581 a group of Lutheran scholars (Martin Crusius, Jacob Andreae, Lucas Osiander, Jacob Heerbrand) from Tübingen exchanged correspondence with the Patriarch Jeremias II, aiming to track the points of convergence between Lutheranism and the Orthodox Church. These contacts led to a theological-confessional dialogue, through which the Lutherans hoped to find their own confessional beliefs confirmed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, in their effort to consolidate the Lutheran movement. Jeremias' responses, indicating the divergences of the Lutheran creed from the Orthodox doctrine, did not meet the Lutherans' expectations. Their aspiration to seek an ally in the Patriarchate of Constantinople – a potentially precious ally in their fight against the Catholic Church – attests though to the prestige the leading institution of the Eastern Orthodox Church still enjoyed in the Christian world<sup>26</sup>.

One year after the end of the religious dialogue with the Lutheran scholars, Jeremias II had to face another challenge, this time from the head of the Catholic Church. In October 1582, Pope Gregory XIII inaugurated a calendar reform, introducing the so-called Gregorian calendar. Gregory tried to persuade Jeremias to adopt the new calendar, but the Patriarch did not agree to the reform. He considered it a potential danger to Orthodox tradition, as he emphatically stated in a letter to the Doge of Venice in February 1583: »Our Church preserves what has been bestowed upon it, while the Western (Church) does as it pleases and wishes. But it is totally impossible to do otherwise, as each and every Patriarch of our Church is subject to rules and laws, as well as to ecclesiastical traditions; and by this way of life and governance are preserved here what have been passed on by the Holy Fathers«<sup>27</sup>.

At the same time, the primacy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which originated from the Byzantine period, and its political connotations were recognized by the Orthodox Christian rulers of Russia. Specifically, in the middle of the sixteenth century (1557), the Tsar Ivan IV (the Terrible) of Russia (1533-1584) requested Patriarch Ioasaph II to recognize him officially as the emperor of Russia. Ivan had already been crowned tsar by the metropolitan of Moscow Makarios in 1547, in an impressive ceremony. Still, he had the ambition to have his title confirmed by the Patriarch of Constantinople,

the high official who crowned the emperor in the last centuries of Byzantium. In his effort to be symbolically legitimized as heir to the Byzantine emperors, Ivan implicitly recognized the historical continuity and the Byzantine legacy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Finally, Ivan received his legitimation in the form of an official patriarchal document. Patriarch Ioasaph II issued a synodical letter in November 1560, that was signed by 36 prelates. Through this official letter Ivan was recognized as legal *basileus* (emperor), crowned by the Patriarch »νομίμως ἄρα καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶς« (legally and ecclesiastically). It should be noted that in the text of the letter Ioasaph referred to the Byzantine tradition, pointing out that Ivan's coronation performed earlier by the metropolitan of Moscow had not been valid, because only the Pope of Rome and the ecumenical Patriarch had the privilege to crown the emperor. In other words, the Patriarch highlighted his historical rights vis-à-vis the political ambitions of the Russian ruler<sup>28</sup>.

Approximately thirty years later, it was in the same religious-political context that the Tsar who succeeded Ivan IV in power, Feodor I (1584-1598), requested that the Patriarch Jeremias II raise the metropolis of Moscow to the rank of a patriarchate. Jeremias granted his request (1589-1593) under pressure and amid negotiations and disputes. Even though the tsar desired and persistently claimed that the Patriarchate of Moscow should occupy the third place in the hierarchical order of the Orthodox patriarchates, it was given the fifth place, after the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem<sup>29</sup>.

Jeremias II convened two plenary synods in Constantinople, in May 1590 and in the beginning of 1593; the main objective was to confirm the establishment of the patriarchate of Moscow. The synodical decisions were recorded in two official documents issued by Jeremias in May 1590 and in February 1593. An awkward – from the point of view of diplomatics – formulation lying in the text of the synodical act of May 1590 reveals the power of the Byzantine legacy of the Patriarchate at the ideological level.

More specifically, the text relates that during the ceremony of consecration of the metropolitan of Moscow Iov as the first Patriarch of Moscow, Patriarch Jeremias II handed to him a »χρυσόβουλλον πατριαρχικόν« (patriarchal *chrysoboullon*). The document in question was actually the constitutional

26 For Jeremias II's dialogue with the Lutherans see Hannick/Todt, *Jérémie* 558-560, and most recently Calis, *Crusius* 34-73. 95-98, with further bibliography. According to Richard Calis, »... reading the correspondence between Tübingen and Istanbul in light of the new confessional landscape that began to take shape in this period strongly suggests that the allegedly uncorrupted tradition of the Greek Orthodox Church became a touchstone for determining who was the genuine custodian of Christian orthodoxy« (ibidem 96).

27 »... ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία ἡμῶν διακρατῆ τὰ παραδοθέντα αὐτῆ, ἡ δὲ Δυτικὴ ὡς θέλει καὶ βούλεται. Ἄλλως γὰρ ποιῆσαι οὐκ ἔχομεν ὄλως, ὡς παντὸς πατριάρχου τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡμῶν κανόσι καὶ νόμοις ὀφειλοντος ὑποκεῖσθαι, καὶ παραδόσειν ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς καὶ οὕτω διακρατοῦντος καὶ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα κυβερνῶντος, μένει τὰ τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων πεφυλαγμένα...«. For the text of the pittakion of February 1583 see Sathas, *Biographikon* 26-28 esp. 27. For the reform of the calendar see Hannick/Todt, *Jérémie* 563-566;

Fedalto, *Calendario*; Tzoga, *Sigillion*; Calis, *Crusius* 80-88, and the bibliography mentioned therein.

28 For the date and authenticity of the synodical letter of Patriarch Ioasaph II (c. November 1560), see Fonkič, *Grecheskie* 247-251; Fonkič, *Gramota*; the text of the document has been recently republished by Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 416-419 esp. 417, l. 8-11. For the recognition of Ivan IV's coronation and imperial title by Patriarch Ioasaph II see also Pitsakis, *Empire* 87-111; Gudziak, *Crisis* 95-97; Bogatyrev, *Reinventing*; Apostolopoulos, *Dilemmas*, studies with further literature.

29 On the establishment of the patriarchate of Moscow see Tsirpanlis, *Church*; Hannick, *Hiérothée*; Pitsakis, *Empire* 111-129; Gudziak, *Crisis* 168-187; Hannick/Todt, *Jérémie* 572-575; Mureşan, *Rome*.

charter of the Patriarchate of Moscow, issued in May 1589 by Tsar Feodor I<sup>30</sup>. The wording of the synodal act is unusual, however, since the term *chrysoboullon* had the meaning of a document issued by the Byzantine emperor. Moreover, only the emperor had a gold seal, whereas official documents issued by the Patriarchal Chancellery were usually stamped with a lead seal. As has recently been argued, the strange term »patriarchal *chrysoboullon*« was not used literally in this text, but metaphorically. With this term, the Patriarchate of Constantinople wanted to set a limit to the aspirations of the Russian political authority, reminding it that the heir to the Byzantine *basileus* was the Ecumenical Patriarch, who therefore had the right to issue *chrysoboulla*, even if they were sealed with a lead seal<sup>31</sup>.

## Visualizing the Spatial Imprint of a Vibrant Institution

All the above aspects of the Ecumenical Patriarchate's operation during the sixteenth century composed and constituted its Byzantine identity. To what extent, however, was this marked Byzantine character perceptible in the public space of the Ottoman capital?

In the first place, in its capacity as a leading ecclesiastical institution that governed the Christian populations of the Ottoman Empire and beyond, the Patriarchate of Constantinople had frequent contacts with Christians, clerics or laymen, from various places, on multiple issues. Many of them went themselves to Constantinople and presented their cause in a session

of the synod. For example, representatives of monasteries asked for the renewal of their privileges, the resolution of disputes regarding immovable property, the exemption from financial contributions, etc.; newly elected prelates went there on the occasion of their election; other prelates requested the modification or the confirmation of the limits of their ecclesiastical provinces or of their jurisdiction; when critical decisions had to be taken, prelates of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem came in order to participate in plenary synods; laymen that had not managed to find a solution to their cases (marriages, inheritance, dowry, disputes, etc.) on a local level, resorted to the Patriarchate; distinguished laymen (among them, powerful *archons* of the patriarchal entourage, noblemen from distant Christian communities, wealthy merchants, etc.) went to defend their protégés' or their own causes, etc. For example, in the patriarchal acts of the sixteenth century we find many cases of translocations of individuals towards Constantinople for any of the above reasons<sup>32</sup>, from the monasteries of: Theotokos Hodegetria in Kios, Bithynia<sup>33</sup>, Saint John Prodromos in Adrianople (Edirne)<sup>34</sup>, Mount Athos<sup>35</sup>, Theotokos Sosinou in Pogdoriani, Epirus<sup>36</sup>, Theotokos Geromeriou in Thesprotia<sup>37</sup>, Meteora<sup>38</sup>, Christ the Savior Dousikou near Pyle, Trikala<sup>39</sup>, Metamorphosi Flamouriou on Mount Pelion<sup>40</sup>, Theotokos Phaneromeni Tatarna in Eurytania<sup>41</sup>, Theotokos Vlochou in Aitolokarnania<sup>42</sup>, Panagia Omplou in Achaia<sup>43</sup>; monasteries of the islands of Lesbos<sup>44</sup>, Chios<sup>45</sup>, Patmos<sup>46</sup>, Paros<sup>47</sup>, Naxos<sup>48</sup>, Cos<sup>49</sup>, Crete<sup>50</sup>; from the archbishopric of Ochrid<sup>51</sup>, from the capital's hinterland<sup>52</sup>, from the metropolis of: Trebizond (Trabzon) in the Pontos<sup>53</sup>, Larissa<sup>54</sup>, Diauleia and Talantion<sup>55</sup>,

30 See the text of the synodical act of May 1590 in Regel, *Analecta* 85-91 esp. 86 l. 15-16; 87 l. 3-4 [= Papoulidis/Papoulidis, *Helleno-Russica* 145-151; 146 l. 15-16; 147 l. 3-4]. For the official document of the Tsar Fedor I (May 1589), see Pitsakis, *Empire* 111-113; Mureşan, *Rome*.

31 Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Chrysoboullon*.

32 The extensive presentation of the patriarchal acts of the 16<sup>th</sup> century is beyond the scope of the present paper. The quantity of the extant material (approximately 455 acts) has led to a selection of only a few indicative examples that testify to the mobility of Orthodox Christians departing from many places throughout the Empire and visiting the Patriarchate's headquarters, as stated in the respective texts. Besides, whenever the acts' texts do not mention the presence in the Patriarchate of the Christians involved, the aforementioned Christians had obviously sent reports and documents through representatives to support their cause (»Τῆ ἡμῶν ἀνηρέχθη μετριότητι ὄτι...« / »It was reported to our mediocrity that...«; »ἠξίωσαν ἐγγράφως« / »they requested in written form«, etc.), therefore these cases presupposed mobility as well.

33 Gedeon, *Ephemerides* 60-65, sigillion of November 1594.

34 Pardos, *Pantocrator* 121-123, sigillion of June 1583.

35 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 107-109, patriarchal letter of May 1521 for the monastery of Zographou; 183-186, patriarchal letter of May 1536 for the monastery of Stavroniketa, etc.

36 Vranousis, *Sosinou* 115-117, sigillion of March 1598.

37 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 169-171, sigillion of January 1533; 437-439, sigillion of 1 September 1560-31 August 1561.

38 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 213-214, patriarchal letter of October 1540 for the monastery of Hagia Triada; 283-285, patriarchal letter of February 1545 for the monastery of Saint Stephen, etc.

39 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 177-182, patriarchal letter of April 1536.

40 Germanos, *Sigillia* 113-115, sigillion of 1 September 1592-31 August 1593.

41 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 385-390, sigillion of January 1556.

42 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 445-448, sigillion of 1 September 1562-31 August 1563.

43 Politis, *Omplou* 244-245, sigillion of 1581.

44 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 125-127. 161-165, sigillia of June 1527 and March 1531 for the monastery of Taxiarchai Leimonos, etc.

45 Amantos, *Mone* 455-458, sigillion of June 1578 for the monastery of Mounda.

46 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 95-97, patriarchal letter of September [1512]; 433-435, patriarchal letter of March 1561.

47 Miklosich/Müller, *Acta* v. 6, 281-282, sigillion of July 1593 for the monastery of Panagia Exochoriani.

48 Oudot, *Acta* 152. 154, sigillion of September 1568 for the church of Protothronos at Chalki.

49 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 393-394, patriarchal letter of 1 September 1556-31 August 1557.

50 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 167-168. 219-221, pittakia of May [1531] and May [1541].

51 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 157-160, patriarchal letter of September 1530.

52 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 379-381, patriarchal letter of August 1554 for the monastery of Timios Prodromos on the island opposite Sozopolis.

53 Sathas, *Biographikon* 175-176, patriarchal letter of ci. 1591 for the monastery of the Virgin Soumela.

54 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 129-130. 131-134. 135-138. 345-349, patriarchal letters of September 1527, July and August 1528, February 1547, etc.

55 Kampouroglou, *Mnemeia* v. 2, 226-229, patriarchal letter of June 1572.

Athens<sup>56</sup>, Argos and Nauplion<sup>57</sup>, Corinth<sup>58</sup>, Monembasia<sup>59</sup>; from Ancona<sup>60</sup>, Venice<sup>61</sup>, Lviv<sup>62</sup>, the monastery of Saint Catherine on Sinai<sup>63</sup>, etc. These cases are found in the extant patriarchal acts, therefore we must take for granted that movement was much more intense and that the points of departure of travelers much more numerous.

As mentioned above, the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not attract only the comings and goings of the Orthodox Christians of the Empire. Representatives of either permanent or occasional diplomatic missions visited its premises in the neighborhood of Fener regularly, for various official or unofficial reasons.

For example, the contacts between the Lutherans of Tübingen and the Patriarchate were mediated by the chaplains of the Holy Roman Emperor's embassy in Constantinople, the Lutherans Stephan Gerlach (1573-1578) and Salomon Scwhegger (1578-1581). Actually, due to the two priests' personal interest, their works are a precious source for the Patriarchate of that time<sup>64</sup>.

The spatial trajectory of the Patriarchate's contacts with members of the resident diplomatic missions was more or less short, as the latter had their headquarters either in the center of Constantinople or on the hill above Galata/Pera. This maritime suburb, where the Genoese colony had been active for a long period of time until 1453, continued in the Ottoman era to attract the international community<sup>65</sup>.

Other missions followed much longer routes, as the envoys Pope Gregory XIII sent to Jeremias II in order to convince him about the introduction of the Gregorian calendar. He

had already sent Livius Cellini de Foligno before the reform, in May 1582. Some months after the reform, Gregory sent another mission consisting of two Greek representatives, Michael Eparchos and John Bonaphes, who had some meetings with Jeremias from June until August 1583<sup>66</sup>. The Venetian *bailo* of Constantinople had also contacts with the Patriarch regarding this issue and informed the central Venetian authorities on the progress of the talks<sup>67</sup>.

With the exception of those who had to accomplish specific tasks or missions in the Great Church, the Patriarchate attracted some Western Europeans as well, members of diplomatic delegations or travelers who were exploring Istanbul in the sixteenth century. Obviously, the Orthodox Patriarchate's headquarters were considered as a point of interest by those visitors, even though the relevant information in their travelogues is scarce<sup>68</sup>.

Furthermore, apart from the incoming movement of visitors to the Great Church, there was also a great deal of outgoing missions from the Patriarchate to various destinations inside and outside the Ottoman Empire. For example, the Patriarchs usually sent patriarchal exarchs on tour to the continental or insular Ottoman territories, in order to collect financial contributions from the local prelates, to regulate administrative issues, to deliver patriarchal documents to their addressees, etc.<sup>69</sup>. Occasionally the Patriarchs sent their representatives to remote locations in non-Ottoman territories inhabited by Orthodox Christian communities or populations, for administrative and pastoral reasons, in quest of material assistance, etc.<sup>70</sup>. Sometimes the Patriarchs themselves (for

56 Kampouroglou, *Mnemeia* v. 1, 144, patriarchal letter of around 1598-1601 for Hosia Philothei.

57 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 223-227, synodical praxis of May 1541 issued for the metropolitan of Argos and Nauplion Dorotheos.

58 Sathas, *Biographikon* 171-172, patriarchal letter of 1 September 1590-31 August 1591 for the reunification of two bishoprics belonging to the metropolitan of Corinth.

59 Miklosich/Müller, *Acta* v. 5, 175-178, synodical letter of July 1570 for the metropolitan of Monembasia Makarios.

60 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 383-384, patriarchal letter of October 1554.

61 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 363-364, *pittakion* of January 1550.

62 Szaraniewicz, *Diplomata* 54, patriarchal letter of October 1587 for the confraternity of Lviv; Milkowicz, *Monumenta* 203-205, sigillion of 1 September 1589-31 August 1590 for the monastery of Saint Onouphrios in Lviv, etc.

63 Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 307-313, sigillion of May [1545].

64 Cazacu, *Patriarcat*; Calis, *Crusius* 41-78; Grélois, *Patriarcat*.

65 From the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the »German House« was located in the center of the Ottoman city, near the Topkapi Palace (Eyice, Elçi; Radway, *Alba* 105), while in the same century the Venetian *bailo* was based initially in the center of Galata/Pera and later on the hill above the suburb, called the *Vigne di Pera* (Dursteler, *Venetians* 25-27, with a map of Galata/Pera on p. 25, and 188 n. 3; Pedani, *Piccola* 28. 30; for the toponyms Galata and Pera see also Gancho, *Privileges* 513 n. 2), where most of the embassies were gradually installed by 1600. Of course, by the standards of those times the distance between the ambassadorial residence (German House) and the Patriarchate was great, and moving around without the protection of Janissaries was dangerous for Christians, as Stephan Gerlach noted around 1573 (Calis, *Crusius* 46). For ambassadors in the Ottoman capital from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards see Mansel, *Constantinople* 202-231.

66 Hannick/Todt, *Jeremie* 563-566; Calis, *Crusius* 80-87. The first meeting between Jeremias II and the two Greek representatives was held at the home of the French ambassador (ibidem 85). It was not the first time the patriarch met Bonaphes, as the two men had become acquainted since 1574, when Jeremias had supported Bonaphes in a critical moment of his life (Tsiknakis, *Synergasia*).

67 Mertziou, *Patriarchika* 8-11.

68 See for example references to the Patriarchate made by Pierre Gilles [1544-1552], Hans Derschwam [1553-1555], Philippe Dufresne-Canaye [1573], Reinhold Lubenau [1588-1589], etc. in Grélois, *Patriarcat*. Contacts with the Patriarchate are also attested indirectly by various kinds of evidence. For example, during his stay in Constantinople (1555-1562), the imperial ambassador Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq acquired several manuscripts that originated from the patriarchal entourage (Gastgeber, *Ogier* 163-167. 169; Cazacu, *Patriarcat* 380). Besides, Arnold Manlius, a humanist from the Habsburg Netherlands who served as a medical doctor of the ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire (1570-1574), compiled in Constantinople an *album amicorum*, or friendship album, which includes, inter alia, signatures he collected on his visits to the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate (Radway, *Alba* 106-108).

69 Among the numerous tours of patriarchal representatives, see indicatively the missions of protonotarios Theodosios Zygomalas in October 1576-October 1577 (Rhoby, *Zygomalas*; Paizi-Apostolopoulou, *Zygomalas*) and of the megas logothetes Hierax in December 1567, 1590-1591 and 1591-1592 (Patrinelis, *Patriarchika* 149), missions assigned to the specific patriarchal officials by the Patriarchs Metrophanes III and Jeremias II.

70 For example, the metropolitan of Caesarea Metrophanes (later Patriarch Metrophanes III) resolved various issues of the Christian community during his mission to Venice (around 1546-1549), where he was sent as patriarchal exarch by Patriarch Dionysios II. For Metrophanes' mission and his subsequent visit to Pope Paul III, which led to his temporary defrocking, see the bibliography cited in Apostolopoulos, *Métrophane* 39 n. 3. For patriarchal missions of the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century to Moscow petitioning the tsars for financial aid, and for the trajectory of the travel route usually taken, see Gudziak, *Crisis* 95-103.

example Patriarchs Pachomios I, Theoleptos I, Jeremias I, Ioasaph II, Metrophanes III, Jeremias II, Theoleptos II, etc.) went on tours, along with their retinues/suites, throughout the Empire or beyond its borders<sup>71</sup>.

Finally, a number of people involved with the Patriarchate's operation were gravitating around its headquarters on an everyday basis, such as the prelates forming the permanent synod, the officials serving in the chancellery, priests and deacons officiating in the patriarchal church, auxiliary staff, etc.

The multiple aspects of mobility around the Patriarchate's headquarters testify to the fact that the prestige of this Byzantine institution did not concern only the Christians that lived or revolved around it in the neighborhood of Fener. Thanks to this authority, the Patriarchate had a spatial imprint that actually extended beyond its immediate entourage forming a lively node at the north-western part of the Ottoman capital, a node that served as the destination or point of departure for various categories of people moving through the Ottoman Empire or beyond its borders.

## Bibliography

### Sources

Apostolopoulos, Hieros: 'Ο »Ιερὸς Κῶδιξ« τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως στὸ Β' μισὸ τοῦ ΙΕ' αἰῶνα. Τὰ μόνα γνωστὰ σπαράγματα. Ed. D. G. Apostolopoulos (Athēna 1992).

Nomimon I: Τὸ Νόμιμον τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας, 1564 – ci. 1593. 1: Τὸ ἱστορικὸ περίγραμμα. Τὰ πανομοιότυπα. Ed. D. G. Apostolopoulos (Athēna 2008).

Nomimon II: Τὸ Νόμιμον τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας, 1564 – ci. 1593. 2: Ἡ ἀρχικὴ συγκρότηση. Ἡ μεταγραφὴ. Ed. D. G. Apostolopoulos, in cooperation with M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou / Y. Evangelou (Athēna 2010).

Çolak/Bayraktar-Tellan, Church: The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution. A study of Early Modern Patriarchal Berats. Eds H. Çolak / E. Bayraktar-Tellan. *Ecclesiastica Ottomanica* 1 (Istanbul 2019).

Ecthesis: *Ecthesis Chronica and Chronicon Athenarum*. Ed. S. P. Lambros (London 1902).

Ganchou, *Privilèges*: T. Ganchou (ed.), Mehmed II, *Privilèges octroyés aux habitants de Péra/Galata – Constantinople, le 1<sup>er</sup> juin 1453*. In: V. Déroche / N. Vatin et als (eds), *Constantinople 1453. Des Byzantins aux Ottomans. Textes et documents* (Toulouse 2016) 513-518.

Kampouroglou, Mnemeia: Μνημεῖα τῆς Ἱστορίας τῶν Ἀθηναίων, Τουρκοκρατία. Ed. D. G. Kampouroglou (Athēnai 1890-1892, repr. Athēna 1993).

71 The trajectories of patriarchal journeys varied according to the prevailing circumstances and the motives that led to each tour. For example, patriarchs of the 16<sup>th</sup> century went – on different occasions – through many continental ecclesiastical provinces of the Balkan peninsula, from Thrace, Macedonia and Epirus in the north to Peloponnese in the south, visiting cities (Thessalonike, Serres, Drama, Ioannina, Arta, etc.) and monasteries (Mount Athos, Meteora, monasteries of Kosinitsa on Pangaio mountain, Hosios Loukas in Steiri, Boeotia, Varnakova in Phokis, Sterea Hellas, etc.); other places that attracted at least

## Synopsis

To sum up, in the sixteenth century the institution of the Patriarchate of Constantinople continued to exhibit its marked Byzantine identity in most aspects of its operation: from the point of view of its administrative structure, its bureaucratic function, the diplomatics of the documents it issued, the legal system it enforced, the religious dogma it was meant to safeguard. Finally, on the ideological-political level, for those who had claims to the Byzantine legacy, the Patriarchate operated as the heir to this tradition.

This primarily Byzantine institution was a prominent hub at the heart of the Christian community in the Ottoman capital. A whole world moved around this hub, people from different geographical and religious backgrounds, people with different agendas, clerics and laymen, who followed Byzantine paths through Ottoman space, contributing to the vibrancy of the colorful capital of two successive empires, namely Ottoman Constantinople.

Kotzageorgis, Found: The Newly Found Oldest Patriarchal Berat. Ed. Ph. Kotzageorgis. *Turkish Historical Review* 11, 2020, 1-27.

Miklosich/Müller, Acta: Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana. Eds F. Miklosich / I. Müller (Vindobonae 1860-1890).

Milkowicz, Monumenta: Monumenta confraternitatis stauropigianae Leopoliensis. 1. Pars I. continens diplomata et epistolas ab anno 1518-1593. Ed. D. W. Milkowicz (Leopolis 1895).

Oudot, Acta: *Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani Acta selecta* 2. Ed. J. Oudot (Grottaferrata 1967).

Paizi-Apostolopoulou / Apostolopoulos, Episema: Ἐπίσημα κείμενα τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Τὰ σωζόμενα ἀπὸ τὴν περίοδο 1454-1498. Eds M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou / D. G. Apostolopoulos (Athēna 2016).

Kataktese: Μετὰ τὴν Κατάκτηση. Στοχαστικὲς προσαρμογὲς τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως σὲ ἀνέκδοτη ἐγκύκλιο τοῦ 1477. Eds M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou / D. G. Apostolopoulos (Athēna 2006).

Paizi-Apostolopoulou / Evangelou / Apostolopoulos, Episema: Ἐπίσημα κείμενα τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. II: Τὰ σωζόμενα ἀπὸ τὴν περίοδο 1498-1565. Eds M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou / Y. Evangelou / D. G. Apostolopoulos (Athēna 2021).

one patriarchal visit lay in the southeastern Mediterranean (Cyprus, Egypt, the monastery of Saint Catherine on Sinai, Jerusalem, etc.) and in the north (the monastery of Prodomos in Sozopolis, on the Black Sea coast, the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, etc.). Jeremias II was the first ecumenical patriarch to travel as far as Kiev and Moscow. For the above, see indicatively Patrinelis, Jeremias; Gudziak, *Crisis* 164-167. 171-187; Angelomati-Tsougaraki, *Zeteia* 262; Cazacu, *Patriarcat* 376-378; Mureşan, *Nouvelle* 128; Paizi-Apostolopoulou/Evangelou/Apostolopoulos, *Episema* 319-321.

Philippides, Emperors: Emperors, Patriarchs and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373-1513. An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century. Ed. M. Philippides (Brookline MA 1990).

Regel, Analecta: W. Regel, Analecta Byzantino-russica (Petropoli 1891).

Romanin, Storia: Storia documentata di Venezia 4. Ed. S. Romanin (Venezia 1913).

Sathas, Biographikon: Βιογραφικὸν σχεδιάσμα περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰερεμίου Β΄ (1572-1594). Ed. K. N. Sathas (Athēnai 1870).

Szaranievicz, Diplomata: Diplomata statutaria a Patriarchis Orientalibus Confraternitati Staupogiana Leopolensis a. 1586-1592 data, cum

aliis litteris coevis et appendice 2. Editionis jubiliae in memoriam confraternitatis Staupogiana Leopolensis ante trecentos annos fundatae. Ed. I. Szaranievicz (Leopoli 1895).

Theunissen, Diplomats: Ottoman-Venetian Diplomats: The Ahd-names. The Historical Background and the Development of a Category of Political-Commercial Instruments together with an Annotated Edition of a Corpus of Relevant Documents. Ed. H. Theunissen. Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies 1/2, 1998, 1-698.

Zachariadou, Deka: Δέκα τουρκικά έγγραφα για την Μεγάλη Εκκλησία (1483-1567). Ed. E. A. Zachariadou (Athēna 1996).

## References

Amantos, Mone: K. Amantos, Ἡ μονὴ τῶν Μουνδῶν ἐν Χίῳ. In: Ἐναίσιμα, τμητικὸς τόμος ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπιστημονικῇ 35ετηρίδι τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀθηνῶν Χρυσοστόμου (Athēnai 1931) 451-469.

Angelomati-Tsougaraki, Zeteia: E. Angelomati-Tsougaraki, Τὸ φαινόμενο τῆς ζητείας κατὰ τὴ μεταβυζαντινὴ περίοδο. Ionios Logos 1, 2007, 247-293.

Apostolopoulos, Anaglypha: D. G. Apostolopoulos, Ἀνάγλυφα μιᾶς τέχνης νομικῆς. Βυζαντινὸ δίκαιο καὶ μεταβυζαντινὴ «νομοθεσία» (Athēna 1999).

Coexistence: D. G. Apostolopoulos, La coexistence de deux espaces juridiques dans l'Empire Ottoman (XV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles). Études Balkaniques, Cahiers Pierre Belon 19-20, 2013-2014, 89-100.

Dilemmas: D. G. Apostolopoulos, Les dilemmes d'un héritier face aux ambitions d'un autre (XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle). In: M. Koumanoudi / C. Maltezos (eds), Dopo le due cadute di Costantinopoli (1204, 1453): Eredi ideologici di Bisanzio, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Venezia, 4-5 dicembre 2006 (Venezia 2008) 51-56.

Métrophane: D. G. Apostolopoulos, Métrophane III, Patriarche et lettré. In: A. Binggeli / M. Cassin / M. Detoraki (eds), Bibliothèques grecques dans l'Empire ottoman (Turnhout 2020) 39-48.

Prattein: D. G. Apostolopoulos, «Πράττειν τὰ κοινὰ τῇ συναίνεσει τῶν ἐνδημούντων ἀρχιερέων»: Ἡ ἀνάγκη τῆς συλλογικότητας σε περιβάλλον ἀπολυταρχίας (15ος-18ος αἰ.). In: D. Apostolopoulos / E. Chrysos (eds), Ἡ τῶν πλειόνων ψήφος κρατεῖται. Ἡ τύχη τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς πλειονοψηφίας ἀπὸ τῆ μετακλασικῆ περίοδο ὡς τοὺς νεότερους χρόνους (Athēna 2017) 203-212.

Puiser: D. G. Apostolopoulos, Puiser aux sources byzantines. Nouveaux éléments sur l'utilisation du registre synodal byzantin par la chancellerie patriarcale post-byzantine (1489/1490, 1499, 1530). REB 79, 2021, 221-236.

Survival: D. G. Apostolopoulos, Continuity and Change: The Patriarchate in the Early Ottoman Period. 1. The Survival of a Byzantine Institution. In: C. Gastgeber / E. Mitsiou / J. Preiser-Kapeller / V. Zervan (eds), A Companion to the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Leiden, Boston 2021) 103-117.

Apostolopoulos/Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Praxeis: D. G. Apostolopoulos / M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Οἱ πράξεις τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Ἐπιτομὴ – Παράδοση – Σχολιασμός I. 1454-1498 (Athēna 2013).

Blanchet, Réaction: M.-H. Blanchet, La réaction byzantine à l'Union de Florence (1439): Le discours antiromain de la Synaxe des Orthodoxes. In: M.-H. Blanchet / F. Gabriel (eds), Réduire le Schisme? Ecclésiologies et politiques de l'Union entre Orient et Occident (XIII<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle) (Paris 2013) 181-196.

Scholarios: M.-H. Blanchet, Georges Gennadios-Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472). Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin (Paris 2008).

Bogatyrev, Reinventing: S. Bogatyrev, Reinventing the Russian Monarchy in the 1550s: Ivan the Terrible, the Dynasty, and the Church. The Slavonic and East European Review 85/2, 2007, 271-293.

Calis, Crusius: R. A. Calis, Martin Crusius (1526-1607) and the Discovery of Ottoman Greece [unpubl. Diss. Univ. Princeton 2020]. URL: <https://dataspace.princeton.edu/handle/88435/dsp019p290d39f> (20.02.2025).

Cazacu, Patriarcat: M. Cazacu, Le Patriarcat de Constantinople dans la vision de Stephan Gerlach (1573-1578). In: Le Patriarcat Œcuménique de Constantinople aux XIV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles: Rupture et continuité. Actes du colloque international, Rome, 5-6-7 décembre 2005 (Paris 2007) 369-386.

Dursteler, Venetians: E. R. Dursteler, Venetians in Constantinople. Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean (Baltimore 2006).

Evangelou, Challenge Management: Y. Evangelou, The Great Church in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century: Challenge Management and Politics. The Historical Review / La Revue Historique 20, 2023, 277-292.

Kathairese: Y. Evangelou, Ἐνας νέος λόγος καθάρσεως θεσμοθετεῖται τὸ 1593. Ho Eranistes 28, 2011, 95-119.

Eyice, Elçi: TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi, s.v. Elçi Hanı (S. Eyice). <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/elci-hani> (06.03.2025).

Fedalto, Calendario: G. Fedalto, Il patriarca Geremia II Tranos, l'arcivescovo Gabriele Severo e la questione del calendario. In: D. G. Apostolopoulos (ed.), Gavriil Sevros, arcivescovo di Filadelfia a Venezia, e la sua epoca (Venezia, 26 settembre 2003) (Venezia 2004) 59-69.

Fonkič, Gramota: B. L. Fonkič, Из истории утверждения царского титула Ивана IV. In: Греческие рукописи и документы в России в XIV – начале XVIII в. (Moskva 2003) 373-376.

Grecheskie: B. L. Fonkič, Греческие грамоты советских хранилищ. In: Проблемы палеографии и кодикологии в СССР (Moskva 1974) 242-260.

- Gara/Olar, Confession-Building: E. Gara / O. Olar, Confession-Building and Authority: the Great Church and the Ottoman State in the first half of the Seventeenth Century. In: T. Krstić / D. Terzioğlu (eds), *Entangled Confessionalizations?, Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. *The Modern Muslim World* 15 (2022) 159-214.
- Gastgeber, Diplomatics: C. Gastgeber, Diplomatics of the Patriarchate of Constantinople: The State of Research on Byzantine Documents of the Patriarchs of Constantinople. In: C. Gastgeber / E. Mitsiou / J. Preiser-Kapeller / V. Zervan (eds), *A Companion to the Patriarchate of Constantinople* (Leiden, Boston 2021) 246-285.
- Ogier: C. Gastgeber, Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq und seine griechischen Handschriften. In: A. Binggeli / M. Cassin / M. Detoraki (eds), *Bibliothèques grecques dans l'Empire ottoman* (Turnhout 2020) 145-181.
- Gedeon, Ephemerides: M. I. Gedeon, Πατριαρχικά Έφημερίδες. Ειδήσεις εκ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας, 1500-1912 (Athēnai 1935-1938).
- Germanos, Sigillia: † Germanos, Metr. of Demetrias, Τρία σιγίλλια τῆς μονῆς Φλαμουρίου τῶν πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἱερεμίου Β' καὶ Τιμοθέου Β'. *Thessalika Chronika* 1, 1930, 113-120.
- Grémois, Patriarcat: J.-P. Grémois, Le patriarcat de Constantinople vu par quelques voyageurs occidentaux (XVI<sup>e</sup>-XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles). In: A. Binggeli / M. Cassin / M. Detoraki (eds), *Bibliothèques grecques dans l'Empire ottoman* (Turnhout 2020) 49-60.
- Gudziak, Crisis: A. Gudziak, Crisis and Reform. The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the genesis of the Union of Brest (Cambridge MA 1998).
- Hannick, Hiérothée: C. Hannick, Le métropolitain Hiérothée de Monembasie et son rôle dans l'érection du patriarcat de Moscou. *Revue des études slaves*, 63/1, 1991, 207-215.
- Tradition: C. Hannick, Tradition et innovation dans les usages de la chancellerie du patriarcat de Constantinople à l'époque postbyzantine. In: C. Hannick (ed.), *Kanzleiwesen und Kanzleisprachen im östlichen Europa*. *Archiv für Diplomatik* 6, 1999, 129-142.
- Hannick/Todt, Jérémie: C. Hannick / K.-P. Todt, Jérémie II Tranos. In: C. G. Conticello / V. Conticello (eds), *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition, v. II (XIII<sup>e</sup>-XIX<sup>e</sup> s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 551-615.
- Harris, Patriarch: J. Harris, The Patriarch of Constantinople and the last days of Byzantium. In: C. Gastgeber / E. Mitsiou / J. Preiser-Kapeller / V. Zervan (eds), *The Patriarchate of Constantinople in Context and Comparison. Proceedings of the International Conference Vienna, September 12<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> 2012*. In *memoriam Konstantinos Pitsakis (1944-2012) and Andreas Schminck (1947-2015)* (Wien 2017) 9-16.
- Konortas, Othomanikes: P. Konortas, Οθωμανικές Θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο, 17ος-αρχές 20ού αιώνα (Athēna 1998).
- Symnivasmos: P. Konortas, Από τον «ιστορικό συμβιβασμό» στην «εγκάρδια συνεννόηση»; πολιτικές συγκλίσεις ανάμεσα στο Ορθόδοξο Πατριαρχείο Κωνσταντινουπόλεως και την οθωμανική διοίκηση (μέσα 15ου-τέλη 16ου αι.). In: C. Aktar / N. Ouzounoglou / Aim. Xanthoroulou (eds), *Το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο. Ιστορικές-Πολιτικές-Θρησκευτικές-Νομικές Μελέτες* (Athēna 2018) 73-105.
- Laurent, Surnom: V. Laurent, Le vrai surnom du patriarche de Constantinople Grégoire († 1459): Ἡ Μαμμή, non ὁ Μάμμας. *REB* 14, 1956, 201-205.
- Mansel, Constantinople: P. Mansel, Constantinople. La ville que désirait le monde, 1453-1924. Transl. P. Chemla (Paris 1997).
- Melvani, Gennadios: N. Melvani, Gennadios Scholarios and the church of the Holy Apostles. *ZRVI* 57, 2020, 117-142.
- Mertzios, Patriarchika: K. D. Mertzios, Πατριαρχικά ἤτοι ἀνέκδοτα πληροφοροῖα σχετικὰ πρὸς τοὺς πατριάρχας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ τοῦ 1556-1702. *Pragmateiai tēs akadēmias Athēnōn* 15,4 (Athēnai 1951).
- Mureşan, Nouvelle: D. I. Mureşan, De la nouvelle Rome à la troisième: La part des principautés roumaines dans la transmission de l'idée imperiale. In: A. Castaldini (ed.), *L'Eredità di Traiano. La tradizione istituzionale romano-imperiale nella storia dello spazio romeno*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Bucarest, 6-7 giugno 2007 (Bucarest 2008) 123-166.
- Rome: D. I. Mureşan, Rome hérétique? Sur les décisions des conciles de Moscou et de Constantinople (1589, 1590 et 1593). *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Italie et Méditerranée modernes et contemporaines* 126/2, 2014, 275-287.
- Necipoğlu, Gennadios: N. Necipoğlu, Gennadios Scholarios and the Patriarchate. A Reluctant Patriarch on the «Unhappy Throne». In: M. Mullett / R. G. Ousterhout (eds), *The Holy Apostles. A Lost Monument, a Forgotten Project, and the Presentness of the Past* (Washington, D.C. 2020) 237-246.
- Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Appealing: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Appealing to the Authority of a Learned Patriarch: New Evidence on Gennadios Scholarios' Responses to the Questions of George Branković. *The Historical Review / La Revue Historique* 9, 2012, 95-116.
- Chrysoboullon: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, «Χρυσόβουλλον πατριαρχικόν». Τὰ παράδοξα τῆς διπλωματικῆς καὶ ἡ ἴδρυση τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Μόσχας. In: *Москва. Проблемы Византийской и Новогреческой Филологии. К 60-летию Б. Л. Фонкича / Προβλήματα βυζαντινῆς καὶ νεοελληνικῆς φιλολογίας γιὰ τὰ 60 χρόνια τοῦ Boris Fonkič* 1 (Moskva 2001) 335-345.
- Exarchia: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Ὁ θεσμὸς τῆς πατριαρχικῆς ἐξαρχίας, 14ος-19ος αἰώνας (Athēna 1995).
- Gamoi: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Γάμοι, κωλύματα καὶ οἱ «κατ' οικονομίαν» ρυθμίσεις τὸς μετὰ τὴν Ἄλωση. In: M. Youni / L. Parrigga-Artemiadi (eds), *Κωνσταντίνω Γ. Πιτσάκη Μνήμης χάριν* (Athēna 2023) 311-320.
- Graphis: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Γραφεῖς ἐπισήμων. Στοιχεῖα γιὰ τὴ λειτουργία τῆς πατριαρχικῆς γραμματείας τὴν περίοδο 1454-1500. In: S. Patoura (ed.), *Ἡ ἑλληνικὴ γραφὴ κατὰ τοὺς 15ο καὶ 16ο αἰῶνες* (Athēna 2000) 65-82.
- Institutions: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Continuity and Change: The Patriarchate in the Early Ottoman Period 2: Institutions and Administration: Continuity and Rupture. In: C. Gastgeber / E. Mitsiou / J. Preiser-Kapeller / V. Zervan (eds), *A Companion to the Patriarchate of Constantinople* (Leiden, Boston 2021) 118-129.
- Zygomalas: M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, Θεοδόσιος Ζυγομαλάς, ἔξαρχος καθολικὸς καὶ ἔξαρχος πατριαρχικὸς. Οἱ ὅροι καὶ ἡ σημασία τους. In: S. Perentidis / G. Steiris (eds), *Ἰωάννης καὶ Θεοδόσιος Ζυγομαλάς. Πατριαρχεῖο – Θεσμοὶ – Χειρόγραφα* (Athēna 2009) 269-278.
- Papademetriou, Render: T. Papademetriou, Render unto the Sultan. Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries (Oxford 2015).

- Paragianni, Nomologia: E. S. Paragianni, 'Η νομολογία τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν δικαστηρίων τῆς βυζαντινῆς καὶ μεταβυζαντινῆς περιόδου σὲ θέματα περιουσιακοῦ δικαίου, ἢ Οἰκογενειακὸ δίκαιο (Athēna, Komotēnē 1997).
- Papoulidis/Papoulidis, Helleno-Russica: Kyr. K. Papoulidis / Konst. K. Papoulidis, Helleno-Russica, ἤτοι Τεκμήρια τῆς πρώιμης νεοελληνικῆς γραμματείας περὶ τῆς Ρωσίας (Thessaloniki 2014).
- Pardos, Pantokratoros: A. Pardos, Ἄρχεῖο τῆς Ἱ. Μ. Παντοκράτορος. Ἐπιτομὲς ἐγγράφων, 1039-1801 (Athēna 1998).
- Patrinelis, Ekklēsia: Ch. Patrinelis, 'Η Ἐκκλησία καὶ ἡ Ὁρθοδοξία. In: Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους 10 (Athēna 1974) 92-113.
- Jeremias: Ch. G. Patrinelis, Χρονολογικὰ ζητήματα τῆς πατριαρχείας τοῦ Ἱερεμίου Α΄ (1522-1546). Μνήμοσυνῆ 1, 1967, 249-262.
- Patriarchika: Ch. G. Patrinelis, Πατριαρχικὰ γράμματα καὶ ἄλλα ἐγγράφα καὶ σημειώματα τοῦ Ἰς΄-ΙΗ΄ αἰῶνος ἐκ τοῦ κώδικος τοῦ Ἱέρακος (Ἐθν. Βιβλιοθ. Ἑλλ. 1474). Epetēris Mesaionikou Archeiou 12, 1962, 116-165.
- Proime: Ch. G. Patrinelis, Πρώιμη νεοελληνικὴ ιστοριογραφία (1453-1821). Περιλήψεις μαθημάτων (Thessalonikē 1986).
- Pedani, Consuls: M. P. Pedani, Venetian Consuls in Egypt and Syria in the Ottoman Age. Mediterranean World / Mediterranean Studies 18, 2006, 7-21.
- Piccola: M. P. Pedani, Una piccola Venezia / Venedik'ten bir parça. In: M. P. Pedani (ed.), Il Palazzo di Venezia a Istanbul e I suoi antichi abitanti / Istanbul'daki Venedik Sarayı ve Eski Yaşayanları (Venezia 2013) 19-34.
- Pitsakis, Empire: C. G. Pitsakis, À propos des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople concernant la proclamation de l'Empire en Russie (XVI siècle): survivances et souvenirs de la terminologie et de l'idéologie impériale constantinopolitaines. In: Da Roma alla terza Roma, IX Seminario internazionale di studi storici (Campidoglio, 21-22 aprile 1989), L'idea di Roma a Mosca, Secoli XV-XVI, Relazioni e comunicazioni (Roma 1993) 87-138.
- Politis, Omplou: L. Politis, Ἡ μονὴ τοῦ Ὀμπλοῦ κοντὰ στὴν Πάτρα. Peloponnesiaka 1, 1956, 238-252.
- Radway, Alba: R. D. Radway, Three Alba Amicorum from the Habsbourg Netherlands: Manlius, Wijts, and Huenich in the Ottoman Empire. Early Modern Low Countries 6/1, 2022, 103-126.
- Rhoby, Zygomas: A. Rhoby, Theodosios Zygomas and his Report on a Journey to the Aegean and the coast of Asia Minor: a contribution to the relations between Constantinople and Tübingen in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century. In: A. Argyriou (ed.), Πρακτικά του Β' Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών, Ρέθυμνο, 10-12 Μαΐου 2002, Ἡ Ελλάδα των νησιῶν ἀπὸ τὴ Φραγκοκρατία ὡς σήμερα. 2: Ἱστορία καὶ κοινωνία (Athēna 2004) 103-113.
- Thiriet, Délibérations: F. Thiriet, Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie, t. troisième 1431-1463 (Paris 1961).
- Tsiknakis, Synergasia: K. G. Tsiknakis, Ἡ συνεργασία τοῦ Ἰωάννη Μποναφῆ μὲ τὸν οἰκουμενικὸν πατριάρχην Ἱερεμία Β' (τὸν Τρανὸ) κατὰ τὸ 1574. In: Τόμος τιμητικὸς Κ. Ν. Τριανταφύλλου (Patra 1993) 819-834.
- Tsirpanlis, Church: C. Trirpanlis, Church Relations between Moscow, Constantinople and Alexandria towards the End of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century. In: Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujčev ([Sofia] 1988) 79-83.
- Tzoga, Sigillion: V. Tzoga, Un sigillion inédit du patriarche de Constantinople Jérémie II et d'Alexandre Sylvestre sur la réforme du calendrier. BZ 107, 2014, 221-252.
- Vranousis, Sosinou: L. I. Vranousis, Ἡ ἐν Ἠπείρῳ μονὴ Σωσίνου. Epetēris Mesaionikou Archeiou 6, 1956, 72-129.
- Yerasimos, Epanoiakes: S. Yerasimos, Ἡ επανοίκηση τῆς Κωνσταντινούπολης μετὰ τὴν Ἄλωση. In: T. Kiousorouli (ed.), 1453. Ἡ ἄλωση τῆς Κωνσταντινούπολης καὶ ἡ μετάβαση ἀπὸ τοὺς μεσαιωνικοὺς στοὺς νεώτερους χρόνους (Iraklion 2013) 3-21.
- Zachariadou, Church: E. Zachariadou, The Great Church in captivity, 1453-1586. In: M. Angold (ed.), The Cambridge History of Christianity. 5, Eastern Christianity (Cambridge 2006) 169-186.
- Constantinople: E. A. Zachariadou, Constantinople se repeuple. In: T. Kiousorouli (ed.), 1453. Ἡ ἄλωση τῆς Κωνσταντινούπολης καὶ ἡ μετάβαση ἀπὸ τοὺς μεσαιωνικοὺς στοὺς νεώτερους χρόνους (Iraklion 2013) 47-59.

## Summary / Zusammenfassung / Résumé

### The Patriarchate of Constantinople during the Sixteenth Century: Byzantine Pathways through Ottoman Space

During the sixteenth century, a Byzantine institution continued to operate in the capital of the Ottoman Empire: the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The main challenge faced by the institution in the Ottoman political framework was to deal with its Byzantine heritage while maintaining a balance between the old and the new. This paper refers to the context of the re-establishment of the Patriarchate in 1454 and Sultan Mehmed II's emphasis on its Byzantine past, and focuses on the Byzantine characteristics of the institution that were still present in the sixteenth century. Specifically, the Patriarchate followed Byzantine practices at most levels of its operation (in terms of its administrative structure, its bureaucratic function, the types of documents it issued, the legal system it enforced, the religious dogma it was supposed to safeguard, its official discourse towards those who made claims to the Byzantine legacy). In this context, the paper argues that the Patriarchate, because of its distinct Byzantine identity, had a specific spatial imprint on the Ottoman capital; indeed, it was a prominent hub around which a whole world moved, people from different geographical and religious backgrounds, people with different agendas, clerics and laymen, who followed Byzantine pathways through Ottoman space.

### Das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel im 16. Jahrhundert: Byzantinische Pfade durch den osmanischen Raum

Im 16. Jahrhundert war in der Hauptstadt des Osmanischen Reiches weiterhin eine byzantinische Institution tätig: das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel. Die größte Herausforderung, der sich die Institution im politischen Rahmen des Osmanischen Reiches gegenüber sah, bestand darin, ihr byzantinisches Erbe zu verwalten und dabei das Gleichgewicht zwischen Alt und Neu zu wahren. Dieser Artikel bezieht sich auf den Kontext der Wiedererrichtung des Patriarchats im Jahr 1454 und auf die Betonung der byzantinischen Vergangenheit durch Sultan Mehmed II. und konzentriert sich auf die byzantinischen Merkmale der Institution, die im 16. Jahrhundert noch vorhanden waren. Insbesondere folgte das Patriarchat auf den meisten Ebenen seiner Tätigkeit den by-

zantinischen Praktiken (in seiner Verwaltungsstruktur, seiner bürokratischen Funktion, der Art der von ihm ausgestellten Dokumente, des von ihm durchgesetzten Rechtssystems, des religiösen Dogmas, das es schützen sollte, seiner offiziellen Haltung gegenüber denjenigen, die Ansprüche auf das byzantinische Erbe erhoben). In diesem Zusammenhang argumentiert der Beitrag, dass das Patriarchat aufgrund seiner ausgeprägten byzantinischen Identität einen spezifischen räumlichen Eindruck in der osmanischen Hauptstadt hinterließ; tatsächlich war es ein bedeutender Knotenpunkt, um den sich eine ganze Welt bewegte, Menschen mit unterschiedlichem geografischem und religiösem Hintergrund, Menschen, die verschiedene Ziele verfolgten, Geistliche und Laien, die byzantinische Pfade durch den osmanischen Raum beschrritten.

### Le patriarcat de Constantinople au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: Les voies byzantines à travers l'espace ottoman

Au cours du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, une institution byzantine a continué à fonctionner dans la capitale de l'Empire ottoman: le patriarcat de Constantinople. Le plus grand défi auquel elle a été confrontée dans le cadre de la politique ottomane a été de gérer son héritage byzantin en maintenant un équilibre entre l'ancien et le nouveau. Cet article se réfère au contexte de la restauration du patriarcat en 1454 et à l'accent mis par le sultan Mehmed II sur son passé byzantin. Il se concentre sur les caractéristiques byzantines de l'institution qui étaient encore présentes au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Plus précisément, le patriarcat suivait les pratiques byzantines à la plupart des niveaux de son fonctionnement (en termes de structure administrative, de bureaucratie, de types de documents délivrés, de système juridique appliqué, de dogme religieux sauvegardé et de discours officiel envers ceux qui revendiquaient l'héritage byzantin). Dans ce contexte, l'article soutient qu'en raison de son identité byzantine marquée, le patriarcat avait une empreinte spatiale spécifique sur la capitale ottomane; en fait, c'était un centre important autour duquel tout un monde se déplaçait, des personnes d'origines géographiques et religieuses différentes, des personnes poursuivant des objectifs variés, des religieux et des laïcs, qui suivaient les voies byzantines à travers l'espace ottoman.