The article tests the established view that Gennadios Scholarios, the first patriarch of Constantinople after the 1453 Conquest, used the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople as the seat of the Patriarchate for a few months in 1454 before moving to the building complex of the Pammakaristos monastery. After pointing out that all the sources that narrate the story of the installation of the Patriarchate in the famous Byzantine church date from the 16th century or later, the author examines sources contemporary with the events, including texts written by Scholarios himself. The aim of the article is to show that Scholarios officiated occasionally in the Holy Apostles and managed to salvage some of the relics it once held, but this does not mean that the church functioned as the official seat of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.
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It is commonly asserted that, after the crisis caused by the Union of the Churches in 1439 and the Ottoman Conquest of 1453, the Patriarchate of Constantinople was re-established in January 1454 by the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II (1451–1481) who appointed the Byzantine scholar George Scholarios, known by his monastic name Gennadios, as patriarch with his seat in the church of the Holy Apostles, formerly the mausoleum of the Byzantine Emperors.¹ The church of the Hagia Sophia, the Patriarchate's
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¹ For a recent overview of these events, see Necipoğlu, Gennadios Scholarios. Also, Blanchet, Georges-Gennadios, 68–84; Konortas, Rapports juridiques; Braude, Foundation Myths, 73–76.
headquarters during the Byzantine millennium, had been taken over by the sultan and turned into a mosque within a few days of the Conquest; and the Church of Constantinople had remained headless since 1451 when the last Byzantine patriarch Gregory III (1445–1459) fled to the West. The sources that relate the story of Gennadios and the Holy Apostles claim that the new patriarch did not remain there for long, since he was soon forced to move chose to relocate to the Monastery of the Virgin Pammakaristos, which subsequently functioned as the seat of the Patriarchate until 1587 or 1588. The Pammakaristos phase of the Orthodox Church is sufficiently documented by textual evidence (see below). On the other hand, although scholars dealing with the transition from the Byzantine to the Ottoman era admit that the sources for the short-term installation of the Patriarchate in the Holy Apostles are all late (the earliest secure reference dates from the 16th century), this information has not been challenged. The present article will revisit the available sources, including those contemporary with the events. It will be shown that the silence regarding the first months of the Patriarchate’s post-Byzantine phase should not be overlooked and that the legend of the move to the Holy Apostles must be re-examined.

The earliest account of the reinstatement of the Patriarchate in the Holy Apostles and its subsequent move to the Pammakaristos is a History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople from Byzantine to Ottoman times up to the year 1574, the first year of the reign of sultan Murad III (1574–1595). This chronicle has been attributed to the 16th-century erudite Damaskenos Stoudites, but according to Dean Sakel it was merely a short version of the more extensive Patriarchal History compiled by the scholar Manuel Malaxos. The text in question states that the sultan Mehmed “ἔδωκε δὲ ἀὑτοῦ [i.e. to Scholarios] καὶ τὸν περίφημον ναὸν τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καὶ ἔκαμεν αὑτὸν πατριαρ-χείον” 

Regardless of who the author was, it is certain that he was an important figure in Church politics of his time and was active within the circles of the Patriarchate. Thanks to his position, he probably had access to archival material in the Patriarchate related to this early period; this position also contributed to the impact his writings had on subsequent literature on the subject, since the information in the History of the Patriarchs is repeated in all major works of the latter half of the 16th and the early 17th centuries.

Indeed, large parts of this “History of the Patriarchs” are repeated almost verbatim in the well-known Historia Patriarchica written by Manuel Malaxos in the 1570s.
In the first pages of his history of the post-Byzantine Patriarchate Malaxos describes how Gennadios Scholarios was chosen by Mehmed II to become patriarch and adds: ἐδωκέ του δὲ καὶ τὸν περίφημον ναὸν τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, καὶ ἐκαμε πατριαρχεῖον. Malaxos’ version was elaborated by another prominent member of the Patriarchal circle, Theodosios Zygomalas, who sent the text to Martin Crusius in Tubingen within the framework of the correspondence between the two men, whereby Zygomalas informed the German theologian about the past and present of the patriarchate of Constantinople under Ottoman rule (ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων: ὁποῦ ἐκτισε Θεοδώρα ἡ βασίλισσα). Crusius published Zygomalas’ text in Greek and in a Latin translation in his famous Turco-Graecia (1584); this is how the tradition about the patriarchate’s settlement in the Holy Apostles reached Western European scholars. The same information was re-cycled in the so-called Chronikon maius, an expanded version of the work of George Sphrantzes by Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos, written ca. 1580 (known as pseudo-Sphrantzes): αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ Ἀποστόλων τέμενος δέδωκεν ὁ Ἀμηρᾶς εἰς πατριαρχεῖον. Another chronicle probably produced by patriarchal circles in Constantinople around the middle of the 16th century repeats the same information with almost identical phrasing, except that the church of the Holy Apostles is described as “περιώνυμος”.

Marios Philippides has demonstrated that all these narratives stem from a common source. Indeed, the phrasing and vocabulary are almost identical in all of them and reflect a single version of the story, probably the official version of the Patriarchate, as it was circulating in the second half of the 16th century. The main information conveyed is that Mehmed II sought Gennadios Scholarios, selected him to be the leader of the Orthodox community, and installed him in the great church of the Holy Apostles. However, Scholarios was soon forced to leave: the body of a murdered man found in the church courtyard was a clear indication that the area was not safe and the patriarch requested to transfer to the monastery of the Pammakaristos.

Thus, the story about the patriarchate and the Holy Apostles was consolidated in Greek and international historiography and became a standard chapter in the patriarchate’s history, present in all major accounts of the period written after the 16th century. For example, it is found in Du Cange’s account of Constantinople, in the chronicle of pseudo-Dorotheos of Monemvasia (published in 1631), and in Hypselantes’s work on the events after the Conquest of Constantinople. This was largely
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due to the success and impact of the expanded version of the chronicle of Sphrantzes known as the *Chronicon majus* or pseudo-Sphrantzes: it was believed that the latter belonged to the original narration written by George Sphrantzes a few years after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople and that it was therefore based on accounts contemporary with the events. Around the middle of the 20th century it was established that this text was in reality a 16th-century fabrication, making the versions of Malaxos and his contemporaries the earliest extant accounts of the settlement of Scholarios in the Holy Apostles.\(^{15}\)

Although modern scholarship has pointed out that the available sources are late, the credibility of the story has not been challenged, because, despite the absence of 15th-century references, it does appear plausible, based on the circumstances as known from other sources of the time. The lack of details regarding the settlement and operation of the patriarchate in the great Byzantine church is not necessarily an obstacle. The fact that the church is described in generic terms (it is referred to as merely “splendid” and other synonyms), despite the monument’s great fame throughout the Byzantine period, is not surprising, since the church had been demolished by Malaxos’ time for more than a century, so no-one from that generation could have had much to add from personal experience. Besides, this temporary stay would not require much space in the narrative and could conveniently be summarized in a few lines without many details. Moreover, the few months that Scholarios allegedly spent there were a short and unstable period for the patriarchate and may not have left evident traces in the archives available to the patriarchal chroniclers of the 16th century.

On the other hand, the chronology, topography, and demography of Constantinople, as described in the story, are consistent with what is known about the transitional period under discussion. Indeed, at the time Scholarios is supposed to have stayed in the Holy Apostles (the first months of 1454), the Fatih mosque complex (constructed between 1463 and 1470), which later replaced the church, had not been envisaged and it is not otherwise known what Mehmed II may have been contemplating about the site on the Fourth Hill at the time.\(^{16}\) The sultan changed his mind over such matters several times within a week\(^{17}\) and it is more than likely that the turbulence of the first post-Conquest months would have resulted in rapid changes and reversals affecting the fate of the Christians and their churches. So, a temporary place for the patriarchate in early 1454 (or perhaps even before that if one admits that Mehmed installed Scholarios there right after their encounter in the second half of 1453) is certainly admissible and a Byzantine church would be the most reasonable location to install the leader of the Christians of Istanbul.
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\(^{15}\) The differences between the two versions of Sphrantzes were noted by several early 20th-century scholars, e.g. Dölger, Makarios von Monembasia, and later described with more accuracy based on meticulous study of the manuscript tradition of both texts (*Maisano, Pseudo-Sfranze*). For a recent discussion of the relationship between Sphrantzes and pseudo-Sphrantzes, see Hanak – Philippides, *Siege and Fall*, 139–192.

\(^{16}\) Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 16–52, 66–70; Raby, From the Founder.

\(^{17}\) Inalcik, *Policy of Mehmed II*. 
Malaxos and the other sixteenth-century sources mentioned above state that Scholarios moved from the Holy Apostles to the Pammakaristos, i.e. he left the area of Constantinople’s fourth hill and settled on the northern slope of the fifth hill (fig. 1). This reveals that the location of the former was inhabited by a Muslim majority making it unsafe for Christians to remain active there and that the fifth hill, toward the shores of the Golden Horn, was more appropriate for a Christian community. Indeed, such a move reflects the realities of Istanbul's topography during the time of Malaxos: the site of the Holy Apostles was occupied by the Fatih complex and the patriarchate and the elites evolving around it were an active element in the area of the Pammakaristos by then (fig. 1); thus, it is not necessarily reliable evidence for the 15th-century events. However, Halil Inalcik and Stephane Yerasimos have studied the demography of 15th-century Istanbul based on Ottoman tax registers and population

Fig. 1. Map of Constantinople with sites mentioned in the text
census documents and demonstrated that the Greek population was indeed concentrated on the brow of the fifth hill overlooking the Golden Horn already since the first years of Ottoman Istanbul. This is true particularly of the new settlers who arrived in the late 1450s within the framework of Mehmed II’s repopulation plan. It is difficult to determine whether this shift also affected the indigenous Greek population and the clergy of the Patriarchate, but in general it appears that the testimony of the 16th-century patriarchal chronicles does not contradict the known settlement patterns of early Ottoman Istanbul.

In short, the narrative concerning the installation of the patriarchate in the Holy Apostles and its subsequent relocation to the Pammakaristos is consistent with the facts in post-conquest Istanbul and is generally not challenged by modern scholarship, despite the fact that it describes the situation in generic and vague terms condensed in a few lines transmitted in sources written approximately 120 years after the Ottoman conquest. In order to effectively test this version of the story, it is necessary to examine the textual evidence contemporary with the events of 1453–1454.

The patriarchal archives contain no records from the time of the Conquest and documents from subsequent decades make no reference to the wanderings of the Patriarchate before its installation in the Pammakaristos. Of the four Byzantine historical accounts of the Ottoman Conquest of Constantinople, those written by Kritoboulos, Sphrantzes, Doukas, and Chalkokondyles, only the first one narrates Scholarios’ election to the patriarchal throne. Kritoboulos describes how Mehmed summoned Gennadios Scholarios and made him patriarch. However, Kritoboulos did not judge it necessary to reveal where the new seat of the patriarch was. Moreover, although he later mentions the construction of the sultan’s mosque complex (the Fatih Camii) on the site of the church of the Holy Apostles, he makes no reference to the church as having formerly been used as the patriarchate.

The information in question is absent from the other accounts of the Fall of Constantinople: Sphrantzes, a close collaborator of the Palaiologoi, who remained in Constantinople for some time after 1453 and whose history includes events after the Conquest, makes no mention of Scholarios or of the re-establishment of the patriarchate. Doukas is also well-informed about events in Constantinople until 1461; he mentions the conversion of the Hagia Sophia and the sultan’s building program of erecting palaces, as well as the resettlement of Greeks in the city, but says nothing about the re-establishment of the patriarchate; his last reference to Scholarios comes before the narration of the final Ottoman siege.
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Texts written by Gennadios Scholarios himself, who actually composed a number of autobiographical and apologetic works, are naturally a noteworthy and reliable source of information from the early years of the Patriarchate after the end of Byzantium. However, his account is notoriously poor in factual information; as Michael Angold has emphasized, the author was primarily interested in defending his actions and was therefore deliberately secretive about the events he described. Yet, there is one reference to the Holy Apostles in a homily delivered in the form of a public prayer addressed to the congregation of Constantinople: although the text contains little concrete historical information apart from the allusion to the Fall of Constantinople through a series of biblical borrowings, its title mentions that it was read out after the patriarch celebrated mass in the church of the Holy Apostles (“ὑπανεγίνωσκε τῷ λαῷ μετὰ τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων”). Since it is clearly stated that Scholarios was patriarch at the time (“ἐν τῇ πατριαρχίᾳ αὐτοῦ”), this text may be considered the earliest reference to the church as the seat of the Patriarchate. The text has additional weight, since the earliest manuscript which preserves it (together with the above-mentioned heading) stems directly from the circle of Scholarios; it is therefore a reliable and well-informed source securely placing the patriarch in the church of the Holy Apostles shortly after the Ottoman Conquest.

However, the church is not referred to in the text as the patriarchal church; all that the title says is that the patriarch would officiate in the Holy Apostles and that he would afterwards address the congregation with the consolation oration in question (the use of the imperfect ὑπανεγίνωσκε implies that this was repeated more than once, although it is not clear how often). The fact that Scholarios celebrated mass there is consistent with his activity during the early days of his patriarchate, when he concentrated on salvaging various churches in Constantinople and reconstituting the congregation: he probably officiated and addressed his followers in various Byzantine churches temporarily in the hands of Christians and the Holy Apostles were apparently one of them. However, it is strange that there is no indication that the church held any special significance among other churches, let alone that it was the patriarchal church.

Additional textual and material evidence supports the above-mentioned reference to Scholarios’ presence in the Holy Apostles: according to 16th-century travel accounts by German scholars who described the Pammakaristos complex when it was the seat of the Patriarchate (mainly Martin Gruneweg and Reinhold Lubenau), three important relics once preserved in the Holy Apostles, the body of Saint Luke, the hand of Saint Andrew, and the Column of the Flagellation, were kept in the patriarchal monastery (the Column of the Flagellation is still preserved in the present

24 Scholarios, Public prayer, 352–355, Blanchet, Georges-Gennadios, 124–135.
25 The manuscript in question is Escorial v.III.3 (De Andrés, Códices griegos 232–233). In fact, the greater part of the codex (although not the part containing this text, whose scribe was most likely a collaborator of Scholarios) was copied by Scholarios himself.
26 Mango, Monument, 34; Lubenau Beschreibung, vol. 1, 172–176. The relics are attested in the Holy Apostles in 14th- and 15th-century Russian travel accounts: Majeska, Russian Travellers, 300–301.
church of the Patriarchate, Saint George at Fener – fig. 2; it probably accompanied the move from the Pammakaristos in the late 16th century). Apparently, the Christian community of post-Conquest Istanbul had access to the church of the Apostles, at least temporarily, and managed to eventually transfer these valuable relics to the Pammakaristos. The translation of these relics may in fact have been carried out under the supervision of Scholarios himself, given his leading role in the reorganization of the post-1453 Church. One more revered relic once in the Holy Apostles, the body of Saint Spyridon, was secured and taken to the Pammakaristos: it is attested in a list of relics and vessels in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, dated 1564 («λείψανον τοῦ ἁγίου Σπυρίδωνος μετὰ θήκης ἀργυρᾶς»). The number of items that are attested in the Holy Apostles in the 15th century and later reached the Pammakaristos indicates that this translation of relics was an organized process. This agrees with Scholarios’ known efforts to collect valuable items for the revival of liturgical and devotional life in the city during the first months after May 1453. Most accounts of these events report that the new patriarch was busy trying to revitalize Christian life in Ottoman Constantinople and that he actively supported abandoned churches and monasteries in order to infuse them with new life. For example, he supported one of the most historic monastic foundations of the Byzantine era, the monastery of Saint John of Petra; the Holy Apostles may have been included in this plan.

Apart from the unique reference in Scholarios’ “Public Prayer” mentioned above, none of his writings dating from the post-1453 period preserves the slightest allusion to the new patriarch’s stay in the Holy Apostles. The most detailed account is contained in his Pastoral letter on the Capture of Constantinople, written before October 1454, where he describes his captivity, his ransoming by the sultan, his return to the conquered city, his efforts to reorganize religious life there, and his ordination as deacon, priest, bishop, and finally election to the patriarchal throne, i.e. events from the second half of the year 1453 and the early days of 1454. Although he vividly reports the difficulties he encountered while governing the Church, he does not name the alleged transfer from the Holy Apostles to the Pammakaristos as one of these difficulties, even though a forced relocation would have reinforced his argument by adding more drama to the narrative. The difficulties Christians were faced with under the new regime is a recurring theme in Scholarios’ writings (including orations and letters addressed to congregations in Constantinople and on Athos and to his relatives); it is strange how a story about a dead body betraying a hostile environment did not find its way into the patriarch’s narrative of his personal struggle, even if it was not crucial for his broader argument, i.e. his own self-defense.
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27 Paizi-Apostolopoulou – Apostolopoulos, Aphieromata, 135.
28 Necipoğlu, Gennadios Scholarios, 243–244; Melvani, Patronage in Constantinople, 412–413.
29 Cronier – Cassin, Du Prodrome de Pétra, 27–28.
30 Scholarios, Letter on the Capture, 224–225; Turner, First Patriarchate.
31 See e.g. Blanchet, Georges-Gennadios, 496–505.
Fig. 2. Istanbul, Church of Saint George (present-day Patriarchate): Column of the Flagellation (once in the Holy Apostles)
In fact, none of the other autobiographical texts singled out by M.-H. Blanchet and Michael Angold, contains any details regarding the seat of the newly elected patriarch.32 The church of the Holy Apostles does not appear in passages that occasionally include some nuggets of historical information. A sermon on the feast of the Holy Apostles has nothing to do with the church: it was delivered in 1456, when the then retired patriarch was residing in the monastery of Vatopedi on Mount Athos. Once again, the author reiterates the issue of the difficulties faced by Christians under Ottoman rule, but goes on to stress the need for a re-evangelization, for which the disciples of Christ can serve as the ideal model.33

The final 15th-century Greek source about the re-establishment of the patriarchate is the narrative about the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans written by Theodore Agallianos, a high-ranking official of the post-1453 patriarchate who was certainly involved in the events of the 1450s and 1460s.34 However, all that Agallianos mentions is that the Sultan selected Scholarios to become patriarch and that the two men met in Adrianople (Edirne), which was still the capital of the Ottoman State and Mehmed’s official seat.35 Of the numerous documents and laments recording the events of the Fall of Constantinople the vast majority do not focus on the re-establishment of the Patriarchate, but rather on the siege and its outcome, and the church of the Holy Apostles never appears within the context of the consequences of the conquest.36

Even less information can be gleaned from Western accounts of the Fall of Constantinople, but some indirect evidence is indicative. A report compiled by the Dominican missionary Giacomo Campora and addressed to the Hungarian king Ladislas V in 1455 contains a lengthy passage on the destruction of the church of the Holy Apostles, whereby the author laments the loss of the imperial tombs.37 Although he was not an eyewitness, he appears to have been well informed and familiar with the monument (which he may have visited before 1453). It may not be without significance that the presence of the Greek patriarchate there is not mentioned; such a fact would potentially have offered an opportunity to attack Scholarios and his anti-Union party. A similar occasion was not missed by Campora’s fellow Dominican Leonardo of Chios, who is the only Latin from this early phase to deal with the re-establishment of
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32 For example, the Letter on the Capture of Constantinople, his Personal Apology, and his Lament (Blanchet, George-Gennadios, 496–505; Angold, Gennadios Scholarios, 80–89; Constantinople 1453, 893–9323, 924–939).
33 Scholarios, Panegyricon, 172–187.
34 For Agallianos, see Blanchet, Théodore Agallianos.
35 Agallianos, 98.
36 Constantinople 1453, 451–980. Even the well-informed Matthew Kamariotes, an eyewitness of the Halosis and a friend of Scholarios, does not mention the Holy Apostles in his “Lament on the Capture of Constantinople”: PG 160, col. 1059–1070; Constantinople 1453, 772–778.
37 Campora Oratio, 57–63, Pertusi, Caduta di Costantinopoli, 192–197, Constantinople 1453, 824. The interest in the church is not surprising; in the West it was considered a landmark of Constantinople’s cityscape and is even depicted in the panoramic view of the city in Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum, printed in 1493, i.e. decades after it had been demolished (Berger – Bardill, Representations of Constantinople, 5).
the patriarchate and has done so in bitter terms. Yet, like the other authors, Leonardo says nothing about Scholarios being based in the Holy Apostles.38

A further text compiled in the West, this time by a Unionist Greek, the Lament on the Fall of Constantinople written by Andronikos Kallistos (d. 1480), contains references to the Holy Apostles and paints a picture of utter destruction. Taking into consideration that the author was prone to exaggeration when referring to the pillaging of the church, the state he describes does not allow much room for a patriarch to settle in the ruined monument. Besides, Andronikos clearly considered the exiled Gregory III the only patriarch and appears to have been unaware of the new Orthodox patriarchate under Scholarios.39

Later Western visitors to Constantinople were also unaware of Scholarios’ short-term installation in the Holy Apostles. The report of the Venetian captive Giovanni Maria Angiolello contains a brief description of Mehmed’s Fatih Camii without any reference to its Byzantine predecessor.40 Pierre Gilles, a well-informed author with good knowledge of the sources, offers a detailed description of the site of the Fatih Camii and identifies it with the location of the Apostoleion, but does not elaborate on the succession between the two buildings and appears unaware of the alleged re-establishment of the patriarchate there.41 Only after Gerlach’s visit in 1573–1578 (who, as mentioned above, owed his information to the Patriarchal circles) does the story begin to appear in the Western sources.

The early post-Byzantine phase of the patriarchate is also absent from the Turkish sources of the 15th and 16th centuries: the transformation of Constantinople and its buildings during the first decades following the Ottoman conquest is adequately described in a great deal of stories and legends about the construction of the Fatih complex, i.e. the great mosque built by Mehmed II on the site of the church of the Holy Apostles (fig. 3).42 The sources mainly retail the story of the architect of the Fatih Camii and the sultan’s ambition to surpass the Hagia Sophia at the site of the Holy Apostles; no text alludes to the presence of Scholarios in the church that preceded the great mosque. It might be questioned whether these sources would be interested in mentioning an interim phase, especially a short one, but it is still noteworthy that 15th- and 16th-century Turkish authors ignore these events.

38 Leonardo, Historia Constantinopolitanae. See Matschke, Leonard von Chios.
39 Constantinople 1453, 871–873; Andronikos Kallistos Monodia. The phrase “the synod will never meet again there” in this text could be sarcastic, given that the author only recognized the Latin patriarchate, but this discretion by indirect omissions is not common in the polemics of the time. If Andronikos had been informed about Scholarios’ activity he would probably have attacked him and the anti-Unionists directly.
40 Angiolello Memorie, 105–106.
41 Grélois, Itinéraires byzantins, 414–415. Gilles was in Constantinople during 1544–1547 and his account was published in 1561.
42 Kafescioğlu, Constantinopolis/Istanbul, 66–96; Yerasimos, Légendes d’Empire, 145–150; Calia, Costantino e Costantinopoli, 390–393. See also the sources conveniently grouped together in the volume Constantinople 1453: passim.
Fig. 3. Cartographic representation of Istanbul, in Nasuhü’s-Silahi, Beyân-ı menâzil-i sefer-i 'Irakeyn-i Sultân Süleymân Hân (Mecmû’-i Menâzil), Istanbul University Library, T. 5964, fol. 8v–9r: the Fatih Mosque is visible near the center of the image.
In short, the information on the first months after the Ottoman Conquest contained in the 16th-century sources differs from the accounts found in texts contemporary with the revival of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In fact, modern scholarship has demonstrated that on more than one occasion the 16th-century chronicles were misinformed about facts from the previous century: for example, the narratives about Scholarios’ election to the patriarchal throne place the events (including his meeting with Mehmed II) in Constantinople, whereas it has been shown, based on the contemporary accounts of Kritoboulos and Agallianos, that the new patriarch met the sultan Mehmed II in Adrianople. Thus, the evidence emanating from the 16th-century chronicles should be treated with caution and even suspicion.

The silence of the early texts regarding the site that accommodated the first post-Conquest patriarch is in accordance with the facts known about the reestablishment of the Patriarchate of Constantinople under Ottoman rule. In fact, the picture that emerges from the sources is one of uncertainty and instability, due to the frequent changes in the policy of the sultan and the tribulations that characterized the first years of Ottoman rule in Istanbul. The inconsistencies in the sultan’s policy as reflected in the sources, as well as the ambivalence of Scholarios’s own words reveal the temporary character of the early arrangements between the sultan and the patriarch. It is not surprising that these precarious circumstances were not favorable for a proper installation in an organized environment. Even when the Pammakaristos is mentioned as the residence of Scholarios around the end of 1454, it is simply referred to as “μονὴ τῆς Παμμακαρίστου” and not as the patriarchal monastery. The first time the monastery or its church is officially mentioned as “patriarchal” in any extant text appears to be in a document issued in 1466/67 by the patriarch Dionysios I (1466–1471, 1488–1490) where it is stated that the Synod convened “ἐν τῷ προνάῳ τῆς σεβασμίας καὶ πατριαρχικῆς μονῆς, τιμωμένης ἐπ’ οἴνομάτι τῆς Παμμακαρίστου Θεοτόκου” . Thus, it appears that even the installation in the Pammakaristos may not have had an official character in the beginning.

In fact, recent scholarship has determined that, unlike the later status of the patriarchate, the developments of these early days should not be viewed as an official re-foundation of the patriarchate by the sultan. The picture that emerges is not that of a relocation of the patriarchate from the Hagia Sophia to a new site within the framework of the new regime, but rather a laborious process of an urgent character to redeem some churches and monasteries and find a secure spot within an Ottoman city in the making, undergoing profound changes on an everyday basis.

43 Zachariadou, Tourkika Eggrafa, 45–47.
44 Scholarios’ “Letter on the Capture of Constantinople” and his “Sermon for the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin” are the only texts explicitly mentioned as having been composed in the Pammakaristos, but without referring to it as the patriarchal church.
45 Paizi-Apostopolopoulos – Apostolopoulos, Episema Keimena, 104.
46 Braude, Foundation Myths, 73–76.
The official character of this activity was overemphasized in later centuries, as part of the so-called “foundation myths” of the Ottoman millets, which reflected the realities of the late Ottoman period. Marie-Hélène Blanchet and Paraskevas Konortas, following different approaches, have both emphasized the personal nature of the arrangement between the sultan and the patriarch, rather than the institutional (which began to crystallize mostly toward the end of Mehmed's reign). In fact, Thierry Ganchou has shown that Mehmed experimented with other forms of government for his Christian subjects and that the institutional role later assigned to the Patriarchate was not conceived from the beginning of Ottoman rule in Istanbul.

The form and appearance of the church of the Holy Apostles have been the subject of continuing debates; archaeological surveys in the area of its site – the Fatih Camii – have yielded only general information about the substructures and the extent of the Byzantine complex. According to travelers’ accounts, the monument was still one of the most important shrines of Constantinople in the 15th century and a revered pilgrimage attraction, thanks to the tombs of the Early and Middle Byzantine emperors and other relics it housed. The prominent depiction of its silhouette on the various versions of the panorama of Constantinople illustrating the city’s description by the Florentine scholar Cristoforo Buondelmonti confirms its symbolic role in shaping the sacred topography of the Byzantine capital during its final days (fig. 4). However, despite the frequent references in the 15th-century sources, very little can be said about its state of preservation just before 1453; the fact that some of its relics had been moved to the Hagia Sophia might imply that it was deteriorating already before the Ottoman conquest. It is not known what secondary structures were still extant after the conquest to accommodate the functions associated with the Patriarchate, but it might be safe to suggest that there were clusters of buildings attached to the historic church (for example, the Russian travelers of the 14th and 15th centuries mention chapels attached to the main structure), as was the case with most imperial foundations.

Apart from its symbolic importance, the sources make it clear that the Holy Apostles were an important stage for public life in the Byzantine capital during the final years of the empire. This is where Joseph Bryennios, a resident of the monastery of Charsianites in the early 15th century, addressed emperor Manuel II Palaiologos (1391–1425)
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49 Dark – Özgümüs, Constantinople, 83–96. For a recent discussion of the sources, see the various contributions in Mullett – Ousterhout, The Holy Apostles.
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and openly confronted him. It might be safe to assume that Scholarios, likewise a monk at Charsianeites in the 1440s, was also active in the Holy Apostles preaching and sermoning during the last days of Byzantium. In fact, the church was institutionally connected to the patriarchate: according to Symeon of Thessalonike, it hosted meetings of the holy synod of metropolitans for the election of a new patriarch; it was therefore already a type of “patriarchal church” during Byzantine times and its importance for the patriarchal election can be explained by the apostolic character of the patriarchal office.

53 Bryennios, Eurethenta, passim; Melvani, Patriarchate and the Monasteries, 177–179.
54 Symeon De sacris ordinationibus, 437–440.
Scholarios’ account of his efforts to restore Christian life in Constantinople after his return to the city in the summer of 1453 often includes references to religious buildings and foundations. Of particular interest is the fact that he was placed in charge of a monastery, which he found in a bad condition, but was able to repair: μονῆς δὲ ἀρχεῖν ἐρήμου πάντων καὶ καταπεπατημένης κελευόμαι. The text implies that the sultan installed Gennadios in this monastery and that it may have served as his headquarters. This is probably the monastery that received the support of the wealthy Greek Nicholas Isidoros, known from his correspondence with Scholarios. Although the name of the monastery is not revealed in the sources, it has been suggested that it may have been the monastery of Charsianeites, where Gennadios had been based before the Conquest.

Indeed, it was here that Scholarios took monastic vows in 1450 when he was leading the opposition against the pro-Union policy of emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos (1449–1453). It would be no exaggeration to state that he formed a shadow patriarchate at Charsianeites from where he escalated the opposition he waged against Constantine and the patriarch in office, Gregory III, especially after Gregory fled to the West in 1450 or 1451. Thus, at the time of the Ottoman Conquest, the monastery was the main nucleus of the opposition to the Byzantine emperor. It is conceivable that he returned to his former base, which would have been allowed to function as a Christian foundation for a short while after the Fall of Constantinople. Indeed, it would have been a convenient choice for his mission, to resume work from where he had been based before the Ottoman assault. Since it was not connected to Byzantine imperial authority, the Ottomans may have considered it harmless to let it survive. However, it quickly disappears from the sources and is not mentioned again in Ottoman times. It is likely that an entry regarding Charsianeites is hidden among the unidentified churches and monasteries in the Ottoman survey of 1455. In any case, the name of the monastery of Charsianeites is absent from all works referring to the monuments of Constantinople in the 16th century: Gilles, Gerlach, and Korobeinikov appear unaware of its existence. The fact that the original manuscript of its foundation document (its typikon) found its way into the book collection of cardinal Bessarion in Italy is perhaps a further indication that the monastic community was disbanded. It is therefore safe to conclude that it did not share the fate of other parish churches and monasteries which survived the turmoil of the conquest and were still attested in the 16th century.
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60 Hunger, Codices Historici, 59–60. It is difficult to explain the presence of the codex in the collection of the Greek cardinal. Its contents do not belong to the type of texts Bessarion was normally interested in; perhaps he acquired it together with other books that reached him via the Uniate Greeks of Crete after the Fall of Constantinople. See Mondrain, Cardinal Bessarion, for an updated account of Bessarion’s book collection.
Another possibility would be to identify the monastery Scholarios settled in with the Pammakaristos, where he is actually attested later in 1454. Since the sources before Malaxos do not explicitly mention any re-settlement, it is conceivable that he was based at the Pammakaristos from the moment he was summoned back to Constantinople. The Pammakaristos was one of the most important aristocratic monastic foundations of the Palaiologan period and it is attested throughout the first half of the 15th century. The circumstances of the installation of the Patriarchate within its premises are unclear and are known only from the 16th-century sources, but it appears that after 29 May 1453 the monastery was abandoned for a while and was facing severe problems during the ensuing months. In any case, the subsequent fate of the complex reveals that a monastery with its cluster of auxiliary buildings was the ideal site for the re-organization of the ecclesiastical government of Constantinople (fig. 5).

61 Blanchet, Georges-Gennadios, 94 (first mention of his presence in the Pammakaristos in the Letter, 211).

62 However, the installation of the patriarchate in the Pammakaristos was not followed by any modifications to the monastic complex (the first interventions are recorded in the 1510s: Mango, The Monument, 25–26). Perhaps this was due to the difficulties and uncertainties of the latter half of the 15th century, but it is possible that the buildings of the Pammakaristos – one of the best monuments of Komnenian and Palaiologan Constantinople in terms of construction techniques – remained in relatively good condition.
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To summarize, the 16th-century sources emanating from the Patriarchate narrate that Mehmed II appointed Scholarios as patriarch and gave him the church of the Holy Apostles as the seat of the patriarchate, whereas texts contemporary with the events only mention that the sultan installed Gennadios on the patriarchal throne, not that he granted him the Apostoleion as his headquarters. The only 15th-century source placing Scholarios in the Holy Apostles after 1453 (a reliable one, indeed), states that he actually officiated there on some occasions. However, since even the subsequent installation in the Pammakaristos is not explicitly announced (the monastery emerges as the patriarchal church only gradually in the sources) and given that the legal status of the agreement between the sultan and the patriarch is not entirely clear for the early years of Mehmed’s reign, there is nothing to suggest that the Holy Apostles functioned as the official seat of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1454.

Although it is not known what sources Malaxos and his contemporaries employed to construct their narrative of the 1453–1454 events, it appears that they merged various traditions and pieces of information on the years before and after the Fall into a single narrative placing Scholarios and the patriarchate of Constantinople in one of the monuments traditionally associated with the patriarchate. This was part of a plan to record the patriarchate’s history at a time when it was struggling to defend its privileges against the aggressiveness of Ottoman officials. This context could explain the eagerness of the patriarchal circles to re-tell the story of their Ottoman re-birth by emphasizing the reference to an illustrious Byzantine imperial monument, as well as the approval received personally from the Sultan; the site was after all intimately connected with Mehmed by the 16th century, since this is where the conqueror’s mosque stood at the time. Placing the rebirth of the Patriarchate at the site which linked the Byzantine imperial past with the establishment of Ottoman rule was the ideal way to enhance its symbolic topography and stress the continuity from the late Palaiologan to the early Ottoman phase of the Church of Constantinople at a time when its status was being challenged.

Moreover, the Ottoman illustrated manuscript of the Hünernâme, a history of the Ottoman dynasty completed in the 1580s, features a miniature showing the encounter between the sultan and the patriarch and places the event in the Hippodrome (fig. 6). No such episode is found in earlier (or later) Ottoman historiography; therefore, it appears that there were attempts to re-invent a narrative about the policy of Mehmed II towards the Church in court circles during the later 16th century. Thus, the enhanced patriarchal version could have been a response to analogous activity among Ottoman authors.
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At around the same time, the issue of the relations with the Church of Rome resurfaced due to negotiations about adopting the Gregorian calendar in the East and to the activity of both Churches in Russian lands. As noted above, the early years of Christian life in Ottoman Istanbul were a complicated time: despite their waning influence, the Uniate Greeks were still active in claiming relics, manuscripts, and monuments. Besides, it is well known that the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople continued its efforts to penetrate into Orthodox territories (Istanbul and Venetian-ruled areas); in fact, the Latin patriarch Bessarion was based in the church of the Holy Apostles in Rome with the permission of the Pope and the eponymous church of Constantinople may have been viewed as a suitable counterpart to the cardinal’s reputation and status. Indeed, within the troubled climate in post-1453 Constantinople,
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not only was Scholarios struggling to keep the congregation alive, he was also dedicated to the task of clarifying things between the rival factions regarding the supposed Union with Rome.\textsuperscript{70} Traces of this rivalry may have persisted in the sources still extant and available to the 16th-century patriarchal chroniclers who re-told the story of Gennadios Scholarios by presenting him as the patriarch who governed the Orthodox Church from the Constantinopolitan Holy Apostles.

To conclude, the only secure fact is that the sultan Mehmed II met with Scholarios in Edirne and invited him to Istanbul to reorganize the Church. The whereabouts of Scholarios after his return to Constantinople can be reconstructed only with the help of indirect evidence which triggers a series of hypotheses. Although he did apparently have access to the Holy Apostles among the numerous churches he was trying to take control of during the troubled first months of Ottoman Constantinople, none of the extant sources say that this is where he installed the reborn patriarchate. Admittedly, the narrative about the patriarchate being based in the Holy Apostles cannot be dismissed conclusively; after all, there is no solid evidence to contradict it. Indeed, the silence of contemporary sources is certainly not a sufficient factor to discredit the narrative about the installation of the Patriarchate in the Holy Apostles. However, this silence is at least suspicious, especially when it is noticeable in sources where one would expect to find abundant information on the physical presence of Scholarios, including Scholarios’ own writings. Future scholarship might be able to detect more concrete references to the location of the early Ottoman Patriarchate and perhaps even identify the sources used by Malaxos and the 16th-century chroniclers, in order to test the truth of these stories. Until then, it is safer to adopt a more nuanced approach to the re-establishment of the Patriarchate: the church of the Holy Apostles was one of the religious buildings Scholarios was active in during his early days as the new leader of the Church of Constantinople, where he celebrated mass and secured a number of relics, but it does not follow that it functioned as the patriarchal church.

\textsuperscript{70} Blanchet, Acolouthie inédite.
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ГЕНАДИЈЕ СХОЛАРИЈЕ И ЦРКВА СВЕТИХ АПОСТОЛА

Уобичајено се верује да је након османског освајања 1453. године Цари-
градску патријаријицу поново успоставио у јануару 1454. године османски сул-
тан Мехмед II (1451–1481), који је за патријарха именовао византијског учењака
Георгија Схоларија, познатог под монашким именом Генадије. Седиште патри-
јаријије било је у Цркви Светих апостола, некадашњем маузолеју византијских
царева, а према овој приповести, она је тамо остала неколико месеци, а касније
исте године је пресељена у византијски Манастир Богородице Памакаристос.
Најраније излагање о поновном успостављању Патријаршије у Светим апосто-
лима и њеном преласку у Памакаристос даје историја цариградских патријара-
ха од византијског до османског времена до 1574. Велики делови ове „историје патријарха“ су готово дословно поновљени у познатој Патријаршијској исто-
рији, коју је написао Манојло Малакс 70-их година 16. века, као и у хроникама
других аутора. Марије Филипид је показао да сви ови наративи потичу из зајед-
ничког извора, вероватно званичне верзије Патријаршије, каква је кружила у
другој половини 16. века. Прича о патријаршији и Светим апостолима постепе-
но је уобличена у грчкој и међународној историографији и постала је стандард-
но поглавље у историји патријаршије, присутно у свим главним излагањима о
том периоду написаним после 16. века. Приповест је у складу са чињеницама
о Истанбулу након освајања и модерна наука је углавном не доводи у питање,
упркос чињеници да прилике описује уопштено и нејасно, сажето у неколико
редова пренетих у изворима написаним приближно 120 година након осман-
ског освајања.

Извори из 15. века дају другачију слику тих догађаја. Од четири византиј-
ска историјска извештаја о османском освајању Цариграда, она која су напи-
sали Критовул, Сфренцис, Дука и Халкокондил, само први приповеда о Схо-
lаријевом избору на патријаршијски престо. Критовул описује како је Мехмед
позвао Генадија Схоларија и поставио га за патријарха, али не открива где је
био ново седиште патријарха. Штавише, он не помиње Цркву Светих апостола
као патријаршију. У делима самог Генадија Схоларија и поставио га за патријарха, али не открива где је
bió ново седиште патријарха. Штавише, он не помиње Цркву Светих апостола
као патријаршију. У делима самог Генадија Схоларија, Свети апостоли се поја-
влjuju једним, у беседи изреченоj u видu jавne молитве уpučenе цариградскоj
пасти. Међутим, црква се ту не назива патријаршијском црквом; једина веза
налази се u наслову, гдe се каже да ће патријарх служити u Светим апостолима и
da ће сe потом обратити пастив сa поменутом утешном беседом. Од преосталих
Схоларијевих дела која потичу из периода после 1453. године, ниједан текст не
садржи ни најмању алузизу на боравак новог патријарха u Светим апостоли-
ма. Заправо, ниједан од његових аутобиографских текстова не садржи детаље
у вези са седиштем новоизабраног патријарха. Остали грчки текстови које су написали очевици, као и западни и турски извори, нису упознати са успостављањем патријаршије у Светим апостолима. Укратко, подаци о првим месецима после османског освајања садржани у изворима из 16. века разликују се од извештаја који се налазе у текстовима који су савремени оживљавању Цариградског патријаршије.

Ђутање извора у вези са местом на коме се налазио први патријарх после освајања у складу је са чињеницама познатим о поновном успостављању Цариградске патријаршије под османском влашћу: недавна истраживања су утврдила да, за разлику од каснијег положаја патријаршије, развој из тих раних дана не би требало посматрати као званично поновно оснивање патријаршије од стране султана. Схоларијево излагање о његовим напорима да обнови хришћански живот у Цариграду након повратка у град лета 1453. често садржи помене верских грађевина и установа: патријарх напомиње да је, када је позван натраг у Истанбул, постављен на чело једног манастира, али не открива његово име. Заиста је вероватније да се под несигурним приликама које су владале у Цариграду мало по освајању, Схоларије настанио у једном византијском манастиру (као што је то учино касније у Памакаристосу), а не да је преузео чувени маузолеј византијских царева.

Да закључимо, извори из 16. века који потичу из Патријаршије приповедају да је Мехмед II именовао Схоларија за патријарха и дао му цркву Светих апостола као седиште патријаршије, док текстови савремени тим догађајима помињу само да је султан Генадиј поставио на патријаршијски престо, а не да му је доделио Свете апостоле као седиште. Иако није познато које су изvore Малакс и његови савременици користили да конструишу свој повест о догађајима из 1453–1454, чини се да су они спојили различите традиције и податке о годинама пре и после пада у једну повест смештајући Схоларија и Цариградску патријаршију у један од споменика традиционално повезаних са патријаршијом. Једина сигурна чињеница је да се султан Мехмед II састао са Схоларијем у Једрену и позвао га у Истанбул да реорганизује Цркву. Иако је Схоларије очигледно имао приступ Светим апостолима међу бројним црквама над којима је покушавао да преузе контролу током немирних првих месеци османског Цариграда, ниједан од постојећих извора не каже да је ту поставио обновљену патријаршију. Стога је могуће да Свети апостоли нису функционисали као патријаршијска црква.