

Byzantina Symmeikta

Vol 27 (2017)

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA 27



“The Hodegon. Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary in Constantinople”

Piotr GROTOWSKI

doi: [10.12681/byzsym.13888](https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.13888)

Copyright © 2017, Piotr GROTOWSKI



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

GROTOWSKI, P. (2017). “The Hodegon. Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary in Constantinople”. *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.13888>

INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
SECTION OF BYZANTINE RESEARCH
NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION



ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ



BYZANTINA ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA

PIOTR Ł. GROTOWSKI

THE HODEGON

Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary
in Constantinople

ΤΟΜΟΣ 27 VOLUME

ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ / APPENDIX

ΑΘΗΝΑ • 2017 • ATHENS

ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΑ ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ
ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ

ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΑ ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ
APPENDIX

NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION
INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
SECTION OF BYZANTINE RESEARCH

PIOTR Ł. GROTOWSKI

THE HODEGON

Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary
in Constantinople

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA

VOLUME 27 – APPENDIX



ATHENS 2017

ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ

PIOTR Ł. GROTOWSKI

THE HODEGON

Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary
in Constantinople

ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΑ ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ

ΤΟΜΟΣ 27 - ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ



ΑΘΗΝΑ 2017

Τα *Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα* είναι η περιοδική έκδοση του Ινστιτούτου Ιστορικών Ερευνών (Τομέας Βυζαντινών Ερευνών) / ΕΙΕ και αποτελούν τη συνέχεια του περιοδικού *Σύμμεικτα*.

Η υποβολή εργασιών προς δημοσίευση γίνεται ηλεκτρονικά στον δικτυακό τόπο του περιοδικού : www.byzsym.org. Οδηγίες προς συγγραφείς και άλλες πληροφορίες περιλαμβάνονται στον ίδιο δικτυακό τόπο.

Διευθυντής έκδοσης: ΤΑΞΙΑΡΧΗΣ Γ. ΚΟΛΙΑΣ

Ηλεκτρονική επεξεργασία-σελιδοποίηση: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑ ΡΕΓΚΛΗ

Διάθεση: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών
Βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου 48, 116 35 Αθήνα
Τηλεομ.: 210 7273629
Ηλεκτρονική Διεύθυνση: bookstore@eie.gr

© Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών
Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών
Βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου 48, 116 35 Αθήνα

Byzantina Symmeikta is the periodical journal of the Institute of Historical Research (Section of Byzantine Research) / NHRF and is the continuation of the journal *Symmeikta*.

Articles must be submitted electronically via the journal's website : www.byzsym.org, where guidelines and further information for authors are available.

Editor: TAXIARCHIS G. KOLIAS

Word processing-layout: DIMITRA REGLI

Distribution: The National Hellenic Research Foundation
48, Vassileos Konstantinou, 116 35 Athens
Fax: (+ 30) 210 7273629
e-mail: bookstore@eie.gr

© The National Hellenic Research Foundation
Institute for Byzantine Research
Vassileos Konstantinou 48, 116 35 Athens - GR

ISSN : 1792-0450

CONTENTS

The Hodegon	1
The Hodegon and the Great Palace	19
The Hodegon and the Palace of Marina	25
The Hodegon and the St. Lazarus Monastery	37
The Hodegon and the Gülhane Hospital	47
Conclusion – Interpretation of Archaeological remains	55
Περίληψη – Summary	62
Plates	65

ABBREVIATIONS

AASS	<i>Acta Sanctorum</i> , 1-71 (Paris 1863-1940)
ACO	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i> , ed. E. Schwartz et al., Berlin 1927
BBA	<i>Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten</i>
BF	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen</i>
BHG	F. Halkin, <i>Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca</i> , Bruxelles 1957 ³
BMGS	<i>Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies</i>
Byz.	<i>Byzantion</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>CahArch</i>	<i>Cahiers archéologiques</i>
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus des séances de l'année de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
EO	<i>Échos d'Orient</i>
GCS	Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>IstMitt</i>	<i>Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Istanbul</i>
JÖB	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i> , vol. 18- (Wien 1969-) (Before 1969, <i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft, JÖBG</i>)
JÖBG	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft</i> , 17 vols. (Wien, 1951-68) (After 1968, <i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik, JÖB</i>)
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
NE	<i>Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων</i>
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , ed. A. Kazhdan et al. (New York-Oxford 1991)
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca</i> , éd. J.-P. Migne (Paris 1857-66)
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina</i> , éd. J.-P. Migne, (Paris 1844-80)

<i>PLRE</i>	<i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , eds. A.H.M. JONES, J. MORRIS, J. R. MARTINDALE, vols. 1-3 (Cambridge 1971-1992)
<i>REArm</i>	<i>Revue des Études Arméniennes</i>
<i>REB</i>	<i>Revue des Études Byzantines</i>
<i>SBN</i>	<i>Studi bizantini e neoellenici</i>
<i>TM</i>	<i>Travaux et Mémoires</i>
<i>WSt</i>	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
<i>ZRVI</i>	<i>Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta</i>

PIOTR Ł. GROTOWSKI

THE HODEGON

*Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary
in Constantinople**

Located at the eastern end of the peninsula over which the city of Constantinople extends, the Hodegon monastery with the accompanying church dedicated to the Holy Virgin was one of the most important Marian shrines in the city. The first centuries of the complex's history are shrouded in mystery due to a scarcity of sources. Already in the 10th–12th centuries it had become one of the most important religious centers in the Byzantine capital and during the reign of the Palaiologan dynasty it played a central role in the political and spiritual life of the Empire. The name means 'guides' (from the genitive pl. of the Greek word *ὁδηγός*) and it may have arisen from the special function of the monks who guided the blind to the holy spring (*πηγή,νάματα, ἅγιον λοῦμα*) whose restorative waters were believed to cure blindness¹. The name was sometimes translated with a more

* The text is an expanded and supplemented version of the paper presented during the 19th Polish Historians Congress in Szczecin (17-21 September 2014). The improvement of the paper was possible thanks to one-month scholarship for research in London libraries (February 2015) awarded by the Lanckoroński Foundation. I would like to express my gratitude to the first reader, Marcin Wołoszyn for his remarks and invaluable help in collecting secondary literature, and to Mrs. Milica Sevkusić for significant linguistic improvement of the paper. I also owe thanks to the anonymous readers for their comments. All remaining mistakes and shortcomings are my responsibility.

1. The term *ὁδηγός* as a reference to guiding the blind was used e.g. in *Romans* 2, 19. Ch. ANGELIDI, Un texte patriographique et édifiant: Le «Discours narratif» sur les Hodègoi, *REB* 52 (1994), 113–149, here 137, lines 56–63 (see also a Russian translation of *The Tale: Povest' o chrame Bogorodicy, imenuemom Odigon, perevod, predislovie i komentarii* A. M. KRJUKOV, in: *Čudotvornaja ikona v Vizantii i Drevnej Rusi*, ed. A. M. LIDOV, Moscow 1996,

solemn connotation, as guiding one towards salvation². The eponym for the acheiropoietos icon of the Holy Virgin kept in the Hodegon was derived from this meaning³.

This miraculous image was the focal point of a great procession (λιτή) held every Tuesday, which proceeded through the entire city towards another center of Marian veneration, the Blachernae complex (fig. 1)⁴. Among the

464-475); Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως III 27 (ed. Th. PREGER, *Patria Konstantinoupoleos, Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, Leipzig 1907 [reprint New York 1975], 233 [apparatus]); in “Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon”, ed. K. HORNA, *WSt* 25 (1903), 165-217, here 190-191, 200 (epigrams XXVII, XLII) the pond with healing water is mentioned and compared to the Pool of Siloam and public baths. A. M. TALBOT, Healing Shrines in Late Byzantine Constantinople, in: *Constantinople and its Legacy. Annual Lecture*, Toronto 2000, 16-17 (reprint in EADEM, *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*, Aldershot – Burlington 2001, XIV); R. G. OUSTERHOUT, Water and Healing in Constantinople. Reading the Architectural Remains, in: *Life is short, Art long. The Art of Healing in Byzantium*, ed. B. PITARAKIS, Istanbul 2015, 65-77, esp. 69-70. In his commentary to *The Tale* (473, note 2), Kryukov points out that the comparison of the *ἀγίασμα* to the Pool of Siloam may have also been related to the fact that both springs were located near the city walls.

2. ANGELIDI, Discours, 141.

3. Acropolites 88 (ed. A. HEISENBERG, *Georgii Acropolitae Opera*, Leipzig 1903, I 187): τὸ τῆς Θεοτόκου ἐκτύπωμα τὸ οὕτω πως ἐκ τῆς μονῆς παρωνομασμένον τῶν Ὁδηγῶν. On the etymology of the place see also: R. JANIN, *Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire Byzantin*, v. 1, part 3: *Les églises et les monastères*, Paris ²1969, 199-200; ANGELIDI, Discours, 123, note 57 (the author cites the 11th century Life of St. Thomaïs of Lesbos, *AASS Novembris* IV 234-42, here 238 [§ 12, Miracle c], where the hagiographer distinguishes the older name Hodegon from the contemporary Hodegetria: Ὁδηγῶν [τῆ νῦν καλουμένη Ὁδηγητρία], whereas Theodore Balsamon (Epigramme, 184 [XIV], still places the icon in the Hodegon). On the miraculous image, see for example: M. TATIĆ-DJURIĆ, L'icône de l'Odigitria et son culte au XVIe siècle, in: *Byzantine East, Latin West. Art Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*, ed. C. MOSS – K. KIEFER, Princeton 1995, 557-564; A. GRABAR, L'Hodigitria et l'Eleousa, *Zbornik za Likovne Umetnosti* 10 (1974), 3-14.

4. The information about the Tuesday processions is provided by: the anonymous author of *The Tale* (see ANGELIDI, Discours, 141, 147 – indicating Pulcheria as the initiator of this tradition), the 11th century Life of Thomaïs of Lesbos (as in n. 3: the processions took place in the early morning), and the narrative about the Roman Virgin (E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, Maria Romaia. Zwei unbekannte Texte, *BZ* 12 [1903], 173-214, here 202). Sources have been analysed by B. V. PENTCHEVA, *Icons and Power: the Mother of God in Byzantium*, University Park, PA 2006, 120-143, *et passim* (= EADEM, The ‘activated’ icon: the Hodegetria procession and Mary’s Eisodos, in: *Images of the Mother of God*, [as in n. 7], 195-208, here 197-202); I. A.

citizens of Constantinople the icon was remembered for its special role as a palladium, thanks to its legendary intervention during one of the Avar sieges of the city (626) or, what is more likely, the Arab siege (717–718)⁵. A

ŠALINA, Vtornične šestvija s ikonoj «Bogomater' Odigitrija» v Konstantinopole, in: *Vizantija i Christianskij Vostok. Naučnaja konferencija pamjati A. V. Bank, Tezisy dokladov*, Sankt-Petersburg 1999, 58-63; EADEM, Čudotvornaja ikona «Bogomater' Odigitrija» i ee vtornične «choždenija» po Konstantinopolju, *Iskusstvo chrianskogo mira* 7 (2003), 51-74; A. LIDOV, The Flying Hodegetria. The Miraculous Icon as Bearer of Sacred Space, in: *The Miraculous Image in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. E. THUNO – G. WOLF, Rome 2004, 291-321; N. D. BARABANOV, Kul't ikony Odigitrii v Konstantinopole v aspekte vizantijskogo narodnogo blagočestija, in: *More i berega. K 60-letiju Sergeja Pavloviča Karpova ot kolleg i učnikov*, ed. R. M. ŠURIKOV, Moscow 2009, 241–258, here 245-256. Ch. ANGELIDI – T. PAPAMASTORAKIS, The Veneration of the Virgin Hodegetria and the Hodegon Monastery, in: *Images of the Mother of God*, here 377-379, figs. 211-213, date the confraternity's formation at the monastery to the middle of the 9th c. and the actual procession to no later than the 11th c.

5. In his homily delivered on the first anniversary of the repulsion of the Avars, Theodore Synkellos mentions that the icon of the Virgin with Child was displayed by Patriarch Sergios on the western gates of Constantinople during the siege, see L. STERNBACH, *Analecta Avarica, Rozprawy akademii umiejtności. Wydział filologiczny* Seria 2, 15 (1900), 297-333, here 304. An anonymous pilgrim (1075–1098/99) describes how the Marian icon was carried by city residents during an attack from land and by sea by two armies (most likely the Avars and Persians), see K. N. CIGGAAR, Une description de Constantinople dans le Tarragonensis 55, *REB* 53 (1995), 117-140, here 128. See also M. HURBANIČ, *História a mýtus. Avarský útok na Konštantinopol roku 626 v legendách*, Prešov 2010, 93, 95-96 (he points out that the earlier sources of the Avar-Slavic siege only mention an unnamed icon of St. Mary without mentioning the attribute Hodegetria). – On the other hand, based on an analysis of the *Letter* of Gregory II to the Patriarch Germanos (*Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. D. MANSI [Venice 1767], XIII 97 = *ACO* III/2, 440; *PG* 98, 153) in the context of early commentaries to Akathistos (Διήγησις ὠφέλιμος [BHG 1060], *PG* 92, 1356D about the procession of the icon along the city walls during the siege of 626, and col. 1352D on the procession during the Arab siege, as well as *Lectio Trodii* [BHG 1063], *PG* 92, 1365C on carrying the Hodegetria icon along the city walls during processions in 717-718). P. SPECK, *Artabasdos, der rechtläubige Vorkämpfer der göttlichen Lehren* [Ποικίλα Βυζαντινὰ 2], Bonn 1981, 169-171, has proposed the theory that the belief in the protective power of the Hodegetria icon dates back to the time of the attack of the Saracens. His viewpoint is strengthened by the tradition, widespread in the west, of associating the victory over the Arabs with the miraculous intervention of the image submerged into the waters of the Golden Horn, see for example BACCI, *Legacy* (as in n. 7), 326–37, where, besides Menaion for August, he mentions the reference in the Norwegian Mariu Saga from the 13th c. and *Speculum historiale* by Vincent of Beauvais. This is also

special confraternity was entrusted with the care of the icon, and its members (*κοῦδαι*)⁶ wore red cloaks when carrying the icon through the streets of Constantinople, a service for which they were richly rewarded by the emperor⁷.

mentioned in a 14th-century Venetian chronicle, cf. Andreae Danduli Venetorum Ducis, *Chronicon Venetum*, in: *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, ed. L. A. MURATORI (Bologna, 1900), 12/1: 109). The carrying of the icon of the Virgin in a procession during the Persian siege of 626 is also mentioned by the 13th-century Greek chronicler Theodore Skutariotes, ed. K. N. ΣΑΘΑΣ, *Μεσαιωνική βιβλιοθήκη* (Venice, 1894), v. 7: 108. PENTCHEVA, *Icons and Power*, 46-48, 56-59) – without proper reasons – refutes all of the above-mentioned sources, arguing that there is insufficient proof confirming the presence of the Hodegetria image in processions during the earlier sieges of Constantinople. Niketas Choniates mentions that the Hodegetria icon was displayed as the *palladium* of Constantinople by Isaac II Angelos during the revolts led by Alexios Branas (1186): (*Nicetae Choniatae, Historia*, ed. J.-L. VAN DIETEN [CFHB 11/1], Berlin – New York 1975, I 382). On the other hand, Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, 42 (ed. St. KYRIAKIDIS, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica* [Testi e monumenti. Testi 5], Palermo 1961) mentions the belief in the protective power of the Hodegetria icon held by the plebs during the reign of Andronikos I; see also ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 382; HURBANIĆ, *História a mýtus*, 95; A. WEYL CARR, *Court Culture and Cult Icons in Middle Byzantine Constantinople*, in: *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. MAGUIRE, Washington, D.C. 1997, 85-86, here 97-98.

6. Most likely, from the Latin *cauda*, Italian *coda* – tail, train, retinue. The term *ἀδελφοὶ* also appears in sources, while the blindfolded monk carrying a heavy icon was called *ὁ βασιτάζων*, see ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 121. On religious confraternities in Byzantium see P. HORDEN, *The Confraternities of Byzantium*, in: *Voluntary Religion*, eds. W. J. SHIELDS – D. WOOD, *Studies in Church History* 23 (Oxford, 1986), 25-45; G. DAGRON, *Ainsi rien n'échappera à la réglementation. État, Église, corporations, confréries: à propos des inhumations à Constantinople (IVe-Xe siècle)*, in: *Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin*, eds. V. KRAVARI – J. LEFORT – C. MORRISSON, Paris 1991, II 155-182; C. RAPP, *Ritual Brotherhood in Byzantium*, *Traditio* 52 (1997), 285-326, esp. 286-290 and EADEM, *Brother-Making in Late Antiquity and Byzantium. Monks, Laymen and Christian Ritual*, Oxford 2016.

7. A description of the costumes of participants in Tuesday processions is given by an envoy of Henry III of Castile at the court of Tamerlane, Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo (*Embajada a Samarcanda. Vida y hazañas del gran Tamorlán*, Madrid 2008, 45) and another Spanish traveller: Pero Tafur (ed. J. DE LA ESPADA, *Andanças é viajes por diversas partes del mundo avidos [1435-1439]*, Madrid 1874, 174-750); N. PATTERSON-ŠEVČENKO, *Servants of the Holy Icon*, in: *Byzantine East, Latin West*, Princeton, N.J. 1995, 547-553, especially 547-549; M. BACCI, *The Legacy of the Hodegetria: Holy Icons and Legends between East and West*, in: *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, ed. M. VASSILAKI, Aldershot – Burlington 2005, 321-331, here 330-331; HURBANIĆ, *História a mýtus*, 98-100. On the salary of the confraternity members as described in the Typikon of the Pantokrator monastery, see

The Crusaders had transferred the image to the headquarters of the Latin patriarch at the Hagia Sophia, but the Venetians who resided in the Pantokrator complex stole it and brought it back to their monastery⁸. While Michael VIII was regaining control over Constantinople in 1261, he carefully planned his triumph, arranging it so as to coincide with the feast of the Assumption (15th August). He was greeted by the Metropolitan of Kyzikos George Kleidas, who displayed the Hodegetria icon, which had been taken from the Pantokrator monastery, on one of the towers of the Golden Gate. Pachymeres explains this choice by the fact that Michael VIII had particular faith in this image and believed that it would help him regain the capital⁹. The Hodegetria icon also played a special role as a protector of Constantinople during the rule of the Palaiologan dynasty¹⁰. The miraculous icon was certainly not the only relic kept in the monastery church. According to the anonymous author of the *The Tale of the Divine and*

N. OIKONOMIDES, *The Holy Icon as an Asset*, *DOP* 45 (1991), 35-44, here 39-40 (reprint *IDEM*, *Society, Culture and Politics in Byzantium*, ed. E. ZACHARIADOU, Aldershot 2005, XIII).

8. Innocentii III PP., *Registrorum lib.* IX. 243, *PL* 215: 1077 (Letter of Innocent III, dated to the year 1206, to the Latin Patriarch Tomas Morosini). Source analysis by R. LEE WOLFF, Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople: the Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria, *Traditio* 6 (1948), 319-328, here 320-321; M. BACCI, *Il pennello dell'evangelista. Storia delle immagini sacre attribuite a san Luca* (Piccola biblioteca GISEM 14), Pisa 1998, 106-108; PENTCHEVA, *Icons and Power*, 126-127; HURBANIĆ, *História a mýtus*, 97; S. KOTZABASSI, *The Monastery of Pantokrator between 1204 and 1453*, in: *The Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople*, ed. EADEM (Byzantinisches Archiv 27), Boston - Berlin 2013, 57-69, here 58 (with further literature).

9. Akropolites 88 (187 HEISENBERG); Pachymeres II 31 (ed. A. FAILLER, *Georges Pachymères, Relations Historiques* [CFHB 24], Paris 1984, I 217).

10. In 1296, Andronikos II prayed in front of the image in the Hodegon giving thanks for his victory over Alexios Philanthropenos, the leader of the army in Asia Minor (see *infra*, note 53). In 1322, the same ruler met in the church with his grandson Andronikos III in order to make peace at the beginning of the civil war (Kantakouzenos I 34, ed. L. SCHOPEN, *Ioannis Cantacuzeni, eximperatoris historiarum Libri IV*, Bonn, 1828, I 168), and the latter offered thanks in the monastery for his victory of 1328 (Kantakouzenos, I 59 [I 305 SCHOPEN]) and, again, Andronikos III went there on foot from the Blachernae after defeating the Turks in a sea battle in August 1337; see Gregoras XI 4 (ed. L. SCHOPEN, *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina historia*, Bonn 1829, I 541-542). On prayers offered before the miraculous icon in the Hodegon during the war between John V Palaiologos and John VI Kantakouzenos, see Kantakouzenos III 50, 70, 99 (II 300, 438, 607 SCHOPEN).

Venerable Church of the Most Holy Mother of God, Called the Hodegon, and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, drops of Mary's milk, her spindle, as well as Christ's diapers and drops of His blood were venerated at the Hodegon, along with the icon¹¹.

From the 10th century, the complex became the residence of the patriarchs of Antioch. In 970, in an imperial chrysobull, John Tzimiskes granted the monastery to the Greek Patriarch Theodore II (966–977) as a residence during his stays in the capital. When John VII Oxite (1090–1155) had to leave his previous see after the Crusaders had taken Syria, he moved to Constantinople in 1100 and settled in the Hodegon¹². Later titular patriarchs, Theodore Balsamon (1185–1195) and Cyril III (13th c.), also resided at the monastery¹³. As a result of a privilege granted by Andronikos II (1282–1328), in the 13th and 14th centuries, the complex was formally acknowledged as the metochion of the Greek Patriarch of Antioch¹⁴.

Sources from the Komnenian and the Palaiologan periods demonstrate that the Hodegetria church was also a place of eternal rest for the most honored citizens of Constantinople. In one of his epigrams, Theodore Balsamon refers to a tomb being transferred from St. Anne's church, where he placed the remains of his relatives, while in another poem he mentions a family tomb erected in the Hodegetria church by the nephew of John II, Stephen Komnenos¹⁵. The metropolitan of Ephesus, Mark Eugenikos (1438–1444) wrote in a calendar note in tribute to Symeon Metaphrastes that the grave of this outstanding hagiographer was located in the Hodegon¹⁶. Andronikos

11. ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 139, 141; Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία* XIV 2 (PG 96, 1061); ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 373–374.

12. P. GAUTIER, Jean V l'Oxite, patriarche d'Antioche. Notice biographique, *REB* 22 (1964), 128–157, here 133. See also BARABANOV, *Kul't*, 243–244.

13. K. PITSAKES, Ἡ ἔκταση τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐνὸς ὑπερόριου Πατριάρχου τὸν 12ο αἰώνα: Ὁ πατριάρχης Ἀντιοχείας στὴν Κωνσταντινούπολη τὸν 12ο αἰώνα, in: *Byzantium in the 12th Century. Canon Law, State and Society*, ed. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, Athens 1991, 91–139, here 119–120; ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 376.

14. Pachymeres V 24 (II 515 FAILLER); JANIN, *Géographie*, 202–203; ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 115–116 and note 15.

15. Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon XI–XII (181–182 HORNA).

16. Markos Eugenikos, Συγγράμματα διάφορα, in: *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη*, ed. A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ – ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, Constantinople 1884, II 94–105, here 101; see also Ch. HØGEL, *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization*, Copenhagen 2002, 156.

III Palaiologos (1325–1341) entered the monastery before his death, and was also probably buried there, as was his son, John V (1341–1347, 1355–1376, 1379–1391)¹⁷. During the Palaiologan period, the Hodegetria church thus became the fourth imperial mausoleum in Constantinople, in addition to the church of the Holy Apostles, and the Pantokrator and the Lips monasteries.

In order to have a more complete idea of the Hodegon's significance in the spiritual life of the Byzantine Empire it should be mentioned that from the 11th century it became an important center of manuscript production. There was a scriptorium in the monastery, and it was well-known for its own form of minuscule used in copying luxurious, illuminated liturgical codices¹⁸.

During the last days of Byzantine rule in Constantinople, the Council of the Twelve met in St. Mary's church in a fruitless attempt to find a way to drive the Ottoman fleet from the waters of the Golden Horn (April 23, 1453); on the same occasion, Alvise Diedo was appointed as the commander of the naval forces¹⁹.

* * *

Despite the monastery's important role in the history and court ceremony of the Byzantine Empire, to us it remains an enigma. Problems arise already in establishing its construction date. While it is true that the *Patria*, currently the oldest known reliable source on the founding of the Hodegon, mentions

17. On the death of Andronikos III in the Hodegon see Gregoras XI 11 (I 556, 559–560 SCHOPEN); Kantakouzenos II 40 (I 557, 560 SCHOPEN). The burial of Andronikos in the Hodegetria church is also mentioned by Clavijo (45 Embajada). Pero Tafur refers to the grave of an unspecified Constantine located in the church (174 ESPADA) – perhaps in this way he made reference to an emperor with whom he was unfamiliar.

18. L. POLITIS, Nouvelles données sur Joasaph, copiste du monastère des Hodèges. *Illinois Classical Studies* 7 (1982), (= *Studies in Memory of Alexander Turyn*), 299–322, here 300; IDEM, Eine Schreiberschule im Kloster ΤΩΝ ΟΔΗΓΩΝ, *BZ* 51 (1958), 17–36, 261–287 (reprint in IDEM, *Paléographie et littérature byzantine et néo-grecque: recueil d'études*, London 1975, VI); H. HUNGER – O. KRESTEN, Archaisierende Minuskel und Hodegonstil im 14. Jahrhundert, *JÖB* 29 (1980), 187–236.

19. These meetings are mentioned in the *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople* by the Venetian patrician Nicolò Barbaro, see M. PHILIPIDES – W. K. HANAK, *The Siege and the Fall of Constantinople in 1453: Historiography, Topography and Military Studies*, Aldershot - Burlington 2011, 449, 576, 581, 583.

Emperor Michael III (842–867) as the founder of the complex, references to an earlier chapel (εὐκτήριον) in the same location and a miraculous spring (πηγή)²⁰ indicate that it must have been founded before this period. This hypothesis is confirmed by a story preserved in an iconodule polemic from the second Iconoclasm period, dated to 836 – The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilus (actually a forgery probably created soon after 843). The author mentions that the lector of the church of the Holy Virgin of the Heavenly Guides (Θεοτόκου τῶν Ὁδηγῶν), the later Patriarch John VII Grammatikos (837–843), urged Emperor Leo V to reinstate Iconoclasm²¹.

On the other hand, the authenticity of Theodore Lector's (ca. 518) references to Empress Pulcheria (414–453) as the benefactor of the Marian shrines at the Blachernae, Chalkoprataia, and the Hodegon, known only from interpolations in Nicephorus Callistus' *Historia ecclesiastica* (ca. 1310–1320)²² is disputed by many scholars²³.

20. Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως III 27 (223 PREGER); see also *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople. The Patria*, trans. A. BERGER (*Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library* 24), Cambridge, MA–London 2013, 150: Οἱ δὲ Ὁδηγοὶ ἐκτίσθησαν παρὰ Μιχαὴλ τοῦ ἀναιρεθέντος ὑπὸ Βασιλείου πρότερον εὐκτήριον ὑπῆρχεν καὶ τυφλῶν πολλῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκεῖσε πηγῇ βλεψιάντων καὶ θαύματα πολλὰ γέγονασι (The Hodegoi were built by Michael who was murdered by Basil. A chapel was previously there, and many blind men saw again at the spring there, and many miracles happened). ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 375, suggested the period between the years 861 and 865 for the renovation and pointed out that the renovation works could have been limited to cleansing the church from the “taint” of Iconoclasm.

21. The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, § 36 (ed. J. A. MUNITIZ, *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to the Emperor Theophilus and Related Texts*, Camberley, Surrey 1997, 111–113). The legend is quoted with minor alterations by the Letter to Emperor Theophilus on the Holy and Venerated Icons [16d] attributed to Pseudo-John Damascene, *ibidem* 177): ... τοῦνομα Ἰωάννης ἀναγνωστικῶ βαθμῶ τῇ εὐαγγελί μονῇ τῆς ἀγίας Θεοτόκου τῶν Ὁδηγῶν σχολάζων.

22. Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. Ch. HANSEN (GCS 54), Berlin 1971, 102; Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos XV 14 (*PG* 147, 44A).

23. Doubts regarding the value of Theodore Lector's account were first expressed by WOLFF, 322–323, who supposed that the information about the foundation of the church could have been a 14th-century interpolation. On the other hand, C. MANGO, *Addenda*, in: IDEM, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993, 4; IDEM, Constantinople as Theotokoupolis, in: *Mother of God*, 17–25, here notes 15 and 58, points out that the Chalkoprataia and Blachernae churches mentioned in *Historia ecclesiastica* in light of other

However, there are two more authors who refer to the virgin empress as the person responsible for erecting a shrine for the image of Mary and Child allegedly painted by St. Luke the Evangelist, which she had received from her sister-in-law Athenais-Eudokia: in his *Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople*, Nikolaos Mesarites refers to the empress as the founder while describing her tomb²⁴; while the anonymous author of *The Tale of the Divine and Venerable Church of the Most Holy Mother of God, Called the Hodegon* repeats, in an expanded form, Theodore's account of the three shrines dedicated to the Theotokos²⁵. The fact that various unrelated sources link the construction of the Hodegon with Pulcheria allows us to conjecture that the complex was founded by this ruler. The time frame for its construction can be defined by Eudokia's pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 438 and her death in 453. The church was founded in an area where many other important historic structures from the Early Byzantine period were also located: the public Baths of Arcadius, built by his daughter,

sources were constructed at a later date. His arguments were accepted by L. JAMES, *The Empress and the Virgin in Early Byzantium: Piety, Authority and Devotion*, in: *Images of the Mother of God*, 145-152, esp. 147-150. Recently, PENTCHEVA, *Icons and Power*, 120 and note 27 on 228, has revisited Wolff's theory. She points out that manuscripts from the 11th century do not contain a reference to the shrines founded by Pulcheria and it could be an interpolation added in the 13th century [manuscripts B and V], whereas HURBANIC, *História a mýtus*, 94, points out that neither Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De ceremoniis* nor any early synaxaria mention the Hodegon. Not all researchers share such a sceptical attitude. For example, S. J. SHOEMAKER, *The Cult of Fashion. The Earliest Life of the Virgin and Constantinople's Marian Relics*, *DOP* 62 (2008), 53-74, here 60-62, demonstrated that arguments against Pulcheria as a founder of Chalkoprateia and Blachernae shrines based on even more disputable evidence remain unconvincing. Due to this fact he suggests return to more secured, traditional attribution.

24. Mesarites XXXIX 7 (ed. G. DOWNEY, Nikolaos Mesarites: *Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople*, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, NS 47 [1957], 855-924, here 915); see also E. BOLOGNESI, *La X Omelia di Fozio. Quale ekphrasis della chiesa di S. Maria Hodegetria*, *Studi medievali*, ser. III 28 (1987), 381-398, here 388-389.

25. ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 139. Pachymeres II 31 (I 217 FAILLER) also mentions that Eudokia gave the Hodegetria icon to Pulcheria. See also PENTCHEVA, *Icons and Power*, 128-129 (this scholar believes that the legend of Pulcheria as the founder of the Hodegon must have become widespread in Constantinopolitan society in the 12th century, which is contradicted by the record in the *Tale*). On the dating and credibility of the *The Tale* as a source see: *infra*, p. 25.

Ariadna, and the Palace of Marina. This fact places the church complex in the broader urban context of fifth-century Constantinople²⁶.

Michael III most likely expanded the preexisting shrine²⁷, or was perhaps responsible only for the renovation of the complex, as often happened in later centuries²⁸. However, it is possible that he merely adapted already existing, older buildings to new functions. As an aside, it should be noted that this is not the only case of crediting Michael III with founding a shrine whose existence is confirmed by earlier sources. According to Angelidi and Papamastorakis, we find a similar situation in the case of the church of St. Mary of Pharos²⁹. While Symeon Magister gives Michael III as the

26. This fact is noted by ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 120; ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 374. On the Baths of Arcadius see *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* (ed. O. SEECK, *Notitia Dignitatum*, Berlin 1876, 230, 13; Procopius, *Buildings* I 11, 1 (ed. J. HAURY, *De aedificiis libri VI*, Leipzig 1964, 41), who places them on the eastern shore of Constantinople, to the left for those sailing from the Propontis; on the Palace of Marina, see *infra*, p. 25ff. Pierre Gilles I 2, II 1-2, IV 11 (most likely based on older sources) also places both buildings in the first region of Constantinople (Petri GYLLII, *De topographia Constantinopoleos*, Lyon 1562 [reprint 1967], 14, 50, 62-63, 230, 238). In addition to these buildings, the French traveller consistently mentions the residence of the daughter of Theodosius I, Aelia Galla Placidia (*ibidem*, 390-450), surely distinguishing it from her palace in the tenth region.

27. This theory was put forward by JANIN, *Géographie*, 199 and 237-240 and was accepted by some researchers, as for example A. M. TALBOT, Hodegon Monastery, *ODB* II, 939; TATIĆ-DJURIĆ, *L'icône*, 557, 561. BOLOGNESI, X Omelia, 396-398, associates Photios' Tenth Homily with the Hodegetria church; according to her, the restoration ordered by Michael III did not deal with architecture (in her opinion, the description corresponds to the traditional form of a fifth-century basilica with an atrium and a portico), but only focused on mural decoration, executed in mosaic after the end of Iconoclasm.

28. Most likely, near the end of the 12th century, works were carried out in the monastery on the orders of the μέγας ἑταρειάρχης, Georgios Komnenos Doukas Palaiologos, who is mentioned in an epigram in the codex *Marc. gr. 524* (see S. P. LAMPROS, Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς κῶδιξ 524, *NE* 8 [1911], 3-59, 123-192, here 148-150: the epigram also mentions six imperial portraits in the narthex of the church: Constantine X, Michael VII, Romanos IV, Nikephoros Botaneiates, Alexios I, John II and Manuel I), while in 1305, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Athanasius I, had the complex renovated (Pachymeres XIII 8 [IV 633 FAILLER]); see also JANIN, *Géographie*, 200; V. KIDONOPOULOS, *Bauten in Konstantinopel 1204-1328: Verfall und Zerstörung, Restaurierung, Umbau und Neubau von Profan- und Sakralbauten* (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 1), Wiesbaden 1994, 77-78; as well as *infra*, note 139.

29. ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 375.

founder of that church³⁰, Theophanes the Confessor mentions that earlier, on November 3, 768, the engagement of Irene of Athens to Leo IV the Khazar took place there, which suggests that the construction of the church should be associated with Constantine V (741–775)³¹.

The Hodegon was most probably demolished shortly after the city had been captured by the Ottomans³². In the year 1456, Joseph, the last hegumen of the monastery, ordered one of its manuscripts to be copied and presented as a gift to the Monastery of the Great Lavra at Athos. According to Raymond Janin, the destruction of the monastery can be most reliably dated to around 1467, when the construction of the New Palace for Mehmed II

30. Symeon Magister 131, 44 (ed. S. WAHLGREN, *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon* [CFHB 44], Berlin – New York 2006, 255); see also Pseudo-Symeon 45 (ed. I. BEKKER, *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, Bonn 1838, 681).

31. Theophanes A.M. 6261 (ed. C. DE BOOR, *Theophanis Chronographia*, Leipzig 1883, I 444); BOLOGNESI, X Omelia, 387-388. The early history of the Pharos church is discussed by JANIN, *Géographie*, 232. ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 375 point out that in the case of founding (or rather reconstructing) the Hodegon, Constantine V, whose other churches are mentioned by Patriarch Nikephoros (*PG* 100, 341-344) could also have been the founder. The ruler mentioned by the anonymous *Tale* as the renovator of the Hodegon, being an iconoclast, could have been replaced in later tradition by Michael III as the builder of the complex.

32. Neither Arnold von Harff (ca. 1499), a pilgrim from Cologne, nor the French diplomat and historian Pierre Gilles mention the Hodegon in their accounts of Constantinople. Mikołaj Lanckoroński (1501) probably did not see the shrine either, see *Die Pilgerfahrt des Ritters Arnold von Harff*, ed. E. VON GROOTE, Cologne 1860, 203-208; GYLLIUS, *De topographia, passim*; A. RÓŻYCKA BRYZEK, Mikołaja Lanckorońskiego pobyt w Konstantynopolu w roku 1501 – nie tylko posłowanie. *Folia Historiae Artium*, Seria Nova 5-6 (1999-2000), 79-92, here 83-85. Although mysterious, a ruined church with mosaics was seen in the corner of the Seraglio and sea walls by Bolognese scientist and spy Luigi Ferdinando Marsili who visited Constantinople around 1680. The traveller mentions three chapels, doors and pillars visible from the outside. Unfortunately, Marsili does not mention neither the name, nor does he specify on which side of the Seraglio wall was the church situated. He mentions only that the remains were below the Sultan's stables and that the place was filled with manure, which may indicate that the shrine was on the south side of the Seraglio wall, see A. PARIBENI, *Chiesa antica greca nel serraglio posta. Memorie di un perduto monumento bizantino nell'Itinerario di Luigi Ferdinando Marsili*, in: *Alle gentili arti ammaestra. Studi in onore di Alkistis Proiou*, ed. A. ARMATI et alii (Testi e studi bizantini-neoellenici 18). Rome 2010, 309-326, here 318-325. The author identifies Marsili's church with Lazarus or St. Michael τὰ Τζήρου monastery.

was underway³³. However, a depiction of the church drawn as an illustration for the text of the *Liber insularum* by Cristoforo Buondelmonti (found in a later manuscript kept in the University Library of Düsseldorf, Ms. G 13, fol. 54r) seems to confirm that the church was still in place around 1480. Unlike the codex Arundel 93 in the British Library, which dates from the same period and which repeats on fol. 155r a simplified depiction of urban details borrowed from older illustrations, the miniature in the German codex shows signs of having been brought up to date. A church dedicated to the Holy Virgin is depicted as a free-standing structure in the garden within the enclosure of the Seraglio, to the north of the imperial stables, which can probably be identified with the Great Stables of the Sultan (Büyük Ahır)³⁴, also known from an engraving that depicts Justinian's Column being struck by a lightning bolt on July 12, 1490, in Hartman Schedel's *Liber chronicarum*³⁵.

33. JANIN, *Géographie*, 203, on the destruction of the Church of the Holy Savior in Chora, where the Hodegetria icon was kept at that time, see Doukas XXXIX (ed. I. BEKKER, *Michaelis Ducae Nepotis Historia Byzantina*, Bonn 1834, 288). R. CORMACK, *Painting the Soul. Icons, Death Masks and Shrouds*, London 1997, 65 believes that the icon was cut into four pieces. On the ceremonial processions with the Hodegetria held during the siege see HURBANIĆ, *História a mýtus*, 100-101.

34. I. R. MANNERS, Constructing the Image of a City: The Representation of Constantinople in Christopher Buondelmonti's *Liber Insularum Archipelagi*, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87 (1991), 72-102, here 87-90, fig. 2; C. BARSANTI, Costantinopoli e l'Egeo nei primi decenni del XV secolo: la testimonianza di Cristoforo Buondelmonti, *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte* 56 (2001), 83-254, here 180 and note 508, fig. 59; A. EFFENBERGER, Die Illustrationen – Topographische Untersuchungen: Konstantinopel/Istanbul und ägäische Örtlichkeiten, in: *Cristoforo Buondelmonti, Liber insularum archipelagi*, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Düsseldorf Ms. G 13. Faksimile, ed. I. SIEBERT – M. PLASSMANN (Schriften der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Düsseldorf 38), Wiesbaden 2005, 13-89, here 27, fig. 32; Ç. KAFESCIOĞLU, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA 2009, 148-153, fig. 111.

35. Woodcut on sheet CCLVII, see e.g. BARSANTI, Costantinopoli, 179, fig. 56; A. BERGER – J. BARDILL, The Representations of Constantinople in Hartmann Schedel's World Chronicle, and Related Pictures, *BMGS* 22 (1998), 1-37, here 21-23, fig. 8 (the authors interpret the inscription above the rotunda depicted in the corner within the walls of the Seraglio gardens as *S. geor<g>ius*. They also admit that the building is located too far to the south to identify it with St. George's monastery in Mangana and this church should most probably be identified with the monastery of St. Lazarus, or the church of St. Michael at the monastery τὰ Τζήρου.

Furthermore, it should be noted that a mysterious building surmounted by domes accompanied by the inscription *S. Luca Evangelista* still appears to the southeast of the Hagia Sophia on a woodcut by Andrea Giovanni Vavassore produced in Venice around 1535 and based on a prototype – which was approximately half a century older (fig. 2)³⁶. As the only known church dedicated to St. Luke the Evangelist was, according to sources, located in the western part of the city, near the shrine of Philip the Apostle and the cistern of Mokios³⁷, the image in Vavassore's engraving could be the last trace of the existence of the Hodegon, the remembrance of which remained at that time only as a name mistakenly associated with the depiction of the Nea church. Nevertheless, the presence of a domed structure in the southeastern corner of the Seraglio is attested till the second half of seventeenth century. It was depicted on the map of Constantinople dated to the first half of that century in the *Book of Navigation (Kitab-i-Bahryie)* by Piri Reis and in the sketch

They unreasonably (based only on Berger's earlier hypothesis) rule out the identification of the building as the Hodegon. In turn, G. NECİPOĞLU, *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power. The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, Cambridge, Mass. – London 1991, 204, pl. 24 mistakenly associates the church on the engraving (deciphered as *S. Grovus*) with the shrine converted into an aviary (*kuşhane ocāğı*) and described by the Armenian historian Eremya Celebi Kōmürçıyan (1637-1695) as the former church of St. John. She ignores the fact that Kōmürçıyan says that the church was located towards the south of the Stable Gate, which indicates that it was outside of the Seraglio walls. In turn, this means that it could be identified with the shrine mentioned by Marsili (cf. *supra*, n. 32), but cannot be identified as the building depicted as standing within the walls.

36. See e.g. C. MANGO, *The Brazen House. A study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople*, Copenhagen 1959, 180; A. BERGER, Zur sogenannten Stadtansicht des Vavassore, *IstMitt* 44 (1994), 329-355 with n. 8, 331, 334, 340-342 (he accepts, after Mango, the identification of the church as the Nea); BERGER - BARDILL, *Representations*, 1-11, fig. 4; MANNERS, *Constructing*, 91-92, fig. 8; BARSANTI, *Costantinopoli*, fig. 58; EFFENBERGER, *Die Illustrationen*, fig. 5; KAFESCIOĞLU, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 154-158, fig. 114. On errors and inaccuracies in Vavassore's woodcut see R. H. W. STICHEL, *Das Coliseo de Spiriti in Konstantinopel: ein Phantom. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung der Stadtansicht vom Vavassore-Typus*, *IstMitt* 51 (2001), 445-459.

37. On the subject of the church of St. Luke by the cistern of Mokios see *Life of Basil*, 80 (ed. I. ŠEVČENKO, *Theophanis Continuati Liber V. Vita Basilii Imperatoris* [CFHB 42], Berlin – Boston 2011, 269), and after him Kedrenos II 339 (ed. I. BEKKER, *Georgius Cedrenus, Compendium Historiarum*, Bonn 1838-1839); Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως III 85 (246 PREGER); JANIN, *Géographie*, 311.

made in 1686 by Francesco Scarella³⁸. Unfortunately none of the pictures referred to include inscriptions or any other indication, which could allow us to link it securely with Hodegon. This fact is not significant, however because the church itself did not outlast the 18th century and every trace of its existence has been erased. The destruction of the Hodegon complex, including the church of the Holy Virgin, along with its attendant side chapels, water source, baths, hagiaσμα, dormitories for monks and ecclesiastical dignitaries³⁹, has led Byzantinists to propose numerous theories about its location over the past century.

* * *

The first attempt to connect the church complex, which was only known from written sources, with archaeological remains was made in 1923 by the French archaeologist Robert Demangel and the Swiss art historian and Byzantine scholar Ernest Mamboury, at that time a lecturer at the Galatasaray High School. Taking advantage of the presence of French occupation troops in Constantinople (1921), they carried out extensive excavations on the eastern slopes of the Seraglio Hill, in the area of the former Mangana neighbourhood, to the east of the Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene churches (fig. 3). At a distance of about 400 meters from the Hagia Sophia, between the sea walls and the Gülhane military hospital (28°59' 6,1"E, 41°0' 32,5"N), they came across the remains of a semicircular portico leading to a hexagonal building with a diameter of approx. 25 m. Its interior was divided into five concentrically placed apses (fig. 4). Inside, the archaeologists found a centrally placed twelve-sided structure fashioned from great blocks of Proconnesian marble which created a depression with six semi-circular niches of a regular shape (figs. 5-7). Carved steps led into

38. W. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls: Byzantion, Konstantinoupolis, Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen 1977, fig. 10; NECİPOĞLU, *Architecture*, figs. 22a, 31b; EFFENBERGER, *Die Illustrationen*, fig. 11, 23; PARIBENI, *Chiesa antica*, 320-324, figs. (the author follows the wrong identification proposed by Necipoğlu, cf. *supra*, n. 35).

39. See ANGELIDI - PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 374 (the authors put forward a hypothesis that the Thermae Arcadianae could have been part of the complex; these baths were renovated in the times of Justinian, but 10th-century patriographic texts are silent on them); BARABANOV, *Kul't*, 243.

these small apses and this hollow was in all likelihood the original bottom of the basin. Below its floor there was another basin, this time with eight semi-circular niches, most probably the remains of an earlier structure of a similar function⁴⁰. Even though the archaeologists at first interpreted the structure as a baptistry, it seems more appropriate to identify these remains as the remnants of a chapel equipped with a small pool in which the sick were washed.

Further down to the east of the hexagonal building, Demangel and Mamboury came upon a walled up rectangular water intake, a hagiaσμα, while heading further in the same direction, they encountered the remains of a small gate in the sea walls in the vicinity of Theophilos' tower [No. 16]. The tower was, according to an inscription in the upper storey, heightened by Leo VI and Alexander in 906 (figs. 8-9). In the vicinity of the postern, they found a richly carved lintel beam with a verse from Psalm 117 (118), 19:

*ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας δικαιοσύνης·
εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐταῖς ἔξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ.*

[*Open for me the gates of the righteousness:
I will enter and give thanks to the Lord.*]

According to the archaeologists', the term «gate» (which was often employed in the Byzantine Empire as a metaphor for the Virgin Mary) was not used in this quotation coincidentally. In their opinion, the small gate must have led to a shrine dedicated to the Virgin, identified by them with the Hodegon monastery⁴¹. Although this interpretation was considered

40. E. MAMBOURY - R. DEMANGEL, *Le quartier des Manges et la première région de Constantinople*, Paris 1939, 71-111; see the review by R. JANIN in *EO* 39 (1940), 236-240. Diehl was the first to write about the results of the excavations (Ch. DIEHL, *Rapport sur les fouilles du corps d'occupation français à Constantinople*, *CRAI* 67 [1923], III 241-248).

41. MAMBOURY - DEMANGEL, *Manges*, 72-78. Doukas writes about the deception used by the supporters of John V Palaiologos in order to sneak into Constantinople in 1355 through the small gate of the Hodegetria, see Doukas XI (41-42 BEKKER). On the subject of the postern see also A. VAN MILLINGEN, *Byzantine Constantinople. The Walls of the City and adjoining Historical Sites*, London 1899, 258-260; R. JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine: développement urbain et repertoire topographique*, Paris 1964, 296-297 and *infra*, p. 56.

unconvincing by Alfons M. Schneider⁴², it was accepted by most researchers of ancient Constantinople⁴³.

When the Turkish army retook control of the area between the Seraglio and the Bosphorus, which limited access to the military zone of the barracks and the hospital, it became impossible to verify the French findings⁴⁴. An alternative theory by Karl Wulzinger should also be noted here. The German scholar links the remains of the Hodegon with the monumental terrace on which the Gülhane military hospital was erected in the 19th century, while associating the discoveries of Demangel and Mamboury with the church of St. Lazarus⁴⁵.

Recently, Firat Düzgüner, an Istanbul-based archaeologist, proposed a completely new hypothesis. He attempted to link the location of the Hodegon with the remains discovered during the excavations of 1997-99 in the cellars of house No. 38 at the junction of Mimar Mehmet Ağa and Amiral Tafdil streets, i.e. in the southern section of the former Great Palace (28°58'47.80" E and 41°00'16.19" N). Under two successive floor levels adorned with geometric floor mosaics tentatively dated to the fifth

42. A. M. SCHNEIDER, *Byzanz. Vorarbeiten zur Topographie und Archäologie der Stadt*, Berlin 1936, 90; F. DÖLGER – A. M. SCHNEIDER, *Byzanz, Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte*, Berne 1952, 275 (Schneider believes that the remains discovered in Mangana could be the remains of a private bath and not the monastery), and after him A. BERGER, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinoupoleos* (Ποικίλα Βυζαντινά 8), Bonn 1988, 376-378. See also R. JANIN, *La topographie de Constantinople byzantine. Études et découvertes* (1918-1938), *EO* 38 (1939), 118-150, here: 132. MAMBOURY – DEMANGEL, *Manganes*, 99-103 polemicize with this opinion.

43. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 42-43, figs. 16-17; JANIN, *Géographie*, 206; ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 117-118; G. MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 19), Washington, D.C. 1984, 363-364; LIDOV, *Hodegetria*, 293.

44. In November 1935, a marble basin still visible at ground level was photographed by a Russian student, Nicholas Artamonoff (see Dumbarton Oaks Photographic Collection, neg. nr RA97a-c). In the summer of 1948, Robert Wolff, after having been arrested twice, managed to carry out a cursory examination of the ground surface while being accompanied by a military escort, but he did not find traces of the archaeological work done by the French team: WOLFF, *Footnote*, 322, note 16.

45. K. WULZINGER, *Byzantinische Baudenkmäler zu Konstantinopel auf der Seraispitze, die Nea, das Tekfur-Serai und das Zisternenproblem*, Hannover 1925, 43-44, 46-47 and the map on 39. His theory was criticized and rejected by DEMANGEL – MAMBOURY, *Manganes* I.

to sixth centuries, he found a spacious barrel-vaulted room. In its eastern wall there was a niche with an *hagiasma* (fig. 10). Based on an analysis of the aforementioned woodcut depicting Justinian's column being struck by lightning in *Liber Chronicarum* (1493) by Hartmann Schedel, he tried to bolster his interpretation with an unconvincing attempt at identifying the first region of Constantinople with Anapulus (sic!), mentioned by Procopius of Caesarea. In so doing, he ignored the fact that both the depicted event and the already-mentioned woodcut dated from a period in which the Hodegon had most likely already been demolished, and that the artist had never been to Constantinople⁴⁶. Even though the identification proposed by Düzgüner partially ignores some essential historical sources and is undermined by a flawed methodology, it is still accepted by some researchers⁴⁷.

It is therefore essential to carefully reconsider all available data regarding the location of the Hodegon. Generally it is possible to divide the evidence into three different categories:

1) written evidence concerning the location of the monastery in relation to other structures, still extant, or to those whose original locations can be established;

46. F. DÜZGÜNER, Anapulus ve Prookhthoi'de Yeni Buluntular, Hagia Maria Hodegetria ve Nea Ekklesia (Mesakepion) Kiliseleri, in: *Myth to Modernity. Istanbul, Selected Themes* (Annual Supplement of Arkeoloji ve Sanat Magazine 1), Istanbul 2002, 32-50; IDEM, *Iustinianus Dönemi'nde İstanbul'da Yapılar. Procopius'un Birinci Kitab (Analiz)*, Istanbul 2004, 32-38, 110-116. 120-125 (*hagiasma*). Düzgüner, unable to construct a reliable hypothesis, in the end is forced to explain that the basin discovered by the French expedition was used for ablutions, while the monk-guides brought the sick from the church of Mary located in the middle of the Great Palace to the water basin.

47. Compare e.g. S. A. IVANOV, *V poiskach Konstantinopolja, Putevoditel' po vizantijskomu Stambulu i okrestostjam*, Moscow 2011, 101-102. A. KOMPA Konstantynopolitańskie zabytki w Stambule [*Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia historica* 87 (2011), 123-214], 136, is more cautious of Düzgüner's hypothesis. On p. 136 he writes: «he tries to connect fragments of the mosaic floor of a mostly geometric pattern, dated to the 5th-6th c. as well as the barrel vaulted room located one level below with a spring – *ἀγίασμα* (the spring was provided with a still partially visible fresco), inconclusively dated to the 11th-12th c., with the Palace of Marina, the Hodegon monastery or the Church of Our Lady who leads the Way (Hodegetria), but these are still only preliminary hypotheses».

2) indirect evidence resulting from sources, especially the Hodegon's position in travellers' descriptions containing orderly topographical information, and early maps;

3) the analysis of archaeological and architectural remains within the context of information contained in written sources.

The Hodegon and the Great Palace

Literary sources suggest quite clearly that the Hodegon was located in the vicinity of the Great Palace, from which one can also clearly conclude that it was situated outside the Palace walls. Before the campaign against Crete (866), occupied by the Arabs, the uncle of Michael III, Caesar Bardas, visited the church of the Hodegetria. During this visit, his cloak fell from his shoulder, which the commander interpreted as an omen of his imminent downfall. In his description of the assassination of Bardas, which took place during the aforementioned campaign, Joseph Genesios contends that the caesar was aware of the danger and that he told his friends who were feasting at his residence – undoubtedly located within the Great Palace – about the ominous events which had occurred while praying in the nearby Hodegon monastery⁴⁸.

Latin sources describe the location of the monastery in a similar way. A patriographic description of the City based on a Greek text known as the *Mercati Anonymus*, places the monastery in a residential district, in the vicinity of the Hagia Sophia, close to the sea and the Great Palace, while also giving an explanation for the monastery's name as deriving from the healing of two blind persons led by the Virgin Mary to a water spring⁴⁹. Vincent of Beauvais (ca. 1190–1264) repeats this information in

48. Genesios IV 20 (ed. A. LESMÜLLER-WERNER – H. THURN, *Iosephi Genesii, Regum libri quattuor* [CFHB 14], Berlin 1973, 73): ἄπεισι πρὸς μονὴν λοιπὸν γείτονα, ἤπερ Ὀδηγοὶ κατωνόμασται. ANGELIDI, Discours, 117 points out the *passus*, but nevertheless gives the wrong pagination. Occurrences in the Hodegon are also described by Theophanes Continuatus IV 41 (205 BEKKER) = Kedrenos II 179 (BEKKER); Zonaras XVI 7 (ed. L. DINDORF, *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum*, Leipzig 1871, IV 20-21). VAN MILLINGEN, Walls, 259-260, mistakenly assumes that Bardas could have sailed from the sea gate of the Hodegetria directly to Crete after his visit to the monastery.

49. K. N. CIGGAAR, Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pèlerin anglais, *REB* 34 (1976), 211-268, here 249 [§ 4] (cf. S. G. MERCATI, Santuari e reliquie Costantinopolitane secondo il codice Ottoboniano Latino 169 prima della Conquista latina [1204], *Rendiconti della pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 12 [1936], 133-156, here 144 [reprint in IDEM, *Collectanea Byzantina*, Bari 1970, II 464-489, here 476]): *In parte palacii prope Sancta Sophia in mari iuxta magnum palacium est monasterium sanctae Mariae Dei genitricis. Et in ipso monasterio est sancta imago sanctae Dei genitricis quae vocatur Odigitria, quod est interpretatum deducatrix, quia in illo tempore erant duo ceci, et apparuit illis sancta Maria et deduxit eos ad aecclesiam suam et illuminavit oculos eorum et viderunt*

his *Speculum historiale*. In a description of the miraculous intervention of the icon during the Arab siege under Leo III, he mentions that the icon was kept in a monastery situated by the sea, in the vicinity of the palace and the city cathedral⁵⁰.

One may indirectly conclude from the writings of Niketas Choniates and Theodore Skoutariotes on the rebellion of John Komnenos the Fat (June 31, 1201) that the Hodegon was located outside the Great Palace, probably to the north, not far from the no-longer-extant ancient theater on the eastern slope of the Acropolis. As the rebels took control of most of the Palace, along with the Nea church and Our Lady of Pharos, the palace guards faithful to Alexios III (1195–1203) took shelter in the Hodegon monastery. Imperial troops from the Blachernae reached them at that place by sea, thereby avoiding the rebellious crowds in the streets. The combined forces then attacked John's army gathered in the theater and killed the usurper⁵¹.

Late Byzantine sources are less unambiguous, due to the relocation of the imperial residence to the renovated Blachernae palace⁵². Georgius

lumen. The traditional point of view, connecting the author with an English pilgrim (active 1089–1120) was corrected by Berschin, who identified him with the Amalfitan monk John (active in Constantinople ca. 1070), for which see W. BERSCHIN, I traduttori d'Amalfi nell'XI secolo, in: *Cristianità ed Europa. Miscellanea di studi in onore di Luigi Prosdocimi*, ed. C. ALZATI, Rome – Freiburg – Vienna 1994, I 237–243, esp. 241–242. ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 377 (these scholars noted that in the account for the first time the traditional etymology of the name *ὄδηγοι* – guides was replaced by the name derived from the icon).

50. VINCENTIUS BELLOVACENSIS, *Speculum historiale*, Douai 1624, 950 [XXIII 147]: *Apud Constantinopolim in monasterio sancti Dei genitricis iuxta palatium, in mari prope Sanctam Sophia erat imago beatae Mariae*.

51. Choniates 527 (VAN DIETEN); K. N. SATHAS, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, Paris 1894, VII, 429. Both chroniclers talk about imperial *πελεκυφόροι*, most likely identifiable as the Varangian Guard, a very likely source of the popular belief that the unit was associated with the Hodegon. See also KIDONOPOULOS, *Bauten in Konstantinopel*, 77; JANIN, *Géographie*, 200 (he gives the wrong pagination); BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, 378.

52. Pachymeres II 31 (I 219 FAILLER) and Gregoras IV 2 (I 87–88 SCHOPEN) mention that Michael VIII Palaiologos at first resided in the Great Palace, because the Blachernae complex had been ruined by the Crusaders. After the residence on the Golden Horn had been cleaned and renovated, the imperial seat was moved there no later than 1268. This was dictated by safety concerns. Despite this, in the 14th century, the Great Palace was still sporadically used as a venue for great ceremonies (e.g. Pachymeres IX 2 [III 221 FAILLER], writes about a ceremonial procession to the Great Palace held in 1294 on the occasion of the coronation

Pachymeres writes that Andronikos II went on foot from his residence (ἐξ ἀνακτόρων) to the Hodegon, after the revolt of Alexios Philanthropenos had been suppressed, in order to pray in front of the icon of the Virgin Mary in thanks for the victory and to place the Empire and the Church under God's protection. He then returned to the palace on horseback⁵³. This last note may imply that the emperor had a considerable distance to go, which favours the identification of the Blachernae as the imperial seat. However, it should be noted that Pachymeres does not mention the emperor entering the confines of the Great Palace or passing through the Chalke Gate while heading towards the Hodegon⁵⁴, which would have been natural if the church had been located within the area of the former residence. On the other hand, travelling from

of Michael XI Palaiologos). Nevertheless, part of the complex had fallen into ruin. See e.g. A.-M. TALBOT, *The Restoration of Constantinople under Michael VIII*, *DOP* 47 (1993), 243-261, here 250-251; E. BOLOGNESI, *Il Gran Palazzo*, *Bizantinistica: Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi*, Serie Seconda, 2 (2000), 197-242, here 200; F. H. TINNEFELD, *Der Blachernenpalast in Schriftquellen der Palaiologenzeit*, in: *Lithostroton. Studien zur byzantinischen Kunst und Geschichte. Festschrift für Marcell Restle*, ed. B. BORKOPP-RESTLE – T. STEPPAN, Stuttgart 2000, 277-285, esp. 278.

53. Pachymeres IX 13 (III 255, 257 FAILLER): ἀυτόθεν ἐξ ἀνακτόρων πεζῇ τὴν ὁδὸν διεξελθὺς ἅμα τῇ περὶ αὐτὸν τάξει, τὴν τῶν Ὀδηγῶν καταλαμβάνει μονὴν καὶ κατέναντι τῆς σεβασμίας εἰκόνης σταθεῖς, ἀπονέμει μὲν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τὴν προσοκύνησιν, λιπαρὰν τὴν ἰκεσίαν ποιούμενος, ἀπονέμει δέ γε καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν μετὰ θερμῆς ὑποπτώσεως, αὐτῇ γε μετὰ Θεὸν λέγων καὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν εἰς χέρας τιθεῖναι καὶ παρ' αὐτῆς καὶ μόνης ἐλπίζειν ἄξιαν γε τὴν διοίκησιν καὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις. Ταῦτα ποτνιασάμενος καὶ τὰ εἰκότα εὐχαριστήσας, ἐπιβὰς ἵππου, ὑπανεζεύγνυ πρὸς τὰ ἀνάκτορα. The publisher (note 88) proposes a location of the Hodegon to the east of Hagia Sophia in the vicinity of the Great Palace. See also R. S. NELSON, *Heavenly Allies at the Chora*, *Gesta* 43 (2004), 31-40, here 36 (reprint in IDEM, *Later Byzantine Painting*, Aldershot – Burlington 2007, III).

54. An anonymous description of Constantinople from Tarragona mentions the route of the Tuesday procession to the Blachernae by the Chalke Gate, see CIGGAAR, *Tarragonensis 127: Dum defertur beate Dei genitricis supradicta imago per urbem et transit iuxta basilicam Sancti Salvatoris, in cuius introitu idem Ihesus est egregie effigiat, sponte sua Dei genitrix sancta vertit se ad filium suum velit nolit ille qui portat eam, et matris imago se convertit ad videndum vultum filii volens cernere. volens et honorare filium qui fecit eam reginam angelorum*. However, from the above-mentioned excerpt it can be ascertained that the image was carried through the Augustaion, in whose southern side an image of Christ could be seen on the façade of the Chalke Gate, and so the procession passed through the Great Palace, cf. LIDOV, *Hodegetria*, n. 51.

the Blachernae in the direction of the Bosphorus by way of the sea walls along the Golden Horn, he could have reached the area east of the Hagia Sophia from the direction of Mangana⁵⁵. Therefore, the possibility that Andronikos arrived on foot by a route leading from the Land Walls to the far eastern end of the peninsula, as Michael VIII had done, cannot be excluded⁵⁶.

The complexity of the problem is illustrated by another text. Pseudo-Kodinos in his treatise on Byzantine court ceremony, probably written during the reign of John VI Kantakouzenos (1347-1354), states while describing rituals associated with Holy Week that the Hodegetria icon was displayed from the fifth Thursday of Lent until Easter Sunday in front of the chapel (*εὐκτήριον*) of Our Lady Nikopoios in the Blachernae Palace⁵⁷. On Easter Monday, the emperor would accompany the icon to the Upper Gate (*Ἵψηλά*), which connected the northern side of the Blachernae palace with the city, from whence it would return to the Hodegon⁵⁸. One can

55. A list of topographical names located along the route from the first region to the Blachernae (the so-called “Dispositio topographica” [§ 14] published as an appendix to the *Πάτρια* by Preger) was completed no earlier than the 12th century. In the description of the road from the Tzykanisterion to the Blachernae it mentions the Hodegon after this polo stadium and before Mangana, see *Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (292 PREGER). The significance of this document for research on the topography of this area is undermined by the fact that in the next list, which is more chaotic, the monastery is mentioned after the Nea church, and before the Baths of Zeuxippos, after which the names Armamenton, Topoi, the monastery of St. Lazarus and the church of St. Demetrios are also mentioned, *ibidem* 294-295.

56. On Michael’s triumphal march on August 15, 1261, heading to the palace by the Hippodrome, see Gregoras IV 2, (I 87 SCHOPEN). Similarly, John Kantakouzenos went on foot to the Hodegon during his triumph in the year 1347, see Kantakouzenos III 99 (II 607 SCHOPEN).

57. Pseudo-Kodinos IV (ed. R. MACRIDES – J. A. MUNITIZ – D. ANGELOV, *Pseudo-Kodinos and the Constantinopolitan Court: Offices and Ceremonies*, Aldershot - Burlington 2013, 174, 178). On the custom of carrying the Hodegetria at Easter to the Blachernae palace see also Doukas XXXVIII (272 BEKKER). According to ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 383, 385, this custom begun in the 14th century as a result of the special veneration that Andronikos II and Andronikos III reserved for the Hodegetria icon. On the chapel see JANIN, *Géographie*, 198-199 as well as Pseudo-Kodinos, commentary on 369-370; PATTERSON-ŠEVČENKO, *Servants*, 54; BACCI, *Legacy*, 331.

58. Pseudo-Kodinos, IV (181 MACRIDES *et alii*). P. MAGDALINO, *Pseudo-Kodinos’ Constantinople*, in: IDEM, *Studies on the History and Topography of Byzantine Constantinople*, Aldershot - Burlington 2007, text XII, 3, reconstructs the location of the gate on the basis of

reconstruct the icon's processional route as proceeding along the shore of the Golden Horn. Such a hypothesis finds support in another written source. During his visit to Constantinople in the spring of 1200, the Novgorod pilgrim Dobrynia Iadreiĳkovitch, saw the Hodegetria image displayed in the Nea church, from which it was carried by the Petriion (*Пятерицею*) to the Blachernae complex⁵⁹. The source does not indicate however, whether the way to the Petriion lead along the sea walls around Acropolis, by Strategion or through Makros Embolos.

On 8 February of the year 1347, John Kantakouzenos swore an oath before the icon, displayed in all probability in the Blachernae palace, thus ending the civil war⁶⁰. In this case, the presence of the image in the Blachernae palace cannot be explained by the period of Holy Week, or the Tuesday procession (that had been associated with Pulcheria since the Middle Byzantine period)⁶¹, because the above-mentioned event took place on a Thursday. Perhaps he brought the icon from the monastery to the imperial

evidence from the next chapter of Pseudo-Kodinos V (196-198 MACRIDES *et alii*), where the source states that Varangian guards, which accompanied the emperor, awaited there, while he was on his way to the church of Blachernae on the feast of Hyrapante.

59. *Kniga Palomnik: Skazanie mest svjatykh vo Caregrade Antonija, archiepiskopa Novgorodskogo v 1200 g.*, ed. Ch. M. LOPAREV. *Pravoslavnyj palestinskij sbornik* 51 (1899), 21 (see also 82): Целовали же есмѧ і образъ пречистыѧ Богородицы Одогитрия, юже свѧѧі апостоль Лука написаль. Иже ходитъ во градъ і Пятерицею, къ ней видить и Лахерную свѧую, к ней же Духъ Свѧтыи сходитъ. A better lection of the slightly corrupted text is given by *Putešestvie novgorodskogo archiepiskopa Antonija v Car'grad v konce 12-go stoletija*, ed. P. I. SAVVAITOV, Sankt-Petersburg 1872, 33, 95-96 (We kissed there also a picture of the all-pure Theotokos Hodegetria, which was painted by the saintly apostle Lukas. It is carried through the city, by the Petriion, it is seen [it is carried to – after Savvitov lection] in holy [B]Lacherns, [where] the Holy Ghost descends on it). Information about the carrying of the icon in processions around the city (but without precisely indicated direction) is repeated by Dobrynia in his *Tale of the Taking of Tsar'grad*. This fact seems to be of key importance for a proper reconstruction of *Kniga Palomnik's* fragment, see *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov*, ed. A. N. NASOVNOV, Moscow – Leningrad 1950, 49, 245. About Petriion see A. SCHNEIDER, *Mauern und Toren am Goldenen Horn*, Göttingen 1950, 72-74.

60. Kantakouzenos III 100 (III 8 SCHOPEN), and also observations made by MACRIDES – MUNITIZ – ANGELOV, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 179, 181, note 507.

61. In the period before the Fourth Crusade, Pulcheria was associated with the procession by the anonymous author of *The Tale* (see ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 141), as well as Mesarites (cf. *supra*, note 24).

residence in order to strengthen his status by means of the presence of the relic, as Andronikos II had done⁶². On the other hand, Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, the Castilian ambassador to the court of Timur (1403), adds in his description of the Tuesday processions that the image was also carried to the Hagia Sophia on various holidays⁶³. A review of the above-mentioned sources shows that portable objects, such as icons, were moved about for reasons that are not always understandable and the route of the procession was not precisely described. This is why the route of the procession is of no help in the reconstruction of the original location of the sanctuary. It is therefore necessary to turn to an analysis of the information on the position of the actual Hodegetria monastery.

62. Gregoras IX. 6 (I 421-425 SCHOPEN) on the capitulation of Andronikos II in the year 1328.

63. Clavijo, *Embajada*, 45.

The Hodegon and the Palace of Marina

We are told about the locations of Hodegon and Marina's Palace relative to each other by the anonymous author of *The Tale of the Divine and Venerable Church of the Most Holy Mother of God, called the Hodegon*. This text was discovered in 1988 on Mount Athos, in the Vatopedi monastery, by Kriton Chrysochoides. It was originally part of an unknown codex and consists of thirteen sheets of parchment written around 1438-1439, which can be ascertained by the list of moveable feasts for the years 6947-6950 AM (1438/39-1441/42) on sheets 12-13. However, the text of *The Tale* (fol. 1r-10v), which comes after the list, is a compilation of various, and sometimes, much older legends concerning the Hodegon⁶⁴.

Among them, there is a description of Emperor Constantine V Copronymus' broken Horologion, which gives us a glimpse of the realities of the early period of Iconoclasm⁶⁵. According to the text, a copper clock fell and broke, and there was nobody at the court who was skilled enough to repair the sophisticated device. Michael, the emperor's valet (*διδάκτορας*), recommended to the ruler his brother Hypatius, well-versed in copper working and mechanics, and who lived in a monastery on the island of Oxeia. Although he was at first concerned for his safety, the monk was persuaded by his brother and the emperor's assurances to come to Constantinople and within a few days he was able to fix the device. The emperor asked Hypatius what he would like to receive as a reward. As the humble monk did not express any wishes, the emperor offered to put him in charge of one of three monasteries in the capital: Sergius and Bacchus by the Hormisdas' palace, Kallistratos or the Florus⁶⁶. Hypatius did not accept any of these, but asked

64. ANGELIDI, Discours, 113 (she accepts the 10th c. as the date of the story of Hypatius).

65. ANGELIDI, Discours, 141, line 175-147, 225 (see also the Russian translation KRYUKOV, 469-471). Recently, an attempt to identify the clock from the legend with the mechanism on the Augustaion (near Milion) known from descriptions by Malalas and Lydos has been made by B. ANDERSON, Public clocks in late antique and early medieval Constantinople, *JÖB* 64 (2014), 23-32, here 24.

66. For the church and monastery of Sergius and Bacchus in Justinian's former palace, see C. MANGO, The Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople and the Alleged Tradition of Octagonal Palatine Churches, *JÖB* 21 (1972), 189-193; IDEM, The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus once again, *BZ* 68 (1975), 385-392 (according to him the church was erected between 531 and 536, as a katholikon of a Monophysite monastery created by Theodora

instead to be allowed to take care of the abandoned chapel of the Virgin Mary, known as the Hodegon, located in the vicinity of Marina's palace, where, at that time, the imperial weavers were located⁶⁷.

The private residence of Marina (403-449), the unmarried daughter of Arcadius (395-408), who was a virgin by choice, just like her sister Pulcheria⁶⁸, was located in the first region of Constantinople⁶⁹. The palace was probably built shortly before 420, when the princess reached the age of 17⁷⁰. It became state property after Marina's death, as she had no offspring and, accordingly, no heirs. Hence the palace was run by curators⁷¹. It served various public uses: during the Second Council of Constantinople (553),

for monks whom she had gathered at the Hormisdas' palace). Brian Croke returned recently to the less convincing early date (between 524 and 527) of the foundation. See B. CROKE, Justinian, Theodora, and the Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus, *DOP* 60 (2006), 25-63, especially 49-53; see also MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 177-183; JANIN, *Géographie*, 275-276 (Kallistratos monastery), 466-470 (Sergius and Bacchus monastery), 495-496 (Florus monastery).

67. ANGELIDI, Discours, 145, lines 184-187: Ἀλλ' εἰ κελεύει τὸ σὸν κράτος εὐεργετήσαί μοι, τὸ σεμνὸν εὐκτῆριον δωρησάτω μοι τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου, τὸ δὲν πλησίον τοῦ ἐνδόξου παλατίου τῶν Μαρίνης, τὸ ἐπιλεγόμενον Ὀδηγῶν, ἔνθα καὶ ἰστοουργικὴ τῆς σῆς βασιλείας ἐξυφαίνεται ὕφανσις. Constantine fulfilled the monk's wishes, giving him both the church and the weaver's workshop. ANGELIDI – PΑPAMASTORAKIS, Veneration, 374-375 remark on the importance of this excerpt.

68. On Marina's life see *PLRE* II 723 [Marina I].

69. See *Notitia dignitatum* (*supra*, note 26): *domus nobilissimae Marinae*; and also e.g. G. DAGRON, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, 97; ANGELIDI, Discours, 120.

70. *Chronicon paschale*, Olympiad 294 (ed. L. DINDORF, *Chronicon Paschale*, Bonn 1836, I 566), for the year 396 Arcadius' three daughters are mentioned. Arcadia founded the Arcadianae Bath, while Marina founded the house of Marina: Μαρίνα δὲ τὸν οἶκον ἔκτισε τῶν Μαρίνης. The *terminus ante quem* for the construction of the residence is determined by the reference in *Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae*, see J. IRMSCHER, Das "Haus der Marina", in: ΓΕΠΑΣ: *Studies Presented to George Thomson on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, eds. L. VARCL – R. F WILLETTS, Prague 1963, 129-133 (with a particular analysis of historical sources).

71. Theophanes, *Chronographia* AM 6053 (I 235, DE BOOR) mentions that Emperor Justinian received an audience with George, a curator of the palace of Marina (κουράτωρ τῶν Μαρίνης). The chronicler mentions the same curator again in the following year 561 (*ibidem*, AM 6054; 237 DE BOOR). C. MANGO, The Palace of Marina, the Poet Palladas and the Bath of Leo VI, in: *Εὐφροσύνη. Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν Μ. Χατζηδάκη*, ed. E. ΚΥΡΑΙΟΥ, Athens 1991, I 321-330.

the palace was inhabited by visiting bishops⁷². When Belisarius died, his valuables were stored in the Palace of Marina⁷³, and in 606/607 the marriage of the daughter of Phocas, Domentzia, to Priscus took place there⁷⁴.

There are no further references to the Palace of Marina in later sources, most probably due to the fact that Leo VI (886-912) converted it into baths, which were subsequently renovated by his son Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913-959):

Constantine did not allow any of the buildings erected by his father to fall into ruin. This also applies to the great baths which had been built by Leo in the Marina. These baths had been as spacious and wondrous as had befitted such an empire, but these same baths fell into such disrepair due to neglect that they became a ruin stripped of all of their decorations and their foundations could be seen. This is why Constantine, who was proud of and felt satisfaction from the works of his father as if they were his own, refurbished and rebuilt the baths, not only by restoring all of the former decorations, but making them in reality even more wondrous by decorating them from every side and granting the bathers the pleasures which they had enjoyed earlier. The baths amazed foreign visitors and locals alike⁷⁵.

We can get some idea of the original appearance of the palace from the Epigram of Palladas of Alexandria (ca. 360-450) preserved in the *Palatine Anthology*:

72. *Sacrorum conciliorum collectio* IX 199 (MANSI) = *ACO* IV 1, 29, where in the course of the second session of the Council the Bishop of Limyra, Theodore, says that he visited the African Bishop Primasius in his residence in Marina's house; see also MANGO, Marina, 322.

73. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, AM 6057 (I 240 DE BOOR).

74. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, AM 6099 (I 294 DE BOOR).

75. Theophanes Continuatus VI 42 (460-461 BEKKER): Ὁ δὲ ἄναξ Κωνσταντῖνος μηδὲν τῶν πατρῶων αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομημάτων συγχωρῆσαι πεσεῖν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο τὸ μέγα λοντρον, τὸ παρὰ Λέοντος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ παρασκευασθὲν εἰς τὰ Μαρίνης, εὐρύχωρόν τε καὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς πολιτείας θαῦμα, τὸ πρότερον παροραθὲν ὡς ἀμελεῖα καὶ ὀρθομυία πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀμορφίαν καὶ ἀκοσμίαν ἐλάσαι καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο αὐτὸ σκοπεῖσθαι ἢ θεμελίους. οὗτος ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος τοῖς πατρικοῖς ἔργοις ὡς οἰκεῖος ἐπιγαννύμενος καὶ τερόμενος ἀνακαινισμὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιδίδωσιν, αὐθις ἀποκαθιστῶν, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸν πρότερον κόσμον ἀναφέρων ἀλλὰ πλέον κρεῖττονα δημιουργήσας, πάντοθεν περικαλλύνων καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἀποδιδούς τοῖς λονομένοις εὐπάθειαν. τοῦτο καὶ ξένους εἰς θάμβος εἰσάγει καὶ τοὺς ἐνδίκους ἐκπλήττει.

Εἰς τὸν οἶκον Μαρίνης

*Χριστιανοὶ γεγαῶτες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἐνθάδε ναιετάουσιν ἀπήμονες· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτοὺς
χώνη φόλλιν ἄγουσα φερέσβιον ἐν πυρί θήσει⁷⁶.*

On the House of Marina

*The inhabitants of Olympus, having become
Christians, live here undisturbed; for here they
shall not be put on fire in the melting-pot that
produces necessary small change.*

As Cyril Mango rightly noted, though the original poem is most likely older than the palace and the description contained in it did not originally refer to this structure, the fact that the distich was given this title (which probably happened in the second half of the sixth century) indicates that at that time the bronze statues of ancient gods adorned the palace of Marina. Therefore it cannot be excluded that they were placed there during the construction of the palace⁷⁷. This information is confirmed in the poetic description of Leo's baths found in the codex *Vat. Barb. gr.* 310 (f. 83v-86r) entitled: *Another anacreontic poem of the same Magistros Leo on the bath built by Emperor Leo in the imperial palace*⁷⁸. The author of this poem was

76. *The Greek Anthology*, ed. R. PATON, London 1917, III 295 [IX 528].

77. MANGO, Marina, 327-330. Mango's point takes on significant meaning in light of Kevin W. WILKINSON's considerations (Palladas and the Age of Constantine, *JRS* 99 [2009], 36-60, here: 38, 54-56; IDEM, Palladas and the Foundation of Constantinople, *JRS* 100 (2010), 179-194, here: 180-181), who proposes to shift the dates of Palladas' lifetime to around 250/60 until 331 (sic!), and interprets the epigram in the context of aniconic actions taken by Constantine the Great including the melting down of bronze statues into coins (circa 330). This controversial interpretation rules out the authenticity of the description, but does not undermine its informational function in light of the activity of the sixth-century author of the lemma who adapted the epigram to the realities of Marina's residence.

78. Ἐτερον ἀνακρεόντιον τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαγίστρου Λέοντος εἰς τὸ λουτρὸν τὸ ἐν τῇ βασιλείῳ ἀλλῇ ὑπὸ Λέοντος τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος οἰκοδομηθέν. The text was published a few times in the modern era: P. MATRANGA, *Anecdota Graeca*, Roma 1850, II 565-568; TH. BERGK, *Poetae lyrii graeci III. Poetae melici*, Leipzig, 1882, repr. 1914, 358-360. Contemporary critical editions: P. MAGDALINO, The Bath of Leo the Wise, in: *Maistor: Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, ed. A. MOFFATT, Canberra 1984, 225-240, here:

the poet, theologian, and diplomat Leon Choïrosphaktes (ca. 845-920), who was also granted the titles of *μυστικὸς* and *σπαθαροκανδιδάτος* by Basil I, and, at Leo's court, the additional titles of *ἀνθύπατος*, *μάγιστρος* and *πατρικίος* (in 896); he was also called Magister⁷⁹.

From the chronological outline of Leo's poem preserved in the Vatican manuscript, Magdalino has concluded that the description of the imperial baths must be dated to the period after the marriage of Leo to Zoe Karbonopsina, i.e. just after Easter in 906, and that the opening expression directed at the audience (lines 9-13, 34) may indicate that it was intended for a public reading during a ceremonial inauguration of an edifice (*ἐγκαίνια*) for the public⁸⁰. Assuming that poems from Choïrosphaktes' collection were composed in a short period of time one after another, while also taking into consideration the author's later troubles⁸¹, one can infer a coincidence

227–231 (with an English translation); IDEM, The Bath of Leo the Wise and the 'Macedonian Renaissance' Revisited: Topography, Iconography, Ceremonial, Ideology, *DOP* 42 (1988), 97-118, here: 116-118; *Cinque poeti bizantini: Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310*, testo e traduzione F. CICCOLELLA, Amsterdam 2003, 94-106 (with an Italian translation); see also T. K. J. NISSEN, *Die byzantinischen Anakreonteen*, München 1940, 60, 62.

79. For a portrait of Leo as a courtier and his writings see G. KOLIAS, *Léon Choerosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie 31), Athènes 1939, esp. 15-75 (along with an edition of Leo's *Letters*); P. MAGDALINO, In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choïrosphaktes and Constantine Manasses, in: *Byzantine Court Culture*, 141-165, here: 146-161; LEON MAGISTROS CHOIROSPHAKTES, *Chiliostichos Theologia*: Editio princeps, Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Indices besorgt von I. VASSIS, (Supplementa Byzantina 6), Berlin 2002, esp. 1-10 (a verse edition of Leo's theological tract); M. J. LESZKA, The Monk versus the Philosopher. From the History of the Bulgarian-Byzantine War 894–896, *Studia Ceranea* 1 (2011), 55–70 (on Leo's diplomatic mission to the Tsar Simeon in 895-896).

80. MAGDALINO, Bath, 226; IDEM, Bath Revisited, 90.

81. This hypothesis relating to the year 906 as a *terminus ante quem* for the creation of the poem is strengthened by the fact that at the end of this year Choïrosphaktes went with a diplomatic mission to the Abbasid court in Baghdad [see e.g. R. J. H. JENKINS, Leo Choerosphactes and the Saracen Vizier, *ZRVI* 8 (1963), 167-175 (repr. IDEM, *Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th Centuries*, London 1970, text XI)], and shortly after his return to Constantinople (probably at the beginning of 907) he fell out of favor and was exiled to a place called Petra. At this time, he was also attacked by Arethas, the bishop of Caesarea, who accused him of paganism. His rehabilitation and return to favor at the court probably took place after the death of Leo VI, see KOLIAS, *Léon Choerosphactès*,

of dates between the works in Marina's palace and the enlargement of Theophilos' tower in the sea walls⁸².

Unfortunately the poem does not contain any clues as to the location of the structure. However, the description is not without significance for further considerations on the location of the palace. Therefore, it is necessary to refer to the most important information contained in the poem. The work is written in the style of an *ἔκφρασις* and it offers readers a vision of an opulent edifice with numerous references to ancient pagan traditions. From the poem it may be inferred that the baths had a centralized layout and were preceded by a spacious entrance hall (*πρόδομος μακρός*) filled with sculptures and surrounded by a colonnaded hall⁸³. The warm bathing pool had eight semi-domes⁸⁴, was surrounded by colonnades featuring gilded capitals and surmounted by a dome and an apse, which were also covered with gold (*θολοκογχόχρυσον ἔργον*), most likely in the form of mosaic tesserae⁸⁵. The building was topped by ancient statues, though it cannot

54-56; Magdalino, *Courtier*, 150-151. However, S. TOUGHER, *The Reign of Leo VI (886-912): Politics and People* (The Medieval Mediterranean 15), Leiden - New York - Cologne 1997, 142-143 points out that Leo VI's fourth marriage was not canonical and, accordingly, it is hard to imagine that Choerosphaktes would have decided to honor it with a poem intended to be read publicly. Also, in the spring of 906, the author may have been outside of Constantinople on an envoy to the emirs of Tarsus and Melitene which had begun in the autumn of 905 (see KOLIAS, *Léon Choerosphactès*, 47-52). Hence, Tougher suggests that the previous poem in Choerosphaktes' collection should be associated with the engagement of Leo to Zoe Zaoutzaina (898). Accepting his argument only means broadening the time span for the construction of the baths to the period between 898 and 906.

82. See *supra*, note 41.

83. MAGDALINO, *Bath*, 234; IDEM, *Bath Revisited*, 100-101; cf. C. CUPANE, *Traumpaläste von Byzanz. Eine unbeachtete Ansicht von «Constantinople imaginaire»*, *Nea Rhome* 6 (2010), 407-439, here 430.

84. Lines 81-82: Ὑπὸ τὴν μέσην δὲ λάμπει / ὑδάτων ἐν ὀκτακόγχῳ. MAGDALINO, *Bath Revisited*, 100, presents a possible reconstruction of an architectural structure with eight conchs (which, however, seems to be a particularly complicated solution), as well as a basin featuring eight semi-circular niches - similar to the aforementioned basin discovered by Demengel and Mamboury. Nevertheless, Magdalino does not associate the description with the marble remains discovered in the Mangana neighborhood, but instead sees an analogy with baptismal fonts in baptisteries.

85. MAGDALINO, *Bath Revisited*, 100-101 expresses his objection to such an interpretation, citing as an example the gilded exterior of the Nea dome. In doing so, he ignores

be ascertained whether these were the same statues mentioned in Palladius' epigram. Other sculptures depicting battle scenes (Gigantomachy?) were arranged in other parts of the building. According to Magdalino, they may have been ancient spoils⁸⁶. A pair of enthroned rulers was painted on the face of the main semi-dome (πρόκοιτος; lines 34-38), which this scholar interpreted at first as being the likenesses of Leo VI and Zoe Karbonopsina (9 January 906 – 11 May 912)⁸⁷.

However, in his analysis of Choïrosphaktes' description, Cyril Mango noted that both the ancient statues (i.e. the female personifications of water sources), the depictions of animals (i.e. lion, snake, crane, griffin), and the bucolic maritime scenes in later parts of the poem rather correspond to the realities of late ancient art than to those of the age of Leo VI. Moreover Mango believes that the enthroned couple depicted in the semi-dome are mythological characters – Poseidon and Amphitrite, or Oceanos and Thetis, rather than an enthroned emperor with his spouse⁸⁸.

These observations, along with information provided by Constantine Porphyrogenitus about further restoration works carried out in the baths during his reign, i.e. shortly after their supposed construction, led Mango to mistakenly identify the building with the Oikonomieion Baths⁸⁹, whose construction is attributed by the *Patria* to Constantine the Great⁹⁰. It seems that Mango did not pay attention to Magdalino's serious reservations about such an identification when citing his remarks. Magdalino has observed that the author of the *Patria* is not only silent about Leo as the supposed

the fact that the order of the description in Leo's poem, in which the viewer seems to be led from the entrance to the centre of the building, excludes such an interpretation of this excerpt.

86. MAGDALINO, Bath, 234.

87. MAGDALINO, Bath, 230, note 10 (where he analyzes the allusion to kinship between Leo Magistros and the empress).

88. MANGO, Marina, 326-327, 330: he notes the epithet γαῖήροχος (ruler of the world) as referring to Poseidon of Homeric Greek, while the use of the word φιλάδελφε (according to Magdalino used to show on the stage a blood relationship between Choïrosphaktes and the empress Zoe) was a reference to a mutual kinship of ancient gods. MAGDALINO (Courtier, 147) finally accepts Mango's remarks.

89. MANGO, Marina, 323 expresses his doubts and difficulty in trying to imagine that the baths fell into ruin within 50 years. His opinion suggests that the baths may have already existed earlier and were merely refurbished by Leo VI.

90. *Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* I 60 (145 PREGER); see also BERGER, *Bad*, 153-154.

restorer of the complex (although he is mentioned as the founder of the church of St. Lazarus)⁹¹ but he also points out that the furnishings and the architectural layout of the Oikonomeion baths differ significantly from what is described by Choïrosphaktes. According to the *Patria*, the baths of Constantine had seven halls corresponding with the seven planets, twelve porticoes in reference to the twelve months and a great bathing pool⁹². The *Anonymous Description of Constantinople* (late 1389 – early 1391) also confirms the distinct independence of both structures, most strikingly in its later Novgorod edition, known as the *Dialogue on the Shrines and Other Points of Interest of Constantinople*. The author not only distinguishes the ruins of the Baths of Constantine, which were still visible at that time beneath the sea walls, from the remains of Leo's Baths (a water collector dried up already in the 14th c.), located in the vicinity of the Imperial Palace, but also blames the participants of the Fourth Crusade for the destruction of Leo's Baths⁹³, while the *Patria* informs us that John Tzimiskes (969-976) demolished the Oikonomeion Baths and reused building materials for the construction of a chapel over the *Chalke Gate*⁹⁴. Accepting Mango's reservations regarding the sculptural program of the structure renovated by Leo, one cannot accept the proposed interpretation according to which the Palace of Marina is associated with the Baths of Oikonomeion. Instead, another possibility could be considered – though this is, of course,

91. See *infra*, note 104.

92. MAGDALINO, *Bath Revisited*, 100. Presented on the following pages (113-114) Magdalino's attempts to identify Leo's baths with these of Oikonomeion are not convincing.

93. *Beseda o svjatyňjach i drugich dostopamjnostjach Caregrada*, see МАЈЕСКА, *Russian Travelers*, 143 (and note 50), 243 (although the story was confusingly written and it is possible to get the mistaken idea that the cistern and barrel with seven spouts in Leo's bath belonged to the baths of Constantine): *А под стеною въскраи моря медведи камены и збури камены. Да была мовница Констянтинова высока велми, да и вода возведена была там и корыта аспидна, желобы были аспидньи; да уже все потеряно. А под царевым двором ины были полаты. В тых полатах есть чаша, воды полна; проходячи крестьяне и фрязове взимали воду от чаши, а воды не убывало, но всегда стоала полна, от тоє воды бывало исцеление болным, а на сих летех пражна чаша стоит.*

94. Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, *loc. cit.* It should be noted that in his earlier publications Mango clearly separated the Baths of Constantine from Leo's complex in the Palace of Marina, see C. MANGO, *Daily Life in Byzantium*, *JÖB* 31/1 (1981), 337-353 (reprint in *IDEM, Byzantium and its Image*, London 1984, IV), here 340-341.

a hypothesis not based on any reliable evidence – that within Arcadius' daughter's residence there were some chambers intended for bathing which were restored by the emperor, while preserving parts of the original decor.

It seems that Symeon Logothete's account of events that took place after the murder of Michael III (September 23-24, 867)⁹⁵ remains the key to establishing the location of the Palace of Marina. The chronicler informs us that after the emperor had been killed, in the suburban Palace of St. Mamas, situated on the European bank of the Bosphorus, in the area of the contemporary Beşiktaş neighbourhood (most likely in the vicinity of the Dolmabahçe Palace), Basil, accompanied by his friends, wanted to reach the Great Palace as quickly as possible in order to seize control of it. However, due to rough seas, the conspirators were afraid to sail directly to the area of the Palace, but instead walked to Galata (Πέριον) and there they crossed the Golden Horn. Finding themselves on the southern side of the bay, they headed to the house of Eulogius the Persian (location unknown to us), perhaps in the area of the Strategion. Taking the home owner with them, they arrived at the Palace of Marina, where they broke through the first barrier, in which Basil, with two of his accomplices, kicked down a stone slab (πλαῖξ) that was blocking their way. When they finally, reached the walls of the Great Palace they were unable to overcome this obstacle. Eulogius then spoke in his own language to the gate keeper, who was the Persian mercenary heteriarch Artabases. Upon learning of the death of Michael, Artabases got the key and opened the gate for them⁹⁶.

Both the direction from whence Basil and his accomplices arrived and the two circuits of walls demonstrate that the conspirators reached the Great Palace from the north, from the direction of the first hill (Acropolis). The wall made of stone slabs, most likely not very sturdy, could have been the fence surrounding the Palace of Marina or the weavers' house located nextdoor at that time. That is why most researchers assume that Marina's

95. On the circumstances of the assassination see E. KISLINGER, Eudokia Ingerina, Basileios I. und Michael III, *JÖB* 33 (1983), 119-136, here 131-132. Plotters' profiles analyses F. WINKELMANN, *Quellenstudien zur herrschenden Klasse von Byzanz im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert* (BBA 54), Berlin 1987, 85-94.

96. Symeon Magister 131, 52-53 (258-259 WAHLGREN - see also Georgios Monachos' and Pseudo-Symeon's abbreviated versions published in: Theophanes Continuatus, [685, 838 BEKKER]); MANGO, Marina, 322.

residence was situated to the north or northeast of the Great Palace⁹⁷. Consequently, it must have stood to the east of the Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene. It can also be concluded from the description that it must have been located beyond the wall surrounding the Great Palace built by Justinian II⁹⁸.

Mango proposes a different interpretation of the same description: he assumes that the first wall forced by Basil must have been the sea walls of Constantinople. Based on this, he concludes, in contradiction to the circumstances described by Symeon, that the conspirators reached the southeast edge of the palace complex, in the area of the Bukoleon Harbor and hypothesizes that the baths in the Palace of Marina are identified with a curtain wall with semicircular-topped windows in front of the façade of the Kaylon Hotel (28°58'50.29" E and 41°00'10.29" N)⁹⁹, hence in an area not far from Düzgüner's later discoveries, which would seem to support the latter's opinion. This debatable hypothesis has been accepted by Eugenia Bolognesi¹⁰⁰, though even a brief review reveals many weak points, of which the following are the most crucial.

1) Even though the sea walls of Constantinople are not as impressive as the Theodosian circuit of land walls and they consist of a single curtain wall reinforced by towers, it is hard to imagine that the conspirators could have forced their way through them simply by kicking them, especially as it is known that the walls facing the Bosphorus had been thoroughly renovated

97. JANIN, *Constantinople*, 136, 221, 385 ascertained from the account that the Palace was located in the first region in the area of the Acropolis, in most likelihood to the east of Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene. MAGDALINO, *Bath*, 233; IDEM, *Bath Revisited*, 99, places it in the NE corner of the Great Palace.

98. Justinian II is believed to have erected the wall surrounding the Great Palace in 693–694, see Theophanes, *Chronographia* AD 6186 (I 367 DE BOOR). According to BOLOGNESI (Gran Palazzo, 233), it extended to Marina's residence, which abutted the Great Palace (as one of its constituent parts). Stephen of Novgorod mentions that the height of Justinian II's walls exceeded that of the city walls, MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, 39, 242–43.

99. MANGO, *Marina*, 322–33.

100. E. BOLOGNESI RECCHI-FRANCESCHINI, *The Great Palace Survey: the Fourth Season* (1995), *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 14/2 (1996), 15–30, here: 16; EADEM, *The First Year of the Bukoleon Restoration Project and the Fifth Year of the Great Palace Survey in Istanbul* (1996), *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 16/1 (1998), 267–277, here: 270, figs. 4–7; EADEM, *Gran Palazzo*, 236.

by Emperor Theophilos (829–842) not so long before¹⁰¹. What seems more probable is that while heading towards the Great Palace from the direction of the Golden Horn, Basil passed through the ancient Acropolis and came across a weak wall, which was easy to force, surrounding Marina's residence or one of the churches in that area¹⁰².

2) In accepting Mango's interpretation of the account, according to which the conspirators at first arrived the Palace of Marina, and then forced their way through the first wall, we would have to locate the residence outside the sea walls, which would have been impossible in the Middle Ages as their circuit ran directly along the edge of the sea shore. This criticism is somewhat weakened by the fact the chronicler may have been referring to the walls surrounding the Palace, but this is excluded by Mango's interpretation.

3) The architectural form of the remains (fig. 11) referred to by Mango does not conform to the description given by Leo Choirosphaktes. While the poet speaks of a centralized structure surmounted by a dome, the remains by the Kaylon Hotel, which consist of parts of two walls, seem to imply a structure with an elongated rectangular plan, with its longer wall abutting the sea walls. This is a masonry structure in the *opus listatum* technique with occasional use of field stone (wall face) and elongated blocks of ashlar masonry (*moyen appareil*), which to a certain extent is similar to the eastern section of the neighbouring Bukoleon Palace. It might indicate that they originally belonged to that structure, though it cannot be excluded that Mango was partially right and that the ruins at the Kaylon Hotel belonged

101. Manasses mentions that Theophilos expended considerable sums in order to renovate the sea wall, see *Constantini Manassis, Breviarium historiae metricum*, ed. O. LAMPSIDES (CFHB 36), Athens 1996, I 259, lines 4747-4753. Numerous inscriptions preserved on the towers in the section of walls along the Bosphorus and the Sea of Marmara confirm the extensive work carried out by and funded during the reigns of Michael II, Theophilos and Michael III, see VAN MILLINGEN, *Walls* 182-185; S. ČURČIĆ, *Architecture in the Balkans from Diocletian to Süleyman the Magnificent*, New Haven 2010, 268.

102. J. P. A. VAN DER VIN, *Travelers to Greece and Constantinople: Ancient Monuments and Old Traditions in Medieval Travelers' Tales*, Leiden 1980, I 265, points out that in Clavijo's description there are many mentions of walls surrounding the monasteries in the capital. As an example, the anonymous Athonite *Tale* speaks of the wall (περιβολος) surrounding the Hodegon, see ANGELIDI, *Discours*, 137.

to the Oikonomeion Baths, situated in the vicinity of the Tzykanisterion of Basil I and the Sea of Marmara.

In summary, it should be pointed out that current evidence seems to support the traditional identification of the location of the Palace of Marina. Therefore, it is plausible to locate it in the northern area of the first region of Constantinople, to the north of the Great Palace in its late seventh-century form, and to the east of the churches of the Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene. Accordingly, the Hodegon, which was connected to Marina's residence, must also have been situated in this area. In order to establish its precise location and associate it with extant ruins we must also refer to other sources.

Hodegon and the St. Lazarus monastery

The cathedral of Constantinople, Hagia Sophia, is a crucial reference point, especially as it still exists. As previously mentioned, the Amalfitan monk John (Mercati Anonymous) places the Hodegon to the east of the Hagia Sophia, in the direction of the sea, and also mentions that the monastery of St. Lazarus was also located in the vicinity of the monastery of the Virgin Mary¹⁰³. This monastery, dedicated to the man resurrected in Bethany (John 11, 1-44), who later became the bishop of Kition in Cyprus, was erected by Leo VI in the 13th year of his reign (30 August 898 – 29 August 899), and the church was consecrated in April 901¹⁰⁴. That is the reason why there are no references to this complex in earlier sources in connection with the Hodegon. This situation changes significantly in the Palaiologan period, when travellers' accounts of Constantinople refer to the two monasteries as being next to one another.

103. CIGGAAR, *Pèlerin Anglais*, 249 [§ 4-5]: ... *In parte palacii prope Sancta Sophia in mari iuxta magnum palacium est monasterium sanctae Mariae Dei genitricis. [...] Iuxta autem monasterium sanctae Mariae Dei genitricis est monasterium sancti Lazari,...*

104. Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως III 33 (288 PREGER), mentions Leo as the founder and benefactor of the St. Lazarus monastery. The emperor was believed to have transferred the relics of Lazarus to the church from Larnaca along with the remains of his sister Mary of Bethany; in C. Mango's opinion, they actually took the relics of Mary Magdalene from Ephesus. The translation of the relics is recalled in two of Arethas' *Homilies*, 58-59 (ed. L. G. WESTERINK, *Arethae Scripta Minora*, Leipzig 1972, II 7-18). Based on an analysis of these in comparison with the twice celebrated holiday honoring the translation of St. Lazarus' relics mentioned in the *Synaxarion* of the Hagia Sophia (17 October and 4 May; see *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, éd. H. DELEHAYE [Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris], Brussels 1902, 146, 658-659), R. J. H. JENKINS – C. A. MANGO – V. LAOURDAS, *Nine Orations of Arethas from Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, BZ 47* (1954), 1-40 (reprint: R. J. H. JENKINS, *Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th Centuries*, London 1970, text VI), here: 7-11, 20-25, they concluded that the church was consecrated in May 902. However, it seems that the *terminus ante quem* for the consecration of the church is set by the death of Empress Eudokia Baiana († 12 April 901). *The Life of Saint Euthymius* informs us that Leo wanted to bury his wife in the newly built monastery; however, the hegumen Hierotheus dissuaded him from this idea by sending the body away to the gate of the Palace, see *Vita Euthymii patriarchae CP*, ed. P. KARLIN-HAYTER (Bibliothèque de Byzantion 3), Brussels 1970, 63 [X]. Pseudo-Symeon mentions that Leo founded the St. Lazarus monastery in the thirteenth year of his reign (see Theophanes Continuatus 704 [BEKKER]).

The anonymous author of the *Tale of the Holy Places, of the City of Constantine, and of the Holy Relics Preserved in Jerusalem and Collected by Emperor Constantine in the Aforementioned Imperial City* is especially detailed in his descriptions. At the end of his list of objects worth seeing in the cathedral he writes: *If you go to the east from St. Sophia toward the sea; to the right, there is the monastery called Hodegetria, and a bit further he adds, As you go to the north from Hodegetria toward Mangana, on the right side, there is the Monastery of St. Lazarus*¹⁰⁵. The Old Russian text was most probably compiled in Novgorod and is a translation of a Greek patriographic work. It is characterized by a high degree of accuracy in terms of geographical details. For example, a little later in the text the anonymous author tells us that heading to the cathedral in the south, in the direction of the Great Palace, one passes by the church of St. Euphemia¹⁰⁶, whose ruins can still be seen to the west of the Hippodrome. The evidence provided by the *Tale of the Holy Places* should therefore be considered reliable and especially important for establishing the precise location of the Hodegon.

Although we are not able to reconstruct the exact street plan in the area of the first region of Constantinople¹⁰⁷, we can try to compare various

105. МАЈЕСКА, *Russian Travelers*, 139: *От свѣтыа Софеи поузи на восток долу к морю естъ на праве манастиръ, рекомъи Дигитриа [...] А от Дегитриа, идя на полночь к Манганом, естъ на праве манастиръ свѣтаго Лазара*. DIEHL, Rapport, 247 already noted the importance of this source.

106. МАЈЕСКА, *Russian Travelers*, 143.

107. For general information on the urban layout and street plan of Constantinople see MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 216-217, 268-270; C. MANGO, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople: IVe-VIIe siècles*, Paris 1985, 19; A. BERGER, *Regionen und Straßen im frühen Konstantinopel*, *IstMitt* 47 (1997), 349-414; IDEM, *Straßen und Plätze in Konstantinopel als Schauplätze von Liturgie*, in: *Bildlichkeit und Bildorte von Liturgie. Schauplätze in Spätantike, Byzanz und Mittelalter*, ed. R. WARLAND, Wiesbaden 2002, 9-19; IDEM, *Streets and Public Spaces in Constantinople*, *DOP* 54 (2000), 161-172 (in the area relevant for this study, he reconstructs the central street G, the only street running from the SW to the NE to the east of Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene). M. MUNDELL MANGO, *The Porticoed Street at Constantinople*, in: *Byzantine Constantinople: Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life*, ed. N. NECİPOĞLU (The Medieval Mediterranean 33), Leiden – Boston – Cologne 2001, 29-51 (based on the *Notitia* she reconstructs the porticoed street I-II 1-2 that ran from the Augustaion to the SE in the direction of the shores of the Propontis). K. R. DARK, *Houses, Streets and Shops in Byzantine Constantinople from the Fifth to the Twelfth*

locations of the Hodegon complex proposed in the literature with the words of the patriographer. Plot no. 38 in the Cankurtaran neighbourhood, which Düzgüner believed to be the remains of the Hodegon, is located at a distance of 385 meters in a straight line from the nearest, SE corner of Hagia Sophia. However, the remains are located directly to the south of the church. Accordingly, it is hard to imagine that heading towards the sea shore, which is approx. 455 meters away from the cathedral, one could deviate so far off course to the right. One would expect the Old Russian source, in its attempt to be precise, to tell readers to walk in a southerly direction¹⁰⁸. The location suggested by Demangel and Mamboury's findings, which is presently inaccessible and only roughly known thanks to the presence of the tower that was enlarged by Leo VI, is also unsatisfactory. Even though the remains are located somewhat closer to the cathedral – about 315 meters away from the NE corner of Hagia Sophia (Leo's tower approx. 475), they are also shifted by 10 degrees to the north (only the tower is located along the eastern axis of the cathedral's NE corner and one would need to turn to the left in order to reach the sea shore).

Another complication which makes it impossible to support the identification suggested by Demangel and Mamboury is the second part of the account of the *Tale of Holy Places*. The archaeologists' assumption connecting the St. Lazarus monastery with the terrace of the 19th-century Gülhane¹⁰⁹ hospital conflicts with the information that this shrine was

Centuries, *Journal of Medieval History* 30 (2004), 83-107, is critical of the methods used by both researchers. Recently, Paul Magdalino presented a convincing reconstruction of the street layout on the Acropolis, made on the basis of Choniates and Prodromos descriptions of the triumphal way of John II Komnenos in 1133, see P. MAGDALINO, The "Columns" and the Acropolis Gate: a Contribution to the Study of the Ceremonial Topography of Byzantine Constantinople, in: *Philopation. Spaziergang im kaiserlichen Garten. Beiträge zu Byzanz und seinen Nachbarn. Festschrift für Arne Effenberger zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. N. ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER – F. DAIM, Mainz 2012, 147-156.

108. DÜZGÜNER, Iustinianus Dönemi'nde, 48, assumes that the street running down to the east towards the sea described by the anonymous Russian writer follows the same line as the contemporary İshak Paşa Caddesi street, though the modern street heads to the SE from Hagia Sophia.

109. DEMANGEL – MAMBOURY, *Manganes*, 79, fig. 1 (and after him e.g. MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, map II). JANIN (*Géographie*, 300) already expressed his reservations about this hypothesis (based only on the account of the John of Amalfi, unaware of the Novgorod text).

situated to one's left when heading to the north towards the palace-monastery complex in Mangana. This currently closed and dilapidated clinic is located about 220 meters to the southeast of the hexagon discovered by Demangel, i.e. in the exact opposite direction to that indicated by the medieval account.

The reliability of the Novgorod *Tale* is confirmed by other indirect premises that can be gleaned from the established topography used in the descriptions of churches in other sources¹¹⁰. From them one can conclude that the monastery founded by Leo VI was located between the Hodegon and the monastery of St. George in Mangana. An anonymous Armenian pilgrim who visited Constantinople sometime between the end of the 13th c. and 1434 follows in his account this system of topographical description, though not entirely consistently¹¹¹. He begins his narration conventionally by starting with the Hagia Sophia, and then proceeds to the Hodegon, which he calls the *Kiramos* monastery (surely a corruption of the Greek form *Our Lady* – Κυρά μας). He mentions the miraculous icon of the Virgin Mary with a scene of the Crucifixion on its rear which was kept in the church, as well as the Tuesday processions¹¹². He mentions next the St. Lazarus monastery and Tapratse¹¹³, which, in Brock's opinion, should be associated with the church of St. Mary τῶν Πατρικιάς¹¹⁴. From the reference to the relic of John

VAN MILLINGEN, Walls, 256, 258, refers to the Russian source in his reconstruction of the location of the Hodegon.

110. In addition the *Dispositio Topographica* § 71, 75-76, 78 (see Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, 295 PREGER) mentions the Lazarus monastery between the Hodegon and the churches of St. Demetrius situated on the northernmost promontory of Constantinople and the Mangana.

111. S. BROCK, An Armenian pilgrim's description of Constantinople, *REArm* 4 (1967), 81-102, here 86-87 [§ 2-11] (English translation); see also VAN DER VIN, *Travelers*, II 606-608.

112. BROCK, An Armenian, 86 [§ 2]; VAN DER VIN, *Travelers*, II 607.

113. BROCK, An Armenian, 86 [§ 3-4]. It should be noted that § 3a is incredible, as it mentions that from the entrance to the church of St. Lazarus it was possible to see Justinian's Column standing to the SW of Hagia Sophia. This seems to be unlikely (similar to the information about stairs leading to the galleries of the church) and BROCK (An Armenian, 93 and commentary on pp. 89-90) suggests that the entire excerpt is an interpolation from a description of the Hagia Sophia.

114. Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως III 204 (279 PREGER) and *Georgii Codini, Excerpta de antiquitatibus Constantinopolitanis*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1843, 125, place the church in

Chrysostom's skull being kept in the shrine we may associate the structure with the church called *Πεπευ* in Stephen of Novgorod account, which was located between the monasteries of St. Lazarus and St. George in Mangana¹¹⁵. The distance between all of these buildings could not have been great since Stephen of Novgorod says that during a visit to the church of Mary of Pantanassa he participated in the Tuesday procession of the Hodegetria icon.

A picture of the northern part of the first region of Constantinople as a district of monasteries can be gleaned from the accounts of late medieval Old Russian travellers. In the Late Byzantine period, approximately 10 monasteries and churches were located in a small area situated between the following points which are all less than 400 meters apart from each other: the Gülhane Hospital on the one hand and the ruins of Mangana near Pearl Kiosk (İncili Köşk) on the other¹¹⁶. A street ran between them and the Hagia Sophia to the octagonal pool which stood between the palace and the monastery in Mangana. The street passed by the Hodegon, the monasteries of St. Lazarus and Mary Panachrantos, the church of Mary τῶν Πατρικίας and the shrine of St. Cyprian, or alternatively by Mary Pantanassa and Christ Philanthropos¹¹⁷.

a general area to the east of Hagia Sophia, in a location closer to an undisclosed residence erected by Constantine the Great, see also JANIN, *Géographie*, 217.

115. Stephen of Novgorod speaks only of the head of Chrysostom, whereas the anonymous Armenian writer also mentions the heads of Sts. Kyriakos and Julitta. Stephen also suggests that the church was located between the shrine of the Savior, which was part of the Mangana complex, and the monastery of St. Mary Panachrantos, which was erected before 1073. On the other hand, Deacon Zosima mentions the head of John Chrysostom in the female convent between the churches of St. Lazarus and St. Cyprian of Antioch (while keeping to the topographical order in his account: Hagia Sophia – Hodegon – St. Lazarus monastery), see MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, 37, 183, 374-376. Based on Zosimas' account, VAN MILLINGEN, *Walls*, 256, concludes that the St. Lazarus monastery was located between the St. George complex in Mangana and the modern Ahırkapı lighthouse.

116. VAN MILLINGEN (*Walls*, 255-256) identified Mangana with the ruins at the Pearl Kiosk. It is described by DEMANGEL – MAMBOURY, *Manganes*, 70-76; WULZINGER, *Byzantinische Baudenkmäler*, 44-45; MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 136-138, fig. 125b. On the pool see MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, 366-372. On the layout see JANIN, *Géographie*, 70-76; P. LEMERLE, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin*, Paris 1977, 273-283; N. OIKONOMIDES, St. George of Mangana, Maria Skleraina, and the 'Malyj Sion' of Novgorod, *DOP* 34-35 (1980-1981), 239-246.

117. JANIN, *Constantinople*, 40 allows this as a possible variant. MAJESKA, *Russian*

The Florentine monk and geographer Cristoforo Buondelmonti presents the opposite direction in his description of Constantinople from the end of 1420 and the beginning of 1421¹¹⁸. In his *Liber insularum archipelagi*, which he dedicated to cardinal Giordano Orsini, Cristoforo mentions, at the end of his description of the capital of the Byzantine Empire, churches located in the eastern part of the city. He starts from the north with the monastery of St. George in Mangana, then lists Hagia Eirene, the monastery of St. Lazarus and the Hodegon which he calls, as did the anonymous Armenian traveller, *Chiramas*. Buondelmonti then heads to the south and slowly turns to the west, while listing in his account the following churches: the Nea, Sts. Peter and Paul (the no longer extant palace chapel of Justinian in the Hormisdas complex, abutting the church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus), and the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste (remodeled by Andronikos I Komnenos [1183–1185] as his mausoleum), a church situated along the Mese in the vicinity of the Tetrasyon and the intersection of this street with the great covered portico¹¹⁹.

There is another reason why Buondelmonti's work is important for a study of the topography of Constantinople: his description is accompanied by a simplified, map-like bird's eye view of the city. Although it schematically depicted the most important buildings of the capital and furnished them with lemmas, in our case the drawing is not helpful in establishing the relative locations of the Hodegon and St. Lazarus monasteries in relation to

Travelers, 382, points out that the first region of Constantinople became the favored place for the safekeeping of relics brought into the city from other places.

118. T. THOMOV, *New Information about Cristoforo Buondelmonti's Drawings of Constantinople*, *Byz* 66 (1996), 431-453, here 432-434.

119. In a shortened version of the text published in: CHRISTOPH. BUONDELMONTII FLORENTINI, *Librum insularum archipelagi e codicibus Parisinis Regis nunc primum edidit. praef. et annot.* G. B. L. SINNER, Leipzig-Berlin 1824, 124 and an older edition by Du Cange: *Ioannis Cinnami, Epitome*, ed. A. MEINEKE (CSHB), Bonn 1836, 181: *Stus Georgius de Mangana, Sancta Herini, Sanctus Lazarus, Chiramas, Enea, Petrusque Paulus, Sti XL martyrum...* Émile LEGRAND published a Greek translation based on a manuscript in the Seraglio Library: *Description des îles de l'archipel Grec (1420) par Christophe Buondelmonti*, Paris 1897 (repr. Amsterdam 1970), 89 (translation 245) [LXV lines 143-46]: οἶον ὁ τοῦ Ἁγίου Γεωργίου τῶν Μαγγάνων, ὁ τῆς Ἁγίας Εἰρήνης, ὁ τοῦ Ἁγίου Λαζάρου, ὁ τῆς Θεοτόκου, ὁ τῶν Ἐννέα, ὁ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, ὁ τῶν Ἁγίων τεσσαράκοντα Μαρτύρων (VAN DER VIN reprinted a French translation, II 668; see also BARSANTI, Costantinopoli, 223-224).

one another. Despite the fact that the *Liber insularum* was quite popular, it was never published in a printed edition and its various versions, full and abridged, circulated amongst readers in manuscripts furnished with hand-made drawings¹²⁰. Neither an autograph of the treatise nor any sketches connected with the oldest surviving codices have been preserved¹²¹, while the later versions belong to two diverse traditions, and the two buildings do not appear simultaneously in either of them¹²².

In miniatures classified by Giuseppe Gerola into Groups I and II A¹²³, a cylindrical structure topped by a dome set on a cubical base (most likely a quadrilateral walled enclosure) with a round topped entrance is consistently shown to the east of the Hagia Sophia¹²⁴. The identification of this image is made possible by inscriptions of the name Hodegon written in various, corrupted forms: *Mira* (*Cod. Ravenna fond. Classense 308*, fol. 58v), *Chiramos* (*Vat. Rossiano 702*, fol. 32v; *Brit. Lib. Arundel 93*, fol. 155r; codex *P/13* in the Caird Library in National Maritime Museum in Greenwich, fol. 30v; [fig. 12]), *j. odigitria* (*Par. lat. 4825*, fol. 37v; *Par. lat. 4823*, fol. 33v), *digitria* (*Par. Lat. Nov. acc. 2383*, fol. 34v), *Santa Maria* (*Düsseldorf Univ. Ms. G 13*, fol. 54r)¹²⁵. On the other hand, in Group II B in more or less the same

120. KAFESCIOĞLU, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 143-154, figs. 107, 113, 115 (author mentions 64 preserved copies).

121. MANNERS, *Constructing*, 81 and note 12 indicates the manuscript *Vat. Chigiana F. IV. 74* as the oldest; it is dated to 1422-1435 based on a comparison with other works of the scribe Onufrius da Penna.

122. G. GEROLA, *Le vedute di Costantinopoli di Cristoforo Buondelmonti*, *SBN 3* (1931), 249-279, here: 254; THOMOV, *New Information*, 436-37 (shows that the drawings were not the works of copyists and clearly demonstrates that establishing influences and links between various groups of miniatures is only possible after establishing a chronology of the manuscripts and studying the various textual versions); MANNERS, *Constructing*, 73-76, points to the Genoese colony at Chios as the place of production of the early codices of the *Liber insularum*.

123. GEROLA, *Le vedute*, 256-57; see also THOMOV, *New Information*, 439-440 (he mentions the *lemma*: *Chiramos* as a group showing common traits).

124. THOMOV, *New Information*, 449, presents a table of various versions of representations of the building.

125. GEROLA, *Le vedute*, 254, 268-69, figs. 2, 5-8; THOMOV, *New Information*, 448, figs. 2-4; BARSANTI, *Costantinopoli*, 182-97 and especially: 226-27, figs. 60, 65, 75, 78, 100; EFFENBERGER, *Die Illustrationen*, figs. 1-2, 27, see also *supra*, n. 34.

area¹²⁶, a small structure with a saddleback roof appears with the caption *S. Lazaros* (i.e. *Laur. Plut. XXIX 25*, fol. 42r) or *Lazar* (i.e. *Marc. Lat. XIV 45 (=4595)*, fol. 123r; [fig. 13])¹²⁷. The small dimensions of the shrine marked on the drawings are confirmed by the text of the *Homily on Mary Magdalene* by Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos. The author described the church of St. Lazarus as being quite small, but outshining other shrines¹²⁸.

Greek sources consistently locate the St. Lazarus monastery in the place known as *Topoi* (*Τόποι*)¹²⁹. According to the *Patria*, it was located between the neighbourhood of pottery craftsmen (*Τζυκαλαρέα*), which was in ancient Byzantium situated to the south of the Milion, and the *Mangana*¹³⁰. This has led to the assumption that the *Topoi* was located in

126. The St. Lazarus monastery is depicted quite far to the north on a sketch on fol. 61v in MS 106 [DV 50] in the Casanatense Library in Rome, as well as on fol. 25v MS 162 in the Ann Arbor Library at the University of Michigan. On the other hand, as an example, on fol. 42r in the codex *Plut. XXIX.25* in the Laurentian Library in Florence, the church is shown next to the hippodrome, hence considerably farther to the south, which however could be the result of the particular placement of other buildings on the map, see BARSANTI, *Costantinopoli*, figs. 83-84, 99.

127. GEROLA, *Le vedute*, 266-267, fig. 3; BARSANTI, *Costantinopoli*, figs. 61, 99.

128. *PG* 147, 573.

129. Theophanes Continuatus VI 18 (365 BEKKER), and also Pseudo-Symeon Magister (*ibidem* 704) and Pseudo-George the Monk 26 (*ibidem* 860); Symeon Magister 133, 33 (283 WAHLGREN). For the etymology of the name see DÜZGÜNER, *Iustinianus Dönemi'nde*, 46-49, though his unfounded attempt at identifying the church of St. Michael the Archangel in *Topoi* (in reality most likely τὰ Τζήρου, according to the *Life of Basil, Synaxarion* of the Hagia Sophia and the *Life of Basil the Younger* located in the *Arcadianae*) with the Michelion in Anaplis arouses objection. On the subject of the church τὰ Τζήρου, see JANIN, *Géographie*, 346 (with additional bibliography).

130. *Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* I 52, 53 (141-242 PRÉGER), see also GYLLII I 2 (14 *De topographia*): *The wall started from the Akropolis wall and extended to the tower of Eugenios, then went up to the Strategion, and went on to Bath of Achilles; the arch there, which is now called the gate of Ourbikios, was a land gate of the Byzantines. And the wall went up to the Chalkoprateia and the Milion; also there was a land gate of the Byzantines. And the wall went on to the Plaited Columns of the Tzykalareia, and descended to the Topoi, and returned to the Akropolis by the way of the Mangana and the Arkadianai.* JANIN (*Constantinople*, 12, 26, 296, 435) analyzes this excerpt and identifies Eugenios' Tower with the neighbourhood of modern Yalı Köşk Kapı (after him MAGDALINO, *Columns*, 148), whereas *Topoi* and *Arcadianae* in the vicinity of the Gülhane (cf. also SCHNEIDER, *Mauern*, 91-93, fig. 2). BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, 105-106, 166-175, 203-207, 311 and sketch 5 came

the area of the circuit of the sea walls. This hypothesis is confirmed by other references in sources that locate this place in the area of the Arcadianae and below the Tzykanisterion¹³¹. Patriographers also mention that after Basiliskos' rebellion had been crushed by Zeno (475), the usurper who had been betrayed by Amatios took shelter along with his family in the old Hagia Eirene church in the hope of finding refuge. The emperor then ordered thrones to be placed for senators and clerks in the Topoi, certainly not far from the shrine, and held a trial of the defeated rebels¹³².

All of the above evidence is of an indirect nature and does not unambiguously establish the exact location of the St. Lazarus monastery. However, taken together it does show that the monastery's location was most likely to the north of the Hodegon. Therefore, it seems unjustified to accept Demangel and Mamboury's opposing theory, which is based solely on the reference by Simeon the Logothete to a street descending from the Tzykanisterion to the church of St. Lazarus. Albrecht Berger was the first

to different conclusions. He seems to place Topoi and Arcadianae too far to the south. MANGO (*Développement*, 52) places the Arcadianae to the north of the Great Palace, which corresponds to Procopius' description, placing the baths on the shore of the Propontis, at the point where it meets the Bosphorus (Procopius, *De aedificiis* I 11/1-8 (41-42 HAURY). See also WULZINGER, *Byzantinische Baudenkmäler*, 43, who places the Arcadianae in the vicinity of the Indian Kiosk (no longer existing) of the Topkapi Palace, erected, however, up against the sea walls.

131. *Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* II 27 (164 PREGER = Codini, 79 BEKKER) tell us that in Arcadianae, near the church of the Archangel, there were stairs called Topoi. In his second *Homily* on the feast of St. Lazarus, Arethas of Caesarea (*Homilies* 59 [11 WESTERINK]) mentions that the crowds gathered by the sea were as numerous as in the previous year. On the other hand, Symeon Magister and Pseudo-George the Monk (Symeon Magister 133, 27 [281 WAHLGREN]) and Theophanes Continuatus 20 ([859 BEKKER]) write that St. Lazarus monastery was situated by the descent from the Tzykanisterion (*καταβάσιον τοῦ τζυκανιστηρίου*). Based on this, DEMANGEL and MAMBOURY (Manganes, 79), and after them C. Mango (JENKINS – MANGO – LAOURDAS, *Nine Orations*, 10 and note 1), question the location of the Lazarus monastery as being to the north of the Hodegon, though sources do not specify either the direction one descended from the Tzykanisterion, nor do they say whether it was the new stadium erected during the reign of Basil I or the remains of an earlier stadium located somewhat higher to the north.

132. *Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* III 26 (222-223 PREGER). This information is repeated in a somewhat different form in Suda α 3947, σ 1084 (ed. A. ADLER, *Suidae Lexicon*, Leipzig 1928-1938, repr. Stuttgart 1967-1971, I 360, IV 432).

to attempt to reconcile the hypothesis identifying the terrace of the Gülhane Hospital as the St. Lazarus monastery with the contradictory account by the Anonymous of Novgorod. Taking into consideration the order of descriptions in the *Dispositio Topographica*, from which it follows that the Hodegon sanctuary stood between the Tzykanisterion and the Topoi, he supposed that it must have been located to the south of the walls of the Seraglio, and also to the south of the Lazarus monastery¹³³. Nevertheless, when formulating his hypothesis in 1988, the German scholar was unacquainted with the anonymous *Tale from Athos* which was only published six years later by Angelidi. A careful reading of this text allows us to conclude that the early reconstruction by Wulzinger, though in many points naive and completely mistaken (i.e. placing the Nea church to the east of Hagia Eirene)¹³⁴, is in the case of the Hodegon supported by new evidence. That is why it seems appropriate to return to it and reverse the order proposed by Berger, by identifying the Hodegon with the Gülhane terrace.

133. *Dispositio Topographica* § 68, 71, 74 (see Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, 294-295 PREGER). BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, 376-378; S. EYICE, İstanbul'da Bizans İmparatorlarının Sarayı: Büyük Saray, *Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1(1988), 3-4 formulated a similar hypothesis independently of Berger. Eyice discerns traces of the Hodegon in the cistern in the sultans' stables. However, the Turkish archaeologist has not taken into consideration the fact that the proposed location is situated quite far from the sea, which conflicts with what is reported in the sources.

134. WULZINGER, *Byzantinische Baudenkmäler*, 48-49.

Hodegon and the Gülhane Hospital

The hospital building is an example of severe classicism. It was erected by Sultan Mahmud II in 1824 as a medical secondary school¹³⁵. At the end of the 19th century, Abdülhamid II (1876–1909) allocated the building to the sultan's Military Medical Academy (*Gülhane Askerî Tıp Akademisi*) which had just been founded under the direction of doctors invited from Germany. After essential refurbishments and adaptations, a military clinic (*Gülhane Tatbikat Mektebi*) was opened there on December 30, 1898, under the initial direction of Robert Rieder from Bonn, and from 1904, by his then assistant Franz Deycke¹³⁶. During the Balkan Wars and World War I, it served as a regular military hospital, and after the end of the latter war it ended up under the control of French occupying troops, just like the entire militarized zone at the foot of the Topkapi Palace. Despite the fact that the seat of the academy was moved to Ankara in 1941, the Gülhane Hospital continued to serve as a military medical institution until the end of the 20th century, while slowly falling into ruin. Since 2008, the dilapidated complex has been undergoing a thorough revitalization. However, it remains in the hands of military authorities and access to the building and a detailed analysis of its structure are still impossible.

The hospital is situated about 300 meters to the east of the NE corner of the Hagia Sophia at a 26-degree angle to the south (approx. 340 m distant at a 10-degree angle calculating from the SE entrance to the narthex of the cathedral), which means that its location precisely corresponds to the description of the Anonymous Novgorod pilgrim. The oldest central wing of the hospital was erected on a rectangular terrace measuring 18 by 13 meters. Its massive walls are additionally strengthened by buttresses on the north and south sides, while on the east side, huge pillars support six wide arcades (figs. 14-15) built of large ashlar and brick. Bricks were also used to line the interior walls. It can be concluded from the plan (fig. 16) published

135. The complex is already visible in the middle of the empty area within Topkapi circuit walls behind the fountain of Ahmet III on Gaspre Fossati's lithograph (1852) which depicts a view from the NE minaret of the Hagia Sophia, see e.g. NECİPOĞLU, *Architecture*, fig. 20c.

136. For the beginnings of the Gülhane hospital see R. RIEDER, *Für die Türkei: Selbstgelebtes und Gewolltes*, Jena 1903, I 5-7.

by Wulzinger that the vaulted interior was additionally supported by six columns with impost capitals that divided the space into twelve square bays, and that stairs leading to an upper story were located in the SE corner¹³⁷. The terrace not only ensured a level area on the slope of the first hill but also housed a cistern that had been used since Byzantine times and was still used by the hospital during summertime dysentery epidemics that afflicted Istanbul at the turn of the 20th century¹³⁸.

As was mentioned in the introduction, the healing water spring, together with St. Luke's painting of the Virgin and Child, was the most important element of the Hodegon shrine and was the source of its fame. However, as it can be deduced from Theodore Balsamon's epigram written to commemorate the renovation works undertaken by Isaac II, this *pool of Siloam with hot water* was furnished with an architectural setting in the shape of a round structure crowned by a dome¹³⁹. This prevents us from identifying the miraculous water spring with the cistern located under the Gülhane terrace. However, in the title of one of his other epigrams Balsamon mentions that the complex housed public baths (*δημόσιον λουτρόν*),¹⁴⁰ which could be associated with the cistern. Leaving the tempting idea of connecting the water collector with the Hodegon baths unresolved, it should be taken into consideration that a confirmation of the hypothetical location of a shrine on a high cistern terrace might be found in historical sources.

137. WULZINGER, *Byzantinische Baudenkmäler*, figs. 23-24; DEMANGEL – MAMBOURY, *Manganes*, fig. 96. Documentation of the conservation work currently being carried out by the Diy-Mar company from Ankara indicates that the columns were replaced with concrete pillars.

138. G. DEYCKE – RESCHAD EFENDI, Die Dysenterie in Konstantinopel: Ätiologische, experimentelle, und anatomische Studie, in: *Für die Türkei: Selbstgelebtes und Gewolltes*, hrsg. von R. RIEDER, Jena 1904, II 183-315, here: 210-12 and fig. 1. Dycke describes the cistern as "einer großen aus byzantinischer Zeit herstammenden Zisterne".

139. Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon XXVII (190-191 HORNA); P. MAGDALINO – R. S. NELSON edited an English translation with commentary in: *The Emperor in Byzantine Art of the Twelfth Century*, *BF* 8 (1982), 123-183, here: 153-154 (the authors tentatively suggest that the thermal equipment of the Hodegon derived from the Arcadianae). According to ANGELIDI – PAPAMASTORAKIS, *Veneration*, 380, the term *σταυροειδές θερμοκεντρογίον* might suggest a vaulted cistern with warm water. See also MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, 139 (a mention of holy water by the Novgorod Anonymous); Berger, *Bad*, 84, 129 and *supra* n. 1.

140. Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon XLII (200 HORNA).

The evidence that allows us to interpret the original shape of the complex's foundations in this way can be found in the introduction to the *Athonite Tale*. This part of the compilation, written in the highly metaphorical and poetic style of an *ἔκφρασις*, is filled with exaggeration and cannot be taken as a literal, precise description of the building. However, a number of allusions and details contained in the text allow us to speculate on the subject of the location and appearance of the Hodegon church. According to the description, the outline of the building was a dominant landmark in the skyline of the city as seen from the sea:

In the past sailors navigated using the battlements of the city walls as a landmark, now the crown of the church is enough. When we sail in boats, we do not need lights, torches, or any towers, because the church obscures the entire view of the city, while at the same time demonstrating the generosity of its rulers¹⁴¹.

In Angelidi's opinion the expression *οὐδὲν δεῖ λαμπτήρων οὐδὲ πυρσῶν οὐδὲ πύργων* can be understood as an allusion to the lighthouse situated in the NE corner of the Great Palace¹⁴². It is possible that the church was associated with the lighthouse erected on the order of Leo VI in the vicinity of his baths and which subsequently was demolished during the rule of the Crusaders¹⁴³. Although the functioning of this lighthouse is poorly documented, its hypothetical location could be in the area of the contemporary Ahırkapı lighthouse, which was built on the southern edge

141. ANGELIDI, Discours, 135, lines 24-28: *Πρότερον μὲν γὰρ ταῖς κορυφαῖς τῶν ἄκρων τῆς πόλεως οἱ πλείοντες ἐτεκμαίροντο· νῦν δὲ ὁ νεὸς ἀντὶ τῶν κορυφῶν ἀρκεῖ. Καὶ μόνοις ἡμῖν οὐδὲν δεῖ λαμπτήρων οὐδὲ πυρσῶν οὐδὲ πύργων τοῖς ἐν ναυσὶ πλέουσι, ἀλλ' ὁ ναὸς πληρῶν ἅπαν τὸ ὁρώμενον τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν μεγαλοφυχίαν τῶν ἐχόντων αὐτὴν ὁμοῦ δηλοῖ.*

142. ANGELIDI, Discours, 118 and note 29 refers to a general observation on the subject of lighthouses in Constantinople by JANIN, *Constantinople*, 409 while giving the wrong pagination.

143. Only the Anonymous of Novgorod mentions it in *Dialogue*, MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, 142, note 50. According to this source, the lighthouse was equipped on all sides with stained glass (*Latin glass*). It should be however noted, that another, more credible version of the text (*Tale of the Holy Places of the City of Constantine*, *Loc. cit.*) situates the lighthouse near the baths of Constantine (Oikonomeion), in which case it must have been the Pharos.

of the Seraglio promontory in 1755 because of navigation problems and numerous catastrophes that took place in this area.

Comparing the outline of the Hodegon with walls and towers in the city confirms its location in the vicinity of the sea walls, although it does not unambiguously settle the question of whether it was located in front of the walls on the sea shore or, as is more probable, towered over their crenellations from within the city. On the other hand, the reference to the impressive height of the church, even if this is a result of literary hyperbole, conflicts with Clavijo's description, according to which the Hodegetria was a small church¹⁴⁴. In order to understand this discrepancy it is necessary to refer to another excerpt from the *Tale* which reads:

Someone could say, in an attempt to show off the eloquence and the clarity of speech that the perfection of every stone is equal to the entire church, and the church to the walls that surround it, while the walls of the shrine suffice for the entire city. The size of the church is similar to a two- or three-story house, except that it exceeds them in greatness, and boasts a tripartite nature. The church has a visible underground, ground level, and an upper structure, divided into parts surrounded by suspended galleries accessible from below. These were not a result of happenstance, but were planned to ease movement within the building¹⁴⁵.

It can be surmised from the description that the Hodegon was erected upon an underground structure (*κατάγειος*) that was visible above ground. We can also infer that the actual church consisted of a nave with galleries and a crowing structure, most likely a dome. If we assume that Clavijo's words

144. Clavijo, *Embajada*, 44: *Iglesia muy devota que llaman Santa Maria de la Dessetria, y es una Iglesia pequena*.

145. Angelidi, *Discours*, 137, lines 34-41: Φαίης ἂν τῶν μὲν λίθων ἕκαστον ἀντὶ νεὸ τοῦ παντὸς εἶναι, τὸν δὲ νεὸ ἀντὶ τοῦ παντὸς περιβόλου, τὸν δ' αὖ περιβόλον τοῦ νεὸ πόλεως ἀποχρῶντα γενέσθαι, εἰ δὲ βούλει τὰ περὶ ῥαστώνης καὶ τρυφῆς ἀντὶ γὰρ τῶν οἰκιῶν τῶν διορόφων καὶ τριορόφων πάρεστιν ὄραν νεῶν τὸν μέγιστον, τῶν μὲν ἄλλων πολλαπλασίονα, αὐτὸν δὲ τριπλοῦν τῇ φύσει. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κατάγειός ἐστι θέα, τὰ δὲ ὑπερφῶς, μέση δὲ ἡ νενομισμένη, δρόμοι δὲ ὑπὸ γῆν τε καὶ κρεμαστοὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διήκοντες κύκλῳ ὥσπερ οὐκ ἐν προσθήκης μέρει, ἀλλ' ἐξεπίτηδες εἶναι δρόμοι πεποιημένοι (see also commentary on pp. 119-20, where the publisher links the underground structure with the miraculous spring mentioned by Balsamon).

only refer to the church, while the Anonymous of Athos describes the entire edifice including its underground level, which taken together comprised a large complex that was visible to sailors from afar and served as a landmark for navigation, this might explain the discrepancy between the two sources.

It seems that the construction of this multilevel structure should be connected with the renovation works carried out during the reign of Michael III mentioned in the *Patria*. The location of a church on an elevated terrace was not a common practice in the Byzantine Empire. However, it is possible to list a number of buildings in Constantinople between the 8th and 11th centuries that were designed in this way. The oldest examples of such structures are the Our Lady of Pharos church, which, similarly to the Hodegon, is considered to have been founded by Constantine V or Michael III, and the Nea church erected in 876–881 by Basil I in the southeast part of the Great Palace. Unfortunately, neither of these buildings has been preserved and their design can only be reconstructed from indirect evidence¹⁴⁶. In Guiland's opinion, the terraces on which they were built could have been the remains of older structures that were then reused¹⁴⁷. Nor do we know their original purpose. The function of the platform under the Nea church can be indirectly inferred from the reference made by the Syrian prisoner of war and geographer Harun ibn Jahya (alive c. 900). He mentions a fountain in one of the Nea courtyards powered by a nearby hidden cistern¹⁴⁸. On

146. The extensive Nea church *ekphrasis* can be found by the reader in the *Life of Basil* 83-86 (272-282, ŠEVČENKO). R. J. H. JENKINS – C. A. MANGO, The Date and Significance of the Tenth Homily of Photius, *DOP* 9/10 (1956), 123-40 present the most convincing arguments for connecting the description by Photius with the Pharos church. Both church terraces (τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ τοῦ Φάρου καὶ τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ τῆς νέας) are mentioned by *De ceremoniis* I 19-20, II 15 (ed. J. J. REISKE, *Constantini Porphyrogeniti, De ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo* [CSHB], Bonn 1829, I 118, 121, 586). More on the subject of sources by P. MAGDALINO, Observations on the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I, *JÖB* 37 (1987), 51-64; IDEM, L'Église du Phare et les reliques de la Passion à Constantinople (VIIe-XIIIe siècles), in: *Byzance et les reliques du Christ*, Paris 2004, 15-30; MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers*, 247-250.

147. R. GUILLAND, Études sur le grand Palais de Constantinople. La terrasse du Phare, *JÖBG* 13 (1964), 87-102 (reprint in IDEM, *Études de topographie de Constantinople Byzantine*, I-II [BBA 37], Berlin – Amsterdam 1969, I 315-325).

148. Jahya (ed. M. J. DE GOEJE, *Kitāb al-A'laq al-Nafīsa* [Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum 7], Leiden 1892), 119-127, here: 121-122. J. MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, 208-237, here 216-217, made a German translation;

the other hand, the image of one of these churches in the depiction of the hippodrome in an Italian drawing from the late 15th century attached to Onofrio Panvinio's *De ludis circensibus*, published in Venice in 1600 (fig. 17) shows a similarity to the architectural form of the Gülhane terrace¹⁴⁹. The church is depicted in the form of five cylinders surmounted by domes standing on a rectangular base with walls articulated by slender arcades.

All of the preserved examples of churches erected on platforms, with walls additionally supported by massive arcades, date only from the 10th and 11th centuries. Shortly after Romanos I Lekapenos (920–940) had assumed the throne, erected the crossed-dome Myrelaion church (now the Bodrum mosque) in the vicinity of his palace, which was built above the port of Theodosius upon a large colonnaded rotunda dating from the fifth century. The church was set upon a rectangular terrace whose thick stone and brick walls were shored up on the outside by buttresses joined to the upper section of the arcades, and the interior was reinforced by additional walls under the apse, as well as four columns, which carried the weight of the pillars that supported the dome above the shrine in the upper story (figs. 18)¹⁵⁰. The structure that supports the walls of the Myrelaion was designed not only to level off the slope between the residence and the church¹⁵¹, but also

see also A. A. VASILIEV, *Byzance et les Arabes*, Brussels 1950, II/2, 379–394, here: 386; IDEM, Hārūn ibn Yahya and His Description of Constantinople, *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 5 (1932), 149–63, here: 156–57. Richard Krautheimer takes into consideration the terrace of the Nea church in his reconstruction, see R. KRAUTHEIMER, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, New Haven, London 1986, 355–356. On the other hand, V. MARINIS, *Architecture and Ritual in the Churches of Constantinople. Ninth to Fifteenth Centuries*, Cambridge 2014, 95, notes that the mention by Dobrynia (20 LOPAREV) of incense smoke permeating through the floor and the accessibility of lower chambers in the Nea attest to the existence of crypts under the church.

149. See e.g. the exhibition catalog *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı. İstanbul'un Tarih Sahnesi*, Istanbul 2010, No. 2.1.

150. The name *Myrelaion* (μυρέλαιον – scented oil) is mentioned in Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως III 134 (258 PREGER) as referring to the monastery in the times of Constantine V. For the architecture of the Myrelaion see MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 103–107, 240 (dating); C. L. STRIKER – J. W. HAYES, *The Myrelaion (Bodrum Camii) in Istanbul*, Princeton 1981, 16–32; ČURČIĆ, *Architecture*, 275–76, figs. 280, 286–88 (proposes a date before Romanos ascended the throne, i. e. *ante* 920); MARINIS, *Architecture*, 172–75.

151. MARINIS, *Architecture*, 95 points to the grading of the terrain as the original reason for erecting the Myrelaion's terrace.

as the Lekapenos family mausoleum. Already in December 922, Romanos' wife Theodora was buried there, and then his sons Christopher (931) and Constantine (946), and he himself in 948, and later his daughter, Empress Helena (961)¹⁵².

The space under the church of Mary Peribleptos may also have had a sepulchral or liturgical function. Founded by Romanos III Argyros (1028–1034), the shrine has not been preserved. The site is presently occupied by the 18th-century church of the Armenian monastery Sulu (Surp Kevork), whose foundations are set upon an old Byzantine structure (fig. 19) that levels the slope of the seventh hill on which the building was constructed¹⁵³. Similarly to the terrace of the Myrelaion, the layout of the underground chambers (fig. 20), corresponds to the layout of the interior of the church that at one time stood above, which suggests that the building served a liturgical or sepulchral function¹⁵⁴. A hagiaσμα is preserved to the west of the church, which indicates the terrace's multifaceted functions.

The latest example of a church erected on a rectangular substructure is Gül Camii (most probably identified with church of the Monastery of Christ

152. Theophanes Continuatus VI 9, 11 (402-404, 473 BEKKER): on the burials of Theodora and Romanos' children (the author of the chronicle informs us that the deceased were buried in the sarcophagi of Maurice and his sons, brought for this reason from the St. Mamas church); Kedrenos II 325 (BEKKER): on the burial of Romanos I. For an analysis of the sources, STRIKER – HAYES, Myrelaion, 6 and 29-31 (on the use of the structure for burial purposes) and MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 103.

153. F. ÖZGÜMÜŞ, Peribleptos ('Sulu') Monastery in Istanbul, *BZ* 93 (2000), 508-520, here: 513-515, figs. 1-9; K. DARK, The Byzantine Church and Monastery of St Mary Peribleptos in Istanbul, *The Burlington Magazine* 141 (1999), 656-664. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 200; MARINIS, Architecture, 201–202. Arguments for reconstruction of the Peribleptos as a spacious building in the form of squinch-plan Byzantine churches on the basis of its substructure present Ö DALGIÇ and T. F. MATHEWS, A New Interpretation of the Church of Peribleptos and its Place in Middle Byzantine Architecture, in: *First International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium. Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Istanbul, 25-28 June 2007. Proceedings*, Istanbul 2010, 424-431.

154. Clavijo (*Embajada*, 32-33), mentions that the stone sarcophagus of the founder, Romanos Argyros, was located in the far recesses of the side aisle of the church, like other burials, which would exclude the idea that the original function of the interior space of the terrace was a mausoleum. However, DARK, Peribleptos, 663 allows the possibility of a second burial for the emperor and points out that the layout of chambers could suggest a sepulchral use, and simultaneously would rule out the identification of the crypt as a cistern.

Euergetes, ca. 1071). However this case involves the reuse of terrace after the demolition of an earlier building. The shrine, built in the recessed brick technique, can be dated to the 11th or 12th century. Its terrace levels off the surface of the slope of the fourth hill, which descends slightly towards the East¹⁵⁵.

All of the above-mentioned examples demonstrate that, though the terrace interiors were used for various purposes, they were all built to create a level surface as a foundation for the construction of a church which would then be clearly visible in the urban skyline. The terrace under the current Gülhane Hospital could also have served a similar purpose on the slopes of the first hill. Its walls reinforced with arcades are analogous to other structures of this type and indicate a Middle Byzantine origin.

To summarize, it can be stated that the lofty Gülhane terrace not only corresponds best to the location described by the Anonymous of Novgorod, but the existence of a terrace is confirmed by the description of the Hodegon in the *Tale* found at Vatopedi. Additionally, it must be said that the location by the southeast corner of the walls of the Seraglio corresponds to the depiction in the Dusseldorf edition of Buondelmonti's map, which is the only illustration from the *Liber Insularum* that takes into consideration changes in the topography of Constantinople after 1453¹⁵⁶. The design of the structure also allows us to associate it with the Hodegon, and more precisely with the renovations carried out by Michael III. Accordingly, it should be acknowledged that there is no other more convincing evidence to demonstrate that the discoveries made by Demangel or Düzgüner are the remains of the Hodegon monastery. Nevertheless, to be systematic, an attempt will be made to interpret the remaining architectural remains linked by scholarly literature with the Hodegon.

155. H. SCHÄFER, *Die Gül Camii in Istanbul. Ein Beitrag zur mittelbyzantinischen Kirchenarchitektur Konstantinopels* (Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Beiheft 7), Tübingen 1973, 42-56, 77-81; B. ARAN, The Church of Saint Theodosia and the Monastery of Christ Evergetes. Notes on the Topography of Constantinople, *JÖB* 28 (1979), 211-228, here 222, 228; MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 140-143, figs. 130-132; MARINIS, *Architecture* 153-157.

156. See *supra*, note 34.

Conclusions – Interpretation of architectural remains

In keeping with a proper chronology of the discoveries, any attempt at reinterpretation should begin with the hexagon unearthed by Demangel and Mamboury. The unusual centralized structure adjacent to the north of the semicircular portico, as well as the masonry techniques used, suggest an association with the residential architecture of the first half of the fifth century – particularly, with the palace of the *Cubicularius* Antiochos (404-421), a eunuch courtier of Arkadios and Theodosius II, whose residence was situated to the west of the Hippodrome and was remodelled around 680 into the church of St. Euphemia¹⁵⁷. Assuming that the building discovered in Mangana was built at the same time and that it originally served a similar function, it seems plausible to identify it as the Palace of Marina¹⁵⁸. This hypothesis is strengthened by the centralized design of the building and the presence of the bathing pool of octofoil plan, which correspond to the description of the Baths of Leo VI written by Leo Choïrosphaktes. Its later hexagonal form with stepped apses could be explained by the remodelling carried out by Constantine Porphyrogenitus¹⁵⁹.

157. Angelidi, *Discours*, 118 has already drawn attention to formal similarities between the two buildings. A theory concerning the residential function of the hexagon (on the basis of a comparison with Antiochos's palace) was also formulated by ČURČIĆ, *Architecture*, 89, fig. 80. His viewpoint is shared by OUSTERHOUT, *Water*, 68, 70-71. On Antiochos and his palace see, G. GREATREX – J. BARDILL, *Antiochus the 'Praepositus': A Persian Eunuch at the Court of Theodosius II*, *DOP* 50 (1996), 171-97 and fig. 1, especially: 191-97; ČURČIĆ, *Architecture*, 87, 201, figs. 78, 208. A brick stamp with the year 402 sets the earliest possible *terminus post quem* for the construction of the building. The date of the translation of St. Euphemia's relics from her sanctuary in Chalcedon (traditionally associated with Herakleios) corrected on the minute analysis of sources and ascribed to the reign of Constantine IV (668-685) A. BERGER, *Die Reliquien der heiligen Euphemia und ihre erste Translation nach Konstantinopel*, *Ἑλληνικά* 39 (1989), 311-322. The German scholar however notes (p. 321) that the building could have been converted into a church already in the 6th century, what is proved by architectural details (especially a column from the templon) discovered during excavations, see R. NAUMANN, *Die Euphemia-Kirche am Hippodrom zu Istanbul und ihre Fresken*, *Istanbuler Forschungen* 25 (1966), 23-24, pl. 8c, 9a, 11b-c.

158. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon*, 42, has already formulated such a theory, cautioning that it is only speculation.

159. A. SCHNEIDER and A. BERGER (see *supra*, n. 42) see private palace baths (built, however, already in the fifth century) in the building with the hexagonal plan. Alternative

The above reconstruction, as well as the interpretation of the postern in the neighbouring tower of Theophilos (heightened by Leo VI) as a small gate to the Hodegetria (ἡ μικρὰ Πύλη τῆς Ὁδηγητρίας) require corrections. Demangel and Mamboury based their identification on a rather dubious assumption that the quotation used in the inscription taken from the *Book of Psalms* was a metaphor referring to Mary. Taking into account that connecting a physically extant structure with the words of a song from the Old Testament is already a metaphor in itself, attempts at explanation should not resort to digging deeper for additional hidden meanings. In addition, the tower and gate are located quite far, i.e. about 150 meters to the east of the hexagon. They are somewhat closer (approx. 140 m) to the complex at Mangana. Attributing the postern at Leo VI's tower to the Hodegon monastery should therefore be considered more an indication of a desire to connect unearthed remains with lofty monuments vital to the history of Constantinople than a reliable interpretation of archaeological discoveries. In addition, the inscription on the tower names Theophilos, as well as Leo VI and Alexander, as the builders of this section of the circuit of walls. None of these rulers are mentioned in any known sources as having any connection with the Hodegon. On the other hand, Leo VI was the founder of two structures located in the near vicinity: the baths, perhaps refurbished in the same year of 906; and the somewhat earlier St. Lazarus monastery. Accordingly, we can accept that the extension of Theophilos' tower was part of broader construction works in the northern part of the first region of Constantinople. No information is available about a gate at the Palace of Marina or at Leo's Baths, but the monastery of St. Lazarus featured its own postern (ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Λαζάρου πυλῖς). In July 1296, Andronikos II sent a messenger through this gate to the head of the Venetian fleet, Roger Morosini

attempts at interpretation of the basin and the hexagonal structure should also be noted: I. BALDINI LIPPOLIS, *Case e palazzi a Costantinopoli tra IV e VI secolo. Corso sull'Arte ravennate e bizantina* 41 (1994), 279-311, here: 298, points to the formal similarity of the building in Mangana to the Roman Tempio di Minerva Medica and believes it to have been a nymphaeum in one of the palaces of Constantinople. On the other hand, Ken R. DARK - J. KOSTENEC, *The Byzantine Patriarchate in Constantinople and the Baptistry of the Church of Hagia Sophia*, *Architectura: Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Baukunst* 36 (2006), 113-130, present an unconvincing theory stating that the hexagon was reused as a baptistry.

Malabranca, who had sailed in from the Dardanelles¹⁶⁰. The identification of the gate with the inscription as belonging to the neighbouring church of St. Lazarus seems therefore more probable¹⁶¹.

In that case, the Hodegon postern should be sought for elsewhere. Unfortunately, apart from the area along the sea walls and the supposed location in the vicinity of the monastery we do not have any evidence as to the location of the postern¹⁶². In his description of the 1453 siege of the city, Doukas only generally mentions that before the last storming of the walls, Mehmed's ships surrounded the double ring of walls from the Beautiful Gate (*Ωραίας Πύλης*), continuing to the church of St. Demetrius, the Acropolis, to the small gate of the Hodegon, up to the Great Palace, harbor and to the Vlanga district¹⁶³. While confirming the general location of the postern in the eastern section of the sea walls, this reference is not sufficiently precise to allow us to identify its exact location. Doğan Kuban has recently proposed the identification of the Hodegetria gate with the remains that were discovered during the restoration of the sea walls in 1994 in the neighbourhood of the Ahırkapı (Turkish *stable gate*, situated below the Sultans' stables; a lighthouse of the same name currently stands in this area). The postern is located 90 meters from the terrace¹⁶⁴. Due to the lack

160. Pachymeres IX 18 (III 263, 263 FAILLER). VAN MILLINGEN, Walls, 259.

161. WULZINGER, *Byzantinische Baudenkmäler*, 46 has already proposed such an identification.

162. F. DIRIMITEKIN, *Fetihten Önce Marmara Surları*, Istanbul 1953, 142, who attempted to determine the topographical location of the gates in the sea walls between the Great Palace and the Mangana, was criticized by DÜZGÜNER, *Iustinianus Dönemi'nde*, 32.

163. Doukas XXXIX (282-83 BEKKER). The Beautiful Gate, also known as the Neorion Gate (*πόρτα τοῦ Νεωρίου*, Tur. Bahçekapı), which leads to the eponymous port (the oldest military port of Constantinople) was situated not far from the entrance to the bay of Golden Horn from the city side in the area where a chain blocked the mouth to the Gold Horn (modern Eminönü, see VAN MILLINGEN, Walls, 220-25, 260; SCHNEIDER, *Mauern*, 84, 87; JANIN, *Constantinople*, 292; W. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Die Häfen von Byzantion, Konstantinoupolis, Istanbul*, Tübingen 1994, 13; D. KUBAN, *Istanbul, an urban history: Byzantion, Constantinopolis, Istanbul*, Istanbul 2010, 219.

164. KUBAN, *Istanbul*, 65 and note 55. The author is not precise in his description as he simultaneously places the gate to the north of the Pearl Kiosk. DÜZGÜNER, *Iustinianus Dönemi'nde*, 32-33, figs. 29-31, proposes to locate the gate to the south, surely too far from Ahırkapı.

of more precise evidence, this theory, just like the previous one, will remain unproven for the time being.

In closing it is necessary to refer to the discovery that Düzgüner links with the Hodegon. The findings by the Mimar Mehmet Ağa and Amiral Tafdil Streets are situated in the central section of the area once occupied by the Great Palace. This fact alone calls into question the identification of the remains as part of the Hodegon complex¹⁶⁵. However, due to limited space, I will pass over the flawed methodology of Düzgüner's topographical arguments, and focus instead on the direct evidence that led him to identify his findings as the remains of the Hodegon. Düzgüner points to a hagiaσμα and a fresco with an image of the Virgin Mary in a niche above it as the key evidence that associates the discovery with the Hodegetria church. He mistakenly identifies this partially preserved painting of the Virgin Mary with Child as the Virgin Hodegetria type¹⁶⁶. At the same time, the discernible outline of Mary's shoulder and the fragment of the Christ child's nimbus on her breast clearly indicate the Platytera type or, as Fusun Tülek has proposed, the Zoodochos Pege type (Mary as the Life-Giving Spring), a subject strongly associated with the hagiaσμα through its reference to the famous shrine located in the suburbs of Constantinople¹⁶⁷. Tülek accurately notes the two-phase character of the findings, showing that the Middle Byzantine fresco and the hagiaσμα have nothing in common with the Late Roman pavements of the two upper stories¹⁶⁸.

165. OUSTERHOUT, Water, 71 already points out that Düzgüner's remains are situated too far to the south to be identified with the Hodegon.

166. DÜZGÜNER, Iustinianus Dönemi'nde, 105, 110-12. His mistaken attribution is adopted by J. KOSTENEC, *Walking thru Byzantium. Great Palace Region*, İstanbul 2008, 78-79, who also accepts this as the basis for identifying the place with the Hodegon.

167. F. TÜLEK, A Fifth-Century Floor Mosaic and a Mural of Virgin of Pege in Constantinople, *CahArch* 52 (2005-2008), 23-30, here: 26-29, figs. 5-7, points to 1300 as the *terminus ante quem* for the paintings, when a cemetery was laid out in this area. At the same time, based on stylistic reasons, she dates the paintings between the mid-11th and late 12th centuries. Unfortunately, due to the poor state of preservation, the inscription in the picture frame cannot be fully deciphered. Currently, the following letters are legible: ... N ... ΗΓ ΑΙ ... Κῶ.Α ...ΘΕΙΣΑ ΘΑ ...which only allows us to surmise the epithet of Theotokos.

168. TÜLEK, Floor Mosaic, 29 (as well as 25-26, figs. 1-4: on the floor mosaics tentatively dated by Tülek to the last quarter of the fifth century).

Executed with small marble cubes, limestone and ceramic tesserae, the simple geometric pavement ornaments feature: circles, knots of Hercules and swastikas, which contrary to Düzgüner's suggestions¹⁶⁹, cannot be associated with the Hodegon. Thanks to the Athos manuscript of the *Tale* we learn that Constantine V sent the *στρατοπεδάρχης* to the church of Hodegetria in order to control the actions of Hypatius. Accompanied by soldiers, he saw in the church's interior mosaics consisting of various types of marbles arranged into the pattern described as *λακαρικόν*¹⁷⁰. Angelidi has already noticed, it is most probably a corrupted form of the noun *λαγαρικόν* noted in Du Cange's *Glossarium*¹⁷¹. However exactly the same form of this word as used in the *Tale* appears also in other descriptions of architectural decorations dated to the 9th and 10th centuries¹⁷². From the context in which the word was used we may deduce that it meant the *opus sectile* technique, in which a mosaic was made from large marble slabs, previously cut in such a way as to form a decorative pattern. Having in mind that the event described took place during the first period of Iconoclasm, and the *στρατοπεδάρχης* understood that certain stone slabs indicated the relics of saints, we may deduce that the mosaic was created using the ornamental technique *opus alexandrinum*, popular for the decoration of church floors in Constantinople (e.g. in the churches of Hagia Sophia, St. John in Hebdomon and in Studios, the Pantokrator and the Theotokos in the Pantokrator monastery; fig. 21)¹⁷³. Thanks to the Cosmati workshops, the popularity of the technique

169. DÜZGÜNER, Iustinianus Dönemi'nde, 105.

170. ANGELIDI, Discours, 147, line 203.

171. ANGELIDI, Discours, 146, note 27; CHARLES DU FRESNE, SEIGNEUR DU CANGE, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis*, Lyon 1688, I 778 [s.v.].

172. Theophanes Continuatus III 42 (140 BEKKER) uses the noun in his description of marble decoration which covered the Trikonchos built by Theophilus (829-842) in the Great Palace. The Anonymous *Tale* about the construction of Hagia Sophia (dated to the 2nd half of the 9th c.) mentions it together with marble slabs, capitals and beams of upper galleries of the cathedral, see E. VITTI, *Die Erzählung über den Bau der Hagia Sophia in Konstantinopel*, Amsterdam 1986, 468 (= Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως § 15 [93 PREGER]). In turn Constantine of Rhodes describes *λακαρικὰ* together with marble slabs carved into motives of vine shoots in the interior of the church of Holy Apostles, Constantine of Rhodes line 725 (ed. L. JAMES - I. VASSIS, *On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles*, Farnham, Burlington 2012, 69).

173. S. PEDONE, The Marble Omphalos of Saint Sophia in Constantinople. An Analysis

also spread to Western Europe¹⁷⁴. The *opus alexandrinum* form in no way resembles the mosaics found at the intersection of Mimar Mehmet Ağa and Amiral Tafdil streets¹⁷⁵.

* * *

In summary, it should be said that the current state of knowledge merely allows us to make hypothetical reconstructions of building locations in the northern part of the first region of Constantinople. However, the existing evidence comes down in favour of connecting the terrace of the Gülhane Hospital with the Hodegetria monastery (whose sea gate was located in the near vicinity, to the east), while the hexagon situated to the north should

of an Opus Sectile Pavement of Middle Byzantine Age, in: *Mosaics of Turkey and Parallel Developments in the Rest of the Ancient and Medieval World: Questions of Iconography, Style and Technique from the Beginnings of Mosaic until the Late Byzantine Era*, ed. M. SAHIN, Istanbul 2011, 749-768; C. BARSANTI, The Marble Floor of St. John Studius in Constantinople: a Neglected Masterpiece, *ibidem*, 87-98; R. DEMANGEL, *Contribution de la topographie de l'Hebdomon*, Paris 1945, 19, fig. 9, plates IV-V; A. H. S. MEGAW, Notes on Recent Work of the Byzantine Institute in Istanbul, *DOP* 17 (1963), 333-371; here 335-340, figs. A-B, 2, 5-6. See also A. OĞAN, Bizans mimari tarihinde İstanbul kiliseleri ve mozaikler, *Güzel Sanatlar* 5 (1944), 103-15; A. G. GUIDOBALDI, L'opus sectile pavimentale in area bizantina, in: *Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico, Atti del 1o Colloquio*, Ravenna 1993, 643-663; U. PESCHLOW, Zum byzantinischen opus sectile-Boden, in: *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasien. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, ed. R. M. BOEHMER - H. HAUPTMANN, Mainz 1983, 435-447; S. EYICE, Two Mosaic Pavements from Bithynia, *DOP* 17 (1963) 373-383; CH. PINATSI, New Observations on the Pavement of the Church of Haghia Sophia in Nicaea, *BZ* 99 (2008), 119-126; H. MAGUIRE, The Medieval Floors of the Great Palace, in: *Byzantine Constantinople*, 153-174. On description of *opus sectile* floors in Nikephoros Botaneiates' Palace, cf. CUPANE, Traumpaläste, 416-420. It should be emphasized that *opus alexandrinum* could also be found on walls, e.g. the mosaic in the apse of the Panagia Chrysokephalos church in Trebizond, possibly done after 1215, see A. EASTMOND, *Art and Identity in Thirteenth-Century Byzantium. Hagia Sophia and the Empire of Trebizond*, Burlington 2004, fig. 23.

174. See e.g. D. GLASS, Papal Patronage in the Early Twelfth Century: Notes on the Iconography of Cosmatesque Pavements, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969), 386-390; P. BINSKI, The Cosmati at Westminster and the English Court Style, *Art Bulletin* 72 (1990), 6-34.

175. KOSTENEC, Great Palace 77, points to the hypothetical possibility of linking the mosaics with Marina's residence.

be linked with a residential building, most likely the Palace of Marina, which was transformed into public baths in the 10th century. Furthermore, the gate by the tower of Leo and Alexander should be identified with the postern of St. Lazarus, next to which the eponymous monastery must have stood. The remains in the Cankurtaran district undoubtedly belonged to the structure of the Great Palace and future study is expected to answer the questions pertaining to their original function.

(Translated by Dennis McEvoy)

Η ΜΟΝΗ ΤΩΝ ΟΔΗΓΩΝ
ΣΚΕΨΕΙΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΑΚΡΙΒΗ ΤΟΠΟΘΕΣΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΙΕΡΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΟΔΗΓΗΤΡΙΑΣ
ΣΤΗΝ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΗ


Αν και ήταν ένα από τα πιο γνωστά ιερά της Κωνσταντινούπολης, η Μονή των Οδηγών παραμένει καλυμμένη από την αγλύ της ιστορίας. Η ίδια δεν διασώζεται μεν, είναι γνωστή όμως χάρη σε πολυάριθμες περιγραφές, τόσο σε βυζαντινές γραπτές πηγές, όσο και σε μαρτυρίες ξένων ταξιδιωτών και προσκυνητών.

Αρχαιολογικά κατάλοιπα που κατά καιρούς συσχετίστηκαν με την μονή είναι: α) η εξαγωνική κατασκευή που εντόπισαν ο R. Demangel και ο E. Mamboury, και β) το αγίασμα κάτω από το κτίριο στην διασταύρωση των οδών Mimar Mehmet Ağa και Admiral Tafdil, το οποίο ανακάλυψε πριν από δύο δεκαετίες ο F. Düzgüner στο κέντρο της περιοχής Cankurtaran. Οι προτάσεις αυτές όμως δεν είναι ικανοποιητικές, αφού δεν συμβιβάζονται με τα στοιχεία που προκύπτουν από τις γραπτές πηγές.

Σύμφωνα με τις περιγραφές των προσκυνητών, η Μονή των Οδηγών βρισκόταν πολύ κοντά στην Αγία Σοφία, προς τα ανατολικά. Το συγκρότημα τοποθετείται κοντά στο παλάτι των Μαρίνης (που αναδιαμορφώθηκε από τον Λέοντα C' σε λουτρό, και είναι δυνατόν να ταυτιστεί με το εξαγωνικό κτίσμα των Demangel και Mamboury), έξω από τα τείχη των ανακτόρων (όπως υποδεικνύεται από την περιγραφή στο *Χρονικό του Συμεών Λογοθέτη*). Επιπλέον, στο κείμενο το γνωστό ως *Λόγος περί του πανσέπτου ναού της Υπεραγίας Θεοτόκου των Οδηγών*, αναφέρεται ότι η εκκλησία ήταν ένα υψηλό κτίριο, το οποίο υπερέβαινε το ύψος των τειχών της Πόλης και ήταν ορατό για τους ναυτικούς που έπλεαν στον Βόσπορο. Το ίδιο κείμενο μας πληροφορεί επίσης ότι το ιερό είχε τρία τμήματα. Ένα κλίτος που καλυπτόταν από θόλο και στηριζόταν σε μια δομή, ορατή μόνο εν μέρει πάνω από το επίπεδο του εδάφους. Η τελευταία μπορεί να χαρακτηριστεί ως εξώστης με δεξαμενή (όπως αναφέρεται στα επιγράμματα του Θεοδώρου Βαλσαμώνας).

Η προσεκτική ανάλυση των γραπτών ενδείξεων μας υποχρεώνει να επιστρέψουμε στην παλαιά υπόθεση που είχε διατυπωθεί πριν από εκατό χρόνια από τον K. Wulzinger, ο οποίος ταύτισε την Μονή Οδηγών με τον εξώστη κάτω από το σημερινό στρατιωτικό νοσοκομείο του Gülhane. Ενώ το κτίριο παραμένει απρόσιτο λόγω του ότι ανήκει στον στρατό, ο εξώστης (και η δεξαμενή που στεγάζεται σε αυτό) είναι αρκετά καλά τεκμηριωμένα χάρη στις ιατρικές εκθέσεις που δημοσιεύθηκαν στις αρχές του 20ου αιώνα από το προσωπικό της κλινικής. Η κατασκευή, μικτής τοιχοδομίας με πλίνθους και λίθους, αρχικά στηριζόταν σε έξι κίονες με σύνθετα κιονόκρανα, και σε παραστάδες. Με βάση τις αρχιτεκτονικές αναλογίες μπορεί να χρονολογηθεί γενικά μεταξύ του ενάτου και του ενδεκάτου αιώνα, όταν οι εξώστες κάτω από εκκλησίες συνηθίζονταν στην Κωνσταντινούπολη. Αυτό υποδεικνύει ότι η δεξαμενή-εξώστης κάτω από το μοναστήρι κτίστηκε κατά τη διάρκεια της βασιλείας του Μιχαήλ Γ΄.

Η οριστική επιβεβαίωση των παραπάνω υποθέσεων θα καταστεί δυνατή μόνο όταν οι ερευνητές αποκτήσουν πρόσβαση στο συγκρότημα Gülhane και στην τεκμηρίωση που σχετίζεται με την αποκατάστασή του, κάτι που αναμένεται με ανυπομονησία στο εγγύς μέλλον.



I Map of the first region of Constantinople (as: background *Plan d'Ensemble de la Ville de Constantinople*, by Societe anonyme Ottomane d'etudes et d'entreprises urbaines, Constantinople 1922:


a) area of Demangel and Mamboury's excavation; b) tower of Theophilos, Leo V and Alexander; c) hagiaσμα at the intersection of Mimar Mehmet Ağa and Amiral Tafdil streets; d) remains by the Kalyon Hotel; e) Gülhane Hospital terrace; f) remains of the palace-monastery complex at Mangana; g) Ahırkapı lighthouse.




1. *Procession with the Virgin Hodegetria icon*, fresco from the Akathistos cycle (verse 24) in the sanctuary apse of Marko's Monastery near Skopje (1376–1381), photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.




2. Fragment of a view of Constantinople by Andrea Giovanni Vavassore, Nuremberg ca. 1535 (according to a model from ca. 1478–1490, photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.



3. Plan of the excavations in the Mangana district (after R. DEMANGEL - E. MAMBOURY, Plate I).



4. Plan of the hexagonal structure with semicircular portico discovered by Demangel and Mamboury (after R. DEMANGEL - E. MAMBOURY, Plate XII).




5. Cross-section and plan of the basin in the hexagon discovered by DEMANGEL and MAMBOURY (after DEMANGEL & MAMBOURY, figure 118).



6. Basin in the hexagon discovered by Demangel and Mamboury, November 1935, view from the north, photo Nicholas V. Artamonoff (Dumbarton Oaks digital archive).



7. Basin in the hexagon discovered by Demangel and Mamboury, November 1935, view from SW, photo Nicholas V. Artamonoff (Dumbarton Oaks digital archive).



8. Theophilos' tower heightened by Leo VI in 906, side view and cross-section (after DEMANGEL & MAMBOURY, figure 77).



9. Theophilos' tower heightened by Leo VI in 906, elevation from the sea side (east), photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.




10. Hagiasma in the house at the intersection of Mimar Mehmet Aga and Amiral Tefdil streets, photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.



11. Remains of the building neighboring the Kaylon hotel, photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.



12. Cristoforo Buondelmonti, *Liber insularum*, view of Constantinople on fol. 30v in codex P/13 (MS. 9918), The Caird Library in the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich (fragment with the Hodegetria church described as *Chiramos*), photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.




13. Cristoforo Buondelmonti, *Liber insularum*, view of Constantinople on fol. 123r in codex Marc. Lat. XIV 45 (=4595), fragment with the church of St. Lazarus, photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.



14. Terrace of the Gülhane Hospital, view from the SE, photo: C. Cangul.



15. Terrace of the Gülhane Hospital, view from the east, photo C. Cangul.



16. Cross-section and plan of the cistern under the Gülhane Hospital (after WULZINGER, fig. 24 on p. 48).




17. *View of the Hippodrome*, ca. 1480, Onofrio Panvinio, *De ludis circensibus*, Venice 1600, p. 60-61.




18. Terrace of the Myrelaion church (after 920), view from the south, photo: Piotr L. Grotowski.



19. Arcades of the terrace below the Peribleptos church (1030–1034) view from the SE, photo Nicholas V. Artamonoff (Dumbarton Oaks digital archive).



20. Terrace below the Peribleptos church, plan (after Özgümüş, plan 2).



21. Floor mosaic from the church of St. John in Hebdomon, drawing (after DEMANGEL, *Contribution à la topographie de l'Hebdomon* [Recherches françaises en Turquie, 3e fasc], Paris 1945, Plate V).

