

BLAZEJ CECOTA

Not Only the Greeks. Strangers in the Early Byzantine Constantinople

Constantinople was a very important focus of attention for newcomers of non-Greek origin. As a capital of one of the most powerful state organisms it attracted Persians and Saracens. Its position on the point of the contact a crucial trade routes could not escape Jewish traders' attention. Constantinople seemed a good place for the development of personal career for the military man, including Armenians, Goths or Isaurians. The important role of Constantinople in the Empire and exceptional wealth of the city attracted all, who seek property and fame. For all of these reasons the capital of Byzantine Empire was a destination of immigration for numerous nations, culturally and linguistically different from the Greeks.

MACIEJ KOKOSZKO, KRZYSZTOF JAGUSIAK

Fish for Constantinople (4th–7th centuries)

Constantinople because of its unique position on the sea of Marmara, the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus enjoyed a constant supply of fish. It was also renowned for its preserves and other fish products manufactured therein. It is hard to assess and quantify the role of the food in the diet of the inhabitants of the city. It is usually thought to have been considerable and moreover it is stressed that it was gradually growing due to an ecclesiastic ban on quadrupeds' meat lasting over a considerable fraction of the year. Fish belonged to the group of prestigious and costly products. It is virtually impossible to establish the popularity of particular species. An analogy to the present day in connection with a cornucopia of source material dating back to antiquity and Byzantium leads to the conclusion that small fry called *afye* was the commonest kind of fish present on the markets of Constantinople. Bonitos and mackerels possibly held the second position, however, the capital was also abundant in tunas, sea perches, grey mullets, red mullets, turbot and many other kinds of fish. It is worth adding that Byzantine dieticians devote to the above mentioned food a lot of attention in their works. The evaluation of the meat was manifold and depended on the size of the fish and characteristic of their natural environment.

ANDRZEJ KOMPA

Constantinopolitan Monuments of Istanbul

The author discusses the multi-faceted problem of the Byzantine monuments of Istanbul, their variety, preservation – with the existing dangers and perspectives – and accessibility to tourists and scholars. Recent changes *in situ*, findings and research are included and updated bibliography is provided. Relics of Constantinopolitan past of Istanbul are grouped into seven categories: I. tourist landmarks and main attractions of Istanbul, usually well preserved, appropriately restored and generally easy accessible to the public, often as musea; II. open and covered cisterns, an abundant and special type of Constantinopolitan historical monuments, either used in proper or neutral way, or still neglected or forgotten. Although positive change is visible in recent years, a holistic, consistent plan of their protection as a whole would be of great value; III. Byzantine churches and remnants of monasteries turned into mosques and retaining their religious character to the present. Despite the alterations of various magnitude or – in some cases – temporary abandonments after the devastating fires or earthquakes, these constitute *en gross* one of the most impressive and best preserved complexes of medieval monuments between the Golden Horn and the Marmara, even if some buildings of the group demand further research and restoration. There can be also noticed

a certain lack of adequate description inside and some careless usage of millennial structures; IV. churches of the two patriarchates, Orthodox (Ecumenical) and Armenian that stem from Byzantine era, never ceased to exist as the places of cult or continue medieval traditions. They survived for many different reasons and, apart from some remarkable exceptions, of minor meaning in the capital of the Christian empire, they have a great and not only symbolic role among the whole corpus of monuments today. State of preservation differs widely between the buildings and sightseeing may be relatively difficult because of the restrictions (e.g. security measures) and rare church services; V. columns and obelisks, originally gracing the main imperial fora. Even better than other categories, this one reveals incoherent treatment of the monuments of extreme importance (cf. the columns of Constantine and of Arcadius); VI. edifices and substructures particularly exposed to dangers, or being at present neglected or dilapidated to the extent that threatens their further unharmed existence. Some of the most important and valuable buildings are still, unfortunately, in this category; VII. the land and maritime walls of Constantinople, a whole category in itself, functionally and morphologically connected with other priceless monuments. Resembling every stage of the town's history, being one of the most acclaimed tourist attractions and partially benefiting from the protection rules of UNESCO, the walls have quite a long history of inadequate or ahistorical restorations, and in many parts are lacking the appropriate preservation. The situation started to change only recently, at rather a slow pace. The last part of the text describes changes in attitude of the present citizens of Istanbul towards the history of the site, discusses threats resulting e.g. from policies of development of the city, and mentions the efforts of the Turkish scholars and quotes the examples of the most noteworthy Turkish undertakings aiming at better preservation of the peninsula's historical heritage.

MIROSLAW J. LESZKA

The Revolt of Marcian in Constantinople (479)

Towards the end of the year 479, Marcian, emperor Zeno's brother-in-law, attempted to seize the throne of the Empire. The revolt lasted no longer than two days and was full of dramatic developments and sudden shifts in the course of events. It took place in the heart of the Byzantine capital, before the eyes of the city inhabitants, who played the role of mere onlookers.

Eventually, Marcian's coup d'état proved unsuccessful. Reasons for the defeat should be found not in the lack of determination on the part of the rebels (the main factor which is suggested by the literary sources) but rather in limited numbers of Marcian's forces, which therefore were unable to win a victory over the troops at the emperor's disposal. Additionally, the military prowess of Marcian's supporters is said not to have been satisfactory and that resulted from the fact that the rebels led by Zeno's brother-in-law included virtually no regular troops, with the only possible exception of the regiment commanded by Busalbus. Neither was the morale of that paisley crowd high, which is demonstrated by their openness to bribery.

The initial success of the rebels should be therefore borne down to the fact that they caught their adversaries off guard. It is, however, also worth stressing that none of the rebels' main goals was achieved. They did not seize the imperial palace because they did not crush the troops defending it. The defenders in turn, though considerably weakened as a result of the fight carried out in the area of the tribunal, managed to retain their military valor. Neither was Illus and his forces neutralized. Quite on the contrary. Having recovered from the initial surprise and having regained the faith in the final success, the *magister officiorum* took decisive steps to quench the rebellion, while his actions were not effectively counteracted by Marcian's forces.

MIROSLAW J. LESZKA

The Role of Anicia Juliana in the Constantinople of the End of the 5th and the Beginning of the 6th Centuries

Anicia Juliana, a member of emperor Theodosius' family, played a prominent, but (in the light of contemporary sources) limited only to the sphere of religious life, role in the city of Constantinople between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th centuries. The grand Constantinopolitan lady was a personage whose fame reached far beyond the Byzantine capitol. The fact is attested by her contacts with the pope or the story composed by Gregory of Tours living in distant Gaul. Despite Anicia's own awareness of the exceptional position she enjoyed the woman did not risk any involvement in the fight for the rule over the Empire, the fact that can testify either to her personal or her husband's lack of such ambitions. Being a woman, she herself was not able to attain the supreme power. In the eyes of her contemporary Constantinopolitans she appeared to be a noble lady, a person close to the imperial court, a founder of many shrines and a brave orthodoxy defender. Rulers, one can surmise, for the reason of her royal blood, wealth and popularity, preferred to have her on their side and did not undertake any hostile actions against her.

TERESA WOLIŃSKA

A Horse Monument of Justinian in Constantinople – Art and Ideology

The mighty column, erected in 543 or 544, stood in *Augusteion*, next to *Hagia Sophia*, where a silver statue of Theodosius used to stand before. Its imposing height (ca. 35 m) made it noticed by numerous authors, both Byzantine (Procopius, Gregoras, George Pachymeres) and foreign (western travelers, Russian pilgrims and Arabs). There also exist iconographic representations (including a drawing attributed to Cyriac of Ancona), depicting both the column itself and the horse monument of the emperor. The inscription on Cyriac's drawing: FON[S] GLORIAE PERENNIS THEODOSI suggests that the previous statue of Theodosius may have been used. Phyllis Willams-Lehmann thinks that Cyriac depicted on his drawing an effigy of Theodosius from his medallion rather than that of Justinian from the column. Partially recognizing the arguments of Willams-Lehmann's opponents, I personally think that only part of Theodosius' statue might have been used.

The column standing on an imposing pedestal was made of marble and adorned with metal (copper or bronze) plates and rings, which were stolen in 1204. Later surface of the column was plastered. The column was surmounted with a horse monument of the emperor of supernatural size. The ruler wore Achilles' robes, and held a globe with a cross in the left hand, while on his head rested a helmet with a plume (*toupha*). The right hand with an open palm was raised.

It is not exactly known what metal was used to cast the figure. It was probably not made of pure copper; bronze or brass seem more likely. In the course of time the monument was frequently damaged and was repaired at least three times. The chains protecting the figure were replaced too. Thanks to the repairing works George Pachymeres had a closer look of the monument by climbing up the scaffolding. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks decided about the future of the object. The column, with the horse statue having been taken away, was gradually destroyed. The figure of the emperor, which had stood in the Saray since 1453 was eventually melted in the 16th century.

The way in which Justinian was shown, his robes and gestures were interpreted as a symbol of restoration of the empire. The cross surmounting the globe is *stauros nikopoios*, the symbol of Justinian's victories and rule over Christian community. The figure turned to the east meant opposition to the power of Persia, while the raised hand – a willingness to struggle. Later authors identified different enemies of the empire. The Persians were then substituted by the Arabs or Turks.

ZOFIA BRZOZOWSKA

***Schede basilike* by Constantinopolitan Deacon Agapetus and Its Influence on the Political Thought of Medieval Russia**

The main purpose of this article is to present one of the best known sources of the Byzantine political thought – *Schede basilike*, which contains a series of exhortations in seventy-two short chapters. Their author, Agapetus – designated by the tradition as Deacon of the Great Church of Saint Sophia – addressed them to “the sacred and venerable Emperor Justinian”. This emperor was Justinian the Great, rather than Justinian II, can be gathered from chapters seventeen and thirty-four of *Schede basilike*. It is very likely, that the *Royal Sections* were written soon after the beginning of Justinian’s sole rule in 527.

The book deals in general terms with the moral, religious and political duties of a ruler. Deacon Agapetus asserts, that the Byzantine emperor is sovereign over all – he is at the helm of the ship of state (chapter 2) and is like God himself in the extent of the earthly power (chapter 21). He received his authority from God “to the similitude of the Heavenly Kingdom” (chapter 1). It means, that he is the imitator of God on Earth and the Heavenly Kingdom is the model for his state. He should imitate God in his own actions: through practice of *philanthropia* – love for his subjects and protection of the poor.

Schede basilike were widely current among the Orthodox Slavs and had a great influence on the political thought of Medieval Russia. I. Ševčenko is completely sure, that the first Slavic translation of Agapetus was made in Bulgaria in the tenth century. Excerpts from the *Royal Sections* were inserted into the famous *Prince Svjatoslav’s Izbornik of the Year 1076* and Russian manuscripts of *Florilegia* dating from as early as the twelfth century. Finally, the Greek and the Slavic version of the story of *Barlaam and Joasaph* contains two passages, which exhibit literal coincidences with *Schede basilike*.

KIRIL MARINOW

Another Constantinople. Tárnovo as the Capital City of Late-Medieval Bulgaria

Between 1185/86 and 1393 Tárnovo was the capital of the Bulgarian State (from mid-14th century of the Tárnovo Tzardom). Different factors were decisive for its history in different decades. When it became a city in the 12th century, its territory was much limited and fulfilled mainly defensive, and to a lesser degree, also economic functions. The renewal of Bulgarian statehood at the end of the century made it the most important centre of the country. The years 1185–1235, that is the era from the proclamation of the Tzardom to the restoration of the Patriarchate of Bulgaria, was the time of expansion of the capital and its prestige. Relics of saints brought to the city by the rulers, as well as churches founded to commemorate those saints played an important role in that process. The name of the city was added to the list of official titles of Bulgarian patriarchs; it also appeared in the titles of the rulers. Not unimportant was the fact that the latter chose the city as the place of permanent residence. The rulers were accompanied by the court and officials, whose structure was understood as the earthly counterpart of heavenly order, created by God himself. From that time on, it was there where state affairs would be decided. It was from there that new cultural currents spread all over the country. Finally, it was the place where the whole official ideology of the country was created. Tárnovo reflected the Constantinopolitan idea of a capital city, both formally (court ceremonies, offices and institutions) and ideologically (the cult of the capital as the city of Providence, the whole ideology of the state). As it was understood at that time, independence of the city would guarantee the existence of the country itself, while the collapse would inevitably lead to its end. Characteristic of

Tárnovo was its role as the central point in both secular and ecclesiastic administration of the Bulgarian State, while its location and architectural shape were much different from that of Constantinople. It also did not have such a long history as the Byzantine capital city, and the breaking up of Bulgarian lands in mid-14th century negatively affected its political significance. In spite of all that, it remained the most important cultural and ecclesiastical centre of the country until the end of the Second Bulgarian State. The downfall of the Byzantine capital in 1204, followed by the policy of Michael VIII Palaiologos and the weakness of the Empire in mid-14th century let the Bulgarian capital pretend to leadership in the whole Orthodox world. It should be emphasized that due to belonging to the cultural circle in which the ideas of the past were particularly remembered and valued, the role which was assigned to Tárnovo and which it actually played, differed very little from its Constantinopolitan model, although the city itself was not its perfect copy. Tárnovo as a capital city was also one of the mightiest Bulgarian fortresses. It was also the economic centre of the country, both from the point of view of the local and foreign trade. It was not by accident that the ethnic and social structure of its inhabitants reflected the one of all subjects ruled by Bulgarian rulers. The capture of the city by the Ottomans in 1393 put an end to its flourishing history as the country capital.