This is an extract from:

Dumbarton Oaks Papers, No. 54

Editor: Alice-Mary Talbot

Published by
Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection
Washington, D.C.

Issue year 2000

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

The Triumphal Way of Constantinople and the Golden Gate

Cyril Mango

The title of this paper requires a few words of justification. To my knowledge the designation Via Triumphalis (or whatever its Greek equivalent may have been) does not occur with reference to Constantinople. Nor do we find there a gate or arch named Porta Triumphalis. Yet, as Michael McCormick has shown in detail,[1] triumphs continued to be celebrated at Constantinople until the second half of the twelfth century, and it would be pedantic to argue that they should not be called triumphs because they differed in many significant respects from their Roman prototype and from one another. The question we wish to address is whether Byzantine triumphs followed a predetermined and specially designed route that may properly be called a "triumphal way." If it is granted that they did, when and how was such a route established?

In Rome the term *triumphus* referred to an archaic and highly regulated rite that was decreed by the Senate upon the fulfilment of certain strict preconditions. Scholars have disagreed whether the triumphal procession, which could be held only in Rome, always followed the same itinerary, but the chances are that it did.[2] It was a circuitous route from the Campus Martius and the Circus Flaminius, through the Porta Triumphalis (close to which stood a temple of Fortuna Redux), across the Circus Maximus, round the Palatine hill, along the Via Sacra, and finally up to the Capitol, where sacrifice was offered. Whether the Byzantine ceremonial mirrored any of these stations is a question that naturally arises. For the present it is enough to note that the Roman *triumphus* was a well-defined and inscriptionally recorded event and that there also existed a more modest rite called *ovatio,* which could be accorded to a general if the victory he had won did not meet all the required criteria for a triumph.

Such clear definitions are lacking in the Byzantine period. When we turn to our chief source, the *Book of Ceremonies,* we find that it describes a variety of different occasions, which either celebrated a victory or similar event. What may be called full triumphs, involving an emperor's entry through the Golden Gate, exhibition of captives and booty, and procession down the main street, are those of Theophilus in 831 (or 837)[3] and Basil

[1] *Eternal Victory* (Cambridge, 1986).

[2] So F. Coarelli, "La Porta Trionfale e la Via dei Trionfi," *Dialoghi di archeologia* 2 (1968): 58.

[3] *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae,* ed. J. J. Reiske, CSHB (Bonn, 1829), 503 ff (= *Constantine Porphyrogenitus: Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions,* ed. J. F. Haldon [Vienna, 1990], 146 ff). We are told (*De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 507.22 ff) that the same ceremonial was observed during Theophilus's second triumph. The

I in 878.[4] In addition, there is a sixth-century chapter devoted to the emperor's return from a campaign or long journey, more of an *adventus* than a triumph, that envisages alternative itineraries. If coming from Thrace, the emperor could make his entry by way of the Hebdomon and, presumably, the Golden Gate;[5] if arriving by water, he could choose to disembark at the forum of the Strategion or go by ship straight to the imperial palace, the last case involving no public exposure. The same chapter contains the well-known account of Justinian's return from Selymbria in 559, which, exceptionally, took place through the gate of Charisios (the Adrianople Gate) because the emperor wanted to pay his respects to Theodora's tomb at the church of the Holy Apostles.[6] Justinian had gone to Selymbria to supervise the repair of the breached Long Walls. He had engaged in no military activity and won no victory. The carefully staged ceremony did not include the exhibition of either captives or spoils (since there were none), yet when Justinian entered the palace, a triumphal address or acclamation (θριαμβευτάλιον) was recited in a loud voice, and we are told that this had been expressly arranged by the Master of Offices (the patrician Peter) because the entry had not been made through the Golden Gate.

Other pertinent accounts in the *Book of Ceremonies* are those of *epinikia* celebrated in both the Forum and the Hippodrome, with exhibition of captives and booty after a victory won by a general.[7] Finally, an emperor's entry into the city after his elevation to the throne could assume a triumphal character, as in the case of Nicephorus II.

What emerges from this brief survey is that the distinction between a triumph and an *adventus* was rather blurred. An emperor's entry into his city was normally made through the Golden Gate, but this practice could be varied in the light of particular circumstances.[8] The mention of the Strategion as an alternative point of arrival in the sixth century is, as we shall see, of some interest. For victories won by generals, no procession through the city is recorded. Even Belisarius in 534, we are told, walked on foot from his house to the Hippodrome.[9]

We should now turn our attention to the route. Before Constantine the main highway leading to Byzantium, which we conventionally call the Via Egnatia, did not follow the Marmara coast all the way, but turned inland after Heraclea in order to avoid the deep

---

accepted dates of the two triumphs are 831 and 837. W. T. Treadgold, "The Problem of the Marriage of the Emperor Theophilus," *GRBS* 16 (1975): 332, argues that the Porphyrogenitus conflated the description of the two triumphal entries.

[4] Bonn, *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 498 ff (= Haldon, 140 ff).

[5] The text (*De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 496.9 [= Haldon, 138, C687]) speaks only of a gate (πόρτη).

[6] *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 497–98 (= Haldon, 138 ff).

[7] *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 607 ff, 612 ff. Both chapters mention ἐπινικάριοι. For the historical circumstances, see McCormick, *Eternal Victory,* 161, 166. Cf. also the *acta* in the Hippodrome after a victory over the Arabs, probably in 863: *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 332–33.

[8] Theophanes, *Chronographia,* ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883–85; repr. Hildesheim, 1963), 469, records that on 24 June 793 Constantine VI brought in through the Blachernai Gate 1000 soldiers of the Armeniac theme who had mutinied. M. McCormick, "Analyzing Imperial Ceremonies," *JÖB* 35 (1985): 8, and *Eternal Victory,* 142–43, makes the ingenious suggestion that the choice of that particular gate was inspired by the circumstance that 25 June was the anniversary of the delivery of Constantinople from the Arab blockade in 678, the service of thanksgiving being held in the Blachernai church. Undoubtedly, the parade of 793 celebrated an imperial success, but can it be called a triumph?

[9] Procopius, *Wars* 4.9.3.

lagoons of Büyük and Küçük Çekmece. After passing through a place called Cenofrurio and another called Melantias, it reached Byzantium,[10] no doubt at the main land gate, which we know to have been just short of Constantine's forum.[11] Melantias, eighteen miles distant from Byzantium, has not to my knowledge been exactly localized, but it is usually placed at the north end of the two lagoons.

By 333, as we learn from the Bordeaux Itinerary, a coastal road had been built. From Heraclea it proceeded to Selymbria, Athyras (Büyük Çekmece), and Rhegion (Küçük Çekmece), and so reached Constantinople.[12] Thus there were now two roads, the old and the new,[13] and we have to ask at what points they entered Constantine's city. The old road probably did so just northwest of the church of the Holy Apostles because it was there that we find the Melantias Gate,[14] and we have seen that Melantias was the station closest to Byzantium on the old road. The fact that Constantine sited his mausoleum there, at the highest point of his city, suggests that he still considered that artery to be very important. As for the new road, it probably terminated at "Constantine's Golden Gate." Inside the city the two roads would theoretically have met at an acute angle in the general area of modern Beyazit or Lâleli.

I have put "Constantine's Golden Gate" in quotation marks because it cannot be taken for granted that Constantine built it. The *Notitia* of ca. 425 offers its earliest attestation and is also the only text that calls it "Porta aurea."[15] Thereafter it is seldom mentioned and appears under several names, including the gate of At(t)alus.[16] It was decorated with statues, including, allegedly, one of Constantine, which fell down in 740.[17] Our only description of the gate is by Manuel Chrysoloras (early 15th century), who specifies that it was built of big marble blocks, had a very wide and lofty opening, and was crowned by some kind of stoa.[18] Strangely enough, the *Patria* does not refer to it, unless it is the enigmatic tetrapylon with a chamber on top of columns (whatever that may mean) indicated in that part of the city.[19] (In Rome, too, the Porta Triumphalis is represented as a *quadrifrons*.)[20]

[10] *Itineraria romana,* ed. O. Cuntz (Leipzig, 1929), 1:20, 33, 50.

[11] Zosimus, 2:30.2, 4.

[12] *Itin. romana,* ed. Cuntz, 90–91.

[13] Cf. the mention of the *strata vetus* by Eutropius, *Breviarium,* 9.15.2, with reference to the murder of Aurelian at Cenofrurio.

[14] The decisive indication about the Melantias Gate is that it was at the Deuteron, whose situation was established by A. M. Schneider, "Deuteron und Melantiastor," *BNJ* 15 (1939): 181–86.

[15] *Notitia dignitatum,* ed. O. Seeck (Berlin, 1876), 239.8 and again at 243.56.

[16] The identity of Attalus is unclear. The only prominent person of that name in the period that concerns us, Priscus Attalus (*PLRE,* II, Attalus 2), was a usurper supported by the Visigoths (409–410, 414–415), who would certainly not have been honored at Constantinople. Indeed, his fall was celebrated by a theater spectacle and chariot races: *Chronicon Paschale,* ed. L. Dindorf, CSHB (Bonn, 1832), 573.

[17] The great earthquake of that year threw down "the statue of Constantine the Great that stood above the gate of Atalos as well as that of Atalos himself," Theophanes, *Chronographia,* ed. de Boor, 412.

[18] PG 156:45C-D.

[19] *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum,* ed. T. Preger (Leipzig, 1989), 181 (we cite this edition by page). A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos,* Ποικίλα Βυζαντινά 8 (Bonn, 1988), 359, thinks that the entry is misplaced because the silly story it tells about the corpse of a dead emperor being placed there prior to burial implies a situation between the Great Palace and the church of the Holy Apostles. The author of the *Patria* does not, however, shine by his logic. The existence of a tetrapylon near the Sigma is confirmed by the Interpretation of the Oracles of Leo the Wise, PG 107:1145B, which Berger quotes.

[20] Coarelli, "La Porta Trionfale," 68 and figs. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8.

The gate stood until 1509, when it was toppled by earthquake.[21] It was then known as the gate of Jesus (İsakapı) after a painting of the Crucifixion that was placed upon it, perhaps in the late Byzantine period.[22] Its situation, as generally acknowledged, is marked by the small Byzantine church converted into a mosque called İsakapı mescidi, and corresponds pretty well to what we know about the line of the Constantinian land walls. The latter, however, were left unfinished by Constantine and were completed by Constantius II.[23] It may even be, as we shall see below, that Julian had a hand in their construction.

The anecdotal evidence outlined above suggests that a great ceremonial gate erected either by Constantine or one of his immediate successors would naturally have marked the southern avenue as the triumphal way. The choice may have been influenced by the fact that the Byzantine equivalent of the Campus Martius (where triumphs traditionally started in Rome) was located at coastal Hebdomon at the seventh milestone. The Hebdomon, however, is first attested in 364.[24]

Our triumphal way can still be traced for much of its course on the map of Istanbul. From the vicinity of İsakapı mescidi, a straight street called Cerrahpaşa Caddesi (Fig. 1) proceeds past the pedestal of the Column of Arcadius as far as the Murad Paşa mosque (built in 1471–78), in front of which were found in 1957–58 the piers of a monumental arch and part of a colossal statue representing a river god.[25] After a gap corresponding to the valley of Aksaray, we pick up the street again at the Theodosian arch, and we know that from there it proceeded in a perfectly straight line, past Constantine's forum, to the Milion, a distance of 1,400 meters. It need not be assumed that the entire extent of this avenue was laid out by Constantine's engineers, except on paper as a long-range project.

The ceremonial stations along what became the triumphal way are known from several medieval itineraries in the *Book of Ceremonies*.[26] Although we might argue about the exact location of some of them, the sequence is established, and there are enough fixed or nearly fixed points to localize the remainder in broad terms (Fig. 2). We know much

[21] The relevant Ottoman texts unfortunately give no particulars about the appearance of the gate. See S. Y. Ötüken, "Isa kapı Mescidi ve Medresesi in Istanbul" (diss., Bonn, 1974), 134 ff.

[22] See T. Papazotos, "To Isa kapī mescidi στην Κωνσταντινούπολη," Δελτ.Χριστ.Ἀρχ.Ἑτ., 4th ser., 18 (1995): 44 ff.

[23] Julian, *Or.* 1.33, ed. J. Bidez (Paris, 1932), 1:59.

[24] When Valens was proclaimed there: *Fasti Hydatiani (Consularia CP),* ed. T. Mommsen, MGH, *AA* IX, 240; *Chron. Pasch.,* ed. Dindorf, 556. It appears from Themistius, *Or.* 6.83a, that at the time the Tribunal of the Hebdomon had not yet been given an appropriate architectural setting. Thenceforth the Hebdomon became the normal locus for imperial proclamations, which meant that the emperor's entry into the city would naturally have taken place through the Golden Gate as recorded in *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 414 ff.

[25] F. Dirimtekin, *Ayasofya Müzesi Yıllığı* 1 (1959): 3, 19, says that the piers, which were immediately destroyed, were of limestone, measured 5 × 6 m, stood 6 m apart and were preserved to a height of 2 m. R. Janin, *REB* 21 (1963): 256, on the other hand, states that the piers measured 3 × 4 m and were separated by a space of 3 m. No photograph of them appears to have been published. For the river god, see N. Fıratlı, *La sculpture byzantine figurée au Musée archéologique d'Istanbul* (Paris, 1990), no. 507, giving the date of discovery as 1959, and my remarks in *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IVe–VIIe siècles), TM,* Monographies 2, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1990), 70.

[26] The more important passages for the stretch between the Golden Gate and the Great Palace are *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 1.8 (pp. 55 ff), 1.17 (pp. 100, 105 f), and the triumph of Basil 1 (pp. 501 f). For the Holy Apostles–Great Palace stretch, see 1.5 (pp. 49 ff), 1.10 (pp. 74 ff).

less about the northerly street. The wide, nearly straight avenue that today links Beyazit, Fatih, and the Adrianople Gate is a modern creation that did not exist even in the nineteenth century.[27] Of the stations named in the *Book of Ceremonies,* only the gate of Charisios (Adrianople Gate), and the churches of the Holy Apostles and St. Polyeuktos are fixed. We do not even know for sure where the north and south streets met, although we are told it was at the Capitolium, which modern scholarly opinion places at Lâleli. I believe that view to be, broadly speaking, correct. Marcian's column, which is not mentioned in Byzantine texts, may have stood off rather than on the northern street.[28]

For our purpose the Capitolium is potentially of great interest. It is said to have been erected by Constantine, and its situation at a major urban junction identifies it as an important landmark. It seems that no capitolia were built in the empire after the Severan period,[29] but even in the fourth century the term must have been understood as a temple of the Capitoline Triad or, at any rate, a temple dedicated to the tutelary deity of Rome. It is hard to imagine to whom or what Constantine's Capitolium would have been dedicated, unless it was to the victorious sign of the cross. We know that it had a prominent cross or chrismon that fell down in a storm in 407[30] and was therefore in an exposed position. But was it an original feature or a later addition? Setting aside Professor Speck's imaginative speculations,[31] we know little about the building apart from there having been exedras on three sides and several porphyry monuments in front of it, including the Tetrarchs that are now in Venice.

It is not certain whether Constantine ever celebrated a triumph at Constantinople. He may have done so after his victory over the Goths in 332,[32] and it may be that the so-called Column of the Goths, which still stands in the gardens of the Seraglio, was erected or adapted to celebrate that occasion. The inscription on its pedestal, *Fortunae reduci ob devictos Gothos,* replaces, as Professor Peschlow has shown,[33] an earlier one, also in Latin but of unknown content. We know that the column supported a statue of Tyche,[34] and it is possible that there was next to it a temple of Fortuna Redux, as there was near the Porta Triumphalis in Rome. If Constantine did plan a triumphal way, it may even be argued on the Roman analogy that the Capitolium would have been its terminal point, meaning that the procession would have moved not from west to east, as it did in later times, but from east to west, starting perhaps at the Strategion, the agora of ancient Byzantium, where Constantine dedicated an equestrian statue of himself.[35] The Strategion, later upgraded to a forum Theodosiacum, also boasted an Egyptian obelisk and an

[27] As shown by the earliest detailed street map of the city (1882), E. H. Ayverdi, ed., *19. Asırda İstanbul haritası* (Istanbul, 1958).

[28] In my *Développement urbain,* 30, 46, I may have erred in assuming that Marcian's column lay on the northern street. Its pedestal, if I am not mistaken, is aligned very nearly north-south.

[29] See M. Cagiano de Azevedo, "I 'capitolia' dell'impero romano," *MemPontAcc* 5 (1941): 66.

[30] *Chron. Pasch.,* ed. Dindorf, 570.

[31] P. Speck, "Urbs, quam Deo donavimus . . . ," *Boreas* 18 (1995): 143–73. He even offers (p. 152) two alternative reconstructions.

[32] See McCormick, *Eternal Victory,* 39.

[33] "Betrachtungen zur Gotensäule in Istanbul," in *Tesserae. Festschrift J. Engemann* (Münster, 1991), 215–28.

[34] As clearly stated by John Lydus, *De mensibus,* 4.132.

[35] Socrates, 1.16.1.

arch surmounted by a bronze statue of Tyche holding a cornucopia.[36] In the same general area, we find something called "the Victories," presumably a monument.[37] Finally, in Region IV, which corresponds to the valley between the first and second hills, stood a *Liburna marmorea, navalis victoriae monumentum,*[38] which may have commemorated Constantine's victory over Licinius in the Hellespont in 324 or possibly that won over Gainas in 400.

In short—setting aside the Column of the Goths, which stands somewhat apart—there is evidence for a concentration of victory monuments in the area of the Strategion, which was certainly linked by a major street to the Augustaion/Great Palace center. That probably explains the choice of the Strategion for the staging of *adventus* ceremonies in the sixth century. The situation of the Strategion is not, however, known exactly (see Appendix), and I would not like to speculate here about the probable course of the connecting street, which need not have been laid out according to a rectilinear pattern. That street must have terminated at a maritime gate, probably the one called the gate of Eugenius in the Byzantine period and usually identified with the Turkish Yalıköşk kapısı.[39] Unfortunately, the gate in question was destroyed along with the Yalıköşkü when the railroad was built in 1871. It seems to have been of marble[40] and was adorned with a statue of Julian, the subject of an epigram in the Palatine Anthology (9. 689): "Julian, whom you see (οὗτος Ἰουλιανός), in setting up walls for the protection of the people, has erected a trophy, symbol of his vigilance. He is eager to slaughter his enemies at a distance rather than waging war in front of the city."

Assuming this was the emperor Julian, who was, in fact, planning a Persian campaign during his stay at Constantinople (361–362), one may well ask what were the people-saving walls (λαοσσόα τείχεα) he built and why the inscription was placed at the gate of

[36] For the obelisk, see *Notitia,* ed. Seeck, 233, and the *Patria* in *Scriptores,* ed. Preger, 183. For the arch, see Marcellinus Comes, a. 510; in the Middle Ages it was known as the Arch of Urbicius (*Patria,* 141.8).

[37] *Chron. Pasch.,* ed. Dindorf, 494, with reference to the city founded by Byzas, ἔνθα νῦν καλοῦνται αἱ Νῖκαι, πλησίον τῶν Κιλίκων (κηλίκων cod.). "The Cilicians," if that is the right reading, appears to refer to a locality. We may note that one of the plotters in the conspiracy against Justinian in 562, the banker Marcellus, is described as ἀργυροπράτης ὁ τῶν Κιλίκων ὁ ἔχων τὸ ἐργαστήριον πλησίον τῆς ἁγίας Εἰρήνης τῆς ἀρχαίας καὶ νέας (Malalas, frag. 49, *Excerpta de insidiis,* ed. C. de Boor [Berlin, 1905], 173). One may wonder whether "the Victories" had anything to do with the group of three 16-cubit statues that were set up ἐν τῷ Βοσπορείῳ in acknowledgment of Athenian help against Philip of Macedon (340–339 B.C.). These are said to have represented the *demos* of Athens being crowned by those of Byzantium and Perinthus. The source is a "decree of the Byzantines" appended to Demosthenes, *De corona,* 90–91. The text of the decree is now held to be spurious, but it does not follow that the gigantic statues did not exist.

[38] *Notitia,* ed. Seeck, 232. Its only other mention is in the context of the Nika Riot, when the insurgents departing from the Octagon, ἔβαλον πῦρ ἐπὶ τὸ Λίβυρνον ἐπὶ τὴν Μαγναύραν, but the fire was put out: *Chron. Pasch.,* ed. Dindorf, 623. If the Magnaura was the palace hall of that name, we may conclude that the Liburna was on or near the Augustaion, which did form part of the Region IV.

[39] For the situation of Yalıköşk kapısı (at the junction of the Golden Horn walls with those of the Seraglio), see "Plan particulier du Sérail," in A. I. Melling, *Voyage pittoresque de Constantinople et des rives du Bosphore* (Paris, 1819), album, pl. 49; and A. G. Paspates, *The Great Palace of Constantinople,* trans. W. Metcalfe (London, 1893), map at the end. For the identification with the gate of Eugenius, A. van Millingen, *Byzantine Constantinople: The Walls of the City* (London, 1899), 227.

[40] MM 2:467, 564. C. G. Curtis and M. A. Walker, *Broken Bits of Byzantium* (London, 1869–91), 1: no. 2, record in the neighborhood of the gate a relief of a Victory standing on a globe and in the same area (nos. 4–7) fragments of a "frieze" representing a Roman soldier holding a shield, a drowning man and striding horses.

Eugenius. The walls referred to would hardly have been the maritime walls, since in the fourth century the city faced no threat from the sea.[41] If the reference is to the completion of the land walls, it would follow that the gate of Eugenius was at the time the main point of disembarkation for visitors arriving at Constantinople—a suitable place for exhibiting such an inscription.

Tentative as they are, the observations above may provide some background to what has been considered an innovation of the Komnenian period, namely the rerouting of triumphs along the relatively short stretch from the "eastern gate of the Acropolis" to Hagia Sophia and the Great Palace.[42] Unfortunately, the new itinerary is not described in sufficient detail to make confident conclusions.[43]

As we have seen, there is considerable uncertainty both about the existence and the direction of a Via Triumphalis during the first half century of the capital's history. It is only in the Theodosian period that its path becomes established by the creation of the ceremonial fora of Theodosius and Arcadius, with their famous historiated columns, triumphal arches, and statues. The fiction that Theodosius was descended from the emperor Trajan no doubt inspired reproduction of Trajan's column and even some features of his forum in Rome.[44] Of these much-discussed monuments I have nothing new to say.

The erection of the Theodosian walls and the new Golden Gate[45] added about 1,800 meters to the length of the Via Triumphalis. I do not know why the Golden Gate was placed so close to the seashore instead of being more or less in line with the old gate, but it is worth pointing out that at no time was there a straight avenue between the two. I believe that some attempt at a monumental linkage was made but not followed up. In 435 yet another Theodosian forum was constructed *in loco qui Heliane dicitur,*[46] clearly

[41] The ancient city was, of course, walled all round, but the Constantinian extension had no maritime defences and it was only in 439 that sea walls were built. For the identification of Julian as the emperor, see A. M. Schneider, "Mauern und Tore am Goldenen Horn zu Konstantinopel," *NachrGött* (1950): 96.

[42] See P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), 240 ff.

[43] *Nicetae Choniatae Historia,* ed. J. L. van Dieten, CFHB (Berlin–New York, 1975), 18–19 (triumph of 1133), 157–58 (triumph of 1167). Theodoros Prodromos, *Historische Gedichte,* ed. W. Hörandner (Vienna, 1974), no. VI, p. 221, v. 24 ff, refers rather obscurely to a colonnade on the shore. The editor translates (p. 226 f) "auf der grossen Landzunge an der Enge der Propontis, wo zahlreiche Säulen, kreisformig angeordnet, in Kreuzform zusammengefügt sind," which I find difficult to visualize. The "eastern gate" is usually identified as that of St. Barbara (Topkapı), which was flanked by two marble towers, destroyed in ca. 1816. Situated just round the point of the promontory, facing east, where the current is strongest, and lacking a harbor (*Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris historiarum libri quattuor,* ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. [Bonn, 1828–32], 3:232), the gate of St. Barbara would not have been a convenient place of disembarkation.

[44] On the Forum of Theodosius, see now A. Berger, "Tauros e Sigma: Due piazze di Costantinopoli," in *Bisanzio e l'Occidente: Arte, archeologia, storia. Studi in onore di Fernanda de'Maffei,* ed. M. Bonfioli, R. Farioli Companati, and A. Garzya (Rome, 1996), 19–24, who argues that, contrary to previous opinion, it was a mere 55 m across.

[45] Opinion has long been divided on the question whether the existing marble gate was put up by Theodosius I or II. The majority view favors the latter, but the claim of Theodosius I was still championed by M. Wheeler, "The Golden Gate of Constantinople," in *Archaeology in the Levant. Essays for K. Kenyon,* ed. R. Moorey and P. Parr (Warminster, 1978), 238–41. What is reasonably certain is that the triple arch and flanking pylons were built as a unit and that the abutting curtain wall on the south represents a second phase, as observed by O. Davies, *JRS* 34 (1944): 74–75. That does not necessarily imply that the first and second phases were separated by an appreciable lapse of time. It seems obvious to me that the gate, with its massive pylons, was planned in the context of the new land walls, which, for all we know, may have been on the drawing board already in the reign of Theodosius I.

[46] Marcellinus Comes, s.a.

referring to Helenianae. A palace of Helenianae is known to have stood in the area of Samatya/Sulumanastır and adjoined or included a semicircular portico called Sigma.[47] Precisely at the Sigma, the *Patria* records a statue of Theodosius II on a column that was erected by the eunuch Chrysaphios Tzoumas.[48] While normally the historical veracity of the *Patria* inspires little confidence, in this case there is no need to doubt the information. Chrysaphios Tzoumas was indeed the most influential person at court in the latter years of Theodosius' reign, and the author of the *Patria,* who mentions him only here, could not have pulled his name out of a hat. In the ninth/tenth century, the triumphal way led from the Theodosian Golden Gate to the Sigma, but there one had to turn left along a street leading to the church of St. Mokios in order to reach the Exokionion or (H)exakionion, the plaza outside the "Constantinian" Golden Gate.[49]

Extending about 5.5 kilometers from the Theodosian Golden Gate to the Milion and the Hippodrome, the triumphal way took one hundred years to create and remained basically unchanged after 435. Some but probably not all of it was colonnaded. The Porticus Troadenses, so named after their columns of Hellespont granite, bordered it from the "Constantinian" Golden Gate to perhaps the Forum of Arcadius,[50] and there were certainly continuous porticoes between the Capitol and the Milion.[51] I find no clear reference to porticoes in the valley of the Lycus or outside the "Constantinian" Golden Gate. Even so, compared to the circuitous route of the Via Triumphalis in Rome, Constantinople's must have had an undeniable grandeur.

The last really flamboyant addition to the triumphal monuments of Constantinople was made by Justinian—I am referring to his column *cum* equestrian statue at the Augustaion. Its position was significant, standing as it did both at the terminal point of the triumphal way and in the closest proximity to Hagia Sophia. It was also the first and only time, if I am not mistaken, that an equestrian rather than a standing statue was placed on top of a monumental column. But did it, strictly speaking, commemorate a victory? I

[47] Berger (as in note 44) argues that the Sigma was not a forum or part of a forum, but the entrance porch of the Helenianae, which he places on the site of St. Mary Peribleptos (Sulumanastır). I am not entirely convinced.

[48] *Scriptores,* ed. Preger, 182.

[49] Combine *De cerim.,* ed. Reiske, 501.19 and 506.7.

[50] It is reasonably certain that the Troadesian porticoes, which were in Region XII (*Notitia,* ed. Seeck, 239), terminated at the Constantinian Golden Gate. Hesychius (*Scriptores,* ed. Preger, 16.5 = *Patria,* 138.1) says that Constantine moved the land walls "to the so-called Troadesian porticoes," and *Chron. Pasch.,* ed. Dindorf, 590, refers to "the Troadesian walls." The *Vita Isaacii* in cod. Monac. gr. 366, as reported by V. Tiftixoglu in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels,* ed. H.-G. Beck (Munich, 1973), 57, 96 n. 66, speaks of "the so-called Troadesian gate" (probably the Constantinian Golden Gate). Marcellinus Comes, a. 448, states that a sudden fire destroyed *utramque porticum Troadensem turresque portarum utrasque,* the damage being immediately repaired by the Praetorian Prefect Antiochus. The towers in question may have been the flanking towers of the Golden Gate. The west starting point of the porticoes is less certain. The statement that the earthquake of 447 caused damage between the Troadesian porticoes and the Bronze Tetrapylon (on the Mese) is not particularly helpful: *Chron. Pasch.,* ed. Dindorf, 589 (misdating the earthquake to 450); Malalas, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1831), 363 f; *Synaxarium CP,* 425.9. Berger, *Untersuchungen,* 353, may not be right in suggesting that the tetrapylon in question was the one near the Sigma. Fig. 3 shows a set of granite columns, which may well have belonged to the Troadesian porticoes, dug up in 1982 a short distance west of the Column of Arcadius. They have since disappeared.

[51] *Cod. Just.* 8.10.12.6 (undated law of Zeno).

have long been intrigued by the reference to "three pagan kings, also bronze and on columns, kneeling before Emperor Justinian and offering their cities into his hands." This description occurs only in two Russian pilgrim texts, of 1390 and 1420 respectively,[52] whose authors may simply have picked up a legend they were told. The three kings can easily be explained as those of the Persians, Ostrogoths, and Vandals. But if Justinian did create such a three-dimensional tableau instead of representing the barbarians in relief on the pedestal of his column, as would have been normal, how is it that this striking arrangement is not mentioned in any description of the monument from Procopius onwards? I hope to discuss on another occasion an independent, if also late, attestation of the three kings transformed into the three Magi. What appears fairly certain is that tribute-bearing barbarians, whether in relief or as statues, did form part of Justinian's monument.

The dedication of triumphal columns, statues, and arches ceased at Constantinople in the early years of the seventh century, but triumphs, as we have said, continued to be celebrated until the twelfth. We know that the tradition of depicting imperial victories was continued in mosaic or painting in palace halls and private mansions, such as those of Basil I and Manuel I, for example. But was any attempt made at a more public expression?

For an answer we must turn to the Golden Gate. It can be described as being double. The outer, or propylaeic, gate opens through the forward wall, which presumably had existed in one form or another since the Theodosian period. The outer gate led into a paved courtyard flanked by two marble pylons, between which stood the Theodosian gate with its three arched openings, originally supporting a quadriga of elephants (as did the Porta Triumphalis in Rome). Between the outer gate and the moat ran a walkway protected by a battlemented parapet. When the Castle of the Seven Towers was built by Mehmed the Conqueror, the outer gate became redundant and was blocked up. It seems that, at about the same time, the walkway in front of it was barred by a transverse wall. Visitors could then gain only a distant view across the moat.

The outer gate is still partly preserved: two ancient columns of Carystus marble are surmounted by Theodosian capitals supporting an arch. Columns, pedestals, and capitals are all reused and have been added to a pre-existing gate structure behind them. On either side of the gate, better preserved on the right than on the left, are remnants of two tiers of marble frames (only one tier remaining on the left) inserted into a straight wall of fairly regular masonry (Figs. 3, 4). The frames, placed at somewhat uneven intervals, once enclosed reliefs and are themselves reused (Fig. 5). They include a cornice fragment not earlier than the sixth century, to judge by its decoration of joined upright palmettes (Fig. 6). Soundings carried out by Theodore Macridy and Stanley Casson in 1927 shed some light on this ensemble and led to the discovery of small fragments of reliefs, both antique and Byzantine, which are now in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum.[53] Further study of the standing structure was carried out by B. Meyer-Plath and

[52] G. P. Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,* DOS 19 (Washington, D.C., 1984), 136, 184 and commentary on p. 240. Cf. my remarks in *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, 1993), study X, 3.

[53] "Excavations at the Golden Gate, Constantinople," *Archaeologia* 81 (1931): 63–84.

A. M. Schneider, who came to the view that the outer gate and straight curtain wall on either side of it dated from the second half of the fourteenth century,[54] a judgment that has been endorsed by Wolfgang Müller-Wiener[55] and further developed by Sarah Guberti Bassett.[56] However, the reasoning of Meyer-Plath and Schneider was based not on archaeological evidence, which merely shows a succession of undated building phases, but rather on a desire to link these phases with textual information. It so happens that Byzantine writers have little to say about any alterations of the Golden Gate complex for the greater part of the Middle Ages[57] but they do record considerable activity in the fourteenth century, namely under John VI Cantacuzenus (1347–54) and at the end of the reign of John V (1389–90). The relevant texts, however, have no demonstrable connection with the propylaeic gate and forward curtain wall,[58] while the careful building technique of the observable phases[59] has none of the characteristics of late Palaiologan work and, to my eye, looks middle Byzantine.

It is, however, the missing reliefs that interest us, and here, without reproducing the entire dossier of travelers' accounts, we must enter into some detail. The reliefs are first specifically mentioned in 1411 by Manuel Chrysoloras, who describes them as the Labors

[54] *Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel* (Berlin, 1943), 2:54 ff.

[55] *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls* (Tübingen, 1977), 297 and fig. 388, stating that the outer gate was thickened by John V and provided with a new facade decorated with reliefs.

[56] "John V Palaiologos and the Golden Gate in Constantinople," in Τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. *Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis, Jr.* (New Rochelle, 1993), 1:117–33.

[57] Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 570.27, reports that the Byzantine notables and armed men, in their haste to flee the city in 1204, broke down the "newly-built wall" at the Golden Gate (τὸ νεόδμητον ἐκεῖσε κατασπῶσι τεῖχος). The identity of that wall remains unclear. In the Bonn edition (ed. I. Bekker [1835], 754.15), instead of τεῖχος, we read τῶν πυλῶν ἐπιτείχισμα, translated as *nuper structo propugnaculo diruto,* which has led to the unwarranted belief that the outer wall was meant. Thus Meyer-Plath and Schneider, *Landmauer,* 41, 57: "das neugebaute Vorwerk des Goldenes Tores."

[58] As for Cantacuzenus, he states himself (Bonn ed., 3:292–93, 304) that on gaining power (1347) he repaired the top part of the two marble towers, which had long been neglected. In 1354 this fort (φρούριον) was surrendered to John V, who undid the repairs and left it unguarded. This, clearly, has nothing to do with the problem that concerns us. The later activity of John V is described by Ducas (ed. V. Grecu [Bucharest, 1958], 75), writing a good 70 years after the event, and represented as a reaction to mounting pressure from Sultan Beyazid (who acceded to the Ottoman throne on 15 June 1389), hence hardly before the latter part of that year. John's intention was not merely to strengthen the Golden Gate but to construct there a "little town" (πολίχνιον). To that end he built "two towers on either side [or on one of the two sides?] of the gate that is made of white marble" (κατασκευάσας πύργους δύο ἐν τῷ θατέρῳ [τη θατέρα cod.] τῶν μερῶν τῆς πύλης λευκῷ μαρμάρῳ συνηρμοσμένῳ [read συνηρμοσμένης?]). He did so not with new materials, which evidently could not be procured in a hurry, but by demolishing three old churches (All Saints, Forty Martyrs, and what remained of the Basilica of St. Mokios). He also fenced off part of the city from the Golden Gate as far as the seashore and made a harbor there as a place of refuge. The exact situation of the two towers is not made clear, but it is likely that they were on the inside of the Theodosian fortifications to provide a point of attachment to the wall extending to the seashore (a distance of some 350 m), which was what constituted the "little town." Soon thereafter Beyazid demanded the demolition of the new fort, and John V had no choice but to comply, a humiliation that hastened his death. These events have often been discussed, e.g., by G. Kolias, Ἑλληνικά 12 (1952): 55–57; by myself, *BZ* 45 (1952): 383–84; by J. W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus* (New Brunswick, 1969), 467–68, 546. I find it quite incredible that in the desperate circumstances in which he found himself John V would have created a vast decorative ensemble, nor can I credit his ability to procure unusually large mythological reliefs.

[59] See sketch-plan in Meyer-Plath and Schneider, *Landmauer,* 54, fig. 17, phases C and D. Phase D, which goes behind the marble jambs of the gate, exhibits very meticulous work with weathered joints plastered over and ruled horizontally and vertically.

of Hercules and the punishment of Prometheus,[60] although they may be the same works referred to in the *Patria* to the effect that the small idols (*xoana*) above and below a statue of Victory (of which more later) conveyed much knowledge of the future to those skilled in interpreting such matters.[61] Our next witness is Gyllius (1544–50), whose account may be rendered as follows:

> . . . the Seven Towers are enclosed by the city wall, having a gate, once open, but now obstructed, whose jambs (*parastades*) are two Corinthian columns of mottled [*sic*] marble marked with green veins, supporting eight colonnettes forming three arches (*sustinentes octo columellas efficientes tres arcus*). On the left side of the gate are preserved six marble plaques, each framed by colonnettes (some rounded, others square), containing nude figures fighting with clubs, artistically carved in relief. The upper ones have above them cupids, as if rushing to fly. On the right side are likewise six plaques framed in the same fashion by colonnettes. In the first plaque of the lower [row] is a youth holding a musical instrument, lying on his back, his legs crossed. Above him is suspended a little figure, like that of a cupid, and above the cupid is a woman. In the upper plaque, is a nude figure holding an upright club, a lion skin wrapped round his arm, leading dogs with his left hand. Above this figure is a she-lion with swollen paps. Another plaque contains two peasants carrying baskets full of grapes. In another is a winged horse, a woman holding its bridle. At the back are two other women. In the upper part of the plaque, another woman is lying down, and near her lies a youth. I have set down these particulars because of the ancient and high artistry of these plaques.[62]

The statement that the two Carystian columns carried eight colonnettes forming three arches troubled Josef Strzygowski, who, after toying with the unlikely idea that *columellas* should be emended to *columbellas* (the little doves at the corners of the Theodosian capitals), had to admit that Gyllius made a mistake: the eight colonnettes were on either side of the gate.[63] It is, of course, entirely possible that Gyllius erred in this respect or that his text was garbled in the process of editing, but unless we are sure that what he says is impossible, we are left with the statement that there was a superstructure above the gate consisting of either paired colonnettes or, more probably, two rows of four each, subtending three arches.

In the 1620s a notorious attempt was made on behalf of two English noblemen, the Earl of Arundel and the Duke of Buckingham, to acquire the reliefs for their private collections of antiquities. The task fell to the British ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, who was less than enthusiastic about the project but did his best to please the noble lords. Besides, Arundel had sent his chaplain, a certain William Petty, who proved extremely persistent. Writing to Buckingham in 1625, Roe describes the reliefs of the Golden Gate in the following terms:

> . . . upon the sides and *over yt* [my emphasis] twelve tables of fine marble, cutt into historyes, some of very great relevo, sett into the wall, with small pillars, as supporters. Most of the figures are equall, some above the life, some less. They are, in my eye, extremly decayed; but Mr. Petty doth so prayse them, as that he hath not seene much better in the great . . . collections of Italye. . . . There are of them but sixe that are woorth the

[60] PG 156:45.
[61] *Scriptores,* ed. Preger, 183.
[62] *De topographia Constantinopoleos* (Lyon, 1561), iv.9, pp. 217–18.
[63] "Das Goldene Thor in Konstantinopel," *JDAI* 8 (1893): 19–21.

> taking downe, the other being flatt Gothish bodyes, lame, and of later tymes, sett up only to fill places of the other sixe. Two, in my opinion (though Mr. Petty like them) want much of excellence, great, but brute; and, as I coniecture, are some storye of Hercules, not mentioned in his labors. The fower [four] to which I have most affection, are fuller of woorke: the one is . . . an Endimion carelessly sleeping by his sheepe; Luna descending from the sckye with a torch in her hand, representing night; and a Cupid hovering in the ayre. . . . The next is an historye I understand not, eyther of some race or game; in the middest is a horse, a young man naked running by yt, and reaching to pull another off. Some other figures there are, which I remember not; but it hath beene a peice of great bewtye and art; the relevo so high, that they are almost statues, and doe but seeme to sticke to the ground; some leggs, and other parts, standing holow off, are broken and lost; yet in the whole, it hath a show of rare antiquitye. The third is a Pegasus, with the Nimphs or Muses; one representing the founteyne Pirenne powring out water. These figures are many, but less than halfe the life. . . . The last is a Satyre, sckipping betweene an Hercules, or a wild man, and a woman . . . the one hath a whip in his hand, the other a pot of water behind her, and may signifye a rescue from ravishment; these are above the life, and rather great and stately than delightfull.[64]

Roe did his best to bribe the captain and soldiers who manned the castle, but to no avail. "The soldiers," he continued, "cannot steal them, beeing 30 foot and 40 foot high, made fast to the wall with iron pinns; and must bee let downe with scaffolds, and the help of at least 50 men." The following year, in April 1626, Roe was still hopeful. The reliefs were promised and the money deposited, but a month later the whole project collapsed. No less a person than the Sultan's Grand Treasurer had agreed to remove the reliefs, but when Roe arrived on the scene, the Castellano and the people mutinied, claiming that the statues were enchanted and that some calamity would befall the city if they were taken down. "Though I could not gett the stones," concluded Roe, "yet I allmost raised an insurrection in that part of the citty."[65]

Since it is unpublished, it may also be worth quoting the 1670s account of Dr. John Covel, although he does not appear to have inspected the reliefs at close quarters. Covel wrote:

> In the wall on either side this Gate are severall Bassi Relievi, which have been very good work; we have a particular account of them in P. Gyllius which we must be satisfyed withall, for to attempt to draw them without leave, may be the hazard of a mans head; the Turkes, as is said, being extremely jealous of men making any remarkes [notes], especially about this place. I have often mention's this matter to his Excellency, the Marquesse Nointel, embassadore from France, who was very curious and had two painters by him for such purposes; he resolved then to get leave for them to designe this whole work, but whether he did it after my departure or no, I know not. It is my present opinion that these several Tables were not thus placed together at first, neither do they seem all of the same Hand, or Order, or Work, or Designe. Travellers do fancy there, Endymion, Phaeton, Hercules, Pegasus, several Cupids, Venus, Adonis, Apollo, Cadmus' sons of the Earth fighting with clubs, men with baskets of Grapes. Yet I cannot imagine what relation these can have to one another. Therefore I conjecture they might have

[64] *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe in His Embassy to the Ottoman Porte* (London, 1740), 386–87. On this incident, cf. A. Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain,* trans. C. A. M. Fennell (Cambridge, 1882), 11 ff.

[65] *Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe,* 434, 444, 495, 497, 512.

> been brought of old from other places and here placed to adorne this Gate when it was open, it having been of Great Note formerly.[66]

Covel fails to say that in his time there were only five or six reliefs remaining, as we learn from Dr. Spon and Sir George Wheler, who met him at Constantinople. These two travelers, who did see the reliefs, mention specifically the Fall of Phaethon, Hercules leading Cerberus, and a sleeping Adonis being approached by Venus. They also say that the Marquis de Nointel was promising to have them sketched.[67] Alas, this does not appear to have happened. Gradually, the number of reliefs was reduced to two,[68] then to one,[69] then to none.[70] Although we possess no pictorial record of them, we can attempt to visualize their appearance in the 1620s. Sir Thomas Roe's account contains two noteworthy statements. The first is that the reliefs were 30 or 40 feet above the ground and that some of them were over the gate. Since he was not a casual observer but concerned with the practicalities of taking them down, it is not likely that he grossly misjudged his figures. Today the bottom tier of frames, which are 2.30 meters tall, is at approximately eye level. The second tier rises another two meters or so. Nor has the ground level of the walkway risen to any appreciable extent. The explanation for this apparent puzzle is provided by a view of the Castle of the Seven Towers by Francesco Scarella of ca. 1685 (Figs. 8, 9).[71] It shows the outer gate twice its present height, flanked by four rows of frames.[72] The twelve reliefs seen by Gyllius and Roe, among others, would probably have been in the two uppermost tiers. Those in the lower tiers, if they ever existed, would have been destroyed at an earlier date. Possibly they included the Punishment of Prometheus, mentioned only by Chrysoloras.

The second interesting statement made by Roe is that some of the figures—he specifically mentions the relief with Hercules, a satyr and a woman (probably Drunken Hercules)[73]—were "above the life," which accords with the height of the two bottom tiers of frames (2.30 and approximately 2 m, respectively). These are unusually large dimensions for mythological or genre reliefs.[74] We are not dealing, therefore, with, say, cut-up Roman

[66] British Library, Add. MS 22912, fol. 83.

[67] J. Spon and G. Wheler, *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece et du Levant, fait aux années 1675 et 1676* (Lyon, 1678), 1:262–63.

[68] So G.-J. Grelot, *Relation nouvelle d'un voyage de Constantinople* (Paris, 1680), 79, and (copying Grelot?) Cornelis de Bruyn (visit 1678–80), *A Voyage to the Levant* (London, 1702), 51–52.

[69] So Choiseul-Gouffier (ambassador to the Porte from 1784 until 1789), *Voyage pittoresque dans l'Empire ottoman* (Paris, 1842), 4:477. Not shown in his view of the Golden Gate (pl. 89).

[70] Cosimo Comidas de Carbognano, *Descrizione topografica dello stato presente di Costantinopoli* (Bassano, 1794; repr. Rome, 1992), 35. No reliefs were seen in 1795 by J. Dallaway, "An Account of the Walls of Constantinople," *Archaeologia* 14 (1803): 241–42 and pl. XLIV.

[71] Austrian National Library, cod. 8627, fol. 5. See F. Babinger, "Francesco Scarella e i suoi disegni di Costantinopoli (circa 1685)," *Rivista d'arte* 35 (1960): 153–67, esp. 155–56 and fig. 7. In spite of the fact that Babinger described our drawing as a "schizzo singolare," it has attracted little attention.

[72] The drawing appears to be in error in showing the arch of the gate at the level of the fourth rather than the second row of frames. Another interesting feature of the drawing is the superstructure of the two marble pylons.

[73] Cf. *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae* (*LIMC*), s.v. Herakles, 3257 ff.

[74] Prof. R. R. R. Smith kindly calls my attention to the relatively large reliefs representing the Labors of Hercules from the Roman villa of Chiragan near Toulouse, but these are no more than 1.50 m high: E. Espérandieu, *Recueil général des bas-reliefs de la Gaule romaine* (Paris, 1908), 2: no. 899.

sarcophagi but with pieces that must have been obtained from some sumptuous villa or public building, possibly outside Constantinople. These were combined with smaller-scale carvings, both antique and Byzantine, to produce a huge montage. A comparable confection, which I discussed on another occasion,[75] decorated the maritime facade of the imperial palace and was made up of non-figural sculpture with a few sitting lions thrown in. It was assembled, I believe, in the ninth or tenth century. The Golden Gate ensemble, which I would be inclined to place in roughly the same period, was an altogether grander affair. Some 40 feet high, it would have looked from a distance not unlike the face of a Roman triumphal arch. Only at closer quarters would its makeshift character have been apparent. Covel was, of course, right in saying that the reliefs had been collected from different places, were at different scales, and had no connection with one another. The imprecision of the travelers' accounts, not all of them based on autopsy, does not, unfortunately, allow us to identify securely more than a few of the compositions: Endymion with Selene (represented by extant fragments), Hercules leading Cerberus,[76] Pegasus tended by nymphs,[77] probably the Drunken Hercules, perhaps Achilles pursuing Troilus.[78] Conceivably, one could read some kind of message into this assemblage—perhaps victory or the blessings of peace following the toils of war—but I would be reluctant to do so. In a passage I have already quoted, the *Patria* speaks of a female statue holding a crown, i.e., a Victory. According to some manuscripts it stood "outside," so possibly was over the outer Golden Gate and was about to crown a victor coming from the west. If that statue, said to have been of bronze, was part of the same ensemble, it would have made the whole all the more impressive.

We have tried to identify a triumphal monument of the middle Byzantine period, and I believe we have found one. Which particular occasion it commemorated remains, of course, a matter of speculation. One is tempted to think of the triumph of Nicephorus Phocas in 965, celebrated after his victories in Cilicia, for on that occasion he brought with him the bronze gates of conquered Tarsus and Mopsuestia, installing the former at the Acropolis walls, the latter at the Golden Gate.[79] One can imagine the ensemble of ancient sculpture being created to set off the Arab spoils. Such an initiative, in any case, would have been meaningful while the Golden Gate was still used for triumphal entries, that is, before the Komnenian period.

Exeter College, Oxford

[75] "Ancient Spolia in the Great Palace of Constantinople," *Byzantine East, Latin West. Art-Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann* (Princeton, 1995), 645–49.

[76] Cf. *LIMC,* s.v. "Herakles," 2643 (tomb of Nasonii on Via Flaminia). Gyllius' statement that Hercules was leading "dogs" may be explained by Cerberus' three heads, probably held by three leashes.

[77] Cf. *LIMC,* s.v. "Pegasos," C3, D (again, tomb of Nasonii). This is a very rare subject, not represented in stone sculpture.

[78] With reference to Roe's naked young man running by a horse, reaching to pull another off. The identification was suggested by Strzygowski, "Das Goldene Thor," 33 ff.

[79] Skylitzes, ed. I. Thurn (Berlin, 1973), 270; Zonaras, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst (Bonn, 1897), 3:503.

Appendix

The Situation of the Strategion

Current opinion places the Strategion at Sirkeci, that is, in the area of the railroad terminal[80] rather than near the Sublime Porte, as had been held earlier. Is it possible to be more precise?

We have seen that a Theodosian forum was installed in the Strategion and adorned with an Egyptian obelisk. The expression *Strategium, in quo est forum Theodosiacum*[81] suggests that the forum was not coextensive with the Strategion, but was only a portion of it. The patriographers, for their part, speak of a "great" and a "small" Strategion, designations that have remained somewhat unclear. The obelisk, still standing in the tenth century, was in the great Strategion as were other monumental adornments, including a statue allegedly of Alexander and a tripod. The small Strategion was said to have had a statue of Leo I[82] and an inscription in lead (?) letters.[83] It can be provisionally suggested that we have here a civic forum flanked by a smaller marketplace, an arrangement that occurs elsewhere, for example, at Palmyra.

According to the author of the *Patria,* the "monolith" at the Strategion was a fragment of the obelisk in the Hippodrome and had been brought from Athens [*sic*] by the patrician Proklos at the time of Theodosius II.[84] At first sight this statement appears acceptable, or nearly so. The Hippodrome obelisk is lacking about two-fifths of its original height, perhaps as much as 12 meters. The fracture may have occurred at Constantinople, and it is quite conceivable that the lower section, after being tapered at the top, was erected at the Strategion by the same Proculus (urban prefect, 388–392), whose name appears in the Hippodrome inscription, along with that of Emperor Theodosius. The patrician Proklos is not mentioned elsewhere in the *Patria* and is unlikely to have occurred to the semi-educated author through confusion with some other Proklos (e.g., the Neoplatonist philosopher) who lived during the reign of Theodosius II. It is more probable that the author read the name in an inscription. If this scenario is true, the monolith of the Strategion would have been rather squat and thick and would yield no topographical indication.

There exists, however, another piece of evidence that may deserve more credence. Gyllius

[80] See my *Développement urbain,* 19. My suggestion that it may have been on the site of the main post office (ibid., 70) is probably incorrect in the light of the evidence presented here. Cf. also Berger, *Untersuchungen,* 408.

[81] *Notitia,* ed. Seeck, 233, Reg. V.

[82] *Patria,* 184.9.

[83] *Parastaseis* in *Scriptores,* ed. Preger, 34.8. The wording is very obscure: ἐν τῷ μικρῷ Στρατηγίῳ μόλιβδος πολὺς χρηματίζει, ἢ αὐτὸς ὁ μόλιβδος ἢ μολίβδου διάθεσις ἔγγραφος, etc. I take χρηματίζει (act.) to mean "is, exists." Cf. Lampe s.v., 5. The meaning cannot be "large amounts of lead are exchanged" as rendered in A. Cameron and J. Herrin, eds., *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century* (Leiden, 1984), 87.

[84] *Scriptores,* ed. Preger, 183, no. 60.

reports that when he first came to Constantinople (1544) he saw an obelisk of Egyptian granite (*ex lapide Thebaico*) standing within the Seraglio enclosure (*intra claustrum regium*) on the side of the first hill facing north, next to the workshops of the Sultan's glaziers, or glassmakers (*iuxta domum vitreariarum officinarum regiarum*). A little later he saw it moved out of the Seraglio and lying on the ground. It measured 35 feet in height and, if memory served him right, 6 feet to the side, so that its lower perimeter was 24 feet. It was bought by the Venetian nobleman Antonius Priolus (Priuli), who was intending to export it and set it up in the piazza of St. Stephen, presumably the present Campo Morosini or Campo S. Angelo,[85] but it does not seem to have ever reached Venice.

The measurements given by Gyllius are consistent with the shape of an obelisk and prove that the monument he saw could not have been the bottom part of the Hippodrome obelisk, which would have been considerably wider at the base.[86] Nor could it have been the same as the small porphyry obelisk standing today in the garden of the Istanbul Archaeological Museum (width 1.12, preserved height 4.13 m). In the absence of any other recorded obelisk, it is reasonable to suggest that Gyllius saw the one from the Strategion, and since it was standing in 1544, it must have been *in situ*. Unfortunately, the location of the Seraglio glass workshops does not appear to be recorded, except that they faced the Golden Horn. In view of the smoke generated in the course of smelting, they must have been on the periphery of the palace enclosure. In general, the Ottoman capital imported its glass, mostly from Venice, but there is evidence of considerable local production during the construction of the Süleymaniye mosque (1550–57).[87] Thereafter, the palace workshops probably declined, hence the lack of information about them. It would not be unreasonable to place them just within the Bostancı kapısı (Demirkapı), the northernmost gate of the Seraglio walls. I see no serious objection to locating the Strategion there, that is, some 300 meters east of Sirkeci station, almost directly on the shore of the ancient harbor. There may be a hint at the closeness between water and marketplace in the reference by Themistius (in 350) to "harbors within gates through which the sea flows in and is entwined with those in the midst of the agoras."[88]

[85] *De topographia CP,* ii. 11.

[86] The sides of the extant obelisk range from 2.21 to 2.57 m, but the complete monument must have been more than 1 m wider at the base.

[87] See the thorough study by M. Rogers, "Glass in Ottoman Turkey," *IstMitt* 33 (1983): 239–67, esp. 242. Ö. Küçükerman, "Camcılık," *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* 2 (Istanbul, 1994):373, mentions the existence in the 1550s of glass workshops "between the Topkapı palace and the Golden Horn," but cites no reference.

[88] *Or.* 4.60d.