

# Gates to Asia Minor: The Harbours of Chalcedon, Chrysopolis, Hiereia and Eutropiu Limen Opposite Constantinople

## Preliminary Geographical and Historical Remarks

A glance at a map or a city plan of today's İstanbul shows that, not only the entire area, but also the densely populated area of the »İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi« (metropolitan municipality of İstanbul), both in area and in population (about 15 million inhabitants), many times surpasses the »Stambul« of the Ottoman period, which corresponded to the Byzantine Constantinople. For many years, the Asian parts of this metropolitan area with about 5 million inhabitants have been more than merely suburbs of İstanbul, as they were regarded at the turn of the nineteenth century. With industries, offices and administrative centres whose skyline is in no way different from that of other major cities, an international airport and dense residential areas, they are a genuine counterpart to the districts on the European side. In 1973, with the opening of the first road bridge over the Bosphorus, the Boğaziçi Köprüsü, a »land connection« was created between the European and Asian districts. In the meantime, the second Bosphorus bridge, the Fatih Sultan Mehmet Köprüsü, has been in existence since 1988; a third Bosphorus bridge, the Yavuz Sultan Selim Köprüsü crossing the northern part of the Bosphorus between Garipçe and Poyraz, was opened to traffic on 26 August 2016<sup>1</sup>. In 2013, the first section of Marmaray, the suburban railway line under the Bosphorus, began operation. In the first years, it connected only the old centre of İstanbul with the Asian districts of Üsküdar (the old Chrysopolis) and Kadıköy (the old Chalcedon), but it has now been extended to the nearby European and Asian hinterland. Recently this suburban line is also being used for long-distance travel and freight transport between Europe and Asia<sup>2</sup>.

Apart from two pontoon bridges over the Bosphorus attested during Antiquity, and in both cases only designed for single use<sup>3</sup>, every journey between Byzantium/Constantino-

ple/İstanbul and the shore of Asia Minor had to be by ship until 1973. The significance of the traffic between Europe and Asia over the Bosphorus, important throughout Antiquity, naturally increased with the foundation of Constantinople on the site of the ancient city of Byzantium as the capital and centre of the Roman and Byzantine Empires respectively. Everyone, whether private person, merchant, clergyman, administrative or military personnel, who travelled from Constantinople to the eastern provinces of the Empire (and vice versa) and any commodity brought from Constantinople to Asia Minor or from there to the capital, was reliant on the ship connections between Europe and Asia Minor, and in particular the harbours lying directly opposite Constantinople. Shipping traffic can be assumed to have been lively, which is also abundantly documented in the sources.

The aim of this chapter is to provide a brief overview of the harbours that were located in the suburbs of the capital on the coast of Asia Minor, and, as it were, still belonged to Constantinople. This study deals with the harbours in the order of their importance, deduced from the written sources: Chalcedon/Kadıköy, Chrysopolis/Üsküdar, Hiereia/Fenerbahçe and the »Harbour of Eutropios« (Eutropiu Limen, east of Chalcedon in the present-day area of Kalamış). After giving an account of their geographical peculiarities and the archaeological remains, their actual and, as will be shown, quite different uses are described on the basis of selected sources. The other harbours along the Bosphorus and the east coast of the Sea of Marmara, which were more important for regional traffic, are not taken into account here. In addition, I will not discuss the commercial harbours of Nicomedia/İzmit at the eastern end of the Gulf of the same name, and Kios/Gemlik at the eastern end of the next bay to the south, the Kianos Kolpos/Gemlik Körfezi; not the harbours on the south bank of the Gulf of Nicomedia, especially Pylai/Yalova and Helenopolis/Hersek, which were often used to shorten the land route to Central Asia Minor<sup>4</sup>.

1 On the third Bosphorus bridge, see, for example: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yavuz\\_Sultan\\_Selim\\_Bridge](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yavuz_Sultan_Selim_Bridge) (accessed 9 June 2020).

2 On the Marmaray project, see, for example: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marmaray> (accessed 9 June 2020).

3 The first pontoon bridge over the Bosphorus was installed in 513 BC by the Persian King Darius in connection with his campaign against the Scythians, presumably between Anadolu Hisarı and Rumeli Hisarı (Herodotus IV 85. 87. – Merkelbach, Kalchedon 92. – Müller, Bildkommentar 792-799. 850-852). The

second pontoon bridge over the Bosphorus is said to have been built in AD 641 for Emperor Heraclius, who was physically and mentally broken after being defeated by the Arabs in 636. He is said to have suffered from an insurmountable fear of water (Nikephoros Patriarches, Breviarium 72 [Mango]. – Suda II 1931 [s. v. Herakleios]). The information is not considered necessarily trustworthy today. – See Kaegi, Heraclius 287 f.

4 For traffic between these harbours and Constantinople, see Lefort, Communications 210-215.

The part of the coast studied here has, or had, three natural harbours that offered more or less good protection against winds and waves: Chrysopolis/Üsküdar and the two harbours of Chalcedon/Kadıköy. They are all located at the mouths of rivers and, like many Mediterranean harbours located at estuaries, are subject to the problem of siltation<sup>5</sup>. This process is most advanced at the northernmost of these harbours, that of Chrysopolis, whose harbour has now completely disappeared. The harbour of Hierēia/Fenerbahçe could use a smaller bay, which had to be expanded into a fully-fledged harbour by the construction of large perimeter walls. The Eutropios harbour was entirely artificially created.

## The Two Harbours of Chalcedon

Chalcedon/Kadıköy was located on a hilly peninsula that protruded south into the Sea of Marmara, approximately corresponding to the present-day district of Moda (fig. 1). This peninsula was bordered to the north-west and to the east by the two estuaries of the River Himeros/Ayrılıksu and of the river of the same name as the town, Chalcedon/Kurbağalidere. It thus had two harbours, which were separated only by a 500m long isthmus, which roughly marked the northern boundary of the actual urban area. However, these two harbours are distinguished only in the *Anapulus* of Dionysius of Byzantium (second century AD)<sup>6</sup>. No other ancient or Byzantine source deals with this geographical peculiarity. Both harbours are now largely silted up by the deposits of these rivers. The wide bay, which today opens south of the Haydarpasha train station, is all that remains of the western or more precisely the north-western harbour. It is now mainly used for the still heavy ferry service from and to İstanbul and to the Princes' Islands. Research publications trace the course of the ancient (and Byzantine) coastline slightly differently. It is agreed that the bay in the estuary of the Himeros river formed a now completely disappeared inlet to the northeast and that it was also considerably reduced in the east and south by sedimentation<sup>7</sup>. The location of the actual harbour

is disputed. The inlet at the Himeros estuary would certainly have offered the best protection against northern winds, and Merkelbach marks an »ancient harbour« here without explanation in the text<sup>8</sup>. The serious disadvantage of a harbour at the old mouth of the Himeros river is the distance of about 500 m to the walled urban area. The old harbour is thus much more probably to be located on the southern shore of the bay, which is directly adjacent to the urban area, following Janin and Asgari/Fıratlı. The relatively open position certainly required protection by elaborate moles. In fact, as Petrus Gyllius reports, their last remains were removed in the long silted-up harbour area around the middle of the sixteenth century. His description also points to this area<sup>9</sup>. Due to the location directly facing Constantinople, it can be assumed that this western harbour was the main harbour of Chalcedon<sup>10</sup>.

Even less has remained of the eastern natural harbour around the mouth of the river Chalcedon. Today, only the broad and quiet river Kurbağalidere that flows through the recent alluvial soil (the old harbour bay), now called Kuş Dili (»bird tongue«), serves as a harbour for small fishing boats<sup>11</sup>. Due to the infilling of the two bays, the old isthmus has disappeared and the peninsula character of the urban area of Chalcedon has been lost. Also on the eastern side of the peninsula of Chalcedon, Petrus Gyllius saw the ruins of an old harbour mole, which he mistakenly considered to be the remains of the Eutropios Harbours (see below), but which were probably a part of the eastern harbour of Chalcedon<sup>12</sup>.

What do the sources say about the harbour or harbours of Chalcedon and their significance? The town was considered the usual starting point of the road diagonally crossing Asia Minor, important since the later part of the Roman imperial period, the so-called »Pilgrim's Road«, which led to Cilicia, Syria and the Holy Land<sup>13</sup>. At various points on this Pilgrim's Road many routes branched off that led to the northeast and east of Asia Minor, e.g., to the Euphrates<sup>14</sup>, which of course increased the importance of the harbour at its outset. Two reports from the Early Byzantine period underline the value of Chalcedon as a ferry harbour. Emperor Justinian I (527-565) discontinued the so-called *cursus publicus* on the

5 On siltation as a general problem of Mediterranean harbours in estuaries, see, e.g., Veikou, *Mediterranean Byzantine Ports 41-43 et passim*.

6 Dionysii Byzantii *Anapulus* 34. – Petrus Gyllius, *De Bosporo Thracio* 246. 250f.; French translation: Grémois, Gilles 244. 247 f. At this point, a comment is due on the relationship between the three works, which are often cited below. Petrus Gyllius (Pierre Gilles) translated, partly paraphrasing, the Greek text of Dionysius of Byzantium into Latin and after each section added extremely valuable comments and observations of his own. Jean-Pierre Grémois translated the Latin text of Pierre Gilles into French with numerous footnotes. The original Greek text (in Dionysii Byzantii *Anapulus*), still read completely by Gyllius, is partially lost today so that the content of the lost passages is known only from Gyllius' translation.

7 Compare the hypothetical course of the old coastlines on the maps at Janin, *Grands Centres* 30 and Asgari/Fıratlı, *Nekropole* 5. The coastline on the map in the historically still valuable article: Janin, *Banlieue I-II*, 353, is obsolete due in part to the more recent observations of Janin himself.

8 Map at Merkelbach, *Chalcedon* 142, which takes up the coastline from Asgari/Fıratlı, *Nekropole*.

9 Maps at Janin, *Grands Centres*, and Asgari/Fıratlı, *Nekropole*. – Cf. Janin, *Banlieue I-II*, 373f. and Petrus Gyllius, *De Bosporo Thracio* 252; French translation: Grémois, Gilles 248.

10 Lehmann-Hartleben, *Hafenanlagen* 251. – Not entirely explainable in this respect is the note in Dionysii Byzantii *Anapulus* 34 that one natural harbour looks west, the other artificial, to the east and Byzantium. Significantly, Petrus Gyllius, *De Bosporo Thracio* 244, in his paraphrase, omits these last words.

11 Also for the area of the old eastern harbour, the approximate old coastlines can be seen on the maps in Janin, *Grands Centres* 30 and Asgari/Fıratlı, *Nekropole* 5.

12 Petrus Gyllius, *De Bosporo Thracio* 253; French translation: Grémois, Gilles 250.

13 *Itinerarium Antonini* 139, 1-2: *Calcedonia, traiectus in Bithinia*. – *Itinerarium Burdigalense* 515, 9-10: *A Constantinopoli transis Pontum, venis Calcedoniam, ambulat provinciam Bithyniam*. – *Tabula Peutingeriana* VIII 1-2: *Calcedonia* is marked as the starting point of the road through Asia Minor; Chrysopolis (see below) is marked on the map as north of *Calcedonia*, but without a road connection indicated.

14 For the most important branches, see Belke, *Paphlagonien und Honorias* 117 f. (from Nicomedia via Paphlagonia to Pontos). – Belke, *Galatien und Lykaonien* 104f.; Hild, *Straßensystem* 104-107 (from Ankyra via Tabia to Sebasteia and Melitene). – Hild, *Straßensystem* 77 (from Ankyra via Kaisareia to Melitene or Germanikeia).

road between Chalcedon and Dakibyza/Gebze. *Cursus publicus* denotes the Roman-Byzantine overland »postal service«, which served exclusively for the transmission of messages and the transport of certain persons and goods strictly in the interest of the state. This service was replaced by a maritime connection from Constantinople to Helenopolis/Hersek on the south bank of the Gulf of Nicomedia that was not safe, especially in winter, and this economic measure was immediately heavily criticised and did not last<sup>15</sup>. The second report to be cited here shows how inconsistently the above-mentioned discontinuation of the *cursus publicus* was carried out. From the paradigmatic description of one of the diplomatic missions of the Persian great envoy Isdekos (Isdigusnas Zich, mid-sixth century), it can be deduced that Chalcedon was the terminus of the journey before the ceremonial entry into Constantinople. The envoy and his entourage were led across Asia Minor to Helenopolis, and here he had the choice to cross the Gulf of Nicomedia to Dakibyza by boat and from there by land to Chalcedon (for ceremonial reasons he could not go by sea directly to Constantinople), or take the road around the whole Gulf of Nicomedia to get to Chalcedon<sup>16</sup>.

The following compilation of a selection of crossings testified to in the sources proves that Chalcedon was the most important ferry harbour to and from Asia Minor especially during the early and the Middle Byzantine period, both for local traffic and long-distance transport<sup>17</sup>. From the Comnenian period onwards, Chrysopolis (and the Cape Damalis, which is located within Chrysopolis) are mentioned more frequently than Chalcedon as a crossing place<sup>18</sup>. Details of the types of vessels used are rarely given – the harbour itself, its facilities, warehouses, accommodation, barracks, etc., are mentioned even less or not at all. However, they are to be presumed as a prerequisite for the function of the harbour.

According to the focus of the reports in the Byzantine sources, especially the historiographical ones, journeys of the emperors with their imperial household, their officials and occasionally their armies are mentioned particularly frequently. This group is, therefore, placed at the beginning. Between 400 and 803 alone, at least ten journeys of Byzantine emperors between Constantinople and Chalcedon are explicitly and unquestionably attested (only a small part of the known crossings actually mention the destination or departure harbour). Emperor Arcadius personally went to Chalcedon to negotiate with the Goth Gainas for the extradition of his main political opponents<sup>19</sup>. On the occasion of

the intrigue of the eunuch Chrysaphios, we are informed *en passant* that Emperor Theodosius and also the synod (*synodus endemusa*) tarried at Chalcedon (perhaps already in the imperial palace?) in 446<sup>20</sup>. In the year 475, Emperor Zenon fled from Constantinople via Chalcedon to Isauria<sup>21</sup>. In 518, Emperor Justin I and the *magister militum* Vitalianus met in the Euphemia Church in Chalcedon to agree on the new Chalcedonian church policy. Together they made their entry into Constantinople<sup>22</sup>. Emperor Constantine III (Herakleios Neos Konstantinos) spent much of his short reign (February to May 641) in Chalcedon, where he had a palace built<sup>23</sup>. It is clear that the mere existence of an imperial palace brought about an active traffic of the emperor, his family, his imperial household and his officials. His successor Heraklonas (May to September 641) was forced to negotiate a peaceful solution in Chalcedon with the general Valentinus, who, with his troops, acted as the protector of the children of Constantine III<sup>24</sup>. Constantine V, however, did not return from Chalcedon directly to Constantinople, but first went to Thrace in order to besiege the rebel Artabados in Constantinople. He had the required troops from Western Asia Minor (theme of Thrakesion) ferried over the Dardanelles near Abydos (not far north of Çanakkale)<sup>25</sup>. In 803, Emperor Nikephoros I sustained a riding accident in a *proasteion* (suburb, house in a suburb, or country estate) in Chalcedon<sup>26</sup>. Whether the *proasteion* is the one built by Constantine III or another imperial palace must remain open. At any rate, this note, handed down without any context, shows how frequent the journeys of the emperors between Constantinople and Chalcedon must have been, and it is precisely for this reason that they are not mentioned in the sources. Byzantine everyday life was usually not reported.

Hundreds of officials and military personnel must have travelled constantly between the capital and the eastern provinces of the empire. Chalcedon would also have been the most important harbour for this group of people. A commission met on behalf of Emperor Julian in 361 in Chalcedon to purge the imperial household of followers of Constantius II<sup>27</sup>. Illos, the general and rebel of Isaurian origin, must have often crossed the waterway between Constantinople and Asia Minor during his long career. In 478, he was recalled from Isauria and solemnly received by Emperor Zenon before reaching Chalcedon. However, he only dared to enter the capital after his opponent, the former Empress Verina, was arrested and then banished to Dalisandos in Isauria<sup>28</sup>. In the following year,

15 Prokopios, *Anecdota* 30, 8f. (182 Haury/Wirth). – Belke, *Pflasterstraße* 271 f.

16 Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos, *De cer.* I 89 (400-403 Reiske) or I 98 (II 393 [Dagron et al.] and D. Feissel, *Commentaire* IV,1 532-537). – PLRE IIIA 722 f. – Dimitroukas, *Reisen* I 237-240.

17 These compilations are based on the corresponding lemmata in Belke, *Bithynien and Hellespont*.

18 Magdalino, *Review* 260, correctly underlines this fact.

19 Zosimos, *Historia Nova* V 18, 6f. (III/1 27 Paschoud). – Albert, *Goten* 69f. 126 et passim.

20 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 98 (de Boor). – Euagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* II 2 (39 Bidez/Parmentier). – Runciman, *Palaces* 220. – Janin, *Constantinople* 147.

21 *Chronicon Paschale* 600 (Dindorf). – Ioannes Malalas, *Chronographia* 301 (Thurn). – Stein, *Geschichte* 537.

22 Zacharias Rhetor, *Historia Ecclesiastica* II 43. – Schwartz, *Schisma* 259. – Schneider, *Sankt Euphemia* 299.

23 Nikephoros Patriarches, *Breviarium* 78 (Mango).

24 Nikephoros Patriarches, *Breviarium* 80-82. 192 (Mango). – Kaegi, *Unrest* 156f.

25 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 419 (de Boor). – Mango/Scott, *Theophanes* 582 n. 10.

26 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 479 (de Boor).

27 Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae* XXII 3. – Borries, *Iulianos* 46f.

28 Ioannes Antiochenus, *Fragmenta* 512-514 (Roberto). – Stein, *Histoire* 13. – PLRE II 587 f.



Fig. 1 Map of the harbours opposite Constantinople. – (Map E. Beer 2016; captions A. Külzer/K. Belke).

Illos had Isaurian troops ferried from Chalcedon to Constantinople to fight the revolt of Marcian<sup>29</sup>. In 1072, Andronikos Dukas travelled on behalf of Emperor Michael VII from Constantinople to Chalcedon, where, within six days, he procured equipment for his campaign against Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes. Later, he gathered the troops in Asia Minor<sup>30</sup>.

The movement of troops from Constantinople to Asia Minor and vice versa was part of everyday military life. The movements of officers and troops, which are here presented only as examples, are intended, above all, to prove the frequency of such ship transports. As already indicated, this presupposes a sufficient size of the harbour and corresponding depots for food and accommodation, and at least space for tented encampments. As can be seen, the specific harbour of destination or disembarkation is rarely mentioned. In addition to Chrysopolis (see below), Chalcedon was most likely to be used. When the later Ostrogoth King Theoderic was sent to

Isauria against the rebel Illos in 484, he also took with him Gothic troops from Thrace, which he brought back after the campaign<sup>31</sup>. For his (failed) campaign against the Bulgarians in 681, Emperor Constantine IV had troops (all »themes«) ferried to Thrace<sup>32</sup>. For his famous campaign against the Bulgarians and Slavs in 687/688, which led him to Thessalonica, Emperor Justinian II moved cavalry units (probably those of the Opsikion Theme, especially) to Thrace. In view of the expansion of the area of the Opsikion, ferry harbours further south as far as Abydos at the Dardanelles were also suitable for this crossing. This was the harbour on the Asian side, to which the emperor shipped most of the Slavs whom he had then re-settled in the Opsikion Theme<sup>33</sup>. Probably in 741, the usurper Artabasdos moved into the capital as emperor with troops of the Opsikion, whose *komes* he had been<sup>34</sup>. In 782, Empress Eirene sent the *tagmata* stationed in the capital under the *domestikos* Antonios against the Arabs,

29 Ioannes Antiochenus, Fragmenta 514 (Roberto). – Stein, Histoire 15f. – PLRE II 588.

30 Nikephoros Bryennios, Hyle Historias 133 (Gautier).

31 Ioannes Antiochenus, Fragmenta 520 (Roberto). According to this report, he had already been summoned back near Nicomedia. – Euagrius, Historia Ecclesiastica III 27 (124 Bidez/Parmentier). – Theophanes, Chronographia 131 (de Boor). – Mango/Scott, Theophanes 202 n. 6. – PLRE II 1081.

32 Theophanes, Chronographia 358 (de Boor); here, it is plausible to assume that the troops from western Asia Minor crossed the Dardanelles at Abydos, those of northern Asia Minor, among other places, at Chalcedon.

33 Theophanes, Chronographia 364 (de Boor). – Nikephoros Patriarches, Breviarium 92 (Mango). – Ditten, Verschiebungen 217-221.

34 Theophanes, Chronographia 414f. (de Boor). – Nikephoros Patriarches, Breviarium 132-134 (Mango). – On the chronology, cf. Mango/Scott, Theophanes 576 n. 1.

who had reached Chrysopolis (or Chalcedon, respectively) under the general and later caliph Hārūn ar-Rašīd<sup>35</sup>. When units in Constantinople (*tagmata* and *scholai*) following the iconoclastic cause disturbed the holding of a council to restore the veneration of images in 786, Irene ordered them to advance to Asia Minor (more precisely to Malagina) under the pretext of a campaign against the Arabs, but then had them disarmed there. The Council was held the following year in Nicaea<sup>36</sup>. This enumeration, which could be continued for quite some time, will end here with three troop transports, for which the harbour of Chalcedon is again explicitly attested. In 1097, two units of the armies of the First Crusade (Godfrey of Bouillon and Tancred with the army of Bohemond) made camp near Chalcedon after crossing the Bosphorus<sup>37</sup>. King Conrad III also took the ferry to Chalcedon with the German army of the Second Crusade in 1147<sup>38</sup>.

There are many pilgrims and clerics to be found among the travellers, individually or in small groups, who used the crossing between Constantinople and Chalcedon, according to the sources, which focus on these groups. The cult of St Euphemia, who had suffered martyrdom in Chalcedon, attracted numerous pilgrims, especially at her annual festival<sup>39</sup>. St Aetheria (or Egeria, end of fourth century) visited the *famosissimum martyrium sanctae Eufimiae* during the return journey from her pilgrimage to the Holy Land before the ferry crossing to Constantinople. So did St Melania in 436<sup>40</sup>. We can only point out here the journeys of bishops and their companions to the councils and synods, which usually took place in Constantinople or in the coastal towns in Asia Minor: Nicaea 325, Ephesus 431 (less important for crossings to the harbours opposite Constantinople), Chalcedon 451, Nicaea 787.

After the synod of Constantinople in 381, the body of St Paul the Confessor, the former bishop of the city, was brought from Kucusos in Cappadocia and solemnly transferred from Chalcedon to Constantinople<sup>41</sup>. At the last stage of the translation of the relics of St John Chrysostomos in 438 from Chalcedon (according to one source from Hieria, see below) to Constantinople, the procession was met by »the whole of Constantinople«. The harbour – exceptionally mentioned here – was that of Chalcedon, and it was full of lamps and ships<sup>42</sup>. In 511, the deposed Patriarch of Constantinople

Macedonius II travelled via Chalcedon on his way into exile in Euchaita in Pontos<sup>43</sup>.

## Chrysopolis

The old harbour of Chrysopolis has now disappeared entirely under a wide alluvial plain in the central part of today's Üsküdar<sup>44</sup>. Only selective rescue excavations and geological surveys carried out in connection with the construction of the underground station for the aforementioned Marmaray suburban railway line brought some clarification regarding the development of the harbour from the Archaic to the Ottoman period. Ceramic finds, especially fragments of amphorae, testify to the continuous and intensive use of the harbour<sup>45</sup>. The former harbour bay had a c. 400m wide opening to the north-west and extended in full width over about 400-500m inland in a southeastern direction<sup>46</sup>. Two rivers fed into this bay, the Bülbül Deresi in the northeast coming from the east and the Çavuş Deresi coming from the southeast. The alluvial deposits of these rivers gradually led to a progressive siltation of the bay, a process that presumably occurred via the intermediate stages of a lagoon lake and a bog and probably began already in Antiquity<sup>47</sup>. A breakwater or a pier and sea walls in front of today's Mihrimah Camii mark the northern border of the harbour in Roman times<sup>48</sup>. Extensive remains of wooden jetties were found c. 100m south of the Roman breakwater. Originally thought to be Byzantine, it has now become clear that they belong to the Roman imperial period<sup>49</sup>. During the Byzantine period and beyond, the expanse of water of the bay was still sufficient for continued operation of the harbour. At the same time, parts of the (former) bay were already populated. The most important proof of this is provided by the largely excavated foundations of a building orientated roughly south-west to north-east and dated to the twelfth to thirteenth centuries on the basis of its building technique (»recessed-brick technique«). This building comprised an apse and was interpreted as part of a larger monastery complex (probably the Trapeza). A plausible counter-proposal sees in this ruin the remains of the Skutarion Palace in Chrysopolis (see the following paragraph), which would fit the dating

35 Theophanes, Chronographia 456 (de Boor).

36 Theophanes, Chronographia 462 (de Boor). – Mango/Scott, Theophanes 636 n. 4-5.

37 Benedictus de Accoltis, Historia Gotefridi 555. – Wilhelmus Tyrensis, Chronicon 175-177. 181 (Huygens). – According to Anna Komnene, Alexias X 9, 11, however, Bohemond and the other leaders of the First Crusade crossed the Bosphorus from Constantinople to Damalis (in Chrysopolis). After that, she only knew of the camp at Pelekanon (on the north shore of the Gulf of Nicomedia); a camp near Chalcedon does of course not exclude a passage via Damalis/Chrysopolis. The main sources of the First Crusade, such as Albert of Aachen 90-94 or the Gesta Francorum 13f., do not mention any names at all. – Cf. Hagenmeyer, Chronologie 271-272. 281. – Runciman, Crusades 1, 152-154. 159.

38 Here, too, the name of the landing harbour can only be found in Wilhelmus Tyrensis, Chronicon 742 (Huygens).

39 Halkin, Euphémie 5f.

40 Itinerarium Egeriae XXIII 7f. (67 Franceschini/Weber). – Vita Melaniae 228 (Gorce). – Schneider, Sankt Euphemia 299.

41 Bios Pauli 238. – Vita Pauli (PG 116) 896 A.

42 Thus the various *vitae* and reports on the translation of John Chrysostom in Halkin, Chrysostome 40. 492. 517. 530.

43 Theophanes, Chronographia 155 (de Boor).

44 Karagöz, Khrysopolis Liman 404f.

45 Karagöz Khrysopolis 33-39. – Karagöz, Excavations 89-105. – Karagöz Khrysopolis Liman 403-406. 411.

46 The harbour bay is mentioned only once in a source (Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus 33: »After which an excellent harbor, both large and calm. A deep, soft beach surrounds it« (translated by B. Kiesling for ToposText: <https://topostext.org/work/619>, accessed 16 October 2020). – See the map in Karagöz, Khrysopolis Liman 405, resim 5, where the presumed coastline in the Archaic period is shown.

47 Karagöz, Khrysopolis Liman 404f.

48 Karagöz, Chrysopolis 46f. – Karagöz, Khrysopolis Liman 410f. – Ginalis/Ercan Kydonakis, Reflections on the Archaeology 45f., in this volume.

49 Karagöz, Yapı 421-423. – Karagöz, Excavations 101-105. – Karagöz, Khrysopolis Liman 408-410. – Ginalis/Ercan Kydonakis, Reflections on the Archaeology 45f., in this volume.

and location. The walls were built over an older necropolis (simple earth burials, some stone cist graves). Early Byzantine architectural fragments were partly re-used in the walls of the building with the apse, partly found in the surrounding area; they were more likely displaced as *spolia* than testifying to an Early Byzantine settlement in the area<sup>50</sup>. Last remnants of the harbour were filled in during the sixteenth century for the construction of the Mihrimah Sultan Camii<sup>51</sup>.

Although the recent archaeological investigations have shown that Chrysopolis had a functioning harbour well into the Middle Ages – despite the beginning of siltation – the number of crossings testified by sources until the Comnenian period is not overly large, in any case much smaller than the numbers for Chalcedon further south. This is astonishing, since it was already known in Antiquity that, due to the currents of the Bosphorus, direct crossing from Chalcedon to Byzantium was hardly possible. Instead, one had to sail along the coast to the area of Chrysopolis first in order to get to Byzantium<sup>52</sup>. This circumstance is explicitly attested again in the sixteenth century<sup>53</sup>. As the following, by no means complete list shows, Chrysopolis and the appendant Cape Damalis are mentioned particularly frequently in connection with troop transports, compared to other crossings. According to rough estimates, their number is the same as for Chalcedon. Appropriate facilities must also be presumed in this case. Perhaps there were barracks in Chrysopolis for the Early Byzantine *scutarii* belonging to the *scholae palatinae*<sup>54</sup> or to the Middle Byzantine *skutarioi*, which are mentioned as a part of the *bigla* created by the Empress Eirene<sup>55</sup>. The name of an imperial palace in Chrysopolis, Skutarion, might testify to this, which is attested since the later Comnenian period (see below). The historian Nikephoros Patriarches twice provides information on Chrysopolis without any direct connection to a crossing. On the occasion of a possibly legendary foray of a small group of Arabs in 708, he reports that they had advanced as far as Chrysopolis, »a village-like settlement by the sea, east opposite of Byzantium«, had slaughtered the inhabitants and burned the ferries (*tas porthmidas naus*)<sup>56</sup>. Later, he characterises Chrysopolis as a harbour (*epineion*) opposite Byzantium on the Asian shore<sup>57</sup>.

In 715, rebels comprising troops from the theme of Opsikion and the so-called Gotthograikoi, who deposed Emperor Artemius (Anastasius II) and elevated Theodosius III to

the throne, made Chrysopolis the basis for the conquest of Constantinople. The imperial fleet, stationed in the harbour of Hagios Mamas (in the area of today's Beşiktaş)<sup>58</sup> and that of the insurgents fought daily battles with each other for half a year, which also required an infrastructure for supply in Chrysopolis besides the harbour itself. Finally, Theodosius took advantage of a relocation of the imperial fleet to the Neorion Harbour (on the south side of the mouth of the Golden Horn) to cross over to Thrace and take the capital<sup>59</sup>. Some of the soldiers who had mutinied in Thrace in 809 were sent to Chrysopolis for punishment<sup>60</sup>. The Arab prisoners of war, who were to be presented in the triumphal procession after the success of Emperor Theophilos in 831 in Constantinople, were shipped from Chrysopolis to Constantinople<sup>61</sup>. In 1029, the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, John VIII bar Abdoun, who had been called to the patriarchal court, was held, with his entourage, in Chrysopolis for twelve days before he was allowed to travel on to Constantinople<sup>62</sup>. Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos in 1047 called the troops of the *tagmata*, operating in eastern Asia Minor, to Europe because of the uprising of Leon Tornikios. On imperial orders, they were ferried over the Dardanelles near Abydos and over the Bosphorus near Chrysopolis<sup>63</sup>. The following year, the emperor had a Pecheneg force cross the Bosphorus near Chrysopolis to use it against the Seljuks who had invaded the east of Asia Minor<sup>64</sup>. In 1050, the *tagmata* of the east again ferried to Europe at Abydos and Chrysopolis, to fight the Pechenegs<sup>65</sup>. In 1057, Emperor Michael VI moved troops of the west against the usurper Isaac Komnenos to Asia Minor at Chrysopolis<sup>66</sup>. From the Comnenian period onwards, Chrysopolis (and Cape Damalis) replaced Chalcedon as the main ferry harbour. For example, Emperor Alexios I crossed the Bosphorus to Cape Damalis in 1113 and 1116 in order to fight the Turks, and in 1116 he returned to Constantinople by the same way<sup>67</sup>. After the death of Emperor John II Komnenos in Cilicia in 1143, the new emperor, Manuel I, marched to Constantinople by land. He ferried across from Chrysopolis to the Bukoleon harbour with the whole army<sup>68</sup>. In 1147, he crossed the *Damaleos porthmos* (the channel of Damalis)<sup>69</sup>. In 1082, Emperor Andronikos I went from Damalis to Constantinople<sup>70</sup>.

Shortly before his death, Emperor Manuel I sought recreation in a palace that is mentioned here for the first time and even named: Skutarion. It was located near Damalis, the cape

50 Karagöz, Marmaray Projesi 149-153. – Karagöz, Chrysopolis 40-46. – Karagöz, Yapı 415-421. – Karagöz, Excavations 98-101. – Ginalis/Ercan Kydonakis, Reflections on the Archaeology 46f., in this volume. – On the interpretation as a palace, see Hellenkemper, Politische Orte 251 f.

51 Petrus Gyllius, De Bosporo Thracio 237f.; French translation: Grélois, Gilles 237f. – Karagöz, Khrysopolis Liman 402. – According to the wording of Gyllius, parts of the harbour were actually filled in to make room for the mosque and adjacent buildings, not, as Karagöz believes, remnants of old harbour buildings that had been demolished.

52 Polybios IV 44, 3f. (II 56f. Büttner-Wobst).

53 Petrus Gyllius, De Bosporo Thracio 239; French translation: Grélois, Gilles 239.

54 Seeck, Scholae palatinae 621f. – Cf. Haldon, Praetorians 131f. 402f.

55 Haldon, Praetorians 241. 509.

56 Nikephoros Patriarches, Breviarium 106. 202 (Mango).

57 Nikephoros Patriarches, Breviarium 134 (Mango).

58 Külzer, Ostthrakien 512.

59 Theophanes, Chronographia 385f. (de Boor). – See Kislinger, Better and Worse Sites 11, in this volume.

60 Theophanes, Chronographia 486 (de Boor).

61 Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, De exped. 146. 287 (Haldon).

62 Chronica Michaelis Syriaci III 141.

63 Ioannes Skylitzes, Synopsis 439. 441 (Thurn).

64 Ioannes Skylitzes, Synopsis 460 (Thurn).

65 Ioannes Skylitzes, Synopsis 467 (Thurn).

66 Ioannes Skylitzes, Synopsis 493 (Thurn).

67 Anna Komnene, Alexias XIV 4, 1. 5, 1; XV 1, 3. 7, 2 (Reinsch/Kambylis).

68 Kleinchroniken 58 (Schreiner).

69 Ioannes Kinnamos, Epitome 294 (Meineke).

70 Niketas Choniates, Historia 254 (van Dieten).

directly opposite the island of Kız Kulesi, i. e., near the sea in Chrysopolis proper. Its remnants might be identified with the recently excavated building with an apse (see above). For a theological dispute with the emperor, described by Niketas Choniates on this occasion, representatives of the clergy and other scholars arrived from Constantinople by ship, which is expressively emphasised. For once, we learn concretely how an imperial palace on the other side of the Bosphorus leads to an increase in shipping traffic<sup>71</sup>. Emperor Alexios III Angelos (1195-1203) also repeatedly sojourned in Chrysopolis<sup>72</sup>. In 1202, a eulogy to the Emperor was read out by Nikephoros Chrysoberges in the »Palace of Skutarion«<sup>73</sup>. At this palace (variously Skutarion, Scutaire, Escutaire) a part of the fleet of the Fourth Crusade anchored, and, before the conquest of the Byzantine capital in 1204, the leaders of the Fourth Crusade stayed here<sup>74</sup>. The name of the palace, Skutarion, eventually replaced the name of the town, Chrysopolis; the linguistic development led from Skutari(on) to today's Üsküdar. It is only according to a later source that Alexios III, in 1203, fled to Asia Minor via Skutarion<sup>75</sup>. For the last time, a Byzantine army crossed the Bosphorus near Chrysopolis in 1329. Under the personal command of Emperor Andronikos III, it was to fight against the Turks of Orhan in the plain of Pelekanos (on the north bank of the entrance to the Gulf of Nicomedia). The Emperor returned directly to his capital after being slightly wounded. The defeated army again debouched via Chrysopolis<sup>76</sup>. Even when the whole peninsula of Bithynia fell into the hands of the Ottomans a little later, the significance of Chrysopolis/Skutari remained unbroken, as is to be illustrated here only by a few examples. Empress Anna, the wife of Andronikos III and regent for her minor son (the later Emperor John V), was at civil war with John VI Cantacuzenus. In 1344/1345 she offered Orhan for military support, among other things, that he could take Rhomaic prisoners of war (subjects of John VI) to Asia Minor via Skutarion, if he did not want to sell them immediately<sup>77</sup>. In 1347, John VI met Orhan, now his father-in-law and ally, in Skutarion<sup>78</sup>. In 1421, Emperor Manuel II accompanied Sultan Mehmed I from Diplokionion (at today's Beşiktaş) to »Skutaris, the former Chrysopolis« by ship<sup>79</sup>. The importance of the ferry traffic between Constantinople, as well as Galata, and Skutari is also evident from the fact that this place served as a market for trade between Turks on the one side and Byzantines and Genoese on the other in the fifteenth century<sup>80</sup>.

## Hiereia

A preliminary remark is due on the evidence presented in this section. The following account is based on Procopius, who wrote of two palaces: one in Heraion, which is »now« called Hieron and whose identification with Hiereia is undisputed; and a second one in lukundianai, whose location at Hebdomon (Bakırköy) on the European coast of the Sea of Marmara about 4 km west of the land walls of Constantinople is also assured. The wording of the passages of Procopius' *De aedificiis*, which were used to determine the location of the additional buildings (harbour, churches, etc.) in relation to one of these palaces, is not very clearly formulated. Thus, opinion is divided among modern researchers as to whether they relate to lukundianai or Hiereia. In his contribution to this volume, G. Simeonov takes a clear position for the European coast based on convincing arguments<sup>81</sup>. According to my opinion, the reference to the Asian coast is not assured, but still a possibility<sup>82</sup>. Two arguments in favour of the European side<sup>83</sup> are not really conclusive. Protection from winter storms is also required on the north side of the flat and narrow cape of Fenerbahçe, especially when wind and waves come from the southwest or even west-north-west. More serious is Procopius' proposition that Emperor Justinian built another harbour, the Eutropios harbour (see below) *en te antiperas epeiro*, »not far from Heraion« (namely, Hieron, Hiereia). If the previous description of the harbour refers to lukundianai, the Eutropios harbour is indeed »on the opposite continent«. However, if Procopius uses *epeiros* in its original meaning »mainland«, then this could indicate the contrast to the peninsula of Fenerbahçe. Finally, Procopius twice mentioned the harbour/harbours at the palace/palaces in the plural, so that he perhaps assigns each of the palaces its own harbour and the other facilities<sup>84</sup>. In this sense, I am referring the passage of Procopius (also) to Hiereia, without taking up again the discussion of locations.

The harbour of Hiereia/Fenerbahçe is located on a peninsula, only 1.5 km as the crow flies south-east of Chalcedon and about 6 km south-east of the tip of Saray in Constantinople. It is, therefore, the furthest away from the imperial city among the harbours examined here, but, as will be shown immediately, has a special significance for the imperial court. Hiereia was one of the Empress Theodora's favourite places. Emperor Justinian not only built a palace for her, but also a

71 Niketas Choniates, *Historia* 215 (van Dieten). – Hellenkemper, *Politische Orte* 251 f.

72 So in 1200 or 1201 (Niketas Choniates, *Historia* 525 [van Dieten]. – Brand, *Byzantium* 121).

73 Nikephoros Chrysoberges, *Orationes* 13. 39. 45 f. (Treu).

74 Niketas Choniates, *Historia* 542 (van Dieten). – Geoffroy de Villehardouin, *Conquête I* 136-138. 142 f. (Faral). – Brand, *Byzantium* 235.

75 *La crónica de Morea* 28, vv. 551-553 (Egea).

76 Ioannes Kantakuzenos, *Historia I* 342. 363 (Schopen).

77 Dukas, *Historia* 55 (Grecu).

78 Ioannes Kantakuzenos, *Historia III* 28 (Schopen).

79 Georgios Sphrantzes, *Chronicon* 16 (Maisano). – Barker, *Manuel II*, 251 f.

80 Majeska, *Russian Travelers* 190.

81 See Simeonov, *Hebdomon*, in this volume, especially p. 192 with n. 110-111. A parallel representation can, therefore, be dispensed with at this point. I would like to thank Dr Simeonov warmly for his references to the passages in modern literature advocating the location on the European coast and for the detailed discussion of the problem.

82 Text and translation in Simeonov, *Hebdomon* 192 with n. 111, in this volume.

83 Cited in Simeonov, *Hebdomon* 192 n. 110, in this volume.

84 Prokopios, *De aedificiis I* 11, 18 (44, 6f. Haury/Wirth): ἐν ταῦθα δὲ καὶ λιμένων σκέπας ἀποτετόρνενται οὐ πρότερον ὄν. – I 11 22 (45, 4 Haury/Wirth): κατὰ ταῦτα εἰργασμένον τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὧν περ ἐπεμνήσθη ἄρτίως. The possibility of two harbours is also considered by Simeonov, *Hebdomon* 92, n. 110, in this volume.

Church of the Theotokos, as well as other churches, columned halls, markets, public baths, etc., »so that it [this palace] was in no way inferior to the palaces in the city [Constantinople]«<sup>85</sup>. The harbour, which the emperor established *ex nihilo* especially for this palace, took advantage of the angle between the southern end of Kalamış Bay and the north-facing tip of the peninsula of Fenerbahçe. In the sixteenth century, this tip was still called *acra Ioannis Calamoti* (on this name see below in connection with the Eutropios Harbour).

Large harbour walls or moles were also required to protect it. Particularly interesting, though not entirely clear to interpret, is Procopius' detailed, but incomplete, description of how the moles were technically built. Justinian had many large »(wooden) boxes« (Greek *kibotos*) made, which he had sunk in the sea, in order to build the perimeter walls of the harbour by means of many rows (of these boxes) placed on each other from the foundations to the water surface. Large undressed stones were laid on top of this construction against the power of the surging waves<sup>86</sup>. Among other details of the construction, Procopius especially does not tell us what the boxes were filled with. One possibility could be heaps of stones (which could certainly be easier to sink in the sea) another one hydraulic mortar (mixed with puzzolans), the use of which (with a somewhat different technology) is described by Vitruvius particularly regarding the construction of harbours<sup>87</sup>. It is especially the laying technique, which seems to underlie Procopius' description, according to which the box constructions were brought to the correct position and then (previously filled or only sunk by the filling), that Vitruvius omits. And yet, in the course of recent research, this very technique, which allows for different variants, was archaeologically verified in various places in the Mediterranean region, especially in the harbour walls built by King Herod (reg. 37-4 BC) at Caesarea Maritima, capital of the province of Palaestina in the Roman imperial period<sup>88</sup>.

At the *acra Ioannis Calamoti*, Peter Gyllius saw remains of old moles and harbour walls, which still offered the ships a certain possibility to anchor<sup>89</sup>. The last remnants were still present in the first half of the twentieth century. A mole projected from the top of the already mentioned northern foothills of the Fenerbahçe peninsula, which was built with Byzantine *spolia* and is attributed to Sultan Süleyman I the Magnificent (reg. 1520-1566). A mole of black stones continued in a northerly direction. It resembled the mole of the Eutropios Harbour (see below) and therefore probably dates

back to Emperor Justinian<sup>90</sup>. The construction of the modern marina of Fenerbahçe has destroyed all the remains of the old moles.

If we now review the crossings between Hierieia and Constantinople, it immediately becomes clear that this completely new harbour had a very different task to perform than the harbours of Chalcedon or Chrysopolis. The harbour of Hierieia was, as said before, built on the occasion of the construction of an imperial palace by Justinian<sup>91</sup>. With few exceptions, only the emperor, his family, his entourage and his officials used the palace and thus the harbour, which was not mentioned again. Since the Empress Theodora wanted to visit the palace of Hierieia frequently and at any time of the year (the place was originally called Herion and similar), her entourage had to make the sometimes – especially in winter – perilous passage by ship<sup>92</sup>. Emperor Heraclius I stayed in Hierieia quite often. His daughter Epiphania was born here in 611<sup>93</sup>. Ceremonial receptions by the people of Constantinople, by officials and clergy with the patriarch at the front, often took place in Hierieia. An instruction handed down in an appendix to the *Book of Ceremonies* of Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, which dates back to Early Byzantine times, demands that the prefect of the city receive the emperor on his return from Asia Minor in one of the four coastal suburbs, namely Satyros/Küçükalyı, Poleatikon/Bostancı, Rупhinaı/Caddebostanı or the very Hierieia<sup>94</sup>. Such a reception in Hierieia is concretely attested for the first time on the occasion of the victorious return of Emperor Heraclius from his Persian campaigns in 628 or 629. Here, however, not the prefect of the city paid homage to the emperor, but instead the patriarch, Heraclius' son and Co-emperor Heraclius (Herakleios Neos Konstantinos = Constantine III) and many people from Constantinople approached him with olive branches and lamps<sup>95</sup>. After the lost battles against the Arabs in Syria, Heraclius did not immediately return to Constantinople, but managed affairs of state from Hierieia for several years before the pontoon bridge over the Bosphorus mentioned at the beginning supposedly was built for him<sup>96</sup>.

The next known major event, which requires a busy shipping traffic between the capital and Hierieia, is the iconoclastic council that Emperor Constantine V held from February to August 754 in the palace of Hierieia<sup>97</sup>. In 769, the bride of Emperor Leon IV, the future Empress Eirene, was solemnly led to Constantinople from Hierieia with a decorated convey of dromons (large, predominantly rowed warships) and

85 Prokopios, *De aedificiis* I 3, 10 (21 Haury/Wirth). I 11, 16, 18-21 (44-45 Haury/Wirth). – Prokopios, *Anecdota* XV 36-38 (99 Haury/Wirth). – Runciman, *Palaces* 221.

86 Prokopios, *De aedificiis* I 11, 18-21 (44 Haury/Wirth); Greek text, English translation and short commentary in Oleson, *Concrete Technology* 35. – Cf. Hohlfelder, *Procopius* 54-59. – Hohlfelder, *Harbours* 367, *passim*.

87 Vitruvius, *De architectura* V 12, 1-6; Latin text with English translation in Oleson, *Concrete Technology* 20-22.

88 Hohlfelder, *Procopius* 57-59. – Hohlfelder, *Harbours* 370-371. 374-379. – Brandon, *Roman Formwork* 211-221.

89 Petrus Gyllius, *De Bosporo Thracio* 255; French translation: Grémois, Gilles 251.

90 Janin, *Banlieue III-XIV* 58. – Janin, *Constantinople* 239. 498f.

91 On the palace and its history, see Janin, *Constantinople* 148-150. – Hellenkemper, *Politische Orte* 247-249.

92 Prokopios, *Anecdota* 15, 36-38 (99 Haury/Wirth).

93 *Chronicon Paschale* 702 (Dindorf). – Janin, *Constantinople* 149.

94 Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, *De exped.* 57. 138. 263f. (Haldon).

95 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 328 (de Boor). – Mango/Scott, *Theophanes* 458 n. 3.

96 See above n. 3

97 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 427f. (de Boor).



chelandia (slightly smaller warships)<sup>98</sup>. Emperor Theophilus had the Augusta, the city prefect and other dignitaries receive him in Hiereia and lead him to the city, probably in 837 after the return from his Cilicia campaign, in keeping with the instructions handed down in the *Book of Ceremonies*<sup>99</sup>. Basil I returned via Hiereia in 878 from his campaign in eastern Asia Minor against Tephrike/Divriği and Germanikeia/Maraş, but the actual homage by the population and the senate did not take place until he arrived in Hebdomon on the European side<sup>100</sup>. The same emperor enjoyed sojourning in the different imperial palaces in the surroundings of Constantinople. For shorter distances, for example to Hiereia, he did not use dromons, but a so-called *agrarion* (a smaller, sailing boat type, also used in fishing)<sup>101</sup>. In addition to other structural measures in Hiereia, Basil I had a chapel of the prophet Elijah set up in the palace<sup>102</sup>. His grandson, Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, enjoyed the fresh air of Hiereia. He restored the palace and added new buildings<sup>103</sup>. Nikephoros II Phokas who had been proclaimed emperor, was received by selected dignitaries in Hiereia in 963. From here, he entered the city<sup>104</sup>. The last proven user of the palace was Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes. He spent the Easter days of 1069 in the »imperial house« *ton Erion* (of Hiereia) before setting out to fight against the Turks and the rebel Krispinos<sup>105</sup>. In 1071, the emperor crossed the *Chalkedonios porthmos* (the waterway of Chalcedon) for the »Day of Orthodoxy« in order to reach the palace of *ton Erion* »as usual«. From there he went by ship directly to Helenopolis/Hersek on the south bank of the Gulf of Nicomedia, where he began the campaign that led to defeat at the hands of the Turks at Mantzikert<sup>106</sup>.

The elaborately built harbour of Hiereia thus served almost exclusively for the use of the imperial family, the imperial household and the dignitaries, civil servants and clerics necessary for the ceremonial appearances and the current state affairs. The few exceptions handed down in the sources concern patriarchs who were deposed and exiled to Hiereia, or who were sent into exile via Hiereia. Patriarch Constantine II was banished in 766 first to Hiereia, then to the island of Prinkipos<sup>107</sup>. Patriarch Ignatios was locked in a goat pen in Hiereia in 858 on his way into exile in Mytilene<sup>108</sup>. Patriarch Photius was banished to Hiereia after his second, forced

abdication<sup>109</sup>. Finally, Patriarch Nikolaos I Mystikos, after his deposition in the winter of 907, was taken on a small ship to Hiereia, from where he could reach his nearby monastery Galakrenai (in the Suadiye Mahallesi of the former village of Erenköy) only with difficulty due to the snow<sup>110</sup>.

## Eutropiu Limen

The site *ta Eutropiu* was located on a rather straight section of the coast, characterised only by a gentle, west-facing embayment of the coastline, between the eastern harbour of Chalcedon and the harbour of Hiereia. It was only 800m away from Hiereia, i.e., on the eastern shore of the bay today called Kalamış Koyu (in the sixteenth century *sinus Calamotus*), which extends between the (former) peninsula of Chalcedon and Hiereia/Fenerbahçe on the opposite side to the south-east. The area was certainly not named after the famous eunuch of the fourth century<sup>111</sup>, and probably not after a *protospatharios* and *koaistor* of the same name<sup>112</sup>, but after an otherwise unknown man whose metric grave inscription was found in the garden of the nearby church of St John Chrysostom, which no longer exists today<sup>113</sup>. According to the report of Procopius, Justinian I had in this place (*en tois Eutropiu eponymois*), in contrast to the harbours described so far, built an entirely artificial harbour with enormous moles. For constructing them, he used the same technique Procopius had described a little earlier for the neighbouring harbour of Hiereia<sup>114</sup>. The Eutropios harbour was therefore probably the smallest harbour on this stretch of coast. Peter Gyllius obviously had not seen any remnants of the actual harbour of Eutropios, as he incorrectly located it on the west bank of the bay. He placed it either halfway between the Moda Burnu and the mouth of the Chalcedon River (here he found an old mole, formerly called mole or harbour of Eirene) or even equated it with the eastern harbour of Chalcedon<sup>115</sup>. In fact, the Eutropios Harbour is the third harbour in the area of Chalcedon, which, as mentioned before, was located on the east bank of the Kalamış Bay, close to the church of St John Chrysostom, which was mentioned by Gyllius and destroyed in the first half of the twentieth century. Here, too,

98 Theophanes, Chronographia 444 (de Boor).

99 Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, De exped. 146. 285 (Haldon).

100 Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, De exped. 140. 268 f. (Haldon). – On Hebdomon (near the current district of Bakırköy), see Külzer, Ostthrakien 391-395.

101 Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, De admin. imp., cap. 51 (246 Moravcsik/Jenkins).

102 Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia V 92 (300-303 Ševčenko).

103 Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia VI, De Constantino Porphyrogenneto 26 f. (451 f. Bekker).

104 Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, De cer. I 96 (438 Reiske) or I 105 (II 453 [Dagron et al.] and D. Feissel, Commentaire IV, 1, 628-632).

105 Michael Attaleiates, Historia 92 f. (Pérez Martin).

106 Michael Attaleiates, Historia 107 f. (Pérez Martin).

107 Theophanes, Chronographia 439 (de Boor).

108 Vita Ignatii 40 (Smithies).

109 Vita Euthymii 11, 163 (Karlin-Hayter).

110 Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia VI, De Leone Basilii F. 24 (371 Bekker).

111 PLRE II 440-444 (see by Eutropius I).

112 Patria Konstantinupoleos 267 (Preger). – Pseudo-Kodinos, De aedificiis 597C. – Berger, Untersuchungen 716-718. This Eutropios is said to have built a harbour here; however, the title protospatharios is not attested until the 8<sup>th</sup> c.

113 Most recently published by Merkelbach, Chalcedon 66 (no. 77).

114 Prokopios, De aedificiis I 11, 22 (44-45 Haury/Wirth).

115 Petrus Gyllius, De Bosporo Thracio 244 (he is here paraphrasing and abbreviating the text of Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus 34, which mentions the two harbours of Chalcedon); 250 (*vter horum* [sc. of the two harbours cited by Dionysios] *postea appellatus fuerit Eutropij portus*); 252-255. – Grémois, Gilles 250 n. 1359, seems to believe that Gyllius had meant today's Moda İskelesi (landing stage of Moda), which, however, is only 250m away from Moda Burnu. Although Gyllius speaks of the »middle of this coast«, he seems to have meant the eastern harbour of Chalcedon or to locate it here. – Lehmann-Hartleben, Hafenanlagen 251 also follows this view.

the remains of an old mole made of black stones were found, similar to those of the harbour of Hiereia (see above), which belong to this harbour<sup>116</sup>. Due to the large extension of the adjacent marinas of Kalamış and Fenerbahçe at the latest, all old remains have disappeared.

Not much is known about the concrete use of the harbour of Eutropios, which was located not far north of Hiereia. Emperor Phokas had his predecessor Maurice and most of his sons executed here in 602, as well as the female members of his family in 605 or 607<sup>117</sup>. At the beginning of the second siege of Constantinople in September 717, the Arab fleet (allegedly 1800 warships and supply ships) spread to various harbours or landing places on the European and Asian coasts. On the Asian coast, Arabs landed in *ta Eutropiu* and *ta Anthemiu* (on the central part of the Bosphorus). Remarkably, the harbours are not named in the sources, only the areas<sup>118</sup>. Finally, the name is found in connection with Saint Luke the Stylite, who climbed on a column on the land of Eutropios (*en tois Eutropiu ktemasin*) in 935 and lived here until his death in 975<sup>119</sup>. On the news of his death, the author of the Vita of the Stylite immediately went from Constantinople to the column. After a stormy crossing, he landed directly in a harbour artificially built of large stones (*hormon tina cheiropoieton ek megalon kateskeuasmemon petron*), which must have meant the Eutropios Harbour<sup>120</sup>. Luke's anonymous successor drowned in 989, when, according to the description in the source, the column was torn away, probably by a storm surge, rather than after an earthquake or a tsunami caused by it<sup>121</sup>.

## Conclusion

A final comparison of the four harbours based on the sources reveals both similarities and differences in their function. All four harbours served on a large scale for local traffic. This was to be expected, as these were suburbs (*proasteia* in the ancient sense) of the capital with their palaces, villas and monasteries, which were built and used or donated mainly by the aristocracy all the way up to the imperial family. The only harbours for long-distance traffic to and from Asia Minor were Chalcedon and Chrysopolis, with Chalcedon being mentioned most frequently by far for all groups of travellers until the Comnenian period. Apart from the imperial palace, particularly important in later times, which alone required numerous crossings, Chrysopolis seems to have been especially suitable for troop transports. These are as frequently attested for Chalcedon, but they only form part of the traffic of this harbour. The importance of the harbour of Hiereia is based almost exclusively on the imperial palace, which seems to have been used longer and more frequently than the other palaces in the area. It was therefore more involved in court ceremonial, which required further regular crossings. The Eutropios Harbour lags far behind. Although, according to Procopius, it was built with an effort similar to the harbour of Hiereia, it is rarely mentioned. Its actual purpose is not clear from the sources. It may have been considered the third harbour of Chalcedon<sup>122</sup> and perhaps some ships originally destined for Chalcedon landed there when the capacity of Chalcedon's harbours was exhausted. The construction of this harbour at the same time as Hiereia and in its immediate vicinity could – perhaps more likely – indicate that, like Hiereia itself, it directly or indirectly served the needs of the palace, in the sense that the lower-ranking staff landed and lived there in simpler quarters and/or that the supply of the palace was handled via the Eutropios Harbour.

116 Janin, *Banlieue I-II* 374 considers that Gilles saw the true remnants of the Eutropios Harbour, which were no longer present at his time. – Janin, *Constantinople* 238f. 297 and map XII (Janin, *Grands Centres*, map p. 30) had noticed by now that there were indeed remnants of a mole.

117 Theophylaktos Simokattes, *Historia* 305-307 (de Boor/Wirth). – *Chronicon Paschale* 694. 696f. (Dindorf). – Theophanes, *Chronographia* 289f. 295 (de Boor). – Whitby, *Maurice* 26f. – *PLRE III* 1, 338.

118 Theophanes, *Chronographia* 395f. (de Boor). – On the chronology, see Mango/Scott, *Theophanes* 548 n. 16-17.

119 Delehaye, *Stylites XCVI-XCIX. CIII-CV*. 206. 222. 235.

120 Delehaye, *Stylites* 234-236.

121 Only Leon Diakonon, *Historia* 175f. (Hase) mentions the collapse of the column. After describing the devastating earthquake that also caused the partial collapse of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, he speaks of the consequences: hunger, epidemics, droughts, floods and the appearance of exceptionally strong winds; »at that time, the column *en tois Eutropiu* was also brought down by the force of the waves«. – See Delehaye, *Stylites XCVII* (who takes over the date 986 handed down by Georgios Kedrenos, *Chronicon II* 438 [Bekker]). – Guidoboni, *Earthquakes* 404f. – Ambraseys *Earthquakes* 256f. with other sources for the earthquake.

122 According to Ioannes Zonaras (*Epitome III* 196f.), the Emperor Maurice was brought to his execution *eis ton en Chalkedoni tu Eutropiu limena*.

## Summary / Zusammenfassung

### Gates to Asia Minor: The Harbours of Chalcedon, Chrysopolis, Hiereia and Eutropiu Limen Opposite Constantinople

This chapter examines the archaeological findings and the function of five harbours, which are situated directly opposite the capital of the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople, on the Asia Minor bank of the Bosphorus and the Sea of Marmara, and belong to its suburban area. Three of these harbours (the two harbours of Chalcedon/Kadıköy and Chrysopolis/Üsküdar) could use natural harbour bays, which are now partially or completely silted up. For Hiereia/Fenerbahçe (probably) and especially for the so-called Eutropios Harbour, the installation of large moles built into the sea was necessary. A study of the sources relating to the harbours shows that Chalcedon and Chrysopolis were used as starting points of the major roads through Asia Minor for all kinds of traffic of passengers and goods (administration, troops, crossings to suburban palaces and villas, trade, supply of the capital). Hiereia, on the other hand, was the most important imperial palace on the Asia Minor side and the one used for the longest period; it served exclusively for crossings of the emperors and their families, their courtiers and high dignitaries, who participated in the court's many and rich ceremonies. The function of the Eutropios Harbour, located just north of Hiereia, is not so clear. Perhaps it was used as the third harbour of Chalcedon, perhaps it was mainly used to supply the imperial Palace.

### Tore nach Kleinasien: die Konstantinopel gegenüberliegenden Häfen Chalkedon, Chrysopolis, Hiereia und Eutropiu Limen

Der vorliegende Beitrag untersucht den archäologischen Befund und die Funktion von fünf Häfen, die auf dem kleinasiatischen Ufer des Bosphorus und des Marmarameeres der Hauptstadt des Byzantinischen Reiches, Konstantinopel, unmittelbar gegenüberliegen und zu dessen Vorstadtgebiet zählen. Drei dieser Häfen (die beiden Häfen von Chalcedon/Kadıköy und Chrysopolis/Üsküdar) konnten natürliche Hafengebiete nutzen, die heute teilweise bzw. völlig verlandet sind. Für Hiereia/Fenerbahçe (wahrscheinlich) und vor allem für den sog. Eutropios-Hafen war die Anlage großer, in das Meer gebauter Molen notwendig. Eine Untersuchung der auf die Häfen bezogenen Quellen zeigt, dass Chalkedon und Chrysopolis als Ausgangspunkte der großen Straßen durch Kleinasien für alle Arten von Personen- und Warenverkehr (Verwaltung, Truppen, Überfahrten zu Vorstadtpalästen und -villen, Handel, Versorgung der Hauptstadt) genutzt wurden, während Hiereia wegen seines hier errichteten Kaiserpalastes, des wichtigsten und am längsten genutzten auf der kleinasiatischen Seite überhaupt, ausschließlich für Überfahrten der Kaiser und ihrer Familien, ihres Stabes und hoher Würdenträger (zeremoniell) diente. Die Funktion des nur unweit nördlich von Hiereia gelegenen Eutropios-Hafens ist nicht so klar. Vielleicht wurde er als dritter Hafen von Chalkedon genutzt, vielleicht wurde über ihn vor allem die Versorgung des Kaiserpalastes abgewickelt.