Constantinople as Center and Crossroad

Edited by

Olof Heilo and Ingela Nilsson

Table of Contents

Argyropolis

A diachronic approach to the study of
Constantinople's suburbs

ISABEL KIMMELFIELD

The challenges faced when studying the old city center of Constantinople are magnified beyond its former walls: besides the lack of extensive archaeological evidence (what little remains has rarely been studied in depth), assigning a geographic location to suburbs named in sources requires much ingenuity. Rarely have Byzantine names for these sites survived, even in Ottomanized toponyms: by the time of the conquest in 1453, most of Constantinople's great suburbs had declined even more than the city center or had been subsumed into Italian trading colonies. The precise location of many Byzantine suburbs thus continues to be debated, with many old attributions overturned in recent years as more research has taken place. Further complicating the study of the suburbs is the tremendous growth of the modern city: what were small suburban villages in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are now busy modern neighborhoods, some of which now lie at the heart of the modern city. The gap between the heyday of the Byzantine suburbs in the early Byzantine period and the Ottoman conquest has often led to the neglect of these sites in considerations of the form and functioning of Constantinople at its height. Yet there is much evidence that the suburbs in the early and even, to a degree, into the middle period were prosperous and sometimes highly-developed regions with close connections to the city center.

This paper will seek to demonstrate the nature of some of these connections through a diachronic study of the Byzantine suburban region called Argyropolis. Located on the northern shore of the Golden Horn next to the suburb of Galata, this region serves well to illustrate the manners in which history of the Byzantine suburbs of the city may be approached: while not highly developed, it was located near to the city and adjacent to a larger, highly developed suburb, with the result that there are many angles from which to approach its history. Other, more isolated and little-developed sites provide limited grounds for research, offering only glimpses into their history at different points in time. Taken as a whole, however, these sites indicate a flourishing and complex extramural side to the city, and Argyropolis throughout its history reflects a number of the ways that the city's suburbs contributed to and interacted with the city center. In the course of this study, I will trace the history of Argyropolis and its environs through the Ottoman period and up to the present day (although large gaps still remain). In the process, it will become necessary to move away from Byzantine Argyropolis and towards

Ottoman Tophane (a name that still applies to the neighborhood today). The degree to which these two sites overlap is not always clear, as Argyropolis may more closely correspond to the eastern end of Galata (cf. Fig. 1 below), but this shift in geographic focus reflects the difficulty of assigning precise boundaries to the former Byzantine suburbs, while also allowing a larger consideration of the environs of both Argyropolis and Tophane.

In the Byzantine period, Argyropolis lay east of the suburb of Sykai (later Galata and today Karaköy), which flourished between the fourth and the sixth centuries, possessing a theater and several baths—trappings of a developed urban area. In the early fifth century, the region to the east of Sykai was christened 'Argyropolis'. Although never developed into an urban center (as happened at Sykai, which had its own walls as early as the sixth, or even late fifth century), this region nonetheless played a role in the Byzantine city, notably as the site for a legend regarding the foundation of the city as an apostolic see. I will start by tracing these early references to the region, both historical and legendary. I will then examine how the region reflected Ottoman encounters with Byzantine heritage in the centuries following the conquest. Finally, I will consider the Byzantine ruins that remain in the neighborhood today, together with a number of artefacts excavated in the region that are now displayed at the Istanbul Archaeological Museums. In the process, this article will also raise questions concerning the future of such fragile Byzantine heritage as may be found in the historical suburbs of the city, away from the touristic center of the Historic Peninsula. Is there a role for Byzantine remains in such regions? Are they worth preserving, or are they negligible, unimportant ruins, lacking the historical weight and significance of those still visible in the Old City? It is the intention of this article to argue that the answer is no, and that these peripheral regions still have much to tell us about the city of Constantinople through the centuries.

Fig. 1. Modern Tophane and neighboring regions, with historical sites and recent findings labelled. Map by the author (cf. Map 4 at the end of this volume).

References in pre- and early Byzantine texts

While the region did not gain the name 'Argyropolis' until the fifth century, already, in the late second century, we find the site described by Dionysios of Byzantion in his *Anaplous Bosporou*. This account informs readers of the route along the Bosphorus, first north along the west bank, then south along the east bank, describing both cult sites and the geography of the land en route. While it is impossible to determine precise locations for the sites Dionysios mentions, it is evident from his account that several altars to the gods were located in the region and the surroundings of Argyropolis. In an article seeking to locate various sites named by Dionysios in the neighbourhood of Galata, Eugène d'Alessio placed the temples of Artemis Phosphoros (or Diana Lucifer) and Aphrodite Praieas (or Venus Placida) to the east of Galata, thus locating them in the region that became Argyropolis.[1] Dionysios reports that these temples were erected as these goddesses were believed to control the winds. These winds, together with the currents of the Bosphorus, had a significant impact on the development of Constantinople's coastal suburbs, as did fishing, which Dionysios states was plentiful along the northern coast of the Golden Horn. Dionysios offers several names for areas along the coast of the Golden Horn and Bosphorus, and it is difficult to establish which most closely corresponds with the modern neighborhood. It seems likely that the areas named 'Bolos,' 'Metopon,' and 'Ostreodes' correspond roughly to the stretch of shoreline currently occupied by the modern neighborhoods of Karaköy, Tophane, and Cihangir.[2]

Following Dionysios, there are no mentions of the region in the first century of Constantinople's history as an imperial capital (dedicated in 330 by Constantine the Great). In the early fifth century, though, it reappears, and is provided with a new name. This event is recorded in Socrates' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and attributed to his contemporary, Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople (r. 406–25). Atticus, it would seem from Socrates' account, was well known for his naming of places, and, among others, he turned his eye to the region across the Golden Horn, beside the suburb then known as Sykai. Seeing that this site lay opposite the suburb Chrysopolis ('Golden City,' modern Üsküdar on the Asian side of Istanbul), and finding the place "delightfully situated, [he] declared that it was most fitting it should be called Argyropolis" ('Silver City').[3] Around the same time that Atticus provided Argyropolis with its new name, an account of Constantinople was produced, describing the division of the city's regions: the *Notitia Urbis Constantino-*

---

[1] E. Dallegio D'Alessio, "Galata et ses environs dans l'antiquité," *REB* 4 (1946), 218–38, here 220. For two other approximations of the locations see R. J. A. Talbert (ed.), *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World* (Princeton 2000) 53 and A. Külzer, "Sonderkarte/Bosporos/Goldenes Horn," *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* 12 (Vienna 2008).

[2] Dionysios of Byzantion, 35, in *Dionysii Byzantii Anaplous Bospori*, ed. R. Güngerich (Berlin 1958), 16.

[3] Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VII.25, in P Schaff & H. Wace (eds.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series, Vol. 2* (Buffalo, NY, 1896-1890). This name may have referred to a church in the region rather than to a neighborhood or suburb as a whole as the name primarily appears in religious sources. However, the use of the term προάστειον by Socrates as well as a reference in the seventh-century *Miracles of Artemios*, to a man residing "on the other side in Argyropolis" (πέραν ἐν Ἀργυροπόλει) suggests that whether or not this name officially referred to the neighborhood as a whole, or only to a religious site within it, the name was sufficient enough a geographical marker to indicate a known extramural residential area to Constantinopolitans. V. S. Crisafulli & J. W. Nesbitt (eds., tr.), *The Miracles of St Artemios: A Collection of Miracles Stories by an Anonymous Author of Seventh-Century Byzantium* (Leiden 1997), 164.

politanae, ca. 425. Although the suburb of Argyropolis is not mentioned, we do learn of the growth of its neighbor, Sykai. This 'regionary' lists the fourteen districts of Constantinople (a system of division adopted from Rome) as well as the various buildings and officials attached to each. The thirteenth region is Sykai, "which is separated by a narrow inlet of the sea but maintains its connections to the city by frequent ferries."[4] At this point, it is unlikely that the region was walled, but the seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* reports that in 528 Justinian had the suburb's walls renewed, suggesting such walls were established at some point between ca. 425 and 528.[5] It was also under Justinian that the region was granted city status, and renamed 'Justinianopolis,' although the name (and with it Sykai's independent status) does not appear to have lasted long.[6] Thus, between the naming of Argyropolis in the early fifth century and the semi-independence of its neighbor Sykai in the early sixth century, it seems likely that the region was at least partially developed, situated so closely to a suburb whose status was increasing in this period.

Argyropolis in religious use and legend

In the face of few direct references to the suburb in contemporary historical accounts, there would appear to be little more to say about the region as a Byzantine suburb. Yet Argyropolis featured at the center of a legend related to Constantinople's ecclesiastical status. This was the legend of the city's foundation as an apostolic see, which provided the city with a comparable ecclesiastical status to Rome. According to this account, the apostle Andrew, while travelling through Asia Minor, stopped at the Greek city of Byzantion. According to some accounts, he found the governor of the city hostile to Christians, and thus instead landed across the Golden Horn at Argyropolis where, after preaching and setting up an altar, he ordained the disciple, Stachys, the first bishop of Byzantion. This legend directly challenged Rome's claim to primacy by virtue of its position as the oldest apostolic see, with Peter as its first bishop. The Andrew legend challenged both the age (claiming Byzantion's see to have been established before Rome's) and the Petrine emphasis (due to Andrew's position as the first to heed the call, responsible for bringing his brother, Peter, to Christianity). Although a precise date cannot be given for the first appearance of this legend, it seems likely that its codification dates from around the second half of the seventh century.[7]

But why locate the legend in Argyropolis? Francis Dvornik argued that this geographic reference, together with the explanation provided in some of the sources for Andrew's choice to land in the suburb rather than in the city proper, served to give the legend a more secure basis in the familiar reality of the city (both

---

[4] *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*, tr. J. Matthews, in L. Grig & G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in late Antiquity* (New York 2012), 95.

[5] *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, tr. M. Whitby & M. Whitby (Liverpool 1989), 110; D. P. Drakoulis, "The Functional Organization of Early Byzantine Constantinople, according to the *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*," in T. Korres et al. (eds.), *Openness: Studies in Honour of Visliki Papoulia* (Thessaloniki 2012), 164; C. Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives and Pseudo-Dorotheus of Tyre," *Nea Rhome* 6 (2009), 157–70, here 164, n. 26.

[6] *Chronicon Paschale* 110.

[7] Though Mango suggests it may have originated closer to the sixth century; Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 167.

historical and contemporary) to seventh-century Constantinopolitans.[8] In two of the three early accounts of the legend Dvornik examines, the governor or 'tyrant' of Byzantion is named as Zeuxippos, a "worshipper of idols"[9] who "threw all Christians out to sea."[10] The name Zeuxippos would have resonated with contemporary Constantinopolitans familiar with the Baths of Zeuxippos, located in the center of the city, near the Hippodrome, the imperial palace, and Hagia Sophia, said to have been erected by the emperor Septimius Severus and embellished by Constantine.[11] These baths would have been well-known to Constantinopolitans. References in Euseubius of Caesarea's *Chronicon* (fourth century) and John Malalas's *Chronographia* (sixth century) to a King of the Greek city of Sicyon named Zeuxippos would, Dvornik argues, have further enabled this use of the name to provide the legend of Andrew with a certain degree of authenticity among learned readers.[12] Similarly, he argues that, although Argyropolis only received its name in the fifth century, making its appearance in the legend anachronistic, by the time the Andrew legend was codified in the seventh century, the location of the legend in this named region would have firmly rooted it in a familiar and identifiable region of the city. It is also possible that the suburban region had declined by the seventh century. The name associated with it thus had something of an old-fashioned—possibly even antiquated—sound to it. As a result, this anachronism might actually have helped to suggest the historical setting of the legend.[13]

The use of Argyropolis in this instance is intriguing, and suggests that the region was certainly familiar (by name) to inhabitants of Constantinople as a suburb of the city in the late seventh century. Its use here as a place 'outside of the ancient city', out of reach of the tyrant, Zeuxippos, also suggests a sense of distance attached to the region, despite its closeness to Sykai (connected to the central city in the early period "by frequent ferries"). Yet the location of so potent a legend in the region indicates that Argyropolis was by no means seen as an entirely remote, disconnected location, and even endows it with significant sacred meaning. In the account by Pseudo-Dorotheus, Andrew is said to have remained for two years in this place, where he erected an altar and made two thousand converts, as well as, finally, ordaining Stachys.[14] The holy nature of Argyropolis is further established by Pseudo-Dorotheus, who describes it as being the resting place of the bodies of the married Saints Adrian and Natalia (and their twenty-three fellow martyrs)

---

[8] F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, MA 1958), 222.

[9] As described in the *Martyrium sancti Apostoli Andreae*, ed. M. Bonnet as *Narratio* in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. 13 (Paris 1894): 358; qtd. and tr. Dvornik, 172.

[10] As described in the *Index apostolurm discipulorumque* by Pseudo-Dorotheus of Tyre, *Index Apostolorum Discipulorumque* in *Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae, Indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini, Dorotheo Epiphanion, Hippolyto aliisque vindicatae*, ed. Th. Schermann (Leipzig 1907), 146; Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 162.

[11] On the Baths of Zeuxippos, see the contribution by Hedlund in this volume.

[12] Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*, 218–19.

[13] However, by the tenth century, a similar legend placing Andrew in the old city center of Byzantion appears in the compilation, the *Patria* of Constantinople, where we are told how Andrew arrived at the city "before Constantine the Great" and set up a cross in "Saint Irene the Old." Does this indicate a gradual shift to relocate the legend away from Argyropolis as the suburb became even more obsolete? Or is this simply an instance of competing narratives such as appear frequently throughout the *Patria*? Certainly, the chapter immediately preceding this account of Andrew's activities states that the apostle ordained Stachys at "Saint Irene called *Ta Galatou*," locating this part of the legend across the Golden Horn at Sykai. *Patria* 3.178–79, pp. 211–13.

[14] Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 162.

whose tombs, we are told, are still visible "in an underground cave where the apostle Andrew set up his altar".[15] These bodies are said to have been placed in "the first Christian church at Argyropolis" by a bishop of Byzantion called Titus, where the relics of Stachys were also laid.[16]

Cyril Mango has further explored the potential religious significance of the region to the Constantinopolitans, tentatively suggesting that the area was used by the Byzantines to correspond to the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem, part of a larger program which saw several sites from the Holy City 'reproduced' for ceremonial use in Constantinople. He elaborates on a theory developed by the Russian linguist, A. A. Dmitrievskij, in 1907, which posited that the stational liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem (described by the Galician noblewoman, Egeria, in her *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, 381–84) was transplanted to Constantinople and adapted to the local topography. While Mango acknowledges weaknesses in this argument and rejects the idea of a wholesale transplantation, he nonetheless sees some promise in pursuing the link between the Mount of Olives (associated with Ascension and Palm Sunday) with the region just above Argyropolis, a steep hill known as Elaiōn or Elaia.[17] In Pseudo-Dorotheus' preface, the writer recounts that, in the years following Stachys' ordination, the Christians at Argyropolis (and Byzantion) flourished following the death of their oppressor (Zeuxippos). The leaders of the church at Argyropolis, "wishing to escape the assaults of pagans and Jews," built another church further inland dedicated to the Maccabees, at which Constantine himself eventually wished to be buried, "but [he] was persuaded that it was not proper for emperors to be interred outside the city."[18] Although Mango does not believe this account's declaration that the Church of the Maccabees was built under Constantine, he does date this church to the fourth century, and notes that Socrates states that in Constantinople Ascension was celebrated at Elaia, the region in which Pseudo-Dorotheus locates this church.[19] References in other sources, including the *Chronicle* of Theophanes and a homily of John Chrysostom, indicate that the Church of the Maccabees was indeed the location of this service.[20] The Byzantine suburbs of Argyropolis and Elaia thus appear to have had not merely a general or legendary, but very specific, historically-attested religious significance for the Byzantines, at least up to the early or even mid-ninth century (the date Dvornik posits for the latest extant source of the legend).[21]

---

[15] … ἐν τῷ ὑπογαίῳ σπηλαίῳ, ἔνθα ἀπόστολος Ανδρέας τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἥδρασεν. Pseudo-Dorotheus, *Index Apostolorum* 148.

[16] Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 161–62. The presence of the bodies of Adrian and Natalia at Argyropolis is also attested in the *Maryrology of Jerome* (probably sixth century), in *Acta Sanctorum, Sept.* III (1750), 230. Mango thus suggests the description of their burial sites is "probably a real detail" (p. 164).

[17] Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 157.

[18] Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 162; Pseudo-Dorotheus 148–49.

[19] Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VII.26.2; Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 168. As for the dating, note that R. Janin suggests this church dates as late as the seventh century. R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin ; Première partie: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique ; T. III: Les églises et les monastères* (Paris 1969, 2nd ed.), 313–14; A. Berger, "The Cult of the Maccabees in the Eastern Orthodox Church," in G. Signori (ed.), *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (Maccabees 1 and 2) in Historical Perspective* (Leiden 2012), 105–12.

[20] Theophanes Confessor, *Chronicle* 139, tr. C. Mango & R. Scott (Oxford 1997), 214; Mango, "Constantinople's Mount of Olives," 168.

[21] Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*, 178. By the tenth century, Ascension Day was celebrated at the Church of the Theotokos of the Pege, the site of a holy spring which also lay outside the city walls, but just beyond the Theodosian Walls, rather than across the Golden Horn – possibly a more convenient

This account found in Pseudo-Dorotheus represents a clear effort to build up the sacred significance of Argyropolis to make it a fitting setting for the Andrew legend, weaving together verifiable facts and familiar locations with legendary elements. This effort both supports the interpretation of Argyropolis' use as a familiar location to add authenticity to the story, and also suggests that the suburb—or, indeed, the suburbs in general—was not seen as a completely meaningless site even before the development of the legend. Like many Constantinopolitan suburbs, Argyropolis had its share of saintly relics and shrines, as well as churches and possibly even a large convent or leper house (see below). The Andrew legend thus offers an interesting window into the 'afterlife' of such a suburb once its greatest spiritual role had faded (which certainly did not happen at all suburban shrines). Clearly it was not forgotten, and, although it may well have been viewed as a site of decreased importance whose heyday was over, the memory of its former spiritual significance remained strong enough to enable it to be reconstructed as a new site of spiritual meaning.

The middle and late Byzantine period

In the middle period of Byzantium, the fortunes of the region around Argyropolis shifted. The city of Sykai or Justinianopolis disappears from sources and may possibly have been abandoned in the seventh century, a time when the city suffered several sieges that devastated many of the suburbs and the empire in general shrank. Plagues also ravaged the city in these years, with the first wave striking in 542. At this time, many of the bodies of the dead were disposed of at Sykai: according to Procopius, when the numbers became too great to be buried, they were piled up inside the towers of the region's walls, causing a great stench to carry over the Golden Horn to the city.[22] A fort (*kastellion*) was built on the shoreline at some point between the sixth and early eighth centuries, to which a chain was attached, barring the mouth of the Golden Horn, first attested in 717.[23] This fort appears to have been called *ta Galatou*, in reference to a former resident of the area, Galates, and the later name of the region, Galata, likely originated as a corruption of this toponym.[24] In the eleventh century, or possibly earlier, it appears that Galata became a Jewish quarter, although this was destroyed when the Latin Crusaders conquered the city in 1204.[25] Following Michael VIII's re-taking of Constantinople in 1261, the neighborhood was granted to the Genoese as a trading colony. In the following centuries, the Genoese maintained their hold on this suburb, frequently clashing with the emperors in Constantinople in conflicts over

---

location (although its flat location lacked the topographic link between the hill of Elaia and the Mount of Olives). Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *The Book of Ceremonies*, vol. 1, tr. A. Moffatt & M. Tall (Canberra 2012), 108–14.

[22] Procopius, *De bello Persico* 2.22–23. See also P. Magdalino, "The Maritime Neighbourhoods of Constantinople: Commercial and Residential Functions, Sixth to Twelfth Centuries," *DOP* 54 (2000), 218–19.

[23] C. Mango, "Galata," *ODB*.

[24] The fort is first mentioned by Theophanes, *Chronicle* 396 (p. 545). This etymology of Galata is offered in the *Patria of Constantinople*, and, despite the legendary nature of much of the *Patria's* material, this would appear to be an accurate attribution. *Patria* 3.178 (p. 210). For a discussion of the potential identity of Galates, see A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* (Bonn 1988), 695.

[25] P. Magdalino, "The Maritime Neighbourhoods of Constantinople" 220; Mango, "Galata". On the presence of Jews in Constantinople, see the contribution by Rapp in this volume.

taxation and fortification (after the Genoese went against the emperor's orders by building new walls around Galata).[26]

Argyropolis at this point does not appear in sources, likely having suffered significant decline along with Sykai in the preceding centuries. In the fifteenth century, seven maps were produced based on the now-lost original by Cristoforo Buondelmonti in his book, *Liber Insularum Archipelagi* (finished sometime after 1418). Four of these show a church located in the region adjacent to Galata, while three do not.[27] Given the dispersal of these maps across the century, it is thus difficult to determine whether Buondelmonti's original (based on his firsthand observation of the city) did or did not locate a church here, and, if it did, impossible to know whether this was a Byzantine rather than Genoese church, or one mentioned in earlier sources.

Early Ottoman Tophane: Byzantine influences?

Further complicating any attempt at interpretation is, of course, the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmet II in 1453. The reproductions of Buondelmonti's map by later cartographers were naturally influenced by this event: some maps showed Mehmet's extensive building projects, while others chose to emphasize the pre-Ottoman monuments instead (Buondelmonti's original focus), or, in the face of the Muslim conquest, to present the city forcefully as a 'New Jerusalem' with great emphasis on the Christian buildings of the city.[28] It is at this point that we must turn to consider the region through the lens of the Ottoman neighborhood of Tophane.

Today, Tophane is bounded to the west by the site of the former extent of Galata's walls, as they stood in the fifteenth century. But until the late fourteenth century, Galata did not extend east beyond the Kastellion. In the thirteenth century Galata became a Genoese colony, but the extramural region to the east continued to be populated by Greeks (who remained in the neighborhood even after the extension of the walls). They referred to the region as Lagirio or Lagero, and it is possible that this represents a corruption of the original Argyropolis, suggesting that Argyropolis may have extended further west than modern Tophane.[29] This uncertainty of location underlines the degree of separation between the Ottoman and early Byzantine suburbs, and indicates the challenges facing scholars who wish to study them. Nonetheless, by using modern Tophane and its

---

[26] Ibn Battuta, in van der Vin, *Travellers to Greece and Constantinople*, vol. 2, 570. On the Genoese in Constantinople, see the contribution by Angar in this volume.

[27] *Without*: Düsseldorf Universitäts-und Landesbibliothek, Ms. G. 13 (ca. 1480); Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, Ms. W.309 (ca. 1475?); Venice Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Ms. Lat.X.215 (=3773) (ca. 1430); *With*: Florence Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Ms. II, II, 312 (ca. 1470?); Florence Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ms. Plut. 29, 25 (ca. 1470?); Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Urb. Lat. 459 (1465); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. Aqu. Lat. 2383, fol. 34v (1457/58). The first six maps are reproduced and studied by I. Manners, "Constructing the Image of a City: The Representation of Constantinople in Christopher Buondelmonti's Liber Insularum Archipelagi," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87.1 (1997), 72–102. The seventh is reproduced in Cristoforo Buondelmonti, *Liber Insularum Archipelagi*, Facsimile, ed. I. Siebert et al. (Wiesbaden 2005). Cf. the article of Angar to this volume (141, fig. 18).

[28] Manners, "Constructing the Image," 86.

[29] C. Desimoni, "I Genovesi ed i loro quartieri in Constantinopoli nel secolo XIII," *Giornale linguistic di archaeologia, storia e belle arti* 3 (1876), 217–74, here 255–56. My thanks to Albrecht Berger for bringing this terminology to my attention.

environs (extending west into Karaköy, north into Galatasaray, and east into Cihangir) as a base, this study seeks to indicate the manner in which the Ottoman development of these suburban regions still reflects larger considerations about the Byzantine history and heritage of Constantinople.

In many ways, the region formerly occupied by Argyropolis and its surroundings was entirely remade in this period, with little influence from its Byzantine past. With the building of a canon and canon ball factory (which gave the neighborhood its new name, meaning '(canon) ball-house') under Mehmet II, Tophane became the oldest surviving industrial region of the city. This new industry, combined with Mehmet II's deliberate program of repopulation, revived the region, and soon Tophane was filled with a large and diverse populace which continued to grow and change in the following centuries. By the seventeenth century, the writer Evliya Çelebi recorded that Tophane contained "one hundred and seventy quarters of Muslims, twenty of Greeks, seven of Armenians, and two of Jews, but none of Franks or Gypsies."[30] Moreover, although neighboring Galata was once again flourishing under the Genoese by the time Mehmet II took the city, it was now a completely 'Frankish', non-Byzantine neighborhood, to the extent that few if any truly Byzantine remains can be found in the modern neighborhood today.[31] The region of Argyropolis, in the shadows of Galata's rebuilt walls (and later potentially included within these walls), would likely have been more colored by this Genoese suburb by the fifteenth century than by the waning Byzantine capital across the water. Indeed, even in the fourteenth century travelers to Constantinople recorded how much more densely populated Galata was in comparison to the once-great central city.[32] In 1332, Ibn Battuta described the city as consisting of "thirteen inhabited villages" within the city walls.[33]

The Ottoman treatment of the region reflects this pre-conquest decline in the Byzantine identity of the region. When Mehmet II decided to revive the dilapidated city through ambitious building programs and repopulation schemes, a significant element of his plans centered on a complex discourse with his Byzantine predecessors. This discourse, which has been well-studied, focused primarily on the monumental heart of the city where, most notably, Hagia Sophia was converted into the imperial mosque. Through such actions, Mehmet sought to establish both primacy—literally embodying the conquest in the architecture of the city—as well as continuity, seeking to place his empire and himself as rightful heirs to the Roman (Byzantine) empire.[34] The area adjoining Genoese Galata, sparsely populated and little developed at this point, neither invited nor required such ideological discourse, and was instead simply developed into a site of industry, more a symbol of the new than an interaction with the old.

Yet there is one notable feature of Ottoman Tophane that does reflect this centralized program of competition, continuity, and improvement. Even in the years immediately following the conquest, the Byzantine architectural influence on Ottoman building styles is already evident. Robert Ousterhout has argued that this was partly a continuation of the pre-conquest interactions that had taken place on

---

[30] E. Çelebi, *Narrative of Travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa in the Seventeenth Century*, vol. 2, tr. J. von Hammer-Purgstall (London 1846, repr. 2007), 158.

[31] Mango, "Galata."

[32] Van der Vin, *Travellers to Greece and Constantinople*, vol. 1, 290.

[33] Ibn Battuta, 569. This comment may also suggest that the fifth-century division of the city into fourteen districts (including Sykai) still existed to a degree nine hundred years later.

[34] R. G. Ousterhout, "The East, The West, and the Appropriation of the Past in Early Ottoman Architecture," *Gesta* 43.2 (2004), 165–76, here 167.

the borders of the Byzantine Empire as the early Ottomans encountered Byzantine churches and other buildings in Syria and Anatolia, and partly due to continuing workshop practices, in which the new Ottoman rulers still used the workshops and workers established by the Byzantines, whose production techniques naturally reflected Byzantine styles.[35] But Çiğdem Kafescioğlu has argued that while this likely had an impact, it cannot account for as far-reaching a program as can be seen in Constantinople in the early years of Ottoman rule. It was not only buildings erected by Mehmet himself which showed strong Byzantine architectural influence, but also those of his viziers, the new elite of the city, charged with patronizing their own building programs throughout the city. Kafescioğlu argues that this indicates a definite central policy of appropriation and architectural ideology, which the viziers were seeking to copy in their own buildings.[36] This discourse was not simply one of imitation, but also improvement. Gülrü Necipoğlu argues that this 'competitive discourse' alluded to the past to legitimize the present by demonstrating not only continuity, but also the superiority of the present.[37]

No one embodied this concept more fully than the man who came to be known as the greatest of all Ottoman architects, Mimar Sinan (ca. 1489/90–1588). The greatest challenge for any Ottoman architect was to outdo the great Hagia Sophia itself, most particularly its great dome. Previous efforts had been made, notably Mehmet II's New Mosque (or Fatih Camii, 'Conqueror Mosque'). But it wasn't until 1575, with the completion of the Selimiye Mosque in Erdine, that Sinan finally achieved this goal, both creating a larger dome and perfecting structural elements, thus successfully 'outdoing' his Byzantine predecessors. Necipoğlu notes the frequency with which references to Hagia Sophia and its (legendary) architect Agnados appear in Sinan's autobiography, indicating the degree to which this building both inspired him and gave him a standard to improve upon.[38]

Five years later, Sinan completed a somewhat surprising mosque in light of his successful perfection of and improvement upon Hagia Sophia. This was the Kılıç Ali Paşa Mosque complex, built for the Grand Admiral, Kılıç Ali Paşa, and located in Tophane. This mosque is a small replica of the Hagia Sophia, made without any effort to 'correct' the Byzantine model. There has been some debate as to why, after creating a 'perfectly centralized space' in the Selimiye Mosque, Sinan 'reverted' to the longitudinal plan of Hagia Sophia (a design that does not lend itself to Muslim worship). Necipoğlu suggests that this was possibly in part a decision influenced by Kılıç Ali himself, who sought to emulate previous Ottoman elites who had followed (or at least strongly drawn upon) the Byzantine model when

---

[35] R. G. Ousterhout, "Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995), 48–62, here 50.

[36] C. Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis / Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital* (University Park, PA, 2009), 120–21.

[37] G. Necipoğlu, "Challenging the Past: Sinan and the Competitive Discourse of Early Modern Islamic Architecture," *Muqarnas* 10 (1993), 169–80, here 170. Necipoğlu links this to a contemporary Ottoman poetical genre, called *naẓīre*, in which poems were composed on the model of admired predecessors, but were "improved" through a "novel twist" (p. 176).

[38] Necipoğlu, "Challenging," 172. The name Agnados derives from the legendary architect Ignatios named in the *Diegesis peri tes Hagias Sophias*, a Greek description of the Hagia Sophia's building, which comprised one of the sections of the tenth-century *Patria*. The *Diegesis* gained new fame under the Ottomans and a translation and adaptation of the text was commissioned by Mehmet II himself. G. Necipoğlu, "The Life of an Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia after Byzantium," in R. Mark & A. Çakmak (eds.), *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present* (Cambridge 1992), 195–225, here 198.

constructing mosques beyond the city walls.[39] The use of the form of Hagia Sophia also may have served to reflect and reinforce the message of conquest that building had come to embody. This message was directed not only to the Muslim users of the Kılıç Ali Paşa mosque, but also to the numerous European observers in the neighborhood (and in nearby Galata).[40] The design likely held additional meaning for Kılıç Ali given his own history as a captured Christian who converted to Islam and rose to prominence in the Ottoman navy—a career which can be seen as paralleling the history of Hagia Sophia. In this way, even separated from the central city where this discourse of competition and conquest was played out with the greatest intensity, Tophane nonetheless reflected such ideological concerns, and, indeed, its own particular nature (with its diverse population) nuanced this reflection, giving it added meaning and purpose.

In the seventeenth century, the traveler and writer Evliya Çelebi remarked on the similarity of Kılıç Ali's mosque to Hagia Sophia, stating it "is built entirely on the plan of Aya Sofya" and that it "rivals those of the Sultans."[41] Besides describing this mosque and the population of the suburb, Evliya also recounted several stories of the region's history, colored by his particular pleasure in myths and legends. In his account of Tophane, Evliya drew on several Muslim myths, notably that of Alexander (or Dhul Qarnayn in the Qur'an—transliterated below as Zúlkarnin):

> A tradition says, that Alexander, Zúlkarnín, enchained at this place magicians and witches from Gog and Magog by throwing mountains on them […] but those demons having cut the mountains, which shut up the Black Sea, it broke in by the Bosphorus and the demons were all buried in the Black Sea. Thus the foundation of Top-khánah is carried back to Alexander.[42]

The legend of Alexander was familiar to the Ottomans, both from the horned Quranic figure of Dhu-l-Quarnayn (Sura 18:83–99) and from the Persian *Iskandarnamah*.[43] Indeed, Alexander, together with Solomon, served as a model for Mehmet II, who possessed both Greek and Persian accounts of Alexander's life and deeds. In legends that developed during Mehmet's reign in part to establish Muslim claims to the city, both Alexander and Solomon were identified as earlier builders of Constantinople. Thus, Evliya locates Tophane within this tradition, firmly placing the suburb within the realm of the city's legendary past.

Evliya also provided more historic details regarding the area, which he states was "in the middle of the forest" in the Byzantine period and housed a convent dedicated to a "Saint Alexander." He associated this with the Cihangir Mosque (built by Sinan in honor of a son of the sultan) and declared that the "Infidels visit

---

[39] G. Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire* (London 2005), 428.

[40] Necipoğlu, *Sinan*, 438.

[41] E. Çelebi, *Narrative of Travels*, vol. 2, 58.

[42] E. Çelebi, *Narrative of Travels*, vol. 2, 54.

[43] The story of Alexander's defense against Gog and Magog has its origins in much earlier texts, namely Syrian apocalyptic literature of the fifth century and several recensions of Alexander novels from the Byzantine period. However, the localization of this story on the Bosphorus was a later development. Albrecht Berger believes it took place in the late Byzantine period, although he knows of no direct evidence for this development, with the result that the late Byzantine version of the legend of Alexander at the Bosphorus can only be guessed at from Evliya Çelebi's account. A. Berger, "Alexander der Große am Bosporus," in C. Sode & S. Takács (eds.), *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck* (Aldershot 2001), 17–18.

it once a year on the feast of this Saint."[44] While this cannot be true given Cihangir Mosque's post-conquest date, it is likely that at least one Byzantine religious building had been situated in this region, possibly as late as the fifteenth century if the Buondelmonti maps indicate a real church. This passage raises the question of whether there was truly any memory of this in the seventeenth century. Was there still a site or a standing Byzantine church in or around Tophane that still had meaning to Orthodox Christians in the period?[45] If so, was it truly Byzantine, or simply Christian, possibly connected to the Genoese at Galata?

Besides buildings, Evliya mentions fragments of a chain kept in Tophane's arsenal, which he identifies as having been stretched across the Bosphorus at Yoros Castle, north of Constantinople. He dates this chain to the mythical prehistory of the city, although such a chain did indeed exist in the late Byzantine period.[46] This was similar to the chain that spanned the mouth of the Golden Horn and, given the proximity of Tophane to this harbor chain, it is perhaps more likely that it is the remains of this latter chain that Evliya saw preserved in Tophane. The fragments of this chain may well have held particular significance for the Ottomans, perhaps part of the reason for their preservation and location: the chain resisted attempts to break it by Mehmet's ships, which were ultimately carried overland instead, passing not far from modern Tophane. Whatever their actual origins, Evliya records that several links of a chain, "as wide as a man's waist," could be found in the arsenal, "covered with sand and rubbish."[47] As late as the 1860s, a single link of this chain (now described as being the thickness of a man's arm) was still said to be kept at Tophane (at this point the chain was identified as that spanning the Golden Horn).[48] Whether these fragments belonged to the chain across the Straits at Yoros Castle, or to the Kastellion, or to neither one, it is notable that a tradition regarding a harbor chain remained attached to Tophane for at least two hundred years. This was possibly due to the region's proximity to the Golden Horn harbor chain and to its subsequent development into a neighborhood based on military and naval industry. Between this tradition and the mosque of Kılıç Ali, it becomes clear that even a region like Tophane, otherwise lacking in overt symbols of Byzantine power, nonetheless invited similar types of discourse as developed in the central city between Ottoman and Byzantine traditions, history, and heritage.

---

[44] E. Çelebi, *Narrative of Travels*, vol. 2, 54.

[45] It should be noted that the 'Greeks' located in this area were unlikely to be descendants from Byzantine inhabitants of Constantinople, many of whom fled following the conquest, but rather of the Greeks who moved into the city under Mehmet II. Thus, whatever memory of the Byzantine, Christian history of the region may have remained in Evliya's time, it would have been very distant and second-hand indeed. D. Kuban, *Istanbul, an Urban History: Byzantion, Constantinopolis, Istanbul* (Istanbul 2010), 355.

[46] Although the chain was no longer present by the fifteenth century when the ambassador Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo travelled past the fortress (see the contribution of Mabi Angar to this volume), he describes its function and observes the still-standing towers to which it was once affixed. *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, A.D. 1403-6*, tr. C. R. Markham (New York 1859), 50. See also P Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel Komnenos* (Cambridge 1993), 444, regarding evidence of a similar chain across the Hellespont.

[47] E. Çelebi, *Narrative of Travels*, vol. 1, 14.

[48] F.W. Hasluck, "Constantinopolitana," *JHS* 43/2 (1923), 164.

Byzantine remains in modern Tophane

In the neighborhood of Tophane today, certainly, almost no Byzantine remains are evident, and very little memory of the region's Byzantine heritage remains. Generally, residents see the Historic Peninsula as being the location of Byzantine remains and history in Istanbul. This belies the fact that some remains have actually been found in the region, including tombs, foundations, and a cistern. Most recently, a sixth- or seventh-century bath has come to light. Several artefacts from excavations in the neighborhood have also made their way into the Istanbul Archaeological Museums, including a funerary stele (discussed below), an elaborately-decorated column drum (inv. no. 901), and a capital decorated with rams' heads (inv. no. 5452), all of which suggest a period of prosperity and a degree of development in the region, more or less contemporary with the Byzantine heyday of Sykai/Justinianopolis. Securely locating recorded buildings in this area remains a challenge, however.

Various sources refer to buildings lying in the vicinity of Sykai. One interesting site which may be associated with this region is the leper house of St. Zotikos. Zotikos was a fourth-century leper-saint, who, according to some traditions, was also the *orphanotrophos*, the director of the main orphanage of Byzantium, before he fell out of favor with Constantius II, apparently for establishing a leper colony at Elaia.[49] In the summer of 1939, during the construction of a garage south of the German Hospital on Sıraselviler Caddesi, a covered Byzantine cistern was discovered. It was recorded and sketched by the Swiss scholar, Ernest Mamboury. The cistern measured 35.2 m x 31.1 m, and originally contained 42 columns, although the remains of only six were visible.[50] On the basis of the brickstamps, the cistern has been dated to the mid-fifth century, and appears to be contemporary with another cistern discovered in the early 1920s in Gülhane Park, next to Topkapi Palace. Mamboury also noted deep fissures opening regularly parallel to the east of the cistern at intervals of 7 or 8 m, leading him to posit that associated buildings may have lain on this side of the cistern. Further taking into account the large number of tombs that had been discovered in the region (see map), Mamboury suggested that this cistern may well have been connected to the leper house of St. Zotikos, which was attested to in the region as late as 1200 by the Russian pilgrim Anthony of Novgorod.[51] Anthony described the leper house as being situated "on a hill," which would match the situation of the Sıraselviler cistern quite well. This is the same region Mango suggested as the location of Elaia, Constantinople's 'Mount of Olives', thus placing the Church of the Maccabees also somewhere in this area, although no remains that can be securely attached to either of these buildings have been found.

On Kadiriler Yokuşu, not far from the Sıraselviler cistern, Byzantine remains and graves were also found during the construction of a house. Here, Mamboury records that Byzantine foundations were discovered, with brick arches he identifies

---

[49] J. W. Nesbitt, "The Orphanotrophos: Some Observations on the History of the Office in Light of Seals," *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 8 (2008), 51–62, here 53. Nesbitt finds it unlikely, however, that the same Zotikos would have begun his career as orphanotroph—a prestigious rank—and ended it as founder of a leper house.

[50] E. Mamboury, "Les fouilles byzantines à Istanbul et ses environs et les trouvailles archéologiques faites au cours de constructions ou de travaux officiels et privés depuis 1936," *Byzantion* 21 (1951), 425–59, here 430; J. Bardill, *Brickstamps of Constantinople*, vol. 1 (Oxford 2004), 80.

[51] Mamboury "Les fouilles," 430–31; Anthony of Novgorod, "Livre du Pèlerin," tr. M. Ehrhard, "Le livre du Pèlerin d'Antoine de Novgorod," *Romania* 58 (1932), 44–65, 63.

as seventh-century.[52] Among the objects excavated was a funerary stele, which was acquired by the Istanbul Archaeological Museums on 28th May, 1921, (inv. no. 3896).[53] The inscription identifies the deceased as 'Amachis', an *apothekarios* (ἀποθηκάριος). In the tenth century, this title referred to an officer in charge of warehouses and public stores who, during imperial campaigns, was also in charge of provisioning the imperial table with food and drink.[54] On the basis of the religious references within the inscription, Gabriel Millet has suggested a fifth-century date for the stele.[55] As Mamboury pointed out, all of these graves indicate a large necropolis in the region, and, indeed, the third book of the late tenth-century compilation known as the *Patria* of Constantinople (in which a version of Hesychios's *Patria* appears as the first book) identified this region (also called Hierion) as the site of many graves.[56] Whether these graves were all associated with a particular religious institution (such as a church or convent), or constituted several distinct cemeteries, is hard to say, but certainly the large cistern suggests at least one large building was located in the region.

Fig. 2. The current state of the wall and arches. Photo by the author.

The cistern of Sıraselviler Caddesi is no longer visible today, though. Following the excavation, the garage was completed, and still occupies the site today. Houses have likewise continued to be built on Kadiriler Yokuşu, covering over the Byzantine foundations. On Murakıp Sokak, close to the waterfront, a set of medieval arches, which possibly belonged to the Christos Kremastos church complex on the edge of Galata, were recently mostly pulled down, leaving only a few remnants of brickwork visible (Fig. 2). In this way, what little evidence there is of Tophane's Byzantine history has become increasingly inaccessible. In the 1950s, however, this process was inadvertently reversed. It was at this point that a

---

[52] Mamboury, "Les fouilles," 431.

[53] Th. Macridy & J. Ebersolt, "Monuments funéraires de Constantinople," *Bulletin de correspondence hellénistique* 46 (1922), 356–93, here 356.

[54] Macridy & Ebersolt, "Monuments funéraires," 351.

[55] G. Millet, "Un type de la prière des morts: l'epitaphe d'Amachis," *Oriens Christianus* 29 (1932), 303–16, 316.

[56] *Patria* 3.177 (p. 211).

row of buildings along what is today Meclis-i Mebusan Caddesi was demolished to make room for the widening of the boulevard. This opened up a strip of hillside that was studded with ruins of uncertain date. Some of these are in fact early Ottoman, including the still partially-standing remains of an early eighteenth-century mosque.[57] Other walls and arches are certainly Byzantine, though, notably those on the lower level of the slope, but no further study on them was conducted. In 2013, the Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University sought to build an annex next to the Tophane cannon factory (today used as an exhibition space by the university). In the process, they discovered what appear to be the remains of a sixth- or seventh-century Byzantine bath and a fourth- or fifth-century marble sarcophagus (Fig. 3).[58] Although the site remains open, there are no currently-known plans to preserve it, despite a 2014 campaign launched by archaeologists and others interested in the site.[59] A newspaper article describing the find indicated that the site was not seen as revealing anything new, quoting the rector of the university, Professor Yalçın Karayağız, as stating that 'every hill' in the city has a sarcophagus.

Fig. 3. View of the west end of the Meclis-i Mebusan Caddesi site from above. Photo by the author

While this is a not unreasonable point—the city cannot preserve every archaeological site discovered—it is important that these sites be properly and thoroughly documented before they are built over, so that there is at least information available with which it might be possible to pursue further the Byzantine history of these suburban regions. For Tophane, whose Byzantine heritage has been almost completely erased or built over, these new excavations would be an excellent opportunity to preserve at least some of that heritage before it disappears completely. In the historic center of the city, in the Sultanahmet quarter, the lost Great Palace of Constantinople lies hidden beneath restaurants, hotels, and shops. There, where

---

[57] S. F. Göncüoğlu, *Bir Semt-i Meşhur Tophane: Değişimin ve Yıkımın Hikayesi* (Istanbul 2009), 54, 58–59.

[58] E. Ince, "O lahitten her dağ başında var," *Radikal*, 16 December 2013, http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/o_lahitten_her_dag_basinda_var-1166347 (last visited 2018-10-01).

[59] "Tophane'de Arkeolojik Park", *change.org*, https://www.change.org/tr/kampanyalar/tophane-de-arkeolojik-park (last visited 2018-10-01).

there is strong tourist interest in Byzantine remains, several business-owners have chosen to preserve and even incorporate these (often privately-funded) excavation sites as tourist attractions in their basements. It remains to be seen whether interest is strong enough to lead to such a decision in Tophane, particularly in the face of renewed plans for significant developments along the waterfront, including the building of a deepwater port for cruise ships, including a shopping center and a five-star hotel.

Conclusion

It is evident that even a site with apparently little Byzantine history or heritage is nonetheless relatively rich, both in remains (visible and covered) and legends, and many small elements from Argyropolis/Tophane reflect larger developments and influences from the city throughout its history. Tophane is certainly not alone among the suburbs of the modern city in its fragmentary, but nonetheless intriguing and potentially meaningful Byzantine heritage. Numerous studies have been made of the Byzantine city's hinterland, but the lack of much evidence has necessarily limited historians' understanding of the relationship between Constantinople and its suburbs.

Yet, as this small investigation into Argyropolis and its environs has sought to demonstrate, much remains to be found. The study of the concepts of and attitudes toward these suburban regions seems a particularly fruitful avenue of research, in particular as reflected in legend-filled accounts like the *Patria*, as well as in Ottoman interpretations and adaptations of these Byzantine myths and legends. Further research along these lines into other suburbs may reveal interesting discoveries when compared to each other, and to the central city. The Tophane region appears to have been the site of an extensive cemetery: was this connected to a particular religious building (or buildings), or more generally to its immediate, more populous neighbor, Galata? How does the use of this cemetery relate to traditions of burials, both within and without city walls? Mango's consideration of the site as a Constantinopolitan emulation of Jerusalem's topography is also interesting, and suggests tempting investigations into other religious (and secular) uses of the land lying immediately beyond the city walls as the beginning or end points for ceremonial processions. Many questions along these lines still remain: how did the Constantinopolitans move between suburb and city? Under what circumstances? How were these outlying regions conceived?

While not every suburb offers enough information for a diachronic study like the one provided in this paper, or even warrants it, the case of Argyropolis nonetheless indicates that these regions, although peripheral, had active roles within the larger urban fabric of Constantinople. Thematic investigation, rather than geographic or chronological, drawing on some of the questions raised above, could offer new understanding of the complex and changing relationship between the central city and its many suburban sites. Furthermore, given the lack of much direct evidence for the suburbs, it is necessary to turn to a variety of different types of source material including legends, liturgical books, and books of imperial ceremony. By studying this material—in conjunction with archaeological investigations where possible—and asking new questions of old sources, we can develop a greater understanding of the manner in which the suburbs of Constantinople functioned through the Byzantine period, both materially and conceptually.