

Observations on the Great Palace at Constantinople: The Sanctuaries of the Archangel Michael, the Daphne Palace, and the Magnaura

Jan Kostenec
Charles University, Prague

Sanctuaries of the Archangel Michael

Numerous religious buildings were built within the Great Palace of Constantinople during the almost one thousand years in which it was the official residence of the Eastern Roman and Byzantine emperors. Until now, scholars have almost exclusively focused their studies on the most prestigious palatial churches and chapels, such as St Stephen, the Theotokos of Pharos or the Nea Ekklesia. One of the aims of this article is to draw attention to the still under-explored question of how many shrines dedicated to the Archangel Michael existed in the Palace, and where they were located in its vast area. Although it is not always clear which archangel is meant when written sources refer to a Great Palace church or chapel dedicated to the archangel, we can assume that – when only the word ‘archangel’ appears – it is the Archangel Michael who is the object of veneration. His cult in Byzantium (and especially at the Imperial court) was much more common than that of the Archangel Gabriel.¹

A Great Palace church dedicated to the Archangel is first attested in the year 511 during the reign of the Emperor Anastasius I (491-518).² Another church dedicated to the archangel was

probably also located in the Palace because it is mentioned along with the Consistorium and the Palace Guard quarters as being the scene of a plot against Justinian I in 563. It was also the place where, according to Corripus, Justin II stopped to pray before he became the new Byzantine emperor in 565.³ At that time, the boundary walls of the Great Palace had not yet reached the sea,⁴ leading one to conclude that the church was most likely located on one of the two upper palace terraces (32 and 26 m a.s.l.).⁵

Two other early sixth-century documents are more helpful in determining the possible location of the church. The church of the Archangel Michael is mentioned in the *Collatio catholicorum cum Severianis* of 532 as being 'at (or near) the spiral staircase' (in *choclio/cochlio*), and several times in the 'Acts of the Constantinopolitan Council' of 536 as 'in the palace' or 'adjacent to the palace'.⁶ Although the bishops were summoned to the Hormisdas Palace in 532 (Schwartz, IV.2, 169), the church of the Archangel Michael is not mentioned as standing in the Hormisdas, either in the document covering these discussions or in the Acts of the Council of 536.⁷ The Acts clearly delineate the location of churches: in Schwartz's edition (III) we can read on p. 159 that the church of the Archangel Michael is in the Palace (*palation*) and that of the Holy Apostles is in the Hormisdas (whose halls and chambers were occupied by the Monophysite refugees at that time); the same is mentioned again on pp. 160, 174-175 and 176. We do not know of any other church or chapel founded by Justinian I in his Hormisdas Palace, except those dedicated to the Holy Apostles and Sts. Sergius and Bacchus, judging from Procopius' detailed account.⁸ Only four years elapsed between the discussions with the Monophysite bishops and the Council of 536, which makes it probable that all mentions of the sanctuaries of the Archangel Michael in these documents most likely concern the same church. There is also a strong likelihood that all the sixth-

century references to the church/chapel of the Archangel in the Imperial Palace refer to one building only.

The Acts give evidence that the church must have been near the boundaries of the early Byzantine Imperial residence – ‘adjacent to the palace’ or ‘in the palace’. Throughout the sixth century, it still occupied merely two upper terraces; its extension down the slope to the Marmara Sea was carried out only in the late seventh century (see note 4). With this in mind, one might then place the church’s location on the terrace at 26 m a.s.l. or, a conclusion that seems less plausible, along the east flank of the Hippodrome, at 32 m a.s.l. The specification of the position of the *eukterion* as ‘at (or near) the spiral staircase’ is equally important. This spiral staircase could be identified as either the *kochlias* leading up to the Kathisma of the Hippodrome or that which connected the two upper terraces of the Great Palace.

The former of the two alternatives was suggested by R. Janin.⁹ Nevertheless, such a positioning of the church on the uppermost terrace near the main halls of Constantine’s Palace would not fully correspond to the specification ‘adjacent to the palace’ given in the Acts of the 536 Council (based on the assumption that one accepts the identity of the churches mentioned in both of the early sixth-century church documents discussed above).

As to the latter alternative, the spiral staircase used for communication between the upper terraces at 26 and 32 m a.s.l. since the early Byzantine period seems to have been near Theophilus’ later semicircular portico called the Sigma (as *De Cerimoniis* suggests), north-west of the north-western corner of the Walker Trust Peristyle.¹⁰ Consequently, the church of the Archangel Michael would be somewhere nearby. One plausible location is the area where a small building with a cross-shaped core was uncovered (east of the Mosaic Museum). It was surveyed first by E. Mamboury and Th. Wiegand (Db in Mamboury’s plan; fig. 1) and belongs to the building phase previous to that of the Apsed




Fig. 1 - Building 'Mamboury Db', Great Palace, Istanbul
(redrawn after E. Mamboury, Th. Wiegand, *Die Kaiserpaläste von Konstantinopel zwischen dem Hippodrom und dem Marmara Meer*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1934, pl.LXXXV)

Hall: the foundations of the Apsed Hall (adjoining the mosaic peristyle) blocked a small window in 'Mamboury Db'.¹¹ The masonry of 'Mamboury Db' (bricks and one band of greenstone at the spring of vaults) is not inconsistent with dating the building's construction to the reign of Anastasius I, when the Archangel's church is mentioned for the first time (AD 511; see note 2).¹²

The fact that the Apsed Hall (which I would ascribe to Heraclius) was later attached to the south flank of 'Mamboury Db'/the Archangel's church does not necessarily mean that the latter had to lose its function as a sacral building: the church of the Archangel appears in Theophanes' *Chronicle* yet again in 796 (Constantine VI's reign).¹³ It is important that all references to the




Fig. 2 - Hosios David, Thessaloniki (redrawn after P. Grossmann, 'Zur typologischen Stellung der Kirche von Hosios David in Thessaloniki', *Felix Ravenna* 1984-1985, 253-60, fig. 1) (see note 11)

church in question (providing that it was not identical with the Archangel's church believed to have been erected by Basil I, for which see below) are earlier than Theophilus' reign (829-842), when a great rebuilding of the Palace was carried out. If my suggestion that the Apsed Hall was renamed by Theophilus as the

Karianos is correct, it would be tempting to connect the end of the existence of 'Mamboury Db' as a church and the consequential possibility that it was converted into use as a secular building (perhaps the *vestiarium* of the Karianos of the tenth-century chapters of *De Cerimoniis*) with this emperor.¹⁴

The greenstone edifice and the paved way which were situated on the site later occupied by the famous Apsed Hall and the mosaic peristyle of the Walker Trust excavations can be identified as the Emperor Tiberius II's new apartments in the Great Palace, of which John of Ephesus informs us, as I have suggested elsewhere.¹⁵ The church of the Archangel played an important role in the *Chronicon Paschale*'s account of the overthrow of Phocas in 610. Phocas who had arrived in the 'urban palace' from Hebdomon was in the end, according to the *Chronicon Paschale*'s contemporaneous account, stripped of the imperial garment by conspirators and then dragged 'from the Archangel of the Palace' (*ek tou Archangelou tou Palatiou*) to the harbour by the Palace of Sophia to be transported to Heraclius' ship.¹⁶ It would be logical that Phocas, immediately before being captured, would be in a part of the Great Palace where he could observe the situation in the harbours and on the sea, and sensing his imperilled position, seek refuge in the nearest church – the Archangel of the Palace. Such criteria would indicate the greenstone chamber, the cross church 'Mamboury Db' and the adjacent terrace, which in the early seventh century represented the latest additions to the Palace. In addition, John of Antioch, a parallel and contemporaneous source, tells us that Phocas was brought before Heraclius from the Palation.¹⁷ The word 'palace' without any further clarification would lead one to believe that he is referring to the Great Palace, rather than the Palace of Sophia or Justinian's palace in the Hormisdas quarter, whose harbours John mentions using their full names.

As in almost every case concerning the topography of the Great Palace, the discussion is still open to other solutions. The above mentioned spiral staircase connecting both upper palace terraces could also be situated further west near the Hippodrome, on the way from the gate beneath the Kathisma (at 32 m a.s.l.) to the Chrysotriklinos, via the Skyla and Justinianos (both of the above mentioned buildings were on the terrace at 26 m a.s.l.). Textual sources tell us of Marcian's Galleries, starting near the Skylla and the Covered Hippodrome and running downhill towards the Boukoleon. According to Theophanes Continuatus' description of Basil I's building activities in the Great Palace, at the upper end of the galleries was the church of St Peter ('built like a corner tower'), to which the church of the Archangel Michael was adjacent, while *De Cerimoniis* specifies its location as being near the Skyla and the Covered Hippodrome.¹⁸ Theophanes Continuatus tells us explicitly that the church of St Peter was built by Basil I, but in the case of the Archangel's shrine, we are only told that he attached this church to that of St Peter. Consequently, the sanctuary of the Archangel in question may have been built by Basil I, but alternatively it could well be much older, perhaps it was the church whose existence in the Palace is attested to by the sources from the early sixth to the late eighth centuries, only later being restored by him and connected to his newly-erected church of St Peter.

De Cerimoniis, the most important and complete source on the Palace's topography, tells us nothing about the location of the church of the Archangel within the vast area of the Imperial residence and it seems possible that the church played no important role in court ceremonies. Taking this into account, we cannot completely exclude any of the suggested alternatives for placing the church near the respective spiral staircases.




Fig. 3 - The Great Palace, the 2002 plan

However, to cite one example, ceremonial itineraries from the Kathisma to the Triklinos of 19 Couches and from the Augusteus to the Kathisma, so minutely described in *De Cerimoniis*, give an impression that the only ecclesiastical building in the vicinity of the Kochlias of Kathisma was the church of St Stephen.¹⁹

For the sake of completeness I must mention another building in the Palace where the Archangel Michael was venerated. It was probably merely a small private oratory in Theophilus' building called Kamilas (near the Chrysotriklinos) dedicated not only to Michael but also to the Theotokos and in all probability had nothing to do with the church or churches of the Archangel which are the focus of the present paper.²⁰

Daphne Palace

I have recently proposed a new hypothetical reconstruction of the original Imperial Palace of Constantine the Great (later known as the Daphne) in which a broad horseshoe portico limiting the courtyard of Onopous (or Onopodion) is the main compositional element.²¹ However, everything is not as clear as it seemed when I prepared my previous study on the Great Palace. The proposed plan runs into several difficulties if one tries strictly to follow the ceremonial itineraries concerning the oldest part of the Great Palace (Daphne). Hence, I feel it necessary to add some additional comments on the published plan (hereafter the 2002 plan; fig. 3) and to put forward a new plan (hereafter the 2005 plan; fig. 4), in which a horseshoe portico plays an important role as well.

First, I shall list simplified versions of some itineraries in the Daphne, as recorded in *De Cerimoniis*, for a better illustration of the reasoning behind both versions of the hypothetical plan of Constantine's Palace.

From Augusteus to Tribunal

De Cer. I.40, 204f. (Coronation of the Augusta): the patricians gather in the Onopous and the members of Senate in the Portico of 19 Couches; the Augusta makes her way from the Augusteus (a




Fig. 4 - The Great Palace, the 2005 plan

coronation and reception hall) to the Chrysocheir (portico); when she arrives at the Onopous the patricians and the other members of Senate perform *proskynesis* and acclaim her, then accompany her as far as the *heliakon* (platform) in the Tribunal (an open space between the palace façade on the south and the Zeuxippos Bath on the north; also called the Delphax in the late fifth-early sixth-century chapters of *De Cerimoniis*) passing through the great gate of the Tribunal; the return to the Augusteus: the consuls stand in

the Portico of 19 Couches and the patricians as far back as the Chrysocheir.

De Cer. I.41, 209-212 (Coronation and wedding of the Augusta): the patricians gather in the Onopous and the consuls in the Portico of 19 Couches – they stand in rows as far as the curtain (which is drawn); the wives of senators go from the Augusteus to the Chrysocheir and stop in front of the curtain; the Augusta goes from the Augusteus to the Onopous and when she arrives at the proper spot, the patricians in the Onopous perform *proskynesis* and acclaim her, then accompany her; the curtain is drawn aside and the Augusta stands between the two columns (*dikionion*) and the members of Senate perform *proskynesis* and acclaim her, as do the patricians; then the Senate and the Augusta go to the platform in the Tribunal through the middle gate of the Tribunal; the return to the Augusteus: the Senate goes to the Portico of 19 Couches and stands as far as the *dikionion* and the Onopous; the patricians accompany the Augusta as far as *Chrysocheir*; the consuls stand as far as the *dikionion* and acclaim her as do the patricians in the *Chrysocheir*; the Augusta enters the Augusteus.

From the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to Tribunal

De Cer. I.43, 218 (Coronation of Caesar): the sovereigns gather in the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches (a dining and audience hall with nineteen apses); the patricians stand in rows in the Portico of 19 Couches; the other senators are on the stairs of the platform in the Tribunal; the patricians in the portico accompany the sovereigns and the patriarch to the Tribunal.

De Cer. I.44, 226 (appointment of *nobilissimos*): same itinerary as in *De Cer.* I.43.

From *Augusteus* to *Consistorium*

De Cer. I.38, 192, I.39, 197, I.1, 9-11: the emperor goes from the *Augusteus* to the *Chrysocheir*, then continues to the *Onopous* and descends to the *Consistorium*.

From the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to *Consistorium*

De Cer. I.9, 62: the sovereigns leave the *triklinos* by the door where a curtain hangs between the two columns; then they walk through the Portico of 19 Couches and pause between the (other) pair of columns; they are acclaimed in the *Onopous* and afterwards descend to the *Consistorium*.

In the 2002 plan, the *dikionion* marks the entrance from the horseshoe portico to the *Onopous* courtyard. I supposed that there was only one joint acclamation of the Senate and the patricians in Bk. 1, Ch. 41 on the way from the *Augusteus* to the Tribunal: lines 16-22 would relate to the ceremony in the *Onopous* which was a part of the ceremonial route (that is, it is specified that the patricians who are the main retinue of the Augusta perform *proskynesis*, acclaim her and accompany her) and lines 23-30 describe the ceremonies in general (that is, after the Augusta arrives at the *dikionion* and the curtain is drawn aside, the patricians in the *Onopous* and the consuls standing in the Portico of 19 Couches simultaneously perform *proskynesis* and acclaim her; the procession then continues on to the Tribunal). This interpretation of Ch. 41 excludes the Portico of 19 Couches from the ceremonial route and it would then only serve as a place where the consuls gathered and from which they acclaim the Augusta who stands between the two columns facing the *Onopous* (supposing the Portico of 19 Couches was of a curved shape, she would be quite capable of seeing them from the *dikionion*). Bk. 1,

Ch. 40 may support such an interpretation: the Augusta on her way to the Tribunal is said to be acclaimed (after she arrives at the *Onopous*) by the patricians standing in the *Onopous* and by the Senate (whose members are in the Portico of 19 Couches). However, the itinerary in Ch. 40 could well be a simplified version of that in Ch. 41. When the procession returns to the Augusteus the patricians accompany the Augusta from the Tribunal as far as the *Chrysocheir* and the consuls stand in the Portico of 19 Couches 'as far as the *dikionion* and the *Onopous* and acclaim her. In order to harmonise this itinerary with the 2002 plan, the *dikionion* would refer to the two columns providing access from the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to the Portico of 19 Couches (*De Cer.* I.9, 62) rather than to those two columns mentioned above, which in the 2002 plan marks the entrance from the horseshoe portico to the *Onopous*. The scene describing the Augusta accompanied by the patricians proceeding through the empty *Onopous* courtyard, while being acclaimed by the consuls standing in the Portico of 19 Couches, has parallel in *De Cer.* I.41, 215 where there is a description of the Augusta passing through the *Anadendradion*, a garden forecourt of the Magnaura, and being acclaimed by the circus factions gathered in both of the flanking porticoes.

More serious difficulties arise if one follows the itinerary of the ceremonial route from the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to the platform of the Tribunal. Bk. 1, Ch. 43 and 44 suggest that the processions went from that *triklinos* via the Portico of 19 Couches directly to the middle gate of the Tribunal. It seems then that it would not be necessary to go via the *Onopous*. However, the ceremonial party would then have to pass through the *Onopous* on the way from the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to the Tribunal in the 2002 plan. We cannot exclude the possibility that the *Onopous* was simply omitted in the description of the itinerary if there were no ceremonies in it (many ceremonial routes are not described in detail in *De Cerimoniis*) or that there was an entrance from the

portico to the *propyleaum*, which faced the Tribunal and contained the main gate of the palace.

Since no parts of the Daphne have been excavated, we cannot completely exclude the proposed layout of the palace (the 2002 plan) despite the difficulties connected with the itineraries of *De Cerimoniis*. Nevertheless, all of the discrepancies described above would disappear if all the major elements (great halls, porticoes and horseshoe courtyard) were arranged differently in the Daphne complex. In the 2005 plan, the Portico of 19 Couches (perhaps a propylaic corridor with conventionally positioned corner towers) runs along the south side of the Tribunal with the main gate in the middle of the palace façade.²² This portico opens onto the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches (the first *dikionion*) on the west, and onto the courtyard of the *Onopous* on the east (the second *dikionion*).²³ The *Onopous* courtyard is limited by the horseshoe-shaped *Chrysocheir* portico containing a gate structure leading to the Augusteus at its southern extremity.²⁴ Both the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches and the *Onopous-Chrysocheir-Augustus* unit are perpendicular to the Portico of 19 Couches. A similar layout can be found in the villa at Piazza Armerina (fig. 10). The *Triklinos* of 19 Couches, attached directly to the palace *propylaeum*, would most likely be the only palace hall visible from the Tribunal, which would accord with the common name of the Tribunal – ‘Tribunal of 19 Couches’.²⁵ Such a modified layout of the Daphne would not exclude the Portico of 19 Couches from the Augusteus-Tribunal itinerary, and it would not require the *Onopous* to be passed through on the way from the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to the Tribunal, which would fully agree with *De Cerimoniis*.

The positions of the courtyard of Daphne and the Octagon, a vestibule near the apsed terminations of both great halls, remain the same as in the 2002 plan.²⁶ From the above listed itineraries of *De Cerimoniis* it is clear that it was necessary to walk via the *Onopous* from both the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches and the Augusteus

to the *Consistorium*. The *Consistorium* was at a lower level than the Daphne, which rose on an artificial platform (a flight of stairs from the Tribunal), to the east of it, and might have been, in my opinion, a later addition to the Great Palace complex.²⁷




Fig. 5 - Suggested reconstruction of the Daphne, Zeuxippos and the Hippodrome



Fig. 6 - Suggested reconstruction of the façade of the Daphne




Fig. 7 - Suggested reconstruction of the Daphne: Onopous courtyard in front of the Augusteus (Triklinos of 19 Couches in the background)



Fig. 8 - Suggested reconstruction of the courtyard of the Daphne

Magnaaura

It is appropriate to present here some notes on this magnificent building. C. Mango suggested long ago that the Senate House at the Augusteon became the Magnaura, a building used as a palatial audience hall and well-known from Middle Byzantine texts.²⁸



Fig. 9 - Suggested reconstruction of the Kathisma




Fig. 10 - Plan of Piazza Armerina villa, Sicily, adapted from R. J. A. Wilson, *Piazza Armerina*, London 1983, fig. 1.

He provided the following reasons: 1. Both buildings could be situated in the same area, namely south-east of Hagia Sophia. 2. The former was not mentioned after Justinian I's reign. However, Mango's hypothesis was challenged by G. Dagron and, recently, by R. Stichel.²⁹ The latter reasonably argues that the Senate stood south of the sultans' tombs in the Aya Sofya precinct, directly facing the Augusteon and may have become a part of the *Patriarcheion* under the name Thomaïtes Hall in the seventh century.

If Stichel is right, what then was the history of the Magnaura? Could the Magnaura have originally been a reception hall in the *magister officiorum's praetorium*? Three *praetoria* are known to have existed in Constantinople: the *praetorium* of the urban prefect on the Mese, the *praetorium* of the praetorian prefect near Hagia Eirene, and that of the *magister officiorum*.³⁰ I think it is reasonable to place the official residence of the *magister officiorum*, the head of the civil service of the empire, in the area where later texts situate the Magnaura (east of the Augusteon and north-east of the Chalke, on the terrace at 32 m a.s.l.).³¹ This is because the building (strictly speaking, only its forecourt, later called the *Anadendradion*) would be accessible to the public either from the street running behind the apse of Hagia Sophia or from the open space directly behind the Chalke, and would be attached to the guard quarters, which were situated east and south of the Chalke, since the *magister officiorum* was also in charge of commanding the *scholae palatinae*.³² The *magister officiorum's praetorium* can be identified as the Schola of Magister, situated in the Great Palace, of the sixth-century chapters of *De Cerimoniis* (*De Cer. Bk. 1, Ch. 87 and 89*). The *magister officiorum* lost its high status during the seventh century and was deprived of many of his former functions (for example the *domestikos ton scholon* replaced him as head of the guards). Since Heraclius is said to have reconstructed the Magnaura (probably after his victory over the Persians and the

return of the Holy Cross to Jerusalem in 630), I would expect this emperor to have converted the former *magister's* reception hall to a new semi-public palace hall used for audiences with foreign envoys and other affairs (judicial hearings, council in 787 etc.).³³

It is conceivable that the *magister's* audience hall was simply called the Magna Aula well before the sixth century, as the Latin of the name Magnaura suggests. The Magnaura is mentioned first in 531 when, according to Kyrillos of Skythopolis (d. around 558), St Sabas was received there by Justinian I in the presence of the questor, Tribonian.³⁴ Normally, imperial audiences took place in the *Consistorium* at that time but St Sabas' meeting with Justinian does not seem to have had the character of a formal audience. The hall in the *magister's praetorium* would be, in my opinion, an appropriate place for such a meeting because during formal audiences foreign envoys were initially received by the *magister officiorum* in his *schola*, where they were asked the usual questions concerning the purpose of their visit, and only then were taken to the *Consistorium* where the emperor sat on his throne.³⁵

The layout of the Magnaura, as reconstructed on the basis of *De Cerimoniis*, is not inconsistent with what we know about the appearance of *praetoria* of provincial governors (such as those at Gorsium, Caesarea Maritima or Gortyn) or urban *domus* of wealthy and powerful aristocrats (such as the House of Bacchus at Djemila and the s.c. Palace of the Dux at Apollonia) in Late Antiquity. The main compositional element was a peristyle courtyard to which an apsed hall flanked by smaller rooms and offices were attached and, frequently, another apsed hall of a more public character accessible directly from the street.³⁶ The chambers near or attached to the hall of Magnaura in the Middle Byzantine period (two apsed rooms which functioned as a *metatorion* and a bedchamber; the emperors and empresses occasionally spent nights in the Magnaura, particularly after an imperial wedding) may, therefore, have originally been part of the *praetorium* as well.³⁷

There are hints that the Magnaura may have been a cross-in-square building (at least in the tenth century, when *De Cerimoniis* was compiled), as Berger has suggested.³⁸ He argues that the four columns mentioned in *De Cerimoniis* (Bk.2, Ch.15) supported the dome of the Great *Triklinos*. Nevertheless, the hall of Magnaura was able to house more than 308 bishops or representatives of bishops who gathered there at the last session of the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787, which would probably have been impossible if the Magnaura had been a cross-in-square building at that time.³⁹ On the other hand, it is also possible that the large hall of the *praetorium* may have been replaced by a smaller, cross-in-square building, possibly erected by Basil I, who is known to have reconstructed the Magnaura.⁴⁰

NOTES

This research was enabled by the kind support of CU Grant Agency, Charles University, Prague. The author would like to thank his father for the drawings and Tayfun Öner (www.byzantium1200.com) for creating the 2D plan and 3D reconstructions for this article.

¹ For a general survey of the churches of the Archangel Michael in Byzantium see R. Janin, 'Les sanctuaires byzantins de saint Michel', *Échos d'Orient*, 33 (1934): 28-52. On the Archangel Michael see A.P. Kazhdan ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2 (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 1360f..

² C. de Boor ed., *Theophanis Chronographia*, (Leipzig, Teubner, 1883-1885), p. 154: *Archangelos tou palatiou* in the account of the deposition of the Patriarch Macedonius in 511. Anastasius I is also mentioned several times in connection with another of the Archangel's churches. He went to Michael's church at Sosthenion to pray after he ward off the attack of the *magister militum per Thraciam*, Vitalianus, who attempted to invade Constantinople three times between 513-517. It may be of interest to mention that Constantine the Great is said to have credited the Archangel Michael for his victory over Maxentius as well and built in his

honour the shrines at Anaplous and Sosthenion: see L. Dindorf ed., *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (Bonn, Weber, 1831), p. 405; G. Peers, 'The Sosthenion near Constantinople: John Malalas and Ancient Art', *Byzantion*, LXVIII (1998), fasc.1: 110-120 and A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos, Poikila Byzantina 8* (Bonn, Halbelt, 1988), pp. 704-708. More importantly, the *Patria* tell us that he had a chapel of the Archangel built at Julian's church near the Forum of Constantine and a small church of the same dedication at the Nea Ekklesia: see Berger, *Untersuchungen* (supra note 2), pp. 587f. and 747f. and Th. Preger ed., *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1901), p. 272. The *Patria*, speaking of the church of the Archangel Michael as adjacent to the Nea, is obviously incorrect, as the Nea Ekklesia was erected almost four hundred years after Anastasius' reign. No church or chapel of the Archangel Michael attached to the Nea is known from other sources, but this Basil I's shrine was among others dedicated to Michael and the whole Nea was often known as Michael's or the Archangel's church during the Late Byzantine period. The Nea was built on the spot where the old *Tzykanisterion* (usually identified as the *Lusorium* of the fifth-century *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*) had formerly been. This area near the sea walls was outside the Great Palace proper in the sixth century. Therefore, the alleged Anastasius' church of the Archangel Michael 'at the Nea' cannot be identified as the aforementioned palace church of the sixth century. Despite this, the *Patria*'s account might reflect some ancient tradition, otherwise unknown to us, which ascribed the foundation of the church of the Archangel Michael in the Great Palace to Anastasius I, and if we suppose that this church was not in use in the late tenth century (see below) the author of the *Patria* naturally placed it within the Nea precinct where the Archangel was venerated at that time.

³ *Theoph.* (supra note 2), 237: the church mentioned only as 'Archangelos'; A. Cameron (ed., transl. and commentary), *Flavius Cresconius Corripus: In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris libri IV* (London, The Athlone Press, 1976), p. 48: (Justin) 'ilicet Angelici pergens in limina templi inposuit pia tura focus cerasque micantes obtulit, et supplex lacrimis ita coepit obortis...'

⁴ I have argued elsewhere that the Great Palace was extended as far as the Sea of Marmara during Justinian II's reign by absorbing the Hormisdas Palace and the two palaces of *Ta Plakidias* (*Domus Placidiae Augustae* and *Palatium Placidianum*): see J. Kostenec, 'The Heart of the Empire: The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors Reconsidered', in K. Dark ed., *Secular Buildings and the Archaeology of Everyday Life in the*

Byzantine Empire (Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2004), pp. 25ff.. However, when I was preparing the final version of that paper I mistakenly omitted the main argument for situating the buildings of *Ta Plakidias*, which were in Region I of the city, between the old Constantinian Imperial Palace (Daphne) and the Hormisdas Palace. Since *Ta Plakidias* served as the residence of papal legates who were probably allowed to use the church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus it is reasonable to assume that the palaces of *Ta Plakidias* were not far from that church. See P. Speck, 'Der Mauerbau in 60 Tagen', in H.-G. Beck ed., *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels, Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 14* (Munich, Institut für Byzantinistik und neugriechische Philologie der Universität, 1973), pp. 144-147; C. Mango, 'The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus once again', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 68, (1975): 385-392, 386f.. The fact that the *Chrysotriklinos*, which may be identified as the main reception and dining hall of the Hormisdas Palace, as E. Bolognesi suggests, is not mentioned in the chapters of *De Cerimoniis* which were written before Justinian II's reign (the first book: chapters 84-95, the second book: chapters 27-30, 51, 54). That the Byzantine historians do not situate any event inside this hall before the ninth century may also indicate that the area close by the Marmara Sea became the focus of everyday life and ceremonies in the Great Palace in a relatively late period. J.J. Reiske ed., *Constantini Porphyrogeniti De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, (Bonn, Weber, 1829-1830). I have, incidentally, found the earliest mention of the *Chrysotriklinos* – 'en to chryso triklino' – in connection with the accession of Leo V in 813 in I. Bekker ed., *Georgii Cedreni Historiarum compendium* (Bonn, Weber, 1838-1839), II. 48.

⁵ For the terracing and the height of 5 m for each floor of the palace buildings, see E. Bolognesi, 'The Great Palace Survey: The First Season', *XI. Araştırma sonuçları toplantısı* (Ankara, Ministry of Culture, 1993), pp. 19-34.

⁶ Council of 536: E. Schwartz ed., *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, tomus III, (Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1940), 159, 160 and 176 (*eukterion* of the Archangel Michael), 174-175 ('en toi sebasmioi oikoi tou hagiou archangelou Michael toi diakeimenoi en toi eusebei palatio'); *Collatio catholicorum cum Severianis*: *ibid.*, tomus IV, vol. 2, (Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1913), p. 183 ('in oratorio gloriosi archangeli Michaelis quod est in choclio'). I refer to all sanctuaries of the Archangel Michael in the Great Palace mentioned in the sources conventionally as 'churches' because it seems likely that the Byzantines did not always use the terms 'naos', 'eukterion', 'oikos' etc. as strictly as they are translated in modern literature (especially church vs. chapel/oratory).

⁷ The Hormisdas Palace only became an integral part of the Great Palace in the late seventh century, during Justinian II's reign. See note 4 above.

⁸ H. B. Dewing with G. Downey ed. and trans., *Procopius, Buildings* (Cambridge MA, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 44-45 (I.4, 1-3). The church in question cannot be identified as the Archangel Michael *Ta Adda* that stood in or close by the Palace of Sophia in the Harbour of Julian/Sophia or the church of the same dedication in the Monastery of the Archangel Michael *Ta Charisiou* that appears in the *Acta* of the Council of 536 as well. On this, see Berger, *Untersuchungen* (supra note 2), p. 620. Procopius tells us about a small church of the Archangel rebuilt by Justinian in the paragraph preceding his account of the churches of the Hormisdas Palace. That sanctuary of unspecified location has been identified by A. Berger as the church of the Archangel *ta Tzerou*: see his *Untersuchungen* (supra note 2), p. 387.

⁹ Janin, 'Sanctuaires' (supra note 1), p. 30f.; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris, Institut français d'études byzantines, 1950), p. 122; R. Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique byzantine, I.3, Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, Institut français d'études byzantines, 1953), p. 355.

¹⁰ Kostenec, 'Heart of Empire' (supra note 4), p. 13.

¹¹ E. Mamboury, Th. Wiegand, *Die Kaiserpaläste von Konstantinopel zwischen dem Hippodrom und dem Marmara Meer*, (Berlin-Leipzig, W. de Gruyter, 1934), pp. 33f., pl. LXXXV. The building survived only on a substructural level. The almost square core consists of an inscribed cross plan surmounted by a cross vault (central bay: 4.95 m x 4.60 m) and four small corner chambers. Whether there was originally an apse on the south-east side was impossible to determine because the east arm of the cross terminates at a Turkish wall. It seems probable that the plan of the superstructures corresponded with that of the substructures. If so, the building may have been a cross domed church, similar (even in its dimensions) to Hosios David at Thessaloniki (fig. 2, late fifth century?; central bay: 4.50m x 4.50 m; its present state does not correspond to the original appearance of the building: see A. Zäh, 'Sulla cronologia edilizia dell' 'Hosios David' a Salonicco', *Quaderni friulani di archeologia* 12.1 (2002): 167-203).

¹² E. Bolognesi, 'The Great Palace Survey: The Second Season, The Third Season of the Great Palace Survey', *XIII. Araştırma sonuçları toplantısı* (Ankara, Ministry of Culture, 1996), pp. 127-142, 135 and 137. She supposes, on the basis of building technique (brick masonry with one band of greenstone), a Justinianic date for 'Mamboury Db' and suggests it could be the Theotokos of the Daphni or the church dedicated to the

Virgin Mary where Sophia, wife of Justin II (565-578), prayed after coming to the Palace following Justinian's death in 565. The use of greenstone in combination with brick masonry is believed to be a main characteristic of Justinianic buildings. The earliest example is provided by the Chalkoprateia Basilica from the second half of the fifth century. For greenstone, see J. Bardill, 'The Palace of Lausus and Nearby Monuments in Constantinople: A Topographical Study', *American Journal of Archaeology* 101 (1997): 67-95, 74, note 37. J. Bardill has also suggested an early sixth-century date for 'Mamboury Db' on the basis of the dimension of the bricks. See J. Bardill, *Brickstamps of Constantinople* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 143, note 295.

¹³ For the Walker Trust complex as Heraclius' foundation: Kostenec, 'Heart of Empire' (supra note 4), p. 17. The Apsed Hall and the Walker Trust Peristyle may have served as a meeting place where the emperor would appear to the circus factions after such ceremonies were withdrawn from the Tribunal (which happened, according to the *Parastaseis*, during Heraclius' reign) but before they were established in Justinian II's *Phialai*. Bardill has recently demonstrated that the mosaic peristyle and the hall were built in the late sixth-early seventh century (reigns of Maurice, Phocas or Heraclius). See Bardill, *Brickstamps* (supra note 12), pp. 134-147, esp. 145ff. *Theoph.* (supra note 2), p. 471: a prison was probably established in the substructures of a building adjacent to the church ('en to nao archistrategou en to palation').

¹⁴ Kostenec, 'Heart of Empire' (supra note 4), p. 18.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 26f. J. Bardill recently proposed that the greenstone predecessor of the Apsed Hall was probably built in the early sixth century on the basis of the dimensions of the bricks (380 mm x 380 mm x 40 mm; 360 mm x 360 mm x 40 mm). See Bardill, *Brickstamps* (supra note 12), p. 143. However, we do not know the average measurements of bricks during the reign of Tiberius. Bardill has merely established that bricks of the first half of the sixth century were ca. 3 cm longer than those produced in the later reign of Maurice. See Bardill, *Brickstamps* (supra note 12), p. 106. It is worth mentioning here that the bricks in the rooms above the southwest vestibule and ramp of Hagia Sophia, attributed to the Patriarch John III (565-577), are 360-370 mm x 45-50 mm and thus close in their dimensions to typical Justinianic bricks. See R. Cormack and E. J. W. Hawkins, 'The Mosaics of St Sophia at Istanbul: The Rooms Above the Southwest Vestibule and Ramp', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 31 (1977): 177-251, 193. It is not impossible, therefore, based on the evidence of the bricks, that the greenstone chamber was built by Tiberius II (unless the

bricks from the rooms above the southwest vestibule and ramp of Hagia Sophia were from an old Justinianic stock and not manufactured in the reign of Justin II). Another possibility is that the bricks in the greenstone chamber were reused since, according to John of Ephesus, the building programme of Tiberius in the Great Palace included the demolition of several older buildings. See E.W. Brooks ed. and trans., *Ioahannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae, Corpus script. ChriSt Orient., Script. Syri* (Louvain, Peeters, 1935-1936), 3. III. 23; English trans. in: C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1986), p. 128. Tiberius' building activities were also concentrated at the north end of the Great Palace complex where he is said to have erected new stables for his horses as well. The stables may have been those mentioned in *De Cerimoniis*, which were situated along the south flank of the forecourt (*Anadendradion*) of the Magnaura. See *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 41, 215.

¹⁶ The overthrow of Phocas: L. Dindorf ed., *Chronicon Paschale*, (Bonn, Weber, 1832), I, 700. The 'Archangel of the Palace' of the *Chronicon Paschale* does not refer to Justin II's church of the Archangel Michael (later known as Michael's church *Ta Adda*) that appears to have been in the Palace of Sophia because both palaces in question are mentioned simultaneously in the *Chronicon Paschale*'s account (the Palace of Sophia is characterised as the 'oikos' but Archangel's church was in the 'palation'). Church of the Archangel Michael *Ta Adda*: Berger, *Untersuchungen* (supra note 2), pp. 578-580.

¹⁷ John of Antioch in: C. Müller ed., *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum I-V*, (Paris, Ambrosio Firmin Didot, 1841-1872), V. 38.

¹⁸ Chapel/church of the Archangel Michael (*eukterion* of the Archistrategos): B. Niebuhr ed., *Theophanes Continuatus*, (Bonn, Weber, 1838), V. 331 (on the other hand St Peter is mentioned as 'naos'); the location of the *eukterion* near the Skyla and Marcian's Galleries as given by *De Cerimoniis*: *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 21, 122. Marcian's Galleries were probably used when the emperor went from the Great Palace to Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Hormisdas: *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 11, 87 and 89. E. Bolognesi plausibly suggests that Marcian's Galleries had not been built by the Emperor Marcian (450-457) but by the general of the same name serving under the Emperors Justinian I and Justin II: E. Bolognesi, 'Il Gran Palazzo', *Bizantinistica (Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi)* II, (2000): 197-242, 231.

¹⁹ *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 68, 304; I. 72, 362

²⁰ *Eukterion* with the altar of the Archistrategos in the Camilas: *Theoph. Cont* (supra note 18), III. 145.

²¹ R. Wünsch ed., *Ioannis Lydi De mensibus*, (Leipzig, B.G. Teubneri, 1898), p. 163; *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 39, 197: *palation tes Dafnes*. In a personal communication, A. Berger has suggested to me that the name of the *Onopous* (*Onopodion*) might imply that it had a horseshoe-shape ground-plan. The plan of the Daphne was first presented at the 'Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople' conference held at the University of Reading on 26 October 2002 and subsequently published in K. Dark ed. *Secular Buildings and the Archaeology of Everyday Life in the Byzantine Empire* (supra note 4).

²² Such corner towers were prominent features of the main façade of the fifth-century Palace of Giants in Athens. The *heliakon* with the flight(s) of stairs in front of the Middle gate of the Tribunal seems to have been the platform of a gabled porch. Such elaborate entrances were in the *principia* of Diocletian's camp at Palmyra, in Diocletian's palace at Split or in Theoderic's palace whose façade is depicted in mosaic at San Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna. Diocletian's palace provides, in my opinion, the closest parallel to the entrance to the Daphne. At Split, two lateral flights of stairs descend from the porch to the so-called Peristyle and there was a railing between the two middle columns of the porch, marking a space reserved for the emperor or the empress. This was also a feature of the *Heliakon* of the Daphne Palace. See *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 41, 211.

²³ It would be tempting to place the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches at the axis of the main palace gate in the centre of the façade facing the Tribunal. However, the ceremonial route from the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches to the Tribunal, as described above, points to the necessity of walking a certain distance from the hall through the Portico of 19 Couches before entering the gate leading to the Tribunal (the patricians accompanied the emperor on his way), and not simply to cross the portico/corridor. In this respect I would like to point to Diocletian's palace at Split where the great apsed hall is off the axis of the vestibule containing the entrance to the representative part of the palace from the so-called peristyle. In the 2004 plan, the central axis of the palace is reserved, as in Spalato, for direct communication (through open space or corridor) between the palace gate and the octagonal vestibule opening onto the courtyard of Daphne. The well-known passage from Luitprand's *Antapodosis* also suggests that the *Triklinos* of 19 Couches was close to the Hippodrome ('domus iuxta yppodromum').

²⁴ The gate structure contained two doors placed directly opposite each other at the distance equating the width of the portico (this part of the portico of Chrysocheir was called the *stenon*, which suggests a narrow space between both doors): a door from the Augusteus to the *Chrysocheir* with a curtain (*De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 1, 9 and 33; I. 10, 72) and a door with a curtain and a few adjacent stairs (*poulpistou pyle*) from the *Chrysocheir* to the *Onopous* courtyard (*De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 52, 264, I. 23, 129, I. 23, 130). Bardill suggests that the statue of the Empress Helena mentioned by Lydus was perhaps in an open court of the Daphne to which a small hall (Augusteus) was adjoined which makes the proposed layout of the *Onopous*-Augusteus unit (the 2005 plan) more probable. See *Ioannis Lydi* (supra note 21), p. 163. For the small hall see J. Bardill, 'The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors, and the Walker Trust excavations', *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 12 (1999): 216-230, note 74.

²⁵ *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 40, 204, I. 44, 226.

²⁶ Kostenec, 'Heart of Empire' (supra note 4), p. 9f.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁸ C. Mango, *Brazen House. A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople* (Copenhagen, I Kommission hos Munksgaard, 1959), pp. 57f..

²⁹ G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), p. 138, note 2. R. Stichel, 'Sechs kolossale Säulen nahe der Hagia Sophia und die Curia Justinians am Augusteion in Konstantinopel', *Architectura* 30 (2000): 1-25.

³⁰ C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, Variorum, 1993), addenda I.

³¹ J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, Macmillan, 1923), pp. 29-31; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (supra note 1), II, 1267.

³² *De Cer.* II.10, 547; II.15, 577 and Kostenec, 'Heart of Empire' (supra note 4), p. 22: the gate in the south portico of the forecourt of Magnaura. For the street running behind the apse of Hagia Sophia see Mango, *Brazen House* (supra note 31), pp. 66-71. The substructures 'Mamboury Ac' shows piers built of stone at their lowest level with bands of brick alternating after each tenth course with one course of stone block, the last one of which is at the spring of each dome. This type of masonry is clearly datable to the sixth century, which corresponds with a possible rebuilding of the *praetorium* after the Nika Riot. Bolognesi places the

magister's offices directly behind the Chalke but at the lower level: see E. Bolognesi, 'The Great Palace of Constantinople' in W. Jobst, R. Kastler, V. Scheibelreiter ed., *Neue Forschungen und Restaurierungen im byzantinischen Kaiserpalast von Istanbul* (Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999), pp. 12f; *ibid.*, 'Il Gran Palazzo' (supra note 18): 220f. She refers to the terrace at 26 m a.s.l.; site 'Ab' in Mamboury and Wiegand's excavations, with post-sixth-century masonry – bands of stone (5 courses) and bands of brick (5 courses).

³³ A.W. Sijthoff ed. *Codices Graeci et Latini, XV. Anthologia Palatina* (Paris, Lugduni Batavorum, 1911), part 2, p. 655.

³⁴ E. Schwartz ed., *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig, Hinrich, 1939), p. 168. Tribonian was Justinian's close adviser and his presence is not surprising. On the other hand, Kyrillos does not mention the *magister officiorum*, Hermogenes. The presence of the *magister officiorum* (or his deputy) at such an informal meeting may not have been necessary or perhaps Kyrillos simply omitted him as he was describing the saint's life and not official ceremonial protocol. Moreover, Hermogenes may not have been in Constantinople because in 532 he was spending the majority of his time in the east negotiating with the Persians. On this last point see G. Greatrex, 'The Nika Riot: A Reappraisal', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117 (1997): 60-86, 72. The Magnaura and the Senate House at the Augusteon are mentioned as two different buildings in *Chronicon Paschale*'s account of the Nika Riot of 532. Cf. Berger, *Untersuchungen* (supra note 2), p. 268; he posits that the Magnaura was merely another name for the Senate at the time when the *Chronicon Paschale* was written.

³⁵ For the audiences of foreign ambassadors as described by Peter the Patrician, see E. Bolognesi, 'Great Palace', (supra note 32).

³⁶ The forecourt of the Magnaura may have had a basin in its centre since Heraclius is said to have filled several 'cisterns' with soil, one of them at the Magnaura: Kedrenos (supra note 4), II. 241; *Theoph. Cont.* (supra note 18), V. 92. As concerns the dimensions of the audience halls within the *praetoria*, it is useful to mention here H. Heinen's hypothesis that the Aula at Trier may have been the audience hall of the praetorian prefect of Gallia: H. Heinen, *2000 Jahre Trier, 1, Trier und Trevererland in römischer Zeit* (Trier, Spee Verlag, 1985), p. 276.

³⁷ *De Cer.* (supra note 4) II. 15, 567, 583: Metatorion; *De Cer.* (supra note 4) I. 39, 200; I. 41, 213; I. 41, 215: Pastos, an apsed bridal bedchamber.

³⁸ A. Berger, 'Die Senate von Konstantinopel', *Boreas* 18 (1995): 131-142, 135.

³⁹ *Theoph.* (supra note 2), p. 463; J. Darrouzes, 'Listes épiscopales du Concile de Nicée (787)', *Revue des études byzantines* 33 (1975): 5-76.

⁴⁰ Kedrenos (supra note 4), II. 204.