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Abstract

The Pantokrator Hospital is the best understood of all Byzantine Hospitals. Almost one third of the monastic charter of the Pantokrator Monastery is devoted to the hospital. The archaeological ruins around the remains of the Pantokrator Monastery (Zeyrek Mosque), however, have not received as much attention. The ruins around the Zeyrek Mosque consist of cisterns, water conduits, terraces, and other Byzantine structures. They paint a complicated and yet important picture of the monastery and its hospital. Despite the fact that a previous study by Alice Taylor had concluded that the hospital was most likely southwest of the Zeyrek Mosque, it is more likely that the Pantokrator Hospital was located north of the mosque on a set of terraces recorded by Ernst Mamboury. Based on the newest survey of the Byzantine water supply by James Crow, Jonathan Bardill, and Richard Bayliss, the latest understand of Byzantine medicine, and a critical hypothesis of the previous history of the hospital by Paul Magdalino, it is evident that this area provided not only the most likely location but also the best one for this important 12th century institution due to its proximity to a key Byzantine water line and the main streets of Constantinople.
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Preface: It’s a Byzantine World

It’s strange how memory works. The first time I had heard about the Byzantine Empire was in grade school, while studying the Roman Empire. I remember being perplexed that the teacher told us that while on one hand the Roman Empire continued in the east and yet on the other hand our study of the Roman Empire stopped with the fall of the western half. Perhaps this was why I fell in love with the civilization. I had some egotistical feeling that it somehow needed me to save it from obscurity. Byzantine studies now, however, are far from the field neglected by the generation of Edward Gibbons.¹

While the Byzantine Empire would continue to be a driving force in my academic career, it was in some ways a personal study. Even this thesis was produced largely by reading and researching during my free time, or when procrastinating on a project for a current class. I always playfully conceived of it as “my video games.” The romanticism of the obscure works, generally in languages I didn’t know, maintained the flame of Indiana Jones-like adventure in completing the research for this report. The difficulties in translation and interpretation of the described physical remains forced me to turn all my study of language and anthropological archaeology from theoretical notions into practical tools. The support given by the Honors College through classes that promote innovative thinking had gone far beyond what I had jokingly referred to as my favorite privilege of the organization: checking out books from the university library for a longer duration of time.

If study of language and archaeology made me believe I could accomplish anything from my armchair, study abroad gave me an important skepticism. In the summer of 2010, I was

given the opportunity to travel to Greece with the Kentucky Institute for International Study. I beheld with sheer excitement the castle of Mystras, the last Byzantine stronghold. I delighted in finding a building with the same features as the monastic clinic in Hosios Loukas. I lost count of how many times I managed to get turned around in Athens. I beheld the amazing effects of topography at Delphi. These places taught me the importance of understanding the landscape of any archaeological site. I must admit, therefore, that this report has one important drawback. I have traveled to Greece and Italy, but I have never seen Istanbul itself.

This, however, I plan to remedy in my graduate career. I intend to apply to study at Koç University, north of the old city of Constantinople. The university is currently conducting research on the Küçükýaly Monastery, which Dr. Alessandra Ricci had identified as the Satyros Monastery. The remains of this monastery may contain the right information to make most of the conjectures about urban monasticism in this report obsolete. Regardless of where I study the material remains of the Byzantine Empire, I will continue to pursue it with the same passion and enthusiasm that I hope will be found in the pages that follow.

Introduction: The Pantokrator Hospital and Archaeology

The Pantokrator Hospital is one of the most important institutions in all of Byzantine medicine. Despite being one of best understood of all Byzantine hospitals because of its monastic charter, the details of its location and arrangement are not known. In their work on hospital architecture, John D. Thompson and Grace Goldin noted, “everything concerning the

---

2 Alessandra Ricci, “The Road from Baghdad to Byzantium and the case of the Bryas Palace,” in Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? Edited by Leslie Brubaker (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997); The Saytros Monastery is actually mentioned as a dependent monastery to the Pantokrator in its monastic charter.

Pantokrator seems to have come down to us but its floor plan. The goal of this study is to use archaeology to fill in the gaps of what is known about the Pantokrator Hospital.

Part of the Pantokrator Monastery has survived as the Zeyrek Mosque in Istanbul, made of three Byzantine churches, the Pantokrator Church, the St. Michael Chapel, and the Theotokos Eleusa Church. The cisterns and structures around the Zeyrek Mosque have been recorded, but rarely in a systematic way. These ruins certainly haven’t earned the same attention as the Zeyrek Mosque itself, which has been the subject of various restorations and investigations. This report, however, will attempt to shed light on these ruins around the mosque.

When addressing the issues of the hospital itself, however, one cannot go straight to the archaeological evidence. Timothy Miller, in his work on Byzantine hospitals, comments, “For more detailed information on these twelfth-century buildings one must turn to the written sources, for the painstaking work of the paleographers, not the archaeologists’ spade, has so far uncovered the most interesting information regarding the various institutions of the Pantokrator complex.”

This means the archaeological remains must be placed in their proper context. This is true of remains in the modern city of Istanbul, which has been continuously inhabited for thousands of years. The study of the Byzantine use of the site, however, is not enough to contextualize the physical remains. The Roman and Ottoman periods must be studied as well for evidence of

---

earlier and later uses of the site. Likewise, the hospital cannot be studied alone. To discern any information about the hospital from the archaeological record it will be necessary to analyze the entire monastery’s organization.

The organization of this study will be in three major parts. The first second will contain the literary and historical sources, organized in a diachronic fashion, tracing the institutions built on the land where the Pantokrator stood during its own time, after, and then before. This will provide the historical context for the archaeological remains.

The next chapter will provide the archaeological remains themselves. This section will be provided in a synchronic way, providing the material culture through space. This section will deal with the various records of these remains, from scholarly archaeological reports to the accounts of recent travelers and amateur surveyors.

The final chapter of this report will be the conclusions drawn from the interpretation of the archaeological remains. This section will attempt to interpret each of the different ruins in relation to the various periods of the site. It will consider the hypothetical reproduction of the hospital made by Anastasios Orlandos. Not only this, but it will also draw new conclusions and cultural information about Byzantine hospitals in general.

---

8 Anastasios Orlandos, Μοναστηριακή Ἀρχιτεκτονική (Athens: Hestia, 1927), 87.
Chapter One: Historical Background

The Life and Times of the Pantokrator Monastery

Figure 1: Zeyrek Mosque from the West.\(^9\)

The Pantokrator Monastery was built by John II Komnenos and his wife, Irene. Compared to the reigns of his father and son, there is little contemporary evidence for the reign of John II Komnenos.\(^10\) Much of this evidence is panegyric in nature, and there are some scholars who believe that some events of his reign were whitewashed by Byzantine historians of the next generation, such as John Kinnamos.\(^11\) Despite the methodological problems, during this period the Byzantine Empire was in a time of revival. The Komnenos, “a great feudal family,” had

---

seized power in Constantinople and were doing everything to reverse the damage done by the Battle of Manzikert.\(^\text{12}\) John, therefore, was a soldier emperor and spent much of his time on campaign, not just defending the borders of the empire, but also trying to reconquer lost lands.\(^\text{13}\)

During this period the perception of the medical doctor in literature seems to have changed from damnation to humorous satire, with avid defenders of the practice having risen up as well. This evidence has been interpreted to mean that the medical profession was more respected in this period than any other previous period in Byzantine history.\(^\text{14}\) The Pantokrator Hospital, therefore, can be seen as one of the results of this new attitude.

The most important documental evidence for the Pantokrator Monastery is the monastic charter. There are, however, other various sources in the historical record that give additional information on the monastery and its hospital. John II Komnenos penned the monastic charter in AD 1136.\(^\text{15}\) The monastic charter has been studied in depth.\(^\text{16}\) Therefore this study will address only the portions of the charter that deals with issues of building structure and topography.\(^\text{17}\)

The first piece of information about the organization of the monastery provided by John II Komnenos is the size of the monastery. He had stated, “The total of the monks will not be less than eighty.”\(^\text{18}\) This would have made the Pantokrator Monastery one of the largest of the Byzantine monasteries whose monastic charters had survived.\(^\text{19}\)


\(^{15}\) Komnenos, “Pantokrator,” 774.

\(^{16}\) Robert Volk, *Gesundheitswesen und Wohltätigkeit im Spiegel der byzantinischen Klosterotypika*, Miscellanea byzantina monacensia, 28 (Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik, neugriechische Philologie, und byzantinische Kunstgeschichte der Universität München, 1983).

\(^{17}\) The recent Dumbarton Oaks translation will be cited unless the original Greek is referenced, where Paul Gautier, “Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator,” *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974), 27-131 will be cited.

\(^{18}\) Komnenos, “Pantokrator,” 749.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 728.
The next important structure described is the monks’ clinic, which had six beds for patients and one for a doctor on duty.\textsuperscript{20} This structure does not seem to have been connected directly with the hospital. It served monks only. The archaeological work done by Anastasias Orlandos, alluded to earlier, was on a monks’ clinic like this one. He was well aware of the differences between this structure and a public hospital.\textsuperscript{21} The monks’ clinic was equipped with a bathhouse.\textsuperscript{22} Bathing was seen as a commonsense remedy for the sick; monastic restrictions on bathing were lifted for the ill.\textsuperscript{23}

Another point that needs to be addressed is the statement that “Women will not enter the monastery and the monastery will be a forbidden area for them...”\textsuperscript{24} An exception was given for those entering by the Theotokos Eleousa (not the main gate) for commemoration or burial at the St. Michael Chapel.\textsuperscript{25} While this statement may seem neither unusual nor topographical, an article by Alice-Mary Talbot demonstrates that various institutions described in the monastery had employed women.\textsuperscript{26} The hospital was one of them; the Theotokos Eleusa church was another.\textsuperscript{27} Talbot notes that the Theotokos Eleusa was not considered “part” of the monastery but next to it.\textsuperscript{28} This demonstrates that not everything described in the charter or found on the landscape is part of the “proper” monastery. It also demonstrates that the Theotokos Eleusa was near the edge of the monastic property.

Next, the monastic charter deals directly with the hospital. The hospital was equipped with fifty beds divided into five wards, five extra beds, and a sixth bed “pierced through the middle

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 745.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Orlandos, \textit{Monastēria}, 82.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Komnenos, “Pantokrator,” 745.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 748.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 749.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 749.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Alice-Mary Talbot, “Women’s Space in Byzantine Monasteries,” \textit{Dumbarton Oaks Papers} 52 (1998), 115.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Komnenos, “Pantokrator,” 757, 754.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Talbot, “Women’s Space,” 115; Gautier, “Le typikon,” 73.728-733.
\end{itemize}
for those who cannot move at all.\textsuperscript{29} The five wards consisted of one for "those suffering from wounds or fractures," a ward for eye diseases, a ward for "those with sickness of the stomach and other very acute and painful illnesses," a women's ward, and a general ward.\textsuperscript{30}

The architectural nature of these wards has been debated. Miller argued that the wards could not represent different rooms, as is usually interpreted.\textsuperscript{31} This is based on two pieces of information.

The first piece of information that supports this interpretation is the word used for ward. John II Komnenos uses the word "ordinos."\textsuperscript{32} In other Byzantine sources it has a military sense of a rank or row.\textsuperscript{33} This word itself is a late addition to Greek from Latin.\textsuperscript{34} The Latin meaning, closest to building arrangement, refers to the rows of the senate or the rows of the theatre.\textsuperscript{35} 36 Both are related to a row of seats. Nowhere does this word mean rooms or wards.

Secondly, in his archaeological work on the monasteries of Meteora, Anastasios Orlandos discovered two monastic clinics. His conclusion was the large open hearth was the signature feature of Byzantine hospitals.\textsuperscript{37} The monastic charter notes later that only one of the five "ordinoi" had its own hearth. The hospital had a large hearth, the women's "ordinos" had a smaller one, and the operating room had a hearth (a separate room from any of the "ordinos").\textsuperscript{38} This means that the four different rows of beds called "ordinos" shared the large hearth in a

\textsuperscript{29} Komnenos, "Pantokrator," 757.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 757.
\textsuperscript{31} Miller, The Birth, 145.
\textsuperscript{32} Grautier, "Le typikon," 85.916.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 145.
\textsuperscript{34} E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), 815.
\textsuperscript{35} Cic. Phil. 2.18.44.
\textsuperscript{36} Suet. Aug. 44.
\textsuperscript{37} Orlandos, Μοναστηριακὴ, 80.
\textsuperscript{38} Komnenos, "Pantokrator," 762.
single room; the woman’s ward would be separate, a feature noted in other Byzantine hospitals. Therefore, Miller concludes that the “ordinoi” of the Pantokrator Hospital would be better rendered as rows of beds around a central hearth.

Just as in the monks’ clinic, the relationship between proper bathing and good health was demonstrated by a bathhouse built into the hospital. This was in addition to the bathhouse for the monks of the monastery, which was associated with the monks’ clinic. Unfortunately, the monastic charter does not specifically say how large the hospital’s bathhouse is. It must, however, have been larger than the monastic clinic’s, because the sick normally “bathe twice a week in the hospital’s bath.” The monks’ house could hold six persons, the amount that would bathe per day in the normal allotment of two baths per month by the eighty monks of the monastery. If the fifty patients of the hospital needed to bathe twice a week, the bathhouse would need to fit fifteen people, over twice the size of the monks’ bathhouse.

Beyond the structures mentioned, the hospital had an outpatient clinic, although the monastic charter is not clear whether this represents another physical feature in the hospital. It also maintained a kitchen, a bakery with mills and a stable, a medical school, two chapels, lavatories, and an office for the doctors. The Pantokrator Monastery also supported an old age home, which can house twenty-four old men. The old age home had a chapel associated with it, but it used the hospital’s bathhouse.

Finally, the monastic charter established a lepers’ sanatorium. This was unique, however, because it was not on the site of the monastery. It is placed near the old age home of the emperor.

---

39 Miller, *The Birth*, 143-144.
40 Miller, *The Birth*, 145.
41 Ibid., 760.
42 Ibid., 760.
43 Ibid., 757-758.
44 Ibid., 760-765.
Lord Romanos because “the establishment in the city of such a place for their residence and way of life seemed an annoyance to those living in the neighborhood because of the concentration of buildings and it being difficult to approach...”46 This sheds some light upon the urban nature of this area of Constantinople.

The next document that gives a clue to the nature of the Pantokrator Monastery is an ekphrasis poem commemorating the founding of the monastery.47 The first few lines of the text were originally found written on the wall of the Pantokrator monastery.48 The full text, however, was found in the Athens National Library. Some scholars believe this text represents a later development, while others consider it contemporaneous with the founding of the monastery.49 50

This poem presents John II Komnenos’s wife, Irene, as the patroness of the monastery. The poem also names Nikephoros as the architect of the project.51

The poem’s description of the monastery has been used to make important statements about Byzantine urban monasteries. Talbot uses the poem’s description of flowers, grass, fountains, and gentle breezes as evidence for the greening of Constantinople during the middle and later periods.52 In this discussion of the green paradise-like nature of the monastery, the poem describes flowing water (visible and in water conduits) and cisterns.53 The description of flowing water is important for two reasons. First, the hospital’s bathhouse would have required a good amount of fresh water to operate successfully. Byzantine medicine in general considered

46 Ibid., 767.
48 Ibid., 125.
50 Gyula Moravcsik, Szent László Leányva és a Bizánci pantokratormonostor (Constantinople: Budapest, 1923).
51 Ibid., 80.
53 Kampouroglous, Μνημεία, 128-129.
bathing to be extremely important and a common component of remedies.\textsuperscript{54} Secondly, it gives credence to James Crow’s projection of the Hadrianic Waterline, which supposedly passed right by the monastery.\textsuperscript{55}

The poem describes the buildings of the monastery as standing in a circle with the trees, flowing water, cisterns, grass, and flowers in between them.\textsuperscript{56} This gives some indication of the overall organization of the monastery. Both the walls and buildings of the monastery encircle the inner parts of the monastery.

The hospital is specifically mentioned twice in the poem. In the second place it is mentioned, it is mentioned with the old age home, which is the association that John II Komnenos seems to have been making in the monastic charter.\textsuperscript{57} The first mention, however, the author seems to have paired the hospital with the churches of the Pantokrator Monastery, commenting on the gold decorations of both buildings.\textsuperscript{58} Therefore the hospital was organized and governed like the old age home, but physically and visually was like the churches.

A foreign document, dating to 1136, by Anselm of Havelberg, describes the monastery as having seven hundred monks under the rule of Saint Anthony the soldier.\textsuperscript{59} This clearly contradicts the capacity of the eighty monks described by the monastic charter.\textsuperscript{60} One possible explanation is that Anslem was describing the “proper” monastery and its dependents, e.g., the hospital and old age home.

The Latin period of Constantinople, following the fall of the city to the Fourth Crusade in 1204, was eventful for the Pantokrator Monastery. The use of the Pantokrator by the Crusaders

\textsuperscript{54} Miller, The Birth, 164.
\textsuperscript{56} Kampouroglous, Μνημεία, 128-129.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 129; Komnenos, “Pantokrator,” 768.
\textsuperscript{58} Kampouroglous, Μνημεία, 129.
\textsuperscript{59} Moravcsik, Szent László Leánya.
\textsuperscript{60} Komnenos, “Pantokrator,” 749.
is very important. The *Annales Iauuenses*, a Genoese document, suggests that the Genoese destroyed the Pantokrator, at the time a Venetian fortified palace, after the Byzantines retook the city. The interpretation of this text is especially important because this study is related to the parts of the Pantokrator that could have been destroyed by the Genoese. The churches of the monastery, surviving to the modern day, have placed some doubt upon this text. It has been suggested, however, that the Genoese destroyed part of the monastery or a dependency of the monastery. It is possible, however, that the mistake was in the association with the Pantokrator at all. While some sources do suggest that the Venetians fortified the Pantokrator, it is unlikely the Byzantines would have given the Genoese such an important institution in the heart of the capital or let them destroy it. The text is probably unreliable, considering its highly didactic nature.

Another role sometimes attributed to the Pantokrator during this period is the residence of the Latin emperor. Nikephoros Gregoras, an important late empire intellectual, is the source of this association. Some scholars accept it as accurate; others consider it an error. The Pantokrator was used as the residence of the Venetian prodesta Marino Zeno and seat of Venetian administration, which could be the source of many of the other associations.

---

63 Jacoby, “The Urban Evolution,” 292-293.
64 Ibid., 292-293.
66 Wolfgang Müller-Weiner, *Bidlexikon zur topographie Istanbul*, Tübingen, 1977, 212; Alexander Van Millingen, *Byzantine Churches in Constantinople: Their History and Architecture* (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1912), 228; see Ousterhout, Ahunbay, and Ahunbay, “Study and Restoration,” 268, where the acceptance of this association by Van Millingen is used to argue that the Byzantine roof was removed during the period of Latin Occupation.
Theodosios of Villehardouin was selected to be the spiritual leader of the Pantokrator after the Byzantine had taken the city back from the Crusaders. He was entrusted with the care of the emperor’s daughter on a diplomatic mission to the Mongols in 1265. This means that even if part of the monastery was burned by the Genoese, it was functioning again within a few years.69

During the 15th century, an Athonite monk named Makarios Makres, a friend of the historian George Sphrantzes, had become the abbot of the monastery.70 At this point, between 1422 and 1425, the monastery had fallen on hard times; its buildings were in ruins and only six monks lived in the monastery.71 Makres would do all in his power to make sure that “all went well in the monastery, harmoniously and decorously.”72

Another source of topographic information about the Pantokrator can be gleamed from the accounts of the Russian pilgrims coming to Constantinople.73 One of these accounts contains an important detail. It is an anonymous text based on a combination of two similar, but differently titled texts. This “Anonymous Description of Constantinople” is as troublesome as it is promising, being the “most extensive of the post-Crusader descriptions of Constantinople in Russian.”74 This text has been dated to between 1389 and 1391.75 The Russian pilgrim noted, “The Pantokrator Monastery of Emperor Justinian is on a mountain. In this monastery, quite marvelously arranged; it is built of stone with water all around it, with stone columns and many decorations...”76 The phrase in this description that is most interesting is the “water all around

---

69 Janin, La Géographie, 517.
72 Sphrantzes, The Fall, 45-46.
74 Ibid., 114.
76 Majeska, Russian Travelers, 152.
it.” This seems to allude to the Hadrianic Waterline, which has been projected as tracing around the Pantokrator Monastery. The important question is how current his information is. While the date of the account may be the end of the 14th century, the attribution of the monastery to the Emperor Justinian demonstrates that the work has anachronistic and erroneous elements. It is hard to believe such praising comments would be warranted before the repairs of Makarios Makres.

The Period After the Pantokrator Monastery

The Byzantine historian Doukas after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks described, “Fullers entered the Monastery of the Pantokrator and took up quarters there, and shoemakers were busy at work in the center of the church.”

The monastery was transformed into the Zeyrek School during the reign of Mehmed II. The most important document recording the establishment of this school is the Endowment Document of Medmed II. In this document, it is shown that the institution was named after Molla Mehmet Zeyrek Efendi, the school’s first teacher. The school would last eighteen years, finally closing in 1471 when the construction of the school of the Fatih Mosque Complex was completed. Another scholar, ‘Alâ al-Dîn ‘Alî al-Tûsî, was recorded as being a teacher at the Zeyrek School. One story of al-Tusi includes the useful fact that the Zeyrek School contained

---

78 Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, translated by Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975), 204-205.
79 Süleyman Kirimtayif, *Converted Byzantine Churches in Istanbul: Their Transformation into Mosques and Masjids* (İstanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2001), 51.
81 Ibid., 11.
82 A. Süheyt Ünver, *Fatih, Külliyesi ve zamanı ilim hayatı* (İstanbul: University of Istanbul, 1946), 12.
83 Ibid., 13.
forty rooms for students. Some scholars have deduced the school had fifty rooms. Either way, this is an important architectural detail.

After Zeyrek died and the Zeyrek School closed, Şeyh Abdullah Ilahi transformed the school into a dervish lodge. This would be the first center of Turkish Nakshbandi Sufism in Istanbul. Şeyh Abdullah Ilahi had been a student at the Zeyrek School and now preferred to be there than to establish himself to other lodges that were better funded. By this time, the buildings that once formed the Zeyrek School and the Pantokrator Monastery were described as dilapidated and derelict. Despite this, Ilahi had a large following at Zeyrek. He would eventually leave the fame and crowded Zeyrek Lodge for tranquility in Thrace. His successor at the Zeyrek Lodge would be Şeyh Bali Efendi, who probably lived in Istanbul during the first two decades of the sixteenth century. After this the history of the Zeyrek Lodge gets very fuzzy. The sources name spiritual leaders of Zeyrek Lodge in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Judging by the description of the Zeyrek Lodge in the 15th century, it is unlikely the later descriptions represent the same buildings that were once used as the Pantokrator Monastery.

The Ottoman sources do not mention a hospital associated with the Zeyrek Mosque, School, or Lodge. The endowment document that finances the Zeyrek School, however, does describe the Aristo hospital. This hospital, which by its name was probably a Byzantine structure,
would have been the city’s only hospital until the completion of the one attached to Fatih Mosque Complex.\textsuperscript{92} The location of the Aristo Hospital, however, is not known from the sources.

Another Byzantine structure that may have been part of the Pantokrator Monastery emerges into history in the Ottoman Period. The Şeyh Süleyman was turned into a masjid by a sheikh of the same name during the reign of Mehmet II.\textsuperscript{93} Records indicate that in the sixteenth century the structure was the center of a neighborhood that seems to have disappeared by the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{94} A fire gutted out the building in the eighteenth century, and Sultan Mustafa III repaired it.\textsuperscript{95}

\textit{The Period Before the Pantokrator Monastery}

One of the most interesting hypotheses proposed for the Pantokrator Hospital was put forward by Paul Magdalino in his work, \textit{Constantinople Médiévale: Études sur l’évolution des structures urbaines}.\textsuperscript{96} In this Magdalino theorizes that the Pantokrator Hospital was a continuation of the earlier hospital named after the Emperor Theophilos. The previous history of the space occupied by the Pantokrator Monastery and possibly the structure that made up the hospital itself is based upon Magdalino’s hypothesis. Magdalino doesn’t stop at connecting the Pantokrator Hospital to the Theophilos Hospital; he also connects it with the house of Hilara, a sixth century patrician woman. With these connections, the history before the construction of the Pantokrator is rich and long. Without it there is much less that can be gleamed from the historical sources.

\textsuperscript{93} Kirimtayif, \textit{Converted Byzantine Churches}, 55.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 55
\textsuperscript{95} Ayvansarayi, \textit{Camilerimiz Ansiklopedisi}, 177.
The Emperor Theophilos was considered to be a romantic. To show that he was a man of justice he would ride out from the Great Palace across the entire capital to the Church of St. Mary of the Blachernae and listen to any complaints of those along his path. One of the Byzantine chroniclers, Pseudo-Simeon (Simeon the Teacher), tells us that on just such a trip he was asked to fix the refractory of a monastery called “Metanoias.” He decided to transform the building into a hospital, which would bear his name. The sources that mention the hospital and give its history roughly agree on its ancient origin; it was house of Isidore, a patrician woman from Rome, who came to Constantinople during the reign of Constantine the Great. It is, however, the time in between that the authors could not agree on. Theophanes Continuatus never stated it was a monastery at any time; Theophilos cleared prostitutes from the site. George the Monk, however, seems to have reconciled these two voices, by declaring that the monastery was a nunnery for ex-prostitutes.

The only source to give topographic information, besides the vague route between the Great Palace and Blachernae, is in the Patria of Constantinople. Here the Theophilos Hospital is described as “on top of a hill called Zeugma.” Elsewhere in the Patria, it is stated that the Zeugma was named after the place where the mules carrying the relics of St. Stephan were yoked and carried to the neighborhood of Constantinae just past the Valens Aqueduct. This was done during the reign of Theodosius the Younger. Therefore the Zeugma can be understood as the area between the Constantinae and the Golden Horn, near the Unkapani Bridge. It is usually

---

101 Georgii Monachi, Bonn, 809.
102 Patria, Scriptores, 185.
103 Ibid., 239.
interpreted as the area on the coast of the Golden Horn, where the ship carrying St. Stephan’s relics must have landed.\textsuperscript{104} The shore, however, may have been much closer to the current location of the Zeyrek Mosque during the earlier times of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{105}

![Figure 2: Map of Archaeological Remains\textsuperscript{106}]

**Chapter Two: The Archaeological Evidence**

**Zeyrek Mosque**

The Zeyrek Mosque was in Byzantine times three buildings. The north section was the Theotokos Eleusa Church. The middle church was a funerary chapel dedicated to St. Michael. The south church was the Pantokrator Church, the main church of the monastery.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{104} Janin, *La Géographie*, 441.


\textsuperscript{106} Müller-Weiner, *Bidlexikon* map used as base.

\textsuperscript{107} Mathews, *The Byzantine Churches*, 71.
Of the remains attributed to the Pantokrator Monastery, the Zeyrek Mosque is the most extensive, the best preserved, and most studied. The Zeyrek Mosque’s connection the Pantokrator Monastery was never forgotten, so the identification has never been questioned.\textsuperscript{108} The most recent works on the Zeyrek Mosque, first by the Byzantine Institute in Istanbul in the 1950’s and 1960’s and secondly by a joint effort with the University of Illinois, Istanbul Technical University, and Dumbarton Oaks in the 1990’s, have greatly enriched and improved the status of knowledge of the monastery.\textsuperscript{109, 110} These studies resulted in a better understanding of the sequence of the three churches, their correct identification, a new perspective on Byzantine stain glass, a detailed description and analysis of the \textit{opus sectile} floor, and stabilization of the entire structure. Bricks were recovered from the cleaning of the structure that bear stamps that are very early, one is in Latin.\textsuperscript{111} This has been used to argue that the structure was built from the remains of an earlier structure.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{109} Megaw, “Notes on Recent Work,” 333.
\textsuperscript{110} Oustehouth, Ahunbay, and Ahunbay, “Study and Restoration”; Ahundbay and Ahunbay, “Restoration Work.”
\textsuperscript{111} Megaw, “Notes on Recent Work,” Figure 12.
This structure has never been seriously studied. The conjectures on the use of the site, however, are plentiful. Many believed it was the library of the Pantokrator Monastery. Others believed it was a funerary chapel. Finally it was thought to be a baptistery. Firatli and Yücel, in their study of the nearby cisterns, discovered a basement of the structure. The basement is divided into eight niches, about 2.3 by 2.2 meters, radiating out of a center space.
measuring 4.35 meters across. The structure is 120 meters from the Zeyrek Mosque. The masonry of the building appears to be early Byzantine, predating the monastery.

Cistern 1: West of Pantokrator Church

This cistern is the westmost of a series of cisterns lining the south side of Ibadethane Street just west of the Pantokrater Church. This cistern is 28.1 meters long and 11.4 meters wide. The cistern is supported by 12 columns, however, only two of these are true columns; the other ten are stone-built piers. The difference between the two styles of columns is considered to be original by Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss, in their work on the water supply of the city. The two columns are near the entrance of the cistern, but do not match. The stone-built block piers are decorated with crosses.

Cistern 2: West of Pantokrator Church

Cistern 2's west wall is set against cistern 1's east wall, although cistern 2 is lower. It measures 15 by 10.65 meters. Nine columns, arranged three by three, support the ceiling. The north side of the cistern is exposed above the surface and is buttressed; this is also where the entrance is found. The east side has two windows.

Cistern 3: Cistern of the Şeyh Süleyman.

Cistern 3 is southwest of Cisterns 1 and 2, next to the Şeyh Süleyman, a mere ten meters from north of it. Six columns, arranged two by three, support the cistern ceiling. "On the columns are low reliefs of a cross supported by a disc, symbol of the world." The cistern is 10.45 meters by 14.5, making it slightly smaller than cistern 2. The entrance of the cistern is

120 P. Forchheimer and J. Strzygowski, *Die Byzantinischen Wasserbehälter von Konstantinopel* (Vienna, 1893), 77.
123 Ibid., 23.
located on the western wall.\textsuperscript{124} On the southern wall there are water pipes that seem to indicate a connection to the Şeyh Süleyman. This has led Thomas Mathews to agree with Ebersolt who suggested that the Şeyh Süleyman most likely was a baptistery during Byzantine use.\textsuperscript{125} Firatlı and Yücel in their study discovered two fragments of stamped bricks, but did not reproduce them in their report.\textsuperscript{126} Another discovery of this survey is that the newly discovered basement of the Şeyh Süleyman is at the same depth as the cistern.

\textit{Cistern 4: West of Pantokrator Church}

Cistern 4 is relatively mysterious compared to cisterns 1, 2, and 3, which have academic illustrations and measurements. Cistern 4 is located southwest of the Pantokrator Church east of cisterns 1 and 2. Firatlı and Yücel do not provide a blueprint of this cistern; it was filled with rubble during their examination, making a survey of the interior impossible.\textsuperscript{127} Wolfgang Müller-Weiner, in his topographic work, shows the wall of cistern that is probably the same as described by Firatlı and Yücel.\textsuperscript{128} If Müller-Weiner is correct, cistern 4 is farther south than the others lining İbadethane Street. Firatlı and Yücel have suggested that cistern 4 and cistern 5 could represent the same larger cistern, but this is unlikely if the map provided by Müller-Weiner is correct.

\textit{Cistern 5: South of the Pantokrator Church.}

Like cistern 4, cistern 5 is mysterious. It is mentioned by Müller-Weiner and projected by Firatlı and Yücel, but otherwise is unrecorded.\textsuperscript{129} There are two important aspects of cistern 5 that are known that are interesting. First the cistern is east of the Pantokrator Church. If the
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interpretation of the ruins by Taylor Alice is correct, and the church represents the east and north most extreme of the monastery, ruins would not be expected farther east than the church.\textsuperscript{130}

Secondly, Firatli and Yücel note that the cisterns along the Ibadethane Street get deeper as they go east. This is especially true of cisterns 4 and 5. This allows speculation to be made on the relationship between the cisterns and the terrace that supports the Pantokrator Church. Firatli and Yücel also suggest the difference in depth may be related to stratigraphy and phases of construction but seem to think the topography is a greater factor.\textsuperscript{131}

\textit{Cistern 6: Unkapani Cistern}

This cistern is fundamentally different than the others in three important ways. First the cistern is much larger than the other, measuring about 55 by 22 meters.\textsuperscript{132} This makes it roughly twice the size of cistern 1. Secondly it is located down the fourth hill, making it at a lower elevation than the other cisterns. If the usual interpretation of the monastery is correct, it lays outside of the walls of the monastery.\textsuperscript{133} Thirdly the cistern appears to be constructed of components of the same period and consistent brick sizes.\textsuperscript{134} Arguing that this cistern is roughly contemporaneous with the Fildami cistern, Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss estimate its age just after the sixth century. This cistern was not constructed for the Pantokrator Monastery.

\textit{Cistern 7: West Most Cistern}

This cistern is the west most of the cisterns located on Haci Hasan Sok.\textsuperscript{135} The cistern is in fact closer to Eski Imaret Mosque (Akataleptos Monastery) than the Zeyrek Mosque. The size of

\textsuperscript{130} Taylor, “Pantokrator Monastery,” 47-48.
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\textsuperscript{134} Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss, \textit{Water Supply}, 134.
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the Akataleptos is not known, so it is not possible to determine if this cistern represents the westmost structure of the Pantokrator or the south most of the Akataleptos.\textsuperscript{136}

\textit{Cistern 8: West of and Close to Zeyrek}

The cistern is mysterious and described briefly by Firatli and Yücel. It can be “entered by an aperture near the subterranean fountain under the house, and that the cistern extended as far as under Kilise Djami.”\textsuperscript{137} It is apparent this information was gained from local knowledge; they did not explore this cistern. They speculate that this cistern may form one large cistern with cisterns 4 and 5.

\textit{Kirkçeşme Fountain}

Firatli and Yücel describe a fountain that is 3 to 3.5 meters below the surface of the street. It draws water from Kirkçeşme and “was used until the water supply was cut off by the Municipality.”\textsuperscript{138} Judging by the depth and the fact that Kirkçeşme may have been the Ottoman repair of the Hadrianic Waterline, the fountain may be Byzantine.\textsuperscript{139}

\textit{Terraces}

“To obtain an idea of the topography of the city in the days of Theodosius II or of Justinian we must figure to ourselves a whole series of high and medium terraces running along the slopes of the seven hills like contour lines, arranged according to the locality in four, five or six levels laid out in the form of an amphitheatre.”\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{136} For the argument that the Eski Imaret Mosque is the Akataleptos see Sofia Kotzabassi, “Zur Lokalisierung des Akataleptos-Klosters in Konstantinopel,” Revue des études byzantines 63 (2005), 233-5; See Janin, \textit{La Géographie}, 41, where it is suggested that “Apolikaptia” is a mutilation of “Akataleptos” and Cyril Mango, “Where at Constantinople was the Monastery of Christos Pantepoptes?” \textit{Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας} 20 (1998), 87-88, where the original argument for calling the Eski Imaret Mosque “Christ Pantepoptes” is refuted.

\textsuperscript{137} Firatli and Yücel, “Cisterns,” 26.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 26

\textsuperscript{139} Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss, \textit{Water Supply}, 116.
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Ernst Mamboury was right to place so much importance on the physical remains of terraces; they can reveal much about the topography of the city. Recorded in Raymond Janin’s topographical work, a map based on the observations of Ernst Mamboury provides much of the information on the terraces of Constantinople.¹⁴¹

In the area around the Pantokrator Monastery, three major terraces are recorded in Mamboury’s map. The first is a line that extends from southwest, halfway between the Zeyrek Mosque and the Valens Aqueduct. The second is a platform northeast of the Zeyrek Mosque, whose southeast part touches the Unkapani Cistern. In Mamboury’s map the terrace continues northwest along the Golden Horn, but when it was reproduced for Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss’s work, The Water Supply of Byzantine Constantinople, only the initial platform is included.¹⁴² The final terrace is above the previous, where the Zeyrek Mosque sits. This platform is the artificial topography that governed the depth of the cisterns located near the Zeyrek.¹⁴³

The unfortunate truth about the terraces around the Zeyrek Mosque is that they are the most mysterious and understudied. James Crow remarks that “On the slopes facing the Golden Horn, the evidence is less secure and could well belong to the Ottoman buildings, as noted before.”¹⁴⁴ This being said, the terrace’s proximity to the Unkapani Cistern (Cistern 6) does seem to suggest a contemporaneous date in the fifth century.¹⁴⁵ This means the terraces north and downhill of the Zeyrek Mosque most likely predate the Pantokrator Monastery. The date of the terrace holding up the church, however, is a bit more mysterious. While Crow does admit some of the terraces

¹⁴² Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss, Water Supply, 112.
¹⁴⁴ Crow, “Infrastructures of a Great City,” 259.
¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 259; This does conflict with Crow, Bardill, and Bayliss, Water Supply, 134, where the cistern is associated with the late sixth or early seventh century.
may have been constructed in the Middle Byzantine Period, most of the terraces seem to represent construction ideas of late antiquity construction.

The Demirchan Water Conduit

Forchheimer and Strzygowski describe a barrel-vaulted conduit near Zeyrek Mosque in the Demirchan neighborhood. The Demirchan neighborhood was named after one of the chief butchers of Mehmed II who as given a home north of the Pantokrator Monastery on the fourth hill.\textsuperscript{146} This has been used to support the path of the Hadrianic Waterline, which passed north and east of the monastery.\textsuperscript{147}

Chapter Three: Conclusions

The Location of Pantokrator Hospital within the Pantokrator Monastery

Alice Taylor suggested based on her study of the ruins with the monastic charter that the hospital was southwest of the Zeyrek Mosque.\textsuperscript{148} While this is still within the realm of possibility, I would like to suggest a different interpretation of the ruins. The Pantokrator Hospital was probably located north of the Zeyrek Mosque and was associated with the Unkapani Cistern. Byzantine medicine required water and constant bathing. John II Komnenos and Irene (or Isidore) would have been wise to place the hospital on an active waterline.\textsuperscript{149} The monastic ekphrasis poem stresses the impressive nature of the water flowing in the monastery.\textsuperscript{150} The anonymous Russian pilgrim notes the similar feature.\textsuperscript{151} This would place the hospital on the terrace described by Mamboury. It is large enough to house a structure close to half the size
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\textsuperscript{150} Kompouroglous, \textit{Μνημεία}, 128-129.
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of the entire monastery. This location would place the hospital close to the same road that Alice Taylor projected that would be used to enter the Theotokos Eleusa. The outpatient clinic maintained at the Pantokrator Hospital suggests that the structure was located close to a road where people could come from off the street. The area southwest of the monastery would not be as accessible to the public as the terrace.

The Ottoman sources do not mention the hospital, but this seems to aid this interpretation. This terrace is farther down the fourth hill than the terrace holding the Zeyrek Mosque. If the hospital’s building survived into the Ottoman period, even if not represented by the Aristo Hospital, its separation from the main church would mean the Ottomans had no reason to associate it with the Zeyrek Mosque. The description of the Zeyrek School suggests that it was composed of the Pantokrator Monastery’s monks’ quarters and refectory, not the dependent institutions like the old age home and the hospital. The Ottomans had to reinterpret the site when they obtained the city. For the Byzantines the Theotokos Eleusa was no more a part of the Pantokrator Monastery proper than the hospital, but its location allowed the Ottomans to interpret the three churches as one structure.

The Şeyh Süleyman was probably used as the bathhouse of the monks’ clinic during the time of the Pantokrator Monastery. The connection with cistern 3, which formed the basis of the baptistery argument, can also be used to argue that it was a bathhouse. These arguments, however, do not have to be mutually exclusive. They are probably not. The building was

---
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probably built as a baptistery for a local church, now lost, or for the “Metanoias” Monastery built by Empress Irene.\textsuperscript{158} Most scholars believe the masonry of the structure is earlier than the Komnenos period.\textsuperscript{159} The structure was then reused as part of the Pantokrator Monastery.

The other cisterns probably represent the water needs of the monks and their living quarters. Dr. \textsuperscript{\textregistered}Üner of Istanbul University was probably correct thinking these cisterns represented the Zeyrek School.\textsuperscript{160} The two were composed of the same buildings. The overall arrangement of the monastery described by Alice Taylor is correct; the “catholicon occupied one corner of the main courtyard, which gave access to the other monastic buildings.”\textsuperscript{161}

\textit{Floor Plans and Reconstructions}

Anastasios Orlandos drew up his reconstruction of the Pantokrator Hospital without taking into account the physical remains dotting the landscape around the Zeyrek Mosque,\textsuperscript{162} and draws criticism from Robert Volk for it.\textsuperscript{163} When Orlandos’ plan is placed upon the landscape it is north of the church and west of the terrace described by Mamboury. The size of the projection, however, seems to fit upon the terrace if moved east. The interior organization, however, is not able to take advantage of Miller’s conclusions of his own archaeological evidence.\textsuperscript{164} Despite the possible argument that the bathhouse would probably have been southeast next to the Unkapani Cistern, the exact interior arrangement is impossible to deduce from the archaeological record.
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Theophilos to Pantokrator to Aristo?

There is no doubt in my mind that the Theophilos Hospital and the Pantokrator Hospital are highly related and occupied the same space. The terrace north of the Zeyrek Mosque currently predates the monastery and probably built for a mansion, either by Isidore in the reign of Constantine the Great or Hilara during the reign of Maurice. They may not be the same building, however. The fact that the Pantokrator churches were probably built from the ruins of an earlier structure could mean the same for the hospital. The Theophilos Hospital could have been destroyed and the later Pantokrator Hospital constructed to serve the same purpose at the same spot. The Aristo Hospital could be the Pantokrator Hospital. It could also be any of a number of Byzantine hospitals that may have survived into the Ottoman period. Some scholars, however, do not believe the hospital survived the destructive years of the Latin Empire.

Architectural Idea of the Byzantine Hospital

If the Pantokrator Hospital is the same building as the Theophilos Hospital, it means that again the Byzantines have chosen a rich domestic structure to house a hospital. The hospital of St. Sampson, arguably the most prestigious in Constantinople, was first a simple domestic structure before becoming a hospital. The monastery and hospital of the emperor Romanos I were established by remodeling an imperial palace. Isaac Angelus transformed both the palace of Andronikos Komnenos and the house of the Grand Admiral of the Byzantine Fleet into hospitals. When the hospital originates as another structure, it is usually domestic instead of
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ecclesiastical. Orlandos’ identification of the hearth as the central element of the hospital supports this notion.\textsuperscript{171} The hearth is a symbol of the home in the Roman worldview.\textsuperscript{172}

While this association between Byzantine hospital architecture and domestic architecture may give insight into the Byzantine worldview, it also raises important questions. First, important archaeological research into the Greek and Roman house has demonstrated that textual evidence can represent the ideal.\textsuperscript{173} One important case is the division of the Classical Greek house into sharply defined gendered halves seen in the literary sources. Archaeology, however, has shown that this is probably an ideal, rarely representing the actual architecture or cultural behavior.\textsuperscript{174} This is especially important because this same characteristic is found in the description of Byzantine hospitals.\textsuperscript{175}

The Christian hospital architecturally combines the notions of the ancient “iatreion” with the domestic.\textsuperscript{176} The “house” is the novel concept of the Byzantine hospital; a new term, therefore, was developed to describe the Byzantine hospital: the xenon.\textsuperscript{177} While Hippocratic medicine had these other offices and buildings before, by opening up the home to strangers, the building structure of the hospital can demonstrate a Christian message of philanthropy, building from ancient notions of hospitality.\textsuperscript{178} The hospital was the house of the doctor and its patents were

\textsuperscript{171} Orlandos, \textit{Μοναστηριακὴ}, 87.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., 71.
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\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., 43.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid., 27; In antiquity, “xenon” is a word for the guest room of a house or palace; its new meaning develops from the third to eighth centuries.
\textsuperscript{178} Ibid., 63; Byzantine hospitals were prohibited from charging its patients, instead promoting the doctor as “anargyros” or silver-less.
his guests. In this way the hospital is a physical representation of Byzantine medicine. It is part ancient Hippocratic wisdom and part medieval Christian philanthropy.
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