

EXTRAIT

# BYZANTION

REVUE INTERNATIONALE DES ÉTUDES BYZANTINES

fondée en 1924

par Paul GRAINDOR et Henri GRÉGOIRE

Organe de la Société belge d'Études byzantines

---

TOME LXXIII  
(2003)

---

Fascicule 2

VOLUME OFFERT AU PROFESSEUR

**Lydie HADERMANN-MISGUICH**

*Publié avec l'aide financière du Ministère de la Communauté française  
(Direction générale de l'Enseignement non obligatoire et de la Recherche scientifique)  
et de la Fondation Universitaire de Belgique*



BRUXELLES  
2003

## WAS BORIS KALAMANOVIČ BURIED IN THE CHURCH OF ST. PLATO AT CONSTANTINOPLE ?

In 1200 Dobrynia Jadrejkovič, the future archbishop Antony, made a pilgrimage to Constantinople, leaving us perhaps the most detailed single description of the shrines and relics of the City before its destruction worked by the Crusaders. Antony's *Kniga Palomnik* (The Pilgrim Book) presents the reader with a detailed recapitulation of what the pious pilgrim would see in the imperial City. Anyone who has read *Kniga Palomnik* may have observed that the author had an exceptional interest in what is concerned to the Russians at the Byzantine capital. He is the only author, for instance, who mentions an embassy of Prince Roman of Galitza to Constantinople and describes a large decorated plate, supposedly contributed to St. Sophia by Princess Olga, that he saw in the skeuophylakion. In this connection, there is a notice in Antony's book according to which the body of a certain Borin [*sic*] was buried in the church of St. Plato. It reads as follows : "Странь же того церковь есть святаго Платона и ту мощи его и святы Иоаннь Милостивый, и Боринь ту въ тѣлѣ лежить" (To one side of this church is [the church] of St. Plato and his relics and [the relics] of St. John the Merciful are here ; and the body of Borin reposes here) (1). It forms part of an enumeration of the churches placed in his second tour, where the way along the Golden Horn is described (2). We are, therefore, confronted with the question : who was

(1) '*Kniga Palomnik*'. *Skazanie mest svjatykh vo Tsaregrade Antonija, archiepiskopa novgorodskogo, v 1200 g.*, ed. Hr. M. LOPAREV, in *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, vol. XVII, 3, 51 (St. Petersburg, 1899), pp. 30, 88 (hereafter, '*Kniga Palomnik*'). I translated in English the Slavonic passages (given in round brackets in the text and footnotes) that concern us as literally as possible. I wish to thank Dr A. Berger for reading the text and offering helpful comments.

(2) For the main division of Antony's book : N. I. PROKOF'EV, *Russkioe khozdenie XII-XV vv. in Učenie zapiski Moskovskogo pedagogičeskogo*

this Borin? This question immediately leads to a second one: why did Antony feel obliged to insert a word about him? It is my aim to give an answer to these questions.

Before going any further a word must be said about the church of St. Plato. It was supposedly built by Anastasios I (491-518) after 500<sup>(3)</sup>, but according to Prokopios of Caesarea, restored by Justinian the Great (527-565) before 527<sup>(4)</sup>. We learn from the *Vita Basilii* that it was rebuilt by Basil I<sup>(5)</sup>. It is said to have been ἐν τοῖς Δομνίνου ἐμβόλοις according to the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*<sup>(6)</sup>. The *Vita Basilii* and Antony of Novgorod repeat the same information and the *Patria* suggests that it overlooked the church of the Resurrection and the Baths of Dagistheus<sup>(7)</sup>. The church can therefore be placed with a degree of

*instituta imeni Lenina*, 363 (1970), p. 88 believes that Antony's *Kniga Palomnik* consists of two sections: description of the church St. Sophia and enumeration of the relics of the Christian martyrs, their shrines and holy places. In contrast to him Hr. Loparev ('*Kniga Palomnik*', p. LXIV) sees three sections in the text: inside the city, along the Golden Horn and outside the city walls. Here I shall follow the view of Loparev.

(3) R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*. 1: *Le siège de Constantinople*, 3. *Les églises et les monastères*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1969, p. 418; A. BERGER, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinopoleos (Poikila Byzantina 8)*, Bonn, 1988, p. 438 [hereafter BERGER, *Untersuchungen*].

(4) PROKOPIOS OF CAESAREA, *De aedificiis*, ed. J. HAURY, vol. III, Leipzig, 1913, p. 26, 27-29 where speaking of St. Plato's church, describes it as situated not far from the Forum of Constantine; G. LASKIN, *G. Kodin. O drevnostjakh Konstantinopolja*, Kiev, 1905, p. 216.

(5) THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, *Chronographia*, ed. B. NIEBUR, Bonn, 1838, p. 324, 16-18; IOANNIS SCYLITZAE, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. I. THURN, Berlin-New York, 1973, p. 163, 62.

(6) The feast of the saint was observed on November 18 ἐν τῷ Σεπτῷ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρείῳ τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς Δομνίνου ἐμβόλοις: *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, ed. H. DELEHAYE, Brussels, 1902, col. 235, 8-10; 706, 40-42; M. GEDON, *Βυζαντινὸν Ἑορτολόγιον*, Constantinople, 1899, p. 108; See also BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, p. 439.

(7) THEOPHCONT, *loc. cit.*; *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. T. PREGER, 2 vols., II, Leipzig, 1901-1907, § 40, 41, 43, p. 232; '*Kniga Palomnik*', pp. 29-30, 88; BERGER, *Untersuchungen, loc. cit.* The church of the Resurrection was located at the juncture of the ἐμβόλος τοῦ Δομνίνου and the

certainty in the Portico of Domninos, although it is unclear on which side of the Portico it lay. To my knowledge there is no reference to the church of St. Plato after 1204. It may have been destroyed by the great fire of 1203<sup>(8)</sup>.

There is some confusion concerning the relics of St. John the Merciful, a famous seventh-century patriarch of Alexandria known for his charity<sup>(9)</sup>. At another point in the text, Antony describes them as being in Galata. Perhaps the connection he makes with Galata goes back to an earlier tradition. Apparently, in an earlier period the relics of St. John had been kept at a church dedicated to that saint in Galata. Due to the tension with the Crusaders' coming to Constantinople the saint's remains seem to have been transferred from Galata to the church of St. Plato in the city itself<sup>(10)</sup>. It is reasonable to accept that Antony may have obtained his information from a local guide, who had come to know something about these relics.

We may now turn our attention to the enigmatic personality : Боринъ (Borin). Apparently this name is misunderstood and Boris is the correct name here<sup>(11)</sup>. In some manuscripts Boris is found, whether in others is left out<sup>(12)</sup>. The statement of Antony gives us no very clear idea about

Mese, or possibly somewhat north of this intersection : JANIN, *Églises*, p. 28, locates the church in the Portico of Domninos ; BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, p. 310 (Skizze 7) also places the church at the Portico but a little north of the Mese ; G. MAJESKA, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, Washington, D.C., 1984, p. 289.

(8) BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 310-311.

(9) We do not know when the relics of St. John the Merciful were transferred from Cyprus to Constantinople. On St. John the Merciful (*Eleomosynarius*, the Almoner), see *BHG*<sup>1</sup>, vol. II, pp. 19-20 ; G. MAJESKA, *op. cit.*, p. 308, n. 118. During the Latin Empire of Constantinople the body of St. John the Merciful is reported to have been transported to Venice.

(10) This is the view of Hr. Loparev ('*Kniga Palomnik*', p. c).

(11) This name, as it stands before us, suggests that it was to be given in its Greek form (in accusative) since normal Russian orthography is Борисъ. See for example LEONIS DIACONI CALOENSIS, *Historiae*, ed. C. B. HASE, Bonn, 1828, pp. 136, 16 ; 158, 24 which speaks about ΒΟΡΪΝ and Hase's note on p. 477. For various orthographic examples see V. N. ZLATARSKI, *Istorija na bulgarskata dържава prez srednite vekove*, vol. I, part 2, Sofia, 1927, p. 1 n. 3.

(12) The name is given in the Jacimirskij manuscript *Gosudarstvennaja Biblioteka imeni Lenina, Muzejnoe Sobranije*, 10261, XVI century and that from *Gosudarstvennyj Isroričeskij Muzej, Muzejnoe Sobranije*, 1428, XVII century.

him and opens the door to various hypotheses. We know of the existence of three persons to whom the name may have been applied: Boris II, son of Tsar Peter of Bulgaria; Boris of Polotsk; Boris Kalamanovič. If the choice lies between these persons, the preference must be given to the last one. The reason for our choice, we shall explain more fully below.

Let us look at the first person. It was Tikhomirov, who has attempted to prove (without giving details) that Boris must have been identified with the son of Tsar Peter of Bulgaria<sup>(13)</sup>. After their mother's death (ca. 963) Peter's two sons, Boris and Romanos, were sent as hostages to the Byzantine capital<sup>(14)</sup>. Upon their father's death (at the beginning of 969)

Unfortunately, the former, the oldest most accurate one was discovered too late to form the basis for Loparev's edition. However, this cannot be assessed until the question of the redaction is resolved: see O. A. BELOBROVA, '*Kniga Palomnik' Antonija Novgorodskogo (k izučeniju teksta)*, in *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, 29 (1974), pp. 179-185. Indeed, the Jacimirskij manuscript was attached as appendix II (pp. 71-94) by Loparev in his edition. Loparev's publication has become the basic study on Antony's text ever since. A new critical edition of *Kniga palomnik*, based on all the preserved manuscripts, remains a strong *desideratum*. As far as I know, Prof. G. Majeska is preparing a critical edition of Antony's *Kniga Palomnik*. As for the latter manuscript which remains unpublished see: L. N. MAJKOV, *Material' I issledovanija po starinnoj russkoj literature. I. Beseda o svjat'njach I drugich dostopamjatnostjach Tsaregrada*, in *Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovestnosti Auademii nauk*, vol. LI, 4 (St. Petersburg, 1890), pp. 3-11; N. V. RUZSKIJ, *Svedenija Daniila v načale XII veka*, in *Čtenija v Obščestve istorii I drevnostej rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, otdel. II (1891), pp. 96-97; M. I. SPERANSKIJ, *Iz starinnoj novgorodskoj literatur' XIV veka*, Leningrad, 1934, pp. 84-85 and 88; See also '*Kniga Palomnik*', pp. XVI-XIX; O. BELOBROVA, *op. cit.*, p. 178, n. 2.

(13) M. N. TIKHOMIROV, *Drevnerusskie goroda*, Moscow, 1946, p. 126.

(14) JOHNSCYL, p. 255, 73-75; JOHN ZONARAS, *Epitome Historiarum*, ed. T. BÜTTNER-WOBST, Bonn, 1897, IV, p. 75, 15-24; V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, pp. 589, n. 2, 590, n. 2; A. LEROY-MOLINGHEN, *Les fils de Pierre de Bulgarie et les Cométopoulos*, in *Byz.*, 42 (1972), pp. 405-419; CH. BRAND, *Boris II*, in *ODB*, vol. I, p. 310; PL. PAVLOV, *Boris II (Opit za novo tülkuvane na semejno-dinastičnite problemi v Preslavskija dvor pri tsar Petür)*, in *Preslav 5 s. a. red. T. TOTEV*, Sofia, 1993, p. 48; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, *Samuilovata dūržava*, Sofia, 2000, p. 49. On the other side, see the argumentation of M. WHITTOW (*The making of Orthodox Byzantium 600-1025*, London, 1996, p. 294) and IV. BOŽILOV (*Bülgarite vüv Vizantijskata imperija*, Sofia, 1995, p. 350) that this happened in 968. A

they seem to have been sent back to Bulgaria<sup>(15)</sup>. The elder was recognized as Tsar Boris II (969-971). It will be remembered that during the Russian incursion into Bulgaria, Boris II and his brother were captured by the Kievan Prince Svjatoslav<sup>(16)</sup> and stayed as his prisoners in the Bulgarian capital until the city fell in the hands of the Emperor John I Tzimiskes in 5 April, 971<sup>(17)</sup>. The latter had no intention to restore the Bulgarian ruler to his throne and once eastern Bulgaria was subdued Boris was stripped of his crown, taken to the Byzantine capital and given the Byzantine court title of *magistros*<sup>(18)</sup>. After John Tzimiskes' death in 976, it seems that Peter's two sons had escaped from Constantinople<sup>(19)</sup>.

little later, Iv. Božilov (Iv. BOŽILOV, V. GJUZELEV, *Istorija na srednovekovna Bulgaria VII – XIV vek*, vol. I, Sofia, 1999, pp. 305, n. 25 and 307, n. 51) modifying his position, has stressed that there are many difficulties involved in Scylitzes's account about the hostage of Peter's sons. He comes to the conclusion that it was merely interpolation of the chronicler.

(15) V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 592; Iv. BOŽILOV, V. GJUZELEV, *op. cit.*, p. 297; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

(16) SCYL., pp. 287, 91-288, 94; *Povest' Vremennykh Let*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. V. P. ADRIANOVA-PERETTS and D. S. LIKHAČEV, St. Petersburg, 1996, p. 31; V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, pp. 598-599; P. MUTAVČIEV, *Russko-bolgarskie otnošenija pri Svjatoslave*, in *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, vol. 4 (Praha, 1931), pp. 78-80; S. A. IVANOV, *Toiranos tōn Boulgarōn. (Ioan Tzimiskhii i Boris II v 971 g.)*, in *Obščestvennoe soznanie na Balkanakh v srednie veka*, (Kalinin, 1982), p. 48; J. A. FINE, *The Early medieval Balkans. A critical survey from the sixth to the late twelfth century*, vol. I, Ann Arbor, 1992, p. 184; M. WHITTOW, *op. cit.*, p. 294; Iv. BOŽILOV, V. GJUZELEV, *op. cit.*, p. 298; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

(17) LEO DIAC., pp. 129-138; SCYL., pp. 294, 3-298, 11; V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, pp. 598-599, 609-613; J. A. FINE, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-188; Iv. BOŽILOV, V. GJUZELEV, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

(18) LEO DIAC., pp. 158, 16-159, 2; SCYL., p. 310, 62-69; V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, pp. 627-628; J. A. FINE, *op. cit.*, p. 187; Ch. BRAND, *op. cit.*, p. 311; Iv. BOŽILOV, V. GJUZELEV, *op. cit.*, pp. 300, 311; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

(19) V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 651 assumes that this happened between 976 and 979; While P. PETROV (*Obrazuvane i ukrepvane na Zapadnata biŭlgarska dŕžava*, in *Godišnik na SU filosofsko-istoričeski fakultet*, vol. LIII, 2 [1960], p. 180) has given preference to 977, J. FERLUGA (*John Skylitzes and Michael of Devoŭ*, in *Zbor.* 10 [1967], p. 165) has reconsidered the evidence and suggested a possibility for 978. The view of the latter is recently supported by S. PIRIVATRIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

At the Bulgarian frontier Boris was accidentally killed by a Bulgarian guard who failed to recognize him <sup>(20)</sup>. Such, in outline, is the story of Boris II. It may be said, therefore, that he had long been a resident in Constantinople. However, this first impression may be misleading. As far as I know, in Constantinople Boris (along with his brother Romanos) was obliged to stay in the precincts of the Great Palace <sup>(21)</sup>. There is no evidence, in the sources, of any connection between him and other places at Constantinople. It is also unbelievable that the memory of this person was alive long after his death. All this goes to show that Tikhomirov's view cannot be taken seriously.

According to Loparev, Boris must be sought among the princes of Polotsk, exiled to Constantinople in 1129 <sup>(22)</sup>. But, this highly speculative view finds no confirmation in the Russian sources <sup>(23)</sup>. As it is known, in 1128 the Kievan Grand Prince Mstislav Vladimirovič (1125-1132) sent troops from all parts of Russia to invade Polotsk and to subordinate the Polotsk lands. The principality had retained its independence up to that

(20) SCYL., p. 329, 72-75 ; V. R. ROZEN, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgaroboitsa. Izvlečenija iz letopisi Jahüi Antiochiiskogo*, St. Petersburg, 1883, pp. 20, 34-21, 10 ; B. PROKIĆ, *Die Zusätze in der Handschrift des Johannes Skylitzes. Codex Vindobonensis hist. Graec. LXXIV*, München, 1906, p. 28 ; V. GJUZELEV, *Izvori za srednovekovnata istorija na Bŭlgaria (VII-XV v.) v avstrijskite rukopisni sbirki i arhivi*, vol. I, Sofía, 1994, p. 45 ; as well as V. N. ZLATARSKI, *op. cit.*, pp. 648, n. 1, 2 and 649, n. 2 ; J. A. FINE, *op. cit.*, p. 189 ; IV. BOŽILOV, V. GJUZELEV, *op. cit.*, p. 316. We may also note that according to the Bulgarian eschatological thinking, Boris II adopts the significance of Michael Khagan or "the last apocalyptic king". Ordinary people, in other words, looked at the new Tsar in expectation for bright prospects. I owe this interesting fact to my colleague A. Nikolov, whom I wish to thank in this place. See also A. NIKOLOV, *Nabludenija vŭrkhu zikŭla starobŭlgarski istoriko-apokaliptični tvorbi ot X-XI v.*, in *Paleobulgarica*, 21, 1 (1997), pp. 99, 105.

(21) In agreement with this is the testimony of Yaḥyā of Antioch in V. R. ROZEN, *op. cit.*, p. 21, 1-2 ; Cf. also the very similar account of al-Makin : translation V. G. VASIL'EVSKIJ, *K istorii 976-986 godov. (iz Al-Mekina i Ioanna Geometra)*, in *Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveščeniija*, part 184, otdl. II (March 1876), p. 138.

(22) 'Kniga Palomnik', pp. CXXII-CXXV.

(23) L. V. ALEKSEEV, *Polotskaja zemlja. Očerki istorii severnoj Belorusii*, Moscow, 1966, p. 260 ; IDEM, *Polotskaja zemlja*, in *Drevnerusskie knjažestva X-XIII vv.*, ed. L. G. BESKROVN'J, Moscow, 1975, pp. 230-232.

time. Upon hearing about Mstislav's expedition the people of Polotsk rebelled against the prince David (eldest son of Vseslav Brjačislavič) and invited his brother and Mstislav's protégé Rogvolod to be their prince<sup>(24)</sup>. In this way the Kievan Grand prince managed to establish his control over the Polotsk lands, which lived their isolated life. We know so little about Rogvolod that it is impossible to verify the other details. One thing is certain: the sources are strong in their affirmation that he had died in 1128<sup>(25)</sup>. As far as I know this fact has never been questioned. The chronicler tells us that one year later (1129) Mstislav exiled the brothers of the late Boris (David, Rostislav and Svjatoslav) and his sons (Basil and John) along with their wives and children to Constantinople<sup>(26)</sup>. This exile shows the close ties between Mstislav and Byzantium at the time. Unfortunately, Loparev confuses the princes of Polotsk and I have no idea on what grounds he imagined that David and Boris are one and the same person. It is an indispensable fact that the sources make a clear distinction between them. He also neglected the fact that according to the later *Gust'nskaja letopis* the baptismal name of Rogvolod was namely Boris<sup>(27)</sup>. Such double names are perfectly common at this time. This evi-

(24) ALEKSEEV, *Polotskaja zemlja. Očerki*, pp. 260-261.

(25) *Polnoe Sobranie russkich letopisej*, St. Petersburg, 1846, vol. I, 2. *Prodolženie Lavrentievskoj letopisi*, p. 131 : s. a. 6636 (1128) (hereafter cited as *PSRL*) ; *PSRL*, St. Petersburg, 1845, vol. II. *Ipatievskaja letopis*, p. 293 : s. a. 6637 (1129) ; *PSRL*, Moscow – Leningrad, 1949, vol. XXV. *Moskovskij letopisn'j svod kontsa XV veka*, p. 31 : s. a. 6636 (1128) ; *PSRL*, Leningrad, 1989, vol. XXXVIII. *Radzivilovskaja letopis*, p. 106 : s. a. 6636 (1128).

(26) *PSRL*, vol. I, 2, *loc. cit.* ; *PSRL*, vol. II, pp. 293, 304 ; *PSRL*, vol. XXV, *loc. cit.* ; *PSRL*, vol. XXXVIII, p. 107 ; ALEKSEEV, *Polotskaja zemlja. Očerki*, p. 260 ; ALEKSEEV, *Polotskaja zemlja*, p. 231. According to V. N. TATIŠČEV, *Istorija Rossijskaja*, vol. II, Moscow, 1848, p. 241, they were welcomed by the Emperor and were sent on the East, where they took part in the war against the Muslims. The choice of Constantinople as a place of exile shows the close ties between Russia and Byzantium and the fact that Mstislav could trust the Byzantine emperor to guard the prince captives well : M. I. LEVČENKO, *Očerki po istorii rusko-vizantijskich otnošenij*, Moscow, 1956, p. 478 ; V. T. PAŠUTO, *Vnešnjaja politika drevnej Rusi*, Moscow, 1968, p. 187 ; G. G. LITAVRIN, *Rus' i Vizantija v XII v.*, in *Vopros' istorii*, 7 (1972), p. 45.

(27) *PSRL*, vol. II, p. 293 : Представился князь Полоцкій Рогволод или Борисъ (Prince of Polotsk Rogvolod or Boris passed away) ; ALEKSEEV, *Polotskaja zemlja. Očerki*, p. 252 ; ALEKSEEV, *Polotskaja zemlja*, p. 230.



dence constitutes one of the chief reasons for rejecting the view of Loparev. Rogvolod-Boris was undoubtedly already dead; had he been along with his brothers, his name would certainly have been mentioned by the chronicler. It is difficult to believe that his body was transported from Polotsk to Constantinople, a point so distant from his fatherland! All this implies that he never entered the confines of the Byzantine Empire. Therefore, this individual cannot be regarded as Boris, which was buried in the church of St. Plato. In sum, neither Tikhomirov's nor Loparev's attempt is at all successful.

As I have already said, for my part, I retain the assumption that a more likely candidate for the individual in question is Boris Kalamanovič, which was a son of the Hungarian king Kálmán (1095-1116)<sup>(28)</sup>. Following the death of his first wife Busilla, Kálmán remarried. His second wife was Euphemia, the daughter of the Kievan Grand Prince Vladimir Monomach (1113-1125). However, the second marriage of the king was unfortunate; Kálmán accused his second wife of adultery and in 1113 sent her back to Russia, where she bore a son, Boris<sup>(29)</sup>. When in 1116

(28) The evidence about Boris was assembled by V. G. VASIL'EVSKU, *Iz istorii Vizantii v XII veke (Souz dvuch imperij [1148-1155]). II. Boris Kolomanovič*, in *Slavjanskij sbornik*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1877, pp. 79-91 (hereafter VASIL'EVSKU, *Boris Kolomanovič*); K. GROT, *Iz istorii Ugrii i Slavjanstva v XII veke (1114-1173)*, Warsaw, 1889, pp. 4, 22, 24, 27-28, 69, 78-85, 111, 117-120, 182, 184, 200, 203-204; Fr. CHALANDON, *Les Comnène: Études sur l'empire byzantin au XI<sup>e</sup> et au XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, II: *Jean II Comnène (1183-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)*, Paris, 1912, pp. 62-63, 401, 406-407, 413-414; S. P. ROSANOV, *Evfimija Vladimirovna i Boris Kolomanovič. Iz evropejskoj politiki XII v.*, in *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR. Otdelenie gumanitarnich nauk*, 8 (1930), pp. 585-599 and 9, pp. 649-671 (hereafter ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*); A. B. URBANSKY, *Byzantium and the Danube frontier*, New York, 1968, pp. 39, 47, 62, 70, 74, 81; V. LAURENT, *Arétè Doukaina, la kralaina*, in *BZ*, 62 (1972), pp. 35-39; Ch. BRAND, *Boris Kalamanovič*, in *ODB*, p. 311; A. KAZHDAN, *Kalamanos*, in *ODB*, p. 1091.

(29) VASIL'EVSKU, *Boris Kolomanovič*, pp. 79-80 with cited sources; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 8, pp. 587, 589, 591; K. GROT, *op. cit.*, p. 22; Fr. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, p. 62; Gy. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Berlin, 1958, p. 96 calls him "angeblicher jüngerer Sohn des ungarischen Königs Koloman"; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 39; V. LAURENT, *op. cit.*, p. 35. The reason about her repudiation was possibly due to the change of Monomach's policy towards Volhynia and Byzantium; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 8, pp. 589, 593; V. T. PAŠUTO, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

Kálmán died, his eldest son of the first marriage István (Stephen) succeeded as István II (1114-1131). Kálmán's second son Boris had been ousted from succession.

Two details, concerning the life of this representative of the House of Árpád, are of particular importance for our inquiry. It should be emphasized, at the first place, his connection with Russia. The fact that Boris was Russian on his mother's side may explain to some extent the important role which Russia played in his life. We happen to be informed from the sources that he was born and raised in Kiev<sup>(30)</sup>. Though little is known about his childhood, we may suppose that he accepted the Orthodox faith and received an appropriate to a prince upbringing. There is good reason to believe that the years which he spent in the court of his grandfather, Vladimir Monomach, influenced Boris very much<sup>(31)</sup>. This is confirmed by the fact that he went back to Russia several times in expectation of support from the Kievan Prince<sup>(32)</sup>. This shows that his connection with Russia was alive long after he had left Kiev.

Upon the discovery of his plot against István II, between 1128 and 1130 Boris fled to Constantinople, hoping that with the aid of the Emperor he would be able to acquire Hungarian throne<sup>(33)</sup>. Again one has to ask the question why. The simplest explanation of the question would be that by this time, Constantinople was becoming a center for Hungarian

(30) VASIL'EVSKU, *Boris Kolomanovič*, p. 80, with reference to the continuator of Cosmas of Prague; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 8, p. 594 and 9, p. 649; K. GROT, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 79.

(31) According to VASIL'EVSKU, *Boris Kolomanovič*, p. 80, Boris had been raised as a Russian prince.

(32) It is enough to note that in 1131 Boris was sent by John II Komnenos to Russia, to start a war against the Hungarian kingdom. However, Mstislav's death in 1132 and the marriage of his granddaughter Ephrosyne with Géza II of Hungary (1141-1162) may be said to mark the end of Boris's hope to find support from his mother's fatherland: ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, p. 653; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 47; Gy. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, Budapest, 1970, p. 78. The reason for Geza's marriage alliance with Izjaslav Mstislavič (1146-1154) was the threat of Kievan support for Boris: M. F. FONT, *Politische Beziehungen zwischen Ungern und der Kiever Rus' im 12. Jahrhundert*, in *Ungarn Jahrbuch*, 18 (1990), p. 10. See also M. I. LEVČENKO, *op. cit.*, p. 479.

(33) VASIL'EVSKU, *Boris Kolomanovič*, p. 82; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 47; K. GROT, *op. cit.*, p. 24; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, pp. 649-650.

dissidents<sup>(34)</sup>. Personally, I believe that the most likely reason for his choice must have been another. The Byzantine capital may well have been chosen by Boris, probably because his relative, the daughter of the Prince Mstislav Vladimirovič, was married (*ca.* 1122) to a certain "царевич" (*tsarevič*) and lived there<sup>(35)</sup>. However, the identification of this *tsarevič* has raised some difficulty to scholars, mainly because the sources are silent<sup>(36)</sup>. It is possible that the two knew each other well, but the sources do not mention any meeting between them.

(34) Kálmán's brother Almoš and his son, Béla (the future Béla II "the Blind"); Béla's son István (IV); István III's younger brother Béla (known as Alexios to the Byzantines). This was a specific mean of the Byzantine government to intervene in the internal affairs of Hungary by supporting and giving refuge in Constantinople to sedition's members of the Árpád dynasty: F. I. USPENSKIJ, *Istorija Vizantijskoj imperii*, vol. III, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, p. 198; J. A. FINE, *op. cit.*, p. 234. The view of K. GROT (*op. cit.*, p. 27) also points in this direction. He has pointed out that the reason for Boris's choice is rather his Hungarian relative Piroška, the wife of John II Komnenos, who in 1118 became empress of Byzantium. The study by F. MAKK, *The Árpád and the Comneni: political relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the twelfth century*, Budapest, 1989, was unfortunately not available to me.

(35) *PSRL*, vol. II, *s. a.* 6630 (1121), p. 9; *PSRL*, vol. VII. *Letopis po Voskresenskomu spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1856, p. 25; *s. a.* 6630 (1121), p. 25. See also ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, p. 652. As has already been noted the Kievan Prince was enjoying good relations with Byzantium and this is also confirmed by the fact that in 1129 the exiled princes of Polotsk were received in Constantinople. M. I. LEVČENKO, *op. cit.*, p. 478; V. T. PAŠUTO, *op. cit.*, p. 167, assumes that Boris arrived in Constantinople along with the exiled princes.

(36) There is disagreement among the scholars about this personality. One view is that he was the emperor's own heir, Alexios. This identification has gained acceptance in the works of HR. LOPAREV, *Brak Mstislavn' (1122)*, in *VV*, 9 (1902), pp. 418-445; S. PAPADIMITRIU, *Brak Mstislav' s Alekseem Komninom*, *VV*, 11 (1904), pp. 75-98; G. OSTROGORSKY, *Autokrator Joannes II and Basileus Alexios*, in *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, 10 (1938), p. 172 f.; K. BARZOS, *Η γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, I, Thessalonike, 1984, pp. 339-348; M. I. LEVČENKO, *op. cit.*, p. 477; V. T. PAŠUTO, *op. cit.*, p. 168 and most recently P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 206. For an opposing view see the study by A. P. KAZHDAN, *Rus' - Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries*, in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12-13 (1988-1989), pp. 414-429, which reexamined these marriages. In our case, according to him (p. 423), we should bear in mind that

Boris was welcomed in the Byzantine court and John II Komnenos's relative was given him in marriage<sup>(37)</sup>. Unfortunately, the sources do not mention who this lady was<sup>(38)</sup>. Such marriages were more often motivated by a need to maintain relatives or rivals of a foreigner potentate in the City<sup>(39)</sup>. They gained the Byzantine financial and diplomatic support for their efforts and were sent back to take power over their homelands. In this way the Emperor was trying to bring them into his sphere of influence. According to the Byzantine manner of thinking, when Byzantium gave the bride away, the act was a favor, which put the other side in a subordinate position<sup>(40)</sup>. In our case, we have an example of how the Em-

"in far-away Kiev, the title [*tsarevič*] could be generously applied to any member of the Komnenian clan" and (p. 425) that "the term *tsarevič* was used by Kievan chroniclers in a vaguer sense than 'the son of an emperor'". Hence, he assumes that the daughter of Mstislav was merely married to a member of the Komnenian clan.

(37) For this marriage, see IOANNIS KINNAMOS, *Epitome rerum ab Ioannes et Manuele Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. MEINEKE, Bonn, 1836, p. 117, 20-21; OTTO BISCHOP OF FREISING, *Chronicon. Historia de duabus civitatibus*, ed. A. SCHMIDT, Berlin, 1960, p. 536, 24. The French chronicler of the Second Crusade ODO DE DEUIL, *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, PL, 185, col. 1214 B, believed her to be a niece of John II; See also VASIL'EVSKIJ, *Boris Kolomanovič*, pp. 82, 87; K. GROT, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 69; FR. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, p. 62; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, pp. 652-653; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 47. MORAVCSIK, *Magyars*, p. 78.

(38) D. I. POLEMIS, *The Doukai. A contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London, 1968, p. 123, n. 2, has tried to identify her as the daughter of Zoe and George Botaneiates and thus he assumed that she belonged to the Doukas family. V. LAURENT, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36, 39, has convincingly argued against Polemis's identification. According to him she must have been Arete Doukaina. On the contrary, A. KAZHDAN, *Princely Marriages*, p. 428, emphasizes that all conclusions of this kind are extremely hypothetical. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I*, p. 55, also assumes that she was an imperial niece.

(39) On that side of the Byzantine diplomacy, see J. SHEPARD, *Byzantine diplomacy, A. D. 800-1204: means and ends*, in *Byzantine diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. J. SHEPARD & S. FRANKLIN, Aldershot, 1992, pp. 60-61; R. MACRIDES, *Dynastic marriages and political kinship*, in *ibid.*, pp. 263-281; N. OIKONOMIDES, *Diplomacy*, in *ODB*, pp. 634-635.

(40) R. MACRIDES, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

peror might well utilize this marriage for his own political goals. Through Boris, Byzantium would interfere again in Hungarian matters. In other words, the Byzantines were presumably happy to have another pretender, if needed, as a threat to hold over the Hungarian king's head.

This marriage bears witness to the "arrival" of the Kalamanos family. It achieved a degree of prominence through its connection with the Doukas family<sup>(41)</sup>. He was, therefore, treated with all due regard and generosity. In Byzantium he became known as Kalamanos. As a pretender, Boris had made several abortive attempts to acquire the Hungarian crown<sup>(42)</sup>. For the sake of brevity, I shall not trouble the reader with their detailed description, which he can make for himself, but I should like only to remind that he was supported by several neighboring states. After his disappearance from the scene between 1135-1146 we can find Boris again in Constantinople, this time along with his young son Kálmán (baptismal name Constantine)<sup>(43)</sup>. Around 1151, encouraged by Manuel I Komnenos, he invaded again Hungary. A little later, however, he was killed in a battle against the Coumans near the Danube River *ca.* 1155/6<sup>(44)</sup>.

(41) V. LAURENT, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 39 ; D. I. POLEMIS, *op. cit.*, p. 123, with references to the sources, assumed that : "through his wife who was presumably a member of the Doukas family he became related to the imperial house". A. KAZHDAN, A. CUTLER, *Doukai*, in *ODB*, pp. 655-656.

(42) All of them are discussed in details by VASIL'EVSKIJ, *Boris Kolomanovič*, pp. 82, 83, 88-89, where the relevant sources are exhaustively reviewed. See also K. GROT, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 78-79, 80, 82-85 ; M. GUMPLOWICZ, *Boris Kolomanowic, królewicz węgierski (1105-1156)*, in *Przegląd historyczny*, 2 (1906), p. 12 ; FR. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, pp. 401, 406-407 ; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, pp. 655-658, 661-662, 665, 668 ; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 70, 74, 80 ; R. KERBAL, *Byzantinische Prinzessinen in Ungarlan zwischen 1050-1200 und ihr Einfluss auf das Arpadenkönnigreich*, Wien, 1979, pp. 58-100 ; F. MAKK, *Contribution à la chronologie des conflits Hungaro-byzantins au milieu du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *Zbor.*, 20 (1981), pp. 30, n. 23, 32, n. 31 ; P. STEPHENSON, *Manuel I Comnenus and Geza II : A revised Context and Chronology for Hungaro-Byzantine Relations, 1148-1155*, in *Bsl*, 55 (1994), pp. 251-277.

(43) VASIL'EVSKIJ, *Boris Kolomanovič*, p. 89 ; K. GROT, *op. cit.*, p. 79 ; FR. CHALANDON, *loc. cit.*, pp. 401, 406-407 ; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, pp. 658, 665 ; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 47 and n. 39.

(44) The account of his death is found in NICETAE CHONIATAE, *Historia*, ed. J. L. VAN DIETEN, Berlin-New York, 1975, p. 93, 72-79 ; OTTONIS ET RAHEWINI, *Gesta*

What is known about the family in the subsequent generation is that the son of Boris, Constantine, entered the army of the emperor, and took part in the war against the Muslims during the reign of Manuel I Komnenos, when he distinguished himself by his bravery. He was raised to the rank of *sebastos* ("venerable") and although still young, held the post of the *dux* of Cilicia (1163-1164; *ca.* 1173) <sup>(45)</sup>. Together with the Franks of Syria, he attacked the Muslims, but he was defeated and taken prisoner at the battle of Harīn in August 1164 by Nūr ad-Dīn Mahmūd, son of Zengi and *atabeg* of Aleppo and Damascus (1146-1174); his ransom was 150 silk garments <sup>(46)</sup>. During his second tenure as *dux* of Cilicia in 1173, he was taken captive by Mleh, the prince of Cilician Armenia (1170-1174/5) <sup>(47)</sup>. In 1166 Constantine presented Manuel I with a golden dish on which his triumphs in Hungary were depicted <sup>(48)</sup>. Circa 1200, a member of the Kalamanos family was mentioned once again in the sources as a lord of the Sampson district <sup>(49)</sup>.

*Frederici I. Imperatoris*, ed. G. WEITZ, Hannover, 1884, *s. a.* 1156, p. 127. See also VASIL'EVSKIJ, *Boris Kolomanovič*, p. 91; K. GROT, *op. cit.*, pp. 182, 184, 203-204; FR. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, p. 413; ROSANOV, *Boris Kolomanovič*, 9, p. 669; A. B. URBANSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

(45) WILLIAM OF TYRE, *Chronikon*, PL, 201, 1, col. 755 calls him "... praeses Ciliciae, domini imperatoris consanguineus et imperialium in illa provincia procurator negotiorum"; CHONIATES, p. 140. 62 σεβαστὸν Κωνσταντίνου τὸν Καλαμάνου; FR. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, pp. 526-527, n. 4; 530; KAZHDAN, *Kalamanos*, *loc. cit.*, p. 1091; MORAVCSIK, *Magyars*, p. 78; VASIL'EVSKIJ, *Boris Kolomanovič*, p. 91; V. LAURENT, *op. cit.*, p. 39; *Prosopographische Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. E. TRAPP, vol. I, 5, Wien, 1981, p. 21, 10221-10223. By this time the title *sebastos* was usually used for more distant relatives of the reigning Emperor or simply honorary members of the imperial family. According to L. STIERNON, *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. Sébaste et gambros*, in *REB*, 23 (1965), p. 229, more than 90 percent of *sebastoi* belonged to the ruling family. See also A. KAZHDAN, *Sebastos*, in *ODB*, p. 1863. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I*, pp. 181-183.

(46) FR. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, p. 525 and n. 2; MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I*, p. 72.

(47) FR. CHALANDON, *op. cit.*, pp. 530, 532.

(48) D. I. POLEMIS, *op. cit.*, pp. 123 and n. 5, 124; MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I*, p. 475. His name is to be found on a Byzantine lead seal; V. LAURENT, *op. cit.*, p. 35, n. 1.

(49) MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, p. 147.

Turning to the family property at the Byzantine capital, in the next place, we can find one further indication also in favour of our assumption. It is known that the family Kalamanos owned a mansion in Constantinople, which was named "the Kalamanos palace" (50). It was a vast complex with mosaic decorated churches, richly inlaid floors and other costly decoration, which originally belonged to the Botaneiates family (51). We do not exactly know what happened to the family mansion after the founder's death. It seems that his son Constantine retained certain rights over it, but in 1192 the palace had passed into the hands of the Genoese with its dependent hours in the Kalybia district (52). We are fortunate in possessing detailed description of the complex in decay when, after the Genoese, it housed German mercenaries (53). There is reason to think, therefore, that the family had either died out or had otherwise lost possession of their palace (54). The latter would not be so strange if we

(50) P. MAGDALINO, *The Byzantine Aristocratic oikos*, in *The Byzantine aristocracy*, ed. M. ANGOLD, Oxford, 1984 (= *BAR International Series*, 221), pp. 91-111, on the aristocratic οἶκος in its various senses; A. J. CAPPEL, *Oikos*, in *ODB*, vol. III, p. 1517; MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I*, pp. 114-115, 119, 169, 186-187, 305; P. MAGDALINO, *Constantinople médiévale. Etudes sur l'évolution des structures urbaines*, Paris 1996, pp. 10, 78-79, 82 (= *Travaux et Mémoires. Monographies*, 9).

(51) M. ANGOLD, *Inventory of the so-called Palace of Botaneiates*, in *idem*, *Byzantine aristocracy*, Appendix, p. 265; D. I. POLEMIS, *op. cit.*, p. 123, n. 2 states that: "the name of Botaneiates might have been that of one his (Constantine) maternal ancestors".

(52) See the chrysobull of Isaac II Angelos dated April 1192 in *MM*, vol. III, p. 28, which calls it οἶκον τοῦ Καλαμάνου ἤτοι τοῦ Βοτανειάτου; as well as R. JANIN, *Constantinople Byzantine: Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1964, pp. 250, 326, 363 (hereafter, cited as JANIN, *CP byz.*); M. BALARD, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. II, Genoa, 1978, pp. 883-885; CH. BRAND, *Byzantium confronts the West, 1180-1204*, Cambridge Mass., 1968, pp. 210, 214, 218; MAGDALINO, *Aristocratic oikos*, p. 95; MAGDALINO, *Constantinople médiévale*, p. 84; K. CIGGAAR, *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962 - 1204: Cultural and Political Relations*, Leiden, 1996, p. 273, n. 55.

(53) The original Greek text was published by *MM*, pp. 55-57; The text is also translated into English: M. ANGOLD, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-262. See also K. CIGGAAR, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

(54) M. ANGOLD, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

remember Andronikos I's savage attack upon aristocracy. It may have functioned as the administrative center of the Guerio family in Constantinople<sup>(55)</sup>. But where exactly was the family's mansion of Kalamanos within Constantinople? Was it, as the traditional view maintain<sup>(56)</sup>, on the slope of the Second Hill, which descends towards the Golden Horn and close to Neorion, or on the other site<sup>(57)</sup>? Unfortunately, the existing indications are absolutely unclear and insufficient to determine its exact location within the capital. Yet it may be said that the traditional location at the old Ottoman ministry of police are not very convincing. In any case, if we adopt this location the palace would be not so far away from the church of St. Plato (a distance of ca. 500 m). The site of this palace is of great significance for us, because if I am not mistaken, it was not far away from the church of St. Plato.

Let us now turn our attention to another piece of evidence. Before speaking of the church of St. Plato, Antony mentions the portico of St. George where he saw the body of the Russian priest Leontios: "А оттоль на уболъ святаго Георгия святы Леонтий, попъ русин, лежить в тѣлѣ: великъ человекъ; той бо Леонтии 3-жъ во Ерусалимъ пѣшь ходилъ" (From there, the body of the Priest Leontios, the great man, reposes in the Embolos of St. George; this same Leontios went on foot to Jerusalem for three times)<sup>(58)</sup>. The term "уболъ" (ubol)

(55) M. BALARD, *loc. cit.*, p. 284; K. CIGGAAR, *loc. cit.*, p. 273.

(56) This palace is usually identified with the site of the old Ottoman ministry of police, where a number of substructures, including a massive cistern, were discovered: JANIN, *CP byz'*, pp. 251, 326; as well as W. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls*, Tübingen, 1977, p. 41. On Müller-Wiener's Plan it stood in Acimusluk Sokağ.

(57) See A. BERGER, *Zur Topographie der Ufergegend am Goldenen Horn in der byzantinischen Zeit*, in *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 45 (1995), p. 160, which leaves the question concerning its location open and put the caption twice on the sketch (Abb. 2 Das Ufer des Goldenen Horns von Perama nach Osten), both times with a question mark.

(58) 'Kniga Palomnik', pp. 29-30; 88. The question to which individual the name Leontios belonged is the most difficult one. Antony does not give any further details about him, except that he had made three visits to Jerusalem. Even in our present state of knowledge, no answer which will commend itself as perfectly satisfactory can be given to the question. Consequently, we can do no more than briefly list the opinions which prevailed long ago before us. One thing is certain: there is disagreement among the scholars about this enigmatic person-



is here being used in the meaning of a "portico" (59). Perhaps, it is a scribal error whereby the Greek term was misunderstood. The portico of St. George does not seem to be mentioned in other literary sources (as far as I know) (60). There must presumably have been a church dedicated to St. George, after which the portico was named (61). However, neither the builder, nor the date of the construction, nor the exact location is known. Apparently, the church was situated in a very short distance from that portico or even directly in it. If we want to understand the passage just quoted, we must pay attention for a moment to the "Inventory of the palace of Kalamanos/Botaneiates". Here we have a precious evidence that a public highway was situated near the Kalamanos palace (62). We are not wrong if we assume that such a highway corresponds exactly to the portico leading from the Forum of Constantine (or, rather a little bit west of it) to the shores of the Golden Horn (63). If we take into consideration this fact, we can assume that when Antony speaks of the portico of St. George as he does here, he means essentially the portico, which joined the Forum of Constantine to the Golden Horn. Thus his information here

ality. Hr. LOPAREV ('*Kniga Palomnik*', pp. CXVI-CXVII) and D. V. AJNALOV (in his review of J. P. RICHTER, *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttechnik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Wien, 1897, in *VV*, 5 [1898], p. 271) has suggested that he was a Greek man, while A. I. JACIMIRSKIJ (*Novie dannye o hoždenie archiepiskopa Antonija v Tsar'grad*, in *Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovestnosti*, 4 [1899], p. 245) has tried to identify him as a Moldavian from Radauz. According to A. N. PYPIN (*Istorij russkoj literatur*', vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1899, p. 408), however, Leontios may rather have been one of the unknown Russian pilgrims. This view is supported by M. N. TIKHOMIROV (*Istoričeskie svjazi russkogo naroda s južnymi slavjanami s drevnejšich vremen do polovin' XVII v.*, in *Slavjanskij sbornik* [1947], p. 163). One would assume that the body of Leontios was sheltered in a church dedicated to his memory or in St. George's church. The exact position of the former cannot be determined. What is significant here, is that Leontios, too, had demonstrable connection with Russia.

(59) On the meaning of the term, see I. I. SREZNEVSKU, *Material' dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka po pismen'm pamjatnikam*, vol. III, St. Petersburg, 1903, col. 20, 827 and 1116.

(60) On the portico see JANIN, *CP byz'*, p. 92.

(61) JANIN, *Églises* and JANIN, *CP byz'* omits to mention this church.

(62) *MM*, p. 57 : ...τήν δημοσίαν ὁδὸν εἰσόδου ἐννέα ....

(63) M. ANGOLD, *loc. cit.*, p. 265 ; JANIN, *CP byz'*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 91-92.

seems acceptable and now regarding the name of that portico there is no doubt. This is a plausible suggestion but, of course, further evidence is needed to prove it. That is, however, only part of the picture. Following the Russian trace, we find in Antony's account another evidence about them in this area. I have in mind Antony's statement that: "Конец же Русскаго убола церковь святыхъ 40 мученикъ, и мощи ихъ ту лежать (а инья мощи въ Севастии) ..." (The church of the Holy Forty Martyrs is at the end of the Russian Embolos) <sup>(64)</sup>. He describes its location as one go from north (Perama) to south (Mesê) through the valley of the Grand Bazaar. Yet he categorically says that the church of the Holy Forty Martyrs lay at the end of the portico <sup>(65)</sup>. The accuracy of information given by Antony about that church has been confirmed many times so far. From the order in which the churches visited by Antony of Novgorod are mentioned, it seems that we are dealing with the Great Porticoed Street of Maurianos <sup>(66)</sup>. The name he bestowed on the portico

(64) 'Kniga Palomnik', p. 88. On the church and its history, see JANIN, *Églises*, p. 499, and JANIN, *CP byz'*, pp. 168, 415, 427. However, he incorrectly speaks about the existence of three different churches dedicated to the Holy Forty Martyrs: n° 3, 5 and 6 respectively. This error originated from confusion of Σοφιαναῖς with τὰ Σοφίαις and incorrect location of the Tetracylon: BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 320, n. 63, 436-437 (on τὰ Σοφίαις, Σοφιαναῖς) and 318-321 (on the church); A. BERGER, *Das Chalkun Tetracylon und Parastaseis, Kapitel 57*, in *BZ*, 90 (1997), pp. 8-11 (my immediate thanks go to Dr A. Berger who was kind to send me his article); C. MANGO, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV-VII siècles)*<sup>2</sup> (*Travaux et Mémoires, Monographies*, 2), Paris, 1990, p. 31, n. 52, pointed out that Janin's churches n° 3 and n° 6 are identical (hereafter MANGO, *Le développement*).

(65) In favor of such an assumption we can quote the statement of the chronicler Theophanes (d. 818), who says that in 394/5 the Emperor Arkadios built the big portico (*Megas embolos*) opposite the Praetorium: THEOPHANES, *Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig, 1883-1885, I, p. 74, 23-24. For the Praetorium of the Praetorian Prefect, see C. MANGO, *Studies on Constantinople, Variorum Collected Studies*, Aldershot, 1993, Addenda, pp. 1-2; MANGO, *Le développement*, p. 71; JANIN, *CP byz'*, p. 415; A. BERGER, *Chalkun Tetracylon*, p. 10. It is an undeniable fact that the Praetorium was shortly afterwards replaced by the church of the Holy Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia.

(66) At various periods of the history of Constantinople, the same portico had different names: μακρὸς ἔμβολος, ἔμβολος τοῦ Δομνίνου, μακρὸς ἔμβολος τοῦ Μαυριανοῦ. For this see BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 321, 444, 738;

was the *Russian Embolos*. Moreover, the testimony of Antony of Novgorod constitutes a solid basis for supposing that the Russian holdings in Constantinople were concentrated in, but not limited to, the Russian quarter, known as the Russian Embolos, or Narrow Street of the Russians<sup>(67)</sup>. It was in the Embolos that Russian businessmen resided and conducted their business. That seems to mean that the Russians occupied the best commercial real estate of the city along the Great Porticoed Street of Maurianos<sup>(68)</sup>. I should like to make one consideration concerning the portico in question: it was not continued in the direction of Propontida<sup>(69)</sup>. This view again owes much to Antony of Novgorod.

Normally, porticoes were long, two storey-covered-structures with statues and monuments on the upper level and merchant's shops beneath. The porticoes in Constantinople have been rented out by the Byzantine Emperors to tradesmen and the rents provided regular income to the Crown that owned the land and the buildings. Moreover, the word ἔμβολος soon acquired a wider meaning and came to be applied to the whole quarter. Therefore, when Antony speaks of the Russian Embolos, he had in mind not merely a street where the Russian merchants regular-

MANGO, *Le développement*, pp. 31, 62. The consensus of scholarly opinion identifies it with the presentday Usunçarşıcaresi (the Long Market), which still follows the original line of the artery linking the Mese and the Golden Horn: Dr A. D. Mordtmann was the first to prove this: IDEM, *Esquisse topographique de Constantinople*, in *Revue de l'Art chrétien*, ser. 4, 2, 1 (1891), p. 27: "Appelée aujourd'hui Ouzon Tcharchi (le Marché long), cette rue portait à l'époque byzantine le nom de μακρὸν ἔμβολον, ce qui signifie la même chose que devait la dénomination turque"; JANIN, *CP byz.*, pp. 344-345, himself quotes Mordtmann.

(67) We should bear in mind that by this time the Russian colony in Galata continued also to be a center of Russian interests in the city: '*Kniga Palomnik*', pp. CXXI-CXXII; M. TIKHOMIROV, *Puti iz Rossii v Vizantii v XIV-XV vv.*, in *Vizantijskie očerki*, 1 (1961), p. 30.

(68) JANIN, *CP byz.*, p. 92; MANGO, *Le développement*, p. 62; BERGER, *Untersuchungen*, p. 443; W. MÜLLER-WIENER, *Die Häfen von Byzantion, Konstantinopolis, Istanbul*, Tübingen, 1994, p. 16.

(69) I have been able to establish this fact during my stay at Istanbul in 1999. In a private letter Dr A. Berger has suggested to me that there was no street leading south from the Tetrasyon, because the hill is simply too steep and that only a flight of steps (βάθρα) is mentioned there by the sources.

ly sold their goods, but the whole quarter where they lived <sup>(70)</sup>. Hence, if you asked anyone about the Russians in Constantinople, you would be told that they were on the Russian Embolos <sup>(71)</sup>. The reader will by now be aware of how well-informed was Antony of Novgorod. But, what is most important for us here, is that once again we find the Russians in the immediate proximity of the church of St. Plato.

Moreover, the statements of Antony does not conflict with what others affirm regarding this part of the city. Since such an assumption can be deduced from Antony's evidence and since it seems to solve old problems rather than to create new ones, we may be permitted to return to the questions raised at the start of our inquiry. If it is so, Antony's remark concerning the church of St. Plato gives strong implications about Boris Kalamanovič.

When all these findings are combined with what is known about Boris, then a simpler and more probable explanation of our first question would be that the founder of the Kalamanos family was buried in the church of St. Plato. Such an assumption could explain Antony's statement that he saw the body of Boris there. Certainly one can not give an absolutely positive answer to this question, but neither can the possibility be excluded.

It remains to solve the question why Antony felt obliged to add a reference to Boris? Perhaps, no answer, which will commend itself as perfectly satisfactory, can be given to the question. The answer, indeed, is not so surprisingly difficult as it might seem when we remember the author's exceptional interest in everything connected with Russia in the Byzantine capital. Evidently, this connection is at the root of Antony's enigmatic statement about Boris. All our knowledge of Boris indicates that the link between him and Russia was, as we have seen, unquestionable. We shall not be too far from the truth in supposing that according to Antony, due to the kinship with the House of Monomach, Boris must have been identified as a Russian and he cannot be identified as any other. At the same time, Antony was in regular contact with the Russian com-

(70) If we accepted the affirmation of TIKHOMIROV, *Drevnerusskie goroda*, p. 126, one would assume that the church dedicated to St. George (or St. Leontios) was under the jurisdiction of the Russians. This church, belonging to the Russian community, could assist compatriots who needed help.

(71) In this article, I do not touch upon that Embolos in details, but I hope to analyze it on another occasion.

munity at Constantinople. Therefore, he was better informed concerning the Russians than any one else at the time. We should not be surprised, then, that he mentions the founder of the Kalamanos family by name. Antony's own guide introduced him to the church of St. Plato where the body of Boris was kept. He was so impressed by the fact that he was in front of the tomb of Vladimir Monomach's grandson that he found it was worth mentioning it. We can only regret, that Antony's notice contains no details, and I suppose it probably is because Boris was well enough known to the Russians.

Now we may be permitted to wonder how Antony got acquainted with the information concerning Boris : through his own eyes or by hearsay. Rather, someone who knew well the story of the Kalamanos family told him the name of its founder Boris. He does not usually say who his informants were, but I believe that they should be sought mainly among the native inhabitants or the Russians of the City. It is true that Antony refers on a number of occasions to local guides. In other words, he too may have taken his own guide with him, or have made use of the resident Russians. However, I do not wish to rule out the possibility that he recorded what he had seen himself. Both answers to the question before us have much in their favour, and possibly the truth on the subject is to be found in their combination.

What can be said in conclusion ? To me it is obvious. As the author of *Kniga Palomnik* spent some time in the Byzantine capital, and was not merely a transitory visitor, his testimony concerning the person in question can be regarded as reliable. Moreover, the accuracy of Antony can be maintained only by the identification of "Боринъ" with Boris Kalamanovič. By this identification, a flood of light is shed upon this person. And so, though not absolutely certain, it is extremely likely that the famous pretender to the Hungarian crown was buried at the church of St. Plato after his death in 1154 <sup>(72)</sup>.

Thomas THOMOV.  
Compl. Ghevgelijsky  
8, Sava Mikhailov Str.  
Enter. D, Apt. 79  
Sofia 1309, Bulgaria

(72) According to Hr. LOPAREV, '*Kniga Palomnik*', p. 211, a bit of the Boris relics is reported to be at the Russian monastery of St. Panteleimon on Mount Athos.