

**MAIN STAGES OF THE HISTORY DOROS-THEODORO (MANGUP)  
IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH EXPEDITION  
TAURIDA VERNADSKY NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

**Gertsen A. G.**

*Taurida National V. I. Vernadsky University, Simferopol, Ukraine*

The article outlines the main stages of the life of the largest settlements of the group of the «cave cities» of Crimea, Mangup, which reconstructed on the basis of known written sources and materials of excavations of the last decades of the archaeological expedition of TNU. Identify the steps of evolution of the evolution of settlement from the IV to the XVIII centuries; It has passed a way from the early Byzantine fortress, which was located on the territory of the allies of the Empire, Goths and Alans, to the provincial Byzantine city, the capital of Feodoro principality. It was captured by the Ottomans in 1475 after a half-year siege and three hundred years was a Turkish fortress, the administrative centre of kadylyk.

**Key words:** Byzantine Empire, Crimea, «Cave cities», Mangup, Feodoro.

The article reflects the main results of the archaeological research of the medieval fortress Mangup. These excavations were conducted during the last thirty years of the expedition of the Taurida National V. I. Vernadsky University (TNU). Mangup is one of the largest monuments of the group of the so-called «cave towns». Materials of excavations significantly complement the scanty news written sources. Strategy of archaeological research was built on sounding of various elements of the complex in order to obtain the most complete picture of his topography, stratigraphy and chronology. In tactically we priority completion of investigation, excavations, which have started our predecessors in the XIX century, as well as examination of monuments, most exposed to the danger of destruction or looting (cemeteries). Based on these studies, certain specified milestones in the evolution of the settlement. In General, this process can be characterise as the formation of early Byzantine fortress, which created in the territory of settlement Goths and Alans, allies of the Empire in the Southwestern Taurica, in the provincial Byzantine city, the residence of the rulers of the Theodoro principality.

The process of formation of towns at the periphery of Byzantine world was determined by several factors, but the major one was the extent and duration of the external military threat. This reason was the most important for Byzantine possessions in Taurica. Gothic campaigns of the third century, Huns invasion in seventies of fourth century, return of part of Huns to Kerch peninsula in the second half of fifth century, neighboring of Turkic kaganat from the second half of the sixth century, and of Khazar kaganat from the second half of the seventh century, the threat of invasion from Magyars – the second half of ninth century, from pechenegs – the end of ninth – middle of eleventh century, from comans – eleventh – beginning of thirteen centuries, shattering invasion of Mongols in 1223, second arrival of Tatars in 1236, the bloody intestine wars in Golden Horde, which were the reason of military raids of the opposing groups of Tatars nobility to the lands of

the enemies [1]. The most devastating for the settled agricultural population at the coastal and mountainous areas were the campaigns of emirs Nogai in 1299 and Tamerlan (end of fourteenth centuries). The existence «of the last piece of Byzantium at the Black Sea», as Alexander Vasiliev called the Crimea, was put to an end by Turkish invasion in 1475.

This is not the full list of the events dangerous for the «extreme North» of the Byzantine reveals that the military threat was present at different during one and a half thousand years. It was the stimulating reason for creation of new and support for old fortresses.

The special attention the Empire paid to Kherson, the main Byzantine base in South-western Taurica [2]. In the sources the measures on strengthening of a defence of city are mentioned [3]. Kherson during all medieval period of the life was the present city keeping an antique design and even some institutes of Antique City State of the device. And though the urban life step-by-step died away, however down to its full termination in the end XIV century, its tracks are quite distinctive by archaeological methods [4].

But what was happening at the outskirts of this city? The military events of third-fourth centuries clearly revealed that the enemy must not be allowed to approach the city walls. This experience was gained during «Diophant Wars» in the last decade of second century B.C. But we don't see features of external defensive system till sixth century [5], however we can't exclude its existence or at least appearance since allied relationships appear between Kherson and barbarian population of the closest periphery. Until the mentioned date there were no fortresses in mountainous area of Taurica. I remind that in second half of third century Goths destroyed the last later-Scythian settlements, which survived Sarmathian raid at the edge of first and second centuries [6].

The opinion that the peak of fortress construction on Taurica falls on the reign of Justinian I («the first») began to form in the beginning of nineteenth century (Duybua de Monpere) and was developed later on by V. Vasiliev, A. Vasiliev, V. Jacobsonom. These authors used written sources as well as architectural and archaeological monuments, among them the special attention was paid to so-called «cave towns» [7]. The feature of these settlements, exotic for the first glance, is presence of artificial cave constructions of different purpose: household, defensive, civil engineering, habitable, cult. These impressive ensembles were interpreted as towns and fortresses, built by Byzantines for protection of territory identified as «Dori country», mentioned by Procopius of Ceasarea [8]. Critics of this hypothesis (E. Veymarn, O. Dombrovskiy, D. Talis) pointed out at variety of these settlements, marking out the real towns, castles, monasteries, unfortified rural settlement [9]. Their probable non-synchronism to each other was also mentioned. To determine the types of the «cave towns» the authors applied the model of feudal relationship genesis, invented by Soviet historians for Kievan Russia. The largest settlements, such as Mangup, Eski-Kermen, Chufut Kale was similar to trade and craft city centres, which appeared at the cross of trade routes. The smaller settlements as Bacla, Tepe-Kermen, Syurenskaya fortress, Kalamita were defined as feudal castles, and settlements without defensive system – as villages and monasteries.

Out long-term study at Mangup and Chifit-Kale revealed that both approaches to the problem could not provide the full solution. We found that during the whole existence these settlements several times changed their type and status [10]. An example of Mangup is very indicative.

Some words about a topographical situation. Mangoup – limestone insulated plateau, its max height above sea level about 600 m. From three parties it is limited to vertical steeps reaching on the western party an altitude 70 m.. Northern decline is cut by three steep gorges dividing capes, doing in the plan Mangoup similar on a paintbrush of an arm with four fingers. In upper reaches of canyons there are powerful sources of water. The general area of a plateau is about 1 square kilometre [11].

According to the Evliya Cheleby, Turkish traveller XVII century, the plateau was generated by the Lord to be a fortress, and not only due to its natural inaccessibility, but also because of availability of natural sources of water [12].

The earliest artefacts found at the plateau are dated back to Eneolit Epoch - early Bronze, however, the significant inflow of people takes place from second half of third century, that coincides with appearance at the peninsula of Germanic tribes and, probably, of their allies – Alanic tribes. Probably since that time unprotected settlement begins to appear, up to now no remnants of fortifications of that period were detected. The artefacts of that period represented by Late Antique ceramics (amphora's, red-lacquered vessels). Bronze Late Roman coins are also found. These materials are usually located at the layers of later periods. At the time of the colonisation of the plateau the major part of its cliff surface was not covered by soil. Only after development of the settlement the cultural layer began to deposit at the inhabited areas. I should mention that even in the period of prosperity the inhabited territory didn't exceed one third of its total area. The free area was intended to shelter the neighbouring population with property and cattle in case of military threat.

After allied relationships were established among newcomers and Byzantium, the territory known as «Dori country» was formed. Fifteen years ago expedition of V. Sidorenko revealed the remnants of strong defensive wall, which crossed the valley, in which Mangup plateau is located [13]. Probably it was one of sections of the system, called «the long walls» by Prokopius. It protected one of the main mountain passes leading to Kherson, the distance to which is 20 kilometres from this place.

It became clear during the last ten years of Justinian I reign that «long walls» – is insufficient defence from invasion from steppes, where power of Turcic Kaganat strengthened. Then in back of these barriers the erection of strong fortresses began, which one could except for constant garrisons could receive under the protection of a fair amount of the outskirts population with his main property – livestock.

From the end of fourth century cemeteries begin to appear at the plateau, mostly consisted of burial vaults of northern Caucasus type, also usual graves are present here. Such three necropolises are open on southern peripherals. Largest, takes bottom of a gully Al-malyk-dere (Apple-gully), its proven area, probably, reaches 6 hectare. The unique road started with this party, on which one the wheel transport could mount. Earliest here are detected funeral complexes of the end IV–V century. It is deep crypts. In their chambers conduct lengthy dromoses, one of them have thirteen footsteps.

Unfortunately cemeteries several times starting from ninth century were raided and the last and largest raid which last up to now started in ninetieth of last century. Nevertheless even the remaining materials allow tracking the gradual penetration of Christian culture to Gothic-Alanic environment. At the time when ceremony was pagan, Christian

symbols such as wall drawings of typical early Byzantine crosses appear. The earliest artefacts of Christianity expansion were found in one of the vaults of fifth century - Bronze body cross and gemma on Cornelia, embedding from fingering with a figure of cherub with wings behind the back and fire-sword in his hand. Similar object, which originates from Syria-Palestine area, is stored in National Library in Paris [14].

The most studied vaults at the three excavated cemeteries at the southern periphery contained artefacts of sixth - first half of eighth century. The most artefacts are golden triangle pendants. Besides eagle-headed buckles, zoomorphing Scandinavian fibulas, golden earrings and other items. Pair of round cast fibula, covered by thin layer of sheet gold with Cornelia embedding. Stone mould for similar paired fibula was found at Northern Danube in Romania and dated back to fifth-seventh century. In our case these items found together with glasses with blue drops, dated back to the end of fourth-first half of fifth century [15]. Found deformed skulls are connected with this early material. They are not found in graves of sixth century. I'd like to mention also stamped golden plaques with human face. Part of artefacts from robbed vaults was found at the surface of the plateau in the ruins of tenth-eleventh century (Teshkly-burun treasure) [16].

Architecture of the vaults is featured with variety of decoration. In three cases imitation of surface temple was found. The most significant is the vault, where the wall opposing the entrance looks like an apse with three deep arched niches. There are lines imitating arched structure at the surface of the conch and at the ceiling. Probably in this case the interior of the vault reflects the view of real surface temple.

Last years several new cemeteries were found at the territory between Mangup and Inkerman. Probably they mark the core of the area of Dori country, with populated allies of Byzantium. Namely here was the most intensive religious transformation of Barbarian neighbourhood of Byzantine Kherson. Its final result was the medieval ethnic and cultural state of population in Taurica.

All the mentioned cemeteries stop functioning no later than the end of eighth century. They are synchronous to the second phase of the settlement life, which may be defined as early Byzantine.

The construction of fortifications at Mangup plateau started, probably, in the last decade of Justinian I reign (fiftieth-sixtieth of sixth century). At that time immense fortress ensemble was built, taking into account and using all factor of natural protection of the flat plateau. There was no larger and stronger fortress in medieval Crimea.

The defensive system of Mangup-Doros is not typical for the medieval town. This is the huge fortress-shelter, which had garrison and had space for additional troops and could shelter the population from neighbouring valleys with cattle and property. The total area of the fortress is ninety hectares. It included the flat surface of the mountain and the upper course of the valleys that cut the plateau from the north. The main efforts of the builders were required at construction of walls crossing gorge between capes.

Western, southern and south-eastern edge of the plateau are cliffs with the height up to 70 meters. There are separate narrow abrupt rifts and, places, rather vast segments sloping, more precisely, stepped decline. It is in case of the former in the gorge the short one - curtain walls connected rocky side rift were carried up, in second it was necessary to construct a wall, which one as though connected on a upper edge of a plateau segments of an

abrupt decline. Thus, fortifications filled gaps in a rocky massif, which set up by the nature. Such fortifications became the major defensive line MDL, which provided defence for the maximum possible area of plateau. There were almost no walls higher than the edge of the plateau and no closed fortification boundary. System contained separate, discrete sections, the main task of such wall sections was to supplement natural borders of the plateau and to create continuous defensive contour with total length about 7 kilometres.

This line existed without any considerable changes up to the beginning of sixteenth century. Only some repairs of separate sections were made, – those, destroyed in battles or by natural forces. The major reconstruction was made twenty-five years after Mangup was captured by Turks-Osmans.

Except of MDL in a fortress ensemble there are two important and well noticeable complexes: the second defence line (SDL) and citadel. However these last two defensive complexes have appeared not earlier XIV century. They already mirror process of becoming and development of city in other historical epoch.

There was one of the biggest in Taurica basilica constructed at the centre of the plateau, its size corresponded to the size of the fortress. Basilica had three naves and two lateral galleries. Central nave separated from lateral series Corinthian columns, with caps of prokoness marble. Floors of the temple were covered with colourful mosaic, walls were covered with frescos. During its excavation in 1912, there was inscription fragment on limestone slab found with the name of Justinian I [17]. That means, that the fortress had not only military purpose, but also became an important ideological centre – the starting point of Christianisation of local population. However, as it was mentioned earlier, this process was not fast and mainly was finished by the edge of firstly and seconds millennium AD.

By the end of Justinian's reign, Byzantium had no possibility to maintain fortresses at the remote frontiers, such responsibility was transferred to local authorities. The situation became worth in the second half of seventh century. However according to archaeological sources and to scarce written sources, relationship of south-western Taurica with Byzantium was not terminated due to proximity of Kherson and due to preservation of nomads' threat. The seal found last year is evidence to this fact. The inscription says that Emperor's Logophet, Patrikiy Dorothey, owned the seal. The type and the features of the font suggest the date of the second half of sixth-seventh century. The high rank of the owner undoubtedly suggests that he be from noble Byzantium society.

Unfortunately the short title of the owner's position makes difficult to study the seal and to search data on the person. The first fair question arises: which one from numerous Logophets owned the seal: Logophet of Genikon, Logophet of drama, Logophet of troops or some other?

The study of sources on structure of early Byzantine administration suggests that the owner of the seal was Senior Logophet. Besides that makes possible to narrow the time frame of usage of the artefact.

Noteworthy, that the person of patrikiy Dorothey is known in Byzantium history. The person with the same name is mentioned in written sources during the reign of Constant II (641–668). He was a witness at the Pope Martin's trial in 654 being in position of Stratig of Sicily Thema. R.Guilland considers the seal with name of Dorothey, published by

V. Laurent, to be owned to that person. Our artefact probably connected to the previous period of his career. It ascertains the fact of relationship between local authorities with Byzantine administration connected with export and import and taxation in the first half of seventh century [18].

Since the second half of seventh century, Khazars appear at the Crimean peninsula, they gradually advance from Bospor to the western part. In the beginning VIII century their effect becomes already appreciable close Kherson, in the city as appears from the story about events bound with punitive measures against cities implemented Justinian II, there was a representative of khasar authority, «tudun» [19]. The Byzantine-khasars political-military alliance induced common for the parties by Arabian hazard, did not allow empire to undertake as – or fissile operations on protection of territories traditionally considered as of its possession.

Crisis broke out by the end of eighth century, when Khazars captured Doros-Mangup and that caused rebellion of Christian population of Gothia. The leaders of rebellion were local icon-respecting party, which was in opposition to official iconoclasm position of authorities, dominating in Kherson and probably at the most territory with Byzantium influence. In such conditions anti-Khazar reconquest was condemned to fail, because there were no hope to get Byzantine support to the rebellion with anti-government mottoes. Not incidentally lesion of revolt main and as a matter of fact unique source communicating about it: Hagiography Jhons Gothes, explains, that the chiefs were betrayed one of village, and on more precise explanation of this piece of the text, were given to khazars « by the his people» [20].

Archaeological situation detected at Mangup allows to connect its specific features to events of anti-khazar rebellion under leadership of bishop Ioann the Goth, the cause of which was the capture of the main fortress of Crimean Gothia by Khazars. Its second capture probably was accompanied by destruction of part of constructions of Major defensive line. Soon after these events these constructions were repaired, because Khazars required this fortress as an outpost at the frontier bordering with Byzantium. The evidences of the repair are several sections of fortification system, reconstructed using methods, typical for Khazars (saltovian) fortification (masonry is laid directly on the ground, blocks are marked with trident (Tamga)). It should be remarked that presence of Khasars in the fortress did not last long and stops, probably, after establishing of Thema of Klimate. Excavations revealed scarcity of Saltovomayatsk culture on the plateau [21].

In stratigraphy during the «khazars» time typical early-Byzantium material complex is replaced with Black Sea area typical materials of ninth-tenth centuries. (jugs with high neck and flat handle, egg-bodied amphoras, household white-clay Glazed wares). It is unlikely to be the fast replacement of population. It is mainly the indication of changes in household, when export started to play important role, first of all – wine. Before ninth century wine was imported to the fortresses of south-western Taurica by the traditional since antiquity Black sea trade routes. But later on, the wine was produced locally, the evidence is appearance of several large winepresses and pottery facilities for mass production of amphora's (at present nine winepresses are discovered at Mangup). Possibly, normalisation of political relationship between Byzantium and Khazaria in the second half of ninth-beginning of tenth century and also openness and safety for Trade of steppe areas of

Northern Caucasus and Don areas, stimulated burst of vineyard growing and winery at the interior areas of Taurica, where such activity was not spread in antiquity.

About the edge of tenth and eleventh century, life in the fortress declined, the reasons are not clear up to now, but chronologically it is connected with the decline of Khazars khaganat. The long pause starts, which continues at least to the beginning of the fifteenth century, when Mangup became a capital of Feodoro principality. At the sites of some desolated wineries Christian churches appear. Maybe the reason of decline was catastrophic earthquake.

In the middle of eleventh century in the steppes between Crimea and Russia, Polovtsian came. Almost entire Crimean peninsula, including southern coast, was taken under authority of Polovtsian Khans. Before the restoration of Byzantium Empire in 1261, Crimean territories of Byzantium were taken by Trapezund Empire, which collected taxes from Gothia. The situation became worth when in 1223 Tatar-mongols invaded. By the middle of thirteenth century Crimean Ulus of Golder Ord already existed, its representative headquarters were situated in new city Krym or Solkhat (at present Stariy Krym) [22]. In sixtieth Genoese appear at the coastal areas, later – their main competitors – Venetians, settled in Sudak. On ruins of antique Feodosiya the capital of the Genoa colonies has grown Kafa. Soon she has turned into one of the largest cities of the Black Sea region, major unit of trade between East and West. These functions she has intercepted from extinction Kherson, former main bulwark of the Greek medieval culture on a peninsula.

By that time, population inhabiting peripheries of Kherson, descendants of invaders, of Goths and Alans, who dissolved other ethnic groups in their environment, due to cultural and political influence of Byzantium, became the integral part of medieval Greek Christian world. So, it was not occasion that namely at the south-western part of peninsula conditions for establishing special ethnic and political organism were created. It was Feodoro principality, which was a bright spot in history of Crimea. It appeared at the border between great Mediterranean Greek and Roman civilisation, represented by Byzantium and original, also great, world of Nomads of Eurasian steppes, who started several times but never finishing the process of settling, which was called way from «nomads to cities». However, culture and ethnic composition of principality population was determined by late-Byzantium factor. It was indicated not only by dominating Greek language and Orthodoxy, but also by the location of the capital, which inherited the Justinian's fortress, within the borders of which a large city was situated, having considerable areas of extra space. Although defensive walls at that time were already seven centuries old there were no better option for their location and structure, only repairs and construction of second defensive line was required, which mainly had organisational purpose to limit the city development. Also citadel was constructed at the utmost north-eastern cape, nature prepared it to be the best place for Kremlin.

There is almost no data about the situation and date of principality appearance. This is the issue of both scientific hypotheses and free fantasies with historical background. Approach to this problem takes into account scarce and indefinite information from written sources as well as general background. Political consolidation of Orthodoxy population was caused by several reasons. During reign of khan Uzbek in Golden Ord the Official Religion was Islam (1313/14) and intensive Islamisation of this population starts. In

the middle of XIV century Genoese captured from Greek Southern Coastal Area from Alushta to Chembalo (at present Balacava). In fact, Orthodoxy population had only territories between Khersones and upper flow of river Alma, where so called «cave towns» are situated, archaeological data indicates that there was the biggest concentration of settled agricultural population during the entire medieval epoch. Unstable political situations were also a consolidating factor. By seventieth of the thirteenth century there are signs of instability in Golden Ord and by the beginning of the next century trends to separation, first of all in the west, became clear.

In Crimea, due to separated geographical situation and its role of transit point of «*inter-civilisation*» trade, all these trends were visible very clear. In the end of thirteenth century the peninsula experienced internal Ord separating conflicts, when raid of Ord of Emir Nogai devastated the most important cities. Probably this event stimulated consolidation of Christian Greek-speaking population under the authority of some Byzantium-provincial aristocratic family, maybe having Trapezund roots [23]. The evidence, that namely Mangup became the uniting centre for Medieval Greek population, is the inscription on the stone, found during the excavation of Grand Basilica in the beginning of last century. It directly says about restoration in 1362 of Feodoro and about construction of some Poyka, probably, meaning citadel of the city. This is the first time the future name of principality and its capital Feodoro was mentioned. More seldom and in different version name «Mangup» is used. This name became widely spread only after Turks captured the fortress in 1475.

In the middle of ninetieth of XIV century Crimea was involved into big inter-conflict of Tohtamysh and Timur. South-western part of peninsula was devastated, similar to devastation a century ago by Nogai. Now the main strike was aimed at the capital of Feodoro principality, which was ruined. The picture of awful destruction of city brightly also is expressively described in a poem of the celibate priest of Matthew [24].

In the beginning of XV century it was revived, the principality enters the last period of its existence and of the highest bloom and being renowned. Its east frontiers stretched to Alushta, only coast was possessed by hostile Genoese [25]. River Belbeck in the north was frontier with dominions of Golden Ord, and since fortieth with the separated from Golden Ord Crimean Khanat. Feodoro has allied relationships with the latter. Total population of the principality reached 150 thousand persons. During reign in 20<sup>th</sup>–30<sup>th</sup> of principal Alexis, the capital developed with very splendid provincial Byzantium architecture. In fact Basilica and Palace were built from the very beginning. Besides the old, repaired early-Byzantium defensive line (MDL), two new important complexes appear in fortification ensemble. First of all – retrenchment (SDL), similar to fortifications of neighbours-Genoese. SDL represents the continuous line consisting from curtains and towers with an open back part. Its general length about 700 m. One of its wing joints inaccessible south-western section of plateau slope, the other wing is ended by a tower at the western slope of Gamam-dere(Bath-gorge) valey. Here SDL is closed with MDL, the link by which one (A. XV) is as though prolongation of a floor line. And the second – full rehabilitation of citadel, or possibly construction from almost the very beginning. The citadel takes an insulated rule position, taking extreme north-east cape Teshkly-burun (Hole-cape). Territory of this cape is filled with architectural monuments. The most considerable monument is



defensive system, which included three-storied dungeon-palace and two walls, joining the building from two sides, the opposite wings of the walls joined the inaccessible cliffs. Armenian-Byzantium style is expressed in decoration of its facade.

Last years there were remaining of household and residential buildings excavated at the territory of citadel, including large four-room building, probably being barracks for garrison. Special interest is attracted by unique for the Northern Black Sea Region eight-sided temple (octagon). It was mainly excavated in the end of XIX century – beginning of XX century, but unfortunately we have low materials from that time. Such situations gave base for different dating of the construction: from VIII to XIII centuries. Early, I stated judgement on more late date: second half XIV – middle XV [26]. Analogy can serve mausoleums of Gold Orden and Crimean Tartars aristocracy, kept, for example, in Bakhchisaray, on Chufut-Kale, in suburb of Bakhchisaray – Salachik. There are examples octagonal temples, which were carried up in the beginning XV century in Constantinople [27]. It is necessary to attribute everything, construction octagon in Mangoup to the reign of prince Alexis. Then there was modern architectural appearance of a citadel. The position of a temple obviously indicates that the selection of a place for it was subordinate composition of planning an ensemble of a citadel. He is arranged precisely on a long axis passing through centre of gate to an end on of cape. Probably, it was prince's chapel.

It is interesting, that in IX–X centuries there was winery at the location of the temple. Outlet chamber of winepress and holes for the vessels with rounded bottom are preserved there. Before the construction of the church started, the surface of the rock was levelled, such works destroyed remaining of complex from previous epoch. Besides, there is information that some other churches of XIV–XV centuries were constructed at the locations of the winepresses. There is an impression that in this period production of wine is sharply reduced in comparison to «khazars period», or possibly it was decentralised, comes out of administrative control and distributed in rural settlements in the valleys.

Beside on-ground constructions, citadel consists of more than 20 caves. First of all these are military-purpose caves, intended to attack the main road, and the second – these are monasteries, located closer to the end of the cape, but in case of threat they were also used for military purpose. The most considerable cave complexes, possibly monastery, are situated at the very end of the cape [28].

Citadel has also independent from the city source of water – well with depth of 24 meters, connected with the spring in the cave under the cliff.

The Turkish conquest became the tragic episode in history of Gothia. Osman troops invaded the Crimean peninsula in 1475, in a week Genoese Kafa surrendered. But siege of Mangup lasted for half year and followed the scenario used twenty-two years ago under the walls of the capital of Byzantium, which resisted only for two months. At that time Greek historian Kritovul, witness of the events, clearly stated the main, according to his opinion, reason of Turks success: «Cannons resolved everything» [29]. Such words entirely fit the situation at Mangup.

On the eve siege to the aid of last mangoup prince Alexander, shortly before these events, mounted on a throne, the squad from three hundred valakhes, directional ruler of Moldavia by the Stefan III has arrived. The brother-in-law related Alexander, to him. In 1472 united in matrimony of the Stefan with Princess Mary from Mangoup. She has gone

through all for two years loss of the native city. The defensive union with the Hungarian king was scheduled also.

First of all, Turks tried to capture the city from the south, i. e. where besieged and researches didn't expect them to do. Last years during excavation of Gothic necropolis near the southern slope of the plateau, the entire cannonball was found and later military positions were found under the foot of the cliff. It was the position, most unprofitable for storm. Combated was necessary on open space of an abrupt decline, crowned by a vertical steep of a plateau. Unique advantage of this position was weak hazard of shelling from flanks. Besides from this party there was a base camp a Turkish troops, to which one the road lead to seaports Balaklava (Chembalo) and Inkerman (Calamita), entrapped by then Turks.

After fail at the south Turks had to start the next phase of siege at the central northern valley Hamam-Dere. That activity left a lot of archaeological evidences. At the middle of the slope of cape Elli-Burun (wind-cape) Turks established breach-battery. Two heavy siege cannons fired from the distance of 200 meters granite cannonballs with diameter of 42 and 35 cm, its weight was 100 and 65 kg correspondingly. From one position they attacked two fortifications. Terrible roar of the cannons had also psychological effect. Most Feodorites knew about such weapon only from the stories. However, the city resisted five storms.

There were breaches found in the walls with stuck Turkish cannonballs and arrows. When cannonballs almost destroyed one of the walls, defenders managed to build the new one of its stones. Turkish source very scarce and state that only with cunning and fake retreat the besieged were taken out and together with them (on their shoulders) Turks entered the fortress [30]. Citadel also resisted for some time and Turks also had to use artillery. After that there was massacre, evidences of which are the mass burials at the Grand Basilica, in fact us was turned at that time into memorial. Cannon master of that time George from Nuremberg, who was forced to serve to Mehmed II, informs that Turks captured 15 thousand persons and three «kings». Although this number is overestimated, it could be understood as a total number of captured during the conquest of the entire principality, which were divided into feudal lands, heads of that were called «kings».

For the three following centuries the capital of Orthodoxy Taurica became the Turkish fortress. New owners maintained the fortifications. To adapt the fortress to usage of firearms some sections of walls were moved higher above the slope, some walls were rounded, old towers were reconstructed, the new ones were added. Architectural details of destroyed building were used during the repair. For example, details of Grand Basilica were used in reconstruction of one of the towers.

However, life at Mangup decayed.

We excavated one of the last churches, which functioned up to the beginning of XVII century. Burial of priest was found there and hidden coins, probably it was treasury of the church – 111 silver coins of Crimean Khanat, dated back to the end of XVI century. It is possible, that this priest was the one, Martin Bronevsky talked to in 1578. Martin Bronevsky is Polish diplomat, who made the first description of Crimea and Mangup in particular. Soon after his visit Christian community here disappeared. Only small Turkish garrison remains here and some Tatars and Karaites blocks with there synagogue at the western part of the

plateau near the ruins of Grand Basilica. At the bottom of valley Tabana-Dere, at the location, where the city had irrigated gardens, large Karaites' necropolis appeared. At present 1008 tombs are registered there, about thirty percent of them carry epitaphs in Ancient Jewish language (Hebrew). There are some inscriptions dated IX–XIII centuries, but unfortunately they are obviously forged, their real dates (XVI–XVII centuries) were altered into more ancient, but it is another, special episode of history of Jewish communities, related to the name of famous Karaite collector and oriental scientist Abram Firkovich. At least archaeological researches allow resolving some of the puzzles left after him [31].

After Kuchuk-Kaynardzshyskiy agreement was signed in 1774, which resumed Russian victories over Osman army at Danube and liberated Crimean khanate from vassalage from Istanbul, Turks left the fortress, and in 1792 the last inhabitants – Karaites forsook it.

So we determined the following phases of evolution of the settlement at Mangup plateau.

1. Pre-fortress period: (middle of third – middle of fourth century). Only the upper parts of the valleys were inhabited at the plateau. The population mostly consisted from Goths, Alans. Christianity was gradually spread among them.

2. Early Byzantium fortress period (sixth–eighth century). Construction of powerful defensive system, Grand Basilica was built in the centre of the plateau.

3. Khazars period (end of eighth – first half of ninth century). Khazars captured the fortress for the short period. The local economy strengthened.

4. Thema period (middle of ninth – tenth centuries). The fortress is back under the Byzantine authority.

5. Period of neglect (ninth–thirteenth centuries)

6. Early-Feodoro period (fifteenth century). The town blocks appear at the plateau, citadel is formed at Teshkli-Burun Cape; at the end of the century the town is devastated by Tamerlan's forces.

7. Late Feodoro period (first–third quarter of fifteenth century). Revival of Feodoro principality, reconstruction of citadel, palace and Basilica, the second defensive line was built.

8. Turkish period (end of fifteenth century – seventieth of eighteenth century). After the town was captured by Turks (1475) it gradually falls into neglect and totally forsook by the residents (karaites) at the very end of eighteenth century.

The last time Doros-Feodoro-Mangup «took part» in war in June 1942. At that time among the ruins of Gothic fortress there was an observation point of commander of eleventh army – Erich Manshtein. In his memoirs he clearly reflected the view from this place: «There was an unforgettable view in front of us. It was the only case in the present war, when commander of the army could see the entire battlefield in front of him» [32]. The remaining of bunkers is preserved at the south-western part of the plateau. Let's hope that they will be the monuments to the last in history usage of Mangup fortress in military purpose.

#### **List of references and literature**

1. The newest monograph lighting these events: Ayababin A.I. *Etnicheskaya istoriya rannevizantiyskogo Kryma* (An ethnic history early Byzantine of Crimea). – Simferopol, 1999.

2. Jakobson A. L. *Vizantiya v istoriyi srednevekovoy Tavriki* (Byzantium in a history of the medieval Taurica) //SA. – 1954. – T. 21. – P. 148–163 ; *Rannesrednekovy Khersones* (Early medieval Chersonesus) // MIA. – 1959. – № 63.

3. The newest review of the literature and sources on the given subject see: Romanchuk A.I. Ocherki istoriyi i arheologiyi vizantiyskogo Hersona (Essays of a history and archaeology of Byzantine Cherson). – Eyekaterinburg, 2000. – P. 37–59.
4. Ibid. – P. 202–207.
5. Zoubar V. M. Hersones Tavricheskiy i Rimskaya imperiya (Chersonesus Tauricanus and Roman Empire). – Kiev, 1994. – P. 74–78.
6. Khrapounov I. N. O prichinah gibeli nekotorykh pozdneskifskikh poseleniy (About reasons of loss some of late scything settlements // MAIET. – 1990. – T. 1 – P. 167–169.
7. The review of the points of view on this problem see: Gertsen A.G. Krepostnoy ansambl Mangoupa. (The fortress ensemble of Mangoupa) // MAIET. – 1990. – T. 1. – P. 92–102.
8. Procopius of Caesarea. O postroykah (About edifices) // VDI. – 1939. – № 4. – P. 249–250.
9. Veymarn E. V. «Peschernye goroda» Kryma v svete arheologicheskikh issledovaniy 1954–55 gg.» A Cave towns» of Crimea in light of archeologically researches // SA. – 1958. – № 1. – P. 77–78 ; item. Escho raz o Tavricheskom limese (It Once again about the Taurican limes) // ADSV. – 1973. – V. 10. – P. 255–258 ; Solomonik E. I., Dombrovskiy O. I. O lokalizacii strany Dorey (About localisation of the country Dorey) // AISK. – P. 29–31; Talis D. L. O klassifikacii i datirovaniy nekotorykh srednevekovykh gorodisch Kryma (About classification and dating some medieval site of ancient settlements Crimea) // Ekspeditsiyi GIM (Expeditions of the SHM). – M., 1969. – P. 130–142.
10. Gertsen A. G. K probleme tipologiyi srednevekovykh gorodisch Eugo-Zapadnoy Tavriki (To the problem of typology the medieval site of ancient settlements Southwest Taurica // Byzantium and medieval Crimea (ADSV. – V. 27). – Simferopol, 1995. – P. 85–90.
11. The description of the plateau Mangoupa see: Gertsen A. G. The fortress ensemble. – P. 103–105.
12. Evliya Chelebi. Kniga puteshestviya (The Book of the travel). – Simferopol, 1999. – P. 33.
13. Sidorenko V. A. «Gory» oblasti Dorey Procopiya Kesariyskogo i «dlinnye steny» v Krymu («The Goths» of area of a Dorey Procopius of Caesarea and «lengthy walls « to Crimea) // MAIET. – 1991. – V. 2. – P. 114–115.
14. Gertsen A. G. Rannekhristianskie pamyatniki iz nekropoley Mangoupa (Early Christian objects from necropolises of Mangoupa) // Kultura i iskusstvo khristian-negrekov (Culture and art of the Christians-non Greeks // The theses of the reports of scientific conference of memory A. V. Bank. – SPb. : publ. house of a State Ermitage, 2001. – P. 10–12.
15. Gercen A., Maczynska M. Ein fruhvolkerwanderungzeitliches Kammergrab aus dem Graberfeld Al-malyk-dere bei Mangup auf der Krim // Die spatromische Kaiserzeit und die fruhe Volkerwanderungzeit in Vittel-und Osteuropa. – Lodz, 2000. – S. 522–544.
16. Guertsen A. Le tresor de Techklibouroun provenant des fouilles de Mangoupa//Archeologie de la Mer Noire. La Crimée a L'epoque des Grandes Invsions IV–VIII siecles. – Caen : musee de Normandie, 1997. – P. 83.
17. Tihanova M. A. Basilica // MIA. – 1953. – № 34. – P. 334–389 ; Barmina N. I. Magoupskaya basilica v svete nekotorykh problem krymskogo srednevekovykh Basilica of Mangoupa in light of some problems of the Crimean middle ages // Vizantiya i srednevekovy Krym (Byzantium and medieval Crimea). – Simferopol, 1995. – P. 77–84.
18. Gertsen A. G. Alekseenko N. A. Vizantiyskie molivdovuly iz raskopok Mandoupa-Kale (Byzantine molivdovuls from the excavations of Mangoupa-Kale // Problemy istoriyi i arkheologiyi Ukrainy (A Problems of a history and archaeology of Ukraine). – Kharkov, 2001. – P. 90–92.
19. The newest publications dedicated Byzantine-Khazar relations in the end VII – the beginning VIII centuries see: Tsukerman K. Khazary i Vizantiya: pervye kontakty (Khazars and Byzantium: the first contacts // MAIET. – 2001. – V. 8. – P. 332–333 ; Naumenko V. E. Khazarskiy tudun v Khersonese v nachale VIII v.: vizantiyskay versiya (Khazaring tudun in Cherson in the beginning VIII century.: the Byzantine version) // MAIET. – 2003. – V. 10. – (in printing).
20. The newest publications dedicated interpretation of events described in the Hagiography Johns Goths : M.-F. Auzepy. Gohie et Crimée de 750 à 830 dans les sources ecclésiastiques et monastiques grecques // MAIET. – 2000. – V. 7. – P. 324–331.
21. Gertsen A. G. Khazary v Dorose-Mangoupe (Khazars in Doros-Mangoupa) // Khazarskiy almanah Khazars anthology. – Kharkov, 2002. – V. 1. – P. 29–34.
22. The newest data about outcomes of researches Solkhat see: Kramarovskiy M.G. Solkhat-Krym: k vo-prosu o naselehiy i topografiy goroda XIII–XIV vv. (Solkhat-Crimea: to a problem on the population and

**MAIN STAGES OF THE HISTORY DOROS-THEODORO (MANGUP) IN THE LIGHT OF  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH EXPEDITION TAURIDA VERNADSKY NATIONAL...**

topography of city XIII–XIV centuries // *Itogi rabot arkhelogicheskikh ekspeditsiy Gosudarstvennogo Ermitaja* (The totals of activities of archeological expeditions the State Hermitage. The collection of scientific works). – Leningrad, 1989 ; item. Zolotoordynskiy gorod Solkhat-Krym. K probleme formirovaniya gorodskoy kultury (novye materialy) (Gold Ording city Solkhat-Crimea. To a problem of formation of urban culture (new materials) // *Tatarskaya arkhelogiya* (Tartars archaeology). – Kazan, 1997.

23. The newest publications about a parentage of a dynasty see: Stepanenko V.P. Knyazyia Feodoro i vizantiyskaya aristokratiya XV v. (The princess of Feodoro and Byzantine aristocracy. International conference «Byzantium and Crimea». The theses of the reports. – Simferopol, 1997. – P. 76–77.

24. The first publication: Mercati S.G. Διήγησις τῆς πόλεως Θεοδώρου. Versi di Matteo ieromonacho // *Studi bizantini*. – 1927. – № 2. – P. 12–30. The newest publication : Bayer H.-F. Istoriya krymskikh gotov kak interpretatsiya Skazaniya Matfeya o gorode Feodoro (The history of Crimean Goths is as interpretation of a Legend of Matthew about city Feodoro). – Ekaterinburg, 2001. – P. 286–309. The archeological comment to the text: Gertsen A.G. Rasskaz o gorode Feodoro: topographicheskoye i arkhelogicheskoye realnosti v poeme ieromonaha Matveya. (The story about city Feodoro: realities in a poem of the celibate priest Matthew) // *ADSV*. – 2001. – V. 32. – P. 257–282.

25. Veymarn E. V. O dvuh neyasnyh voprosah srednekovyayugo-Zapadnogo Kryma (About two vague problems of a middle ages of Southwest Crimea) // *AISK*. – P. 77–82.

26. Gertsen A. G. The fortress ensemble. – P. 144.

27. Schneider A. M. Byzanz. Vorarbeiten zur Topographie und Archäologie der Stadt. – Amsterdam, 1967. – Z. 70-71. – Abb. 31.

28. Gertsen A. G., Mogarichev Yu. M. Peschernye cerkvi Mangoupa (The cave churches of Mangoup). – Simferopol, 1996. – P. 6–15.

29. Critobulos. – FHG. – V. 5. – P. I, 80.

30. The newest publications about Turkish siege of Mangoup see: Haybulaeva F.H. Noviy tureckiy istochnik po istoriyi Kryma (New Turkish source on a history of Crimea) // *MAIET*. – 2001. – V. 9. – P. 362–365 ; Gertsen A. G. Po povodu novoye publikatsiyi tureckogo istochnika o zavoevaniyi Kryma (Concerning the new publication of a Turkish source about seizure of Crimea). – *Ibid.* – P. 366–387.

31 Gertsen A. Archaeological investigations of karait settlements in the Crimea // *Proceedings of the 11th World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division B. The history of the Jewish people. V. 1. Second Temple period to modern times. Jerusalem, 1994 ; Jewish Community of Mangoup According to Archaeology Data // MAIET. – 2000. – V. 7 ; item. Kultovye pamyatniki iudeyskoy obschiny Mangoupa (Cult monuments of a Judaic community of Mangoup) // *Studia judaica. Trzecia edycja konferencji «Zydzi i judaizm we wspolczesnych badaniach»*. – Krakow, 2002.*

32. Manshteyn E. Uteryanye pobedy (The lost victories). – Rostov-na-Donu, 1999. – P. 277–278.

**LIST OF THE USING ABBREVIATIONS**

|       |                                                                                                                                         |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ADSV  | Antichnaya drevnost i sredniye veka (Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Sverdlovsk - Ekaterinburg)                                          |
| AISK  | Arkheologicheskie issledovaniy srednekovogo Kryma (Archeological researches of medieval Crimea. – Kiev, 1968)                           |
| FHG   | Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum                                                                                                        |
| GIM   | Gosudarstvenniy istoricheskiy muzey (State Historical Museum, Moscow)                                                                   |
| MAIET | Materialy po arkhelogiyi. istoriyi i etnographiyi Tavriyi (Materials by the archaeology, history and ethnography of Tauria, Simferopol) |
| MIA   | Materialy i issledovaniya po arkhelogiyi SSSR (Materials and explorations at the archaeology of USSR, Moscow)                           |
| SA    | Sovetskaya arkhelogiya (Soviet archaeology, Moscow)                                                                                     |
| VDI   | Vestnik drevney istoriyi (Bulletin of the ancient history, Moscow)                                                                      |

**Герцен А. Г.** Основные этапы истории Дороса-Феодоро (Мангула) в свете археологических исследований экспедиции Таврического национального университета им. В.И.Вернадского / А. Г. Герцен // Ученые записки Таврического национального университета имени В. И. Вернадского. Серия «Исторические науки». – 2013. – Т. 26 (65), № 1. – С. 193–206.

Охарактеризованы основные стадии жизни крупнейшего поселения из группы «пещерных городов» Крыма – Мангула, реконструированные на основании как известных письменных источников, так и материалов раскопок, проводившихся в последние десятилетия археологической экспедицией Таврического национального университета имени В. И. Вернадского. Выделены этапы эволюции поселения с IV по XVIII вв. Оно прошло путь от ранневизантийской крепости, на территории союзников Империи, готов и аланов, до провинциального византийского города, столицы княжества Феодоро. В 1475 г. Мангуп был захвачен османами после полугодовой осады и триста лет был турецкой крепостью, административным центром кадылыка.

**Герцен О. Г.** Основні етапи історії Доросу-Феодоро (Мангула) в світлі археологічних досліджень експедиції Таврійського національного університету ім. В. І. Вернадського / О. Г. Герцен // Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія «Історичні науки». – 2013. – Т. 26 (65), № 1. – С. 193–206.

Охарактеризовано основні стадії життя найбільшого поселення з групи «печерних міст» Криму – Мангула, що реконструйовані на підставі як відомих письмових джерел, так і матеріалів розкопок, що проводилися останніми десятиріччями археологічною експедицією Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського. Виділено етапи еволюції поселення з IV по XVIII ст. Воно пройшло шлях від ранньої візантійської фортеці, на території союзників Імперії, готів та аланів, до провінційного візантійського міста, столиці князівства Феодоро. 1475 р. Мангуп був захоплений османами після піврічної облоги і триста років був турецькою фортецею, адміністративним центром кадилика.

*Поступила в редакцію 01.11.2013 г.*

**Рецензенты:**

д.и.н., проф. А. И. Айбабин

д.и.н., ст. науч. сотр. Н. И. Платонова