Church Building and 'Caesaropapism,' A.D. 312–565

Deno John Geanakoplos

THE PERIOD from the conversion of Constantine to the death of Justinian is not only that in which the crucial problem of the imperial authority over the church became crystallized; it is also one of the formative eras with regard to monumental church building, perhaps the most formative in the history of the church. Each of these questions separately has been a subject of intensive study, but their correlation has been dealt with only cursorily if at all. It is the purpose of this paper to examine the two considerations in conjunction with each other, with the aim of deriving, in different perspective, new insights into the fundamental problem of the relationship of church and state in this early period.

Of the fifteen emperors of the Byzantine East and the somewhat greater number in the West during the period from A.D. 312 to 565, by far the most important as regards church construction were the first, Constantine the Great, and the last, Justinian. Because of his position as the first Christian Roman emperor it was only naturally Constantine's desire to commemorate, by monumental church building, the most sacred shrines of Christianity. Justinian, the last of this series of emperors, was as great a builder as Constantine, if not greater. And from the viewpoint of political theory, Justinian ruled in the so-called "Caesaropapistic" tradition earlier established by Constantine. Indeed Justinian, historians generally agree—even those who dislike the term—was the most "Caesaropapistic" of all Byzantine emperors. In his reign there was constantly emphasized, as we see clearly both from his civil and canon law, the concept of the unity of the empire—one church, one state, both under the rule of God's representative or vicegerent on earth, the Basileus. This theory of the imperial rule over the Basileia, the Christian empire on earth, in imitation (μίμησις) of God's rule over the divine order in Heaven, was formulated largely by Constantine's adviser Bishop Eusebius, who

combined elements drawn from Christian, Hellenistic and Roman concepts and practices.[1]

Eusebius, however, did not explicitly spell out all aspects of his theory. Indeed, what to our minds seems to be a blurring of the spheres of church and state, as well as Eusebius' impreciseness with respect to the extent of imperial control over the church, was to remain a basic problem for all later emperors and patriarchs—not to speak of modern historians.[2]

The problem of establishing a correlation between the degree of the emperor's authority over the church, in theory and practice, and the amount and kind of church building accomplished in each reign is obviously a very complex one. It involves not only the technical problem of the architecture of the churches erected but, more important, the motivations of individual emperors in such construction, and, finally, of course, the possible effect of this construction in bringing the church and the faithful more closely under imperial control.

It has been suggested that the literary sources are less than adequate in dealing with this problem and that "archeological evidence offers perhaps the surest access to imperial church building, confirming or disproving the literary evidence."[3] Certainly it would seem clear that for this period, where the monuments are so often dilapidated or even destroyed and where the stones themselves, except through an occasional inscription, cannot speak for the emperor's motivations for building, the architectural evidence must be supplemented from other sources. A complete and balanced view of this difficult question must take into account not only the churches themselves but speeches and letters of the emperors, civil and canon law,

[1] Eus. *Laus Constantini* [hereafter *LausC*] (*Eusebius Werke* ed. I. A. Heikel, I [*GCS* 7, Leipzig 1902] 199). For the importance of Eusebius in Byzantine political theory see D. Geanakoplos, "Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism," *Church History* 34 (1965) 385. On Eusebius' political thought see esp. N. Baynes, "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales* 2 (1933–34) 13–18; E. Schwartz, *Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche*[2] (Leipzig 1936); F. Cranz, "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea," *HThR* 45 (1952) 47–66; *cf.* Ph. Sherrard, *Greek East and Latin West* (London 1959) 92ff.

[2] On this problem see, most recently, Geanakoplos, *op.cit.* 385ff with bibl. See also K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to the Emperor* (New York 1941) 48ff, 79ff.

[3] G. T. Armstrong, "Imperial Church Building and Church-State Relations, A.D. 315–565," paper read at the American Society of Church History, December 1965. The topic of this article was originally suggested to me by the title of Professor Armstrong's paper, to whom I am also grateful for some bibliographical suggestions. It is hoped that this paper will supplement the study Armstrong is planning to publish. On Eus. *Vita Constantini*, see below *passim*, esp. n.19.

contemporary histories, encomia, all with their doctrinal and ideological implications and all of course subject to rigorous scrutiny with regard to their reliability. In this paper, which will focus primarily (but not exclusively) on the two most significant builders and examples of what, rightly or wrongly, is termed Caesaropapism, Constantine and Justinian, I shall try to draw on these various sources.

Constantine, in seeking to adjust to the new relationship between the Roman government and the now legally recognized Christian church, established important precedents for subsequent emperors. The reasons for Constantine's conversion to Christianity, are, of course, fundamental for any understanding not only of his policy toward church-state relations but also of his motives in building churches and shrines. Many scholars, Baynes perhaps outstandingly, believe that Constantine was motivated by sincerity, a sincerity however actuated in large part by his need for securing on his side the support of the right God, a God who could bring him victories over his enemies.[4] If we accept this view, as I think we can, we should, by extension, also assume that he would have desired that his chosen God be *properly* worshipped throughout his empire. The corollary to this theory, that of removing the wrong kind of worship, may be said also to have obtained for Constantine. For, in contrast to his apparent building of only two or three pagan temples (that of Tyche, for example, at the time of Constantinople's foundation and one much later in Umbria, dedicated to his family's genius),[5] Constantine, as Eusebius points out, constructed a large number of churches with the aim of suppressing pagan worship (at Marme, for instance, in Palestine).[6] We know also from Eusebius that Constantine "forbade the

[4] N. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (London 1932) 29.

[5] Zosimus, *Historia Nova* ed. Bekker (*CSHistByz* 30, Bonn 1837) 97f, mentions the temple of the Dioskouroi and the Tycheion. Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* (Migne, *PG* 67 [Paris 1864] col. 409), notes that Emperor Julian worshipped the image of Tyche in a building called a *βασιλική*. For Constantine's temple in Umbria see *CIL* XI.2.1 5265. This inscription from Hispellum, dating from the last years of his reign, prohibits the use of the temple for pagan worship. See also A. H. M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (New York 1962) 89, 175.

[6] On Marme see Eus. *Vita Constantini* [hereafter *VitaC*] (*Eusebius Werke* ed. Heikel, I [*GCS* 7, Leipzig 1902] 99–104), where Eusebius tells of the order to build a church building in place of the pagan altar at Marme, and mentions the destruction of temples at Aphaca on Mt Lebanon in Phoenicia and at Aegae in Cilicia. He also reports that a shrine of Aphrodite was removed from the location where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher was built (pp.89f).

immoral customs" (temple prostitution) at Heliopolis in Phoenicia, erecting a church there for which he provided a full staff of clergy.[7] Later in his reign, as attested by an edict of Constantius preserved in the Theodosian Code, Constantine forbade pagan divination under certain conditions.[8] And it is recorded that occasionally when he needed funds, he would despoil a pagan temple, melting down the gold and silver idols[9]—something there is no record he ever did with respect to the treasures of Christian churches.

Why Constantine, despite his marked partisanship for Christianity, retained the pagan title of Pontifex Maximus, head of the state religion, is not clear. But his policy toward the pagans, which may perhaps best be termed one of grudging, even contemptuous toleration, was doubtless based on the realization that the bulk of the Roman population was still pagan. Eusebius' own attitude toward Constantine's continued toleration of paganism might be interpreted as one of anticipation, that as soon as feasible he would entirely proscribe it.[10]

Regarding right worship *within* the Christian church, Constantine was less tolerant of heresy than even of paganism. As Eusebius makes plain in his *Laus Constantini*, Constantine believed that God had appointed him His representative over His earthly kingdom, a fact which, in Constantine's understanding, implied a responsibility to maintain unity in the true faith.[11] A letter of Constantine, dated 316, to his governor Celsus in Africa regarding the heretical Donatists of that area clearly indicates what he felt his rôle to be. Here Constantine announces his intention of using his own authority as emperor to settle the controversy on the spot and to teach the Donatist clergy "what worship and what kind of worship is to be given to the Divinity. . . . Is there anything more consonant with my fixed resolve and *my imperial duty* that I can do, than to scatter errors, extirpate all

[7] *VitaC* p.104f.

[8] *Codex Theodosianus* 9.16.1–2 and 16.10.2, ed. T. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer, in *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus sirmondianis* (Berlin 1905) I.1, 459f and I.2, 897. *Cf.* Eus. *VitaC* pp.59f and 98.

[9] Eus. *VitaC* p.101f; see also Eus. *LausC* p.216.

[10] Eus. *VitaC* p.60f. For Constantine's own views see a letter recorded by Eusebius in *VitaC* pp.61f, and his edict preserved by Eus. *EcclHist* (ed. E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte*, ed.min. [Leipzig 1908] pp.388–91).

[11] Eus. *LausC* p.220, indicates that one aspect of the emperor's task was to foster unity in the construction of houses of prayer. Baynes, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 12–30, convincingly argues that the necessity of ecclesiastical unity was a determining factor in Constantine's religious policy.

vain opinions and cause men to offer the Almighty a genuine religion, a sincere *concord* and a worship that is His due?"[12]

In this and similar directives[13] coming not long after the start of his reign we can see the shape of a policy toward the church emerging, a policy which for lack of a better term has been called by modern historians, though not by those of mediaeval Byzantium (who would probably not have understood it), Caesaropapism.

Constantine's building program would seem to reflect at least one aspect of his control over the church. We know that he confiscated Donatist churches in Africa[14] and, except at the end of his life, when his sympathies for or against Arianism are not always clear, that he probably did not build churches for the Arians. One exception in his policy should be noted, however, that of 330 when with the greatest reluctance he allowed the Donatists to retain a church which they had seized in Cirta, Africa.[15] But it is also significant that he rebuilt another in the same area for the Orthodox.[16]

There is no doubt that Constantine wanted not only to believe, but to make certain that he had secured the stamp of divine approval for his reign. And along of course with his aim of providing at imperial expense larger structures to hold the growing congregations where proper worship could take place, this seeking of divine sanction was probably an underlying motivation for his building of structures to honor the holy martyrs and to enshrine the holy places connected with the life and passion of Christ.[17] The most important churches of Christendom begun or completed by him, especially in Rome,

[12] Letter of Constantine to Celsus, his Vicar of Africa, in *S. Optati Milevitani libri VII*, ed. C. Ziwsa, in *CSEL* 26 (Vienna 1893) pp.211–12 (App. VII).

[13] A fine survey of these documents is found in Baynes, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 12–17 with notes. *Cf.* Jones, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 91–104, who labels Constantine's emerging attitude Caesaropapism (p.103).

[14] Letter of Augustine to Januarius, in *S. Aureli Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae*, ed. Al. Goldbacher, in *CSEL* 34 (Vienna 1895) pp.408f. Jones, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 104ff, suggests that the order for confiscation was revoked after about three months, early in 321. Eus. *VitaC* pp.112f records part of an edict designed to remove from heretical control every building used as a place of prayer. Neither Donatists nor Arians are mentioned in this context, but Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, and Paulianists are named (p.111).

[15] Letter of Constantine to the Bishops of Numidia, in *S. Optati Milevitani* pp.213–16 (App. X).

[16] *Ibid.* p.215 (App. X).

[17] On Constantine's motives for building see Eus. *LausC* pp.220f, 224, 259, and n.24 below. Eus. *VitaC* pp.131f also tells of Constantine's order for fifty copies of the Holy Scriptures to meet the needs of the growing number of new converts and the increased number of churches. On Constantine's enlarging of existing churches, see text for n.21 below.

Constantinople and the Holy Land are well known to historians—those such as St John's Lateran and St Peter's in Rome; St Irene, the first St Sophia, and at least the foundation of the Church of the Holy Apostles, all in Constantinople; the magnificent churches of Nicomedia and Antioch; and most significant of all for his contemporaries, the churches of the Holy Sepulcher and the Nativity in Palestine. We might at this point make one supplemental observation, that we seem to hear little of Constantine's church building activities in Gaul, Spain, and, aside from Constantinople, in the Balkans.[18]

In the *Vita Constantini*, which despite its detractors I think still offers certain important and acceptable material,[19] Eusebius quotes Constantine as saying that he wanted the building of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, Christianity's most sacred shrine, to be more beautiful than any other building in the empire. Constantine also wrote Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, that "a house of prayer worthy of the worship of God should be erected near the Savior's tomb on a scale of rich and royal greatness."[20] Besides erecting new churches, Constantine, as we have heard, restored or enlarged older ones. We might make special mention of a letter sent by Constantine soon after the Council of Nicaea to his governors and bishops explicitly directing "the heightening of the oratories and the enlargement in length and breadth of the churches of God . . ." and urging his officials "not to spare the expenditure of money but to draw supplies from the imperial treasury itself."[21]

[18] The best recent study of Constantine's churches is by L. Voelkl, *Die Kirchenstiftungen des Kaisers Konstantin im Lichte des römischen Sakralrechts* (Cologne and Opladen 1964). G. T. Armstrong has announced (see n.3 above) his intention of seeking to establish a more accurate list of Constantinian sanctuaries in an unpublished article entitled "Ciampini Revised or How Many Churches Did Constantine Build?"

[19] I accept the view of A. H. M. Jones, who holds the *VitaC* to be both a reliable source and an authentic work of Eusebius: see his recent "Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius's Life of Constantine," *JEcclHist* 5 (1954) 196–200. See also Baynes, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 40–49, who is in essential agreement with Jones, although he holds that the *VitaC* "never received final revision at its author's hands" (p.49); and G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople: A Contribution to the Criticism of the *Vita Constantini* attributed to Eusebius," *DOPapers* 6 (1951) 58–72, who holds that certain problematic passages in the *Vita* are later interpolations in an otherwise reliable and authentic work. *Cf.* the most radical view of the *VitaC* by H. Grégoire, "Eusèbe n'est pas l'auteur de la *Vita Constantini* dans sa forme actuelle et Constantin n'est pas converti en 312," *Byzantion* 13 (1938) 561ff.

[20] *VitaC* pp.91f. On the churches of Constantine in Palestine see J. W. Crowfoot, *Early Churches in Palestine* (London 1941).

[21] For this famous passage see *VitaC* 60. On the heightening and enlarging of existing church buildings see L. Voelkl, "Die konstantinischen Kirchenbauten nach Eusebius," *RACrist* 29 (1953) 60–64.

Whether or not Constantine was personally responsible for adopting the basilica type of church—a thorny problem that we shall avoid examining here—several important factors must have entered into the reasoning behind the decision to adopt this type of building: (1) that the basilica form could be better adapted to the growing congregations of Christians than any other existing type of building; and (2) that in the Hellenistic East and pagan Rome the long, rectangular form of building with interior colonnades, called basilica, had for long been a standard type of governmental structure.[22]

Regarding the first point, we might observe that in paganism, in contrast to Christianity, the worshipper did not enter into the temple, the central area of which was generally small and reserved for the god's statue and officiating priests. It is instructive to note that in the sources of the period one often reads of the people's curiosity to enter into the sanctuary of pagan temples to see just what was in there, "to undress the idols," as Eusebius put it. Many pagans were in fact surprised that the god did nothing to avenge the sacrilege committed in his temple.[23]

With respect to the second point, it does not have to be pointed out that the term *basilica* comes from the same root as the word *basileus*, meaning emperor, the head of the imperial government. After the period of the persecutions when the Christians had only just emerged from the Catacombs, it may not have been illogical then—though some historians such as Voelkl would argue otherwise—for Constantine to seek to exalt Christianity as the preferred religion of the state by adapting for Christian use the semi-official basilica form of building. Eusebius suggests in several passages of the *Laus Constantini* that one of Constantine's underlying aims in building churches in Palestine was through such construction to attribute imperial dignity to Christ. The implication is that the ruler of heaven should not have an earthly temple less regal than the emperor, his vicegerent on earth.[24]

[22] The question of the origin of the basilica has produced an abundance of literature, with very varied interpretations. See esp. J. B. Ward Perkins, "Constantine and the Origins of the Christian Basilica," *BSR* 22 (1954) 69–90, and W. L. MacDonald, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (New York 1962) with bibl. See also E. H. Swift, *Roman Sources of Christian Art* (New York 1951). For a short survey of opinions see W. Lowrie, *Art in the Early Church*[2] (New York 1947) 87–110.

[23] *VitaC* pp.101–04 and *LausC* p.216. The practice of opening the temples for public inspection and even displaying the contents was revived in Theodosius I's day: see Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* ed. J. Bidez (*GCS* 50, Berlin 1960) pp.319ff.

[24] For the use of the term *βασιλικά* to apply to secular imperial structures before Constantine's conversion, see the survey by Ward Perkins, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 69–76 with

Why did the bishops of Constantine's reign, Nicene and Arian alike, seem to raise no serious objections to the imposition of Constantine's will over the church? Even Athanasius (that is, before the reign of Constantius) made no real protest, his differences with Constantine apparently being based rather on the emperor's seemingly conciliatory attitude toward Arianism, that is toward false dogma.[25] Athanasius in fact wanted Constantine to use to the full his imperial authority in order to suppress Arianism. The bishops' acceptance of, or apparent concurrence in, Constantine's authority over the church, was probably based on the bishops' need of state support at this crucial period of the church's development, on their gratitude for Constantine's elevation of Christianity to at least the level of the other religions, as well as on the bishops' appreciation of the many favors the emperor had lavished upon them, such as relief from curial duties and the grant of extensive properties, not least impressive, of new churches and shrines.[26]

From the viewpoint of imperial control, however, there was probably no sharp difference in Constantine's mind between the spheres of church and state. Each was an important aspect of the *Basileia* on earth over which the emperor ruled as the divinely appointed agent of God. If at times, because of temporary political exigency, Constantine seemed unduly tolerant of the Arians or even of the pagans—not however of the Donatists—he never really deviated from his underlying conviction of being God's vicegerent on earth. And in his church building program in behalf of the Nicene Orthodox, I think we may see reflected one important side of his concept of stewardship, or if you will, Caesaropapistic control over the church. Constantine's aim of achieving church unity is, to be sure, emphasized by

---

notes, and Swift, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 9–30. *Cf.* L. Voelkl, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) 60ff. We mention here terms applied by Eusebius to early church buildings, some already noted, others unemphasized. For example, for usages of ἐκκλησία, εὐκτήριος νεώς and εὐκτήριος οἶκος see *VitaC* pp.98f; for προσευκτήριον see *EcclHist* ed. Schwartz p.370; and for the first occurrence of κυριακὸν οἰκεῖον see *EcclHist* ed. Schwartz p.363. The church building in Tyre dedicated about 314 (see Setton, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.2] 44) is referred to in Eusebius's panegyric as a βασίλειος οἶκος (*EcclHist* ed. Schwartz p.381). See also n.5 above. Constantine's churches in the Holy Land are characterized by Eusebius as βασιλικῆς διανοίας βασιλικὰ μεγαλουργήματα ('imperial monuments of an imperial spirit'), who calls them trophies to the victory of the heavenly Basileus (*LausC* pp.220, 224, esp. 259).

[25] Setton, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 53ff, 71ff, and n.26 below.

[26] On the attitudes of Constantine's contemporaries see Setton, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 40ff, and n.30 below. On Constantine's beneficence to the bishops, see for example the documents preserved in Eus. *EcclHist* ed. Schwartz pp. 394–395.

many historians, but the corollary idea should also be emphasized—an idea expressed or implied in Eusebius and in Constantine's own letters: that it was his explicit *duty* as emperor to proselytize for Christianity and to promote unity within the faith.[27]

The reigns of Constantine's three sons may, in a sense, be considered an extension of their father's. Constantius, the most important of the three, was, to be sure, an Arian and attempted to force Arian beliefs on the empire.[28] But even in his partisanship of Arianism he was in effect only following his father's policy of seeking to maintain a single faith in the church.

One modern authority has affirmed that the primary reason for Constantius' adoption of Arianism was his conviction that its beliefs would make it easier to accommodate the church to the state.[29] Support for such a view may be adduced not only by quoting Athanasius' famous statement "The Arians have no King but Caesar," but, also, by examining what seem to be the implications of the respective Nicene and Arian views toward the Trinity. According to Nicene trinitarianism the emperor was considered to represent God the Father. The bishops' power, however, was seen as being on the same plane as the emperor's, since their authority was derived from the Logos, by them considered consubstantial with the Father. In the Arian belief, on the other hand, the emperor was viewed as superior to the bishops, since, while his power derived from God, theirs came from the Logos, for them not consubstantial with the Father, thus rendering the bishops' authority inferior to that of the emperor.[30] But the main question for us here should be—and in this context this has, so far as I know, not hitherto been posed—were these differences in dogmatic implications reflected in church building? With respect to architecture there seems to have been no essential difference between Nicene and Arian churches. The differences appear rather in the ornamentation, such as in the mosaics at San Vitale, Justinian's orthodox church, and Theodoric's Arian church, San Apollinare

[27] See sources cited above in nn.6, 10 and 23 for Constantine's attitude toward the pagans; also his letter to the Persian King in behalf of Christians in Eus. *VitaC* p.121. On Constantine's view of his proselytizing as a duty, see Baynes, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 25ff.

[28] See Ernst Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches* I (Vienna 1928) 226f and Setton, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 71ff.

[29] Setton, *op.cit.* 82.

[30] *Cf.* G. H. Williams, "Christology and Church State Relations in the Fourth Century," *Church History* 20 (1951) iii.8–14 and iv.15ff. The statement from Athanasius is found in his *Historia Arianorum*, *PG* 25 (Paris 1884) col. 729.

Nuovo. The pictures we know of in the originally Arian church of San Apollinare emphasize rather the humanity of Christ, while in those of the orthodox San Vitale the emphasis is on the other worldliness, the divinity of the court of heaven as reflected in the earthly court of Justinian.[31]

In any event, in the critical struggle between Arians and Nicenes during the reigns of Constantine's sons, it may be assumed that construction of churches with the government's financial support was one important way the emperor could effectively support the religious group he preferred—a point which to be sure seems obvious and which some scholars have already made. But, it would be most useful to scholarship, if someone—Professor Armstrong I understand has now done this for Constantine—would make a careful survey of all the churches erected by each of Constantine's Arian and Nicene sons to ascertain whether this thesis is borne out. From the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates we know, for example, that Constantius gave a Mithraeum to the Arian Christians of Alexandria to be used as a church[32]—one of the first evidences of imperial assignment of a pagan temple for Arian use. Constantius also completed the construction of certain churches begun earlier by his father (one at Antioch) and himself initiated the construction of others, including the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, though another view has it that this was begun by Constantine.[33] How many of these churches were dedicated by Arian bishops? Did they later have to be reconsecrated by the Orthodox and, if so, were any changes made in them? Though it is difficult to answer these questions satisfactorily, they should at least be raised. Whether or not Constantius destroyed many pagan temples, we know that he was urged to exercise his imperial power to do so by such persons as the senator Julius Firmicus Maternus, who affirmed

[31] On the mosaics of San Apollinare Nuovo and San Vitale see O. M. Dalton, *Byzantine Art and Archaeology* (Oxford 1911) 350ff and esp. 358ff (on the various interpretations of the San Vitale mosaics), and A. Grabar, *Byzantine Painting* (Geneva 1953) 52ff and esp. 68 (on San Vitale). For a comparison between the Arian and the orthodox ornamentation see the views of W. Fleming, *Arts and Ideas* (New York 1963) 146.

[32] *PG* 67, cols. 380–381.

[33] Socrates, *EcclHist PG* 67, col. 196, reports Constantius' completion of the church at Antioch ten years after Constantine started it. Regarding the Holy Apostles, G. Downey, (*supra* n.19) 77ff, concludes, in agreement with Procopius, *De Aedificiis* ed. J. Haury and G. Wirth, in *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia* IV (Leipzig 1964) p.25, that Constantius founded the church—a view I find convincing; but *cf.* J. Vogt, "Der Erbauer der Apostelkirche in Konstantinopel," *Hermes* 81 (1953) 111ff.

that "Christ in his graciousness had reserved for the emperor the duty of blotting out idolatry and destroying the pagan shrines."[34]

For the reign of Julian the Apostate, nephew of Constantine the Great, the Eusebian theory of imperial authority in relation to Christianity is of course not applicable. He used his imperial authority—at least in the latter part of his reign—rather to destroy the Christian church as an institution and to restore paganism. Sometimes, in fact, it would even seem that he intended a building program favorable to non-Christians in order, obliquely, to strike at the Christian church. We know of course that he reopened many pagan temples and restored their revenues.[35] It should be noted that as yet Christianity had not gained a complete victory over paganism; Hellenism was still strong and not many pagan temples had been destroyed. The number of those demolished has probably been exaggerated in the dramatic stories that have come down to us concerning the rôle played by fanatic monks.[36] Theodoret, Sozomen, Rufinus, and Ammianus Marcellinus in their histories all speak of Julian's decree that the great Temple of the Jews in Jerusalem should be rebuilt.[37] No doubt he acted to placate the Jews; but since Julian is hardly known for his philo-Jewish sentiments, it may well be suspected that, at least by implication, his decree was intended to denigrate the prestige of Christianity.

Possibly the unique example that can be cited of Julian's church building is that mentioned by Socrates, who tells us that Julian built a church in Constantinople called Anastasia.[38] It was constructed on the spot where a Novatian church (called "Alexander's church") had formerly stood. We are also told by Sozomen and Socrates that Julian required the orthodox bishop of Cyzicus to rebuild a Novatian church in his city earlier destroyed by his congregation.[39] But, it may be

[34] See Setton's discussion of Firmicus, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 64; also H. Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, trans. Wolf, III (New York 1961) 255.

[35] Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum libri qui supersunt* ed. C. U. Clark, I (Berlin 1910) p.257. Sozomen, *EcclHist* ed. Bidez, p.195. Socrates, *EcclHist*, *PG* 67, col. 337.

[36] An example of the violence which erupted early in Julian's reign is given in Theodoret, *EcclHist* ed. L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler (*GCS* 44, Berlin 1954) pp. 182ff.

[37] Theodoret, *EcclHist* ed. Parmentier, pp.198ff. Sozomen, *EcclHist* ed. Bidez, pp.229ff. Amm. Marc. ed. Clark, I p.296. Rufinus, *EcclHist* ed. Migne, *PL* 21 (Paris 1849) cols. 505–506. See Lietzmann, *op.cit.* III.282, for an evaluation of Julian's policy toward the Jews.

[38] Socrates, *EcclHist*, *PG* 67, col. 327. To be sure it was believed that the Anastasia was contructed of the materials that had once been hauled from the site to construct a church in Sycae but which was now dismantled and brought back.

[39] The church was originally destroyed during the reign of Constantius; Sozomen, *EcclHist* ed. Bidez, pp.200 and 214. Socrates, *EcclHist*, *PG* 67, col. 409.

observed, this was a *heretical* Christian church. Julian's policy at this time seems to have been characterized by the sentiment that to prevail over one's enemies one should show favor to all dissident groups, thus serving further to divide them. At any rate Julian's brief rule was probably too taken up with his campaigns, both military and anti-Christian, to be devoted to any kind of building on a large scale.

It is generally accepted that the definitive triumph of Christianity over paganism occurred in the reign of the Emperor Theodosius the Great, a Nicene Christian. While Jovian earlier had revoked Julian's laws against Christianity,[40] Theodosius in effect dealt the death blow to pagan worship by decreeing that no more sacrifices could take place on pagan altars.[41] And it now became official government policy to begin, or at least to tolerate, the tearing down of pagan temples by Christians.[42] On the positive side of church construction, however, Theodosius did little building in the first part of his reign, though tradition has it that he did help to rebuild the church of St Paul outside the walls of Rome.[43]

The same Theodosius was involved in two famous clashes with Bishop Ambrose of Milan over the question of imperial authority and its relationship to the church. In the case of greater interest to us here Ambrose rebuked Theodosius because of his harshness in dealing with the Christians who had burned a Jewish synagogue in Callinicum, near the Persian frontier in Asia Minor. From the evidence of Ambrose's own letters,[44] it seems that Theodosius intended the synagogue to be rebuilt at the expense of the Christians. Ambrose was not satisfied until Theodosius had halted the imperial investigation of this incident and released the Christians from any obligation. Here in this clash between emperor and bishop we see an example of

[40] Sozomen, *EcclHist* ed. Bidez, pp.239f. Socrates, *EcclHist*, *PG* 67, col. 449. Theodoret, *EcclHist* ed. Parmentier, p.216.

[41] *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.10–11, ed. Mommsen and Meyer, I.2 pp.899f.

[42] The destruction of pagan temples was largely a local task. Under Theodosius, for example, the Eastern Prefect Cynegius sponsored the destruction of temples in his area, especially at Edessa and Apamea: see Lietzmann, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.34) IV.85f. It seems likely, as J. B. Bury in *History of the Later Roman Empire* I (New York 1958) 365 says, that Theodosius intended only to secularize, not to demolish pagan temples. The subsequent edicts of Arcadius in 399 and 407 indicate that only those temples in rural districts were to be razed, and even this was prohibited in 407: *Codex Theodosianus* 16.10.15, 16, 18, 19, ed. Mommsen and Meyer, I.2 pp.901ff. See also Theodoret, *EcclHist* ed. Parmentier, pp.329f, who records that John Chrysostom secured funds from rich Christian women to pay the expenses of razing temples in Phoenicia.

[43] Roger Thynne, *The Churches of Rome* (London 1924) 63.

[44] Ambrose, *Epist.* 40 and 41, in Migne *PL* 16 (Paris 1845) cols. 1101ff.

the church itself victoriously exerting pressure so that the ruler would not promote the building of a shrine dedicated to any religion other than Christianity. Ambrose in fact termed Theodosius' intent with respect to the synagogue "apostasy." The signal victory which Ambrose won over imperial power furnished a precedent for church-state relations which was later frequently to be cited by the Western church, although in the East, despite the fame of the incident at the time, the lesson was quickly lost in the face of the great growth of the emperor's power over the church.

A staunch opponent of Arianism, Theodosius nevertheless permitted his Arian Gothic *foederati* to have their own Arian church in Constantinople. This was in line with his policy of conciliation, or accommodation, toward the Goths, since they then constituted a grave threat to the imperial government itself.[45] Later when the threat subsided, Patriarch John Chrysostom would refuse to continue this permission, though granting a church to the Goths of the orthodox faith.[46]

Under Theodosius' sons, Honorius in the West and Arcadius in the East, there was some church building, but certainly nothing to compare with that of Constantine or of Justinian later. On the other hand, in the East under Arcadius we see a considerable amount of church construction on the part of individual patrons other than the emperor, especially his own wife Eudoxia. She contributed to the building of churches in Gaza, particularly the so-called Eudoxiana, for the construction of which (according to the contemporary writer Mark the Deacon) she assigned 200 pounds of gold out of the revenues of the province of Palestine. This fact would seem to indicate at least the cooperation of the imperial authority in her project.[47]

Mark the Deacon makes an illuminating comment with reference to Arcadius' policy toward the pagans. When Eudoxia interceded in behalf of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza, and requested that Arcadius order the pagan temples of Gaza to be razed and replaced with Christian

[45] Massimiliano Pavan, *La politica gotica de Teodosio nella pubblicistica del suo tempo* (Rome 1964); see review, *AHR* 71 (1965) 131f.

[46] Zosimus, *Hist* ed. Bekker, pp.269ff. Sozomen, *EcclHist* ed. Bidez, pp.355ff. Socrates, *EcclHist*, *PG* 67, cols. 675ff. Theodoret, *EcclHist* ed. Parmentier, p.330. See also Stein, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.28) I.361f.

[47] ed. H. Grégoire and M. A. Kugener, *Marc le Diacre, Vie de Porphyre, Évêque de Gaza* (Paris 1930) pp.44, 71. See also M. Avi-Yonah, "The Economics of Byzantine Palestine," *Israel Exploration Journal* 8 (1958) 42, and G. Downey, *Gaza in the Early Sixth Century* (Norman [Okla.] 1963) 22ff.

churches, Arcadius refused. For, though in defiance of the law the people of Gaza were idol worshippers, they were nevertheless, Arcadius insisted, in the eyes of the imperial government loyal citizens who paid their taxes regularly. According to Amantius the Chamberlain, who reported this conversation to Mark, the only step Arcadius would take was to agree to the closing of the temples and the removal of pagans from public office, fearing that by too harsh an action he might deprive the state of a good source of revenue. If these reports on Arcadius are accurate, it would seem that more important to Arcadius even than the exaltation of the Christian religion was the loyal observance by citizens of their duties to the state.[48]

For the reign of Arcadius' successor, Theodosius II, there is evidence of the building of churches by provincial governors and military leaders, especially in Syria.[49] Most important were the religious structures erected by Theodosius' estranged wife Eudocia. A modern authority calls her the greatest private benefactor in Palestine.[50] We are told that she placed a 6,000-pound copper cross over the Church of the Ascension in Jerusalem, gave 400 gold pieces to a monastery nearby, and built the church of St Stephen also in Jerusalem, besides erecting a palace for the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was now becoming important. It has been estimated that in all she spent in Palestine 20,480 pounds of gold, that is 1,500,000 gold coins, two gold coins then being enough to keep one person for a year. Whether any conclusion may be drawn here as to any connection between her efforts and those of the government to control the spread of Monophysitism in Palestine is a question that still awaits investigation.

The external difficulties of the empire, which waxed more and more serious, now prevented the emperors from undertaking much monumental church building. In Italy, in 476, the Germanic invasions culminated with the deposition of the last western Roman emperor

[48] Mark the Deacon, *Life of Porphyry*, ed. Grégoire and Kugener, p.35. In their introduction (pp. xliii–xliv), the editors compare the use of εὐγνωμονέω 'to be of good feeling', regarding the willingness of the people of Gaza to pay their taxes, with the term εὐγνωμοσύνη 'loyalty', used by Justinian regarding the loyalty of the people of Caesarea—see his Novel 103 (in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, ed. R. Schoell and W. Kroll, III [Berlin 1912] pp.469f). Arcadius' hesitation to destroy the Marneion in the center of the city was in line with a general policy to secularize rather than destroy all city temples; see above, n.42.

[49] Evagrius, *EcclHist*, *PG* 86.2 (Paris 1865) cols. 2469, 2472, mentions churches in Antioch named for Rufinus, Prefect of the East under Theodosius I, for Zoilus and Callistus, each at one time *Consularis* of Syria, and for Anatolius, a *strategos*. See also M. Avi-Yonah, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.47) 43ff and 50f, for a list of private benefactors in Palestine.

[50] Avi-Yonah, *loc.cit.* 44. Evagrius, *EcclHist*, *PG* 86.2, cols. 2476–2484.

Romulus Augustulus. In the East the reigns of the emperors Marcian, Leo I, Leo II and Zeno seem relatively unimportant to our problem, and we come therefore to Anastasius. To strengthen the Empire he built the famous long walls protecting the approaches to Constantinople, and he also promoted a reform of the coinage, leaving a full treasury for his successor Justin. It is of interest, moreover, that Anastasius was the first emperor before his enthronement to be required by the patriarch to take an oath that he would make no changes in the orthodox creed—obviously to prevent partisanship on his part for the Monophysites.[51]

Under Justin, as most historians agree, the power behind the throne was his nephew Justinian. And it seems probable that Justinian did much of his less ostentatious building during his uncle's reign. As noted earlier, Justinian was at once probably the greatest of all Byzantine imperial builders and the most Caesaropapistic of emperors. But the question here is not why he became even more a master of the church than his predecessors—why, for example, he was able not only to secure Pope Vigilius' assent to virtually all his wishes and even to induce the fathers of the Fifth Ecumenical Council to accept his own revised Theopaschite interpretation of Chalcedonian doctrine.[52] Rather, the question is how this mastery he achieved over the church was or was not reflected in his extensive church building program.

It was Justinian's basic political aim to restore the old Roman frontiers, to reconquer the West from the Arian Germans, and, at the same time, in the East, to preserve the loyalty of his provinces in the face of the Persian advances by placating the Monophysites.[53] In Justinian's eyes, as in Constantine's, there is no question that the concept of the unity of empire was absolutely fundamental. But to him, as to his predecessor, it meant not only imposition of one correct orthodox faith under one emperor. Even more explicitly and emphatically than under Constantine, the law codes of Justinian (in which he is termed the Elect of God, king-priest, even archpriest—

[51] P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius I* (Madison 1939) 12.

[52] M. Anastos, "Justinian's Despotic Control over the Church as Illustrated by his Edict on Theopaschite Formula and Letter to Pope John in 533," *ZborRadVizInst* no. 312 (= *Mélanges Ostrogorsky* II [1964] 1–11). See Geanakoplos, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 392–94, 397–98.

[53] Bury, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.42) II.23ff, 360ff and 392. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-empire* II (Paris 1949) 278–279.

ἀρχιερεύς)[54] reveal how church and state had become more closely tied together than ever before. Rather than the church's being simply a department of state, however, as some scholars have inaccurately put it, under Justinian the church and state might better be considered parallel branches of the one Christian commonwealth, Eusebius' Basileia, over which the emperor presided as God's vicegerent. Because of Justinian's close association of church and state and the religious significance he attached to his imperial authority, not to speak of the tenacity of Byzantine ecclesiastical tradition, it seems very possible that the so-called liturgical privileges attributed to the emperors by the later Byzantine canonists may have become crystallized in Justinian's time. The canonists speak of the emperor as a kind of semi-priestly figure who could perform certain liturgical functions normally reserved only to the priesthood. The emperor could for example preach during the religious service, enter into the sanctuary itself where the altar was, cense the people, and even take communion from the cup with his own hands without the intermediary of the priest. It would be wrong, however, as Mitard and Diehl do, to call the emperor a priest. For in the last analysis he could not administer the sacraments.[55]

To what extent do we see reflected in Justinian's church-building program an emphasis on the unity of faith in the Christian empire, that is on orthodoxy, right belief in the basic sense of the word? The historian Evagrius gives us at least a hint of such an emphasis when speaking of the Western areas reconquered from the heretic Arian Germans. In the one-hundred fifty cities of Vandal Africa restored to the empire by Justinian, the emperor built "vast structures [by which] cities are adorned and the Deity propitiated,"[56] a statement that would seem to refer to orthodox churches. One modern historian emphasizes that Justinian's construction, in former Ostrogothic territory, of the church of San Vitale at Ravenna was primarily in-

[54] W. Ensslin, "The Emperor and the Imperial Administration," in *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilization*, ed. N. H. Baynes and H. St B. Moss (Oxford 1961) 275, points out that both Theodosius II and Justinian were greeted as ἀρχιερεύς and that Marcian was acclaimed ἱερεύς and βασιλεύς at the Council of Chalcedon.

[55] See Geanakoplos, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 390–92 with bibl. (citing Mitard and Diehl). As Procopius puts it, *Aed.* ed. Haury/Wirth, IV p.6, Justinian closed all paths leading to error and established religion firmly upon a single foundation of the faith.

[56] Evagrius, *EcclHist*, *PG* 86.2, cols. 2736–2737. See n.58 below for the churches in that area specifically mentioned by Procopius.

tended to supplant Arian with orthodox worship,[57] as seems to have been the case with his construction of the churches mentioned in Vandal Africa, for example, at Septum.[58] And we have explicit evidence, often overlooked, from John of Ephesus, a Monophysite, that Justinian built 96 churches, 55 of these explicitly with imperial funds, for the use of the converted "Hellenes," that is former pagans, in Western Asia Minor.[59] The evidence of these statements would certainly seem to indicate that Justinian, like Constantine before him, followed a policy of encouraging the construction of churches in order to combat heresy as well as paganism.

In the construction of St Sophia in Constantinople, undoubtedly Justinian's greatest building achievement, his architects Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus achieved a solution to one of the most difficult engineering problems in architectural history, the erecting of a huge, round, masonry dome over a large square surface. One leading art historian, B. Smith, believes that Justinian may have been impelled to construct St Sophia's magnificent dome less from structural or aesthetic considerations than from the influence of ideas long current in the Near East—the imagery of the dome as representing heaven, that is as a kind of celestial canopy over the earth, both heaven and earth constituting halves of a great cosmic egg. These ideas are connected with the popular cult of the old pagan heroes, the Greek Dioskouroi, who were considered precursors of the Christian martyrs

[57] MacDonald, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 32, and Fleming, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.31) 147. *Cf.* Bury, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.42) II.284f.

[58] Procop. *Aed.* ed. Haury/Wirth, IV p.185. In addition to the church at Septum, modern Ceuta, five churches at Leptis Magna, modern Lebda (p.177), a church at Sabratha, modern Tripoli Vecchia (p.178), and two churches and a monastery at Carthage are mentioned (p.180). A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* I (Madison 1964) 138f, mentions archaeological evidence of apparently Justinianic churches in Spain and in the Crimea (at Dory).

[59] See Bury, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.42) II.371. These churches were built in Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria; 55 were paid for by the imperial treasury and 41 were built by the proselytes out of their own funds. Two monasteries were also built. Procopius makes no attempt to list all Justinian's buildings (see *Aed.* ed. Haury/Wirth, IV pp.38, 186), yet he does name or imply the presence of church building(s) at over seventy different sites. Twelve of the churches or shrines mentioned were dedicated to the θεοτόκος (*loc.cit.* p.20, *et passim*). In Constantinople and the adjoining areas he built over twenty new churches, shrines and sanctuaries, and rebuilt or enlarged over half that many. *Cf.* G. Downey, *Constantinople in the Days of Justinian* (Norman [Okla.] 1960) 100. Procopius' statement (*Aed.* p.34) that no churches were built anywhere in the empire *without* imperial sanction should be read in the light of statements in his *Historia Arcana* (original title, *Ἀνέκδοτα*) ed. J. Haury and G. Wirth, *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia* III (Leipzig 1963) pp.158f, 164, regarding the emperor's many exactions and control over local spending.

and whose cult, it appears, was of deep interest to Justinian.[60] Justinian's contemporary, the poet Paul the Silentiary, in his long encomium in honor of the church of St Sophia, seems to draw precisely on the above imagery when he describes St Sophia's dome as "the great [celestial] helmet, which, rounded in all respects like a sphere, embraces the top of the building [the church] like the radiant heavens."[61]

Justinian dedicated his cathedral of St Sophia to the Divine Wisdom, the Logos, that is to Christ Himself. (In the *De Aedificiis* Procopius says explicitly that the Byzantines sometimes called God "Sophia.")[62] But it seems certain that Justinian envisioned St Sophia as a symbol of his own imperial authority as well. We know that it was his aim to build the most magnificent church in all Christendom, and for this purpose (he was not the first Christian emperor to do so, by the way)[63] he despoiled ancient temples of their treasures. The remark that Byzantine writers report Justinian to have made at the completion of the structure, "Solomon, I have surpassed thee,"[64] is particularly significant, because it emphasized Justinian's connection with the most famous Hebrew king-priest *and* temple builder. Paul the Silentiary, in his descriptive panegyric on St Sophia (written evidently at imperial request), speaks of the day of that church's dedication as

[60] E. B. Smith, *The Dome: A Study in the History of Ideas* (Princeton 1950) esp. pp.77ff. Procop. *Aed.* ed. Haury/Wirth IV p.30, writes that Justinian expressed his gratitude for a miraculous cure received from Saints Cosmas and Damian, the Christian counterparts of Castor and Pollux, by rebuilding and enlarging their shrine at Constantinople. The association between the Christian saints and the pagan twins is also suggested by Bury, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.42) I.373. *Cf.* Swift, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 80–84, 107f, who argues that the domes of St Sergius and Bacchus and St Sophia were inspired by domes in Rome which Anthemius of Tralles is supposed to have studied. There seems little doubt that the imagery of the dome suggesting heaven and the analogy between the emperor's authority over the earth with that of God in heaven was important in Justinian's adoption of the dome for St Sophia. See esp. Fleming's statement, n.71 below.

[61] Paulus Silentiarius, *Descriptio S. Sophiae* ed. Bekker (*CSHistByz* 32, Bonn 1837) p.25, lines 489–491:

> ἐγρομένη δ' ἐφύπερθεν ἐς ἄπλετον ἠέρα πήληξ
> πάντοθι μὲν σφαιρηδὸν ἐλίσσεται, οἷα δὲ φαιδρὸς
> οὐρανὸς ἀμφιβέβηκε δόμου σκέπας.

Note also lines 529f (p.27) where the dome is described by the words, *καλύπτρη | εὐπήληξ βαθύκολπος ἀείρεται* 'the roof rises like a beautiful high-crowned helmet'.

[62] Ed. Haury/Wirth, IV p.8.

[63] Constantine had despoiled temples: see above, nn.6 and 23. Justinian despoiled Arian churches, according to Procop. *HistArc* ed. Haury/Wirth, III pp.72ff.

[64] Justinian's words are recorded in an anonymous account preserved by Banduri and other editors: see *Διήγησις περὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐπονομαζομένης Ἁγίας Σοφίας* §27, ed. T. Preger, *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum* I (Leipzig 1901) p.105.

one in which "God and the emperor are celebrated together" (*Θεός τε καὶ βασιλεὺς σεμνύνεται*).[65] And, more than once in his *De Aedificiis*, Procopius, while praising Justinian's personal abilities as a kind of non-professional architect-engineer, attributes his success in solving difficult problems of church construction above all to his partnership (*συνδιαπράσσεται*) with God.[66] There is a very striking and effective argument, based on Malalas, regarding the emperor's building creations, *κτίσεις*[67] (the same Greek term used, incidentally, as the title of Procopius' *Buildings*)[68] in imitation of Divine creativity—evidence which further emphasizes the parallel we have been drawing between God's power in heaven and his viceroy's activities on earth. In connection with this imperial ideology it would be useful, also, if it could be determined whether or not the famous passage in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De Cerimoniis* regarding the emperor's double throne obtained as early as the reign of Justinian. According to this tenth century source the emperor's throne was a double one. The emperor usually sat on the right side, which was considered that of Christ. On Sundays and feast days, however, he sat on the left, leaving the right side vacant so as to make it visible to all that he *shared* (*σύνθρονος*) his throne with Christ.[69]

In our analysis of the reigns of the emperors from Constantine to Justinian, we may then distinguish three basic interrelated purposes in their policy of constructing churches. Aside from the obvious practical desire to provide places of worship where none previously existed (as in the newly converted area of Tzanica in eastern Asia Minor under Justinian),[70] the imperial building programs seem basically to have been motivated by: (1) a wish to promote the one true faith (as the emperors saw it) to the detriment of paganism and heresy, (2) the ideological aim (aided by what several scholars have termed "imperial propaganda")[71] of glorifying the imperial power

[65] Paul. Silent. *DescrSSophiae* ed. Bekker, p.3 line 2.

[66] Procop. *Aed.* ed. Haury/Wirth, IV p.55.

[67] G. Downey, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," *BZ* 38 (1938) 1–11, esp. 10 and n.3.

[68] Procop. *Aed.* (*Περὶ κτισμάτων*) ed. Haury/Wirth, IV p.134, concludes his discussion here of all Justinian's buildings (*κτίσεις*) in Constantinople, ecclesiastical and secular.

[69] Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae* ed. Reiske (*CSHistByz* 9, Bonn 1830) p.521. Also see E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae* (Berkeley 1946) 50.

[70] Procop. *Aed.* ed. Haury/Wirth, IV p.92.

[71] G. Armstrong (*supra* n.3) for the term 'propaganda' follows the usage of B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians* I (Berlin 1960) 139–45. Fleming, (*supra* n.31) 171f, suggests that centralized churches like San Vitale and St Sophia with their "sharp hierarchical divisions that set aside a place for men and women, clergy and laity, aristocrat and commoner,

as the representative on earth of the divine power in heaven (as seen most clearly in St Sophia), and (3) (and this is an overlapping psychological consideration that would not of course normally be documented in the official sources except in such a work as Procopius' vituperative anti-Justinianic *Secret History*)[72] the emperors' desire to satisfy their own personal egoism and ambition which, in the *Weltanschauung* of the period, they fused in their own minds with the concept of the emperor as commissioned by God to rule the earth. As Justinian put it, in a typical phrase drawn from his *Codex Justinianus* expressing what might be called this political theology: "We rule, by the authority of God, the empire which has been entrusted to us by the majesty of Heaven."[73]

To conclude: it seems clear that in the case of virtually every emperor we have studied, there existed a definite correlation, expressed or unexpressed, between the emperor's policy of control (or lack of control) over the church, that is his so-called "Caesaropapism," and his policy with regard to the construction of churches. In general then it may be said that the emperors' building of religious structures constituted an instrument not only for the furthering of imperial control over the church, but, through imperial insistence on ecclesiastical unity as reflected in the aims of their building policy, for promoting the ultimate aim of the unity of the empire itself.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

April, 1966

---

were admirably suited to convey the principle of imperial authority. [Such structures inspired an attitude of reverence] not only to God, but also to His viceroys on earth . . . The majesty of God was felt through the infinite power of government . . . Both spiritual and secular authority were imposed on man from above [fostering his acceptance of] the unified ideal of one Christian empire with one church, one emperor, and one body of laws." See also n.67 above.

[72] *HistArc* ed. Haury/Wirth, III pp.51, 120f and esp. 162.

[73] *Codex Justinianus* 1.17.1 ed. Krueger, *Corpus Iuris Civilis* III, p.69. For further analysis of Byzantine church-state ideology see my *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Oxford 1966) 33, 86, 96ff; see also G. Mathew, *Byzantine Aesthetics* (London 1963) esp. 59–64, 86, 93, which deals peripherally with some of the questions discussed in this article.