Petre Guran

THE CONSTANTINOPLE – NEW JERUSALEM
AT THE CROSSING OF SACRED SPACE
AND POLITICAL THEOLOGY

For someone in love with Russian culture and history it is hard once in Moscow not to visit the *Sadovaia 302bis* and the *Patriarshye Prudy*. Quickly and quite naturally in my first walks into Moscow, I entered the world of Mikhail Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita*, which reminded me that the novel's action takes place simultaneously in Moscow and Jerusalem[1]. Does it make sense to link the two historical world capitals? The present international Colloquium fully revealed the meaning and the historical path of such parallelisms. For Bulgakov Moscow stood for the universal capital of the Marxist thought and communist belief, a revolutionary philosophy promising social justice and general welfare, illustrated by Lenin's political achievement, meanwhile Jerusalem was the city of that other founder of hope for universal happiness, almost 2000 years earlier, who preferred to die for his ideas. Jerusalem and Moscow, two places in this world, where confrontation between good and evil took paroxistic dimensions, bound together in a fool's imagination, the Master, by the belief in an otherworldly, non-material, ubiquitous reality.

Russian culture had since long had this stance on its own role in world history. Moscow was alternately "Second Constantinople"[2], "Third Rome"[3], but also, in perfect continuation of this logic, as we shall see, "New Jerusa-

---

[1] *David M. Bethea*. History as Hippodrome: The Apocalyptic Horse and Rider in The Master and Margarita // Russian Review, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Oct., 1982), p. 373–399, especially 387–89 and 395–99 about the Heavenly Jerusalem.

[2] *Лурье Я. С.* Идеологическая борьба в русской публицистике конца XV — начала XVI века. Москва — Ленинград, 1960, с. 375.

[3] L'idea di Roma a Mosca, Secoli XV–XVI. Fonti per la storia del pensiero sociale russo / Éds. P. Catalano, V. Pašuto, N. V. Sinicyna, Ja. N. Ščapov, M. Capaldo. Rome, 1989, p. 147.

lem"[4]. To illustrate this concept, our host, Alexei Lidov, invited us for the opening session of the Symposium to the monastery called "New Jerusalem", built by Nikon, patriarch of Moscow, in the mid-sixteenth century, in the vicinity of Moscow. There we saw in stone and picture a whole sacred landscape: that of Christ's mission on earth, reproduced at natural scale. The phenomenon implies art and religion first of all[5], in a manifestation that surpasses the usual standards of art historical studies, coined by Alexei Lidov as *hierotopy*[6], but I would like to draw attention to a particular aspect that lies beneath this religious and artistic form, a political inspiration. In order to do this, this essay needs to bring into play another concept, that of *political theology*.

As we start the discussion, we will have to take into consideration R. Ousterhout's *caveat* in an article published in one of Alexei Lidov's previous volumes on hierotopy. After a thorough investigation of the possible references to "New Jerusalem", Robert Ousterhout reaches the conclusion that "they are considerably fewer and more elusive"[7] in comparison to the Western religious and artistic occurrences[8] and even to its Russian counterpart[9]. Constantinople is in many respects a new city, which uses old models, but with a great disposition to free associations in a sometimes randomly growing urban context[10], and is thus readier to respond to rhetoric and its fictitious constructions. It is to the role of the New Jerusalem theme within this blurred rhetoric that we address our analysis, not before drawing a sketch of what we understand by the term political theology.

---

[4] *Rowland D.* Moscow — the Third Rome or the New Israel? // The Russian Review, 55/4, 1996, p. 591–615; *Лидов А. М.* Образ Небесного Иерусалима в восточнохристианской иконографии // Иерусалим в русской культуре / Ред. А. Баталов, А. Лидов. Москва, 1994, с. 15–33; *Lidov A.* Heavenly Jerusalem: the Byzantine Approach // The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Art / Ed. B. Kühnel, *Jewish Art* 23/24, Jerusalem, 1998, p. 341–353.

[5] *Khünel B.* From the Earthly to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Representation of the Holy City in Christian Art of the First Millennium // Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte. Supplementhefte 42 (Rom – Freiburg – Wien 1987), 23–28.

[6] *Lidov A.* Hierotopy. The creation of sacred spaces as a form of creativity and subject of cultural history // Hierotopy. Creation of sacred spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia / Ed. A. Lidov, Moscow, 2006.

[7] *Ousterhout R.* Sacred Geographies and Holy Cities: Constantinople as Jerusalem // Hierotopy. Studies in the Making of Sacred Spaces. Material from the International Symposium / Ed. A. Lidov. Moscow, 2004, p. 70.

[8] *Ousterhout R.* The Church of Santo Stefano: A "Jerusalem" in Bologna // Gesta, Vol. 20, No. 2 (1981), p. 311–321; *Idem*, The Temple, the Sepulchre, and the Martyrion of the Savior // Gesta, Vol. 29, No. 1. (1990), p. 44–53.

[9] *Зеленская Г. М.* Новый Иерусалим. Путеводитель. М., 2003.

[10] *Dagron G.* Le christianisme dans la ville byzantine // DOP 31(1977), 6–8; *Ćurčić S.* Late-antique palaces: the meaning of urban context // *Ars Orientalis* 87(1993), 67.

POLITICAL THEOLOGY

It was largely believed that the perfect blend of Christianity and empire was once and forever offered in the refined recipe of Eusebius of Caesarea for his imperial patron, Constantine[11]. Modern scholarship has described the encounter between pagan Rome — or not yet Christian Constantinople — and the religion of Christ as a complex and quite long process[12], stretching well over 300 years since the presumed founder of the Christian empire. A major role has been ascribed to imperial agency, and rightly so.

But whose religion did the emperor actually promote? It would be easy game and probably false to denounce the emperor's, Constantine's for example, cynical use of Christianity, but we are equally critical of accepting pious stories. Whatever the starting point, empire and Christianity grew together for a long time and imperceptibly, maybe unwillingly, twisted each other.

Inside the broader frame of Christianity it is this twist that I aim to call *political theology*. Basically we may infer that it took several generations of Christians in power to read Eusebius of Caesarea, grasp some of his ideas and to transform them through contextual use and oral transmission into common knowledge and belief. We encounter here a great juridical-historical debate of the 20th century, that concerning the notion of political theology. Carl Schmitt described through this notion the secularization of theological concepts as modern juridical terminology of sovereignty[13]. With much more historical depth, Erik Peterson tried to respond by showing that monarchist forms of Christianity, like Arianism, favored the monarchical development of the empire, meanwhile Trinitarian Christianity slowed down the process. Thus, he threw, as a good catholic theologian, the whole responsibility of political theology on non-orthodox Christianity[14]. Finally, the concept was introduced with full legitimacy in medieval historical research by Ernst Kantorowicz. He described a long historical process by which a medieval mystical system of representations penetrated the legal thought of the early modern State and nourished a whole range of politico-juridical concepts[15]. Recently Alain Boureau unveiled the particular intellectual process

---

[11] *Piganiol A.* L'empire chretien (325–395). 2nd. ed. Paris, 1972; *Barnes T. D.* Constantine and Eusebius. Cambridge, 1981.

[12] *Dagron G.* Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 a 451. Paris, 1974; *Fox Robin Lane.* Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine. New York, 1987.

[13] *Schmitt C..* Politische Theologie. Vier Kapitel zur Lehre von der Souveränität. Berlin, 1922.

[14] *Peterson E.* Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Theologie im Imperium Romanum. Leipzig, 1935; *idem*, Christus als Imperator // *Catholica* 5 (1936), 64–72.

[15] *Kantorowicz E.* The King's two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology. Princeton UP, 1957; for the complex intellectual and personal relationship between Schmitt, Peterson

by which the modern State emerged as a subject of political reflection in the early scholastic period (1200–1350). He called that phenomenon *La religion de l'Etat*[16]. In my approach, I will add to this debate the hypothesis that political theology is not only a process specific to early modern or even late medieval Europe, as Alain Boureau put it, the starting point of secularization, but present already in late antiquity. Political organization requires a certain degree of religious involvement, as we believe to know today[17], but political thinkers of the fourth century were naturally aware of this observation (as it is largely attested in the works of Themistius, Libanius or Synesius). Within the religious turmoil of their epoch they built a *political theology*, inspired by a variety of sources, neo-platonic predominantly, that best fitted the political challenges of an overextended and complex empire.

This religion within a religion grew easily in the cultural framework of state-building in late antiquity, but being closely related to the one who made the most use out of it, the emperor, political theology therefore took a path of strong personalization. We may find emperors whose footprints marked the route, but no coherent construction. It is rather the story of a repeatedly renewed but difficult ceasefire between the worldly empire, so hated by the first Christians, and the Kingdom of God, so constantly distrusted and mocked since Pilate of Pontus.

The fifth to seventh centuries are at the core of the process of Christianization of this political theology. Theodosius wanted to learn the true religion from Ambrose, tells us Theodoret in his *Ecclesiastical History*, and by unveiling the opposition between the Constantinopolitan, i.e. oriental, practice of the emperor staying in the sanctuary during liturgy on the one hand and the "western" righteousness of Ambrose, who expels the emperor from the sanctuary and explains the difference between priesthood and emperorship, on the other, he announced a recurrent debate on the sacerdotal status of the emperor. The lesson learned by Theodosius the Elder was applied by Theodosius the Younger in his novel that forbids the emperor to enter in the church with his retinue[18]. As Theodoret's story goes, Theodosius learned the difference be-

---

[16] and Kantorowicz see the remarkable article by *Geréby György*. Carl Schmitt and Erik Peterson on the Problem of Political Theology: A Footnote to Kantorowicz // *Aziz Al-Azmeh, Janos Bak*. Monotheistic Kingship. The Medieval Variants. Budapest, Central European University Press, 2004, 31–61.

[16] *Boureau A.* La religion de l'Etat. La construction de la république étatique dans le discours théologique de l'Occident médiéval (1250–1350). Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2006.

[17] *Dagron G.* Empereur et Prêtre. Étude sur le 'césaropapisme' byzantin. Paris, 1996, p. 17.

[18] "For we, whom always rightly the weapons of military authority surround, and for whom it is not proper to be without bodyguards, when entering God's temple, abandon aour weapons outside, taking off our diadem, and by the appearance of the lessening of our majesty, there is reaped by us all the more awe for the majesty of empire". Council of Ephesus: Collectio Vaticana 137.3 / Ed. Schwartz, ACO 1.4, p 64.8, trans. P. R. Coleman Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church* (London SPCK, 1966) vol. 2, p. 657.

tween priesthood and emperorship the hard way, through a public confrontation[19]. A century later, Justinian took a whole other stand on the issue. He believed that it was his role to teach God's laws, to formulate the truth of the Church, as in the Three Chapters. Justinian's political theology follows the opposite path of sacralization of the imperial function. Agapetus' *Advisory Chapters* to the emperor Justinian attest of this trend. He can be seen entering the churches with his retinue, fully armed soldier, the *doryphoroi*[20]. At the end of the seventh century it seems that once again the emperor had to quit his *regalia* and even his access to the sanctuary was allowed as an exception admitted for the imperial majesty, according to the council *in Trullo*.

Heraclius's reign is no less prominent in this reformulation of political theology by his assumption of the title *basileus* and the innovations in the coronation ritual[21]. Sometimes "Christian History" perfectly overlaps with political theology in the most genuine way, but at other times, no less significant, Christians were at odds with imperial Christianity or liked to make us believe that they were so.

The present study also joins in another historiographic debate, concerning the rhythm of change from a pagan to a Christian society. Since the 1970's the development of the studies of late antiquity has tended to play down the shock of Christianization and barbarization of the empire and to describe a progressive social, political and cultural transformation from the antique to the medieval forms of society. After the opening of the debate in French historiography by Henri-Irénée Marrou[22], Peter Brown was considered the champion of this methodological approach to a period that he stretches from Marc Aurelius to Charlemagne[23]. His determining contribution was to close the eighteenth century rhetoric of decline and fall (Montesquieu, Gibbon), in which Christianity played the role of interior enemy[24]. My contribution to this debate will be to emphasize that Christianity is not directly and genuinely responsible for the political change in the Roman Empire; that the changes we observe from the late third to the sixth century owe as much to the Hellenization of the empire and to the social and political context as to its Christianization. As in any attempt of periodization it is very

---

[19] *Theodoret of Cyrrhus*. Hist. eccl., V, 18, 20–25.

[20] See the commentary on the hymn of the Cherubim in Rudolf H. W. Stichel, « Die Hagia Sophia Justinians in Konstantinople als Bühne des Kaisers », *Kolloquim 2000–2001. Fachbereich Architektur*, TU Darmastadt, p. 10–19.

[21] *Guran P.* Genesis and Function of the Last Emperor myth in Byzantine Eschatology // Bizantinistica, 9, 2007.

[22] *Marrou H.-I.* Décadence romaine ou antiquité tardive? IIIe– IVe siècle. Paris, 1977.

[23] *Brown P.* The world of late antiquity, AD 150–750. New York, 1971.

[24] *Momigliano A.* Christianity and the Decline of the Roman Empire // *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* / Ed. A. Momigliano. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1963.

hard to draw limits. Notwithstanding, Christianity in the fourth century is not a starting point for the monarchical transformation of the empire, the historian needs a larger period to grasp the phenomenon.

It was once considered common knowledge that *political theology* of the Later Roman Empire resulted from the blend of Hellenistic political philosophy, Roman legal thought and Christian faith[25]. Nevertheless the blending itself was a weary process, with successive layers of the different ingredients. By uncovering the chronology and dynamics of the process which brought into existence the ideal image described by Herbert Hunger as "Reich der neuen Mitte"[26] we may discover how much this construction depended on historical evolution and immediate context.

The starting point of any Christian political theology lies in those themes and references to the authoritative writings of the Christians which constituted the base for the Christian insertion into the political world of Rome. Matthew 22, 21[27], Romans 13, 1–6[28], I Peter 2, 13–17[29] described a world of submission to temporal powers and in as much as possible harmonious relation to the pagan environment in hope of the timely relief through the Parousia; meanwhile the Apocalypse of John, expressing another type of political experience by Christians, depicts a full-blown conflict with "forces of evil", a straight denunciation of worldly power. These cases in point foreshadow the two extreme positions of the Christians as to power throughout centuries.

Taking another perspective, Erik Peterson raised the question whether Christianity strengthened the monarchical character of the late Roman world by its doctrinal content. His answer distinguished between a heretical Christianity, guilty of political theology, and an orthodox one, which opposed it. A parallel explanation emphasized that Christian thought just followed a trend better rooted in its Hellenistic ground[30].

To Peterson's heresy/orthodoxy distinction we have to add the more classical distinction East/West and raise the following questions: is there a Western appetite for independence of the Church versus an Eastern tendency

---

[25] *Ostrogorsky G.* History of the Byzantine State. New Brunswick, 1957.

[26] *Hunger H.* Reich der neuen Mitte. Der christliche Geist der byzantinische Kultur. Graz, Koln, Wien, 1965.

[27] "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's".

[28] "Every person must submit to the supreme authorities. [...] The authorities are in God's service and to these duties they devote their energies".

[29] "Submit yourselves to every human institution for the sake of the Lord, whether to the sovereign as supreme, or to the governor as his deputy for the punishment of criminals and the commendation of those who do right. […] reverence to God, honour to the sovereign".

[30] *Dagron G.* L'Empire romain d'Orient au IVe siècle et les traditions politiques de l'hellénisme, le témoignage de Thémistios // Travaux et Mémoires 3, 1968, 1–242.

to submission? Or was it only the mere proximity and solid structure of Roman power in Constantinople that determined the Eastern specificity?

From Constantine to Heraclius, a series of clashes between ecclesiastical authorities and political power and dramatic reconfigurations of the political landscape in late antiquity, such as the fall and loss of the Western half of the empire or later the military and political shock of the war with Persia and the rise of Islam, contributed to a history which made sense of a doctrinal content and transformed practices, precedents and traditions into a fragile but functional "constitutional" thought in Byzantium[31]. Each historical challenge was the opportunity to rethink the Christian character of imperial power. It is hard to draw the line between an imperial and Constantinopolitan production of Christian political doctrine, Heraclius' *basileia* for example, and an ongoing Christian attitude of distrust towards power, expressed in fact in peripheral circles, whether geographic (Rome and its sense of independence), or spiritual (the monastic desert).

Taking another path and a later period than in Peterson's argumentation, we might however reach the conclusion that in Constantinople *political theology* merges with the concern for orthodoxy, as each Church council of the 5th and 6th centuries opens and concludes with imperial acclamations. It is the very end of the seventh century that reserves a wonderful surprise for the historian. The canonical collection, established by the council *in Trullo* (692), was published together with a significant preamble addressed to the emperor, in which we can read an uninhibited rhetoric on imperial power in the genre of Eusebius. Indeed, orthodoxy was there, produced and preserved in the political center, and the abovementioned peripheries always strove to claim their righteousness or to proclaim their challenge in the center. Recalcitrant and noisy monks were to be held out of the councils' gatherings, as orders an imperial constitution of Theodosius II; the non-Chalcedonians sought refuge in Theodora's palace in Constantinople. A heresy was not a heresy until it was expelled from the center. For the seventh and eighth century, the system started functioning the other way round. A severe trial in Constantinople could assure to a religious dissenter his posthumous success. In the seventh century the trial of Maximus Confessor took place in Constantinople and in the eighth century the trial of Saint Stephen the Younger by the iconoclast emperor Constantine V even in the Hippodrome. The initial defeat of the dissenter was eventually turned into triumph when a change of policy occurred in Constantinople. The narrator transforms the castigatory examination in Constantinople in an opportunity to proclaim the truth to the

---

[31] *Beck H.-G.* Res publica romana. Vom Staatsdenken der Byzantiner // Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte. 1970, Heft 2, p. 7–41, reprinted in: Das byzantinische Herrscherbild / Ed. H. Hunger. Darmstadt 1975, p. 379–414.

whole world. The official history of Orthodoxy records the later triumphant point of view and expels the discordant view from the sources. If political will seems primordial in establishing orthodoxy, later narrative strategies about orthodox heroes insert coherence into what looks, from a political point of view, as a change of actors and contexts. Creators of Orthodoxy are thus both those who act directly on the battlefield of political action and those who tell the story of the religious conflict.

The conflict around orthodoxy, or the succession of orthodoxies throughout these centuries, accentuates the fact that the emperor held his own version of Christianity. Historians are privileged by the amount of sources produced in the proximity of power in their attempt to retrace the rise and function of political theology. What the historian should avoid is to merely take the latter as Christianity[32]. We have to group carefully the evidence into small temporal units. What makes sense in the fourth century does not in the sixth. What one believes in Palestine is still unknown in Constantinople at the same time. We will exemplify this idea in the ensuing research on the theme of New Jerusalem.

THE BYZANTINE NEW JERUSALEM

When Simeon the Stylite the Elder advised Daniel the Stylite to travel to Constantinople instead of Jerusalem, he named the imperial city a New Jerusalem. Daniel would find there, the old stylite said, churches and holy places as significant and impressive as those of Jerusalem[33]. By the middle of the fifth century and even more at the end of that century, when the life of Daniel the Stylite was written, Constantinople was the unique center of power in the Roman world and thus central to the Christian community. Simeon the Stylite was quite aware of this fact as it appears from the frequent relations he had with the imperial court under Theodosius II and Leo I. Moreover, upon his death, Simeon sent his monastic leather cowl to the

---

[32] *Rebillard E.* In hora mortis. Evolution de la pastorale chrétienne de la mort au IVe et Ve siècles. Rome, 1994, p. 232 draws the attention to the significant changes which allow him to speak of several «christianismes dans l'histoire». To his view we may add our distinction between simultaneous zones of Christianities, of which one is that in proximity of political power.

[33] *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, chap. 10; *Delehaye H.* Les saints stylites // Subsidia Hagiographica 14. Bruxelles–Paris, 1923, 12; *Dawes E., Baynes N. H.* Three Byzantine Saints. London: 1948. Translation: "go to Byzantium and you will see a second Jerusalem, namely Constantinople; there you can enjoy the martyrs' shrines and the great houses of prayer, and if you wish to be an anchorite in some desert spot, either in Thrace or in Pontus, the Lord will not desert you". *Maraval P.* Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe. Paris 1985, 92 n. 55; *Talbot A. M.* Pilgrimage in the Byzantine Empire: 7th–15th Centuries. Introduction // DOP 56 (2002), 60 and *Maraval P.* The Earliest Phase of Christian Pilgrimage in the Near East (before the 7th century) // DOP 56 (2002), 70.

emperor Leo, but by chance the cowl reached Daniel the Stylite, as a reen-actment of the transmission of Elijah's cloak to his follower Elisha, distort-ing thus the initial signification of a palladium for the emperor or for the whole empire[34]. As the story goes Simeon's spiritual power was transmit-ted to the new holy man, but we are entitled to question the meaning of his initial intent. Finally Daniel himself was not less attentive to political power and took over to guide the emperor through politico-spiritual strug-gles. The notion the text seems to convey is that, in a hagiographical con-text, after Chalcedon, the imperial "New Jerusalem" was ready to reconcile spiritual and political power.

An empire relevant for the whole of mankind needs a religious center, and real power significantly resides only in divinely designed and religiously consecrated spaces. Jerusalem was not only the capital of the anointed king David, but also, as scriptural exegesis and universal chronicles explained for the Byzantine reader[35], the capital of the righteous Melchizedek[36]. This fig-ure embodied the perfect merger of priesthood and kingship, an image which in St. Paul's interpretation was referring to the Christ. The kingdom of Sa-lem was consequently no less an image of the Heavenly Kingdom. Although a Melchizedek-theory was never expressly put forward by imperial ideolo-gists, the comparison with the Byzantine emperor was in the air. The best way to keep this relation discrete but obvious was to attire Melchizedek as a Byzantine emperor in the illustrated manuscripts of the Octateuchs.

Let us put the religious relevance of the Roman power in the terms of R. Guénon's concept of universal kingship (*Le Roi du Monde*). Ancient civili-zations were accustomed to think of history in terms of universal empires.

---

[34] *Dawes E., Baynes N. H.* Three Byzantine Saints: Life of Daniel the Stylite, chap 22: "Not many days later a monk came from the East by name Sergius, a disciple of Saint Simeon, announcing the good end of the Saint's life and carrying in his hands Saint Simeon's leather tunic [the translation leather "cowl" instead of tunic corresponds to a headgear generally used by monks until nowadays] in order to give it to the blessed Emperor Leo by way of benediction. But as the Emperor was busy with public affairs, the aforesaid Sergius could not get a hearing, or rather it was God who so arranged it in order that the new Elisha might receive the mantle of Elijah. When Sergius grew weary of waiting in the City because he could not obtain a hearing, he decided to go as far as the monastery of the Akoimetoi… And Sergius came and embraced the Saint. And whilst they were talking and Daniel, the servant of God, was hearing about the end of the holy Simeon he related his vision to Ser-gius, who on hearing it said, 'It is to thee rather than to the Emperor that God has sent me; for here am I, the disciple of thy father; here, too, is his benediction'. And taking out the tu-nic he handed it in through the window".

[35] *Dagron G.* Empereur et Prêtre. Étude sur le 'césaropapisme' byzantin. Paris, 1996, 184–190.

[36] Gen 14, 18–21: "Then Melchizedek king of Salem brought food and wine. He was priest of God Most High, and he pronounced this blessing on Abram: 'Blessed be Abram by God Most High, creator of heaven and earth. And blessed be God Most High, who has delivered your enemies into your power.' Abram gave him a tithe of all the booty".

The succession of world empires as historical paradigm took shape in Judeo-Christian thought through Daniel's four-empire scheme[37], which connected intimately world history with the Chosen People and the sacred city of Jerusalem. The Byzantine concept of "New Jerusalem" represented a continuation and elaboration of this biblical pattern.

Furthermore, the ancient idea of a sacred center of the world was incorporated into a new Christian view of topographical sacredness, expressed in St. John's notion of Heavenly Jerusalem in the Apocalypse. This Christian interpretation worked in a double sense. On the one hand it liberated the Christian community from the bounds of a unique earthly worship center, Jerusalem, as the new one was spiritual and thus ubiquitous, but on the other hand it conferred Jerusalem a central significance in the new religion. More precisely, the concept of New Jerusalem passed through that of Heavenly Jerusalem. If the Heavenly Jerusalem dwells mystically in a new place, it bestows upon that place the symbolic role of New Jerusalem. The Heavenly Jerusalem is the mould for all subsequent New Jerusalems.

> 'New Jerusalem was built at the very Testimony to the Saviour, facing the famous Jerusalem of old, which after the bloody murder of the Lord had been overthrown in utter devastation, and paid the penalty of its wicked inhabitants. Opposite this then the Emperor erected the victory of the Saviour over death with rich and abundant munificence, this being perhaps that fresh new Jerusalem proclaimed in prophetic oracles, about which long speeches recite innumerable praises as they utter words of divine inspiration.' Eusebius, *De Vita Constantini*, III, 33.1–2 (trans. Av. Cameron and S. G. Hall, 135).

The thought structure of New Jerusalem differs from that of New Rome. While the second is horizontal by reduplication and functional extension of a *topos*, the first one is vertical, it reproduces on earth the model of a heavenly reality. Thus Jerusalem, as it was restored by Constantine in search for sacred places, as testimonies of the earthly dwelling of Christ, was not simply Jerusalem, but the very New Jerusalem prophesied by the prophets of the Old Testament. The rhetoric of New Rome is also plainly political and created in a pagan intellectual context. Many of the references to this term in Byzantine literature pertain to this strictly political understanding. The religious significance of the "New Rome" concept was acquired much later, when Rome first became the religious capital of Western Christendom, and when even later the patriarchs of Constantinople became conscious of the consequences of the principle, enunciated by the councils of Constantinople I and Chalcedon, that the ecclesiastical

---

[37] *Podskalsky G.* Byzantinische Reichseschatologie. Die Periodisierung der Weltgeschichte in den vier Grossreichen (Daniel 2 und 7) und dem Tausendjährigen Friedensreiche(Apok. 20). Eine Motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Wilhelm Finck Verlag, München, 1972.

throne of Constantinople enjoys the same privileges as ancient Rome by being a New Rome. The first one to aim at this ideological construction was the patriarch Photius in the ninth century. The New Jerusalem, on the contrary, is a religious concept deeply rooted in Judeo-Christian thought, as it is emphasized by Eusebius of Caesarea. Recent scholarship established firmly that Constantine's Constantinople was clearly not a New Jerusalem, in the sense that it was hardly a Christianized city. It took over a century, as Dagron contended it in his essay on the creation of Constantinople as a capital, to get the Christian landscape we know from Byzantine sources. Even in the fifth and sixth centuries, when Constantinople came to claim the role of religious capital, evidence lacks or is merely allusive to the rhetoric of New Jerusalem. Robert Ousterhout raised the question as to how active the concept of New Jerusalem was for Constantinople throughout its millenary history. After thorough scrutiny he concluded that at the level of art history it was rather discrete or even ineffective[38]. Fenster's scrutiny of the *Laudes Constantinopolitanae* allows a comparison of the New Rome rhetoric in Byzantine sources with the references to Zion or Jerusalem which confirms Ousterhout's conclusion[39].

We may then rightly ask what made the New Jerusalem rhetoric so problematic. Christian imagery was built upon imperial imagery, as it has been clearly demonstrated starting with the important work of André Grabar[40]. As a matter of fact it is obvious that for the fourth and fifth century the notion of the New Jerusalem did not belong to the imperial vocabulary. The topic appeared first in a monastic hagiography from the end of the fifth century and became more elaborate, as we shall see, in the context of Justinian's imperial restoration project.

Nevertheless, if Thomas Mathews's contestation[41] of Grabar's theory was not successful[42], there is another remark by Mathews that may make sense in our debate. He identified an anti-Arian art as anti-imperial[43], a statement which runs parallel to Erik Peterson's view of a Trinitarian theology structurally opposed to the Arian political theology. Thus, if by stressing

---

[38] *Ousterhout R.* Sacred Geographies and Holy Cities: Constantinople as Jerusalem // Hierotopy. Studies in the Making of Sacred Spaces. Material from the International Symposium / Ed. A. Lidov. Moscow 2004, p. 70.

[39] *Fenster E.* Laudes Constantinopolitanae // Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 9, Munich, 1968, p. 115 et passim.

[40] *Grabar A.* L'empereur dans l'art Byzantin. Paris, 1936.

[41] *Mathews T. F.* The Clash of Gods. A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art. Princeton, 1993, p. 3–22.

[42] *Brown P.* Review of T. F. Mathews, *The Clash of Gods. A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art* (Princeton 1993) // The Art Bulletin, 77, 3, 1995, p. 499–502.

[43] *Matthews T. F.* The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy. University Park, Penn./London, 1971, 52: "This anti-Arian art can be seen as anti-imperial on more than one level".

Christ's divinity the monarchical structure of the Roman society is contradicted, the borrowings of certain imperial themes in Christian art do not pertain to the phenomenon of political theology.

On the field of literary imagery imperial scenes may have found their way into texts that are by no means pro-imperial. For example the homology between the imperial palace and the court of God, sometimes as direct as in the *Visio Dorothei* (fourth century), making use of specific terms indicating dignities in the description of the heavenly court[44], does not imply the reverse identification of the imperial palace with the Kingdom of God. Furthermore, the throne is, since the third century passions of the martyrs, a central element in the saints' visions of the Kingdom of God. Saturus in the *Passio Perpetuae* sees a heavenly throne; St. Maura in her vision sees a throne with a white cloth and a wreath as manifestations of God[45]. The process unfolds strictly one way, namely the borrowings from an imperial surrounding meant to describe God's majesty did not call for a Christian exaltation of imperial dwellings in the fourth century. There is a throne in heaven because people are used to appeal to imperial thrones for justice and mercy on earth[46]. In Peter Brown's analysis, views of the other world are produced on the basis of simple, common life experiences shared by a large number of people. East and West part their ways in the sixth/seventh centuries on the basis of a different relation to power. In fact, the imperial vocabulary and imagery did not contain a New Jerusalem theme[47]. For this to be formulated it needed a whole ideological construction that I will describe further on. The imperial palace as a New Jerusalem rose to prominence in a building program and few rhetorical occurrences during the first three emperors of the Macedonian dynasty, as it will be shown in the last part of this essay.

Let us return to the hagiographical perspective conveyed in the Life of Daniel the Stylite. By sending Daniel to Constantinople Simeon the Stylite purports to further the spiritual process by which a place having acquired features of the Heavenly Jerusalem entered the religious role of a New Jeru-

[44] *Bremmer J.* An Imperial Palace Guard in Heaven: the Date of the Vision of Dorotheus // Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 75 (1988), р. 82–88.

[45] For the vision of the throne in the third-century life of St. Maura, see: *Passio SS. Timothei et Maurae*, 18 // Acta *SS. Maii*, I, 744; *Baus K.* Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum. Eine religions geschichtliche Untersuchung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Tertullians. Bonn, 1940, reprint 1965, p. 214–215; *Hellemo G.* Adventus Domini. Eschatological Thought in 4th century Apses and Catecheses. Leiden — New York — København — Köln. 1989, p. 107.

[46] *Brown P.* The decline of the Empire of God: from Amnesty to Purgatory // The Tanner Lectures on Human Value. Yale University, 1997, lecture II.

[47] I do disagree on this aspect with *Carile Maria Cristina.* Constantinople and the Heavenly Jerusalem?: through the imperial palace // 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London, 2006, Panel VII.2: In the palace (coordinator Lynn Jones), online resources of the Congress, p. 12–14.

salem. When Constantine founded his new capital, he projected it as a New Rome. By the end of the fifth century, particularly after the half-failed attempt of the Council of Chalcedon to bring Constantinople to the same ecclesiastical function as Rome, the rise of the theme of the New Jerusalem reflected the substantial Christianization of the Roman power. A Christian history set in to back up Roman history and eventually to merge so thoroughly together so as to amount to a substitution[48].

Henceforth, throughout the social and political changes of late antiquity, the "New Jerusalem" joined company with the identification of the Roman imperial power with Israel's kingship and the assumption of the *basileus* title, in order to invest with a precise significance the exceedingly dynamic geopolitics of the sixth and seventh centuries. A few steps brought the "New Jerusalem" into a central rhetorical position: Justinian's reign, Heraclius war with Persia and the rise of Islam with the final loss of Jerusalem.

JUSTINIAN'S FOOTPRINTS ON THE PATH TO NEW JERUSALEM

Entering into Hagia Sophia for the inauguration, Justinian disrupted the orderly ceremony, stepped forward and shouted "I have outdone thee, Solomon", purports the ninth century *Narratio de S. Sophia*[49]. This anecdote points to the comparison, most probably obvious in Justinian's own time, between Hagia Sophia and Solomon's temple of Jerusalem[50]. The *Narratio* also invites us to believe that an angel revealed the plan of Hagia Sophia to Justinian. Furthermore, an angel (the same? the heavenly architect of Hagia Sophia?) conveyed the solution regarding the right number of windows in the altar apse (three, certainly, in the name of the Trinity, explained the angel-theologian), as he appeared to the hesitant engineers disguised as the emperor Justinian. Hagia Sophia, like the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, had a heavenly model. They were both supposed to reproduce it faithfully. In the same vein of comparison, the descent of the Shekinah on the Temple built by Solomon corresponds to the manifestation of the divine light in Hagia Sophia:

"Thus through the spaces of the great Church come rays of light, expelling clouds of dissipation, and filling the mind with joy. The sacred light cheers all: even the sailor guiding his bark on the wave…

---

[48] The Christian topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian monk / Translated from the Greek, and edited, with notes and introd. by J. W. McCrindle, New York, B. 1967, book II, p. 68–71

[49] *Diegesis,* 27–28, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, recensuit Theodorus Preger (Lipsiae : B. G. Teubner, 1901–1907) p. 104–105; *Vitti E.* Die Erzählung über den Bau der Hagia Sophia in Konstantinopel: kritische Edition mehrerer Versionen. Amsterdam, A. M. Hakkert, 1986; *Marichal R.* La construction de Saint Sophie de Constantinople dans l'Anonyme grec (Xe siecle) et les versions vieux-russes // Byzantinoslavica 21 (1960), p. 238–259.

[50] To support this hypothesis we have the inscription for Anicia Iuliana's church of saint Polyeuktos, *Ousterhout R.* Sacred Geographies and Holy Cities, p. 102.

does not guide his laden vessel by the light of Cynosure, or the cir-
cling Bear, but by the divine light of the church itself. Yet not only
does it guide the merchant at night, like the rays from the Pharos on
the coast of Africa, but it also shows the way to the living God."

Such phrases in Paul the Silentiary's *Ekphrasis of Hagia Sophia*[51] receive
confirmation also in the words of Procopius of Caesarea, as he describes the
Church as God's dwelling, created by His divine influence and chosen by
Him[52]. Rhetoric, usually with overwhelming metaphorical expressions, plays
its part in these texts. Nevertheless, although it is appropriate to call every
church a house of God, there is an emphasis in these descriptions that conveys
the impression of a special house of God in Saint Sophia, the same way as the
Temple of Solomon itself was a unique house of God[53]. This understanding is
quite strong among Byzantine authors, from Justinian's time to the last days of
Constantinople, when some of the chroniclers remembered to remove the "di-
vine light" from Saint Sophia, through a miraculous vision of the withdrawal
of the light, before allowing the City to be conquered[54]. We may infer from the
"miracle of the holy fire" that descends on Easter night on the Holy Sepulcher
in Jerusalem that "divine light" could step out of rhetoric into collective ex-
periences and was ready to cross centuries to reach our own age. But Christ,
the True Wisdom of God, was not the only one to make his abode in Constan-
tinople. Through relics and miraculous apparitions a whole heavenly court —
the Virgin, the Baptist, the Apostles, martyrs and holy bishops — took up
residence in different "homes"[55]. Jerusalem's holy inhabitants moved progres-
sively into the city on the Bosporus' shore, keeping a pace with the growing
awareness that Constantinople might be a New Jerusalem[56].

---

[51] *Paul the Silentiary.* Descriptio S. Sophiae, v. 884 / Ed. P. Friedlander, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius.* Leipzig–Berlin, 1912, apud D. Geanakopoulos, Byzantium: Church, Society and Civilisation Seen through Contemporary Eyes. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1984, 196; *Isar N.* "Χορός of Light": Vision of the sacred in Paulus the Silentiary's Poem *Descriptio S. Sophiae* // Byzantinische Forschungen 28, 2004, p. 215–243.

[52] *Procopius De aedificiis*, I, 1, 23ff (*Procopius VIII*, Loeb Classical Library 1940, trans. H. B. Dewing and G. Downey), apud *Mango C.* The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312–1453. Prentice-Hall, Englewood, New Jersey, 1972, 76.

[53] Leontios of Neapolis in Cyprus translated and summarized by *Baynes N. H.* The icons before iconoclasm // Byzantine Studies and Other Essays. Univ. of London the Athlone Press, 1960, p. 230–234.

[54] *Nestor-Iskander.* The Tale of Constantinople / Trans. and ed. Walter K. Hanak and Marios Philippides, 1998, p. 62; *Pseudo-Sphrantzes (Makarios Melissenos).* A contemporary Greek source for the siege of Constantinople 1453: the Sphrantzes Chronicle / Trans. Margaret Carrol. Amsterdam, 1985, p. 64–65.

[55] *Cameron A.* Images of Authority: elites and icons in sixth-century Byzantium // Continuity and Change in Sixth Century Byzantium. VR, London, 1981, XVIII.

[56] *Cameron A.* The language of images: the rise of icons and Christian representation // History, Hope, Human Language, and Christian Reality / Ed. Everett Ferguson (Recent Studies in Early Christianity: A Collection of Scholarly Essays, New York: Garland, 1999) 261–302.

A more militant "New Jerusalem" arises from the Homily on the Avaro-Persian siege of 626 by Theodore Synkellos. In his view Byzantine history is no longer a copy of the sacred history of the People of Israel, but the type itself of this history, which the Old Testament only foreshadowed. Constantinople became thus for Theodore the original Jerusalem. It is only "now" in 626 that the truly significant event happens. More unambiguously than the divine presence in Hagia Sophia, this metamorphosis of Constantinople into Jerusalem on the battlefield was politically effective: the enemies were defeated by divine appointment[57]. The rhetoric functioned better than Theodore could ever dream. The Avar khagan as king Gog defeated at the ramparts of the New Jerusalem represents in this case not the reiteration of a biblical event with prophetical significance, but the actual first time realization of a biblical prophecy. He felt himself amazed as he wrote it down as such.

A few years later, Heraclius just drew the right conclusion out of the same events. The Cross needed to come to Constantinople, which was fully functional as a New Jerusalem for a New David (as such Heraclius might have been depicted in the David cycle plates[58]). Although in our texts the Cross was returned to Jerusalem, we may however ask ourselves to which Jerusalem? Its entry into the geographical one is described triumphantly in the Life of Saint Anastasius the Persian[59]. But it is very likely that the Cross soon continued its way to Constantinople, turning the New Jerusalem — Constantinople into the final goal of its journey. It indeed makes sense to bring the cross from Jerusalem to Constantinople, in a legitimate *translatio* of what was already a palladium of the empire, and in strong contrast to its departure fifteen years earlier into captivity to Persia. The ideological enactment of such a translation must correspond to that of another sacred relic related to Jerusalem: the robe of the Virgin. In the oldest version of the Menologion text (probably from the second half of the sixth century), the power of the place, as dwelling of divine presence, where the robe was kept hidden, moves from near Jerusalem together with the relic to the new shrine in Constantinople, producing a new *locus sanctus*. Concealed in a private house outside of Jerusalem, the robe of the Virgin takes a similar peripheral position in the suburban shrine of Blachernai, outside of Constantinople. The relic functions like a quill for inscribing the new

---

[57] *Makk F.* Traduction et commentaire de l'Homélie écrite probablement par Théodore le Syncelle sur le siège de Constantinople en 626. Szeged, 1975, p. 96 (p. 320 L. Sternbach).

[58] *Suzanne Spain Alexander*. Heraclius, Byzantine Imperial Ideology, and the David Plates // Speculum, 52, 2, Apr., 1977, p. 217–237.

[59] *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VIIe siècle* / Edition, traduction et commentaire par Bernard Flusin // CNRS, Paris, 1992, p. 46–47, 98–99.

sacred geography upon the city[60]. Nevertheless the quill starts drawing almost two centuries after the beginning of the cult of the Virgin in the council of Chalcedon, which proclaimed as a dogma the title Theotokos, and also since the supposed translation of the relic. This time corresponds exactly to that period which saw the Roman world move politically and socially from late antiquity to Christian Middle Ages.

Byzantine "Cesaropapism" found its most striking expressions in the theologico-political history of the long century from Justinian I to Justinian II, from the construction of Hagia Sophia to the council *in Trullo*. It is thus more significant to see the theme of the New Jerusalem rise to prominence in this epoch. The Preamble of the Trullanum exploits the idea in such a manner as to extend it to Church and State at the same time.

Nevertheless, on the road from the historical and geographical Jerusalem to the Heavenly Jerusalem a rather spurious Jerusalem awaited its time to rise on the world's stage: that of the last things (*ta eschata*), of diverse prophets, messiahs and last emperors (interpretation should be checked according to Muslim, Hebrew and Christian readings) and their devilish opponents. The Antichrist would play his role in *a* Jerusalem. Thus, seen from its future, the city could legitimately claim a special place in political theology (with or without geographical precision[61]).

A new house of worship, a mosque, elevated in 691–692 on the same spot were the Temple once has been built, shows just how deeply Jerusalem was involved in the political struggle for religious certitudes at that time. But Islam was not an innovator in this respect. A century earlier Ethiopia and the Roman Empire were seen rushing to Jerusalem in order to draw the curtains of History, as told in the last chapters of the *Kebra Nagast*[62].

History can only make sense in the high temperatures of an already burning world. But how can one be sure that the end of the world will find him in the right Jerusalem? Davidic kings as messiahs, ante-messiahs or anti-messiahs, took the historical floor in the rich Hebrew, Christian and then Muslim eschatological productions of the late sixth to early eighth centuries. The Byzantine response was to install firmly a New David, the Christian

---

[60] *Baynes N. H.* The finding of the Virgin's robe // Byzantine Studies and Other . Univ. of London the Athlone Press, 1960, p, 240–247; *Cameron A.* The Theotokos in the sixth century Constantinople: a city finds its symbol // Journal of Theological Studies 29:1, 1978, 70–108; ibid, The Virgin's robe: an episode in the history of early seventh-century Constantinople // Byzantion 49, 1979, p. 42–56 (reprinted also in *Continuity and Change in Sixth-century Byzantium*, VR, London, 1981).

[61] For St Andrew the Fool the "Son of Iniquity" will appear and reign in Constantinople, *Ryden L.* Life of St Andrew the Fool. Uppsala, 1995.

[62] *The Kebra Nagast* / Translated by E. A. Wallis Budge. London, 1932 {Reduced to HTML by Christopher M. Weimer, September 2002}, chapters 72 and 111–117.

emperor, into history, playing thus down the relevance of the precise date of the end of time.

Ὁ Ἀσσύριος. THE ENEMIES OF THE NEW JERUSALEM

As we mentioned earlier, to the historian's surprise the preamble of the Trullanum contains this magnificent description of the cosmological struggle between good and evil:

"Now that the ineffable divine grace of our Redeemer and Sav-ior Jesus Christ has compassed all the earth and the life-giving preaching of the truth has been sown in the ears of all (Matt. 24, 14), the people who sat in the darkness of ignorance have seen the great light (Is. 9, 2; Rom. 1, 21b; I Thess. 5, 4–5) of knowledge and have been delivered from the bonds (Is 9,4) of error, exchanging their servitude of old (Heb. 2, 14–15) for the Kingdom of Heaven; whereas he who was cast out of the beauty of the primal splendor through his pride, the first dragon (Is. 27,1; Apoc 13, 4; Apoc 12, 9; Apoc 20, 2)[63], the great intelligence (ὁ μέγας νοῦς) (II Cor. 11, 3)[64], the Assyrian[65], is taken prisoner by those who were formerly captive, and by the power of the incarnate Word he is deprived of all strength".

---

[63] Is. 27, 1 "In that day God will bring up the holy, great and strong sword upon the running and twisting dragon serpent and he will kill the dragon"; Apoc 13, 4; Apoc 12, 9; Apoc 20, 2 = the dragon, the ancient serpent.

[64] II Cor. 11, 3: and I fear, lest, as the serpent did beguile Eve in his subtlety, so your minds may be corrupted from the simplicity [and sanctity] that [is] in the Christ / φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως, ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὔαν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος [καὶ τῆς ἁγνότητος] τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν.

[65] Micah 5, 5–7: Ὅταν Ἀσσύριος ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν, καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐπεγερθήσονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἑπτὰ ποιμένες καὶ ὀκτὼ δήγματα ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ποιμανοῦσι τὸν Ἀσσοὺρ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Νεβρὼδ ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσοὺρ, ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρια ὑμῶν.

Cyril of Alexandria. Commentary on Micah 5, 5–7, *Pusey P. E.* Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in xii prophetas. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1868 (repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965), vol. 1, p. 680, 15–25: Ἀσσύριον μὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ἄνδρα μὲν οὐκέτι τὸν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος, κατασημαίνει δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας εὑρετήν, φημὶ δὴ τὸν σατανᾶν, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἁπαξαπλῶς εἰπεῖν, τὴν ἀτίθασόν τε καὶ φιλοπόλεμον τῶν δαιμονίων πληθὺν, ἢ παντὸς ἁγίου κατεξανίσταται νοητῶς καὶ μάχεται τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει, τῇ νοητῇ Σιών, "ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος" καὶ τῆς ἄνω καὶ ἐπουρανίου νοουμένης Ἱερουσαλὴμ τύπος οἷά τις καὶ εἰκὼν ἐμφερής.

The name *ho Assyrios* given to the devil, as historical enemy of the holy city, inspired by Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentary on Micah* but possibly also related to the corresponding rhetorical themes of the *Homily* of Theodore Synkellos[66], presents the Church of the living God typologically as Zion, and mystically as an icon of the heavenly Jerusalem. By these references, Constantinople itself becomes a besieged Jerusalem, in which Church and empire merge into an undifferentiated unity. If in Cyril's commentary, following Clement of Alexandria[67], the Church is the icon of the heavenly Jerusalem, the preamble extends this function to the empire, as it is clearly stated that the emperor is the good shepherd:

> "It was your (the emperor's) great desire therefore, after the example of Christ, the good shepherd (John 10, 1–14), searching for the sheep lost in the mountains, to bring together this holy nation, as a special people, and to return it to the fold and convince it to keep the divine commandments and statutes."[68]

The same confusion/identification is operated by Pseudo-Methodius when he applies the reference in Matt. 16, 18 ("the gates of Hades shall never prevail over the Church") to the kingdom of the Christians (i.e. that of the Greeks, i.e. that of the Romans), whose power is justified by the Holy Cross[69].

The canons 36, 38 and 69 respond to the theologico-political scope of the preamble. First, the apparently unnecessary repetition of the principle stated in canon 3 of the second ecumenical council (Constantinople I) reformulated by canon 28 of the forth ecumenical council (Chalcedon), which equates ecclesiastically Constantinople with Rome, reiterates, very appropriately in the historical context of the Trullanum, the role of Constantinople as both political and religious capital[70]. Canon 38 reinforces this intention through invocation of the principle of geographic accommodation of ecclesiastical authority upon civil authority, going even further in this logic by replacing the dignity of ecclesiastical centers based on an-

---

[66] *Makk F*. Traduction et commentaire de l'Homélie écrite probablement par Théodore le Syncelle sur le siège de Constantinople en 626. Szeged, 1975, p. 96 (p. 320 de l'édition L. Sternbach).

[67] *Clement of Alexandria*. Stromatum liber IV, 8, 18, *PG* 8, col. 1277B.

[68] Ibid. 52–53.

[69] *Pseudo-Methodius* / Translation P. J. Alexander, *op. cit*., p. 42 (f 126v).

[70] Canon 36: "Renewing the enactments by the 150 Fathers assembled at the God-protected and imperial city, and those of the 630 who met at Chalcedon; we decree that the see of Constantinople shall have equal privileges with the see of Old Rome, and shall be highly regarded in ecclesiastical matters as that is, and shall be second after it. After Constantinople shall be ranked the See of Alexandria, then that of Antioch, and afterwards the See of Jerusalem".

cientness of the see with the hierarchical order of cities created by imperial authority[71]. Canon 36 is thus in fact the very logic consequence of canon 38. Ultimately, canon 69 addresses, albeit in an ambiguous form, the question of the sacred status of the emperor[72]. Although this canon is part of the segment of the canonic collection that deals with laity, it creates an exception for the imperial power.

THE DUSK OF THE NEW JERUSALEM

In the second half of the ninth century, a new dynasty in Byzantium, inaugurated by Basil I the Macedonian, built a cozy New Jerusalem inside their palace by means of chapels and relics. In 880 Basil I together with patriarch Photius inaugurated the New Great Church (known simply as the Nea) inside the imperial palace. It was also dedicated to Christ and became progressively throughout the tenth century the depository for a collection of relics related to the Old Testament[73]. Other chapels of the palace were the depositaries of New Testament relics, the so-called indirect relics of Christ's earthly life. The inspiration was still political, but the demarche needed to be subtler in the context of the ecclesiastical "Triumph of Orthodoxy". Constantine VII put rhetorical order into this new development inside the palace by describing the ceremonies in which the respective chapels and their collections of relics were involved. The sense, basically acknowledged by Constantine VII, was to link the Byzantine monarchy to the biblical kings of Israel. The imperial palace was as much a New Jerusalem as the emperor was a New David or New Salomon. The collusion of "Rhomaerreich" and "Gottesvolk", so eloquently exposed by Endre von Ivanka[74], found its strongest political expression in this ninth-tenth century ideological construction. The restriction of the symbolism of New Jerusalem to the imperial palace followed the symbolic division of the power center of Constantinople into two spheres: that of the emperor, the imperial palace and its chapels, and that of the patriarch, the Great church, Saint Sophia, and the patriarchal palace. Konstantinos Rhodios in his description of the church of the Holy Apostles states that the city of Constantine rightly serves a unique master, the Christ,

---

[71] Canon 38: "the canon which was made by the Fathers we also observe, which thus decreed: If any city be renewed by imperial authority, or shall have been renewed, let the order of things ecclesiastical follow the civil and public models".

[72] Canon 69: "it is not permitted to a layman to enter the sanctuary (Holy Altar, Gk.), though, in accordance with a certain ancient tradition, the imperial power and authority is by no means prohibited from this when he wishes to offer his gifts to the Creator".

[73] *Dagron G.* Empereur et prêtre, 219–225.

[74] *Endre von Ivanka.* Rhomäerreich und Gottesvolk. Das Glaubens-, Staats- und Volksbewußtsein der Byzantiner und seine Auswirkung auf die ostkirchlich-osteuropäische Geisteshaltung. Verlag Karl Alber, Freiburg/München, 1968.

its protector[75], but we have to remember that the Holy Apostles was precisely the place where emperors and patriarchs once again joined the route to their celestial master, as tombs of holy emperors and relics of saintly patriarchs.

When a century later a Byzantine emperor, John Tzimiskes, reached the Holy Land, he put on the pilgrim's cloak, but gave up on entering Jerusalem, since he already had found in Gabala the sandals of Christ, which would best fit into his "New Jerusalem-palace" back in Constantinople. As a general, he knew well enough that Jerusalem was at that moment of his campaign strategically worthless. The symbolic aspect was taken care of by the imperial storytellers.

The collection of relics seems to be out of fashion by the 11th century, corresponding to the political instability and lack of imperial initiatives. Manuel I Comnenus in the mid 12th century added a piece to the collection, the slab on which Christ was laid after his deposition from the cross, bringing thus the last contribution not only to the most precious relic collection of the empire, but also, unconsciously, to its sacred history[76]. The political relevance of Constantinople-New Jerusalem died before its 1204 conquest by the Crusader army. Ironically, the Crusaders aimed at Jerusalem, but got Constantinople. In booty and prestige it amounted to a better achievement. The Latin emperors made good money with the relics that once ascertained the religious function of the Byzantine emperor. It was down to the saintly king Louis IX, in the thirteenth century, to recognize the link between Christ and sacred monarchy as he bought the relics of the Passion for his new Parisian "Sainte Chapelle", as much as the church of Pharos in the sacred palace of Constantinople was in the words of Robert of Clari also a "Sainte Chapelle"[77].

In this context, when in the *Life of Saint Basil the Younger* the saint's disciple visits the New Jerusalem in Heaven he describes in fact the urban fabric of tenth century Constantinople with palaces and enclosed gardens. For sure, the author did not have the experience of any other big city, whether he meant to imply that Constantinople was a New Jerusalem is less certain[78]. Andrew the Fool, the fictional character of a 10th century hagiographical novel, in his foretelling of the future of Constantinople had no tender-

---

[75] *Legrand E.* Description des œuvres d'art et de l'église des Saints Apôtres de Constantinople. Poème en vers iambiques par Constantin le Rhodien // Revue des Etudes Grecques 9, 1896, 32–65, and commentary by Th. Reinach 62–103, here page 38.

[76] *Flusin B.* Construire une nouvelle Jérusalem: Constantinople et les reliques // L'Orient dans l'histoire religieuse de l'Europe. L'invention des origines / Ed. par M. A. Amir-Moezzi et J. Scheid, EPHE, Brepols, 2001, 56–57.

[77] The *Chronicle* of Robert de Clari // *Historiens et chroniqueurs du moyen âge. Robert de Clari, Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart, Commynes /* Edition établie et annotée par Albert Pauphilet, Paris, 1938, réimpression Paris, 1979, p. 63.

[78] Vita Basilii iunioris, ed. S. G. Vilinskij: *Вилинский С. Г.* «Житие Василия Нового» в русской литературе, ч. II. Одесса, 1911, с. 9, 20, 23, 47.

ness for the imperial city and did not imply any sacred mission for the times of the end. Hagiography and imperial ceremonies did not share the same inspiration in the tenth century.

To finish the present survey, we may note a late Greek occurence which exalts Constantinople as a religious capital. Among the long list of *threnoi*, lamentations, dedicated to the fallen Constantinople there is a *Dialogue* between Venice and Constantinople, where the latter is called New Jerusalem[79], but it hardly conveys more than the memory of the rhetorical tradition in which the authors were trained.

In an attempt to delineate a political "New Jerusalem" we have tried to avoid general theological symbolism and to extract those texts and images which make the theme of New Jerusalem central to Byzantine power. Besides the *hieros topos* of each religious foundation, there is a sacred area in which power is more effective than in others. Only from such a *place*, which relates to mankind's mythical memory, could the world be ruled.

<div align="center">

Петре Гуран

Institute for South-Eastern European Studies of the Romanian Academy

КОНСТАНТИНОПОЛЬ – НОВЫЙ ИЕРУСАЛИМ
НА ПЕРЕСЕЧЕНИИ СВЯЩЕННОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА
И ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО БОГОСЛОВИЯ

</div>

Свидетельства очевидного ассоциирования Константинополя с Новым Иерусалимом довольно редки. Даже если собрать воедино всю информацию, ее трудно привести в систему. В Константинополе не было здания, которое впрямую копировало бы какой-либо архитектурный аспект римского города Иерусалима. Такое отсутствие можно сопоставить с феноменом копирования храма Гроба Господня в Западной Европе и России в средние века. Тем не менее, Константинополь время от времени называли Новым Иерусалимом. Таким образом, проблема в том, как интерпретировать немногочисленные ссылки и упоминания термина Новый Иерусалим. Формула эта фиксируется в конце V в. в агиографическом тексте. Символические элементы появляются в правление Юстиниана, но самые важные ссылки относятся к VII в. Литературные свидетельства, таким образом, оказываются сильнее архитектурных.

Что же они выражают?

Прежде всего, делается попытка объяснить существование таких отсылок политическим богословием. Тема Нового Иерусалима в пер-

---

[79] *A Papadopoulos-Kerameus.* Threnoi tes Konstantinoupoleos // *BZ*, 12, 1903, 267–272.

вую очередь относится к риторике власти. Если исключить первое упо-
минание, в котором агиограф указал на факт, что в Константинополе
есть так много святых мест, церквей и монастырей, что он вполне мо-
жет заменить по значимости Иерусалим (см. сноски 33 и 34), апелляция
к Новому Иерусалиму вызывает в памяти образ столицы царства Дави-
да в большей мере, чем образ города, в котором распяли Христа. В ка-
честве доказательства можно напомнить сравнение Святой Софии с
Храмом Соломона, восхваления императора Ираклия как Нового Дави-
да, ассоциирование осады Константинополя в 626 г. с блокадой Иеру-
салима Синахерибом (2 Царей 18–19; 2 Пар 32 и Ис 36:1–37:38) и со-
поставимые упоминания в преамбулах канонов Трулльского собора.
Цель всех этих сравнений — продемонстрировать, что римская монар-
хия была преемницей царства Давида, что она правит новым избран-
ным народом, истинным Израилем, т. е. политическим сообществом
христиан. В этом смысле Константинополь был столицей государства в
качестве Нового Иерусалима, нового священного города.

Согласно этой логике, тема Нового Иерусалима становится фено-
меном политического богословия. Статью открывает краткая дискуссия
о главных теориях, касающихся концепции политического богословия
(Э. Петерсон, К. Шмитт, Э. Канторович, А. Буро), политическое бого-
словие считается попыткой адаптировать христианство к идеологиче-
ским потребностям поздней Римской империи. Преимущество этого
исследовательского инструмента состоит в том, что он позволяет иден-
тифицировать множественные проявления христианской веры и куль-
туры в текстах, ритуалах, церемониях и в священном пространстве (от-
куда рождается и иеротопия Алексея Лидова), через которые идея
вселенской власти и монархического устройства стала центральной для
Средиземноморья. Соотносить Новый Иерусалим с центром такой вла-
сти — естественное следствие такого образа мыслей.

Особый феномен IX–X вв. — распространение реликвий, связан-
ных с иудейской историей, т. е. с Ветхим Заветом, а также с земной
жизнью Христа, их размещение в капеллах-реликвариях императорско-
го дворца Константинополя, что подтверждало идеологическую функ-
цию его связи с Иерусалимом. Схема прохода по капеллам Богоматери
Фаросской, св. Стефана в Новой Великой церкви, Неа, внутри священ-
ной территории дворца сохраняла свидетельство библейских реалий в
большей мере, чем знаки паломничества в географически конкретный
Иерусалим. Там можно было увидеть посох Моисея, иерихонские тру-
бы, плащ Илии и другие ветхозаветные реликвии; древо Креста, копье,
которым пронзили тело Христа, терновый венец, реликвии страстей
Христовых. В XI–XII вв. это увлечение ослабевает, и после завоевания
крестоносцами Константинополя в 1204 г оно перестает играть идеоло-

гическую роль. Интерес в священным реликвиям страстей Христовых в западноевропейских монархиях приводит к их тотальному хищению из Константинополя. Таким образом, мы можем выявить периоды интенсивной риторической эксплуатации темы Нового Иерусалима, а также последующего постепенно слабеющего эха. Пик этого процесса совпадает с усилиями по созданию идеологической конструкции и реконструкции Византийской монархии, т. е. с тем, что мы называем политическим богословием.