

Malgorzata B. Leszka

THE ROLE OF THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN PATRIARCH
AT THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPERORS' COURT

The bishop of Constantinople was the most eminent figure among the clergy of early Byzantine Church. It was manifested both in the sphere of church policy and activity of priests from the capital at the emperor's court.

According to the tradition the community as well as bishops of a given province had the right to choose a bishop, also of Constantinople. The community made the choice of a candidate and the bishops were to express their agreement and consecrate the elect.

Certain conditions had to be fulfilled to acquire that honorable office. The conditions were precisely defined by the council legislation. Spotless reputation, well-tryed belief, high moral and intellectual level were required from the elect. He could not be physically handicapped in the way that his condition could make him unable to hold his office¹. Among other conditions there was also the demand of personal freedom. The slave could be consecrated only when his owner agreed to give him freedom². It was forbidden to consecrate those secular people who were newly baptised and gave up their pagan beliefs³. Only the people who were first lectors, deacons or presbyters could be nominated as bishops in the light of the church

¹ Apostolic canons specified cases of bodily injuries which made taking over bishop's see impossible. There were, among other things, blindness and deafness [Ap. 78; ed. *Discipline generale antique (IVe-IXe s.)*, t. I, 2, Grottaferrata 1962]. On other kind of invalidism and the holding of bishop's office – see Ap. 21, 77.

² Ap. 82. State legislation also talked about raising slaves to the ministry. Emperor Arcadius in 398 forbade such practice [*Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, t. 1–2, Berolini 1954, IX, 45, 3 (later ThC)]. Similar or a little softened rules were issued by emperor Zeno [*Corpus Iuris Civilis*, t. II: *Codex Iustinianus*, I, 3, 36 (later CJ), Berolini 1954] and Justinian (*Corpus Iuris Civilis*, t. III: *Novellae*, CXXIII, 17).

³ Ap. 80. There was a possibility of some deviations from this rule. Further part of the same canon suggested that such a situation could happen at the instance of God's will. Similarly – canon 2 of Council of Nicaea (325) in: Ch. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* (later H–L), t. I, 1, Paris 1907, p. 532.

legislation⁴. Celibacy of the clergy was not obligatory from the beginning, but Eastern Church demanded that its priests should not get married after being consecrated. They could however continue those relationships which were contracted before ordination⁵. It was forbidden to return to secular life to receive public offices not connected with priestly vocation under the threat of being removed from office and even thrown out of the community⁶.

The conditions mentioned above were obeyed only when they did not disturb in promoting to bishopric of Constantinople persons who were accepted by emperor's court. Both emperors and persons from their closest surroundings were involved in the election of Constantinopolitan bishops. The example can be Demophilus' accession to the bishop's throne; Emperor Valens took an active part in it⁷. Gregory of Nazianzus⁸ and Nectarius⁹

⁴ Serdica 343, canon 10 (H-L, I, 2, p. 790). Controversial matter is knowledge of canons from Serdica in Byzantine Church. On this subject, see E. Przekop, *Wschodnie patriarchaty starożytne (IV-IX w.)*, Warszawa 1984, p. 150-151.

⁵ In apostolic canons there was opposition against these bishops, who under the mask of piety, were leaving their wives (Ap. 5).

⁶ Ap. 6, 81, 83; Chalcedon, canon 7 (H-L, II, 2, p. 788-789).

⁷ After death of capital bishop Eudoxius double election took place in 370. Arian party chose Demophilus who belonged to the group collaborating with Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, while the orthodoxes chose Evagrius. There was a clash between the adherents of Eudoxius and those of Evagrius. When the emperor Valens was informed about these events he sent troops to the capital to prevent further unrest and to remove Demophilus' antagonist. On these events, see Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV, 14-15 (later Socr., HE), *Patrologiae cursus completus... Series graeca...*, accurate J. P. Migne, t. 67 (later PG); Sozomenus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VI, 13 (later Sozom., HE), PG, t. 67.

⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus had two opponents to the power. The first was Demophilus already holding bishop's post. He was removed by the emperor Theodosius I [Sozom., HE, VII, 5; Socr., HE, V, 7; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, AM 5872, Lipsiae 1883 (later Theoph.); cf. Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IX, 19 (later Philost., HE), PG, t. 65]. The second was Alexandrian bishop's candidate - Maximus the Cynic [on problems connected with Maximus the Cynics' activity - Gregorius Presbyteros, *Vita S. Patris Nostri Gregorii Theologi*, PG, t. 35, col. 280ff. (later *Vita Gregorii*)]. Gregory took over the central church of the capital by emperor's full acceptance - *Vita Gregorii*, col. 292; *Sancti Gregorii Theologi, Carmina*, II, 1, 11, PG, t. 37, col. 1119f. For more on the circumstances of Gregory's accession to the City bishopric, see N. V. Černiavskij, *Imperator Fedosij Velikij i jego carstvovanie v cerkovno - istoričeskom otnošenii*, Saraktev Posad 1913, p. 219-220, 252-264; W. Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Theodosius d. Gr.*, München 1953, p. 28ff.; N. H. Baynes, *Alexandria and Constantinople: a Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy*, [in:] idem, *Byzantine Studies and other Essays*, London 1960, p. 104; J. M. Szymusiak, *Grzegorz Teolog. U źródeł chrześcijańskiej myśli IV wieku*, Poznań 1965, p. 225-230.

⁹ Senator Nectarius, native of Tars in Cilicia [on Nectarius' career, see *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, t. I, Cambridge 1971, p. 621 (later PLRE)], was chosen by the emperor as a candidate from the list which was prepared by bishops (Sozom., HE, VII, 8). Socrates (HE, V, 8) did not notice imperial part in Nectarius' election. According to him this choice was made only by bishops themselves. Theophanes (AM 5876) joined these positions claiming that Nectarius' accession was the result of cooperation of both the emperor

got offices as men of Theodosius the Great's choice. Similarly John Chrysostom owed his board to Emperor Arcadius and eunuch Eutropius¹⁰. Proclus was called according to Theodosius II's decision¹¹ and Acacius – thanks to the support of Leo I's son-in-law – Zeno¹². As we see the involvement of state authorities in elections of Constantinopolitan patriarchs was common practice and it became one of the elements which characterised relations between Church and State in early Byzantium.

It is interesting to examine the intentions of emperors in supporting certain candidates on the bishopric of the capital. One of the main factors was certainly actual situation in Church, State and the emperor's policy of course.

Demophilus mentioned above was supported by Valens because he claimed to continue pro-Arian policy realized by the emperor. John Chrysostom got the support of Arcadius and Eutropius because his clever activities against Arians in Antioch guaranteed elimination of such problem also in Constantinople¹³. Such values as saintly life or oratorical abilities may have played a role in selecting the candidates. These elements could be taken into consideration in the case of Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom or John the Faster¹⁴. Such choices were not always right because they often

and the clergy. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh 1988, p. 811.

¹⁰ John Chrysostom's accession abounded in sensational events. John, being Antiochene priest, was kidnapped and secretly transported to Constantinople. The way in which he left Antioch shows that the state authorities feared the resistance on the part of the local community which would have protested against deprivation of its popular priest [Palladius, *Dialogus de vita s. Johannis Chrysostomi*, 5 (ed. Palladios, *Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome*, t. 1–2, Paris 1988); Sozom. (HE, VIII, 2)]. Theodoretus [*Historia Ecclesiastica*, V, 27 (later Theodoretus, HE), PG, t. 82], Theophanes (AM 5892) and Socrates (HE, VI, 2) also testify the participation of state authorities in John Chrysostom's accession. This question was examined among other by P. V. Gidulianov, *Vostočnyje patriarchy v period četyrioch vselenskich soborov*, Jaroslav 1908, p. 564; P. Baur, *Der Heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, Bd. 2, München 1930, p. 12–21; Baynes, *op. cit.*, p. 105; J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops. Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom*, Oxford 1992, p. 166–167.

¹¹ Proclus, at the moment of his consecration in 434, was formal bishop because earlier he was granted the see of Cizicos. However the local community did not accept him. On the emperor's participation in Proclus' accession to the bishopric of Constantinople, see Socr., HE, VII, 40.

¹² Acacius' elevation took place in 472. Zeno's role in this event was underlined in anonymous excerpt of Suda – *Anonyma Suda*, [in:] *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, t. 2, Liverpool 1983, p. 474 (later FCH).

¹³ Liebeschuetz, *op. cit.*, p. 166ff.

¹⁴ Both Gregory of Nazianzus (Socr., HE, V, 7) and John Chrysostom (*ibidem*, VI, 2) were famous as excellent orators. John Faster on account of his ascetic mode of life was

caused more troubles than advantages to those who inspired them. Good administrators and people interested in cooperation with emperors were searched for, rather than doctrinaires and ideologists. The evidence of a such situation was the promotion of senator Nectarius experienced in public service, after Gregory of Nazianzus had left his office.

Different ecclesiastical centres also joined the fight for bishopric of the capital. Heraclea and then Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople itself were most active here¹⁵. On this occasion there were numerous attempts to gain allies and the struggle among Churches which had their own candidates for the bishop's throne in the capital. In many cases chances to win were connected with the fact that a given Church had its own apocrisarius in Constantinople. Staying in the capital, those delegates had an opportunity to build their strong position among the local clergy and first of all to obtain sympathy of the emperor and his closest surrounding. Anatolius¹⁶ and Acacius¹⁷, the apocrisariuses of Alexandrian bishops probably got their posts in that way. The delegates of the Church of Amasea – Eutychius¹⁸ and bishop of Antioch – John III Scholasticus¹⁹ got their thrones on the similar basis.

It often happened that the bishop of Constantinople was elected as a representative of the party which removed the former priest, if it was

surrounded with a halo of holiness – J. Andreev, *Konstantynopolskie patriarchi ot vremeni chalkidonskogo sobora do Fotija*, Sergiev Posad 1895, p. 257ff. When the decision on regarding John's accession to the post of the City bishop was taken he refused, considering himself unworthy of this honour. Then emperor Tiberius ordered to lead John to the palace. Emperor had difficulty in persuading him to change his decision. John's consecration took place in 582 (Joannes Ephesinus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, 39 (later Joannes Ephesin., HE), *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, 104 (later CSCO), *Scriptores Syri*, 53).

¹⁵ The fact that Heraclea was trying to appoint its candidate as bishop of Constantinople is clear because through the major part of the fourth century bishop of Heraclea had been the formal superior of Constantinopolitan Church. Antioch and Alexandria were competing with each other not only as important ecclesiastical centers but also as representatives of separate Christological schools. Also the clergy of the capital were trying to designate their candidates.

¹⁶ First Anatolius was apocrisarius of Alexandrian patriarch Cyril (Andreev, *op. cit.*, p. 206–207) then of Dioscurus (W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, p. 43).

¹⁷ Acacius was the representative of Timothy the Cat in the capital (P. T. R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden 1979, p. 24).

¹⁸ Eutychius, native of Phrygia, was archimandrite of monastery in Amasea Ponticus and he was staying in the capital on behalf of the bishop of the local church. On Eutychius as apocrisarius, see – Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV, 38 (later Evagr., HE), PG, 86; Theoph., AM 6044; Malalas, *Chronographia*, Bonn 1831, p. 486 (later Malalas); Joannes Ephesin., HE, I, 42.

¹⁹ John, native of Sirimis in Cynegica which belonged to the area of Antioch (Evagr., HE, IV, 38), was staying in Constantinople as apocrisarius of Antiochene patriarch (Theoph., AM 6057).

convenient for the emperor. This chance was used among others by Arsacius who took an active part in fighting against John Chrysostom and after his removal in 404 he replaced him on the bishop's throne²⁰.

In the history of bishops of Constantinople we can find an interesting case of rewarded perseverance and patience in fighting for the office. It was Proclus, who after three unsuccessful attempts of gaining the bishops throne of the capital, competing with Sisinnios, Nestorius and Maximianus, became the bishop in 434²¹.

Among Constantinopolitan shepherds we can also see those who were members of the same family. Such was the situation in the case of Arsacius who was bishop Nectarius' brother²² and in the case of Macedonius II, a close relative of bishop Gennadius²³. It is difficult to say whether the promotion to bishop's rank in Constantinople in the case of Nectarius and Gennadius influenced the career of their relatives later on. It can be supposed, however, that it may have given them a big advantage.

Analysing the nominations for bishops of Constantinople we can conclude that they were affected by actual situation and demands. It is especially visible if we examine the problem of canonicity of those elections. And so bishop Paul was called without the permission of Theodor of Heraclea Thracesean. Being the supervisor of Constantinopolitan Church at the time he ought to have a decisive role in this case²⁴. Eusebius of Nicomedia was

²⁰ Arsacius was a supporter of Alexandrian patriarch Theophilus. He accused John Chrysostom at the Synod of the Oak (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 59, [in:] Palladios, *Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome*, t. 2, Paris 1988). Cf. J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *The Fall of John Chrysostom*, [in:] idem, *From Diocletian to the Arab Conquest: Change in the Late Roman Empire*, Variorum 1990, IV, p. 13.

²¹ On Proclus' efforts to obtain the capital bishop's see Socr., HE, VII, 26, 29, 35, 40.

²² Socr., HE, VI, 19; Sozom., HE, VIII, 23.

²³ Theodor Lector, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 14 (later Theodor Lect., HE), PG, t. 86; Theoph., AM 5989.

²⁴ Sozom., HE, III, 3. Church historian mentioned that Paul's election took place against Eusebius of Nicomedia's will. Sozomen made a mistake here because Eusebius' acceptance was not necessary in this case – see Hermiasz Sozomen, *Historia Kościoła*, Warszawa 1989, p. 153, note 9. W. Telfer (*Paul of Constantinople*, „The Harvard Theological Review” 1950, t. 43, p. 56) suggests, in spite of Sozomen's opinion, that accession of Paul was canonical. According to this scholar Theodor could send his representative to Constantinople to take part in the election of local bishop. It seems that the opinion, in principal rested on speculations, and as such it can not be accepted. Sozomen (*loc. cit.*) who is the main source as regards this question did not underline Theodor of Heraclea's absence but only the lack of his agreement to Paul's accession. According to Telfer the cause of Theodor's absence was his stay at the synod of Tyre (335). In the light of recent studies (T. D. Barnes, *Emperor and Bishops, A. D. 324–344: Some Problems*, „American Journal of Ancient History” 1978, t. 3, p. 66; idem, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, London 1993, p. 212–213; M. di Maio, Fr. Arnold, *Per Vim, Per Caedem, Per Bellum: A Study of Murder and Ecclesiastical Politics in the Year 337 A. D.*, „Byzantium” 1992, t. 62, p. 187) which date Paul's elevation on 337 the argumentation explains nothing.

at first bishop of Berytos²⁵, and next of Nicomedia²⁶, before he became the bishop of the capital²⁷. The same was true for Eudoxius who was at first bishop of Germanicea²⁸, next of Antioch²⁹, and lastly of Constantinople³⁰. Demophilus was moved to the capital from Beroe³¹, Gregory of Nazianzus was formally bishop of Sasime³², Proclus – bishop of Cyzicus³³, and Anthimus of Trebizond³⁴. Nectarius makes a special case here. Even though he was a convert without any religious education he was consecrated the bishop of the capital (without canonically demanded intermediate levels)³⁵.

These cases show that most commonly omitted rule was interdiction to change one bishop throne for the other³⁶. A conclusion arises that the requirements of canonical law did not have to be met, especially if the person nominated as a bishop was promoted by the ruler.

²⁵ Socr., HE, I, 6; Theodoretus, HE, I, 18; Athanasius, *Apologia contra arianos*, 6 (later Athan., *Apol. con. arian.*), PG, t. 25.

²⁶ Socr., HE, I, 6, 24; Sozom., HE, I, 15; Theodoretus, HE, *loc. cit.*; Athan., *Apol. con. arian.*, *loc. cit.*

²⁷ Socr., HE, II, 7; Sozom., HE, III, 5; Theodoretus, HE, *loc. cit.*; Philost., HE, II, 10; Theoph., AM 5837.

²⁸ Sozom., HE, III, 5, 11, 14; Socr., HE, II, 19, 37, 40.

²⁹ Sozom., HE, IV, 12; Socr., HE, II, 40; Philost., HE, IV, 4.

³⁰ Sozom., HE, IV, 26; Socr., HE, II, 43; Philost., HE, V, 1; Theoph., AM 5857.

³¹ L. Duchesne, *Istoriya drevnej cerkvi*, t. 2, Moskva 1914, p. 261.

³² On Gregory's consecration to the bishop of Sasima, see Szymusiak, *op. cit.*, p. 147; R. R. Reuther, *Gregory of Nazianzus. Rhetor and Philosopher*, Oxford 1969, p. 35–38.

³³ Socr., HE, VII, 28; Theoph., AM 5921. Cf. note 12.

³⁴ Theoph., AM 6029; Zacharias Rhetor, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IX, 19 (later Zacharias, HE) CSCO, *Scriptores Syri*, III, t. 5, Lovanii 1924; Joannes Ephesin., HE, I, 42; Liberatus, *Breviarium*, 20, *Patrologiae cursus completus... Series latina...* accurate J. P. Migne (later PL), t. 68; *Victoris Tonnennensis Episcopi Chronica*, a. 537 (later Vict. Ton.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, t. XI (later MGH, AA).

³⁵ Nectarius at the moment of his election was not even baptised (Sozom., HE, VII, 8; Theoph., AM 5876). E. Przekop (*Nielegalność wyborów patriarchów w pierwszym tysiącleciu Kościoła*, „Prawo Kanoniczne” 1976, t. 19, p. 130–133) claims that Nectarius' accession can be recognized as canonical because the tenth canon of council of Serdica (343) that required a candidate for a bishop to meet particular expectations was unknown in Byzantium. It seems that this argument is not sufficient because apart from the council of Serdica ecclesiastical legislation also regulated this question (for more on canons of the Council of Serdica, see H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A. D. 343. A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law*, Oxford 1958). Council of Nicea (325) in its second canon clearly forbade granting ecclesiastical dignity to people who were only converted to Christianity. Legislation of that council was commonly known. The other thing is putting this canon into practice.

³⁶ Nicea 325, can. 15 (H-L, I, 1, p. 597); Antioch 341, can. 13, 21 (H-L, I, 2, p. 718, 720–721); Serdica 343, can. 1, 3 (H-L, I, 2, p. 760, 762–763); Chalcedon 451, can. 5, 20 (H-L, II, 2, p. 783–784, 807). Canon Ap. 14 confirmed interdiction of leaving his diocese by bishop. However it allows such situations of their cause was the decision made by majority of bishops or the needs of a given community.

The state authorities interfered in elections of new City patriarchs. It was not only reduced to imposing their own choice (as in the case of John Chrysostom). Sometimes clerical circles took the initiative, but even in such situation the final decision belonged to the emperor. The moment they took office, the bishops of the capital were under the ruler's control. That is why they tried to keep good, or at least correct relations with him. Such conduct could not only give stability to the patriarchal position but also provide the possibility of realizing the patriarch's own plans and ambitions.

Let's take a look at the activities of bishop of Constantinople at the early Byzantine court. The first bishops of the city did not always keep in contact with the emperor since the court often changed the place of stay. After a few years' reign of Constantine the Great (333–337) Constantinople was no longer the permanent seat of rulers. Constantius and Julian the Apostate were mainly staying in Antioch. Valens changed his seat to Sirmium, Constantinople, Marcianopolis and Antioch. In the time of Theodosius the Great the seat of the court was Thessalonica and Constantinople. Only Arcadius settled down in Constantinople³⁷.

It seems that already Eusebius of Nicomedia noticed the advantage of the proximity of imperial court to the bishop's seat. That is why he rarely stayed in Constantinople but more often in Antioch together with emperor Constantius where he could consolidate his influence on the emperor's environment³⁸. From the times when Constantinople became a permanent seat of emperors the bishops of the City were not forced to leave their community to stay in the imperial closest surrounding.

The proximity of imperial court gave Constantinopolitan bishops the possibility of contacts with a lot of eminent people. By way of example, John Chrysostom had his supporter on the court in the person of eunuch Brisson³⁹. Macedonius II stayed in close relationship with empress Ariadne and Pompeius, emperor Anastasius' nephew⁴⁰. Anthimus was supported by

³⁷ G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une Capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, p. 78–85; M. Salamon, *Rozwój idei Rzymu–Konstantynopola od IV do połowy VI wieku*, Katowice 1975, p. 106–108.

³⁸ On Eusebius' places of stay when holding the post of the Constantinopolitan bishop, see – Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 76; J. Gliściński, *Współczesny Ojcu*, Łódź 1992, p. 53–57.

³⁹ On Brisson see PLRE II, Cambridge 1980, p. 242. On the other supporters of John Chrysostom, both in secular and ecclesiastical circles, see Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 85–90; J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I. to the Death of Justinian*, t. 1, New York 1985, p. 141–142; J. H. G. W. Liebeschuetz, *Friends and Enemies of John Chrysostom*, [in:] *idem, From Diocletian...*, V, p. 102–109.

⁴⁰ P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First*, Tessaionike 1974, p. 59.

Justinian I's wife – Theodora – who took care of him even after his removal from the patriarch's office⁴¹.

The priests kept in contact with famous persons who could make access to the ruler possible for them, and were generous in spending money on it. If getting to the court was possible bishops could try to influence the ruler in the way that he would agree to their suggestions.

The scope of Constantinopolitan bishops' interest was not only limited to taking care of his fold. Special attention of the City bishops was directed to gaining the court's support for personal changes on ecclesiastical offices which were inspired by them. Changes led to the removal of religious adversaries and replacing them by friendly persons. And so during the reign of Constantius II Eusebius of Nicomedia cooperated with the ruler backing the Arian party and fighting against orthodoxes⁴². Similarly Eudoxius, Macedonius I's successor, used the help of emperor Valens to decide about filling the main church offices⁴³. John Chrysostom's successors – Arsacius and Atticus were able to strengthen their position towards adherents of the removed bishop thanks to the favourable politics of the imperial court⁴⁴. And bishop Gennadius successfully intervened in the case of orthodoxes threatened by monophysites in the reign of Leo I⁴⁵.

The possibility of keeping in permanent contact with the ruler not only gave the clever bishop of Constantinople the opportunity to influence the personal policy of the Church but also to call councils which fixed disciplinary and doctrinal rules of the Church. In such a way under emperor Valens' reign bishop Eudoxius was able to prevent councils from being called, as he feared that their decisions might be unfavourable for him and his supporters⁴⁶.

⁴¹ J. W. Barker, *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*, Madison 1960, p. 104–105; G. Downey, *Constantinople in the Age of Justinian*, Norman 1968, p. 144; S. Runciman, *Teokracja bizantyjska*, Warszawa 1982, p. 48–49.

⁴² Gidulianov, *op. cit.*, p. 291; Gliściński, *op. cit.*, p. 53–57.

⁴³ Eudoxius induced Valens to remove these clergymen who were exiled by Constantinus II (Theoph., AM 5861). On Eudoxius' influence on the emperor, see J. Češka, *Rimský štát a katolícka cirkev ve IV století*, Brno 1983, p. 95.

⁴⁴ Liebeschuetz, *The Fall...*, p. 23ff.

⁴⁵ Gennadius came out against patriarch of Alexandria Timothy the Cat. His efforts met with resistance of influential commander Aspar. However emperor Leo I ordered to exile Timothy to Gangra (Theoph., AM 5952). According to Zacharias Rhetor (HE, IV, 11) Gennadius contributed to Timothy's transfer from Gangra to Cherson. Another time Gennadius interceded with Leo I for Martirius, bishop of Antioch. This patriarch was ejected from the city by the monophysite Peter the Fuller. Thanks to Gennadius' intercession Peter had to leave Antiochene see (Theoph., AM 5956; Theodor Lect., HE, I, 21).

⁴⁶ Influences of the bishop caused the emperor to forbid organizing the synod in Tarsus in Cilicia (Sozom., HE, VI, 12).

Patriarch who was esteemed by the emperor could also participate in creating the ruler's religious policy. The best example is bishop Acacius' activity. He initiated the work on Henoticon issued by emperor Zeno; it voiced an official imperial position in religious cases. Henoticon was an attempt of compromise between orthodoxes and monophysites in the East⁴⁷.

It seems that the activity of Constantinopolitan bishops at the imperial court was not without influence on the character and kind of legislation issued by the emperor's chancellery. So, for example, Theodosius the Great's rule which allowed to judge priests only by church court was probably inspired by Gregory of Nazianzus with patriarch Nectarius' help⁴⁸. We can also attribute state acts allowing to destroy pagan temples to John Chrysostom's activity⁴⁹. It is also very probable that Theodosius II's rules against heretics were patriarch Nestorius' achievement⁵⁰.

The connections between the emperor and the City bishop were also visible in the activity of ἐνδημοῦσα σύνοδος in Constantinople⁵¹. Its beginning

⁴⁷ Henotikon was elaborated without calling a council and consultation of bishops. It confirmed canons of Nicea, Constantinople and Ephesus. Eutyches and Nestorius were condemned. Cyril's Twelve Anathemas were added to works of Ephesus while Tome of Leo was omitted (text of Henotikon, see Evagr., HE, III, 14; Zacharias, HE, V, 8). Acacius' attitude met with a negative reaction of pope Felix III who excommunicated Constantinopolitan patriarch. In 484 the so-called Acacian schism began. On this subject, see – W. T. Townsend, *The Henotikon Schism and the Roman Church*, „The Journal of Religion” 1936, t. 16; p. 78–86; G. Every, *Byzantine Patriarchate 451–1204*, London 1951, p. 50–51; F. Dvornik, *Pope Gelasius and Emperor Anastasius I*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1951, Bd. 44, p. 111–116; idem, *Bizancjum a prymat Rzymu*, Warszawa 1985, p. 43–50; *Akakian Schism*, [in:] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, t. 1, Oxford 1990, p. 42–43.

⁴⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus had revolted at the fact that the quarrel between bishop of Colonia, Bosporius, and the superior of the neighbouring diocese would be examined by secular court. He wrote about this case to patriarch Nectarius. The bishop asked the patriarch not to allow such situation (Gregorius Nazianensis, ep. CLXXXV, PG, t. 37; on Bosporius, see M. M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, Bonn 1960, p. 45–47). After this intervention the imperial regulation mentioned above was issued; it was ment for Optatus, governor of Egypt. Text of law – *Constitutiones Sirmondianae*, 3, [in:] CTh, p. 909–910. On Optatus, see PLRE I, p. 649–650.

⁴⁹ W. Dziewulski, *Zwycięstwo chrześcijaństwa w świecie starożytnym*. Zarys, Wrocław-Warszawa 1969, p. 119–120; G. Fowden, *Bishops and Temples in the Eastern Roman Empire AD 320–435*, „Journal of Theological Studies” 1978, t. 29, p. 75–76; A. Dębiński, *Ustawodawstwo karne rzymskich cesarzy chrześcijańskich w sprawach religijnych*, Lublin 1990, p. 160–161.

⁵⁰ CTh, XVI, 5, 65. On Nestorius' hostility to heretics, see Socr., HE, VII, 29. Cf. K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empress: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1982, p. 150–151.

⁵¹ On ἐνδημοῦσα σύνοδος, see – S. Vailhe, *Le droit d'appel en Orient et le synode permanent de Constantinople*, „Echos d'Orient” 1921, t. 20, p. 129–146; K. Stephanides, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Synoden des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel*, „Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte” 1936, Bd. 55, p. 122–157; P. J. Hajjar, *Le synode permanent dans*

is dated for the second half of the fourth century. That council consisted of bishops who, partly for personal reasons, partly for the matters connected with managing the diocese, came to the capital where under the leadership of the local bishop they considered the problems raised by the ruler or discussed of their own initiative. It seems that the emperor's decision to summon the bishop and his council to the capital was obvious especially since the moment when Constantinople had become the permanent seat of state authorities. It was the cause of intensification of direct contacts between the patriarch and the emperor. Such for example was the situation when in 543 Justinian I ordered patriarch Meletios to call council *endimousa* and to sanction his own decisions with regard to Origenes' errors⁵².

As time passed by Constantinopolitan bishops' aspirations systematically increased. They were trying to extend their power. It was possible only thanks to the support of state authorities. The evidence of such a situation was canon 3 of the council of Constantinople I (381) which gave the City bishop an honourable place after the bishop of Rome because Constantinople was considered to be a New Rome⁵³. About twenty years later John Chrysostom was able to interfere in the matters of neighbouring Churches which were formally independent of him. It would not have been possible without the full imperial acceptance⁵⁴. In 421 patriarch Atticus gained the right to expand his authority on Illyricum area from Theodosius II⁵⁵. It caused the opposition of western clergy backed by the local power and the necessity of resignation from undertaken enterprises⁵⁶.

l'Eglise Byzantine des origines au XI e siècle, Roma 1962; E. Przekop, *Patriarcha i synod stały (synodos endimousa) w Konstantynopolu do XI w.*, „Prawo Kanoniczne” 1974, t. 17, p. 63–90; idem, *Wschodnie patriarchaty...*, p. 89–91, 94–100; M. de Sardes, *Le patriarchat oecumenique dans l'Eglise orthodoxe*, Paris 1975, p. 119; H. J. Widuch, *Konstantynopol stołicą ekumenicznego patriarchatu 325–870*, Katowice 1988, p. 94–108.

⁵² Włodarski, *op. cit.*, p. 153; Przekop, *Wschodnie patriarchaty...*, p. 96–97.

⁵³ Text of canon – H-L, II, 1, p. 21–23.

⁵⁴ On the subject of John Chrysostom's intervention in the ecclesiastical affairs of other churches, see Gidulianov, *op. cit.*, p. 567ff.; P. Karlin-Hayter, *Activity of the Bishop of Constantinople Outside his Paroikia Between 381 and 451*, [in:] *Καθ' ἑστέρην. Essays presented to John Hussey for her 80th birthday*, Porphyrogenitus 1988, p. 203–204; Liebeschuetz, *Friends...*, p. 94. Liebeschuetz (*The Fall...*, p. 4) states that: „Without full imperial backing this would have been quite impossible”.

⁵⁵ CTh, XVI, 2, 45.

⁵⁶ Pope Boniface I came out against Theodosius II's decision which subordinated Illyricum to Constantinopolitan bishop. The pope was supported by western emperor Honorius. In this situation Theodosius II resigned. Cf. Gidulianov, *op. cit.*, p. 608–609; F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge 1958, p. 29; A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602. A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, t. 2, Oxford 1964, p. 889.

Rulers of the East not only consolidated the Constantinopolitan bishops' position but also in the visible way tried to widen their competence even at the cost of other dioceses. The tendency was especially visible during the council of Chalcedon (451). 28 canon of that council recognized Constantinople, as the emperor's city, as equal in privileges with old Rome. It was in fact the evidence of strengthening the power of Constantinopolitan patriarch to whom metropolitans of Asia, Thrace, Pontus were subordinated. He could also consecrate bishops for barbarian countries⁵⁷. Contemporary patriarch Anatolius owed this unquestionable success to emperor Marcianus and his wife Pulcheria's policy. Thanks to the support of state authorities Chalcedonian Council put an end to efforts of Alexandrian community led by its bishop who had aspired for the dominant role in the Eastern Church (since the fourth century)⁵⁸.

The provincial clergy noticed the increasing importance of the City bishop and wide possibilities of his activity at the imperial court. That was why they were frequently asking him for an intervention in the palace circles. And so Gregory of Nazianzus asked patriarch Nectarius to take care of certain Pancratius and grant him a military post⁵⁹. Another time Gregory appealed to his correspondent to use his influence on comes domesticorum in deacon Georgius' favour⁶⁰. Finally he asked the patriarch to induce emperor Theodosius the Great to take action against heretics⁶¹. Similarly Theodoretus of Cyrrhus wrote to the other of Constantinopolitan bishops, Proclus, when he wanted to defend tax-payers from Cyrrhus. He asked the patriarch persuade high state officials to issue favourable decision in this case⁶². The tendency shown above was caused not only by trust in the efficiency of City bishops' activity at the imperial court. Other causes of such situation were: limitation of the direct access of clergymen outside Constantinople to the emperor's court⁶³;

⁵⁷ Text of canon – H-L, II, 2, p. 815.

⁵⁸ R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, London 1961, p. 97; S. Bralewski, *Sobór w Chalcedonie w polityce wewnętrznej cesarza Marcjana*, „Acta Universitatis Lodziensis” 1992, Folia historica 44, p. 68–70.

⁵⁹ Gregorius Naz., ep. XCI.

⁶⁰ Gregorius Naz., ep. CLI.

⁶¹ Gregorius Naz., ep. CCII. Imperial rules against religious apostates probably resulted from the activity of patriarch Nectarius and his correspondent Gregory – CTh, XVI, 5, 14–15. Cf. Dębiński, *op. cit.*, p. 72–73, 81 (chapter II of this study is devoted to legislation against heretics – p. 59–116).

⁶² Theodoretus, ep. 47 (ed. Theodoretus, *Correspondance, Source Chretienne*, 40, 98, 111, Paris 1955–1965). This affair was one of more important plots of Theodoretus' correspondence (ep. XVII, 42, 43, 44, 45).

⁶³ Antioch 341 can. 11–12 (H-L, I, 2, p. 717–718); Serdica 343 can. 8 and 9 (H-L, I, 2, p. 786–788). The question of the stay of clergymen at the imperial court was explicitly specified in Justinian's novellae from A. D. 528 (*Novellae*, VI, 3). It was said that all affairs at the imperial court had to be sorted out by the Constantinopolitan patriarch or by apocrisarius of a given Church.

distance of a given episcopal seat from the capital and the cost of journey, or lastly the anxiety that a temporarily left cathedral could be easily captured by another priest.

Being so close to the ruler, bishops of Constantinople were often participated in the events important for the court and the whole state. For example John Chrysostom, a perfect orator and religious rigorist, played an important role in the events connected with the rebellion of Gainas – the leader of Gothic troops, who in 400 came forward against the rule of anti-Gothic party⁶⁴. According to the agreement between emperor Arcadius and count Gainas three of the most eminent leaders of that party, Aurelian, Saturninus and John⁶⁵ were to be given over to Gainas, and probably sentenced to death. John Chrysostom came out in their defence probably with the court's knowledge. This mediation caused Gainas to treat Aurelian, Saturninus and John gently. They were only sentenced to exile⁶⁶. In July 400 there was a massacre of Goths in the capital. In the revenge, Gainas devastated the territory of Thrace⁶⁷. John Chrysostom once more undertook the role of mediator between emperor Arcadius and the general without any positive result this time⁶⁸. Showing the above examples I am not going to suggest that patriarch John had any political ambitions. Chrysostom's participation in Gainas' crisis was caused by his ecclesiastical function. Bishop came out as a protector of wronged people (the case of Aurelian and his friends) or as a representative of Byzantine society which suffered from Gothic activity. The evidence for it was the bishop's intervention in the case of Gainas' demands to give the Arian one of the churches in the capital as a place of their cult. John, together with his court, protested against it courageously at the emperor's palace⁶⁹. Being conscious of the

⁶⁴ On the events connected with Gainas' revolt, see Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 129–135; K. Zakrzewski, *Rządy i opozycja za cesarza Arkadiusza*, Kraków 1927, p. 112–126; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, t. 1: *De L'Etat Romain a L'Etat Byzantin (284–476)*, Paris 1959, p. 235–237; G. Albert, *Goten in Konstantinopel: Untersuchungen zur oströmischen Geschichte um das Jahr 400 n. Chr.*, Paderborn 1984; S. Elbern, *Usurpationen im Spätromischen Reich*, Bonn 1984, *passim*; Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians...*, *passim*.

⁶⁵ Aurelian (PLRE I, p. 128–129), Saturninus (PLRE I, p. 807–808) and John (PLRE II, p. 593–594) are mentioned by Zosimus (*Historia nova*, V, 18, Lipsiae 1883 – later Zosimus). Socrates (HE, VI, 6) and Sozomen (HE, VIII, 4) do not mention John.

⁶⁶ Zakrzewski, *op. cit.*, p. 116–117; Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁶⁷ On Goths' massacre – Zosimus, V, 19; Socr., HE, VI, 6; Sozom., HE, VIII, 4.

⁶⁸ Theodoretus, HE, V, 33. Liebeschuetz (*Barbarians...*, p. 191–192 and note 18) suggests that the officials mentioned above were released as a result of John's mediation. That scholar does not accept the possibility of double mediation of Constantinopolitan patriarch. He thinks that John Chrysostom's homily *Cum Saturninus et Aurelianus acti essent in exilium* (PG, t. 52, col. 413–420) refers to the events after July massacre.

⁶⁹ Theodoretus, HE, V, 32; Sozom., HE, VIII, 4; Socr., HE, VI, 5. It must be pointed out that according to Synesius of Cyrene (*De providentia*, PG, t. 66, col. 1257) the emperor and prefect of pretorium were ready to accept Gainas' demand.

fact that citizens of Constantinople backed the patriarch, Gainas gave up.

Being in contact with different people, Constantinopolitan bishops were also sources of important information for the emperor and state authorities. Patriarch Attic for example informed emperor Theodosius II about the situation of Christian refugees from Persia⁷⁰. This obviously gave some view on the territory of the hostile country, Besides, it enabled the emperor to make strategic decisions.

The authority of the City bishops at the imperial court can be seen in the fact that they were asked for advice on important political matters, too. John IV Faster for instance, was participated in the council under the leadership of emperor Maurice. The council referred to the Byzantine intervention in the support of Chosroes, who was the son of a murdered Persian ruler Hormisdas⁷¹.

Acacius' participation in reestablishing the power of emperor Zeno in 476 offers a particularly interesting though not typical example of the involvement of Constantinopolitan patriarch in politics. The year before usurper Basiliscus gained the Byzantine throne⁷². The new emperor decided to change hitherto existing religious policy. He permitted monophysite bishops to return to their sees⁷³. Basiliscus issued the encyclical in which he outlined new religious order⁷⁴. At the first stage of Basiliscus' reign patriarch Acacius took the expectant attitude toward the new ruler⁷⁵. The first unfriendly step of Constantinopolitan bishop toward the emperor was declining to sign of the encyclical mentioned above⁷⁶. When at the council in Ephesus⁷⁷, the leader of monophysite party Timothy the Cat led to

⁷⁰ Socr., HE, VII, 18.

⁷¹ Pieces of information concerning the council are contradictory. Sources partly imply that patriarch John with senators were for undertaking military intervention on Persian king's side, other parts claim that they were opposed to it. Cf. R. Paret, *Dometianus de Melitene et la politique religieuse de l'empereur Maurice*, „Revue des Etudes Byzantines” 1957, t. 15, p. 46–47.

⁷² On Basiliscus' usurpation, see E. W. Brooks, *The Emperor Zeno and the Isaurians*, „The English Historical Review” 1893, t. 8, p. 216–218; Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 389–393; Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 363–364; J. Jarry, *Heresies et Factions dans l'Empire Byzantin du IV^e au VI^e Siecle*, La Caire 1968, p. 244–253; Frend, *The Rise of Monophysite...*, p. 169–174; M. B. Leszka, *Patriarcha Akacjusz wobec usurpacji Bazyliskosa 475–476 roku*, „Acta Universitatis Lodziensis” 1993, Folia historica 48, p. 71–78; M. J. Leszka, *Legalizacja władzy uzurpatorów we wczesnym Bizancjum*, *ibidem*, p. 82–83, 90.

⁷³ Evagr., HE, III, 4; Theodor Lect., HE, I, 31; Theoph., AM 5967.

⁷⁴ Text of encyclical, see Evagr., HE, III, 4; Zacharias, HE, V, 2.

⁷⁵ Sources are silent about Acacius' attitude to the change on imperial throne. It can be supposed that bishop was waiting for progress of events, maintaining neutral attitude.

⁷⁶ Jarry, *op. cit.*, p. 246; Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

⁷⁷ Evagr., HE, III, 6; Zacharias, HE, V, 3.

depriving the City patriarch of his rights, Acacius went into unhesitating actions. He recognized that Timothy the Cat's protector Basiliscus was a heretic⁷⁸. The patriarch instigated riots against the emperor among the inhabitants of the capital and monks⁷⁹. Basiliscus' position was weakened and he decided to back out of his religious policy⁸⁰. But it was too late. Removed by the usurper, emperor Zeno gathered large forces and seized the capital. Acacius, to whom Zeno owed his return to the throne to a great extent, gained a strong position keeping close to the emperor. The patriarch became Zeno's adviser and co-author of imperial religious policy. The case of Acacius suggests that the bishop of the capital was not always a puppet in the emperor's hands.

The evidence of increasing importance of the Constantinopolitan patriarch at the early Byzantine court was the fact that since the first half of the fifth century he began to take part in the election of the emperor. It was possible when the dying ruler did not indicate his successor by nomination of the co-emperor. Then, the decision to choose the emperor belonged to the Constantinopolitan senate (at least formally)⁸¹. It can be observed that the bishop of the capital was invited to its sessions.

The first situation of this kind happened in 491⁸². When emperor Zeno died the senate gathered to decide about the election of new Augustus. Patriarch Euphemius was also invited to the session. During the break in the meeting the City bishop found himself in the company of Zeno's widow

⁷⁸ Evagr., HE, III, 7.

⁷⁹ The orthodox majority of the capital population supported patriarch Acacius. The causes of such attitude were not only religious questions but also severe fiscal policy of the usurper (*Malchus*, fr. 9, 3, [in:] FCH). The proof of such an attitude on the part of inhabitants of Constantinople was their readiness to burn the city (*Theodor Lect.*, HE, I, 33). Monks played an important role in these events (Evagr., HE, III, 7; *Theodor Lect.*, HE, I, 33; *Theoph.*, AM 5968). Daniel the Stylite, the great authority of that time, came out against Basiliscus too (*Theodor Lect.*, HE, I, 32–33; *Theoph.*, AM 5968; *Zacharias*, HE, V, 5; *Vita S. Danielis Stylitae*, „*Analecta Bollandiana*” 1913, t. 32, p. 186–200). The role of Daniel the Stylite in the fight against usurper was analysed by W. H. C. Frend, *The Monks and the Survival of the East Roman Empire in the Fifth Century*, „*Past and Present*” 1972, t. 54, p. 19–20.

⁸⁰ Basiliscus issued the so-called anti-encyclical in which he gave up his original religious position – Evagr., HE, III, 7; *Zacharias*, HE, V, 5.

⁸¹ On the rules of accession to the imperial throne in early Byzantine State, see J. B. Bury, *Gosudarstvennyj stroj Vizantijskoj Imperii*, S. Peterburg 1912, p. 7; L. Brehier, *Les institutions de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris 1949, p. 5–6; P. Karayanopulos, *Der frühbyzantinische Kaiser*, „*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*” 1956, Bd. 49, p. 369–384; W. Ensslin, *Cesarz i administracja cesarska*, [in:] *Wstęp do cywilizacji wschodniorzymskiej*, Warszawa 1964, p. 240.

⁸² The description below was based on Constantini Porphyrogeniti, *De caerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, I, 92 (later *De caerim.*), t. 1, Bonnae 1929. Cf. C. Capizzi, *L'Imperatore Anastasio I (491–518). Studia sulla sua vita, la sua opera e la sua personalita*, Roma 1969, p. 71–86.

– Ariadne. She walked into the hippodrome where the people of Constantinople and the troops had gathered. Here she made a speech. Ariadne asked to keep peace and thus create proper conditions for the election of a new ruler. The empress stressed that the election was to be made in the patriarch's presence. As we can see Euphemius was distinguished from the other state dignitaires. It is difficult to say what kind of influence among the members of the senate the patriarch had but it seems that they accepted his honourable leadership since he was given the mission of informing Ariadne about the senate's will. According to it she was to make the choice of a new emperor. Her candidate became Anastasius, who held the post of silentarius. The role of the patriarch in Anastasius' enthroning did not end with reporting the senate's will. Already before Anastasius' coronation Euphemius demanded his promise not to introduce any novelty to the Church⁸³. As we know the demand was caused by Anastasius' religious point of view which tended to monophysitism⁸⁴. The City bishop as a guardian of orthodoxy could not agree to the election of such an emperor. That is why he tried to obtain at least formal acceptance of orthodox creed from Anastasius. The bishop could get it because his presence during the ceremony of crowning was necessary for the newly chosen ruler.

The second case of the patriarch's participation in the election of an emperor can be found in 518⁸⁵. After Anastasius' death the senate gathered to choose a new emperor. The City bishop – John of Cappadocia was among the invited people. Unfortunately the sources are enigmatic and that is why we do not know what role he exactly played in this event. The decision to choose Anastasius' successor was taken in the hippodrom. Here Justin, *comes excubitorum*, was chosen by the troops and people after a stormy debate. In this situation the senate had to agree with this decision. The patriarch probably did the same, because we know nothing about his opposition to Justin I.

The participation of patriarchs in the election of the emperor was also caused by their presence in the coronation of a new ruler. They were in charge of religious side of the ceremony. Let's take a look at the role the Constantinopolitan bishops in the crowning ceremony of early Byzantine emperors.

The participation of the patriarch in the emperor's coronation probably goes back to 450, when Marcian was elected. In this ceremony the bishop

⁸³ Evagr., HE, III, 32; Theoph., AM 5983; Zacharias, HE, VII, 1; *Vict. Ton.*, a. 491; Theodor Lect., HE, II, 6; cf. Charanis, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

⁸⁴ On Anastasius' and his family's religious views, see Charanis, *op. cit.*, p. 39–43.

⁸⁵ Description of events – *De caerim.*, I, 93. Events which led to Justin I's elevation are discussed by A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge 1950, p. 68–82.

of the capital Anatolius played a passive role, being only the witness of that event⁸⁶. Only seven years later the position of the City patriarch was emphasized when Anatolius put the diadem on Leo I's head. It must be remarked that this act took place at the end of the secular part of the coronation because Leo himself had put on the diadem during the first part of the ceremony⁸⁷. As we can see the patriarch only repeated the emperor's act.

The coronation, which was celebrated by the patriarch, attained its final form in 491 (in the period under analysis). Then the City bishop, Euphemius was the first one to put the diadem and the purple on the new emperor, Anastasius I⁸⁸. During next coronations Constantinopolitan bishops also handed insignia over to the ruler. In 518 Justin I was crowned by patriarch John of Cappadocia⁸⁹ and in 565 Justin II by John III Scholasticus⁹⁰. It must be stressed that till the end of early Byzantine period the act which was celebrated by the patriarch had been the background of the military part of coronation. The latter consisted of elevation of a new ruler on the shield, decorating him with a military necklace – *torques*, raising banners and lances⁹¹.

The bishop of Constantinople crowned the new emperor only in such situations when the ruler had been chosen after the death of his predecessor.

⁸⁶ Theoph., AM 5942. F. Winkelmann (*Zur Rolle der Patriarchen von Konstantinopel bei den Kaiserwechseln in frühbyzantinischer Zeit*, „Klio” 1978, Bd. 60, p. 468–470) questions credibility of this fact. He suggests that sources, giving evidence to it, are not trustworthy.

⁸⁷ *De caerim.*, I, 91; cf. Theodor Lect., II, 65; Theoph., AM 5950. In Winkelmann's opinion (*op. cit.*, p. 470–471) coronation by patriarch did not take place then. No source concerning this fact mentions such event. The fullest relation of this coronation in *De caerimoniis* is unclear at this point and Theophanes' mention is not trustworthy. On this subject see also H. J. Magoulias, *Byzantine Christianity: Emperor, Church and West*, New York 1970, p. 8; C. N. Tsirpanlis, *The Imperial Coronation and Theory in „De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae” of Constantine VII Porphyrogennitus*, „Kleronomia” 1972, t. 4, p. 74–75.

⁸⁸ *De caerim.*, I, 92.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, I, 93.

⁹⁰ Description of Justin II' elevation – Corrippi, *In laudem Iustini*, II, MGH, AA, III, 2. Cf. Av. Cameron, *Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium*, „Past and Present” 1979, No 84, p. 10–14.

⁹¹ On imperial coronations in early Byzantium, see W. Sickel, *Das byzantinische Krönungsrecht bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1898, Bd. 8, p. 511–557; F. E. Brightman, *Byzantine Imperial Coronations*, „Journal of Theological Studies” 1901, t. 2, p. 359–392; A. E. R. Boak, *Imperial Coronation Ceremonies of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, „Harvard Studies in Classical Philology” 1919, t. 30, p. 37–43; P. Charanis, *The Imperial Crown Modiolus and its Constitutional Significance*, „Byzantion” 1937, t. 12, p. 185–195; Tsirpanlis, *op. cit.*, p. 63–91; G. Ostrogorski, *Evolucija vizantijskogo koronovanja*, [in:] *Vizantija, Južnyje Slovjane i Drevnaja Ruš, Zapadnaja Evropa: Isskustvo i kultura*, Moskva 1973, p. 33–44; J. Nelson, *Symbols in Context: Rulers' Inauguration Rituals in Byzantium and the West in the Early Middle Ages*, „Studies in Church History” 1976, t. 13, p. 97–119.

In elevations of co-emperors the patriarch only said the prayer before the coronation which was celebrated by the emperor. Such a case occurred in 473 for the first time. Then patriarch Acacius took part in the coronation of Leo II, which was celebrated by his grandfather Leo I⁹². In the later acts the role of the patriarch does not change, with the exception of Justinian's case⁹³. The evidence of it is Theophanes' mention of Tiberius' coronation. We read in it that during the ceremony patriarch Eutychius had said the prayer and after that emperor Justin II handed insignia over to the co-emperor⁹⁴. It is also known that John II Faster participated in the coronation of Maurice⁹⁵. As the emperor put on the diadem and purple, the patriarch could only say a prayer for the welfare of a new emperor.

Whether the patriarch represented the electors⁹⁶ or the Church⁹⁷ is a subject of controversy. It seems that J. N. Nelson is right stating that the distinction is improper because: „In act of coronation, the patriarch was not therefore priest as such, but like the emperor himself, transcended distinction between empire and priesthood”⁹⁸. Such a role fell to the City patriarch only in the case of crowning the emperor who was chosen in interregnum. In the elevation of co-emperors his role was smaller, priestly, unless the emperor ordered him to celebrate an act of coronation (for example: the case of Justinian I).

Because of his function the bishop of the capital participated in numerous state and religious celebrations, too. And so bishop Eudoxius celebrated baptism of emperor Valens⁹⁹. John IV Faster was in charge of Maurice's wedding ceremony¹⁰⁰. We can also see patriarch Epiphanius

⁹² *De caerim.*, I, 94.

⁹³ *Ibidem*, I, 95 (not only did the capital bishop say a prayer but he also put diadem on Justinian's head). Malalas (p. 422) and *Chronicon Paschale* (Bonnae 1832, p. 616) mention Justinian's coronation by Justin I. According to R. Browning (*Justinian i Teodora*, Warszawa 1977, p. 61–62) Justinian was proclaimed first by Justin I (1 April 527) and then (4 April) he was crowned by the patriarch. The same A. Külzer, *Studien zum Chronicon Bruxellense*, „Byzantion” 1991, t. 61, p. 432.

⁹⁴ The person who gave Tiberius insignia during his elevation to the position of Caesar was emperor Justin II (Evagr. HE, V, 13). Before this act Constantinopolitan bishop probably said a prayer (Theoph., AM 6070). On bishop's presence, see Evagr., *loc. cit.*; Theophylactus Simocatta, *Historiae*, III, 11, 12, Lipsiae 1887 (later ThS). On this event, see also Joannes Ephesin., HE, III, 5.

⁹⁵ ThS, I, 1, 2; Theoph., AM 6074. On Maurice's coronation, see also Joannes Ephesin., HE, V, 13.

⁹⁶ Such a view was represented for example by Bury (*Gosudarstvennyj...*, p. 10) or by Ensslin (*Cesarz...*, p. 240–241).

⁹⁷ Charanis, *The Imperial...*, p. 193; Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁹⁸ Nelson, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁹⁹ Socr., HE, IV, 1.

¹⁰⁰ On Maurice's wedding, see ThS, I, 10, 2–12.

blessing the troops who, under Belisarius, were marching out against Vandals¹⁰¹. These and similar ceremonies gave patriarchs an occasion to tighten relationships with the emperor and court circles. They were also the factor strengthening the priest's authority in the eyes of the community. The City bishops profited by their priestly competence, claiming the role of the emperor's spiritual guides, leading him by the only true way of faith. But it referred only to those who had a great influence and charisma. However, playing the role of the emperor's conscience did not always appear safe (as evidenced by the case of John Chrysostom).

The post of the City bishop demanded special knowledge from the priests holding it. Many patriarchs did not have it. It is useful to discuss the causes of Constantinopolitan bishops' depositions or free resignations from their position. It allows us to show what attributes should characterise the City shepherd so that he could not only maintain his post but also lead his own effective policy at the imperial court. Already one of the first City bishops, Paul, did not meet with the approbation of emperor Constantinus II and his advisers. The main cause of this situation was a religious dispute between the bishop and the ruler. Paul was orthodox. Constantius II and his closest environment represented Arian views¹⁰². In the fight against the bishop not only religious arguments were used, but also political accusations such as collaboration with usurper Magnentius¹⁰³. Macedonius

¹⁰¹ Evagr., HE, IV, 16; Procopius, *De bello Vandalico*, I, 12, Bonn 1833. When Belisarius was marching out to Africa the Constantinopolitan patriarch baptised a few soldiers. This fact gave the expedition religious dimension. It must be remembered Arian Vandals were the enemies of Byzantine soldiers. On the atmosphere around the expedition against Vandals, see P. Krupczyński, *Trudności zachodnich wypraw Belizariusza*, Łódź 1981, p. 21–22; W. E. Kaegi, *Arianism and the Byzantine Army in Africa 533–546*, [in:] *idem, Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium*, London 1982, p. 26–27; J. Strzelczyk, *Wandalowie i ich afrykańskie państwo*, Warszawa 1992, p. 171.

¹⁰² Paul was removed from his post several times. Some scholars suggest that his first exile took place under Constantine the Great (for example Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 71). According to Barnes (*Emperor and Bishops...*, p. 66; *Athanasius and Constantius...*, p. 213) it happened in autumn of 337 under the pressure of emperor Constantius II. Recently the question of dating Paul's first exile has been discussed by di Maio and Arnold in article *Per Vim, Per Caedem, Per Bellum...*, p. 206, note 268. After the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia Paul returned to Constantinople. However in 342 he was exiled again. Thanks to the intervention of western emperor Constans he came back to the capital again in 346. A few years later Paul finally lost bishop's see. At the beginning of his last exile the bishop died in obscure circumstances. On Paul's career consult the following – Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 31–92; Nordberg, *op. cit., passim*; M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Roma 1975, *passim*; R. Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche*, Darmstadt 1977, *passim*; Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 280–284; Gliściński, *op. cit., passim*; Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius...*, esp. Appendix 8, p. 212–217.

¹⁰³ Telfer, *op. cit.*, p. 87–88; Dagron, *op. cit.*, p. 435.; cf. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius...*, p. 215.

I incurred the displeasure of emperor Constantius II because of his unfortunate behaviour which contributed to bloodshed in Constantinople. It was connected with the attempt of transfer of Constantine the Great's corpse to the place where martyr Acacius was buried. Worsening relationships between the bishop and the court provided an opportunity for Macedonius' enemies who led to his removal from the bishopric in 360¹⁰⁴. Demophilus was expelled by Theodosius the Great for the refusal to convert to orthodoxy which was propagated by the ruler¹⁰⁵. Gregory of Nazianzus was charged with uncanonical appointment. It can be suggested that machinations of Alexandrian and Thessalonician Churches also contributed to his independent departure from the cathedral¹⁰⁶. John Chrysostom was brought to ruin by his unceremonious attack on the licentiousness of court circles, under the leadership of empress Eudoxia, and also because of his interfering in the matters of other, independent dioceses, and rigorous discipline which he was trying to enforce among the clergy and monks. Also the ambitious Alexandrian patriarch Theophilus came out against John¹⁰⁷. Nestorius was deprived of his post on account of being accused of heresy¹⁰⁸. Both he and patriarch Flavian¹⁰⁹ did not manage to defend themselves

¹⁰⁴ List of accusations against Macedonius – Socr., HE, II, 38, 42; cf. Sozom., HE, IV, 21, 24; Theoph., AM 5852. Question of Macedonius' removal is discussed by Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 94–95.

¹⁰⁵ Socr., HE, V, 7; Sozom., HE, VII, 5; Theoph., AM 5872. These events occurred in 380.

¹⁰⁶ On leaving Constantinopolitan bishopric in 381 by Gregory of Nazianzus, see Gidulianov, *op. cit.*, p. 537–538; Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik...*, p. 32; S. J. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nicee et Constantinople*, Paris 1963, p. 176–178; Szymusiak, *op. cit.*, s. 235; Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 104–105; Ruether, *op. cit.*, p. 47–48.

¹⁰⁷ Recently the problem of John Chrysostom's fall was scrupulously examined by F. van Ommeslaeghe (*Que vaut le témoignage de Pallade sur le Procès de Saint Jean Chrysostome?*, „*Analecta Bollandiana*” 1977, t. 95, p. 389–414; *Jean Chrysostome en conflit avec l'imperatrice Eudoxie. Le dossier et les origines d'une légende*, „*Analecta Bollandiana*” 1979, t. 97, p. 131–159; *Jean Chrysostome et le Peuple de Constantinople*, „*Analecta Bollandiana*” 1981, t. 99, p. 329–349) and Liebeschuetz (*Friends...*, p. 85–111; *The Fall...*, p. 1–31; *Barbarians...*, *passim*).

¹⁰⁸ On the causes and circumstances of Nestorius' removal in 431, see – Gidulianov, *op. cit.*, p. 626ff.; Ph. Hughes, *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire (427–692)*, London 1944, p. 2–7; Baynes, *op. cit.*, p. 108–110; F. Dvornik, *The Ecumenical Councils*, New York 1961, p. 24; Frend, *The Rise of Monophysite...*, p. 16–24; Baus, Ewig, *op. cit.*, p. 105–111; Holum, *op. cit.*, p. 154–174; K. Iłski, *Sobory w polityce religijnej Teodozjusza II*, Poznań 1992, *passim*; S. Bralewski, *Postawa cesarza Teodozjusza II wobec biskupów*, „*Acta Universitatis Lodzensis*” 1993, Folia historica 48, p. 41–48; A. de Halleux, *Nestorius. Histoire et Doctrine*, „*Irenikon*” 1993, t. 56, p. 38–51.

¹⁰⁹ Gidulianov, *op. cit.*, p. 690ff.; Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 8–10; H. Chadwick, *The Exile and Death of Flavian of Constantinople: A Prologue to the Council of Chalcedon*, „*The Journal of Theological Studies*” 1955, t. 6, p. 17–34. Deposition occurred in 449.

against the attack of Alexandrian bishops who were exploiting their contacts with imperial court and considerable, financial resources. Euphemius¹¹⁰ and Macedonius II¹¹¹ were not able to adapt their religious policy and political knowledge to emperor Anastasius' requirements. Euphemius was also accused of plotting with Isaurians against the ruler¹¹². Bishop Anthimus resigned from his post therefore his conversion to monophysite views made cooperation with the orthodox emperor impossible. His decision however anticipated only synodical will which declared him unworthy of holding his position¹¹³. Eutychius was deposed because he did not want to sign Justinian the Great's edict referring to one of the dogmas of faith¹¹⁴.

Summing up the material showed above, it can be stated that the causes of deposing Constantinopolitan bishops from their posts were: the inability to cooperate with the emperor and imperial court; representing other religious views than those presented by the emperor, and finally – weak position in ecclesiastical circles. Formal causes of removal from the patriarchal position were: uncanonical appointment to a post, heresy, activity against the emperor. In general from among 32 bishops of Constantinople holding their post from the times of Constantine the Great to Maurice, eleven were removed or left on their own initiative¹¹⁵. Some bishops, like Paul for instance, were deposed several times.

Knowing the reasons which led to the removal of Constantinopolitan patriarchs from their post, we can try to answer the question: what factors accounted for the stability of City bishops' position? In that context careers of patriarch Anatolius and John of Cappadocia are particularly interesting.

¹¹⁰ Charanis, *op. cit.*, p. 55–56; W. H. C. Frend, *The fall of Macedonius in 511 – a suggestion*, [in:] *Kerygma und Logos. Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum*, 1976, p. 184–185. Euphemius' removal occurred in 496.

¹¹¹ Charani, *op. cit.*, p. 69–71; Frend, *Fail...*, p. 186–195; Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 38–41. It occurred in 511.

¹¹² Capizzi, *op. cit.*, p. 112; Charanis, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

¹¹³ Evagr., HE, IV, 11. Circumstances of Anthimus' resignation in 536 are discussed in Ewagriusz Scholastyk, *Historia Kościoła*, Warszawa 1990, notes 18–19, p. 180–181; cf. E. Schwartz, *Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians*, [in:] *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 4, Berlin 1963, p. 286–290; Frend, *The Rise of Monophysite...*, p. 271–273; Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

¹¹⁴ Patriarch did not want to sign imperial edict, issued in 564, in which apothartodocetism was sanctioned (Stein, *op. cit.*, t. 2, p. 687–688; P. van den Ven, *L'Accession de Jean le Scholastique au Siège Patriarcal de Constantinople en 565*, „Byzantion” 1965, t. 35, p. 324–328; P. Allen, *Neo-Chalcedonism and the patriarchs of the Late Sixth Century*, „Byzantion” 1980, t. 50, p. 10–11). Eutychius was reinstated in Constantinopolitan see after the death of John III Scholasticus in 577 (on regaining of the bishopric – Theoph., AM 6070; Evagr., HE, V, 16).

¹¹⁵ List of bishops according to V. Grumel, *La Chronologie*, Paris 1958, p. 434–435. The text omits Evagrius and Maximos the Cynic who were consecrated but they did not take over their offices.

Anatolius, who was the influential apocrisarius of Alexandrian patriarch Dioscurus, began to hold his post during the reign of Theodosius II. Anatolius took over the City bishopric after patriarch Flavian had been removed in 449. However during the reign of the new emperor, Marcianus, in the time of council endimousa in 450, he decided to judge his former supporter Eutyches, one of the most implacable enemies of the exiled patriarch¹¹⁶. In 451 during the council of Chalcedon Anatolius, authorized by the ruler, created a comission which worked out a new profession of faith and condemned the events of 449 which led to the overthrowing of his contemporary enemy – Flavian¹¹⁷. Such attitude contributed to Anatolius' maintenance of the post and also led to his elevation above his former superior, patriarch of Alexandria. As regards John of Cappadocia he was reised to the patriarchal throne by the emperor Anastasius¹¹⁸. Though orthodox the successor of that emperor, Justin I, did not remove John from his post. The cause of it was undoubtedly the fact that the patriarch did not clearly define his religious views. It allowed him to steer a middle course between orthodox and monophysite party. John, who took part in Justin's elevation, was able to gain the emperor's confidence. The patriarch's loyalty to Justin was illustrated by the events which took place in the capital in 519. In the presence of the emperor, the senate and the clergy bishop John signed papal libellum restoring the union between Constantinople and Rome. Emperor Anastasius was among people who were condemned in this document even though John owed him his elevation, which was mentioned earlier¹¹⁹. The above examples clearly indicate that skiful policy of adapting oneself to the present ruler's will, good cooperation with the imperial court and also proper balance between priest's duties and policy could guarantee of maintenance of the post even if there was a change of emperor.

When we try to estimate the activity of Constantinopolitan bishops' at the imperial court in early Byzantium we must state that during the three centuries there occurred considerable promotion of the bishop rank from the moment when he was an uniportant figure in the church of Heraclea till the time when he gained the position of the first patriarch of the East. From the times of Theodosius the Great its power was systematically established by rulers. In this situation the question of appointing the City bishop became an important element of competition

¹¹⁶ *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, 2, 1, 1, Berolini-Lipsiae 1933, p. 124–144.

¹¹⁷ Bralewski, *Sobór...*, p. 61–67.

¹¹⁸ Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹¹⁹ In the libellum next to condemnend Anastasius there were names of emperor Zeno and five Constantinopolitan patriarchs – Acacius and his four successors (Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, p. 177).

between great ecclesiastical units which put up their candidates. Having direct access to the emperor and his family, being in close contact with high state officials, the bishop of Constantinople did not limit his activity at the court only to ecclesiastical affairs like personal policy in the ecclesiastical circles, religious advice or celebration of church ceremony. He could also participate in important, political events.

The extent to which the emperor and patriarch cooperated with each other depended on the unity of views or bishop's skills in adapting his activity to imperial will, because the ruler always played the decisive role.

Małgorzata B. Leszka

ROLA PATRIARCHY KONSTANTYNOPOLA NA DWORZE CESARZY WCZESNOBIZANTYŃSKICH

Artykuł poświęcony został roli, jaką odgrywali biskupi Konstantynopola na dworze cesarzy bizantyńskich w IV–VI w. Analizując wybory stołecznych biskupów autorka wskazuje na rosnące zainteresowanie nimi panujących, którzy starali się o to, by tron patriarchy znalazł się w rękach odpowiadających im kandydatów. Przedstawiając działalność konstantynopolińskich biskupów na dworze cesarskim autorka podkreśla fakt, iż umiejący pozyskać zaufanie władcy patriarchowie mogli prowadzić własną politykę personalną w kręgach kleru, czy też uczestniczyć w kreowaniu oficjalnego stanowiska zajmowanego przez cesarzy w sprawach kościelnych. Ich działalność nie pozostawała również bez wpływu na charakter i rodzaj ustaw opuszczających cesarską kancelarię. Poparcie ze strony władców umożliwiało im także rozszerzanie zakresu własnych kompetencji kosztem innych diecezji. Rosnący autorytet stołecznych biskupów powodował, iż byli oni pośrednikami między innymi duchownymi a dworem cesarskim. Odgrywali także istotną rolę w życiu politycznym państwa, o czym świadczy choćby postawa Jana Chryzostoma podczas buntu Gainasa, czy wystąpienie patriarchy Akacjusza skierowane przeciw uzurpatorowi Bazyliskosowi. Widowym wyrazem znaczenia konstantynopolińskich patriarchów stał się, od drugiej połowy V w., ich udział w elekcji władców oraz celebrowanie obrzędu koronacyjnego.

Szczególne wymagania stawiane przed osobami pełniącymi tak ważną godność powodowały, iż nie wszyscy duchowni potrafili im podołać. Spora grupa stołecznych biskupów została zmuszona do odejścia z piastowanych stanowisk. Przyczynami tego zjawiska były: brak umiejętności współpracy z panującym i dworem cesarskim, reprezentowanie odmiennych przekonań religijnych niż miał aktualnie panujący władca, wreszcie zbyt słaba pozycja wobec konkurujących z konstantynopolińskim biskupem duchownych. Na tronie patriarchalnym utrzymywali się ci, którzy potrafili dostosować się do wymagań stawianych im przez panującego, bowiem w ostatecznym rozrachunku to on był czynnikiem decydującym.