

WIENER JAHRBUCH FÜR
KUNSTGESCHICHTE

Herausgegeben vom
Bundesdenkmalamt Wien
und vom Institut für Kunstgeschichte
der Universität Wien

BAND LX / LXI

2011/2012

BÖHLAU VERLAG WIEN · KÖLN · WEIMAR

Das Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte setzt folgende Zeitschriften fort: Jahrbuch der kaiserl. königl. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale (Jg. I/1856–IV/1860); Jahrbuch der k. k. Zentral-Kommission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale (NF I/1903–NF IV/1906); Kunstgeschichtliches Jahrbuch der k. k. Zentralkommission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst und historischen Denkmale bzw. Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Institutes der k. k. Zentral-Kommission für Denkmalpflege bzw. Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Institutes (Bd. I/1907–Bd. XIV/1920); Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte (Bd. I [XV]/1921 f.). Es erscheint unter dem Titel Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte seit dem Band II (XVI)/1923.

REDAKTION :

Für das Bundesdenkmalamt :
N.N.

Für das Institut für Kunstgeschichte der Universität Wien :
HANS H. AURENHAMMER UND MICHAEL VIKTOR SCHWARZ

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung durch:

Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung



Historisch-Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät der Universität Wien



ISSN 0083–9981

ISBN 978-3-205-78840-9

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. © 2014 by Böhlau Verlag Gesellschaft m. b. H. und Co. KG.

This publication is abstracted and indexed in BHA

Druck: Dimograf Druckerei GmbH

Printed in Poland

THE PATRONAGE OF AELIA EUDOKIA IN JERUSALEM

KONSTANTIN M. KLEIN

Sozomenos informs us that when Theodosios II became emperor of the Byzantine Empire at the age of seven in 408 CE, the affairs of state were influenced by his elder sister, Aelia Pulcheria, who gave an identity to her brother's reign.¹ The church historian writes that she even had to show him how to gather up his robes.² But the Theodosian wardrobe contained more than just silk dresses: it has been repeatedly pointed out in recent scholarship that the imitation of previous rulers, both mythological kings and real predecessors, was a convenient and effective method of defining the character and style of individual emperors.³ Like other Byzantine rulers, Theodosios had patterned his life from an early age on the model of Constantine, David and Solomon.

However, this concept of imitation was not only restricted to the male Theodosians. Princesses and empresses as well modelled their public image on the lives of paradigmatic female examples. Byzantine aristocratic women used role models of pious and philanthropic, humble and educated empresses to gain influence in connection with their personal patronage.⁴ Even though a certain amount of extravagance ran in the family, Pulcheria's imitation of the Virgin Mary within this concept was exceptional. Inside the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, the emperor's sister had an altar consecrated *on behalf of her own virginity and her brother's rule*.⁵ Modern scholars have often pointed to the rivalry between Pulcheria and Theodosios's wife, Eudokia.⁶ It is, however,

I am particularly grateful to Judith McKenzie for her help and support. Jaimie Lovell, Mandy Turner, and Maida Smeir opened many doors in Jerusalem, I would like to thank them very much.

- 1 The image of Theodosios II as a generally weak emperor who was largely influenced by others has to be reconsidered. It is noticeable that both Aelia Pulcheria and the empress Eudokia play almost no role in Fergus Millar's recent study on Theodosian politics, cf. F. MILLAR, *A Greek-Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408–450)*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 2006.
- 2 [Κ]αὶ πρῶτα μὲν τὴν αὐτῆς παρθενίαν τῷ θεῷ ἀνέθηκε καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπαιδαγωγῆσε βίον, cf. SOZOMENOS, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 9,1, ed. G. HANSEN, *Sozomenos, Historia Ecclesiastica*. Kirchengeschichte, 4 vols., Turnhout 2004.
- 3 Theodosios II was portrayed as a second Constantine mainly by Socrates and Sozomenos who stood in his favour and enjoyed his patronage. Cf. J. HARRIS, *Pius princeps: Theodosius II and Fifth-Century Constantinople*, in: P. MAGDALINO (ed.), *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries*. Papers from the Twenty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St Andrews, March 1992, Aldershot 1994, pp. 34–44, esp. pp. 37–38, see also M. WHITBY, *Images for Emperors in Late Antiquity: A Search for a New Constantine*, in: MAGDALINO, *New Constantines*, pp. 83–94, esp. p. 84.
- 4 Cf. L. JAMES, *Empresses and Power in Early Byzantium*, London 2001, esp. pp. 12, 14, 148–150.
- 5 SOZOMENOS, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1,3–4 (cit. n. 2), cf. V. LIMBERIS, *Divine Heiress: The Virgin Mary and the Creation of Christian Constantinople*, London/New York 1994, pp. 54–60.
- 6 Cf. K. HOLM, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1982, p. 176, and JAMES, *Empresses and Power* (cit. n. 4), p. 156.

questionable to what extent their activities – both in politics and patronage – were really in opposition. If so, Eudokia, who was not a virgin like Pulcheria, had to choose other ways to emulate her pious sister-in-law.⁷ It is very likely that the empress eventually found her imperial role model, when she set off for a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 438/439 CE. She was the first member of the court after Helena and Eutropia, Constantine's mother and mother-in-law respectively, to travel to the Holy Land.⁸ Just a few years after this journey, Eudokia left the court in Constantinople for unknown reasons.⁹ Again, she chose Jerusalem as the place for her retirement, a city where she would live the rest of her life as an important patroness of buildings and a strong supporter of anti-Chalcedonian monks – even after she renounced Miaphysitism and was eventually re-admitted into the Orthodox Church. Eudokia died

in 460 CE and was buried in the church of St Stephen, her most important religious foundation.

The aim of this case study in early Byzantine patronage is not to examine whether Eudokia made her foundations in the Holy Land as acts of defiance in order to emulate or antagonize her husband and sister-in-law. Moreover, we cannot measure how deep or sincere her Christian devotion was solely through her charitable foundations. Both questions cannot be answered sufficiently – and can only provide material for historical narratives with quite a moving plot, something that has already been done.¹⁰ In this study, Eudokia's possibilities and limits as an imperial founder will be discussed by asking why she chose Jerusalem as the goal of her final retreat and whether her foundations in the Holy City show a deliberate concept of patronage.

-
- 7 For other contemporary forms of pious rivalry see J. MATTHEWS, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, AD 364–425*, Oxford 1975, pp. 130–131.
- 8 Nevertheless, Eudokia was not the first female member of the Theodosian house who made donations to the holy places. The mother of Theodosios II, Eudoxia, supposedly played a key role in the destruction of the sanctuary of Zeus Marnas in Gaza and the subsequent building of a church at the same spot, the Eudoxiana, cf. H. GRÉGOIRE/M.-A. KUGENER (ed.), *Marc le Diacre: Vie de Porphyre évêque de Gaza*, Paris 1930, pp. 53, 75–92, cf. p. 92: ἐκλήθη δὲ Εὐδοξίανη ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς θεοφιλεστάτης Εὐδοξίας τῆς βασιλίδος. For Helena as a female role model of Byzantine empresses, cf. L. BRUBAKER, *Memories of Helena: Patterns in Imperial Female Matronage in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, in: L. JAMES (ed.), *Women, Men and Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium*, London/New York 1997, pp. 52–75, esp. pp. 56–62. For an interesting re-evaluation of the role of Eutropia in the Holy Land, cf. R. VAN DAM, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 300–302. Kenneth Holum refers to Eudokia as a “latter-day Helena”, HOLUM, *Theodosian Empresses* (cit. n. 6), p. 188. The choice of Helena as a role model turned out to be a formidable one, when, for example, Pulcheria herself was acclaimed as a new Helena at the sixth session (25 October 451 CE) of the Council of Chalcedon, at a time when Eudokia had been away from the court for almost a decade: *Pulcheria noua Helena. Helena fides demonstrasti. Helena zelum tu ostendisti*, cf. E. SCHWARTZ (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, 3.2, Berlin/Leipzig 1936, Actio 6, II (versio antiqua), p. 177; cf. BRUBAKER, *Memories of Helena* (cit. n. 8), p. 62; L. GARLAND, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527–1204*, London/New York 1999, p. 89.
- 9 Later writers report that Eudokia was accused of adultery, but the sources remain rather vague. John Malalas is the first of many ancient authors to tell a fabulous story involving a notorious Phrygian apple which leads Theodosios to the wrong assumption that Eudokia was unfaithful. Cf. MALALAS, *Chronographia* 14,8, ed. J. THURN, Johannes Malalas, *Chronographia*, Berlin 2000. However, the source material equally supports a version of the story according to which Eudokia left Constantinople for Jerusalem in accordance with and perhaps even encouraged by her husband, Theodosios II.
- 10 Cf. F.-T.-M. DE BACULARD D'ARNAUD, *Eudoxie* [sic], in: *Nouvelles historiques (1774–1783)*, III, Paris 1803 (=Évre de M. d'Arnaud, 9), pp. 181–312; W. WIEGAND, *Eudoxia* [sic], *Gemahlin des oströmischen Kaisers Theodosius II.*, Worms 1871; F. GREGOROVIVUS, *Athenais: Geschichte einer byzantinischen Kaiserin*, Leipzig 1892, and I. TSATSOU, *Athenais*, Athens 1970 (in Greek).

AELIA EUDOKIA AS PILGRIM AND
PATRONESS IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

It appears that before Eudokia left the court, there was little space for her to cultivate her prestige in the capital. Historians praised her beauty, her wit and her literary talents, but the dominant figure representing piety and Christian devotion was Pulcheria, who accomplished this through her vow of virginity, her ascetic lifestyle and her religious foundations such as the church of St Lawrence and several others in honour of the Theotokos. Eudokia's first pilgrimage to Jerusalem may be seen as one attempt to challenge this perception. The empress used the prestige gained from the journey to establish herself in Constantinople, when she brought back relics of St Stephen just as Helena had once returned with parts of the True Cross. The relics allowed her to command over important religious resources for the first time; something that only her sister-in-law could do in the past.¹¹ This also marks the beginning of increased interaction between Constantinople and Jerusalem during the reign of Theodosios II.¹² As this paper tries to demonstrate, the connection between the two cities went both ways: Eudokia imported relics

to Constantinople, but also exported a distinctive form of veneration from there to Jerusalem. As a dedicatory epigram from the *Greek Anthology* informs us, back at court after her pilgrimage, Eudokia built a small church for St Polyuktos which would eventually be rebuilt and enlarged by her great-granddaughter Anicia Juliana.¹³ The choice for this rather rarely venerated saint may be seen as having a clear religious-political meaning. Polyuktos suffered martyrdom in Armenia under Decius for having destroyed statues of pagan gods. Despite her supposed pagan upbringing, Eudokia emerged, on the eve of her departure from Constantinople, as a true Christian empress, even though she had the charming flaw to be the only daughter of a Greek sophist in Athens. Her alleged hometown profited under the reign of Theodosios II.¹⁴ But Eudokia did not choose Athens as her final retreat, nor did she retire to Antioch, where she had been received with great honour when she passed through on her first journey to Jerusalem.¹⁵ Her address to the Antiochians, in which she employed a quotation from Homer's *Iliad*, of

- 11 Cf. BRUBAKER, *Memories of Helena* (cit. n. 8), p. 62, and HOLUM, *Theodosian Empresses* (cit. n. 6), pp. 137, 189. Sozomenos's description of the *inventio* of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia through Pulcheria, however, was also modelled on Helena's discovery of the True Cross, cf. SOZOMENOS, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (cit. n. 2), 2,2 and 9,2.
- 12 As discussed below, Theodosios II may have founded a church in Jerusalem in the late 430s as well. Generally, an exchange of pious and prominent pilgrims started off at this time: Melania the Younger travelled to Constantinople in 436–437 CE, and Peter the Iberian, who grew up in Constantinople, left for the Holy Land in 437 CE.
- 13 Εὐδοκίη μὲν ἄνασσα θεὸν σπεύδουσα γεραίρειν, / πρώτη νηὸν ἔτευξε θεοφραδέος Πολυεύκτου / ἄλλ' οὐ τοῖον ἔντευξε καὶ οὐ τόσον οὐ τινὶ φειδοί, / οὐ κτεάτων χατέουσα – τίνος βασιλεία χατίζει; – / ἄλλ' ὡς θυμὸν ἔχουσα θεοπρόπον, ὅττι γενέθλην / καλλεΐψην δεδαυῖαν ἀμείνονα κόσμον ὀπάζειν. *Greek Anthology* 1,10 (Εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Πολυεύκτου), 1–6, ed. H. BECKBY, *Anthologia Graeca*, I, Munich 1965. For the archaeological remains of the church near the Şehzade Camii in Istanbul's Saraçhane quarter, cf. C. MANGO / I. ŠEVČENKO, *Remains of the Church of St. Polyuktos at Constantinople*, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 15, 1961, pp. 243–247.
- 14 Cf. *Codex Theodosianus* 16,2,45 and 11,1,33, ed. T. MOMMSEN / P. MEYER, *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, Berlin 1905. For a church foundation in Athens by Eudokia, cf. G. FOWDEN, *Late Roman Achaëa: Identity and Defence*, in: *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 8, 1994, pp. 549–567.
- 15 For Eudokia addressing the people in Antioch, cf. EVAGRIOS, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1,20, ed. A. HÜBNER, *Evagrius Scholasticus, Historia ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte*, 2 vols., Turnhout 2007; MALALAS, *Chronographia* 14,8 (from the *fragmenta tusculana*) (cit. n. 9), and *Chronicon Paschale* 585, ed. L. DINDORF, *Corpus scriptorum historiae by-*

the same kin and blood I am proud to be,¹⁶ generated the speculation as to whether Eudokia had originally been born in Antioch and whether she had been brought up a pagan or a Christian.¹⁷ Be that as it may, Eudokia indeed looked favourably on Antioch. The life of St Kyprianos, a former bishop of the city, was one of the topics of her literary interests.¹⁸ When Theodosios and Eudokia were still living together, they extended Antioch's city walls, a form of patronage which was an attempt to provide security in a visible manner for the early Byzantine provin-

cials.¹⁹ However, Eudokia had good reason to choose Jerusalem and not Antioch or Athens as her goal for patronage and final retreat during her exile. Only this city could offer her the possibility to retain her role as a Christian empress. This was much easier to accomplish in a place associated with Christian salvific history than in the distinguished classical cities of Antioch or Athens. Whether originally pagan or not, Eudokia clearly transferred everything which related to her classical upbringing solely into her literary activities as a learned Christian poet.²⁰

zantinae, Bonn 1832. Both, Evagrius and Malalas, came from Antioch and Eudokia's influence may be over-estimated in their accounts.

- 16 Ὑμετέρης γενεῆς τε καὶ αἱματος εὐχομαι εἶναι, adapted from HOMER, *Ilias* 6,211 and 20,241. Traditionally, Eudokia's quotation was explained as a reference to the citizens from Athens, who founded Antioch in 300 BCE, cf. M. WHITBY (tr.), *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, Liverpool 2000, p. 48, n. 173. However, Kenneth Holm assumes that Eudokia actually came from Antioch, cf. HOLM, *Theodosian Empresses* (cit. n. 6), pp. 117, 278; see also J. BURMAN, *The Athenian Empress Eudokia*, in: P. CASTRÉN (ed.), *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects in Life and Culture in Athens AD 267–529*, Helsinki 1994, pp. 63–87, esp. p. 81.
- 17 Most scholars assume that Eudokia was born and brought up as a pagan, cf. BURMAN, *Athenian Empress* (cit. n. 16), pp. 71–74; M. HAFFNER, *Die Kaiserin Eudokia als Repräsentantin des Kulturchristentums*, in: *Gymnasium*, 103, 1996, pp. 216–228; J. HERRIN, *Women in Purple: Rulers of Medieval Byzantium*, London 2001, p. 135, and HOLM, *Theodosian Empresses* (cit. n. 6), pp. 112–115. The possibility remains that Eudokia was in fact brought up as a Christian. It might be debatable whether the bride's beauty and her family's reputation for Greek philosophy was enough for Pulcheria to give her consent to the marriage. Eudokia's baptism shortly before her marriage with Theodosios, however, is not sufficient proof that she had been pagan up to that moment, as it was rather common to be baptised in adulthood. Only in the Justinianic period did the baptism of infants become more widespread, cf. BURMAN, *Athenian Empress* (cit. n. 16), p. 71.
- 18 Cf. AELIA EUDOCIA, *De Sancto Cypriano libri II*, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, in: *PG*, 85, Paris 1864, coll. 827–864; cf. 2,856d–857a for a praise of Antioch.
- 19 For the late antique and early Byzantine perception that the provincials lived in fear of a barbaric world engulfing the individual, the city or the Empire as a whole, cf. e.g. AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Res Gestae* 14,4,1.3–4, ed. W. SEYFARTH, *Ammianus Marcellinus, Res Gestae*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1978; ANONYMUS, *De rebus bellicis* 6,1–3, ed. R. IRELAND, *Anonymi Auctoris: de rebus bellicis*, Leipzig 1984; HIERONYMUS, *Vita Malchi* 4,2, ed. E. MORALES, *Jérôme: trois vies de moines* (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion), Paris 2007, pp. 184–211, and PROKOPIOS, *De aedificiis* 2,6,15, ed. J. HAURY, *Procopius: Opera omnia IV. De aedificiis libri VI*, Leipzig 1964. Regarding Jerusalem's city walls, this view has been challenged by Shlomit Weksler-Bdolah who convincingly interprets the fortifications as reflecting the city's prosperity and wealth, cf. S. WEKSLER-BDOLAH, *The Fortifications of Jerusalem in the Byzantine period*, in: *Aram*, 18–19, 2006–2007, pp. 85–112, esp. pp. 97–98.
- 20 Even Christian authors praised the ideal of pagan poetic learning, cf. T. GELZER, *Zum Hintergrund der hohen Schätzung der paganen Bildung bei Sokrates von Konstantinopel*, in: B. BÄBLER, *Die Welt des Sokrates von Konstantinopel: Studien zu Politik, Religion und Kultur im späten 4. und frühen 5. Jh. n. Chr.* (FS Christoph Schäublin), Munich/Leipzig 2001, pp. 111–124, esp. pp. 116–121. Eudokia's literary activities, especially the *Homeroecentones*, were commended by Malalas, the *Chronicon Paschale*, Evagrius, Theophanes and the Suda, cf. P. VAN DEUN, *The Poetical Writings of the Empress Eudokia: An Evaluation*, in: J. DEN BOEFT (ed.), *Early Christian Poetry: A Collection of Essays*, Leiden/New York/Cologne 1993, pp. 273–282, esp. pp. 277–278. Even Photios, renowned for his notorious detest for poetry, mentioned and praised her work, cf. B. BALDWIN, *Photius and Poetry*, in: *Byzantine and*

who presented “salvation history in a most precious frame.”²¹

From the time of her departure from the court, her entire building activity proceeded in the manner of that of a new Helena in the Holy Land. This comparison with the most famous Jerusalem pilgrim and benefactor²² allowed Eudokia to actively remain in the role of an empress for the rest of her life. In explaining her patronage in the Holy City, it is usually said that she desired Jerusalem to rival the capital in the magnificence of its monuments, at a location where she was free from the control of her family and where her prestige was able to grow in spite of her political misfortune.²³ However, it remains questionable whether her activities in the Holy Land were in opposition or perhaps rather complementing the Theodosian benefactions in Constantinople. Eudokia’s patronage can be seen as one of three major Byzantine phases of development in

the Holy City, the others being the Constantinian building program and later that of Justinian. However, urban development and patronage in Jerusalem followed certain rules. The city was the actual location where salvation history took place. When Eudokia visited Jerusalem for the first time in 438/439 CE, every church she saw was connected to a local tradition remembering salvation history at the very spot under the assumption that Biblical history had taken place exactly there. Therefore, every religious building became a unique place: There could not be a second place commemorating the resurrection of Christ beside the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the sending of the Holy Spirit was celebrated at the Hagia Sion and nowhere else. Therefore, it is not only worth asking how Eudokia’s buildings fit into this scheme of religious urban development, but also what the meaning of her foundations was and what her patronage meant for Jerusalem.

AELIA EUDOKIA IN JERUSALEM

According to several historical sources, written down some time after Eudokia’s death, the empress rebuilt not only the city walls of Antioch, but also of Jerusalem. Through this, the south-

eastern hill with the Pool of Siloam and the southwestern hill with St Peter and Hagia Sion were integrated into the city until the extent of the walls was later reduced in Fatimid times.²⁴ However, in

Modern Greek Studies, 4, 1987, pp. 9–14. Earlier in the century, however, the genre itself found a critic in Jerome, who commented on the *Homerocentones* as literary childrens’ games: *Quasi non legerimus Homerocentonas et Uergiliocentonas ac non sic etiam Maronem sine Christo possumus dicere Christianum [...] puerilia sunt haec et circulatorum ludo similia*, HIERONYMUS, *Epistulae* 53,7, ed. I. HILBERG, Hieronymus, *Epistulae*, 3 vols., Vienna 1996.

21 H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, II, Munich 1978, p. 101.

22 The literature – both in ancient sources and modern studies – on Helena’s church foundations abounds; how important her acts in the Holy Land actually were can be shown by the large material taken from Eusebios’s *Ecclesiastical History* and quoted in Socrates Scholasticus, cf. SOCRATES, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1,9 and esp. 1,17, ed. G. HANSEN, Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte, Berlin 1995. For the Helena-tradition, cf. J. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding of the True Cross*, Leiden/Boston 1992.

23 Cf. J. BINNS, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314–631*, Oxford 1994, p. 88.

24 Cf. EVAGRIOS, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1,22 (cit. n. 15); cf. K. BIEBERSTEIN/H. BLOEDHORN, *Jerusalem: Grundzüge der Baugeschichte vom Chalkolithikum bis zur Frühzeit der osmanischen Herrschaft*, 3 vols., Wiesbaden 1994, I, p. 178, II, pp. 114, 390 and III, p. 143. Eudokia may have re-used parts of Herod’s so-called “Upper Wall” for the fortifications built by her, cf. K. PRAG (ed.), *Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961–1967, V: Discoveries in Hellenistic to Ottoman Jerusalem. Centenary volume: Kathleen M. Kenyon 1906–1978*, Oxford 2008, pp. 85, 474–478. The archaeological evidence, however, illustrates that parts of the Byzantine city wall discovered thus far appear to be constructed uniformly. Therefore, it has been suggested that the walls were built together at the same time between the late fourth and mid-fifth century. Whereas Hillel Geva’s dating of the walls to Constantinian times

contrast to Antioch, this construction was not only meant to provide security for the population.²⁵ The new walls would have rather encompassed new foundations in the city, some of them surely donated by Eudokia herself. According to John Malalas, she referred explicitly to Psalm 51 (50) when she said that it was for her that the prophet David spoke when he said *in thy good pleasure* [ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ σου], *O Lord, the walls of Jerusalem shall be built.*²⁶ With a poetess so well-versed in classical and biblical literature, we may assume that if the reference to her own name in the psalm is genuine, the extension of the wall was indeed both an intended act and a proud statement.

Besides the city's walls, the most important foundation of Eudokia was the church of St Stephen, on the site of today's École biblique et archéologique française, outside the city walls on the main road northwards that connected the

city with Neapolis (Nablūs) and Damascus. It is remarkable that Eudokia did not attempt to reproduce Pulcheria's devotion to the Virgin at a new place but built a church of St Stephen instead. I would argue that it was not possible any more to donate a church of the Theotokos in Jerusalem, as this position in the religious landscape of Jerusalem was already filled: The third ecumenical Council of Ephesos in 431 tried to establish the status of Mary as Theotokos both in Christian vocabulary and worship. This found a parallel in the memorial landscape of Jerusalem shortly after the council was completed. There are many traces of attempts to find the location of Mary's tomb in the sacred landscape of Jerusalem between 430 and 450 CE, eventually complemented by the building of a church in the Kidron Valley, perhaps commissioned by Eudokia's husband, Theodosios II.²⁷ Hence,

has to be discarded as the discovered course of the wall does not correspond with the Constantinian city limits (cf. H. GEVA, Jerusalem: The Roman Period, in: E. STERN/A. LEWINSON-GILBOA/J. AVIRAM [ed.], *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, II, pp. 758–766), Shlomit Weksler-Bdolah put forward the suggestion that it was not Eudokia, but Eudoxia who commissioned the encircling of the city some time in the first days of the fifth century (cf. WEKSLER-BDOLAH, *Fortifications* [cit. n. 19], pp. 93–102). The archaeological record, according to her discussion of the material, favours a late fourth or early fifth century construction date rather than the mid-fifth century. This would leave the possibility open that Eudokia may indeed have restored parts of the wall some decades later. The literary sources, however, remain ambiguous on the matter with most of the later authors ascribing the walls to Eudokia, but also two pilgrim accounts who name Eudoxia as the founder. Weksler-Bdolah argues that John Rufus's *Vita Petri Iberii* mentions the city's "holy walls" in an episode prior to Eudokia's arrival. This does not necessarily attest to an earlier construction of the city walls as the *Vita* was written down almost sixty years later and we cannot be sure whether John Rufus was aware whether there was a city wall in the 430s or not. Moreover, the episode of Peter the Iberian first beholding, then entering Jerusalem is highly fashioned in the wording of the Psalms and Isaiah 33:20 – therefore, the mention of the walls might also be a purely stylistic necessity.

25 Cf. R. SCHICK, Jerusalem in the Byzantine Period, in: Z. KAFARI/R. SCHICK (ed.), *Jerusalem before Islam*, Oxford 2008, pp. 169–188, esp. p. 175, and PRAG, Jerusalem, V (cit. n. 24), p. 477.

26 Δι' ἐμὲ εἶπεν Δαβὶδ ὁ προφήτης, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ σου οἰκοδομηθήσεται τὰ τεῖχη Ἱερουσαλήμ, κύριε. MALALAS, *Chronographia* 14,8 (cit. n. 9). Cf. ἀγάθυνον, κύριε, ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ σου τὴν Σιών, καὶ οἰκοδομηθήτω τὰ τεῖχη Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ps 50,20 (LXX).

27 Three independent sources point to a church of Mary in the Kidron valley: The second homily on the Dormition of Mary by John of Damascus includes a lengthy quotation of the now lost *Historia Euthymiaca*. In this, Pulcheria asks patriarch Juvenal of Jerusalem to grant her the body of Mary – which she expected to be found in the church at Gethsemane in Jerusalem, cf. JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De dorm.* 2,18, ed. P. VOULET, S. Jean Damascène, *Homélies sur la nativité et la Dormition*, Paris 1998. Of course, Pulcheria was to be disappointed: The body remained unfound, in accordance with the Church's teaching that Mary's body had been taken into heaven at her death. The Coptic memorial speech for bishop Makarios of Tkōw, written in the early sixth century, relates that after a riot, the whole city gathered together in the church of Mary in the Kidron valley, cf. DIOSCORUS 49,28–31, ed. D. JOHNSON, A Panegyric on Macarius Bishop of Tkōw: Attributed to Dioscorus of Alexandria, Louvain 1980. The third source which suggests that a new

Eudokia had to fix her patronage in the Holy City to new goals.

The foundation of a church of St Stephen in the north of Jerusalem was connected with Eudokia's successful *translatio* of the saint's relics to Constantinople.²⁸ She provided the place, which would become her burial site,²⁹ not only with

bones of St Stephen but also with relics of the saints Kallinikos, Dominos and Thekla, a name which might refer to Melania the Elder who was often called Thekla.³⁰ The consecration of the basilica with two side-aisles (41,7 × 19,3 m) was a major event for Jerusalem.³¹ Eudokia invited Cyril of Alexandria, who also consecrated Melania's

church was being built to commemorate the Theotokos is the Syriac *Vita Petri Iberii*, ed. C. HORN/R. PHENIX JR., John Rufus: The *Lives* of Peter the Iberian, Theodosius of Jerusalem, and the Monk Romanus, Leiden/Boston 2008. In it, a monk explains that he was visited in a dream by Peter, who took him through Jerusalem, showing him the church of Gethsemane, cf. JOHN RUFUS, *Vita Petri Iberii* 134. As this church of Gethsemane was no longer standing at this time, Stephen Shoemaker and Klaus Bieberstein have argued that the monk meant in fact to indicate the church of Mary, which was later often referred to as Gethsemane, taking the name of the church which had previously stood on the adjacent site, as mentioned by Eutychios of Alexandria, who ascribed the erection of the church to Theodosios I. This must be considered a misunderstanding on his part. Theodosios II alone can have built the church, according to the accepted chronology. Thus it appears that the church of the Dormition of Mary can only have been built in the later part of the reign of Eudokia's husband between 430 and 450 CE, cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, Jerusalem (cit. n. 24), I, p. 156; S. SHOEMAKER, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford 2002, pp. 98–107, and K. BIEBERSTEIN, „Zum Raum wird hier die Zeit“: drei Erinnerungslandschaften Jerusalems, in: *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie*, 22, 2007, pp. 3–39, esp. pp. 24–26. The confusion of Theodosios I and II is a common problem in the sources, cf. the question of the attribution of the Antiochian city walls in EVAGRIOS, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1,20 (cit. n. 15), and in MALALAS, *Chronographia* 13,39–41 (cit. n. 9). I would argue, however, that the same sources also allow a different interpretation of the ecclesiastical landscape in the valley of Gethsemane. The weak point in the above argument made by Klaus Bieberstein is the existence of a church in the valley mentioned by Egeria. The sources are too vague to attribute a specific donor to what she called the “graceful church” – it might well have been the clergy with the aids of various donors, but though unlikely, we cannot completely exclude Theodosios I as a potential founder, as mentioned in the late testimony of Eutychios. This would be the first and only imperial foundation in Jerusalem between Constantine and the early fifth century. As Egeria makes no mention about whether the church was liturgically used, I would suggest that it simply was not finished or not yet dedicated. It may have commemorated the Virgin's Dormition, however, I think it would be more plausible if we rather assumed it marked e.g. Christ's teaching or prayer in the hours before his passion associated with this area. Whatever the original church commemorated, it becomes clear from the late fifth-century sources that at some time during this century (perhaps in 431, perhaps not) it was or eventually became the place in which the Dormition of Mary was commemorated. Whether the re-dedicated church or a newly built church on the same spot was erected by Theodosios II thus remains open to question.

- 28 Eudokia's acquisition of the relics of the protomartyr was not an easy task, for Gerontius and Melania the Younger too had attempted to claim them for a *martyrion* on the Mount of Olives, cf. JOHN RUFUS, *Vita Petri Iberii* 49 (cit. n. 27); cf. E. CLARK, Claims on the Bones of St Stephen: The Partisans of Melania and Eudokia, in: *Church History*, 51, 1982, pp. 141–156, and B. LEYERLE, Children and Disease in a Sixth-Century Monastery, in: L. RUTGERS, *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology* (FS Gideon Foerster), Leuven 2002, pp. 349–372, esp. p. 350.
- 29 Eudokia's funeral in Jerusalem forms the single exception of the whole Theodosian dynasty (cf. MALALAS, *Chronographia* 14,8 [cit. n. 9]), as she was the only member who is not buried in the imperial mausoleum in the so-called South Stoa, a cruciform annexe to Constantine's Apostoleion in Constantinople, which was built under Theodosios I, cf. M. JOHNSON, On the Burial Places of the Theodosian Dynasty, in: *Byzantion*, 61, 1991, pp. 330–339, and now M. JOHNSON, *The Roman Imperial Mausoleum in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2009.
- 30 Cf. *SEG* 8, 1937, p. 192. The inscription is today in the museum of the École Biblique (Inv. 2497/42). For Eudokia's church, cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, Jerusalem (cit. n. 24), II, pp. 231–233, and M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Saint Étienne et son sanctuaire à Jérusalem*, Paris 1894.
- 31 For the construction of the church see SOCRATES, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 7,47,3 (cit. n. 22), and EVAGRIOS, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1,22 (cit. n. 15).

martyrion on the Mount of Olives on the following day.³² The empress knew about the considerable popularity of the protomartyr throughout the whole Empire. Stephen's death was interpreted as an echo of the Crucifixion, and the church of Stephen donated by Eudokia resembled the revelation of the True Cross by Helena and the erection of the church of the Holy Sepulchre by Constantine.³³ She also dedicated a church to him in Gaza and one in Antioch containing the remains of the saint's foot in gratitude for the cure of an affliction.³⁴ Eudokia's devotion to the protomartyr may originate from personal reasons, but it is more likely that Eudokia realised that a church for St Stephen in Jerusalem was a building project still missing in the city's memorial landscape. The martyr's bones were discovered at Kaphar Gamala, probably Bait Jamal in the Shephelah, in 415 CE and temporarily buried in the Hagia Sion, the place actually commemorating the events of the Last Supper and Pentecost. Within the sacred topography of Jerusalem a space dedicated exclusively to St Stephen was still missing when Eudokia arrived there.

This appears to be no coincidence. Looking closer at the churches which were built

in Jerusalem until the time of Eudokia, it becomes clear that the commemoration of St Stephen was neglected due to the dominance of places of remembrance of Christ's life and passion: The first two churches built in Jerusalem were Constantine's church of the Holy Sepulchre and that of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives, the so-called Eleona. The latter was complemented with the Imbomon, erected by the Roman noble woman Poemenia before 374 CE.³⁵ The Hagia Sion, built before 384 CE, commemorated the community of the Disciples (e.g. the Last Supper and Pentecost). The fourth-century pilgrim Egeria mentions a church at Gethsemane, connected with the prayer of Christ's agony in the garden in the night before his death.³⁶ A church on the Mount of Olives on the road to Bethany celebrated Jesus's path when he entered the Holy City.³⁷ A church of St Peter was built in the house of Kaiaphas shortly after 451 CE, being the reminder of Christ's trial.³⁸ This church and the so-called Hagia Sophia, built in the supposed house of Pontius Pilatus and mentioned for the first time in the *Life of Peter the Iberian*, formed important stations of the gradually de-

32 Cf. CLARK, *Bones of St Stephen* (cit. n. 28), p. 151; C. HORN, *Ascetics and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford 2006, p. 75, and B. BITTON-ASHKELONY/A. KOFSKY, *The Monastic School of Gaza*, Leiden/Boston 2006, pp. 49–50.

33 Cf. CLARK, *Bones of St Stephen* (cit. n. 28), p. 142, and E. HUNT, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312–460*, Oxford 1984, pp. 212, 220. Indeed, Eudokia's church had a precinct to rival that which the Constantinian builders had constructed around the Holy Sepulchre, EVAGRIOS, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1,22 (cit. n. 15). Cf. HUNT, *Holy Land Pilgrimage* (cit. n. 33), p. 242.

34 Cf. HUNT, *Holy Land Pilgrimage* (cit. n. 33), p. 223. For Eudokia's sprained foot, cf. HOLUM, *Theodosian Empresses* (cit. n. 6), p. 185, and HUNT, *Holy Land Pilgrimage* (cit. n. 33), p. 233. For the church in Gaza, cf. MARK THE DEACON, *Life of Porphyrius* 54, ed. H. GRÉGOIRE/M.-A. KUGENER, *Marc le Diacre: vie de Porphyre*, Paris 1930.

35 Cf. PALLADIOS, *Historia Lausiaca* 35, ed. D. C. BUTLER, *The Lausiaca History of Palladius, II: The Greek Text Edited with Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge 1904; JOHN RUFUS, *Vita Petri Iberii* 38 (cit. n. 27), cf. J. WILKINSON, *Egeria's Travels: Newly Translated with Supporting Documents and Notes*. 3rd ed., Warminster 1999, pp. 14–16.

36 Cf. *Itinerarium Egeriae* 36,1–2, ed. A. FRANCHESCHINI/R. WEBER, *Itinerarium Egeriae*, Turnholt 1965, pp. 35–103.

37 Cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, *Jerusalem* (cit. n. 24), I, p. 156.

38 Cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, *Jerusalem* (cit. n. 24), III, p. 414, and BIEBERSTEIN, *Erinnerungslandschaften* (cit. n. 27), pp. 26–27. In later times this traditions moved to the Hagia Sion, and the church became a place of remembering the denial of Peter. For the sacred topography see the seminal study M. HALBWACHS, *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en Terre sainte: étude de mémoire collective*, édition prepare par M. Jaisson, avec des contributions de D. Hervieu-Léger, J. P. Cléro, S. Gensburger et E. Brian, Paris 2008, *passim*.

veloping Via Dolorosa.³⁹ Two other churches of the fifth century were erected on the sites of miracles performed by Christ, the healing of the blind man and the paralytic.⁴⁰ A church at the eastern Mount of Olives, built in the reign of Valens or Theodosios I, commemorated the meeting between Christ and the sisters Martha and Mary.⁴¹ So far, all buildings mentioned honoured different events in the life of Christ – we may add another church connected with his mother, the Virgin Mary, the above mentioned Theodosian church for the Dormitio Mariae at Gethsemane. It seems that in Jerusalem the veneration of Christ was – for understandable reasons – so important and dominant that the commemoration of saints and martyrs was less distinctive than in other cities of the early Byzantine Empire. And indeed, the sacred topography for such places of remembrance remained extraordinarily vague in the period up to Eudokia's arrival in the Holy City. Besides her foundation of St Stephen, we can find only a

very small amount of sacred places which were not connected directly to the life and passion of Christ: Rufinus of Aquileia and Palladios of Hierapolis mention that a church on the eastern Mount of Olives was dedicated to St John the Baptist after some of emperor Julian's soldiers allegedly defiled his tomb in Samaria.⁴² However, the sources remain very vague on this place. Unlike in other cities, most of the early monasteries in Jerusalem, built e.g. by Melania the Elder, Gerontius, Melania the Younger, Eustorgios, Peter the Iberian and John the Eunuch, were erected not at holy places and did not carry the name of a certain saint. Eudokia's hospice with its attribution and chapel to St George again formed an exception.⁴³ The attempts of Melania the Younger to erect a private *martyrion* for St Stephen have already been mentioned. A chapel for the military saint Menas, probably in the Armenian quarter,⁴⁴ was founded by a Roman noble woman, Bassa, who exchanged letters with Pulcheria⁴⁵ and belonged to

-
- 39 Cf. JOHN RUFUS, *Vita Petri Iberii* 120 (cit n. 27). Cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, Jerusalem (cit. n. 24), III, p. 418. The term "Via Dolorosa" is, of course, a medieval invention, for stational liturgy in Jerusalem, cf. J. BALDOVIN, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Rome 1987, and its condensed version in: J. BALDOVIN, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*, Nottingham 1989.
- 40 Cf. John 5 and 9. A successor-building of the church of the paralytic today is known as St Anna, as starting from the sixth century, the birth of the Virgin was connected with this place.
- 41 Cf. *Itinerarium Egeriae* 25,11; 29,3–6 (cit n. 36), BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, Jerusalem (cit n. 24), I, p. 156.
- 42 Cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, Jerusalem (cit n. 24), III, p. 416.
- 43 Cf. CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS, *Life of John the Hesychast* 204,9, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Kyrillos von Skythopolis, Leipzig 1939; BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, Jerusalem (cit n. 24), II, pp. 51–52. Blake Leyerle suggested that Eudokia's foundation of St Stephen as well included an important hospital, especially for infants. Cf. LEYERLE, *Children and Disease* (cit n. 28), pp. 360, 369–372.
- 44 When a mosaic inscription was discovered in the area of the Armenian garden, which contains the beginning of a personal name starting with the Greek letters *BA*, the excavators restored it to *Bassa* and identified the place as Bassa's chapel or church, cf. K. KENYON, *Excavations in Jerusalem 1963*, in: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 96, 1964, pp. 7–18. Until today, the nearby Armenian church of St James contains a chapel dedicated to St Menas dating to the late fifth or sixth century. The monastery, mentioned by CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS, *Life of Euthymios* 49,20 (cit. n. 43), however, was perhaps different from the church of St Menas though the two buildings were presumable close to each other. A. Douglas Tushingham dated the findings rather to the Justinianic restoration of the monastery of the Iberians (cf. PROKOPIOS, *De aedificiis* 5,9,6 [cit. n. 19]; A. TUSHINGHAM [ed.], *Excavations in Jerusalem 1961–1967*, I, Toronto 1985, p. 101), though if the chapel now included in the church of St James was indeed part of Bassa's church, the nearby mosaic could well have been part of her nunnery located in the Armenian garden area, cf. also C. JONES, *The Inscription on the Hare Mosaic*, in: TUSHINGHAM, Jerusalem, I, pp. 88–90.
- 45 A letter dating to late 453 CE from Pulcheria to Bassa is preserved among the post-conciliar documents in the Greek acts of Chalcedon, cf. E. SCHWARTZ (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, 2. I. 3, Berlin 1935, pp. 494–495.

Assuming that the empress as an imperial founder had a certain liberty in choosing her preferred forms of patronage,⁴⁹ it becomes clear that she introduced this concept to Jerusalem. Another novelty of Eudokia's act is that this building in the north of the city was the first sacred building that had no direct connection with a local tradition, for Stephen's stoning was commemorated in the Kidron valley.⁵⁰ Only later, from the sixth century onwards, does the legend appear that the place of Eudokia's church of St Stephen was indeed the exact location of the martyr's stoning.⁵¹

Through her foundations Eudokia managed to uphold her role as a model Christian empress and – tentatively more importantly – took provision for her posthumous fame as one of the

main benefactors of the Byzantine Holy Land, the only one who actually dwelled in Jerusalem herself. Judging from the broad distribution of texts, ranging from the hagiography of Cyril of Skythopolis to early Byzantine legends and medieval romance, which praise Eudokia's imperial presence and always closely link her name to Jerusalem, it appears that her strategies in patronage were successful: in the end, she died in the *odour of sanctity* and became a saint of the Orthodox Church.⁵² Eudokia was the first to recognise the potential of Jerusalem beyond the enhancement of places of remembrance with religious buildings in the manner of Constantine and brought the cult of martyrs back to the very city that once had killed the prophets and stoned those sent to her.

der Heiligen in der frühen Kirche, in: F. VON LILJENFELD (ed.), *Aspekte frühchristlicher Heiligenverehrung*, Erlangen 1977, pp. 77–125, esp. p. III.

- 49 It is noticeable that Eudokia received an annual appanage and/or could command her own fortune when she was away from the court. Nevertheless, the construction of St Stephen took relatively long and was not completed at the time of Eudokia's death in 460 CE (cf. CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS, *Life of Euthymios* 53,5–54,11 [cit. n. 43]), which points at least to a certain shortage of funds. For Eudokia's political activities in the Holy Land see the monographs by BINNS, *Ascetics* (cit. n. 23); BITTON-ASHKELONY/KOFSKY, *School of Gaza* (cit. n. 32), and HORN, *Ascetics* (cit. n. 32), as well as A. KOFSKY, *Peter the Iberian: Pilgrimage, Monasticism and Ecclesiastical Politics in Byzantine Palestine*, in: *Liber Annuus*, 47, 1997, pp. 209–222.
- 50 Jodi Magness suggested that the Hadrianic re-foundation of Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina was situated further north than the city today, having the plaza behind the Damascus gate as a central square. Even though the archaeological evidence is not strong enough to support this theory, this would be a further explanation why Eudokia's church was erected in the North, not only because of the main street, but also because of the use of spoils from the remains of the Hadrianic city wall. Cf. J. MAGNESS, *The North Wall of Aelia Capitolina*, in: L. STAGER (ed.), *The Archaeology of Jordan and Beyond* (FS James Sauer), Winona Lake 2000, pp. 328–339.
- 51 Cf. BIEBERSTEIN/BLOEDHORN, *Jerusalem* (cit. n. 24), II, pp. 231–232. In Eudokia's times, the Damascus gate was called Stephen's gate, a tradition which was moved in the twelfth century onto the Eastern gate, today's Lion's gate.
- 52 Enrico Livrea attributes the *opus alexandrinum*-icon from the monastery of the Theotokos tou Libos (now in the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul) to Aelia Eudokia, cf. E. LIVREA, *L'imperatrice Eudokia santa*, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 119, 1997, pp. 50–54.