

**A New  
Jerusalem  
Facing  
the  
Renowned  
City of  
Old**

After the defeat of Bar Kochba in 135 C.E. the Romans plowed over the city of Jerusalem. Following an ancient rite for the founding of a new city, they yoked an ox and a cow to a curved plow, traversed the future city's boundaries, and where the earth formed a furrow marked out the location of its walls. When the outline had been traced in the soil they suspended the plow at the site of the principal gate.<sup>1</sup> Dio Cassius, a Greek historian, recorded the event: "At Jerusalem Hadrian founded a city in place of the one which had been razed to the ground, naming it Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the temple of God he raised a new temple to Jupiter" (69.12). Named after the emperor's family, Aelius, and the gods of the Mons Capitolinus in Rome, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno, and Minerva,

Aelia Capitolina was henceforth to be a Roman colony, displacing the ancient city of the Jews.<sup>2</sup>

Every effort was made to sever Jerusalem's ties with the past and to erase signs of the city's ancient glory as the seat of Jewish kings.<sup>3</sup> According to Dio the Jews were driven from the city and replaced by gentile settlers (69.12.21). Once Hadrian had "destroyed the temple of the Jews in Jerusalem," writes an ancient chronicler, he built public baths, a theater, a temple to the Capitoline gods, a sanctuary to the nymphs, a large ceremonial gate, a public esplanade, and other features of a Roman city.<sup>4</sup> Stones from the Jewish temple were used to build the theater and to construct the city wall.<sup>5</sup> The temple mount itself was turned into a "Roman farm," and Eusebius had seen "bulls plowing there, the sacred site sown with seed" (*d.e.* 8.3; 406c; cf. 4.13; 273d). At the place that would later be identified as the site of Jesus' tomb, a Roman temple was constructed.<sup>6</sup> Coins minted for Aelia Capitolina bore the names of pagan deities: Jupiter, Dionysius, Sarapis, Astarte, the Dioscuri.<sup>7</sup> On pain of death Jews were prohibited from entering the city (Dio Cassius 69.12; Justin, *apol.* 1. 47) and were forbidden even from "gazing on the soil inherited from their fathers" (*h.e.* 4.6.3).

So thoroughly had the Romans expunged Jerusalem from memory that in the early fourth century a Roman magistrate in Caesarea did not recognize the former name of the city when a Christian identified it as his home.<sup>8</sup> In the persecution under Diocletian a Christian was brought before the local judge in Caesarea, located only sixty miles from Jerusalem. When he was asked what his home city was, he answered, "Jerusalem." (According to Eusebius he meant the heavenly Jerusalem.) Puzzled, the magistrate inquired where this city was located. At first the Christian refused to answer, but then he identified it as the "fatherland of the pious [that is, Christians] . . . lying toward the East." Whether Eusebius's editorial gloss that *Jerusalem* designated the heavenly Jerusalem is correct or not, the name Jerusalem was unfamiliar to the magistrate.

Together, it seems, Romans and Christians had conspired to obliterate the memory of Jewish Jerusalem, the Romans by founding a new city dedicated to the gods of Rome, the Christians by directing people's affection to the heavenly Jerusalem.<sup>9</sup> Jerusalem had become Aelia, a name that would live on in Roman and Christian memory long after the city had regained its former name. As late as the tenth century, a Christian chronicler in Alexandria writing in Arabic, the new language of the Christian East, still knew the name Aelia.<sup>10</sup>

The efforts of Eusebius and Origen to demote the earthly city of Jeru-

salem in favor of a heavenly city were, however, already being undermined by quiet developments taking place in Palestine. During Origen's lifetime Alexander, a native of Cappadocia in Asia Minor, journeyed to Jerusalem "for prayer and investigation of the *places*" (*h.e.* 6.11.2). Shortly afterward another Cappadocian, Firmilianus by name, also visited Palestine "for the sake of the holy *places*" (Jerome, *vir. ill.* 54). These are the earliest-known Christian pilgrims to Palestine.<sup>11</sup> The first to write an account of his pilgrimage was a pilgrim from Gaul in the early fourth century.<sup>12</sup>

There were reasons other than pilgrimage to visit Palestine. From the time of Jesus Jerusalem had been the home of a Christian community. Unfortunately its early history is shapeless and obscure. None of its earliest documents, for example, letters to the churches in Asia Minor and Greece, are extant.<sup>13</sup> At an early date the Christians, like other Jews living in Jerusalem, suffered the cataclysm of the war with the Romans, and some (perhaps most) fled to Pella, a Greek city across the Jordan River (*h.e.* 3.5.3).<sup>14</sup> Some Christians, however, remained in Jerusalem after the war. Eusebius reports that until the time of Hadrian the church in Jerusalem was composed of "believing Hebrews," that is, Jewish Christians (*h.e.* 4.5.2). Eusebius provides a list of bishops for the city, as he did for other Christian centers, for example, Antioch and Rome, but like some episcopal lists from this period it is too symmetrical, too tidy, and apparently contrived. Exactly the same number of bishops presided over the church from the beginning to Hadrian as ruled from Hadrian to Narcissus in the late second century (*h.e.* 5.12.1–2). The first fifteen are Jewish, the next fifteen are gentile.<sup>15</sup>

When Jerusalem (or Aelia) comes clearly into view in the second century its bishops are leading figures in the Christian world. At the end of the second century a synod was held in Palestine to adjudicate whether Easter should be celebrated on the day of the Jewish Passover or on the Sunday following. The presidents of this synod were Theophilus, bishop of Caesarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem (*h.e.* 5.23.3). It is unlikely that the church that emerges in Jerusalem after Bar Kochba was a new foundation composed only of gentiles who settled in the city after it became a Roman colony and who had no links to earlier generations of Christians living there.<sup>16</sup>

Christianity in Palestine was not confined to Jerusalem. In the first century there were Christian groups in Joppa and Caesarea (Acts 10:5, 24; 23:23, 33) on the coastal plain, where Christianity had its initial success. Early in the fourth century, when Eusebius recounts the trials of the martyrs of Palestine, among the cities that were home for Christian

martyrs, those on the plain predominate: Diosopolis (Lydda), Gaza, Caesarea, Tyre, Ascalon, Jamnia, Eleutheropolis (Bet Gubrin). He also mentions Phaeno, a city in the Negev desert, and Scythopolis (Beth Shean), a Greek city south of Tiberias in the Jordan valley, and Gadara east of the Jordan River.<sup>17</sup>

The list of cities whose bishops were in attendance at the Council of Nicaea, the first great Christian synod, convoked in Asia Minor in 325 C.E., confirms that Christian strength lay outside of Judea and Galilee.<sup>18</sup> Not all manuscripts of the council agree, but the following cities appear in all: Caesarea, Nicopolis (Emmaus), Lydda, Jamnia, Eleutheropolis, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Jericho, and Scythopolis. Some lists include Neapolis (Schechem) and Sebaste (Samaria), others Gaza, Aila (Eilat) and Maximiniapolis, and still others Capitolias and Gadara east of the Jordan. Noticeably absent is the name of any Christian bishop from central Galilee. The only city mentioned from Galilee is Maximiniapolis, and it lies on the southern edge. Maximiniapolis, home of the Sixth Roman Legion, was composed almost wholly of new settlers from outside Palestine. Not until the middle of the fourth century is there evidence of a bishop in Tiberias, and the first mention of a bishop of Diocaesarea (the home of the Jewish patriarch) does not occur until the sixth century. Christians had not yet penetrated the Jewish areas.<sup>19</sup>

### **Constantine, Builder of Churches**

By the beginning of the fourth century Jerusalem, which had lived in the shadow of Caesarea, began a swift rise to honor and authority. It was no doubt inevitable that its unique status as an apostolic city and the scene of Jesus' death and Resurrection would give it a singular place in the Christian world—but developments in the fourth century hastened its aggrandizement. The Council of Nicaea declared that Jerusalem (the bishops call the city Aelia), though subservient to Caesarea in the ecclesiastical structure, was to be esteemed first honoris causa: "Since custom and ancient tradition have established that the bishop in Aelia be honored, let him have the succession of honor, preserving, however, the proper right of the metropolis [Caesarea]" (*Nicaea*, Canon 7). Both the bishop of Aelia, Macarius, and the bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius, were in attendance at the council.

The Council of Nicaea was convoked by the emperor Constantine, the first Roman ruler to embrace the Christian religion. After exemplary service as a young military officer in Persia (ca. 290 C.E.) and another stint on the Danube, he returned to the imperial court in Nicomedia.

From there he was summoned to Gaul, where he joined his father, the *augustus* of the west. On his father's death in 306 at York the army acclaimed Constantine as emperor, and he assumed the rule of Britain, Gaul, and Spain. At first he accepted the title *augustus* but later prudently relinquished it when Galerius, the senior emperor in the West, offered him the lesser office of *caesar*. This meant that he was one of the two subordinate emperors (the two senior emperors were called *augusti*) responsible for the Roman provinces north of the Alps.

Sometime during this period Constantine made a slow turn toward Christianity. How and why he embraced the new religion remains a mystery. His father was a pagan who had tolerated the persecution of Christians in his domain, but when Constantine succeeded his father, he put an end to persecution. Soon he was seeking the counsel of Christian bishops. Six years later, after defeating the Franks, on his march south to Rome to challenge the emperor Maxentius, his resolve becomes visible for the first time. The night before the battle at the Milvian bridge Constantine had a vision of a cross (or the Greek letters chi-rho, signifying Christ). Constantine, it seems, was already thinking Christian thoughts. When he awoke the next morning, bishop Osius of Cordova, who was traveling with him, confirmed that the symbol represented Christ. At once Constantine acknowledged the protection of the new divinity. Ordering the removal of the pagan standards in his army, he led his troops into battle under a Christian banner.<sup>20</sup>

After defeating his rival Maxentius, Constantine publicly displayed his allegiance to the God of the Christians. When he arrived in Rome he refused to go to the Capitol, as was customary, to offer sacrifice in thanksgiving to the Roman gods for his victory. For this gesture he received the adulation of Christians and suffered the obloquy of pagans (Zosimus 2.29.5). Constantine was, however, not sole emperor of the Roman world; Licinius ruled as *augustus* in the East. In Constantine's domain, Rome and the West, the emperor's loyalties were evident. His soldiers were allowed to attend church on Sundays (*v.C.* 4.18.3), and he kept bishops in his company. A Christian symbol appeared on his helmet.

For centuries Roman emperors had used their office as well as the resources of the imperial treasury to build and endow sacred edifices. The first Roman emperor, Augustus (d. 14 C.E.), had built a temple to Apollo on the Palatine, another to Jupiter the Smiter and Jupiter the Thunderer on the Capitoline hill, another to Minerva and Queen Juno on the Sacred Way, to mention but a few of his endowments. In the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, a self-congratulatory account of his accomplishments, Emperor Augustus boasted that he "repaired eighty-two temples of the gods

in the city.”<sup>21</sup> Nero, it is reported, gave one hundred thousand sesterces to the shrine at Delphi after receiving a favorable reply. Elagabalus built temples at Taurus and Nicomedia as well as new shrines in Rome. And in the decade before his defeat at the Milvian bridge, Constantine’s foe Maxentius had built a new temple to Venus.

Almost at once Constantine initiated a building plan of his own that would continue unabated until his death in 337.<sup>22</sup> Constantine’s building program differed in one significant respect from that of former emperors: it featured churches. In Rome, where emperors had formerly constructed temples to Jupiter or Apollo or Venus, Constantine built basilicas to Christ and shrines to the martyrs. Pagans thought Constantine’s zeal to build “memorials to human corpses” ignoble and demeaning (*laud. C.* 11.3).<sup>23</sup> The first, begun almost at once, was dedicated six years later to St. John (S. Giovanni in Laterano). Constantine’s churches were not private structures, but public buildings, lavishly endowed, requiring thousands of gold solidi for maintenance alone.<sup>24</sup>

Before Constantine could launch a building program in the eastern provinces, he had to rid himself of his rival the augustus of the East, Licinius. In a war of attrition stretching over the next decade, Constantine occupied, piece by piece, the territory ruled by Licinius. The decisive battle took place in 324 at Chrysopolis, near Chalcedon across from Byzantium in northwestern Asia Minor. In triumph Constantine marched into Nicomedia the sole emperor of the Roman world. As he entered the capital of the East, his mind had already begun to think of founding a new Christian capital.

The new city, Constantinople, named after the victorious emperor, was constructed on the site of an ancient Greek city called Byzantium on the eastern tip of a promontory extending into the Bosphorus on the European side. Wishing to build a city to honor the God of the Christians, Constantine resolved that it would be untouched by pagan worship. He embellished it with numerous sacred edifices, memorials of martyrs on a grandiose scale, and other buildings of the most splendid kind, not only within the city itself but in the surrounding territory. He venerated the memory of the martyrs and consecrated the city to the “God of the martyrs” (*v.C.* 3.48). By 330, only five years after work was begun, building had progressed to the point that the city could be dedicated. Constantine chose 11 May 330, the festival of St. Mocius, a Christian who had been martyred in Byzantium during the reign of Diocletian, the last great pagan emperor and persecutor. The symbolism was apparent. Purged of its ancient idolatry, Byzantium would no longer honor the Roman deities worshipped during the reign of Diocletian. The city was adorned with

figures from biblical history, and a jeweled cross hung in the imperial palace.<sup>25</sup>

### The Sacred Cave in Jerusalem

As grand and sumptuous as Constantinople was to be, it was soon to have a rival in Palestine. For Constantinople, though designed as the new capital, the home of the emperor, and the premier Christian city, was created *ex nihilo*. It was a city without history, a place that invoked no past. Like pebbles on a seashore, its stones bore no memories, a work of the imagination transformed into wood and stone. Jerusalem was the work of God, and its stones displayed the grainy texture of the city's past. In turning his attention to Palestine, Constantine aimed not simply to rebuild a city, but to construct a "memorial" of what God had done there (*v.C.* 3.25).

When Constantine first envisioned a Christian Jerusalem is unknown. It is possible that Macarius broached the matter at the Council of Nicaea. If Constantine was endowing churches in other cities across the empire, Jerusalem could hardly be overlooked. Yet Jerusalem had played only a minor role in Christian piety up to this point; it was venerated more as a symbol of the Jerusalem above than as a historical site or spiritual center in its own right.<sup>26</sup> There had been some pilgrims to Jerusalem, but there was little there for them to see. The tomb of Christ was buried beneath tons of dirt, and over it stood a pagan temple. Some came to Palestine to see the cave in Bethlehem or the tomb of Rachel near Bethlehem or the tombs of the patriarchs in Hebron and other places mentioned in the Bible, but in Jerusalem itself the preeminent site was hidden from view.

What we know of Constantine's plan as well as of its execution comes from the *Life of Constantine* written by Eusebius, Constantine's ardent admirer. In this remarkable book, designed as much to lionize the emperor before his contemporaries as to instruct later generations of his exploits, Eusebius directed attention, for the first time in Christian history, to the religious and theological significance of space.<sup>27</sup> He was interested in Jerusalem not as a symbol of something else, that is, the heavenly Jerusalem, but because it is the site of the places associated with the life of Jesus. His account of the discovery and building of the Church of the Anastasis bristles with a sacral vocabulary that has few precedents in Christian literature before his time. The term *place* (*topos*) has become incandescent, afire with energy and potency. Reporting on Constantine's plan for Jerusalem, Eusebius wrote that Constantine's

greatest concern was how he might adorn “this *holy place* . . . which from the beginning was *holy* . . . and now appears more *holy* because it has brought to light proof of the suffering of the Savior” (*v.C.* 3.30). Formerly Christians had spoken of virtuous men and women as holy, of the holy church or holy Scriptures. Now holiness is attributed to a place: the “most blessed place,” the “saving cave,” the “holy cave,” the “most holy cave,” the “most marvelous place in the world” (*v.C.* 3.31).

Eusebius’s words to depict the holiness of the tomb are complemented by another vocabulary drawn from the lexicon of ritual purity. The cave where Christ was buried had been covered with “impurities.” The entire area had to be cleansed because it had been “stained.” The workmen were ordered to “dig to a great depth and to transport to a far distant place the soil that had been polluted by the foul impurities of demon worship.” The object of this digging and transporting of dirt was not simply to prepare the ground for a new building, but to uncover and display what was already there. Indeed Eusebius says the place was holy even before the burial and Resurrection of Christ, “from the beginning,” suggesting that he has integrated the historical event of the Resurrection into an older cosmogonic myth.<sup>28</sup>

Eusebius repeatedly identifies the place as a cave, a term that does not occur in the New Testament. In the Mediterranean world caves were sacred places whose darkness and inaccessibility made them particularly suitable places to encounter the divine.<sup>29</sup> Porphyry, the philosopher and literary critic who wrote several books against the Christians shortly before the time of Eusebius, wrote a little essay on the “cave of the nymphs” in Homer’s *Odyssey*. Caves, according to Porphyry, are not simply holes in the ground, but sacred precincts where the divine and human meet. They serve as “icons” and “symbols” (*antr. nymph.* 6.9) of higher things, and even before temples were built, people recognized the holiness of caves and grottoes. Eusebius calls the cave where Christ was buried “the sacred cave” or the “most holy cave.” Eusebius also designates the place of Jesus’ birth a cave as well as the place of his Ascension on the Mount of Olives. “In this same region [Judea] Constantine uncovered three sites venerated because of the three *mystical caves*, and enhanced them with opulent structures.” By building these churches Constantine announced the “saving sign to all” (*laud. C.* 9:17). In Eusebius’s account the term *cave* seems intentionally to accent the sacral character of the places he describes.

Of course the presumption behind Eusebius’s account is that the workmen knew where to dig and had in fact discovered the place of Christ’s burial. But how did they know where to place their spades and how could



they be certain they had uncovered the tomb? Eusebius seems aware of such doubts. He says that the discovery of the tomb was “contrary to every expectation” (*v.C.* 3.28), implying that it was discovered unexpectedly. But that seems unlikely. Eusebius’s language may be less an expression of surprise than a stylized way of displaying astonishment and wonder that the location of the great miracle had actually been uncovered. It is more likely that the Christian community in Jerusalem had a sense of where the tomb had been located. It is unlikely the tomb was uncovered by chance. The contractors knew *in general* where to dig.<sup>30</sup>

Certainty about the location is an essential feature in Eusebius’s account, for he imposes on the discovery a provocative theological claim. The tomb of Christ is not simply a memorial of the place where the sacred events occurred—that is, a hedge against forgetfulness—but also proof of the veracity of what happened there, a “sign” or “token” of the saving Resurrection of Christ. Eusebius’s Greek term for *sign* means “evidence” or “proof.” It recalls the word *sign* in the Gospel of John, a term used in connection with Jesus’ miracles, for example, the turning of water into wine at Cana (John 2:11) or the healing of the official’s son in Capernaum (John 4:54). Through these and other signs Jesus evoked faith in those who saw them (John 20:30). In the midst of his *Life of Constantine* Eusebius has inserted a book of signs, but unlike the signs in the Gospel of John, which were miracles, those in Eusebius’s book are *places*. Looking at the cave, the observer sees a “likeness of the coming to life of the Savior . . . a visible and clear sign of the amazing things that took place there, bearing witness to the Resurrection of the Savior by a deed that spoke more loudly than any voice” (*v.C.* 3.28).<sup>31</sup>

On the face of it Eusebius’s claim that the discovery of the place is proof of what happened there appears illogical. Does the identification of the place where a famous battle presumably took place verify *that* it actually occurred? Such evidence can only be circumstantial. Yet when sight is joined to memory, stones and dirt and caves do not remain silent. Without memory there can be no identification, but without sight memories are evanescent and ephemeral. As Maurice Halbwachs reminds us in a book on “collective memory,” it is difficult “to evoke the event if we do not think about the place itself.” A community’s memory is more likely to endure “when it concentrates on places,” for seeing impresses on the imagination what one learns through hearing.<sup>32</sup> When linked to oral tradition or written texts sight bridges the gulf between past and present.

In Eusebius’s day for the first time—or at least for the first time since the tomb of Christ was covered over—sight begins to be a component of

Christian faith. As this new “fact” penetrated Christian consciousness in the fourth and fifth centuries, Christians realized that seeing the holy places was a way of “renewing the image” of what had happened, that is, re-presenting the saving events of the past in the present, of allowing believers through “memory” to “become spectators of history.”<sup>33</sup> If there were no places that could be seen and touched, the claim that God had entered human history could become a chimera. Sanctification of place was inevitable in a religion founded on history and on the belief that God “became flesh” in a human being. The holy places and the tombs of the patriarchs and prophets as well as the sites in Jerusalem and Bethlehem became witnesses to the truth of the biblical history and of the Christian religion. It would take time for these ideas to work their way into Christian piety and thought, but the discovery of the tomb of Christ in Jerusalem helped to hasten the inevitability. By “exposing to sight” the tomb of Christ Constantine unveiled the “deeds of God.”<sup>34</sup>

### Sacred Space and History

Earlier Christian sources have much to say about time, but what they say about space appears to dethrone place as the locus of the divine presence.<sup>35</sup> The most famous passage is, of course, the word of Jesus in John 4: “Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father. . . . God is spirit and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth” (21–24). This sentiment is echoed in popular as well as philosophical writings from the earliest centuries. Origen criticized pagan piety because it associated the divine with particular places. We have no need to go to a shrine to “seek God,” he wrote (*Cels.* 7.35); the gods do not dwell “in a particular place” (*Cels.* 3.34).<sup>36</sup> Origen was uncomfortable *even* with the phrase “holy city” in the Gospel of Matthew. In his commentary he disassociated the epithet *holy* from the actual city of Jerusalem, as he had eschewed the term *holy land* for Judea (*comm. ser. in Mt.* 27:53).<sup>37</sup>

Yet these reproaches of pagan piety do not tell the full story. From early times Christians gathered for worship at the places where the faithful departed had been buried.<sup>38</sup> Like Greeks and Romans who built shrines to mark the place where they buried their famous dead or celebrated the exploits of mythical heroes, Christians constructed memorials to their dead. Called *martyria* (places that bear witness), these rooms were erected over the site where the martyr had been buried.<sup>39</sup> The earliest Christian martyrrium was the tomb of St. Peter in Rome. In a room above the tomb a niche was carved in the wall and before it was

constructed a small shrine containing two columns with a stone plaque. Peter was believed to have died at Rome, and the monument of his death was venerated by the year 200.<sup>40</sup> Other martyria have been discovered at Salona on the Dalmatian coast and at Bonn in Germany. At Salona, the room included a small apse, a table, and a canopy over the tomb. At Bonn archaeologists uncovered a room with benches and a stone table (altar) where Christians gathered to commemorate the dead.<sup>41</sup> The purpose of these shrines was to provide a place for the celebration of Christian worship at the burial site of a holy person.<sup>42</sup>

Adopting the terminology of the early Christian funerary shrines to designate the tomb of Christ, Eusebius calls it a "*martyrion* of the saving resurrection." His point is that the tomb "bears witness [*martyromenon*] more clearly than any voice to the Resurrection of the Savior" (*v.C.* 3.28). Elsewhere in the same account he uses the term *martyrion* to designate the basilica that was constructed adjacent to the site of the tomb (*v.C.* 3.40). Similarly the churches built on the sites of the two "mystic caves," the place of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem and the site of the Ascension, were called martyria.

Yet the martyrion at the tomb of Christ differed from the shrines of the apostles and martyrs in one noteworthy respect. Unlike the other martyria it did not hold any human remains. In John Chrysostom's memorable words, "The whole world runs to see the *tomb which has no body*."<sup>43</sup> For John, the fact that the tomb was empty was reason to visit it; for John Milton, it was evidence that pilgrimage was a debased form of piety: "Here pilgrims roam, that strayed so far to seek/ In Golgotha him dead who lives in Heaven."<sup>44</sup> Early Christians knew that what was being marked and venerated was not the resting place of relics, but an event, the Resurrection from the dead (*v.C.* 3.28). The martyrion in Jerusalem marked the "place of the Resurrection," wrote Cyril of Jerusalem (*catech.* 14.6). Because the tomb as well as the sites marking the place of Christ's birth and Ascension were memorials of events, they were fixed and immovable. Unlike the tombs of the martyrs, which could be located anywhere (at least theoretically), the holy places were stationary. Paradoxically, the emptiness of the martyrion in Jerusalem made the bond between place and memorial more intimate.<sup>45</sup>

Another way of putting the matter is that Eusebius's account in the *Life of Constantine* is confined to historical sites, that is, to the places where significant events took place in the life of Jesus of Nazareth: the cave where he was born in Bethlehem, the place where he suffered and died, the site of his Resurrection, and the mountain from which he ascended into heaven. Besides these places, Eusebius also discusses the oak

of Mamre near Hebron, a holy place associated with the patriarch Abraham.<sup>46</sup> At Mamre God first appeared to Abraham and promised that he would be the father of many nations (*v.C.* 3.53). By including the church at Mamre, Eusebius not only claimed Abraham's tomb for Christians, but also extended his conception of the holy places to embrace the territory of biblical history. For Eusebius, holy place is not confined to the sites hallowed by Jesus' life and ministry; it is wedded to the sacred history of the Bible, including the history of ancient Israel and hence to the *land* of biblical history. Unlike relics, the tomb of Christ, the cave in Bethlehem, the oak at Mamre could not be transported. Holy places were beginning to create an idea of holy land.

### A New "Temple" in Jerusalem

It was said that when Justinian completed the building of Agia Sophia in Constantinople he exclaimed, "Solomon, I have conquered you." No such words are attributed to Constantine, but Jewish Jerusalem was very much on Eusebius's (if not Constantine's) mind as the Church of the Anastasis was being built.<sup>47</sup> Eusebius says that at the very place where Christ was buried, at the life-giving martyrion "a new Jerusalem was constructed" (*v.C.* 3.33).<sup>48</sup>

In describing the future building to the bishop of Jerusalem Constantine declares that it will eclipse every other building in the empire: "Not only will the church be grander in every respect than all others, but the details of the building will be of such a sort that when it is built it will surpass the most beautiful buildings in every city." Constantine instructs Macarius to procure whatever is needed for the building for "it is fitting that the most splendid place in the world should be adorned in an appropriate manner" (*v.C.* 3.31). In its size, in the opulence of its materials, and in the grandeur of its decorations, the basilica constructed at the site was without rival. Eusebius wrote,

The interior surface of the building was hidden under slabs of multi-colored marble. The exterior aspect of the walls, embellished with well-matched and polished stones, gave an effect of extraordinary beauty which yielded nothing to the appearance of the marble. As to its roofing, the outside was covered with lead, a sure protection against the winter rains; the inside of the roof was decorated with sculpted coffering, which, like some great ocean, covered the whole basilica with its endless swell, while the brilliant gold with which it was covered, made the whole *temple* sparkle with a thousand reflections. (*v.C.* 3.36)<sup>49</sup>

For the ancient Israelites Jerusalem was situated at the center of the world. "This is Jerusalem," wrote Ezekiel: "I have set her in the center of the nations, with countries round about her" (Ezek 5:5). The center around which everything took its orientation was the temple, the "most holy place," as the final chapters of Ezekiel make clear. By Eusebius's time this conception of concentric circles radiating out from the holy of holies was firmly established in Jewish tradition: "The land of Israel is holier than other lands. . . . The walled cities (of the Land) are more holy. . . . Jerusalem is yet more holy. . . . The temple mount is more holy. . . . The sanctuary is still more holy. . . . The Holy of Holies is still more holy for no one may enter it except the High Priest on the Day of Atonement" (m. Kelim 1.6).<sup>50</sup>

Whether the architects of the buildings at the tomb were aware of this tradition is uncertain, but the form of the shrine lent itself to such a conception. From the reports of pilgrims we know that in the original complex the tomb stood in the open air, a "vast space, open to the sky, paved with beautiful stones and surrounded on three sides by long porticos" (v.C. 3.35). Across from the tomb to the south and east was the hill of Golgotha, the place where Christ was crucified. How the rock of Calvary fitted into the overall plan of the courtyard is still unclear to architectural historians, but the proximity of the two holy sites, the place of Christ's death and the place of his Resurrection, set this place apart from every other place in the world. In the original plan the tomb stood in an indentation on one side of a courtyard, but later in the fourth century the square courtyard was made into a circle and moved so that the tomb was at its center. Around it were set twelve enormous columns interspersed by square pillars at twelve, three, six, and nine o'clock, and the area was covered by a circular dome, known as the Rotunda.<sup>51</sup>

Eusebius does not use the phrase *center of the earth*, but the idea was aborning and may lie behind some of his observations on the new building. As early as the third century Origen knew of a tradition "that the body of Adam, the first human being, was buried where Christ was crucified" (*Comm. Ser. in Mt.* 27:32-3). Perhaps this is why Eusebius says that the place of Christ's burial was "holy from the beginning." In the generations that followed Christians would draw out this spatial parallel between Adam and Christ, just as Paul had drawn out a historical parallel between the first Adam and the second Adam (Rom 5). Ambrose, writing later in the fourth century, brings the two primordial beings into intimate relation: "The place of that cross was in the middle [of the earth] that it might be visible to all, over the tomb of Adam, a point the Jews dispute. The first fruits of new life and death's beginning come

together at this place.”<sup>52</sup> In time the new Christian “temple” at the place of Christ’s burial and Resurrection would be viewed, like Jewish Jerusalem, as the “center of the earth.”<sup>53</sup>

Eusebius knew, of course, that the Temple Mount was the center of Jewish Jerusalem. The temple had been constructed on a massive platform at the easternmost part of the city, where today the Dome of Rock is located, overlooking the Kidron valley and looking over toward the Mount of Olives. The Church of the Resurrection was built in a completely different part of the city, indeed near the center of the new Roman colony, well to the west of the old Jewish center. Eusebius is quite conscious of this topographical fact: “A new Jerusalem has been constructed *facing* the one renowned of old. . . . Opposite this city the emperor now began to rear a memorial to the Savior’s victory over death with rich and lavish magnificence” (*v.C.* 3.33). Eusebius wished to set off the new Christian city centered around the Church of the Anastasis from the old Jewish city centered on the Temple Mount. Yet he emphasizes that the new Christian temple is located in the ancient land of the Jews. Constantine built an “enormous house of prayer, a temple holy to the ‘saving sign’ in the Palestinian nation in the heart of the Hebrew kingdom” (*laud. C.* 9.16).

Not once does Eusebius mention Aelia Capitolina in his several accounts of the new building. For Eusebius, the relation of the new Christian city to biblical Jerusalem was much more significant than its relation to the Roman colony of Aelia. In his description of the discovery of the tomb he contrasted the polluted temple of Venus with the sacred site of Christ’s Resurrection. The one was a “gloomy shrine to lifeless idols” and the other a monument of the “return to life” (*v.C.* 3.26). But when he describes the majesty and grandeur of the new temple, he contrasts Christian Jerusalem with the Jewish city.

In his earlier treatise, the *Evangelical Demonstration*, written before the discovery of the tomb of Christ and before any churches were constructed in Jerusalem, Eusebius had drawn a contrast between the present ruins of the temple and the splendor of the ancient city. Standing on the Mount of Olives one could look down on the “old earthly Jerusalem” which lay in ruins. The testimony of the rubble, however, was largely negative. From it one could learn that the “city was taken and devastated as the prophets foretold.” Eusebius is thinking specifically of Ezekiel’s statement that the “glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city” (Ezek 11:23). Eusebius now applies his words to the destruction of the Second Temple at the hands of the Romans.<sup>54</sup> Just as in former times God’s glory had fled the city, so now in our own days the “glory of the

Lord departed the former city" to rest on the Mount of Olives (*d.e.* 6.18; 288d).

The prophet Ezekiel had, of course, not only spoken of the departure of the glory of God from Jerusalem; he had also prophesied its return: "Afterward he brought me to the gate, the gate facing east. And behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the east, and the sound of his coming was like the sound of many waters; and the earth shone with his glory" (Ezek 43:1–2). In Ezekiel the return of God's glory to Jerusalem was associated with the future building of a new temple; in Eusebius's account the new Jerusalem is identified with the new Christian temple. "Perhaps," he writes, "this is the new and second Jerusalem announced in the prophetic oracles" (*v.C.* 3.33). The glory of the Lord had again returned to the holy city; as the departure of God's glory was predicted by the prophets, so the building of the new temple was a fulfillment of biblical prophecy. No doubt Eusebius realized that in his earlier writings he had interpreted the oracles of the prophets to refer only to a future eschatological city. Hence the subtle qualifier "perhaps." Yet, as he now beholds the new Christian city rising over against the ancient city of the Jews, he applies the words of the prophets to the actual city being built in the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina.<sup>55</sup>

Responding as he had throughout his life to a new turn of events, Eusebius has made yet another shift in his thinking. Now the earthly Jerusalem is beginning to clothe itself in the images of the eschatological city. The prophecies to which Eusebius appeals are the same ones that Christian chiliasts and Jews had used in constructing their visions of a glorious future. For Eusebius, however, the prophecies are being fulfilled in his own lifetime, not in a future eschatological city. His is a more radical interpretation of the prophets than that of the chiliasts.

Eusebius applies to Christian Jerusalem the metaphor of a river that flows from the center of the city and brings salvation to the world. "In the Palestinian nation in that very place," he writes, "as from a fount a lifegiving river gushed forth for all" (*laud. C.* 9; also 11). This river is an "ever-flowing fount, streaming forth, overflowing with salvation for all."<sup>56</sup> This language recalls the final chapter of the Apocalypse: "Then he showed me the river of the water of life, bright as crystal, flowing from the throne of God" (Rev 22:1–2). The source of the metaphor (at least within the biblical tradition) is much earlier. It occurs in Ezekiel: "Then he brought me back to the door of the temple: and behold water was issuing from below the threshold of the temple . . . and the water was flowing down from below the south end of the threshold of the temple. . . . And wherever the river goes every living creature which swarms

will live. . . . And on the banks, on both sides of the river, there will grow all kinds of trees for food. . . . Their fruit will be for food, and their leaves for healing" (Ezek 47:1–12).<sup>57</sup> In contrast to his earlier works, in which he had identified this city with the heavenly city, Eusebius here applies the images of the eschatological city to the actual city in Judea, the new Christian city, at whose center stood the "new temple" of the Lord. Roman Palestine, like the ancient land of Israel, again had a holy temple in its midst.

### **Envy of the Temple**

In a suggestive article entitled "Christian Envy of the Temple" (1959), H. Nibley wrote that Christians, no less than Jews, recognized the importance of a tangible bond between earth and heaven.<sup>58</sup> Although Christian apologists, appealing to Isaiah 66:1, "What is the house which you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest?", manufactured innumerable arguments against the Jewish temple, they believed that God's dwelling place was on earth as well as in heaven. Indeed the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation required as much, for it affirmed that God had taken up residence on earth in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. With the building of the Church of the Resurrection God's glory again dwelled in Jerusalem, and the new Christian temple commemorated this fact. By the end of the fourth century the church in Jerusalem had set aside a special day, called Encaenia [Renewal], to mark the discovery of the true cross and the dedication of the temple at the site. Egeria reports that the festival was celebrated "with all possible joy" and, following the model of the celebration in ancient Israel of the dedication of Solomon's temple, was observed for eight days. "You will find in the Bible that the day of Encaenia was when the House of God was consecrated, and Solomon stood in prayer before God's altar, as we read in the Books of Chronicles" (*itin. Eger. 48.2*).<sup>59</sup>

Whether it is proper to speak of Christian envy of the Jewish temple, as Nibley does, is moot, but the language Eusebius uses in his *Life of Constantine* suggests that the parallel between the ancient temple of the Israelites and the new temple, a "memorial of the Savior's resurrection," was not far from his mind. In the *Life of Constantine* he cites as a "prophetic word" a passage from the Psalms on pilgrimage to the temple. The Greek text reads as follows: "Let us worship at the place where his feet have stood" (Ps 132:7). Psalm 132 is one of the songs of ascent, sung by pilgrims as they went up to the mountain of Jerusalem to join in the pilgrim festivals. In the original Hebrew the psalm reads, "I will not



enter my house or get into my bed; I will not give sleep to my eyes or slumber to my eyelids, until I find a place for the Lord, a *dwelling place* for the Mighty One of Jacob. . . . Let us go to his dwelling place; let us worship at his footstool.”

In Eusebius's Greek translation the term *footstool* was rendered “where his feet stood.” The reason for this translation is unknown, but it is obvious that its language lent itself easily to a Christian interpretation (“his” = Jesus' feet). Eusebius cites the psalm in reference to Helen, the mother of Constantine, who had visited Palestine shortly before her death in 329 c.e., at the time Constantine was initiating his building program in Jerusalem and environs. No doubt she came with the emperor's blessings.<sup>60</sup> In later tradition Helen was celebrated as the first Christian pilgrim, and Eusebius presents her act of piety as a model for future generations (*v.C.* 3.42).<sup>61</sup> In later tradition she was associated with the discovery of the true cross,<sup>62</sup> and for that feat Sir Stephen Runciman called her “the most successful of the world's great archaeologists.”<sup>63</sup> In the fifth century she was accorded equal honor with her son Constantine in the building of the temple at the tomb which was called the New Jerusalem (Socrates, *h.e.* 1.17).

Eusebius also mentions Helen in connection with the building of churches at Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives. By visiting the territory where Christ had sojourned, Helen had “venerated the saving places” (*v.C.* 3.42), thereby fulfilling the word of the prophet, “Let us worship at the place where his feet have stood.” Up to this point in his account of Constantine's building projects in Palestine Eusebius has eyes only for Jerusalem. But now he says that “in this same *region*” other auspicious places were discovered. The first is Bethlehem, the “cave which was the first manifestation of the Savior, where he had undergone birth in human flesh.” The second mystic cave is located on the Mount of Olives and is a “memorial of his ascension into heaven” (*v.C.* 3.41).

Although Eusebius's intention is to highlight these two specific holy places, he introduces for the first time in his narrative a territorial designation. The two mystic caves were located in the same *territory* in which the temple was located (*v.C.* 3.40–41). Eusebius extends the idea of a sacred place to include the region surrounding Jerusalem. In the vicinity of the “most holy place” could be found two other “holy places.” In the next paragraph he also uses a territorial term, but now the word is not “region” but “land,” the biblical term for the land promised to Abraham. Helen, in her travels to the cities and provinces of the East, wanted to “behold this venerable *land*” (*v.C.* 3.42). Only here, in this land, could she “venerate the saving places” the Savior had hallowed by his presence and

fulfill the words of the Psalmist, "Let us worship at the place where his feet have stood."

Eusebius does not use the term *holy land*; indeed it may be that he shuns it, as had Origen, because of its traditional Jewish overtones. But his phrase "marvelous" or "admirable" land is a singular addition to the emerging idea of a Christian holy land. It suggests that the holy places do not exist in isolation from the territory that surrounds them, and that their unique quality as signs of the divine presence extends beyond the sites themselves to the surrounding area, as Ezekiel had shown. A century later monks will come to Judea "to live in *this* desert" (Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Euthymius* 6), that is, the desert surrounding Jerusalem. What area was included under the term *marvelous land* is of course not specified; Eusebius is not thinking of a territory with boundaries. But he surely includes the area immediately around Jerusalem, including the Mount of Olives, Bethlehem, and perhaps the oak at Mamre near Hebron. Whether he included his own city of Caesarea as part of this land, though, is unclear. Caesarea does not figure large in biblical history, yet it does appear in the book of Acts as the place of the conversion of the Roman centurion Cornelius (Acts 10.1–11) and the place where Paul stood trial before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa II (Acts 24–26).<sup>64</sup>

### A New Ezekiel

Long before the discovery of the tomb of Christ Eusebius had written a book that bears the title *Onomasticon*. Its fuller title is "On the location and names of places among the Hebrews." According to the preface it included the following information: Hebrew names translated into Greek, a map (or description) of ancient Judea and the ancient tribal divisions among the Hebrews, a plan of Jerusalem and the temple, and the distances between the various cities.<sup>65</sup> The work is arranged according to the books of the Bible (intended to aid the Bible reader), but it could also serve as a handbook for pilgrims. Eusebius identifies obscure biblical sites and mentions places where memorials can be seen, for example, the tomb at Bethlehem, the terebinth at Hebron. Most important, he makes no apparent distinction between places in the Hebrew Bible and places in the Christian New Testament. At Jericho he mentions the tomb of Joshua, but also says that it is a city that the Lord Jesus honored with his own presence.<sup>66</sup> In modern terminology Eusebius's work might be called a gazetteer, a geographical dictionary of names and places. To a certain extent the *Onomasticon* was a modification of a work of Origen on the Hebrew names in the Scriptures. Eusebius's book, however, had

certain original features: a map or description of ancient Judea and a plan of ancient Jerusalem and the temple. His purpose was historical and exegetical. He seems to have used a contemporary map of Roman roads of Palestine as well as other sources on the geography of Palestine, as his use of phrases such as “to this day” or “shown to this day” indicate.

But the work has a larger significance. By conceiving of the land of the Bible as a geographical territory in which Christians have an interest and in which Christian sites are mentioned along with ancient Israelite sites, Eusebius had begun to envision Palestine not as a Roman province but as a land whose character and identity were formed by biblical *and* Christian history. In the Roman province of Palestine Caesarea was the premier city, but in Eusebius’s *Onomasticon* the center is Judea and Jerusalem. As Dennis Groh has observed, Eusebius brings together “biblical, Roman and Christian realities . . . in such a way that Christianity in his own day can be seen to be the successor of the biblical realities in the Roman world.”<sup>67</sup> The biblical land was not only an ideal land or a place of past history; it was also a land where Christians lived. In several places Eusebius mentions villages that are “wholly Christian.”<sup>68</sup>

It would be stretching the evidence to claim that Eusebius first imagined a Christian holy land. Yet, like Ezekiel eight centuries earlier, Eusebius set some of the foundation stones in place. Ezekiel had written, “This is the law of the temple; the whole territory round about upon the top of the mountain shall be most holy” (Ezek 43:12). In his description of the discovery of the tomb of Christ and the building of the Church of the Anastasis Eusebius gave the land a center, a holy place and sacred edifice, that made this land venerable and marked it off from all others.

Without the developments that took place in Eusebius’s lifetime—the conversion of Constantine, his lavish endowments to build churches, the discovery of the tomb of Christ, the building of the Anastasis, Helen’s fervor for the holy places, the construction of churches at Bethlehem, on the Mount of Olives, and at Mamre—Jerusalem and the land surrounding it would not have been catapulted so quickly to the center of Christian devotion. Yet Eusebius saw something that others had not yet discerned and had the theological sophistication and the religious imagination to portray what he had seen. The Christian holy land was, however, not the work of bishops or intellectuals: its artisans were the faithful who lived in the land and the pilgrims who came from abroad to worship at the holy places.

## Chapter 5

### A New Jerusalem Facing the Renowned City of Old

- 1 For a description of the traditional ceremony, see Servius's commentary on Vergil's *Aeneid* 5.755–56. He is commenting on the following passage: “Meanwhile Aeneas / Marked with a plow the limits of the town / And gave home sites by lot.” On the Roman colony, see H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, *Jérusalem: Recherches de Topographie, d’archéologie et d’histoire*. Vol. 2: *Jérusalem Nouvelle* (Paris: 1914), 1–39.
- 2 The name, spelled Helya Capitolina, occurs in the Peutinger Table, a “map” or guide to the Roman world (and beyond) from the fourth century. K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana* (Rome: 1916), 833.
- 3 “Nothing was overlooked which could signify a total rupture with the past” (F. M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d’Alexandre jusqu’à l’invasion arabe* [Paris: 1952], 2:97).
- 4 *Chronicon Paschale* 119 (PG 92, 613).
- 5 F. C. Conybeare, ed., *The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila* (Oxford: 1898), 98 (Folio 130r of the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila).
- 6 “From the time of Hadrian to the reign of Constantine—a period of approximately 180 years—the place of the Resurrection was occupied by a statue of Jupiter; on the rock where the cross had stood, a marble statue of Venus, set up by the pagans, was an object of worship” (Jerome, *ep.* 58.3). There is, however, dispute about what was actually on the site. See John Wilkinson, *Egeria’s Travels*, 36ff., and Georg Kretschmar, “Festkalender und Memorialstätten Jerusalem in altkirchlicher Zeit,” in *Jerusalem Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit*, ed. H. Busse and G. Kretschmar (Wiesbaden: 1987), 62ff.
- 7 For the coins, see L. Kadman, *The Coins of Aelia Capitolina* (Jerusalem: 1956), 36–44.
- 8 The story can be found in Eusebius, *Martyrs of Palestine*, 2.9–13.
- 9 “Jerusalem was destroyed to make place for a city with a completely different character, established with its own rituals and organized according to the demands of an absolutely different civilization.” Abel-Vincent, *Jerusalem* (1914), 2:1.
- 10 Eutychius, *Chronicles* (CSCO 471, 58; 472, 49). Eusebius identifies the home of a martyred deacon as Aelia (*mart. pal.* 11.5). This term occurs only intermittently in Christian writers.

- 11 H. Windisch, "Die ältesten christlichen Palaestinapilger," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 48 (1925): 145–58. More recently, E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312–460* (Oxford: 1982), and Pierre Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie. Des origines à la conquête arabe* (Paris: 1985). Pilgrimage to Palestine will be discussed in the following chapter.
- 12 *Itinerarium Burdigalense (The Pilgrim of Bordeaux)* edited by P. Geyer and O. Cuntz in *CC*, vol. 175. Translation in Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels*.
- 13 "It is a remarkable fact," writes S. G. F. Brandon "that the Mother Church of Christianity is known to us through no writing which can unhesitatingly be accepted as one of its own production." *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: 1957), 31.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 167–84; Gerd Lüdemann, "The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella-Tradition," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia: 1980), 1:161–73.
- 15 Hugh Jackson Lawlor and John Ernest Leonard Oulton, *Eusebius. Bishop of Caesarea. The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine* (London: 1954), 2:167–70
- 16 "There is no ground for supposing that the Church of Aelia in 135 was a mere chance collection of Levantine Greeks looking up to the Church of Caesarea rather than back to the historic Church of Zion." William Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* (Philadelphia: 1955), 59.
- 17 *Martyrs of Palestine*, passim. Joseph Geiger, "The Spread of Christianity in Eretz Israel from the beginning until the time of Julian," in *Eretz Israel: From the Destruction of the Second Temple until the Muslim Conquest* (Jerusalem: 1982), 1:223–25 (in Hebrew). The largest Christian community was in Caesarea.
- 18 Günter Stemberger, *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land. Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius* (Munich: 1987), 49–51; also Geiger (1982), 225–26. List of bishops in H. Gelzer, H. Hilgenfeld, and O. Cuntz, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina* (Leipzig: 1898).
- 19 There can be little doubt that Christians lived in Galilee, but their numbers were few. One was the so-called Count Joseph, a native of Tiberias, who, according to Epiphanius (*Panarion* 30.4.1–12.8), was charged by Constantine to build churches "in the cities of the Jews," i.e., Tiberias, Diocaesarea (Sepphoris), Capernaum. Archaeological excavations give some evidence of churches in the region—e.g., in Capernaum, Sepphoris, and Nazareth—but the evidence is fragmentary and its significance is disputed. For discussion of the story of Count Joseph and the archaeological evidence, see Stemberger, 66–75.
- 20 On Constantine, see Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge: 1981), 28ff., and Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (New York: 1987), 609ff. "Constantine publicly declared himself a Christian before battle. It seems natural to conclude that he was converted to Christianity before the Battle of the Milvian Bridge. . . . In the ultimate reckoning, however, the precise details of Constantine's conversion matter little. After 28 October 312 the emperor consistently thought of himself as God's servant, entrusted with a divine mission to convert the Roman Empire to Christianity." Barnes, 43.

- 21 Text of *Res Gestae Divi Augusti (Monumentum Ancyranum)*, in V. Ehrenburg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford: 1976), 1–31. See esp. paragraph 20.
- 22 “This deluge of Christian publicity exceeded any other programme in precious stone which was realized by a ruler in antiquity.” Fox, 623. On Constantine’s building program, Joseph Vogt wrote, “Constantine’s church buildings are indisputable signs of his Christian outlook.” “Bemerkungen zum Gang der Konstantinforschung,” *Mullus: Festschrift Th. Klauser (JbAC, supp., vol. 1 [Münster, 1964], 378)*.
- 23 Drake, *In Praise of Constantine* (Berkeley: 1976), 173, n. 9.
- 24 Richard Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (Berkeley: 1983), 23. For the legal basis for Constantine’s building program, see Ludwig Voelkl, *Die Kirchenstiftungen des Kaisers Konstantin im Lichte des römischen Sakralrechts (Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen Geisteswissenschaften, Heft 117 [Köln: 1964])*.
- 25 “Instead of the usual figures and scenes from Greek mythology, there were statues of the Good Shepherd, of Daniel in the lion’s den, and other biblical characters, often in gilded bronze—and a cross of precious stones hanging in midair dominated the principal hall of the imperial palace.” Barnes (1981), 22.
- 26 K. L. Schmidt, “Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild,” *Eranos Jahrbuch* 18 (1950): 107–248.
- 27 The recent study of P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?* (Oxford: 1990), argues that Eusebius was not able to accommodate his thinking to the new developments taking place in Jerusalem. He is correct in exposing the ambivalence of Eusebius’s view of Jerusalem and the “holy land” and shows in detail the factors that went into Eusebius’s thinking: rivalry between Caesarea, the metropolitan see, and Jerusalem, Eusebius’s theological views, particularly his understanding of Christ’s Resurrection as a “theophany,” his anti-Jewish polemic, his Origenism, et al. He is also correct in highlighting the differences between Eusebius and Cyril, the bishop of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century. Yet in his efforts to defend the theological consistency of Eusebius’s views, he misses, in my view, the subtle ways Eusebius’s thinking shifted as he took account of the new things happening in Jerusalem. By drawing so heavily on *Theophania* and *Demon. Evang.*, Walker minimizes the significance of the unprecedented language for the holy places (and the land) in the *Vita Constantini* and the *de laudibus Constantini*. His argument that “Jerusalem” in *v.C* 3.33 (p. 399) refers to the heavenly city is ingenious but unconvincing. In the context I do not see how terms such as “build” or “over against” can refer to anything but the actual place. Eusebius’s embryonic theology of Jerusalem fits comfortably with the realized eschatology exhibited in his depiction of Constantine’s reign in book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History*.
- 28 Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place* (Chicago: 1988), 80.
- 29 A cave near Corycus in Asia Minor is called “venerable and very holy . . . worthy to be a dwelling place for the gods and believed to be” (Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia* 1.13.75, ed. A. Silberman [Paris: 1899], 22). See Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge: 1985), 24.

- 30 H. A. Drake, "Eusebius on the True Cross," *JEH* 36 (1985): 1–21. In an unpublished paper, "Constantine, Macarius, and the Tomb of the Lord," Kenneth Holum (dept. of history, University of Maryland) argues that the present site was chosen *because* a pagan temple stood on it. By destroying the temple and building a church, Christians showed the power of their god to vanquish idols. He draws a parallel between the building of the Anastasis and the construction of a church on the site of a pagan temple in Gaza (cf. Mark the Deacon, *Life of Porphyry*). Also Kretschmar (1987), in Busse-Kretschmar, 33ff.
- 31 Also *I. C.* (Sepulchre of Christ), 18. On Eusebius's treatise "on the sepulchre of Christ," included in his *de laudibus Constantini*, see Drake (1976). Gregory of Nyssa said that in Jerusalem one could see the "signs" of the Lord's sojourn in the flesh (*PG* 46, 960).
- 32 Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (New York: 1980), 154, 156. See also his *La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte* (Paris: 1971). "The past becomes part of the present; one touches it, one is in direct contact with it" (1).
- 33 Asterius of Amasea, *hom.* 9.2 (ed. Datema, 116–17).
- 34 For Eusebius the holy places served more as proofs of the truth of Christianity than objects of devotion. A. Lassus, "L'Empereur Constantin, Eusebe et les lieux saints," *Revue de l'histoire des Religions* 171 (1967): 142; also Wilkinson (1971), 20.
- 35 On time, see Hebrews 1:1: "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son." Or Gal 4:4: "When the time had fully come, God sent forth his Son born of woman." On place, see Acts 7:48: the "Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands," citing Isaiah 66:1–2. These passages should not be overworked, at least in their original setting. John 4 may be less a reproach of the temple than a censure of impure offerings. G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrange-meinde und im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: 1971), 93ff.
- 36 "The God of the Christians is not confined by place; being unseen he fills heaven and earth and is worshipped and glorified by the faithful everywhere" (*Acts of Justin* 3.1). There is "no place of (God's) resting" (Theophilus, *Autol.* 1.4). Justin, *dial.* 127.2. Theophilus, *Autol.* 2.3; Athenagoras, *leg.* 10.1. "Every place is suitable for prayer if a person prays well" (Origen, *orat.* 31.4). Minucius Felix: "Templum quod ei extruam, cum totus hic mundus eius opere fabricatus eum capere non possit?" (*Octavius* 32). Also Eusebius, *demon. evang.* 1.6.40–42 (18b-19d); 2.3 (61b). In his *Leviathan* Thomas Hobbes wrote, "Holy implies no new quality in that place . . . but only a new relation by appropriation to God." Sabine MacCormack, "The Organization of Sacred Topography," in *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, ed. R. Ousterhout (Urbana: 1990), 9.
- 37 Eusebius follows Origen's interpretation of the "holy city" as the "heavenly city." See d.e. 4.12,166d; 10.8,501c; and also *Comm. in Ps.* 87(88).11–13; *PG*, 23, 10641-b.
- 38 See the provocative article by Paul Crosby Finney, "Topos Hieros und christlicher Sakralbau in vorkonstantinischer Überlieferung," *Boreas, Münsterische Beiträge zur Archaeologie* 7 (1984): 193–225. Finney shows that there is greater continuity between early Christian veneration of particular places (the house

church at Dura, early Christian martyria) and the fourth-century veneration of holy places than many historians, influenced particularly by nineteenth-century Protestant historiography, will allow. *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, written in mid-second century, gives evidence of worship at the site of the martyr's tomb. After his death, "we deposited his bones in a suitable place . . . and we will come together with joy and gladness to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom" (18.2–3).

- 39 The literature on the martyria is extensive. For a general account, see Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (New York: 1979), 30–37; André Grabar, *Martyrium. Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique* (Paris: 1943, 1946), 1:47ff. Klaus Staehler, "Grabbau," in *RAC* 14 (1982): 423–27; Graydon F. Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life before Constantine* (Macon, Ga.: 1985), 87–114.
- 40 Excavations in Rome have uncovered a fragment of an inscription that may belong to Peter's martyrdom. The inscription reads *PETR ENI*, which may mean *PETER IN PEACE* or *PETER IS HERE*. Another inscription found under St. Peter's (at the mausoleum di Valerii) mentions Christians being buried "near your [Peter's] body." M. Guarducci, *Pietro in Vaticano* (Rome: 1983), 65–68, 74–77.
- 41 On Salona, Einar Dyggve, *History of Salonitan Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1951). On Bonn, T. Kempf, "Frühchristliche Funde und Forschungen in Deutschland," *Atti del congresso internazionale di archeologia cristiana* 5 (1967): 61–72.
- 42 D. W. Rordorf, "Was wissen wir über die christlichen Gottesdienstraume," *ZNW* 55 (1964): 110–28. Christians were sometimes buried near the holy place. See Dyggve (1951), 71ff. on burial near graves of martyrs: "iuxta loca sanctissima or martyribus adscita." See R. Egger, *Forschungen in Salona* 2 (Vienna: 1926), inscriptions # 106 and 110 (p. 82). The burial places of the apostles were called "sacred tabernacles," and their remains the "trophies of the apostles" (*h.e.* 2.25.7). Eusebius provides details of another kind of devotion to place, a monument at Pania (Caesarea Philippi) in Galilee that commemorated the woman who had suffered from a hemorrhage for twelve years and who was healed by Jesus (*Matt* 9:19–26). In Eusebius's day her house was pointed out to visitors. At the site were "memorials" to her healing, two bronze statues in relief, one of a woman bending her knee and stretching forth her hands in supplication, and opposite her a man clothed in a double cloak extending his hand in blessing. A curative herb grew at the base of the monument. The statue, which Eusebius had seen "with his own eyes," bore the likeness of Jesus (*h.e.* 7.18).
- 43 *Hom. in Ps.* 109.5 (110.5); *PG*, 55, 274a.
- 44 *Paradise Lost* 3.476–77.
- 45 Of course there were relics, chiefly fragments from the holy cross. From the end of the fourth century, veneration of these relics was part of every pilgrim's journey to Jerusalem (*Itin. Eger.* 37). Collection of earliest references to the true cross in Anatole Frolov, *La Relique de la vraie croix: Recherches sur le développement d'un culte* (Paris: 1961).
- 46 Mamre was a pagan and Jewish shrine before it became a Christian holy place, and even after a church had been built there, incorporating a former pagan building, the site was still venerated by Jews and pagans. See E. Mader, *Mambre*



- (Freiburg im Breisgau: 1957), and G. Kretschmar, "Mambre: von der 'Basilika' zum 'Martyrium,'" *Mélanges liturgiques offerts au R. P. dom Bernard Botte* (Louvain: 1972), 272–93.
- 47 Constantine was called a "new Bezalel or Zerubbabel who builds blessed temples to Christ" (Antiochus Monachos, *ep. ad Eustath*, PG 89, 142a).
- 48 See Drake (1976), 171, n. 24, and 173, n. 6.
- 49 The term *temple* (*naos*) was used of other churches as well (v.C. 3.45). For *templum* as a term in Latin writers for the Anastasis, see Ambrosiaster, *Liber. quest.* 127.16 (CSEL 50. 405–06).
- 50 Also *Midrash Tanhuma, Kedoshim* 10.
- 51 Charles Coüasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem* (London: 1974), 36. Also H. A. Drake, "A Coptic Version of the Discovery of the Holy Sepulchre," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 383–85; Kretschmar, *Jerusalem Heiligstumstraditionen*, 33ff.
- 52 Ambrose, *exp. Luc.* 10.114.
- 53 Cyril of Jerusalem cat. 13.28; Didymus, *de trin.* 1.1. (PG 39, 324); Sophronius, *Anacreon.* 20.29. See W. H. Roscher, "Omphalos" in *Abhandlungen der Phil., hist. Klasse der Koenig. Saechs. Ges. der Wissenschaft* 29.9 (1913). A. Piganiol, "L'hémisphairion et l'omphalos des lieux saints," *Cahiers archaéologiques* 1 (1945): 11; also Grabar, *Martyrium*, 1:234ff. Of course the term *navel* (*omphalos*) of the world had been used earlier for Greek shrines, notably Delphi (Aeschylus, *Seven against Thebes*, 747).
- 54 In his commentary on Ezekiel, Theodoret of Cyrus interpreted Ezekiel 11:23 in light of the destruction of the Second Temple (PG 81, 901).
- 55 The editors of the *Life of Constantine* assume Eusebius is referring to the passage about the new Jerusalem in Revelation 21. But considering Eusebius's reservations about the Apocalypse (R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* [Oxford: 1980], 126–27, 130ff.) and his abhorrence of chiliasm, it is possible he is thinking of the prophecies of Isaiah and Ezekiel. The term *new* or *second* Jerusalem does not appear, but Isaiah speaks of a "new heaven and a new earth" (Isa 65:17) and of a city whose foundations will be laid "with sapphires" and whose walls will be made of "precious stones" (Isa 54:11–12), language similar to Eusebius's description of the new church at the site. Ezekiel envisioned a city with a new temple out of which flows a river of life whose name would be the Lord's name (Ezek 48:35, LXX).
- 56 In the Syriac version of the *Martyrs of Palestine*, Eusebius says that the Savior arose "like a life-giving fountain in the middle of our land" (*m.P.*, pref.). The pronoun "our" is striking, because elsewhere he refers to Palestine as the land of the Jews, "their land," and "their own land" (*d.e.* 6.18, 284d). "Our" probably means the land where Eusebius was born and lived, not a Christian land.
- 57 Jerome applies the image of the river in Ezekiel to the heavenly Jerusalem (*ep.* 129.2).
- 58 *JQR* 50 (1959): 97–123.
- 59 Dedication of the Anastasis (Encaenia) was thought to replace the Jewish feast of Sukkoth, which commemorated the dedication of Solomon's temple. "No longer does one speak of the transitory festival of Tabernacles but of the festival of the

- dedication of the great temple erected for the Holy Resurrection" (G. Bayan, *Synaxaire arménien de Ter Israel* (Patrologia Orientalis [Turnhout: 1971], 6.2, 215–16). Egeria says the day was celebrated "cum summo honore" and people came from all over the East, from Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt for the celebration. Encaenia (renewal) was the day that Solomon consecrated the temple, as recorded in 2 Chr 6.12 (*Itin.* 48–49). Some saw Encaenia as a parallel to Hannukah. See M. Black, "The Festival of the Encaenia Ecclesiae in the Ancient Church with Special Reference to Palestine and Syria," *JEH* 5 (1954): 78–86.
- 60 It should be observed that as late as 327 Constantine also supported pilgrimage to pagan shrines. In an inscription found at the tomb of the kings in Egypt a priest from Eleusis thanks Constantine for underwriting the trip (*OGIS* 2721). See F. Millar, "P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third Century Invasions," *JRS* 59 (1969): 17.
- 61 Hunt, 28. Constantine himself did not go to Jerusalem on pilgrimage. For a discussion of possible reasons, see Joseph T. Rivers, "Pattern and Process in Early Christian Pilgrimage" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1983), 235ff.
- 62 See the discussion of Helen in Hunt, 29–49, and Drijvers (1992). Ambrose of Milan (d. 397) was the first to mention Helen's discovery of the cross (*in ob. Theod.* 46). See Wilkinson (1971), 240–41; also Drake (1985). For a discussion of the different ways eastern and western writers remembered the discovery of the tomb and the cross, see H. A. Drake (1979), 381–92. Ze'ev Rubin believes that Eusebius deliberately suppressed information about the discovery of the cross for political reasons, namely, he wished to guard the prerogatives of his own city, the metropolitan see in the region. This seems unlikely, but tension there was between the two cities. "The Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Conflict between the Sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem," *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (1982): 79–99.
- 63 Stephen Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (Cambridge: 1951), 1:39. Eusebius, however, says nothing about the "invention" of the cross in his account of the uncovering of the tomb of Christ. This omission is puzzling. However, if the story of the discovery of the true cross did not begin to circulate until later in the fourth century (as seems likely), Eusebius can hardly be faulted for omitting it from his account. Later, however, the "invention of the cross" was made part of the Celebration of the Dedication celebrated on September 14, and Helen was accorded equal honor with her son in the "rebuilding of Jerusalem" (Socrates, *h.e.* 1.17). On Helen, see also Stefan Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegenda im Pilgerbetrieb Jeruslems," *JbAC* 32 (1989): 40–71.
- 64 For Eusebius's emphasis on Palestine as a whole, see Walker, (1990), 108. I am, however, not convinced that Eusebius exalted Palestine at the expense of Jerusalem.
- 65 Text ed. E. Klostermann, *Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen*, GCS (Berlin: 1904). In regard to the date, see Barnes (1981), 106–11 as well as his article "The Composition of Eusebius' Onomasticon," *JTS* 26 (1975): 412–15.
- 66 For analysis of the text, see Peter Thomsen, "Palästina nach dem Onomasticon des Eusebius," *ZDPV* 26 (1903): 97–188; also E. Z. Melamed, "The Onomasticon of Eusebius," *Tarbiz* 3 (1932): 314–27 (in Hebrew).

- 67 Dennis Groh, "The Onomastikon of Eusebius and the Rise of Christian Palestine," *Studia Patristica* 18 (1983): 29.
- 68 Anaia, Jetheria (266), near Eleutheropolis, and Kariatha (239).