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Thesis Abstract

The increased Christian interest in sacred space during late antiquity has been understood as a shift from a more spiritualised practice in early Christianity (the ‘Utopian’) towards a more place-based form of devotion (the ‘Locative’). This transition is acutely apparent in the case of Jerusalem. During the fourth century, in the wake of imperial investment, the city gained unprecedented theological and liturgical importance. However, its development complicated – perhaps even supplanted - the significance of the heavenly Jerusalem ‘above’ that predominated in early Christianity. In this study, I revisit this development with a renewed emphasis on spatiality. By employing terminology and methodology from the works of Jonathan Z. Smith, Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja, I examine the interrelationship between urban and theological change in fourth century Jerusalem.

The first part of this thesis establishes the wider spatial and historical background of Jerusalem from 70 to 385 CE. Then, focusing on the half century after the construction and dedication of a church on Golgotha (335—385 CE), I trace the physical and ideological trajectories of its major religious spaces: Golgotha, Mount Zion, the Mount of Olives, and the Temple Mount. To this end, I highlight the impact of liturgical engagement with the sacred spaces of the Golgotha church in the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem and the later Mystagogical Catecheses. I then consider the subsequent development of Mount Zion in the context of ecclesiastical advancement and the re-assertion of apostolic origins between the ecumenical councils of Nicaea (325 CE) and Constantinople (381 CE). Thirdly, I highlight the conceptual expansion of Jerusalem through the monastic development and integration of the Mount of Olives. Lastly, I investigate the processes of inversion and erasure at work in Christian representations of the Temple Mount before and after the reign of Julian.

The third and final part of this study examines the two accounts of Christian pilgrimage, which effectively bookend this period - the Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria - as forms of spatial practice. I examine the degree to which accounts of pilgrimage attest to the significance of Jerusalem, while also composing and conveying sacred topography from the pilgrim’s own perspective to a far-off audience. In conclusion, I revisit the transition from the Utopian to Locative in the case of fourth century Jerusalem. Rather than a discrete transition, I adopt a third possibility: that the real and invisible, earthly and heavenly, historical and eschatological remained intermingled in the Jerusalem of late-antique Christian thought, practice, and place.
Lay Summary

Though there was a shift away from place-based worship in early Christianity, scholars have highlighted an increased interest in sacred spaces in late antiquity. This has been called a shift from the ‘Utopian’ to the ‘Locative’. A particularly vivid example of this transition is Jerusalem. During the fourth century, the city gained a great deal of theological and liturgical importance. However, the development of the earthly Jerusalem ‘below’ complicated the earlier significance of the heavenly Jerusalem ‘above’. In this study, I revisit this moment in the history of Jerusalem in order to emphasise the importance of the sacred spaces. By using the terms and methods created by Jonathan Z. Smith, Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja, I ask: what’s the relationship between urban and theological change?

In the first part of this thesis, I provide the background for my study: Jerusalem from 70 to 385 CE. I then focus on the half century after the construction and dedication of a church on Golgotha – 335 to 385 CE. The main subjects of my study are the major religious spaces of fourth-century Jerusalem: Golgotha, Mount Zion, the Mount of Olives, and the Temple Mount. Over the course of this study, I consider the physical development of these spaces and their importance for fourth-century Christians. I highlight the impact of sacred space in the liturgy of the Golgotha church through two catechetical texts: the Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem and the later Mystagogical Catecheses. I then consider the development of Mount Zion in the context of ecclesiastical advancement and the desire to re-establish an apostolic connection in the Jerusalem Church. Thirdly, I highlight the idea of an expanding Jerusalem from the perspective of the Mount of Olives. Lastly, I investigate the way that Christian representations of Jerusalem also involved the marginalisation and erasure of sacred space in my discussion of the Temple Mount.

The third and final part of this study presents two accounts of Christian pilgrimage: the Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria. I discuss how pilgrimage accounts reveal the significance of Jerusalem from the individual perspectives of the pilgrims to their specific audiences further afield. In conclusion, I once again revisit the transition from the Utopian to Locative in the case of fourth-century Jerusalem. Rather than a distinct transition from one to the other, I adopt a third possibility: that the real and invisible, earthly and heavenly, remained intertwined in the way late-antique Christians developed and discussed Jerusalem in late antiquity.
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<td><em>Itinerarium Burdigalense</em></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Epiphanius, <em>De Mensuris et Ponderibus</em></td>
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<td><em>Catecheses Mystagogicae</em></td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</table>
1. Introduction

Perhaps no exchange better encapsulates the ambiguous condition of Jerusalem at the start of the fourth century than the one recorded between Pamphilus of Caesarea and Firmilianus in Eusebius’ *Martyrs of Palestine*. First composed around 311 CE, the *Martyrs of Palestine* provides a vivid recollection of the persecutions that affected Eusebius’ native Caesarea in the preceding years. A key moment in the narrative was the interrogation of Pamphilus and his companions by the provincial governor. When asked their place of origin, the martyrs reportedly remarked that they came from “Jerusalem”. Their answer, Eusebius inferred, was a reference to the Jerusalem *above* [ἡ δὲ ἄνω]:

... meaning, to be sure, that one of which it was said by Paul, ‘But the Jerusalem that is above is free, which is our mother’ and ‘Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem [*Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ*]’. Firmilianus, in contrast, was obviously confused by their answer. He had never heard of a place called ‘Jerusalem’. Eusebius dismissed his response as a theological ignorance; the governor’s frame of mind was hopelessly “fixed on this world here below”. As such, the alleged confusion between martyr and judge signified “two worlds unreconciled”. However, the two worldviews, opposing though they had been,

---

1 Eusebius, *De Martyribus Palestinae* 11.9-12. As a result, many chapters such as Hunt (1982), Irshai (1999), Stroumsa (1999) have begun with this exchange. I first considered its historical and theological implications in my (2021) article. This introduction offers an extension of those initial impressions.

2 On the dating and recensions of the *Mart. Pal.*, see Penland (2010), 5-17.


5 Hunt (1982), 5.
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did converge on one point. As O. Irshai has concisely summarised: “There was no place on earth named Jerusalem.”

Two important phenomena underlie this exchange. Firstly, there was the elimination of Jerusalem from the geographic memory of Palestine. The Jewish wars, which spanned the period from 66 CE to 135 CE, resulted in a comprehensive alteration of urban space. The city and Temple were destroyed, the Jews were expelled from Judaea, and soldiers of the Roman legion became its primary occupants. Jerusalem was renamed ‘Aelia Capitolina’ and was reconfigured to follow a Roman pattern, as the ideological centre shifted from the Temple Mount to a newly constructed Roman forum in the west. Therefore, nearly two centuries later, there would be little reason why Firmilianus would have known a place called ‘Jerusalem’ within his province.

Secondly, for early Christians, a tension existed between Jerusalem’s importance as a city of historical and biblical memory (the city ‘below’) and its importance as the object of eschatological hope (the city ‘above’). Many early Christian theologians subscribed to a more spiritualised view of Jerusalem, as was

---

6 Irshai (1999), 205. A similar sentiment is found in Stroumsa (1999), 349.
7 These phenomena will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.4.
8 See Chapter 2. The early Christian community in Jerusalem does not seem to have been spared expulsion. Rather, Christians and Christian monuments were likely not distinguished from the greater Jewish environment. I will interrogate issues of continuity in the Jerusalem Church during the second century, as well as the claim of a flight to Pella in Eusebius’s Historia Ecclesiastica 3.5.3 and Epiphanius’ de Mensuris et Ponderibus 15, in Chapter 2.4.1.
9 The absence of geographic memory does not mean that a memory of Jerusalem was not maintained in Judaism and Christianity. The author of the Itinerarium Burdigalense reports that it was custom for Jews to visit and mourn the Temple annually on the ninth of Ab (591.1-5). On the importance of the earthly Jerusalem in early Christianity, see Chapter. 2.4.3.
10 See Chapter 2.4.2. Perrone (1999a) referred to this as the tension between “history” and “symbol”.
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displayed in New Testament scriptures such as *Galatians* 4:26\(^\text{11}\) and *Hebrews* 12:22.\(^\text{12}\)

The passage of the *Martyrs of Palestine* quoted above is exemplary of this tradition, as Eusebius employed both verses in his explanation of the martyrs’ allegiance to the Jerusalem ‘above’.\(^\text{13}\) In sum, both political and theological circumstances converged in the erasure of Jerusalem during the interim centuries.\(^\text{14}\)

However, Eusebius’ composition also sits at a threshold. The fourth century brought about considerable change for Jerusalem. The emperor Constantine, who likely expressed a similar ignorance of Jerusalem during his first and only tour of Palestine, would later express a great deal of interest and involvement in the city.\(^\text{15}\) Following the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE, a construction project began at the city’s centre by imperial decree. The resulting rediscovery of Christ’s tomb and church complex on Golgotha – accompanied by additions in Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives – marked an important change to the religious fabric of the city.\(^\text{16}\) Compounded further by the imperial tour conducted by the empress Helena and the emerging

\(^{11}\) “But the Jerusalem above is free [ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν]; she is our mother [ἡτίς ἐστίν μήτηρ ἡμῶν]” *Galatians* 4:26.

\(^{12}\) “You have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem [Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ]”. *Hebrews* 12:22.

\(^{13}\) This tendency in early Christianity, as well as the degree of ambiguity on this shift, is discussed in Chapter 2.4.

\(^{14}\) Wilken (1992), 83. However, see note 9 above and Chapter 2.4.3.

\(^{15}\) Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 1.19; Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorium* 18. On Constantine’s relationship to Jerusalem see Chapter 3.1.

\(^{16}\) Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3:25-40. The church at Mamre, also built by the order of Constantine, serves as an outlier in this respect; Eusebius suggests that this was a reactionary construction. Constantine ordered the basilica’s construction in response to a report by Eutropia of pagan use of the site (*Vit. Const.* 3.51-3). However, Mamre did follow the same architectural pattern evident in the Constantine triad, in which the sacred monument is incorporated into the church complex. On the Church at Mamre, see Mader (1957); Kofsky (1998).
mythology of the True Cross, to which she was later associated\textsuperscript{17}, this period saw a swift revitalisation of the geographic consciousness of Jerusalem.

Simultaneously, the earthly Jerusalem gained much significance in late-antique Christianity. While the city was likely little more than a “provincial backwater” in the early 330s CE, it became a destination for Christian travellers from afar\textsuperscript{18}. Spectacular church buildings came to define various sites of Christian sacred memory, extending beyond Golgotha to other areas of importance, Mount Zion and the Mount of Olives. These changes also inspired further modes of liturgical interaction with sacred space in the form of public and performative church processions.\textsuperscript{19} When the pilgrim Egeria visited the city in the early 380s CE, she portrayed Jerusalem as a vibrant, ecclesiastical hub, in which the roads seemed purposed for little else than the liturgical movement of pilgrims and locals between stations of sacred memory.\textsuperscript{20} As an apt culmination of these developments, the city was given special mention at the ecumenical council at Constantinople in 381 CE, as Jerusalem, the “Mother of all churches [μητήρ τῶν ἁπασῶν ἐκκλησιῶν]”.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{17} On the relationship between Helena and the True Cross, see Borgehammar (1991) and Drijvers (1992). The historicity of the Cross’s origins during the empress’s imperial visit is much debated, primarily because of Eusebius’ silence on the matter in his \textit{Vit. Const}. Eusebius’ silence and its impact of the historiography of the True Cross myth will be discussed in Chapter 4.2.

\textsuperscript{18} Elsner (2000), 189. The earliest example is the \textit{It. Burd}.

\textsuperscript{19} The liturgy of Jerusalem is particularly well preserved thanks to Egeria’s extensive account (the \textit{Itinerarium Egeriae}) of the liturgical scene during her pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 381-4 CE, and Cyril of Jerusalem’s \textit{Catecheses}. The \textit{Codex Arménien}, which details later liturgical readings, rounds out our primary evidence of the liturgy of late-antique Jerusalem. On the stational element of the Jerusalem liturgy, see Baldovin (1987) and Verhelst (1999).

\textsuperscript{20} The \textit{Itinerarium Egeriae} will be discussed in Chapter 8.

\textsuperscript{21} Theodoret, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 5.9.17 (GCS 44, 234).
1.1. A Review of the Literature

Many scholars have examined the revitalised interest and investment in Jerusalem during the fourth century. In particular, much focus has been given to the theological impact of this development on late-antique Christianity. The revitalisation of Jerusalem encouraged greater Christian interest in the earthly city and its sacred places. In turn, this imposed complications on the spiritualised attachment to the Jerusalem ‘above’ that predominated in early Christianity.\(^{22}\) While there was initially an “impulse to detach oneself from the concrete, historical city” of Jerusalem, Christians began to express greater attachment to the city ‘below’ over the course of the fourth century.\(^{23}\)

This development was not unique to Jerusalem alone. The earlier emergence of local martyria inspired a widespread interest in holy places. On this development, R.A. Markus employed the dichotomy of “Locative” and “Utopian” orientations in religion – terms originally coined by the theorist J. Z. Smith – to discuss the origins of sacred space in late-antique Christian practice.\(^{24}\) The commemoration and imitation of the martyrs answered his question, “How on Earth could Places become Holy?”\(^{25}\) Markus argued that a shift toward the “locative pole”\(^{26}\) in Christian worship was a

---

\(^{22}\) This phenomenon is explored in Cardman (1984), MacCormack (1990), Wilken (1992), Markus (1994), Caseau (1999), and Perrone (1999a).

\(^{23}\) Perrone (1999a), 222.

\(^{24}\) Markus (1994); See Smith (1978) for the terminology of “Locative” and “Utopian” orientations. These are discussed in greater detail below and will be revisited throughout the study.

\(^{25}\) Markus (1994).

\(^{26}\) Markus (1994), 265.
consequence of the “increased materiality … in late antique notions of sanctity” – what Peter Brown referred to as the “Localization of the Holy”. Increased interest in the martyr, relic, and holy man insisted upon a sense of geographic importance and particularity.

However, Markus’ focus on the cult of the martyrs differed considerably from the spatial theorist, whose terminology he borrowed. J.Z. Smith asserted that the liturgical practices arising out of Jerusalem were integral to the creation of Christian sacred topography. He highlighted the impact of imperial intervention as having crafted a ‘holy’ city through architecture and text: “What Constantine accomplished with power and wealth was advanced by rhetors like Eusebius, who built a ‘Holy Land’ with words”. However, Smith concluded that the emperor merely contributed the infrastructure for the true volte-face in late-antique Christianity. It was the intersection of sacred time and space in the Jerusalem liturgy that ultimately laid the foundation for a localised form of Christian worship.

Smith’s theory was influenced by G. Dix’s classic notion of a “liturgical revolution” in Jerusalem. Dix’s assertion was that the eschatological concerns of early Christian liturgy were fused with - even eclipsed by - a “new historical

---

27 Frank (2000), 121.
29 Smith adopted what has been referred to as a “situational” approach to sacred space, in which human agency, ritual practice, and symbolic interpretation are integral to the formation of sacred topography. This approach, which I also adopt in this study, will be discussed in Chapter 1.5.2 below.
30 Smith (1987), 79.
31 Smith (1987), 88. Bitton-Ashkelony (2005) referred to Constantine’s efforts as the “ultimate locating” of holy space, though part of a greater process (p. 28)
32 Smith (1987), 94; Dix (1945), 349. While Dix considered fourth-century Jerusalem as the “centre of innovation” (p. 348), Talley (1986) argued that it was through the incorporation of external practices, likely through the influence of visiting pilgrims, that the liturgy of Jerusalem developed. See also Drijvers (2004), 27; Bradshaw (1999), 254.
understanding” of redemption.³³ Many others adopted this argument; F. Cardman later employed these terms directly in her discussion of religious geography in late-antique Christianity. Cardman emphasised the impact of Constantine’s churches in liturgical development as both “historicizing” and “de-eschatologizing” Christian hope.³⁴ While J. Baldovin criticised Dix’s conclusion, he did so only to expand theological development beyond solely a discussion of sacred time to one of space:

If the Christian liturgy became more historical in Jerusalem, i.e., if it now tended to be organized into services focusing on discrete historical events, this was the result not of a new concept of time, but of the accessibility of new spaces that enabled Christians to claim the former Roman colonia as their own.³⁵ Dix’s notion of a liturgical revolution encountered more comprehensive criticism in the works of T.J. Talley and R. Taft. Talley and Taft noted that ‘historicising’ tendencies in Christian liturgy were not absent in the ante-Nicene Church, nor did the period after witness a “radical decay of eschatology”.³⁶ In essence, the conceptual boundaries between the ‘Eschatological’ and ‘Historical’ – or the Utopian and Locative – were not so absolute. Nevertheless, when it comes to the case of Jerusalem, most continue to acknowledge a notable transition in the fourth century. P. Bradshaw maintained that to see “the influence of the earthly city [Jerusalem] … we must turn our attention … from the fourth century onwards”.³⁷ This is because in the preceding

---

³³ Dix (1945), 347-60, esp. 348. See also Baldovin (1987), 103.
³⁴ Cardman (1984), 58.
³⁵ Baldovin (1987), 104.
³⁶ Talley (1973), 212; (1986); Taft (1982).
³⁷ Bradshaw (1999), 251.
centuries, Jerusalem was “invariably employed as a symbol of the eschatological age to come” in liturgical practice.\textsuperscript{38}

Notions of a theological and liturgical shift in the portrayal of Jerusalem have been greatly informed by the theorist of collective memory, M. Halbwachs. In addition to his classic study, \textit{Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire}, Halbwachs made a case study of the localisation of gospel memory in the topography of the Holy Land in early Christianity.\textsuperscript{39} While Halbwachs traced the desire to localise the memories of Christ’s life, death, and resurrection from the very advent of the Gospels, the geographic expansion of Christianity in the first centuries – in conjunction with the unfortunate circumstances of the city during that time – destabilised the physicality of Gospel memory for a more “symbolic reflection”.\textsuperscript{40} It was only in the fourth century, the so-called “Epoch of Constantine”, that Jerusalem was first rendered as a ‘Christian’ centre, requiring a more concerted identification and systematisation of its sacred topography.\textsuperscript{41}

In sum, increased Christian interest in Jerusalem (that is, the Jerusalem ‘below’) occurred within the context of a developing interest in holy places in late-antique Christianity. This marked a shift from the spiritual, eschatological orientations of early Christianity towards a more place-based form of devotion – from the Utopian to the Locative. While it was not unprecedented in this process, the movement in late-

\textsuperscript{38} A notable exception is the liturgy of St. James, noted Bradshaw (1999), 251.

\textsuperscript{39} Halbwachs (1941); (1952). Both texts have been translated into one English volume \textit{On Collective Memory} in Coser (1992).

\textsuperscript{40} Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 205.

\textsuperscript{41} Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 224-35, esp. 233.
antique Christianity towards the ‘Locative’ had an acute impact on Jerusalem. However, the causes, extent, and impact of this development have encountered more recent revision.

1.1.1. Causes: Dismantling a “Holy Land Plan”

When considering the development of Jerusalem during the fourth century, it is impossible to avoid the commanding figure of Constantine. After all, it was under Constantine that the religious fabric of the city began its transformation through the (re)discovery of sites associated with Christian sacred memory and the construction of commemorative basilicas. As a result, many have regarded the emperor as the influencer, or even author, of the ‘Holy Land’. Much of this stems from W. Telfer’s article, “Constantine’s Holy Land Plan”, which portrayed the emperor’s development of Jerusalem as an integral component of his greater religious agenda. Telfer argued that Constantine, fuelled by his own frustrated attempts to be a pilgrim to the land, sought to create a religious centre and pilgrimage hub out of a new, revitalised, Christian Jerusalem. While few have adopted Telfer’s theory entirely, the language of an imperial “Holy Land Plan” has surfaced in various studies of late-antique Palestine.

42 Markus (1994), 264-5.
43 Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 224-5.
44 Telfer (1957).
45 His argument was based primarily off Constantine’s reported ambition to create a “centre of attraction and venerable to all” [τόπον ἐδόξει δεῖν αὐτῷ προφανῆ καὶ σπατῶν ἀποφήγναι τοῖς πάσιν] in Eusebius’ Vit. Const. 3.25.1 (GCS 1.2, 95).
46 For example, Hunt (1982) and (1997); Walker (1990), 106-16; Drijvers (1992), 57; (2011), 141; (2013), 311; Wharton (1992); Jacobs (2004); 143-6; and Irshai (2009), 465. Taylor (1993) attributed the late-antique reverence of sacred topography to a “pagan concept grafted onto Christianity” by the
Constantine and his influence on the Roman Empire and Christianity has undergone wide revision.\textsuperscript{47} However, while it is increasingly uncommon to see the development of Jerusalem described as an imperial “Holy Land Plan”, scholars continue to place a similar weight on the bishop of Jerusalem and his own aspirations towards establishing a sacred centre.\textsuperscript{48} This is because the revitalisation of Jerusalem in Christianity occurred simultaneously with a resurgence of the city’s episcopal authority. The promotion of Jerusalem has been attributed to the machinations of the bishops in Jerusalem and their tenuous relationship to the metropolitan see of Caesarea over the course of the fourth and fifth centuries.\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, episcopal conflict offers a fascinating window into the controversies over Nicene Christianity, as the rift between the two bishops often existed along the lines of doctrinal parties.\textsuperscript{50}

One of the most notable contributions of this perspective is P.W.L Walker’s \textit{Holy City, Holy Places}, which provides a thorough examination of the generational, theological, and geographic divide between Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{51} However, while valuable in expressing their theological differences, the exclusive attention placed on the two bishops provides a limited view of the ‘holy’ city.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{47} For instance, Drake’s (2000) critique of the “Rational Actor Approach” (p. 24); Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 23-4.

\footnotetext{48} The emphasis of the bishop was emphasised in Dix’s (1945) notion of a “liturgical revolution” (discussed further below), which credits the “personal ideas and liturgical initiative” of Cyril of Jerusalem (p. 349).

\footnotetext{49} See Chapter 5.3, as well as Rubin (1982) and (1999); Irshai (2006).


\footnotetext{51} Walker (1990).
\end{footnotes}
and its greater context.\textsuperscript{52} The intertwining of Jerusalem with the bishopric is equally present in J.W. Drijvers’\textit{ Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City}. Drijvers’ work conveys much of the city’s development through the lens of one of its most famous and fascinating bishops.\textsuperscript{53} He provides an accomplished account of Cyril of Jerusalem’s life and writings, as well as his role in “promoting” Jerusalem as a major Christian centre.\textsuperscript{54} However, its premise also assumes that the biography of Jerusalem can be understood from the biography of one person.\textsuperscript{55} One can level a similar argument against J. Baldovin’s\textit{ The Urban Character of Christian Worship}, which remains an essential text on the origins of stational liturgy in Jerusalem and elsewhere. Baldovin emphasised the centrality of the bishop as a force of unity and stability in the Jerusalem liturgy:

One can conclude, then that … in the midst of the popularity of the holy places Jerusalem maintained an ecclesiological consistency in that its bishop was the unitive liturgical focus …\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{52} Markus (1991) noted, “The discussion of Eusebius and Cyril, ample as it is, needs to be placed in the wider context suggested by the book’s title and sub-title but hardly touched in the book itself. The pilgrims’ own accounts are used incidentally, but neither their attitudes nor those of other (though, admittedly, mainly later) fourth-century Christians - Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome, above all — are subjected to any examination. As a result we are left with the tantalising question: can the shift the author has so fully demonstrated between Eusebius and Cyril be taken as epitomising Christian attitudes in the fourth century?” (p. 301). Wilken (1992) made a similar critique (p. 291, n. 27).

\textsuperscript{53} Drijvers (2004).

\textsuperscript{54} Drijvers (2004), 153-76.

\textsuperscript{55} Drijvers is one of the people to still refer to the ‘Holy Land Plan’. See note 46 above. On the “Biography of Landscape”, see note 64 below.

\textsuperscript{56} See Baldovin (1987), 103. Baldovin asserted that “the Jerusalem liturgy was a mobile system of worship with two main\textit{ foci}: the bishop of the city and the sacred sites of hagiopolite stational practice and pattern” (p. 83).
However, as J. Elsner more recently argued, the development of Jerusalem was likely not as “consensual, or as bishop- … centred” as the liturgy implies.\textsuperscript{57} Liturgical development presents only one facet of a far more complex setting.\textsuperscript{58}

In this respect, two contributions in particular, D. Hunt’s \textit{Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire} and R. Wilken’s \textit{The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought}, more sufficiently consider the creation of a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem and ‘Holy Land’ and its various contributing factors.\textsuperscript{59} Following their lead, more recent studies have encouraged us to look at a wider breadth of forces at work in the development of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{60} In addition to episcopal influence, the growth of Christian pilgrimage and monasticism in Palestine had a significant impact on the rising status of the city and its surrounding region in late-antique Christianity.\textsuperscript{61} Further, the employment of Christian ritual – particularly in its public forms – played an important role in both the Christianisation and ‘consecration’ of urban space.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{57} Elsner’s (2007) chapter criticised a tendency towards idealism in the historical liturgical approach to late-antique Jerusalem in Baldovin (1987) and (1989). He contended for an approach that took into account these considerations, citing Eade and Sallnow’s (1991) theory of contestation in pilgrimage environments.

\textsuperscript{58} The importance of context in the study of liturgy has been emphasised by Bradshaw (2001), and was central to Day’s (2007) examination of Jerusalem’s baptismal liturgy and its perceived originality (discussed in note 32 above). More recently, Mayer (2016) asserted the future of liturgical history was attending to social, cultural, and political contexts, as well as regarding the complex relationship between ‘Christianities’ and the role of the laity. These amend Dix’s (1945) earlier conclusions.


\textsuperscript{60} This is well observed in Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 25; see also Perrone (2006), 147-9.

\textsuperscript{61} On pilgrimage, see Maraval (1985); Wilkinson (1990). On monasticism, see Perrone (1998); Sivan (1990); Binns (1996); Wilken (1999); Darmagnac (2013).

\textsuperscript{62} Kretschmar (1971) and Baldovin (1987). See also Latham (2018) on the role of ritual in Christianisation.
1.1.2. Extent and Impact: Christianisation

In addition to the causes for a shift in the Christian definition of Jerusalem, scholars have considered the extent of its impact ‘on the ground’ within the wider biography of Jerusalem, itself.\(^63\) Providing a true biography of place requires attention to its various periods, occupations, and changes.\(^64\) As such, the development of Jerusalem cannot solely be understood through theological concepts but also through the “real material impact” of Christianisation.\(^65\) An understanding of Christian representations of Jerusalem necessitates an understanding of the physical city, its history, and the extent of urban change that occurred during this period.

As a result, Jerusalem can be, and has been, viewed as a metaphorical “palimpsest”\(^66\). Like a palimpsest, places change under new powers and peoples; they are written and re-written with the accumulation of new constructions and associations.\(^67\) The addition of a new layer to the urban landscape, whether it is physical or mental, is both a destructive and reconstructive process. In this respect, O. Limor described the inheritance and re-composition of sacred spaces:

---


\(^64\) Lorimer (2007) asserted: “A ‘biography of landscape’ can long outlast the span of a single human life. Landscapes can be understood to have a biography that has accumulated across centuries, or aggregated over millennia. This stretched temporality is significant, and in tandem with it, the researcher’s attunement to the multivariate agencies that co-produce landscape” (p. 18). See also Pred (1984); Limor (2014), 32-3.

\(^65\) Jacobs (2004), 15, 200-9. This transition in the study of the late-antique Jerusalem is indicative of a greater shift in the field as new social and cultural approaches have encouraged a shift from ‘Patristics’ to ‘Early Christian Studies’; see Clark (2008).

\(^66\) Palimpsests are formed through a process of erasure and rewriting in manuscripts. On its use as a metaphor, see Chai-Elsholz (2011), 3, and its application in Smith (1987), 79.

\(^67\) Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 219. See also Huyssen (2003), 9.
New owners of a region are confronted by these sacred spaces and must relate to them in some way. They can desacralise temples and destroy them … or they can convert and sacralise them, but they cannot simply ignore them.\textsuperscript{68}

The connection between space, ideology, and confrontation was also essential to Halbwachs’ study of collective memory in the ‘Holy Land’ and the dynamics between Christianity and Judaism. The localisation of Christian memory was not limited to the sites of Christ but often assimilated and appropriated sites of Jewish memory, as well.\textsuperscript{69}

In some cases, memories were transported or supplanted with the creation of rival Christian \textit{topoi}.\textsuperscript{70}

Consequently, treatments of late-antique Jerusalem have become increasingly attentive to the confrontation of space and memory through the process of Christianisation. To this end, O. Irshai adjusted Markus’ theory on the origins of Christian sacred topography. He asserted that the cult of the martyrs not only led to the localisation of Christian worship in Palestine but also served as the “launching pad” for the “Christian appropriation of the land”.\textsuperscript{71} A. Jacobs’ \textit{Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity} similarly discussed the cognitive and geographic control of Christian imperialism that was asserted on Palestine in late antiquity.\textsuperscript{72} Conversely, the use of the palimpsest analogy also brings a degree of nuance to the discussion of spatial re-inscription and ‘conversion’.\textsuperscript{73} The existence of

\textsuperscript{68} Limor (2014), 31. In highlighting this element of conflict, Limor was also influenced by Eade and Sallnow’s (1991) theoretical approach to sacred space and pilgrimage.

\textsuperscript{69} Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 215, 219.

\textsuperscript{70} Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 219.

\textsuperscript{71} Irshai (2009), 466. See as well Irshai (1996), (1999), and (2011).

\textsuperscript{72} Jacobs (2004) articulated a connection between knowledge and control (or power); it was through the assertion of knowledge of people, places, and ideas, that they (ostensibly) could be “controlled”. See also Krewson’s (2017) volume on the innovative “supersessionism” of Jerome.

\textsuperscript{73} Levinson (2013), 102. On spatial ‘conversion’, see Limor (2014).
Jewish material, such as rabbinic literature, provides scriptio inferior, or undertext, to the “competing landscape” of late-antique Palestine.74

1.1.3. Extent and Impact: Change and Continuity

As Constantine’s building programme imposed a swift and permanent alteration to the urban topography, it has been regarded as a moment of ‘conversion’ in the city of Jerusalem. As a result, many have supposed that both a physical and conceptual transformation of Jerusalem happened instantaneously.75 In this respect, B. Caseau described the jointly spatial and religious ‘conversion’ of Syria and Palestine as a sort of discrete ‘sea change’:

Like rivers that create currents when they meet the sea, the religions in competition in the Roman and Persian worlds altered the societies they encountered. In regions like Syria and Palestine the currents were the strongest. First the sounds and perfumes of Pagan processions had filled the streets of Syrian cities; then the music of Christian hymns and the odor of incense sanctified the urban spaces as Christians went in procession from one sanctuary to another …76

As Constantine is often attributed disproportionate credit on the theological reconfiguration of Jerusalem, the emperor has also at times been deemed responsible for the physical “Christianisation” of Jerusalem.77 Indicative of this perspective is F. Millar’s assertion that “Christianisation, and the Christian monumentalisation of the landscape of Palestine did indeed begin immediately after Constantine’s conversion.”78

74 Levinson (2013), 120. See also Jacob’s (2004) discussion of the potential for resistance to colonial power in Christian rhetoricisation of the Jews in his conclusion (esp. 207-9).

75 Levinson (2013), 100.


77 See for instance Tsafrir (1993); Patrich (1995); Avi-Yonah (1976), 220-1.

78 Millar (2006), 154.
However, the issue with this interpretation is whether ‘Christianisation’ and ‘Christian monumentalisation’ describe the same process. Recent studies have also shown that the development of Christian sacred topography in and around Jerusalem was a process distinct from the conversion of the population to Christianity, which yielded much more varied and gradual results throughout Palestine.\(^79\) This was particularly the case for the majority of the population, who resided in the rural zones of the province.\(^80\) In addition, contrary to assumptions about imperial and institutional support, the local interaction with monasticism contributed considerably to the slow and varied process of Christianisation in Palestine.\(^81\) As a result, D. Bar amended Millar’s earlier conclusion:

In contrast with the quick sanctification of Palestine, a process unmatched in either scope or dynamics in any other part of the Roman empire, the rate at which the population, in particular the rural population, converted to Christianity more closely resembles the relatively slow process that characterised other regions of the Roman empire.\(^82\)

While Bar’s conclusion emphasised the slow Christianisation of the rural areas of Palestine, there is reason to apply this principle to Jerusalem, as well. The theological transformation of Jerusalem in the fourth century does not necessarily equate to a

\(^79\) Bar (2003); Friedheim and Dar (2010); Hajbi (2019). The coastal region from Caesarea to Gaza and the Negev, for instance, maintained much of its pagan character throughout this period. This is evident in Mark the Deacon’s *Vita sancti Porphyrii*, which suggests that Christianity was a minority religion in Gaza during the final years of the fourth century. See Geiger (1998); Rubin (1998); Stemberger (2000), 18-19, 190-1.

\(^80\) Bar (2003) compared the initial efforts in Jerusalem of the fourth and fifth centuries to the slower process of constructing community churches in rural Palestine; he argued that this process was only really accomplished in the later Byzantine period. However, even then, churches were often built on the outskirts of villages, further suggesting a sense of Christian insecurity far later than attention to the ‘Holy Land’ would suggest. In addition to this, see Di Segni (1999) and Ovadiah (1970), whose corpora of churches both suggest most ecclesiastical constructions date to the later Byzantine period. This was particularly the case in the Galilee and Samaria, in which Jewish and Samaritan communities were particularly resistant to Christian conversion, as Aviam (2004), observed.

\(^81\) Bar (2003), (2005); Perrone (1998).

\(^82\) Bar (2003), 406.
physical transformation. While there was a veritable shift in the Christian conceptualisation of Jerusalem in the fourth century, this should be compared, not conflated, with actual urban and demographic change.

### 1.2. Research Question

In summation, an increased Christian interest in sacred space in late antiquity has been understood as a shift from the spiritual, eschatological orientation of early Christianity (the ‘Utopian’) towards a more place-based form of devotion (the ‘Locative’). This transition is particularly clear in the Christian reception of Jerusalem, as it gained theological and liturgical importance over the course of the fourth century. How do we account for this shift? Was this primarily a change in perception? How much did the actual city change during this period? The causes of this development, and the extent of Christianisation in the city itself, have been challenged in modern scholarship. These contributions will guide my research questions and approach.

The aim of this study is to revisit the theological and spatial circumstances surrounding the development of Jerusalem from 325 to 385 CE. While I do not deny the influence of major imperial and ecclesiastical figures, I include other lines of evidence, such as pilgrimage *itineraria*, liturgical documents, artistic representations, and the correspondences of those further afield to generate a wider perspective. In particular, I question how an element of spatiality, made available through the rich archaeological research undertaken in Jerusalem, can contribute to our understanding of this development and its material impact on the city. I question how a broader spatial and historical ‘biography’ of Jerusalem can better contextualise the developments of the fourth century. Then turning to our period of interest, I question
whether the ideological development of Jerusalem was accompanied by a mutual
degree of physical change. Thirdly, I will consider the accounts of Christian pilgrims
as mediators of the material and theological aspects of Jerusalem. To what extent did
they perpetuate or challenge Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem? Having
explored the spatial and theological dimensions of fourth-century Jerusalem, I will
revisit the proposed transition from the Utopian to Locative in late-antique Christianity
in my conclusion. There, I will answer a final, overarching question: To what extent
is this framework sufficient for understanding the place of Jerusalem in fourth-century
Christianity?

1.3. Methodology

Spatial Theory is helpful in answering these questions. Alongside other
scholastic movements such as the Linguistic and Cultural turns, the Spatial turn directs
our attention to ‘space’ and ‘place’ in the study of history and religion.\(^{83}\) These
descriptors do not solely represent the arbitrary settings of historical events, but
integral components of history itself. ‘Space’ is shaped by, and in turn shapes, human
experience, interaction, and identity.\(^{84}\) In essence, space is intrinsically linked to

---

\(^{83}\) The bibliography on the “Spatial turn” and its application to historical and cultural studies is
extensive. The following sources have been particularly helpful in this project: Warf and Arias (2009),
especially Edward Soja’s chapter. See also Zeller (2004), Torre (2008), and Withers (2009). Sheppardson
(2014) is an ideal example of spatial theory at work in a study of late antiquity. For spatial theory in
the study of Religion, see Knott (2005a), (2005b), and (2010); Kong (2001) and (2007); Corrigan (2009).

\(^{84}\) Sheppardson (2014), 7-8. See also the Introduction to Day et al. (2016); Fitzgerald and Spentzou
(2018).
human events and systems. As such, it deserves a central role in historical and religious study.

There are many reasons for engaging with the spatial turn in this study. Firstly, the dialogue between spatial theory and the study of late-antique Christianity has already been evident in R.A. Markus’ employment of J.Z. Smith’s terms: the Utopian and Locative. In addition, Smith’s emphasis on ritual in the creation of sacred space relied heavily on the liturgical historiography of Jerusalem. Thirdly, accounts of Christian pilgrimage have been appreciated as geographic documents and forms of ‘cartography’. Lastly, the connection is intuitive: the essential focus of this study is ‘Jerusalem’ as a geographic and symbolic space. Spatial theory offers a methodological framework for discussing the composition, conceptualisation, and experience of Jerusalem during the fourth century.

1.3.1. Defining ‘Space’

Scholars of religion and social geography have emphasised the dynamic and

---

85 Soja (1996) asserted that spatiality (“the production of space”) is intrinsically linked with historicity (“the making of history”) and sociality (“the composition of social relations”). He called this the “transdisciplinary nature of geography” (pp. 56-7).

86 See discussion of the Utopian and Locative in 1.1. above.

87 Smith (1987), chapter 4, nn. 82-9. In turn, Smith’s study has become an authoritative work in response. See also the citation of Smith’s work in Jacobs (2004), 132-3; McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 50. See also Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 27 n. 123; however, she relies more on Dupront’s (1973) theory of pilgrimage, which shares a similar emphasis on ritual.

88 It is not unprecedented to draw comparison between textual and pictorial depictions of geography; the grounds for such a comparison are justified as scholars have recently explored the commonalities shared between “map” and “text”, such as Harley (1989). Related to this is the theory that Roman maps were not drawn “to scale”, but were oriented around the Roman itinerarium and the literal, linear relationship between Point A and B, as is suggested in Brodersen (2001), 7–21; Fitzgerald and Spentzou (2018), 2-3.

89 Halbwachs in Coser (1992), 204-5.
multi-dimensional nature of space. Space encompasses both the “material and
classical, physical and imagined”. The study of religion, so J. Corrigan put it, is
an “investigation of the invisible worlds”:

There is a rich history of the geographic exploration of those invisible worlds, and for
believers, religious history is as real as the history of the exploration of landforms,
peoples, languages, flora, societies, climates, and every other aspect of life on Earth.
Religion conflates the visible and invisible, the world of the senses and the world of the
imagination. In this respect, K. Knott conveyed the importance of the body in the
production and perception of space in the study of religion. Like the body, space
encompasses the physical, mental, and social. However, the mental and physical
components of space are ultimately conveyed through communication. For that reason,
space is “socially constituted”. It is defined by the reciprocal relationship between
humans, human relations, and their environment. Because of this social aspect, D.
Massey discussed space as dynamic and powerful: “Space is by its very nature full of
power and symbolism, a complex web of relations of domination and subordination,
or solidarity and co-operation”.
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90 Knott (2005b), 12-13. For discussion of geography as “Real” and “Imagined”, see Johnson (2014),
(2016b); Soja (1996); and French (1995).
91 Corrigan (2009), 160.
92 See Massey’s discussion at the beginning of her (1992) article and Jackson (2000).
93 Knott (2005b), 15-20. Knott was informed predominantly by the work of H. Lefebvre, which will be
discussed in Chapter 1.3.1.
94 This is what Knott (2005a) refers to as the “Properties of Space”. Here, she draws from Lefebvre.
96 See note 85 above.
97 Massey (1992), 155.
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1.3.1.1. The “Production of Space”

The interrelationship between sacred space, human history, and social-political systems emerges most clearly in H. Lefebvre’s *La Production de l’Espace*. Lefebvre provided a conceptual framework for understanding the production and experience of space through three interlocking aspects: “Representations of Space”, “Spaces of Representation”, and “Spatial Practice”. However, rather than creating a typology of space – attempting to distinguish between its physical, mental, and social components – Lefebvre defined the three corners of his spatial triad as the “spatial possibilities” available through their combination.

The first aspect, “Representations of Space”, or conceived space [*l’espace conçu*], articulates the way that space is conceptualised and idealised by the dominant authority. Of central concern is the imposition of ideology, knowledge, and power in its determination. For that reason, ‘Representations’ maintain “public, influential, authoritarian, and invasive … mastery over the body and everyday spaces.” E. Soja later adapted this facet of the spatial triad as ‘Secondspace’, the “storehouse of epistemological power … the primary space of utopian thought and vision”. In contrast is the second, opposing aspect of Lefebvre’s triad: “Spaces of Representation”,
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100 Knott (2005a), 15. Soja (1996) described these as the “re-combinations and simultaneities of the ‘real-and-imagined’” (p. 65).
101 For Lefebvre, this is the work of “scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers, and social engineers” (p. 38).
103 Soja (1996), 67. Soja’s use of the term ‘Utopian’ signifies its more common definition rather than a spatial orientation, such as J.Z. Smith employs. I will revisit the dualistic meaning of Utopian in the conclusion.
or lived space \([l\text{’}espace vécu]\). This describes the “space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’”.\(^{104}\) While ‘Representations’ are dominant, ‘Spaces’ are “dominated”.\(^{105}\) Nevertheless, it is the lived space that “the imagination seeks to change and appropriate”.\(^{106}\) As a result, this aspect of Lefebvre’s triad most appealed to Soja. He reimagined this as “Thirdspace”: a resistant space, “where different and contested ideas of what places are and mean can arise”.\(^{107}\)

Both Lefebvre and Soja articulated the limitations of dichotomy in their discussions of space.\(^{108}\) The incorporation of a third element was a process Soja called “Third-as-othering”, in which the “creative processes of restructuring that draw selectively and strategically from two opposing categories … open new alterations.”\(^{109}\) No one aspect of the spatial triad relies on the other, however, it is helpful to envision Lefebvre’s “spatial practice”, or perceived space \([l\text{’}espace perçu]\), as the third, complementary aspect.\(^{110}\) Spatial practice conveys “the way people generate, use, and perceive space”.\(^{111}\) It is determined by one’s conscious and unconscious involvement in both human systems and their environment.\(^{112}\) As such, Lefebvre emphasised the

---


\(^{105}\) Soja (1996) observes, “Lefebvre did not define the ‘dominated’ space as that of material spatial practices. Instead, he turned to the third space of his triad to exemplify the controlling powers of conceived space” (p. 67).


\(^{107}\) Soja (1996)


\(^{109}\) Soja (1996), 5.

\(^{110}\) Soja (1996), in contrast, emphasised “Thirdspace” as this addition.

\(^{111}\) Stewart (1995), 610.

\(^{112}\) Knott (2005b), 39.
influence of conceived space on spatial practice; perception primarily exercises a degree of cohesion with social systems:

The spatial practice of a society secretes that society’s space; it propounds and presupposes it, in a dialectical interaction; it produces it slowly and surely, as it masters and appropriates it.113 However, while spatial practice might primarily ensure cohesion, it can also exhibit aspects non-conformity. Through spatial practice, one can also create “stories that are inaccessible to”, or even in opposition of, the conceived norm.114 In essence, spatial practice is the mediation of “Spaces” and “Representations” and exists somewhere between these two poles.

1.3.2. Defining ‘Sacred Space’

The concept of ‘sacred space’ requires further definition. Scholars have come to different conclusions about the origin and nature of a place’s underlying ‘holiness’, or ‘power’.115 Some have highlighted the phenomenological, theological, and embodied impact of sacred space, while others have taken to a more “social-constructionist” approach concerned with its “production, practice, and representation”.116 D. Chidester and E. T. Linenthal called these two perspectives the “substantial” and “situational” approaches to sacred space. Advocates of the substantial approach emphasise the “ontological” nature of the sacred.117

---

115 Chidester and Linenthal (1995). The contrary nature of these two divergent treatments of sacred seemingly provides “Insider” and “Outsider” perspectives of religion, as was articulated in McCutcheon (1999). See also Knott (2005b), 98-9.
116 Chidester and Linenthal (1995), 5-9, esp. 6. Further distinction between the “phenomenological” and the “social constructivist” approaches is made in Knott (2010), 37.
117 Eliade (1954), 34; Smith (1978), 92.
favoured the term ‘irruption’ when discussing the foundations of sacred space through ‘kratophany’ and ‘hierophany’. The place where the sacred ‘irrupts’, Eliade argued, becomes a fundamental ‘centre’ of the world:

It is for this reason that the religious man has always sought to fix his abode at the “center of the world.” If the world is to be lived in, it must be founded and no world can come to birth in the chaos of the homogeneity and relativity of profane space.

B. Lane later expanded upon Eliade’s axioms of sacred space. In his first axiom, Lane likewise emphasised the “independence of the holy”: “sacred space is not chosen, it chooses”.

In contrast, scholars who have adopted a situational approach regard space not as “inherently sacred”, but as a product of human interpretation and action. Human participation composes the “symbolic labor that goes into making space sacred”. One of the prominent contributors of this perspective was Eliade’s student, J.Z. Smith. Contrary to Eliade’s assertion that man merely appropriated the sacred through forms of ritual, Smith emphasised that repetition and ritual were integral to the formation of sacred spaces.

---

118 Eliade (1958), 367.
119 Eliade (1959), 22.
120 Lane (2002), 19; Knott (2005b), 96.
123 Smith has been regarded as a key influence on the situational approach to sacred space. See Knott (2005a), 11; Chidester and Linenthal (1995), 15-16.
124 See Lane’s (2002) adoption of Eliade’s second axiom: “Sacred place is ordinary place, ritually made extraordinary.” However, Lane asserted that sacred space is merely “recognized”, not created, through ritual practice (p. 19).
125 Smith (1978), 88-103.
Chidester and Linenthal ultimately transferred their definition of the ‘situational’ and ‘substantial’ approaches to the ‘poetics’ and ‘politics’ of sacred space.\textsuperscript{126} The ‘poetics’, as the primary concern of the ‘substantial’ approach, alludes to the “essential character” of the sacred and its phenomenological experience.\textsuperscript{127} In contrast, the ‘politics’ reflect the intrinsic relationship between the sacred and social. However, as interrelated aspects, rather than alternative approaches, the ‘poetics’ and ‘politics’ in tandem convey how the realms of the sacred and social are never entirely distinct.\textsuperscript{128} Sacred space is always “entangled with the entrepreneurial, the social, the political, and other ‘profane’ forces”.\textsuperscript{129}

1.3.2.1. The Spatial Orientation of Religion

While differing on the origins and nature of the sacred, both Lane and Smith came to similar conclusions on the spatial orientation of religion. In contrast to Eliade’s notion of a sacred centre, Lane observed the simultaneous centripetal and centrifugal nature of religion.\textsuperscript{130}

The experience of the holy is perceived to occur at a sacred centre, an axis mundi where heaven and earth, the sacred and profane, intersect. To meet God is to be found there at the centre. Yet the religious experience is also subsequently centrifugal in its impulse. The believer is driven beyond the sacred place of initial encounter to expect God in every other place as well.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{126} Chidester and Linenthal (1995), 6-7.
\textsuperscript{128} Kong (2001).
\textsuperscript{129} Chidester and Linenthal (1995), 17. In explaining space in this way, they attempted to “creatively subvert Eliade’s axioms” (p. 17).
\textsuperscript{130} This is Lane’s (2002) fourth axiom (pp. 19-20).
\textsuperscript{131} Lane (1992), 5. See also his axioms in (2002), 15.
Lane’s assertion correlates with the two spatial orientations, or “maps” designed by J.Z. Smith – the Locative and the Utopian. As is evident in Markus’ application of these terms, there is an impulse to attribute significance to ‘place’ or ‘no place’ in religious practices and perspectives. However, Smith’s distinctions are not solely spatial indicators. As an advocate for a situational approach, Smith emphasised the enduring relationship between the sacred and society. As such, the Locative orientation of religion not only emphasised place but one’s social positioning. In reverse, the Utopian “test[s] the boundaries of the cosmos” by “breaking out of, or being liberated from, the bonds of a prevailing social order”.

While more directed at the relationship between the sacred and society than Lane’s approach, the inward and outward motions of Smith’s framework come to a similar conclusion. There are two coexistent orientations, or motions. Lane emphasised that the sacred could be “local and universal”, while Smith conveyed the impulse for both conformity and rebellion in sacred placemaking. To emphasise this ambiguity, Smith offered a third map: the map of “Incongruity”, which held the two orientations in tension: “They neither deny nor flee from disjunction but allow the incongruous element to stand”.

---

133 Obadia (2015) referred to this as the “Location of the system” and “Location in the system”, akin to the notion of “Positionality” (p. 211). See also Chidester and Linenthal (1995), 15; Kong (2007), 370.
134 Smith (1978), 103.
137 Smith (1978), 309; see also Knott (2005a), 20.
1.4. Argument and Organisation

When R.A. Markus employed the terms Utopian and Locative, he did so to observe a shift in late-antique Christianity towards a more place-based form of worship. These terms find powerful application in the Christian conceptualisation of Jerusalem over the course of the fourth century. However, Markus’ theory fails to encompass the wider definition of space embraced by Smith, Lefebvre, and Soja: Space is dynamic, composed of both material and ideological components, it is social and powerful, a source of both concord and contestation.\(^{138}\) It is my aim to re-examine the development of Jerusalem and its significance in fourth-century Christianity using the frameworks and terminology of spatial theory. This is not solely a theological question, nor is it solely a spatial question. It is, as Lefebvre’s triad displays, the junction between the physical and ideological within the overlapping arenas of society.

The first part of this thesis (Chapters 2 and 3) will establish the wider spatial and historical background of Jerusalem from 70 to 385 CE. Contextualising fourth-century Jerusalem within the city’s wider ‘biography’ will allow for a fuller appreciation of the contours between the Utopian and Locative in early Christianity and its relationship to urban change. In the second part of this thesis (Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7), I turn to the fourth century to consider the developing Christian conceptualisation of Jerusalem from the perspective of its primary spaces: Golgotha, Mount Zion, the Mount of Olives, and the Temple Mount. I discuss the church complex on Golgotha and its importance in shaping the identity and liturgical

\(^{138}\) A tangential comparison can be drawn to the two prevailing theories of pilgrimage: Turner’s (1978) theory of *Communitas* and Eade and Sallnow’s (1991) theory of contestation. This division was influential in Elsner’s (2007) critique of Baldovin (1987) and (1989), in note 57 above.
sensibilities of the Jerusalem congregation in Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Catechetical Lectures*. I then move to the emergence of Mount Zion and its associations with the early Jerusalem church in conjunction with the city’s episcopal scene during the fourth century. Thirdly, I discuss the Mount of Olives, which emerged as a place of great monastic importance and saw a considerable expansion of the conceptual borders of Jerusalem during the latter half of the century. Finally, I revisit the Jewish Temple Mount and the impulse of erasure in Christian polemic and eschatology following the reign of Julian.

In the third and final part (Chapter 8), I examine the two accounts of pilgrimage that bookend this period, the *Bordeaux Itinerary* and the *Itinerary of Egeria*, as forms of spatial practice. I consider the authors’ engagement with text and topography as a means of navigating the physical and ideological components of space. I examine the degree to which accounts of pilgrimage attest to the significance of Jerusalem as a venerable destination, while maintaining individual agency in composing and conveying sacred topography from the pilgrim’s own perspective to a far-off audience.

In conclusion, I revisit the transition from a Utopian to a Locative orientation to Jerusalem in late-antique Christianity. I suggest an increased interest in the real Jerusalem did not supplant spiritual and eschatological concerns. Rather, fourth-century Jerusalem is best understood as the ‘in-between’ map, where the real and invisible, conceived and lived, earthy and heavenly realms were intermixed.
1.5. Topographical Notes on Jerusalem

Finally, a brief outline of the topography of Jerusalem is in order, as this will help to contextualise the urban developments to be discussed in this study.\textsuperscript{139} We can identify much of Jerusalem by its primary hills and valleys. The city has three valleys, which run north to south. The Valley of Hinnom to the West and the Kidron Valley to the East mark the approximate natural borders for the city during our period of interest. The third valley, the Tyropoeon Valley, intersects the city in the middle, separating the eastern and western ridges. The eastern ridge, later synonymous with Mount Moriah, is the site of the Jewish Temple and Herodian Temple Mount. The western ridge, in contrast, would be associated with various Christian sites of sacred significance over the course of the fourth century CE. The southwestern hill was referred to as Mount Zion, while the northwestern peak would be associated with Golgotha and the events of Christ’s life, death, and resurrection. In addition to the three hills to the west of the Kidron Valley, the Mount of Olives lies outside of the topographical limits of Jerusalem to the east.

\textsuperscript{139} See Topographical Map of Jerusalem in the Appendix (Figure 1).
2. Jerusalem to Aelia Capitolina: Aspects of Urban Change before the Constantinian Period and its Impact on Christianity: 70-325 CE

In the Introduction, I highlighted a shift in late-antique Christianity towards a more place-based form of devotion. This transition, what R.A. Markus referred to as a move from the Utopian to the Locative, is particularly clear in the case of Jerusalem in the fourth century.\textsuperscript{140} However, the reason for this development, as well as the ‘lived’ experience of the city itself, has been challenged, particularly as it relates to the influence of the emperor Constantine.\textsuperscript{141} Therefore, in the first part of this study (Chapters 2 and 3), I will establish the city’s wider ‘biography’ through its spatial and historical context.\textsuperscript{142} In doing so, I will consider the impact of urban change on early Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem before and after the reign of Constantine (70 CE – 385 CE).

In this chapter, I examine the period before the reign of Constantine. I will briefly sketch Hasmonean and Herodian periods of Jerusalem’s history on until the city’s destruction in 70 CE. I then turn to the years encompassing the Jewish Wars (70-135 CE), which saw a comprehensive deconstruction of the urban landscape and depletion of its population. I complete my survey with the systematic reorganisation of the city as Aelia Capitolina during the reign of Hadrian. Finally, having established this spatial and historical background, I consider the impact of this urban change on early Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem. The Jewish wars and the

\textsuperscript{140} See Chapter 1.1; Markus (1994). See also Smith (1978).
\textsuperscript{141} Chapter 1.1.
\textsuperscript{142} See note 64 above.
establishment of Aelia Capitolina prompted a tendency toward a spiritualised, or Utopian, view of Jerusalem.

2.1. Pre-70CE: Jewish Jerusalem

The city of Jerusalem did not initially have any significance in the Hebrew Scriptures. In its earliest iteration, Jerusalem was a Canaanite “city of foreigners”. It was not until the reign of David, who according to biblical tradition “set out for Jerusalem against the Jebusites who inhabited the region”, that the city gained a political and religious connection to the kingdom of Israel. David’s decision to conquer the city was motivated by an ambition to create a new capital. The city, then called Jebus, was conveniently situated centrally between the northern and southern tribes, in an easily defensible position and with easy access to natural resources. The city became central to the Davidic dynasty as Jerusalem, the “City of David”. While politically important, Jerusalem did not yet carry a sense of sacred significance. Jerusalem’s ‘holiness’ was imported with the Ark of the Covenant, which was brought into the city in royal procession. However, it was not until the construction of the Temple during the reign of Solomon that Jerusalem became the
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143 Japhet (1999); Eliav (2005), 1-8.
144 Judges 19:12. However, it was not one of the places that the patriachs visited, notes Japhet (1999), 5.
146 This was also a conscious effort to move the capital away from Hebron, the capital of the tribe of Judah. Eliav (2005), 5; Goldhill (2005), 19-41.
147 Japhet (1999), 6-7; Eliav (2005), 5.
148 This is the sentiment expressed in Japhet (1999), 7.
149 2 Sam. 6:6-10. Japhet (1999) called this “contrived sanctification” (p. 7). See also Stroumsa (2009), 321.
religious, social, and political heart of Israel.\textsuperscript{150} 

The destruction of the Temple during the Babylonian invasion in 586 BCE and the Persian decree to resettle and rebuild under Cyrus a half century later ushered in the era of the “Second Temple”. During this period, Jewish communities settled across the Near East and Mediterranean experienced a physical separation from the Temple, though maintaining connection through ritual practice, frequent pilgrimages, and a shared sense of religious identity and memory.\textsuperscript{151} Therefore, the ideological importance of the Temple in Jewish thought and practice endured. Throughout the Hellenistic, Hasmonean and Herodian periods,\textsuperscript{152} the Temple remained central to Jewish identity and foundational to the prominence of Jerusalem as a religious centre.

The memory of the First Temple period was integral to Hasmonean ideology.\textsuperscript{153} Inspired by the judges and kings of ancient Israel, the Hasmoneans took on the roles of both ethnarchs and high priests.\textsuperscript{154} Fervour in religious policies converged with a political desire for territorial expansion. In addition to an extension of the boundaries

\textsuperscript{150} Even so, it was not until the reign of Josiah, that religious restrictions made the Temple exclusive in Jewish worship (2 Kings 23). The exception to this is the Temple of Onias, as is noted in Goldenberg (2006), 192.

\textsuperscript{151} On the Jewish diaspora during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see Barclay (1996), Collins (2000), and Gruen (2009).

\textsuperscript{152} The integration of Judaea into the Hellenistic orbit, first under the Ptolemies and later under the Seleucids, introduced elements of Hellenistic culture and architecture into Jerusalem. However, the reign of the Seleucid King, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, might have taken this further than was welcome. The reforms of Antiochus and his appointed high priest, Jason, are recorded in 2 Maccabees 4. The end of the Seleucid period came when Epiphanes reportedly plundered the Temple treasuries in a fit of destruction after an unsuccessful campaign in Egypt (1 Macc. 1:20-40). Then, the city was reportedly emptied and made once again a “dwelling of strangers” (1 Macc. 1:39). The events ignited the Maccabean rebellion, which culminated in the Temple’s re-consecration by Judas Maccabeus in 164 BCE (1 Macc. 4:36-58, 2 Macc. 10:1-9). However, it was not until 141 BCE that his brother, Simeon, seized the Acra and finally eliminated Seleucid control in Jerusalem (1 Macc. 14:25-15:9). On these events, see Schürer (1973), 146-54, 174-88; Levine (1997); (2002), 70-90.

\textsuperscript{153} Levine (2002), 91-149.

\textsuperscript{154} Levine (2002), 95; Galor and Bloedhorn (2013) 65.
of Judaea, the Hasmoneans revitalised Jerusalem through various urban projects.\footnote{Levine (2002), 95-6; Alexander (1999), 107.} New walls expanded the city limits. In the second century BCE, under the reign of John Hyrcanus I or Alexander Jannaeus, the so-called “first wall” enclosed the southwestern region (the modern-day Armenian and Jewish quarters) within the city boundaries.\footnote{Josephus, \textit{de Bello Judaico} 5.142-145. See also Levine (2002), 106-7; Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 69; Geva (1993a), 724-9.} The “second wall”, built under Hyrcanus II, then expanded the city to the northeast.\footnote{Josephus, \textit{Bell. Jud.} 5.146. Galor and Bloedhorn (2013) noted that this likely was not to accommodate population expansion but was a defensive measure to protect the Baris and Temple Mount (p. 71). See also Levine (2002), 109; Geva (1993a), 719. See map of Jerusalem during the Second Temple Period for the first and second wall in the Appendix.} A new palace and other public infrastructure projects were also completed.\footnote{Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 65.} While the Temple likely also underwent some renovations, it was not until 23/22 BCE that it received a significant overhaul during the reign of Herod I.\footnote{In 63 BCE Pompey sieged Jerusalem under the pretence of brokering peace between feuding Hasmonean brothers (Josephus, \textit{Bell. Jud.} 1.123-154; \textit{Antiquitates Judaicae} 14.4). This culminated in a siege of Jerusalem and Pompey’s entrance into the Holy of Holies (Tacitus, \textit{Historiae} 5.9; and Cicero, \textit{Oratio Pro Flacco} 28). After a period of unrest, the last Hasmonean king died in 37 BCE and the Idumaean tetrarch, Herod I, assumed the throne. Herodian rule, which was interspersed with periods of Roman rule under a procurator, lasted, at least nominally, until the death of Herod Agrippa II around 100 CE. However, the Jewish and Herodian periods of Jerusalem’s history primarily ended in 70 CE, when the Roman siege and invasion laid waste to much of the city and its famous Temple. For the history of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty, see Stern (1974); (1982); Pearce (2002); Levine (2002), 151-281; Peleg-Barkat (2019).}  

### 2.1.1. The Herodian Temple Mount\footnote{Safrai (1976); Bahat (1999) and (2008).}

Herod’s legacy was primarily related to his various building projects in Jerusalem, Caesarea and beyond. While Jerusalem decreased in political authority following the development of the coastal city of Caesarea during the Herodian period, it maintained much of its religious character and prominence. Considered the “most
famous city in the East” by Pliny the Elder, Jerusalem boasted multiple palaces, a theatre, and a hippodrome. However, the most memorable feature was the massively refurbished Second Temple.

The Temple itself was finished in a year and half, in time for an important anniversary of Herod’s rule. However, the entire project, namely the construction of the Temple Mount, was not completed for another seventy-five years. The accounts of Josephus and the post-destruction tractate of the Mishnah, the Middot, indicate how the Temple dominated the urban topography of Jerusalem. In his design, Herod sought to emulate both the biblical image of the First Temple as well as elements of Graeco-Roman architecture. Following a Hellenistic model, the Temple platform boasted a large temenos, trapezoidal in shape and surrounded by porticoes on all sides. To accommodate this, Herod expanded the Temple Mount to the north, south, and west – virtually beyond the natural boundaries of Mount Moriah.

The defining feature of the Temple Mount was its distinctive, concentric
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161 longe clarissima urbium orientis. Pliny, Historia Naturalis 5.70 (LCL 352, 274).
162 On the Hasmonean palace, see Josephus, Ant. Jud. 2.8.11. On Herod’s Palace, see Bell Jud. 5.176-181. On Helena of Adiabene’s palace, see Bell Jud, 5.253.
163 Josephus, Ant. Jud. 15.8.1; Chronicon Paschale. See also Patrich (2002a).
164 Josephus, Bell. Jud. 2.44; Ant. Jud. 17.10.2. For a comparative discussion of the Hippodrome in Caesarea and elsewhere in Palestine, see Patrich (2002b).
165 Josephus, Ant. Jud. 15.11.6.
166 Patrich (2009), 50.
167 Middot. For a use of the Middot in reconstructing the Temple, see Patrich (1986).
169 Josephus, Bell. Jud. 5.190-192; Mid. 2.1. Patrich (2009) measured this as more than 135,000 sq. m. (p. 54). See also Foerster (1976); Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 77-8.
170 Josephus, Bell. Jud. 5.188. See also Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 77; Patrich (2009), 50; Bahat (1999), 44.
organisation of sacred spaces, with increasing levels of prohibition. This culminated in the most central and most exclusive space, the ‘Holy of Holies’, within the Temple precinct. The division between the outer and inner courts was marked by a partition and Greek and Latin inscriptions prohibiting gentile access on the penalty of death:

No foreigner shall enter within the balustrade of the Temple, or within the precinct, and whosoever shall be caught shall be responsible for (his) death that will follow in consequence (of his trespassing).

The Temple itself was centrally placed within the inner courts and was separated into three parts, with additional levels of exclusivity. The Temple structure, apart from its dimensions, was not described in any detail. However, representations of the Temple on Bar Kokhba coinage provide clues to its appearance. In addition to its various courtyards, the Temple proper was divided into two rooms. The first contained the most important objects in Second Temple Judaism, what Jospehus called the “most wonderful works of art, universally renowned: a lampstand, a table, and an altar of incense”. The second, in contrast, contained nothing. Josephus remarked: “In this stood nothing whatsoever: unapproachable, inviolable, invisible to all, it was called
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171 See also the Tanhuma to Leviticus, which applies these concentric circles to the Eretz Israel as the navel of the world. On this, and the idea of the omphalos in Jewish thought, see Alexander (1999) and Sivan (2008), 191-2. See also Chapter 2.1.2, below.

172 CIIP 1.1, 2 (Cotton et al. (2010), 42); Bickerman (1947), 388. It is mentioned in Josephus, Ant. Jud. 15.11.5; Bell. Jud., 5.193-196; Mid. 2.3. See also Llewelyn and van Beek (2011); Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 88; Montieth (2017).

173 See Figure 3 in Appendix. Avi Yonah (1968); Levine (2002), 242.

174 The easternmost part was Women’s Court. Despite its name, this was where the communal practices occurred. The court contained four corner chambers: The Chamber of the Lepers and the Nazirites, The Chamber of Wood and Oil. To the West of the Women’s Court (and accessible only to Jewish men and priests) were the Courts of the Israelites and Priests. Separating the Court of the Israelites from the Court of the Priests was a “low stone parapet” (Josephus, Bell. Jud. 5.226, tr. Thackeray, LCL 210, 71) This allowed men to bring sacrifices and watch the events taking place in the visible priestly area. In the western portion of the Court of the Priests was the Temple structure itself; this was situated on a platform, and accessible by stairs.

2.1.2. The Significance of the Temple

During the early Roman period, the Jewish Temple was foundational to the prominence and prosperity of Jerusalem. The Temple composed the city’s core. From a religious perspective, it was the *axis mundi*, the centre of the world and the connecting point between God and His people. The Hasmonean *Book of Jubilees* coupled the city’s geographical position with the memory of Noah and his offspring:

And he (Noah) knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies and the Lord’s dwelling place, and Mount Sinai the center of the desert, and Mount Zion the center of the navel of the earth: these three were created as holy places facing each other.

The Greek concept of the navel, or ὀμφαλός, was reconfigured within a Jewish framework. Jerusalem, in contrast to Delphi, was the central point in the Jewish view of the world. Josephus asserted, “The city of Jerusalem lies at its very centre [μεσαιτάτη], for which reason the town has sometimes, not inaptly, been called the ‘navel [ὁμφαλὸν]’ of the country.” In later rabbinic literature, geography was ordered according to various circles of holiness that extended from the Temple:

As the navel is in the middle of a human being, the Land of Israel (*Eretz Israel*) is the navel of the world … Just as *Eretz Israel* is located in the centre of the world so is Jerusalem in the centre of *Eretz Israel*, the temple in the centre of Jerusalem, the holy of holies in the centre of the temple, the ark at the centre of the holy of holies, and right in front is the foundation-stone of the whole of the universe.

178 *Jubilees* 8.19, tr. Alexander (1999), 104. The use of ‘Mount Zion’ here was a reference to Jerusalem rather than the southwestern hill (see Chapter 5.1.1, below). Venter (2008) argued that this passage of *Jubilees* was a rethinking of the geography in *Genesis* 10.
179 Alexander (1999), 104-5.
181 *Tanhuma to Leviticus, Qedoshim* 10, tr. Alexander (1999), 114.
From a social and commercial perspective, the Temple courtyards effectively served as the city’s forum and *agora*.\(^{182}\) Despite its shortcomings in raw materials, water supply, and trade networks, the city flourished on account of its Temple.\(^{183}\) Jews frequented the Temple for worship, prayer, and ritual cleansing.\(^{184}\) In addition, biblical commandment required that every adult Jewish man was required to go to Jerusalem three times a year.\(^{185}\) Therefore, during the major festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, Jerusalem filled with crowds of visiting pilgrims.\(^{186}\) The city benefitted greatly from the revenues of pilgrimage. In addition to the purchasing of sacrifices and accommodation, donations to the Temple are also well-attested.\(^{187}\) The demand of Temple sacrifice governed the subsistence strategies of the surrounding region of Judaea.\(^{188}\) A recent analysis of food remains has suggested that a considerable portion of the sheep and goats consumed in Jerusalem were imported from different regions to accommodate such a high demand.\(^{189}\)

While some recent studies have de-emphasised the centrality of Judaea and the Temple in diaspora communities,\(^{190}\) shared religious practice and ideology maintained

\(^{182}\) Keddie (2019), 162.  
\(^{184}\) Safrai (1976), 876-7.  
\(^{185}\) *Exodus* 23:17; *Deuteronomy* 16:16.  
\(^{186}\) During the Passover festival of 66 CE, Josephus suggested that 2,700,000 pilgrims descended upon Jerusalem (Bell. *Jud.* 6. 428). See also Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 1.69.  
\(^{188}\) Lapin (2017); Keddie (2019), 161-96.  
\(^{189}\) Hartman *et al.* (2013).  
\(^{190}\) Schwartz (1996); Hacham (2011) and Tuval (2012).
for many a means of connection.\textsuperscript{191} Jewish connection to the Temple was not just exercised through the practice of pilgrimage, but also vicarious participation through the sending of donations and representatives.\textsuperscript{192} Nevertheless, the sort of mass international pilgrimage noted in first-century Jerusalem CE and the solidarity it encouraged was a distinguishing, and potentially threatening, phenomenon within the Roman imperial system.\textsuperscript{193}

In contrast to other prominent temples in the East, worship at the Jewish Temple did not include emperor worship.\textsuperscript{194} However, daily sacrifices offered for the wellbeing of the emperor were maintained as expressions of loyalty to Rome.\textsuperscript{195} Nevertheless, the Temple remained a setting of political tension.\textsuperscript{196} The Maccabean revolt signified the consequences of external intervention in Temple practice.\textsuperscript{197} Again after Herod’s death in 4 BCE, his son Archelaus’ presence in the Temple during Passover caused riots that continued at Pentecost the following year.\textsuperscript{198} Reminiscent of Antiochus IV’s desecration of the Temple, the emperor Caligula’s attempt to erect a statue of himself in the Jewish Temple was met with similar unrest.\textsuperscript{199} Finally, the procurator Gessius Florus’ theft of silver from the Temple treasury became an igniting

\textsuperscript{191} Johnson (2012), 108.

\textsuperscript{192} Philo,  \textit{Spec. leg.} 1.78; \textit{Legatio ad Gaium} 156, 216, 312. See also Trotter (2019).

\textsuperscript{193} Goodman (1999); Rives (2005) referred to this as a “Shadow civitas”. See also Magness (2008).

\textsuperscript{194} Keddie (2019).

\textsuperscript{195} Philo,  \textit{Spec. leg.} 1. 137, 157; Josephus, \textit{Bell. Jud.} 2.409; see also Tacitus, \textit{Hist.} 5.5. It is likely that this was funded by the emperor, argued Keddie (2019), 164.

\textsuperscript{196} Rives (2005), 150.

\textsuperscript{197} See note 152 above.

\textsuperscript{198} Josephus, \textit{Ant. Jud.} 17.9 (200-218); See also Bahat (1999), 39-41.

\textsuperscript{199} Philo,  \textit{Legat.} 188; Josephus, \textit{Bell. Jud.} 2.184. See note 152 above.
element for the First Jewish Revolt. A termination in sacrifices for the emperor followed shortly thereafter.

2.2. 70-135 CE: The Jewish Wars

The First Jewish War ended in 70 CE with the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of its Temple. This was a catastrophic end to the tensions between the Jewish people and the Roman Empire that reverberated in the social, political, and religious spheres of first-century Palestine. The city’s complete destruction was with few exceptions. Only the Herodian towers and Palace were spared for Roman use. In addition to the architectural impact, the siege resulted in great human loss. It seems that only a small portion of the population remained in Jerusalem after its fall. Participants in the revolt had their properties confiscated, and many fled elsewhere. An epitaph found in Puteoli, Italy refers to one such survivor: “Claudia Aster, captive of Jerusalem”.

In addition, epigraphic evidence dating after the First Jewish War shifts almost exclusively to Latin and relates predominantly to the prolonged residence of the Legio

---

201 This “laid the foundation of the war (τοῦτο δ’ Ἰν τοῦ πρὸς Ἰουδαιοῦ πολέμου καταβολή)” according to Josephus, Bell. Jud. 2.408, ed. and tr. Thackeray (LCL 203, 482).
202 While Josephus interpreted the destruction of the Temple as an unintended consequence of the hostilities, this portrayal runs contrary to most historical accounts, which found Titus culpable for the events. See Talmud Gittin 56b; Cassius Dio, Historia Romana 65.2; Orosius, Historiarum Adversum Paganos 7.9.5-6. The origins of this perspective might have arisen from the fifth book of Tacitus’ Hist. On this see Barnes (1977); Rives (2005), 146-7.
203 Josephus, Bell. Jud. 7.1-5.
204 Josephus, Bell. Jud. 6.420.
This suggests that a considerable, immediate change had occurred in the population and its administration after 70 CE. The destruction of Jerusalem also led to a regional reorganisation; the area became a Praetorian province. The term Judaea also went out of circulation, as it was replaced with terms such as Idumaea and Palaestina. In sum, the years between the Jewish Wars offer little information. However, the lack of evidence further confirms the comprehensive deconstruction and depopulation of the city after the siege of 70 CE.

2.3. 135-325 CE Roman Aelia Capitolina

The city re-entered the historical record during the reign of Hadrian, whose various imperial tours and urban projects included Jerusalem within their scope. It was then that Jerusalem became Aelia Capitolina – named after both the emperor himself and Jupiter Capitolinus. The city underwent a great deal of urban and demographic reconfiguration. While this change is well-attested, the dating and

207 Josephus, Bell. Iud. 7.1-5. Monumental and funerary inscriptions also suggest the legion’s occupation of Jerusalem, such as a building inscription attributed to Vespasian and Titus collected in Bieberstein and Bloedhorn (1994), ii, 397, and CIIP 1.2, 712 (Cotton et al. (2012), 11-12). See also the funerary inscription of Tiberius Claudius Fatalis in Bieberstein and Bloedhorn (1994), ii, 372 and CIIP 1.2, 734 (Cotton et al. (2012), 36-8).

208 Bieberstein (2007), 137.

209 See Mor (2016), 21. For a discussion of Judaea’s change in status to that of a provincia consularis in 117 CE, see Schäfer (1990), 282-3; Ben Zeev (2018).

210 As our primary witness, it is significant that Josephus started to refer to the area as Palaestina after 70 CE. See Schwartz (2005); Magness (2008), 10.

211 While the city re-emerges most clearly in the reign of Hadrian, an inscription relating to the vexillatio of the legio III Cyrenica indicates the presence of a second legion in Jerusalem during Trajan’s Parthian war (117/8 CE). The presence of the legion might have been related to the uprisings in the Jewish Diaspora. See Bieberstein and Bloedhorn (1994), ii, 166-7; CIIP 1.2, 705 (Cotton et al. (2012), 1-2). In addition, Ben Zeev (2018) drew attention to a military inscription recently discovered in Autun, describing Marcus Titius Lustricus Bruttianus, head of the “Jewish and Arabic armies” during the reign of Trajan (pp. 85-6). On this, see also Mignon, Lavergne, and Rossignol (2013).

212 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4.6. The gens of the emperor was commonly associated with any colonia he founded. See Bieberstein (2007), 143-4.
intentions of this imperial project vary in the historical accounts. According to the earliest version of the foundation story, Cassius Dio’s *Roman History*,213 the emperor’s establishment of Aelia Capitolina coincided with one of Hadrian’s imperial tours, most likely his well-known journey to the East from 128 to 132 CE.214 According to the *Roman History*, the emperor’s decision to rebuild the city and construct a temple to Jupiter on the Temple Mount were also igniting factors for the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135 CE). In contrast, Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*215 placed the founding of Aelia Capitolina as a consequence of the Bar Kokhba revolt, emphasising a punitive character in Hadrian’s intervention in Jerusalem.216 Lastly, Epiphanius of Salamis’ *On Weights and Measures*217 offers a third timeline for the events. Epiphanius placed the founding of Aelia Capitolina to much earlier in Hadrian’s reign, in 117 CE.218 However, while recent excavations of the Eastern Cardo might corroborate this earlier


214 However, as Capponi (2010) noted, this account “does not carry any indication of dates” (p. 497). Because of the general reliability of the *Hist. Rom.* and the author’s proximity to the time of Hadrian, the account had traditionally gone unquestioned. However, more recent examinations of the account, which now solely exists in an epitome from the 11th century Byzantine author, Xiphilinus, have questioned its reliability on these most basic elements of the foundation account. Eliav (1997) best summarised the arguments against the claim made in the epitome of Cassius Dio’s account. However, some criticisms of using the *Hist. Rom.* had been made earlier in Gréville (1972), 227-8, and Bowersock (1980). See also Mallan (2013) for a more general treatment of Xiphilinus’ *Epitome*.


216 The expulsion of the Jews from Judaea is also implied in Eusebius’ depiction of the Christian Church of Jerusalem in his *Hist. Eccl.* 4.5. A similar turn of events might also be found in the Ta’anit, which noted on the Ninth of Ab, after Bethar was captured (130 CE), “the city of Jerusalem was ploughed” (4.6.) This reference to ploughing perhaps refers to the ceremonial drawing of a new sacred perimeter [*pomerium*] for the Roman *colonia*, which was also depicted in the earliest coinage of Aelia Capitolina (Meshorer (1989), 21, 70, n. 2. Eshel (1997); (2000); Eshel and Zissu (2002), 172). See also Smallwood (1981), 459, and Zissu and Eshel (2016), 388-9, for comparisons between these sources.


date,\textsuperscript{219} it ultimately rests on a miscalculation.\textsuperscript{220}

Instead, it is thanks to numismatic and epigraphic evidence that the foundation of Aelia Capitolina can more conclusively be dated before the Bar Kokhba revolt. A recently discovered hoard in the el-Jai cave of the Judaean desert contained coinage from both Aelia Capitolina and Bar Kokhba. This discovery confirmed that the \textit{colonia} was founded before 135 CE.\textsuperscript{221} In addition, two halves of a monumental inscription, only recently combined,\textsuperscript{222} denote the erection of a monument on behalf of the \textit{Legio X Fretensis} for the occasion of Hadrian’s visit to the city.\textsuperscript{223} The regnal year listed on the inscription secures its dating between December 129 and December 130 CE.\textsuperscript{224} However, the fact that the legion, not a municipal representative, welcomed the emperor suggests that the \textit{colonia} had not yet been established. It remains possible that

\textsuperscript{219}Refuse collected alongside a retaining wall between the preparation of the road and its eventual paving suggests that the project began early on in Hadrian’s reign. The material found dates to the late-first and early-second centuries. See Weksler-Bdolah, \textit{et al.} (2012); Weksler-Bdolah (2014).

\textsuperscript{220}In the previous section, Epiphanius had miscalculated the destruction of Jerusalem – the date on which this founding forty seven years later is based. Epiphanius noted that Jerusalem was destroyed in the “50th year after the Crucifixion of Christ (\textit{μετὰ πεντηκοστὸν ἔτος τῆς Χριστοῦ σταυρώσεως}) minus 3 months”. Epiphanius’ date of the crucifixion in the 18th year of Tiberius (31/32 CE) provides an incorrect date for Jerusalem’s destruction, 81/2 CE. This is well summarised and considered in light of other historical and epigraphic evidence in Baker (2012). Cf. Di Segni (2014).

\textsuperscript{221}Eshel and Zissu (2002) detail the hoard of 16 coins, which included two Aelia Capitolina coins (11 and 12) and four coins of Bar Kokhba (13,14,15, and 16). The coins, deposited before the end of the revolt, suggest that the Aelia Capitolina coins were minted before 135 CE. See Meshorer (1967), 92-3; Eshel and Zissu (2002), 174.

\textsuperscript{222}The left side of the stone, first published by Clermont-Ganneau (1903), 486-9, is also collected in \textit{CIIP} 1.2, 715 (Cotton \textit{et al.} (2012), 14-5). However, the right-hand side of this stone was recently discovered in 2014 and is discussed in Cotton and Ecker (2018/9), (2019); Ecker (2019). While some (Magness (2000) and Avni (2005)) have suggested that the inscription might have been related to a monumental arch at the old city limits of the “Third Wall”, Gibson and Nagorsky (2016), have shown that this is likely not the case.

\textsuperscript{223}Imp(eratori) Caesar[ ]divi[ ]Traiani[ ]Parthic(i) fil(io) divi Nervae nep(oti) | Traiano [Hadri]ano August(o) | pont(ifici) ma[xi]m(o) trib(unicia) pot(estate) XIII[II] | c(o(n))s(uli) III P(atri) P(atriae) | L[eg(io) X Fretensis (2nd hand) Antoniniana].

the preparatory work began in the early years of Hadrian’s reign, however the *colonia* was only officially established during his visit to Jerusalem in 129/130 CE.\(^{225}\)

While the date of the foundation has become more conclusive in recent years, the intentions behind Hadrian’s imperial project remain widely disputed.\(^{226}\) Much of this debate relates to the validity of Cassius Dio’s *Roman History* and state of the Temple Mount in Aelia Capitolina. Contrary to the turn of events recorded in the *History*, the urban composition suggests that imperial attention was situated westward – on the legionary camp and *forum*. Hadrian’s policy toward the Temple Mount was most likely one of exclusion.\(^{227}\)

### 2.3.1. Urban Composition

As previously noted, Hadrian was not only credited with founding Aelia Capitolina but transforming the ruined Herodian city into a Roman *colonia*.\(^{228}\) However, few monumental inscriptions from the Hadrianic period have actually been discovered in the city.\(^{229}\) For this reason, it is possible that the architectural development of Aelia Capitolina was a gradual process. Nevertheless, the

\(^{225}\) Di Segni (2014), 448-9; Ben Zeev (2018), 97.

\(^{226}\) Smallwood (1981) and Bazzana (2010) suggested that the rebuilding of the city might have been a conciliatory gesture to integrate the Jewish people into his pan-Hellenistic empire. Rives (2005) and Magness (2008), in contrast, interpreted Hadrian’s actions as an adoption of Flavian policies, following the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. Golan (1986) interpreted the foundation of Aelia as the result of ongoing animosity between the emperor and burgeoning Christianity. In this chapter, I adopt the arguments of Isaac (1980), Bieberstein (2007), and Cotton and Ecker (2019), that the foundation of Aelia was a practical response to its resident Legion.

\(^{227}\) The exclusion of the Temple from Roman Jerusalem is convincingly argued in Eliav (2005). However, see also Wharton (2000).

\(^{228}\) On monumental constructions in Roman Jerusalem, see the *Chron. Pasch.* 254 (Dindorf 474).

infrastructural and demographic changes attributed to Hadrian should not be understated.

The primary aspect of urban change associated with the foundation of Aelia Capitolina was a reconfiguration of its infrastructure to conform to the orthogonal pattern of the Roman *colonia*. However, this did not fit the topography of Jerusalem perfectly; the city had two prominent north-south streets: the *Western Cardo* and the *Eastern Cardo*. Both streets were illustrated on the Madaba Mosaic. The *cardines* intersected with the east-west thoroughfare of the city, the *decumanus*. This organisation still composes the basic structure of the Old City of Jerusalem today.

The boundaries of the *colonia* were determined by entrance gates. Two of these gates are still extant; the remnant of a northern gate is located underneath the Ottoman Damascus gate. In addition, the so-called ‘Ecce Homo’ arch belongs to a second triumphal gate located north of the Temple Mount. The *Ecce Homo* arch is perpendicular to the Damascus Gate and likely accommodated east-west traffic.

---


231 Weksler-Bdolah *et al.* (2012); Weksler-Bdolah (2014); (2016); Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 116. Recent excavations of the eastern *Cardo* have greatly developed our understanding of the Roman city. The eastern thoroughfare might have been the primary street of activity in Aelia Capitolina, instead of the traditionally titled ‘*Cardo Maximus*’ to the west, argued Kloner and Bar-Nathan (2016), 51.

232 See Figure 4 in Appendix. The bibliography on the Madaba Mosaic Map is vast; see general studies such as Avi-Yonah (1954), Donner (1992), Piccirillo and Alliata (1999). On Jerusalem, see M.-J. Lagrange (1987), 165–84; Guth (1905): 120–30; Thomsen (1929): 149–74. On the date and purpose of the map, see Donceel-Voûte, (1988). More recent studies include Madden, (2012): 495–513; Eckersley (2016). See also Leal (2018), 123–43 for a contrary opinion on the purpose of Madaba Map.

233 See Figures 4 and 5 in the Appendix.

234 On the Damascus Gate, see Hamilton (1940); Hennessy (1970); Wightman (1989). The origins of this gate – whether a Hadrianic construction or a remnant from the Second Temple period – is debated. See also Geva (1993b), 761; Geva and Bahat (1998); Arnauld-Béhar (1998) and (1999).

Excavations around the Damascus gate have confirmed that Aelia Capitolina was likely not walled until the late third, or early fourth century. In lieu of city walls, the two gates likely defined the urban boundaries of Aelia Capitolina. The *Ecce Homo* arch, located in line with the western wall of the Temple Mount, plausibly defined the eastern boundary. Therefore, the paved area east of the arch, though occasionally associated with a secondary forum, likely belonged to an “(extra)urban” complex north of the Temple Mount.

2.3.1.1. **The Capitoline Temple**

While there is no evidence of pagan practice in Jerusalem during the Second Temple period, this seems to have changed almost instantaneously following the destruction of the Jewish Temple. According to Josephus, Titus ordered a “vast number of oxen” to be sacrificed in celebration of his victory. A complete reconfiguration of the religious demography is then evident in changes to artistic production, faunal remains, and the elimination of ritual baths during the Roman period. In addition, the existence of pagan temples, attested only in literary and numismatic evidence, further illuminates the religious topography of Aelia

---

236 Geva (1993b), 761. The reconstruction of the city’s walls might have coincided with the removal of the legion argued Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 114-15. The reconstruction of the city walls will be discussed in Chapter 3.3.2.

237 Benoit (1971), 162-3; Geva (1993b), 764-5; Bar (1998); Magness (2000), 332. In addition, Gibson and Taylor (1994) interpret a reference to two *demosia* in the *Chron. Pasch.* as evidence of these two forums (p. 70).

238 Vincent and Abel (1912), 24; Wightman (1989), 197-9; Eliav (2005), 99-116. See Figure 6 in Appendix.

239 However, the lack of evidence does not mean absence, noted Fowden (2002).


241 Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 204.
Capitolina. Epigraphic evidence suggests that new cults were introduced by the legionary camp. A dedicatory inscription attributed to the vexillatio of the *Legio III Cyrenaica* attests to the construction of a temple to Jupiter-Sarapis:

To Jupiter the Best and Greatest Sarapis|for the salvation and victory|Of Imperator Nerva Traianus Caesar|Augustus the Best, with the victory|Titles Germanicus, Dacicus, Parthicus, and the Roman People|The vexillation of the third legion Cyrenaica erected this ...

In another Latin dedicatory inscription, we learn of a temple dedicated to a *Genius Africae*, which was also potentially associated with a *vexillatio*. In addition, various religious objects discovered near the Bethesda Pool in the northwest of the city indicate that it was also a place of worship to Asclepius or Sarapis.

A prominent element of the religious topography, found in both literary and numismatic representations of Aelia Capitolia, is the Capitoline Temple. While the name Aelia Capitolina might have been referential to the Capitoline Temple in Rome, to which the *fiscus iudaicus* was directed after 70 CE, it seems that Hadrian’s appellation signified a change in the religious identity and landscape of the city.

---


244 This *legio* was likely stationed in Jerusalem from 116/17 CE. See note 211 above.


246 “For the salvation of the emperor this sanctuary (was dedicated) to the Genius by a vexillation from Africa [GENI | V AFRICE]”. *CIIP* 1.2, 706; tr. Cotton *et al.* (2012), 3. It has been debated whether an abbreviated ‘V’ referred to a ‘vexillatio’. See also Bieberstein and Bloedhorn (1994), 2.127-8; Bieberstein (2007), 138.


248 Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.* 65.7.2; Josephus, *Bell Iud.* 7.218. The *fiscus iudaicus* was reportedly eased during the reign of Nerva.
Coinage circulated after the foundation of Aelia Capitolina depicts a temple to Capitoline gods, as well as the motif of a ceremonial plough. However, given the absence of archaeological evidence, the location of the temple is much debated. Further engagement with the literary sources suggests that Hadrian’s ultimate policy towards the Temple Mount was one of exclusion. In this respect, the most plausible location for the Capitoline Temple was the forum.

### 2.3.1.2. The Temple Mount

With respect to archaeological remains, Roman imperial statuary has been found in excavations near the Temple Mount. The existence of statuary on the Temple Mount is also attested in several later Christian sources. However, there is little architectural or literary evidence for a Roman edifice there. The main exception to this is the previously noted account of Cassius Dio’s *Roman History*:

> At Jerusalem he 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 the god [ἐς τὸν ναὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τόπον] he raised a new temple to Jupiter.

---

249 Bieberstein (2007), 143.

250 See note 216 above, Figures 7 and 8 in Appendix.

251 Peleg-Barkat (2011); Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 125.

252 Origen, *Commentarii Matthaeum* 24:15; *It. Burd.* 591.1-5; Jerome, *Commentarii Isaiah* 2:9, *Commentarii Matthaeum* 24:15. Origen thought the predicted desolation of Matthew’s gospel “took the form of statues of Hadrian and Gaius”. The reference to Gaius likely reflects an earlier event mentioned by Philo and Josephus (see note 200 above), in which Gaius Caligula erected a statue of himself as Jupiter in the innermost area of the Jewish Temple. The *It. Burd.* later referred to two statues of Hadrian on the Temple Mount. While it is likely that the author was confused as to the identity of the two figures, it is possible that one of the statues was Antoninus Pius, as an inscription on the south wall of the Temple Mount describes. Jerome, on several occasions, referred to Roman statuary still in place at the end of the fourth century, such as his commentary on *Matthew* 24:15, in which a statue of Hadrian was compared to an image of Caesar established by Pontius Pilate (Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* 2.169-172; *Ant. Jud.* 18.55-59). However, elsewhere in his *Comm. Isa.*, he referred to a statue of Hadrian and Jupiter on the ruins of the Temple; this was likely an adoption of the earlier instance recalled by Origen. See Murphy O’Connor (2012); Bieberstein (2007), 151.

This reference, which at first glance seems significant, has recently been denounced as a later insertion by the Byzantine author, Xiphilinus.\textsuperscript{254} A related phenomenon can be found in a collection of later Georgian sources, which refer to the Haram al-Sharif as the site of the ‘Capitol’ during the early Islamic Period.\textsuperscript{255} It is convincing, then, that both the Georgian sources and Xiphilinus’ epitome of the Roman History originate from a later, Byzantine tradition that associated the Capitoline Temple with the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{256}

In addition to the Roman History, we might also consider a peculiar reference found in the Epistle of Barnabas, which referred to a rebuilding of the Temple:

> Behold, those who tore down this temple will themselves build it [οἱ καθελόντες τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον αὐτοί αὐτῶν οἰκοδομήσουσιν]. It is happening, for because of their fighting it was torn down by the enemies. Now the very servants of the enemies will themselves rebuild it [νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ύπηρέται οἰκοδομήσουσιν].\textsuperscript{257}

The purpose and interpretation of this puzzling remark is also much debated. It is on account of this phrase that scholars have dated this epistle to the reigns of Nerva,\textsuperscript{258} Trajan,\textsuperscript{259} or Hadrian.\textsuperscript{260} However, in contrast to the Roman History, the Epistle does not share the negative connotation between Hadrian’s project and the Temple Mount. Rather, it was those who tore down the temple [οἱ καθελόντες], who allegedly endeavoured to rebuild it. This has caused some scholars to interpret this as the

\textsuperscript{254} Eliav (1997) compared the two subordinate clauses of the account. The latter clause, Eliav argued, appears to be Xiphilinus’ impression rather than that of Cassius Dio.

\textsuperscript{255} Flusin (1992) and Mango (1992).

\textsuperscript{256} Murphy O’Connor (2012), 155.

\textsuperscript{257} Epistula Barnabae 16.4 (SC 172, 190). Tr. Grant (TAF 3, 131).

\textsuperscript{258} Richardson and Shukster (1983); Clements (2012).

\textsuperscript{259} Horbury (2014), 298-307.

\textsuperscript{260} Carleton Paget (1994); (2006); Hvalvik (1996); Capponi (2010); Bazzana (2010); Sheppard (2017).
emperor’s intended, or perhaps only rumoured, ambition to reconstruct the Jewish Temple. This did not happen in the end; as Epiphanius’ account later asserted matter of factly: “Hadrian intended to build the city, and not the temple.”

Other textual evidence seems to deny, rather than confirm, building activity on the Temple Mount during the Roman period. A common subject in Christian commentary about Jerusalem was the apparent vacancy and dilapidation of the Temple Mount. Eusebius envisioned the redistribution of Temple stones as building materials:

The Romans cultivate it as the rest of the countryside, and we ourselves have seen it ploughed and seeded … Those who live in the city draw on its ruins for materials for private houses, common buildings, and public edifices. Such is the saddening spectacle that any can see: the stone of the temple itself, even those of the once inaccessible sanctuary, are pillaged for the construction of temples to idols or for the erection of places of public display.

The Bordeaux pilgrim adopted a different approach. In their Itinerary, the Temple – the first and longest stop in their tour of Jerusalem – is predominantly imagined. The monuments associated with the Temple were not those of Herod but of Solomon and a prominent object of interest was the altar stained with the blood of Zacharias. While the author dwells on the Temple’s symbolic past, the Itinerary’s brief foray into the present, to the lapis pertusus and the statues of Hadrian, also obliquely refer to Christ’s judgement of desolation on the Temple. Cyril of Jerusalem likewise used

---

261 Bazzana (2010); Sheppard (2017).
263 Much of this was related to the prediction of desolation found in Matthew 24:15. See note 252 above and further discussion in Chapter 7.1.
265 This passage will be revisited in Chapter 8.3.1.
266 Et in aede ipsa ubi templum fuit, quem Salomon aedificavit, in marmore ante aram sanguinem...
the imagery of the Temple as a derelict ruin to promote the eschatological scheme of his Catechetical Lectures.\(^\text{267}\)

... when there does not remain a stone upon a stone of the temple of the Jews. When, therefore, it collapses from extreme old age, or when it is demolished with a view to rebuilding or for any other reason that does away with all the stones ...\(^\text{268}\)

The tendency of Christian writers to depict the Temple as ‘unused’ space served a polemical purpose: the Temple served as prophetic implication of the “abomination of desolation” alluded to in Daniel and the Gospels.\(^\text{269}\) Even so, these accounts still suggest something of the urban reality.\(^\text{270}\) The Temple Mount was likely excluded from Roman Aelia Capitolina, not the site of its most prominent temple. Apart from a few imperial statues, it is likely that the Temple Mount remained a ruin in the landscape of Aelia Capitolina.

### 2.3.1.3. The Forum

Fourth-century references to the Constantinian church on Golgotha are also illuminative of the pre-existent topography of Aelia Capitolina. In the disparaging portrait of Jerusalem displayed in his Epistle 58, Jerome delved into the city’s history, when “pagans worshipped a likeness of Jupiter set up in the place of the resurrection

---

\(^{267}\) On this, see Chapter 7.2.2.

\(^{268}\) ὅταν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον μὴ μείνῃ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἀπόφασιν. ὅταν γὰρ ἢ διὰ τὴν παλαιότητα πτώσις ἢ προφάσεις οἰκουμηνής κατάλυσις ἢ ἐξ τινῶν ἐπεράν παρακολούθησας καθέλη πάντας τοὺς λίθους ... Cyril, Cat. 15.15 (Reischl and Rupp ii, 172-4); tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 62).


\(^{270}\) Hunt (1984) asserted, “The pilgrim’s devotion, we may add, was further charged by the reflection that the sight of the visible remains in some way contributed to confirming the truth of Christian claims” (p. 415).
and a marble statue of Venus on the rock of the cross. In addition to the Roman statuary that remained on the Temple Mount, statues of Jupiter and Venus had previous associations with the site of Golgotha. The connection between Golgotha and a temple to Venus was more thoroughly emphasised by Eusebius in his Life of Constantine. However, he referred to the site as a tomb for dead idols, “contrivances of fraud” and “houses of error” all in the plural. This suggests that multiple places of worship were likely uprooted in the construction process.

Eusebius and Jerome’s remarks imply that the area of activity was likely concentrated in the northwest (the modern-day “Christian Quarter”) of the city. This is furthered by archaeological evidence, which has established a connection between Constantine’s Church and the forum. The construction of the adjacent Alexander Nevsky Russian Orthodox Hostel in the late nineteenth century allowed for the discovery of paved flagstones, now typically regarded as the remnants of the forum of Aelia Capitolina. In addition, L.H. Vincent and F.M. Abel documented the remnants of a triple-arched propylaeum adjacent to the western cardo, in the early twentieth century.

---

271 In loco resurrectionis simulacrum Iovis, in crucis rupe statua ex marmore Veneris a gentilibus posita … Jerome, Epistula 58.3 (CSEL 54, 531-2). Paulinus would later refer to a statue of Jupiter over the site of the passion (Ep. 31.3), however this was likely a misremembering of Jerome’s earlier letter. On the circumstances surrounding Jerome’s Ep. 58, see Chapter 6.4.


274 Gibson and Taylor (1994) argue this was a complex of shrines to Venus (p. 71).

275 Geva (1993b), 763.

276 The relationship between the Church and the forum will be discussed in Chapter 3.2.3.

277 Clermont-Ganneau (1899), 85-115; Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 55-6.
The association was then confirmed during the renovation of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which uncovered the Roman foundations at various parts of the church complex.

Ultimately, the location of the Capitoline Temple on the western forum is plausible, though unprovable. The evidence for a “likeness of Jupiter” from a late fourth-century source is not enough to confirm that this was the location of the Capitoline Temple – so much is also said of the Temple Mount. However, later Christian commentary, which highlighted the “abomination of desolation” fulfilled in the disuse of the Temple Mount, suggests that Roman activity was centred elsewhere. The transition of activity from east to west suggests an alternate perspective of the intentions behind the foundation of Aelia Capitolina. The *colonia* might have been a practical choice to accommodate the resident legion.

### 2.3.1.4. *Legio X Fretensis*

It remains unclear how many people still resided in the city by 130 CE, though the population likely retained only a fraction of its earlier size. While estimates have ranged anywhere from 20,000 to 100,000 residents in Jerusalem on the eve of the first Jewish revolt, the population of Aelia was significantly smaller, with estimates between 4,000 and 15,000. The boundaries of the city were similarly retracted to

---

278 Vincent and Abel (1912), fig. 6. See also Mazor (2017), 75-6.
279 Coüasnon (1974); Corbo (1981); Gibson and Taylor (1994). See Chapter 3.2.3.
280 See note 252 above.
281 See Geva (2014) for a review of the estimates given for the population of Jerusalem (pp. 144-8).
283 See Belayche (2001), 110.
encompass the area of the Old City.\textsuperscript{284} This is also reflected in the epigraphic output; only seventy-eight inscriptions date to the Roman period, in contrast to 704 dating to the Second Temple period and 303 to the Byzantine period.\textsuperscript{285} From 70 CE onwards, the city was, epigraphically speaking, a “Latin Island”.\textsuperscript{286} While inscriptions before this time were primarily in Hebrew, and occasionally in Greek and Aramaic, Latin inscriptions predominate during the period from the First Jewish Revolt to the reign of Constantine. The vast majority of these inscriptions relate to the Roman legion.\textsuperscript{287} This suggests that the makeup of Aelia Capitolina’s population was predominantly related to the legionary camp.\textsuperscript{288}

Ever since J. Germer-Durand’s map of Aelia Capitolina was published at the end of the nineteenth century, most scholars have considered the Camp of the Tenth Legion to be located along the Western edge of the “First Wall”, which was built during the Hasmonean period.\textsuperscript{289} This placed the camp on the southwestern hill in the area close to the Herodian towers – a location that aligns well with Josephus’ location for the camp in his \textit{Jewish War}.\textsuperscript{290} While many scholars still hold this position, little

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{284} See Figures 9 and 10 in Appendix.
\item\textsuperscript{285} \textit{CIIP} 1.2, 705-52 (Cotton \textit{et al.} (2012), 1-57); Seligman (2016) draws comparison to Caesarea Palaestina, which has a very prolific epigraphic record from this period (p. 111).
\item\textsuperscript{286} Millar (1990), 189.
\item\textsuperscript{287} On the Inscriptions of Aelia Capitolina, see \textit{CIIP} 1.2, 705-52 (Cotton \textit{et al.} (2012), 1-57), 707, 712, 715, 717, 721-727 deal specifically with \textit{Lego X Fretensis}. Funerary inscriptions 732-736 explicitly note an association to the military. Only a few funerary inscriptions exist in Greek.
\item\textsuperscript{288} A vexillation of veterans is also attested on coinage. Millar (1990), on account of the \textit{vexilla} for the tenth legion found on colonial coins, argues that the veterans were likely from the tenth legion. In contrast, Friedheim (2007) argued the veterans were likely from the fifth legion \textit{Macedonica} (p. 125).
\item\textsuperscript{289} Germer-Durand (1892), 373; Geva (1984), 247, and (1993b), 758; Eliav (2005), 107; Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 25.
\item\textsuperscript{290} Josephus, \textit{Bell. Jud.} 7.1-2.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
archaeological evidence has surfaced to confirm the location of the legionary camp.\textsuperscript{291} In contrast, material remains associated with the legion, such as coins containing legionary symbols,\textsuperscript{292} bread stamps,\textsuperscript{293} and stamp impressions on roof tiles and brick fragments\textsuperscript{294} have been found in various locations across the Old City.\textsuperscript{295} On account of this, other plausible locations have been suggested, such as southwest of the Temple Mount\textsuperscript{296} and along the Western edge of the Agrippan “Third Wall”.\textsuperscript{297} It has been recently proposed by J. Seligman that the location of a discrete legionary camp might misrepresent the civic organisation of the Roman \textit{colonia} as a whole. There might have not actually been a spatial distinction between camp and \textit{colonia} in Aelia Capitolina. While there is reason not yet to abandon the notion that a legionary camp was located on the southwestern hill,\textsuperscript{298} Seligman’s argument highlights an important aspect about the urban composition of Aelia Capitolina: the \textit{colonia} was essentially oriented around the resident legion.\textsuperscript{299}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{291} Seligman (2016).
\item \textsuperscript{292} Meshorer (1989), 28-9.
\item \textsuperscript{293} \textit{CHIP} 1.2, 755, 756, 757, 761 (Cotton \textit{et al.} (2012), 59-61, 64). See also Di Segni and Weksler-Bdolah (2012); Stiebel (2011).
\item \textsuperscript{294} Geva (2003), (2006); Nenner-Soriano (2010), (2014), (2017); Adler (2011); Behar (2013).
\item \textsuperscript{295} Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 19.
\item \textsuperscript{296} Mazar (2011), 1-8.
\item \textsuperscript{297} Bar (1998).
\item \textsuperscript{298} Weksler-Bdolah (2019b). In this respect, I find it notable that the southwestern hill was not used again until the second half of the fourth century. This suggests some retained use for the Roman legion. This is central to my argument in Chapter 5.2.
\item \textsuperscript{299} Seligman (2016), 108. On account of this, there is reason to adopt the view that the foundation of Aelia was a practical response to its resident legion. See note 226 above.
\end{itemize}
2.3.2. Initial Conclusions

So far in this chapter, I have outlined the primary structural and demographic changes that occurred in Jerusalem during the first centuries of the common era. The key points might be summarised as such: the dominant feature of Herodian Jerusalem was the Temple Mount, which served as the religious, social, and political centre of the city prior to its destruction in 70 CE. After its destruction, the city diminished during the interbellum period. Soldiers of the Legio X Fretensis remained its primary occupants. However, during the reign of Hadrian, the city underwent a significant transformation. This was not only a nominal change; the city was reconfigured to adhere to an orthogonal pattern. The ideological centre of the city moved westward from the Temple Mount to a newly constructed forum in the west. The Temple Mount, in contrast, likely remained a ruin outside the realm of urban activity. This is the spatial and historical context of Jerusalem prior to the fourth century.

Having established this context, I turn to the second inquiry of this chapter. How did these transformations influence ideas about Jerusalem? It is my assertion that the spatial reconfiguration of the historical, earthly Jerusalem had a significant impact on its symbolic representation in early Christian thought. Therefore, in the final part of this chapter, I will reflect on the ways that the Jewish wars and the establishment of Aelia Capitolina prompted a shift towards a non-locative, spiritualised definition of Jerusalem in Christianity before the fourth century.
2.4. Jerusalem and Christianity: 70-325 CE

Jerusalem figured prominently in earliest Christianity as the place of Christ’s death and resurrection and the base for his disciples thereafter.\textsuperscript{300} In this respect, Jerusalem maintained a subtle, geographic prominence in Paul’s writings.\textsuperscript{301} It was also to “the poor” of Jerusalem that funds were collected and presented by Paul during his final trip to the city.\textsuperscript{302} In the retrospective history of the \textit{Acts of the Apostles}, Jerusalem was the authoritative core for the early and expanding Christian community in its first chapters.\textsuperscript{303} Then, the authority of the early Jerusalem community under the “Twelve” was extended to the bishop James the brother of Jesus, who was referred to as an important “pillar” of the Church in Paul’s \textit{Letter to the Galatians}.\textsuperscript{304} However, the city’s destruction in 70 CE, after which most early Christian texts were written, challenged a connection to, and perception of, Jerusalem. Therefore, the events of 70 CE, in addition to the “interbellum period” (70-132 CE) and the aftermath of Bar

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{300} Wilken (1992), 46-7.
\item \textsuperscript{301} \textit{Romans} 11:26; 15:19.
\item \textsuperscript{302} References to this in Paul’s correspondence include \textit{1 Corinthians} 16:3; \textit{2 Corinthians} 8:19; \textit{Galatians} 2:10; and \textit{Romans} 15:25–29. Implicit references to the donation might be found in \textit{Acts} 11:27–30 and 24:17. The “poor” might have been a sort of honorific for the Jerusalem congregation, argued Georgi (1992).
\item \textsuperscript{303} Bruce (1985), 642.
\item \textsuperscript{304} \textit{Galatians} 2:9. This shift is discerned in \textit{Acts} 11:30: as Paul and Barnabas send relief to Jerusalem, they send it to the “elders” [τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους], rather than the apostles. The change in leadership is contextualised by the rule of Agrippa I in the mid-40s, resulting in the death of James (the brother of John) and Peter’s imprisonment (\textit{Acts} 12:1-3). As the authoritative figure in the Jerusalem church during the later apostolic period, it is surprising that James is only explicitly mentioned three times in the \textit{Acts}, as the recipient of Peter’s news (12:17), as the convenor at the Council of Jerusalem (15:13), and as Paul’s host on his final visit to Jerusalem (21:18). On James, see Painter (2004) and Bauckham (1995).
\end{itemize}
Kokhba (132-135 CE), remain an important consideration in the “parting of the ways” between Christianity and Judaism on the subject of Jerusalem.  

2.4.1. Issues of Continuity and Prominence in the Jerusalem Church

The First Jewish Revolt certainly interrupted the continuity between the early Christian community in Jerusalem (those of the “Apostolic period”) and the generations that followed. In this respect, two later Christian writers, Eusebius and Epiphanius, both claimed that the Christian community in Jerusalem was spared from the destruction due to a prophetic warning prompting them to leave the city and seek refuge in Pella. While it is possible that the two texts find their origin in an earlier, Palestinian source, Epiphanius likely based his account on Eusebius’ History. Therefore, the historicity of the post-apostolic congregation of Jerusalem relies heavily, 

305 While scholars continue to debate the context and timing of the “parting of ways” between Christianity and Judaism during and after the “interbellum period”, many now consider the aftermath of the Bar Kokhba revolt, rather than the aftermath of the First Jewish war as a moment of significant change. On 70 CE as a moment of significant change, see Harnack (1908), Brandon (1951), Goodman (2007) and its more recent adoption in Cohen (2017). In contrast, see Wilson (1995), Dunn (1992), Clements (2012) and Frey (2012). See also Schwartz and Tomson (2017), esp. Carleton Paget’s chapter in this volume.

306 The “Apostolic period” can be loosely defined from the crucifixion of Christ around 29-32 CE to the death of his brother James in 62 CE. The transition between the Apostolic and Post-Apostolic periods began in the 60s CE with the deaths of James, Peter, and Paul and ostensibly lasted in Jerusalem until the crucifixion of James’ successor and cousin, Simeon, around the turn of the second century. On this, we are dependent on Eusebius’ Hist. Eccl. 3.32.3-6, though drawing on an earlier account by Hegesippus.

307 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 3.5.3; Epiphanis, Mens. et Pond. 15; Panarion omnium haeresium 29.7.7; 30.2.7.

308 Hegesippus, whom Eusebius used as his source on the death of James, or Aristo of Pella, Eusebius’ source for the Bar Kokha revolt are potential unnamed sources. For Hegesippus, See Lawlor, (1912), 28-34; Simon (1972), 39. For Aristo, see Ludemann (1980). In addition, some scholars have considered two earlier sources, Luke 21:20-24 and the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions as earlier, implicit references to the Pella flight. See Bourgel (2010), Verheyden (1990), 369.
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if not exclusively, on the testimony of Eusebius and his handling of earlier texts. In contrast, the recession of the congregation after this moment casts doubt on Eusebius’ claim that there was a “very important Christian Church in Jerusalem … until the siege of the city under Hadrian”. While Eusebius’ *History* does include an early list of the bishops of Jerusalem, it is problematically organised. Fourteen bishops are named from 62 to 135 CE, with James’ successor and cousin, Simeon, serving for more than half of this period until his death at the age of 120. When compared with the epigraphic evidence discussed above, there is little reason to assert that the Jewish Christian community was spared from the factors that decimated Jerusalem’s population after 70 CE. The loss of prominence in the Jerusalem Church might also be implied in the *Acts of the Apostles*, as the city receded with the emergence of other early Christian centres outside of Judaea. Jerusalem’s regression in the *Acts* might be reflective of its dating and the city’s condition at the time of its authorship. Most scholars date the *Acts* to the period after 70 CE on account of an eschatological

---

310 The Christian presence in Jerusalem before, during, and after the siege of Jerusalem under Vespasian and Titus and the so-called “Flight to Pella” has been the subject of much scholarly debate, deriving much from its negation in Brandon (1951). Brandon’s influence is apparent in Munck (1959), Strecker (1981), Verheyden (1990), and Houwelingen (2003). Ludemann (1980) considered the Pella tradition an attempt by Jewish Christians in Pella to assert apostolic roots (cf. Koester (1989)). Furneaux (1973) disregarded the possibility of a flight to Pella because it was likely that the early Jewish Christian community participated in the resistance efforts on account of their own eschatological/messianic expectations (pp, 121-2). Following Pritz’ (1981) refutation of Brandon’s arguments, Bourgel (2010) has proposed the most recent reinterpretation of the events, suggesting the possibility of historicity.

311 Eusebius, *Dem. Ev. 3.5*. Tr. Ferrar (*TCL* 1.1, 143).

312 Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl. 3.32.3-6*. Horbury (2006) noted that this is during the governorship of Atticus and is best dated to 99-103 CE rather than Eusebius’ dating of 106-7 CE (p. 13). See also Bieberstein (2007), 141.

313 As it relates specifically with one of the ecclesiastical ‘zones’ of fourth-century Jerusalem, the existence of a “small church of God” on Mount Zion at the time of Hadrian, as is suggested in Epiphanius’ *Mens. et Pond.* will be treated separately, in Chapter 5.1 and 5.2.

314 Brandon (1951); Bruce (1985), 660. However, the degree to which Jerusalem plays such a central role in the *Acts* at all might suggest the opposite, argued Bauckham (1995), 426.
reflection of Jerusalem’s destruction in Luke’s corresponding Gospel.\textsuperscript{315}

But when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then recognize that her desolation \textit{[ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς]} is near. Then those who are in Judea must flee to the mountains, and those who are in the midst of the city must leave, and those who are in the country must not enter the city; because these are days of vengeance, so that all things which are written will be fulfilled.\textsuperscript{316}

Issues of continuity are then compounded when we turn to Hadrian’s reconfiguration of Aelia/Jerusalem and the Bar Kokhba revolt. Hadrian’s efforts to repopulate Aelia Capitolina, as well as the imposition of legal prohibitions to Jews living in Judaea, indicates that the demographic shift in Jerusalem was then complete.\textsuperscript{317} On this point, Eusebius’ referred to a definitive change in the demographics of the Jerusalem church, from those “of the Circumcision” to “Gentiles” in his bishop list.\textsuperscript{318} However, given the historical issues associated with this list, it is impossible to determine how much of an impact these events actually had on the Christian congregation of Jerusalem. At any rate, we can be certain that the congregation was certainly changed by 135 CE.

\textbf{2.4.2. Jerusalem in Christianity, the First Three Centuries}

In addition to the practical consideration of prominence and continuity in the early Christian community in Jerusalem, is a broader, theological question: What was the significance of Jerusalem in Christianity before the fourth century? What was the

\textsuperscript{315} A similar argument has been made of \textit{Matthew} 24:15-20, both of which likely derive from \textit{Mark} 13:14-18. A similar hint toward the destruction of the temple is absent from the \textit{Acts}, however, which has led some to consider this an earlier work, e.g. Marshall (1980), 47. For a later date, see Kümmel (1966), 147-51, 156-9.

\textsuperscript{316} \textit{Luke} 21:20-22.

\textsuperscript{317} Turner (1900), 550, and Wharton (1992), 322.

\textsuperscript{318} Eusebius, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 4.6.
impact of the events that radically altered the city’s shape during the first and second centuries? The answer is varied. Even before 70 CE, the Pauline letters reveal an “impulse to detach oneself from the concrete, historical city” and the Temple.\(^{319}\) The “Building of God” in 2 Corinthians was not “built by human hands” but belonged to Christians as ‘temples’, themselves.\(^{320}\) Christians were depicted as “pillars” and “stones”, composing a sort of communal “temple of the living God”.\(^{321}\) This notion, R. Bauckham argued, liberated Christians from the “geographical limitations” of Jerusalem whilst also continuing to maintain a coherence to “the essential structures of the new Temple”.\(^{322}\) Paul also delineated between the earthly Jerusalem and the Jerusalem above, which “is free and … our mother”.\(^{323}\) The notion of the heavenly city later articulated in Hebrews\(^ {324}\) then gained eschatological shape in the book of Revelation as the “New Jerusalem” – the heavenly city to eclipse the earthly one.\(^ {325}\) Nevertheless, the value of earthly city was ultimately treated with ambiguity; while detachment from Jerusalem and the Temple was articulated in Jesus’ dialogue with the Samaritan woman: “A time is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem”, \(^ {326}\) he also wept for Jerusalem.\(^ {327}\) Even after the crucifixion, Jerusalem was regarded as the “Holy City” in Matthew 27:53.

\(^ {319}\) Perrone (1999a), 222; Frey (2012), 457.

\(^ {320}\) 2 Corinthians 5:1-6.

\(^ {321}\) 2 Corinthians 6:14-17.

\(^ {322}\) Bauckham (1995), 423.

\(^ {323}\) Galatians 4.26.

\(^ {324}\) Hebrews 12:22.

\(^ {325}\) Revelation 21.1-2.


\(^ {327}\) Luke 29:41.
A change in the perception of Jerusalem is first evident in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. The *Epistle* has invited much scholarly attention regarding its interpretation of the Jewish Temple and a peculiar and much-debated reference to its rebuilding, noted above. In addition to the historical issues the account poses, the author’s theological reflections on the Jewish Temple and Christianity’s territorial attachment to Jerusalem, has also been of interest. In response to the rumours of the temple’s rebuilding, the author employed an established line of argument: that God does not need to reside in a Temple but has a heavenly residence. In this respect, the author’s adoption of spiritual, heavenly Temple is not, by any means, original. Where the *Epistle* diverged was in its direct reference to the destruction and absence of the Temple as an argument against its rebuilding. In response to these circumstances, the author offered a conclusion that would become commonplace in *Adversus Iudaeos* literature thereafter: “It was made clear that the city and the Temple and the people of Israel were destined to be abandoned.” The reasoning behind this abandonment, it should be noted, was not yet explicitly related to the crucifixion of Christ nor his predictions of the city’s desolation. Nevertheless, the author’s point remains clear: that worship at the Temple and the religious significance of Jerusalem were deemed

---

328 Hvalvik (1996); Carleton Paget (2006), 444; Frey (2012), 463.


330 Carleton Paget (2006); Clements (2012).

331 “… those wretched men, when they went astray, placed their hope on the building and not on their God … as though God has a house!” (16.1). Tr. Clements (2012), 522.

332 “The heaven is my throne, and the earth is the stool for my feet. What sort of house will you erect for me, or what place for me to rest?” (16.2). Tr. Clements (2012), 522.


334 Clements (2012), 525.
The desolate circumstances of Jewish Jerusalem began to be associated more clearly with the crucifixion of Christ and prophetic fulfilment after the foundation of Aelia Capitolina and the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt.\footnote{In this respect, Carleton Paget (2006) asserted, “The author’s appropriation for the Christians of central Jewish symbols such as the land (6) and the temple (16.7f.) is viewed almost monolithically as only ever having had one reference and that is a Christian reference and only ever referring to one covenant, the Christian covenant …” (p. 444). This underscores the polemical tone of the letter.} This is evident in Justin Martyr’s First Apology, which was designed as a treatise to legitimise Christianity within the Roman imperial system. The text, alongside Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho,\footnote{See also Justin’s Dialogus cum Tryphone 110.5.} signifies a more definitive shift in the portrayal of Jerusalem toward the polemical.\footnote{Mach (1996); Clements (2012), 526; Gregerman (2016), 19-58.} On the crucifixion, Justin wrote:

\[
… \text{For people from all races of humankind do await the one who was crucified in Judaea, immediately after whom the land of the Jews was given in captivity to you} \ldots \text{he has made his entry to Jerusalem, where was the great temple of the Jews, which was later destroyed by you. And afterwards he was crucified, in order that the rest of the prophecy might happen} \ldots
\]

While the crucifixion of Christ was not, in actuality, “immediately” followed by the city’s destruction, the two events were combined in give the impression of causation. Melito of Sardis’ On the Pascha similarly dwelt on the culpability of the Jews for the crucifixion of Christ inside of Jerusalem.\footnote{Melito of Sardis, Peri Pascha 72, 93, 94; Harvey (1966). See also Origen, Homiliae in Ieremiam 10.2.} The combination of the two events was obsolete.\footnote{\(\text{ἐκ πάντων γὰρ γενόν ἄνθρωπων προσδόκωσι τὸν ἐν Ἰουδαίας σταυρωθέντα, μεθ’ ὧν εἰθὺς δορὰλωτος ἕμεν ἢ γῇ Ἰουδαίων παρεδόθη. Justin Martyr, I Apologia 32.4-5, ed. and tr. Minns and Parvis (OCT, 2009, 168-71).}
used to confirm the desolate and deserted state of Jerusalem as the fulfilment of divine judgement.\textsuperscript{341}

In contrast, Christ’s ascent to heaven\textsuperscript{342} and the expansion of Christianity elsewhere further dismantled the significance of the earthly Jerusalem:

The saying, ‘he shall send for you a sceptre of power from Jerusalem,’ announces in advance the powerful word which his apostles, going out from Jerusalem, proclaimed everywhere, though death had been decreed against those who taught or simply confessed the name of Christ, which we everywhere both embrace and teach.\textsuperscript{343}

The joint spiritualisation and eschatologisation of Jerusalem was manifest in the self-portrayal of Christians as “spiritual descendants”, a new “Israel”.\textsuperscript{344} This perspective is most evident in the writings of Origen, whose allegorical interpretations of scripture pointed to the Christian Church as offspring of the heavenly Jerusalem:\textsuperscript{345} “For we live, God willing, in Jerusalem … if we have our treasure in heaven, also we have our heart in Jerusalem above.”\textsuperscript{346} In this respect, Origen diverged from his predecessors on the interpretation of \textit{Galatians} 4:26.\textsuperscript{347} His was not an eschatological expectation of a Jerusalem on earth that resembles the Jerusalem ‘above’ but of a heavenly city.

\textsuperscript{341} \textit{I Apol.} 47, drawing on \textit{Isaiah} 1:7 and \textit{Jeremiah} 50.3.

\textsuperscript{342} Ὅτι δὲ ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν … Justin Martyr, \textit{I Apol.} 45.1 (Minns and Parvis, \textit{OCT}, 198).

\textsuperscript{343} Justin Martyr, \textit{I Apol.} 45.5. Tr. Minns and Parvis (2009), 198-9.

\textsuperscript{344} Justin Martyr, \textit{Dial.} 123. With this said, Justin’s interpretation of Jerusalem was ultimately Chiliastic – that Jerusalem would eventually be restored, however only within an eschatological framework. See also Irenaeus’ \textit{Adversus Haereses} 5.35, which interprets \textit{Galatians} 4:26 from this perspective. Wilken (1992), 58; Heid (1993); Perrone (1999a), 227.

\textsuperscript{345} In addition, Origen interpreted the etymology of Jerusalem, “Vision of Peace”, as a reflection of the soul in his \textit{Comm in Ier.} 13.3. See Wilken (1992), 65-78; Perrone (1999a), 225.

\textsuperscript{346} Origen, \textit{Comm. In Ier.} 5.13. Tr. Smith (\textit{FC} 97, 54). This is followed by a reference to \textit{Galatians} 4:26. See also \textit{Comm. in Ier.} 12.3, which draws on \textit{Hebrews} 12:22.

\textsuperscript{347} See n. 344 above. See Wilken’s (1992) interpretation of Origen’s use of the “metropolis” as a potential reaction against rabbi Yahanan ben Nappaha’s interpretation of \textit{Song of Songs} 1:5 (p. 70)
altogether:

If there Israel consists of a race of souls, and Jerusalem is a city in heaven, it follows
that the cities of Israel have for their mother city the Jerusalem in the heavens; so
consequently does Judaea as a whole.\textsuperscript{348}

This configuration, H. Sivan argued, was responsive to the sacred geography
espoused in earlier, Jewish thought.\textsuperscript{349} However, the “amalgam of vertical and
horizontal planes” that made up the concentric ideal of the omphalos of Jerusalem
and Judaea was then reconfigured to the heavenly metropolis, Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{350}

2.4.3. “The Circle and the Ellipse”

As Henry Chadwick observed in his lecture, \textit{The Circle and the Ellipse}, the
prominence and historical reputation of Jerusalem was not entirely lost following the
Jewish wars.\textsuperscript{351} Despite trends towards a spiritualised, “Utopian” vision of Jerusalem,
the earthly city was never wholly eclipsed. The fate of the earthly Jerusalem was not
solely allegorical, but was as matter of eschatological expectation in early Christian
Chiliasm.\textsuperscript{352} In addition, the ecclesiastical legacy of Jerusalem as the “mother of all
churches” was not wholly forgotten.\textsuperscript{353} The Jerusalem church, particularly during the

\textsuperscript{348} εἰ τοῖνον ἔστιν ἐν ψυχῶν γένει ὁ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ τις πόλεις Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἀκολουθεῖ τὰς πόλεις Ἰσραήλ, μητροπόλει χρῆσθαι τῇ ἐν οὐρανῷ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ πόλει Ἰουδαίῳ. Origen, \textit{De Principiis} 4.3.9 (\textit{GCS} 22, 334). Tr. Crombie (\textit{ANF} 4, 371). Here, Origen discusses both Galatians 4:26 and Hebrews 12:22.

\textsuperscript{349} Sivan (2008), 192.

\textsuperscript{350} Sivan (2008), 192.

\textsuperscript{351} See Chadwick (1959).

\textsuperscript{352} Such as is evident in Justin’s response on the rebuilding of Jerusalem in \textit{Dial.} 113. Justin was the first Christian to refer to Israel as the ‘Holy Land’. On this, see Wilken (1992), 57-8. Perrone (1999a) articulates well how even early Christian Chiliasm was still a preference of the symbolic over the historical (p. 226).

\textsuperscript{353} McCauley and Stephenson (1969-70) note this on account of Origen’s description as a “metropolis” (p. 15). However, the sense of this term in Origen’s \textit{de Prin.} is a reference to the Jerusalem ‘above’ as mother in Galatians 4:26. See note 355; Wilken (1992), 71.
episcopacies of Narcissus (180-212 CE) and Alexander (212-25 CE), maintained a
degree of autonomy during the second and third centuries, even if it was ultimately
eclipsed by Caesarea in the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Palestine.\textsuperscript{354}

The remains of Jerusalem’s biblical and Christian origins also continued to
attract the interest of early Christians such as Origen, Alexander of Cappadocia, and
Melito of Sardis.\textsuperscript{355} These early Christian visitors to Jerusalem have been connected
to the classical idea of travelling for the sake of \textit{historia}, however their journeys should
not necessarily be discounted as early Christian renditions of “pilgrimage”.\textsuperscript{356} In these
sparse accounts, the portrayal of the city exhibits a complex combination of curiosity
and contempt. A text attributed to the martyr Pionius reports that he saw the land that
“bears witness even to this day to divine anger”.\textsuperscript{357} In addition, Melito of Sardis, who
reportedly visited Palestine to “set down the facts” of the Old Testament books,
asserted in his \textit{On the Pascha} that “The Jerusalem below was of value, but it is
worthless because of the heavenly Jerusalem”.\textsuperscript{358} Somewhat paradoxically, even when
the earthly Jerusalem was equated with the suffering and judgement of Christ and the
grace of God extended to the “ends of the earth”, early Christians still found value in
visiting this “narrow plot”.\textsuperscript{359}


\textsuperscript{356} See Hunt (1984). The definition of early Christian pilgrimage will be discussed in Chapter 8.1.3.

\textsuperscript{357} \textit{ἐθεασάμην γῆν ὡς τὸν μαρτυρόσαν τὴν θεοῦ γεωμερίαν αὐτὴν ὑπήρχην. Martyrium Pionii} 4.18.
Ed. and tr. Musurillo (\textit{OCT}, 1972, 141).


Christian representation of Palestine shifted to a more positive representation during the early fourth century, when the memory and ritual associated with the cult of the martyrs laid the groundwork for a network of holy places.\textsuperscript{360} Eusebius’ \textit{Martyrs of Palestine} offers unique insight into the legacy of the region, through Eusebius’ proximity to his own city of Caesarea and the martyrs, themselves.\textsuperscript{361} However, the sacred topography sketched by the \textit{Martyrs of Palestine} is centred on Caesarea.\textsuperscript{362} Jerusalem, in contrast, was only mentioned three times. All three mentions came within the exchange between the Roman governor Firmilianus and Pamphilus, introduced at the beginning of this study.\textsuperscript{363} Therefore, this account serves as an apt culmination of the themes explored in this chapter – the removal of Jerusalem from the geographic map and the adoption of a Jerusalem “above” in early Christianity. The urban and demographic reorganisation of the city was exemplified in the Roman governor’s apparent confusion of a place on earth called ‘Jerusalem’. In contrast, the prisoners’ reference to their home in the “Jerusalem that is above [ἡ δὲ ὄνο]”, the “heavenly Jerusalem [Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ]” exemplifies the spiritual and eschatological dimensions of Jerusalem in early Christian thought.\textsuperscript{364} In either case, both parties conceded, “There was no place on earth named Jerusalem”.\textsuperscript{365}

\textsuperscript{360} Markus (1994).
\textsuperscript{361} Penland (2010).
\textsuperscript{362} Irshai (2011), 27.
\textsuperscript{363} Eusebius, \textit{Mart. Pal.} 11. See also Hunt (1982), 4-5
\textsuperscript{364} Eusebius, \textit{Mart. Pal.} 11.9 (\textit{SC} 55, 159). Tr. Lawlor and Oulton (1927), 385.
\textsuperscript{365} Irshai (1999), 205.
2.5. Conclusion

Over the course of this chapter, I have surveyed the structural changes that occurred in Jerusalem during the first and second centuries CE and its impact on early Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem. In this respect, the Jewish wars and the establishment of Aelia Capitolina further accommodated the transition towards a spiritualised and eschatologised definition of Jerusalem in the early Christianity before the fourth century. This aligns well with the Utopian orientation of early Christianity, which was suggested by Markus.

However, Markus only brushed the surface of the meaning behind this term. As discussed in the Introduction, J. Z. Smith conveyed the outward, Utopian orientation of religion as one that “test[s] the boundaries of the cosmos”. In this respect, it is comparable to Soja’s “Thirdspace”: an intersection between the real and imagined worlds, where the meanings of space are ultimately negotiated. According to Soja, this was the “terrain … of ‘counterspaces’, spaces of resistance to the dominant order arising precisely from their subordinate, peripheral or marginalised positioning”. Soja’s “Thirdspace” ultimately originates from H. Lefebvre’s ‘Spaces of Representation’. This foundational aspect of Lefebvre’s triad explores how space is adapted, appropriated, and symbolised by its “users”. Though it is a ‘dominated’ space, there is also an element of resistance. It is one that “the imagination seeks to

366 Smith (1978), 103.
367 Soja (1996), 68.
368 See Chapter 1.3 above.
Therefore, the treatment of Jerusalem in early Christianity exemplifies a Utopian orientation in a fuller sense. In light of the destruction, peripheralisation, and ultimate erasure of Jerusalem from the geographic map, the development and articulation of a Jerusalem ‘above’ functioned as a sort of counterspace to urban reality. As the earthly city was being rendered unrecognisable by conflict and resettlement, Christians became increasing focused on the immutable and impermeable notion of a Jerusalem ‘above’.

3. *Aelia Capitolina to Jerusalem: Continuity and Change during and after the Constantinian Period: 325-385 CE*

In the previous chapter, I examined the major urban changes that occurred in Jerusalem during the first and second centuries CE. These alterations, which remained in place until the fourth century, had a significant impact on early Christian interpretations of the city. In addition to a loss of prominence and continuity in the Jerusalem Church, I considered the prevalence of a non-locative, or Utopian, orientation to Jerusalem in early Christianity.

I now turn to the second half of my spatial and historical survey. Here, I focus my discussion on the Constantinian period, particularly 325-335 CE, which has often been regarded as an important turning point in the history of Jerusalem.\(^{371}\) In this chapter, I interrogate and qualify this assumption. First, I examine the construction of an imperial church as the most notable change to occur in Jerusalem during this period.\(^{372}\) The prominent location of this church – associated both with the site of Golgotha and the urban centre of Aelia Capitolina – sheds light on the intentions behind the imperial project and its spatial significance. However, when considering the urban composition of the city, which seems to have remained largely unchanged for much of the fourth century, there is reason to reframe the ‘turning point’ often credited to Constantine as one of perception, rather than reality. Jerusalem was cast as

\(^{371}\) See Chapter 1.1.

\(^{372}\) Because of its significance in fourth-century Jerusalem and thorough archaeological treatment, the Church on Golgotha (or, more commonly, referred to as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre) will be discussed in both this chapter and the next. In this chapter, I limit my discussion to the spatial context of the church. In Chapter 3, I discuss its architectural layout and significance in the Jerusalem liturgy.
a ‘Christianised’ city, reigniting theological discussion about the significance of the earthly Jerusalem ‘below’.

3.1. Jerusalem during the Reign of Constantine: 325-335 CE

The emperor Constantine’s first and only visit to Palestine was likely as part of Diocletian’s entourage in the first years of the fourth century. However, contrary to the “Eusebian hindsight” with which his biographer treated these early years of his career, we might assume that the emperor shared the ignorance of the governor Firmilianus, whose interaction with Pamphilus of Caesarea has been a touchstone in this study. He likely had little concern for such a small Roman outpost on the peripheries. This had changed, however, by the time of his victory over Licinius and accession as the sole Roman Emperor in 324 CE. Twelve years after the defeat of Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge in 312 CE, Constantine had since proclaimed himself as a benefactor of the Christian God, enacting policies to restore the property of churches and arbitrate ecclesiastical peace. In addition to initiating building projects

---


in the east, in Antioch and Constantinople, the emperor set his sights on Aelia Capitolina.\textsuperscript{379}

Constantine’s interest in the Roman \textit{colonia} was likely stirred at the Council of Nicaea, which assembled in June and July of 325 CE, in conjunction with the emperor’s \textit{Vicennalia}. It was immediately following this council that Eusebius’ \textit{Life of Constantine} transitioned to the building project in Palestine.\textsuperscript{380} It seems likely that this transition was in part influenced by the bishop of Jerusalem, Macarius, who was in attendance and enjoyed the bestowing of special privileges on Jerusalem in Nicaea’s seventh canon.\textsuperscript{381} However, the results of the imperial project and its identification with Golgotha also aligned well with the core concerns of the council and the Emperor’s own desire to restore places “honoured by the bodies of the martyrs”.\textsuperscript{382} Allegedly in pursuit of the tomb of Christ, the emperor ordered the comprehensive demolition of a pagan temple at the centre of the city and a church built in its stead. However, on the turn of events in Jerusalem, we are dependent almost exclusively on Eusebius’ \textit{Life}.\textsuperscript{383} The only supplementary evidence comes from a short reference to

\textsuperscript{378} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.47-50.

\textsuperscript{379} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.25-47.


\textsuperscript{381} Council of Nicaea, Canon 7. The influence of Macarius will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.3.2. See also Hunt (1982), 7; (1997), 411-12; Walker (1990) 276-7; Wilken (1992), 88; Biddle (1999), 65. While it seems quite likely that Macarius had some influence in the imperial project in Jerusalem, the question of the bishop’s involvement is often interpreted in conjunction with a tradition regarding the location of Golgotha. This is especially the case for Biddle (1999).

\textsuperscript{382} Eusebius’ \textit{Vit. Const.} 2.40 (\textit{GCS} 1.2, 65). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 109. Drake (2000) observed that while Macarius was likely interested in locating and memorialising the Tomb of Christ, this was a departure from the emperor’s initial intention, which “undoubtedly had more recent confiscations in mind” (p. 274). In addition to the Christological question, the dispute over the celebration of Easter addressed at the Council of Nicaea would have had relevance to the Jerusalem project, observed Shalev-Hurvitz (2015), 50-2.

\textsuperscript{383} The issues that arise from Eusebius’ \textit{Vit. Const.} will be discussed over the course of this chapter and the next.
the church in the *Bordeaux Itinerary* of 333 CE. Then, the basilica built “by the order of Constantine” seems to have been completed, and its adjacent cisterns and *balneum* were used for baptising Christian initiates.\(^{384}\)

The imperial church building programme also extended to the sites of Christ’s birth in Bethlehem and ascension on the Mount of Olives.\(^{385}\) These latter two constructions, Eusebius noted, were done in memory of the emperor’s mother, Helena, whose journey to Palestine was also a subject of interest in the *Life*.\(^{386}\) While essentially a well-timed *itinera principium* organised to rehabilitate the imperial image, the empress’ presence in Palestine also took on the characteristics of a royal pilgrimage.\(^{387}\) The enduring memory of Helena as both pilgrim and patron of the Holy Land was widely embraced in late antiquity.\(^{388}\) Despite the fact that Eusebius did not make a connection between the Empress and the foremost church of the imperial project, the church on Golgotha, nor any explicit reference to the miraculous discovery of the True Cross, the two were intertwined by the last decade of the fourth century and first years of the fifth with the emergence of a ‘Helena Legend’.\(^{389}\)

---


\(^{385}\) In my discussion, I exclude Constantine’s fourth construction, which was built at Mamre (Eusebius’ *Vit.Const.* 3.51-3). See note 16 above for the reasons for this exclusion. The church of the Nativity in Bethlehem will be discussed briefly in comparison to the *Eleona* and the Mount of Olives in Chapter 6.


\(^{387}\) Holum (1990). In contrast, the potentially subversive nature of Helena’s journey has been suggested in Lenski (2004).

\(^{388}\) Brubaker (1997); Georgiou (2013).

\(^{389}\) The existence of the True Cross as early as 325 will be discussed in Chapter 4.2.3. The sources of the “Helena Legend”, however, date to the end of the fourth century. Ambrose’s *de obitu Theodosii* dates to 395 CE, Rufinus’ *Historia Ecclesiastica* to 402 CE. Paulinus’ *Ep.* 31, to be discussed in the conclusion of this paper, is often dated to 402/3. Gelasius’ *Hist. Eccl.*, though now only available through reconstruction, was originally written early 390s CE. Wallraff, Stutz, and Marinides (2018). On account of this later date, the development of the legend is outside the confines of the present examination. See Drijvers (1992), 147-80. Following Heid (1989), 61, I consider the Helena legend the third phase in the development of the *inventio crucis*, following the sepulcher and the cross.
became a memorable figure, whom later generations of imperial and aristocratic women sought to emulate in their own eastward travels.\(^{390}\)

Despite its apparent use in 333 CE, the Golgotha church was dedicated two years later, on 13 September 335 CE.\(^{391}\) The delay in dedication might well have been a consequence of the ecclesiastical schisms formed after the Council of Nicaea.\(^{392}\) Prior to its dedication, a synod was convened in Tyre to settle the charges made against Athanasius. However, the combination of events seems to have been somewhat forced, as both Eusebius and the later church historians acknowledge that the bishops hastened to Jerusalem shortly thereafter.\(^{393}\) It was then in Jerusalem that the affairs of the council were later reopened.\(^{394}\) In this respect, Socrates referred to the council as a mere “secondary matter” to the dedication of Constantine’s church.\(^{395}\) The coordination of the synod and dedication event auspiciously coincided with the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine’s rule. This appropriately mirrored the Council of Nicaea and the start of construction a decade prior.\(^{396}\)

The imperial festival in Jerusalem, its lavish decorations, regal banquets, and munificent almsgiving, were also incorporated into Eusebius’ *Life of Constantine*.\(^{397}\)

---

\(^{390}\) See Chapter 6.2.

\(^{391}\) On the dating of the *Encaenia*, see *It. Eg.* 48-49. In contrast, see the *Chron. Pasch.*, which gives the 17th of September.

\(^{392}\) Barnes (1993), 22-3; Parvis (2006) and Drake (2014).


\(^{396}\) The comparison is observed in Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4.47.

\(^{397}\) Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4.43-47. Eusebius praises “a man close to the emperor” for the organisation of these festivities. While some have attributed this to the *notarius* Marianus, mentioned in the Chapter heading 4.44, see Warmington (1986) and Woods’ (2002) contrary perspective.
The symbolic importance of the church was reportedly iterated in the various orations delivered for the occasion. Eusebius confirmed that he delivered multiple orations at the dedication events, one of which still survives. Even so, the Life of Constantine remains the primary source on the church’s historical, topographic, and theological significance.

As a culmination of these interlocking facets, Eusebius praised the church as a “New Jerusalem [ἡ νέα … Ἱεροσολύμη]”.

3.2. Urban Change during the reign of Constantine: The Church on Golgotha

The most obvious geographical landmark associated with the imperial project in Jerusalem was the pagan monument destroyed in the construction process. Eusebius of Caesarea described this as a temple to Venus, which had been established over the tomb of Christ.

It was this very cave of the Saviour [τὸ σωτήριον ἄντρον] that some godless and wicked people had planned to make invisible to mankind [ὑφανεῖς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ποιήσασθαι διανενόηντο], thinking in their stupidity that they could in this way hide the truth. Indeed with a great expenditure of effort they brought earth from somewhere outside and covered up the whole place, then levelled it, paved it, and so hid the divine cave

---

398 Eusebius, Vit. Const. 4.43-48.

399 Eusebius, Vit. Const. 45. Hunt (1982) described the Church on Golgotha as Eusebius’ “springboard for a sermon on the progress of the faith and the Christian empire” (p. 10).

400 Drake (1976) convincingly argued that what exists in the second half of the Tricennial Oration, chapters 11-18, represents a portion of the speeches given at the festival, though to be supplemented with a physical description of the Sepulchre itself. In addition, Eusebius’ earlier oration on the basilica of Tyre (Hist. Eccl. 10.4) was an exposition of prophetic fulfilment comparable to the one we would expect on the Holy Sepulchre.


somewhere down beneath a great quantity of soil. Then … they constructed a terrible and truly genuine tomb [ταφεῶνα], one for souls, for dead idols … Jerone provided a complementary view in his letter to Paulinus (Ep. 58). He noted that the site of Christ’s death and resurrection was once occupied by statues of Jupiter and Venus: 

From the time of Hadrian to the reign of Constantine – a period of about one hundred and eighty years – the spot which had witnessed the resurrection was occupied by a figure of Jupiter [in loco resurrectionis simulacrum Iovis]; while on the rock where the cross had stood, a marble statue of Venus [in crucis rupe statua ex marmore Veneris] was set up by the heathen and became an object of worship. The original persecutors, indeed, supposed that by polluting our holy places they would deprive us of our faith in the passion and in the resurrection [quod tollerent nobis fidem resurrectionis et crucis, si loca sancta per idola polluissent].

Their claims, in addition to the archaeological evidence presented in the previous chapter, suggest that the Constantinian structure was built on the foundations of the Roman forum. It has already been noted that the reconfiguration of the city in the second century drew the centre of activity westward, away from the Temple Mount to the northwestern hill in Jerusalem. However, an additional element of this site’s history arises in Christian accounts after the Constantinian period. Both Eusebius and Jerome associate the monuments of the Roman forum with a site of great Christian significance: Golgotha. Therefore, to measure the degree of urban change that

---

404 While Eusebius only speaks of the tomb of Christ, it is reasonable to assume that the church complex was associated with the events of Christ’s death and resurrection from its foundations. On this, see Chapter 4.2.3. Jerome’s association to both Jupiter and Venus on the site of Golgotha has been noted previously in Chapter 2.3.
405 Jerome, Ep. 58.3 (CSEL 54, 531-2). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 298).
406 Chapter 2.3.
407 See previous chapter and Figure 11 in the Appendix. For a contrary view that the northwestern hill was the location of the Roman Legion, see Bar (1998).
408 On the reconfiguration of Aelia Capitolina, see previous chapter.
occurred during the reign of Constantine, I shall consider the spatial positioning of the church and its relationship to both Golgotha and the forum.

### 3.2.1. Constantine’s Church and Golgotha

All four Gospels refer to the site of the crucifixion as the place “of the skull [Κρανίου τόπος]” or called “skull [τόπον καλούμενον Κρανίον].” The term ‘Golgotha’ would later refer to the rocky outcrop of Calvary, which was housed within the Constantinian church complex. However, the shape and size of this rock make it an unlikely spot for the crucifixion. Rather, Golgotha initially had a wider, regional connotation associated with Christ’s crucifixion and burial. This is most clear in the description of Golgotha in the *Gospel of John*:

> The place [ἐν τῷ τόπῳ] where Jesus was crucified [Γολγοθα], there was a garden [κῆπος], and in the garden a new tomb [ἐν τῷ κηπῳ μνημειον καινον], in which no one had ever been laid.

The geological and geographic circumstances of the northwestern hill in Jerusalem, on which the Constantinian Church was built, do advance the case of its authenticity. The site was originally an Iron Age quarry rich in Turonian limestone. Archaeological survey of this area has confirmed its later use as a burial ground during the early Roman period. In addition, the garden [κηπος] associated with Christ’s burial in the vicinity was provided in Gibson and Taylor (1994), 52, 63, and its reproduction in Kelley (2020), 68-9. It is on account of this that Kenyon (1974) argued it was plausible

---


410 Gibson and Taylor (1994), 57; Kelley (2020), 72 n. 15.

411 *John* 19:17.

412 *John* 19:41. For a potential schematic of this region, see Taylor (1998), 184.

413 Known locally as *mizzi meleke* and *mizzi hila*. Gibson and Taylor (1994), 51; Kelley (2020), 66.

414 Such as the “Tomb of Joseph of Arimathea” in Clermont-Ganneau (1877); Vincent and Abel (1914), 192-3. A map of tombs in the vicinity is provided in Gibson and Taylor (1994), 52, 63, and its reproduction in Kelley (2020), 68-9. It is on account of this that Kenyon (1974) argued it was plausible
Gospel of John might relate to the southern end of the quarry, which met the east-west road leading out of the Genneth (“Gardens”415) gate of Jerusalem.416 During the reign of Herod Agrippa I (41-44 CE), the “Third Wall” expanded the northern and western boundaries of the city; the region of Golgotha was then included within the city walls.417

Nevertheless, the period between the Jewish Wars marks an interruption for the Christian community in Jerusalem and with it their traditions regarding the locations of sacred memory.418 A Christian presence in the city after its destruction is by no means certain, regardless of the short and contested statements by Eusebius and Epiphanius about a flight to Pella.419 Issues of continuity were then compounded with the foundation of Aelia Capitolina, which permanently altered the urban and demographic composition of Jerusalem.420 It was during this period that the quarry was covered and levelled to accommodate the construction of a Roman forum.421 Therefore, the question remains. Was the location of Constantine’s church based on a

416 This was located at the western junction of the “First” and “Second” walls. Josephus, Bell. Jud. 5.146-147. See also Kelley (2020), 72; Avigad (1984), 65-72; Geva (1993a), 724-9.
417 See Figure 2 in the Appendix; Gibson and Taylor (1994), 51-63. Kelley (2020), 18. See also Harvey (1966), who discusses this phenomenon in relation to Melito of Sardis’ Pasch.
418 See Chapter 2.4.1 and its application in Chapter 5.
419 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 3.5.3; Epiphanius Panarion 29.7.7; 30.2.7; Mens. et Pond. 15. See also Chapter 2.4.1.
420 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4.12; Turner (1900), 550, and Wharton (1992), 322.
prevalent Christian tradition of Golgotha? Or, was it an advantageous site for other reasons? While it remains possible that a general location for the site of Golgotha remained in the consciousness of the Jerusalem community until the fourth century, early references only provide general coordinates. If Hadrian had intentionally concealed the place of Christ’s death and resurrection, as Eusebius and Jerome implied, it is problematic that no pre-Constantinian source makes this connection.

3.2.2. The Location of Golgotha in Early Christian Tradition

Melito of Sardis visited Palestine in the latter half of the second century. Later, he referred to the site of Christ’s passion in his treatise On the Pascha as having taken place in the “middle of Jerusalem [ἐν μέσῳ Ἰερουσαλήμ]”. On account of his first-hand knowledge of the city, Melito’s account has often been regarded as a reliable reference on the urban geography of Aelia Capitolina. Following the construction of Agrippa’s “Third Wall”, the region of Golgotha was located centrally in the Roman city, framed by the Western Cardo and the Decumanus. However, there is reason to read this as a rhetorical, rather than geographic, statement. Melito’s account, as an

423 These questions are frequently disagreed upon. Taylor (1998) aptly summarised: “Both traditionalists and sceptics have good reasons for their arguments” (p. 195).
427 See Figure 2 in Appendix. Harvey (1966), 404; Walker (1990), 11-12; Biddle (1999), 61-2; Murphy-O’Connor (2012), 176.
428 See Figure 11 in Appendix. See also Harvey (1966).
early example of anti-Jewish polemic, capitalised on the visible, public context of Christ’s crucifixion.\textsuperscript{430}

Now in the middle of the street,  
And in the middle of the city,  
In the middle of the day before the public gaze,  
The unjust murder of a just man has taken place.\textsuperscript{431}

The crucifixion of Christ underscored the author’s ultimate judgement of the earthly city: “The Jerusalem below was of value, now it is worthless…”\textsuperscript{432} In this respect, R. Clements interpreted the reference to the “Middle of Jerusalem” as an allusion to \textit{Lamentations} and the destruction of the First Temple.\textsuperscript{433}

The kings of the earth, and all the inhabitants of the world, would not have believed that the adversary and the enemy should have entered into the gates of Jerusalem. This was for the sins of her prophets, [and] the iniquities of her priests, that have shed the blood of the Just in the midst of her.\textsuperscript{434}

The geography of Melito’s description is complicated further by his reference to the crucifixion in the “middle of the street \[ἐπὶ μέσης πλατείας\]”.\textsuperscript{435} The sense of \textit{πλατεῖα} most plausibly refers to a broad street, such as a \textit{cardo}.\textsuperscript{436} It is on account of this term that J. Taylor suggested that the site of Christ’s crucifixion occurred on the southern end of the northwestern hill, where the east-west thoroughfare of the Roman city, the \textit{Decumanus}, was later established.\textsuperscript{437} However, it is equally plausible that this

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{430}Clements (2012), 533 n. 51; Turtledove (2013), 32-3.
\item \textsuperscript{431}Melito of Sardis, \textit{Pasch.} 94. Tr. Stewart-Sykes (2001), 63. See also Ryan (2021).
\item \textsuperscript{432}Melito of Sardis, \textit{Pasch.} 45. Tr. Stewart-Sykes (2001), 48.
\item \textsuperscript{433}Clements (2012), 533.
\item \textsuperscript{434}\textit{Lamentations} 4:12-13.
\item \textsuperscript{435}Melito of Sardis, \textit{Pasch.} 94. Harvey (1966), 402. Tr. Stewart-Sykes (2001), 63.
\item \textsuperscript{436}See also Taylor (1993), 116-7, 121-2; (1998), 189. Conversely, Murphy-O’Connor (2012) and Biddle (1999) have interpreted this as the \textit{temenos} of the Venus Temple. This application, however, seems to try to fit the description with what most suitably fits the Byzantine identification of Golgotha. See the linguistic argument made against in Taylor (1998), 191.
\item \textsuperscript{437}Taylor (1998), pp. 189-90.
\end{itemize}
specification again reflects the “poetic license” of the author; Melito sought to emphasise the public nature of Christ’s death.\textsuperscript{438} Therefore, it is not wholly convincing that he was referring to a specific location.

Another reference to Golgotha is made in Eusebius’ \textit{Onomasticon}.\textsuperscript{439} Written early in Eusebius’ career, the text is important for capturing Christian engagement with the biblical landscape of Palestine prior to the Constantinian age.\textsuperscript{440} Eusebius referred to the “place of a skull [Κρανίου τόπος] where Christ was crucified” in the “northern parts of Mount Zion” [πρὸς τοῖς Βορείοις τοῦ Ζιὼν ὄρους]”.\textsuperscript{441} The meaning of ‘Zion’ in Eusebius’ works will be discussed in a later chapter. Suffice it to note here that he employed the title in a variety of ways, not including the southwestern hill of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{442} Rather, it was far more common for Eusebius to refer to the Temple Mount, or the city of Jerusalem as a whole, as Zion.\textsuperscript{443} Therefore, while this text is often interpreted as a more specific reference to Golgotha on the northern edge of the southwestern hill (which pairs well with the \textit{Decumanus}),\textsuperscript{444} it is more likely a general reference to the northern area of the city. In any case, Eusebius’ entry can only be read as a general location, not a specific site.\textsuperscript{445}

\textsuperscript{438} Taylor (1993), 121-2.

\textsuperscript{439} Eusebius \textit{Onom.} 365. On this vagueness, Walker (1990) argues that it is “exactly what we would expect if such an important site was so painfully buried under a pagan temple” (p. 243 n. 10).

\textsuperscript{440} On an early date of the \textit{Onom.} see Barnes (1975), which is adopted in Walker (1990), 42-3. See also Wilken’s (1992) reflections on the \textit{Onom.} in the years before the discovery of Christ’s tomb (pp. 99-100).

\textsuperscript{441} Eusebius \textit{Onom.} 365 (\textit{GCS} n.f. 24, 92).

\textsuperscript{442} See Chapter 5.1.1.

\textsuperscript{443} Eliav (2005), 136-7.

\textsuperscript{444} Taylor (1998), 193.

\textsuperscript{445} Taylor (1993) remarked, “It would be stretching the ‘northern parts of Mount Zion’ rather far if we
A final piece of evidence is a Latin inscription and *graffito* of a ship, which was discovered in 1971 during the Armenian Patriarchate excavations of the Chapel of S. Vartan in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The inscription was subject to some controversy in its early translations, however it is now widely read as DOMINE IVIMUS. Early on in the inscription’s analysis, P. Benoit reportedly associated the inscription with *Psalm* 121:1: “We shall go to the house of the Lord [in domum Domini ibimus]” and Christian pilgrimage during the early fourth century. Independent of Benoit’s interpretation, E. Testa also emphasised the Christian nature of the inscription and its proximity to Golgotha. M. Broshi furthered these conclusions; he considered it the work of a Latin Christian pilgrim during the construction of the Constantinian Church. However, S. Gibson and J. Taylor have convincingly dated the inscription much earlier, to the first or second century. In addition, they warned against interpreting the inscription any further, such as it being the work for an early Christian

---

446 See Figure 12 in Appendix.

447 Following its discovery, the nearly illegible inscription was first rendered as ISIS MIRIONIUM: ‘Many-named Isis’ in Bennett and Humphreys (1974), 310, and Helms (1980). However, following the stone’s cleaning and reinterpretation in Testa (1976), the inscription radically departed from its original reading to DOMINE IVIMVS. The different transcriptions led to accusations that the stone had been altered during the cleaning process (Helms (1980)). However, an infra-red photo taken by the Israeli Police in 1977 verified that the stone had not been tampered with. The latter reading of the inscription, though with some variations, is now widely accepted, as in Broshi and Barkay (1985), Gibson and Taylor (1994), and Kelley (2020), 53-60. However, Wilkinson (1995) provided an alternative reading of the inscription: DD M. NOMIMUS, signifying a gift from a visitor, perhaps a Roman soldier and initiate in Mithraism. See Gibson and Taylor (1994), 25-8, for a summary of this debate.

448 Benoit’s interpretation is unpublished but widely mentioned, such as in Broshi (1977), 349, and Helms (1980), 109. While Gibson and Taylor (1994) also refers to a reference to Benoit in Humphreys’ (1974) publication (p. 42), I have not been able to find this reference.

449 Testa (1976), 221.

450 Broshi (1977), 352.

Therefore, while the *graffito* remains a mysterious aspect of the Holy Sepulchre complex, it is not advisable to include the inscription as evidence for an early Christian tradition at Golgotha.

In sum, it is possible that a tradition regarding the location of Golgotha did prevail in the Jerusalem Church. This allowed Eusebius to assert that Golgotha was able to be “pointed out [δείκνυται]” in the last years of the third century. However, there is no evidence for a more precise association between Golgotha and the Roman forum, nor its temples. This appears only after the Constantinian period. Some have interpreted the vagueness of our early Christian sources as a conscious act to downplay the unfortunate state of Christ’s tomb during the Roman period. However, it is equally plausible that the greater region of Golgotha was preserved in Christian memory while a precise location was not. While J. Taylor ultimately concluded that the serendipitous discovery of the empty tomb and its apparent “self-evidence” validates its authenticity, this is not unassailable. The discovery occurred in a quarry area known to have been used for burial during the first half of the first century CE. The incorporation of the quarry into the city walls under Agrippa would have required the removal of these remains in accordance with Halakhic laws. Provided

---

453 However, it does cause us to question Eusebius’ assertion that the ground was completely cleared before Constantinian Construction. See Wilkinson (1995), 160.
454 Eusebius, *Onom.* 365 (*GCS* n.f. 24, 92).
456 Walker (1990), 243 n. 10.
457 See note 439 above.
this point, it is worth interrogating other reasons why Constantine’s church might have been constructed where it was. For this, we must turn our attention from Golgotha to the Roman forum.

3.2.3. Constantine’s Church and the Roman Forum

The lack of evidence for a pre-Constantinian connection between the traditional location of Golgotha and the Roman Forum sits in contrast to the texts from the period after Constantine. Christian rhetoric of the site was then dominated by the relationship between the imperial church and the pagan temples that preceded.\footnote{Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.26 and Jerome, \textit{Ep.} 58.3, cited above.} For this reason, it is worth considering the precise positioning of Constantine’s church further. Contrary to the image of destruction and erasure regarding the pre-existent landscape provided by Eusebius, archaeological evidence has suggested that the relationship between the forum and the church was much more complex. The location of Constantine’s church effectively reconstituted the religious, civic, and political centre of Aelia Capitolina. However, the degree of physical change might have been minimal.

3.2.3.1. Elements of Destruction and Elements of Re-use

Eusebius of Caesarea’s \textit{Life of Constantine} and archaeological evidence both demonstrate that the construction of the imperial church in Jerusalem required a considerable amount of destruction. The primary object of Eusebius’ concern was the tomb of Christ, which was reportedly “consign[ed] to darkness and oblivion”.\footnote{Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.26.1 (GCS 1.2, 95). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 132.} He
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juxtaposed the tomb of Christ to the “terrible and truly genuine tomb, one for souls, for dead idols [ἀληθῶς ταφεῶν ψυχῶν ... νεκρῶν εἰδώλων]” \(^{462}\). According to Eusebius, the “houses of error” were utterly destroyed and even the rubble was cleared away.\(^{463}\) In his account, Eusebius attempted to eradicate any connection between Christian church and pagan temple.\(^{464}\) In this respect, the destruction of the Temple and the shifting of rubble elsewhere reflected the overarching theme of Eusebius’ work: Christianity’s triumph over paganism.

However, Eusebius’ impression contrasts architectural reality. Archaeological excavations conducted at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre during the latter half of the twentieth century have revealed several Roman wall segments incorporated into the Constantinian foundations.\(^{465}\) In particular, excavations undertaken by the Armenian Patriarchate in the Chapels of St. Helena and St. Vartan uncovered four consolidation walls dating to the Hadrianic period.\(^{466}\) Other consolidation walls north- and southeast of the Edicule and south and east of the rock of Golgotha have also been identified.\(^{467}\) On account of this, C. Coüasnon proposed that Roman materials were not merely used in the construction of the imperial church. Rather, monuments of the forum, such as a civic basilica, might have served as its architectural outline.\(^{468}\) V.


\(^{463}\) Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3.26.7 (GCS 1.2, 96). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 133.

\(^{464}\) Tsafrir (1999a), 138.

\(^{465}\) This is summarised in Gibson and Taylor (1994), 17-24; 65-8. See also Corbo (1981), 41-2; Broshi and Barkay (1985); Geva (1993b), 780; Phillips (1977), 37; Ousterhout (2003), 7; Prusac (2015), 261-2; Kelley (2020), 48-52. See Figure 13 in Appendix.

\(^{466}\) Broshi and Barkay (1985); See Walls 1,2,3, 7 in Gibson and Taylor (1994), 10, fig. 6.

\(^{467}\) These walls were built into the bedrock to support the structures of the forum. Eighteen wall segments are included in Gibson and Taylor’s (1996) survey (p. 66).

\(^{468}\) Coüasnon (1974), 41-2; Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 73, 124.
Corbo conversely interpreted the pre-existent structures as evidence of the *Temenos* of the Venus Temple.\(^{469}\)

The reuse of building materials calls into question the architectural relationship of the church and its preceding environment. The pre-existing walls functioned as *spolia* of the reconstituted forum.\(^{470}\) However, the sheer extent of re-use might also suggest that imperial vision for the basilica might have been a “refurbishing of an existing structure”.\(^{471}\) If, as Coüasnon and Corbo both suggest, aspects of the forum served as a template for the Constantinian construction, it is persuasive that a political reasoning underpins the church’s precise location.\(^{472}\) On this point, A. Wharton argued that the Constantinian ambition was to construct a church in the centre of Jerusalem (a “Cathedral”\(^{473}\)), in order to establish a nexus of both spiritual and social/political power in fourth-century Jerusalem.\(^{474}\) Constantine’s church effectively supplanted the social and administrative centre of Roman Aelia Capitolina.\(^{475}\) However, the relationship between the two places might not have been solely adverse or destructive.

\(^{469}\) Corbo (1981), pl. 68; Gibson and Taylor (1994), 65.

\(^{470}\) Prusac (2015), 264.

\(^{471}\) Phillips (1977), 13, 37.

\(^{472}\) In this respect, Wharton (1995) argued that the discovery of Christ’s tomb and the addition of the westernmost element was something of an afterthought (pp. 88-91).

\(^{473}\) Wharton (1992), 318; (1995), 88-9; Drijvers (2004), 16. Wharton compared the church in Jerusalem to the Lateran Basilica. McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), however, have considered this title too “anachronistic” (p. 62).


\(^{475}\) Wharton (1995), 91.
3.3. Urban Continuity during and after the Reign of Constantine

So far in this chapter, I have discussed how the construction of an imperial church was the primary feature of urban change that occurred during the Constantinian period. The spatial context of the structure likely had socio-political implications, beyond its later associations with Golgotha, within the topography of Aelia Capitolina. The re-use of Roman walls and potential adherence to a pre-existing building plan suggest that the church’s relationship to the Roman forum might not have been entirely oppositional and its overall impact on the urban landscape minimal. I now turn to the other structural and demographic evidence regarding Jerusalem over the course of the fourth century. Doing so, I observe a degree of continuity in urban shape and population. In contrast to the establishment of Aelia Capitolina, which involved a great deal of urban upheaval, the construction of Constantine’s church appears to have been an isolated occurrence.

3.3.1. Urban Composition

We are indebted once again to the sixth-century floor mosaic, the Madaba Map, for visualising the urban plan of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{476} The most identifiable characteristics are the colonnaded western and eastern \textit{cardines} inherited from the Roman period. However, in contrast to the Madaba Map’s depiction of Jerusalem as a city primarily composed of churches, it was only over the course of the following centuries that the urban centre began to be altered with the construction of other ecclesiastical

\textsuperscript{476} See Figure 4 in Appendix.
A potential turning point in the ecclesiastical development of the city was a large earthquake that inflicted much damage on the province of Palestine in May, 363 CE. While there is considerable textual evidence for the earthquake, only recently has archaeological excavation confirmed architectural damage associated with the seismic event. On account of these recent findings, scholars have suggested that the earthquake might have offered an opportunity for Christianisation to advance within the confines of Jerusalem itself. The physical and ideological impact of this event requires further consideration and will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 7.

3.3.2. City Walls

The Madaba Map also depicted Jerusalem as a walled city. A similar impression comes from Eucherius’ *Letter to Faustus*, in which the bishop of Lyon described how the walls forced the city into a “circular shape”. This was a notable divergence from the state of the city under the Roman period. Therefore, its completion has been regarded as an important transitional feature of Byzantine Jerusalem. Various archaeological excavations along the course of these fortifications have

---

477 There were three major periods of ecclesiastical development, argued Ovadiah (1970): the Constantinian period, the period of the empress Eudocia, and the Justinianic period. A similar division is made in Avi Yonah’s (1958) study on the economics of Byzantine Palestine.


480 Tchekhanovets (2014); Ben-Ami and Tchekhanovets (2017); Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 145-6.


482 See Figure 14 in Appendix and Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 146.
widely identified remains of a late Roman/Byzantine wall along the perimeter of Jerusalem’s Old City.\textsuperscript{483} Though with some variation between the north and south of the city, the walls follow a relatively uniform construction. This suggests the walls were likely completed as part of a single campaign.\textsuperscript{484} However, the date and context of its construction has been the subject of much ongoing debate.

A traditional, though still widely-held, opinion is that the departure of the tenth legion at the end of the third century instigated a reconstruction of the city’s walls.\textsuperscript{485} This early dating allows us to make sense of the reference to a wall in Jerusalem in Eusebius’ \textit{Onomasticon}.\textsuperscript{486} However, this stands at odds with the impression of the city left by John Rufus in his \textit{Life of Peter the Iberian}. He described Jerusalem was an empty and wall-less city when it was “rebuilt by the … emperor Constantine”.\textsuperscript{487} While it is worth reading John Rufus’ portrayal of an earlier Jerusalem with scepticism, the construction of the Byzantine wall is also credited in several accounts to a contemporary of Peter the Iberian: Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius II.\textsuperscript{488} Therefore,

\textsuperscript{483} Wightman (1993), 209-23; Geva (1993b); 770-2; Weksler-Bdolah (2006-7), 93-4.
\textsuperscript{484} Weksler-Bdolah (2006-7), 97.
\textsuperscript{485} Geva (1993b); 770-2, suggested that the wall was likely built during the Constantinian Age. This is unlikely, given the lack of any reference to a wall by Eusebius of Caesarea. Weksler-Bdolah (2006-7), 93-4c, argued that its construction was later, during the late fourth century or early fifth. However, this conclusion relies much on John Rufus’ \textit{Vita Petri Iberi}.
\textsuperscript{486} Eusebius, \textit{Onom.} 332. In the entry on Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, Eusebius noted that it was behind the wall of Jerusalem to the east [προσπαράκειται τῷ τείχῃ Ἰερουσαλήμ πρὸς ἀνατολάς] (GCS n.f. 24, 84). In addition, the early reference to a \textit{murum sion} in the \textit{It. Burd.} (592-3 (IR 1, 96)) seems to pertain to an area delineated from Jerusalem. The pilgrim’s movement to this southern area was described as “exiting Jerusalem [\textit{exunctibus Hierusalem}]” (It. Burd. 591.7 (IR 97)).
\textsuperscript{488} Cassiodorus, \textit{Expositio Psalmorum} 50.20; \textit{Itinerarium Antonini Placentini} 25; \textit{Chron. Pasch.} (Dindorf (1832), 585). Eudocia came to Jerusalem first on pilgrimage in 439 CE; she would then return shortly afterwards to settle in Jerusalem permanently following her separation from the emperor. See Hunt (1982), 221-48; Holum (1989). However, this attribution is somewhat complicated by the reference to city walls in John Rufus’ \textit{Vit. Pet.}, which ostensibly relates to the state of the city slightly
no singular campaign fits the contrasting accounts of our sources. A third-century wall conflicts with both the Life of Peter the Iberian and accounts of Eudocia’s project, whereas a fifth-century construction conflicts with Eusebius’ Onomasticon.

A potential solution is that the project was in fact completed in two campaigns. If most of the wall was built after the departure of the Roman legion, this would explain the common mode of construction shared across the extant segments, in addition to Eusebius’ remark. Then, the empress Eudocia’s later contribution was likely to incorporate Mount Zion within the city boundaries. On this note, Cassiodorus credited Eudocia with “a superior encirclement of walls” in the context of Psalm 50:20 and Zion in particular: “Treat Zion kindly according to your good will; build up the walls of Jerusalem.” While this chronology is plausible, the origins of the Byzantine walls of Jerusalem will likely remain an open question. However, we can make three important points, which are relevant to the present discussion. Firstly, the construction of the city walls was not a project of Constantine. Secondly, an early date of construction causes us to reconsider both the administrative and demographic situation before the reign of Constantine. Thirdly, the southwestern hill of Jerusalem, Mount Zion, was likely incorporated into the city at a much later date.

earlier, in 437-8 CE. In addressing this inconsistency, Weksler-Bdolah (2006-7) suggested that walls might have been constructed by Aelia Eudoxia, the wife of Arcadius.

*Cassiodorus, Expositio Psalmorum 50.20. Tr. Walsh (ACW 50, 509). The use of ‘Zion’ is a particularly slippery concept, as will be discussed in Chapter 5.1. The original use of the term in Psalm 50 was Jerusalem as a whole. However, use of the term from the mid-fourth century onwards refers increasingly to the southwestern hill of Jerusalem. Therefore, I assume here that Cassiodorus refers to Zion as the southwestern hill, specifically. In this way, Eudocia’s wall likely updated the murum Sion mentioned in the It. Burd. (592-3 (IR 1, 96)).

*This point informs our understanding of Mount Zion as an ecclesiastical zone and will be revisited in Chapter 5.2.
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3.3.3. Population

As with the Roman period, there is no firm textual evidence for the population size of Jerusalem during the Byzantine period.\textsuperscript{491} There is, however, another notable shift in epigraphic evidence. While inscriptions were almost exclusively in Latin during the Roman period, the use of Greek became dominant from the fourth century onward.\textsuperscript{492} In addition, recent archaeological excavation of the large peristyle mansion at the Givati Parking Lot has revealed that urban expansion south of the Temple Mount began earlier than previously expected.\textsuperscript{493} The organisation of the late Roman structure and its neighbouring elements suggests that the southward expansion during the late third century was well-planned and adhered to the orthogonal grid of the Roman Colonia.\textsuperscript{494}

Evidence of the religious demographics of the late Roman city is equally sparse. With respect to a Jewish presence, Eusebius’ Ecclesiastical History referred to the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem and the surrounding area following the Bar Kokhba revolt.\textsuperscript{495} However, issues with Eusebius’ chronology and the alleged demographics of the early Christian community have already been highlighted in the

\textsuperscript{491} Di Segni and Tsafrir (2012) note the exception to this is a report of the casualties during the Persian conquest (p. 411).

\textsuperscript{492} CIIP 1.2, 784-1120 (Cotton et al. (2012), 83-472). Di Segni and Tsafrir (2012) argue that Greek was likely the predominant spoken language during the Roman period (p. 407). A prevalence of Aramaic is suggested by the translations of sermons, observed in \textit{It. Eg.} 47.3-4. The presence of Latin pilgrims (not least of all Egeria) and monastic emigrants imply that Latin would have been common as well.

\textsuperscript{493} See Ben-Ami and Tchekhanovets (2013a); (2013b); see (2017) for conclusions based on their findings in the Givati parking lot, as well as comparative excavations nearby. See also their discussion of Tsafrir’s (1999b) and (1999c) reconstruction of the Roman city and its impact.

\textsuperscript{494} Ben Ami and Tchekhanovets (2017), 61; 64-5; Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 134.

\textsuperscript{495} Eusebius, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 4.5.
While there might be some truth to Eusebius’ mention of legal prohibitions, it is impossible to know how leniently these laws were enforced over time. At some point during the third century, a small Jewish community might have resettled in Jerusalem, as rabbinic sources referred to a “Holy Community” in Aelia around the figure of Rabbi Meir. A tradition regarding seven synagogues that once existed in the southwestern portion of Aelia Capitolina is also attested first in the *Bordeaux Itinerary* and later in Epiphanius’ *On Weights and Measures*. However, the historicity of these claims – to be explored in Chapter 5 – is not easily proven. By the fourth century, perhaps following the expansion of the population in the late third century, a Jewish presence appears to have been renewed. According to the *Bordeaux Itinerary*, Jews entered the city on the ninth of Ab to visit the *lapis pertusus* on the Temple Mount. In addition, frequent mention of the Jews in Cyril’s *Catechetical Lectures* suggests a more permanent and prominent population by the mid-century.

Late Roman coinage and a small corpus of engraved semiprecious gemstones discovered during the Temple Mount excavations provide insight into the variety of cultic representation in late Roman Aelia Capitolina. However, it is the excavations recently conducted at the Givati parking lot that have provided the most conclusive evidence for the variety of religious practice represented in Jerusalem during the late

496 Chapter 2.4.1, above.

497 *Berakhot* 9b.16; *Yoma* 69a:6; *Tamid* 27b:3; Lifshitz (1977), 487; Bieberstein (2007), 154.


500 See Chapter 7.2.

third and early fourth centuries.\textsuperscript{502} In addition to an inscription of the \textit{Chi Rho},\textsuperscript{503} excavators have identified evidence of magic in the form of a curse tablet and phylactic graffiti. Most notably, a large assemblage of pig jaws was discovered in a courtyard cistern and has been interpreted as an act of communal worship prior to the building’s destruction in 363 CE. Based on this example, we might suspect that there was a more considerable shift in urban dynamics after this time.\textsuperscript{504}

\textit{3.4. 335 CE a Turning Point? Jerusalem in Christianity}

Evidence of the urban composition of Jerusalem during the fourth century, while minimal, suggests that the Constantinian period was not a moment of immediate urban upheaval, expansion, or conversion. The only notable change was the construction of a basilica church complex at the site of the Roman forum. However, the relationship between the church and its pre-existing landscape might not have been as destructive as Eusebius’ \textit{Life of Constantine} implies. Therefore, the question remains: Why is the Constantinian period regarded as a turning point in the history of Jerusalem? The answer lies in Christian interpretations of Constantine’s building programme, which invariably portray the imperial project as a significant change of the urban landscape. Jerusalem was perceived as a ‘changed’ city.

\textsuperscript{502} On the Givati parking lot, see Tchekhanovets (2014); Sharabi, Tchekhanovets, and Ben Ami (2020). See also on the Bethesda Pool: Beyache (2001), 157-69; Gibson (2011); Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 143.

\textsuperscript{503} On the discovery of Christian Graffiti, see Sharabi, Tchekhanovets, and Ben-Ami (2020). They noted that the graffiti is “one of the earliest documented expressions of Christian belief in Jerusalem” (p. 300).

\textsuperscript{504} With that said, sacred sites outside of Jerusalem, such as the area around Hebron, continued to be a place of shared sacred significance much longer. The most extensive description of this is Sozomen’s \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 2.4. See also Kofsky (1998); Fowden (2002).
3.4.1. The Constantinian Project and Narratives of Transformation

In addition to revering the sacred sites themselves, identifying and celebrating the monumental legacy of Constantine became an important aspect of pilgrim practice. Even in 333 CE, the Bordeaux Pilgrim drew attention to the four basilicas “built by the order of Constantine” in their account of Jerusalem and its surrounding region.\(^{505}\) A similar admiration of Constantine’s churches, which were ornately decorated during liturgical festivals, is evident in Egeria’s later *Itinerary*.\(^{506}\) However, while the observance of other Jewish and Roman monuments served to contextualise those of a new Christian era in the *Bordeaux Itinerary*, Egeria’s account presented Jerusalem as an exclusively Christian city.\(^{507}\) The narrative of Christianisation in Jerusalem after Constantine was also expressed in the notion of urban renewal; John Rufus in his *Life of Peter the Iberian* capitalised on the city’s former emptiness, devoid of people and city walls before the reign of Constantine in contrast to the “multitudes” that occupied the fortified city in the fifth century.\(^{508}\) In this respect, later Christians not only conceptualised a religious transformation of the city following Constantine, but an urban transformation as well.

The transformation of Jerusalem was also articulated through the narratives of its pre-existing topography. We have seen how Eusebius and Jerome reflected on the sacrilege of holy sites during the Roman period as a juxtaposition to the sacred monuments of Christ that were identified and memorialised in the early fourth

\(^{505}\) *It. Burd.* 594.1-4 (*IR* 1, 97). Tr. Wilkinson (1971), 158. For the Church at Mamre, see note 16.

\(^{506}\) *It. Eg.* 25.1, 10.

\(^{507}\) This aspect of the *It. Eg.* will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 8.3.2.

The statues of Venus and Jupiter, which were installed at the site of Christ’s passion, were later inserted into the myth of the True Cross \([\text{inventio crucis}]\) as an expression of pious imperial interest and initiative.\(^{510}\) The demolition of pagan monuments and establishment of the Christian church, whether or not a physical reality, served as a microcosm of Jerusalem as whole.

However, the largest and most visible aspect of pre-existing topography, the Temple Mount, required a different strategy of interpretation. Eusebius paired the two edifices as opposing entities: Golgotha was the “New Jerusalem … facing the famous Jerusalem of old”.\(^{511}\) However, the relationship between the two structures was not solely antithetical.\(^{512}\) While there was little architectural similarity between them, Eusebius portrayed the basilica as the “Royal Temple \([\text{ὁ βασίλειος νεώς}]\)” and the tomb itself as the “Holy of Holies \([τό ἁγιον τῶν ἁγίων]\)”.\(^{513}\) Even the term μαρτύριον, meaning ‘testimony’ or ‘witness’ and often associated with shrines of the Christian martyrs, might also have denoted an eschatological association with the Jewish Temple.\(^{514}\) The appropriative associations between the church and Temple would

---

\(^{509}\) Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3.26; Jerome, *Ep.* 58.3. However, it is worth noting that Jerome’s reference to this pre-existing topography had a negative connotation. He used this anecdote to deter his correspondent, Paulinus, from journeying to the Holy Land. On the context of Jerome’s *Ep.* 58, see Chapter 6.3 and 6.4.

\(^{510}\) In this instance, the focus was not on Constantine but his mother, Helena. On the ‘Helena Legend’, see note 389.


\(^{512}\) Ousterhout (2010), 239.

\(^{513}\) Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3.28; 36.1. (GCS 1.2, 96, 100). An exception to this, Ousterhout (1990) noted, was the Edicule. Depictions of the Edicule on late antique pilgrimage *ampullae* resembles depictions of the Temple in coinage from Bar Kokhba (figs. 4-6; pp. 47-8) and Figure 15 in Appendix.

\(^{514}\) Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3.33, 38, 40. Wilkinson (1979) argued that Eusebius used the term in the same respect that Cyril of Jerusalem did in his *Cat.* 14.6 (p. 351). See also Ousterhout (1990), 46; (2010), 237.
continue to develop over time.\textsuperscript{515} Egeria observed that the veneration of the Cross during the Great Week also incorporated objects of Temple memory, such as the ring of Solomon and the anointing horn of the Jewish kings.\textsuperscript{516} Further, in a liturgy that became increasingly concerned with its spatial, as well as temporal, application, it is striking that Jesus’ presentation at the Temple, commemorated on Golgotha, is one of the only moments that the readings were not literally \textit{apta loco}.\textsuperscript{517} Therefore, contrary to the narrative of erasure that characterised later Christian writings of the Roman forum, a narrative of both opposition and appropriation characterised Christian writings about the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{518}

The language and ideology of urban transformation was written into the fabric of Jerusalem during the reign of Constantine and was integral to the dedication festival (\textit{Encaenia}) in 335 CE. While Eusebius’ account conveys its associations with Constantine’s \textit{Tricennalia}, other elements of careful scheduling can be gleaned from the festival’s later, annual celebration.\textsuperscript{519} Egeria’s account confirms that by the 380s, the \textit{Encaenia} lasted an octave, commemorating the completion of Constantine’s basilica, the \textit{Anastasis} Rotunda, and the discovery of the True Cross.\textsuperscript{520} In addition, the festival also coincided with two other events in the Roman and Jewish calendars:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{515} Taylor (1993), 122-134.
\item \textsuperscript{516} \textit{At ubi autem osculati fuerint crucem, pertransierint, stat diaconus, tenet anulum Salomonis et cornu illud, de quo reges unguebantur. It. Eg. 37.3 (SC 296, 286).}
\item \textsuperscript{517} \textit{It. Eg. 26.}
\item \textsuperscript{518} The Temple Mount was significant space in fourth-century Jerusalem and will be discussed separately in Chapter 7.
\item \textsuperscript{519} Sozomen, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 2.26, \textit{It. Eg.} 48-49.
\item \textsuperscript{520} In contrast, see the \textit{Chron. Pasch.}, which gives 17 September. The liturgical year observed by Egeria began on 13 September and lasted the octave. The duration of the Encaenia period might have also found precedence in the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, as well as the Festival of Lights, or Hanukkah. On this, see Schwartz (1987), 269 n. 21; Sivan (2008), 197.
\end{itemize}
the festival of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the consecration of Solomon’s Temple. Therefore, the creative temporal positioning of the Encaenia festival illustrated what O. Limor referred to as the “double conversion” of Jerusalem in the wake of imperial intervention. Through the demolition and reconstitution of the Roman forum and through the appropriation and assimilation of the Jewish Temple, Constantine’s Golgotha Church became the primary locus of Christian activity in the fourth century. The dedication festival in turn presented a layering of events that reflected both spatial and ideological supersession. The Encaenia presented a new, ‘Christian’ Jerusalem, which was “laid palimpsest-like” over its Jewish and Roman past.

3.4.2. Jerusalem in Christianity Revisited: The Fourth Century

The impulse to identify a new, Christianised Jerusalem in the fourth century also reverberated in theological discourse; the relevance and significance of the earthly city had once again become a question of importance. This is evident in the theological trajectories of Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Jerome, whose works reveal an increasing readiness to accept Jerusalem as a significant, even sacred, city.

521 Schwartz (1987), 270. The festival also coincided with the ludi triumphales commemorating Constantine’s victory over Licinius on the 18th of September mentioned in the Calendar of 354 (Salzman (1991), 134, n. 1). See also Baumstark (1958), 183; Fraser (1995), 121; Hunt (1997), 421; Goodman (2007), 565; Prusac (2015), 270.

522 Et hoc per Scripturas sanctas invenitur, quod ea dies sit enceniarum qua et sanctus Salomon consummata domo Dei, quam edificaverat, steterit ante altarium Dei et oraverit, sicut scriptum est in libris Paralipomenon. It. Eg. 48.2 (SC 296, 316). Tr. McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 194. See also Fraser (1997) on a potential correspondence with the Day of Atonement in 335 CE.

523 Limor (2014), 37.

524 Smith (1987), 79.

525 Here, I draw on Jerome’s Ep. 46, which provides the most comprehensive argument for the
Eusebius of Caesarea entered into the Constantinian age wrestling with the “weight of a previous theology”. His portrayal of Constantine’s projects in and around Jerusalem was tempered not only by his uneasy position as metropolitan bishop of Caesarea, but his identity as a theologian influenced by the Caesarean school. Like Origen before him, Eusebius emphasised an allegorical interpretation of the scriptures and the non-locative nature of Christianity. When comparing the promised land of Moses to the beatitude, “Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth”, Eusebius envisioned “a far better land … not the land of Judaea, which in no way excels the rest (of the earth), but the heavenly country”.

However, As P.W.L. Walker has carefully observed, Eusebius’ tone toward sacred topography changed in response to Constantinian intervention. The discovery and monumentalisation of Christ’s tomb in Jerusalem spurred Eusebius to regard Christ’s Sepulchre as a “holy” place.

The church “of the resurrection”, as Eusebius would have called it, functioned significance of Jerusalem. However, I will highlight in due course that Jerome is also one of the city’s most vocal critics, as well.

Walker (1990), 313.

Eusebius’ ecclesiastical position will be explored in Chapter 5.3. As the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea, he was likely wary of the rising ecclesiastical prominence of Jerusalem. This was compounded by the early debates of Arianism in Palestine, which further engulfed the two sees in conflict during his lifetime.

Eusebius’ theological reservations are most thoroughly discussed in Walker (1990). See also Wilken (1992), 78-81. Wilken referred to Eusebius as a latter-day Ezekiel, as he was the “first to discern the profound shift in devotion that was taking place in his day and to lay the foundations for a Christian idea of the holy land” (p. 81).

Perrone (1999a), 225. See also Wilken’s (1992) analysis of Origen (pp. 65-78, esp. 70).

Eusebius, Dem. Ev. 3.2.10. Tr. Ferrar (TCL 1.1, 105).

Walker (1990), 93-116.

Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3.28 (GCS 1.2, 96).

Eusebius’ prioritisation of the resurrection and alleged silence on the Cross of Christ will be explored
as the “New Jerusalem”. This was not only to contrast the Temple Mount (the “Jerusalem of old”), but also to highlight its fulfilment of the “prophetic oracles”. Later on in his narration of the Encaenia festival and its accompanying orations, Eusebius related that he had “endeavoured to gather from the prophetic visions apt illustrations of the symbols it displayed”. While this oration is no longer extant, we might assume that Eusebius utilised prophetic language to illustrate the typological relationship between the church and temple. In this respect, the prophetic fulfilment that Eusebius spoke of was likely not the ‘New Jerusalem’ of Revelation 21 (that is, the city as whole), but the new temple, in particular, which was prophesied in Ezekiel. In this way, it was the church of the resurrection, rather than the city as a whole, which served as his ‘Holy Jerusalem’.

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem from 348 to 386 CE, witnessed the emperor’s building programmes first-hand and far more readily considered Jerusalem as an important, and indeed “Holy”, city. With respect to the “Holy City” of Matthew 27:53, Cyril clarified that this was not the heavenly city, but the city “we are presently

in the following chapter.

536 Wilken (1992), 93-100. See also Fraser’s (1995) comparison to Ezekiel’s vision of the new temple (p. 124).
537 Ezekiel 40-43. In this respect, it is probable that Eusebius would have been inclined to employ a similar comparison between Solomon and Constantine as he did for the bishop Paulinus during the dedication of the Tyre Basilica. Eusebius cast Paulinus as a perfected version of Jewish figures associated with the building of the first and second Temples (Hist. Eccl. 10.4.3).
538 It is striking that Eusebius’ interpretation of Matthew 27:53 in his Commentarii in Psalmum 87:11, still interpreted the “Holy City” as the heavenly Jerusalem after 325 CE. This is observed by Walker (1990), 107.
539 Walker (1990), 313; Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 59-60.
in”.\textsuperscript{540} While Eusebius employed Temple imagery in his description of the Church, it is in Cyril’s \textit{Catechetical Lectures} that we first see an adoption of \textit{omphalos} language in late-antique Christianity. In Cyril’s conception, Golgotha - not the Temple - was the sacred core. Serving as the backdrop for Cyril of Jerusalem’s \textit{Catechetical Lectures}, Golgotha was referred to as the very “centre of the earth [τῆς γῆς γὰρ γῆς τὸ μεσότατον]”.\textsuperscript{541} Like Eusebius, Cyril also delineated between the ‘two Jerusalems’, however this demarcation was not solely spatial but temporal: “That Jerusalem crucified Christ, but \textit{that which now is} worships him.”\textsuperscript{542} In this respect, the significance of Jerusalem articulated in the \textit{Catechetical Lectures} was predominantly liturgical. The discovery of Christ’s tomb and the emergence of the True Cross allowed the congregation in Jerusalem to see and touch the monuments and objects of Christ.\textsuperscript{543} Cyril’s ardent promotion of Jerusalem and liturgical engagement with the Cross founded both his catechetical instruction and his polemic. Therefore, in this “New Jerusalem”, the Cross served as a foundational element for the city’s fame rather than its judgement.\textsuperscript{544} It was for this reason that he was able to say that the “prerogative of all good things” is found in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{545}

\textsuperscript{540} δῆλον δὲ ὅτι ταύτην, ἐν ᾗ νῦν ἔσμεν. Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 14.16 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 128). Walker (1990), 325-6.

\textsuperscript{541} Cyril of Jerusalem, \textit{Catecheses} 13.28 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 86). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (\textit{FC} 64, 22).

\textsuperscript{542} ἔθρηνε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν τότε ἡ νῦν γὰρ οὐ θρηνηθήσεται. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐσταύρωσεν, ἡ δὲ νῦν προσκυνεῖ τὸν χριστόν. Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 13.7 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 60). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (\textit{FC} 64, 9).

\textsuperscript{543} “While other merely hear [ἀκούουσι μόνον]”, he famously preached, “We see [βλέπουμεν] and touch [ψηλαφῶμεν]”. Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 13.22 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 80). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (\textit{FC} 64, 19). The liturgical significance of Golgotha is covered in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{544} Cyril of Jerusalem’s eschatological scheme and the celestial apparitions of the Cross in 351 and 363 CE will be treated in Chapter 7. However, see Irshai (1996).

\textsuperscript{545} τὸ γὰρ ἀπάντων ἀγαθόν ἀξίωμα ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμως. Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 3.7 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 74). Tr.
Jerome, for all his vacillation on the subject of Jerusalem, provides us with the most thorough conceptualisation of a holy, earthly Jerusalem in his Epistle 46 to Marcella.\textsuperscript{546} The letter was written shortly after his own arrival in Bethlehem and was still “full of the happy atmosphere of a new beginning in a long desired setting”.\textsuperscript{547} Writing under the names of Paula and Eustochium, Jerome implored his friend to make the journey to Palestine as an ascetic imperative, preceded by God’s instruction to Abraham: “Go from your country, your people and your father’s household to the land I will show you.”\textsuperscript{548} In this respect, the Jerusalem ‘below’ and its encompassing Holy Land was portrayed as the Christian’s ‘Promise Land’.\textsuperscript{549} Also adopting the idea of the omphalos, Jerome alluded to the concentric nature of holiness resonating from Jerusalem: “Judaea is exalted above all other provinces, so is this city exalted above all Judaea”.\textsuperscript{550} On the question of Jerusalem as the “Holy city” of Matthew 27:51-53, he argued:

\begin{quote}
We must not interpret this passage straight off, as many people absurdly do, of the heavenly Jerusalem [Hierosolyma caelestis]: the apparition there of the bodies of the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{546} While ostensibly written by Paula and Eustochium to encourage their friend to join them in the Holy Land, it is often assumed that it was written by Jerome. On the authorship of Jerome, see Kelly (1975), 141; Nautin (1984), 441–49; Newman (1998), 215–27; Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 66; Cain (2010), 114 n. 47. It seems most likely that Jerome is the author of Ep. 46, as he would once again use Paula as a mediating force to talk about pilgrimage in 404 CE, as is observed by Limor (2006), 5.

\textsuperscript{547} Perrone (1999a), 230. There has been some debate on the dating of Ep. 46, however, most recent works have adopted Nautin’s (1984) assertion that the letter was drafted in 386 CE, such as Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 71 and Cain (2010), 114.

\textsuperscript{548} Ep. 46.2 after Genesis 12:1.

\textsuperscript{549} However, Jerome later interpreted the Promised Land as the heavenly Jerusalem in his Ep. 129 to Dardanus; Wilken (1992), 127-32; Perrone (1999a), 235.

\textsuperscript{550} Quanto Judaea caeteris provinciis, tanto haec urbs cuncta sublimior est Judaea. et ut coactus disseramus totius provinciae gloria metropoli vindicatur et, quidquid in membris laudis est, omne refertur ad corpus. Jerome, Ep. 46.3 (CSEL 54, 332). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 186). However, the city’s geographic and cultural centrality was more explicitly relayed in his Commentarii in Ezechielem 5.5, in which Jerusalem is portrayed as the umbilicium terrae (CCSL 75, 55–6)
saints could be no sign to men of the Lord's rising. Since, therefore, the evangelists and all the Scriptures speak of Jerusalem as the holy city, and since the psalmist commands us to worship the Lord at his footstool; allow no one to call it Sodom and Egypt, for by it the Lord forbids men to swear because it is the city of the great king [civitas magni regis].

Jerome combated traditional arguments regarding Jerusalem’s associations with the crucifixion of Christ and Jesus’ prophecy of “desolation” in Matthew 23:37-38, on which Christian interpretation of the Temple Mount was frequently pinned. To this, he responded, “The Lord wept for the fall of Jerusalem, and He would not have done so, if He did not love it”. Making a distinction between the city and its people, he remarked that for the city, the “lapse of time has invested it with fresh grandeur”.

Shifting from exegesis to experience, Jerome appealed to the privilege of pilgrimage and proximity to Christ’s tomb on Golgotha: “As often as we enter it, we see the Saviour in his grave clothes …” On account of the new context of Golgotha, the death of Christ no longer made Jerusalem a “cursed land”, but “precious soil inasmuch as the blood of Christ has been poured onto it”.

Christian response to the notion of a ‘Holy City’ and ‘Holy Land’ was not invariably well-received. An obvious contrary example is Jerome’s own Letter 58

---

551 Jerome, Ep. 46.7 (CSEL 54, 337-8). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 189-90).


553 Caeterum quantum ad locum pertinet, per profectus temporum multo nunc augustior est, quam ante fuit. Jerome, Ep. 46.5 (CSEL 54, 334). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 187).

554 Quod quotienscumque ingredimur, totiens iacere in sindone cernimus saluatorem et paululum ibidem commorantes rursum uidemus ... Jerome, Ep. 46.5 (CSEL 54, 334). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 187).

555 Perrone (1999a), 233.

556 This is treated in Bitton-Ashkelony (2005). Criticism is most evident in Gregory of Nyssa’s Ep. 2 and Jerome’s Ep. 58, which deal particularly with the topic of pilgrimage. While I will return to Jerome’s Ep. 58, space will not allow further discussion of Gregory’s objections. Suffice it to note here that, like Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa was solely, nor unerringly, ‘anti-pilgrimage’. It is well known that he celebrated the cult of the martyrs in Cappadocia. In addition, in the following letter (Ep. 3) Gregory
to Paulinus of Nola, in which he reverted to a strikingly Pauline perspective of Jerusalem, speaking disparagingly of the city and its value for Christian pilgrimage and habitation.\textsuperscript{557} However, Jerome’s objections, so we will see in a future chapter, were primarily a consequence of his own circumstances rather than a reflection on Jerusalem itself. L. Perrone considered the tension between an emergent “reality” of a Christian Jerusalem and its later formulation in the “consciousness of theologians” as an essential component of understanding the transition from the Jerusalem “above” to “below” in late antiquity.\textsuperscript{558} Cyril’s \textit{Catechetical Lectures} and Jerome’s \textit{Letter 46} exhibit the extent to which a more serious discourse about the value of the earthly city had begun to re-emerge into this consciousness during the fourth century.

3.5. Conclusion

The construction of an imperial church on Golgotha was, undoubtedly, a turning point in the Christian definition of Jerusalem. Its very existence insisted upon a theological recalibration, where the significance of the earthly Jerusalem “below” was increasingly embraced. It is for this reason that the Constantinian period is often regarded as a critical hingepoint in the shift from the Utopian to Locative in a Christian orientation to Jerusalem. However, it has become apparent that the turning point credited to Constantine was one primarily of perception rather than reality. By situating the events within the greater urban biography of Jerusalem, we see that the

\begin{itemize}
\item even admitted to his own spiritual engagement with the holy places of Palestine. On Gregory’s \textit{Ep. 2}, as well as its reception after the Reformation, see Williams (1998), 94–124; Maraval (1986), 131–46.
\item On Jerome’s change of attitude, however with little historical contextualisation, see Cardman (1982) and Prawer (1996). On the effect of the Origenist controversy, see Abel (1920) and Maraval (1988). For an interpretation of Jerome’s letters from the perspective of Jerusalem and Bethlehem as two corresponding entities, see Newman (1998).
\item Or, what Perrone (1999a) called ‘History’ and ‘Symbol’ (p. 235).
\end{itemize}
imperial project was situated in an otherwise largely unchanged city.\textsuperscript{559} In contrast to the first three centuries CE, where more comprehensive urban changes prompted theological adaptations, the reverse is true of the fourth century. Ideological predispositions were the primary informants of Christian interpretations of Jerusalem. Despite the lack of widespread change in the urban landscape, Christians impressed upon their audience the image of a transformed, Christian, and ‘holy’ city.

It is for this reason that we move from the ‘Spaces of Representation’ in Lefebvre’s framework to the ‘Representations of Space’. As discussed in the Introduction, “Representations” are created not by lived experience but by the imposition of ideology and power.\textsuperscript{560} It is a dominating and idealising force that is removed from, but seeks mastery over, physical and lived space. In this respect, the shift from Utopian to Locative was not solely a reinvigorated interest in the Jerusalem ‘below’. It was “an attempt to order the unconnected, dominate the environment, and control through symbolisation”.\textsuperscript{561} In this respect, Locative maps are not unlike the “totalizing discourse” of imperial hegemony, what A. Jacobs described as the desire to “know and contain everything under [an] imperial gaze”.\textsuperscript{562} When considering the relationship between urban and theological change in Jerusalem during and after the reign of Constantine, it is apparent that this was no longer a theological adaptation from a place of peripherality. It as an effort to establish Jerusalem as a prominent Christian centre on earth.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[559] Wharton (1992); (1995).
\item[561] Knott (2005b), 100.
\item[562] Jacobs (2004), 23.
\end{footnotes}
4. Golgotha and Liturgical Interaction with the Sacred in the Jerusalem Catechumenate

Over the course of the previous two chapters, I established the context of this study through a discussion of the major structural changes that occurred in Jerusalem from 70 to 385 CE. Turning to the reign of Constantine, I situated the imperial church on Golgotha within the greater urban biography of Jerusalem to highlight the implications of its spatial positioning. However, I also noted that the church was situated in a largely unchanged city. Therefore, while the Constantinian period had a significant impact on late-antique Christianity, this did not equate to an immediate change in the urban and demographic composition of Jerusalem. The disparity between ‘spaces’ and their ‘representations’ in the development of Jerusalem has now become apparent. In the following four chapters, I will question the degree to which the ideological development in Jerusalem from 335 to 385 CE was accompanied by a mutual degree of physical change. To this end, I will trace the physical and ideological trajectories of the city’s primary religious ‘zones’ – Golgotha, Zion, the Temple Mount, and the Mount of Olives.

Firstly, I return once more to the complex on Golgotha. Believed to be the site of both Christ’s death and resurrection, the church was the centre of ecclesiastical activity throughout this period. As such, it was instrumental in shaping Christian liturgical practice around the sacred topography of Jerusalem. This is particularly evident in the process of Christian initiation, on which Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Catechetical Lectures*

---

563 See Chapter 3.3.
and the later Mystagogical Catecheses provide complementary insight.\textsuperscript{564} I argue that the symbolic content of Christian initiation profited from proximity to the holy places of Christ housed in the Golgotha complex. As early expressions of a ‘spatially-rooted’ liturgy, catechetical instruction and baptism encouraged participants to experience the holy places first-hand, through materiality and motion. In turn, this process trained participants to employ a sort of “exegetical vision”, which shaped Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{565} Like the catechumens themselves, Jerusalem was seemingly immersed in biblical associations and clothed in a new, Christian form.\textsuperscript{566}

4.1. Contextualising the Jerusalem Catechumenate

During the fourth century, bishops primarily utilised the weeks approaching Easter (otherwise known at the Lenten period, or Quadragesima) as a period for Christian initiation.\textsuperscript{567} The culminating ritual of the catechetical programme, baptism, coincided with the most important event of the liturgical year: Easter.\textsuperscript{568} This arrangement highlighted the symbolic significance of baptism as a reflection of Christ’s death and resurrection, as conveyed in Romans 6:3-4:

Don’t you know that all of us who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were therefore buried with him through baptism into death in order that,

\textsuperscript{564} Cyril, \textit{Cat.: Catecheses Mystagogicae.}

\textsuperscript{565} Kalleres (2005), 448

\textsuperscript{566} It is striking that catechetical language has been utilised to describe the process of Christianisation in Jerusalem. Following Bowman (2001), who compared \textit{It. Burd.} to a catechetical text, Irshai (2009) suggested that the \textit{Itinerarium} portrayed the “catechetical phase” of Jerusalem’s Christian history, where it is a sort of “neophyte Christian holy city” (pp. 473-4).

\textsuperscript{567} On the Lenten Catechumenate see Dujarier (1979), 77-111; Finn (1997), 196-206; Doval (2001), 29-56.

\textsuperscript{568} Wharton (1992), 319-20.
just as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, we too may live a new life.  

However, the widespread use of the Lenten period for catechesis was also practical. As it became socially advantageous to convert to Christianity following its imperial acceptance, an influx of catechumens caused a set of unprecedented issues in the existing structures of Christian initiation. While many underwent the baptismal rite without the adequate preparation, others opted to reject it altogether and remain permanently as a catechumen. In response, bishops were encouraged to create a regular and robust catechetical programme and to circulate treatises on the theological importance and integrity of the ritual. It is in this context that Cyril of Jerusalem’s eighteen Catechetical Lectures, and the five Mystagogical Lectures (of a more disputed authorship) originate.

The former, first delivered in 351 CE, conveys at least part of this instruction, in which the core beliefs of Christianity were illustrated through an exposition of its

---

569 Romans 6:3-4.

570 However, such problems likely began to affect prevailing systems of catechesis in the third century, argued Telfer (1955), 31. On baptism as a force of social power, see Wharton (1992), 320.

571 However, see Bradshaw (2011).


573 Other Christian writers such as John Chrysostom and Ambrose of Milan also developed treatises on baptism during this period. Their contributions have been regarded as a sort of “renaissance” of Pauline baptismal theology during the fourth century, as in Riley (1974), 223.

574 In contrast to Cyril of Jerusalem’s Cat., the Mys. Cat. likely dates to the late fourth century and has been attributed either to Cyril of Jerusalem or his successor, John. On Cyrilline authorship of the Mys. Cat., see Piédagnel (1966), 18–40; McCauley and Stephenson (1970), 142-9; Yarnold (1978); Röwekamp (1992), 8-15; Yarnold (2000), 22-32; Drijvers (2004), 59-61. For the most thorough case for Cyrilline authorship, see Doval (2001). Cf. Swaans (1942), Day (2007) and (2011) for a discussion of Johannine authorship.

575 For this dating, see Doval (1997) and (2001), 27-8. It is likely these lectures were revised over the course of his episcopacy. An example of later revision in Cyril of Jerusalem’s fifteenth lecture on eschatology will be explored in Chapter 7.3.4. On this, see also Irshai (1999), 213-14.
central tenets (the *traditio symboli*) as part of a Lenten catechetical programme.\textsuperscript{576} The latter *Mystagogical Catecheses* provides a short post-baptismal syllabus, in which newly baptised Christians were educated on the “mysteries” of the sacraments they had then experienced. The *Mystagogical Catecheses* is typically dated to the end of the fourth century, either to the latter years of Cyril of Jerusalem’s episcopacy (bishop from 348 to 386 CE) or to the episcopacy of his successor, John (bishop from 386 to 417 CE).\textsuperscript{577} While the chronological gap between the texts suggests they were not part of the same liturgical practice, they reflect a shared aim: to systematically illustrate the core beliefs and practices of Christianity, which were ultimately internalised through the act of baptism.

In conjunction with catechetical instruction, the Lenten period consisted of a rigorous routine of ritual preparation. Through the combined practice of ritual and teaching, candidates embarked on a journey to Christian enlightenment, which was completed in the rite of baptism.\textsuperscript{578} Both pre- and post-baptismal teaching conveyed the symbolic significance of rite as well as its transformative impact on the life of the Christian. Catechetical instruction, A. Jacobs observed, also inculcated a “totalising

\textsuperscript{576} The creed was first summarised in Cyril’s fourth lecture (*Cat.* 4.4-17) and then conveyed in greater detail in the following lectures (*Cat.* 5-18). Johnson (1988) and (1990) considered this as evidence of an earlier tradition, when the catechetical period was still shorter. See also Cabrol (1895); Stephenson (1954a) and (1954b); McCauley and Stephenson (1969-70), 2-3; McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 84-5.

\textsuperscript{577} See note 575 above. While Day (2007), (2011) makes a convincing argument for the authorship of John of Jerusalem, Yarnold (1978) and Doval (2001), attributed the *Mys. Cat.* to the last years of Cyril of Jerusalem’s episcopacy. Paulin (1959) considered the influence of Cyril on the later text.

\textsuperscript{578} Όρ φωτιζόμενοι. Cyril, *Procat.* 1 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 2).
form of Christian knowledge” in its audience.579 Ultimately, Christian initiation elucidated a new form of seeing and knowing the world.580

4.1.1. Aspects of “Spatial-Rootedness” in Christian Initiation

Comparative study has confirmed that the process of Christian initiation in Jerusalem shared much regularity with practices elsewhere.581 Despite the city’s significance as an emerging hub of Christian activity, Jerusalem functioned primarily as an importer – rather than exporter – of innovative practices.582 This was likely due to the increasing presence and influence of Christian pilgrims and monastic emigrants over the course of the fourth century. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to expect a degree of particularity with regards to the city’s unique geographic, social, and theological setting.583 On account of this, scholars have drawn attention to aspects of “social-rootedness” in Christian liturgical practice; liturgy was inevitably a product of its immediate context.584

While the methods of teaching employed in Jerusalem were not particularly original, the liturgical sources reveal a unique engagement with the immediate setting. In this way, we can trace aspects of ‘spatial-’ as well as “social-rootedness” in the

579 Jacobs (2004), 38
580 Finn (1997), 205; Regule (2020).
582 Bradshaw (1999).
583 Telfer (1955) considered the catechumenate as a practice which “clothed itself in local practice in a variety of different usages” (p. 32).
584 Wharton (1995), 76-85; Kalleres (2005) employed Wharton’s idea of “Social Rootedness” to discuss how “particularities of location” can be extracted from Cyril’s Cat. The importance of context in the study of liturgy has been emphasised by Baldovin (1987); Bradshaw (2001). This concern was also central to Day’s (2007) examination of Jerusalem’s baptismal liturgy and its perceived originality. See also Belcher’s (2019) discussion.
liturgical practices of Jerusalem. Integral to this was the construction and expansion of the Golgotha complex during the first half of the fourth century to house the primary monuments of Christ’s death and resurrection: Tomb, Calvary, and Cross. This immediate setting informed the additional aim in the bishop’s method of catechesis to celebrate the holy places of Christ through first-hand experience. Therefore, to consider aspects of ‘spatial-rootedness’ in the Jerusalem Catechumenate, we must consider the lectures within the backdrop of its immediate setting. For this, we return to the ecclesiastical and liturgical centre of fourth-century Jerusalem, the church on Golgotha.

4.2. The Golgotha Complex (335-385 CE)

Situated in the city centre on the remains of the Roman forum, Constantine’s church in Jerusalem opened onto the primary thoroughfare of the city, the Cardo Maximus. 585 As discussed in the previous chapter, the emperor’s decision to erect a church at this location likely had political motivations. 586 Nevertheless, the miraculous and mythological occurrences surrounding the church’s origins and its relationship with the sites of Christ ultimately imbued its significance. Most obvious was the discovery of Christ’s tomb, which became the foremost subject of interest for Eusebius of Caesarea. 587 Archaeological survey made possible during the last half century has allowed for a more accurate reconstruction of the complex and its chronology. When considered in conjunction with the church’s associations with the True Cross of Christ

585 See Figure 11 in the Appendix.
586 See Chapter 3.2.
587 Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3.25–40.
and the “rocky outcrop” known as Calvary shortly thereafter, it is evident that the design of the complex was multifarious, relating to both Christ’s passion and resurrection.

4.2.1. Evidence of Christ’s Resurrection: Tomb

The earliest reference to a church complex on Golgotha comes from a short entry in the Bordeaux Itinerary, which addressed both the “little hill [monticulus]” of Golgotha, “where the Lord was crucified” and the “tomb [cripta] where they laid his body” in conjunction with a basilica built “by the order of the emperor Constantine”. While brief, the entry provides an important note on the dating of the church, which seemed to be completed years prior to its formal dedication in 335 CE. In addition, the author’s reference to both the death and resurrection of Christ illustrates the church’s manifold significance. However, it is the third book of Eusebius of Caesarea’s Life of Constantine, which was published after the emperor’s death in 337 CE, that provides us with the most comprehensive description. In contrast to the Bordeaux Itinerary, Eusebius’ lengthier description presented an alternative view of the church’s early significance. Eusebius exclusively focused on the “Testimony of the Saviour’s resurrection” as the raison d’être of Constantine’s project.

--

588 McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 65.
589 Drake (1985), 6-7; Hunt (1997), 413.
590 It. Burd. 594.1-4. (IR 1, 97). Also, as previously noted, the entry concluded with a set of cisterns and a bath where infants (likely neophyte Christians) were baptised.
591 See the previous chapter (3.1; 3.4.1) for a discussion of the delay in dedication.
592 Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3.25-40.
According to Eusebius, Constantine’s ambition from the start was to locate and memorialise the “most blessed site … of the Saviour’s resurrection”. In this respect, it is somewhat strange that when the destruction of the Venus temple prompted the unearthing of that selfsame “Testimony [μαρτύριον]”, it was still a discovery “against all expectation”. Nevertheless, Eusebius did not hesitate to illustrate the symbolic resonance of miraculous event: Christ’s tomb, like Christ himself, re-emerged from the ground in a tremendous event of architectural resurrection. The discovery of Christ’s tomb, Eusebius reported, was the inspirational force behind the ambitious building project in Jerusalem. It is a consequence of Eusebius’ profound concentration on the tomb of Christ, as well as the longstanding Anastasis Rotunda that remains a prominent part of the complex today, that the building is commonly referred to as the Church of the “Anastasis”, or the “Church of the Holy Sepulchre”.

Embedded within Eusebius’ account is a remnant of an imperial letter, in which Constantine tasked the bishop of Jerusalem with constructing a basilica “superior to those in all other places”. The basilica, referred to as the “Royal Temple” by

---


595 Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3.28, 40 (GCS 1.2, 96 and 101).


597 Eusebius noted that the tomb “took on the appearance of a representation of the Saviour’s return to life [τὴν ὀμοίαν τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀναβιώσεως ἀπελάμβανεν εἰκόνα]” (Vit. Const. 3.28 (GCS 1.2, 96)). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 133.

598 While the Martyrium basilica was destroyed in 1009 CE, much of the fourth-century rotunda was restored and still survives.

599 In this study, I refer to this as the ‘Church on Golgotha’. This is because Golgotha was a more common name for the church during the fourth century. When referring to the modern structure, however, I will refer to it as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

Eusebius, received the most extensive description in the Life.\textsuperscript{601} The prominent structure, accessible via an entry courtyard to the east, was extensively adorned in marble and gilded colonnades. Eusebius referred to the western apse [ἡμισφαίριον] of the basilica as “chief point of the whole [τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντός]”.\textsuperscript{602} To the west of the basilica was another open-air courtyard lined on three sides with colonnades.\textsuperscript{603} Finally, the westernmost component of the complex, what Eusebius perplexingly also regarded as the “principle item” [κεφαλή] of the church itself, was the site of Christ’s Tomb.\textsuperscript{604} However, the tomb received only minimal description.\textsuperscript{605} From Eusebius’ account, we can only make one architectural note with certainty: that it was adorned with “superb columns and full ornamentation”.\textsuperscript{606} Cyril of Jerusalem later referred to the means by which Christ’s tomb was “hewn [λελαξευμένην] away to make room for the present adornment”.\textsuperscript{607} Visual evidence from later pilgrimage \textit{ampullae} confirm


\textsuperscript{605} Eusebius’ disproportionate praise of the tomb has inspired much ongoing debate regarding the author’s own theological anxieties about the True Cross. The lack of an explicit reference to the Cross by Eusebius, as well as in the brief account of Jerusalem in the \textit{It. Burd.}, casts some doubt on the Cross discovery during the reign of Constantine. However, close analysis of Eusebius’ account and context has inspired some to re-assess his perplexing silence. Rubin (1982), Drake (1985), Drijvers (1992) Borgehammar (1991), and Walker (1990) have considered a more conscious attempt at silence on theological and ecclesiastical grounds. However, the question of Eusebius’ silence is still much debated. Cameron and Hall (1999) considered the “amount of space and emphasis given” to Constantine’s church as an indication of his excitement in the imperial project, rather than hesitation. Drijvers (2011) rescinded his previous opinion on the silence of Eusebius to consider the \textit{inventio crucis} rather a tradition to originate after 337. See also Spieser’s (2014) more recent discussion of this debate.

\textsuperscript{606} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.34. Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 135.

\textsuperscript{607} Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 14.9 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 116). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson \textit{(FC} 64, 37). See Kalleres (2005) for a discussion of Cyril’s treatment of the tomb in his \textit{Catechesis}. 
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that the tomb was raised from the ground and encased in a small structure – the *aediculum*, or Edicule.\footnote{On the *aediculum*, see Wilkinson (1971), 247; Biddle (1999), 53-108. The *aediculum* was a common feature on later pilgrimage flasks, such as those of the Treasury of the Monza Cathedral and Bobbio Abbey. See Figure 14 in Appendix. Restoration of the Edicule in 2016 allowed for an unprecedented opportunity to examine the rock-cut tomb underneath. See Romey (2016a and b).}

Though Eusebius’ description of the complex is extensive, it is also uneven.\footnote{Rubin (1982); Drake (1985).} While the tomb of Christ was ostensibly the central component of Constantine’s church, it is the hardest element to reconstruct based on textual description alone. In contrast, the basilica received the most description and appears to have been the primary focal point of the imperial project. Even Eusebius conceded that the tomb was not the only “head [κεφαλή]” of the complex. The apse in the western end of the basilica seems to have been a place of equal, if not greater importance. These issues come to the fore when compared with the archaeological surveys of the church complex made possible during restoration projects of the last half century. More accurate reconstructions of the complex and its chronology have further dismantled aspects of Eusebius’ account.

### 4.2.2. Archaeological Reconstructions of the Golgotha Complex

When L.-H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel presented their historical and structural study of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, they depended primarily on the testimony of Eusebius’ *Life of Constantine*.\footnote{Vincent and Abel (1914), 154-206.} As a result, their reconstruction of the complex placed prime importance on the area of the tomb, which was surrounded by a large circumference.\footnote{See Vincent and Abel’s (1914) reconstruction after Eusebius’ *Vit. Const.* in the Appendix (Figure 16). See also Telfer (1955), 44; Conant (1956), 39; Walker (1990), 247.} However, restoration of the Church complex from 1960 to 1981
allowed for an unprecedented degree of archaeological examination.\textsuperscript{612} The structural data accumulated during this period was then collated in two prominent studies by C. Coüasnon and V. Corbo, which remain authoritative texts on the architectural history of the church.\textsuperscript{613} Following Coüasnon and Corbo, further archaeological contributions of the last half century have provided a more accurate reconstruction of the building complex and its chronology.\textsuperscript{614}

In particular, archaeological study of the church’s structural components has provided important revision to the puzzling elements of Eusebius’ \textit{Life of Constantine}.\textsuperscript{615} Reconstructions have once again drawn attention to the western apse of the \textit{Martyrium} (Eusebius’ ἡ μισφαίριον) as the structural centre of the complex. In contrast, the tomb has been somewhat peripheralized; the monument was located in a semi-circular area in the westernmost portion of the complex. In addition, the basilica’s apse was not oriented centrally in accordance with the tomb but was “offset to the south”.\textsuperscript{616} This is likely on account of its relationship to a third prominent feature in the early Constantinian church: the conspicuous monolith in the southeast corner of the western courtyard, known as Calvary.\textsuperscript{617} In sum, the early church complex was likely not as oriented around the tomb of Christ as Eusebius’ account suggests. Rather,
as C. Coüasnon’s convincingly proposed, the church complex was constructed in two phases.\textsuperscript{618} The first phase, completed by 335 CE, consisted of the basilica, Edicule, and courtyards.\textsuperscript{619} The second phase, completed during the reign of Constantine’s son, Constantius II, entailed the addition of a large, double-shelled rotunda over the site of Christ’s tomb - the \textit{Anastasis}.\textsuperscript{620}

Therefore, the \textit{Anastasis} Rotunda was an important expansion of the westernmost element of the Golgotha complex in the years following the reign of Constantine. Twelve columns and four masonry piers, roughly twenty metres in diameter, surrounded the inner shell of the rotunda.\textsuperscript{621} At its centre was the tomb and \textit{aediculum}. Three apses to the north, west, and south were accessible through the ambulatory. On the eastern side of the building, an entry façade opened onto the intermediary courtyard. The \textit{Anastasis} Rotunda was certainly completed by the time of Egeria’s pilgrimage in the early 380s CE, because she described an enclosed structure frequently used in the daily offices of the Jerusalem Church.\textsuperscript{622} Egeria’s account confirms that the Rotunda was the venue for post-baptismal (or

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{619} Textual evidence confirms the completion of this phase as early at 333 CE, however certainly by the Encaenia festival of 335 CE. See note 590 above.
\item \textsuperscript{620} Coüasnon’s (1974) assertion was rejected by Corbo (1981). However, the two-phased construction of the complex on Golgotha is now generally accepted on account of W.E. Kleinbauer’s re-assessment of the Rotunda’s double-shelled design, which is shared with the “Great Church” in Antioch, and the Santa Constanza in Rome. Kleinbauer convincingly suggested that the architectural forms were an innovation dating to the time and patronage of Constantius II. See Kleinbauer (1998) and (2006), Ousterhout (2016), and Kelley (2020), 104. Cf. Shalev-Hurvitz (2015).
\item \textsuperscript{621} Adomnán, \textit{De Locis Sanctis} 1.2.4. As opposed to the ten columns of the present-day Rotunda.
\item \textsuperscript{622} It. \textit{Eg.} 25.2 Egeria’s terminology is somewhat confusing: She refers to the \textit{Anastasis} as both a “basilica” and “spelunca” (SC 296, 246).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
“mystagogical”) catechism, as well as monastic liturgies in the early mornings.\textsuperscript{623} Therefore, Egeria’s citation of the \textit{Anastasis} serves as the most reliable \textit{terminus ante quem} for its construction. However, evidence from the \textit{Catechetical Lectures} suggests the edifice was completed much earlier. In his fourteenth lecture, Cyril of Jerusalem referred to the “Holy church of the \textit{Anastasis} … inlaid with silver and wrought with gold”, which was built by “the emperors of our times”.\textsuperscript{624} The dating of the \textit{Lectures}, as well as its reference to ‘emperors’ in the plural, implies that the Rotunda was constructed in the fifteen years following the Encaenia festival, during the reign of Constantius II and before the death of Constans in 350 CE.\textsuperscript{625}

\textbf{4.2.3. Evidence of Christ’s Passion: Calvary and Cross}

Eusebius of Caesarea referred to the Constantinian Church as a “Testimony [\textit{μαρτύριον}]” on three occasions. Two instances, we have seen, referenced the “Testimony [\textit{μαρτύριον}] of the Saviour’s resurrection”. These references come at the beginning and end of Eusebius’ description, framing the construction’s ostensible orientation around the hallowed site of Christ’s tomb.\textsuperscript{626} However, on a third occasion, Eusebius referred to the church as having been “built at the very Testimony of the Saviour [\textit{τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον}]”.\textsuperscript{627} Having now established that the \textit{Anastasis} was

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{623} \textit{It. Eg.} 24:1, 3, 9.
\item \textsuperscript{624} οἱ τότε μὲν στρατιώται ἄργυριον προδεδόκασι τὴν ἄληθεαν, οἱ δὲ γυν βασιλεῖς δὲ εὐσέβειαν ἄργυρον ἄντων καὶ χρυσάλλητον τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν ταύτην ... Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 14.14 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 124). Tr. Kleinbauer (1998), 141; (2006), 130-1. In addition, the \textit{Cat.} also confirms that the \textit{Anastasis} was used for mystagogical instruction by the mid-fourth century (18.33).
\item \textsuperscript{625} For this argument, see Kleinbauer (1998) and (2006); however, also see Wistrand (1952) and Colaissnon (1974), 15.
\item \textsuperscript{626} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.28, 40. See notes 593 and 595 above.
\item \textsuperscript{627} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 3.33 (\textit{GCS} 1.2, 97). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 134.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
a later addition, this third use is harder to reconcile solely as a reference to the Tomb. Rather, the site on which the complex was built was, more generally, a “Testimony” of Christ.

Eusebius’ concentration on the Tomb is complicated further by the emperor’s emphasis on the “evidence of his most sacred passion [γνώρισμα … τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πάθους]” in his letter to the bishop of Jerusalem.\(^{628}\) It appears that there was an early connection to the topography of Christ’s death, in addition to his resurrection. The multifaceted significance of the complex is also implied in Eusebius’ oration, *In Praise of Constantine*, which once again referred to the site as the Testimony of the Saviour/Salvation [τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον]:

... Such things he accomplished in this place. In the Palestinian nation, in the heart of the Hebrew kingdom, on the very site of the evidence of salvation [τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον], he outfitted with many and abundant distinctions an enormous house of prayer and temple sacred to the Saving Sign, and he honored a memorial full of eternal significance and the Great savior’s own trophies over death with ornaments beyond description ...\(^ {629}\)

In the oration, Eusebius’ description of the complex is seemingly “redundant” with its references to adornments on the “Evidence of Salvation”, “Saving Sign”, and the “Saviour’s … trophies over death”.\(^ {630}\) However, H.A. Drake discerned that “the key to his description lies in the complicated nature of the site itself”.\(^ {631}\) The church, composed of multiple prominent areas, was associated with the monuments of Christ’s death and resurrection from the very start.

---


\(^{630}\) Drake (1976) 171.

\(^{631}\) Drake (1976) 171.
Cyril of Jerusalem later discussed the multifarious nature of the church more explicitly:

You see that the prophet foresaw that the Resurrection was to be called "the martyry." Now for what reason is this place of Golgotha and of the Resurrection called, not a church like the rest of the churches, but a “martyry” [μαρτύριον]? 632

The Catechetical Lectures attest that a dual focus in the sacred topography of Golgotha was well established by the mid-fourth century. By the time of Egeria’s pilgrimage, this association was also embedded in the very vocabulary of pilgrimage, as the basilica was commonly referred to as the Martyrium. When explaining its title, Egeria reasoned that it was called this because “it is on Golgotha, that is, behind the Cross where the Lord suffered”. 633

Both Cyril of Jerusalem’s Catechetical Lectures and Egeria’s Itinerary relay the liturgical significance of the two other areas that compose the topography of “Golgotha”: the “Cross” and the Martyrium. Cyril of Jerusalem commonly regarded the setting of his Catechetical Lectures as ‘Golgotha’. 634 While we might interpret his use of the term as a more general description of the church complex, the “conspicuous” mount of Golgotha was likely a specific reference to the stone monolith of Calvary located in the southeastern corner of the courtyard. 635 Egeria similarly referred to the church complex generally as the “Church on Golgotha”. 636 However, her account also demonstrates the addition of two liturgical stations “Before the Cross [ante Crucem]”

632 Cyril, Cat. 14.6 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 115). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 36).
634 Cyril, Cat. 1.1, 4.14, 5.10, 10.19, 13.4, 13.22, 13.23, 13.28, 14.6, 16.4.
635 Cyril, Cat. 10.19. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 209). See also Cat. 13.39.
636 Ecclesia in Golgotha est post Crucem. It. Eg. 25.1 (SC 296, 246).
and “Behind the Cross [post Crucem]” within the Golgotha complex. While the precise location of these stations is difficult to verify, they were most likely associated with the area around this rocky outcrop, on which a large representation cross was installed. The station “Before the Cross” was in the courtyard and required the congregation to exit the Martyrium. However, the station “Behind the Cross” appears to refer to an area within the basilica, itself. This is most evident during Holy Week, when the congregation went “Behind the Cross”, to venerate the holy relic:

A chair is placed for the bishop on Golgotha behind the Cross [in Golgotha post Crucem] … a silver-gilt casket is brought, in which is the holy wood of the cross; it is opened and [the wood] is brought out … thus, all the people pass through one by one, all bowing, touching the cross …

The frequent reference to Golgotha in our later sources has typically been interpreted in opposition to Eusebius’ unerring focus of the Tomb. Drawing on the Cyrilline “misgiving” proposed by P.W.L. Walker, D. Kalleres interpreted Cyril’s Lectures as a departure from the imperial representations of sacred topography towards a more intimate and immanent engagement with the incarnate Christ, crucified. In contrast to the Eusebian focus on the tomb, which was hewn from the rock and concealed in the Edicule, Cyril treasured the accessible, material evidence of Christ found in the Cross. While the precise origins of the relic are ultimately elusive, Cyril of Jerusalem’s Lectures confirm its centrality in the liturgical practices of the

---

637 It. Eg. 24.7, 11; 25.11; 35.2; 36.4; 37.1, 5; 39.2.
640 It. Eg. 37 (SC 296, 284-6). Egeria noted that this took place in the area where the oblation was performed the day prior. This oblation, Egeria notes earlier in It. Eg. 35.1, was in the Martyrium.
Jerusalem Church by the mid-fourth century. While it is more contentious, the “saving passion” in Constantine’s letter seems to suggest that the Cross was likely foundational to the Church’s construction.\textsuperscript{642} In addition, Egeria’s account further elucidates the purpose behind the basilica’s apse from Eusebius’ description. This area correlates well with the station “Behind the Cross”, where the veneration of the cross would take place during Holy Week.\textsuperscript{643}

4.2.4. Initial Conclusions

So far, I have discussed how the discovery and monumentalisation of Christ’s tomb was the central component of Eusebius’ portrayal of the imperial church in Jerusalem. However, archaeological study over the last half century has allowed for a more accurate reconstruction of the building complex and its chronology. While Eusebius portrayed the tomb of Christ as the impetus for, and central component of, Constantine’s basilica in his \textit{Life of Constantine}, it seems the reverse was true. The primary subject of imperial interest was the basilica, while the tomb of Christ stood amid an open-air courtyard at the time of its dedication in 335 CE. Further examination of Cyril of Jerusalem’s \textit{Catechetical Lectures} and Egeria’s \textit{Itinerary} have highlighted the site’s importance as the “Testimony” of Christ’s passion and resurrection. Having now examined the construction and expansion of the Golgotha complex during the first half of the fourth century to house the primary monuments of Christological significance (Cross, Calvary, and tomb), we can now consider the literature of

\textsuperscript{643} It. Eg. 37.3.
Christian initiation as “spatially-rooted”. This immediate setting encouraged participants to experience the holy places first-hand, through materiality and motion.

4.3. Materiality in Catechetical Instruction

Given the nature and context of the Catechetical Lectures, we can understand Cyril of Jerusalem primarily as a “testimonial” preacher. Central to his instruction was an exploration of the various witnesses, testimonies, and proofs that confirmed both scripture and Creed. While Cyril’s methods of teaching were not particularly original, the Lectures are unique in their engagement with the immediate setting. The bishop of Jerusalem expressed the importance of both scripture and place in the formation of Christian faith. Preaching in the very location of Christ’s death and resurrection, Cyril considered the sacred topography of Jerusalem as essential to establishing the truth of the scriptures. Landscape functioned as a sort of “fifth gospel”.

On three occasions in particular, Cyril provided extensive lists of scriptural witnesses to illustrate the veritability of Christ’s life, death, and resurrection. In his thirteenth Lecture on the crucifixion, the bishop embarked on a rhetorical tour of the city to consider the events leading up to Christ’s death. Through mental procession, Cyril reviewed the events as if suspended in time:

---

645 Jackson (1991), 435.
646 Perrone (1999b) noted that it is because of this that Cyril developed a sort of “‘experimental’, devotional, if not altogether ‘sacramental’ Christology, nourished together with the biblical memories by the local setting of Christ’s earthly life and events” (pp. 14-15).
647 Walker (1995), 32. See also Perrone (1999a), 229.
First Judas the traitor will confute [ἐλέγξει] you; for he who betrayed Him knew that He was condemned to death by the chief priests and the ancients. The thirty pieces of silver bear witness [μαρτυρία]; Gethsemane bears witness, where the betrayal took place; not yet do I speak of the Mount of Olives, where they who were with Him that night … Remember the swords that came against him in Gethsemane, that you may not feel the eternal sword. The house of Caiaphas will convince you, which by its present desolation manifests the power of him who once was judged in it … The false witnesses will rise up against you, and the soldiers who put the purple cloak upon Him, set the crown of thorns on His head, crucified Him on Golgotha, and cast lots for His tunic. Simon of Cyrene, who carried the Cross after Jesus, will confound you.

The bishop used a wide range of witnesses [μαρτυρία]: both people and places served as proofs. He frequently transitioned from biblical event to physical landmark, wherever possible grounding scripture in recognisable places. The Mount of Olives, with Gethsemane at its foot, the House of Caiaphas on Mount Zion, and Golgotha all seemingly defied any doubt of historicity.

The bishop of Jerusalem used a similar strategy further afield. In his tenth Lecture on Christ, he pointed to witnesses with a wider geographical breadth:

There are many true testimonies [μαρτυρία] … concerning Christ. The Father from heaven bears witness [μαρτυρεῖ] concerning the Son; the Holy Spirit, descending in a bodily shape, in the dorm of a dove … The Virgin Mother of God is His witness [μαρτυρεῖ]; the blessed place of the manger is His witness [μαρτυρεῖ]. Egypt bears witness to Him [μαρτυρεῖ], having received Him when still young in body … A witness also is John the Baptist [μαρτυρεῖ], the greatest of the prophets and inaugurator of the New Testament and, in a way, linking in himself the Old and New Testaments. Among rivers, the Jordan bears witness [μαρτυρεῖ]; among seas, the Sea of Tiberias …

In a similar fashion to his retelling of the crucifixion, Cyril compiled scriptural and geographic proofs. However, the extensive list of people and places that bore witness to Christ ultimately shifted the focus of his congregation back to Jerusalem, to

---

648 Cyril, Cat. 13:38 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 98-100). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 29-30).
649 Walker (1990), 331.
650 Cyril, Cat. 10.19 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 284-6). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 207-8).
651 Perrone (1999a), 229.
the “palm tree in the valley”, Gethsemane and Golgotha.\textsuperscript{652} Cyril drew a connection between his city and the greater region of the Bible, which had begun to invite much Christian interest during his episcopacy.\textsuperscript{653} It was in Jerusalem alone, however, that he invested the vast majority of his interest. Even Bethlehem, which one would assume would have great significance as the place in which Christ was first incarnate, was eclipsed by the later glory of his death and ascension in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{654}

4.3.1. Participation in Proximity: Seeing and Touching the Sacred

Both before and after Constantinian intervention, engagement with the Christian topography of Jerusalem was essentially scriptural.\textsuperscript{655} However, following the discovery of Christ’s tomb, and in turn the emerging relic of the True Cross, the invitation was not only to investigate and consider but also to physically interact with biblical event through a shared sense of place. With this new physicality, remnants of a former era could be seen and touched.\textsuperscript{656} The unearthing of biblical landmarks set in motion a theological shift that became integral to Cyril’s method of instruction: that sight was an essential “component of Christian faith”.\textsuperscript{657} As the bishop directed his audience’s focus to the resurrection of Christ, he invoked a similar set of witnesses:

\textsuperscript{652} Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 10.19. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (\textit{FC} 63, 208).

\textsuperscript{653} Interest in the greater region of the “Holy Land” is first evident in the \textit{It. Burd}. There, the author embarked on a tour of Palestine, in which Jerusalem is only part (albeit a large one). Interest in sites beyond the life of Christ is evident in the \textit{It. Eg}. from the 380s CE and Jerome’s own geographic interest in Palestine. Therefore, Cyril stands as an outlier in his focus on Jerusalem. He does not make many references to places outside of his city; when he does, he referred almost exclusively to the New Testament. See Wilken (1992), 111.

\textsuperscript{654} Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 60.

\textsuperscript{655} Limor (2001); Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 10; Levinson (2013), 114.

\textsuperscript{656} Wilken (1992), 90-1.

\textsuperscript{657} Wilken (1992), 91.
Golgotha here, the pre-eminent, which is still visible today [σήμερον φανόμενον] and still shows how the rocks were split … by the grave nearby where he was laid; by the stone which was placed over the door and still lies next to the tomb today; by the angels who were there that day; by the women who adored him after the resurrection, by Peter and John, who ran to the tomb, and Thomas, who put his hand into Christ’s side and his fingers into the prints of the nails. For it was for our sake that he felt them so carefully [ἀκριβῶς ἐψηλάφησεν] by God’s providence he was there to seek [ζητεῖν] what you were to seek [ἐζήτησεν] though you were not there.658

Once again, Cyril conveyed a series of scriptural and geographic proofs. However, the primary place of interest was the tomb of Christ, which was then enshrined in the Anastasis, mere steps away. Amid the host of witnesses to the resurrection, Cyril praised Thomas as an important and emulative example. Rather than condemning Thomas’ lack of faith, the bishop considered his interaction with Christ as important evidence of his death and resurrection. When Thomas touched Christ’s side, Cyril instructed that “It was for our sake that he felt …so carefully”.659 Because of Thomas’ desire to touch Christ’s wounds, he too became an informed witness. It then comes as little surprise that Cyril abandoned the rest of John’s statement, “Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed”.660 Instead, the bishop of Jerusalem affirmed that sight and touch were valuable, even essential, aspects of faith.661 After all, the Jerusalem congregation had an immense privilege on account of their proximity to the holy places: “While other merely hear [ἀκοόσωσι μόνον]”, he famously preached, “we see [βλέπομεν] and touch [ψηλαφῶμεν].”662

660 John 20:29.
661 Walker (1990), 331; Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 60.
662 Cyril, Cat. 13.22 (Reischl and Rupp ii, 80). tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 19).
In Cyril of Jerusalem’s catechetical teaching, it was not enough to simply spectate. Catechumens were called to investigate the scriptures for themselves. Delineating between sight and hearing, Cyril questioned:

You have heard [Ὁξουσίας] that His side was pierced by a spear. Are you not obliged to see [ὁφεῖλες ἰδεῖν] if this is also written? You have heard that he was crucified in a garden; ought you not to see if this is written?663

However, the bishop’s encouragement to “see” the evidence was not solely textual. He also advised them to “seek to know … where [ποῦ] [Christ] was buried”.664 Making use of his privileged position on Golgotha, Cyril conveyed how biblical history and the person of Christ could be affirmed through the present setting. Throughout his *Catechetical Lectures*, the bishop reminded his audience of their privileged position. He repeated phrases, such as “*Here* in this city of Jerusalem [ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει]”665, “*He who was here* [ἐνταῦθα] crucified”666, and “*In this place* of Golgotha [τοῦ Γολγοθᾶ τὸν τόπον]”.667 Doing so, Cyril emphasised a means of present engagement.668 The incorporation of geographic cues encouraged his audience to make a "personal connection" with scriptural event.669 The foremost of all, Golgotha, was the context of their instruction, and it was a proof that they could not help but see.

---

663 Cyril, *Cat.* 13:8 (Reischl anhd Rupp, ii, 60). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (*FC* 64, 9).
665 Cyril, *Cat.* 17.13 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 266). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (*FC* 64, 104).
667 Cyril, *Cat.* 13.23 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 80). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (*FC* 64, 19).
669 Jackson (1991), 444.
4.3.2. The True Cross

The most powerful example of materiality in the Jerusalem liturgy was the True Cross. Cyril of Jerusalem’s Lectures provide the earliest explicit evidence of the physical presence of the Cross in Jerusalem and its apparent distribution “over all the world”.670 The cross’s significance as a physical artifact and witness to biblical event and the person of Christ made it an essential component of Cyril’s theology.671 In his teaching, the cross was pre-eminent: “The Catholic Church glories in every action of Christ, but her glory of glories [καύχημα δὲ τῶν καυχημάτων] is the Cross”.672 It was the “indestructible foundation” of faith, on which the reality of resurrection and ascension, salvation and eschatology all rested:

For if the crucifixion was an illusion [φαντασία], and salvation comes from the cross, then our salvation is illusory too … If the Cross is an illusion [φαντασία], the ascension is also an illusion [φαντασία], and if the ascension is an illusion, so is the second coming and everything in the end is unfounded.673

The True Cross was the ultimate material witness. Its authenticity was conveyed through its tangibility. “For if I should deny it [ἀρνήσομαι],” Cyril remarked, “the wood of the cross, now distributed piecemeal from Jerusalem over all the world, refutes me [ἐλέγχει με]”.674 The Cross’s intrinsic association with Golgotha also exemplified the privilege of Cyril’s congregation to access these witnesses first-hand. Egeria’s Itinerary, it has already been noted, testifies to its later use in the events of

670 Cyril, Cat. 4.10; 10.19; 13:4, 37-40. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 6).
671 Walker (1990), 256.
672 Cyril, Cat. 13.1 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 50). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 4).
674 Cyril, Cat., 13.4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 54). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 6). See also Cat. 4.10.
the Great Week. On the Friday, each member of the congregation was invited “Behind the Cross” to “stoop down, touch the holy Wood first with their forehead and then with their eyes, and then kiss it”. These actions reinforced the importance of not solely hearing – but seeing and touching the objects and monuments of sacred memory.

4.4. Ritual Movement and the Spatial-Rootedness of Baptism

Catechumens in Jerusalem did not tour the city solely through mental contemplation and catechetical instruction; they were encouraged to experience the monuments and objects of Christ’s passion and resurrection first-hand. It has already been noted that the Itinerary of Egeria attests to the extensive liturgical use of the Golgotha complex. The manifold significance of the complex encouraged congregational movement around its prominent stations: the Anastasis Rotunda, the Martyrium Basilica, and the stations around “The Cross”. Movement, as well as materiality, was an integral component of the liturgical experience on Golgotha.

The advantage of this setting is particularly evident in the culminating rite of baptism. While the ritual was only alluded to in the Catechetical Lectures, the first three lectures of the Mystagogical Catecheses expand on its physical and symbolic components to a congregation of newly baptised Christians. The underlying principle of the Lectures was that the Christian could now understand “the heavenly

---

675 It. Eg. 37.3. Tr. McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 176.
676 See McGowan and Bradshaw’s (2018) impression of these stations (Figure 4, p. 63).
677 Following Day (2011), I do not necessarily see the Catechetical Lectures and Mystagogical Lectures as two halves of a co-existing practice. However, a shared structural and symbolic engagement with Golgotha conveys the prevailing ideological importance the Church had on shaping the liturgical identity of Jerusalem.
mysteries [ἐπούρανίων μυστηρίων]” of Christianity and its rituals. By reiterating the physical components of the baptismal rite, the bishop offered insight into its narrative significance – the Christian’s rite of passage disclosed the realities of Christ’s death and resurrection. By considering the physical components (or “structural units”) of the baptism, the liturgical setting, and the narrative significance attributed to the ritual in the Mystagogical Catecheses, further aspects of ‘spatial-rootedness’ become apparent.

4.4.1. The Structural Units of Baptism

The ritual sequence of the baptismal rite – what liturgical historians have called “structural units” – can be split into three universal sections: the pre-immersion, immersion, and post-immersion rituals. It is in the more minute details, gestures, and phrases (“secondary units”) that we see a degree of variation between baptismal rites. As such, the baptismal liturgy in fourth-century Jerusalem can be divided into a series of primary and secondary ‘units’, or actions. However, it is striking that the Mystagogical Catecheses was not organised in this way. The catechetical syllabus was oriented around changes in setting. The first lecture discussed the ritual components that took place in the antechamber, while the second and third lectures conveyed the events that occurred in the baptistery. Therefore, in order to fully appreciate the physical, or “structural”, components of the baptismal rite, we must also consider its

678 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.1 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 344).
679 For the organisation of baptismal liturgy into structure and narrative, see Day (2007).
680 Taft (1978); Day (2007), 3-6. However, see the limitations of this mentioned in Belcher (2019).
682 Dix (1945).
The ritual began in the antechamber [ἐξωτέρος οίκος] or vestibule [προαύλιον], where candidates faced westward, stretched out their hand, and recited a statement of renunciation to Satan. Candidates then turned eastward and gave their confession of faith: “I believe in the Father and the Son and in the Holy Spirit and the only baptism of repentance”. Then led into the inner chamber [ἐσωτέρῳ οίκῳ], baptisands removed their garments and were anointed with exorcised oil. They then approached the baptismal font, confirmed their confession of faith and made three descents into the water. Emerging out of the pool, each member was given a second anointing on the forehead, ears, nose, and breast. While their exit is not clearly described in the Mystagogical Catecheses, the Itinerary of Egeria suggests that the newly-baptised Christians would travel from the baptistery to the Anastasis before re-entering the Martyrium for the Easter vigil.

4.4.2. The Location of the Baptistery on Golgotha

Reference to cisterns and a balneum in the Bordeaux Itinerary suggests that a baptistery was included in Constantine’s project. The author’s reference to infantes

---

683 See Table 1 in Appendix for this organisation.
684 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.2 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 346). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 153).
685 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.9. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 159).
686 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 2.3 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 356).
687 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 2.4.
688 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 3.4.
689 It. Eg. 38.1. Day (2007) does not include these in her discussion of the post-immersion/transitional rite (p. 124).
690 It. Burd. 594 (IR 1, 97).
as baptisands, rather than children, is supplemented by a more explicit explanation of terminology in Egeria’s account:

The paschal vigil is done in the same way as with us; but this alone is different, that the “infants,” when they have been baptized and clothed, as they come out of the font, are first led alone with the bishop to the Anastasis.\(^{691}\)

Little else is known of this early baptistery; Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Catechetical Lectures* do not contain any reference to it and our later sources provide few additions. The *Mystagogical Catecheses* suggests that the baptistery had multiple rooms – an outer and inner chamber – to accommodate a change in location after the pre-immersion rites.\(^{692}\) In addition, Egeria implied the baptistery’s proximity to the Anastasis, as newly baptised Christians would exit the building and enter the site of Christ’s tomb as part of the post-baptismal procession.

In addition to the dearth of textual evidence, archaeological interpretations of the baptistery have been similarly variable. Some scholars have regarded a series of buildings to the north of the Golgotha complex as the site of a Constantinian baptistery.\(^{693}\) This is on account of a large marble font located to the northwest of the Anastasis, potentially dating to the Constantinian period.\(^{694}\) While not in its original context, it does not seem possible that such large structure was moved far.\(^{695}\) Further, a relevant Greek inscription referencing *Psalm* 29:3 (“The voice of the Lord is over

\(^{691}\) *It. Eg.* 38.1. Tr. McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 179.

\(^{692}\) *Myst Cat.* 1 and 2.

\(^{693}\) Corbo (1962), Tinelli (1973).

\(^{694}\) Tinelli (1973), 95-103. See also Wharton’s (1992) analysis of Tinelli’s conclusions. See Figure 18 in the Appendix for an example of this reconstruction.

\(^{695}\) Tinelli (1973).
the waters”) has been found in the northwest corner of the cistern. However, while the inscription bears resemblance to early baptismal liturgies, it is now typically dated to the later sixth or early seventh century. Therefore the cistern, while potentially from the Constantinian period, does not irrefutably prove a northern location for an early baptistery. Influenced in part by the Madaba Map’s depiction of a series of buildings to the southwest of the Golgotha complex, C. Coüasnon conversely proposed the baptistery was located to the south of the Anastasis.

While we cannot place the baptistery to the north or south of the complex with much certainty, its apparent proximity to both the Martyrium and Anastasis accommodated both practical and symbolic concerns. Easy access to the Anastasis accommodated post-baptismal procession. However, this proximity also cemented the centrality of the holy places of Christ within in the culminating events of Christian initiation.

4.4.3. The Narrative Significance of Baptism

In addition to summarising the ritual components of baptism, the central aim of the Mystagogical Lectures was to convey the symbolic significance of the rite they had just performed. The lecturer wove the Christian’s rite of passage into the greater narrative of salvation history. It is in this respect that the architectural staging of the baptismal rite was integral to its narrative significance. The baptisands renounced

---

696 CIIP 1.2, 789 (Cotton et al. (2012), 94).
697 Cotton et al. (2012), 94.
698 Coüasnon (1974), 48-50. See Figure 19 and Doval’s (2001) reconstruction of this area (p. 26).
699 This is Wharton’s (1992) argument, however, she argued that the baptistery was conclusively in the south.
Satan, who was compared to the “cruel” and “tyrannous despot”, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, while their eastward confession pointed them towards both Moses and Christ. Then, the catechumens’ movements from the vestibule to the “saving streams” of the baptismal font were representative of the biblical Exodus from Egypt.

The centrality of baptism was ultimately rooted in the symbolism of Christ’s death and resurrection. Firstly, the participant’s shedding of garments was an imitation of Christ, “who was stripped naked on the cross”. Then, their descent into the baptismal font functioned as a reflection, and imitation, of Christ’s three days in the grave.

...and here, through a symbol hinting at the days of Christ’s burial [καὶ ἐνταῦθα διὰ συμβόλου τὴν τριήμερον τοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰνετόμενοι ταφήν]. For just as our saviour spent three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, so your first ascent represents the first day of Christ in the earth and descent, the [first] night.

Baptismands participated in the death and resurrection of Christ through the immersion ritual. The timing of the baptism, as part of the Easter vigil, would have made the symbolic significance fully apparent. The candidates’ geographic proximity to the places of Christ’s death and resurrection allowed for an even more powerful contextualisation. Invoking spiritual sight, the lecturer encouraged his audience to picture how “Christ passed from Cross to sepulchre before you [τὸ προκείμενον
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700 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.2. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 154).
701 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.3. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 154).
702 ἐπὶ σταυροῦ γυμνωθέντα Χριστόν. Cyril, Mys. Cat. 2.2 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 356). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 161).
704 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 2:4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 360). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 163-4).
μνήμα]” 705 One of the unique aspects of the Jerusalem liturgy was the subsequent exit from the baptistery and entrance into the Anastasis itself. 706 The change in setting caused newly baptised Christians to tangibly confront the narrative significance of the ritual. Having witnessed the site of Christ’s resurrection, they processed back to the Martyrium to complete the Easter vigil in the company of the faithful. 707 In sum, while the ritual sequence of baptism shared the standard features of a well-established Christian practice, the Jerusalem Church exercised a specific privilege in imitating Christ’s death and resurrection within the spatial context of those very events.

4.5. Conclusion: Conceptualising Jerusalem in the Catechumenate

Over the course of this chapter, I have sketched the content and context of Christian initiation in fourth-century Jerusalem. I have highlighted the church on Golgotha and its associations with the holy places of Christ – Cross, Calvary, and Tomb – as instrumental in shaping Christian liturgical practice. Christian initiation in Jerusalem was a ‘spatially-rooted’ process, in which the culminating ritual of baptism took on a mobile, stational aspect. In conclusion, we might consider the reciprocal relationship that existed between the holy sites of Golgotha and the initiatory experiences of the catechumen. While the immediacy of the Anastasis, Martyrium, and Cross affirmed the symbolic elements Christian initiation, the process also shaped catechumens’ conceptualisations of themselves and their setting. This transformative aspect was conveyed as a new form of “sight”.

705 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 2.4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 358). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 163-4).
707 It. Eg. 38.
Catechetical instruction and the ritual act of baptism trained participants to employ a sort of “exegetical vision”, which shaped their understanding of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{708} The rhetorical strategies employed in Cyril of Jerusalem’s \textit{Lectures} were not only meant to keep his audience’s interest but to encourage action and imitation. Such strategies “heightened the drama” of catechetical teaching and instilled a sense of “true sight” in the audience.\textsuperscript{709} Therefore, the encouragement to “see” was not solely an investigation of evidence, but a more intimate engagement with scriptural event. “True sight”, not bound by the delineations of past and present, provided a sense “of unbroken and unmediated contact” with the biblical age.\textsuperscript{710} Ultimately, it was one’s sensory participation with the sites of sacred memory that granted this temporal mobility.\textsuperscript{711} The prominent setting that staged catechetical learning further facilitated the “eyes of faith”.\textsuperscript{712}

However, it was in the rite of baptism that candidates were fully granted this “new sight”.\textsuperscript{713} The narrative journey of baptism was not solely from death to life but from darkness to light. It is likely that the outer chamber remained dark to allow for a more personal experience in their renunciation of Satan and profession of faith.\textsuperscript{714} Facing westward, in the direction of “visible darkness [\textit{τοῦ φαινομένου σκότους}}

\textsuperscript{708} Kalleres (2005), 448
\textsuperscript{709} Jackson (1991), 445.
\textsuperscript{710} Walker (1990), 246; Kalleres (2005), 434.
\textsuperscript{711} Frank (2000) argued that the combined elements of sight and touch “created the conditions for a biblical realism” (p. 1333). See also Kalleres (2005), 449; Levinson (2013), 114.
\textsuperscript{712} Kalleres (2005), esp. p. 450. Kalleres discussed Cyril’s catechetical strategy with Frank’s (2000) consideration of the “eye of faith” in late-antique Christianity.
\textsuperscript{713} Yarnold (2000), 35, 49; Doval (2001), 186-7.
\textsuperscript{714} Cyril \textit{Mys. Cat.} 1.4.
τόπος", the candidate’s temporary blindness created an instructive and sensory experience that was remedied in their turning eastward, to “the place of light [τοῦ φωτός τὸ χωρίον]”. Later in immersion, the symbolism of death and resurrection was compared to a transition from darkness to light. The descent into the water, as a symbol Christ’s burial, was also a descent into night. Their ascension, as a symbol of Christ’s resurrection, brought them back into the light of day:

For as our Savior passed three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth, so you by your first rising out of the water represented Christ's first day in the earth, and by your descent the night. For as in the night one no longer sees [οὐκέτι βλέπει], while by day one is in the light, so you during your immersion, as in a night, saw nothing, but on coming up found yourselves in the day [ἐν ἡμέρᾳ].

The Christian’s passage through baptism was then overlaid with eschatological imagery that re-oriented both their identity and their setting. The audience was invited into the “brighter and more fragrant meadows of this second Eden”. The candidates’ turning from west to east allowed them to see “God’s paradise [ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ θεοῦ]” which now opened “before them [ἀνοίγεται σοι]”. Taking off their garments in baptism, they were once again transported to Eden, as the bishop exclaimed: “Marvellous! You were naked in the sight of all and were not ashamed”.

The Christian’s introduction into the congregation of the faithful was commemorated by liturgical celebration beyond the Holy Week. As part of the post-baptismal programme, Christians made daily processions from the Mount of Olives to

715 Cyril Mys. Cat. 1.4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 348), 9 (354). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 155, 8).
716 Cyril, Mys. Cat.. 2.4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 360). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 164-5).
717 … εἰς τὸν φωτεινότερον καὶ εὐωδέστερον λειμῶνα τοῦ παραδείσου χειραγωγήσω. Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.1. (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 344). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 153). See also Procat. 16.
718 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 1.9 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 354). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 158).
719 Cyril, Mys. Cat. 2.2 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 358). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 162).
the *Anastasis* in the week following their baptism.\(^{720}\) This practice, A. Wharton argued, “presented the spiritually charged initiates to the broader community at the same moment that it absorbed the aura of the other sacralized sites of the city”.\(^{721}\) It seems rather fitting, then, that the paschal octave concluded with a procession to the church on Mount Zion to commemorate the Lord’s appearance to his disciples. There, Egeria noted, the passage was about Thomas: “When he returned and the other apostles told him that they had seen the Lord, he said, ‘I do not believe unless I shall see.’”\(^{722}\)

Sight was a central component of the initiatory experience. While the holy sites of Christ’s death and resurrection were integral to one’s journey to Christian ‘enlightenment’ in catechetical instruction, the ritual act of baptism trained participants to exercise their newly acquired vision in their conceptions of the city. The process of Christian initiation was not solely a journey from death to new life; it was a journey from ignorance to spiritual sight. As a result, liturgical interaction effectively construed “a new world for the baptizands”.\(^{723}\) Trained in this new form of seeing, Christians were reintroduced to a new Jerusalem – “not the earthly Jerusalem of old, but the transformed Jerusalem with its numerous holy places, an icon through which the heavenly Jerusalem could be glimpsed”.\(^{724}\)

\(^{720}\) *It. Eg.* 39.3.

\(^{721}\) Wharton (1992), 321


\(^{723}\) Finn (1997), 205.

\(^{724}\) Finn (1997), 205.
5. Mount Zion and the Re-Assertion of Apostolicity in Jerusalem

In the previous chapter, I discussed how the physical expansion of the Golgotha complex coincided with the formation of a catechetical programme that was tailored to its immediate context. This aspect of “spatial rootedness” in Christian initiation attests to a reciprocal relationship between sacred topography and religious experience. Engagement with the sites of Christ’s death and resurrection was integral to one’s journey toward Christian ‘enlightenment’. In turn, catechetical instruction, and the ritual act of baptism, trained participants to employ a sort of “exegetical vision”, which shaped their conceptualisations of Jerusalem.725

In this chapter, we continue our tour of fourth-century Jerusalem by turning to its southwestern hill, Mount Zion. During the fourth century, the hill invited much Christian interest as a place rich in apostolic memory. However, contrary to assumptions of a continuous presence on the southwestern hill, a renewed examination of textual and archaeological evidence suggests that the area, and its ties to the early Christian Church, developed gradually. In this respect, I interrogate why Mount Zion’s association with the apostolic community of Jerusalem is best understood as a fourth-century development, in conjunction with the city’s episcopal scene between the ecumenical councils of Nicaea (325 CE) and Constantinople (381 CE). I suggest that early years of Cyril of Jerusalem’s episcopacy and the discovery of the remains of St. James in 351 CE signify a turning point in the history of Jerusalem and its ecclesiastical significance. The subsequent development of Mount Zion as a prominent Christian

725 Kalleres (2005), 448
‘zone’ can then be understood as an impulse to reassert apostolic origins after a period of episcopal anonymity.

5.1. Contextualising the Claims of Apostolicity in Jerusalem

It has already been established that the measures taken to repopulate Aelia Capitolina following the Bar Kokhba revolt had a lasting impact on the religious demographics of the city.\footnote{See discussion in Chapter 2.2 and 2.4.1.} It is reasonable to come to a similar conclusion regarding a Christian presence in Jerusalem during the interim centuries. Eusebius’ note of a shift in the episcopal lists of the Jerusalem Church being ‘of the Circumcision’ to one ‘of the Gentiles’ reflects a “break in continuity” between the earliest congregation and its later occupants on account of the city’s dramatic reorganisation.\footnote{Eusebius’ Hist. Eccl. 4.5-6. See also Turner (1900), 550, and Wharton (1992), 322.} As a result, the Jerusalem Church experienced a degree of episcopal obscurity in the interim centuries as it lost a discernible, historical link to its apostolic origins.\footnote{This is not to say the see of Jerusalem was obsolete, as noted in Chapter 2.4.3.}

While Christian interest in locating the sites of Christ is attested at Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives from an early period, there is little evidence for a similar tradition associated with the early Christian community of Jerusalem.\footnote{For a pre-Constantinian presence at Bethlehem, see Justin Martyr, Dial. 78; on the Mount of Olives, see Eusebius, Dem. Ev. 6.18.23.} Indicative of this lack is the absence of any attention to apostolic memory in the Bordeaux Itinerary.\footnote{Irshai (2006), 100.} The author regarded the pinnacle of the Temple, which was traditionally
connected to the death of James, solely as the place of Christ’s temptation.\textsuperscript{731} The exception to this was an apostolic artifact, James’ episcopal chair, which remained in the possession of the Jerusalem Church, according to Eusebius’ \textit{Ecclesiastical History}.\textsuperscript{732} However, we are given no further details of this chair, nor – crucially - any geographic specifications.\textsuperscript{733} During the fourth century, the discovery and ecclesiastical development of Golgotha stirred an emerging concern to locate other places of sacred memory – particularly those associated with the apostolic age. Over the course of the fourth century, ecclesiastical and ideological investment of the southwestern hill in Jerusalem resulted in the development of another prominent Christian ‘zone’. The region, then referred to as Mount Zion, became deeply associated with the events of Jerusalem’s early Church.\textsuperscript{734}

In this respect, many historians and archaeologists have interpreted fourth-century developments as evidence for a pre-existent Christian community prior to the Constantinian period.\textsuperscript{735} Epitomising this view, B. Pixner asserted that “Very few

\textsuperscript{731} \textit{It. Burd.} 590. On the tradition of James, see Eusebius, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 2.23. While the grave of James was near the foot of the Temple Mount according to Eusebius’ source, Hegesippus, this tradition changed in the Byzantine period to the Kidron Valley. The circumstances surrounding the rediscovery of James’ remains will be discussed in the conclusion of this chapter. However, it is treated more thoroughly in Eliav (2004).

\textsuperscript{732} Eusebius, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 7.19.

\textsuperscript{733} The \textit{a priori} association between the apostolic chair and Mount Zion is evident in Walker’s (1990) assertion: “… that Mt. Sion was the pre-Constantinian home of the Jerusalem church is based largely on the fact that Mt. Sion was clearly associated in the fourth century not simply with Pentecost but also with the ‘throne’ of James” (p. 287).

\textsuperscript{734} In particular, the appearance of Jesus to the disciples and Pentecost. The tradition of the Last Supper became associated with Mount Zion from the fifth century onwards, as is evident in works of Hesychius of Jerusalem. On this, see Abineau (1972); Maraval (1982), 68; Taylor (1993), 207; Verhelst (1999), 250; Verstegen (2019), 70. Zion’s associations with St. Stephen likely originated after the discovery of the martyr’s remains in 415 CE and a subsequent renovation of the fourth-century church. It is this renovation that likely explains why John of Jerusalem is referred to as the “first builder” of Zion in a later Georgian lectionary. See Tarchnišvili (1959); Van Esbroeck (1975).

\textsuperscript{735} Hunt (1982), 19; Baldovin (1987), 49-50; Walker (1990), 282-308, esp. 287; Reisner (1993), 85-90;
places in Jerusalem can point to such an enduring tradition as Zion’s claim to be the see of the primitive church.” Pixner’s conclusion is representative of a school of scholars, including B. Bagatti and E. Testa, who considered sites such as Zion as evidence for a pre-existent community of Jewish-Christians in Jerusalem. This claim, what J. Taylor referred to as the “Bagatti-Testa Hypothesis”, was comprehensively refuted in her 1993 study, *Christians and the Holy Places*. Nevertheless, the veracity of the apostolic origins attributed to Mount Zion is often still left unquestioned in surveys of Jerusalem and its early churches, with few exceptions. A renewed examination of the textual and archaeological evidence of Mount Zion and its ties to the apostolic church suggests that Mount Zion cannot convincingly be considered the site of a continuous Christian presence. Rather, its emergence as a prominent Christian Zone is best understood in conjunction with the ecclesiastical-political milieu of the latter fourth century and the ambition to reassert an apostolic connection in Jerusalem.

### 5.1.1. Mount Zion: The “Moveable Mountain”

It is important to first establish that the Mount Zion of the fourth and fifth centuries was not the one of earlier tradition. Rather, ‘Zion’ was a mutable referenc
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Bagatti (1971a) and (1971b); Pixner (1990).


See note 735 above. Exceptions include recent archaeological surveys, such as Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 134-5; Verstegen (2019), 70.

Taylor (1993), 208. See also Pixner (1990).
– a “moveable mountain” – in the topography of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{741} The original Zion – the place of David’s conquest – was associated with the southeastern hill of the city.\textsuperscript{742} By the Hasmonean period, Mount Zion was a term typically used to describe Mount Moriah, or the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{743} The southwestern hill, in contrast, was only then incorporated into the city with the construction of the Hasmonean “First Wall”.

The destruction of the city during the Jewish wars then diminished its size considerably. The urban boundaries retracted to areas north of the Decumanus by 135 CE, while the southwestern hill was likely reconstituted as a military camp for the resident legion that remained stationed in the city until the late third century.\textsuperscript{744} The events spurred the use of ‘Zion’ in Christian scriptural interpretation as an indication of prophetic judgement on Jerusalem and its environs.\textsuperscript{745} Two verses in particular: Isaiah 1:8, which described Zion as “a booth in a vineyard … a lodge in a cucumber field” and Micah 3:12, which described Zion as “ploughed as a field … a heap of ruins, and … a wooded height” were commonplace in discussions of Jerusalem and its historic topography.\textsuperscript{746}

\textsuperscript{741} Pixner (1990); Eliav (2005), 136. Wharton (2013) referred to this mutability as “slippage”.

\textsuperscript{742} 2 Samuel 5:6-7. This geographical confusion is evident in the It. Burd, 592, when the author conflated a structure inside the walls (perhaps remnants of the Herodian palace) on Mount Sion as that of David’s.

\textsuperscript{743} 1 Maccabees 5:54; 7:33. Taylor (1993), 208.

\textsuperscript{744} Avigad (1983); Gutfeld (2017); Weksler-Bdolah (2019b). It is in this respect that the southwestern hill as the site of the Christian and Jewish community seems unlikely. It is also unlikely that the central cardo extended south of the decumanus into Mount Zion at an early period, as Tsafrir (2000), 158, and Walker (1990), 284, suggest.

\textsuperscript{745} Wilkinson (1977), 171; Mimouni (2012), 325. However, see Wharton’s (2013) argument that this association might have come earlier (p. 221).

\textsuperscript{746} Isaiah 1:8; Micah 3:12.
5.1.2. Geographic Mutability in Early Christian Sources

It is on account of this geographic mutability that we might make sense of Eusebius’ varied use of the term in his writings.\textsuperscript{747} His reference to ‘Zion’ was most frequently spiritual – of the “Heavenly Zion” or the Christian Church – which emerged together in the sixth book of his \textit{Proof of the Gospel}:

…The apostle knew to be heavenly [ἐπουρανίους], when he said, "But Jerusalem that is above [ἐκ τούτου] is free, that is the mother of us," and, "Ye have come to Mount Sion, and the city of the: living God, heavenly Jerusalem [Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ], and to an innumerable company of angels". Sion might also mean the Church [ἐκκλησία] established by Christ in every part of the world...\textsuperscript{748}

However, Eusebius’ engagement with \textit{Isaiah} 1:8 caused him to take a more locative interpretation. It was the Temple Mount, or Jerusalem as a whole, that evidenced divine judgement: “He [Isaiah] then prophesies that the city and the temple will be abandoned. He says, like a booth in a vineyard, and like a garden-watcher’s hut in a cucumber field …”\textsuperscript{749} It was in the life and teachings of Christ that Eusebius made a more specific topographical reference to Zion.\textsuperscript{750} In this instance, Eusebius operated under the assumption that a third prophecy: “The law will go out from Zion …” was fulfilled in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ.\textsuperscript{751} In this respect, Eusebius also referred to Golgotha, the site of Christ’s death and resurrection, as an earthly Zion.\textsuperscript{752}

\textsuperscript{747} Walker (1990), 290-308.

\textsuperscript{748} Eusebius, \textit{Dem. Ev.} 6.24.5-6 (GCS 23, 293). Tr. Ferrar (TCL 1.1, 45). See also Walker (1990), 298.


\textsuperscript{750} \textit{Dem. Ev.} 1.4; 6.13; 9.14.

\textsuperscript{751} \textit{Isaiah} 2:3. \textit{Dem. Ev.} 1.4. See also Walker (1990), 299-304.

\textsuperscript{752} \textit{Comm. Is.} 2.1-4, ‘… in the Zion on the earth, where the death of the Savior at the hands of men and his resurrection from the dead took place ... ’ Armstrong (ACT, 2013), 12. See also Eusebius, \textit{Onom.} 365: Γολγοθά «κρανίον τόπος», ἐνθα ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν (αὐ)ρώθη, ὁς καὶ δείκνυται ἐν Αἰλίᾳ πρὸς τοῖς βορείοις τοῦ Σιὼν ὅρους (GCS n.f. 24, 92).
In sum, while Zion was used in a variety of ways – both spiritual and locative – in Eusebius’ early writings, there is little indication of its reference to the southwestern hill.\footnote{The nearest association is Zion as a δῶρος ἐν Ἰεροσολήμι in Onom. 894 (GCS n.f. 24, 217).}

After 325 CE, Eusebius made virtually no reference to Zion at all. P.W.L Walker reasoned Eusebius’ silence was a consequence of his theological and ecclesiastical misgivings about the holy places in Jerusalem.\footnote{Walker (1990), 307.} However, it is more likely that there was little to say of the southwestern hill of Jerusalem during the early fourth century.\footnote{There is little reason to interpret the episcopal chair of James in Eusebius’ Hist. Eccl. as a conclusive reference to Mount Zion, either. Taylor (1993) notes that “Nowhere does Eusebius write that the Christian community, whether past or present, met in this area. His remarks on the chair of James might suggest that the object was in the keeping of successive members of the Jerusalem community, but that it had no definitive home” (p. 209).}

Therefore, it is the Bordeaux Itinerary of 333 CE that provides us with the earliest conclusive reference of the southwestern hill of Jerusalem as ‘Mount Zion’.\footnote{It. Burd. 592-3.} After a series of remarks regarding the Jewish Temple Mount, the author passed through the southern exit via the Eastern Cardo and along the perimeter of a walled portion of the southwestern hill, the ‘murum sion’.\footnote{Intus autem intra murum Sion paret locus, ubi palatium habui t… It. Burd. 592-3 (IR 1, 96). On the murum Sion, see Weklser-Bdolah (2019b), 32, 35; Re’em (2013).} On this southern detour, the author recorded the House of Caiaphas and the pillar of Christ’s punishment.\footnote{It. Burd. 592-3 (IR 1, 96).} Referring to the inner portion of the hill, the author also alluded to a tradition regarding
seven synagogues that once existed there.\footnote{Cuing \emph{Micah} 3:12, the author noted that one still remained at the time of the visit, while the rest “had been ploughed and sown \textit{[arantur et seminantur]}”. While the \emph{Bordeaux Itinerary} provides our earliest reference to Mount Zion as the southwestern hill of Jerusalem, the observations follow a theme of juxtaposition that is embraced in the textual narrative. In this respect, the author did not always provide literal descriptions but opted to amalgamate present and past images in their portrayal of the landscape.\footnote{On Mount Zion, the author compared the monument of Christ’s abuse with the prophetic fulfilment of desolation on Mount Zion. The standing synagogue, whether literal or figurative, is best understood as the topographic expression of the “booth in the vineyard”.} On Mount Zion, the author compared the monument of Christ’s abuse with the prophetic fulfilment of desolation on Mount Zion. The standing synagogue, whether literal or figurative, is best understood as the topographic expression of the “booth in the vineyard”.

5.1.3. Mid-Fourth Century Developments: Commemorating Apostolic Memory in Jerusalem

The construction of a church complex on Golgotha gave impetus to locate other places of sacred memory in Jerusalem. This was predominantly related to the early Christian community and the city’s apostolic origins with the emergence of a second religious ‘zone’ at Mount Zion. Early evidence of this may be found in the

\footnote{It. \emph{Burd.} 592-3. It is evident that this is still inside the wall, as the author refers once again to the outside in the following annotation. The pilgrim’s attention to details of Jewish legends and monuments has led some to question the pilgrim’s identity and intel. Wilkinson (1976), 86, and Stemberger (2000), 88-9, concluded that the pilgrim likely had a Christian guide, who sought to convey how Jewish monuments of Jerusalem were being superseded by the Christian, Constantinian structures. This is evident in the pilgrim’s reference to Zion, where the monuments of the Jewish past were merely remnants. See also Chapter 8.2 and 8.3.}

\footnote{It. \emph{Burd.} 592-3 (IR 1, 96). See also Walker (1990), 286-7. Walker argued that the pilgrim could have confused the synagogue for a synagogue/church. Conversely, they might have been mistaken or have just forgotten to mention it, but this does not seem entirely convincing.}

\footnote{See my discussion of the Temple in the \emph{It. Burd.} in Smith (2021).}

\footnote{Micah 3:12.}
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Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem. In addition to his praise of Golgotha as the place of Christ’s death and resurrection, the bishop referred to the “Upper Church [ἀνωτέρα ἐκκλησία]” of the Apostles in his sixteenth lecture on the Holy Spirit. Cyril regarded the church as a monument of divine interaction on par with Golgotha:

We know one Father, who sent His son to be our Savior; we know one Son, who promised to send the Advocate from the Father; we know the Holy Spirit, who spoke in the prophets, and on Pentecost descended upon the Apostles in the form of fiery tongues here in Jerusalem, in the Upper Church of the Apostles [ἐν τῇ ἱερουσαλήμ ἐν τῇ ἀνωτέρᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκκλησίᾳ]. The most honored privileges are ours. Here Christ descended from heaven; there the Holy Spirit descended from heaven …

Cyril’s reference to an “Upper Church” has often been interpreted as a description of elevation – referring to a hill in Jerusalem. As a result, many have regarded the Lectures as the earliest reference to a church on Mount Zion. However, a convincing case can also be made that this is a reference to the Constantinian basilica on the Mount of Olives, the Eleona. Constructed well before the delivery of the Lectures, the Eleona was located at a height and was celebrated for its own early Christian connections.

The case for an “Upper Church” on the southwestern hill is complicated further by the bishop of Jerusalem’s later quotation of both Isaiah 1:8 and Micah 3:2 in the same lecture. There, Cyril capitalised on the emptiness of Mount Zion, rather than its ecclesiastical importance:

763 Cyril, Cat. 16.4. See also Taylor (1993), 210-11.
764 Cyril, Cat., 16.4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 208-10). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 78).
766 Vincent and Abel (1912), 460; Walker (1990), 286; Drijvers (2004), 75.
767 See Bieberstein (1991), 545, for further discussion of why Cyril’s “Upper Church” is best understood as a reference to the Eleona.
768 See Bieberstein (1991). Walker (1990), in contrast, attempted to reconcile Zion as a “patch of melons” with an Upper Church in the vicinity: “In so doing, Cyril reveals that, despite the renovation of the ‘upper church’ large areas of Mt. Sion remained abandoned and desolate in 348” (p. 302).
Isaiah lived almost a thousand years ago and saw Sion as a hut. The city was still standing, beautified with public squares and clothed in honor; yet he says: “Sion shall be plowed like a field [Ζιών ὡς ἀγρός ἀπατριδῆται]”, foretelling what had been fulfilled in our day. Observe the exactness of the prophecy; for he said: “Daughter Sion shall be left like a hut in a vineyard, like a shed in a melon patch [ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἐν σκωνήλαιῳ]”. Now the place is full of melon patches …

Cyril of Jerusalem’s reference to the “Upper Church” certainly reflects an early impulse to locate other sites of holy memory – particularly apostolic memory – within the topography of Jerusalem. Therefore, it is conceivable that a church was constructed in an otherwise undeveloped area of Jerusalem by 351 CE. However, Cyril of Jerusalem’s lectures do not offer the degree of indisputable proof that it is often granted.

It was not until the pilgrim Egeria frequented a church on Mount Zion, which was then associated with the Acts of the Apostles, that we conclusively see the emergence of an apostolic connection. Egeria’s account confirms that by the early 380s CE, it was customary to attend services on Mount Zion during the fourth and sixth days of the week. The Jerusalem congregation would make a special procession to the Zion church to commemorate Jesus’ appearance to the disciples and Thomas on the Sunday after Easter and on Pentecost. In both instances, Egeria regarded Zion as the place of these occurrences, though the church itself was relatively new:

For the presbyters read there from the Acts of the Apostles from this that is read, because that is the place on Zion – another church is there now [alia modo ecclesia est] – where

---

769 This is an error; Cyril refers to Micah 3:12, not to Isaiah.

770 Isaiah 1:8.

771 Cyril, Cat. 16.18 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 228). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 87).

772 Taylor (1993), 211.

773 It. Eg. 27.5-6.

774 It. Eg. 39.3; 40.2.

775 It. Eg. 43.3.
once after the Lord’s passion a crowd gathered with the apostles when this was done …

In addition to the extant passages of Egeria’s text, P. Maraval has drawn attention to a section from Peter the Deacon’s *Book on the Holy Places* as a potential lost excerpt of Egeria: “And in the church called Holy Sion is the Throne of James, the Lord’s brother, who is buried near the Temple.” The construction of a church on Mount Zion and the development of its apostolic connections would have offered an ideal venue for the episcopal chair. While conceivably installed there by the 380s CE, it was certainly a fixture by the time of the Piacenza Pilgrim’s visit in the sixth century.

The emerging significance of Mount Zion culminates in the fourteenth chapter of Epiphanius’ *On Weights and Measures* – a text discussed in an earlier chapter for its timing of Hadrian’s visit and the foundation of Aelia Capitolina. Epiphanius also referred to the synagogue tradition in conjunction with the fate of the Christian community during the founding of the Roman city.

And he [Hadrian] went up to Jerusalem, the celebrated and famous city, which Titus son of Vespasian destroyed in the second year of his reign. And he saw the entire city levelled to the ground, and the Temple of God ruined, except for a few houses and for the small church of God [τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας μικρᾶς], which stood where the Disciples, who returned after the Saviour ascended from the Mount of Olives, went up to the upper chamber [τὸ ὑπερόων]. For there it was built, that is in the part of ‘Zion’ [τοῦ ἐν τῷ μέρει Σιών] that escaped the devastation; and [there were] parts of houses around ‘Zion’ itself [καὶ μέρη οἰκίσεων περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς Σιὼν] and seven synagogues which stood alone in ‘Zion’ merely as huts [ἐπὶ συναγωγαί, αἱ ἐν τῇ Σιὼν μόναι]

776 *It. Eg.* 43.3. (SC 296, 298-200). Tr. McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 184-5. See also *It. Eg.* 39.3.

777 On the use of Peter the Deacon as a source for reconstructing the lost sections of the *It. Eg.*, see Chapter 8.1.2.


779 See Chapter 2.3; Baker (2012) and Di Segni (2014).

780 The synagogue tradition emerges in a third source, Optatus of Milevus’ *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 3.2. However, as Bieberstein (1991) has discussed, Optatus used the “topographical digression” as an indicator of prophetic judgement in contrast to a spiritual understanding of Sion as the Church following *Isaiah* 2:3 and *Psalm* 2:6.
Epiphanius drew on a tradition shared with the author of the *Bordeaux Itinerary* regarding a series of synagogues whose remnants were interpreted as the “huts” of Zion from *Isaiah* 1:8. However, Epiphanius also referred to the Christian community who were miraculously spared when Hadrian entered the city. Because of this, some have reinterpreted the entry in the *Bordeaux Itinerary* not as a synagogue, but as the “small church of God” later referenced in Epiphanius’ work.\(^{782}\)

However, it has already been established earlier that *On Weights and Measures* is problematic in its chronological inconsistencies for the timing of Hadrian’s visit. In addition, Epiphanius’ reference to Zion introduces other historical issues, as its association with the southwestern hill was a fourth-century development. It is important to remember that Epiphanius’ account originates in the final years of the fourth century, after Mount Zion had emerged as a site of apostolic significance for the fourth-century Church.\(^{783}\) While we can neither entirely confirm nor deny the historicity of Epiphanius’ account, it is most fruitful to consider this text as a compilation of the various traditions in circulation during the fourth century.

5.2. *Aspects of Physical Change on Mount Zion (335-385 CE)*

The case for a continued Christian presence on Mount Zion is negated most conclusively by archaeological evidence. While evidence suggests there was a rapid


\(^{782}\) Walker (1990), 286; Pixner (1990).

\(^{783}\) Bieberstein (1991), 547; Taylor (1993), 211.
expansion in the area south of the Temple Mount at any early stage of the Byzantine period, this was not matched by an equivalent amount of development on the southwestern hill (Mount Zion). S. Weksler-B dolah has recently attributed the slow development of the southwestern hill to the continued maintenance of the military camp following the departure of the Roman legion in the late third century. In this respect, the reference to a murum Sion in the Bordeaux Itinerary can be interpreted as a reference to the fortifications of an abandoned legionary camp. The walls of Mount Zion likely continued to restrict access to the southwestern hill long after the legion’s departure. This hypothesis is corroborated by chronological dating of two prominent structures: the Zion Church and “David’s Tomb”.

5.2.1. The Zion Church and “David’s Tomb”

In 1899, the construction of the Church of Dormition uncovered the remains of a Byzantine church on Mount Zion. H. Renard produced a survey of the church, including the western and northern walls, as well as the remnants of columns, capitals, marble lattice, and tesserae from floor and wall mosaics. Renard’s reconstruction of the church presented Zion as a double-naved basilica with five aisles, four rows of

784 On this expansion, see Chapter 3.3.
785 Avni and Steibel (2017), 8; Gutfeld (2017); Weksler-B dolah (2019b), 134.
786 See Figure 14 in the Appendix for Weksler-B dolah’s (2019b) proposed reconstruction.
787 Weksler-B dolah (2019b), 32.
788 Not included in this discussion is the Church of the House of Caiaphas, which was likely constructed in the fifth century, according to Broshi (1976). On the history of “David’s Tomb” and the later upper-level structure referred to as the Cenacle, see Limor (1988) and Wharton (2013).
790 Renard (1900), 20. See also Clausen (2015), 177. On the decorative elements, see Broshi (1976).
columns, and three apses.\textsuperscript{791} However, shortly after the Church of the Dormition was completed, L.-H. Vincent offered his own reconstruction of the Zion basilica based on Renard’s notes.\textsuperscript{792} Vincent compared the edifice to the Constantinian church of the Nativity, with four rows of columns, and a single apse.\textsuperscript{793} Controversially, Vincent argued that the nearby structure referred to as “David’s Tomb” was incorporated into the basilica at its southeastern corner.\textsuperscript{794} This was in contrast to Renard’s reconstruction, which suggested that the structure must have been constructed prior to, or contemporaneously with, the Zion church.\textsuperscript{795}

The structure referred to as “David’s Tomb” was excavated in 1957 by J. Pinkerfeld, who suggested that the original building, of which three walls (the north, east, and south) still exist, was made of ashlar stones dating to the ‘Roman Period’.\textsuperscript{796} In the northern part of the building was an apse oriented towards the Temple Mount and raised above the main floor.\textsuperscript{797} Because of this, Pinkerfeld concluded that the building was a synagogue.\textsuperscript{798} However, Pinkerfeld’s early dating of the structure led to other contrary interpretations. Influenced by the synagogue tradition of the

\textsuperscript{791} Renard (1900), 14.

\textsuperscript{792} Vincent and Abel (1912), 434.

\textsuperscript{793} Vincent and Abel (1912), 437.

\textsuperscript{794} Vincent and Abel (1912), 435. See also Geva (1993b), 778. See also Clausen’s (2015) comparison of Renard and Vincent’s reconstructions (Figures 20 and 21) in the Appendix. A similar comparison can be found in Wharton (2013), 223.

\textsuperscript{795} Clausen (2015), 177; Wharton (2013), 230.

\textsuperscript{796} Pinkerfeld (1960), 41-3.

\textsuperscript{797} Pinkerfeld (1960), 43. Germano (2003), 4.

\textsuperscript{798} Pinkerfeld (1960), 43. Given that the apse was asymmetrically positioned on the northern wall and was composed of large ashlar stones, others have reconsidered the date of this building entirely. Taylor (1993) has proposed that the early walls of “David’s Tomb” are the remains of the larger, Byzantine church (p. 215).
Bordeaux Itinerary and Epiphanius’ On Weights and Measures, the structure has also been identified as a Jewish-Christian church. More recent archaeological excavation on Mount Zion has produced pottery fragments of the Roman-Byzantine period and coinage from the later fourth century (383-395 CE) that suggests a later, Byzantine origin. Therefore, while some architectural elements might conceivably come from an earlier period, the structure itself is likely contemporary with the construction of the Zion Church.

5.2.2. Initial Conclusions

Textual and archaeological inquiry provides us with some preliminary conclusions. Firstly, there is no concrete reference to the southwestern hill of Jerusalem as Mount Zion before the fourth century. By the time the Bordeaux Itinerary was written, the hill was perceived as evidence of the fulfilment of Isaiah 1:8 and Micah 3:12, as a solitary building reportedly stood “like a booth in a vineyard”. By the mid-fourth century, an impulse to locate sites of early Christian memory in Jerusalem is evident in Cyril of Jerusalem’s praise of the “Upper Church of the Apostles”. However, it was not until decades later that historical sources describe a church on Mount Zion that was the suitable location for readings from the Acts of the Apostles. Finally, the merging of apostolic origins with the synagogue tradition is

---

799 Pixner (1990) considered the orientation of the building more accurately faced Christ’s tomb rather than the Temple Mount. Cf. Germano (2003), 18. Lastly, a few elements of Greek graffiti were found in the apse of the northern wall. Bagatti (1971a, 121) interpreted these fragments as Christian in tone, however Taylor (1993) thought this interpretation “owes much to imagination” (p. 216).

800 Taylor (1993), 214-7; Re’em (2013).

801 It. Burd. 592-3.

802 Cyril, Cat. 16.4.

803 It. Eg. 29.3; 40.2; 43.3.
first found in Epiphanius’ *On Weights and Measures*. The trajectory suggested by textual evidence correlates with archaeological evidence on the development of the southwestern hill of Jerusalem and the dating of its most prominent structures, the Zion Church and “David’s Tomb”, to the Byzantine period.

**5.3. Re-asserting Apostolicity: The Episcopal Scene of Jerusalem**

So far, I have discussed the emergence of a second ecclesiastical ‘zone’ in the topography of late antique Jerusalem. The physical development of the southwestern hill, Mount Zion, coincided with an assertion of its apostolic ties. However, contrary to popular assumption, textual and archaeological evidence has suggested that this was a likely gradual development. The southwestern hill of Jerusalem was likely not the site of uninterrupted Christian activity. It gained a reputation for its apostolic origins over the course of the fourth century. In this respect, a sketch of the episcopal scene of Jerusalem during the period between the ecumenical councils of Nicaea and Constantinople can be enlightening of the social and ecclesiastical milieu from which this development originates. This period was marked by conflict between the bishop of Jerusalem and the metropolitan seat of ecclesiastical authority in Caesarea on issues of doctrine and episcopal succession. However, the rising tension between the two churches was also underpinned by the ascending ecclesiastical status of Jerusalem and the destabilising impact that had on the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Palestine.

**5.3.1. The Council of Nicaea and the “Special Honours” of Jerusalem**

The ecumenical council at Nicaea in 325 CE was instrumental in the

---

development of Jerusalem in two profound ways. The first has already been apparent: the council provided inspiration for the “memorable work of great importance ... done in the province of Palestine” on behalf of the emperor Constantine, the excavation and monumentalisation of Golgotha.\textsuperscript{805} The second impact was on the ecclesiastical status of Jerusalem. While the fourth and sixth canons of the council dealt with issues of succession and the authority of the metropolitan bishop in church affairs, the seventh canon granted Jerusalem a special privilege:

Let the bishop of Aelia [Jerusalem] keep his honorary precedency, warranted as it is by custom and ancient tradition, without prejudice to the proper dignity to the metropolitan see.\textsuperscript{806}

The impetus for these two results has been the subject of some debate. Advocates of an imperial “Holy Land Plan” have understood Constantine’s subsequent interest in Palestine from the perspective of a more deep-seated interest in its holy places.\textsuperscript{807} To an extent, this might explain the immediate transition of imperial gaze from Nicaea to Jerusalem. However, the addition of the seventh canon, which dealt with more minute ecclesiastical matters regarding the position and representation of the bishop of Jerusalem, suggests a Palestinian interest as well.\textsuperscript{808} The sixth and seventh canons of Nicaea reflect the tension that characterised the episcopal scene of Palestine over the course of the fourth century: the rising status of Jerusalem and its relationship to the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{806} \textit{Council of Nicaea, Canon 7}. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (\textit{FC} 63, 14).
\textsuperscript{807} Telfer (1957).
\textsuperscript{808} Macarius’ involvement in the ecclesiastical politics has been studied most extensively by Rubin (1982), (1984), and (1999). Inspired by Rubin’s hypothesis, Walker (1990) considered the ecclesiastical-political circumstances of the early fifth century in his discussion of Eusebius’ theology of holy places. See also Hunt (1997), 410; Walker (1995), 24-5; Drijvers (2013), 311.
\end{flushright}
metropolitan see in Caesarea.\textsuperscript{809}

The question of Jerusalem’s special status was not a new concept in the fourth century. The legacy of Jerusalem as the “mother of all churches” was not forgotten after 135 CE.\textsuperscript{810} Nevertheless, the Roman \textit{colonia} likely had minimal impact on the emerging ecclesiastical hierarchy in Palestine. While the Church of Aelia Capitolina functioned as a shadow of its former self, the provincial capital of Caesarea was of rising ecclesiastical importance at the start of the fourth century. This is evident in the completion of Eusebius of Caesarea’s \textit{Ecclesiastical History} and \textit{Martyrs of Palestine}, which provide a positive self-representation of the Church in Caesarea enriched by the legacies of Origen and Pamphilus.\textsuperscript{811} The organisation of the sixth book of Eusebius’ \textit{History} articulated the inversion of the two sees in the ecclesiastical primacy of Palestine.\textsuperscript{812} In addition, the sacred topography sketched in Eusebius’ \textit{Martyrs of Palestine} drew attention not to Jerusalem, but to Caesarea as the central point of an emergent ‘Holy Land’.\textsuperscript{813} While Eusebius’ perspective should be read with his own interests in mind, it is plausible that Caesarea, not Jerusalem, initially showed promise for imperial interest and patronage.

However, the Arian controversy, which divided the churches in Palestine by the early 320s CE, engulfed the two sees in bitter theological conflict.\textsuperscript{814} Macarius,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{809} Perrone (1993), 50-1; Rubin (1999), 151.
\textsuperscript{810} McCauley and Stephenson (1969-70), 15.
\textsuperscript{811} Irshai (2006), 123; (2011), 27. See also Penland (2010), (2011).
\textsuperscript{812} Irshai (2006), 139.
\textsuperscript{813} Irshai (2011), 27.
\textsuperscript{814} This is the corrective of Rubin (1982) and (1999) offered by Irshai (2011), 27-8.
\end{flushleft}
bishop of Jerusalem, had become an influential voice in the early debates of Arianism in Palestine. His opposition is implied in a letter from Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia, which referred to Arius’ eastern opponents, Philogonius, Hellanicus, and Macarius, as “unlearned and heretical men [ἀνθρώπων αἱρετικῶν]”. In contrast, Eusebius of Caesarea entered the Council of Nicaea under the threat of excommunication on account of his own Arian sympathies. The antithetical relationship between the two bishops on theological grounds was then only complicated further by the presentation of Jerusalem’s “Special Honours”. While likely drafted as a point of compromise between the warring bishops, the Honours obscured the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Palestine even further. Over the next half century, the bishops of Jerusalem asserted their ‘special privilege’ in issues of succession – both in and outside of their seat in Jerusalem.

5.3.2. Issues of Succession – Macarius, Maximus, and Cyril of Jerusalem

It is in the fifth-century history of Sozomen that we first hear of an issue of succession in Palestine during the years following the Council of Nicaea. Sozomen reported that Macarius of Jerusalem attempted to appoint a prominent confessor, Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. 1.4. Tr. Jackson (NPNF 2.3, 24). The fact that Macarius is mentioned last likely reflects the degree to which his own theological position most contrasted Arius’, as Irshai (2011) suggests (p. 30).

In the same letter noted above, Arius referred to Eusebius as a fond supporter. Though in attendance at the Council of Antioch, Eusebius faced excommunication and came into the Council of Nicaea under particularly disparaging circumstances.


Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 2.20

815 Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. 1.4. Tr. Jackson (NPNF 2.3, 24). The fact that Macarius is mentioned last likely reflects the degree to which his own theological position most contrasted Arius’, as Irshai (2011) suggests (p. 30).

816 In the same letter noted above, Arius referred to Eusebius as a fond supporter. Though in attendance at the Council of Antioch, Eusebius faced excommunication and came into the Council of Nicaea under particularly disparaging circumstances.


819 Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 2.20
Maximus, as the bishop of a nearby church in Diospolis/Lydda. Macarius’ move was prevented – either on account of Maximus’ popularity with the presbyters of Jerusalem, or by Eusebius’ own interventions. The historian concluded that Macarius’ attempt to intervene in the church affairs at Lydda was rooted in the theological controversy that continued to divide Palestine in the mid-330s CE:

... Macarius … feared that, at his death, the adherents of Eusebius and Patrophilus, who had embraced Arianism, would take that opportunity to place one of their own views in his see [ὁμοθάτως τὸν ἐνθάδε θρόνον ἐπιστείροντον]; for even while Macarius was living, they had attempted to introduce some innovations, but since they were to be separated from him, they on this account kept quiet.

Maximus’ appointment seems to have arisen amidst the existing theological rivalry between Jerusalem and Caesarea. However, the instance also reflected an overstep of episcopal authority on the part of Macarius. The bishop of Jerusalem not only appointed his own successor without the approval of his metropolitan; he also attempted to intervene in the affairs of a neighbouring church. Though operating contrary to the fourth and sixth canons of Nicaea, we might understand Macarius’ move as a cunning re-interpretation of its seventh canon. The bishop of Jerusalem exercised a ‘special privilege’ in the context of succession.

Theological tension remained a prominent aspect of Maximus of Jerusalem’s episcopacy (335-348 CE), as he and Eusebius’ successor, Acacius, were on no better terms. Like his predecessor, Maximus acquired a reputation for his anti-Arian

---

820 McCauley and Stephenson (1969-70), 20 n. 23.
822 Consequently, Maximus’ appointment seems to have been done in secret.
stance, while Acacius acquired a following of adherents to his *Homoian* formula.\textsuperscript{824} Conflict between the two bishops was ignited at the Council of Serdica in 342 CE, where Maximus, along with fourteen other bishops in Palestine, supported the reinstatement of Athanasius and the deposition of a series of prominent eastern bishops – Acacius included.\textsuperscript{825} In addition to deposing the metropolitan bishop, Maximus then hosted Athanasius on his journey back to Alexandria in 346 CE – undoubtedly goading Acacius’ retaliation.\textsuperscript{826} When it came time to appoint a successor, Maximus did so from his deathbed. However, Maximus’ choice was ultimately overruled: Acacius instead put forward his own candidate, Cyril of Jerusalem, while Maximus’ choice, Heraclius, was demoted to the rank of presbyter.\textsuperscript{827}

It is then in the long and intermittent episcopacy of Cyril of Jerusalem that the contours of episcopal conflict can be seen most clearly.\textsuperscript{828} While he owed his appointment to Acacius of Caesarea and his early associations with the *Homoian* party, it was not long before his relationship with both deteriorated.\textsuperscript{829} Only half a decade after Cyril became bishop, Acacius had already made a move to depose him, reportedly on the grounds of an unsanctioned selling of church property.\textsuperscript{830} However, later

\textsuperscript{824} While the bishop of Jerusalem agreed to the deposition and exile of Athanasius at the Synod of Tyre, Socrates noted that he later considered himself deceived into the act (*Hist. Eccl.* 2.8).


\textsuperscript{827} Jerome, *Chronicle* 352. See Doval (2001), 16; Drijvers (2004), 33.

\textsuperscript{828} In reconstructing Cyril of Jerusalem’s career, I accept Van Nuffelen’s (2007) narrative of events. For a contrary reconstruction, with particular attention to Cyril’s nephew, Gelasius, see Wallraff, Stutz, and Marinides (2018).

\textsuperscript{829} It is unclear whether Cyril of Jerusalem’s early associations were indicative of his theology, as his *Cat.* did not reflect his doctrinal affiliations, observed Drijvers (2004), 34; Doval (2001), 15.

\textsuperscript{830} According to Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.* 2.23.1-2), an object of value – a robe given to the bishop
accounts concede that this was merely a pretence for a more serious rift that existed between the two bishops: Cyril had ambitions that exceeded the oversight of his metropolitan. He claimed his bishopric was an apostolic see. We can infer Cyril’s episcopal ambitions further from his response to Acacius. The bishop of Jerusalem managed to avoid the summoning from his metropolitan for two years before he was finally deposed and replaced by Eutychius in 357 CE. Then, even after his deposition and exile, Cyril retaliated further by appealing directly to the authority of the emperor Constantius. At the Council of Seleucia in 359 CE, where his case was revisited, Cyril found himself reinstated with the support of the Homoiousian party.

Cyril likely returned from the Council of Seleucia as bishop of Jerusalem once again in 359 CE. Bolstered by this good fortune and Acacius’ brief absence, Cyril even attempted to intervene in the ecclesiastical leadership of Caesarea by ordaining his own candidate, Philumen, as bishop. However, Cyril’s victory was short-lived. Following the Council of Seleucia, Acacius went to the court of Constantinople and convened another synod the following year, which once again had Cyril deposed – this Macarius by the emperor Constantine – was amongst the items sold. The robe allegedly ended up in the possession of an actress, offending the bishop of Caesarea to the point of ousting Cyril from the see of Jerusalem. See also Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 4.25.1. Bihain (1962) considered the accounts of Sozomen and Theodoret as originating from the now lost Contra Eunomium by Theodore of Mopsuestia. See also Vaggione (1980).

831 Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 2.25.2. See also Theodoret Hist. Eccl. 2.23.1-2.

832 Telfer (1955) argued that Cyril’s rejection of Acacius’ summons was “proof of the rising pride and ambition of the Jerusalem see” (p. 26). Drijvers (2004) suspected that Cyril’s successor was Eutychius of Eleutheropolis (p. 39), however Van Nuffelen (2007) observed that Eutychius signed as such in Acacius’ synodal letter at the Council of Seleucia in 359 CE (p. 137). Therefore, it is more likely that this Eutychius was the one to later become the bishop of Scythopolis, who opposed Cyril’s intervention in appointing the bishop of Caesarea, as Telfer (1955) observed (p. 26 n. 20).

833 Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 2.40.40-41) noted that Cyril was “the first and indeed only clergyman who ventured to break the ecclesiastical tradition by becoming an appellant”. Tr. Zeno (NPNF 2.2, 70).

834 Theodoret (Hist. Eccl. 2.26.7-9) noted that Cyril went to Antioch and Tarsus, where he befriended the bishop Silvanus, despite Acacius’ interventions. Upon arriving at Seleucia, Cyril joined the party of Basil, Eustathius, and Silvanus. See also Epiphanius’ Panarion 73.27.5.
time by imperial decree.\textsuperscript{835} Hints to Cyril’s presence outside of Jerusalem suggest he was exiled once more for a brief period.\textsuperscript{836} However, Constantius’ death in 361 CE and the reversal of his episcopal banishments under Julian might explain the presence of Cyril as bishop of Jerusalem during the Temple rebuilding events of 363 CE.\textsuperscript{837} He was certainly bishop of Jerusalem at the start of Valens’ reign in 364 CE.\textsuperscript{838}

While still engulfed in ecclesiastical conflict, Cyril began to make more concerted efforts to interfere in the episcopal affairs of Caesarea following the death of Acacius in 366 CE. He first attempted to ordain Philumen a second time as bishop of Caesarea. When that failed, he appointed his own nephew, Gelasius.\textsuperscript{839} This too proved unsuccessful for a time, as Gelasius’ appointment was followed shortly by the reinstatement of Constantius’ earlier ecclesiastical policies under the emperor Valens.\textsuperscript{840} Around the same time, we can assume that Cyril experienced his third deposition around 367 CE.\textsuperscript{841}

Nearly nothing is known of the episcopal scene over the course of the following

\textsuperscript{835} He was replaced by Herennius. According to Theodoret (\textit{Hist. Eccl.} 2.23.1-2), Acacius once again revisited the earlier allegations against Cyril to Constantius, emphasising the robe as a gift from Constantine.

\textsuperscript{836} Theodoret (\textit{Hist. Eccl.} 2.26) mentioned Cyril’s first stop in Antioch before staying with Silvanus in Tarsus during his first exile. Later, he noted that Cyril accompanied a priest’s son from Antioch to Palestine (\textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.10). Telfer (1955) argued the place of Cyril’s second exile was north of Antioch (p. 27).

\textsuperscript{837} Socrates, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.1; Sozomen, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 5.5. See also McCauley and Stephenson (1969), 29; Drijvers (2004), 42.

\textsuperscript{838} Socrates, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} 4.1.15-16.

\textsuperscript{839} Epiphanius, \textit{Panarion} 73.35.5.

\textsuperscript{840} Telfer (1955), 27. Epiphanius, \textit{Panarion} 73.35.5. Gelasius was deposed and replaced by Euzoius, whose work to restore the library of Caesarea earned him mention in Jerome’s \textit{De viribus illustribus} 113.

\textsuperscript{841} He was replaced by Hilarius. See Drijvers (2004), 44.
decade. At the time Epiphanius wrote his *Panarion*, around 377 CE, Hilarius was still bishop of Jerusalem.\(^{842}\) However, when Gratian recalled the bishops exiled under Valens the following year, Cyril likely became bishop once more.\(^{843}\) Some have interpreted his reinstatement as the grounds for Sozomen’s claim that at the time of Theodosius’ accession, “all the churches of the east, with the exception of Jerusalem, were in the hands of the Arians”.\(^{844}\) By 381 CE, Cyril’s nephew, Gelasius, was also once again reappointed as the bishop of Caesarea.\(^{845}\)

Both bishops were named amongst the participants of the Council of Constantinople. However, Gelasius was listed after his uncle, who enjoyed a favourable reception as one of the council’s most longstanding bishops.\(^{846}\) There, the status of Jerusalem once again became a topic of interest. While the city was referred to as ‘Aelia’ in the canons of Nicaea, the Church of ‘Jerusalem’ was addressed in 381 CE. The reception of Jerusalem also transcended the honours of Nicaea; while the seventh canon maintained the “due dignity” of Palestine’s metropolitan see in Caesarea, Jerusalem was then received as the ‘The Mother of All Churches’ in the

\(^{842}\) Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.20.3


\(^{844}\) Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 7.2 (GCS 4, 303). Tr. Zenos (*PNF* 2.2, 377). See also Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 5.3. While Sozomen’s comment is certainly skewed in its own right, it is also unclear what doctrinal allegiances Cyril had during this time. In this respect, it is striking that Socrates does not mention Cyril’s association with a party at the beginning of the reign of Valens (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.1).

\(^{845}\) Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 113) suggested that Euzoius was bishop of Caesarea until the reign of Theodosius. Wallraff, Stutz, and Marinides (2018) reason that it was likely not until Theodosius’ move eastward in 380 or 381 that Gelasius was reinstated (p. XIV).

\(^{846}\) It appears that Cyril of Jerusalem was given amnesty for his former associations as, Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* 5.8) and Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* 7.7.3) acknowledge Cyril as having “retracted his former opinion” and recognised the *Homoousian* doctrine. McCauley and Stephenson (1969) argued that Cyril was new to the *Homoousian* party in 381 CE (p. 31).
Council’s proceedings. While this acclamation was not unprecedented, it permanently reconstructed the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Palestine. Jerusalem was not solely a “second sun”, but the “de facto metropolitan” in Palestine. This was a foundational development for the city’s acclamation as a patriarchal see at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE.

5.4. Conclusion: Conceptualising Apostolicity in Jerusalem

The development of Zion as a second ecclesiastical ‘zone’ in Jerusalem can be contextualised by the appreciation of the city’s ecclesiastical status between the ecumenical councils of Nicaea and Constantinople. The two phenomena reflect an increased concern to reassert an apostolic connection in the Jerusalem Church. I have now established that the development of Mount Zion likely occurred sometime in between the delivery of Cyril’s *Catechetical Lectures* (351 CE) and the *Itinerary of Egeria* (381-4 CE). However, the reasoning behind Cyril of Jerusalem’s conflict with Acacius and ultimate deposition early on in his episcopacy suggests a shift not solely on the grounds of theological difference. It is in this respect that Rufinus’ description of Cyril as someone who “wavered sometimes in doctrine [and] often in communion” seems especially perceptive. The bishop of Jerusalem’s early rejection

---


849 Wallraff, Stutz, and Marinides (2018), XIV.

850 See Rubin (1999), as well as Honigmann’s (1950) study of the career of Juvenal of Jerusalem.

851 In this respect, I am unconvinced of the former part of Doval’s (2001) sympathetic proposal that “Acacius had come to realize too late that he had underestimated Cyril’s mind and heart both on matters of doctrine and on the ecclesiastical status of the Jerusalem Church” (p. 21).

of his former allegiances is revealing of another motive suggested more explicitly in the later histories: he claimed that his bishopric was an apostolic see.\textsuperscript{853}

In this respect, there is a final piece to this puzzle that is worth exploring in conclusion. A strong case can be made for a turning point in the physical and ideological trajectory of Mount Zion, as well as the episcopal scene in Jerusalem, in the earliest years of Cyril of Jerusalem’s episcopacy. This is the resurgence of a cult to the first bishop of Jerusalem, James. A text now preserved in a tenth-century Latin manuscript, though derived from a Greek original, describes the miraculous discovery of the remains of three scriptural figures, among them James, in the year 351 CE.\textsuperscript{854}

The hagiographic account follows Epiphanius, a hermit living in Jerusalem, who began to receive a series of visions instructing him to unearth the remains of Saint James. With the help of a wealthy man named Paul from Eleutheropolis, they successfully recovered the remains of James, as well as those of Zachariah and Simeon. This feat earned the interest of the bishop. Cyril of Jerusalem reportedly acquired the remains and deposited them on Mount Zion while a suitable chapel was built.

The historical basis for the account is indeed questionable. The text bears many similarities with the later discovery of Stephen’s remains in 415 CE, causing some to suggest that the former was simply a later adaption.\textsuperscript{855} However, it is certainly not out


\textsuperscript{854} This manuscript was translated into French in Abel (1919) and into English in Murphy-O’Connor (2012). The dating of the event is established on account of the consuls named, Sergius and Nigrinianus. The text is given varied degrees of acceptance in Murphy-O’Connor (2012), 138-9; Drijvers (2004), 163-4; Eliav (2004), 43-4; and Rubin (1999), 154.

\textsuperscript{855} Lucian, \textit{Epistola ad omnem ecclesiam de revelatione corporis Stephani Martyris}. On this text, see Vanderlinden (1946) and Clark (1982). On the similarities between the two texts, see Drijvers (2004), 164.
of the question that the reverse is true.\textsuperscript{856} The reintroduction of James into the commemorative topography of Jerusalem fits well within the apostolic reflections that first surfaced in Cyril of Jerusalem’s \textit{Catechetical Lectures}. In addition, the account concludes with a series of climatic and celestial events that is reminiscent of those reported in Cyril of Jerusalem’s \textit{Letter to Constantius} from the same year.\textsuperscript{857} More broadly, the re-establishment of a cult around Jerusalem’s first bishop offers a potential explanation for the rapid development of Mount Zion, and Cyril’s assertion that Jerusalem was an apostolic see in the early years of his episcopacy. Finally, the discovery would have given impetus for an early instalment of the bishop’s throne on Zion, as well as reinforce the city’s reputation as the “Mother of all Churches” approaching the Council of Constantinople.

Therefore, the early career of Cyril of Jerusalem and the re-emergence of James’ remains provide a plausible turning point in the history of Jerusalem and its ecclesiastical reception. The subsequent development of Mount Zion as a prominent Christian zone can then be understood within the context of a reassertion of apostolic origins in Jerusalem. The convergence of tradition, location, and ecclesiastical ambition provide an ideal context, from which we might understand the emergence of Jerusalem into a period of episcopal renown.\textsuperscript{858}

\textsuperscript{856} Argued Rubin (1999), 155.
\textsuperscript{857} Cyril, \textit{Epistula ad Constantium imperatorem}. See Chapter 7.2.
\textsuperscript{858} Irshai (2006).
6. The Mount of Olives, Monasticism, and the Expansion of Jerusalem

In the previous chapter, we turned from Golgotha to the southwestern hill of Jerusalem, Mount Zion, which became a site of Christian importance on account of its associations with apostolic memory. However, I argued that it is best understood as a fourth-century development, in conjunction with the ecclesiastical advancement of Jerusalem. The growth of Mount Zion as a prominent Christian ‘zone’ was simultaneous with an impulse to reassert apostolic origins after a period of episcopal anonymity.

In this chapter, I explore the physical and ideological trajectory of the Mount of Olives as a third Christian ‘zone’ in Jerusalem. Like Mount Zion, the Mount of Olives was located on the peripheries of the city. However, in contrast, the peripheral nature of the Mount of Olives was an essential component of its importance. The Mount served as a gateway and vantage point for Jerusalem; its geographic proximity to – but distinction from – the city was foundational for theological reflection. However, the relationship between the Mount of Olives and the city of Jerusalem increasingly became one of integration over the course of the fourth century. The proliferation of ecclesiastical buildings and their incorporation into the liturgical itineraries of the Jerusalem Church attests to the expansion of the city’s conceptual boundaries beyond the city walls. A key factor in this development, I argue, was the arrival of western monastic emigrants, whose investment in the area and participation with the Jerusalem Church furthered the connection between city and Mount. Contrary to the case in Bethlehem, monastic settlement contributed to the theological evolution
of the Mount of Olives – from opposing entity to integral component – in fourth century Jerusalem.

6.1. The Mount of Olives (335-385 CE)

The Mount of Olives carves a unique position in the biblical geography of Jerusalem. Its topographic relationship with the city was traditionally understood as a point of juxtaposition: while geographically near to Jerusalem, the Mount of Olives was distinctly ‘outside’ of the city.\(^{859}\) However, over the course of the fourth century, the spatial relationship increasingly became one of integration. Following the construction of the Eleona (or ‘Olivet’) church alongside those at Golgotha and Bethlehem, the Mount of Olives underwent a significant degree of architectural development over the course of the fourth century. The liturgical connectivity of the Mount of Olives reinforced its assimilation into the expanding notion of a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem.

6.1.1. The Mount of Olives before 325 CE

As the place of Christ’s triumphal entry into Jerusalem,\(^ {860}\) his eschatological teaching,\(^ {861}\) agony and arrest,\(^ {862}\) and ascension to heaven,\(^ {863}\) the Mount of Olives figured prominently in the scriptural geography of the Holy Land. Therefore, it was a site of pilgrim interest prior to the Constantinian period, reportedly inviting visitors

\(^{859}\) The duality of the Mount of Olives is observed in Walker (1990), 199-200; Limor (1998), 20.

\(^{860}\) Matt. 21.

\(^{861}\) Matt. 24.


\(^{863}\) Luke 24:50. It is important to note that while the summit of the Mount of Olives became associated with the ascension of Christ, it was traditionally believed to have occurred at Bethany.
“from all parts of the world [πανταχόθεν]”. 864 The Mount of Olives is the tallest of the primary hills in and around Jerusalem, providing an ideal “vantage-point” for the city.865 However, the Mount was also geographically distanced from Jerusalem by the Kidron Valley, which runs between them. 866 This distinction was attributed theological significance. While the Mount of Olives was the place of Christ’s entrance into Jerusalem and departure to heaven, the interim moments of his life cast it as a place of retreat. 867 It was on the Mount that Christ considered, and judged, Jerusalem. 868 Jesus’ prophecy against the Jewish Temple, that “not one stone … will be left on another” and his subsequent eschatological discourse reportedly occurred from this perspective. 869

Therefore, the Mount of Olives was not only a place rich in Christological memory; it was geographically and symbolically ‘opposite’ Jerusalem. In this respect, Eusebius carefully qualified early Christian pilgrims to the Mount, in contrast to Jewish pilgrims to the Temple, as spectators of the ruined city in his _Proof of the Gospel_. 870

… Not as of old times because of the glory of Jerusalem, nor that they may worship in the ancient Temple at Jerusalem, but they rest there that they may learn both about the

---

865 Walker (1990), 199-200.
866 See Figure 22 in Appendix.
867 Following Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem and his dismissal of the Temple Courts in _Matthew_ 21, he reportedly returned to Bethany.
868 This distinction, Limor (1998) argued, shows the extent that the Mount of Olives was “beyond the range of the curse” set upon Jerusalem (p. 20).
870 Walker (1990), 206-10, 222-7. Irshai (2009) suspected that the Bordeaux Pilgrim’s entry into Jerusalem from the east in 333 CE followed this practice (p. 477, f. 33).
city being taken and devastated as the prophets foretold, and that they may worship at the Mount of Olives opposite [κατέναντι]…

Eusebius emphasised the oppositional relationship of the Mount of Olives as a physical and theological vantage point for Jerusalem. His distinction was founded upon Zechariah 14:4 – the only prophetic scripture to refer to the Mount of Olives by name: “On that day His feet will stand on the Mount of Olives, which is in front of Jerusalem on the east”. He emphasised the fulfilment of this prophecy in the final moments of Christ’s life on earth, when his feet were “borne up the Mount of Olives” before his ascent to heaven. However, he also alluded to the earlier event, when Christ divulged the “final mysteries [τῆς συντελείας μυστήρια]” before his crucifixion. In this respect, Eusebius interpreted the Mount of Olives as the topographical context for Christ’s rejection of Jerusalem through the eschatological discourse and ascension.

Having established these connections, Eusebius was then well placed to give a spiritualised and disparaging portrait of the city:

The Mount of Olives is therefore literally opposite [κατέναντι] to Jerusalem and to the east of it [ἐξ ἀνατολῶν], but also the Holy Church of God, and the mount upon which it is founded, of which the Saviour teaches: “A city set on a hill cannot be hid,” raised up in place of Jerusalem that is fallen never to rise again, and thought worthy of the feet of

---


872 … ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους δὲ ἦν ἀπέναντι τῆς πόλεως. Eusebius, Dem. Ev. 6.18.22 (GCS 23, 278). Eusebius also described the Mount as ἄντικρυς and κατέναντι. For a discussion of this, see Walker (1990) 199-234.

873 “… and the Mount of Olives will be split in its middle from east to west forming a very large valley. Half of the mountain will move toward the north, and the other half toward the south.” Zechariah 14:4. See also Limor (1998), 16.

874 Dem. Ev. 6.18.23 (GCS 23, 278). Tr. Ferrar (TCL 1.2, 30). Eusebius emphasised that Christ’s ascension took place on the summit [ἀκρωρία]. On this confusing use of geographic terminology, see Walker (1990), 209.

875 Eusebius, Dem. Ev. 6.18.23 (GCS 23, 278). Here, Eusebius referred directly to the eschatological discourse in Matthew 24:3: “Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ’ ἱδίαν λέγοντες· εἰπέ ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος;”
the Lord, is figuratively not only opposite [κατέναντι] to Jerusalem, but east of it [ἐξ ἀνατολῶν] as well ... By emphasising the fulfilment of Zechariah in the context of Christ’s departure, Eusebius reiterated a traditional argument regarding the declining significance of the earthly Jerusalem in early Christianity. In this respect, the oppositional relationship of the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem was symbolic of the Christian Church, the true “city on a hill”.

6.1.2. The Mount of Olives in 325 CE: Architectural Investment and the Legacy of Helena

As was the case with Golgotha and Mount Zion, the fourth century marked an important turning point for the Mount of Olives. By the end of the century, it was perceived not as a distinct and opposing entity, but an integral and much-developed facet of Jerusalem. Like Golgotha, this transition can be first traced to the period following the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE. Then, imperial investment in Jerusalem extended to two other constructions at the sites of Christ’s birth in Bethlehem and ascension on the Mount of Olives. However in contrast to the Church at Golgotha, the latter two churches were associated with Constantine’s mother, Helena. Eusebius’ portrayal of Helena’s tour, which became a prototypical pilgrimage imitated by many wealthy and influential women thereafter, also credits the empress with a

877 Walker (1990), 226-7. For further discussion on this line of argument, see my discussion on Jerusalem in early Christianity in Chapter 2.4.
878 In this, Eusebius referred obliquely to Matthew 5:14.
879 Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3.25-40.
880 τῆς αὐτοῦ μητρός ... διαιωνίζων τὴν μνήμην. Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3:42.1 (GCS 1.2, 101). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 137.
significant amount of responsibility in the foundation of these two churches. The construction of the imperial church on the Mount of Olives, the *Eleona*, reinforced the sense of cohesion between the monuments of Christ’s birth, death and resurrection, and ascension.

In this respect, Eusebius portrayed the *Eleona* as an ideal complement to the Nativity in Bethlehem in his *Life of Constantine*. The two sites effectively bookended Christ’s first and final moments on earth:

On the cave of the first divine manifestation of the Saviour, where he submitted to the experience of birth in the flesh, he bestowed appropriate honours; while at the other he dignified the monument on the mountain-top to his ascension to heaven [τῷ δὲ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοῦ ἀναλήψεως τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀχρωμείας μνήμην σεμνύνον] The Christological unity between the three sites was also reflected in architectural resemblance. Archaeological excavation during the early twentieth century confirmed that the *Eleona* church adhered to a similar architectural plan as the former two, consisting of an atrium and peristyle court, a basilica with two aisles and two rows of columns, and a sacred cave. However, while maintaining architectural consistency, the organisation of the *Eleona* was not so straightforward: a cave was a strange place

---

881 Eusebius referred to Helena’s consecration [προσκυνηθέντι θεῷ] of the churches at Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives (*Vit. Const.* 3.43.1). However, shortly thereafter, he referred to her embellishment of these sites with “wonderful monuments [μνήμασι θαυμαστοῖς]”. In *Vit. Const.* 3.34.3, Eusebius then asserts, “The Emperor’s mother erected on the Mount of Olives the monument to the journey into heaven … in lofty buildings” (*Vit. Const.* 3.43.2 (*GCS* 1.2, 101-2)). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 137. Later iterations of the ‘Helena Legend’ attribute all the church building ventures, included Golgotha, to the empress; see note 389 above.


883 Vincent (1910) and (1911); Vincent and Abel (1914), 336–60; Loukianoff (1939). Excavations also uncovered the remains of a mosaic floor. See also Bloedhorn (1995); Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 135–6; Taylor (1993), 143-56. Compare Figures 23 and 24, as well as the plan of Golgotha church discussed previously. The architectural relationship between these three edifices provides a convincing case against Shalev-Hurtiz’s (2015) hypothesis that the round Church of the Ascension (to be discussed below) was a product of Helena.
to commemorate Christ’s ascension to heaven.\textsuperscript{884} In this respect, Eusebius considered another event altogether: Jesus’ eschatological teaching in \textit{Matthew} 24:3:

\ldots Up by the ridges [\textit{ἀκρωρεία}] at the peak [\textit{κορυφή}] of the whole mountain she raised the sacred house of the church and constructed just there a shrine for prayer to the Saviour who chose to spend his time on that spot, since just there a true report maintains that in that cave the Saviour of the Universe initiated the members of his guild in effable mysteries [\textit{τοὺς αὐτὸν θαυμάστας μυεῖς τὰς ἄπορρήτους τελετὰς τὸν τὸν ὅλων}].\textsuperscript{885}

Once again Eusebius depicted the Mount of Olives as the location for two distinct moments in Christ’s life.\textsuperscript{886} The cave on the Mount of Olives could logically be associated with Christ’s teaching, which reportedly happened “in private [\textit{κατ’ ἰδια}].”\textsuperscript{887} While not the site itself, the \textit{Eleona} was near the summit of the Mount of Olives, which more conveniently conjured the image of Christ’s ascension.\textsuperscript{888} Though requiring a more convoluted explanation, the \textit{Eleona} maintained symbolic and geographic consistency with the two other churches of the imperial triad.\textsuperscript{889} In contrast to Eusebius’ earlier interpretation of Christ’s apocalyptic teaching and ascension on the Mount of Olives, the \textit{Life of Constantine} implied a greater sense of symbolic and monumental association between Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and the Mount of Olives through the same events.

\textsuperscript{884} Walker (1990), 211.

\textsuperscript{885} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const.} 43.3 (\textit{GCS} 1.2, 102). Tr. Cameron and Hall (1999), 137-8.

\textsuperscript{886} Some have disagreed on the \textit{Eleona} church’s relationship to the ascension and eschatological discourse: Grabar (1946) suggested that Helena was responsible for two churches on the Mount of Olives (p. 284), while Vincent (1957) argued for an association to both events at the church itself (p. 53). Vincent’s solution is more widely accepted. Walker (1990) interpreted a reflection of the “bifocal nature” of the Mount of Olives (p. 213).

\textsuperscript{887} \textit{Matt.} 24:3.

\textsuperscript{888} However, see note 863 above about the ascension’s initial association with Bethany.

\textsuperscript{889} The “structural staging” of the three churches is emphasised in Verstegen (2015), 151–70; (2019), 64–76.
6.1.3. Latter Fourth-Century Developments

By the time Cyril of Jerusalem delivered his *Catechetical Lectures* in 351 CE, he envisioned Jerusalem extending well beyond the city walls.890 When he compared Christ’s descent from heaven in the Nativity and the Holy Spirit’s descent in Pentecost, he referred to the two events as both taking place “here”, in Jerusalem.891 Likewise comparing Christ’s descent with his ascension back to heaven, he referred his audience “as far as [μέχρι]” the Mount of Olives, which stands “even to this day”.892 As with Eusebius, Cyril also considered the Mount of Olives as a theological vantage point, from which he could discuss the significance of Jerusalem.893 While the bishop referred to the Mount as the place of Christ’s agony and ascension, it was his entrance into Jerusalem that received the most thorough explanation.894 For Cyril, the prophecy of Zechariah was fulfilled in Jesus’ triumphal entry:

But it might happen that He should sit upon a foal; give us rather a sign where the king who enters will stand. Give us a sign not far from the city [καὶ τὸ σημεῖον μὴ μακρὰν δός τῇ πόλει], that it may not be unknown to us; give us a sign nearby and clearly visible that being in the city we may behold the place [ἐγγὺς ἡ μῖν δός τὸ σημεῖον ὁφθαλμοφανῆς, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ὄντες τὸν τόπον θεωρήσωμεν]. Again, the prophet answers saying, ‘That day his feet shall rest upon the Mount of Olives, which is opposite

890 On the development of Mount Zion after 351 CE, see previous chapter.


892 Cyril, *Cat.* 14.23 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 138). Tr McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 47).

893 Cyril, *Cat.* 4.14; 10.19; 12.11; 13:8; 14:23. The Mount did not figure as prominently as one might expect from a bishop who privileged the places of biblical memory in and around Jerusalem. This can be explained in part by Cyril’s unerring focus on Golgotha. When taking up the words of Matthew 24, it was not to the apocalyptic discourse on the Mount of Olives, but the spatial and ideological relationship between Golgotha and the Temple Mount (*Cat.* 10.11) that he turned.

894 On Christ’s agony, see Cyril, *Cat.* 13.38. On the Triumphal entry, see Cyril, *Cat.* 10.19; 12.11. Christ’s ascension on the Mount of Olives comes up more frequently, at *Cat.* 4.14; 10.19; 14.23; however, it is only treated in passing.
By emphasising the moment of Christ’s first entrance, Cyril promoted a more positive image of Jerusalem; he creatively disassociated it from Christ’s wrath, judgement, and departure. While in his citation of Zechariah’s prophecy, Cyril referred to the Mount of Olives as “opposite” [κατέναντι] Jerusalem, he otherwise referred to it solely as “to the east [ἐξανατολῶν]” in his Catechetical Lectures. In order to further articulate the geographic relationship between city and mount, he emphasised the nearness (“not far [μὴ μακρὰν]”, “nearby [ἐγγὺς]”) and visibility (“clearly visible [ὁφθαλμοφανές]”) of the Mount of Olives from the perspective of the Golgotha church. In his presentation of the city, the Mount of Olives was not only integral but essentially unavoidable: “Is it possible for anyone standing within the city not to behold the place?”

While we are given the impression of the expanding conceptual boundaries of Jerusalem in Cyril of Jerusalem’s Lectures, it is most easily traceable in the extension of its liturgical circuits. The later pilgrimage account of Egeria (381-384 CE) describes the itinerant nature of Jerusalem’s liturgy, which utilised the various spaces of the Golgotha Complex as well as various churches in the surrounding area. While

---

895 Cyril, Cat. 12.11 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 14). Tr McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 233). See also Walker (1990), 221.

896 In this respect, we can note the absence of Jesus’ cursing of the fig tree from his catechetical discourse. Jesus’ judgement of Jerusalem in Matthew 24 is applied solely to the Temple Mount.

897 Cyril, Cat. 4.14, 14.23-5. This is observed by Walker (1990), 220.

898 Cyril, Cat. 12.11 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 14). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 233).

899 άρʹ οὐϰ ἐνδον ἔστως τις ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως θεαρεῖ τὸν τόπον; Cyril, Cat. 12.11 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 14). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 233).

Golgotha maintained importance as the heart of liturgical life in Jerusalem, regular procession to its associated churches in Bethlehem, Mount Zion, and the Mount of Olives established a relationship between the centre and the peripheries. The liturgical schedule, as it comes down to us in Egeria’s account, also provides a means of calculating the spatial and liturgical development of these regions. In contrast to the Church on Golgotha, the Zion Church, or the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, which serviced their regions exclusively, Egeria referred to various stations on and around the Mount of Olives. This included the Lazarium\(^{901}\) and Mary and Martha’s Hospitium\(^{902}\) in Bethany, stations at both Christ’s agony and arrest at Gethsemane,\(^{903}\) as well as the Eleona church and another site associated with Christ’s ascension, the Imbomon,\(^{904}\) at its summit. The sheer concentration of churches on and near the Mount

\(^{901}\) On the development of the Lazarium, compare the It. Burd. 596.1-3 and Eusebius’ Onom. and Jerome, de locis 289 (GCS n.f. 24, 71-2); Jerome, Ep. 108.12; It. Eg. 29.3-6. The remains of this church were excavated by Sylvester Saller during the mid-twentieth century. Saller’s reconstruction in (1950) and (1957) correlates with the impression given in Jerome’s loc. that the tomb was incorporated into the structure (… cuius et monumentum ecclesia nunc ibidem extracta). However, there is some debate on the existence of this church during Egeria’s pilgrimage. See Maraval and Díaz (1982), 268, followed by Verhelst (1999), 271-4. In contrast, McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 68.

\(^{902}\) It. Eg. 29.3-6. Roughly 400m away from the Lazarium, a cave was discovered near today’s Sisters of Mercy of S. Vincenzo da Paola. Originally a cistern or bath, the cave was later covered in Christian graffiti during the latest period of its use (CIIP 1.2, 842-843 (Cotton et al. (2012), 160-3)). See also Benoit and Boismard (1951); Taylor (1993), 180-92; Nowakowski (2017). While some have suggested the cave was associated with Christ’s Last Supper, these conclusions were more recently connected with the hospitium in Taylor (1987) and (1993). This hypothesis offers a more coherent context for both Egeria’s account and Jerome’s recollection of Paula’s pilgrimage.

\(^{903}\) Egeria referred to an ‘ecclesia ... elegans’ at the site “where the Lord prayed [ubi oravit Dominus]” (It. Eg. 36; SC 296, 280), while there is no architectural description for the following station, at the site of Christ’s arrest. It is plausible, though unclear, if this is the place now referred to as the “Cave of Gethsemane”. While formerly used as an olive press, remnants of marble pavements, Christian graffiti, and marble fragments (perhaps of a liturgical nature) attest to its change of use over the course of the fourth and fifth centuries (CIIP 1.2, 818-823 (Cotton et al. (2012), 133-7)). Taylor (1993) found this plausible on account of the use of candles in It. Eg. 39.2. Further, the It. Burd. (594.7) referred to a petrus on the Mount of Olives, where Judas betrayed Christ [ubi Iudas Scarioth Christum tradidit] (IR 1, 97). However, it might be going too far to conflate ‘petrus’ with ‘cave’, as did Testa (1964), 192.

\(^{904}\) Egeria was the first to delineate between the Eleona and the place “on the hill [ἐν βωμῷ, or ‘Imbomon’] as the site of Christ’s ascension. It is plausible that the Imbomon refers to the Church of the Ascension founded by Poemenia (see below). Excavations of the Ascension Church have confirmed many of the architectural features recalled in a drawing of the building by the seventh-century pilgrim.
of Olives attests to its importance in the religious life of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{905} By the late fourth century, it is apparent that the Mount was not an isolated and distinctive region, but a thoroughfare for pilgrims and local congregants as they journeyed between city and Mount.

6.1.4. Initial Conclusions

In sum, the Mount of Olives functioned as a geographic and theological paradox in fourth-century Jerusalem. On account of its location and association with Christ – particularly his entrance into and departure from Jerusalem – the Mount of Olives existed on its borders. However, its peripherality underpinned its theological significance and, as such, its intrinsic connection to Jerusalem. As Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem developed over the course of the fourth century, the Mount of Olives was increasingly perceived – through both theological reflection and liturgical movement – as an integral component of the city “to the east”, rather than a region directly “opposite” Jerusalem.

The symbolic, as well as architectural, cohesion between Jerusalem and its peripheral region is reflected in architectural investment and liturgical movement. In this respect, it is striking that Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives share similar trajectories for much of the fourth century. Beginning with the construction of the Nativity and Eleona churches, the two areas shared an important link to the empress

---

\textsuperscript{905} See Figure 25 in Appendix.

\textsuperscript{Arculf. The church was round with concentric rows of columns and a domed roof. Compare Corbo (1960) and Adomnán, \textit{Loc. Sanct.} v.247.9. Further confirmation of the Church of the Ascension is found in Jerome’s \textit{Commentarii in Sophoniam}, which refers to a gleaming Cross on the Mount of Olives. His later \textit{Epitaphium Paulae} (Ep. 108.12) suggests this was a permanent installation on the church.}
Helena. While also united in their theological and architectural connection to Jerusalem, the simultaneous peripherality of Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives offered ideal conditions for the foundation of western monastic communities in the outlying area of Jerusalem. However, while both were subject to the same processes of integration, it yielded different results. The Mount of Olives was integrated into the conceptual boundaries of Jerusalem, whereas Bethlehem maintained a degree of distinction.906 Therefore, in considering the physical and ideological trajectory of the Mount of Olives, it is valuable to refer to Bethlehem as a point of comparison.

6.2. Contextualising Monasticism around Jerusalem

Monastic practice was not new to Palestine in the second half of the fourth century. The bishop Narcissus’ withdrawal from the city during the second century, for instance, has been regarded by some as an act of “pre-monasticism”.907 However, two other figures, who retreated to their respective deserts in the early fourth century, influenced more widespread practice. Inspired by Antony’s example in Egypt, Hilarion withdrew to the desert south of his native Gaza during the first decade of the fourth century.908 Shortly thereafter, the pilgrim-monk Chariton began to set up monastic laurae in the Judaean desert, establishing a more distinctive form of

---

906 The Mount of Olives was nearer to Jerusalem, however not by much. Bethlehem is located roughly seven miles south of Jerusalem and, according to Baedeker (1973), would have taken less than an hour and a half to reach by foot (p. 134). Cain (2010), 108.

907 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 6.9.8. Narcissus apparently withdrew from Jerusalem on account of some ongoing conflict within his congregation. See Binns (1996), 154; Guillaumont (1979), 218, for this terminology.

Palestinian monasticism. A key difference between these two paradigmatic figures was their relationship to Jerusalem. While Hilarion reportedly only spent a single day in the city, permanent proximity to Jerusalem was an essential component of Chariton’s monastic establishments. A similar identification with Jerusalem was adopted by the author of the Vita Charitonis – likely a member of one of his laurae – who referred to himself as part of the “holy church of God here in Jerusalem”. In a similar fashion, the Lives of the Monks of Palestine authored by Cyril of Scythopolis articulates a similar pride of place for the monastic communities situated in the “desert of Jerusalem”. These later examples imply that the monks of the Judaean desert asserted a connection to the city and Church of Jerusalem. Proximity to Jerusalem was not viewed as contrary to the monastic pursuit. When Cyril of Scythopolis referred to

---

909 The chronology of the Vita Charitonis is complicated, as it is situated in both the reign of Aurelian (270-275 CE) and Macarius’ episcopacy in Jerusalem (312-335 CE). The gap has been convincingly explained by Di Segni (1990) as an authorial attempt to solidify the “priority” of Chariton in Palestinian monasticism. Hilarion’s withdrawal near Gaza, however, is more firmly dated to the first decade of the fourth century (p. 394). On the anonymous vita, see Garrite (1940), 5–46; Di Segni (1990), 393–421; Binns (1996), 155; and Guillaumont (1996), 217. On the archaeological evidence of Chariton’s laurae, see Hirschfeld (1990).

910 On the contrasting treatment of Jerusalem, see Wilken (1992), 151-4.

911 So that he would not “neglect the holy places, nor … appear to confine God within local limits”, noted Jerome (Ep. 58.3). However, Hilarion’s example fulfilled a distinctive narrative aim in Jerome’s Ep. Fuelled by a personal conflict with prominent people on the Mount of Olives and in Jerusalem, Jerome cited Antony and the “host of monks” who never set foot in Jerusalem and yet still maintained a holy life. Hilarion was a key example for his brief time in Jerusalem. While there is no reason to immediately discount the historicity of Jerome’s statement, it is important to read Hilarion’s perceived motives from the perspective of Jerome. On the historical context behind Jerome’s change of attitude, see Abel (1920), Maraval (1988), and the discussion below. See also Newman (1998) for an interpretation of Jerome’s letters from the perspective of Jerusalem and Bethlehem as two corresponding entities.

912 Chariton was initially barred from entering Jerusalem when he was kidnapped by a band of robbers (Vit. Charit. 9).

913 Vit. Charit. 13.

914 Wilken (1999), 243. In the petition addressed to Anastasius by the monks of Palestine recorded in Cyril of Scythopolis’ Vitae Monachorum, they identified themselves as dwellers of both the “Holy City of God and the desert all around it” (152, 25). Tr. Price (1991), 162.
Cyriacus’ decision to “withdraw to the Holy City”, he need not have found this to be a contradiction.\textsuperscript{915}

The conceptual relationship between monasticism and pilgrimage is also evident in terminology: in antiquity, the Latin term ‘\textit{peregrinus}’ was commonly associated with travelling abroad and the state of being a foreigner.\textsuperscript{916} In early Christianity, ‘\textit{peregrinatio}’ was used to describe the Christian condition; as inheritors of heaven, however in exile on earth, Christians were ‘\textit{peregrini}’.\textsuperscript{917} Therefore, at its origins, the act of pilgrimage carried the sense of both movement and estrangement, “travel and absence”,\textsuperscript{918} which was comparable to the monastic ideal of ‘\textit{ξενιτεία}’.\textsuperscript{919} The converging objectives in pilgrimage and monasticism were particularly relevant for a group of western religious visitors to Palestine, whose goal was not temporary contact with the sacred topography, but a life of permanent ‘\textit{peregrination}’.\textsuperscript{920}


\textsuperscript{916} Dietz (2005), 27; Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 18; Falcasantos (2017), 93-4. A Greek equivalent can be found in \textepsilon\textipa{κ}δημέω / \textepsilon\textipa{κ}δημος, however the association to pilgrimage is not as clear.

\textsuperscript{917} This was exemplified by Augustine’s \textit{De Civitate Dei}, in which the concept of \textit{peregrinatio} was allegorical for the Christian’s journey through life as an “alien in this world”. See Clark (2004); Pullan (2007), 387–410; Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 113.

\textsuperscript{918} Clark (2004), 153.

\textsuperscript{919} Bitton-Ashkelony (2002); (2005), 140-83. See also Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky (2006), 265.

\textsuperscript{920} On ascetic emigration to the Holy Land and the development of monastic communities on the Mount of Olives and in Bethlehem, see Hunt (1982), 166-79; Stemberger (2000), 115-19; Jacobs (2017).
6.2.1. Ascetic Emigration to the Holy Land

As previously discussed, the Mount of Olives had a “double-edged quality”; it was both ‘in’ Jerusalem and ‘outside’ of it. The Mount’s existence between “city and wilderness” appealed to the host of western monastic emigrants who settled there in the latter fourth century. Jerome’s correspondences and the Lausiac History provide glimpses of its earliest arrivals. One of these figures was Florentinus, who hosted Jerome’s correspondent and friend Heliodorus and in all likelihood Rufinus and Melania on their respective arrivals from Egypt. Jerome praised Florentinus for his hospitality, as he offered visitors a “kindness with which … [he] smoothed a pilgrim’s path”. Another early arrival was the Italian emigrant Innocent. After serving as a dignitary for the emperor Constantius, Innocent settled on the Mount of Olives seeking solitude in later life. There, he constructed an oratory, and he too obtained a reputation for hospitality and generosity. We learn of Innocent from the Lausiac

921 For this terminology, see Jacobs (2017).
923 Chitty (1966), 48.
924 Jerome, Ep. 4 and 5 are addressed to Florentinus. In Ep. 4.2, we learned that Jerome expected Rufinus and Melania to be soon arriving from Egypt. However, in the following letter to Florentinus, we learn that Rufinus had stayed in Egypt.
925 … Quibus gratiis, quo ille praeconio peregrinationis incommoda a te fata referebat. Jerome, Ep. 4.2 (CSEL 54, 19). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 76).
926 Palladius, Historia Lausiaca 44.
927 According to Palladius, Innocent “left the world, leaving his marriage [ἀπετάξατο ὁρμόμενος ἀπὸ γάμου] by which he had a son, Paul, one of the royal bodyguard” (Hist. Laus. 44; ed. Butler, 131). Innocent’s withdrawal was in part influenced by an unclear incident between his son and the daughter of a priest. See Butler (1904), 131; 219 n. 80; Meyer (1965), 204 n. 392. Following Butler (1898), Meyer (1965) and Hunt (1982) suggest this Innocent might be one and same as the bishop of Rome.
928 ὡς πολλάς κλάττειν αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδέλφων καὶ διδόναι τοῖς διομένοις, Palladius, Hist. Laus. 44 (Butler, 131). A relic of John the Baptist was reportedly interred in Innocent’s oratory (Hist. Laus. 44.4). It is reasonable to imagine that he was amongst the monks of Jerusalem who collected the saint’s relics in Sebaste during the reign of Julian (Rufinus, Hist. Eccl. 11.28). On this argument, see Chitty (1966), 48-9; Hunt (1982), 167.
History by Palladius, who reportedly spent three years with Innocent during his time on the Mount of Olives.\textsuperscript{929}

Another prominent arrival was Melania the Elder. Originally an aristocratic resident of Rome, Melania first journeyed to Egypt before accompanying a host of monastic exiles\textsuperscript{930} to Palestine following the death of Athanasius in May 373 CE.\textsuperscript{931} Her financial support of the Nicene exiles was a point of praise by her admirers; Paulinus of Nola later likened her generosity to the miraculous feeding of the five thousand.\textsuperscript{932} Palladius offered a more specific account, naming the prominent monks and clergy she accompanied, as well as their place of exile in Diocaesarea.\textsuperscript{933} It is there that Melania’s socio-political and spiritual authority was lauded in an incident where she was reportedly arrested, tried, and released by the governor of Palestine.\textsuperscript{934} According to the chronology posed by Palladius, it was not until the exiles were recalled in 378 CE that Melania established a monastery on the Mount of Olives for

\textsuperscript{929} οὐδὲν δὲ ἦτον καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν τῶν σωζόμενων αὐτῷ τρία ἡκούσῃ. Palladius, Hist. Laus. 44 (Butler, 131). In this respect, it is rather coincidental, and confusing, that an Innocent was also mentioned in two letters by Basil of Caesarea (Ep. 258 and 259) and one by Athanasius (Ep. 63) regarding his relationship to another, earlier Palladius, who also stayed with him on the Mount of Olives. Butler (1898) makes an important distinction (pp. 219–22). Cf. Hunt (1973), 460, and (1982), 167–8.

\textsuperscript{930} On this instance, see Rufinus, Hist. Eccl. 11.3; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 4.22–24; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 6.2. See also Hunt (1982), 166–8; Wilkinson (2012), 167; Mratshek (2012), 250–68.

\textsuperscript{931} On Melania’s arrival, see Palladius, Hist. Laus. 46.5. Paulinus of Nola’s Ep. 29.11 and Jerome’s Ep. 39.5 referred to Jerusalem alone as her destination. On the dating of Melania’s arrival in Jerusalem, see Jerome’s Chron. 247. Palladius noted twice that she stayed in Palestine for twenty-seven years (Hist. Laus. 46.5, 6); Paulinus made a similar claim, referring to five lustra (approx. twenty-five years) spent in Jerusalem (Ep. 29.6). A convincing timeline of Melania’s life is constructed in Schwartz (1937), 166–8; Murphy (1947), 59–77; and Wilkinson (2012), 167. The contradictory chronology in Moine (1980) is most comprehensively negated in Wilkinson (2012).

\textsuperscript{932} Paulinus, Ep. 29.11. However, Rufinus mentions 3,000 exiles in his Hist. Eccl. 11.3.

\textsuperscript{933} Among them, Isidore, Pisimius, Adelphius, Paphnutius, Pambo, and Ammonius Parotes (Palladius, Hist. Laus. 46.3). These monks would later fall into accusations regarding their associations with Evagrius and Origenist sympathies. See Hunt (1973), 472; Elm (1991), 115; Clark (1992), 20.

\textsuperscript{934} Palladius, Hist. Laus. 46.3. On this incident, Mratshek (2012) suggested the anonymous governor of Palestine might have been Proculus Tatianus, whose family was known for supporting the Homoian party in Egypt.
herself and her entourage of fifty virgins. However, Melania’s early years in Palestine remain a perplexing and debated portion of her life, as both Jerome and Paulinus convey her journey as one from Rome to Jerusalem, directly. Approaching these chronological issues, A. Jacobs has convincingly described this elision as a means of “capturing a particular spatial relationship between center and ‘abroad’”. In this respect, Paulinus of Nola depicted Melania’s move from Rome as an ascetic retreat and a pilgrimage from home and body:

Abandoning worldly life and her own country, she chose to bestow her spiritual gift at Jerusalem, and to dwell there as a foreigner from her body [in qua a corpore peregrinaretur]. She became an exile from her fellow citizens [exul civium], but a citizen among saints [civis sanctorum] …

Melania’s destination of Jerusalem further illustrates the conceptual link between pilgrimage and monasticism in late-antique Christianity. In Melania’s case, Jerusalem – the Mount of Olives, in particular – effectively functioned as the geographic and ideological complement to the urban centre of Rome.

The juxtaposition between Rome and the Holy Land is also evident in Jerome’s portrayal of his own flight from the city shortly thereafter, in 385 CE. In a letter ostensibly written to Asella, Jerome reframed his unceremonious departure from Rome as an escape from biblical Babylon:

Pray for me that, after Babylon, I may see Jerusalem once more; that Joshua, the son of Josedech, may have dominion over me, and not Nebuchadnezzar, that Ezra, whose name

---

935 Palladius, Hist. Laus. 46.5. This does not mean, Wilkinson (2012) has noted, that she did not reside in Jerusalem during the interim years. The implications of this for the chronology of Melania’s life posed by Moine (1980) are discussed in detail in Wilkinson’s article.

936 See note 931 above.

937 Jacobs (2017), 209.

938 Paulinus, Ep. 29.10 (CSEL 29, 257). Tr. Walsh (ACW 36, 112-13).

means helper, may come and restore me to my own country [\textit{reducat me in patriam meam}].\footnote{Jerome, \textit{Ep. 45.6} (CSEL 54, 327). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (\textit{NPNF 2.6}, 183). On Jerome’s depiction of Rome as Babylon, see Weingarten (2005), 234; Grig (2012), 141; Jacobs (2017), 210.}

Jerome inverted the nature of his exile as a pietistic withdrawal; transforming Rome into the foreign land [\textit{terra aliena}], he portrayed his journey as an intentional return to \textit{patriam meam}.\footnote{Jerome, \textit{Ep. 45.6.} (CSEL 54, 327). Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 66; Jacobs (2017), 210.} However, the merging of monastic and pilgrim interest is evident in his reportedly “deep-seated love for the holy places [\textit{inueteratum locorum sanctorum desiderium}]”.\footnote{Jerome, \textit{Ep. 77.8} (CSEL 55, 46). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (\textit{NPNF 2.6}, 381). Krewson (2017), 65.} Jerome later recounted his journey as an act of both pilgrimage and permanent relocation, as he settled in “My Lord’s native place [\textit{patria}] … this spot my Saviour has chosen”.\footnote{Jerome, \textit{Ep. 108.10} (CSEL 55, 318). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (\textit{NPNF 2.6}, 461).} Shortly after his own arrival in Bethlehem, Jerome wrote to Marcella under the names of his companions, Paula and Eustochium, imploring her to join them.\footnote{Jerome, \textit{Ep. 46.} On the authorship of this letter, see note 546 above.} Jerome urged Marcella to depart from the “city of confusion [\textit{confusionis urbem}]” and “pass through the waves of this world” to the lofty “land of hills and valleys”.\footnote{Jerome, \textit{Ep. 46.2} (CSEL 54, 330-1). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (\textit{NPNF 2.6}, 185).} Mixing geographic and symbolic imagery, Jerome portrayed Marcella’s prospective journey as a long-distance trek and a “spiritual ascent”.\footnote{Perrone (1999a), 231.} However for Jerome, the ultimate destination was Bethlehem, the
“poor crevice in the earth” [*parvo terrae foraminae*] that most thoroughly contrasted the distractions of Rome.\textsuperscript{947}

It is evident that the joint peripherality of the Mount of Olives and Bethlehem served as a literary convention in both the *Letters* of Paulinus and Jerome. The tension between Rome and the Holy Land displayed the travellers’ piety for pursuing solitude and seclusion in the “provincial periphery”.\textsuperscript{948} However, it is striking that in both instances, the Mount of Olives and Bethlehem were subsumed under the rich geographic and symbolic imagery evoked by the term ‘Jerusalem’. This terminology was not wholly inaccurate; both places offered a degree of seclusion that accommodated the demands of monasticism whilst remaining within the jurisdiction of the Jerusalem Church.\textsuperscript{949} However, it is in the context of their respective monastic communities that the trajectories of the Mount of Olives and Bethlehem diverge. On the Mount of Olives, monastic investment in the sacred topography of Jerusalem and participation in the Jerusalem Church contributed to its integration. By the final years of the fourth century, the Mount of Olives was physically and conceptually brought within its orbit.\textsuperscript{950}


\textsuperscript{948} Jacobs (2017), 214.

\textsuperscript{949} The episcopal scene and the extension of Jerusalem’s influence was explored in Chapter 5.3.

\textsuperscript{950} Despite the dualistic quality of the Mount of Olives, it is typically regarded as a setting for ‘urban monasticism’. See Goldfus (2003); Bitton-Askelony and Kofsky (2006), 260.
6.3. Monasticism as a Factor of Integration

While little is known for certain of the empress Helena’s tour of Jerusalem, it is evident that her memory was well-embedded in late-antique Jerusalem.\(^{951}\) Eusebius’ *Life of Constantine* displayed a transition in the Empress’ journey, from *iter principis* to pilgrimage, in Jerusalem.\(^{952}\) This established an important precedent in the performance of piety in the Holy Land. Following Helena’s example, wealthy women from both the imperial family and upper echelons of Roman aristocracy combined acts of worship at the holy places with munificent almsgiving, patronage, and church construction.\(^{953}\) Helena’s legacy was particularly embraced on the Mount Olives.\(^{954}\) Monastic investment in the landscape of Jerusalem and participation in the ecclesiastical life of the city served to further integrate the Mount within the urban sphere.

### 6.3.1. Monastic Investment on the Mount of Olives

Innocent’s oratory offers only a brief glimpse at the emerging monastic topography of the Mount of Olives during the latter half of the fourth century.\(^{955}\) In addition to this, we are slightly more informed of two other contributions: Poemenia’s Church of the Ascension and the monasteries funded by Melania the Elder. In both instances, the contributions of wealthy female visitors fittingly mirror the early

---

\(^{951}\) Brubaker (1997).

\(^{952}\) Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3.44. See Holm (1990) for a discussion of Helena’s eastern tour as *iter principis*.

\(^{953}\) Hunt (1982), 155-79; Georgiou (2013), 603.

\(^{954}\) The legacy of Helena was not lost in the monastic community of Bethlehem, which benefited from the patronage of Paula. See Cain (2010) and (2013).

\(^{955}\) Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 44
example of the empress Helena – not only in architectural investment, but in the
symbolic assimilation of the Mount of Olives into Jerusalem.

We learn of the noblewoman Poemenia from John Rufus’ *Life of Peter the
Iberian*, which refers to her as an influential figure for both Melania the Elder and her
granddaughter:

… Before these two [Melania the Elder and the Younger] was another [woman], famous
by lineage and wealth, of great modesty and God-fearing, whose name [was] Poemenia,
who loved to dwell in the holy and worshipful places, so that by her ways of life and by
her love those who were named [above] were made zealous. It was she who built the
Church of the Holy Ascension and surrounded [it with] buildings …

What little else is known of Poemenia is found indirectly in Palladius’ entry on John
of Lycopolis in the *Lausiac History*. Following an anecdote in which John claimed
that he had not seen a woman in forty years, Palladius referred to Poemenia: a “servant
of God”, who once attempted to visit him. Reportedly “famous by lineage and
wealth”, Poemenia first travelled to Egypt seeking healing from John. Palladius also
reported that Poemenia travelled with a large entourage of presbyters as an exhibition
of her exorbitant wealth and piety. However, her ultimate legacy, like Helena, was


\[958\] clause is to this short account that Devos (1969) managed to graft further fragments relating to the *Vita Joannis de Lycopoli* - from which our
image of Poemenia can be expanded slightly further still. See also Teja (1998).


the construction of a new church dedicated to Christ’s ascension on the Mount of Olives.\textsuperscript{961}

Descending from the prominent *gens Antonia*, Melania the Elder also played a vital role in the religious enterprises of the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{962} Melania endeavoured to dispense her wealth through construction projects and financial patronage. This is evident in her support of the monastic exiles from Egypt, noted above. In addition, Melania funded the construction of two monasteries on the Mount of Olives for herself and Rufinus of Aquileia in 378 CE.\textsuperscript{963} Then, as a newly established resident near to Jerusalem, Melania reportedly displayed unstinted hospitality for the “steady stream of visitors” who arrived over the course of the following decades.\textsuperscript{964} Rufinus and Melania’s monasteries functioned as prominent *xenodochia* for incoming pilgrims, dignitaries, and ascetics. Many of these visitors were members of their social circle, such as Evagrius Ponticus,\textsuperscript{965} Palladius,\textsuperscript{966} and Silvia, the sister-in-law of Flavius

\textsuperscript{961} See note 904 above.

\textsuperscript{962} *PLRE* I, 592-3. Evidence of Melania the Elder’s wealth is more clearly evidenced in the vita of her granddaughter, Melania the Younger, which narrates her and her husband Pinianus’ renunciation of their social and financial ties before settling on the Mount of Olives. However, as Clark (1992) noted, we cannot be sure how much was “inherited through Melania the Elder’s side of the family” (p. 21).

\textsuperscript{963} According to his *Apologia contra Hieronymum* 2.12, Rufinus of Aquileia stayed in Egypt for eight years under the tutelage of Didymus the Blind. See also Jerome, *Ep.* 3. For an outline of Rufinus’ life, see Murphy (1945), 80-1; Amidon (1997), VII. Melania’s contributions to the landscape of the Mount of Olives would later be furthered by her granddaughter, Melania the Younger. On Melania the Younger’s building projects on the Mount of Olives, see Gerontius, *Vita Melania Iunioris* 40, 48; Clark (1984), 115-19; Alciati and Giorda (2010), 435-6.


\textsuperscript{965} Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 38. Evagrius came to Palestine in 382 CE before moving to Egypt. However, we know from the letters (*Ep.* 7, 8, 19, 20) and treatises (*ad Monachos; Sententiae ad virginem*) addressed to Melania the Elder that they maintained a friendship. See also Driscoll (1991); Elm (1991); Clark (1992), 43-84; Casiday (2013), 19-21.

\textsuperscript{966} On Palladius, his relationship to the monastic community on the Mount of Olives, and his participation in the Origenist controversy, see Hunt (1973); Katos (2011), 98-124.
Rufinus. Poemenia’s church and Melania’s monastery provide a fuller picture of the architectural development of the Mount of Olives by the later fourth century. Fuelled by the practice and infrastructure of monasticism, the establishment of churches and xenodochia on the Mount Olives furnished the pilgrimage circuits around Jerusalem.

6.3.2. Monastic Participation in Ecclesiastical Life and Conflict

In addition to monastic contributions to the infrastructure of pilgrimage, participation in the ecclesiastical life of Jerusalem also reinforced the connection between city and Mount. Egeria’s description of the liturgy in Jerusalem paid frequent attention to the presence of monazontes in the proceedings. While many pilgrims to the Holy Land likely had monastic motivations, it is reasonable to assume the monastic presence was not made up of pilgrims alone. The compilation of both ‘monastic’ and ‘cathedral’ liturgies into the Great Church is revealing of the significant presence and influence of the urban monastic community in shaping the character of Christian worship in Jerusalem. In addition to liturgical participation, a more poignant link is monastic involvement in the ecclesiastical politics of the Jerusalem church. This is evident as early as 374 CE; we might speculate that Melania the Elder’s arrival in Jerusalem may have had an influence on the episcopal conflicts prior to Cyril’s re-

---

967 Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 55. Gamurrini (1888) suspected that the author of the text now attributed to Egeria was Silvia of Aquitaine, whose presence in the region earned her a chapter in Palladius’ history. On Silvia’s short-lived spotlight and a fascinating speculation on her life and influence, see Hunt (1972). We might suspect the visits of other prominent members from their circle, such as Bacurius the Iberian, the dux Palestinae from 378 to 394. See also Hunt (1982), 166; Clark (1992), 21-5; Whiting (2014), 76-7.

968 *It. Eg.* 24.1, 2; 25. 2, 6-7, 12.

969 See Chapter 9 for a discussion about Egeria and the debate over her own monastic affiliations.

970 Bradshaw (2009), 101-6; McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 71-3.
instatement as bishop. However, the ties established between the monastic community and the Jerusalem church are most clearly evident in the controversy surrounding the interpretation of Origen that erupted during the last decade of the fourth century. While falling outside of the temporal parameters of this study, it provides a telling culmination of a processes of integration at work throughout the fourth century, as well as the contrasting circumstances of the Mount of Olives and Bethlehem on the eve of the fifth century.

6.3.3. The Mount of Olives and Bethlehem: The Origenist Controversy

The origins of Origenist Controversy can be traced to 393 CE, when Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, visited Jerusalem with the express purpose of confronting the incumbent bishop, John. It appears that Epiphanius chose the timing of his attack carefully; he came during the Lenten period approaching Easter, when the Great Church would be filled with visiting pilgrims and catechumens undergoing Christian initiation. While Epiphanius ostensibly used this public moment to denounce Origenism, Jerome later acknowledged that his primary target was John. In this revealing turn of events, we see that the ensuing Origenist

---

971 This is important when we consider the ambiguous position that Cyril held during the interim years of his episcopacy, discussed in Chapter 5.3.2. We are not certain that he had adopted the homoousian stance by this time, further calling into consideration the impact monastic residents had in the representation of Jerusalem.


973 Epiphanius’ charges against John are best captured in his Epistula ad Joannem Episcopum, which is recorded in Jerome, Ep. 51. The turn of events is recalled in Jerome’s drafted, but incomplete Apologia contra Joannem addressed to Pammachius of Rome.

974 This is because John uses his catechetical teaching as an argument for his orthodoxy, according to Jerome’s Apol. c. Joan. 11. On Christian Initiation in Jerusalem, see Chapter 4.

975 Jerome, Apol. c. Joan. 11.
Controversy was not solely a theological debate on the reading and translating of Origen’s works, but a dispute between conflicting personalities and networks. On this point, E. Clark observed:

If there is anything surprising about the way the conflict developed, it is the degree to which the factions lined up precisely on the basis of old friendship and association … in fact, some might argue that the multifaceted relations to be examined – kinship, marriage, hospitality proffered and received, religious mentorship, gift-giving, and literary and financial patronage – illumine the developing antagonisms with less recourse to theological debate than students of Christian history would have imagined.⁹⁷⁶

In addition to the theological questions at hand, another facet of the dispute was the contrasting opinions of Jerusalem and its bishop. Epiphanius’ accusations, which reportedly culminated in multiple confrontations between the two bishops in the church on Golgotha,⁹⁷⁷ effectively sent the nascent Christian ‘Holy Land’ into discord. It was on this question that the monastic communities on the Mount of Olives and Bethlehem took opposing sides.

We learn from Epiphanius’ Letter to John of Jerusalem (Jerome’s Ep. 51) that Rufinus of Aquileia’s advocacy for Origen’s writings came initially at John’s defence.⁹⁷⁸ The bond between the bishop of Jerusalem and the “Italians” on the Mount of Olives was still a point of frustration for Jerome when he drafted his Apology against John years later.⁹⁷⁹ Epiphanius, in contrast, found allies in Bethlehem. Jerome reported

---

⁹⁷⁶ Clark (1992), 16.

⁹⁷⁷ Jerome, Apol. c. Joan. 11-14.

⁹⁷⁸ Epiphanius, Epistula ad Joannem Episcopum (Jerome, Ep. 51.6). As Kim (2011) noted, Rufinus and Jerome came to differing conclusions on Origen slightly earlier in 393 CE, when the anti-Origenist monk Atarbius confronted both theologians (p. 413). See also Kelly (1975), 198.

⁹⁷⁹ In his derision of John, he wrote that the bishop “constantly converses and daily associates with Italians” (Ep. 82.7). Tr. Freemantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 404). This is undoubtedly a reference to Melania and Rufinus and their community on the Mount of Olives. See Clark (1992), 21.
that he withdrew to Bethlehem following his confrontation of John in 393 CE.\textsuperscript{980} Then, when he returned to Palestine the following year, he was met with a monastic delegation from Bethlehem at his native Eleutheropolis. Ostensibly in a moment of complete spontaneity, Epiphanius ordained Jerome’s brother, Paulinianus, as a priest.\textsuperscript{981}

The ordination of Paulinianus only instigated a retaliation from the bishop of Jerusalem. While Bethlehem was technically under the jurisdiction of the Jerusalem church, the incident functioned as a volatile assertion of autonomy.\textsuperscript{982} In this respect, Epiphanius’ justified his actions as concerning “a monastery whose inmates were foreigners \textit{in monasterio \ldots fratum peregrinorum} and in no way subject to your provincial jurisdiction”.\textsuperscript{983} While the initiating moments of the conflict served to knit the monastic community on the Mount of Olives and the Jerusalem Church closer together, it had a polarising effect for the other suburb in Bethlehem.\textsuperscript{984}

\textit{6.4. Conclusion: Conceptualising an Expanded Jerusalem}

At the height of the Origenist Controversy, Jerome redacted many of his earlier

\textsuperscript{980} Kim (2011); (2013).


\textsuperscript{982} See Kim (2011); (2013); Jacobs (2016), 124-7.

\textsuperscript{983} Epiphanius, \textit{Ep. ad Joan}. Jerome, \textit{Ep.} 51.1 (CSEL 54, 396). Tr. Freemantle, Lewis, and Martley (\textit{NPNF} 2.6, 227). Nevertheless, Epiphanius’ appointment had dire consequences for the monastic community in Bethlehem; they were subsequently banned from the Church of the Nativity and communion with the Jerusalem Church. This result only further alienated the community in Bethlehem, winning Jerome to Epiphanius’ side. Kim (2011) suspected that this was Epiphanius’ aim (p. 418).

\textsuperscript{984} John appealed to Theophilus of Alexandria, and the subsequent arrival of Isidore (whom Jerome assumed was partial to the bishop of Jerusalem) resulted in a prolonged conflict that left Jerome cut off from the community in Jerusalem. Reconciliation was made, albeit briefly, in 397 CE prior to Rufinus’ return west (\textit{Apologia contra Rufinum} 3.33). For a summary of the conflict, see Kelly (1973), 195-208; Hunt (1982), 180-202; Clark (1992), esp. 1-42; Rebenich (2002), 41-51.
sentiments of Jerusalem in an attempt to dissuade Paulinus of Nola from making the journey to Palestine. In striking contrast to his Letter to Marcella (Ep. 46), written nearly a decade prior, Jerome praised Antony and the “host of monks” who never set foot in Jerusalem and Hilarion, who was content having spent just a single day. Jerome stressed that proximity to Jerusalem was not an assured route to piety. What was of true value, he wrote, “is not to have been at Jerusalem but to have lived a good life while there”. In the pursuit of a holy life, it seems, a trip to Jerusalem was no longer a religious imperative.

Jerome’s Letter is widely read within the context of the ecclesiastical milieu during the last years of the fourth century. The deterioration of his relationship with the prominent Christians in Jerusalem – Rufinus, Melania, and the bishop John – weighed heavily on his portrayal of the city and its significance as a centre for pilgrimage. In this conflict, Paulinus of Nola was situated at a complicated intersection. While Paulinus remained a correspondent of Jerome’s, he was more closely tied to Rufinus and Melania on the Mount of Olives. Therefore, it was in Jerome’s best interest to keep Paulinus far away from the Holy Land. However, the

---

985 Antonius et cuncta Aegypti et Mesopotamiae, Ponti, Cappadociae et Armeniae examina monachorum non uidere Hierosolymam, et patet illis absque hac urbe paradisi ianua. Ep. 58.3 (CSEL 54, 531). Tr. Freemantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 298).

986 On Jerome’s use of Hilarion, see note 911 above.

987 Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 92.


989 Abel (1920) and Maraval (1988).

990 Paulinus of Nola epitomised what Clark (1992) called “weak-tied relationships”, as he maintained ties with the partisans of both Jerome and Rufinus’ networks. He played a similar role in the Pelagian controversy shortly thereafter (pp. 41-2)

991 Paulinus and Melania shared a close familial relation. See his Ep. 29.
restrictions placed on the community in Bethlehem by the bishop of Jerusalem likely made it impossible to host Paulinus even if he wanted to.

Jerome’s portrayal of Jerusalem, while not representative of the city’s wider reception, is still valuable in its insight into his own altered opinion. In this respect, it is striking that Jerusalem is described in terms reminiscent of his earlier judgements of Rome. Jerome lamented that the sites of Christ’s passion and resurrection took place in “a populous city [in urbe celeberrima] with court and garrison, with prostitutes, play actors, and buffoons, and with the medley of persons usually found in such centres [in ceteris urbis].” He highlighted the cosmopolitan nature of Jerusalem as a problematic condition:

Men rush here from all quarters of the world, the city is filled with people of every race, and so great is the throng of men and women that here you will have to tolerate in its full dimensions an evil from which you desired to flee when you found it partially developed elsewhere.

While certainly fuelled by his precarious circumstances in the mid-390s, Jerome’s portrayal also highlights a crucial difference between Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives in their relationship to Jerusalem. While still inevitably tied to Jerusalem, Bethlehem was more easily distinguished. Under the same pretence that Epiphanius could justify his ordination for the benefit of the monastic brethren and peregrini in

---

993 Ep. 58.4 (CSEL 54, 533). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 299).
994 Quam eras uicturus in patria, de toto hoc orbe concurritur; plena est ciuitas uniuersi generis hominibus et tanta utiusque sexus constipatio, ut, quod alibi ex parte fugiebas, hic totum sustinere cogaris. Ep. 48.4 (CSEL 54, 533). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 299).
Bethlehem, Jerome could belittle Jerusalem and still regard Bethlehem as the “most venerable spot in the world”. 995

In contrast, Jerome’s judgements of Jerusalem – fuelled by his tenuous relationship with both the bishop and his supporters on the Mount of Olives – illuminates the degree to which the two were taken together. Over the course of the fourth century, there was a shift in perception. The Mount of Olives was no longer a separate region “opposite” Jerusalem; it was embraced within the city’s expanding theological, liturgical, and ecclesiastical orbit. While this is attested in the ecclesial and liturgical expansion of the Jerusalem Church to spaces on and around the Mount of Olives, a vital window into this integration is the monastic scene. Monasticism on the Mount of Olives – like the Mount itself – was not a distinct or opposing force, but an integral component of fourth-century Jerusalem. The same, however, cannot be said for Bethlehem.

995 augustissimum orbis locum. Ep. 58.3 (CSEL 54, 532). Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley (NPNF 2.6, 298).
7. The Temple Mount, Eschatology, and Erasure

Over the course of the previous three chapters, I have discussed the three primary areas of Christian development in Jerusalem – Golgotha, Zion, and the Mount of Olives – during the half century following the reign of Constantine (335-385 CE). Exploring these spaces separately has illuminated the ways in which Jerusalem gained ideological significance as a prominent Christian centre. However, I have also observed how the development of these spaces stands in contrast to the lack of substantial urban and demographic change. In this respect, the development of Christian topography after Constantine was limited primarily to the peripheries of the city, Mount Zion and the Mount of Olives. This suggests that the process of Christianisation in Jerusalem, while first instigated through a central imperial project, was later characterised by a slower, less invasive form of development.

Based on these observations, the notion of the Constantinian period as a ‘turning point’ in the history of Jerusalem has been interrogated in a previous chapter. In that discussion, I posed another plausible moment of transition: an earthquake that occurred in 363 CE. While textual evidence of the earthquake exists, only recently have archaeological findings advanced the case of its historicity. Greek inscriptions identified in a late-antique cemetery in Zoora refer to four deaths “during the earthquake [ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ]” on the 28th day of Artemisios in the year 258 of the

---

996 See Chapter 3.3.
997 Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 144.
999 The dating and impact of the earthquake was the subject of the Syriac Epistula de Templo, which will be discussed below.
Bostran calendar, or 18 May 363 CE.\textsuperscript{1000} In addition, the damage and discontinued use of a fourth-century structure at the Givati Parking Lot in Jerusalem has been identified as a consequence of the seismic event in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1001} However, contemporaneous damage found elsewhere in the city has been attributed not to natural disaster, but to an alleged attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple during the reign of Julian (361-363 CE).\textsuperscript{1002} Only Christian sources refer to the events in conjunction: the earthquake, in addition to an outbreak of fire and a celestial apparition of the Cross, not only halted the Temple project, but served as driving forces for significant transformation in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1003} The aim of this chapter is to consider the significance of the two events, their connection and overall impact on the urban landscape.

To this end, I will interrogate the narrative of Christianisation in Jerusalem in conjunction with a final religious zone, the Temple Mount. Though it was an important and visible aspect of the urban landscape, the Temple Mount was peripheralised in Christian interpretations of the city. Its simultaneous existence in – and distinction from – Jerusalem make it an important example of the disparity between the reality and representation of Christianisation. In this respect, the attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple struck at the vulnerable core of a ‘Christianised’ Jerusalem. While the


\textsuperscript{1001} Ben-Ami and Tchekhanovets (2013a); (2017); Tchekhanovets (2014); Weksler-Bdolah (2019b), 145-6. Architectural damage has been identified elsewhere in Palestine and Syria, as Russell (1980) summarised.


project itself seems to have had little impact on the urban topography, responses to the events – which come primarily from the Christian perspective – portray it as an urban and eschatological turning point. The social and theological implications of the failed Temple project, in combination with the physical impact of the earthquake, allowed for a more confident portrayal of Christianisation in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1004}

\textbf{7.1. The Jewish Temple: before 363 CE}

Because of its profound significance in the history of Jerusalem, the physical condition and theological symbolism of the Temple Mount has emerged at various points throughout this study. For centuries, Mount Moriah was the focal point of Jewish sacred geography; as the nexus of vertical and horizontal planes, it was the holy “Mount of God” and the \textit{omphalos} of the world.\textsuperscript{1005} Monumental construction during the Herodian period effectively turned mountain into edifice. The Herodien Temple Mount was a remarkable architectural achievement and the religious and socio-political hub of Jewish Jerusalem prior to its destruction in 70 CE. The westward shift in the foundation of Aelia Capitolina in 135 CE left the Jewish Temple Mount as a “military and political ruination” outside the limits of the city throughout the Roman period.\textsuperscript{1006} While the construction of the city walls at the end of the third century likely incorporated the Temple Mount into the urban boundaries of Jerusalem once again, a policy of abandonment and exclusion was maintained throughout the fourth

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1004} Isaac (2012), 29; Tchekhanovets (2014).
\textsuperscript{1005} Alexander (1999) and Sivan (2008), 191-2; Chapter 2.1.1.
\textsuperscript{1006} Wharton (2000), 197-8; Chapter 2.3.1.
\end{flushleft}
Christian interpreters regarded the Temple Mount as ‘unused’ space – marginalised in an expanding Jerusalem.

The Temple’s disuse was an important element of early Christian interpretation. It served as the physical manifestation of a theological point. The ruinous state of the Temple Mount functioned as a physical reminder of the crucifixion and the fulfilment of Jesus’ declarations against Jerusalem in Matthew 23:37-38 and 24:1-2. In this respect, the Temple and Jerusalem were taken together in early Christian polemic. This was evident in the previous chapter, when early Christians used the Mount of Olives, which was “opposite [κατέναντι]” Jerusalem, as a vantage point for the desolation of both city and Temple. In addition, early Christian use of other prophetic allusions, such as the desolation of ‘Zion’ in Isaiah and Micah, were related to Jerusalem and the Temple Mount before its associations with the southwestern hill

1007 Eusebius referred to an eastern wall adjacent to the Valley of Hinnom [τῷ τείχῳ ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς] in his Onom. 332 (GCS n.f. 24, 84). In addition, the It. Burd. does not give the impression of entering the city after visiting the Temple Mount. Rather, the Temple Mount appeared to be an integral component of the author’s literary tour. The integration of the Temple Mount is apparent in Eucherius’ Ep. ad Faust. 9, which referred to the eastern wall of Jerusalem and the eastern wall of the Temple Mount as one and the same. This conclusion contrasts with Eliav (2005), 130-5. While I follow Eliav’s conclusion that a significant fortification project likely occurred before Constantine with the departure of the Roman Legion, I do not agree that the first circuit of walls to incorporate the Temple Mount was Eudocia’s addition. Eliav’s argument depends on the southward expansion of the city taking place in the later fourth century. However, it is now generally acknowledged that expansion into the southeast (south of the Temple Mount) occurred earlier than previously expected (see Chapter 3.3; Ben-Ami and Tchekhanovets (2017)). On the policy of exclusion in the Constantinian period, see Cameron and Hall (1999), 285.

1008 “Look, your house is left to you desolate [ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν … ἔρημος]” (Matthew 23:37-38). This passage was widely used in early Christian writings. See Cyprian, ad Quirinum 1.12.6; Eusebius, Theophania 4.18, explored below. See also discussion in Thorpe (2009), 126-41.

1009 “Truly I tell you, not one stone here will be left on another; everyone will be thrown down” (Matthew 24:1-2). See Cyprian, ad. Quir.1.12.15; Eusebius, Theoph. 4.18; Cyril, Cat. 10.2. See also discussion in Thorpe (2009), 142-56.

1010 Eusebius, Dem. Ev. 6.18.23 (GCS 23, 278); 7.3.26. See also Eliav (2005), 174-5. See discussion in Chapter 6.1.1.
Early Christian interpretations of Jerusalem as a ‘place of desolation’ did not necessarily reflect urban reality. We have already seen how Jerusalem continued to exist as the Roman *colonia* Aelia Capitolina during the second and third centuries. However, it was not until the construction of the church on Golgotha in 325 CE that a theological recalibration had become essential. This is first evident in Eusebius of Caesarea’s interpretation of Jesus’ prophecies in the fourth book of his *Theophany*. Eusebius artfully distinguished between the city and Temple; while destroyed together, the two experienced different fates. Eusebius argued that the demolition of the Jewish Temple by the Romans and further decay over time represented “the most complete fulfilment of the prediction [*τοῦ λόγου μᾶλλον τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα*]” recorded in *Matthew* 23. However, he noted, “It was with special care that He [Jesus] said, not the city itself should be desolate [*οὐ τὴν πόλιν ἔρημον*], but the house that was within it [*Ἄλλα τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ οἴκον*].” Eusebius asserted that the inhabitants of Jerusalem,

---

1011 *Isaiah* 1:8; *Micah* 3:12. This is evident in Eusebius’ *Comm. Is.* 1.20 and *Dem. Ev.* 6.13; Walker (1990), 300; Taylor (1993), 209. See discussion in Chapter 5.1.2.

1012 “After Constantine’s emergence, the unified pair was sundered”, argued Eliav (2005) (p. 175).


1014 In this respect, Walker (1990) notes a “marked tightening” of Eusebius’ vocabulary (p. 384). While the city was “razed to the ground [*καθαίρεσιν*]” in his *Dem Ev.* 9.5.8, a more temporary destruction is suggested in later works. As the city was “besieged”, the Temple alone “experienced a final destruction” [*ἐσχάτον ἀφανισμὸν*] in his *Comm. in Psalm.* 73:1-10.


not Jerusalem itself, received this punishment.\textsuperscript{1017} In this respect, he defined the fate of the Temple, which was to be permanently desolate, and the fate of the Jews, who were to be dispersed.\textsuperscript{1018} However, of the city itself, Eusebius cited another passage from \textit{Luke} 21: “Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles”.\textsuperscript{1019} Doing so, Eusebius qualified the fate of Jerusalem as re-inhabitation, not desolation. This was a crucial distinction after 325 CE, when the construction of a new, imperial church required a more positive outlook on the city. Nevertheless, Eusebius’ concession only went so far; while Christians could inhabit Jerusalem, he maintained the city did not hold any theological significance.\textsuperscript{1020}

The distinction between Jerusalem and the Temple was then manifested in the contrasting architectural and theological relationship between the Temple Mount and Golgotha.\textsuperscript{1021} The two composed essential and opposing \textit{foci} in Jerusalem’s religious topography.\textsuperscript{1022} Situated on adjacent hills, Christian writers referred to the two structures as two ‘Temples’\textsuperscript{1023} or ‘Jerusalems’.\textsuperscript{1024} This distinction, so we have seen, was not solely oppositional, but appropriative.\textsuperscript{1025} Christian writers evoked Temple

\textsuperscript{1017} Eusebius argued that Jesus’ weeping for Jerusalem was directed towards inhabitants, not buildings, in \textit{Theoph}. 4.19.

\textsuperscript{1018} Eliav (2005), 176; Thorpe (2009), 132-3.

\textsuperscript{1019} “It was not, that He had so much pity on the buildings, nor indeed upon the land, as He had first upon the souls of its inhabitants, and (then) upon (the prospect of) their destruction.” \textit{Theoph}. 4.19 (\textit{GCS} 3.2, 26-7). Tr. Lee (1843), 248.

\textsuperscript{1020} To reiterate this, Eusebius maintained its Roman name, Aelia. See also Walker (1990), 101.

\textsuperscript{1021} See Chapter 3.4.

\textsuperscript{1022} Limor (2014), 34.

\textsuperscript{1023} Cyril of Jerusalem, \textit{Cat}. 15.15.

\textsuperscript{1024} Eusebius, \textit{Vit. Const}. 3.33.1g

\textsuperscript{1025} Ousterhout (2010), 225.
imagery in their descriptions of the Golgotha Church in order to advance the notion of a ‘New Jerusalem’, which was oriented around the sites of Christ’s death and resurrection.

As the physical and conceptual boundaries of Jerusalem expanded, it encompassed two other areas of Christian significance: Mount Zion and the Mount of Olives. Paradoxically, however, the expansion of Jerusalem’s boundaries caused further marginalisation of the Temple Mount. Three Christian ‘Mountains’ – Golgotha, Zion, and the Mount of Olives – effectively composed the theological and liturgical topography of a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem. This organisation excluded, and ostensibly superseded, the Temple Mount. In sum, the place of the Temple Mount in fourth-century Jerusalem was one of increasing alienation. This was not a topographic reality but a product of Christian representation. The Temple Mount’s simultaneous existence in – and distinction from – the city offers a vivid example of the disparity between reality and representation in the formation and assertion of a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem.

7.2. Contextualising Christianisation in Fourth-Century Jerusalem

I have already discussed in an earlier chapter how recent archaeological excavations have provided important evidence of the religious life in Aelia/ Jerusalem during the first half of the fourth century. In particular, the discoveries at the Givati Parking Lot have prompted further questions regarding the perceived Christianisation

---

1026 Eliav (2005), 185-6.
1027 The clearest example of this strategy of erasure is Adomnán’s Loc. Sanct. 1.22, in which the pilgrim Arculf referred only to the Valley of Jehoshaphat (Kidron Valley) between the Mount of Olives and Golgotha. In this organisation, the Temple Mount, which exists between them, was ignored altogether. See Eliav (2005), 185-6.
1028 Chapter 3.3.3.
of Jerusalem after Constantine. In addition to this archaeological example, the works of Cyril of Jerusalem provide insight into the religious context of fourth-century Jerusalem. Two of the bishop’s works, both penned early on in his episcopacy, reveal seemingly incongruent perspectives. In 351 CE, Cyril’s Letter to Constantius II presented the city as having converted en masse to Christianity after a miraculous work of God. However, his Catechetical Lectures, first delivered in the same year, suggest a far more complex religious landscape. By discussing these texts in conjunction, we are given greater understanding of the Christianisation of Jerusalem in reality and representation and the oppositional relationship between Golgotha and the Temple Mount.

7.2.1. Conflicting testimonies of Christianisation: Cyril of Jerusalem’s Letter to Constantius and Catechetical Lectures

Cyril of Jerusalem’s Letter to Constantius II narrated the appearance of a cross (Staurophany) over Jerusalem on 7 May 351 CE. The miraculous event reportedly prompted “the whole populace [ἀπαν] at once to run together into the holy church”. There, the varied congregation, composed of “young and old, men and women of every age … natives [ἐντοπίων] and foreigners [ξένων], Christians and pagans [ἐθνικῶν]”

---

1029 Ben-Ami, Tchekhanovets, and Daniel (2013); Tchekhanovets (2014); Sharabi, Tchekhanovets, and Ben-Ami (2020).

1030 For this dating, see Doval (1997); (2001), 27-8.

1031 Cyril, Ep. ad Const. 4. The event was later commemorated in the city's liturgical calendar, as the Armenian Lectionary attests. For general discussions, see Telfer (1955); McCauley and Stephenson (1970), 225-30; Bihain (1973); and Yarnold (2000). Divergent interpretations of the epistle and its purpose are represented in Vogt (1949), Chantraine (1993-4), Irshai (1996), Drijvers (2009), Gassman (2016).

1032 Cyril, Ep. ad Const. 4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 436). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 232). The corporate nature of the sighting by the “whole population [πάντα τῆς πόλεως]” is also emphasised.
unanimously praised “God’s only-begotten Son the wonder-worker”. 1033 The widespread conversion of Jerusalem’s population on account of the Staurophany served as a climactic moment in the Letter. 1034 Both the miraculous apparition and mass conversion were absorbed into later historical tradition; Sozomen referred to both in his Ecclesiastical History, and the date became a liturgical holy day recorded in the Armenian Lectionary. 1035 In addition, the Staurophany in Cyril of Jerusalem’s Letter was archetypal for the portrayal of other Cross sightings – most notably in its reported reappearance in 363 CE.

The Letter to Constantius functioned as the epistolary “first fruits [ἀπαρχάς]” between bishop and emperor. 1036 The Staurophany, which was reminiscent of the celestial sign offered to Constantine in 312 CE, 1037 ostensibly offered proof of divine approval for Constantius’ reign and Cyril’s episcopacy. 1038 In this respect, the letter need not solely be read in the context of imperial praise, but also in Cyril’s agenda of

1033 Cyril, Ep. ad Const. 4 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 436). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 232). The conversion of the Jews was a later historiographic tradition, such as in Sozomen’s Hist. Eccl. 4.5. On this development, see Irshai (1996), 103-4.

1034 However, the true climax of the letter, Irshai (1996) argued, was the eschatological symbolism of the event and the ultimate adventus of Christ.


1036 Cyril, Ep. ad Const. 1, 7 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 434, 440). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 231, 234). The term is used in the introduction and conclusion of the letter. While Cyril of Jerusalem’s later deposition by Constantius II suggests that the Letter was not successful, it was likely during the reign of Constantius that the Anastasis Rotunda was completed. See Kleinbauer (2006) and discussion in Chapter 4.

1037 Though it is not known whether Cyril knew and intentionally followed Eusebius’ narrative of the Milvian Bridge (Vit. Const. 1.28-32), the resemblance between the two incidents has been noted in Irshai (1999), 211; Gassman (2016), 121. Cf. Vogt (1949), 595-6. See also Drijvers (2009), 242.

1038 … ἔργῳ τὴν σήν βασιλείαν ἀγαπάσθαι πρὸς θεοὶ δι’ ἐν ἐπὶ σοῦ ἡματωριγε καταλαβών. Cyril, Ep. ad Const. 2 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 436). In this respect, the political significance of this letter has been much discussed, such as in McCauley and Stephenson (1970), 226-7; Barnes (1993), 101-8; Irshai (1996), 86-8; 91-2; Drijvers (2009); Gassman (2016), 121, 126. The miraculous incident in Jerusalem offered a “favourable premonition” for Constantius’ future during a moment of vulnerability, in the wake of Constans’ death and Magnentius’ usurpation of the throne in the west, as well as the ongoing Persian conflict in east.
self-promotion.\textsuperscript{1039} In the short epistle, the bishop mentioned Jerusalem five times. Cyril’s frequent and laudatory mention of both the emperor and Jerusalem was likely an effort to gain a similar degree of imperial patronage to that granted during the era of Constantine to his predecessor, Macarius.\textsuperscript{1040} Therefore, when he referred to the inhabitants of Jerusalem [οἱ τῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ οἰκήτορες] as the collective author of the letter, we can read this as an attempt to further the connection between Jerusalem and imperial authority:

… We citizens of Jerusalem [οἱ τῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ οἰκήτορες] … have offered, and will continue to offer, fervent prayers in the holy places on behalf of your sacred majesty … it is our duty to announce the good news to your godly Majesty … to the end that … you may boldly advance the standard of the Cross …\textsuperscript{1041}

The \textit{Letter to Constantius} provides a remarkably positive image of Jerusalem. Inclined to satisfy his political and ecclesiastical ambitions, Cyril of Jerusalem promoted an idealised picture of his city.

However, a contrary impression comes from the bishop’s contemporaneous work, the \textit{Catechetical Lectures}. While catechetical learning and interaction with the sacred served as conduits for “new sight” and the presentation of a ‘New’, holy Jerusalem, the bishop also conveyed this process as a preparation for war.\textsuperscript{1042} In this respect, the tone of Cyril’s \textit{Lectures} is, at times, markedly combative. The bishop advised his congregation of neophyte Christians to “take up arms against the enemy [δύνα λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας] … against heresies, against the Jews,
against the Samaritans, against the Gentiles”.

The theme of conflict in Cyril’s catechetical instruction provides insight into the religious diversity of fourth-century Jerusalem. This is evident in the bishop’s warning against “the assemblies of … heathen spectacles” and the “observation of sabbaths”. However, the religious landscape of the city is only treated vaguely, alluding to the “gathering” [ἀθροίσμα] or “assembly” [συνέδρια] of these religious ‘foes’. It is only in his vilification of the Jews that Cyril of Jerusalem referred to the religious topography, directly. In this respect, the bishop emphasised the geographic relationship between Golgotha and the opposing Temple Mount [ὁ ἀντικρύς] as symbolic of a theological disparity. The circumstances of the Temple Mount ostensibly evidenced the “sin of the transgressors [ἡ ἁμαρτία τῶν παρανόμων]”. Cyril articulated the inverse fate of the two spaces as two contrasting ‘Jerusalems’: “That Jerusalem crucified Christ, but that which now is worships him.”

1043 Cyril, Procat. 10 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 14). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 78).

1044 This is particularly the case in the Procat. 10, which frames catechetical learning as παραγγελία (Reischl and Rupp, i, 14). See also Drijvers (2004), 97-8; Jacobs (2004), 39-40.

1045 Μήτε δὲ θεωριῶν ἠθυμοὺς ἀθροίσμασι παράβαλλε … Πάσης σαββάτων παρατηρήσεως ἀπόστηθι. Cat. 4.37 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 130-2). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 137). In this passage, Cyril exceptionally treated the “assemblies of wicked heretics”, which his catechumens were called to “especially” [ἐξαιρέτως] avoid. This is emphasised in Drijvers (2004), 103; Jacobs (2004), 39.

1046 Cyril, Cat. 4.37 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 130-2). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (1969), i, 137.

1047 Jacobs (2004), observes, “The demonic presence of the Jews, unlike the Greeks or heretics, is also inscribed spatially, making them particularly dangerous foes for the Christian catechumen learning his or her Christian identity at the foot of the ruins of the Jerusalem Temple” (p. 41).

1048 Cyril, Cat. 10.11 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 276).

1049 Cyril, Cat. 10.11 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 276). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 203).

1050 Cyril, Cat. 13.7 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 60). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 9). See note 542 above.
While it is impossible to know the extent of the Jewish population in Jerusalem during the fourth century, the *Catechetical Lectures* implies their continued presence and influence.\(^{1051}\) However, in addition to the demographic context, the *Lectures* display the bishop of Jerusalem’s fixation on the essence and significance of his city, which was inevitably rooted in Jewish memory and topography. The militant nature of the *Catechetical Lectures*, particularly in its portrayal of the Jews, reflects a present anxiety. Cyril did not solely use location to highlight the liturgical privilege of proximity to the holy places, but also to further distinguish the “polarity between Jews and Christians”.\(^{1052}\)

### 7.2.2. Christianisation, the Cross, and Eschatological Premonition

The *Letter to Constantius* provides a snapshot of an idealised, ‘Christian’ Jerusalem, to which the *Catechetical Lectures* contribute further complexity. Nevertheless, while the images presented in Cyril’s *Letter* and *Lectures* are at times contradictory in the presentation of Jerusalem and its population, it is in the manifold significance of the Cross that the two accounts converge. Astute readings of Cyril’s *Letter to Constantius* have suggested that the bishop of Jerusalem might have had more than one audience in mind. In addition to an imperial readership, the letter likely circulated within Jerusalem as well.\(^{1053}\) In this respect, the bishop’s understanding of the miraculous event was not solely political or promotional; it was a sign for

---

\(^{1051}\) On the Jewish presence in fourth-century Jerusalem, see discussion in Chapter 3.3.3.

\(^{1052}\) Thorpe (2009), 70.

\(^{1053}\) This is encouraged in Irshai (1996), particularly p. 90. See also Drijvers (2009); Gassman (2016), 123.
Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1054} It is therefore striking that the Cross apparition was not the main topic of discussion in the \textit{Letter}. It served as a preamble for an eschatological reading of recent events. The apparition served as evidence of the “truth of the predictions contained in the Holy Gospels”.\textsuperscript{1055} In particular, it pointed to the coming “Sign of the Son of Man in heaven” from \textit{Matthew} 24:30.\textsuperscript{1056} In response to this association, Cyril encouraged the emperor – and his audience in Jerusalem – to “peruse this prophecy with more anxious attention on account of the whole context of the passage”.\textsuperscript{1057} Cyril made his plea urgent: “The predictions of our saviour demand the most reverent study if we are to escape injury at the hands of the opposing power [Ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας]”.\textsuperscript{1058}

Recently initiated members of Cyril’s congregation might have recalled a similar charge to “take up arms against the enemy [Ἀντικειμένης]” in the \textit{Procatechesis}, noted above.\textsuperscript{1059} The Cross of Christ, present and tangible in the Golgotha church, confronted both internal doubt and external objections.\textsuperscript{1060} It is in this context that we ought to understand Cyril’s most often quoted remark: “For others merely hear, but

\textsuperscript{1054} In addition to the political and ecclesiastical ambitions behind Cyril’s letter, Gassman (2016) interpreted Cyril’s eschatological exposition as an effort to “confirm the truth of the gospels” and “strengthen Constantius’ confidence in Christ” (p. 123). While this is a well-examined approach, the polemical undertone of Cyril’s eschatology cannot be ignored, such as is outlined in Irshai (1996).

\textsuperscript{1055} Cyril, \textit{Ep. ad Const.} 1 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 434). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 231).

\textsuperscript{1056} “For in the Gospel according to Matthew, the Savior, imparting the knowledge of future events to his blessed Apostles, and through them to later generations of Christians, declared plainly beforehand: ‘And then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven’. ” Cyril, \textit{Ep. ad Const.} 6. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 233-4).

\textsuperscript{1057} ὃν μάλιστα σε, δέσποτα, πυκνοτέρᾳ τῇ μελέτῃ προσέχειν παρακαλῶ διὰ τὰ λοιπὰ. Cyril, \textit{Ep. ad Const.} 6 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 440). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 233-4).

\textsuperscript{1058} Cyril, \textit{Ep. ad Const.} 6 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 440). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 234).

\textsuperscript{1059} ὅπλα λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀντικειμένης. Cyril, \textit{Procat.} 10 (Reischl and Rupp, i, 14). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 63, 78).

\textsuperscript{1060} Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 4.10.
we see and touch … take up arms against the adversaries [λάβε τὰ ὅπλα κατὰ τῶν ἐναντίων] for the sake of the Cross itself.”

In addition to seeing and touching the Cross relic as a reminder of Christ’s crucifixion, Christians were also called to use the Cross as “a trophy against objectors”.

However, the bishop’s exposition of Matthew 24 in the fifteenth Lecture establishes the clearest connection to the Staurophany of 351 CE. There, Cyril taught that the imminence of the coming sign would be instigated by the arrival of the “opposing power” [ἀντικειμένος].

He instructed his audience to be on the lookout for the Antichrist, who would come and “deceive the Jews” and “lead astray the Gentiles”, as a harbinger of the end of days.

Then, the “Sign of the Son of Man” – a luminous Cross [φωτοειδὸς σταυρὸς] – would herald the Parousia of Christ.

Therefore, through an allusion to the eschatological age, Cyril offered a means of reconciling present circumstances with the pre-eminence of the Cross.

This was the case of the Cross apparition in 351 CE, which served as a “preliminary rehearsal” of this future sign. However, it was also the case in the religious landscape of Jerusalem, in which the conflict alluded to in the Catechetical Lectures was ultimately expected to be resolved. In addition to the Cross, Cyril of Jerusalem’s eschatological
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1061 Cyril, Cat. 13.22 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 80). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 19).
1062 τρόπαιον στῆσον τὴν πίστιν τοῦ σταυροῦ κατὰ τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων. Cyril, Cat. 13.22 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 80). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 19).
1063 Cyril, Cat. 15.11.
1064 καὶ διὰ μὲν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσηγορίας Ἰουδαίους τοὺς τῶν ἠλειμμένων προσδοκῶντα, τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν δὲ ταῖς μαγικαῖς φαντασίαις ὑπαγόμενον. Cyril, Cat. 15.11 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 168). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 60).
1065 Cyril, Cat. 15.22 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 184).
1066 Irshai (1996) referred to this as a sort of “Praeparatio Eschatologica” (p. 104).
framework also hinged on the inverse relationship of Jerusalem’s two ‘temples’: Golgotha and the Temple Mount.1068 Cyril instructed that the Antichrist would one day engage the Jews’ messianic hopes to restore the “Temple of God” in Jerusalem.1069 However, this effort would fail with the second coming of Christ.1070 Ultimately, the bishop presented a bleak resolution:

The Cross will appear again with Jesus from heaven; for His emblem will precede the King; and the Jews, seeing Him whom they pierced and recognizing by the Cross Him whom they dishonoured, will repent and mourn (and they shall repent then, when there shall be no time for repentance [ὅτε οὐχ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς μετανοίας καμός]).1071

While it was common to interpret the “coming sign” as the Cross of Christ, Cyril was unprecedented in portraying the Jews as the bearers of the entire weight of this prophecy.1072 This interpretation could have been a product of the bishop’s immediate context. Cyril anticipated the religious and topographical conflict to be resolved in eschatology, when the second coming of Christ involved a return to his “own Temple” on Golgotha.1073

7.3. The Jewish Temple Mount in 363 CE: History and Reception

Though peripheralised during the Roman and Byzantine periods, the Temple

1069 τὸν καταλαμμένον τῶν Ἰουδαίων φησίν. Cyril, Cat. 15.15 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 172). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 62).
1070 Cyril, Cat. 15.22.
1071 Cyril, Cat. 13.41 (Reischl and Rupp, ii, 104). Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 31). See also Cat. 15.22.
1072 Matthew 24:30. In contrast to the conversion of the nations in Revelation, noted Irshai (1996), 101-3. The exclusion of the Jews was also evident in the conversion event of the Ep. ad Const. Jacobs (2004) also observed the conspicuous absence of Jews from the post-baptismal Mys. Cat., which also share an eschatological theme (p. 43).
1073 Cyril, Cat. 12.7. This juxtaposition is observed in Thorpe (2009), 71.
Mount was never wholly erased; its ruins remained an integral part of the urban landscape in Jerusalem and a prominent element of Christian prophetic and eschatological discourse about Jerusalem. These considerations obtained a degree of present concern during the reign of Julian, which marked a short but important reversal of the Christianising efforts of his predecessors. Julian sought to restore and re-invigorate the traditional, polytheistic cults of empire.\textsuperscript{1074} It was also during his reign that we are given sparse but conclusive evidence of an attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem. By first examining testimony of the Temple project in works of Julian and Ammianus Marcellinus, it is possible to extract a “historical nucleus” of the Temple project.\textsuperscript{1075} However, source material is otherwise entirely skewed toward the Christian perspective, which portrayed the building project and its cessation as a miraculous and eschatological event.

### 7.3.1. The Temple Project in the Works of Julian and Ammianus Marcellinus

The emperor Julian’s interest in the Jews and the Jewish Temple likely originated from his time in Antioch on the eve of his Persian campaign in 362 CE.\textsuperscript{1076} His attitude towards the Jews was generally, if not totally, positive. In his \textit{Letter to the High Priest Theodorus}, Julian wrote:

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1075} Brock (1976), 103. Julian, \textit{Ep.} 89b, 134, and 204; Amm. Marc. 28.1-3.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1076} Stemberger (2000) reasoned that Julian hoped for ‘support’ or at least ‘neutrality’ in his Persian campaign (pp. 200, 205).
\end{flushleft}
These Jews are in part god-fearing [θεοσεβεῖς ὄντες], seeing that they revere a god who is truly most powerful and most good and governs this world of sense, and, as I well know, is worshipped by us also under other names. They act as is right and seemly, in my opinion, if they do not transgress the laws; but in this one thing they err in that, while reserving their deepest devotion for their own god, they do not conciliate the other gods also …

Even in his Against the Galileans, which ultimately dwelt on the inferiority of the Jewish God, Julian distinguished Jews from Christians (“Galileans”) because of their adherence to tradition. In particular, their historical observance of temple sacrifice appealed to Julian’s religious vision. Therefore, out of a respect for Jewish tradition and a desire to restart their sacrificial cult, Julian likely set about organising the Temple project in Jerusalem.

In the peculiar letter addressed “To the Community of the Jews” (Ep. 204), Julian expressed a desire to reverse the “negative policies of his predecessors”. He endeavoured to lift the apostolé tax levied by the Patriarch, so that the Jews might “have security of mind … [and] offer more fervid prayers” on his behalf. In
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1077 Julian, Ep. 89a (Bidez and Cumont, 126–7). Tr. Wright (LCL 29, 61).
1078 Julian’s Contra Galileos was an anti-Christian polemical work influenced by those written by Celsus and Porphyry. Consequently, the invective of Christianity had ramifications on the emperor’s portrayal of Judaism. Drijvers (1992), 23; Burr (2000), 145; Finkelstein (2018), 101-14; Bradbury (2020), 274.
1079 John Chrysostom, Ad. Iud. 5.11.5-8.
1080 Admiration of the Jews’ adherence to divine commandment in circumcision and food laws was mentioned in Gregory Nazianzus’ Or. 5.3; Julian’s interest in sacrifice is stated in Socrates’ Hist. Eccl. 3.20. See also Stemberger (2000), 199-204; Drijvers (2004), 133-5; Bradbury (2020), 273.
1081 As Roux (2018) noted, it is unclear what Jewish community is being addressed.
1082 Hostility between Constantius II’s administration and the Jews is suggested in a conflict that broke out in Diocæsarea, according to Sozomen’s Hist. Eccl. 4.7. This, Den Boer (1962), argued, explains the repetition of the phrase καθ’ ὑμῶν several times throughout the letter (pp. 188-90). Julian’s rejection of Constantius’ taxation policy was likely an attempt to differentiate himself. This distinction is somewhat artificial, as Van Nuffelen (2002) has argued that Constantius II was not responsible for collecting the apostolé for the patriarch.
1083 … ἴδια ἀπολλάοντες … ἐπὶ μεῖζονας εἰγὸς ποῆσθε [ὑπὲρ] τῆς ἐμῆς βασιλείας … Julian, Ep. 204.5 (Bidez and Cumont, 281). Tr. Wright (LCL 157, 179). See also Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 5.22. Finkelstein (2018) suggested that the cutting of taxes was integral to an attempt of resettlement in Judaea (pp. 86-100, esp. 146)
response, Julian promised to “rebuild … the sacred city of Jerusalem” after his Persian campaign. While this letter has undergone much scrutiny, there is reason not to reject it altogether. After all, an imperial letter drafted “to the Jews” is recorded in the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates and Sozomen. In addition, the emperor’s interest in Jerusalem emerges in two other correspondences, which refer specifically to the initiative to rebuild the Jewish Temple. Julian’s Letter to a Priest (Ep. 89b), written in the summer of 363 CE, mentioned the endeavour in the past tense:

As for those who make such profanation a reproach against us, I mean the prophets of the Jews, what have they to say about their own temple, which was overthrown three times and even now is not being raised up again? This I mention not as a reproach against them, for I myself, after so great a lapse of time, intended to restore it …

A fragment from another letter, preserved in John Lydus’ de Mensibus (Ep. 134), referred to the building project in the present: “I am rebuilding with all zeal the temple of the Most High God”. The correlation between the Temple project and Julian’s wider religious and monumental policies has maintained the wider acceptance

---

1084 πόλιν ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐμοῖς καμάτοις ἀνοικοδομήσας (Bidez and Cumont, 281-2). Tr. Wright (LCL 157, 181).
1085 Bidez and Cumont (1922) included the letter in their collection of epistulae spuriae vel dubiae. Vogt (1939), 64-86, offered the most comprehensive critique, while Van Nuffelen (2002), 131-50, and Bouffartigue (2005), 231-42, offered cautious acceptance. Following Van Nuffelen, Bradbury (2020) considered the resemblance of the letter to the fifth-century Julian Romance (p. 280). Even if it is a fifth-century forgery, Penella (1999) and Simmons (2006) have not discounted its value as a historical document.
1086 Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 3.20; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 5.22; John Chrysostom, Adv. Iud. 5.11.5.
1087 Julian, Ep. 89a and b, 134 (from Lydus’ de Mensibus). On the historiography of these fragments, see Levenson (2004), 415.
1088 The use of the aorist likely suggests the Temple project had failed prior to the letter. However, scholars have disagreed on the sense of διενοήθην, either as the past perfect, meaning the project had already ceased (“I intended”) or as an ‘Epistolary Aorist’, meaning a contemporaneous attempt (“I intend”). On the former, see Wright’s translation and Drijvers (1992), 23 n. 27. On the latter, see Simmons (2006), 74.
1089 Julian, Ep. 89b (Bidez and Cumont, 135). Tr. Wright (LCL 29, 313).
of Julian’s *Letter* “To the Community of the Jews” as an authentic document. 

When combined with other extracts, it appears that the Temple project likely began in the spring of 363 CE and ceased shortly thereafter.

If authentic, the *Letter* provides further insight into Julian’s motivations. In addition to the emperor’s proclivity for reopening temples and promoting sacrificial practices, the emphasis on the lifting of taxation might have been a move to encourage Jews in the Diaspora to resettle in Judaea. In this respect, the letter bears some similarity to Cyrus’ decree in *Ezra*:

The Lord, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem in Judah. Any of those among you who are of his people — may their God be with them! — are now permitted to go up to Jerusalem in Judah, and rebuild the house of the Lord, the God of Israel — he is the God who is in Jerusalem ...

Cyrus need not have been the only figure Julian attempted to emulate. M.B. Simmons has suggested that the projected completion date of the building might have also been organised to coincide with Julian’s *decennalia*, the tenth anniversary of his appointment as Caesar, in November 365 CE. This organisation would have echoed Herod and Constantine, who both celebrated an important anniversary with a project

1091 Den Boer (1962), 188-97; Blanchetière (1980); Levenson (1990); Penella (1999); Simmons (2006), 72; Finkelstein (2018), 145.

1092 Following a reference to an imperial council in the “middle of winter” in Ephrem’s first *HeJul* (1.5.3), Simmons (2006), 72-3, and Elm (2012), 447, have argued that the project was likely underway in early spring. A contrary date in May was given in the Syriac letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem (discussed below). This could, however, have been an attempt to conflate the earthquake and Temple episode as one event.

1093 This is the argument of Finkelstein (2018).

1094 Associations between Julian and Cyrus are made elsewhere, such as in Libanius’ *Oratio* 12.66. A comparison between Julian’s *Letter* and *Ezra* 1 was drawn in Sivan (2008), 205-9.

1095 *Ezra* 1:2-4.

in Jerusalem. While a more positive association could be made with the monumental legacy of Herod, Julian’s project might also have been an antagonistic counterpoint to Constantine’s endeavour on Golgotha.\(^{1097}\) If completed, the project would have de-legitimised the often-quoted lamentation of Jesus in *Matthew* 24.\(^{1098}\) Rebuilding the Temple would not only divest Christ of the fulfilment of his prophecy, but once again reconstitute Jerusalem – a nexus of rising importance for Christians – as a Jewish city.\(^{1099}\)

Ultimately, Julian’s motivations can only be inferred.\(^{1100}\) It is striking that the only other non-Christian source of the event, Ammianus Marcellinus’ *History*, omitted a religious motivation altogether.\(^{1101}\) Ammianus referred to the imperial project solely as an attempt to “extend the memory of his [Julian’s] reign by great works”.\(^{1102}\) The *History* also provided a more comprehensive outline of events:

… [Julian] planned at vast cost to restore the once splendid temple at Jerusalem, which after many mortal combats during the siege by Vespasian and later by Titus, had barely been stormed. He had entrusted the speedy performance of this work to Alypius of Antioch, who had once been vice-prefect of Britain. But, though this Alypius pushed the work on with vigour, aided by the governor of the province, terrifying balls of flame [*metuendi globi flammarum*] kept bursting forth near the foundations of the temple, and

\(^{1097}\) As Sivan (2008) put it, Julian effectively called for a “pre-Christian” and “pre-Hadrianic” urban plan (p. 207).

\(^{1098}\) *Matthew* 24:30. This is an integral part of later Christian retelling of the event.

\(^{1099}\) This would particularly be the case if the Temple project was accompanied by an effort of repopulation in Judaea and Jerusalem. Avi-Yonah (1976) suspected that Julian might have found the promotion of a Jewish Jerusalem essential for stirring an anti-Christian majority in Palestine. This is an interesting suggestion, particularly with respect to our understanding of the state of Christianisation. In the mid-fourth century, Christianity was not a majority religion in the province. See also Drijvers (2004), 133.

\(^{1100}\) Wilken (1992), 139.

\(^{1101}\) It is on account of this source that Drijvers (1992) argued Julian’s project was not instigated by anti-Christian sentiment (p. 25). However, on a potential intentionality behind these omissions, see Hunt (1985); Barnes (1998), 48-51; Simmons (2006), 70.

\(^{1102}\) *Diligentiam tamen ubrique dividens, imperiique sui memoriam, magnitudine eorum gestiens propagare …* Amm. Marc. 23.2. Tr. Rolfe (*LCL* 315, 311).
made the place inaccessible to the workmen, some of whom were burned to death; and since in this way the element persistently repelled them, the enterprise halted.  

Ammianus’s account further confirms a dating for the project in early 363 CE, while preparations for the Persian campaign were still underway. The project began at great expense under the supervision of Alypius of Antioch. However, it eventually failed on account of an outbreak of fire that resulted in several casualties. It is important to note that Ammianus made no mention of the earthquake as a contributing factor.

7.3.2. Jewish Sources on the Rebuilding Episode

While Christian sources invariably refer to significant Jewish support in the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple, no Jewish source refers to the event until many centuries later. Some scholars have drawn allusions to the event in rabbinic literature, most notably a statement from Rabbi Acha in the Jerusalem Talmud, which referred to the restoration of the Temple “before the kingdom of the House of David”. The attempt to distinguish between the restoration of the Temple and the Messianic restoration of the House of David might have been a consequence of the

1103 Amm. Marc. 23.1.2-3. Tr. Rolfe (LCL 315, 311).
1104 “And although he weighed every possible variety of events with anxious thought, and pushed on with burning zeal the many preparations for his campaign …” Amm. Marc. 23.1.2. Tr. Rolfe (LCL 315, 311).
1105 Ammianus refers to two earthquakes in the vicinity in 362 CE (22.8.5) and 365 CE (26.10.15-19). See also Russell (1980), 50-4.
1106 Gregory of Nazianzus, Or. 5; Socrates, Hist Eccl. 3.20; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 5.22. The Jewish acceptance of the Temple building project is portrayed as aggressive arrogance in Rufinus’ polemical portrayal (Hist. Eccl. 10.38).
1107 The earliest example is from the sixteenth century. On this silence, see Adler (1893), 625-6; Levenson (2004), n. 1.
1108 Bacher (1897); Avi-Yonah (1976), 197-8.
Temple project initiated by Julian.\textsuperscript{1109} However, whether this was a reference to an historical event or a more general prediction, remains unclear.\textsuperscript{1110} An additional piece of evidence is a Hebrew inscription partially transcribing Isaiah 66:14 (“You shall see and your heart shall rejoice …”) on the western wall of the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{1111} Excavator B. Mazar dated the inscription “undoubtedly from the Byzantine period, and possibly from the days of Julian”, however various other interpretations of the inscription have also been presented.\textsuperscript{1112} Even if the Temple project might appear implicitly in rabbinc literature and epigraphic evidence, the lack of a more overt Jewish reference to the project is perplexing. This could have been influence of the Patriarch, who might have opposed the project both for its impact on the apostolé tax and the potential reinstatement of a High Priest.\textsuperscript{1113} It could also reflect a more ambivalent attitude towards the Temple and the prospect of its rebuilding in Rabbinic Judaism.\textsuperscript{1114} Nevertheless, while the Patriarch and rabbinate might have treated the project with restraint, there is little reason to suspect that the popular Jewish opinion of the Temple project would have been so dismissive.\textsuperscript{1115} The lack of a Jewish response could equally reflect the lack of a widespread knowledge of the project and

\textsuperscript{1109} See comparison between Julian and Cyrus in note 1094 above.

\textsuperscript{1110} Stemberger (2000), 207-8.

\textsuperscript{1111} CHP 1.2, 790 (Cotton et al. (2012), 95-6).

\textsuperscript{1112} Mazar (1970), 56. The inscription might have been a response to the opening of Jerusalem to Jewish pilgrims and settlers by Eudocia. See Levenson (2004), 409-10 n. 1; Isaac (2012), 29; Cotton et al. (2012), 1.2, 96.


\textsuperscript{1114} Goldenberg (2006) has shown how Rabbinic literature reacted to 70 CE in creative ways, by making the Temple both unnecessary and indispensable to Jewish thought.

\textsuperscript{1115} While the lack of rabbinc reference to the event might suggest that the patriarchate likely opposed the plan, Stemberger (2000) interpreted the Jewish enthusiasm mentioned in Gregory’s account as the “greater spontaneity” of a popular Jewish response (p. 209).
the immediacy of its failure.

### 7.3.3. The Attempt to Rebuild the Temple in Christian Representation

The lack of a wider corpus of textual accounts – particularly from the Jewish perspective – suggests that the failed project was likely ultimately of little significance.\(^{1116}\) On account of its swift cessation, it is likely that the project had little impact on the urban landscape of Jerusalem, as well. Nevertheless, the Temple episode was widely elaborated with hostile vigour in Christian writings.\(^{1117}\) Beginning with two of the earliest accounts, Gregory of Nazianus’ fifth *Oration* (Against Julian) and Ephrem of Nisbis’ fourth *Hymn against Julian*, I will now consider the events’ significance in the *interpretatio Christiana*. Both texts dwell on the project’s failure as proof of the enduring integrity of Christian prophetic interpretation. Heightened by the incorporation of miraculous and catastrophic elements, both writers also portray the events through the lens of eschatology.

#### 7.3.3.1. Gregory of Nazianzus’ *Oration against Julian*

One of the earliest extant references to the Temple event comes from Gregory of Nazianzus’ second *Oration against Julian* (*Or. 5*).\(^{1118}\) In the *Oration*, Gregory sought to condemn the life and legacy of Julian following his death and subsequent *apotheosis* in 363 CE.\(^{1119}\) In Gregory’s derision of the “Apostate” emperor, he never referred to

---

\(^{1116}\) Drijvers (1992), 25.

\(^{1117}\) See Wharton (2000), 199-200; Van Nuffelen (2020). Drijvers (2004) considered the development of anti-Jewish sentiment in the Syriac environment from which the *Julian Romance* and Syriac redactions of the Helena legend emerged (pp. 150-2).

\(^{1118}\) Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or. 5*.3-7.

\(^{1119}\) Elm (2012), esp. 457.
Julian by name. Rather, he portrayed a contemptuous figure first among the ranks of biblical adversaries:

> It is more proper to call him Jeroboam or Ahab, the most wicked of the Israelites; or Pharaoh the Egyptian, or Nebuchadnezzar the Assyrian; or coming all together shall we name him one and the same, since he showed himself to have united in himself the vices of them all …

Then turning to the failed Temple project, Gregory argued the event was a foundational example of Julian’s misinterpretation of divine oracles. Gregory noted that the emperor stirred Jewish support by “speaking prophetically [ἐπιθειάζων] … from the books and esoteric revelations that it was the time now for them to go down to their country, rebuild the temple, renew the vitality of their ancestral customs …” The initiative was reportedly met with enthusiasm, as a large number of Jews contributed to the building project with “great zeal”. However, Gregory’s emphasis was on the fact that the project had failed. According to Gregory, the termination was proof of Julian’s – and the Jews’ – misinterpretation of prophetic scripture. Further, the resulting events – the onset of natural disaster in Jerusalem – were the provocation of divine wrath and an unfortunate omen for the Persian campaign and Julian’s death shortly thereafter.

In contrast to Ammianus Marcellinus’ *History*, which referred only to an outbreak of fire as the cause for the project’s termination, Gregory referred to three sequential events. The first was an earthquake – a “sudden heaving of the earth” that drove Jews

1120 Gregory, *Or. 5.3*. Tr. King (1888), 87. See a similar portrayal in *Or. 4.1.*

1121 Gregory, *Or. 5.3*. Tr. Simmons (2006), 85. See also Elm (2012), 447-8.


1123 Gregory, *Or. 5.4* (*SC* 309, 298). Tr. King (1888), 88.

1124 Elm (2012), 450. See also Fowler (2018).
participating in the building effort to seek shelter in “one of the neighbouring sacred places [τῶν πλησίων ἱερῶν]”. It is apparent that τὸ ἱερὸν does not refer to the Jewish Temple in Gregory’s usage. Rather, the reference to multiple neighbouring places most plausibly alludes to the Christian sacred topography of the adjacent hills: Golgotha and the Mount of Olives. By referring to other ἱερὰ, Gregory sought to further pinpoint Julian’s error. By attempting to rebuild the Jewish Temple, which was no longer sacred but doomed to desolation, he failed to recognise the authentic ἱερὰ located elsewhere in Jerusalem.

The misjudgement of Julian and the Jews had catastrophic repercussions in Gregory’s narrative. Jewish admittance into the church was prevented first by “an unseen and invisible power” followed by a fire that “issued forth” from its entrance. The outbreak of fire is an element shared in all early accounts of the Temple event; however, the location and impact of this instance varies widely, often fulfilling an anti-Jewish imperative. Gregory stressed that it was only after a luminous Cross appeared over Jerusalem as a “trophy of God’s victory [τρόπαιον τὸ Θεὸ τῆς νίκης]”,

1125 Ὡς δὲ ὑπὸ ἀγρίας λαίλαπος καὶ βρασμοῦ γῆς ἀφὼν συνελαθέντες ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον ἱερὸν. Gregory, Or. 5.4 (SC 309, 300). Tr. King (1888), 88. The fifth-century ecclesiastical historians all referred to the earthquake on the day following the preparation of the Temple’s foundations. In this, they share in a tradition also found in the Syriac Ep. de Temp. to be explored below.

1126 Both Golgotha and the Mount of Olives figure prominently in the Ep. de Temp.

1127 Elm (2012) noted: “Gregory’s principal point … is that Julian could not interpret divine will, read oracles, or understand portents because he was not divinely elected, divinely born, or in any way close to the divine … Furthermore, only those who are truly divinely chosen, purified, and legitimately entrusted with the hiera could alter the sacred topography of a city” (p. 450).

1128 Gregory, Or. 5.4 (SC 309, 300). Tr. King (1888), 88.

1129 While all sources refer to the outbreak of fire, both Gregory and Sozomen referred to the controversy of its origins. While Gregory referred to fire bursting forth from the “sacred place”, Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. 5.22) referred to fire either from the foundations of the Temple (see also Anm. Marc.) or the earth itself (see also Ephrem, HcJul 4.20). Socrates noted the fire came from heaven, in conjunction with the celestial apparition. Rufinus (Hist Eccl. 10.38) portrayed the fire as bursting through the square, however spreading throughout the city.
that the Jews were rescued in a moment of mass conversion, symbolised through a transfiguration of the Cross on the garments of all citizens.\textsuperscript{1130}

Let those who were spectators and partakers of that prodigy exhibit their garments, which to the present time are stamped with the brandmarks of the Cross! … Such great consternation at the spectacle that nearly all, as by one signal and with one voice, invoked the God of the Christians \[\text{ὅσπερ ἐξ ἑνὸς συνθήματος καὶ μᾶς φονῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀνακαλεῖσθαι Θεὸν},\] and propitiated Him with many praises and supplications.\textsuperscript{1131}

In Gregory’s narrative, the combination of the earthquake, fire, and \textit{Staurophany} symbolised a monumental act of divine retribution in Jerusalem. By retelling the events as the disastrous consequences of prophetic ignorance, Gregory then positioned himself as a more reliable interpreter: “I, too, have something to tell from the heavens: that Star declared the presence of Christ [τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν]: this Crown is that of the victory of Christ!”\textsuperscript{1132}

\textbf{7.3.3.2. Ephrem of Nisbis’ \textit{Hymns against Julian}}

Gregory of Nazianzus’ \textit{Orations} were highly influential in the later Christian reception of Julian in the fifth century \textit{Ecclesiastical Histories} and beyond.\textsuperscript{1133} This is evident in the later recapitulation of the Temple episode, which largely followed a similar turn of events to those first articulated by Gregory. However, an exception is the collection of four \textit{Hymns against Julian}, written by Ephrem of Nisbis.\textsuperscript{1134} It is

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1130} The conversion of the population varies in the accounts. In Rufinus (\textit{Hist. Eccl.} 10.38) and Socrates (\textit{Hist. Eccl.} 3.20), the Jews were forced and unwilling converts, who endeavoured to wash away the Cross on their garments to no avail.

\textsuperscript{1131} Gregory, \textit{Or.} 5.7 (SC 309, 304). Tr. King (1888), 91.

\textsuperscript{1132} Gregory, \textit{Or.} 5.5 (SC 309, 302). Tr. King (1888), 90.

\textsuperscript{1133} Van Nuffelen (2020), 365. Van Nuffelen contrasted the impact of Gregory’s \textit{Or.} to Ephrem’s \textit{HcJul}, which are preserved in only one manuscript (MS BL Add. 14,571). On the later reception of Ephrem in Syriac Christianity, see Butts (2017).

\textsuperscript{1134} On Ephrem’s \textit{HcJul}, see Lieu (1986), 81-128; Griffith (1987); Simmons (2006), 91-6; Van Nuffelen
\end{flushleft}
likely that the *Hymns* were written shortly after Julian’s death and the secession of Nisbis to the Persians under Jovian in 363 CE and before Ephrem’s own flight to Edessa the following year.\textsuperscript{1135} Therefore, the *Hymns* were roughly contemporaneous with, and likely independent of, Gregory’s *Orations*. However, contrary to Gregory of Nazianzus’ specific invective of the emperor in his fourth and fifth *Orations*, Ephrem’s hymns have more accurately been interpreted as madrāšê: “biblically oriented meditations on history, Christianity, imperial power, and the putative eclipse of paganism and Judaism”.\textsuperscript{1136} In Ephrem’s presentation, these themes culminate in the reign of Julian, which saw the ultimate victory of Christianity in its conclusion.\textsuperscript{1137} Quoting liberally from the book of *Daniel*, Ephrem portrayed Julian’s reign as a climactic, even eschatological, moment in Christian history.\textsuperscript{1138} In this respect, it is striking that Ephrem chose the failed attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple as the point of conclusion in his fourth and final *Hymn*.\textsuperscript{1139} In this respect, the project served as the climactic endpoint for his reflections.

In the last verses of the fourth *Hymn*, Ephrem evoked a personified Jerusalem, who condemned the Jews for their attempt to rebuild the “desolation … caused by their sins”.\textsuperscript{1140} Expanding on the theme of desolation, Ephrem referred to the past and

\textsuperscript{1135} On this date, see Brock (1977), 283; Lieu (1986), 94-5; Griffith (1987), 238; and Drijvers (1992), 20.

\textsuperscript{1136} Griffith (1987), 244. On the liturgical context of Ephrem’s madrāšê, see Wickes (2018).

\textsuperscript{1137} Griffith (1987), 250.

\textsuperscript{1138} HcJul 1.19-20; 2.14; 4.20, 23. On Ephrem’s incorporation of *Daniel*, see Griffith (1987), 250-1.

\textsuperscript{1139} Ephrem, *HcJul* 4.18-20.

\textsuperscript{1140} Ephrem, *HcJul* 4.18. Tr. Lieu (*TTH* 2, 125).
present forms of the Temple as a more comprehensive refutation of Judaism:1141

Fools and senseless, they made it desolate while it was built and now that it is desolate they threaten to rebuild it. When it was established, they pulled it down, and when it was desolate they loved it.1142

The ambition to rebuild the Temple was interpreted as a disruption of Jerusalem’s “tranquillity”.1143 Rather than referring to the predictions of Matthew 23 and 24, Ephrem cited Daniel 9:26-27 to convey its fate to be “desolate forever”.1144 On this, Ephrem also connected the Jewish interpretation of scripture with the disastrous events that followed.1145 In this narrative, the catastrophic combination of earthquakes, storms, and fire served to preserve this desolation and clarify its ‘right’ interpretation. Finally, Ephrem turned to a redemptive moment for Jerusalem: “Cana, through her wine, brought consolation”.1146 The city, though still ruined and desolate, is ultimately portrayed as a place at rest:

Better for you than such a cultivated land of heathenism
Is devastation without sins and desolation without oracles.
Bethlehem and Bethany, both are surety for (you) both
That in the place of that people who were destroyed,
(men) will come from all peoples with praising
In order to see in your laps the grave and Golgotha.1147

Once again drawing from Daniel 9:26-27, Ephrem referred to both Jerusalem and the

---

1141 The anti-Jewish rhetoric of Ephrem’s hymns and sermons follows a similar strategy to that of the Catechetical Lectures, in which the religious “other” is a means of delineating orthodoxy. On this, see Shepardson (2001); Siquans (2020).


1144 Ephrem, HcJul 4.20. Tr. Lieu (TTH 2, 126).

1145 This is particularly evident in HcJul 4.20, which depicts Jewish scribes as victims of the outbreak of fire.


Temple in the context of desolation.\textsuperscript{1148} However, it is striking that he did not delineate between the fate of the Temple and city; he portrayed Jerusalem, too, in ruins.\textsuperscript{1149} For Ephrem, the distinction between the two was in the meaning of this desolation; in contrast to the Temple, Jerusalem’s desolation was one “without sins”. Nevertheless, the image of a ruined Jerusalem is somewhat compromised in Ephrem’s conclusion. The resulting impression is still one of Christianisation, as people came “praising … the grave and Golgotha”.\textsuperscript{1150}

A central concern of both retellings of the Temple project was the preservation of prophecies regarding the desolation of the Temple Mount. In this respect, both authors emphasised both Julian and his Jewish supporters as incorrect interpreters of prophetic scripture. By incorporating and interpreting the events of 363 CE, the writers themselves assumed an active role in establishing their own interpretation. The events and characters were moulded to adhere to an eschatological narrative. The caricature of Julian as nefarious and deceptive and the Jews as gullible and zealous participants, in conjunction with the incorporation of natural disaster and the Cross apparition, further highlights the event as an eschatological turning point. It is in this respect that both accounts present a narrative that is remarkably similar to the one presented in Cyril of Jerusalem’s earlier works. Therefore, as we conclude our investigation of the Temple episode, it is imperative to return once more to the bishop of Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{1148} There is less of a distinction in Daniel 9:26 which refers to “the people of the ruler who will … destroy the city and the sanctuary”, than there is in Matthew 23:38.

\textsuperscript{1149} Griffith (1987) interpreted this as a symbol of Christianity’s victory over Judaism (p. 249).

\textsuperscript{1150} Ephrem, HcJul 4.25. Tr. Lieu (TTH 2, 127).
7.3.4. Cyril of Jerusalem: The Rebuilding of the Temple as an Eschatological Turning Point

While scholarly consensus has established a “historical nucleus” on which the more legendary accounts of the Temple episode are founded, the absence of any definitive reaction from the bishop of Jerusalem poses a definitive problem.\(^\text{[1151]}\) It appears that Cyril’s silence was likewise a concern in the fifth century, as he was inserted into the narrative of the *Ecclesiastical Histories*, where he publicly proclaimed that “Not one stone here will be left on another” from *Matthew* 24:1-2.\(^\text{[1152]}\) In addition, a letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem (but likely written in Jerusalem after the bishop’s death) reiterated the Temple rebuilding episode from the bishop’s perspective.\(^\text{[1153]}\) There, the writer referred to another peculiar event that allegedly occurred afterwards: the citizens of Jerusalem endeavoured to re-erect a statue to Hadrian on top of the Temple Mount in order to further confirm the prophetic accuracy of *Matthew* 23 and 24.\(^\text{[1154]}\) While both instances seem to be later revisions, there was evidently an impulse to associate Cyril of Jerusalem, the Temple episode, and the integrity of Christian prophetic interpretation.

Returning to the *Catechetical Lectures*, O. Irshai suggested an alternative answer to the “age-old enigma” of Cyril’s silence during this important moment of his

\(^{1151}\) On a “historical nucleus”, see Brock (1976), 103. Adler (1893) succinctly argued that “Cyril’s complete silence is therefore more eloquent than all Gregory’s violent denunciations of his imperial enemy” (p. 649).


\(^{1153}\) On the *Ep. de. Temp.* and its provenance, see Brock (1976) and (1977).

\(^{1154}\) While the text notes this was a statue to Herod, it is likely a mistranslation. See Brock (1977), 279. It has been previously mentioned that Christian writers often referred to a statue to Hadrian on the Temple Mount as a physical manifestation of *Matthew* 24:15. See Chapter 2.3.1.
Irshai highlighted the eschatological vision of Jerusalem supplied in Cyril’s fifteenth Lecture (which is largely an exposition of Matthew 24) as the product of later revision after 363 CE. While the bishop affirmed it was not for anyone to know the times, certain portions of his Lectures seem to allude to specific historical events. The most obvious example of this was his depiction of the Antichrist and the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple, noted above.

Whether or not the bishop made a public appearance in 363 CE, it is apparent that his interpretation of Matthew 24 was an influential element of Christian interpretation of the event thereafter. This is evident in the second apparition of the Cross, which was taken not as a premonition, but as the actual “Sign of the Son of Man”. Drawing on Cyril’s earlier Letter, Gregory emphasised the eschatological significance of its appearance. However, in contrast to the apparition of 351 CE, which would be “more amply fulfilled”, it was perceived as the genuine “presence of Christ [ὁ Χριστὸς παροισίαν]” in 363 CE. The Pseudo-Cyrilline letter likewise asserted: “The entire people thought that, after these signs which our Saviour gave us in His Gospel, the fearful (second) coming of the day of resurrection had arrived.”

---

1155 Irshai (1999), 213.
1156 Cyril, Cat. 15.4.
1157 Cyril, Cat. 15:15. See also Irshai (1999), 213-14.
1158 See the timeline of Cyril’s episcopacy in Chapter 5.3.2.
1159 Matthew 24:30.
1160 Cyril, Ep. 6. Tr. McCauley and Stephenson (FC 64, 233).
1161 Gregory, Or. 5.5 (SC 309, 302). Tr. King (1888), 90.
events of 363 CE we considered a sort of *Demonstratio Eschatologica.*

7.4. Conclusion: Conceptualising Jerusalem without a Temple Mount

Over the course of this chapter, I have considered the extent of Christianisation in Jerusalem in conjunction with the Temple Mount and the reign of Julian. While the historical and spatial significance of the project itself was likely minimal, its ideological impact is evident in the Christian response. Contrary to its portrayal as an abandoned and excluded space in the topography of Jerusalem, the attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple posed a threat to these basic preconditions. While likely not as simultaneous as these sources imply, the Temple Project and earthquake of 363 CE coincide at an important turning point in the history of Jerusalem. For this reason, we have observed an impulse in Christian accounts to synthesise the two occurrences into one cohesive event. After 363 CE, the narrative of Christianisation in Jerusalem was exerted with greater vigour through an eschatological portrayal of Jerusalem and a more comprehensive erasure of the Temple Mount in Christian representation.

A clear encapsulation of these two phenomena is the fifth-century apse mosaic of Santa Pudenziana in Rome. The central motif of the mosaic is a seated, enthroned Christ. Behind him is a mound, on which a large, bejewelled Cross, along with four mythical creatures: a winged-man, lion, ox, and eagle, are situated above an encompassing cityscape. Art historians have long identified the eschatological themes present in the mosaic, as well as its significance for Rome in the early fifth century.

---


1164 See Figure 26 in Appendix.

However, these motifs are also intermingled with the architectural landscape of Jerusalem and its prominent ecclesiastical structures.\textsuperscript{1166} As such, the apse fuses both eschatological motifs with the topographical setting of Jerusalem on earth. The fusion of topography and eschatology is clarified in the composition’s central symbol, the Cross.\textsuperscript{1167} The bejewelled Cross and mound show resemblance to the installation on Calvary in the Golgotha Church.\textsuperscript{1168} However, the Cross is not bound by this association alone; it stretches to the higher register, giving the impression of its centrality in the heavens. The Cross’s centrality in the sky imposed the symbolism of a celestial trophy.\textsuperscript{1169} Therefore, the eschatological and architectural imagery meet at the Cross, the manifold symbol of Christ’s death and second coming.

However, while scholars have attempted to compare the architectural scene to the buildings of fourth-century Jerusalem, there are some exceptions. Crucially, there is a blatant omission of the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{1170} In addition, the walls surrounding Christ and the Cross are round and gated. This is not easily reconciled with the architectural layout of the Church on Golgotha. On this point, F. Schlatter persuasively identified this as an element of eschatology, not topography. The walls could be a representation of the gates that would encompass the new Temple, according to the concluding chapters of \textit{Ezekiel}.\textsuperscript{1171} If this is the case, this depiction of Jerusalem not

\begin{flushright}
Natalie Smith | 234
\end{flushright}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1166} Kühnel (1987), 63-6; Clausen (2015), 125-7.
\item \textsuperscript{1167} Pullan (1997-8), 413-4.
\item \textsuperscript{1168} On the installation of Calvary, see Chapter 4.2.3; Milner (1996).
\item \textsuperscript{1169} Pullan (1997-8), 413-14.
\item \textsuperscript{1170} A comparable example of this omission is the Madaba Map, to be discussed in the following Chapter.
\item \textsuperscript{1171} Schlatter (1992), 282. The winged beasts in the sky over Jerusalem is also a motif from \textit{Ezekiel} 1.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
only reveals an erasure of the Temple Mount from the urban scene, but a more complete superscription of the Temple with Golgotha.
8. Early Christian Pilgrimage as a Form of Spatial Practice: The Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria

In previous chapters, I explored the spatial and ideological trajectories of the primary ecclesiastical ‘zones’ in fourth-century Jerusalem. In addition to considering the physical development of these spaces, I highlighted their impact on Christian representations of Jerusalem. Over the course of this discussion, the disparity between idea and reality has been a recurrent theme. In contrast to the physical and demographic circumstances of the city, the forces of liturgical vision, ecclesiastical ascendancy, pilgrimage, and monasticism enriched and expanded the image of Jerusalem. However, in turning to the Temple Mount, this disparity was traced in reverse. The ostensible inversion and erasure of sacred space within the city walls was evident in Christian representation rather than topographic reality.\footnote{1172}

The interface between ‘Space’ and ‘Representation’ is captured well on the Madaba Map, the sixth-century floor mosaic that has aided our examination of the urban organisation of Jerusalem at various points in this study.\footnote{1173} However, its depiction of Jerusalem is not wholly exact. The city is centrally positioned in the wider mosaic and is considerably larger than its surroundings.\footnote{1174} In addition, Jerusalem is shaped as a symmetrical ellipse, in which the \textit{Cardo Maximus} and the Church on Golgotha meet at the centre.\footnote{1175} The idealisation of Jerusalem in both structure and

\footnote{1172} Tsafrir (1999d), 158.

\footnote{1173} The Madaba Map was used in my discussions of the ‘Urban Composition’ in Chapters 2 and 3. A more extensive bibliographic note was given in the first instance (note 232 above).

\footnote{1174} Figure 4 in Appendix. Tsafrir (1999d) argued that its use of the title ‘Jerusalem’ – especially with the epithet ΗΑΓΙΑΠΟΛΙΣ – reveals the artists’ ideological position and purpose, as Aelia Capitolina remained the official title of the city throughout this period (p. 158). See also Jacobs (2004), 139.

\footnote{1175} Tsafrir (1999d), 155. The impression of a circular city is also given in Eucherius, \textit{Ep. ad Faust.} 3.
size was then compounded by another conspicuous omission, of the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{1176} The presentation of Jerusalem, and the decisions of presence and absence in the urban scene, corresponded to Christian ideological imperatives.\textsuperscript{1177}

In the context of fourth-century Jerusalem, the practice and documentation of pilgrimage provided another method of “mapping”\textsuperscript{1178} the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{1179} For this reason, I conclude my discussion with two accounts that conveniently bookend our period of interest: the \textit{Bordeaux Itinerary} of 333 CE and the \textit{Itinerary of Egeria} from the early years of the 380s CE.\textsuperscript{1180} While differing in style and scope, the texts are comparable examples of the third and final element of Lefebvre’s triad, ‘Spatial Practice’.\textsuperscript{1181} While giving greater attention to the later and fuller account of Egeria, I explore the relationship between text and topography in both pilgrims’ portrayals of the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{1182} By discussing their geographic observations, we learn of the

\textsuperscript{1176} Though some have argued that it might be compressed. See Avi-Yonah (1954), 59; Jacobs (2004), 140-1.

\textsuperscript{1177} Limor (2006), 351.

\textsuperscript{1178} On this terminology, see Weingarten (2005), 197; Leyerle (1996), 121; Jacobs (2004), 106. For a more general discussion of pilgrimage and cartography, see French (1995); Leyerle (1996); Smith (2007). It is not unprecedented to draw comparison between textual and pictorial depictions of geography; see Harley (1989).

\textsuperscript{1179} In addition to two \textit{itineraria} of interest in this chapter, the corpus of late-antique pilgrimage literature is compiled in Geyer \textit{et al.}, \textit{Itineraria et alia geographica}, excluding Willibald’s \textit{Hodoiporicon}. Evidence can be found elsewhere, such as Jerome’s \textit{Ep.} 108 and the \textit{Vit. Pet}. See Johnson (2016b) for a discussion of the corpus of late-antique pilgrimage and the \textit{It. Ant. Plac}.

\textsuperscript{1180} The dating of these texts is discussed in notes 1185 and 1198 below.

\textsuperscript{1181} On “Spatial Practice”, see Lefebvre in Nicholson-Smith (1991), 38, and my discussion in Chapter 1.3.1. Spatial practice and its relationship to the Utopian and Locative orientations to religion will be revisited in the Conclusion.

\textsuperscript{1182} Bowman (1992), 149–68; Harley (1988), 279.
ideological import on which these impressions were grounded. The two accounts
demonstrate the rising importance of Jerusalem in late-antique Christianity. However,
a discussion of authorial voice and prospective readership also reveals how the sacred
city was experienced from afar. Navigating both ‘material’ and ‘ideology’ in their
presentations of Jerusalem, pilgrims displayed both an ideal and accessible city on
earth.1183

8.1. Contextualising Early Christian Pilgrimage

The two earliest accounts of Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land, written
fifty years apart, effectively bookend this period in the development of Jerusalem (325
– 385 CE). The two texts, The Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria, address
a rapidly changing topography through different modes of writing. While both are
classified loosely as itineraria and exist within the emerging genre of early Christian
pilgrimage, they exhibit significant differences in both style and scope. However, too
much emphasis on these differences provides a limited view of the context and content
of early Christian pilgrimage in late antiquity. Rather than the parameters of pilgrim
practice, I argue that the intersection of text and topography in pilgrimage accounts
offers a more fruitful way forward.

1183 On the intersection of ‘material’ and ‘ideological’, see Jacobs (2004), 141.
8.1.1. The Bordeaux Itinerary

The text typically referred to as the earliest account of Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land is the anonymously written *Itinerary* of a roundtrip journey from Bordeaux to Palestine.\(^{1184}\) Written on the heels of the imperial building programme in Jerusalem and Helena’s eastern tour, the so-called *Bordeaux Itinerary* provides an important witness into Palestine at a moment of transition.\(^{1185}\) Prompted by these previous events, the author’s annotations reflect a distinct Christianising mentality.\(^{1186}\)

The text largely follows the conventions of the Roman *itinerarium*.\(^{1187}\) Much of the *Itinerary* constitutes a listing of place names, which function as the points of rest [*mansio*], transition [*mutatio*], and cities [*civitas*] encountered over the course of the journey, as well as the distance between them.\(^{1188}\) These stops structure the rhythm of the *Itinerary*, making up the bare bones of author’s own ‘map’.\(^{1189}\) Occasionally, the author included further description; the crossing of regional borders [*fines*] and

---

\(^{1184}\) On the *It. Burd.*, see Douglass (1996); Weingarten (1999); Bowman (1999); Elsner (2000); Irshai (2009); Salway (2012). See Salway (2012) for an argument that the destination might have been Constantinople and not Jerusalem (pp. 299, 312-22). Little is known of its author, apart from the fact they were a Latin-speaker from Bordeaux, or elsewhere in Northern Italy or Gaul.

\(^{1185}\) The dating of this text is conclusive as the author mentioned leaving Chalcedon on 30 May and returning to Constantinople on 25 December (*It. Burd. 571.6-8*). The dating of the *It. Burd.* and its importance as a source for the Golgotha church has been discussed in previous chapters.

\(^{1186}\) Irshai (2009).

\(^{1187}\) We can draw comparisons to other examples of Roman *itineraria*, most notably the compilation known as the *Itinerarium Antonini Augusti*. The *It. Burd.* has also been compared to the near-contemporary travel account of Theophilus of Hermopolis. Also contemporary is the Latin *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, which also categorised information by provincial boundaries. The genre of *itineraria* is discussed in Elsner (2000), 90; Salway (2001), 22–66; Johnson (2016a).

\(^{1188}\) The *It. Burd.* is notable in its addition of these annotations. See Elsner (2000), 187; Salway (2012), 305.

\(^{1189}\) Salway (2012) used a similar, anatomical analogy, in which the places and distances of the *Itinerarium* compose a “simple spine… progressively clothed in notations of the traveller’s activities at each stage” (p. 306). The Itinerary is organized further into five primary legs of the journey, in which the total distance between each is summarised. For further exposition of the Itinerary’s organisation, see this breakdown at Salway (2012), 309-312.
bridges [pontes], for instance, earned special mention. In addition, the occasional reference to local, historical monuments such as Hannibal’s grave at Libissa or the villa of Pammatas at Andavilae function as sporadic interjections within an otherwise precise and impartial framework. However, this changes radically upon entry into the region of Palestine. There, the author abandoned the coastal route and with it their citations of changes and rest-stops. Places associated with the Bible become the primary objects of interest. In this section, the linear and measurable framework of the itinerarium is replaced with a sense of investigative wandering. While not unlike the earlier, more sporadic annotations on local history, these descriptions became the main objective. The author committed wholly to an encyclopaedic approach to the scriptural geography. It is only after the author left Jerusalem that they adopted the previous structural framework once again.

As adaptative practices in the understanding, writing, and compiling of geographic information, accounts of pilgrimage reflect spatial and societal change. The imperial endowment of Jerusalem and its surrounding areas was one such

---

1190 The author most likely composed his itinerary from a basic template, which was then annotated throughout the journey. On fines, see It. Burd. 555.5, 556.7, 559.2, 564.1, 565.7, 567.9, 574.3-4, 576.3, 579.1, 581.2, 582.8, 585.3, 602.2, 603.7, 607.3, 610.8. On pontes, see 552.9, 558.4, 561.5, 567.10, 571.9, 611.5, 616.10.


1193 This “shift in discourse” (Elsner (2000), 189) is the most notable aspect of the text, as it transcends the hodological structure of the itineraria, offering a more expansive attempt at description. The tradition of describing and mythologising geography beyond solely nomenclature is exemplified in Greek periegesis, or “leading around”, of which Pausanias’ Description of Greece is iconic. For a brief but informative comparison of influential genres, see Elsner (2000), 185-6; Johnson (2016a), 29-60.

1194 The It. Burd. literally departed Jerusalem at 596.4. However, when the author left the region toward Caesarea, the author referred to this journey as ‘ab Hierusolyma’. It. Burd. 600.1 (IR 1, 98).

recalibration, to which the *Bordeaux Itinerary* was acutely responsive. In this respect, Jerusalem became a focal point, extended detour, or even the ultimate destination of the *Itinerary*. Therefore, while not necessarily unprecedented in its form or technique, the author adapted the conventions of genre to fashion geography in a new way. It is for this reason that the *Bordeaux Itinerary* is often credited as being the first account of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage. The text not only put Jerusalem “back on the map”, but it put it there centrally.\(^{1197}\)

### 8.1.2. The Itinerary of Egeria

Half a century later, a Spanish pilgrim arrived in Jerusalem, where she would stay for several years while touring the wider Holy Land and documenting its liturgical festivities.\(^{1198}\) The remnants of her account, the much-studied *Itinerary of Egeria*, offer a valuable snapshot of Jerusalem and its environs at the time of her visit. Like the *Bordeaux Itinerary*, Egeria’s text can be separated into two distinct sections. The first half (§§ 1-23) documents a series of journeys that she took to and from Jerusalem.\(^{1199}\) In this section, the first-person voice predominates, as the narrative is driven by

---

\(^{1196}\) This is striking contrast to the contemporary *Expositio*, which missed out Jerusalem altogether. Nor was Jerusalem mentioned in the *It. Ant. Aug.* See Elsner (2000), 188; Stemberger (2000), 193; Johnson (2016a), 45. For an alternative perspective of the author’s destination, see note 1184 above.


\(^{1198}\) Egeria mentions that it had been “three full years” since her arrival in Jerusalem (*It. Eg.* 17.1). The date of the pilgrimage has been debated. The journey certainly occurred after 363 CE, when Nisbis was taken by the Persians. In addition, Egeria’s presence in Antioch places it before the city was destroyed in 540 CE. More precise dating to the 380s CE was suggested by Baumstark (1911), who organised his argument around the use of the term “confessor” in Egeria’s description of the bishops at Batanis, Edessa, and Carrae. (pp. 32–76). See also Lambert (1939), 49-69. Devos (1967) came to a similar conclusion, however through an examination of the date of Easter and Egeria’s departure to Edessa, arriving in Carrhae on the feast day of St. Helpidius (*It. Eg.* 20.5). See also Gringas (1970); McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 30-2.

\(^{1199}\) See Table 2 in Appendix.
Egeria’s movement from one place to the next. There are frequent pauses, as she relayed the landscape and monastic inhabitants she encountered along the way. The second half of the account (§§ 24-49) differs in tone: Egeria’s voice recedes as she provided a report of the major festivals and the congregational movements of the Jerusalem Church in the third person.

The contrasting nature of these sections, particularly in the transition of voice, reflect issues of transmission. The two parts could originally have been separate letters, as the first section concludes with an articulation of Egeria’s final plans before embarking on the arduous, and uncertain, journey home:

From this place [de quo loco], ladies, my light, while I send this [letter] to your affection, I have already decided … to travel to Asia, that is, to Ephesus, for the sake of prayer [gratia orationis] at the martyrium of the holy and blessed Apostle John. And if after this I remain in the body, if I am able to visit other places besides, I will either relate them to your affection in person [ipsa presens], if God shall be gracious enough to grant it, or certainly, if something else shall be resolved in my mind, tell you in writing [scriptis nuntiabo] …

It is equally plausible that a lost section of the Itinerarium more clearly conveyed the relationship between the two parts. The text is, after all, incomplete. It begins as Egeria ascended Mount Sinai and it ends abruptly during her description of the Encaenia festival in Jerusalem. Missing folios in the middle of the text create further gaps. In addition, despite the prominence of Jerusalem as the hub of Egeria’s excursions and the setting of her liturgical census, the account fails to convey a real sense of place.

1200 Spevak (2005), 239.
1201 According to Spevak (2005), the third-person accounts for 98 per cent of the verbs in the second part of the Itinerarium.
1203 It. Eg. 1.1: 49.3. On more recent fragments, see De Bruyne (1909): 481–4; Alturo (2005), 241–50; Brodersen (2016), 138-41.
1204 It. Eg. 16.4-5 and at 25.6.
Any description of the city itself, or the churches beyond a short digression on liturgical furnishings, are also acutely missing. Therefore, we cannot reconstruct the totality of Egeria’s itinerary, nor conclusively answer any of the pressing questions regarding her origins or identity. Nevertheless, it is possible to make some informed speculations.

Circumstantial evidence allows us to piece together the rest of Egeria’s journey. For instance, she referred to a previous trip to the Thebaid.\footnote{It. Eg. 7.1, 9.1.} In addition, the works of two later readers supplement her Itinerary further. Egeria’s life was the subject of a seventh-century letter written by Valerius to the monks of Vierzo.\footnote{Epistola beatissime Egerie laude conscripta fratrum bergidensium monachorum a Valerio conlata (SC 296, 336-49). On Valerius and his letter, see Maraval and Díaz (1982), 323-35.} It is because of Valerius that scholars have been able to identify the name of the “blessed nun [beatissimia sanctimonalis]”, who “set out on an immense journey to the other side of the world [totius orbis arripuit iter]”.\footnote{Ep. a Valerio 1 (SC 296, 336-8). Tr. Wilkinson (1971), 174-8. See also Férotin (1903); García (1910). For a sceptical view of Valerius’ account, see Sivan (1988a).} Valerius recounted Egeria’s journey to “many different provinces and cities”, such as Egypt and the Thebaid, in her pursuit of the “ancient wanderings” [antiquae peregrinationis] of the Israelites.\footnote{... per diversas provincias vel civitates (SC 296, 338).} In addition, G.F. Gamurrini observed a connection between Peter the Deacon’s \textit{Book on the Holy Places} of 1137 CE and the missing chapters of Egeria’ \textit{Itinerary}.\footnote{Gamurrini (1887).} As the librarian of the monastery at Monte Cassino, Peter had access to Egeria’s work and likely used it in the composition of his \textit{Book}.\footnote{We are certain that the Monastery at Monte Cassino held the \textit{Codex Aretinus}, along with a copy of Bede’s \textit{Loc. Sanct.} Another anonymous account was likely used in the composition of his work.} Therefore, parts of Peter the Deacon’s work, such
as the description of Jerusalem, excursions to Alexandria, the Thebaid, and Galilee, have been identified as originating from Egeria’s missing text.¹²¹¹

The missing folios of the *Itinerary* also leave us with perplexing questions regarding the identity of its author. As a result, her name,¹²¹² place of origin, social and financial status, and monastic ties have all been debated. While the absence of a beginning or an end to the text obscures any reference to Egeria’s home, internal evidence suggests that she travelled far to reach the eastern provinces. During her time in Edessa, the bishop remarked of her “long journey … right from the other end of the earth [de extremis porro terris]”.¹²¹³ While Egeria’s reference to the Rhone and some philological clues have caused some to suggest she originated from Aquitania in Gaul, Valerius’ letter and more recently discovered fragments of her account in Spanish manuscripts pose a strong case for her Galician origins.¹²¹⁴

A Spanish origin has led some scholars to consider her connection to the emperor Theodosius.¹²¹⁵ While there is no conclusive evidence for an imperial

¹²¹¹ Peter the Deacon, *Loc. Sanct.* The text C1 to Y17 may have been extracted from Egeria. See for instance Gringas (1970), 16-17; Wilkinson (1971), 27-30, 179-210; Maraval and Díaz (1982), 56. For an insightful criticism of Peter the Deacon’s account, see Mayerson (1996), 61-4.

¹²¹² This debate has been resolved. While G.F. Gamurrini (1888) suspected that the author was Silvia of Aquitaine, whose presence in the region earned her a chapter in Palladius’ *Hist. Laus.*, Kohler (1884) speculated that the author, whose long season in the Holy Land with retinue, was Galla Placidia. However, this assumption was quickly overturned by Férotin (1903), 367–97, who cited the *Epistola beatissime Egerie* by Valerius, noted above. Férotin’s assertion has become the popular opinion. However, for further discussion on the spelling of her name, Egeria or Aetheria, see Mountford (1923), 40–1.


¹²¹⁴ On Egeria’s origins in Gaul, see Meister (1909) and Sivan (1988b). On Galician origins, see McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 30; Argárate (2019).

¹²¹⁵ Most clearly Hunt (1982), who proposed Egeria’s participation in the emperor’s entourage (pp 164-5).
association, it is plausible that Egeria enjoyed a high social and financial status. This would explain how she afforded to take such a lengthy and wide-ranging pilgrimage. However, Egeria’s aristocratic origins are complicated somewhat by her writing style. She filled her Itinerary with superfluous repetition of demonstratives, nouns, and phrases. Egeria’s literary presentation could indicate that she did not benefit from the extensive aristocratic education of contemporaries, Melania the Elder or Paula. In this respect, while she exhibited a clear knowledge of the Bible and Christian practice, she gave no further indication of her exposure to classical, or even extra-biblical Christian literature. While Egeria was well-versed in the scriptures and drew biblical connections to the topography wherever present, she did not opt for an allegorical or typological interpretation. Nevertheless, we cannot assume much of Egeria’s level of education from a text never intended for a wide readership.

Valerius’ reference to Egeria as a ‘sanctimonalis’ has also encouraged much discussion about whether she was a part of the monastic movement. Egeria addressed her audience as ‘sisters’ and the monks who accompanied her as

---

1216 McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 11-12.

1217 See Viäänen (1987) for the most comprehensive recent treatment. Egeria’s writing style caused Sivan (1988a) to consider her “middle-class” (p. 66).

1218 Spitzer (1949) described these as “ever-recurring sentence fragments … stationed throughout the period like reminiscent milestones and seem to obstruct the straightway” (p. 233). However, linguistic analysis of Egeria’s account suggests that the textual style might have been innovative in Late Latin writing rather than an indicator of the author’s low status or poor education. On Egeria’s use of demonstratives and its relationship to the definite article in medieval Romance, see Hertzberg (2015). On the transition between Late Latin and Medieval Romance, see also Ledgeway (2017).

1219 “From Egeria’s prose style, with its frequent repetitions, disregard for rules of classical grammar, and clumsy syntax, it is clear that her education was not what aristocratic Roman ladies received” argued Sivan (1988a), 66. A more thorough comparison is made in Limor (2001).

1220 Palmer (1994) highlighted Egeria’s interaction with the bishop of Edessa, who compared the sacred pool to the Apostle’s breakfast with the resurrected Christ (It. Eg. 19.7; p. 50).

1221 See note 1206 above. See also Devos (1983), 43-70; Sivan (1988a) and (1988b); Palmer (1994), 41-3; Dietz (2005), 48; McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 20-3.
‘brothers’.\footnote{It. Eg. 3.8, 12.7, 20.5.} Her frequent interest in local holy men also suggests a keen interest in monasticism. However, it is Egeria’s relationship with the deaconess Marthana – the only named person in the text – that seems most revealing of a shared vocation.\footnote{Marthana is also described as a superior of some cells of virgins in It. Eg. 23.3.} However, as H. Sivan has asserted, interests in liturgy and holy people were not solely indicators of the monastic life.\footnote{Sivan (1988b), 531.} Expressing a general distrust of Valerius’ later account, Sivan highlighted Egeria’s freedom of movement over the course of her long sojourn as evidence that she was likely wealthy and lay.\footnote{Sivan (1988b); This assertion was integral to her portrayal of Egeria as part of a “bourgeois milieu” in Gaul (pp. 534-5).} Sivan’s argument regarding the parameters of the monastic life might be more limiting than necessary. It is plausible that Egeria belonged to a “quasi- or peripherally monastic” circle of women, who would not have looked down upon such freedom of movement.\footnote{McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 21.} Rather, Egeria served a unique role in her community, whose vicarious experiences of the Holy Places were made possible through the exchange of letters. In this respect, Egeria was able to “bring alive for her compatriots what they knew only through written word”.\footnote{In this respect, Palmer (1994) compared Egeria to the space-probe Voyager (p. 50).}

8.1.3. Defining Pilgrimage: Between the Bordeaux Pilgrim and Egeria

Although it has acquired a reputation for ‘inaugurating’ the pilgrimage genre, the sophistication and significance of the Bordeaux Itinerary has been a source of some
disagreement. In the latter half of the twentieth century, scholars often reduced it to little more than “stark” and “stenographic” work, deficient in theological reflection. In his article on fourth-century Jerusalem, R.W. Hamilton gave a telling dismissal; the *Itinerary* reportedly bore the “stamp of a primitive tradition not yet inflated by the curiosity of pilgrims or the growing opulence of ecclesiastical foundations”.

Many have so easily dismissed the *Bordeaux Itinerary* because of its comparative example. Half a century later, we encounter the *Itinerary of Egeria*, which encapsulates the pilgrim *curiositas* and abundant infrastructure often envisioned of fourth-century pilgrimage. Written for her audience of ‘sisters’ back at home, Egeria’s account also strikes a vastly different tone from the *Bordeaux Itinerary*. Her use of the first person, paired with her positive descriptors and sense of narrative, has been praised as providing “a more penetrating glimpse into the devotion of the Christian traveller”. She identified her journey as both an exposition of the scriptural topography and a journey for the “sake of prayer [gratia orationis]”. In this respect, hers is the first pilgrimage account of its kind and serves as an essential

---

1228 On the “Inauguration of genre”, see Limor (2006), 331.
1229 Hunt (1982), 86.
1231 Campbell (1988), 27.
1232 Hamilton (1952), 84. More recent studies have credited the *It. Burd.* as having greater influence, however these revisions have led to a myriad of interpretations that further indicate the difficulty of making sense of the text. See Elsner (2000); Bowman (2001); Kalleres (2014); and Irshai (2009).
1234 On Egeria’s self-proclaimed curiosity, see note 1315.
1235 Hunt (1982), 86.
1236 *It. Eg.* 13.1; 17.1.
“linchpin” in our chronological understanding of the liturgical development, monastic expansion, and practice of pilgrimage of the later fourth century.\textsuperscript{1237}

Nevertheless, while scholars have often illuminated the differences between the two Itineraries, there is much to commend their similarity. As Hamilton’s dismissal of the Bordeaux Pilgrim implies, documents of Christian pilgrimage in late antiquity (especially those to the Holy Land) have too often been defined by the parameters of pilgrim practice. This is evident in the misleading distinction between travelling for the sake of intellectual interest (ἱστορία)\textsuperscript{1238} and travel for the sake of worship (θεωρία).\textsuperscript{1239} In this respect, Egeria’s well-documented participation in collective rituals at the Holy Places laid the foundations for the definition of pilgrim practice in late antiquity. However, establishing parameters based on Egeria alone does not sufficiently reflect the approaches to sacred space, matter, and ritual represented in our sources.\textsuperscript{1240}

A more fruitful mode of study is the intersection of text and topography in the pilgrim experience.\textsuperscript{1241} A commonality shared between all early Christian examples of pilgrimage to the Holy Land – the Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria included – is the impulse to proof, experience, and transcribe the scriptural

\textsuperscript{1237} Johnson (2016a), 27. See also Campbell’s (1988) claim that Egeria made “the leap between itinerary and prayer” (p. 33). In this respect, Campbell strongly (though wrongly) asserted Egeria’s account as the inauguration of the Christian peregrinatio (p. 20). However, Campbell’s remark exemplifies the “pilgrimage problem” observed in Elsner and Rutherford (2007), 3.

\textsuperscript{1238} See Hunt (1984) and Falcasantos (2017), 96.

\textsuperscript{1239} As is observed by Falcasantos (2017), 96-7.

\textsuperscript{1240} Notably, Smith (1987) considered the intersection of place, story, and ritual as the essential components of sacred topography. See Smith (2021) for an issue with framework on the interpretation of the Bordeaux Itinerary. On the “liturgical irrelevancies” of the Piacenza Pilgrim, see Johnson (2016b).

\textsuperscript{1241} On the textual nature of Holy Land pilgrimage, see Limor (2001) and Bitton-Ashkelony (2005), 10.
The intrinsic textual nature of Holy Land pilgrimage seemingly upends an investigative/pietistic divide. As E.D. Hunt observed, a ‘scholarly’ interest in the places of the Bible necessitates some involvement of faith. This relationship is also reciprocal; the pilgrim’s interest in geography was fuelled by its textual associations. However, the documentation of pilgrimage was also an attempt to transmit geographical information back into text. Therefore, the interaction between text and topography not only defines the essential conditions of a scriptural pilgrimage but provides a framework for understanding pilgrimage texts as documents of translation. It is in this reciprocal relationship that we can view pilgrimage accounts as forms of “spatial practice”.

8.2. Content: Text and Topography

During their detour into Palestine in 333 CE, the author of the *Bordeaux Itinerary* documented the scriptural footprint in the topography of the region. Interest in past events and the remnant of material evidence rendered the landscape as a palimpsest, evoking various parallel narratives in the mind’s eye. An illuminative example of this is the description of Mount Gerizim:

Mount Gerizim is there [ibi], where, according to the Samarians, Abraham offered his sacrifice … at the foot of the mountain [inde ad pedem], is the place [locus est] called Shechem, which is the site of the tomb [ibi est monumentum] in which Joseph is buried,

---

1242 It is this interaction that has served as the ‘coordinates’ for studying Christian pilgrimage in modern anthropological discourse, such as in Eade and Sallnow (1991), 9.

1243 Hunt (1999), 27.

1244 See Elsner’s (2000) delineation between textuality and practice in Christian sacred journeying (p. 181). The relationship between ‘word’ and ‘world’ was discussed in Bowman (1999). However, it is not solely a case of “word … becoming world”, but the world of the pilgrim becoming rendered back into words.

1245 Sites of interest were more frequently associated with the Old Testament – twenty-three sites in contrast to seventeen associated with the New Testament, as calculated by Wilkinson (1990), 44.
in the estate given him by his father Jacob. That too was where Dinah, Jacob’s daughter, was seized by the Amorites. A mile from there is the place called Sychar, where the Samaritan woman went down to draw water, at the very place [ad eundum locum] where Jacob dug the well, and our Lord Jesus Christ spoke with her. Some plane trees are there [ubi sunt], planted by Jacob, and there is a bath which takes its water from this well.  

The author depicted tombs, trees, and a bath as the carriers of scriptural memory.

Annotations rapidly transition from present to past to compare contemporary places [locus est] with biblical events [rapta est, locutus est]. However, with the exception of a shared topography, such as in Jacob’s well, the author’s participation with historical event was predominantly as an exercise of recollection. The author provides a “historicised” vision.

Egeria’s imperative was likewise to contextualise and confirm scriptural event in the landscape. For her, ‘reading’ and ‘seeing’ went hand in hand: she did not delineate between her investigation of the scriptural landscape [videre] and her sisters’ investigation of the scriptures [pervidere]. On occasion, Egeria’s own survey of the Holy Places was described as an act of pervidere: “I wanted to see all the


1247 Jacobs (2004) considered the author’s mode of representation as a depopulating of the terrain from all except for the “dead heroes” of the Old Testament and their associatedcriptae and monumenta. See also Leyerle (1996), who considered omission in pilgrimage accounts as causing a sense of “social emptiness” (126). See also Harley (1988) for the notion of a “desocializing territory” (p. 312) and Limor (2014) for the impact of this emptiness on the “pilgrims’ field of vision” (p. 33).

1248 In this respect, Bowman (2001) distinguished between ‘contiguous’ and ‘continuous’ arrangements (p. 170).

1249 Jacobs (2004), 111-17.

1250 Leyerle (1996), 129.

1251 Egyptum autem et Palestinam et mare Rubrum et mare illut Parthenicum, quod mittit Alexandriam, nec non et fines Saracenorum, infinitos ita subter nos inde videbamus … It. Eg. 3.8 (SC 296, 136).

1252 Sed cum leget affectio vestra libros sanctos Moysi, omnia diligentius pervidet, quae ibi facta sunt. It. Eg. 5.8 (SC 296, 146).
places where the Children of Israel had been on their way”, she later wrote.1253 The interchangeable verbs exhibit a shared ambition to engage with the Christian scriptures. To this end, Egeria also considered open, geographic expanses as catalogues of biblical memory.1254 Egeria’s initial trek up Mount Sinai provided multiple opportunities for this sort of reflection.1255 She utilised the landscape outside the city of Livia in a similar fashion:

It is a vast plain [campus ... infinitus] stretching from the foot of the Arabian mountains to the Jordan, where [hic est locus] the Bible says [de quo scriptum est] that “The children of Israel wept for Moses in Araboth Moab at Jordan over against Jericho forty days”. It is where [hic etiam locus est] Joshua son of Nun “was filled with the spirit of wisdom” when Moses died, “for Moses had laid his hand upon him”, as it is written [sicut scriptum est]. It is where Moses [hic etiam locus est] wrote the Book of Deuteronomy, and where he “spoke the words of this song until they were finished, in the ears of all the assembly of Israel”, the song written in the Book of Deuteronomy.

And it is where [his est ipse locus] holy Moses the man of God blessed each of the children of Israel before his death.1256

As a result, the first part of Egeria’s account bears much similarity to the Bordeaux Itinerary. Both authors engaged with topography as a catalyst for scriptural insight. However, Egeria’s account differs in the extent to which the landscape had become identified and monumentalised in the interim decades.1257 In addition to her citation of empty plains, Egeria also observed the various churches and holy men found amid the sacred sites. Egeria’s pilgrimage, though primarily a study of text and topography, was essentially informed by social and liturgical interaction. By examining the

1253 Tamen ut perviderem omnia loca ... It. Eg. 7.1 (SC 296, 152). Tr. Wilkinson (1971), 100. See also It. Eg. 7.3.
1254 On the prevalence of vistas in Egeria’s account, see Campbell (1991), 3–15.
1255 See It. Eg. 2.1-2; 5.3-5.
1256 It. Eg. 10.4-7 (SC 296, 167-8). Tr. Wilkinson (1971), 105.
1257 Leyerle (1996) observed, “Egeria’s travel account illustrates the creation of the holy land as a map of scriptural events. Unlike the depopulated landscape of the Bordeaux pilgrim, she is explicit about who was responsible for staking out the countryside” (p. 128).
corresponding sections of Egeria’s text – her experiences outside and inside of Jerusalem – we are given a greater sense of the extent to which monasticism and liturgy had established a complementary and symbiotic partnership in informing the experiences of Christian pilgrims and their perception of a ‘Holy Land’.

8.2.1. Egeria Outside of Jerusalem: Monastic Encounters

The first half of Egeria’s Itinerary takes place outside the city of Jerusalem, along the various pathways that connected the city to the other, remoter regions of scriptural and spiritual importance. In the interim half-century since the Bordeaux Itinerary was written, the peripheral regions of Egypt and Palestine had become increasingly popular destinations for visiting pilgrims. In addition to prominent geographic markers associated with biblical memory, the region was populated with monastic settlements that also attracted pilgrim interest. The landscape was not solely the realm of biblical figures but also that of monks and presbyters, who had become its new inhabitants. Egeria’s time outside Jerusalem was primarily spent in the company of her informative and hospitable hosts. As a result, her account illustrates the centrality of monasticism and monastic hospitality in the pilgrim experience of the Holy Land.

A monastic presence is evident at the outset. As Egeria ascended Mount Sinai, her accomplices first informed her of what to expect. Therefore, Egeria’s initial experiences were simply a confirmation of the instructions she had already received:

1258 On Palestinian monasticism, see Binns (1996); Wilken (1992), 166-72; (1999). See also my discussion in Chapter 6.2.
“Before we arrived at the mountain of God, I had already known this from what the brothers reported, and after I arrived there, I knew that was definitely so.”

The local authorities were the primary informants of Egeria’s pilgrimage. She frequently opted for a passive sense of sight. While Egeria was prone to see the land as she did the scriptures, biblical sites were often “pointed out” [ostendebantur] to her. After leaving the place of the Burning Bush, Egeria considered another flurry of biblical events. However, she did not solely see these places – they were shown to her:

When we set out from the bush, they began constantly to show us [semper nobis coeperunt ostendere] the rest of the places. For they also pointed out [monstraverunt] the place where the camps of the children of Israel were on those days when Moses was on the mountain. They also pointed out [monstraverunt] the place where that calf was made; for in that place a great stone is fixed down to this day …

Egeria relied not only on her own physical and scriptural sight, but also on the guidance of others. It was even to local tradition, rather than scripture, that she occasionally attributed a site’s significance. On the burial place of Moses on Mount Nebo, Egeria quoted her host:

Our predecessors here pointed out [ostensum est] this place to us, and now we point it out [monstramus] to you. They told us that this tradition came from their predecessors.

Elsewhere, she acknowledged a local tradition regarding the destruction of Rameses.

---


1262 It. Eg. 1.1, 2, 3; 3.7; 4.2, 4, 8; 5.3, 4-9; 7.2, 4-6; 8.5; 10.3; 12.2, 6-8, 10; 15.2; 16.4, 5-6; 19.5-6, 18; 20.2, 4, 11; 21.2, 4. See also the use of monstrare 5.3; 7.2; 19.18.

1263 It. Eg. 5.3 (SC 296, 144). Tr. McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 112.


1265 “For the holy bishop informed us [retulit] that Pharaoh, when he saw the children of Israel had escaped him, then before he took off after them, had gone with all his army into Rameses and had burned
Egeria’s inspection of the holy places was also accompanied by an interest in its caretakers. Once again at Sinai, Egeria noted that the ground was well-cultivated by the local monks, who were “always busy planting shrubs, and setting out orchards or vegetable-beds round their cells”.1266 There and elsewhere, Egeria benefited from the literal fruit of their labour, as the locals dispensed of these “blessings [eulogiae]” to visiting pilgrims as an expression of hospitality.1267 Egeria’s observations of the monastic habitation of the holy places often emphasised their enrichment of the landscape. Of the fruit dispensed on Mount Sinai, Egeria remarked that, “It looks as if they gather fruit which is growing in the mountain soil, but in fact everything is the result of their own hard work.”1268 In addition, she gave the impression that the Burning Bush, still “alive and sprouting”, was as much a consequence of the “pleasant garden [hortus gratissimus]” as it was a miraculous preservation by God.1269

Egeria’s satisfaction with the Holy Land was as much a product of its biblical origins as it was a product of its current stewards.1270 She referred to both people and places as ‘sanctus’, and she often cited both as the objects of her pilgrimage:

… Having seen all the holy places [visa loca sancta omnia] that we desired as well as all the places that the children of Israel had reached in going to and from the mountain of God, having also seen the men [sanctis viris] who lived there, in the name of God we return to Pharan …1271

---


1270 Campbell (1988), 22.

Egeria’s experience outside of Jerusalem demonstrates what G. Frank called a “coextensive piety”. Together, her scriptural understanding and the monastic tradition shaped her sense of geography. In contrast to the direct and exclusive relationship between text and topography in the *Bordeaux Itinerary*, Egeria wove a harmonious world in which the scriptures, monastic tradition, and her own sense of sight coalesced in her portrayal of the Holy Land.

8.2.2. Egeria in Jerusalem: Liturgy and Sacred Topography

While both accounts of pilgrimage reveal the wider geographic scope of the Holy Land, special significance is given to Jerusalem. The city was a focal point in the *Bordeaux Itinerary*, taking up 50 of the 131 lines in the Palestine section. However, the author gives the impression of a city primarily in ruins. Following their entry near the Temple Mount, the author observed the pierced stone of the Temple [*lapis pertusus*], synagogues now “ploughed and sown” [*arantur et seminantur*] on Zion, and the remains of Pontius Pilate’s *praetorium* that attested to a past left untouched, but also unpreserved. The author’s predominantly “historicised” portrayal of Jerusalem is overturned only slightly by the miraculous preservation of landmarks associated with Christ and a city’s natural, perpetual rhythm. The pillar of Christ’s suffering was still “there” [*ibi est*] and the fountain of Siloam still ran on its irregular,


1273 Using Wesseling’s (1735) paging system, which is used in Cuntz’s (1990) edition.


1275 Jacobs (2004), 111-17.

1276 *It. Burd.* 592.5 (*IR* 1, 96).
miraculous schedule.\textsuperscript{1277} This is compounded by the sense of “social emptiness” that pervades the \textit{Itinerary}.\textsuperscript{1278} Only in two instances does the \textit{Itinerary} refer to a present population in Jerusalem. Of the pierced stone, the author reported that “the Jews come and anoint [it] each year”.\textsuperscript{1279} This practice was later juxtaposed against what was likely also an annual tradition: alongside Christ’s Sepulchre and Constantine’s basilica were reservoirs where “Infants \textit{[infantes]} (likely neophyte Christians) are bathed/baptised \textit{[lavantur]}”.\textsuperscript{1280} Jerusalem, as with the rest of the Holy Land, was immersed primarily in historical reference; we are only given momentary glimpses of the city in the present. In these instances, the \textit{Bordeaux Itinerary} contrasted the city’s Jewish and Roman past with the new and existing monuments of the Christian era.\textsuperscript{1281}

Egeria, in contrast, did not describe the pre-existing topography of Jerusalem at all. She focused exclusively on the various churches in and around Jerusalem as theatres for the contemplation and re-enactment of sacred memory.\textsuperscript{1282} While ritual engagement with the land was integral to her account throughout, it is most evident in Jerusalem. The second half of Egeria’s text, which details the liturgical context of Jerusalem, abandons the structure of an itinerary to adopt a temporal organisation.\textsuperscript{1283}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{1277} \textit{It. Burd.}, 592.3. \\
\textsuperscript{1278} On “Social Emptiness”, see note 1247 above. \\
\textsuperscript{1279} \textit{It. Burg.}, 591.5 (\textit{IR} 1, 96). Tr. Wilkinson (1971), 157. See also Jacobs (2004), 114. \\
\textsuperscript{1280} \textit{It. Burd.}, 593.4-594.4 (\textit{IR} 1, 97). \\
\textsuperscript{1281} Irshai (2009), 475-85. \\
\textsuperscript{1282} Perrone (1999), 230; Kalleres (2005), 433. Liturgical interaction with the sacred, particularly its connection to Christian initiation, has been treated in Chapter 4. \\
\textsuperscript{1283} Smith (1987), 90.
\end{footnotes}
The account then journeys through the services and festivals that made up the liturgical year.\textsuperscript{1284}

It is thanks to Egeria’s descriptive account that we are well-informed of the liturgical life in fourth-century Jerusalem. Her observations, supplemented by the previously discussed \textit{Catechetical Lectures} and later post-baptismal \textit{Mystagogical Lectures}, shed a great deal of light on Christian worship during this period. Particularly interesting is Egeria’s inclusion of the \textit{missa}, or dismissal of liturgical services.\textsuperscript{1285} In addition, her frequent attention to the role of \textit{monazontes} in the liturgical proceedings, as well as the compilation of ‘monastic’ and ‘cathedral’ aspects of the liturgy, is revealing of the composition of the congregation and the wider influence of monasticism in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1286} However, Egeria’s most apparent contribution is her depiction of the liturgical stations that proliferated in and around Jerusalem.

Egeria’s outline of the liturgical year and its stations illuminates the degree to which the sacred topography extended beyond the \textit{Martyrium} and \textit{Anastasis} to other places of Christian significance. She reported that the Jerusalem congregation frequented Mount Zion on the fourth and sixth days of the week.\textsuperscript{1287} Additionally, the Mount of Olives was a place of importance during the Paschal season, in which congregations would visit Bethany, Gethsemane, the \textit{Imbomon} and the \textit{Eleona}.\textsuperscript{1288} However, the itinerant nature of the Jerusalem liturgy not only highlighted the

\textsuperscript{1284} See Table 3 in Appendix.
\textsuperscript{1285} McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 69.
\textsuperscript{1286} On the monastic scene in Jerusalem, see Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{1287} \textit{It. Eg.} 27.5. This custom was maintained during the period of Lent (\textit{It. Eg.} 27.6.).
\textsuperscript{1288} \textit{It. Eg.} 30-37.
interconnectivity of the ecclesiastical topography, but also a continued adherence to sacred time. Egeria repeatedly referred to liturgical celebrations that were “suitable to the day and place [apta dei et loco]”. These constraints determined Jerusalem’s stational schedule and encouraged liturgical engagement with the sacred landscape.

The intersection of space and time is particularly clear in the “Great Week” leading up to Easter. Taking up nine chapters in Egeria’s account, the liturgical programme included processions and services that conveyed the movements, memories, and emotions of Jesus’ life approaching his crucifixion and resurrection. Through an extensive use of the sacred topography, Christians were invited to, quite literally, “trace the footsteps of Jesus”. Egeria described the days as filled with an intensive schedule, consisting of frequent processions around the city. In addition to congregational weeping over the readings, participants re-enacted biblical episodes through motion and imitation. On the Sunday afternoon, after a tour of the Mount of Olives, the congregation descended into the city with palm branches, emulating Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem in Matthew 21. On the Thursday, participants would re-enact Jesus’ prayer and arrest at Gethsemane before making a slow and sorrowful return to the Cross. A remnant of the True Cross, stored in the Great Church, was

---

1289 It. Eg. 24.10; 25.5; 29.2; 31.1; 32.1; 35.4; 36.1; 37.6; 40.1; 43.1; 47.5.
1290 See Table 4 in Appendix. For a similar breakdown of the liturgical year, see Smith (1987), 93.
1291 Wilken (1992), 108.
1292 For an outline of these services, see Drijvers (2004), 187-90; McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 93.
1293 It. Eg. 31.
1294 It. Eg. 36.3-4.
also displayed during the culminating moments of the Greek Week as a tangible symbol of the crucifixion.\footnote{1295}

Congregational movement highlighted the privilege of proximity for the congregation in Jerusalem. As was evident in Chapter 4, the invitation to “touch” and “see” became integral to the liturgical experience.\footnote{1296} Sight was not solely an exercise in optics, but “a reconstructive process … that considers how language, symbols, myths, and values become attached to the act of seeing”.\footnote{1297} Likewise, the invitation to “touch” transcended solely an object’s or place’s physicality. In the intersection of both place and time, the communal liturgy of Jerusalem offered an unprecedented participation in scriptural memory.\footnote{1298} In this respect, the addition of movement and gesture, what P. Connerton called “mnemonics of the body”, further accommodated the internalising of sacred memories.\footnote{1299} In contrast to the practice of recollection of biblical event in the \textit{Bordeaux Itinerary}, ritual participation allowed for a greater sense of continuity between the biblical age and the pilgrim’s own experience.\footnote{1300}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{1295}{For the liturgical significance of the True Cross, see Chapter 4.3.2.}
  \item \footnote{1296}{Cyril, \textit{Cat.} 13.22.}
  \item \footnote{1297}{What Frank (2000) calls “visuality” (p. 103).}
  \item \footnote{1298}{Frank (2000) argued that the combined elements of sight and touch “created the conditions for a biblical realism” (p. 133). A famous example of this is Jerome’s account of Paula’s emotive reaction to Christ’s cross and tomb during her own pilgrimage in 385 CE \textit{(Ep. 108.9)}. See also Jerome’s earlier invitation to Marcella \textit{(Ep. 46.5)}: “Does the Lord’s sepulcher seem less worthy of veneration? As often as we enter it we see the Savior in His grave clothes \textit{[quod quotienscumque ingredimur, totiens iacere in sindone cernimus salvatorem et paululum]} …” Jerome, \textit{Ep.} 46.5 \textit{(CSEL 54, 334)}. Tr. Fremantle, Lewis, and Martley \textit{(NPNF 2.6, 187)}.}
  \item \footnote{1299}{Connerton (1989). On the vicarious participation of memory, see Dal Santo (2015).}
  \item \footnote{1300}{Smith (2021), 13-14.}
\end{itemize}
8.3. Authorial Voice and Readership in Early Christian Pilgrimage Itineraria

Both the Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria displayed a participation with place and text in the context of pilgrimage. However, the degree of difference attests to the way that the “contours of the biblical map”, and the parameters of pilgrim practice, adapted and changed over this period. The integration of monasticism and liturgical engagement into Egeria’s experience of the Holy Land expanded and enriched her presentation of the scriptural topography. In addition to content, authorial presence in the two itineraries has become another common distinction. However, here too there are grounds for comparison.

8.3.1. Authorial Absence in the Bordeaux Itinerary

Adhering to the characteristic impersonality of the itinerarium, the author of the Bordeaux Itinerary was largely a silent spectator of the topography and memory of the Holy Land. The text gives very little evidence of the author’s own voice, engagement, and personal conviction. There is only one use of the possessive, where the author refers to “Our Lord Jesus Christ [Domimus noster Iesus Christus]” in the passage of Mount Gerizim above, however its usage barely registers. Contextual clues corroborate this to confirm that the author was a Christian. However, they did not seem concerned with conveying the ways to pray at the holy places. As previously noted, the lack of a pietistic, ritual component in the Bordeaux Itinerary has invited much scepticism as to its place in the greater genre of pilgrimage literature. However,

---

1302 It. Burd. 588.4. (IR 1, 95).
the lack of mention does not mean that it did not exist. Rather, authorial absence in the *Bordeaux Itinerary* was likely a purposeful omission.\textsuperscript{1303}

In this respect, a distinctive characteristic of the *Itinerary* is its sporadic use of the second person.\textsuperscript{1304} Its insertion occasionally drove the movement between places of importance: “As you ascend Sion [ascendes] …”, “As you leave [eas] the gate of Sion’s walls …”.\textsuperscript{1305} In this way, its usage shaped an instructive relationship between author and reader. The pilgrim became a sort of guide in their navigation of the urban landscape. However, this form of instruction was predominantly used to direct the reader’s interpretation. Citing the ruined remains on the Temple Mount, the author offered a vivid and didactic presentation:

… Before the altar in marble is the blood of Zacharias – you would say it had been shed today [*ibi dicas Hodie fusum*]. Also all around are the hobnails of the soldiers who killed him, throughout the area, so that you might think [*putes*] they had been pressed in wax …\textsuperscript{1306}

The author’s citation of the blood of Zacharias was not a physical observation but a scriptural insertion. It drew the reader’s attention to a passage on Christ’s judgement of the Temple in *Matthew 23*.\textsuperscript{1307}

… From the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah son of Berekiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar … Truly I tell you, all this will come on this generation. Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her

\textsuperscript{1303} Elsner (2000), noted this distinguishing feature of the *It. Burd.*, whereas Roman *Itineraria* are typically impersonal, using the third person (p. 194-5).

\textsuperscript{1304} Salway (2012) thought the use of the second person, in addition to dative present participles of motion verbs, “definitely read like the sort of practical orientation provided by a modern tourist guidebook”. (pp. 301-2). In contrast, Bowman (1999) interpreted the second person as a sort of “detached impersonality” (p. 169).

\textsuperscript{1305} *It. Burd.* 591.7; 593.1 (*IR* 1, 96-7). See also 556.2; 561.5-6; 562.8; 571.9-19; 595.4-5.


\textsuperscript{1307} For the significance of this passage in Christian interpretations of the Temple Mount, see Chapter 7.
chicks under her wings, and you were not willing. Look, your house is left to you desolate … ¹³⁰⁸

The lack of personal voice in exchange for the second person causes us to consider the value of ‘reading’, as well as ‘seeing’, the Holy Land. The author not only instructed the reader on how to understand the province of Palestine as a ‘Christian’ land, and the city of Jerusalem as a ‘Christian’ city, but also how to engage with these realities without ever setting foot there.

8.3.2. Egeria’s Authorial Voice and Intentions

For an ostensibly personal account, the Itinerary of Egeria makes very few references to its author. There are moments when Egeria confessed her own curiosity¹³⁰⁹ and excitement in seeing her close friend Marthana¹³¹⁰ or observing the furnishings of the churches in Jerusalem.¹³¹¹ However, they are short-lived as she quickly reverted “back to the point” [Sed ut redeam ad rem].¹³¹² The repetition of this phrase implies that there was an agreed ‘point’ to her letter and that such comments were superfluous to that aim. Therefore, it is not that Egeria lacked a vocabulary to describe these aspects of her journey. Rather, they were not of primary importance. A similar restraint is evident in Egeria’s detail of the environment. For someone driven such a distance to see the land of the Bible, she speaks little of the land itself, instead

¹³⁰⁹ ut sum satis curiosa. It. Eg. 16.3. (SC 296, 192).
¹³¹⁰ Quae me cum vidisset, quod guadium illius vel meum esse potuerit, nunquid vel scribere possum? It. Eg. 23.3 (SC 296, 228).
¹³¹¹ Nam quid dicam de ornatu fabricate ipsius, quam Constantinus sub presentia matris suae, in quantum vires regni sui habuit, honoravit auro, musiuo et marmore pretioso, tam ecclesiam maiorem quam Anastasim vel ad Crucem vel cetera loca sancta in Ierusolima? It. Eg. 25.9 (SC 296, 252).
¹³¹² It. Eg. 23.4; 25.10 (SC 296, 228, 252). See also McGowan and Bradshaw (2018), 46.
consolidating it into a few vague “aesthetic judgements”.\textsuperscript{1313} Valleys were endless \textit{[infinitam]} and huge \textit{[ingens]};\textsuperscript{1314} gardens were beautiful \textit{[amoenissimam]},\textsuperscript{1315} and mountains were large and tall \textit{[ingens et altus]}.\textsuperscript{1316} Undoubtedly, Egeria’s focus was on the scriptural significance of the landscape. As a result, the topography was simply pleasing by association.\textsuperscript{1317}

The \textit{Itinerary of Egeria} is formulaic in its praise of each geographic feature, the extraction of its biblical significance, the gracious hospitality of its host, and the unerring enthusiasm and faith of Egeria herself. It is for this reason that some have criticised the text not only for its inelegant Latin syntax, but also for its lack of dynamic.\textsuperscript{1318} Egeria overlooked all elements of difference. Only in brief asides, such as her intriguing observation on the travel practices of the Paranites, are we given glimpses of Palestine beneath the biblical and liturgical veneer.\textsuperscript{1319} This is most glaring in Jerusalem, in which Egeria’s meagre topographical description contrasts with much of what we have already ascertained of the city’s state during the later fourth century.\textsuperscript{1320} While Egeria’s account was not as socially or scenically “empty” as the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1313} Campbell (1988), 24.
\item \textsuperscript{1314} \textit{It. Eg.} 1.1 (\textit{SC} 296, 120).
\item \textsuperscript{1315} \textit{It. Eg.} 15.2, 16.2 (\textit{SC} 296, 188, 190-2)
\item \textsuperscript{1316} \textit{It. Eg.} 16.4 (\textit{SC} 296, 192)
\item \textsuperscript{1317} Leyerle (1996), 128. See also Campbell’s (1988) assertion that “significance precedes existence” in Egeria’s account (p. 22).
\item \textsuperscript{1318} “There is never a mishap, and gradually one almost begins to long for one …”, commented Dronke (1984), 21.
\item \textsuperscript{1319} \textit{It. Eg.} 6.2.
\item \textsuperscript{1320} Most notably, she makes no note of the Jewish Temple Mount, which would have been unmissable for any visitor to the city.
\end{itemize}
Bordeaux Itinerary, she did navigate a fine line between vision and blindness.1321 Egeria’s control reveals much about the pilgrim imagination, the literary practice of conveying pilgrimage and sacred space, as well as one’s ability, whether deliberately or not, to distort geography.1322

While we can only speculate on the prospective readership of the Bordeaux Itinerary, Egeria’s account explicitly existed for the benefit of a specific audience: her company of “sisters” at home in late Roman Galicia.1323 Egeria addressed her sisters several times throughout the text, often directing their attention to something she deemed particularly important. It is in her direct addresses that the purpose of Egeria’s text became most clear. Egeria later confessed that the aim of her letter was to inform them of her experiences so that they might “better picture [pervidet] what happened in these places.”1324 Considering Egeria’s text as a letter oriented around this aim helps to re-adjust our expectations.

Providing a generous interpretation of Egeria’s writing style, L. Spitzer considered her use of the first person as an early example of the impersonal, ‘didactic I’, with which she accommodated her readers to insert themselves into the pilgrimage.1325 M. Campbell developed Spitzer’s theory further, considering Egeria’s “rhetorical presence” as creating a “transcendent” and “transpersonal” account of

---

1321 Campbell (1988); (1991), 27.
1322 On ideological distortion in the practice and documentation of pilgrimage, see Bowman (1992).
1323 It. Eg. 3.7; 12.7; 20.5. See also Campbell (1988), 17.
1324 It. Eg. 5.8.
1325 Spitzer (1949), 256.
More important than conveying the specific details of Holy Land was relating a “universalized experience” of it. As such, Egeria’s observations were primarily written for the benefit of her readers and their scriptural understanding. To this end, she collapsed the geographic distance through a sense of familiarity. Egeria capitalised on the aspects that they could benefit from in their own worship; it was to their own bibles and familiar liturgical practices that Egeria bid her readers turn. In this respect, the instructional role of the pilgrim in contextualising their audience’s scriptural experience is an element shared between the two itineraries. In their shared prioritisation of the reader, the authorial presence of both the Bordeaux pilgrim and Egeria receded.

8.4. Conclusion: Conceptualising an Ideal and Accessible Jerusalem

Over the course of this chapter, I have considered two texts, the Bordeaux Itinerary and the Itinerary of Egeria, as valuable accounts that bookend our period of interest in the development of Jerusalem, from 325 CE to 385 CE. By examining the organisation, content, and authorial voice of both documents, their similarities became apparent as texts of ‘spatial practice’. Considering the dynamic relationship between pilgrim, place, and text, I considered the content of pilgrim accounts and their textual mediation of topography. In this respect, both itineraries attest to the growing significance of the sacred topography and the pilgrim’s participation in the Christianisation, and idealisation, of Jerusalem. However, their accounts also reveal agency in the conceptualisation and conveyance of Jerusalem. In this respect, the very

---

1327 Campbell (1988), 27.
existence of pilgrimage documents signifies the transmission of topography back into text. The pilgrims’ desire to articulate their experiences for the scriptural benefit of their readers offered a more universalised experience. The product was an ideal and accessible city on earth.
When J.Z. Smith titled his compilation of essays on space and religion *Map is Not Territory*, he drew on a phrase first popularised by the mathematician A. Korzybski. Korzybski’s original intention was to target the semanticisation of mathematics and the imperceptible notion of ‘infinity’. However, he also drew comparisons to the limitations of language and mapping as comparable abstractions: “Words are not the things they represent”, “Map is not the territory” – representations are not reality. The practical and self-evident application of this is that the theological treatises and pilgrimage diaries, on which we are dependent, inform us of the representation of Jerusalem, rather than its reality. This is the challenge of the historian who, “like the pilgrim”, Smith poetically described, “must circumambulate the spot several times before making even the most fleeting contact”.

In this study, I have attempted to make ‘fleeting contact’ with fourth-century Jerusalem by traversing its primary spaces. Without an attention to spatiality, we run the risk of detaching ourselves from the physical city, on which so much ideological import was invested. Therefore, my engagement with the theological discourse of Jerusalem as it is presented in the works of theologians such as Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem has ultimately been rooted in the context of the fourth-century city. The spatial element, I have argued, has been an underappreciated component of Jerusalem’s rise in significance during this period. However, it is also an essential
component of the sources themselves. It is difficult, if not impossible, to separate the Catechetical Lectures from the setting in which they are so deeply embedded.

By first delving into a broader spatial and historical context, as was presented in Chapters 2 and 3, I traced the relationship between urban change and Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem. In the case of the first and second centuries, the comprehensive re-inscription of the city with the foundation of Aelia Capitolina spurred an orientation toward the immutable Jerusalem ‘above’ in early Christianity. As was evident in Origen’s transference of the omphalos heavenward – to the metropolis above – the spiritual and eschatological Jerusalem functioned as a sort of counterspace to urban reality.\(^\text{1331}\) It reveals most clearly the application of a Utopian map.

However, the spatial and ideological circumstances changed in the early fourth century, as imperial investment in Jerusalem prompted a narrative of transformation in Christian sources. Revitalised discussion about the theological significance of the earthly Jerusalem reflects its transition to the Locative plane, as R.A. Markus had observed so well. However, it was the emerging idea of a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem that most clearly reflects its journey from periphery to centre. The Locative orientation, as Smith first designed, infused space with “meaning and value through structures of congruity and conformity”.\(^\text{1332}\) In no place is this more evident than the strategic organisation of the Encaenia festival in 335 CE. Its temporal positioning imitated – and perfected – the spatial positioning of the Golgotha Church. It gave the impression

\(^{1331}\) Origen, De Prin. 4.3.9

\(^{1332}\) Smith (1978), 292.
of a comprehensive spatial and ideological supersession. The dedication of Constantine’s church encapsulated the notion of a re-inscribed ‘Christian’ Jerusalem, which was “laid palimpsest-like” over its Jewish and Roman past.1333

However, the palimpsest merely gives the impression of erasure. Both time and technology have unveiled the work that came before – the *scriptio inferior*, or “undertext” of medieval manuscripts. In the same way, the underlying reality of Jerusalem, continuously revised through archaeological excavation and critical textual inquiry, suggests that a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem did not emerge fully formed in 335 CE. The subsequent development of ecclesiastical spaces, discussed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, reveals the degree to which the ideological importance of Jerusalem was enriched through liturgical interaction, ecclesiastical ascendancy, and monasticism. However, this development was primarily concentrated to the undeveloped peripheries of the fourth-century city, to Mount Zion and the Mount of Olives. The conceptual integration of these outlying areas into Jerusalem suggests that the Christianisation of the urban centre might not have been as swift and comprehensive as previously believed. Likewise, the continued presence of the Temple Mount, in contrast to its erasure in Christian representation (Chapter 7), illuminates the extent to which the spaces and borders of Jerusalem were distorted and inverted to create the impression of an ‘ideal’ Jerusalem. In this respect, the very notion of a ‘Christian’ Jerusalem was also detached from its physical state: it was Utopian, in the common sense of the term.

We can trace the idealistic tendencies of Christian representation in the first accounts of Christian pilgrimage written during this period. As discussed in Chapter 8,

---

1333 Smith (1987), 79.
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textual and narrative analysis illuminates the pilgrim’s scriptural engagement with the landscape, as well as their process of transmitting experience back into text. As such, we encounter not only the pilgrim’s engagement with material and ideology, but also their inclination to uphold expectations for their audiences.\textsuperscript{1334} Pilgrims were both active and passive forces in the representation of Christian topography. Comparative study of the \textit{Bordeaux Itinerary} and the \textit{Itinerary of Egeria} has displayed the meanings they etched into the ‘Holy Land’.

Referring to a pilgrimage account as a sort of “Mental-”\textsuperscript{1335}, “Cognitive-”\textsuperscript{1336} or “Cultural”\textsuperscript{1337} map makes Korzybski’s observation plainly clear. Maps are \textit{not} territories. The blatant erasure of the Temple Mount from Egeria’s portrayal of Jerusalem mirrors its vacancy on the Madaba map. In both cases, absence directly opposes what we know of topographic reality.\textsuperscript{1338} Nevertheless, maps provide us with a semblance of territory and a guide for navigating it. Just as we can draw the urban composition of Jerusalem from the amalgamation of buildings tessellated on the Madaba Map, we can trace the route that the Bordeaux Pilgrim took around Jerusalem. While the \textit{Itinerary} prioritised text to topography, it nevertheless maintained its function as a “guidebook” to geography.\textsuperscript{1339}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1334} See Bowman (1992).
\textsuperscript{1335} Weingarten (2005), 197.
\textsuperscript{1336} Leyerle (1996), 121.
\textsuperscript{1337} Jacobs (2004), 106.
\textsuperscript{1338} Tsafrir (1999d), 158.
\textsuperscript{1339} Cf. Bowman (1999), 170.
\end{flushright}
While Korzybski’s adage provides necessary caution to our reliance on maps, we are, as Smith concluded, reliant on them, nonetheless. In understanding the circumstances of Jerusalem during the fourth century and its place in late-antique Christianity, the Utopian and Locative have been helpful visualisations of the inward and outward motions of Christianity and the potential for conformity and rebellion in the production of sacred space. However, there are limitations to their application. While we might trace a shift from the Utopian to the Locative in Christian conceptualisations of Jerusalem, the city ultimately exists in spatial ambiguity. There is always tension between ‘above’ and ‘below’ when talking about Jerusalem.

As W. Pullan astutely acknowledged, the practice and symbolism of pilgrimage is both complicated and enriched by this ambiguity. Pilgrims confirmed the importance and centrality of the earthly Jerusalem, while also creating universal experience through the literary packaging and scriptural application designed for an audience far afield. The composition of an ideal and accessible Jerusalem in the accounts of early Christian pilgrims seemingly upends the Utopian and Locative divide. In addition, pilgrimage did not solely denote a journey to the region of Palestine, but one’s estrangement from their ultimate, eternal home in the Jerusalem ‘above’. The *Itinerary of Egeria* effectively straddles this divide in the conclusion of her pilgrimage. As Egeria considered the dangerous and uncertain journey home, she questioned whether she would “remain in the body” long enough to relay her experiences first-
hand or whether her sisters would have to rely solely on her written words. In doing so, she expressed her immediate and eternal role as pilgrim to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1342}

As we puzzle at the ambiguity of Jerusalem, it is convenient that Smith offered a third possibility: the map of “Incongruity”, which exists somewhere in between.\textsuperscript{1343} As the Utopian map paired well with Lefebvre’s ‘Spaces of Representation’ and the Locative map with ‘Representations of Space’, ‘Spatial practice’ composes the movement in between these two poles.\textsuperscript{1344} The resulting picture of Jerusalem is a city “intermingled” – suspended between history and eschatology, material and symbol, local and universal – a Utopian Jerusalem on earth.\textsuperscript{1345}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{1342}] \textit{It, Eg}. 23.10.
\item[\textsuperscript{1343}] Smith (1978), 309.
\item[\textsuperscript{1344}] Knott (2005a).
\item[\textsuperscript{1345}] Pullan (2007).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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Figure 1 Topographical Map of Jerusalem. Designed by Leen Ritmeyer.
Figure 2 Map of Second Temple Jerusalem. Geva (1993a), 718.
Figure 3 Bar Kokhba Tetradracham. Avi-Yonah (1968), 329, pl. 1.
Figure 4 Madaba Mosaic. Judith McKenzie/Manar al-Athar
Figure 5 The Old City of Jerusalem with the remains of the Roman, Byzantine and Ummayad periods noted. The cardines are highlight in Green. Avni and Stiebel (2016), 10 (fig. 2).
Figure 6 Aelia Capitolina according to Eliav (2005), 107.
Figure 7 Rev. COL(onia) AEL(ia) KAPIT(olina) COND(ita) – “The founding of the Colony of Aelia Capitolina”. Ceremonial Plough. Eshel (1997).

Figure 8 Rev. COL(onia) AEL(ia) KAP(itolina) - “The Colony of Aelia Capitolina”. Distyle temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (Jupiter, Minerva, and Juno). Meshorer (1989), 1.
Figures 9 and 10 Jerusalem during the late Herodian Period (Left) and Aelia Capitolina (Right) in Geva (2014), 146, 149.

Figure 11 Stages of development within the urban context of Jerusalem; in particular, Golgotha and the Temple Mount. The left reconstruction covers the period from 135 to 325 CE. The right construction covers the fourth to eleventh centuries. Kelley (2020), 19.
Figure 12 Jerusalem Ship Drawing and Inscription. Broshi and Barkay (1985), 126
Figure 13 The Church of the Holy Sepulchre during the Late Roman Period (Remnants of building material). Gibson and Taylor (1994), 66.
Figure 14 Fourth-Century Jerusalem. Weksler-Bdolah (2019), 132.
Figure 15  Pewter Flasks from the Treasury of the Monza Cathedral and Bobbio Abbey. Fig 4.19 in Kelley (2020), 103.

Figure 16  Reconstruction of the Constantinian Complex after Eusebius’ Life of Constantine in Vincent and Abel (1914), 155.
Figure 17 Architectural Plan of the Fourth-Century Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Corbo (1981) Pl. 3.

Figure 18 Boomer and Ousterhout’s (2018) redrawing of Corbo’s (1981) plan with northern baptistery (p. 171).
Table 1: The “structural units” of the baptismal liturgy of Jerusalem and their spaces, according to the Mystagogical Catecheses
Figure 20 Zion Church and the Cenacle according to Vincent. Clausen (2015), 283.

Figure 21 Zion Church and the Cenacle according to Renard. Clausen (2015), 283
Figure 22 Topographical Map of Jerusalem. Drawn by Leen Ritmeyer.
Figure 23 Eleona Church Plan and Reconstruction. Galor and Bloedhorn (2013), 136, after Vincent and Abel (1914), plate 34.

Figure 24 Church of the Nativity Plan. Richmond (1938), redrawn by Bacci, et al. (2012).
Figure 25 Liturgical Stations in Jerusalem. Mapped by Smith (1987), 93. Note 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 for stations in the region of the Mount of Olives; compare to Bethlehem at 9.
Figure 26 Apse Mosaic, Santa Pudenziana; Artstor, library-artstor
org.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk/asset/ASJAMES_10313460206
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§§ 1-6.4&lt;sup&gt;1346&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mount Sinai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 10-12</td>
<td>Mount Nebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 13-16</td>
<td>To Carneas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 17-21</td>
<td>Seleucia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 23.6-10&lt;sup&gt;1347&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1346</sup> Egeria then detoured to Goshen (§§ 7-9). See also Peter the Deacon, *Loc. Sanct.*, V9-Y17.

<sup>1347</sup> Adapted from Wilkinson (1971), 29-30.

*Table 2* Egeria’s journeys outside of Jerusalem, according to the *It. Eg.*
Table 3 Outline of liturgical festivals in the It. Eg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§§ 24-25.5</th>
<th>Daily Services and Sunday Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§§ 25.6-26</td>
<td>Epiphany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 26</td>
<td>Fortieth day of Epiphany (Presentation at the Temple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 27-29</td>
<td>Lenten Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 30-38</td>
<td>Great Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 39-40</td>
<td>Easter Week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1348 See It. Eg. § 41 for the days between Easter and Pentecost.

1349 Egeria’s description of the liturgical schedule on the fortieth day of Easter is perplexing. While tradition regards this as the day of the Ascension, Egeria documented an unexpected procession to Bethlehem, not the Mount of Olives. While this had led some (e.g. Wilkinson (1971), 49–51; Hunt (1982), 162) to conclude that the Church of the Ascension was not yet constructed, this does not explain the diversion to Bethlehem, as the Eleona would have been the most logical alternative. The instance is confused further as Egeria noted the preaching in Bethlehem to be apta dei et loco (It. Eg. 42). In addition, a procession to the Inbomon for readings on Christ’s Ascension occurred later in the year, as part of the Pentecost festivities (It. Eg. 43.4). On these grounds, it has been convincingly argued (Devos (1968); Baldovin (1987), 90; Verhelst (1999), 140) that a coinciding festival, likely that of the Holy Innocents, caused the Jerusalem congregation to make a special trip to Bethlehem during Egeria’s pilgrimage.

1350 See It. Eg. 44 for the daily services after Pentecost. In It. Eg. 45-48, Egeria digressed to the period of Christian initiation. This placement is confusing.

Natalie Smith | 330
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Stations$^{331}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Lazarus’ Saturday</td>
<td><em>Lazarium, Anastasis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td><em>Eleona, Imbomon, Anastasis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><em>Martyrium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td><em>Martyrium, Eleona</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td><em>Martyrium, Anastasis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td><em>Martyrium, Anastasis, Eleona, Imbomon, Gethsemane,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td><em>Calvary, Martyrium, Anastasis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td><em>Anastasis, Martyrium</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4 Stations of the Great Week in the It. Eg.*

$^{331}$ Here, I exclude the customary morning service at the *Anastasis*. 